

Exhibit No.:
Issues: EV Charging Pilot Project
Witness: Mark J. Nealon
Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony
Sponsoring Party: Union Electric Company
File No.: ET-2016-0246
Date Testimony Prepared: August 15, 2016

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FILE NO. ET-2016-0246

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MARK J. NEALON

ON

BEHALF OF

**UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY
d/b/a Ameren Missouri**

**St. Louis, Missouri
August 15, 2016**

1 the Power On – Undergrounding Program), Smart Grid Strategy & Implementation, and
2 Engineering Design & Project Management.

3 **Q. Please describe your qualifications.**

4 A. I am a Registered Professional Engineer in the states of Missouri and
5 Illinois. I am a senior member of the Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers and
6 an active member of the National Society of Professional Engineers and the Electrical
7 Board of Missouri and Illinois. I was also recently inducted into the Academy of
8 Electrical Engineering at the Missouri University of Science & Technology.

9 In 2009, I was named the Manager of Smart Grid Strategy & Implementation at
10 Ameren Missouri. In this role I was tasked to develop, in concert with Ameren Illinois, a
11 corporate strategy around the integration of control, automation and communications
12 technologies into the electric transmission and distribution infrastructure systems in our
13 service territory. The technologies emerging at this time included those associated with
14 the electric transportation industry, which was in the midst of a revival from its earlier
15 popularity in the 1990s.

16 Ameren Missouri took this opportunity to immerse itself in electric vehicle
17 (“EV”) and vehicle charging technologies. As a result, I was directly involved in the
18 acquisition of several EV models, the deployment of charging stations at our
19 headquarters in St. Louis and delivering presentations in several public forums, including
20 the various Smart Grid workshops hosted by the Missouri Public Service Commission
21 (“Commission”) Staff (“Staff”) in Jefferson City, Missouri. Our activity at the time was
22 focused on self-education of electric transportation-related capabilities and
23 communicating Ameren Missouri’s point of view on the technology in general. With this

1 expertise now firmly rooted in our corporation, Ameren Missouri is ready to get involved
2 on a more aggressive level in the promotion and support of electric transportation and
3 associated charging technologies.

4 **Q. What are your responsibilities in your current position?**

5 A. As Director of Engineering Design & Project Management, I am
6 responsible for leading capital project design and project management activities
7 associated with all bulk and distribution substations in the Missouri service territory, and,
8 in particular, electric facilities therein operating at voltages under 100,000 volts. These
9 activities encompass several design disciplines, including electric and civil engineering,
10 design drafting, and system protection. I am also responsible for supporting project
11 management activities associated with Ameren Missouri's Energy Delivery electric and
12 gas capital projects.

13 Additionally, I lead a pilot project team called EV Promotion & Support that was
14 launched in early 2016. This team was charged with building on Ameren Missouri's
15 previous work in the EV space and exploring the various means by which customers and
16 businesses are motivated to further consider electric transportation options. Current areas
17 of focus for this team include workplace EV charging, fleet electrification options, long-
18 distance public charging and avenues for raising stakeholder awareness of electric
19 transportation issues and technology. My work on the EV Promotion & Support team to
20 date has led directly to the formulation of this testimony.

21 **Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony in this proceeding?**

22 A. This direct testimony supports a tariff filing that establishes our proposed
23 pilot program for fueling electric vehicles at Ameren Missouri-affiliated charging stations

1 within its service territory. This testimony is aimed at establishing Ameren Missouri's
2 point of view regarding electric transportation, communicating our philosophy behind and
3 justification for a more direct involvement in the ownership, deployment and operation of
4 electric vehicle charging stations and the billing associated with the service provided.

5 **Q. What is the nature of Ameren Missouri's proposal that would**
6 **necessitate a tariff rate for electric vehicle charging?**

7 A. As part of the EV Promotion & Support effort I lead, Ameren Missouri
8 proposes to deploy an electric vehicle charging station pilot project aimed at investigating
9 the merits of providing an EV charging service intended for use by both the long-distance
10 driving public and the communities that are situated along long-distance driving
11 corridors.

12 This will involve the identification of six charging station site locations, or
13 "charging islands," each of which will feature both direct current fast-charging ("DCFC")
14 and standard Level 2 alternating current ("AC") charging stations for public use. These
15 charging islands will be located in selected communities along the I-70 interstate corridor
16 between Boonville and St. Louis City – respectively the western-most and eastern-most
17 reaches of the Ameren Missouri service territory along this route – plus an additional
18 charging island in Jefferson City. Ameren Missouri chose the I-70 corridor for this
19 charging station deployment for three reasons: (1) it is the most heavily trafficked
20 interstate in Missouri (with 2013 Annual Average Daily Traffic volume exceeding
21 100,000 vehicles in St. Louis City and County, and in the range of 30,000 to 50,000
22 vehicles west of St. Charles County); (2) it connects the two largest metropolitan areas in
23 Missouri that together account for over 80% of the EVs registered and operating in the

1 state; and (3) it is the interstate corridor selected by the Missouri Department of
2 Transportation (“MODOT”) for its “Road to Tomorrow” initiative, launched in June
3 2015. Ameren Missouri’s proposal for corridor charging along I-70 is complementary to
4 the Road to Tomorrow initiative, and there has been on-going communication with
5 MODOT regarding this proposed pilot project.

6 Ameren Missouri designed the distance between adjacent charging islands to be
7 in the range of 20 to 45 miles and is intentionally planning their locations to serve both
8 the local communities and the corridor’s long-distance driving public. In the spirit of
9 providing a truly public service that accommodates all currently available EV models,
10 each of Ameren Missouri’s six charging islands will feature DCFC and standard Level 2
11 AC charging stations that provide access to all industry-standard plugs. Ameren
12 Missouri proposes “pay at the charger” transactions in order to mirror the kind of liquid
13 fueling experience with which consumers are familiar. These “on-the-spot” transactions
14 can take the form of a credit card payment using a toll-free telephone number, magnetic
15 card swipe technology, radio frequency identification, or billing to an account the EV
16 Customer¹ may already have with the charging station network vendor.

17 For this pilot, Ameren Missouri proposes the electric fueling charges take the
18 form of a flat rate charged per 15-minute “plug time” interval, regardless of the amount

¹ I will be discussing several types of “customers” throughout this testimony. For the sake of consistency, I will use the following terms to reference each customer type:

“EV Customer” an EV owner, lessee, or charging station vendor account holder, who may or may not also be a Utility Customer;

“Non-Participating Customer” a customer to whom Ameren Missouri provides traditional electric service, who is not also an EV Customer;

“Participating Customer” a customer to whom Ameren Missouri provides traditional electric service, who is not also an EV Customer;

“Utility Customer” traditional electric service customer of Ameren Missouri who is either a Participating or Non-Participating Customer.

1 of energy dispensed or the length of time necessary to dispense it. Ameren Missouri
2 currently does not have a tariff defining the rates to be paid for EV Customers utilizing
3 charging stations, and we are not aware that the Commission has endorsed a time-based
4 fee assessment concept that would address the potential energy re-sale concerns when
5 third parties begin building and operating charging stations of their own. Regardless, for
6 reasons I will discuss later in this testimony, Ameren Missouri believes it is appropriate
7 for an electric utility to conduct a pilot project of this nature even though the service
8 involved is not part of the traditional suite of offerings provided to Utility Customers.

