Exhibit No.: 1068

Issues: Merger Savings; Aries Unit
Witness: Cary G. Featherstone
Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.: ER-2004-0034

Date Testimony Prepared: January 26, 2004 as modified February 27, 2004

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

CARY G. FEATHERSTONE

MAY 0 4 2004

Missouri Public Service Commission

AQUILA, INC. d/b/a AQUILA NETWORKS-MPS (Electric)

CASE NO. ER-2004-0034

Case No(s), 21 264 2634

Jefferson City, Missouri January 2004

Denotes Highly Confidential Information

NP

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the matter of Aquila, Inc. d/ba L&P and Aquila Networks MI general rate increase in electricity	PS to implement a) Case No. ER-2004-0034	
AFFIDA	AVIT OF CARY G. FEATHERSTONE	
STATE OF MISSOURI)	ss.	
COUNTY OF COLE)		
Cary G. Featherstone, of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the following rebuttal testimony as modified on February 27, 2004, in question and answer form, consisting of 57 pages to be presented in the above case; that the answers in the following rebuttal testimony as modified on February 27, 2004, were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.		
	Cary G. Featherstone	
Subscribed and sworn to before	me this 27th day of February 2004.	
CHARLY OF	Spain Chareto	

TONI M. CHARLTON NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF MISSOURI COUNTY OF COLE My Commission Expires December 28, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF **CARY G. FEATHERSTONE** BUILDING GENERATION CAPACITY FOR MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE.......55

1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		CARY G. FEATHERSTONE
4	A	QUILA, INC., d/b/a AQUILA NETWORKS-MPS (Electric)
5		
6		CASE NO. ER-2004-0034
7		
8	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
9	Α.	Cary G. Featherstone, 3675 Noland Road, Independence, Missouri.
10	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
11	Α.	I am a Regulatory Auditor with the Missouri Public Service Commission
12	(Commission).	
13	Q.	Are you the same Cary G. Featherstone who has previously filed direct
14	testimony in	this proceeding?
15	Α.	Yes, I am. I filed direct testimony in this case on December 9, 2003 on the
16	areas of cost	of removal / salvage and the Aries Combined Cycle generating unit.
17	Q.	What is the purpose of this rebuttal testimony?
18	A.	The purpose of this rebuttal testimony is to address the direct testimony filed by
19	Aquila, Inc.	(Aquila or Company; formerly known as UtiliCorp United, Inc.)
20		
21		
22		
23		

Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone 1 2 Pages 3 through Page 51 Intentionally Left Blank

	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1 2	
3	
4	
_	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10 11	
11	
12 13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	Page 4
	n e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

--

	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6 7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23 24 25	
	Page 10

	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	·
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
19 20 21	
22	
23	
•	
	1

	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	·
7	
8	
9	
10 11 12 13 14 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

i	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

Page 35

2 3

19 20

Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone

Page 39

	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	·
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

:	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone

Page 43

	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1	
2	
3	
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	
24 25	
252627	
25262728	
2526272829	
252627282930	
25 26 27 28 29 30 31	
25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32	
25 26 27 28 29 30 31	

	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary G. Featherstone
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
9 10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
	Page 46

Page 49

ARIES COMBINED CYCLE UNIT

- Q. Has the Company made an adjustment to annualize the capacity charges associated with MPS' purchase of power from the Aries Generating Unit?
- A. Yes, it has. Company witness Starkebaum sponsors Aquila's adjustment to annualize capacity charges associated with MPS purchased power agreements (PPAs, purchased sales agreements or capacity agreement) at page 12 of her direct testimony. She states that the Company's adjustment includes an annualization of Aries capacity charges.
- Q. What level of capacity charges associated with the Aries unit has Aquila included in its case?
 - A. The Company has reflected an annualized level of \$27.66 million.
- Q. Does the Staff agree that \$27.66 million is an appropriate level to include in rates for Aries capacity charges?
- A. No. Because MPS is purchasing power from the Aries unit through an affiliated entity (Merchant Energy Partners Pleasant Hill or MEPPH), Staff believes that the Company has overstated its capacity purchase relating to the Aries capacity agreement referred to as a "purchased power agreement" (PPA). Staff witness Mark L. Oligschlaeger will provide the rationale in his rebuttal testimony for Staff's position that the Aries contract should be treated on lower of cost or market basis.

3 4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

Q. Did the PPA between MPS and the partners of the Aries Combined Cycle Unit allow the pass-through of construction cost amounts in excess over the original estimate?

A. Yes. The agreement MPS reached allowed for certain costs to be absorbed Some construction problems resulted in costs over the original through the PPA. construction estimate. Installation of the two heat recovery steam generators (HRSGs) caused some of the cost overruns. Also, the purchase and installation of the two combustion turbines caused cost overruns.

The combustion turbine cost overruns have been charged back to MPS through terms of the PPA.

- Q. What amount has been charged to MPS relating to the increase in cost for the combustion turbines at Aries?
- In a March 19, 2001 letter from Aquila Energy, MPS was notified of a cost A. increase for power purchased through the PPA. The letter from Aquila Energy stated that the combustion turbines cost \$2.4 million more than expected and, in accordance with Section 5.1(a) of the agreement, "an increase of the capacity charge to [MPS] by \$0.055 per kW-month for the first \$1,000,000 of cost increase above the original estimate" would be charged to MPS.

