FILED March 19, 2020 **Data Center** Missouri Public **Service Commission**

Exhibit No .:

Issue(s):

Quality of Service

Paperless Billing Program

Witness:

Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit:

MoPSC Staff Rebuttal Testimony

Contessa King

Case No.:

ER-2019-0335

Date Testimony Prepared:

January 21, 2020

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION FINANCIAL and BUSINESS ANALYSIS DIVISION CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE DEPARTMENT

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

CONTESSA KING

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a Ameren Missouri

CASE NO. ER-2019-0335

Jefferson City, Missouri January 2020

Staff Exhibit No_110 P Date 3 4 20 Reporter Smg File No_ER-2019 - 0338

** Denotes Confidential Information **

1		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY				
2		OF				
3		CONTESSA KING				
4 5		UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a Ameren Missouri				
6		CASE NO. ER-2019-0335				
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.				
8	A.	My name is Contessa King. My business address is 200 Madison Street,				
9	Jefferson City, MO 65101.					
10	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?				
11	A.	I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") as				
12	the Manager of the Customer Experience Department.					
13	Q.	Are you the same Contessa King who contributed to the Missouri Public Service				
14	Commission	Staff's ("Staff") Class Cost of Service Report ("CCOS Report"), filed				
15	December 18, 2019?					
16	A.	Yes, I am.				
17	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?				
18	A.	The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to expound on my testimony in Staff's				
19	CCOS Report and respond to Union Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren Missouri's ("Ameren					
20	Missouri") Witness Mark C. Birk regarding Ameren Missouri's proposed incentive to					
21	encourage customers to adopt paperless billing.					
22	Q.	On page 39 of Staff's CCOS Report, you state that Staff is opposed to Ameren				
23	Missouri's pr	oposed incentives to encourage paperless billing; is that still your position?				

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20-

A. Yes, Staff remains opposed to Ameren Missouri's paperless billing incentive proposal. I will address Staff's opposition to the incentives from a customer experience perspective, and Utility Regulatory Auditor Karen Lyons will respond to the proposal from an auditing viewpoint. Ms. Lyons will further explain how the proposed incentive in this case compares to the incentive proposed in Ameren Missouri's last general rate Case, No. ER-2016-0179.

- Please briefly describe the incentives Ameren Missouri is proposing in this case Q. to encourage paperless billing.
- In an effort to increase paperless billing enrollment by its customers, Ameren A. Missouri is proposing a \$0.50 incentive per bill to each new enrollee in Ameren Missouri's paperless billing program. The \$0.50 bill credit, over a one-year period, will amount to \$6.00 for each new enrollee in the program.
- Does the \$0.50 proposed bill credit reflect the exact amount of savings Q. associated with the Company rendering a paperless bill instead of a paper bill?
- No. According to Ameren Missouri, the total cost of issuing a paper bill per A. customer is \$0.4707 and approximately \$0.007 for paperless. The \$0.04 difference between the incentive offered (\$0.50) and the Company's savings per customer (\$0.46) would be absorbed by the Company.² The incentive is intended to reasonably approximate the amount of cost sayings resulting from customers converting from a paper bill to paperless billing. Ameren Missouri is not seeking recovery in rates in this proceeding of the cost associated with

¹ ER-2019-0335, Direct Testimony of Mark C. Birk, p. 4.

² ER-2019-0335, Direct Testimony of Mark C. Birk, p. 4-5.

- the bill credit incentives; however, the Company is asking the Commission to approve the tariff change filed to implement the incentive.³
 - Q. Will existing paperless billing participants qualify for the bill credit?
- A. No. Based on Ameren Missouri's current proposal, only new paperless billing enrollees will qualify for the incentive.
- Q. Does Staff oppose Ameren Missouri's proposal to limit the incentive to new paperless billing enrollees?
- A. Yes. Staff is opposed to a bill credit used as an incentive to drive paperless billing adoption.
 - Q. Can you please explain why Staff is opposed to the proposed incentive?
- A. Staff is of the opinion that since all customers pay for all costs associated with generating paperless and paper bills, including printing and mailing, all customers should equally benefit from savings associated with paperless billing (also referred to as electronic billing). Currently, all customers, irrespective of how their bills are generated, can benefit from the savings Ameren Missouri receives from customers opting for paperless billing. It is Staff's position that the Company should continue to pass savings associated with generating paperless bills to all Ameren Missouri customers, instead of passing a portion of the savings exclusively to newly enrolled paperless bill customers, as proposed.
 - Q. Are there other reasons why Staff opposes the proposed paperless bill incentive?
- A. Yes. Ameren Missouri has not made the case on why incentivizing regulated utility customers to participate in its paperless billing program, as proposed, is necessary. The Company did not reference a particular electronic billing adoption rate or regional industry

³ 3rd Revised Tariff Sheet No. 63.

