

Exhibit No.:  
Issues: Maintenance Contract  
Witness: David W. Elliott  
Sponsoring Party: MoPSC  
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony  
Case No.: ER-2001-299  
Date Testimony Prepared: May 3, 2001

**FILED**<sup>3</sup>  
MAY 9 3 2001  
Missouri Public  
Service Commission

**MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**DAVID W. ELLIOTT**

**THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY**

**CASE NO. ER-2001-299**

**Jefferson City, Missouri  
May, 2001**



Rebuttal Testimony of  
David W. Elliott

1           A.     Staff has been informed by Empire that there are now two contracts under  
2     consideration. One contract is for maintenance of the State Line Combined Cycle Unit,  
3     and the other is for maintenance of State Line Unit No. 1 and Energy Center Units Nos. 1  
4     and 2.

5           Q.     Did Empire indicate when it expected these contracts would be executed?

6           A.     No.

7           Q.     If the contracts have been executed and provided to the Staff in time for  
8     the Staff to review them before the true-up filings, will the Staff consider these contracts  
9     as a basis for maintenance expenses in the context of this rate case?

10          A.     Yes.

11          Q.     Will the Staff automatically include this level of maintenance expense if it  
12     receives the contracts and supporting documentation prior to the true-up hearings?

13          A.     No. Staff will first review the contracts, including all supporting  
14     documentation and economic analyses performed by the Company, to determine if the  
15     actual costs associated with the contracts are cost effective relative to paying for  
16     maintenance as it occurs.

17          Q.     Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

18          A.     Yes, it does.

My commission expires \_\_\_\_\_