

*Exhibit No.:*  
*Issue(s):* *Low-Income  
Program*  
*Witness:* *Kory J. Boustead*  
*Sponsoring Party:* *MoPSC Staff*  
*Type of Exhibit:* *Rebuttal Testimony*  
*Case No.:* *ER-2019-0335*  
*Date Testimony Prepared:* *January 21, 2020*

**MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION**

**TARIFF/RATE DESIGN**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**KORY J. BOUSTEAD**

**UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY,  
D/B/A AMEREN MISSOURI**

**CASE NO. ER-2019-0335**

*Jefferson City, Missouri  
January 2020*

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**KORY J. BOUSTEAD**

**UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a AMEREN MISSOURI**

**CASE NO. ER-2019-0335**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Q. Please state your name, employment position, and business address.

7 A. Kory J. Boustead, Rate and Tariff Examiner II with the Missouri Public Service  
8 Commission, 200 Madison Street, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.

9 Q. Are you the same Kory J. Boustead that supported testimony in Staff's Cost of  
10 Service Report?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?

13 A. I am responding to the direct testimony filed regarding the Keeping Current  
14 and Keeping Cool program ("Program") of: 1) Consumers Council of Missouri witness  
15 Jacqueline A. Hutchison; and 2) Office of the Public Counsel witness Geoff Marke.

16 Q. What is the Consumers Council of Missouri position regarding Ameren Missouri's  
17 Program?

18 A. Ms. Hutchison recommends an increase to the annual program funding level to  
19 \$5,000,000, with the ratepayer portion of program funding to be allocated among all customer  
20 classes based upon a usage allocation.<sup>1</sup>

21 Q. Does Staff support the recommendation of Ms. Hutchison?

---

<sup>1</sup> Direct testimony of Consumers Council of Missouri witness Jacqueline A. Hutchison, page 8 lines 13-20.

Surrebuttal Testimony of  
James A. Busch

1           A. No. Staff does not support an increase of annual program funding to \$5,000,000  
2 as there is no support filed to show a need for such an increase from the current approved annual  
3 program funding of \$1,331,000.

4           Q. What is OPC's position?

5           A. Dr. Marke filed a few recommendations, including applying a 20% budget variance  
6 (\$141,200) extension to be created and applied from the ratepayer-funded portion of the current  
7 budget,<sup>2</sup> with any remaining annual budget surplus allocated evenly to the remaining  
8 participants' last monthly bill. This report would be filed in the Company's next rate case.<sup>3</sup>

9           Q. Does Staff support Dr. Marke's recommendations?

10          A. Yes, Staff is in support of the recommendations to allow for continued growth and  
11 success of the program with budget flexibility if necessary while providing participants  
12 additional bill arrearage credits in the event of surplus funds at the end of each program year.

13          Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

14          A. Yes.

---

<sup>2</sup> The current approved budget is funded at 53% (\$706,000) by ratepayers and 47% (\$625,000) by Ameren Missouri shareholders.

<sup>3</sup> Direct testimony of the Office of Public Counsel witness Geoff Marke, page 1, lines 15-19 and page 2, lines 1-10, page 4, lines 18-25 and page 5 lines 1-7.