9 **Q. Why is Ameren Missouri choosing this particular approach to EV**
10 **charging? That is, what are the specific needs Ameren Missouri is looking to**
11 **address with this pilot project?**

12 A. The evolution of EV technology offerings in the United States is
13 progressing at a very rapid pace – the same pace, for all practical purposes, as the
14 advances being made in battery technology. Ameren Missouri believes that the
15 “breakthrough” EV – the model that begins removing the last of the vehicle barriers to
16 widespread consumer adoption – will be the EV that offers at least a 300-mile range and
17 costs less than \$30,000 (before incentives). When this happens, American consumers
18 will have their first viable alternative to gas-powered vehicles since the EV revival began
19 back in 2011.

20 There is a high probability that the 300-mile, \$30,000 "breakthrough" in EV
21 technology will be realized in 2020 or before, as evidenced by the unveiling of the
22 200-mile, \$35,000 (before incentives) Chevrolet Bolt and similar offerings from other
23 auto manufacturers already planned for 2017. This will create new end-uses for EVs that

1 stand to significantly expand the market, including worry-free, long-distance driving,
2 light commercial and industrial delivery/transport, and public transit.

3 While the prospect of all this would unlock huge benefits for Ameren's Utility
4 Customers and the general public (as will be discussed in detail later in this testimony), a
5 potentially lingering issue is that the driving public will expect charging infrastructure to
6 be readily accessible in order to accommodate these new freedoms. Put another way, in
7 the absence of any action being taken to deploy public charging means, along medium
8 and long-distance driving routes in particular, the infrastructure barriers to consumer
9 adoption of EV will remain despite the last of the vehicle barriers having been removed.
10 The longer this kind of vehicle choice is constrained, the longer the associated societal
11 benefits are forestalled. So, rather than wait for the full emergence, Ameren Missouri
12 believes we should be on the front end of the EV breakthrough, with infrastructure in
13 place not just to accommodate, but to foster, its growth.

14 In the end, as a means of enabling EV technology that offers a medium to long-
15 distance driving alternative to the consumer public for the very first time starting next
16 year, Ameren Missouri sees the deployment of a public EV charging service along
17 regional driving corridors as serving a need that will ultimately allow Missouri
18 households the benefit of having an electric vehicle be their household's only vehicle.

19 **Q. You stated this is a “charging corridor pilot project.” By conducting**
20 **this pilot project, what is it that Ameren Missouri wants and expects to learn about**
21 **the physical deployment of these new assets?**

22 A. There are several deployment-related aspects of this pilot project that
23 represent learning opportunities for Ameren Missouri, including developing a clear

1 understanding of the costs and schedules involved, and the most effective options for site
2 locations and site host partnerships.

3 Unique to this pilot project is the fact that while in the end it deploys physical
4 assets that provide electric service, the assets involved do so to support a specific end use
5 – driving a car. This places Ameren Missouri in the position of not only providing the
6 traditional line extension and associated transformation, but also providing, operating and
7 maintaining the charging stations themselves and the electric panel that distributes energy
8 to each of them. Ameren Missouri intends to determine the most efficient deployment
9 model for accomplishing this from both cost and scheduling standpoints. This includes
10 selecting the best charging station hardware and network vendor for this application and
11 determining the partners best suited for the various stages of field installation and site
12 commissioning.

13 Ameren Missouri also anticipates a need to acquire easements from local property
14 owners in the identified communities for the traditional line infrastructure as well as the
15 charging station panel and equipment. While the securing of easements is a standard part
16 of daily business at Ameren Missouri, there are numerous learning opportunities
17 associated with this particular application, including how to: (1) garner local support for
18 the installation of such facilities; (2) interest-specific property owners in playing "host" to
19 this new type of installation; and (3) best address the types of issues that will surface in
20 the negotiation of property agreements with these parties. Becoming adept in all of these
21 project management areas will only serve to minimize the time necessary to deploy
22 additional charging islands in the future, if prudent, and hence reduce cost.

1 Today, the fastest charging station that is commercially available for public use
2 charges an EV at a rate of 50 kilowatts (“kW”), the equivalent of recovering 75 to 100
3 miles of electric range in roughly 30 minutes. This is obviously not yet comparable to
4 the current consumer experience of fueling with gasoline or diesel. This predicament
5 invites two more opportunities for learning: (1) establishing which types of merchants or
6 venues are the best for locating charging islands in that they offer a means by which EV
7 Customers can occupy themselves for the "dwell times" involved (which can be an hour
8 or more for a 200-mile vehicle battery); and (2) determining the ways in which Ameren
9 Missouri can build upgrade capability into the charging island installations as a means of
10 preparing now for charging speeds that are expected to approach 150 to 300 kW in the
11 next several years.

12 **Q. By conducting this pilot project, what is it that Ameren Missouri**
13 **wants and expects to learn about the EV Customers involved as they use this**
14 **service?**

15 A. There are several EV Customer-related aspects of this pilot project that
16 represent learning opportunities for Ameren Missouri, including, but not limited to, the
17 nature and extent of charging behaviors, the degree to which they are satisfied with the
18 charging service, and the impact this service offering ultimately has on the consumer
19 adoption of EVs within the service territory.

20 In addition to the physical means by which EVs are fueled, charging station
21 vendors bring to the table a software network application with which the charging
22 stations can be remotely monitored, controlled and managed. Based on our knowledge of
23 these network capabilities, Ameren Missouri will have access to data on charging

1 durations, "plug-in" durations, numbers of charging sessions, numbers of unique and
2 repeat EV Customers, the energy dispensed, charging station traffic by time-of-day and
3 day-of-the-week, revenues collected, and more. This data will be available not only by
4 individual charging station (or "plug"), but by charging island, by the community served,
5 and across the total network. Further analysis of this data can be used to evaluate the
6 quality of the choices made for both charging island sites (e.g., with respect to
7 merchant/venue types or their times of operation) and the communities served (e.g., with
8 respect to their populations or distances off the interstate).

9 With regard to customer satisfaction, Ameren Missouri will ultimately be judged
10 by the EV Customer base as a result of their personal experiences with finding these
11 charging stations, using them to fuel their vehicles and completing their transactions.
12 Ameren Missouri proposes to make available a truly public charging service that is not
13 discriminating of any EV Customer, plug-in vehicle or charging network association (if
14 any). Ameren Missouri's goal is to deliver an EV Customer experience that is as
15 satisfying as possible with these unmanned charging facilities, in concert with our
16 "Customer First Customer Now" commitment and mindset. As such, there will be much
17 to learn regarding the elements that make for such an experience, including: (1) the ease
18 with which the charging islands can be located; (2) the availability, performance and
19 reliability of the charging station hardware; (3) the smoothness of the various payment
20 methods; (4) the quality of the technical/phone support available; (5) the reasonableness
21 of the pricing; and (6) the local attractions available for occupying the driver and
22 passengers during the charging period. Between the data that will be available on
23 equipment performance and the ability of various charging station registration websites to

1 log EV Customer comments and feedback, there will be significant, near real-time
2 information with which Ameren Missouri can gauge the quality of the EV Customer's
3 experience and make any necessary adjustments.

