

FILED

MAY 07 2002

Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No.:

Issue(s):

Environmental Expense/

Injuries and Damages Expense/

Legal Expense/

Midwest Independent System Operator

Cancellation Fee/

Venice Power Plant Fire Costs/

Lobbying Costs

Witness/Type of Exhibit:

Robertson/Direct

Sponsoring Party:

Public Counsel

Case No.:

EM-96-149

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

TED ROBERTSON

Submitted on Behalf of
the Office of the Public Counsel

NP

UNION ELECTRIC

Case No. EM-96-149

May 7, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Testimony	Page
Introduction	1
Environmental Expenses	3
Injuries and Damages Expense	14
Legal Expense	17
Midwest Independent System Operator Cancellation Fee	20
Venice Power Plant Fire Costs	30
Lobbying Costs	37

**DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
TED ROBERTSON**

**UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY
d/b/a
AMERENUE**

**CASE NO. EM-96-149
EARP II YEAR III**

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. Ted Robertson, P. O. Box 7800, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?

A. I am employed by the Office of the Public Counsel of the state of Missouri ("OPC" or "Public Counsel") as a Public Utility Accountant III.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS.

A. I graduated from Southwest Missouri State University in Springfield, Missouri, with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting. In November, 1988, I passed the Uniform Certified Public Accountant examination, and obtained C. P. A. certification from the state of Missouri in 1989.

Q. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF YOUR CURRENT DUTIES WHILE IN THE EMPLOY OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL?

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 A. Under the direction of the OPC Chief Public Utility Accountant, Mr. Russell W. Trippensee, I am
2 responsible for performing audits and examinations of the books and records of public utilities
3 operating within the state of Missouri.

4
5 Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE
6 COMMISSION?

7 A. Yes, I have. Please refer to Schedule No. TJR-1, attached to this direct testimony, for a listing of
8 cases in which I have previously submitted testimony before the Missouri Public Service
9 Commission ("MPSC" or "Commission").

10
11 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

12 A. The purpose of this direct testimony is to address various costs incurred by the Union Electric
13 Company d/b/a AmerenUE ("UE", "Ameren" or "Company") during the third year of the
14 Experimental Alternative Regulation Plan II ("EARP II"). In particular, I will address OPC's
15 position on how the costs discussed in the following testimony should be treated with regard to
16 the development of the earnings sharing credit. The costs that I will discuss include;
17 Environmental Expense, Injuries and Damages Expense, Legal Expense, Midwest Independent
18 System Operator Cancellation Fee, Venice Power Plant Fire Costs and Lobbying Costs.

ENVIRONMENTAL EXPENSE

1
2
3 Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

4 A. This issue concerns the proper level of expense for test period environmental activities that should
5 be used in the determination of the earnings sharing credit. The Commission should determine
6 whether it is proper to recognize the actual payments incurred in the test period or recognize the
7 actual payments incurred in the test period plus an accrual of estimated expense for potential
8 **future** liabilities that the Company also booked during the test period.

9
10 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE?

11 A. The Public Counsel believes that only the actual payments that the Company incurred during the
12 test period should be utilized in the determination of the earnings sharing credit. Company's
13 inclusion in the test period of an accrual for estimated expenses, for potential future liabilities or
14 services, should not be allowed to impact the determination of the earnings sharing credit because
15 the estimated expense pertains to activities expected to occur subsequent to the test period
16 operations being reviewed. Furthermore, these estimated expenses may not occur in the years
17 subsequent to the end of the test period.

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 Q. DOES THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S POSITION TO ALLOW ONLY THE ACTUAL
2 PAYMENTS ALSO INCLUDE COSTS FOR THE REMEDIATION OF MANUFACTURED
3 GAS PLANT SITES DURING THE TEST PERIOD?

4 A. No.

5
6 Q. DOES THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S POSITION TO ALLOW ONLY THE ACTUAL
7 PAYMENTS ALSO INCLUDE COSTS FOR THE REMEDIATION OF PROPERTIES NOT
8 OWNED BY THE AMEREN MISSOURI ELECTRIC OPERATIONS DURING THE TEST
9 PERIOD?

10 A. No.

11
12 Q. DOES THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S POSITION TO ALLOW ONLY THE ACTUAL
13 PAYMENTS ALSO INCLUDE COSTS FOR THE REMEDIATION OF PROPERTIES
14 OWNED BY THE AMEREN MISSOURI ELECTRIC OPERATIONS BUT NOT PROVIDING
15 USED AND USEFUL ELECTRIC SERVICE?

16 A. No.

17
18 Q. ARE THE ESTIMATED FUTURE EXPENSES KNOWN AND MEASURABLE FOR
19 REGULATORY PURPOSES?

1 A. No. The estimated expenses Company booked represent costs for liabilities or services that have
2 not been incurred, and thus, these costs are not known and measurable for regulatory purposes.
3

4 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE GIVEN BY THE COMPANY FOR BOOKING THE ESTIMATED
5 EXPENSE ACCRUAL?

6 A. Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1015 states that the estimated expense
7 accrual was related primarily to environmental activities at the Sauget Site Cleanup.
8

9 Q. WHAT IS THE SAUGET SITE?

10 A. Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1030 states that the Sauget Site or
11 Sauget Area 2 Sites is an attempt by the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA")
12 to list the sites on the National Priorities List ("NPA"). The NPA is concerned with identifying
13 and documenting the clean-up or remediation of chemically contaminated sites in this country.
14 Company states that it is in the process of negotiating final details of the Area 2 Sampling Plan
15 with the U.S. EPA and anticipates that investigative work will commence in the summer and fall
16 of 2002.
17

18 Q. WHAT WAS THE TOTAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXPENSE BOOKED BY THE COMPANY
19 DURING THE TEST PERIOD?

