

FILED

SEP 28 2016

Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No.: 132
Issues: Tariff Issues, AMI Opt-Out
Witness: Jerry Scheible, P.E.
Sponsoring Party: MO PSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony
Case No.: ER-2016-0156
Date Testimony Prepared: September 2, 2016

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

**COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION
OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT
ENGINEERING ANALYSIS UNIT**

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JERRY SCHEIBLE, P.E.

KCP&L GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY

CASE NO. ER-2016-0156

*Jefferson City, Missouri
September 2016*

Surrebuttal Testimony of
Jerry Scheible

1 A. Yes. Staff received a Data Request from GMO on August 3, 2016, requesting

2 Staff to:

3 ... provide any and all reports, lists or information of any kind
4 available, documenting customer inquiries or complaints that have
5 been received by the Consumer Services Department of the MPSC
6 regarding the use of what is commonly referred to as smart meters.
7 ... at both KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company and
8 Kansas City Power and Light Company during 2013, 2014, 2015
9 and year to date 2016.²

10 Staff's response on August 9, 2016, included a summary of all contacts regarding concerns
11 about smart meters from KCPL and GMO customers to Staff from 2013 through July 2016, as
12 documented in EFIS. That summary listed: one Formal Complaint, eight Informal
13 Complaints, nine Quick Hits, and two Inquiries. Therefore, KCPL and GMO have been made
14 aware of at least twenty contacts from concerned customers.

15 Q. Ms. Dragoo states, "Our current plan is to eliminate the need for a
16 manual meter reading system at the completion of our system wide AMI roll out in the 2020
17 time frame, as well as the employees whose sole job is to read the meters."³ Does Staff
18 expect that this plan will completely eliminate the need for personnel to ever physically visit
19 customer meters?

20 A. No. No system is without error or malfunction. Staff would expect that
21 personnel, representing either the utility or a contracted party, will occasionally need to
22 physically verify the function of any given meter, its transmitting capabilities, or confirm a
23 recorded reading. Therefore, some method of performing visits to meters and recording
24 the results of any physical meter reading would need to remain in place. Meter reading

² Data Request No. 0430.

³ Rebuttal testimony of Julie Dragoo, page 6, lines 14 - 17.

Surrebuttal Testimony of
Jerry Scheible

1 and recording for those customers participating in an opt-out program could utilize that
2 same process.

3 Q. Ms. Dragoo states:

4 While we have not done a complete cost analysis on an opt-out
5 program, the tariff recommendation of a \$10/month meter reading
6 fee is too low. This is based purely on the known costs of a Field
7 Service Professional to perform a 'Customer Trip' such as a
8 reconnect after disconnection. The Company's approved
9 Reconnection Charges is \$25, and does not include costs that
10 would be incurred with an opt-out for software, hardware, and
11 systems support.⁴

12 Is GMO recommending a \$25 "Recurring monthly meter read charge," or any other fee
13 amount, rather than the \$10 that Staff proposed in testimony?

14 A. No. Staff agrees that the exact proper fees are yet unknown and therefore
15 continues to recommend that GMO keep track of the costs associated with the opt-out
16 program in order to have actual cost data in future rate cases to evaluate the fees necessary to
17 support the program, as was presented in testimony.⁵

18 Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?

19 A. Yes.

⁴ Rebuttal testimony of Julie Dragoo, page 8, lines 19 - 24.

⁵ Staff's Revenue Requirement Cost of Service Report, page 202, lines 6 - 8.