4 Lastly, Ameren Missouri feels that to the extent these charging corridors truly
5 enable the long-distance capability that EV technology provides, these deployments
6 should have a positive, discernable effect on consumer adoption. To date, plug-in EVs
7 represent roughly 0.18% of new vehicle registrations in Missouri going back to 2011.
8 Ameren Missouri currently receives aggregate quarterly vehicle registration data from the
9 Electric Power Research Institute (“EPRI”) that is presented nationally, by state and by
10 service territory. EV registration data stratified by county is also available based on our
11 recent discussions with IHS Automotive (formerly R. L. Polk & Company). Ameren
12 Missouri proposes to use this data to investigate EV adoption trends in its service
13 territory in the wake of the I-70 deployments, particularly comparing counties along the
14 corridor to those more remote from it.

15 The language in the accompanying tariff refers to Ameren Missouri’s proposal as
16 a “three-year pilot project,” a reference to the length of the study period being suggested
17 subsequent to the charging island deployment. The aforementioned data sources offer a
18 wealth of information that will allow Ameren Missouri the benefit of learning the
19 described, and three years is the period of time we feel would be sufficient to confirm
20 them and the other impacts of this public charging service. The tariff further describes
21 reporting as being conducted annually, though Ameren Missouri is willing to consider
22 other suggestions on reporting frequency.

1 **Q. Why should Ameren Missouri pursue this “charging corridor pilot**
2 **project” rather than simply wait for an entity in the free market to do so?**

3 A. Within the Kansas City and St. Louis metropolitan areas, hundreds of EV
4 charging stations exist for public use, and these numbers are steadily growing. Despite
5 this, there are a couple of glaring infrastructure gaps that still persist today: (1) a lack of
6 regional connectivity; and (2) a lack of fast-charging service equipment.

7 First, large communities are not “connected together” with charging infrastructure
8 on a regional basis in Missouri. Given the driving ranges of EVs today, their owners
9 might comfortably navigate Kansas City proper or, to a lesser extent, St. Louis Metro
10 proper thanks to the EV charging facilities located within these cities. However, what
11 most of these drivers can’t conveniently do today is make the trip from Kansas City to
12 St. Louis or vice versa, much less a trip even half that distance – to Columbia or Jefferson
13 City or Lake of the Ozarks, for example – from either starting point.²

14 Second, while website sources indicate the existence of a few charging stations
15 along regional routes, they are either: (1) Level 2 AC charging stations, which require
16 several hours to fully recover an EV’s range, or (2) Tesla charging stations, which feature
17 a proprietary (as opposed to an industry standard) charging plug. The fastest
18 commercially-available charging stations today featuring standard charging plugs are
19 what the industry refers to as DC Fast Chargers. At 50 kW of output power, they can
20 recover 75 to 100 miles of electric range in 30 minutes, but they currently do not exist in
21 sufficient numbers to fully enable the long-distance driving capability of next year’s

² The exceptions to this are Tesla EV owners; some Tesla models have in excess of 200-mile ranges today and are accommodated by a regional build-out of proprietary charging islands.

1 200-mile range EV models.

2 There is nothing to stop today's free market from addressing these two
3 infrastructure gaps, provided of course there is a desire to do so in combination with the
4 right business model. Notwithstanding, the free market has not stepped up to do this,
5 either in Missouri or elsewhere in the Midwest, likely for a lack of those very criteria. In
6 response to similar inactivity on both regional and national levels, some state
7 jurisdictions have stepped in and authorized, to varying degrees, local regulated entities
8 to get involved in the deployment of such infrastructure. This very issue was brought up
9 recently in the form of Attachment B to the Commission Staff's *Agenda for Workshop*
10 *and Request for Comments*, filed January 15, 2016, in File No. EW-2016-0123. In
11 particular, Question 7 of this attachment asked "what other states [are] doing to fund the
12 development and installation of EV charging stations" and whether or not "cost recovery
13 [is] allowed through a utility's rates." (Please refer to Schedule MJN-1 for Ameren
14 Missouri's response to this question).

15 Ameren Missouri considers it appropriate to engage as a regulated entity in order
16 to address this infrastructure gap and believes that now is the time, given the current state
17 of EV technology. Since the provision of electric service began, utilities have provided a
18 single point of electric service to Utility Customers' premises – historically a fixed
19 structure on a tract of real estate wherein inhabitants are sheltered from the environment,
20 are heated and cooled, and can work, play, eat and/or sleep. Today, modern technology
21 has introduced a new kind of premises – a "mobile premises" – occupied by a new kind
22 of customer – a "mobile customer" – wherein they are sheltered from the environment,
23 are heated and cooled, and can work, play, eat, and/or sleep, for the period of time they

1 are traversing the service territory. Like the traditional structural premises, this new
2 “mobile” premises also requires a single point of electric service – the charging port – in
3 order for it to serve its intended purpose.

4 The most recent Missouri Comprehensive State Energy Plan (October 2015)
5 states that, due to the close inter-relation between EV charging stations and the electric
6 grid, “electric utilities are uniquely positioned to help support electric vehicle
7 infrastructure and charging station networks.” Ameren Missouri agrees and is proposing
8 this EV charging pilot project as a tangible and creative means of providing such support.
9 We clearly see an opportunity like this – especially amidst the dormancy of free market
10 activity to seize it – as lying comfortably within our domain, both as an electric service
11 provider and as an owner/operator of delivery service assets.

12 While Ameren Missouri is not prepared to declare long-distance EV charging an
13 “essential service,” we are positing that it, like our area lighting offering, can be
14 considered a “public service” to the extent that it enables the free flow of people and
15 goods across our state. Public area lighting and public charging stations are both
16 consumers of distribution service, and Ameren Missouri sees both as worthy of regulated
17 offerings, despite neither being something that we alone have the skillset to provide.

18 Lastly, with the announcement earlier this year of the first medium-range mass-
19 market electric vehicles becoming available in 2017, Ameren Missouri is struck by the
20 realization that both the private sector and regulated utilities may be too late in
21 adequately addressing the long-distance charging infrastructure gap. The consumers who
22 start seriously considering the possibilities of electric long-distance travel with next year's
23 EV models will likely expect the charging stations enabling this kind of travel to already

1 be in place – and unfortunately they will not be, at least not on a widespread basis. The
2 transformation and the preparation for what is an inevitable future in electric
3 transportation, both for Missourians in general and our Utility Customers specifically,
4 must begin somewhere and be undertaken by someone, and Ameren Missouri is willing
5 to assume that responsibility.

6 **Q. What is the anticipated cost of the charging corridor pilot project?**

7 A. The average cost to procure equipment, install, and commission each of
8 the EV charging islands along I-70 and in Jefferson City is estimated at \$95,000. This
9 would result in a total infrastructure investment of \$570,000 after completing all six
10 charging islands along the proposed driving route by the end of 2017. The \$95,000 per
11 charging island is comprised of an average \$15,000 Ameren Missouri line extension and
12 transformation cost, an average \$60,000 hardware cost for charging equipment and an
13 outdoor electric panel, and an average \$20,000 cost for civil construction, hardware
14 installation and site commissioning. On-going expenses for all six islands are estimated
15 at \$40,000 annually for hardware operation and maintenance and for access to the
16 vendor’s managing charging station network. Lastly, education and marketing expenses
17 are estimated at \$10,000 annually for the first three years after deployment is completed.

18 There are federal and state tax credits associated with the deployment of EV
19 charging infrastructure that could reduce Ameren Missouri's investment total and benefit
20 Utility Customers – a federal tax credit of 30% (up to \$30,000) through December 31,
21 2016, available per physical charging island location, and a Missouri state tax credit of
22 20% (up to \$20,000) through December 31, 2017, available per annum pending state

1 funding decisions. It is also possible to sell these credits as a means of achieving the
2 same benefits.