1 A. Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1015 states that it utilized two methods
2 to record expenses during the test period. The first method direct charges actual payments for
3 environmental activities to an expense account. The accounting entry for this method consists
4 simply of debiting an expense account and crediting a cash or accounts payable account for the
5 payment of the services provided. Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1031
6 states that during the test period **

7 **

8
9 The second method the Company utilizes involves an expense estimation process which records
10 expense estimates and subsequent pay-outs to a balance sheet liability (reserve) account. In
11 addition to the direct charges expensed during the test period, the Company booked (according to
12 its response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1031), **

13
14 ** Combining the expense amounts for the two methods results in **

15 ** being allocated to the Missouri electric operations.
16

17 Q. WHAT WAS THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS ACTUALLY PAID
18 DURING THE TEST PERIOD?

19 A. The total costs actually paid consist of the direct charges plus reductions to the liability reserve
20 account. During the test period the Company reduced the environmental reserve liability account

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 by \$342,000 (response to OPC Data Request No. 1015). The Missouri portion of the \$342,000
2 approximates ** ** (response to OPC Data Request No. 1031). Combining
3 this amount with the amount direct charged provides a total of **

4 ** paid in the test period.

5
6 Q. DID THE REDUCTIONS TO THE LIABILITY RESERVE ACCOUNT INCLUDE
7 PAYMENTS FOR REMEDIATION EFFORTS THAT SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED IN THE
8 DETERMINATION OF THE EARNINGS SHARING CREDIT?

9 A. Public Counsel currently has several data requests outstanding which seek information on test
10 period payments made for the remediation of manufactured gas plant sites, properties not
11 currently owned by the Ameren Missouri electric operations and properties owned by the Ameren
12 Missouri electric operations but not providing used and useful electric service. If any portion of
13 the \$342,000 includes payments for these types of remediation, Public Counsel believes that those
14 specific payments should also be excluded from the determination of the earnings sharing credit.

15
16 Q. BY HOW MUCH DID THE BOOKED EXPENSE EXCEED ACTUAL PAYMENTS FOR THE
17 TEST PERIOD?

18 A. Taking into account the Public Counsel data requests that are still outstanding, subtracting the
19 actual test period payments of ** ** from the ** ** total expenses booked

1 results in ** ** of excess expense being included in the determination of the earnings
2 sharing credit for the Missouri electric operations.
3

4 Q. WHAT IS A LIABILITY RESERVE ACCOUNT?

5 A. A liability reserve account is really nothing more than a simple liability account that is shown on a
6 company's balance sheet. Accounting standards require that a company book in its accounting
7 records future costs for liabilities it expects to incur if those costs can be reasonably estimated.
8 The following is an example of accounting entries that would typically occur to recognize the
9 future expected costs:

- 10
11 1. Company develops an estimate of the future liabilities to be incurred and books that
12 estimate to the accounting records:

13
14 Debit - Expense (Income Statement Account)

15 Credit - Liability (Non-Current Balance Sheet Account (Reserve))
16

17 The accounting entry is made to recognize the estimated expense on the income statement
18 of the company in the period that the entry is made and also to recognize the future
19 liability on the balance sheet. Even though the Company has not actually incurred the

1 expenditures, it is recognizing its estimate of the expense in the period that the accounting
2 entry is booked.

- 3
- 4 2. Once the estimated liabilities or services are actually incurred (the sources of the actual
5 charges), the Company would then recognize their payment in the accounting records with
6 the following entry:

7

8 Debit - Liability (Non-Current Balance Sheet Account (Reserve))

9 Credit - Cash or Accounts Payable (Current Balance Sheet Account)

10

11 The accounting entry reduces the balance sheet reserve liability account balance and
12 recognizes the actual payment of the costs in the year that they are incurred. In this
13 example, as in Ameren's situation, the payment of the estimated expense accrued will not
14 occur, if they occur at all, until after the end of the test period in this case because the
15 expected liabilities or services have not yet become a reality.

16

17 Q. IS AMEREN CONSIDERED A CASH BASIS COMPANY?

18 A. No. Ameren is an accrual basis company, and thus, it keeps its accounting records on an accrual
19 basis for financial presentation purposes.

20

1 Q. WHY IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL RECOMMENDING THAT AN ACCRUAL BASIS
2 COMPANY UTILIZE CASH BASIS ACCOUNTING?

3 A. Public Counsel believes that actual cash expenditures are the appropriate reflection of known and
4 measurable costs for regulatory purposes consistent with past MPSC practice and consistent with
5 the Stipulation and Agreement approved by the Commission in this case when it established the
6 EARP II. Public Counsel's position is not that the Company change it's current accounting
7 methodology or its procedures for financial statement presentation nor in this testimony is the
8 Public Counsel proposing an adjustment or modification of its current Commission approved
9 tariffs. Public Counsel also understands that Financial Accounting Standards and Generally
10 Accepted Accounting Procedures ("GAAP") require the Company, for financial reporting
11 purposes, to recognize and book an estimate of costs for liabilities it expects to incur in future
12 period if those amounts can be reasonably estimated. However, the estimated costs have not yet
13 occurred and are not a factor in the actual operations that existed during the instant case test
14 period. Furthermore, I believe that the Company has routinely over-estimated the annual
15 expenses it pays for environmental activities during the years that the Experimental Alternative
16 Regulation Plans have been in effect.

17
18 The Commission should not allow the Company to treat the accrued estimate of future costs as an
19 expense of the test period for the purpose of determining the earnings sharing credit. The

1 earnings sharing credit should be based on Company's operations during the test period and not
2 include the potential impact of operations that may or may not occur in some future year.

3
4 Q. IS IT CONCEIVABLE THAT THE COMPANY'S ESTIMATE OF THE FUTURE COSTS IT
5 ACCRUED WILL NOT ACTUALLY EQUAL THOSE FUTURE COSTS?