In addition, the March 19, 2001, letter indicated that there was a \$0.0297 per kW-month credit in the capacity charge. The credit offset to the increase results in an overall increase in the capacity charge of \$0.0253 per kW-month.

Q. Should this increase be charged to MPS customers?

- A. No. One of the purposes of purchasing capacity through a PPA is not having to absorb the "risk" of ownership, in particular, the risks associated with the construction of the generating facility. These cost overruns are clearly the responsibility of the owners, Aquila and Calpine, and not the entities acquiring short-term power or capacity. Therefore, if the Commission allows the capacity charge costs in rates as proposed by the Company, the amount of the increase of \$0.0253 per kW-month for these associated overruns and underruns should not be included in rates.
- Q. What is the total amount of the increase relating to these overruns and underruns?
- A. The PPA provides MPS 200 megawatts for the 12 months of the year (January 1 through December 31). The PPA also provides an additional 300 megawatts of capacity for six months (April through September) of each year of the PPA starting April 1, 2002 through May 31, 2005, the date the PPA terminates. Based upon this information, the \$0.0253 per kW-month cost overrun pass through amounts to \$106,260 on an annual basis:

200 megawatts for 12 months (200,000 kWs)	\$ 60,720
[200,000 kWs times \$0.0253 per month times 12]	
300 megawatts for six months (300,000 kWs)	<u>45,540</u>
[300,000 kWs times \$0.0253 per month times 6]	

Q. Is Aquila being charged the \$0.0253 per kW-month for the cost overruns?

TOTAL MPS - electric

\$106,260

A. Yes. A review of the Aries invoices charged MPS for capacity and energy costs shows that the Aries partners are billing the overrun amount to MPS and MPS is paying the \$0.0253 per kW-month above the agreed upon contract amount shown in the PPA signed on February 22, 1999.

Q. How should the amounts identified above be considered by the Commission?

A, If the Commission adopts the Aries capacity agreement amounts identified in the direct testimony (page 12) of Company witness Lisa A. Starkebaum, the overrun adjustment determined above should reduce the amount of the costs for this capacity charge. If the Commission values the Aries capacity agreement according to the Company's position, then the contract demand charges should be used and not the inflated amount resulting from the costs overruns.

BUILDING GENERATION CAPACITY FOR MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE

Q. Did Aquila examine the building of generating capacity as part of its regulated operations?

A. Yes. In 1998, prior to the decision to build Aries by the non-regulated side of Aquila, the Company considered building a 500-megawatt combined cycle unit on the same land that Aries was built on by its non-regulated operations (MPS). This unit was intended to be an Exempt Wholesale Generator (EWG) with Aquila's regulated operations bidding on providing capacity to MPS.

In the summer of 1998 at the time of the initial evaluations of the request for proposals (RFP) for capacity for MPS, which were issued on May 22, 1998, the regulated operations of Aquila responded to its own RFP with a "build" proposal. This build option to supply capacity and energy to MPS from a combined cycle unit operated by the EWG was the low cost option at the time of the initial review phase of the RFP.

Q. Why didn't the regulated side of Aquila (MPS) build the combined cycle unit as a EWG?

- A. The regulated operations of the UtiliCorp presented its proposal to Robert Green, then UtiliCorp President, who made the decision that the regulated side of UtiliCorp's operations would not build the Aries project. The material covered two different dates: 1) October 8, 1998-Financial Analysis of Supply Options, and 2) October 28, 1998-Updated Analysis of Supply Options. The presentation material was provided to Staff in response to Staff Data Request No. 301 and is attached to this testimony as Highly Confidential Schedules 3 and 4.
- Q. How did Staff find out about the process that was used to determine who would build the Aries project?
- A. This was discussed with former Aquila personnel who were involved in not only the issuance and review of the RFP, but also as one of the bidders to the RFP to supply capacity to MPS through the EWG. Staff conducted an interview with the individuals who were directly involved in the issuance and review of the RFP and also in making the decision to submit a bid to build a combined cycle unit to supply power to MPS as an EWG.
 - Q. How did the interview with the former Aquila personnel come about?
- A. Staff indicated to Aquila that it wanted to discuss the RFP process and aspects of how MPS came to agree to purchase power from the Aries partners. Aquila contacted two individuals who were directly involved in these decisions and provided them for an interview with Staff.
- Q. Is it Staff's view that UtiliCorp should have given more consideration to the building of the Aries project as a regulated unit?

5

6

7

8

- A. Yes. Staff believes that the option to build the Aries project by the regulated operations of UtiliCorp and rate base the generating station in the traditional manner should have been chosen.
 - Q. Is there another Staff witness who is providing rebuttal testimony on the Aries issue concerning the build options?
 - A. Yes. Staff witness Mark L. Oligschlaeger also addresses the Aries build option in his rebuttal testimony.
 - Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
 - A. Yes, it does.

SCHEDULES 1-1 THROUGH 1-4 SCHEDULES 2-1 THROUGH 2-8 ORIGINALLY FILED JANUARY 26, 2004 HAVE BEEN INTENTIONALLY REMOVED

Featherstone

Schedules 3 and 4

Are Highly Confidential

In Their Entirety