

Exhibit No.:
Issues: Jurisdictional Allocations
Witness: Alan J. Bax
Sponsoring Party: MoPSC
Type of Exhibit: Direct True-Up Testimony
Case No.: ER-2001-299
Date Testimony Prepared: August 7, 2001

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISION

DIRECT TRUE-UP TESTIMONY

OF

ALAN J. BAX

THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY

CASE NO. ER-2001-299

Jefferson City, Missouri
August, 2001

Exhibit No. 129
Case No. ER-2001-299
Reporter KRM

DIRECT TRUE-UP TESTIMONY

OF

ALAN J. BAX

THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY

CASE NO. ER-2001-299

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. Alan J. Bax, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.

Q. Are you the same Alan Bax who, in the evidentiary hearing for this case held this past June, adopted the Direct Testimony of Dr. Eve Lissik, filed on April 3, 2001?

A. Yes.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to present revised jurisdictional allocation factors as part of the True-Up phase of this proceeding. These factors are attached as Schedule 1 to this True-Up testimony.

Q. Please discuss how these numbers were determined.

A. These factors were based on information obtained in updates provide by The Empire District Electric Company (Company) to Staff Data Requests 13, 2918, and 2946. Subsequently, the Company discovered that it made an error in recording the value of the coincident peak megawatts reported for December 2000. This error occurred following certain changes made to the relaying equipment at the Company's State Line Power Plant facility. The Company explained to Staff the reason for this discrepancy and

Direct True-Up Testimony of
Alan J. Bax

1 provided the revised information in an update to Staff Data Request 2917. As a
2 consequence, I had to further adjust the allocation factors for transmission and
3 production, and the result was a shift of 24 basis points from Kansas Retail to Missouri
4 Retail (depicted in BOLD on Schedule 1).

5 Q. Were further adjustments made to any of the other allocation factors you
6 determined for the true-up phase of this case due to this error or other discrepancy?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Did you use the same methodology in determining the revised allocation
9 factors as was described in the Direct Testimony of Dr. Lissik?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Were you involved in the development of the original allocation
12 methodology used in the direct filing?

13 A. Yes. I was assigned to determine the jurisdictional allocations in this case
14 and was directly involved in the development of the methodology used to calculate these
15 particular jurisdictional allocation factors. Because of a personal commitment, Dr. Lissik
16 wrote testimony in which my calculations were incorporated and displayed. When this
17 testimony was presented in the evidentiary hearing, I officially adopted it, disclosed my
18 involvement in the development of its contents and was tendered for cross-examination.
19 The Company offered no objections to this filing.

20 Q. Does this conclude your prepared true-up testimony?

21 A. Yes, it does.

~~My Commission Expires Jan 9, 2005~~