6 A. Yes. If the future costs actually incurred do not match the estimated expense accrued in this
7 period, the Company may revise the balance in its recorded liability reserve lower or higher
8 depending on those circumstances. For example, if the estimated costs are revised lower, the
9 Company would decrease the expense recorded on its balance sheet and income statement in the
10 year the revision occurs with the following entry:

11
12 Debit - Liability (Non-Current Balance Sheet Account (Reserve))

13 *Credit - Expense (Income Statement Account)

14 *Company may instead credit the balance sheet account Retained Earnings. Crediting
15 Retained Earnings effectively recognizes a prior period adjustment to correct the level of
16 expense originally estimated.
17
18

19 This accounting entry lowers the liability and expense levels that would be represented in the
20 future year balance sheet and income statement and corrects the Company's financial records for
21 the incremental difference between the lower expenses actually incurred in the future year and the
22 total expenses originally estimated and accrued in the instant case test period. However, the fact

1 does not change that the actual services and their respective costs whether lower or higher will
2 still occur in a year subsequent to the end of the instant case test period. In a nutshell, the
3 Company is using GAAP to move up expenses for the cost of services or potential liabilities in
4 future years to the current EARP II test period.

5
6 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S RECOMMENDATION ON THIS ISSUE?

7 A. The excess accrued estimated expense is not relevant to the current test period operations;
8 therefore, it is the Public Counsel's recommendation that the Commission authorize allowing only
9 the ** ** of actual environmental charges paid during in the test period in the
10 determination of the earnings sharing credit. Public Counsel recommends that the Company's
11 booked test period expense for the Missouri electric operations be reduced by the ** **
12 of excess estimated expense (this amount may adjusted higher if the responses to outstanding data
13 requests indicate test period payments were made for other inappropriate remediation efforts, e.g.,
14 manufactured gas plant sites).

15
16 Public Counsel believes that the Company's calculation of this issue, for purposes of the sharing
17 credit, is not appropriate pursuant to the EARP II. Company's accrual of the excess estimated
18 expense represents costs for liabilities or services that will not occur until future years, if at all. It
19 also represents costs that may be reduced or eliminated in years subsequent to the end of the
20 EARP II. If the estimated expenses are included in the calculation of the EARP sharing credit

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 today but in a later year the estimates are reduced or even eliminated, ratepayers would have no
2 recourse for recovery from the Company of the earnings sharing credit that is due them now. In
3 the Public Counsel's opinion, the excess estimated expense accrual is an inappropriate exploitation
4 of accounting procedures.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

INJURIES AND DAMAGES EXPENSE

1
2
3 Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

4 A. This issue concerns the level of expense for test period injuries and damages activities that should
5 be used in the determination of the earnings sharing credit. The issue is whether it is proper to use
6 the actual amount paid in the test period or the actual amount paid in the test period plus an
7 additional accrual of estimated expense for the payment of potential future liabilities that the
8 Company also booked during the test period.

9
10 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE?

11 A. Essentially, this issue is similar to the environmental estimated expense accrual discussed in the
12 prior section of this testimony. Public Counsel believes that only the actual amount paid during
13 the test period should be utilized in the determination of the earnings sharing credit. The
14 Company's addition of an accrual of estimated expense, for potential future liabilities or services,
15 should not be allowed to impact the determination of the earnings sharing credit because the
16 excess expense estimate pertains to activities expected to occur outside the test period operations
17 being reviewed. If the estimated costs are actually incurred, and they may not be, they will occur
18 in a year subsequent to the end of the instant case test period.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

Q. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF THE ESTIMATED EXPENSE ACCRUAL THAT THE COMPANY BOOKED IN THE TEST YEAR?

A. Pursuant to the Commission's Order in Case No. EM-96-149, the Company is required to provide various monitoring reports to MPSC and the OPC. The monitoring report, "Summary of Major Accruals," states that, during the test period, the Company accrued to the liability reserve account estimated expenses totaling \$17,800,000.

Q. WHAT WAS THE AMOUNT OF ACTUAL PAYMENTS FOR INJURIES AND DAMAGES INCURRED DURING THE TEST YEAR?

A. The monitoring report, "Summary of Major Accruals," states that the actual payments or charges to the liability reserve for injuries and damages during the test period was \$4,855,000.

Q. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF THE EXCESS ESTIMATED EXPENSE?

A. The excess estimated expense for the test period is the difference between the estimated expense accrual and the actual test period paid amounts. That difference, \$12,945,000 (i.e., \$17,800,000 less \$4,855,000), represents an estimate of future costs with unknown payment dates.

Q. WHAT IS THE MISSOURI ELECTRIC OPERATIONS PORTION OF THE EXCESS ESTIMATED EXPENSE?

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

A. Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1047 states that the Missouri electric operations portion of the excess estimated expense is **

**.

Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S RECOMMENDATION ON THIS ISSUE?

A. The excess estimated expense is not relevant to the current test period operations; therefore, it is the Public Counsel's recommendation that the Commission authorize allowing only the Missouri electric operations portion of the actual injuries and damages paid during in the test period in the determination of the earnings sharing credit. Public Counsel recommends that the Company's booked expenses be reduced by the ** ** of excess estimated expense.

Public Counsel believes that the Company's position on this issue, similar to the issue regarding the environmental estimated expense accrual, is not appropriate for calculating a sharing credit pursuant to the EARP II. Company's accrual of the excess estimated expense represents costs for liabilities or services which will not occur until future years. The accrual also represents costs which potentially may be reduced or even eliminated in years subsequent to the end of the EARP II. In the Public Counsel's opinion, the excess estimated expense accrual is an inappropriate exploitation of accounting procedures.

LEGAL EXPENSE

1
2
3 Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

4 A. This issue concerns the level of test period legal expense that should be used in the determination
5 of the earnings sharing credit. The issue is whether it is proper to use the actual amount paid in
6 the test period or the actual amount paid in the test period plus an additional accrual of estimated
7 expense for future payment of potential liabilities that the Company also booked during the test
8 period.

9
10 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE?

11 A. This issue shares the same point of view as the environmental estimated expense accrual and the
12 injuries and damages estimated expense accrual discussed in the previous two sections of this
13 testimony. The Public Counsel believes that only the actual amount paid during the test period
14 should be utilized in the determination of the earnings sharing credit. Accruals of excess
15 estimated expense for potential future liabilities or services should not be allowed to impact the
16 determination of the earnings sharing credit because the expense estimate pertains to activities
17 expected to occur outside the test period operations being reviewed.

