

Exhibit No.: Issue: Response to Staff True-up Filing Witness: W. Scott Keith Type of Exhibit: True-up Rebuttal Testimony Sponsoring Party: Empire District Electric Case No. ER-2008-0093 Date Testimony Prepared: June 2008

Before the Public Service Commission

of the State of Missouri

True-up Rebuttal Testimony

of

W. Scott Keith

June 2008

 $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}$

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF W. SCOTT KEITH THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
POSITION	1
PURPOSE	ł
REGULATORY PLAN AMORTIZATION	2
OUTSTANDING ISSUES	3
NATURAL GAS CONTRACT	6

TRUE-UP REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF W. SCOTT KEITH THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION CASE NO. ER-2008-0093

1 INTRODUCTION

- -

2 -

- 2 Q. STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS PLEASE.
- 3 A. My name is W. Scott Keith and my business address is 602 Joplin Street, Joplin,

4 Missouri.

5 **POSITION**

6 Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

- A. I am presently employed by The Empire District Electric Co. ("Empire" or "the
 Company") as the Director of Planning and Regulatory. I have held this position
 since August 1, 2005. Prior to joining Empire I was Director of Electric
 Regulatory Matters in Kansas and Colorado for Aquila, Inc. from 1995 to July
 2005.
- Q. ARE YOU THE SAME SCOTT KEITH THAT HAS PREVIOUSLY
 TESTIFIED BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
 ("COMMISSION") IN THIS CASE?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 PURPOSE
- 17 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TRUE-UP REBUTTAL
 18 TESTIMONY?

1

1	А.	My true-up rebuttal testimony will address certain aspects of the true-up direct		
2		testimony filed by Mark Oligschlaeger of the Missouri Public Service Commission		
3		Staff ("Staff"). Specifically, I will explain Empire's understanding of Staff witness		
4		Oligschlaeger's regulatory amortization recommendation, clarify the issues that		
5		remain between Empire and the Staff in this case, and address Staff witness		
6		Oligschlaeger's comments on the unwinding of a natural gas contract that took		
7		place during February 2008.		
8	REGULATORY PLAN AMORTIZATION			
9	Q.	HAVE YOU REVIEWED THE TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY FILED		
10		BY STAFF WITNESS OLIGSCHLAEGER?		
11	A.	Yes.		
12	Q.	HOW DOES EMPIRE INTERPRET STAFF WITNESS		
13		OLIGSCHLAEGER'S RECOMMENDATON CONCERNING THE		
14		AMOUNT OF REGULATORY PLAN AMORTIZATION THAT SHOULD		
15		RESULT FROM THIS CASE?		
16	A.	For purposes of this case, Empire, Staff and the Office of Public Counsel ("OPC")		
17		have reached an agreement involving the calculation of regulatory amortization.		
18		Mr. Oligschlaeger has correctly applied the terms of that agreement to the updated		
19		or true-up numbers. As a result of applying the agreed to calculation procedures,		
20		Staff has arrived at an ongoing level of annual Regulatory Plan Amortization		
21		("RPA") of \$7.3 million. This \$7.3 million amount represents a \$2.8 million		
22		reduction from the RPA level authorized by the Commission in Empire's last		
23		general rate case, Case No. ER-2006-0315. If the Staff positions on all of the		

--- -

1.

r.

1.

1

-2-

- - ----

. _____

remaining issues were accepted by the Commission in this case, the rates resulting
 from this case would include, on a going-forward basis, \$7.3 million in annual
 RPA.

4 Q. PLEASE QUANTIFY THE RESULTS OF THE STAFF'S TRUE-UP 5 RECOMMENDATION ON EMPIRE'S OVERALL REVENUE 6 REQUIREMENT, INCLUDING THE RPA.

The Staff true-up recommendation in the current case would result in an overall 7 Α. This \$22.8 million consists of a annual increase in rates of \$22.8 million. 8 traditional revenue requirement increase of \$25.6 million (See Staff EMS run) and 9 10 a reduction in ongoing RPA of \$2.8 million. Staff witness Oligschlaeger discusses this issue at pages 11 through 13 of his true-up testimony. The following table 11 displays the overall change in revenue that results from the Staff's true-up 12 recommendation in this case. 13

Type of Revenue	Staff True-up ER-2008-0093
Traditional Revenue	
Deficiency	\$25,668,911
Regulatory Plan	
Amortization	(2,849,541)
Change in Overall	
Revenue	\$22,819,370

14 **OUTSTANDING ISSUES**

. .

15 Q. ARE THERE ISSUES THAT REMAIN OUTSTANDING BETWEEN

16 EMPIRE AND THE OTHER PARTIES TO THIS CASE?

A. Yes, and depending upon the decisions the Commission makes on these issues the
level of RPA resulting from this case will change. Other than an issue related to

an apparent oversight in the application of the terms and conditions associated with an earlier agreement in this case between Empire, Staff and OPC, none of the remaining issues are directly related to Staff's true-up filing. These issues are simply a carry over from earlier in the case.

