

Exhibit No.:
Issues: Injuries and Damages
Merger Costs
Advertising
Witness: Michael G. Gruner
Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony
Case No.: EO-96-14

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

UTILITY SERVICES DIVISION

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MICHAEL G. GRUNER

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY

CASE NO. EO-96-14

Jefferson City, Missouri
April 1999

Exhibit No. 8
Date 6-1-99 Case No. EO-96-14
Reporter TU

Surrebuttal Testimony of
Michael Gruner

1 A. No, I do not. As Mr. Baxter stated in his testimony (page 30, lines 1-5),
2 the Stipulation and Agreement for Case No. EM-96-149 does read:

3 The annual amortization of merger transaction and transition cost will be
4 the lesser of : (1) the Missouri jurisdictional portion of the total Ameren
5 amount of \$7.2 million; or (2) the Missouri Jurisdictional portion of the
6 total Ameren unamortized amount of actual merger transaction and
7 transition costs incurred to date.

8
9 But the Stipulation and Agreement also states, in the sentence directly before the
10 portion Mr. Baxter quotes:

11 Actual prudent and reasonable merger transaction and transition costs
12 (estimated to be \$71.5 million) shall be amortized over ten years
13 beginning the date the merger closes. (Emphasis added.)
14

15 This is the portion of the Stipulation and Agreement the Staff believes is
16 controlling. The Stipulation and Agreement states that actual transaction and transition
17 costs should be amortized over a ten-year period. By stating that the \$71.5 million
18 amount is only an estimate, the language in the Stipulation and Agreement indicates that
19 the number is subject to change as time passes and more accurate estimates or actual
20 amounts become available.

21 Q. Do you agree with Mr. Baxter that the Stipulation and Agreement intends
22 the amount of \$7.2 million as a fixed amount to be compared to the Missouri
23 jurisdictional portion of the total Ameren unamortized amount of actual merger
24 transaction and transition costs incurred to date?

25 A. No, I do not agree with Mr. Baxter's (page 31, lines 12-18) assertion with
26 regard to the \$7.2 million. The \$7.2 million (or \$6.2 million Missouri jurisdictional
27 portion) Mr. Baxter uses in his calculation simply reflects a ten-year amortization of the
28 \$71.5 million of merger and acquisition costs, estimated at the time the Stipulation and

1 Agreement was entered into by the signatories. The Stipulation and Agreement does not
2 state that the \$7.2 million estimate is a fixed amount and will not be adjusted to reflect
3 actual costs or new and more accurate estimates as they become known. What the Staff's
4 adjustment accomplishes is adjusting the \$7.2 million estimate to reflect a more accurate
5 estimate of prudent and reasonable merger transaction and transition costs as of June 30,
6 1998, and then amortizing that amount over the agreed-upon ten-year period.

7 Q. Are actual and/or more current estimates of merger and acquisition costs
8 now available?

9 A. Yes. The actual merger transaction costs are \$25,620,950, compared to the
10 original estimate in 1996 of \$21,834,000. The original estimate of merger transition costs,
11 approximately \$50 million, has been revised to \$41 million as of June 30, 1998. As a
12 result, the Company's estimate of total merger and acquisition costs as reflected in the
13 Stipulation and Agreement for Case No. EM-96-149 was overstated.

14 Q. If merger and acquisition costs remain at their current estimated level,
15 could the Company's interpretation of the language result in an amortization period of
16 less than ten years?

17 A. Yes. Using the Company's method of amortization and its June 30, 1998
18 estimate, merger and acquisition costs would be amortized in approximately 9.25 years.

19 **ADVERTISING EXPENSE**

20 Q. Does the Company agree with your classification of certain advertising
21 expenses as merger and acquisition costs?

22 A. Yes, Mr. Baxter states in his rebuttal testimony (page 38, lines 12-16) that
23 the Company did not include any of the \$1,198,124 of advertising costs, associated with

1 UE's name change to Ameren, in its calculation of merger and acquisition costs. As a
2 result, he now proposes to properly include these costs in the total merger and acquisition
3 costs which are subject to amortization. Therefore, there is no longer an advertising issue,
4 between UE and the Staff regarding the classification of advertising. This amount
5 becomes part of the merger and acquisition cost amortization issue discussed previously.

6 **INJURIES AND DAMAGES EXPENSE**

7 Q. Have you read Company witnesses Baxter and McKnight's rebuttal
8 testimony relating to injuries and damages expense?

9 A. Yes, I have.

10 Q. Do you agree that the Company has provided a reasonable explanation for
11 the increase to injuries and damages expense in the third sharing period?

12 A. No, Mr. Baxter states in his rebuttal testimony (page 34, lines 19-20) the
13 Company's accrual for injuries and damages is correct under GAAP. However, the
14 Commission has never held itself to be bound by GAAP for ratemaking purposes. Mr.
15 Baxter also states (pages 34-35, lines 20-21 and 1-2) the injuries and damages reserve
16 represents management's best estimate of the ultimate amount necessary to settle all
17 claims or damages that arose from events that occurred prior to the balance sheet date.
18 Estimates involve subjective judgment and the Company believes that, under the terms of
19 the Stipulation and Agreement, the Staff must unquestioningly accept the Company's
20 estimate. The Company states the increase is caused in part by an increase in adverse
21 court judgments which it believes will ultimately result in payouts. In his testimony
22 (page 35, lines 8-11) Mr. Baxter also asserts that, based on the trend in the third sharing
23 period, future payouts will also be larger than in prior years. In other words, customers

Surrebuttal Testimony of
Michael Gruner

1 are being hit twice in the third sharing period for injuries and damages expense: once
2 with abnormally high payments for actual claims from adverse judgments and again with
3 an increased accrual reflecting UE's subjective expectation of higher future payments.

4 Q. Is there anything else you want to say at this time?

5 A. Yes, I reserve the right to file supplemental surrebuttal testimony based on
6 outstanding data requests. I submitted the data requests on April 6, 1999, relating to the
7 injuries and damages expense testimony contained in UE's rebuttal filing of April 2,
8 1999. I will submit supplemental testimony as soon as possible after UE responds to the
9 outstanding data requests.

10 Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?

11 A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI


In the Matter of the Monitoring of the Experimental)
Alternative Regulation Plan of Union Electric Company)

EO-96-14

AFFIDAVIT OF MICHAEL G. GRUNER

STATE OF MISSOURI)
)
COUNTY OF COLE) ss.

Michael G. Gruner, is of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the foregoing Surrebuttal Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of 5 pages to be presented in the above case; that the answers in the foregoing Surrebuttal Testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.


Michael G. Gruner

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of April, 1999.


Toni M. Willmeno
Notary Public, State of Missouri
County of Callaway
My Commission Expires June 24, 2000

