

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a            )  
Ameren Missouri’s 2<sup>nd</sup> Filing to Implement            )        File No. EO-2015-0055  
Regulatory Changes in Furtherance of Energy            )  
Efficiency as Allowed by MEEIA                            )

**POSITION STATEMENT OF  
UNITED FOR MISSOURI, INC.**

Comes now United for Missouri, Inc. (“UFM”) and, in response to the List of Issues, Order of Opening Statements, Order of Witnesses, and Order of Cross Examination (“List of Issues”) filed by the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, files its Position Statement. For its Position Statement, UFM states as follows:

**List of Issues**

**1. Should the Commission approve, reject or modify Ameren Missouri’s MEEIA Cycle 2 Plan1 (hereafter the “Plan”)?**

UFM Response: The question before the Commission must be kept in the context of the policy of the state to value demand-side investments equal to traditional investments in supply and delivery infrastructure. Section 393.1075.3. RSMo. (2013 Cum. Supp.) This case represents Ameren Missouri’s representation that certain energy efficiency and demand side programs are as cost-effective or more cost-effective than traditional investments. Ameren Missouri must show that these energy efficiency and demand side investments are prudent when compared to traditional investments.

UFM believes this is a close question depending on the facts to be adduced at the hearing. Staff has recommended the Commission reject Ameren Missouri’s Plan because it is not

beneficial to all customers in the customer class in which the programs are proposed, regardless whether the programs are utilized by all customers as is required by statute.<sup>1</sup> Ameren Missouri disputes Staff's conclusion.<sup>2</sup> Staff's overall analysis is essentially correct. However, an underlying dispute between Staff and Ameren Missouri regarding the accuracy of Ameren Missouri's projected realistic achievable potential ("RAP") is critical in determining the size of the benefit to customers not participating in the programs. Ameren Missouri defends the accuracy of its RAP and claims a law of diminishing returns for several of its programs. To the extent the Commission finds that all customers benefit from these programs pursuant to Staff's analysis, UFM believes the Commission should approve the Plan. To the extent the Commission finds the Ameren Missouri RAP accurate and all customers will not benefit from these programs consistent with the Staff's analysis, the Commission should reject the Plan. The Commission should not modify the Plan. Ameren Missouri has the burden of proof in this case and the Commission has no authority to modify the Plan.

Quite frankly, if the Commission determines that these programs are not beneficial to all customers, UFM prefers that Ameren Missouri get out of the energy efficiency business and fulfill its first business function of providing safe and reliable energy service at just and reasonable rate.

**2. Do the programs in the Plan, and associated incremental energy and demand savings, demonstrate progress toward achieving all cost-effective demand-side savings consistent with state policy (as established by MEEIA)?**

UFM Response: UFM's position is similar to 1 above. Staff's position is that Ameren Missouri's RAP is vastly underestimated. Therefore, the Plan does not represent progress

---

<sup>1</sup> Rebuttal Testimony of John A. Rogers, p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Surrebuttal Testimony of Steven M. Wills, p. 14 and following.

towards achieving all cost-effective demand-side savings.<sup>3</sup> Ameren Missouri defends the accuracy of its RAP. Ultimately, the case and the facts are Ameren Missouri's to present and prove. If the Commission finds the RAP accurate and the Commission accepts Staff's assessment, the Commission should reject the Plan because it does not demonstrate progress toward achieving all cost-effective demand-side savings. The Commission should not modify the Plan. Again, UFM prefers to see Ameren Missouri out of the energy efficiency business. Such determinations should be left to each customer. Ameren Missouri should return to its first business purpose.

**3. If the Commission approves a Plan, what are the components of the demand-side programs investment mechanism and how will each of the components be administered?**

UFM Response: No position at this time.

**4. If the Commission approves a Plan, what variances from Commission rules based on a showing of good cause are necessary?**

UFM Response: No position at this time.

**Office of the Public Counsel's Issues:**

**1. If the Commission approves a plan, should the total resource cost test be applied uniformly when calculating net shared benefits?**

UFM Response: No position at this time.

**2. If the Commission approves a demand-side programs investment mechanism that includes a performance incentive, should the performance incentive be included as a cost when calculating the net shared benefits?**

UFM Response: No position at this time.

---

<sup>3</sup> Surrebuttal Testimony of John R. Rodgers, p. 3.

**Sierra Club's Issue:**

**In assessing the cost-effectiveness of demand-side programs, should Ameren Missouri consider the results of the utility cost test?**

UFM Response: No position at this time.

**Missouri Division of Energy's Issue:**

**If the Commission modifies Ameren Missouri's MEEIA Cycle 2 Plan what modifications should the Commission adopt?**

UFM Response: None. The Commission has no authority to make modifications to a MEEIA plan submitted by an electric utility.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ David C. Linton

David C. Linton, #32198  
314 Romaine Spring View  
Fenton, MO 63026  
Telephone: 314-341-5769  
Email: [jdinton@reagan.com](mailto:jdinton@reagan.com)

Attorney for United for Missouri, Inc.

Filed: May 11, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true copy of the foregoing was sent to all parties of record via electronic transmission this 11th day of May, 2015.

By: /s/ David C. Linton