Exhibit No.:

Issue: Rate Switching,

Customer Growth, Community Solar,

**MEEIA** 

Witness: Kim Cox

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal/True-Up

**Testimony** 

Case No.: ER-2022-0337

Date Testimony Prepared: March 13, 2023

# MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION TARIFF/RATE DESIGN DEPARTMENT

### SURREBUTTAL/TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY

**OF** 

### KIM COX

# UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a AMEREN MISSOURI

**CASE NO. ER-2022-0337** 

Jefferson City, Missouri March 2023

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS OF
2	SURREBUTTAL/TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY
3	$\mathbf{OF}$
4	KIM COX
5 6	UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a AMEREN MISSOURI
7	CASE NO. ER-2022-0337
8	SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY1
9	COMMUNITY SOLAR1
10	LIGHTING CLASS MUNICIPAL DISCOUNT2
11	TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY2
12	CONCLUSION3

1		SURREBUTTAL/TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY
2		OF
3		KIM COX
4 5		UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a AMEREN MISSOURI
6		CASE NO. ER-2022-0337
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
8	A.	Kim Cox, 200 Madison Street, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.
9	Q.	Are you the same Kim Cox who filed direct Cost of Service ("COS") and
10	rebuttal testi	mony in this case?
11	A.	Yes, I am.
12	SURREBU	TTAL TESTIMONY
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?
14	A.	The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the rebuttal
15	testimony fi	led in this case by Union Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren Missouri ("Ameren
16	Missouri")	witness Nicholas Bowden, Ph.D., regarding the Community Solar Pilot Program
17	and the Ligh	nting Class Municipal Discount.
18	COMMUN	ITY SOLAR
19	Q.	Ameren Missouri witness Dr. Bowden states in his rebuttal testimony <sup>1</sup> that Staff
20	applied the v	wrong rate per block to calculate the Community Solar Pilot Program revenue. Does
21	Staff agree?	
	<sup>1</sup> Nicholas Boy	vden Ph.D., rebuttal testimony, page 21, lines 2-7.

Yes. While correcting the error<sup>2</sup>, Staff also discovered that \$14.19<sup>3</sup> per block 1 A. 2 was applied when adjusting for the rate change annualization. Staff has applied the correct rate 3 in its true-up adjustments. 4 LIGHTING CLASS MUNICIPAL DISCOUNT 5 Q. Ameren Missouri witness Dr. Bowden also states that Staff made an error in its calculation of discounts received by the municipal lighting customers<sup>4</sup>. Does Staff agree that 6 7 an error was made? 8 A. Yes. Staff did not increase the lighting discounts. The discounts are 10% of the 9 total bill, and the lighting tariff class rates increased. Therefore, the discounts needed to be 10 increased when adjusting for the rate change annualization adjustment. 11 Q. What is the impact of the increase to the discounts? 12 A. The overall impact is (\$36,928). 13 TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY 14 Q. What is the purpose of your true-up direct testimony in this proceeding? 15 A. The purpose of my true-up direct testimony is to address customer growth, rate switching, community solar, and the Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act ("MEEIA"). 16 17 Q. What is Staff's true-up customer growth adjustment? As stated in my direct COS and rebuttal testimony, Staff reviewed and 18 A. 19 made necessary adjustments to the Residential ("RES"), Small General Service ("SGS"), 20 Large General Service ("LGS"), and Small Primary Service ("SPS") number of customer bills

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Staff applied \$11.92 per block for the months of July 2021 through February 2022 instead of \$13.91.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> \$14.19 is the rate that was effective February 28, 2022. Staff has applied the \$11.92 rate that became effective June 16, 2022, for the rate change annualization in the true-up filing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Nicholas Bowden PhD, page 22, lines 14 and 15.