5 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ISSUES THAT REMAIN BETWEEN THE 6 PARTIES IN THIS CASE.

There are three basic issues that remain between Empire and Staff that have a Α. 7 monetary impact on the overall revenue requirement and an additional issue related 8 to the misapplication of the terms and conditions in an earlier agreement among 9 Empire, the Staff and OPC. The issues are: the rate of return on equity, 10 depreciation rates and the Commission Rule tracking mechanism. In addition to 11 these monetary issues, the Commission must decide if Empire can implement a fuel 12 adjustment mechanism, and if so, how the fuel adjustment is to be structured. All 13 of the parties to this case have taken different positions with respect to the structure 14 of the fuel adjustment. Empire has estimated the value of each of the outstanding 15 monetary issues between it and the Staff, and yet to be decided by the Commission 16

17 is as follows:

Description	Staff True-up
Millions of Dollars	
Return on Equity	\$7.700
Depreciation Rates	2.200
PSC Rule Tracker	.225
ADIT VEBA (S&A)	<u>.498</u>
Total	<u>\$10.623</u>

18

As indicated, the total difference between the Staff true-up revenue requirement

and Empire is approximately \$10.6 million. If the Commission were to accept Empire's positions with respect to each of the outstanding issues, the overall revenue deficiency would be \$33.4 million. Since the OPC and Industrial Intervenors did not file any true-up direct testimony, I did not attempt to include any monetary values for their positions as compared to the Staff's true-up position for return on equity, Commission Rule tracking mechanism or depreciation rates.

7 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ISSUE LABELED AS "ADIT VEBA" IN THE 8 ABOVE TABLE.

The issue is related to the application of the terms and conditions in the first 9 Α. stipulation and agreement reached between Empire, Staff and OPC in this case. 10 That agreement contained a component related to the accumulated deferred income 11 taxes associated with Empire's VEBA funding and the accumulated deferred 12 income taxes used as an offset to Empire's rate base in this case. When the Staff 13 compiled the results of its true-up audit, it failed to reflect this part of the 14 agreement. It is my understanding that Staff will acknowledge this oversight and 15 make corrections to the Staff true-up presentation later in this process or at the 16 upcoming hearing on June 19th. 17

Q. IF THE COMMISSION WERE TO DECIDE IN FAVOR OF EMPIRE ON THE REMAINING ISSUES, WOULD THIS REDUCE THE LEVEL OF RPA?

A. Yes. In fact, given the level of monetary differences between the Staff and Empire,
\$10.6 million, the need for RPA would be reduced.

-5-

1 NATURAL GAS CONTRACT

Q. HAVE YOU REVIEWED STAFF WITNESS OLIGSHCLAEGER'S TRUE UP TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE DECISIONS EMPIRE MADE IN
 FEBRUARY OF 2008 REGARDING A NATURAL GAS CONTRACT?

5 A. Yes. Mr. Oligschlaeger, at pages 6 through 9 of his true-up testimony, describes 6 the financial affect of the transaction, sets forth the Staff position on how this 7 transaction should be handled in the true-up and discusses how the Staff is still 8 reviewing the transaction to see how it fits in with other Commission policies and 9 procedures.

Q. WHAT IS EMPIRE'S RESPONSE TO THE STAFF TESTIMONY ON THIS TRANSACTION?

Mr. Oligschlaeger accurately describes the transaction and the reasons Empire 12 A. entered into the transaction at pages 6 and 7 of his testimony. Empire understands 13 that the Staff has decided to exclude the impact of this transaction from the Staff's 14 true-up evidence. As indicated by Mr. Oligschlaeger's testimony at page 7, this 15 transaction and the reasons it was undertaken are very similar to those that caused 16 Empire to unwind several natural gas contracts in the summer of 2005, namely to 17 offset unforeseen fuel cost increases. The Commission essentially found, in Case 18 No. ER-2006-0315, that these types of gains can be used by Empire to offset these 19 unforeseen increases in fuel costs. At page 8, line 2, Mr. Oligschlaeger begins to 20 discuss additional Staff concerns with respect to this transaction. None of these 21 concerns are relevant to this case and the true-up proceeding and as a consequence 22 Empire has no further response. 23

-6-

1 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TRUE-UP REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

2 A. Yes.

1

×,

AFFIDAVIT OF W. SCOTT KEITH

STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss COUNTY OF JASPER)

On the 16th day of June, 2008, before me appeared W. Scott Keith, to me personally known, who, being by me first duly sworn, states that he is the Director of Planning and Regulatory 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.

1) John Hout

Subscribed and sworn to before me this $\frac{16^{4b}}{2}$ day of June, 2008.

Marily Ponder Notary Public

My com	mission expires: June 27, 2009
	MARILYN PC**DER Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri - County of Jasper My Commission Expires Jun. 27, 2009 Commission #05434907