Exhibit No.:

Issue: Maintenance Expense

Witness: Amanda C. McMellen

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony
Case Nos.: ER-2001-672 and EC-2002-265

Date Testimony Prepared: January 22, 2002

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

a

UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

FILED³

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

JAN 2 2 2002

OF

Missouri Public Service Commission

AMANDA C. McMELLEN

UTILICORP UNITED INC. d/b/a MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE

CASE NOS. ER-2001-672 AND EC-2002-265

Jefferson City, Missouri January 2002

| 1 | | SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY |
|----|-----------------|---|
| 2 | | OF |
| 3 | | AMANDA C. MCMELLEN |
| 4 | | UTILICORP UNITED INC. |
| 5 | | d/b/a MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE |
| 6 | | CASE NOS. ER-2001-672 AND EC-2002-265 |
| 7 | Q. | Please state your name and business address. |
| 8 | A. | Amanda C. McMellen, P.O. Box 360, Suite 440, Jefferson City, MO |
| 9 | 65102. | |
| 10 | Q. | By whom are you employed and in what capacity? |
| 11 | A. | I am a Regulatory Auditor for the Missouri Public Service Commission. |
| 12 | Q. | Are you the same Amanda C. McMellen who has previously filed direct |
| 13 | and rebuttal to | estimony in this case? |
| 14 | A. | Yes, I am. |
| 15 | Q. | What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony? |
| 16 | A. | The purpose of this testimony is to address the rebuttal testimony of |
| 17 | Missouri Pul | olic Service (MPS or Company) witness Allison K. Moten regarding the |
| 18 | proper detern | nination of maintenance expense for purposes of this case. |
| 19 | Q. | Ms. Motens' rebuttal testimony disagrees with the use of Staff's "three- |
| 20 | year average' | ' for normalizing maintenance expense. How would you respond? |
| 21 | Α. | The Staff has utilized averaging for normalization purposes for many |
| 22 | years, in mar | ny different cases, for many issues and will likely continue to in the future |
| 23 | A three-year | average was proposed in the Staff's direct case because MPS was unable to |

provide data to perform the five-year (1996 through 2000) analysis of maintenance expense that the Staff typically performs. Since the time of the Staff's direct testimony, maintenance expense for 1996 was also analyzed (1997 data is still unavailable). This information was not provided by the Company but is available in the Staff workpapers in MPS' last rate case (Case No. ER-97-394). Including 1996 in the average shows the historical annual volatility in the maintenance expense accounts. The Staff calculated a four-year average based on this additional data. Please reference Schedule 1 attached to this testimony.

- Q. Why does the Staff typically analyze five years of data for maintenance expense?
- A. Five years of data provides the Staff with enough historical analysis to smooth any significant fluctuations in maintenance expense that may have occurred from year-to-year during that five years.
- Q. Specifically, what is Ms. Motens' objection to utilizing a three-year average for normalizing MPS' maintenance expense?
- A. Ms. Motens' opposition relies almost entirely on the fact that actual costs have been "steadily increasing from 1998-2000" (rebuttal testimony, page 2, line 10). However, the inclusion of 1996 in the Staff's averaging calculation further demonstrates the annual volatility experienced in maintenance expense. In some accounts, the 1996 expense is even higher than the test year. Since some maintenance expenses are continually increasing, decreasing or fluctuating over the four years (1996, 1998, 1999 and 2000) in the Staff's analysis period, the Staff calculated an average for total maintenance expense in order to normalize these impacts.

- Q. What do you mean by "total" maintenance expense?
- A. Total maintenance expense includes production, transmission and distribution maintenance expenses.
- Q. Do you have a graph that shows the fluctuations in maintenance expense since 1996?
- A. Yes. Please reference Schedule 2 attached to this testimony. The graph shows the substantial drop in expense from 1996 to 1998. In just a two-year period of time, total maintenance expense dropped by more than \$1.5 million. An average was calculated in this case in order to take into account the possibility that upward or downward volatility may recur based upon historical experience.
 - Q. Is the Staff suggesting a change in its position on maintenance expense?
- A. Yes. Since the 1996 data is available, the Staff is now proposing to use a four-year average to calculate maintenance expense, reflecting the years 1996, 1998, 1999 and 2000.
 - Q. How much is this change in the Staff's position on maintenance expense?
- A. The total change in position is worth \$72,289. Regarding Production maintenance expense, the additional 1996 data now shows little difference (\$663) between the Company and the Staff. Transmission maintenance expense is a difference of (\$257,238) between the Company and the Staff. With Distribution maintenance expense, there is a (\$561,702) difference between the Company and the Staff.
- Q. Might another year of maintenance expense information be sufficient for the Staff to determine if there is, in fact, an upward trend in transmission and/or distribution maintenance expense?