18
19 Q. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF ESTIMATED EXPENSE THAT THE COMPANY ACCRUED
20 IN THE TEST PERIOD?

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 A. According to the Company's response to MPSC Staff Data Request No. 41, during the test period
2 it accrued a total of ** ** in legal expenses on a Missouri electric operations basis.

3
4 Q. WHAT WAS THE AMOUNT OF THE ACTUAL TEST PERIOD EXPENSES THAT THE
5 COMPANY PAID?

6 A. The actual legal expenses paid during the test period on a Missouri electric operations basis was
7 ** ** (response to MPSC Staff Data Request No. 41).

8
9 Q. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF THE EXCESS ESTIMATED EXPENSE?

10 A. The excess estimated expense is the difference between the total estimated expense accrual and
11 the actual test period expense paid. That difference, ** **, represents expense
12 estimates of future costs with unknown payment dates.

13
14 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S RECOMMENDATION ON THIS ISSUE?

15 A. The excess estimated expense at issue is not relevant to the current test period operations;
16 therefore, it is the Public Counsel's recommendation that the Commission authorize allowing only
17 the ** ** of actual legal expense paid during the test period in the determination of the
18 earnings sharing credit. Public Counsel recommends that the Company's booked expense be
19 reduced by the ** ** excess estimated expense.
20

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 Public Counsel believes that the Company's calculation of this issue for purposes of the sharing
2 credit, just like the environmental and injuries and damages estimated expense accruals discussed
3 in the previous sections, is not appropriate pursuant to the EARP II. Company's accrual of the
4 excess estimated expense represents costs for liabilities or services which will not occur until
5 future years. The accrual also represent costs which potentially may be reduced or eliminated in
6 years subsequent to the end of the EARP II. In the Public Counsel's opinion, the excess estimated
7 expense accrual is an inappropriate exploitation of accounting procedures.

MIDWEST INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR

CANCELLATION FEE

1
2
3
4 Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

5 A. The issue is whether or not a cancellation fee the Company incurred to end its membership in the
6 Midwest Independent System Operator Regional Transmission Organization ("MISO") should be
7 allowed as an expense in the determination of the earnings sharing credit.
8

9 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF A REGIONAL TRANSMISSION ORGANIZATION?

10 A. It's my understanding that pursuant to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission "FERC" Order No.
11 2000, electric companies are required to transfer operational control of their jurisdictional
12 transmission facilities to an Independent Regional Transmission Organization ("RTO"). The
13 purpose of the control transfer to the RTO is to allow it to coordinate activities for transmission
14 and transmission-related services so that the regions under its jurisdiction will be able to operate
15 as a seamless market.
16

17 For a more detailed review of the formation and character of the Independent Regional
18 Transmission Organization, please review the direct testimony of OPC witness, Mr. Ryan Kind, in
19 the instant case.
20

1 Q. WHAT WAS THE AMOUNT OF AMEREN'S PORTION OF THE MEMBERSHIP
2 CANCELLATION FEE?

3 A. The Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1003b states that Ameren

4 **

5
6
7
8 ** Company's response to Public
9 Counsel Data Request No. 1003 adds that, of the \$12,502,800 allocated to AmerenUE,
10 \$11,322,536 (90.56%) was allocated to the Missouri electric operations.

11
12 Q. WHY DID THE COMPANY INCUR THE CANCELLATION FEE?

13 A. It's my understanding that the Company, after joining the MISO, and in collaboration with various
14 other electric companies, later desired to join and operate a totally different Independent Regional
15 Transmission Organization (i.e., the Alliance RTO). The Alliance RTO business model included
16 the establishment of a "for-profit" transmission company ("Transco"). In order to join the new
17 Transco, Ameren first had to cease its membership in the MISO. The membership cancellation
18 prompted the MISO to file suit to recover potential damages caused by Ameren's elimination of
19 support for the organization. The dispute was later resolved at the FERC level by negotiated

1 settlement. The Chief Judge's Certification of Settlement, Issued April 6, 2001, in FERC Docket
2 No. ER01-123-002, states on pages thirty-four and thirty-five:

3
4 The Chief Judge finds that the Settlement certified herewith constitutes a
5 complete resolution of the issues involved...
6
7

8 And,

9
10 the approval of Illinois Power, Commonwealth Edison and Ameren to withdraw
11 from the Midwest ISO with a combined payment of \$60 million...
12
13

14 Q. DOES YOUR TESTIMONY ADDRESS WHETHER IS WAS PROPER FOR AMERENUE TO
15 ATTEMPT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE MISO AND PAY THE FEE?

16 A. No. Ryan Kind's direct testimony in this case addresses this issue and explains other reasons why
17 it would not be appropriate to recognize this expense in the calculation of the sharing credit.

18
19 Q. REGARDING THE CANCELLATION FEE WHAT WERE THE TERMS OF THE FERC
20 SETTLEMENT?

21 A. Regarding the negotiated settlement, Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No.
22 1003 states:
23

1 In the Settlement of the parties in FERC Docket No. ER01-966-000,
2 Ameren agreed to a payment of \$18 million as its stipulated fair share of
3 MISO startup costs (Settlement Agreement, Section 4.1).
4
5

6 The response cited above was corroborated by the Company's response to OPC Data Request No.
7 1003a which provided a copy of the "Settlement Agreement" in the FERC case discussed prior.

8 On page nine of the Settlement Agreement it states:
9

10 4.1 Settlement Amount. The Departing Companies agree to pay the Midwest ISO
11 the aggregate Settlement Amount, in the following shares: ComEd: \$35.5 million
12 (59.2%); Illinois Power: \$6.5 million (10.8%); Ameren: \$18 million (30%). All
13 of the Midwest ISO Transmission Owners agree that this payment reflects the
14 Departing Companies' fair share of the Midwest ISO's Start-Up Costs.
15
16

17 Q. WAS IT UNDERSTOOD THAT THE COMPANY WOULD AT A LATER DATE RECIEVE
18 CREDITS FOR SERVICES PROVIDED TO IT BY THE MISO UP TO THE AMOUNT OF
19 THE CANCELLATION FEE?

