**EXHIBIT** 

Exhibit No.:

Issue(s): Witness/Type of Exhibit: Sponsoring Party: Case No.: Natural Gas Prices Busch/Direct Public Counsel ER-2001-299

# OF JAMES A. BUSCH

Submitted on Behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel

The Empire District Electric Company

Case No.: ER-2001-299

April 3, 2001

Date 5/29/01 Case No. ER-2001-299

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

	ectric Company for a general rate  Case No. ER-2001-299  )					
	AFFIDAVIT OF JAMES A. BUSCH					
STATE OF MISSOURI ) ) ss COUNTY OF COLE )						
James A. B	usch, of lawful age and being first duly sworn, deposes and states:					
1.	My name is James A. Busch. I am the Public Utility Economist for the Office of the Public Counsel.					
2.	Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my direct testimony consisting of pages 1 through 6 and Schedule JAB-1 and JAB-2.					
3.	I hereby swear and affirm that my statements contained in the attached testimony are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.					
Subscribed	James A. Busch  I and sworn to me this 3 <sup>rd</sup> day of April, 2001.  Bonnie S. Howard, Notary Public					

My Commission expires May 3, 2001.

1		DIRECT TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		JAMES A. BUSCH
4		CASE NO. ER-2001-299
5		EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY
6		
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
8	A.	My name is James A. Busch and my business address is P. O. Box 7800,
9		Jefferson City, MO 65102.
10	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
11	A.	I am a Public Utility Economist with the Missouri Office of Public Counsel
12		(Public Counsel).
13	Q.	Please describe your educational and professional background.
14	A.	In June 1993, I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Economics from
15	u	Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville (SIUE), Edwardsville, Illinois. In
16		May 1995, I received a Master of Science degree in Economics, also from SIUE.
17		I am currently a member of the American Economic Association and Omicron
18		Delta Epsilon, an honorary economics society. Prior to joining Public Counsel, I
19		worked just over two years with the Missouri Public Service Commission as a
20		Regulatory Economist in the Procurement Analysis Department and worked one
21		year with the Missouri Department of Economic Development as a Research
22		Analyst. I accepted my current position with Public Counsel in September 1999.

Direct Testimony of
James A. Busch
Case No. ER-2001-299

Further, I also am a member of the adjunct faculty of Columbia College, Jefferson City Campus, teaching Managerial Economics in the MBA program.

- Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?
- A. Yes. Attached is Schedule JAB-1 which is a list of the cases in which I have filed testimony before this Commission.
- Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in Case No. ER-2001-299?
- A. The purpose of my testimony is to present Public Counsel's recommendation for natural gas costs that should be included in Empire District Electric Company's (EDE, Empire, or Company) rates.

#### **Public Counsel's Recommendation**

- Q. What is Public Counsel's recommendation for the price of natural gas to be imbedded in rates in this case?
- A. In this case, I believe that the price of natural gas that should be included for the purpose of reflecting proper fuel costs should be based on a four-year average of natural gas prices. The four years that I have utilized are the actual settlement prices based on the New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX) for the two years ended December 31, 2000 and the two-year futures strip price. Based on the closing 24-month strip price on March 30, 2001, the underlying price of natural gas I would recommend is \$3.912 per MMBtu. Attached, as Schedule JAB-2, is the calculation of my recommendation.

- Q. Why did you utilize this type of four-year average for the basis of Public Counsel's recommendation?
- A. I utilized this hybrid approach of historical and future data in recognition of the volatility of the natural gas market. I believe it is important to use both historical and future information to arrive at the appropriate natural gas cost to build into rates. Simply picking a date and using a 12-month strip of futures prices for natural gas prices does not have a lot of reliability. I will address these concerns in my rebuttal testimony. Therefore, combining the past with the future provides a better basis for establishing the level of natural gas costs to be reflected in the Company's rates in this case.
- Q. On what pricing information is Public Counsel's recommendation based?
- A. The pricing information is based on the NYMEX monthly settlement prices for the months January 1999 December 2000 and the 24-month futures strip for the months May 2001 April 2003, based on the March 30, 2001 closing prices. The prices based on the NYMEX were utilized because it is data that is readily available. I am currently awaiting some overdue responses to Data Requests that Public Counsel sent to the Company which may provide more guidance on this issue. If data arrives that causes me to alter my recommendation, I will submit my updated recommendation in rebuttal or supplemental direct testimony.
- Q. What will be the affect on the Company and the ratepayers under your recommendation?
- A. Under my recommendation, the ratepayers and the Company shareholders will share in the inherent price risk of procuring natural gas. As has been noted by

others, the price of natural gas is extremely volatile. For instance, in just the past two years, the price for natural gas has gone from around \$1.70 per MMBtu to nearly \$10.00 per MMBtu. By utilizing the hybrid approach, the Company's rates will reflect a level of fuel cost that is fair and which will allow the Company to benefit from prudent fuel management practices. The Company will be able to rely on its market expertise to procure natural gas economically, able to switch between the appropriate fuels to arrive at the most economically sound mix, and able to determine which plants to use to generate electricity in the most economically sound manner. The Company will benefit from the extent to which it can secure reasonable fuel costs.

