Exhibit No.:

Issues: Weather

Normalization

Witness: Shawn E. Lange Sponsoring Party: MO PSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony

Case No.: ER-2006-0315

Date Testimony Prepared: July 28, 2006

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

SHAWN E. LANGE

EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY

CASE NO. ER-2006-0315

Jefferson City, Missouri July 2006

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the matter of The Empire District Electric) Company of Joplin, Missouri for authority to file) tariffs increasing rates for electric service provided) to customers in the Missouri service area of the) Company.
AFFIDAVIT OF SHAWN E. LANGE
STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss. COUNTY OF COLE)
Shawn E. Lange, of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of 3 pages to be presented in the above case; that the answers in the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.
Shown E. Lange Shawn E. Lange
Subscribed and sworn to before me this Andrew day of July 2006.
My commission expires Aday of July 2000. Notary Public DAWN L. HAKE My Commission Expires March 16, 2009 Cole County Commission #05407643

1 REBUTTAL TESTIMONY 2 **OF** 3 SHAWN E. LANGE 4 EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY 5 CASE NO. ER-2006-0315 6 7 Q. Please state your name and business address. 8 Α. My name is Shawn E. Lange and my business address is Missouri Public 9 Service Commission, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102. 10 Q. Are you the same Shawn E. Lange that filed direct testimony in this 11 proceeding? 12 Α. Yes, I am. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony? 13 Q. 14 A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to describe to the Commission why 15 the weather normalized sales calculated by the Staff should be used in the determination of 16 normalized revenues instead of the weather normalized sales as presented in the direct 17 testimony of Jayna Long for the Empire District Electric Company (Empire). 18 Q. Are there differences in the methods that The Empire District Electric Company and Staff used? 19 20 A. No, both the Staff and Empire used the same computer model and basic 21 method for weather normalization. However, there are two differences in the input data used 22 that I would like to touch on that resulted in different results. The first is in regard to the daily

load data that is used to determine the weather response of the classes and the second deals with monthly billing data.

- Q. What differed in regard to the daily load data used?
- A. Staff used two years of daily load data to determine the weather response of the classes whereas Empire used only one year.
 - Q. Why is it better to use two years of daily class load data?
- A. The model calculates a weather response function for each class using regression analysis on daily class loads. Using two years of daily class load data provides more data points for determining the weather response. Using more data results in a more accurate representation of what is occurring in each class. This is especially critical when determining the weather response for weekend days. With only one year of data, the model only has 13 Saturday data points in which to calculate the weather response across a three month season. With two years of data, there are 26 Saturday data points across the same three month season.

While the statistical results using just thirteen data points may be excellent, what it is saying is that the regression equation is a good fit to the data; not that it accurately models the response. Using twenty-six data points gives the regression models a greater likelihood of both fitting a good regression equation and modeling the correct response.

- Q. What differed in regard to the actual billing month class usage data?
- A. Empire did not "clean up" the actual billing data used as an input in determining the weather adjustment. The billing data used, contained bad bills (i.e. bad original bills and cancels) and good bills, which included rebills. For this test year, December 2005 actual billing month class usage data contained an abnormally large amount of bad

1

5

9

10

8

original bills. Staff corrected the bad billing data by moving the cancel that went with the bad original bill from the months of January and February 2006 into December 2005. The rebills that were associated with the moved cancels, were also moved from January and February 2006 into December 2005. It appears that Empire did not adjust for this.

- Q. Are these the only differences in the weather normalization of the sales data?
- A. No, they are not. There were other minor differences. However, more important than these minor differences, Staff believes that is important in any type of modeling to have the best input data because a model is only as good as the data input into it.
 - Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
 - A. Yes, it does.