3 **Q. What will the cost be “at the pump” for the consumer and how did**
4 **you arrive at that pricing for the electric fueling transaction?**

5 A. The rate tariff being filed with this testimony proposes a “plug time”
6 charge to the EV Customer of \$2.50 per quarter hour of use for the DCFC charging plugs
7 and \$0.30 per quarter hour of use for the Level 2 AC plugs. The difference between
8 these two proposed rates is based on the significant difference in charging speeds
9 provided by the two types of chargers. The payment processing fee is 2% of the
10 transaction amount plus \$0.25 (per vendor quotation), but this is embedded in the
11 proposed rates and will not be assessed separately. The primary determinants of these
12 price points were: (1) the results of a charging island traffic study conducted for the I-70
13 and Highway 54 corridors; (2) the net revenues from “corridor charging” over the 15-
14 year operating lives of the charging equipment; and (3) the equivalent prices of a gallon
15 of gasoline relative to the charging rates selected. Each of these determinants will be
16 discussed presently in greater detail.

17 **Q. What did Ameren Missouri’s traffic study entail, and how did that**
18 **help you determine the amount of use that the proposed charging islands would get?**

19 A. The traffic study of the I-70 corridor from St. Louis to Boonville and the
20 Highway 54 corridor from Kingdom City to Jefferson City was based on Annual Average
21 Daily Traffic (“AADT”) data for these routes provided by MODOT for the year 2013.
22 (Please refer to Schedule MJN-2 for MODOT’s map of this AADT data). MODOT
23 defines the “daily traffic” for a particular point along a driving route as the total number

1 of vehicles – private and commercial – passing that point going in either direction every
2 day. The AADT is the average of all these daily traffic volumes over the course of a
3 year. The preliminary goal of utilizing this data was to get to how much of this daily
4 traffic involves one-way trips of 40 miles or more in passenger vehicles, because if the
5 vehicles making these one-way trips were EVs, they would have to charge at one of the
6 corridor islands in order to get back.

7 Ameren Missouri first took the AADT volumes for all the appropriate segments
8 of I-70 and Highway 54 and their associated exits, and subtracted 35% at MODOT’s
9 recommendation as a means of eliminating all commercial traffic across the board. Then
10 a conservative assumption was made that 100% of all the on-ramp/off-ramp traffic was
11 involved in one-way trips of less than 40 miles. All this traffic volume was then used to
12 remove the maximum daily passenger vehicle traffic from the I-70 and Highway 54
13 backbones. Overall, this reduced the traffic numbers along these backbones another
14 50%. The remaining traffic volumes from these two successive operations were then
15 multiplied by 0.00045, the fraction of Missouri’s population of registered passenger
16 vehicles (3,626,224 per the Missouri Department of Revenue) that were Ameren
17 Missouri service territory EVs (1,686 per EPRI) as of year-end 2015.

18 The daily traffic volumes remaining at this stage were considered the number of
19 Ameren Missouri EVs that could be involved in trips requiring a charge to “get back” –
20 these EV traffic volumes averaged 6.5 vehicles between adjacent charging islands along
21 I-70 and 2.5 vehicles between I-70 and Jefferson City along Highway 54. The last step of
22 the analysis was to reduce these figures a final time based on the anticipated willingness
23 of today’s EV driver population to actually use the new corridor charging facilities.

1 As of year-end 2015, the EVs in Ameren Missouri’s service territory were split
2 49%/51% between full battery electric vehicles (“BEV”) like the Nissan LEAF and
3 plug-in hybrid electric vehicles (“PHEV”) like the Chevrolet Volt. Ameren Missouri
4 assumed that 25% of current BEV owners would not venture onto I-70 at all due to their
5 either: (1) feeling skittish about it; or (2) merely being content with their short distance
6 commuting routines. We also assumed that 75% of current PHEV owners would not
7 bother to charge along I-70 due to a combination of: (1) the much longer charging times
8 involved with Level 2 AC chargers; and (2) they are already accustomed to covering long
9 distances on gasoline power.

10 Subsequent to these final traffic reductions, and assuming the resulting vehicle
11 averages represent EVs traveling both east and west as they head to a particular
12 destination and then return (thus requiring a single charge), the “plug traffic” anticipated
13 at the charging corridor islands immediately after they are built was determined to be 1.5
14 charging sessions daily using DCFC plugs (each 30 minutes in duration) and 0.5 charging
15 sessions daily using Level 2 AC plugs (each 3 hours in duration).

16 **Q. What kind of revenue test was performed in order to validate the**
17 **charging rates being proposed in the accompanying rate tariff?**

18 A. Ameren Missouri performed a detailed Utility Cost Test (“UCT”)
19 assuming 15-year operating lives for the equipment at the six charging islands. The
20 15-year Net Present Value (“NPV”) of net corridor charging revenues – i.e., [corridor
21 charging revenues] less the [revenue requirement for the charging island investment and
22 annual costs], less the [transmission, distribution, energy and capacity costs associated
23 with corridor charging], is negative at the \$10.00 and \$1.20 hourly “plug time” rates

1 being proposed for the two plug types. This 15-year NPV calculation is also negative at
2 charging rates that are 50% higher – \$15.00 and \$1.80 per hour respectively for the two
3 plug types. In fact, the 15-year NPV calculation does not begin to go positive until we
4 approach hourly charging rates that are 100% higher – \$20.00 and \$2.40 respectively for
5 the two plug types. This observation alone goes a long way in explaining the reasons
6 why the free market has not stepped up to deploy charging infrastructure in long-distance
7 corridor settings. The business case would be difficult for any entity requiring a quick
8 payback period.

9 However, for Missouri’s State Energy Plan to cite that “electric utilities are
10 uniquely positioned to help support electric vehicle infrastructure and charging station
11 networks” is extremely intuitive, and for one reason that ultimately made all the
12 difference in the results of Ameren Missouri’s UCT analysis: electric utilities have the
13 benefit of both corridor charging and home charging revenues associated with
14 Participating Customers. The UCT ratio associated with the \$10.00 and \$1.20 hourly
15 charging rates being proposed is 1.42 (a number greater than 1.00 indicates a benefit to
16 all Utility Customers). This is the result of estimated total revenues that will have been
17 generated from both corridor and incremental residential charging activities in direct
18 response to Ameren Missouri’s deployment of long-distance charging facilities.

19 **Q. How do Ameren Missouri's proposed corridor charging rates**
20 **compare to gasoline prices?**

21 A. A lot of discussion ensued – both internally at Ameren Missouri and
22 externally with various stakeholders – as to what kind of pricing would be tolerated by
23 the long distance EV Customer. Before the rate model and UCT were fully developed,

1 Ameren Missouri vacillated philosophically between maximizing these rates (thus
2 holding the EV Customer as accountable as possible for the costs involved) and capping
3 them at an equivalent price level per gallon (thus staving off any claims that fueling
4 electrically could ever be more expensive than doing so with gasoline or diesel).

