1	STATE OF MISSOURI	
2	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	
3		
4	SEP 2 9 2006	
5 [`]		
6	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS SOLVED COMPANY OF PROCEEDINGS	
7	Hearing	
8	December 7, 2004 Jefferson City, Missouri	
9	Volume 8	
10		
11		
12 13	In the Matter of the Tariff Filing) of The Empire District Electric) Company to Implement a General) Case No. ER-2004-0570 Rate Increase for Retail Electric) Service Provided to Customers in) Its Missouri Service Area)	
14		
15		
16		
17	KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Presiding, DEPUTY CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.	
18	CONNIE MURRAY,	
19	ROBERT M. CLAYTON, JEFF DAVIS,	
20	LINWARD "LIN" APPLING, COMMISSIONERS.	
21		
22	REPORTED BY:	
23	KELLENE K. FEDDERSEN, CSR, RPR, CCR MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES	
24		
25		

Prexaly_Exhibit No. 116 Case No(s). F.C. 2006-0315 Date 9-12-06 Rptr_XK

442

ę.

1

I

ĥ

, ī

1 something like the subject to refund when the money is 2 collected by the utility, it belongs to the utility. 3 So I don't know if that helps. It's a '79 4 case. Like you, I have some difficulty in recalling with 5 precision all the facts. But it was not, sir, a rulemaking. I hope that helps. I don't want to just 6 7 leave it. COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Stu, let me ask you 8 9 one more question. 10 MR. CONRAD: Sure. 11 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Do you think there --12 I'm just trying to think outside the box here. 13 MR. CONRAD: Sure. 14 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Do you think it is 15 conceivable that there is any way that we could develop 16 some sort of -- I mean, this would probably require the 17 unanimous consent of all parties concerned, but that some 18 sort of sharing grid could be developed or something like 19that? 20 I know we -- I mean, it's never been used 21 in this context before, but would something like that be 22 feasible? 23 MR. CONRAD: That's an interesting --24 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Obviously I want to 25 encourage Empire to be prudent and would like to find some

482

-

way to reward them for purchasing cheaper gas, you know.
I don't know. I'm just --

3 MR. CONRAD: It's harder to do. We have --4 Judge, we had applied that very concept, I think, that 5 you're talking about at one point in time in concept, a 6 name that some people will remember here, Paul Phillips, 7 who now works for the Department of Energy, but at that 8 time was with the General Counsel's Office, and I tried to 9 work to a point of crafting a band-type incentive for the 10 purchased gas adjustment clause, where a target would be 11 set by the Commission and then if the company was able to 12 beat that, you know, progressively more and more, then 13 they could realize more and more to a bottom line.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right.

14

MR. CONRAD: If they went the other way, 15 16 the ratepayers were protected and so on. It's harder to do on the electric side when you look, Judge, at the bus 17 18 bar cost because it is a function not only of the cost of 19 gas, which is predominant for this utility, but it's a 20 function of all the other mix of fuels. It's a function 21 of the efficiency of the units that are being used. 22 It's a function of loading order of them, it's -- that's 23 why those -- that's why it's so interesting in this case 24 that the fuel runs that the company did and Staff did are 25 so closely together, because they obviously have modeled

483

1 the same incentive. But it's an interesting concept. 2 It's certainly one that I, you know, for my 3 folks, we'd be willing to sit down and explore with somebody. I don't know what the context of how to do that 4 5 within a case like this, but like you, I share the concern that if you just take -- you know, just pick a number and 6 7 say go at it, that you have a tendency of putting the 8 company in the box of having a subjective after-the-fact 9 review, which they don't like, or having -- or having no 10 prudence review at all. So it's a challenging question. 11 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I'm just looking for a 12 way that we can create a box where neither the company nor 13 the ratepayers would be on the hook, so to speak. Thank 14you. 15 MR. CONRAD: Sure. 16 JUDGE THOMPSON: Further questions? 17 (No response.) 18 JUDGE THOMPSON: Mr. Beecher? 19 (Witness sworn.) 20 JUDGE THOMPSON: Do you understand, 21 Mr. Beecher, if you give false testimony in this 22 proceeding, you'll be subject to prosecution for perjury? 23 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 24 JUDGE THOMPSON: Please take your seat. 25 State your name for the record.

484

2

÷

1	I N D E X	
2	FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER/INTERIM ENERGY	CHARGE
3	Opening Statement by Mr. Stewart Opening Statement by Mr. Frey	448 455
4	Opening Statement by Mr. Coffman Opening Statement by Mr. Conrad	455 459 46.7
5	Opening Statement by Mr. Molteni	475
6	EMPIRE'S EVIDENCE:	
7	BRADLEY P. BEECHER Direct Examination by Mr. Keevil	485
8	Cross-Examination by Mr. Conrad Cross-Examination by Mr. Frey	403 490 493
9	Cross-Examination by Mr. Coffman Questions by Commissioner Murray	544 538
10	Questions by Commissioner Clayton Questions by Commissioner Appling	542 551
11	Questions by Commissioner Davis Further Questions by Commissioner Appling	553 555
12	Further Questions by Commissioner Murray Further Questions by Commissioner Davis	556 558
13	Recross-Examination by Mr. Conrad Further Questions by Commissioner Davis	560 567
14	Recross-Examination by Mr. Frey Recross-Examination by Mr. Coffman	568 569
15	STAFF'S EVIDENCE:	
16	JOHN CASSIDY	
17	Direct Examination by Mr. Frey Cross-Examination by Mr. Coffman	572 574
18		~ / ·
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

-

۰.

ł

T

586