Exhibit No.:

Issues: Lack of Relevance of JDA

Agreement on Application to Participate in MISO through

GridAmerica

Witness: James C. Blessing

Sponsoring Party: Union Electric Company
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony
Case No.: EO-2003-0271

Date Testimony Prepared: June 3, 2003

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO. EO-2003-0271

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JAMES C. BLESSING

ON BEHALF OF

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a AmerenUE

> St. Louis, Missouri June, 2003

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Application of Union Electron Authority to participat ISO through a contractual with GridAmerica	e in the Midwest)))	Case No. EO-2003-0271		
AFFIDAVIT OF JAMES C. BLESSING					
STATE OF MISSOURI)					
CITY OF ST. LOUIS) ss)				
James C. Blessing	, being first duly sworn	on his oa	ath, states:		
1. My name i	s James C. Blessing. I	work in S	St. Louis, Missouri, and I am employed		
by Ameren Services Com	pany as a Consulting P	lanning E	Engineer in the Corporate Planning		
Department.					
2. Attached h	ereto and made a part l	nereof for	all purposes is my Surrebuttal		
Testimony on behalf of U	nion Electric Company	/ d/b/a An	nerenUE consisting of <u>6</u> pages,		
which has been prepared i	n written form for intro	oduction i	nto evidence in the above-referenced		
docket.					
3. I hereby sw	ear and affirm that my	answers	contained in the attached testimony to		
the questions therein prop	ounded are true and co	rrect.			
		_	_		
	_	Ja	James C. Blessing		
Subscribed and sworn to b	pefore me this 3rd day	y of June,	2003.		
	. •	Val	eview. Whitehead		
My commission expires:	VALERIE W		Notary Public		

Notary Public - Notary Seal STATE OF MISSOURI Jefferson County My Commission Expires: Dec. 10, 2006

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		JAMES C. BLESSING
4		CASE NO. EO-2003-0271
5	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
6	A.	My name is James C. Blessing. My business address is One Ameren
7	Plaza, 1901 (Chouteau Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63103.
8	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what position?
9	A.	I am employed by Ameren Services Company as a Consulting Planning
10	Engineer in t	he Corporate Planning Department.
11	Q.	Please describe your educational background, your work experience
12	2 and the duties of your position.	
13	A.	I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Electrical Engineering from the
14	University of	Missouri-Rolla in 1988 and a Masters in Business Administration from
15	St. Louis Uni	iversity in 1998.
16		My work experience started as an Electrical Project Engineer for Southern
17	Indiana Gas	& Electric Company in October of 1988. In 1992, I accepted a position with
18	the Power Ge	eneration Services Division of General Electric Company as a Field
19	Engineer. In	1994, I left General Electric Company to accept a position with Union
20	Electric Com	pany as a Plant Engineer at the Labadie Power Plant. In 1999, I transferred
21	to Corporate	Planning and assumed my current duties. As a Consulting Planning
22	Engineer in t	he Corporate Planning Department, these duties consist of market modeling,
23	development of forward price curves for the Ameren system and asset valuation analysis	

1 What is the purpose of your Surrebuttal Testimony in this Q. 2 proceeding? 3 A. My surrebuttal testimony will address the rebuttal testimony of MoPSC 4 Staff witness Dr. Michael S. Proctor. Specifically, I will address Dr. Proctor's 5 recommendation that the Commission's approval of Union Electric Company's d/b/a 6 AmerenUE's ("AmerenUE" or "UE") request to participate in the Midwest ISO through a contractual arrangement with GridAmerica be conditioned on AmerenUE terminating the 7 8 Joint Dispatch Agreement prior to the end of the rate moratorium on June 30, 2006. 9 Q. What is the Joint Dispatch Agreement? 10 The Joint Dispatch Agreement ("JDA") is the agreement originally A. 11 entered into by UE and Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS 12 ("AmerenCIPS" or "CIPS") in 1995 (CIPS's obligations were eventually transferred to 13 AEG). These obligations require UE and CIPS to operate as a single, integrated control 14 area and to economically commit and dispatch their combined generating resources. The 15 basic premise of the JDA is that UE and CIPS operate as an integrated control area but 16 plan as two separate operating companies. In other words, UE and CIPS each must 17 acquire sufficient generation capacity to meet their respective planning reserve 18 obligation. Once each has acquired sufficient generation capacity, the actual generation 19 resources are dispatched real-time on a least cost basis regardless of the respective real-20 time loads of UE or CIPS. 21 How does the existence of the JDA bear on the Commission's Q. 22 determination of whether UE's Application in this case is detrimental to the public 23 interest?

1	A. It does not bear on that determination at all. In his rebuttal testimony,			
2	Dr. Proctor describes "the need for and benefits of RTOs" (see Dr. Proctor's discussion			
3	beginning on page 6, line 12 of his rebuttal testimony). He lists two such items: 1) the			
4	need for an independent provider of transmission service, and 2) the need for a facilitator			
5	for wholesale energy markets. The existence of the JDA in no way impedes an			
6	independent provider of transmission service or diminish the value of a facilitator for			
7	wholesale energy markets as described by Dr. Proctor. And therefore the existence of a			
8	JDA has no bearing on whether or not UE's Application in this case is detrimental to the			
9	public interest.			
10	Q. What reasons does Dr. Proctor provide for the need for an			
11	independent provider of transmission service?			
12	A. Dr. Proctor states that an independent provider of transmission service is			
13	needed to prevent integrated utilities from asserting monopoly power in non-regulated			
14	wholesale markets. The market power he discusses comes from integrated utilities			
15	owning and controlling both generating assets and transmission assets and his opinion			
16	that "the vertically integrated utility has every motivation to withhold transmission			
17	service whenever it is to the advantage of its generation operations to do so". (Proctor			
18	Rebuttal at p. 7, 1. 3-4.)			
19	Q. Does Dr. Proctor state in his rebuttal testimony how the JDA reduces			
20	the benefits of an independent provider of transmission service?			
21	A. No, he does not.			

