Exhibit No.: Issue: Weather Normalization Witness: George M. McCollister Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony Sponsoring Party: Kansas City Power & Light Company Case No.: ER-2012-0174 Date Testimony Prepared: September 5, 2012

Filed November 30, 2012 Data Center Missouri Public Service Commission

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2012-0174

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

GEORGE M. McCOLLISTER

ON BEHALF OF

KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Kansas City, Missouri September 2012

KCPL Exhibit No. 33 Date 10-29-22 Reporter 45 File No. 52-2012-0174

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

GEORGE M. McCOLLISTER

Case No. ER-2012-0174

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:	What is the purpose of your Rebuttal Testimony?
8	A:	The purpose of my testimony is to respond to certain conclusions sponsored by Shawn E.
9		Lange and Karen Lyons in the Missouri Public Service Commission Staff's ("Staff")
10		Revenue Requirement Cost of Service Report ("Report") for Kansas City Power & Light
11		Company ("KCP&L" or the "Company") concerning the weather sensitivity of the Large
12		Power ("LP") class and the customer growth adjustments.
13	Q:	What was Mr. Lange's conclusion regarding the weather adjustment for LP
14		customers?
15	A:	He states at page 81 of Staff's Report:
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Staff did not weather normalize the Large Power Service (LPS) class. The members of this class are not homogeneous and, consequently, a weather response function created for one member should not be applied to any other member. Staff concludes it is both appropriate and necessary to annualize rather than normalize LPS for changes in customer usage and count. Please see Large Power Annualization by Staff witness Seoung Joun Won for a more detailed explanation of the annualization adjustments for the LPS class. Applying the weather normalization

1

1 2 process to annualized usage would have introduced statistical error into the product of the analysis.

- **3 O: Do you agree with Mr. Lange's statement?**
- 4 A: No.
- 5 Q: What do you disagree with in his statement?

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

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

- A: The weather adjustment is computed before the LPS loads are annualized. In theory, the
 annualization would change the weather adjustment as well as the actual unadjusted
 usage.
- 17 Q: Why do you believe that this error is small?
- 18 A: Both adjustments are small compared to total kwh sales, so the product of the two
 19 adjustments on a percentage basis would be much smaller than either adjustment by
 20 itself.

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

A: KCP&L and the Staff use a similar methodology for making this adjustment. The
 adjustment made by the Staff is described on page 84 of its Report. However, I noticed
 major differences in our results made for customer counts as of March 2012. The

majority of this difference occurs because Staff did not make an adjustment for the entire
class, whereas my adjustment includes the entire class. Schedule GMM-4 shows the
customer counts in March 2012 by class and subclass. Staff witness Karen Lyons only
adjusted the subclasses shown in the rows that are shaded in my schedule. While she did
adjust the largest subclasses within each class, there are a substantial number of
customers in the subclasses that were not adjusted. Neither KCP&L nor Staff made this
adjustment for the Large Power Class.

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

A: The adjustments for the subclasses that were not adjusted by Staff add up to several
 million dollars in revenues in this case based on March 2012 customer counts. Both
 KCP&L and the Staff will revise these adjustments based on August 2012 customer
 counts during the true up, but I expect the differences to remain substantial.

14 Q: What is your conclusion on these issues?

A: I recommend that the Commission accept KCP&L's weather adjustments to kWh sales
and revenue for the LPS class and KCP&L's customer growth adjustments to kWh sales
and revenue.

18 Q: Does that conclude your testimony?

19 A: Yes, it does.

3

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light Company's Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate Increase for Electric Service

Case No. ER-2012-0174

AFFIDAVIT OF GEORGE M. McCOLLISTER

)

STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss COUNTY OF JACKSON)

George M. McCollister, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:

1. My name is George M. McCollister. I work in Kansas City, Missouri, and I am employed by Kansas City Power & Light Company as Manager of Market Assessment.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of Kansas City Power & Light Company consisting of three (3)

pages, having been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the abovecaptioned docket.

3. I have knowledge of the matters set forth therein. I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded, including any attachments thereto, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

<u>Mene M. Me Callet</u> George M. McCollister

Subscribed and sworn before me this 5^{th} day of September, 2012.

Notary Public My commission expires: Flb. 4 2015 NICOLE A. WEHRY Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri **Commissioned for Jackson County** My Commission Expires: February 04, 2015 Commission Number: 113

LGSPA	14
LGSS - Harris Harris - Harris - Harris	frideseparting 679
LGSSA	209
LGSSH	36
LARGE GEN SVC TOTAL	1,016
 D = 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0	
LPGSP	33
LPGSPO	10
LPGSS	32
LPSSSO	-
LPGSSS	3
LPGSTR	2
LPSTRO	2
LARGE POWER TOTAL	82
MGSP	39
MGSPA	1
MGSS Hand Street	4,866
MGSSA	408
MGSSH	89
MEDIUM GEN SVC TOTAL	5,403
SGSP	42
SGSPA	-
SGSS	23,528
SGSSA	508
SGSSH	230
SGSSU	1,216
SMALL GEN SVC TOTAL	25,524
	20
ROU RESA	 Second and a statistical advantage of the second secon
	20
RESA	20
RESA RESB	20 189,263 - 40,083
RESA RESB RESC	20 40,083 40,083 10,783

MISSOURI RATE GROUP

LGSP

LGSPA

BF Actual

Customer Count

78

14