5 Based on the results of the UCT, Ameren Missouri settled on the \$10.00 and
6 \$1.20 hourly rates – more specifically, \$2.50 and \$0.30 per quarter hour – on the basis of
7 their equivalent prices of gasoline, calculated at \$2.52 and \$2.10 per gallon respectively.
8 Ameren Missouri feels EV charging rates like these would make a big difference in
9 driver acceptance relative to the \$15.00 and \$1.80 hourly rates that were also being
10 seriously considered. The UCT analysis shows this price differential has a financially
11 immaterial effect on Non-Participating Customers, which will be discussed later in this
12 testimony.

13 **Q. What is Ameren Missouri’s estimate of revenues to be collected**
14 **through this pilot project, and on what is this estimate based?**

15 A. Based on Ameren Missouri’s UCT analysis, the 15-year NPV of net
16 corridor and residential charging revenues – i.e., [corridor charging revenues] plus
17 [Ameren Missouri-impacted residential charging revenues], less the [revenue requirement
18 for the charging island investment and annual costs], less the [transmission, distribution,
19 energy, and capacity costs associated with corridor charging], less the [transmission,
20 distribution, energy, and capacity costs associated with Ameren Missouri-impacted
21 residential charging], is approximately \$3.8 million. Annual net corridor and residential
22 charging revenues are positive for the first time in Year 5 of the 15-year analysis. The
23 primary determinants of these revenues were: (1) the anticipated 15-year EV adoption

1 rates in Ameren Missouri’s service territory; (2) the anticipated impact of Ameren
2 Missouri’s charging corridor deployment on these adoption rates; and (3) the resulting
3 “plug traffic” anticipated among corridor-charging and residential-charging EV
4 Customers. Each of these determinants is discussed presently in greater detail.

5 **Q. What is Ameren Missouri’s view of future EV adoption in the state?**
6 **What effect do you think a network of long-distance charging stations along the I-70**
7 **corridor would have on this level of adoption?**

8 A. Since 2012, cumulative EV registrations in the United States, Missouri,
9 and Ameren Missouri’s service territory have grown on a largely linear scale. As of year-
10 end 2015, there were 2,480 EVs registered in Missouri, 1,686 of which were registered
11 inside Ameren Missouri’s service territory, split evenly between BEVs and PHEVs.
12 Registrations have grown in Ameren Missouri’s territory at just about 400 EVs annually,
13 so this is considered the UCT’s “baseline” EV projection over the next 15 years.

14 Ameren Missouri does not view the forthcoming 2017 EV models with 200-mile
15 ranges as being fully “enabled.” While they will be capable of driving long distances for
16 the first time, Ameren Missouri doesn’t see them actually doing so until the means to
17 charge them along the way (i.e., the means to “get back”) is provided. Ameren Missouri
18 proposes to provide this means within the confines of our service territory with this pilot
19 project.

20 The question then becomes, “What does the adoption rate of ‘fully enabled’
21 vehicle technology look like?” We submit that Missourians have already shown us the
22 answer, in the form of their adoption rate of hybrid electric vehicles (“HEV”) like the
23 Toyota Prius. When HEVs were introduced in 2000, they were already “fully enabled,”

1 operating to their fullest capability immediately upon hitting the road, since they operate
2 on gasoline. Ameren Missouri has cumulative adoption rate data for HEVs in our service
3 territory going back to 2000. We believe that the adoption rate of EVs subsequent to our
4 building the I-70 charging corridor would look like the historical straight line EV
5 adoption up until now, superimposed with the adoption rate of HEVs as it looked starting
6 back in 2000. The UCT uses this adoption curve in its analysis, beginning with the 1,686
7 EVs in Ameren Missouri's service territory in 2016 and ultimately growing to 37,623 in
8 2031. Please refer to Schedule MJN-3 for a depiction of this forecasted EV adoption
9 data. The red portion of the graph represents the continuation of "baseline" adoption at a
10 rate of 400 EVs annually. The purple and green portions together represent the HEV
11 adoption curve as it looked beginning in 2000. This is what Ameren Missouri believes
12 "accelerated" EV adoption will look like beginning with the 2017 models, over and
13 above "baseline" adoption. The sum of the red, green, and purple portions is Ameren
14 Missouri's total forecasted EV adoption for its service territory over the next 15 years.

15 The next step in the process gets to what Ameren Missouri's contribution is to the
16 15-year EV adoption rate model above as a direct result of our building the I-70 charging
17 corridor. This is an important consideration because while 100% of I-70 corridor
18 charging revenues over the UCT's 15-year analysis period can be attributed to our
19 provision of corridor charging stations, much of the residential charging revenues over
20 this same period will not be. The residential charging revenues included in the UCT will
21 depend on how many currently Non-Participating Customers purchase EVs (becoming
22 Participating Customers) based on their awareness of both the EVs and the proposed
23 long-distance charging infrastructure enabling them.

1 In the UCT analysis, Ameren Missouri conservatively lays claim to 25% of this
2 accelerated adoption. We acknowledge that fully enabled EV long-distance driving
3 requires, first and foremost, a car that can make the trip. It's the vehicle and its
4 capabilities that will grab the potential EV Customer's attention first, and Ameren
5 Missouri assumes in the majority of cases – 75% of the time – the vehicle alone will be
6 enough to tip this potential consumer in favor of purchasing one. In the remaining 25%
7 of cases however, Ameren Missouri feels that consumers will insist on actually being
8 able to do that long-distance driving before they commit to purchasing – meaning they
9 will also insist on being able to charge along those routes.

10 Therefore, the residential charging revenues that went into the UCT analysis are
11 only those associated with 25% of the Participating Customers in the Ameren Missouri
12 “accelerated” adoption curve (i.e., the green portion in Schedule MJN-3), beginning with
13 16 EVs in the service territory in 2017 and ultimately growing to 7,050 in 2031. These
14 numbers represent the “incremental” number of EVs adopted due to the pilot project. A
15 10-year EV operating life was assumed, after which the vehicle is considered retired from
16 being on the road.

17 **Q. Did Ameren Missouri consider how EV “plug traffic” at home and on**
18 **the I-70 charging corridor is going to change over the 15 years in the UTC analysis**
19 **and what effects those changes will have on estimated revenues?**

20 A. Yes. As the 15 years in the UCT horizon marches on, Ameren Missouri
21 assumes that residential charging traffic increases in direct proportion to the number of
22 EVs in the vehicle population. Daily charging habits will continue to prevail at home,
23 and regardless of the charging speeds and vehicle ranges involved, the average daily

1 range recovered per EV will remain the same 40 miles for the vast majority of any given
2 year. Again, throughout the 15-year horizon, the only residential charging revenues
3 considered in the UCT are those Ameren Missouri claims to have directly influenced –
4 the incremental amount associated with 25% of EVs in the “accelerated” adoption curve
5 (i.e., the green portion of Schedule MJN-3).

6 Determining how corridor charging traffic along I-70 and Highway 54 changes
7 over the 15-year analysis period is a bit more complex. As the driving ranges of EVs get
8 to 200 miles next year and beyond 200 miles in the years following, these new models
9 will not have to charge as often as today’s 80 to 100-mile range BEVs. Conversely, the
10 miles recovered per charging session will increase. On this basis, Ameren Missouri
11 assumes the driving ranges of future EV models by themselves will have no effect on
12 corridor charging revenues over time.