20 A. Yes. Beginning on page thirteen of the Settlement Agreement it states:
21

22 4.7 Service Fee Credits. The Departing Companies will receive a credit (to be
23 negotiated with the Midwest ISO) against their combined portion of the service
24 fees owed by the Alliance RTO for any services that the Midwest ISO provides to
25 the Alliance RTO. The Departing Companies agree to allocate such credits among
26 themselves in proportion to the percentages set forth in Paragraph 4.1 above with
27 respect to their portion of the Settlement Amount.
28

29 4.8 Schedule 10 Credits. The Departing Companies will also receive credits
30 against the amounts owed for transmission services provided by the Midwest ISO

1 to the Departing Companies or their current affiliates (or their successors or
2 assigns) up to the Settlement Amount of \$60 million, which credits will be applied
3 only against the amount each Departing company or any of their current affiliates
4 (or their successors or assigns) pays with respect to the capital cost component of
5 the Administrative Cost Adder under Schedule 10 of the Midwest ISO OATT and
6 implemented through an alternate Administrative Cost Adder to the Midwest ISO
7 OATT, subject to transfer of the benefit of such credits beyond any Departing
8 Company's portion of the Settlement Amount to the other Departing Companies as
9 provided in Paragraph 4.9 below. The terms of the said alternate adder are to be
10 negotiated by the Departing Companies and the Midwest ISO.

11
12 **4.9. Credit Limits.** The total credits to be provided to the Departing
13 Companies under Paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 shall not exceed \$60 million, and no
14 Paragraph 4.8 credits shall be provided in connection with services rendered after
15 December 15, 2013. When any of the Departing Companies has received credits
16 equal to its share of the Settlement Amount as provided in Paragraph 4.1, the
17 remaining Departing Companies shall be entitled to the benefit of any additional
18 credits that would otherwise have been due to the Departing company that has
19 received its share of the Settlement Amount (including further credits based on
20 transmission service provided to such Departing Company or its affiliates), in
21 allocable shares.
22
23

24 Q. IS THE CANCELLATION OF THE AMEREN'S MEMBERSHIP IN THE MISO
25 ESSENTIALLY A MOOT POINT?

26 A. Yes. The FERC recently ordered that Ameren, and the other Alliance Companies, may not create
27 a separate RTO and instead encouraged their integration into the MISO. On page forty-six of its
28 Order Granting RTO Status And Accepting Supplemental Filings, issued December 20, 2001, the
29 FERC stated:

30
31 The Commission finds:
32

1 While we are granting RTO status to Midwest ISO in today's order, we emphasize
2 that the Midwest ISO should continue working diligently to complete its
3 announced merger with SPP and to integrate the Alliance Companies into the
4 Midwest ISO in order to develop an RTO that truly encompasses the natural
5 markets in the Midwest.
6
7

8 Q. IS IT LIKELY THAT THE CANCELLATION FEE PAID BY AMEREN WILL BE
9 REFUNDED DUE TO THE FERC'S DECISION TO DISALLOW THE FORMATION OF THE
10 INDEPENDANT ALLIANCE RTO?

11 A. Yes. According to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the cancellation fee will be refunded to
12 the Alliance Companies. On page twenty-four of the Settlement Agreement it states:
13

14 **11.1 Nonseverability.**

15
16 (a) The individual components of this Settlement Agreement are not severable.
17 This Settlement Agreement is expressly conditioned on the Commission's
18 acceptance of all provisions herein without change or condition. If this Settlement
19 Agreement is not accepted in its entirety, without modification or condition, it shall
20 be deemed withdrawn unless all Executing Parties agree to all of the required
21 changes or conditions. If the Settlement Agreement is deemed withdrawn, it shall
22 not constitute any part of the record in any of the captioned proceedings and shall
23 not be used for any other purpose.
24

25 (b) **Notwithstanding the foregoing, should a final, non-appealable order**
26 **deny the right of the Departing Companies to withdraw from the Midwest**
27 **ISO pursuant to Paragraph 4.11 above or modify or condition such right in a**
28 **manner unacceptable to the Departing Companies in their sole discretion, this**
29 **Settlement Agreement shall be null and void, except for the provisions of the**
30 **Paragraph 11.1, and the Midwest ISO will be obligated to repay the**
31 **Settlement Amount paid pursuant to Paragraph 4.1 of this Settlement**
32 **Agreement to the Departing Companies, net of any amounts paid to the**
33 **Departing Companies with respect to credits pursuant to Paragraphs 4.7 and**
34 **4.8 above. The Midwest ISO shall render such repayment by the earlier of**

1 **180 days from the date of such final order or the date that the Midwest ISO**
2 **obtains financing pursuant to its existing authorization granted by the**
3 **Commission under Section 204 of the FPA on February 6, 2001 in Docket No.**
4 **ES01-13-000. Such repayment will include an interest charge computed at**
5 **the interest rate then available to a utility company rated BBB+ by Standard**
6 **& Poor's for unsecured notes having a term comparable to the period since**
7 **the Settlement Amount was paid. In the event that this Settlement Agreement**
8 **shall become null and void in accordance with the foregoing, the Departing**
9 **Companies will not be deemed to have been granted the right to withdraw**
10 **from the Midwest ISO. (emphasis added by OPC)**
11
12

13 Q. HAS THE FERC RECENTLY ISSUED ANOTHER ORDER THAT CONCERNS THIS
14 MATTER?

15 A. Yes. On April 25, 2002, the FERC issued its Order On Petition For Declaratory Order, Alliance
16 Companies Docket Nos. EL02-65-000 and RT01-88-016. On page forty-six of the Order, it
17 states:

18
19 Petitioners claim that as a result of the Alliance VI Order, the Illinois Companies
20 were denied the opportunity to participate in the Alliance RTO, and thus there has
21 been failure of consideration for the payment by the Illinois Companies.
22 Consequently, Petitioners argue that, if Alliance GridCo participates within the
23 Midwest ISO, the Commission should order the Midwest ISO to refund the \$60
24 million, with interest, to the Illinois Companies.
25
26

27 The above citation clearly indicates Ameren's position that it should be refunded its portion of the
28 cancellation fee.
29

1 Q. IS THERE ANOTHER REASON THAT THE START-UP COSTS OF THE RTO SHOULD
2 NOT BE REIMBURSED BY THE RATEPAYERS OF THE REGULATED MISSOURI
3 ELECTRIC OPERATIONS?