The ratepayers on the other hand will be protected from a price that is set in an arbitrary manner that puts greater risk on the back of the ratepayers. The ratepayers still will bear the risk of paying rates that reflect fuel costs that are too high if the price of natural gas continues to fall below the recommended level, but the detriment is less than under a plan that may be based solely on the futures market. Ultimately, this spreading of the risk to both parties, ratepayers and shareholders, is the fairest resolution of this issue.

- Q. What are some of the ways that the Company can mitigate its risk profile?
- A. The Company has a myriad of ways to mitigate any risk that it may have in procuring natural gas. One way is by locking in prices by using either futures or forward contracts. Futures contracts are generally traded on exchanges and are characterized by a standardized contract for delivery of the commodity. Forward

•

contracts are generally between an end-user and supplier and give the parties flexibility to meet any specific demands of either party. These types of contracts can be in varying lengths of duration from one-month to 20 years, depending on whether or not it is a standardized future contract (one-month to 3 years), or a forward contract (no restrictions on length).

Other financial instruments available to the Company are call and put options.

These instruments can be used either by themselves or in some combination of the two, such as in a collar arrangement. Option contracts protect the purchaser from adverse price movements while letting the purchaser participate in favorable price movements for only the cost of a premium. Adding these types of financial instruments with the future or forward contracts above provides the Company with many different avenues to protect itself.

Furthermore, the Company can allow a third party to manage its natural gas purchasing activities. Allowing a third party to utilize its expertise and market clout to procure the Empire's portfolio may lower the actual price paid by Empire for natural gas.

- Q. What other options may be available to the Company to help lower natural gas costs?
- A. Other options available to the Company involve managing capacity release and off-system sales. The Company has had to contract for additional pipeline capacity to meet its increased demand for natural gas. With additional capacity to

meet its demand, the Company may have increased opportunities to release any excess capacity when its needs can be met by less capacity requirements than the Company's contracted maximum capacity levels. This is especially relevant when one considers that most of the need for capacity for Empire would be in the summer, and thus this electric company would have available capacity to release in the winter when other entities would have a greater need for it.

Along with capacity release potential, the Company will have increased opportunities for off-system sales. Unlike capacity release, off-system sales are a bundling of capacity with the natural gas already purchased. The Company would have these opportunities whenever it has contracted for natural gas

supplies, but no longer needs the natural gas to meet its needs.

- Q. Please summarize your testimony.
- A. In my testimony, I have provided Public Counsel's recommendation as to the appropriate level of natural gas costs that should be included in Empire's rates. The level that Public Counsel recommends is \$3.912 per MMBtu. This price was derived by taken a four-year average of natural gas prices. The four-year average that I utilized was a combination two-year historical plus a 24-month futures strip. This hybrid approach balances the inherent risk in procuring natural gas between the ratepayers and the shareholders.
- Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
- A. Yes it does.

## Cases of Filed Testimony James A. Busch

Company Union Electric Company	<u>Case No.</u> GR-97-393	
Missouri Gas Energy	GR-98-140	
Laclede Gas Company	GO-98-484	
Laclede Gas Company	GR-98-374	
St. Joseph Light & Power	GR-99-246	
Laclede Gas Company	GT-99-303	
Laclede Gas Company	GR-99-315	
Fiber Four Corporation	TA-2000-23; et al.	
Missouri American Water Company	WR-2000-281/SR-2000-282	
Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE	GR-2000-512	
St. Louis County Water	WR-2000-844	

### Office of Public Counsel

Natural Gas Cost Calculation Empire District Electric Company Case No. ER-2001-299

NYMEX	Fir	st-of-				
Month Se	ettle	ement	24-month	24-month Futures Strip		
Prices			as of Mar	as of March 31, 2001		
Jan-99	\$	1.765	May-00	\$	5.025	
Feb-99	\$	1.810	Jun-00	\$	5.072	
Mar-99	\$	1.666	Jul-00	\$	5.122	
Apr-99	\$	1.852	Aug-00	\$	5.150	
May-99	\$	2.348	Sep-00	\$	5.130	
Jun-99	\$	2.226	Oct-00	\$	5.133	
Jul-99	\$	2.262	Nov-00	\$	5.250	
Aug-99	\$	2.601	Dec-00	\$	5.360	
Sep-99	\$	2.912	Jan-01	\$	5.390	
Oct-99	\$	2.560	Feb-01	\$	5.220	
Nov-99	\$	3.092	Mar-01	\$	4.860	
Dec-99	\$	2.120	Apr-01	\$	4.450	
Jan-00	\$	2.344	May-01	\$	4.355	
Feb-00	\$	2.610	Jun-01	\$	4.360	
Mar-00	\$	2.603	Jul-01	\$	4.390	
Apr-00	\$	2.900	Aug-01	\$	4.404	
May-00	\$	3.089	Sep-01	\$	4.388	
Jun-00	\$	4.406	Oct-01	\$	4.391	
Jul-00	\$	4.369	Nov-01	\$	4.504	
Aug-00	\$	, 3.820	Dec-01	\$	4.602	
Sep-00	\$	4.618	Jan-02	\$	4.636	
Oct-00	\$	5.312	Feb-02	\$	4.466	
Nov-00	\$	4.541	Mar-02	\$	4.240	
Dec-00	\$	6.016	Apr-02	\$_	4.026	
24-month			24-month			
average	\$	3.077	average	\$	4.747	

4-year average \$ 3.912