Filed
September 28, 2022
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No. 31

Evergy Missouri Metro – Exhibit 31 Jim Flucke Surrebuttal Testimony File Nos. ER-2022-0129 & ER-2022-0130

Exhibit:

Issue: Transmission ROE; Transource

Witness: Jim Flucke

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony

Sponsoring Party: Evergy Missouri Metro and Evergy

Missouri West

Case Nos.: ER-2022-0129 / 0130

Date Testimony Prepared: August 16, 2022

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2022-0129 / 0130

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JIM FLUCKE

ON BEHALF OF

EVERGY MISSOURI METRO and EVERGY MISSOURI METRO

Kansas City, Missouri August 2022

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JIM FLUCKE

Case No. ER-2022-0129 / 0130

1		I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>
2	Q:	Please state your name and business address.
3	A:	My name is Jim Flucke. My business address is 1200 Main, Kansas City, Missouri 64105.
4	Q:	Are you the same Jim Flucke who submitted direct and rebuttal testimony in these
5		dockets on January 7, 2022 and July 13, 2022?
6	A:	Yes.
7	Q:	On whose behalf are you testifying?
8	A:	I am testifying on behalf of Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro ("Evergy
9		Missouri Metro") and Evergy Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West ("Evergy
10		Missouri West") (collectively, the "Company" or "Evergy").
11	Q:	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?
12	A:	The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the Wholesale Revenue Credit
13		rebuttal testimony of Missouri Public Service Commission ("MPSC") Staff witness Karen
14		Lyons.
15	Q:	What is Staff's position regarding the Company's proposed return on equity
16		("ROE") adjustment in the transmission revenues received from SPP for other
17		Transmission Customers' use of Evergy's transmission facilities?
18	A:	Staff recommended that transmission revenues not be adjusted to reflect the differences
19		between MPSC- and FERC-authorized ROE as discussed in my direct testimony.

1	Q:	What is the Company's position regarding Staff's recommendation to not adjust for
2		the ROE differences?

Q:

A:

A:

As I discussed in my rebuttal testimony, the Company does not agree with Staff's exclusion of the adjustment nor does the Company agree with Staff's flawed rationale for its exclusion of the adjustment. The adjustment was proposed to correct a situation where the crediting of transmission revenue results in the Company receiving less than the MPSC authorized return from Missouri retail customers.

Why does Staff's transmission revenue crediting result in the Company earning less than the MPSC authorized ROE?

Under the current Missouri retail ratemaking methodology, all of the Company-owned transmission assets and related expenses are included in the calculation of the gross retail revenue requirement. This gross retail revenue requirement is based on a MPSC authorized ROE. The transmission revenue crediting occurs when the Company charges other Transmission Customers through the SPP Open Access Transmission Tariff ("OATT") for their use of the Company-owned transmission assets. Because all of the Company-owned transmission assets and related expenses have been included in the gross Missouri retail revenue requirement calculation, transmission revenues received through the SPP OATT for the use of those same Company-owned transmission assets must be credited against the gross retail revenue requirement to arrive at a net retail revenue requirement.

The problem with this revenue crediting, however, is that transmission revenues that are being received from other Transmission Customers through the SPP OATT are based on an Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement ("ATRR") calculated in the Evergy Metro Transmission Formula Rate ("TFR") and Evergy Missouri West TFR that is

based on a FERC-authorized ROE. The FERC-authorized ROE is currently higher than the MPSC authorized ROE. When the FERC-authorized ROE is higher than the MPSC authorized ROE, the transmission revenues from other Transmission Customers that are being credited against the gross retail revenue requirement are greater than that which was calculated in the gross retail revenue requirement. Essentially, Missouri retail customers are credited back more than they have paid for the transmission assets. This crediting back of more revenue to Missouri retail customers than was built into their gross retail revenue requirement is an improper arbitrage by Staff which doesn't reflect the rates paid by Missouri retail customers to recover the transmission assets. The Company's adjustment should be used by the Commission so that the Company is afforded an opportunity to earn its authorized ROE. Otherwise, crediting the revenues using the higher ROE is basically a taking of the Company's opportunity to earn its authorized ROE through arbitrage of the FERC-approved ROE in TFR which is inappropriate.

14 Q: Does that conclude your testimony?

15 A: Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro's Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate Increase for Electric Service) Case No. ER-2022-0129)
In the Matter of Evergy Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West's Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate Increase for Electric Service) Case No. ER-2022-0130)
AFFIDAVIT OF 3	IIM FLUCKE
STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss COUNTY OF JACKSON)	
Evergy Metro, Inc. as Vice President, Transmission 2. Attached hereto and made a part Testimony on behalf of Evergy Missouri Metro and pages, having been prepared in written form for captioned docket.	Kansas City, Missouri, and I am employed by an and Distribution. thereof for all purposes is my Surrebuttal devergy Missouri West consisting of three (3) or introduction into evidence in the above-to the forth therein. I hereby swear and affirm that to the questions therein propounded, including the best of my knowledge, information and blucke
	ANTHONY R. WESTENKIRCHNER NOTARY PUBLIC - NOTARY SEAL STATE OF MISSOURI MY COMMISSION EXPIRES APRIL 26, 2025 PLATTE COUNTY COMMISSION #17279982