Exhibit No.:

Issues: Connection Charges,

ReconnectionCharges, Transfer Rate Tariffs, Return Check Charge Tariff

Witness: Kim J. Elvington

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony

Case No.: GR-2001-292

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

KIM J. ELVINGTON

FLED?

APR 1 9 2001

Service Commission

CASE NO. GR-2001-292

MISSOURI GAS ENERGY

A Division of Southern Union Company

Jefferson City, Missouri April 2001

| 1 1 | TABLE OF CONTENTS |
|-----|---|
| 2 | DIRECT TESTIMONY |
| 3 | OF |
| 4 | KIM J. ELVINGTON |
| 5 | MISSOURI GAS ENERGY |
| 6 | A DIVISION OF SOUTHERN UNION COMPANY |
| 7 | CASE NO. GR-2001-292 |
| 8 | |
| 9 | RECONNECTION, CONNECTION AND TRANSFER TARIFF CHANGES2 |
| 10 | RETURN CHECK CHARGE |
| 11 | |

| 1 | | DIRECT TESTIMONY | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | OF | | | | | | | |
| 3 | KIM J. ELVINGTON | | | | | | | |
| 4 | MISSOURI GAS ENERGY | | | | | | | |
| 5 | A DIVISION OF SOUTHERN UNION COMPANY | | | | | | | |
| 6 | CASE NO. GR-2001-292 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Q. Please state your name and business address. | | | | | | | |
| 9 | A. Kim J. Elvington, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity? | | | | | | | |
| 11 | A. | A. I am a Regulatory Economist with the Missouri Public Service Commission | | | | | | |
| 12 | (Commission). | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Q. | Please describe your educational background. | | | | | | |
| 14 | A. I attended William Woods University in Fulton, Missouri, where I obtained a | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Master in Business Administration degree in December 1998. Prior to graduate school, l | | | | | | | |
| 16 | attended Columbia College in Columbia, Missouri, from which I received a Bachelor of | | | | | | | |
| 17 | Science degree in Business Administration, with a major in Management, May 1997. | | | | | | | |
| 18 | Q. | What has been the nature of your duties with the Commission? | | | | | | |
| 19 | A. | Since January 2000, I have worked in the Gas Tariffs/Rate Design Department | | | | | | |
| 20 | of the Comm | ission, where my main duties consist of analyzing and evaluating various tariff | | | | | | |
| 21 | filings from | regulated utilities operating in the state of Missouri and making | | | | | | |
| 22 | recommendations to the Commission regarding those filings. | | | | | | | |

| | Direct Testimo Kim J. Elvingt | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Q. | Q. Have you previously filed testimony before this Commission? | | | | | |
| 2 | A. | No. | | | | | |
| 3 | Q. | With reference to Case No. GR-2001-292, have you made an examination and | | | | | |
| 4 | study of the material filed by Missouri Gas Energy, a division of Southern Union Company, | | | | | | |
| 5 | (MGE or Company) relating to its proposed increase in rates? | | | | | | |
| 6 | A. | A. Yes, I have. | | | | | |
| 7 | Q. | Q. Are you sponsoring any adjustments? | | | | | |
| 8 | A. Yes, I am sponsoring Staff Adjustment S-5.3. | | | | | | |
| 9 | Q. | Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony? | | | | | |
| 10 | A. | The purpose of my direct testimony is to present the Commission Staff's | | | | | |
| 11 | (Staff) position regarding MGE's proposed connection charge, reconnection charge, and | | | | | | |
| 12 | transfer rate tariffs, as well as the codification of a return-check-charge tariff. | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | |
| 14 15 16 | RECONNE CHANGES | | | | | | |
| 17 | Q. | Has MGE proposed a change in their reconnection charges, and proposed new | | | | | |
| 18 | connection and tariff charges? | | | | | | |
| 19 | A. | Yes, MGE is proposing to increase its standard reconnect fee from \$29 to \$40; | | | | | |
| 20 | the \$50 reconnect fee after turn off at the curb to \$61; and the \$100 fee after turn off at the | | | | | | |
| 21 | main to \$111 | . The company is also proposing to institute a new-service-connection fee of | | | | | |
| 22 | \$40 and a transfer fee of \$6. | | | | | | |
| 23 | Q. | Is it important for these miscellaneous charges to accurately reflect what it | | | | | |

costs MGE to provide these services?

2

1

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Yes, it is important for these miscellaneous charges to reflect MGE's cost of A. performing these various services. The individual customers causing the Company to incur these expenses should be responsible for the associated costs.

- Q. Does the Staff agree with these proposals?
- Staff does not object to some increase in most of these charges. However, Α. Staff disagrees with the amount of increase MGE has requested. Staff witness, Thomas M. Imhoff of the Gas Tariffs/Rate Design Department, describes the Staff's rationale for it's proposed increases to these charges.
 - What does Staff believe is the correct charge for each service? Q.
- A. After careful review and consideration of MGE's actual costs, Staff has calculated the standard reconnect fee to be \$35.00, the new-connection fee to be \$35.00, and the transfer fee to be \$6.00. The Staff is proposing no change to the reconnect fees of \$50.00 and \$100.00 for turn offs at the curb and main respectively. Staff witness, Imhoff, addresses the Staff's reasons for recommending these charges remain at their current rates.
 - Q. How did Staff compute these rates?
- A. Staff utilized the company's hourly rate and calculated a loading rate that was applied to the amount of time spent on performing each of these services. The Staff disagrees with MGE on the inclusion of a "non-productive time" percentage load for these services. Staff witness, Imhoff, will address the Staff's rationale for the exclusion of "nonproductive time" in these calculations.

RETURN CHECK CHARGE

- 3
- Q. Has MGE proposed a returned-check charge?
- 4
- A. Yes, MGE has proposed a returned-check tariff rate of \$15.00.
- 5
- Q. Does Staff agree with this proposal?
- 6
- A. Staff does not object to this proposal. MGE has been charging customers a returned-check fee for more than four years. The tariff proposed will codify MGE's current
- 7
- charge for returned checks. MGE incurs costs when processing returned checks, and
- 8
- customers causing these expenses should pay for the service.
- 10
- Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
- 11
- A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

| In the matter of Missouri Gas advision of Southern Union for File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Service Provided to Customers Company's Missouri Service A | Authority to or Gas in the |))) | Case No. GR-2001-292 | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| AFFIDAVIT OF KIM J. ELVINGTON | | | | | | | | | |
| STATE OF MISSOURI COUNTY OF COLE |)) ss) | | | | | | | | |
| Kim J. Elvington, of lawful age, on her oath states: that she has participated in the preparation of the foregoing written testimony in question and answer form, consisting of pages of testimony to be presented in the above case, that the answers in the attached written testimony were given by her; that she has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true to the best of her knowledge and belief. | | | | | | | | | |
| Subscribed and sworn to before | re me this | 16th | Kim J. Elvington day of April, 2001. | | | | | | |
| My commission expires | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | Notary Public DAWN L. HAKE Notary Public – State of Missouri County of Cole Notary Public – State of Missouri County of Cole Notary Commission Expires Jan 9, 2005 | | | | | | |