13 However, two other factors will have a substantial impact on corridor charging
14 revenues: (1) an ever larger population of EVs on the road in general; combined with
15 (2) far greater consumer propensities to take the newer models greater distances, since
16 that is the reason they will have purchased them to begin with. The UCT model’s
17 forecast of EV adoption discussed herein has the 2016 EV population in Ameren
18 Missouri’s service territory growing more than nearly twenty fold over the next 15 years.
19 This, coupled with the consumer propensity to drive ever greater distances, led Ameren
20 Missouri to the conservative assumption that corridor plug time traffic – and hence
21 corridor charging revenues – will increase by a factor of five over this same timeframe.

22 **Q. Will there be a subsidy required across Non-Participating Customer**
23 **classes in order to cover the costs of this pilot project?**

1 A. Yes. Even absent the UCT results, Ameren Missouri does not expect
2 revenues from the six charging islands to cover all costs of the pilot project. However,
3 any subsidy provided by Non-Participating Customers will be very modest. This is true
4 because the Company did not include any capital or operating costs associated with the
5 project in its pending general rate case, File No. ER-2016-0179. That could change if
6 one or more charging stations is installed and begins providing service before the end of
7 the rate case true-up period, but capital costs associated with any such station(s) would
8 increase rate base by no more than a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Therefore,
9 except for any amounts described in the preceding sentence, while rates set in the
10 pending rate case remain in effect, no Non-Participating Customer would pay any costs
11 of the pilot project. Instead, Ameren Missouri's shareholders would bear those costs
12 through reduced earnings.

13 As previously noted, Ameren Missouri used a UCT analysis period of 15 years,
14 based on the anticipated operating lives of the charging island hardware. With
15 "accelerated adoption" just getting underway in Year 1 subsequent to the charging
16 corridor deployment, annual corridor and residential charging net revenues are expected
17 to be negative for each of the first four years of the analysis period. According to the
18 UCT model, the total non-NPV valuation of this subsidy accumulated over this period of
19 time is approximately \$475,000, requiring an average 11.3 cents annually from each
20 residential Non-Participating Customer for those four years.³

³ At the \$15.00 and \$1.80 rates that were being considered for DCFC and Level 2 AC plugs, this non-NPV subsidy valuation would have been approximately \$390,000, saving each residential Non-Participating Customer 2.1 cents annually for those four years compared to the pricing Ameren Missouri is proposing.

1 With “accelerated adoption” continuing over time, annual corridor and residential
2 charging net revenues are positive for the first time in Year 5 of the 15-year analysis,
3 growing to \$1.9 million in Year 15. In summary, there is a small cross-subsidy by Non-
4 Participating Customers involved over this pilot project, but by virtue of the UCT ratio of
5 1.42 for the entire analysis period, Ameren Missouri’s estimated revenues from EV
6 charging will indeed exceed the marginal costs to deliver this electricity to the EV
7 Customer, providing positive net revenues sufficient to exert a downward pressure on
8 rates for all Utility Customers. The 15-year NPV of this downward pressure is quantified
9 at \$3.63 per residential Utility Customer.

10 **Q. Who are the various beneficiaries associated with this charging**
11 **corridor pilot project?**

12 A. The advent of mass-market, production-volume EVs over the past few
13 years began the transformation of the last remaining industry sector to undergo
14 electrification – the transportation sector. In the end, Ameren Missouri's charging
15 corridor pilot project is intended to stimulate and accelerate consumer adoption of EVs
16 (particularly among our Non-Participating Customer base), enable the long-distance
17 capability that the auto industry will provide consumers beginning with its 2017 EV
18 models, and help better prepare Missouri for a future in electric transportation. There are
19 a number of widely-recognized societal benefits associated with an increased consumer
20 adoption of EVs, some affecting the general public, others shared by all Utility
21 Customers, and others limited to EV Customers.

22 **Q. What types of benefits to the general public does Ameren Missouri**
23 **expect would result from undertaking this charging corridor pilot project?**

1 A. An increase in adoption of EVs across the state benefits the general public
2 through reduced greenhouse gas emissions and greater energy security.

3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions. An increase in consumer adoption of EVs in
4 Missouri, to the extent that these vehicles supplant comparable combustion engine
5 vehicles on our roadways, results in a cleaner environment for everyone in terms of
6 greenhouse gas emissions. In an internal analysis conducted in 2011 associated with the
7 release of a report entitled *Emerging Customer Technology – Ameren's Proposal in*
8 *Support of Plug-In Electric Vehicles*, Ameren Missouri determined that mile for mile,
9 based on its power generation fuel mix at the time, the carbon dioxide (“CO₂”) emissions
10 produced from charging an EV in its footprint is approximately 35% less than the CO₂
11 tailpipe emissions of a comparable gasoline-fueled vehicle. Ameren Missouri conducted
12 this analysis having compared the 2011 Nissan LEAF to a "small" combustion engine
13 vehicle built on a similar chassis that gets 40 miles per gallon of gasoline. Assuming an
14 annual average 14,600 miles driven and the then-current CO₂ intensities of Ameren
15 Missouri's generating fleet, charging the Nissan LEAF was calculated as being
16 responsible for producing approximately 0.38 pounds of CO₂ per mile compared to the
17 "small" vehicle's tailpipe emissions of approximately 0.59 pounds of CO₂ per mile
18 (please refer to Schedule MJN-4 for a copy of this report; the analysis details are
19 described in Appendix C). Environmentally-based conclusions similar to this one were
20 also presented on May 25, 2016, at Staff's EV Charging Facilities Workshop by
21 representatives from the Electric Power Research Institute, the Sierra Club and the
22 Natural Resources Defense Council.

1 Also noteworthy regarding the environmental benefit of EVs is the fact that in
2 Ameren Missouri's service territory - where dependence on fossil fuels is relatively high -
3 EVs are rendered "greener" in lockstep with our own efforts to transition to cleaner
4 energy. Since the aforementioned 2011 study, Ameren Missouri has added more
5 renewable resources to its generation portfolio, including the utility-scale solar facility in
6 O'Fallon, and this trend will continue. Additionally, Ameren Missouri has plans for
7 significant mass-based reductions in its carbon emissions as the state pursues compliance
8 with the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Power Plan. Every subsequent action
9 taken in Ameren Missouri's clean energy transition will reflect in kind on every road-
10 worthy EV its generation fleet charges on a daily basis.

11 Greater Energy Security. Ameren Missouri's corporate vision is one in which we
12 see ourselves "leading the way to a secure energy future." Indeed, the greater the
13 adoption of EVs in our service territory and beyond, the greater the extent to which we
14 help reduce our dependence on foreign supplies of petroleum. The driving that Ameren
15 Missouri's EV Customers do with the help of domestically-produced electricity rather
16 than fossil fuel reduces our reliance on these markets, thus promoting greater energy
17 security.

18 **Q. What types of Utility Customer benefits does Ameren Missouri expect**
19 **would result from undertaking this charging corridor pilot project?**

20 A. An increase in consumer adoption of EVs across the state benefits all of
21 Ameren Missouri's Utility Customers in the form of more efficient grid utilization, state
22 and regional economic gains, and an integration of EV charging with renewable energy
23 and other grid services.

1 Efficient Grid Utilization. Ameren Missouri’s electric grid, like most others
2 across the nation, operates below maximum capacity for most of any given year. Aided
3 by thoughtful load management, a considerable EV population could root itself in the
4 service territory without the need for generation or line infrastructure upgrades, hence
5 applying a consistent downward pressure on electric rates. This carries a necessary
6 presumption that Ameren Missouri’s grid infrastructure is, in its present form, ready to
7 accommodate considerable growth at the hands of the electric transportation movement,
8 without the burden of such investment.

