Exhibit No.: Issue(s): MEEIA Programs Witness: Daniel G. Laurent Type of Exhibit: Supplemental Testimony Sponsoring Party: Union Electric Company File No.: EO-2015-0055 Date Testimony Prepared: June 30, 2015

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FILE NO. EO-2015-0055

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

OF

DANIEL G. LAURENT

ON

BEHALF OF

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a Ameren Missouri

St. Louis, Missouri June 2015

1	SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY
2	OF
3	DANIEL G. LAURENT
4	FILE NO. EO-2015-0055
5	Q. Please state your name and business address.
6	A. My name is Daniel G. Laurent. My business address is One Ameren
7	Plaza, 1901 Chouteau Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63103.
8	Q. By whom and in what capacity are you employed?
9	A. I am employed by Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri
10	("Ameren Missouri" or "Company") as Director of Energy Efficiency and Demand
11	Response.
12	Q. Please describe your educational background and employment
13	experience.
14	A. I joined Central Illinois Public Service Company ("CIPS") as a
15	Meter/Distribution Engineer in June of 1988 and held several positions in Engineering,
16	Customer Service and Marketing before being promoted to Marketing Manager prior to
17	the merger of CIPS and Union Electric Company in 1998. After the merger, I was named
18	Manager, Pricing and Contract Administration for Ameren Services Company. After
19	holding Manager positions in Marketing, Business Development and Regulatory
20	Compliance, I was promoted to my current position within Ameren Missouri. I have a
21	Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from the University of Illinois and
	Duchelor of Science Degree in Dicenteur Displaceting from the Oniversity of minors and

What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony in this 1 0. 2 proceeding? 3 The purpose of my testimony is to provide an overview of the additional A.

4 savings targets, budget, programs and enhancements to the original MEEIA 2016-18 5 Plan, which was filed by the Company in December of last year (the "MEEIA 2 Plan"), 6 and as reflected in the Non-Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement ("Stipulation") 7 recently filed in this case.

8

At a high level, please describe the change in targeted savings and the Q. 9 increase in budget required to achieve those savings.

10 A. The Stipulation reflects an increase in the targeted cumulative savings to 11 583,563 megawatt-hours ("MWh") as compared to the targeted savings in the original 12 MEEIA 2 Plan of 426,382 MWh. To achieve this total, the Stipulation calls for a 13 substantial increase in the multi-family, low-income program offering based primarily on 14 input from the National Housing Trust ("NHT") and Tower Grove Neighborhoods 15 Community Development Corporation ("TGNCD"). The Stipulation also proposes to 16 implement a small business direct install ("SBDI") program based in part on input from 17 the National Resource Defense Council ("NRDC") and the Sierra Club. Based on input 18 from the Division of Energy, the Stipulation proposes to incentivize compact fluorescent 19 lamp ("CFL") purchases in grocery, drug, discount and online store channels in 2016, 20 which will also increase savings. Additionally, based in part on input from the NRDC, 21 the Stipulation reflects the signatories' agreement that energy efficiency incentives will be 22 provided to public facilities in order to achieve additional energy savings. Finally, based on input primarily from the Division of Energy, the Stipulation proposes to include 23

- 1 Combined Heat and Power as an eligible measure under the business custom program. In
- 2 summary, the Stipulation proposes to increase energy savings by approximately 37% and
- 3 to increase the overall Plan budget by approximately 47%.
- 4

5

The following table details the proposed annual and cumulative savings and budget.

	2016	2017	2018	Total
Res Net Energy				
Savings (MWh)	101,740	61,757	60,066	223,563
C&I Net Energy				
Savings (MWh)	104,991	123,557	131,452	360,000
Total Net Energy				
Savings (MWh)	206,732	185,314	191,518	583,563
Residential Program				
Costs	34,279,782	26,852,995	26,166,797	87,299,574
Business Program				
Costs	32,065,882	37,890,359	39,954,045	109,910,286
Total Program Costs	66,345,664	64,743,354	66,120,841	197,209,859

6

7

8

Q. Why did Ameren Missouri agree to raise the savings target to a level that is higher than the target it had in its original MEEIA 2 Plan?

9 A. The Company believes that continuing to pursue energy efficiency is in 10 the shared interest of customers, the environment, the state of Missouri, and its 11 shareholders. Therefore, in the spirit of compromise and with the support of numerous 12 interveners, the Company proposes to substantially increase the proposed savings targets 13 and budget.

Q. The MWh target contained within the Stipulation is not as high as the
target that some parties have testified is possible. Are additional energy savings
feasible?

A. The revised proposed target was the result of much discussion and compromise. Ameren Missouri re-examined its MEEIA programs, based on input from the interveners, looking for additional energy savings potential. This analysis cannot be as rigorous as the analysis that was undertaken for its original proposal, but represents a compromise energy savings target that Ameren Missouri hopes to achieve.

