

Exhibit No.:
Issue(s): *Renewable Solutions
Program*
Witness: *Cedric E. Cunigan, PE*
Sponsoring Party: *MoPSC Staff*
Type of Exhibit: *Surrebuttal Testimony*
Case No.: *EA-2022-0245*
Date Testimony Prepared: *January 18, 2023*

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION

ENGINEERING ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

CEDRIC E. CUNIGAN, PE

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

CASE NO. EA-2022-0245

*Jefferson City, Missouri
January 2023*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

TABLE OF CONTENTS
OF
SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF
CEDRIC E. CUNIGAN, PE
UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY,
d/b/a Ameren Missouri
CASE NO. EA-2022-0245

RESPONSE TO MIEC.....1
RESPONSE TO WALMART.....2

1 the subscribing customers. This can be accomplished by a 5% reduction in the annual
2 Renewable Resource Charge.¹”

3 Q. Should the RRC be reduced by 5%?

4 A. No. At this time, it is unclear the magnitude of benefits that would be received
5 by changing from ITCs to PTCs. Staff witness Michael L. Stahlman discusses this calculation
6 of benefits more in his rebuttal testimony. Further, Staff’s understanding at present is that
7 Ameren Missouri is still determining which type of tax credit will be utilized due to an increase
8 in estimated project costs. It is Staff’s recommendation that the Commission reject the
9 Renewable Solutions Program (“RSP”). However, if the Commission should choose to approve
10 the RSP, Staff recommends that all costs of the renewable generation facilities in the program
11 shall be borne by the subscribers and/or shareholders while the RSP phase is in effect. Any
12 recalculation of the RRC should ensure that program and facilities costs are fully covered during
13 the program phase.

14 **RESPONSE TO WALMART**

15 Q. What does Mr. Teague propose in his rebuttal testimony regarding the RSP?

16 A. Mr. Teague recommends changing the language in the proposed RSP Rider to
17 reflect the Company’s proposal to retire RECs on the customer’s behalf.

18 Q. What is Staff’s opinion of this change?

19 A. Staff primarily recommends that the Commission reject the RSP. However, if
20 the Commission chooses to approve the RSP, Staff would support adding language to the tariff

¹ Rebuttal Testimony of Maurice Brubaker page 2, lines 11-13.

1 outlining the retirement of RECs on the customers behalf, in addition to the following
2 conditions Staff proposed in Rebuttal:

- 3 1. All costs of the renewable generation facilities in the program shall
4 be borne by the subscribers and/or shareholders while the RSP phase is
5 in effect.
- 6 2. In addition to an in-service evaluation at the time the facility is initially
7 placed into rates, Ameren Missouri shall demonstrate the facility is fully
8 operational at the time the RSP program ends.
- 9 3. The costs of the generation facilities to be placed on ratepayers will be
10 determined at the time the RSP program ends. The valuation of the
11 facility will take into account the current book cost, the state of the
12 facilities, depreciation, degradation over time, and current market prices
13 for similar sized assets. The least cost option will be chosen.

14 Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?

15 A. Yes.