9 Ameren Missouri's grid is prepared in terms of capacity. From a generation
10 standpoint, per the Integrated Resource Plans filed in recent years, weather-normalized
11 system peak loads over the five years from 2008 – 2013 decreased from 8,567 megawatts
12 (“MW”) to 7,633 MW in our service territory, representing an average annual decline of
13 2.3%. Weather-normalized energy over the same period decreased from 40,637,933
14 MW-hours to 39,076,549 MW-hours, an average annual decline of 0.8%. This was
15 largely the result of meaningful industry advances in lighting and motor technology,
16 effectively-executed energy efficiency programs and responsible load management.

17 From a grid standpoint, in the response to Data Request 442 (regarding St. Louis
18 City and County) associated with File No. ER-2014-0258, Ameren Missouri reported that
19 the temperature-corrected 2013 summer peak loadings among 660 medium-voltage
20 distribution feeders serving this portion of the service territory were such that an average
21 34% of their capacities remained, even after allowing for what is deemed necessary to
22 reserve portions of adjacent feeders in outage scenarios. Similarly treated 2013 summer
23 peak loadings among 115 distribution substations serving the same area were such that an

1 average 24% of their capacities remained, even after allowing for the simulated loss of
2 each station's largest unit in a contingency scenario. Therefore, at a time when electric
3 infrastructure loading is in the midst of steady decline and transportation is among the
4 only load sectors with the potential for growth in the foreseeable future, Ameren
5 Missouri's distribution grid is poised today to accommodate EVs in the hundreds of
6 thousands of units across its service territory.

7 Ameren Missouri's grid is also prepared in terms of reliability. The storm-
8 normalized System Average Interruption Frequency Index ("SAIFI") – that is, the
9 average number of "blue sky" extended outages (i.e., over five minutes) experienced by
10 each Utility Customer annually – has been less than 1.0 for over five years running, with
11 an Ameren Missouri record having been set in 2013 at 0.70. In 2015, SAIFI was 0.77,
12 and based on reliability metrics year-to-date, SAIFI is forecasted at 0.75 in 2016. A
13 number of factors have contributed to this level of performance, including: (1) the 2007
14 adoption of Rule 4 CSR 240-23.020 – Electrical Corporation Infrastructure Standards
15 regarding the periodic inspection and repair of distribution grid assets; (2) the effective
16 execution of this rule on an annual basis since then; and (3) a similar overhaul of
17 vegetation management practices over the same time period.

18 A 2015 analysis of Ameren Missouri's system determined that even if EV sales
19 were to steadily grow to 50% of all new vehicle sales in Missouri by 2030, the total
20 increase in associated energy usage over that time period will still not have made up for
21 what energy efficiency programs and related lighting and motor technology advances
22 have removed from Ameren Missouri's base load in recent years. Ameren Missouri's
23 distribution grid is reliable, capacity-rich, and more than ready for widespread consumer

1 adoption of EVs, requiring virtually no investment – in either generation or distribution
2 plant – to comfortably accommodate hundreds of thousands of these vehicles today. This
3 would have the benefit of spreading Ameren Missouri’s fixed costs over more units,
4 exerting a downward pressure on rates across all Utility Customer classes.

5 Economic Development. Macroeconomic studies indicate that money saved
6 annually by EV owners on fuel costs and vehicle maintenance will ultimately be spent as
7 disposable income in other sectors of the local economy. The combination of fuel and
8 maintenance savings together can approach thousands of dollars annually per EV owner
9 that would be re-directed into the communities served in Ameren Missouri’s service
10 territory, creating more local jobs and economic activity.

11 Renewables & Services Integration. Another widely touted benefit associated
12 with EVs is the fact that they represent among the most flexible and controllable electric
13 load segments on a utility grid. This is especially advantageous given how substantive
14 the rates of charge can be in a residential setting. When aided by a home charging
15 device, an EV can use energy at a rate of over 3 kW, which could roughly double an
16 average household’s demand on a summer afternoon. Some EV models charge at a rate
17 of over 6 kW, nearly tripling an average residential household’s summer demand.

18 This type of load coincidence is what carries the threat of unwanted infrastructure
19 upgrades, especially given the vast majority of EV charging will continue to be
20 conducted at home. The utilization of Time-of-Use (“TOU”) rate structures to encourage
21 EV charging at times during the day other than when the typical peak loading occurs,
22 and/or that coincide with the operation of renewable energy sources, provides another

1 means of ensuring the most efficient use of the grid in its current form and staves off the
2 need for additional investment.

3 It may appear counter-intuitive to discuss the residential flexibility of EV
4 charging as part of testimony relating to EV charging in a long-distance setting, arguably
5 the least flexible of all possible charging scenarios. However, according to the 2009
6 National Household Travel Survey, 95% of trips made by the driving public are trips of
7 fewer than 30 miles, most of which do not make use of interstates. To the extent that EV
8 adoption can be positively affected by enabling the long-distance end-use, the fact
9 remains that the vast majority of the charging involved for those new vehicles – in fact,
10 80% to 90% of it – will still be done at home, and subject to the types of creative load
11 management measures a well-designed TOU rate represents. Therefore, home charging
12 will likely be an area of focus for load management programs Ameren Missouri
13 considers.

14 **Q. What types of benefits to EV Customers does Ameren Missouri expect**
15 **could result from undertaking this charging corridor pilot project?**

16 A. Aided by the enablement that long-distance charging offers, EV
17 Customers who traverse the State of Missouri would come to enjoy the full breadth of
18 vehicle utilization for the first time. Motivated by the prospect that a household could
19 function with just an EV, everyone with the means to own a car could look forward to
20 having one that promises far greater end-use efficiency and substantially-lower operating
21 costs.

22 Full Vehicle Utilization. Again, an underlying premise of the charging corridor
23 pilot project is to help enable the long-distance capability that the electric transportation

1 industry will avail to the consumer public with its 2017 EV models. For the past several
2 years, EVs have categorically represented "niche purchases" for a relatively small
3 number of consumers – typically those with technology and/or environmental leanings, or
4 with enough household income to support owning an "extra" vehicle dedicated solely to
5 daily commutes. To date, the EV adoption rate in Missouri has been 0.18% of new
6 vehicle sales going back to 2011, compared to 0.53% nationally. All this will likely
7 change very soon – the state of the technology today is such that the historical range and
8 price barriers to widespread adoption of EVs will be removed starting in the next six
9 months.

10 The most expensive (and most limiting) single component of an EV has been its
11 propulsion battery. The current tracks of two battery technology measures – battery pack
12 energy density and battery pack cost – are indicative of the rapid rate of progress being
13 made to increase an EV's driving range while reducing its price. The USDOE's Energy
14 Efficiency & Renewable Energy division indicates that since 2008, battery pack energy
15 densities have increased from 50 to 300 watt-hours per liter of volume at the same time
16 their costs have decreased from \$1,000 to \$80 per kilogram of mass. It is neither measure
17 alone, but rather the combination of the two that already represents a complete iteration
18 on the technology that was introduced back in 2011 – an iteration that is transforming a
19 "niche purchase" into the mass market product that will be accessible to the consumer
20 public for the first time next year.