4 A. Yes. Typically, start-up costs (i.e., organization costs) include items such as investigation costs,
5 payment of an incorporation fee to the state, payment of fees to attorneys for their services,
6 payments to promoters, accounting services and a variety of other outlays necessary to bring a
7 new company into existence. According to standard accounting and business processes and
8 procedures, start-up costs of any new company are included as an investment in the financial and
9 accounting records of the company being formed. The organization costs are charged to an asset
10 account which is shown only on the balance sheet of the company being created. The incurring of
11 the organization costs leads to the existence of the entity; consequently, the benefits derived from
12 these costs may be regarded as extending over the entire life of the new company; however,
13 present income tax rules do permit organization costs to be amortized over a period of five years
14 or more.

15
16 Ultimately, if a new company is successful, the costs should be recovered in the prices that they
17 charge customers for their services and the resulting earnings (if any) would typically flow back
18 to the owners either through dividends or an increase in the value of the organization created.

19 This procedure would be little different in substance than any of the other unregulated companies
20 that Ameren has created within the last few years, e.g., Ameren Energy, Ameren Energy

1 Marketing Company , Ameren Energy Generating Company, Ameren Energy Resources
2 Company, etc.

3
4 Q. ARE THE ALLIANCE COMPANIES AND MISO DISCUSSED IN THIS TESTIMONY
5 SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT COMPANIES?

6 A. Yes. The RTO entities discussed in this testimony are separate and independent companies. It's
7 my understanding that the **

8
9
10 ** While a major difference in the Alliance RTO was its
11 intention to be a for-profit limited liability corporation.

12
13 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S RECOMMENDATION ON THIS ISSUE?

14 A. The Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1003 states that the total
15 cancellation fee booked to the Missouri electric operations during the test period is \$11,322,536.
16 Public Counsel recommends that this amount not be allowed as an expense in the calculation of
17 the earnings sharing credit. It is more than likely that the cancellation fee will be refunded via
18 credits for services provided to the Alliance Companies by the MISO or refunded due to the
19 withdrawal of the Settlement Agreement because of the FERC's refusal to let the Alliance
20 Companies setup an independent RTO.

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 Regardless of whether the cancellation fees will be refunded or not, they represent new company
2 start-up costs which should have been, if the cancellation costs were determined to be prudent and
3 reasonable, recorded on the financial books and records of the Alliance Companies proposed
4 RTO. Given that the Alliance RTO was to have been partially owned either by the Ameren
5 Corporation, or an affiliated company, it is only reasonable that the costs would have been
6 reflected in the value of the Alliance RTO capital account which the Company would own.

VENICE POWER PLANT FIRE COSTS

1
2
3 Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

4 A. On or about August of the year 2000, the Company suffered a catastrophic fire at its Venice
5 Power Plant located in Venice, Illinois. The issue here is whether or not the test period costs the
6 Company incurred due to the fire should be treated as an expense in the determination of the
7 earnings sharing credit.

8
9 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S POSITION ON THIS ISSUE?

10 A. Public Counsel believes that the test period costs incurred should be netted against the insurance
11 recovery that the Company received for the fire. If the insurance recovery is not recognized, an
12 inappropriate imbalance occurs. The Company booked a portion of the fire costs in the test
13 period, but in reality the outlays were only temporary because it was reimbursed by insurance for
14 most of the expenditures in a period subsequent to the end of the test period.

15
16 Q. WHAT WAS THE AMOUNT OF THE TEST YEAR FIRE COSTS?

17 A. The Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1039 states that the Venice Power
18 Plant fire costs incurred during the test period totaled **

19
20 **

1 Q. DID THE COMPANY INCUR ADDITIONAL FIRE RELATED COSTS AFTER THE END OF
2 THE TEST YEAR?

3 A. Yes. Fire costs incurred subsequent to the end of the test period totaled,**
4
5

6 ** (response to OPC Data Request No. 1039)
7

8 Q. DID THE TOTAL COSTS INCURRED ALSO INCLUDE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH
9 PLANT IMPROVEMENTS?

10 A. Yes. It is my understanding that some costs associated with plant improvements are included in
11 the total fire costs identified by the Company.
12

13 Q. WHAT IS THE AMOUNT OF INSURANCE RECOVERY RECEIVED IN THE TEST YEAR?

14 A. Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1010b states that **
15

16 ** However, Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No.
17 1039 states the **
18

19 **
20

1 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S RECOMMENDATION FOR THIS ISSUE?

2 A. Public Counsel recommends that a pro-rata share of the insurance recovery be netted against the
3 fire costs expensed and capitalized to the books of record during the test period. To achieve this
4 goal, the Public Counsel calculated the percentages of the total fire costs (i.e., expensed and
5 capitalized) actually allocated to the Missouri electric operations during the test period and then
6 multiplied those percentages by the insurance recovery amount allocable to the Missouri electric
7 operations (the insurance recovery amount allocable to the Missouri electric operations was
8 calculated by multiplying the total insurance recovery amounts times the percentages of the total
9 fire costs actually allocated to the Missouri electric operations). The calculation produces the
10 insurance recovery amounts allocable to the Missouri electric operations for the test period and
11 those amounts represent the Public Counsel's recommended adjustments to the actual fire costs
12 the Company booked during the test period.

13
14 The following illustration will help clarify the development of the adjustments that I am
15 proposing:
16

17 **
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

**

Note: The total insurance allocable to Missouri electric operations was developed utilizing the AmerenUE allocation factors for the twelve months ended June 30, 2001.

