FILED
June 4, 2008
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No.

Issue: Amortization

Witness: Robert W. Sager

Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony Sponsoring Party: Empire District Electric

Case No. ER-2008-0093

Date Testimony Prepared: April 2008

Before the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri

Rebuttal Testimony

of

Robert W. Sager

April 2008

2008 Exhibit No. 23

Case No(s). 51-2008-0093

Date 5-12-08 Rptr 45

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ROBERT W. SAGER THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION CASE NO. ER-2008-0093

1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

- 2 A. Robert W. Sager, 602 Joplin Street, Joplin, Missouri 64801.
- **Q. WHO IS YOUR EMPLOYER AND WHAT POSITION DO YOU HOLD?**
- 4 A. The Empire District Electric Company ("Empire" or "Company") is my employer. I
- 5 hold the position of Director of Financial Services.
- 6 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY.
- 7 A. My testimony responds to the testimony of the other parties on the issue of
- 8 regulatory plan amortization.
- 9 Q. WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE REGULATORY PLAN
- 10 **AMORTIZATION?**
- 11 A. As I indicated in my direct testimony in this case, the purpose of the regulatory plan
- amortization provisions agreed to in Case No. EO-2005-0263 is to determine
- whether rate relief calculated for Empire under traditional methods must be
- supplemented to enable Empire to maintain its investment grade rating, although, the
- amortization and its effect on the Company's financial ratios by itself does not
- guarantee that Empire's ratings will be assigned an investment grade.
- 17 Q. PLEASE RESPOND TO THE STAFF TESTIMONY ON THIS ISSUE.
- 18 A. As a result of our review of the direct testimony filed by Mark Oligschlaeger on
- behalf of the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Staff") and

ROBERT W. SAGER REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

1	discussions held with the Office of the Public Counsel ("OPC") an agreement
2	between the Staff, OPC, and Empire has been reached concerning the numeric value
3	of the Additional Net Balance Sheet Investment and the basic structure for purposes
4	of calculating the amount of Regulatory Amortization which will result from this
5	case.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE AGREEMENT REACHED BETWEEN THE
STAFF, OPC AND EMPIRE ON HOW TO ESTABLISH THE LEVEL OF
ADDITIONAL NET BALANCE SHEET INVESTMENT FOR PURPOSES OF

CALCULATING REGULATORY AMORTIZATION IN THIS CASE.

The amount of Additional Net Balance Sheet Investment to be included in the calculation of Regulatory Amortization in this case has been established at \$94,500,000 by mutual agreement between the Staff, OPC and Empire. I have attached an illustration of the calculation of the Regulatory Amortization using this Addition Net Balance Sheet Investment as Rebuttal Schedule RWS-1. This schedule is intended to display a hypothetical calculation that incorporates the agreement reached between the Staff, OPC and Empire on the level of Additional Net Balance Sheet Investment and the agreement on the basic structure and is not intended to indicate the overall level of Regulatory Amortization that will ultimately be required in this rate case, which will depend upon the Commission's ultimate findings concerning Empire's overall traditional revenue requirement. The agreed to level of Additional Net Balance Sheet Investment is displayed on Rebuttal Schedule RWS-1 on line 1 of the schedule. As indicated on Rebuttal Schedule RWS-1, the

- 1 hypothetical calculation results in a Regulatory Amortization requirement of
- 2 \$19,815,820.
- **Q. DOES THIS RESOLVE THE ISSUE FOR THIS CASE?**
- 4 A. Not necessarily.
- 5 Q. ARE THERE OTHER WITNESSES IN THIS CASE THAT HAVE
- 6 PRESENTED TESTIMONY ON REGULATORY AMORTIZATION?
- 7 A. Yes. Mr. Gorman on behalf of the industrial interveners has presented direct
- 8 testimony concerning some aspects of the Regulatory Amortization calculation. The
- 9 Regulatory Amortization agreement reached between the Staff, OPC and Empire
- does not address all of the issues Mr. Gorman raised in his direct testimony.
- 11 Q. HAS MR. GORMAN BEEN MADE AWARE OF THE AGREEMENT THAT
- 12 HAS BEEN REACHED BETWEEN THE STAFF, OPC AND EMPIRE
- 13 CONCERNING THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF ADDITIONAL NET
- 14 BALANCE SHEET INVESTMENT TO BE INCLUDED IN THE
- 15 REGULATORY AMORTIZATION CALCULATION IN THIS CASE?
- 16 A. Yes. The hypothetical regulatory amortization calculation that has been attached to
- my testimony as Rebuttal Schedule RWS-1 has been provided to Mr. Gorman. Mr.
- Gorman did not have time, however, prior to the deadline to file rebuttal testimony in
- this case to completely review the calculation and join in the agreement.
- 20 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. GORMAN'S REGULATORY
- 21 AMORTIZATION CALCULATION?
- 22 A. No. Mr. Gorman indicated, among other items, that S&P is including an implied
- 23 depreciation component to the Funds From Operations (FFO) calculation for

ROBERT W. SAGER REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

- purchased power agreements (PPA). Mr. Gorman cited a report issued by S&P in March 2007. We requested this S&P report from Mr. Gorman but at this time it has not been provided. However, reports issued by S&P in a generic context do not necessarily apply to Empire's ratios calculated by S&P, and also do not necessarily apply to the regulatory amortization calculation in this case. My review of reports issued by S&P during 2007 and through the date of this testimony have not discovered that S&P is further adjusting our FFO for Empire's PPAs.
- **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**
- 9 A. Yes, it does.

AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT W. SAGER

STATE OF MISSOURI)
COUNTY OF JASPER)
On the day of April, 2008, before me appeared Robert W. Sager, to me personally known, who, being by me first duly sworn, states that he is the Director of Financial Services of The Empire District Electric Company and acknowledges that he has read the above and foregoing document and believes that the statements therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.
Robert W. Sager
Subscribed and sworn to before me thisday of April, 2008.
Marilyn Ponder
My commission expires: June 27, 2009.
MARILYN PC "DER Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri - County of Jasper My Commission Expires Jun. 27, 2009 Commission #05434997

			Total	Juris
			Company	Alloc
1	Additional Net Balance Sheet Investment	(numeric value for this case only)		94,500,000
2	Rate Base	Schedule D		670,433,470
3	Jurisdictional Allocation for Capital			0.837404
4	Total Capital	12/31 Consolidated BS		764,933,470
5	Equity	Schedule H1	50.82%	388,739,189
6	Trust Preferred	Schedule H1	4.58%	35,033,953
7	Long-term Debt	Schedule H1	44.61%	341,236,821
8	Cost of Debt	Schedule H4		6.80%
9	Interest Expense	L7 * L8 (+\$2,125,000 (TOPRs))		25,329,104
10	Revenue	plus staff rate case \$10.3m		353,642,502
11	Other Electric Operating Revenue			3,010,138
12	Operating Revenue	L10 + L11		356,652,640
13	Operating and Maintenance Expense	Cons income stmt		217,470,936
14	Depreciation			35,721,512
15	Amortization			13,504,374
16	Interest on Customer Deposits			593,870
17	Taxes Other than Income Taxes			13,106,455
18	Federal and State Income Taxes			19,201,605
19	Total Electric Operating Exp	Sum of L. 13-18		299,598,752
20	Operating Income - Electric	L12 - L19		57,053,888
21	less: Interest Expense	L9		-26,427,527
22	Depreciation	L14		35,721,512
23	Amortization	L 15		13,504,374
24	Deferred Taxes	Schedule J		-3,309,636
25	Funds from Operations (FFO)	Sum of L20-24		76,542,611

26	Additional Financial Information Needed	for Calculation of Ratios				
27	Capitalized Lease Obligations	EDE Accounts 227 + 243	479,951	401,913		
28	Short-term Debt Balance	EDE Form 10-Q, p. 8	33,040,000	27,667,828		
29	Short-term Debt Interest	EDE Accounts 417.891 + 431.400	2,940,317	2,462,233		
30	Cash Interest Paid	Information Supplied by EDE	35,781,815	29,963,835		
31	AFUDC Debt (capitalized interest)	EDE Form 10-Q, p. 4	4,732,378	3,962,913		
32	Adjustments Made by Rating Agencies for	Off-Balance Sheet Obligations				
33	Debt Adj for Off-Balance Sheet Obligs	-				
34	Operating Lease Debt Equivalent	Information Supplied by EDE/S&P	2,937,000	2,459,456		
35	Purchase Power Debt Equivalent	Information Supplied by EDE	86,546,000	72,473,967		
36	Total OBS Debt Adjustment	L34 + 135	89,483,000	74,933,423		
37	Operating Lease Deprec Adjustment	Information Supplied by EDE/S&P	1,255,000	1,050,942		
38	Interest Adjustments for Off-Balance She	et Obligations				
39	Present Value of Operating Leases	L34 * 10%	293,700	245,946		
40	Purchase Power Debt Equivalent	L35 * 10%	8,654,600	7,247,397		
41	Total OBS Interest Adjustment	L39 + L40	8,948,300	7,493,342		
42	Ratio Calculations					
43	Adjusted Interest Expense	L9 + L29 + L41		35,284,679		
44	Adjusted Total Debt 12/31/07	1/2 of L6 + L7 + L27 + L28 +L36		461,756,961		
45	Adjusted Total Debt 12/31/06	Same as L65, but for prior year		443,934,000		
46	Adjusted Total Capital	L4 + L27 + L28 + L36		867,936,634		
47	Adj. FFO Interest Coverage	(L25 + L37 + L43)/L43	<u>-</u>	3.20		
48	Adj. FFO as a % of Ending Debt	(L25 + L37)/ L44		0.1680		
49	Adj. Total Debt to Total Capital	L44/L46		0.5320		
50	Changes Required to Meet Ratio Targets					
51	Adj. FFO Interest Coverage Target	Target		3.20		
52	FFO Adjustment to Meet Target	(L51 - L47) * L43		32,740		
53	Interest Adjustment to Meet Target	L25 * (1/L51 - 1) - 1/L47 - 1)		-14,680		
54	Adj. FFO as a % of Average Total Debt	Target		0.195		
55	FFO Adjustment to Meet Target	(L54 - L48) * (Avg of L44 + L45)		12,208,799		
	Debt Adjustment to Meet Target	L25 * (1/L54 - 1/L48)		-62,976,626		
57	Adj. Total Debt to Total Capital Target	Target		56.50%		
58	Debt Adjustment to Meet Target	(L57 - L49) * L46		28,627,237		
59		L44/L57 - L46		-50,667,676		
60	Amortization and Revenue Needed to Meet Targeted Ratios					
61	FFO Adj Needed to Meet Target Ratios	Maximum of L52, L55 or zero		12,208,799		
62	Effective Income Tax Rate	Schedule G3		0.3839		
63	Deferred Income Taxes	L61 * L62/(1 - L62)	=	-7,607,021		
64	Total Amortization Req for FFO Adj	L61 - L63		19,815,820		