Filed
September 30, 2022
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No. 278

MoPSC Staff – Exhibit 278 Kim Cox True-up Rebuttal Testimony File Nos. ER-2022-0129 & ER-2022-0130

Exhibit No.:

Issue: Revenue,

Other Revenue Issues

Witness: Kim Cox

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: True-Up

Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.: ER-2022-0129 &

ER-2022-0130

Date Testimony Prepared:

August 25, 2022

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION TARIFF/RATE DESIGN DEPARTMENT

TRUE-UP REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

KIM COX

Evergy Metro, Inc., d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro Case No. ER-2022-0129

Evergy Missouri West, Inc., d/b/a Evergy Missouri West Case No. ER-2022-0130

> Jefferson City, Missouri August 2022

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS OF
2	TRUE-UP REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
3	\mathbf{OF}
4	KIM COX
5 6	Evergy Metro, Inc., d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro Case No. ER-2022-0129
7 8	Evergy Missouri West, Inc., d/b/a Evergy Missouri West Case No. ER-2022-0130
9	RECOMPUTED REVENUES
10	TRUE-UP GROWTH METHOD3
11	CONCLUSION4

1		TRUE-UP REBUTTAL TESTIMONY							
2		OF							
3		KIM COX							
4 5	Evergy Metro, Inc., d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro Case No. ER-2022-0129								
6 7 8		Evergy Missouri West, Inc., d/b/a Evergy Missouri West Case No. ER-2022-0130							
9	Q.	Please state your name and business address.							
10	A.	Kim Cox, 200 Madison Street, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.							
11	Q.	Are you the same Kim Cox who has filed direct, rebuttal, surrebuttal and true-							
12	up direct testimony in this case?								
13	A.	Yes.							
14	Q.	What is the purpose of your true-up rebuttal testimony?							
15	A.	The purpose of my true-up rebuttal testimony is to address Company witness,							
16	Marisol E. M	iller's true-up direct testimony and her true-up workpapers and Company witness,							
17	Albert R. Bas	ss, Jr.'s true-up workpapers. Specifically, I will address Ms. Miller's recomputed							
18	revenues using the 12 months ending December 31, 2021 and Mr. Bass' true-up customer								
19	growth method.								
20	RECOMPU	TED REVENUES							
21	Q.	What revenues did Ms. Miller recompute?							
22	A.	Ms. Miller states on page 32, that the Company recomputed normalized,							
23	annualized revenues through the update period, December 31, 2021.								
24	Q.	What billing determinants did Ms. Miller use to recompute revenues?							
25	A.	Ms. Miller used actual billing determinants by rate code for the 12 months							
26	ending December 31, 2021 as the starting point. She did not include the Company's proposal								

- of the jurisdictional alignment prior to annualization and normalization of billing determinants.
- 2 Ms. Miller states on page 32 that the revenues associated with the jurisdictional alignment were 3 added/subtracted as needed at the end of the process.
 - Q. What does Ms. Miller mean by the revenues associated with the jurisdictional alignment were added/subtracted as needed at the end of the process?
 - A. Staff is not sure. Although Ms. Miller did not explicitly state in her true-up testimony the recomputed revenue adjustments, Staff was able to review Ms. Miller's true-up workpapers. Based off of Ms. Miller's workpapers, it appears that each rate code's billing determinants as of December 31, 2021 were adjusted and calculated individually and once completed were combined into the tariffed rate class.
 - Q. Does Staff agree with the recomputed revenues?
 - A. Staff does agree that the jurisdictional alignment should not be included in beginning billing determinants and revenues, as stated and calculated in Staff's direct position in this case and now in the Company's true-up. Although Staff agrees with the starting point of using actual billing determinants and not including the Company's proposal of the jurisdictional alignment, Staff maintains its direct and true-up position on the revenue adjustments and how those adjustments should be calculated. Specifically, the calculation of test year billing determinants, the update adjustment, rate switchers, weather normalization adjustment, 365 days adjustment, Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act ("MEEIA"), customer growth and the alignment of Evergy Missouri Metro ("EMM") summer and winter billing periods. In summary, Staff's normalized and annualized billing determinants and the

 $^{^1}$ Miller true workpaper, Billed Revenue TYE 20211231 - MO Metro_TrueUp and CONFIDENTIAL_Billed Revenue - MO West - TYE 20211231_TrueUp.

revenue associated with them are the better method because: 1.) the growth adjustments is based off of customer charge counts as of April 2022,² 2.) the weather normalization factor was not applied to net metering and parallel generation customers,³ 3.) no revenue adjustment was made for EMM seasonal billing period,⁴ and 4.) Staff's weather normalization adjustment, 365 days adjustment and MEEIA adjustment were applied to Staff's billing determinants.