6 Ameren Missouri has agreed to meet with the signatories to the Stipulation during 7 the first four months of 2016 to review potential additional energy efficiency 8 opportunities to determine if it is possible to achieve savings above the targeted level in 9 2017 and 2018. Ameren Missouri cannot commit to a higher target level than the level 10 set in the Stipulation, but it is certainly willing to continue to discuss this issue with the 11 signatories to the Stipulation and determine if there are additional cost-effective measures 12 or program changes which could be adopted that would result in the achievement of 13 additional MWh savings or cost reductions.

Q. Beyond just increasing the MWh target, the Stipulation also addresses several programs and enhancements that were not included in the Company's original MEEIA 2 Plan. Please discuss some of these new programs and enhancements.

A. Ameren Missouri appreciates the varied viewpoints of the signatories to
the Stipulation and has utilized their input to propose new programs and program changes
for Ameren Missouri's MEEIA 2 portfolio.

The proposed multi-family, low-income program budget increased by approximately \$4 million and the program has been significantly enhanced to better serve this vulnerable and hard-to-reach market segment. The program enhancements reflect the

outcome of a series of five St. Louis metro area conventions in 2014 that included the
 National Housing Trust, the Natural Resources Defense Council and a wide range of
 stakeholders. In addition to the increase in budget of approximately 58%, the program
 enhancements are described in the Stipulation and partially include:

- Creating a single point of contact for owners of low-income, multi-family
 properties which will assist in ensuring that the impacted low-income
 customers receive more of the benefits available under Ameren Missouri's
 MEEIA 2 programs and programs provided by others.
- Providing a 25% bonus incentive for multi-family, low-income common area
 measures for customers served under the Company's non-residential service
 classifications.
- Conducting level 1 energy audits to provide information on savings,
 recommended energy efficiency measures and typical payback ranges to
 increase customer understanding and facilitate increased program
 participation.

16 The Company worked closely with NHT to create an outline of how this program 17 will work. We are looking forward to seeing how this program will help Ameren 18 Missouri's multi-family, low-income customers.

On the business side, the Stipulation proposes to add an SBDI Program. This
program targets energy savings of 30,000 MWh and has a target budget of \$9.9 million.
The program will be available to small business customers that are difficult to reach
through traditional energy efficiency programs and is intended to open the door to

directly-installed lighting measures that should lead to additional savings in areas such as
 refrigeration and HVAC.

Based on input from the Division of Energy, the signatories to the Stipulation are proposing to include Combined Heat and Power (CHP) as an eligible measure under the business custom program and to provide incentives to purchase CFLs in grocery, drug, discount and online store channels in 2016. A maximum of 1,150,000 CFLs would be incentivized and the proposed energy savings would amount to 27,722 MWh.

8 The continuation of the CFL program recognizes that there are still low-priced, 9 incandescent bulbs available that our customers for purchase and will incentivize 10 customers to purchase CFLs instead of less-efficient, incandescent bulbs.

11 Q. As you stated above, the MWh savings target increased by 37%, but 12 the expected budget increased by 47%. Please explain why it was necessary to 13 increase the budget by a higher percentage than the target.

14 The budget is based on the knowledge and experience of our team of A. 15 energy efficiency managers and reflects the fact that more extensive, incremental energy 16 savings are costly to obtain. It is also reflective of the substantial increase in cost of 17 energy efficiency portfolios that strive to achieve energy savings beyond the realistically-18 achievable potential, as identified in Ameren Missouri's potential study and outlined the 19 testimony of Company witness Richard A. Voytas. As the portfolio of energy efficiency 20 programs continues to mature and more codes and standards are adopted, it requires 21 extensive engineering analysis and incentives to encourage customers to adopt the more 22 expensive energy efficiency measures.

Ameren Missouri recognizes the importance of being a good steward of the money that customers entrust to us to manage these programs. The proposed performance incentive encourages the Company to pursue all cost-effective energy savings at the lowest possible cost.

- 5 Q. Does this conclude your supplemental testimony?
- 6 A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

)

)

)

)

In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri's 2nd Filing to Implement Regulatory Changes in Furtherance of Energy Efficiency as Allowed by MEEIA.

File No. EO-2015-0055

AFFIDAVIT OF DANIEL G. LAURENT

STATE OF MISSOURI

CITY OF ST. LOUIS

Daniel G. Laurent, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:

)) ss

)

1. My name is Daniel G. Laurent. I work in the City of St. Louis, Missouri,

and I am employed by Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri as Director of

Energy Efficiency and Demand Response.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my

Supplemental Testimony on behalf of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri consisting of $\underline{7}$ pages and Schedule(s) $\underline{N/A}$, all of which have been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the above-referenced docket.

3. I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded are true and correct.

Daniel G. Laurent

Subscribed and sworn to before me this day of 2015.

1. Eaut Notary Public

My commission expires:

