Exhibit No.:

Issue(s): Rate Design
Witness: Marina Gonzales
Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.: ER-2024-0261

Date Testimony Prepared: August 18, 2025

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION

TARIFF & RATE DESIGN DEPARTMENT

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MARINA GONZALES

THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a Liberty

CASE NO. ER-2024-0261

Jefferson City, Missouri August 2025

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS OF
2	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
3	MARINA GONZALES
4 5	THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a Liberty
6	CASE NO. ER-2024-0261
7	Asymmetrical Rate Schedule Adjustments1
8	Recovery of Fixed Costs4

1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY			
2		OF			
3		MARINA GONZALES			
4 5		THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a Liberty			
6		CASE NO. ER-2024-0261			
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.			
8	A.	Marina Gonzales and my business address is Missouri Public Service			
9	Commission, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.				
10	Q.	Are you the same Marina Gonzales who filed Functionalized Class Cost of			
11	Service ("CCOS") and non-residential Rate Design testimony, as well as Large Power Service				
12	("LPS") billing determinants and revenues in this matter?				
13	A.	Yes.			
14	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?			
15	A.	I will respond to the allocation of the non-residential rate design of Midwest			
16	Energy Consumer Group ("MECG") witness Kavita Maini and Empire witness Tim Lyons.				
17	ASYMMET	RICAL RATE SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENTS			
18	Q.	Are there any differences in the adjustments proposed for alternative rate			
19	schedules ¹ w	ithin a rate class in this case?			
20	A.	Yes. Both MECG witness Kavita Maini and Empire witness Tim Lyons propose			
21	adjustments	for alternative rate schedules within a rate class in their direct testimonies as			
22	opposed to an	n equal percent increase within rate classes.			
	¹ Non-Standard	Time Choice, or Time Choice Plus.			

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Q. Describe the revenue requirement allocations among the non-residential rate classes provide by MECG.

As is demonstrated in Figure 2.1 from Ms. Maini's direct testimony, the different A. rate options within the rate classes are assigned "class multipliers" that align with MECG's calculated cost of service. Ms. Maini states that "[t]he multipliers are calculated by taking the class increase and dividing it by the system average... The class multiplier would be applied to the final authorized increase." Within the Small Primary class, Figure 2.1 (shown below) illustrates a different Class Cost of Service ("COSS") percentage and MECG COSS Class Multiplier, but ultimately recommends the same class multipliers to these alternative rate schedules. Meanwhile, within the General Service Class the MECG Recommend Class Multiplier for non-standard ("NS") and time-choice ("TC") rate options are the same, but not the time-choice plus ("TP") option. For example, if an increase of 10% is approved, the NS General Service and TC General Service rates would receive an increase of 8% and the TP General Service rate would receive an increase of 12.5%. A Data Request ("DR") was sent on July 24, 2025, requesting an explanation behind the reasoning and methodology that was used to calculate the MECG Recommended Class Multipliers, but unfortunately, the response received on August 13, 2025, declined to provide this additional information, instead primarily providing citation to Ms. Maini's existing testimony.

 $^{^{2}}$ Case No. ER-2024-0261, Maini Direct Testimony, Page 21, Lines 16-19.

Figure 2.1: MECG COSS Based Multiplier and MECG Recommended Class Multiplier

Column	1	2	3
			MECG
		MECG COSS	Recommended
Class	MECG COSS	Class Multiplier	Class Multiplier
NS Residential	27.7%	0.94	0.88
TC Residential	42.5%	1.43	1.15
TP Residential	61.7%	2.08	1.20
NS General Service	17.7%	0.60	0.80
TC General Service	10.1%	0.34	0.80
TP General Service	98.7%	3.33	1.25
NS Large General	24.3%	0.82	0.85
TC Large General	34.1%	1.15	1.01
NS Small Primary	-1.0%	-0.03	0.74
TC Small Primary	-5.0%	-0.17	0.74
Large Power	5.6%	0.19	0.76
Transmission	10.4%	0.35	0.77
MS-Miscellaneous	-22.7%	-0.77	0.70
SPL-Municipal St Lighting	55.1%	1.86	1.20
PL-Private Lighting	-30.1%	-1.01	0.70
LS-Special Lighting	240.8%	8.13	1.25
Total Company	29.64%	1.00	1.00

