Exhibit No.:

Issues: Off System Sales Margin;

Pensions and OPEBs

Witness: Dana E. Eaves Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony

Case No. ER-2008-0093

Date Testimony Prepared: April 25, 2008

# MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

## SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

**OF** 

### DANA E. EAVES

## THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY

CASE NO. ER-2008-0093

Jefferson City, Missouri April 2008

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY	
3	DANA E. EAVES	
4	THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY	
5	CASE NO. ER-2008-0093	
6		
7	APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF MARGINS ON OSS	2
8	RATE TREATMENT FOR FAS 88 AND FAS 106 "SPECIAL EVENTS"	4

#### 1 SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY 2 OF DANA E. EAVES 3 THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY 4 5 CASE NO. ER-2008-0093 6 7 Q. Please state your name and business address. 8 A. Dana E. Eaves, PO Box 360, Suite 440, Jefferson City, MO 65102. 9 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity? 10 I am a Utility Regulatory Auditor for the Missouri Public Service Commission A. 11 (Commission or PSC). 12 Q. Are you the same Dana E. Eaves who contributed to the Staff's Cost of Service Report (COS Report) in this case? 13 14 Yes, I am. A. 15 Q. What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony? 16 A. The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to address the rebuttal testimony 17 of The Office of the Public Counsel (OPC) witness Ryan Kind on the issue of Off-System 18 Sales Margin (OSS). Also, I will be addressing the rebuttal testimony of The Empire District 19 Electric Company (Empire or Company) witness C. Kenneth Vogl as it relates to certain 20 Financial Accounting Standards 88 (FAS 88) and Financial Accounting Standards 106 21 (FAS 106) issues. In particular, I will address the following points in this testimony: 22 The Staff's position on the appropriate level of OSS to be included in the 23 Company's revenue requirement.

1 The Staff's position on suggested language by Empire for the accounting 2 treatment of costs associated with certain "special events" as they impact its 3 pensions and other post employment benefits (OPEB) cost levels. 4 APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF MARGINS ON OSS 5 Q. Did you address the Staff's position on the level of margins on OSS revenue 6 in the Staff's COS Report in this case? 7 A. Yes, I did. 8 Can you briefly describe the position of OPC witness Kind concerning Q. 9 OSS margins? 10 A. Yes. Mr. Kind is recommending the level of OSS margins that Empire 11 achieved during calendar year 2007 in the amount of \$5,955,336 as an appropriate ongoing 12 level. Q. What is the level of OSS margins the Staff is recommending in this case? 13 14 A. The Staff is recommending an adjusted level of OSS Margin of \$4,415,779. 15 This amount was derived by multiplying the January through June 2007 OSS margin amounts by two. The Staff believed this approach gave appropriate recognition to new 16 factors impacting Empire's ability to achieve higher OSS margins during the last six months 17 18 of the test year for this case, the 12 months ending June 2007. 19 Q. Has the Staff addressed why it chose not to recommend a multi-year average 20 of OSS margins to develop its recommended level of margins to include in the case, which is 21 the approach the Commission ordered in its Report and Order in Empire's previous

Missouri rate proceeding, Case No. ER-2006-0315?

A. Yes. In the Staff's COS Report, it states:

Starting in February 2007, Empire has participated in the Energy Imbalance System (EIS) Market operated and controlled by the Southwest Power Pool (SPP). The EIS market is intended to allow member utilities access to economical real time energy based upon market bids by members and the

the SPP market footprint.

Since Empire began participating in the EIS market, it has been a net seller of power into the market. Involvement in the EIS market has benefited Empire with increased margins from the sale of power. Empire has cited this benefit from participation in the SSP EIS Market in its Form 10-K and 10-Q filings with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

availability of dispatchable generation and transmission with in

Using an OSS margin calculation based upon the last six months of the test year gives recognition to the new and ongoing environment for OSS caused by the new EIS market.

Use of a multi-year historical average for OSS margins in this proceeding would not have done so.

