

Edward F. Downey Direct: (573) 556-6623 efdowney@bryancave.com

October 6, 2006

#### BY HAND DELIVERY

Ms. Cully Dale Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Missouri Public Service Commission

Re:

In the Matter of the Application of Kansas City Power & Light Company for Approval to Make Certain Changes in its Charges for Electric Service to Begin the Implementation of Its Regulatory Plan, Case ER-2006-0314

Dear Ms. Dale:

Attached for filing in the above-referenced case are an original and eight (8) copies of the Surrebuttal Testimony of James T. Selecky on Cost of Service On Behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP to be filed in the above matter.

Thank you for your assistance in bringing this filing to the attention of the Commission, and please call me if you have any questions.

Very Truly Yours,

Edward F. Downey - Edward F. Downey by leas

EFD: lea

cc: All Parties

Tel (573) 556-6620 Fax (573) 556-6630

Jefferson City MO 55101 1574

Bryan Cave LLP Riverview Office Center 221 Bohvar Street

www.bryancave.com

Hong Kong

Irvine

Jefferson City

Kansas Crtv

Kuwart

Los Angeles

New York

Overland Park

Phoen-x

Biyadh

Shanghai

St Louis

United Arab Emirates

Abu Bhab.

Ouha.

Washington DC

In Association With Bryan Cave (Ittinois)

Chicago

and Bryan Cave A Multinational Partnership

London

**Exhibit No.:** 

Witness:

Type of Exhibit:

Issues:

Sponsoring Parties: Case No.:

James T. Selecky Surrebuttal Testimony

Cost of Service

Wal-Mart Stores East, LP

ER-2006-0314

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Kansas City Power & Light Company for Approval to Make Certain Changes in its Charges for Electric Service to Begin the Implementation of Its Regulatory Plan

Case No. ER-2006-0314

Surrebuttal Testimony of

James T. Selecky on Cost of Service

FILED<sup>3</sup>
OCT 6 2006

Missouri Public Service Commission

On Behalf of

Wal-Mart Stores East, LP

October 6, 2006



Brubaker & Associates, Inc. St. Louis, MO 63141-2000

### BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of
Kansas City Power & Light Company
for Approval to Make Certain Changes
in its Charges for Electric Service to
Begin the Implementation of Its
Regulatory Plan

STATE OF MISSOURI
SS
COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS

#### Affidavit of James T. Selecky

James T. Selecky, being first duly sworn, on his oath states:

- 1. My name is James T. Selecky. I am a consultant with Brubaker & Associates, Inc., having its principal place of business at 1215 Fern Ridge Parkway, Suite 208, St. Louis, Missouri 63141-2000. We have been retained by Wal-Mart Stores East, LP in this proceeding on their behalf
- 2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my surrebuttal testimony on cost of service issues which was prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in Missouri Public Service Commission Case No. ER-2006-0314.
- 3. I hereby swear and affirm that the testimony is true and correct and that it shows the matters and things it purports to show.

James ♥. Selecky

Subscribed and sworn to before this 6th day of October 2006

CAROL SCHULZ
Notary Public - Notary Sea)
STATE OF MISSOURI
St. Louis County

My Commission Expires: Feb. 26, 2008

Notary Public

My Commission Expires February 26, 2008.

BRUBAKER & ASSOCIATES, INC.

WDC99 1294484-1 075844 0016

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Kansas City Power & Light Company for Approval to Make Certain Changes in its Charges for Electric Service to Begin the Implementation of Its Regulatory Plan

Case No. ER-2006-0314

### Surrebuttal Testimony of James T. Selecky

1	Q	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
2	Α	James T. Selecky; 1215 Fern Ridge Parkway, Suite 208; St. Louis, MO 63141-2000.
3	Q	ARE YOU THE SAME JAMES T. SELECKY WHO HAS PREVIOUSLY FILED
4		DIRECT AND REBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
5	Α	Yes. I have previously filed direct and rebuttal testimony on cost of service and
6		revenue allocation issues.
7	Q	ARE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE OUTLINED IN
8		THAT PRIOR TESTIMONY?
9	Α	Yes. This information is included in Appendix A to my direct testimony on cost of
10		service and revenue allocation issues.
11	Q	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS
12		PROCEEDING?
13	Α	The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimony of
14		Kansas City Power & Light Company witness Tim M. Rush.

James T. Selecky Page 1

1	Q	BASED ON YOUR REVIEW OF THE OTHER PARTIES' REBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		IN THIS PROCEEDING ON COST OF SERVICE, DO YOU HAVE ANY REVISIONS,
3		ADJUSTMENTS OR ADDITIONS TO YOUR DIRECT AND REBUTTAL
4		TESTIMONY?
5	Α	No. I continue to support the use of the cost of service study that allocates the fixed
6		production cost either on the coincident peak method or the average and excess
7		demand method.
8	Q	DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS TO MAKE REGARDING KCP&L WITNESS TIM
9		M. RUSH'S REBUTTAL TESTIMONY ON CLASS COST OF SERVICE ISSUES?
10	Α	Yes. Mr. Rush states on Page 9, Lines 5-6, that Mr. Selecky's proposed class cost of
11		service study has the same flaw as Mr. Brubaker's regarding the allocation of off-
12		system sales. Since I did not take a position on the allocation of the off-system sales,
13		I allocated the off-system sales using the same method that the Company employed.
14		Therefore, Mr. Rush's statement is inaccurate.
15	Q	HAS THE COMPANY CHANGED ITS POSITION REGARDING THE ALLOCATION
16		OF ANY RATE INCREASE IT IS GRANTED?
17	Α	No. Mr. Rush states on Page 9 that the Company's position is that the rate increase
18		be equally distributed to all classes, and that all additional changes recommended by
19		the Company in its initial filing be implemented. I disagree with that position and
20		continue to recommend that any reductions from the level of increase that the
21		Company has requested be used to move rates closer to cost of service.
22	Q	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?
23	Α	Yes, it does.  James T. Selecky
		Page 2