

Exhibit No.:

Issue(s):

Witness:

Type of Exhibit:

Sponsoring Party:

Case Number:

Date Testimony Prepared:

---

Cost of Service

Barbara Meisenheimer

Surrebuttal

Public Counsel

ER-2005-0436

December 13, 2005

## **SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**BARBARA MEISENHEIMER**

Submitted on Behalf of  
the Office of the Public Counsel

**AQUILA, INC.**

**Case No. ER-2005-0436**

December 13, 2005

In the Matter of the Tariff Filing of Aquila, Inc., )  
to Implement a General Rate Increase for Retail ) Case No. ER-2005-0436  
Electric Service Provided to Customers in its )  
MPS and L&P Missouri Service Areas. )

**STATE OF MISSOURI            )**  
   )  
**COUNTY OF COLE              )          ss**


1. My name is Barbara A. Meisenheimer. I am Chief Utility Economist for the Office of the Public Counsel.
2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my surrebuttal testimony consisting of pages 1 through 3.
3. I hereby swear and affirm that my statements contained in the attached testimony are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

  
Barbara Meisenheimer

Subscribed and sworn to me this 13<sup>th</sup> day of December 2005.



JERENE A. BUCKMAN  
My Commission Expires  
August 10, 2009  
Cole County  
Commission #05754036

  
Jerene A. Buckman  
 Notary Public

My commission expires August 10, 2009.

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY  
OF  
BARBARA MEISENHEIMER**

**AQUILA INC.**

**CASE NO. ER-2005-0436**

1       **Q.       PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2       A.       Barbara A. Meisenheimer, Chief Utility Economist, Office of the Public Counsel,  
3               P. O. 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

4       **Q.       HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED IN THIS CASE?**

5       A.       Yes, I submitted direct testimony on cost of service and rate design issues on  
6               October 28, 2005 and rebuttal testimony on November 18, 2005.

7       **Q.       WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

8       A.       The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimony of  
9               Aquila Inc. (Aquila or the Company), the Public Service Commission Staff (Staff)  
10              and Brubaker & Associates filed on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies, the  
11              St. Joe Industrial Group and the Sedalia Industrial Energy Users' Association  
12              (Industrials).

1       **Q.       IN PREPARATION OF YOUR TESTIMONY, WHAT MATERIALS DID YOU REVIEW?**

2       A.       I have reviewed the rebuttal testimony of Matt Tracy filed on behalf of Aquila,  
3               the rebuttal testimony and supporting documentation of James Watkins filed on  
4               behalf of the Staff, and the rebuttal testimony and supporting documentation of  
5               Maurice Brubaker filed on behalf of the Industrials.

6       **Q.       PLEASE SUMMARIZE MATT TRACY’S CONCERNS WITH YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY.**

7       A.       On page 7 of his rebuttal testimony Mr. Tracy criticizes the study in my direct  
8               testimony in this case as in error because it is the same as from my rebuttal  
9               testimony in TO-2002-0384 and did not reflect issues discussed in surrebuttal.

10      **Q.       WHY WAS THE STUDY IN YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE THE SAME AS**  
11      **THAT FILED IN YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN TO-2002-0384?**

12      A.       The surrebuttal in Case No. TO-2002-0384 was filed on the same day as the direct  
13               testimony in this case. I proposed no additional changes to my cost study until I  
14               testified in the live hearing that began November 7<sup>th</sup> 2005, at which time, I  
15               accepted some of Mr. Brubaker’s recommendations. These changes are reflected  
16               in my rebuttal testimony in this case.

17      **Q.       DO YOU HAVE ANY RESPONSE TO THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF JAMES**  
18      **WATKINS?**

19      A.       Yes. I agree with Mr. Watkins at pages 3-4 of his rebuttal testimony, in which he  
20               recommends that energy charges be applied to each class based on an equal-cents-  
21               per-kilowatt-hour basis. Mr. Watkins has offered no new study results or specific

1 rate design recommendations so I have no additional comments on these issues at  
2 this time.

3 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY RESPONSE TO THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF MR. BRUBAKER?**

4 A. No. Mr. Brubaker has offered no new study results or specific rate design  
5 recommendations in his rebuttal testimony. His testimony appears primarily to  
6 submit into the record, his direct, rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony from EO-  
7 2002-384. I have addressed these issues in my testimony in EO-2002-384 and in  
8 the direct and rebuttal testimony in this case. I have no additional comments on  
9 these issues at this time.

10 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

11 A. Yes.