Exhibit No.: Issue(s): Fuel Adjustment Clause Witness: Brooke Mastrogiannis Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff Type of Exhibit: Supplemental Testimony Date Testimony Prepared: May 6, 2020

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION

ENERGY RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

OF

BROOKE MASTROGIANNIS

THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY

CASE NO. ER-2019-0374

Jefferson City, Missouri May 2020

** Denotes Confidential Information **

1	SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF							
2	BROOKE MASTROGIANNIS							
3 4	THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY							
4 5	CASE NO. ER-2019-0374							
6	Q. Please state your name and business address.							
7	A. My name is Brooke Mastrogiannis. My business address is 200 Madison Street,							
8	Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.							
9	Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?							
10	A. I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") as							
11	a Utility Regulatory Auditor IV.							
12	Q. Are you the same Brooke Mastrogiannis who has previously provided testimony							
13	in this case?							
14	A. Yes. I contributed to the <i>Staff Direct Report (Public and Confidential)</i> , Appendix							
15	1 and Appendix 2 (Public and Confidential) ("COS Report") filed on January 15, 2020. I also							
16	contributed to the Staff Direct Report - Class Cost of Service (Public and Confidential),							
17	Appendix 1, Appendix 2 (Public and Confidential) and Appendix 3 ("CCOS Report") filed on							
18	January 29, 2020. I also filed Rebuttal Revenue Requirement testimony on March 3, 2020 and							
19	Rebuttal Rate Design testimony filed on March 9, 2020. I also filed True-Up Direct and							
20	Surrebuttal testimony on March 27, 2020.							
21	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY							
22	Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony?							
23	A. I will address the Commissioner's questions filed on April 28, 2020, specifically							
24	what is the appropriate base factor for the FAC, and what evidence supports it.							

Supplemental Testimony of Brooke Mastrogiannis

1

11

12

13

14

15

FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE

Q. Does Staff support the base factor in the Global Stipulation and Agreement?
A. Yes. On April 15, 2020 Staff entered into a Global Stipulation and Agreement
which was either supported to or not objected to by all parties, except the Office of the Public
Counsel. If the Commission approves it, all issues in this rate case would be resolved.
As described below, Staff supports no change to the base factor, if the Commission approves
the Global Stipulation and Agreement.

Q. Staff's trued-up base factor calculation is \$0.02333/kWh¹. Did Staff agree to a
different base factor than the one recommended in its Surrebuttal Testimony in the
Global Stipulation and Agreement?

A. Yes. The Global Stipulation and Agreement reached an agreement that the base factor will remain the same from what was approved in the last rate case, which is \$0.02415/kWh. (See Confidential Schedule BM-sup1.)

Q. Why does Staff support this base factor in the Global Stipulation and Agreement?

A. Staff supports no change to the base factor as it was approved by the
Commission in the last general rate case, ER-2016-0023. The base factor from the last general
rate case still has the same general components of Staff's recommendation proposed in this rate
case, i.e. only variable fuel and purchased power costs, inclusion of the pass-through SPP
transmission cost percentage, etc. These components would not include fixed, labor, or

¹ Staff's True-up and Surrebuttal Testimony of Brooke Mastrogiannis, page 2, filed on March 27, 2020.

administrative costs. Specific components of Staff's base factor calculation in this rate case are
 addressed in *Staff's Direct Report- Class Cost of Service*, pages 38 and 39.

3 As part of its settlement consideration, Staff also reviewed the last seven 4 Fuel Adjustment Rate ("FAR") filings to compare actual costs to the net base. This review is 5 attached as BM-sup2. The reason why the last seven FARs are the only filings included in this 6 Schedule is because Staff particularly wanted to focus on the outcome of the actual versus the 7 net base energy costs for the base factor that has been in effect since the last general rate case. 8 In this review, Staff has identified that four Accumulation Periods ("AP") were under-recovered and three were over-recovered.² Staff is aware these over/under recovieres are all affected by 9 10 the actual total energy costs, and following this rate case that will be the same scenario. This 11 appears to reflect a balanced base factor as the AP filings do not reflect consistent over-recovery 12 or under-recovery. For the reasons stated Staff supports no change to the current base factor as 13 part of the global settlement.

