

Exhibit No.:
Issue: *Fuel Adjustment Clause –
Voltage Adjustment Factors*
Witness: *Alan J. Bax*
Sponsoring Party: *MoPSC Staff*
Type of Exhibit: *Rebuttal Testimony*
Case No.: *ER-2016-0179*
Date Testimony Prepared: *January 20, 2017*

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION

**OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS
ENGINEERING ANALYSIS UNIT**

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

ALAN J. BAX

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

CASE NO. ER-2016-0179

*Jefferson City, Missouri
January 2017*

Rebuttal Testimony of
Alan J. Bax

1 concerns with these proposed VAFs, specifically, with the value that Mr. Davis proposes for
2 VAF_{trans} .

3 Q. Does Mr. Davis include an explanation as to the reasoning behind the proposed
4 value of VAF_{trans} ?

5 A. No, Mr. Davis is proposing that VAF_{trans} be increased from .9917 to 1.0327 in
6 his exemplar FAC Rider tariff. However, Mr. Davis's testimony contains no information
7 detailing his reasoning behind this proposed revision. A spreadsheet in his work papers
8 indicates that the proposed value of 1.0327 contains an additive component of .035 that is not
9 included in the calculation of the current value of VAF_{trans} . Staff can find no reason to adjust
10 the VAFs with additional components of any amount.

11 Q. What is Staff's recommendation regarding this proposed value?

12 A. Staff recommends that the Commission reject the proposed value of VAF_{trans}
13 as suggested by Ameren Missouri witness William R. Davis in the schedule to his
14 direct testimony and accept Staff's transmission, primary and secondary voltage adjustment
15 factors included on page 151, lines 5-7, of Staff's COS Report.

16 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

17 A. Yes.