The prior illustration shows that the Missouri electric operation's portion of the total fire costs booked to expense and capital accounts during the test period was ** ** and ** **, respectively. To maintain consistency and to match the fire costs with the costs recovery, it is the Public Counsel belief that the booked test period costs should be reduced

1 by a pro-rata share of the insurance recovery that the Company received from its policies on the
2 plant. The calculations in the illustration identify what Public Counsel believes is a reasonable
3 pro-rata share of the insurance recovery that is allocable to the Missouri electric operations.
4

5 It's the Public Counsel's recommendation that the Missouri electric operations test period expense
6 and capital accounts be reduced by ** ** and ** **, respectively.

7 Public Counsel believes that the proposed adjustments are extremely conservative given the fact
8 that a large portion of the total fire expenses claimed by the Company may be considered plant
9 improvements rather than actual Venice Power Plant fire costs.
10

11 Q. ARE PLANT IMPROVEMENTS NORMALLY SUBJECT TO A PORTION OF THE
12 INSURANCE RECOVERY FOR A FIRE?

13 A. In the Public Counsel's opinion plant improvements would not normally receive a portion of
14 insurance recovery related to a fire.
15

16 Q. HOW SHOULD THE INSURANCE RECOVERY RELATED TO PLANT RETIREMENT
17 SALVAGE BE TREATED?

18 A. It is the Public Counsel's recommendation that the insurance recovery associated with plant
19 retirement salvage costs should be booked as an increase in the accumulated depreciation reserve
20 for the plant that was retired. The basis for this recommendation is that the salvage costs would

1 have reduced the balance of the accumulated depreciation reserve account; therefore, since the
2 Company has recovered those expenditures, the reserve balance should be increased to account
3 for the recovery of the costs to remove the plant. Because the Company has not identified the
4 exact date that the salvage costs occurred, Public recommends that the test period accumulated
5 depreciation reserve account for the plant retired be increased by the total amount of the insurance
6 recovery applicable to the Missouri electric operations. The Public Counsel's recommended
7 increase, based on the insurance recovery for salvage multiplied by the demand allocation factor,
8 is ** **.

9
10 Q. HOW SHOULD THE INSURANCE RECOVERY RELATED TO LOST REVENUES BE
11 TREATED?

12 A. It is the Public Counsel's recommendation that the insurance recovery associated with lost
13 revenues should be booked as an increase to test period revenues in proportion to the revenues lost
14 during the test period. The basis for this recommendation is that a portion, if not all, of the
15 revenues lost have been recovered via insurance thus, the Company's test period revenues should
16 be made whole for the amount of the insurance payment received. Because the Company has not
17 identified the exact amount of the recovered revenues allocable to the Missouri electric operations
18 during test period, I have calculated a conservative pro-rata amount utilizing the same basic
19 calculations identified above for the expense insurance recovery. Public recommends that test

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 period revenues be increased by **
2 revenues.

** to account for the test period recovery of lost

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

LOBBYING COSTS

1
2
3 Q. WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

4 A. The issue is whether or not lobbying costs the Company incurred during the test period should be
5 treated as an expense in the determination of the earnings sharing credit.
6

7 Q. DID THE COMPANY REPRESENT TO THE PUBLIC COUNSEL THAT IT CHARGES ALL
8 LOBBYING COSTS BELOW THE LINE?

9 A. Yes. Public Counsel Data Request No. 1017 requested whether all lobbying costs, expenditures
10 and expenses incurred during the test period have been excluded from the regulated Missouri
11 electric operations. The Company's response stated:

12
13 The Company charges its lobbying costs and expenses to a below the line account.
14 Thus (sic) these costs and expenses are not charged to the Missouri jurisdictional
15 electric operating expenses.
16
17

18 Q. HOW DID THE COMPANY RESPOND TO THE MPSC STAFF'S REQUEST FOR
19 INFORMATION ON THIS ISSUE?

20 A. In its response to the MPSC Staff Data Request No. 42, the Company stated:

21
22 Labor on Service Requests A0387, A0388, and A0393 is charged to non-operating
23 expense account 426. Labor on Service Request A0633 is charged to Account 920.
24

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 Expenses other than Labor on Service Requests A0387, A0388, and A0393 is
2 charged to non-operating expense account 426. Expenses other than Labor on
3 Service Request A0633 is charged to A&G accounts 921-001, 021-002, 923-001,
4 and 930-239 along with non-operating expense account 426.
5
6

7 Q. WERE THE COMPANY'S RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COUNSEL DATA REQUEST NO. 1017
8 AND MPSC STAFF DATA REQUEST NO. 42 TRUE IN THEIR ENTIRETY?

9 A. No. The Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1027a subsequently identified
10 that during **
11
12
13

14
15
16
17
18 **
19
20

21 The Company also did not identify in its response to the Public Counsel data request or the MPSC
22 Staff data request the lobbying costs that it booked above the line for the **

23 ** nor did it identify in its response to the Public Counsel data
24 request that it booked lobbying costs above the line for ** ** activities.
25

1 Q. DOES THE COMPANY DISPUTE THE FACT THAT THE COSTS IT INCURRED TO
2 SPONSER OR PROMOTE LOBBYING IN **

3 ** ARE ACTUALLY LOBBYING COSTS?

4 A. Yes.

5
6 Q. DID THE PUBLIC COUNSEL REQUEST THAT THE COMPANY EXPLAIN WHY IT
7 BELIEVES MISSOURI RATEPAYERS OF THE REGULATED OPERATIONS SHOULD BE
8 REQUIRED TO REIMBURSE IT FOR LOBBYING/LEGISLATIVE COSTS IT INCURRED
9 TO CHAMPION THE MISSOURI ELECTRIC AND GENERATION "GENCO"
10 DEREGULATION BILLS?

11 A. Yes. Public Counsel Data Request No. 1038 requested that information. Company's response to
12 the data request stated:

13
14 Lobbying and Legislative costs are very different. Legislative costs are those costs
15 associated with the Company's need to be aware of and respond to legislation that
16 affects the Company, its customers, employees and shareholders. While lobbying
17 costs are recorded below the line, legislative costs should be included in the
18 Company's cost of service because they are ordinary and necessary business
19 expenses. Ameren, like any other company, must participate in, and respond to the
20 legislative process.

