

Exhibit No.:
Issue: Weather Normalization
Witness: George M. McCollister
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony
Sponsoring Party: KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company
Case No.: ER-2012-0175
Date Testimony Prepared: September 12, 2012

Filed
December 03, 2012
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2012-0175

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

GEORGE M. McCOLLISTER

ON BEHALF OF

KCP&L GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY

**Kansas City, Missouri
September 2012**

GMO Exhibit No. 127
Date 10-25-12 Reporter FF
File No. ER-2012-0175

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
OF
GEORGE M. McCOLLISTER
Case No. ER-2012-0175

1 **Q: Please state your name and business address.**

2 A: My name is George M. McCollister, Ph.D. My business address is 1200 Main Street,
3 Kansas City, Missouri 64105.

4 **Q: Are you the same George M. McCollister who pre-filed Direct Testimony in this**
5 **matter?**

6 A: Yes, I am.

7 **Q: On whose behalf are you testifying?**

8 A: I am testifying on behalf of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company (“GMO” or
9 the “Company”) for St. Joseph Light & Power (“L&P”) and Missouri Public Service
10 (“MPS”) territories.

11 **Q: What is the purpose of your Rebuttal Testimony?**

12 A: The purpose of my testimony is to respond to certain conclusions sponsored by Shawn E.
13 Lange and Karen Lyons in the Staff’s Revenue Requirement Cost of Service Report
14 (“Report”) for KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations concerning the weather sensitivity of
15 the Large Power (“LP”) class and the customer growth adjustments.

16 **Q: What was Mr. Lange’s conclusion regarding the weather adjustment for LP**
17 **customers?**

18 A: He states at page 100 of Staff’s Report:

19 Staff did not normalize weather for the Large Power Services (LPS) class,
20 but instead annualized the LPS class for changes in customer usage and

1 count. The members of this class are not homogeneous; and, consequently,
2 a weather response function created for one member should not be applied
3 to any other member. Staff concluded it is both appropriate and necessary
4 to annualize rather than normalize the LPS class for changes in customer
5 usage and count. Applying the weather normalization process to
6 annualized usage would have introduced statistical error into the product
7 of the analysis.

8 **Q: Do you agree with Mr. Lange's statement?**

9 A: No.

10 **Q: What do you disagree with in his statement?**

11 A: First, for all the classes that are weather normalized, the weather response function is
12 estimated for the class as a whole and applied to the actual sales of the entire class. It is
13 never applied to individual customers in the methods used by either GMO or the Staff, as
14 Mr. Lange inferred. Second, Mr. Lange states that both weather normalizing and
15 annualizing LPS loads would introduce a statistical error into the product of the analysis.
16 While I agree with this statement, I maintain that the error is small, especially in
17 comparison to the error of not weather normalizing sales.

18 **Q: Can you describe the error to which Mr. Lange refers?**

19 A: The weather adjustment is computed before the LPS loads are annualized. In theory, the
20 annualization would change the weather adjustment as well as the actual unadjusted
21 usage.

22 **Q: Why do you believe that this error is small?**

23 A: Both adjustments are small compared to total kwh sales, so the product of the two
24 adjustments would be much smaller than either adjustment by itself.

25 **Q: What issue do you have with the Staff's adjustment for customer growth?**

26 A: GMO and the Staff use a similar methodology for making this adjustment. The
27 adjustment made by the Staff is described on page 103 of its Report. However, I noticed

1 major differences in our results made for customer counts as of March 2012. A large
2 portion of this difference occurs because Staff did not make an adjustment for the entire
3 class, whereas my adjustment includes the entire class. Schedule GMM-4 shows the
4 customer counts in March 2012 by class and subclass. Karen Lyons only adjusted the
5 subclasses shown in the rows that are shaded in my schedule. While she did adjust the
6 largest subclasses within most of the classes, there are a substantial number of customers
7 in the subclasses that were not adjusted. Neither GMO nor Staff made this adjustment for
8 the Large Power Class.

9 **Q: Why should the customer growth adjustment apply to the entire classes that are**
10 **adjusted?**

11 A: Some of the subclasses that were not adjusted by the Staff contain a substantial number
12 of customers. For example, the Staff omitted the entire Small General Service class from
13 this adjustment. Both GMO and the Staff will revise these adjustments based on August
14 2012 customer counts during the true up.

15 **Q: What is your conclusion on these issues?**

16 A: I recommend that the Commission accept GMO's weather adjustments to kWh sales and
17 revenue for the LPS class and GMO's customer growth adjustments to kWh sales and
18 revenue.

19 **Q: Does that conclude your testimony?**

20 A: Yes, it does.

