Exhibit No.: Issue(s): Payroll, Insurance Expense Witness: Ali Arabian Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal/True-Up Testimony Case No.: ER-2019-0374 Date Testimony Prepared: March 27, 2020

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FINANCIAL AND BUSINESS ANALYSIS DIVISION

AUDITING DEPARTMENT

SURREBUTTAL/TRUE-UP TESTIMONY

OF

ALI ARABIAN

THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY

CASE NO. ER-2019-0374

Jefferson City, Missouri March 2020

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS OF		
2	SURREBUTTAL/TRUE-UP TESTIMONY OF		
3	ALI ARABIAN		
4	THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY		
5	CASE NO. ER-2019-0374		
6	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY1		
7	PAYROLL1		
8	INSURANCE EXPENSE		
9	TRUE-UP TESTIMONY		
10	Payroll		

1		SURREBUTTAL/TRUE-UP TESTIMONY OF
2		ALI ARABIAN
3		THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY
4		CASE NO. ER-2019-0374
5	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
6	А.	Ali Arabian, 200 Madison Street, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102.
7	Q.	By whom are you employed?
8	А.	I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") as
9	a member of	the Auditing Staff ("Staff").
10	Q.	Are you the same Ali Arabian who contributed to Staff's Cost of Service Report
11	filed January	15, 2020 in this case?
12	А.	Yes, I am.
13	EXECUTIV	E SUMMARY
14	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal/true-up direct testimony?
15	А.	The purpose of my surrebuttal/true-up direct testimony is to address certain
16	arguments ma	de concerning Staff's calculation of payroll and insurance expense as referenced
17	in The Empir	e District Electric Company ("Empire" or "Company") witness Sheri Richard's
18	rebuttal testin	nony. My testimony will also address Staff's true-up adjustment to payroll.
19	PAYROLL	
20	Q.	In Sheri Richard's rebuttal testimony, she disagrees with Staff's exclusion of
21	certain payro	ll related costs such as retention and incentive payments in Staff's adjustment
22	calculation. V	Why were incentive payments and retention excluded from Staff's adjustment
23	for payroll?	

Surrebuttal/True-up Testimony of Ali Arabian

A. The incentive payments and retention program are associated with a proposal
 mentioned in Empire witness Jeffrey Westfall's direct testimony. As described, the program
 would be used to attract journeyman lineman and retaining them by offering monthly retention
 bonuses of \$1,500 per lineman. Mr. Westfall states that this program will not continue long
 term but cannot predict when it will end.

6 The incentive payments and retention program proposed by Empire in Mr. Westfall's 7 direct testimony that were intended to be used to attract lineman have not yet been implemented 8 at this time, and thus were not included in Staff's payroll adjustment. Staff only included 9 amounts considered to be known and measurable in its direct case as of September 30, 2019, 10 the end of the update period. If the problem of not being able to retain qualified lineman occurs 11 in the future, Staff encourages Empire to develop a program that would encourage future 12 employees to become qualified lineman and possibly less any shortage of available linemen.

Q. Did Staff's adjustment of payroll incorrectly include fiber and water employees?
A. Yes, Staff incorrectly included fiber and water employees in its payroll calculation in its direct filing. Staff assumed when receiving the list of employees in response to Staff Date Request No. 0027 that no fiber and water employees were included, just electric. The Company did not include fiber and water employees in the updated employee list as of 1/31/20 that Staff is relying on for its payroll true-up calculations.

19 20

13

14

15

16

17

18

Q. Did Staff exclude several active employees from its payroll calculation that should have been included?

A. Staff did purposely exclude one employee located in Iowa. The reason for the
removal is because the employee was not involved in the operations of Empire Electric. An
email from Charlotte Emery, Manager of Rates and Regulatory Affairs for Empire Electric,

1	dated December 30, 2019 states "we should have not included the employee from Iowa. She is		
2	a Central Region employee, but her time is primarily spent on our Gas Commodities."		
3	However, Staff did mistakenly exclude several active employees located in Missouri in its direct		
4	filing. Staff included those and other active employees as of January 31, 2020 in Staff's true		
5	up calculation.		
6	INSURANCE EXPENSE		
7	Q. In Sheri Richard's rebuttal testimony Page 30, Lines 1-3 she states		
8	"DR0052 omitted a correcting entry, which included, increases Liberty-Empire's portion of the		
9	2019-2020 property insurance premiums by \$934,813". Did Staff exclude the correcting entry		
10	of \$934,813?		
11	A. Yes in our direct filing we excluded it. Empire has provided additional		
12	information and Staff has included the amount in its revenue requirement.		
13	TRUE-UP TESTIMONY		
14	Payroll		
15	Q. Has Staff updated its position through the true-up date in this case?		
16	A. Yes. Staff has updated the amount of payroll annualized as of January 31, 2020.		
17	Staff also annualized payroll taxes and Employee 401K. The true-up adjustment for payroll is		
18	\$1,731,204.		
19	Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal/true-up testimony?		
20	A. Yes.		

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of The Empire District Electric)	
Company's Request for Authority to File)	Case No. ER-2019-0374
Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service)	
Provided to Customers in its Missouri)	
Service Area)	

AFFIDAVIT OF ALI ARABIAN

STATE OF MISSOURI)	
)	SS.
COUNTY OF COLE)	

COMES NOW ALI ARABIAN and on their oath declares that they are of sound mind and lawful age; that they contributed to the foregoing Surrebuttal/True-Up Direct Testimony; and that the same is true and correct according to their best knowledge and belief, under penalty of perjury.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

/s/_Ali Arabian_____ ALI ARABIAN