1	Q.	Does JDA affect the benefits of an independent provider of	
2	transmission	service as described by Dr. Proctor?	
3	A.	No. The JDA does not affect, in any way, (1) the Midwest ISO's ability to	
4	take on and p	perform the role of an independent provider or transmission service, or	
5	(2) UE's part	cicipation in the Midwest ISO through GridAmerica.	
6	Q.	What reasons does Dr. Proctor provide for the need for a facilitator	
7	for wholesal	e energy markets?	
8	A.	Dr. Proctor states that "a formal spot-market for electricity that is overseen	
9	by a market monitor to identify and mitigate market power provides the most efficient		
10	short term use of generation". (Proctor Rebuttal at p. 7, l. 16-18.) He also states that "the		
11	bilateral markets that exist today do not provide a structure for the most efficient short-		
12	term use of generation". (Proctor Rebuttal at p. 7, l. 15-16.)		
13	Q.	Does Dr. Proctor state in his testimony how the existence of the JDA	
14	affects the n	narket facilitator's ability to identify and mitigate market power?	
15	A.	No, he does not.	
16	Q.	Does the existence of the JDA affect the market facilitator's ability to	
17	identify and	mitigate market power?	
18	A.	No. The JDA does not affect the Midwest ISO's ability to facilitate	
19	wholesale en	ergy markets, nor does it affect UE's participation in the Midwest ISO via a	
20	contractual re	elationship with GridAmerica.	
21	Q.	Does Dr. Proctor state in his testimony how the JDA affects the	
22	market facil	itator's ability to create an efficient short-term market?	
23	A.	No, he does not.	

1	Q.	Does the existence of the JDA affect the market facilitator's ability to		
2	create an eff	icient short term market?		
3	A.	No. Whether or not the JDA exists has no effect on the Midwest ISO's		
4	ability to crea	ate such a market.		
5	Q.	If the JDA has no effect on the market facilitator's ability to identify		
6	and mitigate	e market power and to create efficient short-term markets, why does		
7	Dr. Proctor ask the Commission to condition its approval in this case on AmerenUE			
8	committing	to terminate the JDA?		
9	A.	Dr. Proctor states that the benefits of the Midwest ISO-facilitated spot		
10	markets to U	E are likely to be minimal because of the existence of the JDA. His		
11	statement im	plies that the benefits of the JDA flow only to AEG because AmerenUE's		
12	low cost gene	eration sources may be used to meet AEG's native load at cost rather than		
13	being sold in	to the market. But these benefits flow in both directions, a fact Dr. Proctor		
14	overlooks. T	The magnitude of the benefits to either company vary over time, with		
15	significant of	perating benefits associated with operating as a single, integrated system		
16	rather than m	aultiple independent systems.		
17	Q.	Do you agree that as a condition to the Commission's approval in this		
18	case Amerer	TOTAL TOTAL NAME OF THE PARTY O		
19	A.	No, I do not. Dr. Proctor recommends that the JDA be terminated as a		
20	condition of	the Commission approval in this case based on a narrow, unqualified		
21	perception of	the value of the JDA to AmerenUE. A decision to terminate the JDA		
22	should be bas	sed on a robust analysis that quantifies the bilateral benefits the JDA brings		
23	to both comp	anies, including UE. Furthermore, as the JDA has no effect on the benefits		

- of RTO participation as discussed by Dr. Proctor, its termination or continuation is an
- 2 inappropriate issue for this case.
- **Q.** When does AmerenUE believe is the appropriate time to perform a
- 4 robust analysis of the JDA?
- 5 A. The rate moratorium in the state of Missouri makes the AmerenUE
- 6 Missouri ratepayers indifferent to the existence of a JDA through June 30, 2006. Because
- 7 of the rate moratorium in Missouri, AmerenUE sees the JDA as an option that should
- 8 remain available, including the option to continue the JDA beyond June 30, 2006.
- 9 Similar to a stock option, it does not make sense for AmerenUE to give up its right to
- strike on this option today. The value of the JDA depends on many ever changing
- variables including the capacity mix of each party to the JDA, the price of fuel of each
- 12 generating unit included in the joint dispatch, the availability of those generating units
- and the market price of electricity. The decision to terminate the JDA must be made on
- 14 the best available information at the time such decision needs to be made. That time is no
- earlier than June 30, 2005 (the JDA requires a one year notice of cancellation)
- Q. Does Dr. Proctor agree that the JDA, even if his views of its benefits
- 17 or lack of benefits were assumed to be correct, need not be terminated at this time?
- A. Yes, in his rebuttal testimony he states "Since AmerenUE's Missouri
- bundled retail customers are currently under a rate moratorium, there is some flexibility
- in the exact timing for terminating the Joint Dispatch Agreement". (Proctor Rebuttal
- 21 p. 9, l. 17-19.)
- Q. Does this conclude your Surrebuttal Testimony?
- A. Yes, it does.