TRUE-UP GROWTH METHOD

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. What method did Mr. Bass use to calculate the Company's true-up growth adjustment?
- A. Mr. Bass did not provide true-up testimony on this issue; however, Mr. Bass did provide true-up workpapers.⁶ Mr. Bass used the number of customer bills to calculate a two-month average for each month of the update period ending December 2021. Mr. Bass also used the average of April 2022 and May 2022 to determine the growth factor that was then applied to each month. For example, the growth adjustment for June 2021 was calculated by:
 - 1. Changing the actual number of customer bills for June 2021 to the average of May 2021 and June 2021.
 - 2. Then dividing the "new" June 2021 number of customer bills by the average of April 2022 and May 2022.
 - 3. The calculated factor was then applied to the June 2021 billing determinants for the growth adjustment for that month. Ms. Miller then applied the growth adjustment to calculate the revenue.

² Cox True-up testimony, page 11-12.

³ Cox rebuttal, page 9-11.

⁴ Cox True-up testimony, page 9-11.

⁵ Staff witness, Michael Stahlman provided the monthly weather normalization factor for each rate class and the 365 days adjustment. Mr. Stahlman provides the data provided in his direct testimony. Staff witness, J Luebbert provided the true-up monthly MEEIA kWh adjustments for each rate class. Mr. Luebbert discuss the data provided in his true-up direct testimony.

⁶ Bass workpaper, Metro: Customers_2MonthAverage and

EvergyMetro_kWhAdjustments_UpdateYE202112_Trueup. West: Customers_2MonthAverage and WeatherNormSalesWest TYE202106 Trueup.

1	Q. Does Staff agree with Mr. Bass' method for customer growth?								
2	A. No. As stated earlier in this testimony, Staff maintains its growth adjustment								
3	as filed in true-up direct. Staff used actual customer charge counts, not an average								
4	(customer bill count) of two months to apply the growth factor. Staff used April 2022 customer								
5	charge counts as stated in my true-up testimony ⁷ to determine the growth factor not an average								
6	(customer count) of April 2022 and May 2022.								
7	Q. Why did Staff use actual customer charge counts and not a two-month average								
8	customer bill count to calculate the customer growth adjustment?								
9	A. The billing determinants ⁸ such as the customer charge are what a revenue								
10	requirement is divided by to produce rates. Therefore, Staff maintains using the customer								
11	charge to calculate the growth adjustment.								
12	CONCLUSION								
13	Q. What is Staff's recommendation for the true-up rebuttal issues discussed in								
14	this testimony?								
15	A. Staff recommends that the Commission:								
16	a. rely on Staff's test year starting billing determinants and revenue,								
17	b. accept Staff's update adjustment to billing determinants and revenue,								
18	c. accept Staff's true-up growth adjustment,								
19	d. accept Staff's true-up rate switcher adjustment,								
20	e. accept Staff's MEEIA true-up adjustment, and								
21	f. order Evergy to align EMM and EMW winter and summer season ⁹								
22	with no revenue adjustment.								

 ⁷ Cox true-up testimony, page 11, lines 9-22.
 ⁸ Examples are: customer charge, usage, facilities, demand, reactive demand, net metering and parallel generation.
 ⁹ The summer months will be the four (4) monthly billing periods of June through September. The winter months will be the eight (8) monthly billing periods of October through May.

4

5

6

- 1 Q. What are your recommended rate revenue adjustments?
- A. The Commission should base its awarded revenue requirement on Staff's rate revenue adjustments as provided below.