- Q. Is the amount of OSS Margin that Mr. Kind recommending the highest amount the Company has achieved during recent history?
- A. Yes. The table below shows the annual amounts of OSS Margins for the period 1999 thru 2007:

23	Calendar Year	Net Sales Margins
24	1999	\$2,378,042
25	2000	\$2,443,844
26	2001	\$832,651
27	2002	\$5,116,368
28	2003	\$3,016,910
29	2004	\$1,687,445
30	2005	\$3,502,169
31	2006	\$3,441,831
32	2007	\$5,955,336

- Q. In your opinion, why would it be inappropriate to use calendar year 2007 margins to set rates in this case?
- A. It is possible that some of the very high margins achieved in 2007 were caused by temporary factors other than the new EIS environment. For that reason, the Staff approach is more conservative and is more appropriate than OPC's approach.
- Q. Are there any other issues in this case that relate to the OSS margin issue in dispute?
- A. Yes. The Staff has recommended that OSS margins be incorporated in its fuel adjustment clause (FAC) pass-through mechanism. The Staff believes that all parties either support or do not object to the inclusion OSS margins in the FAC. Under the FAC proposals sponsored by the parties to this proceeding, inclusion of OSS margins in the FAC would mean a majority of any difference between future achieved OSS margin levels and the level reflected in Empire's rates will be passed on to customers as either an increase or decrease in the Company's FAC rate. While the Staff still believes it is important for the Commission to select the most reasonable amount for OSS margins for purposes of setting Empire's rates, the inclusion of these margins in the FAC will make the consequences of "guessing wrong" on this amount considerably less onerous to Empire and its customers than under traditional regulation.

#### RATE TREATMENT FOR FAS 88 AND FAS 106 "SPECIAL EVENTS"

Q. What are FAS 88 and FAS 106 "special events"?

1 A. Company witness Laurie A. Delano provides the explanation of these events 2 in her direct testimony on pages 4 and 5 as follows: 3 Statement of Financial Accounting Standards 4 No.88 ("FAS 88") and FAS 106 require the Company to 5 recognize one-time charges (expense or credits (income). Consistent with the stipulation and agreement in AmerenUE's 6 7 recent cases (GR-2007-0003) and (ER-2007-0002), we are 8 requesting a procedure to ensure that any on-time charges or 9 credits recognized in accordance with FAS 88 or FAS 106 be 10 properly reflect in rates. We are also requesting modifications to provide additional funding flexibility that would enable the 11 12 Company to avoid benefit restrictions due to certain provisions of the Pension Protection Act of 2006. 13 14 Q. Since the filing of direct testimony, has Empire proposed specific language to modify past stipulations concerning pensions and OPEBs to specify accounting treatment of 15 FAS 88 and FAS 106 special events and Pension Protection Act benefit restrictions? 16 17 A. Yes. Suggested language was attached to the rebuttal testimony of Empire 18 witness C. Kenneth Vogl. 19 Q. Is Ms. Delano correct that similar language has been afforded to utilities in 20 prior AmerenUE and Laclede Gas Company stipulations and agreements? 21 A. Yes, she is. 22 Q. Does the Staff agree with the language suggested by Mr. Vogl? 23 Yes. However, the Staff recommends that the following language be added to A. 24 that suggested by Mr. Vogl: "Empire shall inform the Staff of the occurrence of any 25 "special events" under FAS 88 and FAS 106 that would trigger the accounting treatment 26 discussed in the preceding paragraphs, and well as any contributions of additional amounts to 27 its pension trust fund to avoid Pension Protection Act benefit restrictions."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. Mr. Vogl questions the Staff's COS Report as it relates to a description of how Empire's Prepaid Pension Asset is impacted by a past Empire Stipulation and Agreement. Do you agree with Mr. Vogl's statement on page 4, line 11 that "Empire's pension methodology is not based on ERISA minimum funding?
- A. Yes. The statement in the COS report that Empire's ratemaking for pensions is based upon ERISA minimum funding levels was an inadvertent error.
  - Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
  - A. Yes, it does.

## **BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

## **OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of The Empire District Electric Company of Joplin, Missouri's Application for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Missouri Service Area of the Company	) ) Case No. ER-2008-0093 )				
AFFIDAVIT OF DANA E. EAVES					
•					
STATE OF MISSOURI )					
) ss.					
COUNTY OF COLE )					
Dana E. Eaves, of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the foregoing Surrebuttal Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of					
•					
	Dana E. Eaves				
	Dana E. Eaves				
Subscribed and sworn to before me this <u>fuerty-fourth</u> day of April, 2008.					
4	alli Sem				
	Notary Public				
NIKKI SENN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Osage County My Commission Expires: October 01, 2011 Commission Number: 07287016					