

Exhibit No.:

Issue(s):

Witness/Type of Exhibit:

Sponsoring Party:

Case No.:

Cost of Service/
Rate Design

Meisenheimer/Rebuttal

Public Counsel

ER-2010-0355

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER

Submitted on Behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel

Kansas City Power & Light

Class Cost of Service and Rate Design

CASE NO. ER-2010-0355

December 10, 2010

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF
BARBARA A. MEISENHEIMER
KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT
(CLASS COST OF SERVICE AND RATE DESIGN)
CASE NO. ER-2010-0355

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

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

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

5 A. Yes, I filed testimony with the Missouri Public Service Commission. (PSC or Commission)
6 regarding class cost of service and rate design issues on November 24, 2010. I also filed
7 rebuttal testimony on revenue requirement on December 8, 2010.

8 **Q. IN PREPARING YOUR TESTIMONY, WHAT MATERIAL DID YOU REVIEW?**

9 A. I have reviewed the direct rate design testimony and Class Cost of Service Report filed on
10 behalf of the PSC Staff and the direct testimony filed on behalf of the Missouri Industrial
11 Energy Consumers (MIEC).

12 **Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MIEC WITNESS MAURICE BRUBAKER'S DERIVATION OF AN AVERAGE**
13 **AND EXCESS PRODUCTION COST ALLOCATOR?**

1 A. No. Mr. Brubaker's method of selecting non-coincident peak (NCP) demands for use in his
2 Average and Excess (A&E) production allocators is incorrect. On page 49 of the 1992
3 NARUC Electric Cost Allocation Manual (NARUC Manual) it states that the required data
4 for the A&E method "are the annual maximum and average demands for each customer
5 class and the system load factor." NCPs are used to represent the annual maximum demand
6 for each class. However, Mr. Brubaker limits his selection of NCPs used in his 4 NCP
7 A&E allocator to the summer months of June through September and limits his selection of
8 NCPs for his 2 NCP A&E allocator to the summer months of June disproportionately. His
9 NCP selection ignores actual KCP&L data demonstrating that for many rate schedules the
10 customers' annual maximum demands occur outside of the limited periods that Mr.
11 Brubaker considers. As a result, the Excess component of his A&E allocators distorts the
12 allocation of costs to customer classes; over allocating costs to customer classes that use
13 disproportionately more electricity in the months that Mr. Brubaker selected and under
14 allocating costs to customer classes that use disproportionately more electricity at other
15 times of the year. Schedule BAM RD REB-1 and Schedule BAM RD REB-2 illustrate how
16 Mr. Brubaker's proposals for selecting the NCPs from a limited number of months differ
17 from selecting NCPs whenever they occur throughout the year. The shaded boxes
18 correspond to the highest annual NCPs. It is clear from the Schedules that for a number of
19 rate schedules the NCPs occur outside Mr. Brubaker's selection months.

20

1 **Q. DOES MR. BRUBAKER'S CHOICE OF NCPS RESULT IN A HIGHER ALLOCATION OF COSTS TO**
2 **THE RESIDENTIAL CLASS?**

3 A. Yes. Schedule BAM RD REB-1 and Schedule BAM RD REB-2 include calculations
4 demonstrating the difference in the A&E allocators derived from using Mr. Brubaker's
5 NCPs compared to using NCPs from throughout the year. Limiting the NCP selection
6 produces a lower allocation of costs to the Large General Service class while increasing the
7 allocation to the Residential class. For example, based on a 4 NCP, Mr. Brubaker's
8 selection of NCPs from a limited number of months results in an allocation of 51.71% to
9 the Residential class and only 15.71% to the Large General Service class compared to a
10 51.24% allocation to the Residential class and a 17.10% allocation to the Large General
11 Service class that would be produced by selecting NCPs based on annual maximums. Based
12 on a 2 NCP, Mr. Brubaker's selection of NCPs from a limited number of months results in
13 an allocation of 54.18% to the Residential class and only 14.71% to the Large General
14 Service class compared to a 53.00% allocation to the Residential class and a 16.28%
15 allocation to the Large General Service class that would be produced by selecting NCPs
16 based on annual maximums. These allocation differences can have significant impacts on
17 the class cost assignments due to the large amount of investment and expenses that are
18 allocated based on a production allocator. As illustrated on page 10 of the PSC Staff Rate
19 Design and Class Cost of Service Report, production capacity is the largest functionalized
20 cost category representing 40% of the cost of investment and associated expenses. The

1 Average and Excess production method proposed by Mr. Brubaker should be rejected
2 because of its unreasonable over allocation of costs to the Residential class.

3 **Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. BRUBAKER'S CONCLUSION THAT OFF-SYSTEM SALES REVENUE**
4 **SHOULD BE ALLOCATED ON THE BASIS OF KWH?**

5 A. No. To allocate off system sales revenue on energy alone as Mr. Brubaker suggests would
6 ignore that plant investment is a component of the cost of generating off-system sales
7 volumes.

8 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

9 A. Yes, it does.

