Exhibit No.: 1,133

Issues: Miscellaneous Charges;

Miscellaneous Tariff

Issues

Witness: William L. McDuffey

Sponsoring Party: MO PSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony

Case No.: ER-2004-0034

Date Testimony Prepared: February 13, 2004 as modified February 27, 2004

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

WILLIAM L. MCDUFFEY

AQUILA, INC. D/B/A AQUILA NETWORKS--MPS

CASE NO. ER-2004-0034

Jefferson City, Missouri February 2004

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In The Matter Of Aquila, Inc Networks L&P And Aquila To Implement A General R Electricity	Networks MPS)	
AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM L. MCDUFFEY		
STATE OF MISSOURI COUNTY OF COLE)) ss)	
William L. McDuffey, of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the following testimony, as modified, in question and answer form, consisting of pages of testimony to be presented in the above case, that the answers in the following testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.		
	<u> William L. McDuffey</u> William L. McDuffey	
Subscribed and sworn to be	efore me this day of February, 2004.	
	DAWN L. HAKE Notary Public Notary	
My commission expires	County of Cole My Commission Expires Jan 9, 2005	

1	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2	OF
3	WILLIAM L. MCDUFFEY
4	AQUILA, INC.
5	D/B/A AQUILA NETWORKS-MPS
6	
7	CASE NO. ER-2004-0034
8	
9	Q. Please state your name and business address.
10	A. William "Mack" L. McDuffey, 200 Madison Street, Jefferson City
11	Missouri 65101.
12	Q. Are you the same William L. McDuffey who previously filed Direct and
13	Rebuttal Testimony in this case?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. What is the purpose of your Surrebuttal Testimony in this case?
16	A. The purpose of my Surrebuttal Testimony is to address the late paymen
17	charges (LPC) applicable to the electric operations of Aquila, Inc. ("Aquila") d/b/a
18	Aquila Networks-L&P ("L&P") and Aquila Networks-MPS ("MPS") filed by Aquila
19	Inc. witness J. Matt Tracy in his Rebuttal Testimony.
20	LATE PAYMENT CHARGE
21	Q. What is Aquila witness Tracy's position regarding the LPC?

A. In his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Tracy stated,

2 3 4

5 6 7

8 9 10

11 12

13

14

15

16

18 19

17

24 25 26

27 28

29 30 31

32

33

34

"Mr. McDuffey's analysis looks at the proposed charge as the Company's carrying cost, as an interest payment on the Company's involuntary loan to the customer. As I explained in my Direct Testimony, page 5, lines 18–20 (should be lines 16-18), the Company's LPC reimburses the Company for the handling cost, with no provision for the time value of money. The 0.5% Mr. McDuffey proposes should be added to the 1.5% currently charged by Aquila Networks – MPS, because it recovers a different cost."

Q. Do you agree with Aquila's position relating to the handling costs and time value of money for the LPC?

- A. No. The LPC should be based on a reasonable level of cost. The present monthly charge of 1.5% that is compounded is not reflective of the current monetary borrowing environment. Administrative costs to handle customer billings are already included in the cost of service.
 - Q. On page 2 of Mr. Tracy' Rebuttal Testimony he states that,

"Missouri's three other investor owned utilities ("IOU's") all have charges that equal or exceed what the Company is proposing. KCPL charges residential customers 2% on the first \$50, 1% on the remainder, and may charge interest at an additional 6% per annum. For non-residential service, the first \$50 is charged 5%. AmerenUE charges 1.5%, compounded. Empire charges residential customers 1.5%, small commercial customers 5%, and large commercial customers 2%. As I noted in my Direct Testimony, page 5, lines 15–16, Aquila Networks-L&P's current LPC is 1.25%, and Aguila Networks – MPS's is 1.5%."

Do you agree with that assessment?

A. Yes. Mr. Tracy's reference for the LPC in the present tariffs of the other regulated electric companies is true. The Staff is currently proposing the position that the LPC should reflect the current monetary borrowing environment for each electric and gas utility. Staff proposed this position in a gas company rate case with positive results.

Surrebuttal Testimony of
William L. McDuffey

24

3.

1	Q. On page 2 of Mr. Tracy's Rebuttal Testimony, he poses the question of
2	who should pay for the cost imposed on the Company. He also states that customers
3	subject to the LPC are imposing an administrative cost and a carrying cost on the
4	Company. Those costs do not stop after the first month, but in fact increase. Failing to
5	compound the LPC simply shifts those costs to customers that pay their bills on time.
6	Has he provided any studies to support this assertion?
7	A. No. The Company has not provided, to date, any supporting
8	documentation detailing the additional costs the Company incurs for the LPC. The
9	Company assumes that because every other utility has a 1.5% LPC in their tariffs, then
10	that is an appropriate amount to charge.
11	Q. On page 3 of Mr. Tracy's Rebuttal Testimony, he asserts that the
12	Company incurs additional costs by waiving the LPC when energy assistance money is
13	being credited against a customer's bill. Do you agree?
14	A. No. The Company receives energy assistance payments already and
15	should be able to track those currently in their books. As I have stated previously, there
16	should not be additional costs related to the record keeping of energy assisted payments.
17	Aquila has not provided any support for the 1.5% monthly LPC.
18	Q. Mr. McDuffey, has your position regarding the LPC changed from your
19	Direct Testimony?
20	A. No, I will summarize my position:
21	1. LPC equal to 0.5% of that month's current delinquent amount
22 23	2. No charge during energy assistance payments

Charge reflects Company cost to carry additional month

Surrebuttal Testimony of William L. McDuffey 4. Aquila's rates adjusted to reflect any change in charge Q. Does this conclude your Surrebuttal Testimony? A. Yes, it does.