Exhibit No.:

Issue(s): Aquila Inc. Purchase Transition Costs

Transmission Expense Iatan 2 O&M Expenses

Witness: Ted Robertson
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal
Sponsoring Party: Public Counsel
Case Number: ER-2010-0356
Date Testimony Prepared: January 12, 2011

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

TED ROBERTSON

Submitted on Behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel

KCP&L GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY

Case No. ER-2010-0356

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of KCP&L)	
Greater Missouri Operations Company for)	File No. ER-2010-0356
Approval To Make Certain Changes in its)	File No. ER-2010-0356
Charges for Electric Service)	

AFFIDAVIT OF TED ROBERTSON

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS
COUNTY OF COLE)	

Ted Robertson, of lawful age and being first duly sworn, deposes and states:

- 1. My name is Ted Robertson. I am a Chief Utility Accountant for the Office of the Public Counsel.
- 2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my surrebuttal 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.

Ted Robertson, C.P.A.

Chief Public Utility Accountant

Subscribed and sworn to me this 12th day of January 2011.

NOTARY SEAL OF MISS

JERENE A. BUCKMAN My Commission Expires August 23, 2013 Cole County Commission #09754037

Jerene A. Buckman Notary Public

My Commission expires August, 2013.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Testimony	Page
Introduction	1
Purpose of Testimony	1
Aquila Inc. Purchase Transition Costs	2
Transmission Expenses	3
Iatan 2 O&M Expenses	6

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY 2 3 **TED ROBERTSON** 4 **KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT** 5 **GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY** 6 **CASE NO. ER-2010-0356** 7 8 9 10 I. INTRODUCTION PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS. 11 Q. 12 Ted Robertson, PO Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-2230. Α. 13 14 Q. ARE YOU THE SAME TED ROBERTSON THAT HAS PREVIOUSLY FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE? 15 16 A. Yes. 17 18 II. **PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY** 19 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY? 20 I will provide the Public Counsel surrebuttal to the Rebuttal Testimony of Kansas Α. 21 City Power & Light Company's (KCPL or Company) witnesses, 1) Mr. Darrin R. 22 Ives - Aquila Inc. Purchase Transition Costs, 2) Mr. Tim M. Rush - Transmission 23 Expenses, and 3) Mr. John P. Weisensee - latan 2 O&M Expenses. 24 25 26

III. AQUILA INC. PURCHASE TRANSITION COSTS

Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

A. On page 2, lines 4 - 8, of his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Darrin R. Ives states that the Public Counsel's position on this issue is consistent with the Company's request in this case; however, his testimony is not completely accurate. Public Counsel's position on this issue, as stated beginning on page 4, line 11, of my Direct Testimony, is:

Pursuant to the Commission's authorization, Company has deferred transition costs for both its MPS and L&P service areas and will amortize those costs over five years beginning with the effective date of the Commission's authorization in the instant case. However, while Public Counsel will not oppose what the Commission authorized for this issue, Public Counsel recommends that any future costs incurred subsequent to the test year and true-up period of the instant case not receive continued deferral authorization or amortization in any future rate cases.

- Q. WHY DOES PUBLIC COUNSEL RECOMMEND THE DISCONTINUANCE OF THE DEFERRAL/AMORTIZATION AUTHORIZATION FOR ALLEGED FUTURE TRANSITION COSTS?
- A. Public Counsel's recommendation is primarily based on the fact that sufficient time has already passed to effect the integration of Aquila Inc. into the operations of the current owner. In fact, it has been more than two years since the purchase of Aquila Inc. was authorized in Case No. EM-2007-0374 (the effective date of the Report and Order was July 11, 2008). Furthermore, it is my understanding, any

additional transitional costs likely to be incurred may not be material and, given the dynamics of the Company's ongoing operations, may be considered costs which have been incurred due to changes caused by current operations of the total entity because there is no foolproof manner to determine whether the costs were incurred because of the purchase of Aquila Inc. or are simply a normal reaction to the operation of the utility as it currently exists.

(Emphasis added by OPC)

Public Counsel's position includes a recommendation that any future costs incurred subsequent to the test year and true-up period of the instant case not receive continued deferral authorization or amortization in any future rate cases. I have not been able to identify in any testimony where Company states its agreement with this portion of Public Counsel's recommendation, but if it does, we are in agreement. If Company does not support this recommendation, we are not consistent with the Company's position.

IV. TRANSMISSION EXPENSES

- Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?
- A. The issue concerns whether the Commission should authorize a Transmission

 Expense tracker requested by the Company as an alternative position if its primary position to include certain transmission and administrative & general expenses in its

proposed Fuel Adjustment Clause (FAC) is not authorized. To support its position, on page 23, lines 3 - 6, of his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Rush states that, "As can be seen on the attached Schedule TMR2010-5 filed in my Direct Testimony, transmission costs have increased significantly in recent years. These costs are expected to grow at an even faster pace in the future in order to address these regional energy needs." Public Counsel is opposed to the Company's request because we believe that the historical costs incurred do not justify the need for a tracker mechanism and the projected costs, as alleged by the Company, have not been incurred and are not yet known and measureable.