5

7

8

6

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

A. Yes. Information, for all or part of 2001, would help the Staff determine if there is, in fact, an upward trend as proposed by Ms. Moten. The Staff plans to review 2001 maintenance data in the true-up audit in this case.

- Q. Has the Staff utilized this normalization process for maintenance expense in previous cases with MPS?
- A. Yes. The Staff also utilized a five-year average of maintenance expense in a complaint case it brought against MPS (Case Nos. ER-97-362) and MPS's last rate case (Case No. ER-97-394). Although the Commission did not adopt the Staff's use of an average maintenance calculation in the rate case, it is still the Staff's position that use of multi-year averaging is appropriate for ratemaking purposes when there is annual volatility in expenses.
- Has the Staff proposed utilizing a multi-year normalization process in Q. determining any other costs to be included in the cost of service in this case?
- Yes. Please refer to page 25 of the direct testimony of Staff Accounting A. witness Janis E. Fischer. Ms. Fischer states, "Taking a five-year average has normalized the fluctuation in the level of bad debt write-offs."
 - Q. Does this complete your surrebuttal testimony?
 - Yes, it does. Α.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

| In the Matter of the Application of the Tariff Filing of Missouri Public Service (MPS) A Division of UtiliCorp United Inc., to Implement a General Rate Increase for Retail Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Missouri Service Area of MPS |) Case No. ER-2001-672)) |
|--|--|
| AFFIDAVIT OF AMANDA | A C. MCMELLEN |
| STATE OF MISSOURI) ss. | |
| COUNTY OF COLE) | |
| Amanda C. McMellen, being of lawful as participated in the preparation of the foregoing answer form, consisting of pages to be answers in the foregoing Surrebuttal Testimo knowledge of the matters set forth in such answ correct to the best of her knowledge and belief. | Surrebuttal Testimony in question and e presented in the above case; that the ny were given by her; that she has |

Mulanda C. M. Mulla Amanda C. McMellen

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of January 2002.

D SUZIE MANKIN NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF MISSOURI COLE COUNTY MY COMMISSION EXP. JUNE 21,2004

Dhuzillankin

Utilicorp/ Missouri Public Service Case No. ER-01-672 Calculation of Normalized Maintenance Expense For the Year 2000

| Production | Maintenance | Evanasa |
|------------|-------------|---------|
| | | |

| Account | 1996 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 4 Year Total | Adjustment* | Adi# | Adjustment* | Adi# |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|--------------|---------|-------------|-----------|
| | \$817,213 | \$1,230,815 | \$1,038,169 | \$1,075,122 | \$4,161,319 | | S- 20.2 | | |
| 510 511 511 512 513 514 551 551 552 553 554 Total Production Less Payroll Less Overhaul Accrual Net Production 4 Year Average Production Mai | | | | | | | | | |
| 511] | \$79,091 | \$656,281 | \$1,007,459 | \$1,191,507 | \$2,934,338 | <u> (76)</u> | S-21.2 | \$ (16,348 | S- 21.6 |
| 510 511 511 512 513 514 551 552 553 554 Total Production Less Payroll Less Overhaul Accrual Net Production 4 Year Average Production Mai Staff Adjustment# 1 \$6,561,740 | \$6,225,349 | \$4,023,879 | \$4,747,666 | \$5,07 <u>8,</u> 777 | \$20,075,671 | \$ (323) | S- 22.2 | \$ (69,685 |) S- 22.8 |
| 513 | \$1,302,638 | \$2,860,174 | \$2,942,519 | \$2,476,731 | \$9,582,062 | \$ (157) | S-23.2 | \$ (33,983 |) S- 23.8 |
| 514 | \$972,970 | \$35,597 | \$93,733 | \$158,664 | \$1,260,964 | \$ (10) | S-24.2 | \$ (2,177 |) S- 24.5 |
| 551 | \$82,159 | \$919 | \$36 | \$1,955 | \$85,069 | \$ (0) | S-30.2 | \$ (27 |) S- 30.6 |
| 552 | \$47,875 | \$53,762 | \$91,780 | \$56,095 | \$249,512 | \$ (4) | S-31.2 | \$ (770 |) S- 31.7 |
| 553 | \$170,201 | \$459,495 | \$469,489 | \$370,697 | \$1,469,882 | \$ (24) | S-32.2 | \$ (5,086 |) S- 32.8 |
| 554 | \$60,678 | \$1,653 | \$316 | \$12,627 | \$75,274 | \$ (1) | S-33.4 | \$ (173 |) S- 33.6 |
| Total Production | \$9,758,174 | \$9,322,575 | \$10,391,167 | \$10,422,175 | \$39,894,091 | | | | |
| Less Payroll | (\$2,293,351) | (\$2,862,531) | (\$3,131,478) | (\$3,359,773) | (\$11,647,133) | | | | |
| Less Overhaul Accrual | (\$500,000) | (\$500,000) | (\$500,000) | (\$500,000) | (\$2,000,000) | | | | |
| Net Production | \$6,964,823 | \$5,960,044 | \$6,759,689 | \$6,562,402 | \$26,246,958 | | | | |
| 4 Year Average Production Main | \$6,561,740 | | | | | | | | |
| Staff Adjustment# 1 \$6,561,740 | (\$663) | | | | | | | | |
| Staff Adjustment# 2 \$357,000 (N | Iormalized Overhaul Accrual | (\$2,500,000 / 7 yrs)) - \$500 | ,000 (2000 Overhaul Accuru | al (\$2,500,000 / 5 yrs)) | (\$143,000) | | | | |
| Total Staff Adjustment | (\$143,663) | | | | | | | | |