Q. If the Commission does not approve the Global Agreement, does Staff have analternative recommendation?

A. Yes. If the Commission does not approve the Global Agreement, Staff
recommends Staff's trued-up base factor calculation of \$0.02333/kWh³.

Q. Does this conclude your supplemental testimony?

19

20 21 22

18

A. Yes, it does.

² This does not include the most recent Empire FAR filing for AP23, since it has not yet been approved by the Commission and the effective date is June 1, 2020.

³ Staff's True-up and Surrebuttal Testimony of Brooke Mastrogiannis, page 2, filed on March 27, 2020.

1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION								
2	OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI								
3									
4									
5 6									
0 7	In the Matter of The Empire District Electric)								
8	Company's Request for Authority to File) <u>Case No. ER-2019-0374</u>								
9	Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service)								
10	Provided to Customers in its Missouri Service Area)								
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16 17	AFFIDAVIT OF BROOKE MASTROGIANNIS								
17 18	STATE OF MISSOURI)								
19) ss.								
20	COUNTY OF COLE								
21									
22									
23	COMES NOW BROOKE MASTROGIANNIS and on their oath declares that they are								
24	of sound mind and lawful age; that they contributed to the foregoing Surrebuttal/True-Up								
25 26	Direct Testimony; and that the same is true and correct according to their best knowledge and belief.								
20 27	bener.								
28	Further the Affiant sayeth not.								
29									
30	<u>/s/_Brooke Mastrogiannis</u>								
31	BROOKE MASTROGIANNIS								
32									
33									
I									

SCHEDULE BM-sup1

HAS BEEN DEEMED

CONFIDENTIAL

IN ITS ENTIRETY

	ER-2020-009	93 ER-2019-030	01 ER-2019-0095	5 ER-2018-0270	ER-2018-0086	ER-2017-0254	ER-2017-0092
	7th Revised Sheet No. 17a	c 6th Revised Sheet No. 17ac	c 5th Revised Sheet No. 17ac	4th Revised Sheet No. 17ac	3rd Revised Sheet No. 17ac	2nd Revised Sheet No. 17ac	1st Revised Sheet No. 17ac
Total Energy Cost	\$ 63,483,11	.4 \$ 74,862,132	2 \$ 64,930,243	\$ 84,144,071	\$ 69,070,641	\$ 66,508,009 \$	60,294,281
Net Base Energy Cost	\$ 64,887,76	66 \$ 66,584,207	7 \$ 67,415,208	\$ 65,471,519	\$ 62,822,095	\$ 62,011,760 \$	5 71,719,486
(TEC-B)	\$ (1,404,65	52) \$ 8,277,925	5 \$ (2,484,965) \$ 18,672,552	\$ 6,248,546	\$ 4,496,249 \$	5 (11,425,205)
Missouri Energy Ratio (J)		*	* >	* *	*	*	*
(TEC-B)*J	\$ (1,148,90	00) \$ 6,901,802	2 \$ (2,047,187) \$ 15,532,199	\$ 5,110,442	\$ 3,716,245 \$	5 (9,371,395)
95%	\$ (1,091,45	5) \$ 6,556,712	2 \$ (1,944,828) \$ 14,755,589	\$ 4,854,920	\$ 3,530,433 \$	6 (8,902,825)
True-Up Amount	\$ (2,140,52	20) \$ 844,601	1 \$ (1,224) \$ 1,076,500	\$ (1,045,682)	\$ 5,816 \$	5 (516,561)
Interest	\$ 70,36	61 \$ 31,323	3 \$ 145,446	\$ (86,537)	\$ 28,026	\$ (15,140) \$	5 (37,172 <u>)</u>
Total FPA	\$ (3,161,61	.4) \$ 7,432,635	5 \$ (1,800,606) \$ 15,745,552	\$ 3,837,264	\$ 3,521,108 \$	6 (9,456,541)

* designates a different Missouri Energy Ratio (J) for every tariff sheet