A.

Q. IS THERE AN ERROR CONTAINED MR. RUSH'S REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

Yes. On page 16, lines 18 - 20, of his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Rush discusses that certain amounts in his Direct Testimony Schedule TMR2010-4 were incorrect and that the Schedule TMR2010-6, attached to his Rebuttal Testimony is a corrected schedule. However, in his Rebuttal Testimony, page 23, line 3, he references his Direct Testimony Schedule TMR2-010-5 as support for his position. Mr. Rush's Schedule TMR2-010-5 is a listing of 2010-14 GMO Energy Resources and not transmission expenses. His Direct Testimony Schedule TMR2010-4 is his transmission expense schedule.

- Q. DOES MR. RUSH'S CORRECTED SCHEDULE TMR2010-6 PROVIDE ANY INFORMATION THAT WOULD LEAD PUBLIC COUNSEL TO CHANGE ITS POSITION?
- A. No. The corrections Mr. Rush made to his Direct Testimony Schedule TMR2010-4 merely involved the moving of costs shown as booked in one account to a different account. The total annual costs for each of the years shown did not change; however, the year over year percentage changes I presented in my Direct Testimony Schedules TJR-2.1 and TJR-2.2 do require re-computation. Attached as Schedules TJR-1.1 and TJR-1.2 to this testimony are my updated Direct Testimony Schedules TJR-2.1 and TJR-2.2.
- Q. DOES PUBLIC COUNSEL ALSO OPPOSE COMPANY'S PRIMARY PROPOSAL

 TO RECOVER THE TRANSMISSION EXPENSES THROUGH ITS CURRENT

 FAC MECHANISM?
- A. Yes. Public Counsel believes that the transmission expenses Company proposes to include in its FAC are not consistent with the costs allowed in Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-20.090(1)(B). That is, the rule allows only fuel and purchased power costs (and depending on the circumstances off-system sales revenues). The costs that the Company proposes to include are expenses that are booked in transmission expenses operation and maintenance accounts and an administrative

and general expenses operations account. They are not fuel and purchased power costs.

Q. IN WHAT ACCOUNTS ARE FUEL COSTS BOOKED?

- A. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) provisions published at 18 CFR
 Part 101 identify the power production fuel accounts as, 1) Account 501 Steam
 Power Generation Fuel, 2) Account 518 Nuclear Power Production Nuclear Fuel
 Expense (Major Only), 3) Account 536 Hydraulic Power Generation Water For
 Power, and 4) Account 547 Other Power Production Fuel.
- Q. IN WHAT ACCOUNT ARE PURCHASED POWER COSTS BOOKED?
- A. FERC 18 CFR Part 101 identifies Account 555 Other Power Supply Expenses

 Purchased Power as where purchased power costs are booked.

V. IATAN 2 O&M EXPENSES

- Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?
- A. Beginning on page 9, line 20, of his Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Weisensee discusses that the Company is agreeable to the MPSC Staff's proposal to use estimated latan 2 O&M expense and a tracker to afford the utility recovery of the costs. He adds that not only should a tracker be established for latan 2, but one should be utilized to account for and track the estimated costs of the latan Common assets. Public

Counsel opposes both the MPSC Staff's proposal and the Company proposed additional tracker.

- Q. WHY DOES PUBLIC COUNSEL RECOMMEND THAT THE COMMISSION NOT AUTHORIZE THE O&M EXPENSES TRACKERS REQUESTED BY THE MPSC STAFF AND COMPANY?
- A. As I stated in my Direct Testimony on the issue of a Transmission Expense tracker, beginning on page 7, line 1, trackers are normally utilized for material costs that significantly fluctuate that are associated with events that are outside the control of a utility's management, e.g., acts of God, government actions, etc.

In this instance, just like the proposed Transmission Expense tracker, which Public Counsel also opposes, the respective costs may be subject to increases due to Company's future operations; however, latan 2 met its in-service criteria on August 26, 2010. Company, and the other parties to the case, will have had approximately four months of cost information up and through the true-up period of the instant case with which to develop an annualized level of expense for inclusion in the cost of service. The annualization amount, and its support, can be audited and scrutinized for prudence and reasonableness just like any other expense for which a full year's worth of data is not available. That is the normal way for accounting for such costs in the regulatory ratemaking process. Once subjected to such scrutiny,

8

6

10

11

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

the parties can present their positions to the Commission for a decision if an agreement between the parties cannot be reached on an appropriate amount. Therefore, there is no need for the trackers proposed.