Rebuttal Testimony of Contessa King

1	standard that it is trying to achieve by offering the incentive. Additionally, the Company did								
2	not provide analysis indicating that its paperless billing program is significantly underutilized								
3	and that the only way reluctant customers are willing to participate in paperless billing is if the								
4	Company provides a bill credit.								
5	In data requests (DR) 0257 and 0257.1 (Schedule CK-r1), Staff inquired about any								
6	research or surveys conducted by Ameren Missouri, or by a third party, to assess Amerer								
7	Missouri customers' willingness or unwillingness to sign up for electronic bills. The Company								
8	referenced several sources and studies,4 including a recent Paperless Billing Statement Study								
9	prepared by Ameren Missouri. Four key insights from the Study stand out to Staff:								
0	1) **								
1									
2	2)								
.3									
.4	3)								
.5	4)								
7	5								
.8									
9									
:0									
	4 **								
	**								

•	
<u>*************************************</u>	
	6 **
Q.	How can Staff claim that the proposed incentive is not necessary to increase
articipatio	when Company Witness Mark C. Birk states that out of 1,200,000 custome
bout 204,0	00, or about 17%, of Ameren Missouri customers participate in paperless billing
hich is on	y a 2% increase in participation from the 15% stated in Ameren Missouri's previou
ate case?	
A.	Staff's analysis of participation numbers differ from Mr. Birk's analysis. It
taff's belie	f that from July 2016 to July 2019 the percentage of customers enrolled in paperle
illing impi	oved from 15% to approximately 23% and not from 15% to 17% as indicated b
⁄Ir. Birk.	
Acc	ording to DR No. 0254.1 (Schedule CK-r2), **
	**
Staf	es analysis indicates a steady increase in customers opting for paperless billing, ar
his increase	occurred without a bill credit in place to incentivize participation.
Q.	In an effort to create customer awareness, does Ameren Missouri promote i
paperless bi	lling program through multiple consumer touch points?
-	

Rebuttal Testimony of Contessa King

1	A. Yes, Ameren Missouri promotes its paperless billing program by utilizing							
2	various communication channels. In Staff DR Nos. 0255, 0256 and 0259 Staff inquired about							
3	past, current and proposed marketing strategies and promotion efforts utilized by the Company							
4	to promote its paperless billing program. Specifically, Staff DR No. 0256 inquired about							
5	changes or improvements to promotion efforts from 2016 to 2019. The Company provided the							
6	following response to Staff's DR No. 0256:							
7 8	**							
9 10								
11 12 13								
14 15								
16 17								
18 19	=							
20								
21	' * *							
22	Additionally, in an effort to improve program enrollment, **							
23								
24								
25	7 **							
į	⁷ Confidential DR Nos. 0259 and 0259 1							

Page 6

Rebuttal Testimony of Contessa King

Company provided data states that paperless billing enrollment numbers increased from 15% in July 2016, to approximately 25% in November 2019. Staff cannot definitively state that Ameren Missouri's improved promotion efforts is the sole contributor to greater electronic billing participation, but improved customer engagement and outreach typically increases customer awareness, which can result in increased participation.

Given the correlation between Ameren Missouri's improved promotion strategies and increased paperless billing adoption, Ameren Missouri should continue aggressively promoting paperless billing with a comprehensive marketing approach if it desires greater customer adoption of paperless billing.

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

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Union Eld/b/a Ameren Missouri's Its Revenues for Electric	Fariffs t))	Case No. ER-2019-0335
	AFFI	DAVIT OF	CONT	ESSA KING
STATE OF MISSOURI)			
COUNTY OF COLE)	SS.		
COMES NOW CON	TESSA	KING and	on her o	ath declares that she is of sound mind and
lawful age; that she contri	buťed to	the foregoi	ng <i>Rebu</i>	ttal Testimony of Contessa King; and that
the same is true and correc	t accord	ing to her b	est know	ledge and belief.
Further the Affiant say	eth not.		Inte	Ma Ling SSA KING

JURAT

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my office in Jefferson City, on this ______ day of January, 2020.

Notary Public N

DIANNA L. VAUGHT
Notary Public - Notary Seal
State of Missouri
Commissioned for Cole County
My Commission Expires: July 18, 2023
Commission Number: 15207377

SCHEDULE CK-r1

HAS BEEN DEEMED

CONFIDENTIAL

IN ITS ENTIRETY

SCHEDULE CK-r2

HAS BEEN DEEMED

CONFIDENTIAL

IN ITS ENTIRETY