Q. Describe the revenue requirement allocations among the non-residential rate classes provide by Empire.

A. The substitute workpapers provided by Empire witness Tim Lyons on February 5, 2025, do not align with the proposed rate schedules outlined in Tariff JE-2025-0127 for the General Service, Large General Service, and Small Primary Service rate classes. While it is unclear how Empire determined the exact rates in the tariff for these classes, the percent increase of the rates within each of these rate classes consistently indicates a lower percent increase to the time-of-use rates compared to the non-standard rates. A Data Request for clarification and the workpapers used to generate the rates illustrated in the proposed Tariff JE-2025-0127 was sent on July 31, 2025. A response was not provided in time for this testimony.

Q. Is it reasonable to adjust alternative rate schedules differently within a rate class under the circumstances of this case?

A. No.

Q.

What would be needed to reasonably adjust rates within a rate class? 1 Q. 2 A clear understanding of the cost basis is needed to reasonably realign revenue A. 3 recovery within a class. That is not present in this case, as discussed further in Staff witness 4 Sarah L.K. Lange's rebuttal testimony. 5 **RECOVERY OF FIXED COSTS** 6 Q. What is considered a "fixed cost"? 7 A. A fixed cost is something that costs the same no matter how much or how little 8 of something is used. As it is used in on page 26 of MECG witness Kavita Maini's direct 9 testimony, "fixed cost" means a class's allocated share of capital cost recovery for power plants. 10 Q. What is the relationship between capital costs for power plants and long-term 11 system coincident peak ("CP") demand? 12 A. A customer's CP demand represents a customer's load during the hour when the 13 system as a whole has its highest energy usage. The system CP is the total load occurring in 14 that same hour. Over time, a utility such as Empire will generally seek to balance its system 15 CP demand, plus reserve margin, with its resource adequacy requirements. 16 Q. What would be the result of shifting the recovery of "fixed costs" more heavily 17 on billing demand charges as opposed to energy charges? 18 A. As discussed on page 26 of MECG witness Maini's direct testimony, shifting 19 the recovery of fixed costs more heavily to the demand charges would decrease the energy 20 charge. This would effectively place more of the recovery for the cost of Empire to own power 21 plants into the demand charge.

Are Empire's billing demand charges based on CP demand?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

- A. No. Empire's billing demand charges are based on a customer's non-coincident peak³ ("NCP") demand.
- Q. What is the relationship between a given customer's monthly NCP and the overall system CP relevant to resource adequacy requirements?
- A. There is little to no relationship. The given customer's monthly NCP used for billing represents a class's maximum usage regardless of when it occurs relative to other classes, other customers, or the system as a whole. Compared to using CP demand as a cost basis, NCP demand charges allow for more inefficient customer responses. Due to the minimal relationship between a given customer's monthly NCP and the overall system CP, the NCP demand charge does not properly align the customer's usage with the grid's capacity and potentially penalizes customers that use the most of their energy when the system is not under strain by overstating their responsibility for system capacity costs.
- Q. Is it reasonable to increase the cost recovery of NCP demand charges, and to further bill customers who use most of their energy in off peak hours for the cost of owning power plants?
- A. No.
- Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
 - A. Yes, it does.

_

³ Non-Coincident Peak ("NPC"), refers to the customer's maximum usage regardless of when it occurs relative to other classes on the system, while Coincident Peak ("CP") refers to a given customer or class's load in the hour in a given month (or year) when the system has the highest energy usage.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Request of The Empire District Electric Company d/b/a Liberty for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in Its Missouri Service Area Case No. ER-2024-0261 Case No. ER-2024-0261
AFFIDAVIT OF MARINA GONZALES
STATE OF MISSOURI)
COUNTY OF COLE) ss.
COMES NOW MARINA GONZALES and on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and lawful age; that she contributed to the foregoing <i>Rebuttal Testimony of Marina Gonzales</i> ; and that the same is true and correct according to her best knowledge and belief.
Further the Affiant sayeth not. MARINA GONZALES
JURAT
Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for
the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my office in Jefferson City, on this day
of August 2025.
Notary Public - Notary Seei Commission Express April 04, 2029 Commission Mumber: 12412070