

SEP 2 8 2016

Missouri Public Service Commission Exhibit No.: Issues: Witness: Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit: Case No.: Date Testimony Prepared:

132

Tariff Issues, AMI Opt-Out Jerry Scheible, P.E. MO PSC Staff Surrebuttal Testimony ER-2016-0156 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

1	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2	OF
3	JERRY SCHEIBLE, P.E.
4	KCP&L GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY
5	CASE NO. ER-2016-0156
6	Q. Please state your name and business address.
7	A. My name is Jerry Scheible and my business address is Missouri Public Service
8	Commission, P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
9	Q. Are you the same Jerry Scheible that supported sections in Staff's Revenue
10	Requirement Cost of Service Report in this case?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
13	A. I discuss certain aspects of the rebuttal testimony of GMO's witness
14	Julie Dragoo regarding the issue of an opt-out program for customers that do not want an
15	Advanced Meter Infrastructure (AMI) meter, also known as a smart meter, installed at their
16	residence.
17	Q. Ms. Dragoo states in rebuttal testimony that KCPL and GMO are aware of one
18	formal complaint and seven informal complaints that resulted in calls to their Customer
19	Relations Department. ¹ Has Staff been contacted by KCPL and GMO customers who
20	voiced concerns about AMI meters, other than those eight total formal and informal
21	complaints mentioned in Dragoo's rebuttal testimony, and has KCPL and GMO been made
22	aware of these additional contacts?

• •

¹ Rebuttal testimony of Julie Dragoo, page 5, lines 21 - 24.

Surrebuttal Testimony of Jerry Scheible

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

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

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

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

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

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

,

.

same process.			
same process.			
Q. Ms. Dragoo states:			
While we have not done a complete cost analysis on an opt-out program, the tariff recommendation of a \$10/month meter reading fee is too low. This is based purely on the known costs of a Field Service Professional to perform a 'Customer Trip' such as a reconnect after disconnection. The Company's approved Reconnection Charges is \$25, and does not include costs that would be incurred with an opt-out for software, hardware, and systems support. ⁴			
Is GMO recommending a \$25 "Recurring monthly meter read charge," or any other fee			
amount, rather than the \$10 that Staff proposed in testimony?			
A. No. Staff agrees that the exact proper fees are yet unknown and therefore			
continues to recommend that GMO keep track of the costs associated with the opt-out			
program in order to have actual cost data in future rate cases to evaluate the fees necessary to			
support the program, as was presented in testimony. ⁵			
Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?			
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.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

)

)

)

In the Matter of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company's Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate Increase for **Electric Service**

Case No. ER-2016-0156

AFFIDAVIT OF JERRY SCHEIBLE, PE

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS.
COUNTY OF COLE)	

COMES NOW JERRY SCHEIBLE, PE and on his oath declares that he is of sound mind and lawful age; that he contributed to the foregoing Surrebuttal Testimony and that the same is true and correct according to his best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

SCHEIBLE, PE

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 3l st day of

, 2016.

D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: December 12, 2016 Commission Number: 12412070

Jusullankin Notary Public