1	per month.	Staff applied December 2022 customer counts to the 12 months ending June 2022									
2	for the RES, SGS, LGS and SPS.										
3	Q. What is Staff's rate switching true-up adjustment?										
4	A. In response to Staff's Data Request No. 0148, Staff accounted for two custom										
5	switching from SPS to SGS, and one customer switching from SGS to SPS.										
6	Q.	What is Staff's MEEIA true-up adjustment?									
7	A.	Staff witness, Dr. Hari Poudel provided total true-up kWh MEEIA adjustment									
8	for the RES, SGS, LGS and SPS rate classes <sup>5</sup> . Staff applied the true-up monthly MEEL										
9	adjustment	by using the same method it did in the direct COS filing in this case <sup>6</sup> .									
10	Q.	What is Staff's Community Solar true-up adjustment?									
11	A.	As stated in my direct COS and rebuttal testimony, Staff reviewed the subscribed									
12	Community	Solar Bank through the December 31, 2022, true-up cut-off. Based on the									
13	information received from the Company in response to Staff's Data Request No. 0150, Staff										
14	made adjustments to the RES and SGS subscribed blocks.										
15	CONCLUS	SION									
16	Q.	What are your recommended true-up rate revenue adjustments?									
17	A.	The Commission should base its awarded revenue requirement on Staff's rate									
18	revenue adj	ustments as provided below.									
19											
20											
21	continued o	on next page									
		idel discusses the MEEIA and the calculation of the MEEIA kWh adjustment in his true-up testimony. testimony, page 7, lines 6-9.									

1

					R	ate Switching					Co	ommunity	Rate change annualization including rate						Total MO	
Date Class	<b>.</b>		U	odate Period	١.	Customer	We	ather & Days		o d. ad		<u>Solar</u>		change for	Low Income		FD: 4D:	Normalized		
Rate Class	ies	t Year Revenue		<u>Adj.</u>	-	Annualization		<u>Adj.</u>	MEEIA Adj.	 Growth Adj.	Anı	nualization	cor	nmunity solar		<u>Charge</u>		EDI ADJ		Revenue
Res 1M	\$	1,288,439,439	\$	36,766,652	\$	-	\$	(24,066,225)	\$ (8,936,618)	\$ 6,832,351	\$	459,924	\$	83,777,621	\$	(1,821,671)			\$	1,381,451,474
SGS 2M	\$	281,277,422	\$	9,499,924	\$	15,622	\$	(3,524,480)	\$ (2,291,334)	\$ 2,029,391	\$	25,407	\$	17,801,454	\$	(310,452)			\$	304,522,952
LGS 3M	\$	520,252,648	\$	14,986,823	\$	1,140	\$	(3,275,441)	\$ (6,061,761)	\$ 195,862			\$	32,957,026	\$	(264,677)		(482,414)	\$	558,309,206
SPS 4M	\$	222,687,480	\$	6,480,369	\$	(2,629,291)	\$	(1,559,752)	\$ (1,130,557)	\$ 1,195,064			\$	13,864,282	\$	(16,464)		(179,990)	\$	238,711,140
LPS 11M	\$	190,174,326	\$	4,244,098	\$	1,677,473	\$	(785,375)	\$ (78,268)				\$	11,678,119				(61,598)	\$	206,848,776
Lighting 5m	\$	35,346,814	\$	874,654									\$	2,074,994					\$	38,296,461
Lighting 6m	\$	881,596	\$	17,243									\$	65,733					\$	964,572
Lighting 6m																				
metered	\$	1,810,487	\$	12,866									\$	134,746					\$	1,958,100
MSD	\$	75,516	\$	1,649									\$	4,398					\$	81,564
Total	\$	2,540,945,729	\$	72,884,279	\$	(935,057)	\$	(33,211,274)	\$ (18,498,539)	\$ 10,252,669	\$	485,331	\$	162,358,373	\$	(2,413,264)	\$	(724,002)	\$	2,731,144,245

2

4

- Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal and true- up direct testimony?
- A. Yes.

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri's Tariffs to Adjust Its Revenues for Electric Service	) Case No. ER-2022-0337
AFFIDAVIT O	OF KIM COX
STATE OF MISSOURI )	
COUNTY OF COLE ) ss.	
COME NOW THE COV1 - 1 - 1 - 1	
	leclares that she is of sound mind and lawful age;
that she contributed to the foregoing Surrebuttal/	True-Up Direct Testimony of Kim Cox; and that
the same is true and correct according to her best	knowledge and belief.
Further the Affiant sayeth not.	Kin Cox
JUR	AT
Section of the Commission of	stituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for
the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my off	ice in Jefferson City, on this & day
of March 2023.	
	(6)
D. SUZIE MANKIN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: April 04, 2025	Muziellankin ary Public