- Q. WITHOUT TRACKERS ISN'T IT POSSIBLE THAT THE COMPANY COULD OVER-RECOVER OR UNDER-RECOVER ON THE ANNUALIZED AMOUNT ACTUALLY INCLUDED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF RATES?
- A. The answer is yes, but that is the nature of public utility regulation. As regulators, the Commission does not guarantee a utility that it will recover its authorized rate of return. The regulatory compact is that the utility is provided the "opportunity" to recover the authorized return. It is up to the utility's management to operate the company so as to achieve that goal.

The Commission's job is not to micro-management the utility and neither is it to absolve the company's management of its duties and responsibilities, and consequences of actions they make take. However, that is exactly what the proposed trackers would do. The trackers, both the O&M and the Transmission, would account for the dollars expended and provide for recovery on a one to one basis thus eliminating the incentive for management to control the costs and absolving them of any missteps they might have possibly taken.

- Q. IS IT NOT ALSO POSSIBLE THAT WITHOUT A TRACKER RATEPAYERS

 COULD BE NEGATIVELY AFFECTED?
- A. Yes. If the level of annualized costs included in the development of rates turn out to be higher that the actual level of costs incurred by the utility, ratepayers would end up paying higher rates than necessary to support the Company's revenue requirement (assuming all other costs held equal). That is the reality of regulatory ratemaking. It is not an exact science.
- Q. WHAT DO YOU MEAN WHEN YOU STATE THAT REGULATORY RATEMAKING IS NOT AN EXACT SCIENCE?
- A. Simply put, regulatory ratemaking, at its core, is the process of acting as a surrogate for competition as applied to monopoly enterprises. It is the attempt to avoid, or at least mitigate, the excesses of pricing and costs associated with monopolies.

 Regulators take the most recent historical financial and operational information available to develop rates which the utility's management then takes and attempts to achieve or exceed for the benefit of shareholders. The implementation of trackers, as proposed by the MPSC Staff and Company, essentially eliminates the necessity of the utility's management to compete. Why should they if the recovery of the expenditures are guaranteed?

- Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?
- 2 A. Yes, it does.

Prepared By: XCPL GMO Case No. ER-2010-0356 OPC Transmission WP - L&P Sources

MPSC DR 13 Co 063010 Cutoff xis Tim Rush Rebutlal Schedule TMR2010-6 (Corrected Direct Schedule TMR2010-4)

Account Acco														2002 10
2005 % Change 2006 % Change 2007 % Change 2007 % Change 2007 % Change 2007 % Change 2008 % Change 20	L&P											12 Mth End		12 Mth End
Color Colo	Account	2005	% Change	2008	% Change	2007		2008	% Change		% Change	Jun-10	% Change	Jun-10
Column C	561400 - Trans Op-Schd, Confr & Dis Serv	0		669,227		743,117		785,029	5.640%		-62.330%	367,484	24.268%	71,764
5 4,174,803 4,231,449 1,357% 2,646,461 -37,457% 81,158 96,833% (35,445) -143,675% 1,529 -104,596% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	551900 - Trans Op-Rell Plan&Std Dv-RTO	0		1,577		3 949		3,061	-22,487%		1185,560%	47,489	20.681%	8,138
1,515,600 1,515,600 1,515,600 0.000% 442,050 0.7083% 0.1000% 0.000% 0.000% 0.000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.100000% 0.1000	565000 - Transm Oper-Elec Tr-By Others	4,174,803		4,231,449	1.357%	2,646,461		81,158	-96.933%		-143.675%	1,629	-104.596%	37,075
Uniff 0 0 1,515,600 1,515,600 0,000% 442,050 -70.833% 0 -100.000% 0 0,000% 442,050 -70.833% 0 -100.000% 0 0,0000% 0	565020 - Trans of Electricity by Others	Q		0		0		0				0		0
0 0 2,941,279 2,313,040 -21,359% 2,273,000 -1,731% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	565021 - Transm Oper-Elec Tr-Interunit	0		0		1,515,600		1,515,600	0.000%	442,050	-70.833%		-100.000%	(442.050)
0 26.970 7,135 -73.545% 0 -100.000% 3,047 #DIVIOR 0 0 0 286.99 286.99 286.99 286.99 286.94 6.565% 0 4.174.805 4.902.255 4.936.957 6.333.562 5.41,414 2.900.967	565027 - Trans Oper-Elec Tr-Demand	Q		0		0		2,941,279		2,313,040	-21.359%		-1.731%	(40.040)
0 0 0 286.699 288.318 0.565% 4.174,803 4.902,253 4.906,097 6.333,262 3,341,414 2,980,967	565030 - Transm Oper-Elec Tr-OffSys	٥		0		26,970		7,135	-73.545%	0	-100.000%		#DIV/O	3,047
4,902,253 4,936,037 5,333,262 3,341,414 2,	575700 - Trans Op-Mkt Mon&Comp Ser-RTO	0		0		0	1	0		286 699			0.565%	1,619
	Total	4.174.803		4.902,253		4,936,637		5,333,262		3,341,414		2,980,967		(360,447)

corrections.	
are Rush C	
olded #s	
Note: B	