21 The current iteration rates in battery energy densities and costs make it likely the
22 300-mile, \$30,000 breakthrough EV will debut before 2020, at which time consumers
23 will be presented with the first viable alternatives to modern day gasoline vehicles. Over

1 30 EV models are available today, with dozens more soon to follow, especially given that
2 several manufacturers have announced their intent to offer a plug-in electric version for
3 every model they offer. All this serves to perpetuate two other attractive trends for car
4 buyers: (1) new EV prices that are driven downward into "volume sale" ranges as a by-
5 product of increased adoption; and (2) EV re-sale prices that remain depressed amidst
6 continued iterations in battery technology.⁴

7 Within a few short years, the only likely remaining barriers to full EV utilization
8 and widespread adoption of this technology will be those associated with charging
9 infrastructure. Regardless of how EV driving ranges increase over time, what will never
10 change is the need to charge an EV over long distances – and it is this that Ameren
11 Missouri is working to address directly with this corridor charging pilot project.

12 Superior Energy Efficiency. The savings associated with electric fueling
13 represent a significant benefit to EV owners. These fuel savings are primarily the result
14 of the higher energy efficiency levels of EVs. An EV today, propelled under the power
15 of an electric motor, is roughly 60% efficient in translating the electrical energy stored in
16 the propulsion battery to the rotary motion of the axle, and hence the motive power of the
17 wheels. This level of efficiency is about three times that of a vehicle with an internal
18 combustion engine and two times that of a hybrid vehicle. For example, a conventional
19 vehicle with a fuel economy of 30 miles per gallon uses roughly 4.0 megajoules (“MJ”)
20 of purchased energy per mile. By contrast, an EV with a fuel economy of 2.9 miles per
21 kW-hour (assuming a charging efficiency of 85%) uses 1.5 MJ of purchased energy per

⁴ As evidence of this, a pre-owned, low-mileage Nissan LEAF can be purchased today for about \$10,000 and leased for under \$200 a month. Nancy E. Ryan and Luke Lavin, *Engaging Utilities and Regulators on Transportation Electrification*, Energy+Environmental Economics, 2015.

1 mile while in electric mode. All told, EV owners generally have to purchase 60% to 70%
2 less energy per "electric mile" traveled than would be required for conventional gasoline
3 vehicles. The conservation potentials for this kind of cross-fuel efficiency are easily as
4 large as those being sought in the electricity sector today.

5 Lower Operating Costs. Compared to an internal combustion engine vehicle that
6 gets 30 miles per gallon, "driving electric" at Ameren Missouri residential energy prices
7 is equivalent to paying \$1.00 per gallon or less, and electricity prices have proven to be
8 far less volatile than those of liquid fuels over the years. At \$2.50 per gallon of gasoline,
9 and assuming the U.S. median 30-mile daily commute, this can save EV Customers over
10 \$350 in fueling costs annually compared with a hybrid, and over \$800 annually compared
11 with an average gas-powered vehicle.

12 Additionally, there are hundreds less moving parts to maintain in a full battery EV
13 relative to those in a combustion engine vehicle. There are fewer fluids to manage, no
14 spark plugs, no oil changes, no muffler, no fuel filters, and no transmission in the
15 conventional sense, given that electric motors produce full, usable torque starting at zero
16 RPMs. EV manufacturers are warranting their propulsion batteries for up to 100,000
17 miles. On this basis, both EPRI and consumer information sources on EVs estimate a
18 two-thirds annual maintenance savings relative to conventional gasoline vehicles.

19 **Q Have you read Staff's report in File No. EW-2016-0123 and are you**
20 **familiar with the recommendations made in that report?**

21 A. Yes, I have read Staff's report and am familiar with the recommendations.

22 **Q. Staff's report notes that Kansas City Power & Light/Greater Missouri**
23 **Operations Company ("KCPL/GMO") has been able to get businesses that host**

1 **charging stations to pay some of the costs associated with EV charging. Has**
2 **Ameren Missouri investigated this possibility?**

3 A. We have not looked into the possibility of getting the site hosts of our
4 proposed charging islands to pay a portion of the costs associated with installing and
5 operating them, but we intend to explore that possibility once that level of engagement
6 with property owners begins. However, we have not made that a requirement for our
7 proposed pilot project, nor have we made this assumption in our UCT analysis. While
8 the EV charging program underway at KCPL/GMO is complementary to the long-
9 distance corridor charging project Ameren Missouri is proposing, there are significant
10 differences between the two. Those differences may make it less likely that charging
11 station hosts along the I-70 and Highway 54 corridors will be willing to bear some of the
12 costs of the pilot. That said, as with the federal and state tax credits I mentioned earlier,
13 Ameren Missouri will investigate and take advantage of any opportunity available to
14 reduce the cost of the proposed pilot project.

15 **Q. What about Staff's recommendation that any utility implementing an**
16 **EV pilot project be required to annually report data derived from the project to the**
17 **Commission and interested stakeholders?**

18 A. Ameren Missouri supports Staff's recommendation, and our proposed pilot
19 project tariff includes an annual data reporting element. While some items identified in
20 Staff's recommendation in its report in File No. EW-2016-0123 are not applicable to
21 Ameren Missouri's proposed pilot – underscoring the differences between our proposed
22 pilot and the EV charging program underway at KCPL/GMO – sharing with the

1 Commission and interested stakeholders data derived from our pilot project is something
2 we have intended to do from the outset.

3 **Q. What final remarks would you like to make with regard to Ameren**
4 **Missouri's undertaking of this charging corridor pilot project?**

5 A. Given the prices of batteries – and the EVs they propel – are on a steady
6 decline, and further aided by well-documented savings on fuel and maintenance costs,
7 Ameren Missouri recognizes a growing awareness of and appeal for EV technology on
8 the part of consumers. While it's unrealistic to ever expect that all road-worthy consumer
9 vehicles will be electric – indeed, our most economically secure future is likely one
10 featuring a balance among several fuel types – it is likely that someday 10%, 25%, or
11 even 50% of these vehicles could be fueled electrically, given sufficient infrastructure to
12 support their use. Whatever their market penetration, Ameren Missouri sees the
13 environment, the regional economy, the reliance on petroleum markets, the energy
14 efficiency play and our grid utilization all improving with every new EV that hits the
15 road in our service territory, in our state and beyond.

16 The Participant Customers in Ameren Missouri's service territory will be winning
17 to the greatest extent as they reap the societal and Utility Customer benefits above, in
18 addition to those associated with an ever-declining cost of ownership. This begs the
19 biggest question of all, as Ameren Missouri considers this long-distance charging
20 infrastructure deployment – the question that asks why all Missourians who have the
21 means to own one car should not at least have the opportunity for that one car to be an
22 EV, thus unlocking the full range of benefits for everyone. The opportunity for
23 Missourians to even have that choice to make will not wholly present itself until the

1 associated charging infrastructure – particularly in the long-distance arena – helps to
2 make that choice possible.

3 As the charging infrastructure gap continues to go unaddressed amidst a growing
4 consumer consideration of electric transportation options, many Non-Participating
5 Customers who are in the market for a new car will naturally gravitate toward pondering
6 the various reasons behind their electric company's silence on this matter. The
7 automobile industry is doing its part on the vehicle side of the consumer adoption issue.
8 With this pilot project as a start, Ameren Missouri sees an opportunity – even a
9 responsibility – to do our part on the infrastructure side.

10 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

11 **A.** Yes, it does.