Transmission Maintenance Expense

| Account | 1996 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 4 Yes | ar Total | Adjustment* | Adi# |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------|
| 568 | \$677 | \$45,799 | \$64,060 | \$48,299 | \$158,835 | \$ (7,293) | S- 45.2 |
| 569 | \$20,698 | \$75,795 | \$34,868 | \$29,882 | \$161,243 | \$ (4,512) | S-46.5 |
| 570 | \$137,754 | \$368,849 | \$550,710 | \$405,460 | \$1,462,773 | \$ (61,225) | S- 47.5 |
| 571 | \$857,402 | \$574,299 | \$967,618 | \$1,106,976 | \$3,506,295 | \$ (167,154) | S- 48.5 |
| 572 | \$0 (| \$6,996 | \$33 | \$97 | \$7,126 | | |
| 573 | \$828 | \$149,307 | \$145,489 | \$112,839 | \$408,463 | \$ (17,053) | S- 49.5 |
| Total Transmission | \$1,017,359 | \$1,221,045 | \$1,762,778 | \$1,703,553 | \$5,704,735 | | |
| Less Payroli | (\$112,925) | (\$319,980) | (\$372,278) | (\$295,236) | (\$1,100,419) | | |
| Net Transmission | \$904,434 | \$901,065 | \$1,390,500 | \$1,408,317 | \$4,604,316 | - | |
| 4 Year Average Transmission Maintenance Expense | | | | | | | |
| Staff Adjustment \$1,151,079- (\$1,703,553 (2000 Books) - \$295,236 (Payroll)) | | | | | | | |

Distribution Maintenance Expense

| Account | 1996 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 4 Ye | ar Total | Adjustment | , A |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|--------|
| 590 | \$123,631 | \$302,792 | \$42,271 | \$26,471 | \$495,165 | \$ (1,758 |) S- |
| 591 | \$44,650 | \$31,920 | \$20,635 | \$52,759 | \$149,964 | \$ (3,505 |) S- |
| 592 | \$756,200 | \$617,176 | \$554,952 | \$581,186 | \$2,509,514 | \$ (38,607 |) S-(|
| 593 | \$5,272,144 | \$5,124,631 | \$5,237,918 | \$5,775,400 | \$21,410,093 | \$ (383,644 |) S- |
| 594 | \$831,289 | \$280,420 | \$521,957 | \$738,289 | \$2,371,955 | \$ (49,043 |) S- (|
| 595 | \$103,642 | \$47,616 | \$40,721 | \$33,560 | \$225,539 | \$ (2,229 |) S-(|
| 596 | \$240,966 | \$348,544 | \$297,654 | \$356,531 | \$1,243,695 | \$ (23,683 |) S- (|
| 597 | \$148,516 | \$85,910 | \$68,844 | \$23,618 | \$326,888 | \$ (1,569 |) S-(|
| 598 | \$233,441 | \$729,066 | \$787,020 | \$868,069 | \$2,617,596 | \$ (57,664 |) S- (|
| Total Distribution | \$7,754,479 | \$7,568,075 | \$7,571,972 | \$8,455,883 | \$31,350,409 | | |
| Less Payroll | (\$2,387,880) | (\$2,713,921) | (\$2,435,913) | (\$2,588,010) | (\$10,125,724) |] | |
| Net Distribution | \$5,366,599 | \$4,854,154 | \$5,136,059 | \$5,867,873 | \$21,224,685 | 1 | |
| 4 Year Average Distribution Maintena | | \$5,306,171 | 1 | | | | |
| Staff Adjustment \$5,306,171 - (\$8,4 | | (\$561,702) | 1 | | | | |

^{*} Allocated based on 2000 information