	Test Year	Update	True up adi-		Large Power billing adjustment and	MEEIA, Weather Norm and			
	Revenue (As	period	nucor J	Nam la maka		365 days	Growth	Total Ending	
West	Billed)	adjustment	Luebbert	Non lp rate switcher	n -J Luebbert		adjustment	Revenue	
Residential	\$ 378.056.023	\$ 2.822.638	Luebbert	Switcher	II -3 Luebbert	\$(8,142,039)	\$ 4,833,447	\$ 377,570,070	
SGS	\$ 114,077,108	\$ 4,693,891				\$ (558,613)	7 .,,	\$ 120,104,604	
LGS	\$ 92,099,331	\$ 1,040,746		\$ (1,150,777)			\$ (622,977)	\$ 90,331,044	
LPS (J Luebbert)	\$ 116,266,882	\$ 1,098,225		y (1,130,777)	\$ 1,048,252	\$ (70,332)	y (022,377)	\$ 118,343,027	
Metered Lighting	¥ 110,200,002	y 1,030,223			y 1,0-10,232	y (10,332)		Ç 110,545,027	
(Joe Roling)	\$ 100,515	\$ 1,922						\$ 102,437	
Thermal -650	\$ 460.184	\$ 10,909						\$ 471,093	
Lighting (Joe Roling)	\$ 12,971,049	\$ (14,887)						\$ 12,956,162	
TOD-630	\$ 17.864	\$ 820						\$ 18,684	
Nucor (J Luebbert)	\$7,898,321	\$ 765,810	\$ 318,224					\$ 8,982,355	
CCN	\$ 34,279	\$ 8,740	,					\$ 43,020	
	\$721,981,558	\$10,428,815		-\$1,150,777	\$1,048,252	-\$9,806,263	\$6,102,688	\$728,922,496	
	Test Year As								
	Billed								
	(Without		Large power		MEEIA,		Revenue		
	DSIM,	Update	customer		Weather		Subtotal (No		
	MPower, and	period	annualization	Non Ip rate	Norm, & 365	Growth	DSIM,	Add EDR- Nancy	
Metro	EDR)	adjustment	(J Luebbert)	switcher	Day Adj.	adjustment	Mpower, EDR)	Harris	Final Total
Residential	\$ 333,618,742	\$ 2,427,009	\$ -	\$ -	\$(8,474,187)	\$ 4,652,860	\$ 332,224,424		\$ 332,224,424
Small GS	\$ 67,036,786	\$ 3,928,326		\$ -	\$ (498,276)	\$ 418,027	\$ 70,884,863		\$ 70,884,863
Medium GS	\$ 122,838,175	\$ 1,782,750	-	\$ -	, ,	\$(1,371,180)	\$ 122,572,259	\$ 42,260	\$ 122,614,519
Large GS	\$ 180,421,816	\$ 3,593,706		\$ 1,038,861	\$ (274,747)	\$(2,667,723)	\$ 182,111,913		\$ 182,111,913
arge Power (J Luebbert)	\$ 122,018,674	\$ (1,271,450)	\$ (1,921,193)		\$ 4,951		\$ 118,830,982		\$ 118,830,982
Lighting (Joe Roling)	\$ 9,951,318	\$ (63,569)					\$ 9,887,749		\$ 9,887,749
CCN	\$ 76,457	\$ 26,825					\$ 103,282		\$ 103,282
	\$ 835,961,968	\$10,423,597	\$ (1 Q21 1Q2\	\$ 1,038,861	\$ (9,919,745)	¢ 1 021 00/	\$ 836,615,471	\$ 42,260	\$ 836,657,731

- Q. Does this conclude your true-up rebuttal testimony?
- 7 A. Yes.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Missouri Metro's Request for Au	he Matter of Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy) ssouri Metro's Request for Authority to blement a General Rate Increase for Electric) vice							
In the Matter of Evergy Missour d/b/a Evergy Missouri West's Re Authority to Implement a General Increase for Electric Service)))	Case No. ER-2022-0130						
A	AFFIDAVIT OF KIM COX							
STATE OF MISSOURI)								
COUNTY OF COLE)	SS.	18						

COMES NOW KIM COX and on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and lawful age; that she contributed to the foregoing *True-Up Rebuttal Testimony of Kim Cox*; and that the same is true and correct according to her best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

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 25 th day of August 2022.

D. SUZIE MANKIN
Notary Public - Notary Seal
State of Missouri
Commissioned for Cole County
My Commission Expires: April 04, 2025
Commission Number: 12412070

Notary Public