Exhibit No.:

Issue(s):

Witness/Type of Exhibit:

Sponsoring Party:

Case No.:

Payne/Rebuttal

Public Counsel

WR-2023-0344

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MANZELL PAYNE

Submitted on Behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel

RAYTOWN WATER COMPANY

CASE NO. WR-2023-0344

October 24, 2023

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MANZELL M PAYNE

	RAYTOWN WATER COMPANY				
		CASE NO. WR-2023-0344			
1	Q.	Please state your name, title, and business address.			
2	A.	Manzell Payne, Utility Regulatory Auditor, Office of the Public Counsel ("OPC" or "Public			
2		Counsel"), P.O. Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.			
4	Q.	What are your qualifications and experience?			
5	A.	Please refer to the Schedule MMP-R-1 attached hereto.			
6	Q. A.	Have you testified previously before the Missouri Public Service Commission?			
7	A.	No, I have not.			
8	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?			
9	A.	I intend to respond to the rate case expense calculation and amount in the audit report that was			
10		attached to Keith Foster's direct testimony in this case. Further, I will respond to Raytown			
11		Water Company ("Company") witness Neal S Clevenger's effort to include the recent			
12		retention of counsel into this rate case's revenue requirement.			
13	RATE CASE EXPENSE				
14	Q.	How has Staff developed the amount of rate case expense it has included in this rate			
15		case?			
16	A.	To quote Staff from its Auditing Department Report included with the non-unanimous			
17		agreement in this case:			
18		Rate Case Expense			
19		Staff used a two-case average of rate case expense. By using a two-			

Staff used a two-case average of rate case expense. By using a two-case average, Staff is normalizing rate case expense while capturing costs RWC will continue to incur in this proceeding. Staff recommends normalizing this cost over a two-year period. The normalized amount of rate case expense included in Staff's revenue requirement is \$5,856.

3

8

11

16 17

> 18 19

20

21 22

24 25

23

Q. Staff has applied this two-case average to Raytown rate cases for at least the past three cases. Why are you opposing this treatment of rate case expense?

A. Staff's attempt to normalize rate case expense is not taking into consideration the built-in, ongoing level of rate case expense that the Company recovers in rates *every* year. Currently, the amount of rate case expense that is imbedded in rates is \$5,146 annually¹. Staff's approach does not realize that rate case expense has already been recovered from customers prior to every upcoming rate case.

Q. Could you clarify this point?

A. Yes. In WR-2015-0246, Staff included \$5,826.58 in rates to satisfy a two case amount of \$17,479.73. This amount was a normalization over three years. (Schedule MMP-R-2) However, the Company did not request another rate increase for five years. So, while Staff was developing a revenue requirement for WR-2020-0264, the Company was collecting \$5,826.58 for an expense that had been satisfied two years earlier.

As represented in a rate case expense workpaper for this case, (MMP-R-3) Staff acknowledged that the 2020 rate case costs were \$8,593. As previously mentioned, \$5,146 is the ongoing amount of rate case expense built into the 2020 revenue requirement. So roughly \$15,429 in rate case expense has been recovered since the 2020 case, far more than the actual amount of rate case expense of the current test year. As we are debating the revenue requirement that Staff is proposing to apply to Raytown's rates; the Company is still collecting an annualized amount of \$5,146 in rate case expense for a current actual outlay of \$3,119.

- Q. Do you agree with Mr. Clevenger's request to include the cost to retain an attorney in rate case expense in this case?
- A. No. Mr. Clevenger has argued in testimony that the Company's rate case expense should reflect the ongoing expenses of hiring legal counsel for a possible hearing. However, due to my above point, I believe ratepayers have provided more than enough compensation to the

¹ WR-2020-0264, Auditing Unit Recommendation Memorandum, Accounting Schedule 9 – Income Statement, Schedule 10, Adjustments to Income Statement Detail., Top of Page 4 of 5

Rebuttal Testimony of Manzell M Payne Case No. WR-2023-0344

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

Company. The Company has collected and will continue to collect ample money through rate case expense for the retention of an attorney.

Q. What are your recommendations for rate case expense?

A. I am recommending that the rate case expense included in rates be only for the amount of current rate case expense (\$3,119). Rate case expense for this case should exclude the residual rate case expense from WR-2020-0264 due to these expenses having already been paid for by rate payers. The new amount of rate case expense included, should be sufficient enough to satisfy \$3,119 in existing costs plus the retention of an attorney for a rate case hearing.

Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

A. Yes it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of a Rate Increase of Raytown Water Company)	Case No. WR-2023-0344
æ		

AFFIDAVIT OF MANZELL PAYNE

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS
COUNTY OF COLE)	

Manzell Payne, of lawful age and being first duly sworn, deposes and states:

- 1. My name is Manzell Payne. I am a Utility Regulatory Auditor for the Office of the Public Counsel.
 - 2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my rebuttal testimony.
- 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.

Manzell Payne

Utility Regulatory Auditor

Subscribed and sworn to me this 23rd day of October 2023.

TIFFANY HILDEBRAND
NOTARY PUBLIC - NOTARY SEAL
STATE OF MISSOURI
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES AUGUST 8, 2027
COLE COUNTY
COMMISSION #15637121

My Commission expires August 8, 2027.

Tiffan Hildebrand

Notary Public