21
22 I assume the data request is referring to SB-455 and HB-676. SB-455 was filed by
23 Senate President Pro-Tem Peter Kinder and co-sponsored by former President Pro-
24 Tem John Scott, Majority Floor Leader Kenney and Sen. Chuck Gross. HB-676
25 was filed by Rep Carol Jean Mays. Neither bill was enacted into law.

26
27 The bills would have allowed large customers to choose their energy supplier(s).
28 Customer issue and competition typically lead to investment in generation in that

1 market, clearly providing benefits to residential customers. Benefits from
2 additional generation include reliability and more competitive prices. In addition,
3 the proposed legislation provided for a five year rate freeze protecting customers
4 from volatile energy prices like those in California.
5
6

7 Q. DOES THE PUBLIC COUNSEL BELIEVE THAT ELECTRIC DEREGULATION LOBBYING
8 ACTIVITIES AND COSTS ARE ANY DIFFERENT FROM OTHER COSTS THAT ARE
9 NORMALLY CLASSIFIED AS LOBBYING COSTS?

10 A. No. Public Counsel believes that the Company is attempting to create an artificial demarcation
11 line that would separate lobbying activities from activities incurred primarily to influence
12 proposed Missouri and Federal legislation. If Ameren has its way, it would have the Commission
13 believe that legislative activities it has participated in are distinct in character and in no way
14 resemble or represent lobbying. Public Counsel on the other hand would not deny that the
15 Company needs to be aware of activities and legislation moving through government that would
16 effect its operations; however, reading legislation and becoming actively involved in its passage
17 are separate matters indeed.

18
19 For example, the Company essentially admits that it responded to and attempted to influence the
20 passage SB-455 and HB-676. These pieces of legislation would have allowed the Company to
21 create an unregulated generation company. Something that the Public Counsel believes would
22 not have been in the best interests of the Company's Missouri ratepayers. Public Counsel does not
23 believe that ratepayers should be required to reimburse the Company for activities it engages in to

1 create an unregulated company that would be a detriment to the services they currently receive.

2 Company's attempt to influence the passage of the legislation is clearly a lobbying activity.

3
4 Q. WHAT IS THE STANDARD THAT THE COMMISSION UTILIZES TO DEFINE LOBBYING
5 COSTS?

6 A. This Commission has defined lobbying as, "an attempt to influence the decisions of regulators and
7 legislators in general." Re: Kansas City Power and Light Company, 24 Mo. P.S.C. (N.S.) 386,
8 400 (1981).

9
10 Q. WERE THE ACTIVITIES AND COSTS THE COMPANY INCURRED TO SPONSER OR
11 PROMOTE ELECTRIC AND GENERATION DEREGULATION AN ATTEMPT TO
12 INFLUENCE THE DECISIONS OF REGULATORS AND LEGISLATORS?

13 A. Yes, it's my understanding that the activities and costs the Company incurred for this issue were
14 done so to influence the decisions of regulators and legislators.

15
16 Q. HAS THIS COMMISSION DEFINED THE PARAMETERS FOR ALLOWING LOBBYING
17 COSTS TO BE INCLUDED IN A PUBLIC UTILITY'S RATES?

18 A. Yes. Re: Kansas City Power and Light Company, the Commission stated the following:

19
20 ...the mere fact that an activity might fall within the very broad general definition
21 of lobbying as used by Public Counsel should not necessarily mean that it is an

1 improper expense for ratemaking purposes. The question is one of benefit or lack
2 of benefit to the ratepayers. (Id.)
3
4

5 Q. HAS THE COMPANY PROVIDED A REASONABLE EXPLANATION OF THE BENEFIT
6 TO RATEPAYERS FOR THE LOBBYING COSTS INCURRED?

7 A. No. The MPSC Staff, in its Data Request No. 42, asked, "describe specifically what AmerenUE
8 and Missouri electric ratepayers received for each payment." The Company provided no response
9 to the question.
10

11 However, the Company did provide the following response to the OPC Data Request No. 1038
12 discussed earlier in this section:
13

14 The bills would have allowed large customers to choose their energy supplier(s).
15 Customer issue and competition typically lead to investment in generation in that
16 market, clearly providing benefits to residential customers. Benefits from
17 additional generation include reliability and more competitive prices. In addition,
18 the proposed legislation provided for a five year rate freeze protecting customers
19 from volatile energy prices like those in California.
20
21

22 Public Counsel believes that Company's explanation is not reasonable because it fails to
23 specifically identify the benefit the regulated customers of the Missouri electric operations receive
24 from the activities and costs of lobbying regulators and the Missouri Legislature. In addition, it is
25 nonsensical because it does not address why the regulated electric customers of the Company

1 should be required to reimburse the Company for the costs it incurs to promote the passage of
2 legislation that would allow it to create or develop new deregulated electric companies. If it is the
3 Company's intention to develop, in the future, new unregulated electric or generation companies,
4 then the costs to develop and undertake the operation of those companies should flow directly to
5 them as a start-up cost and not to the customers of the regulated electric operations who would
6 have no representation or stakeholder position in them.

7
8 Q. DOES THE RECONCILIATION PROCEDURE OF CASE NO. EM-96-149 REQUIRE THE
9 COMPANY TO EXCLUDE ALL LOBBYING COSTS FROM THE DETERMINATION OF
10 THE EARNINGS SHARING CREDIT?

11 A. Yes.

12
13 Q. IS IT THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S OPINION THAT THE COMPANY HAS FAILED TO
14 FOLLOW THE TERMS OF THE RECONCILIATION PROCEDURE?

15 A. Yes.

16
17 Q. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC COUNSEL'S RECOMMENDATION ON THIS ISSUE?

18 A. It's the Public Counsel recommendation that the Commission disallow as an expense all lobbying
19 costs that the Company booked to the Missouri electric jurisdictional operations during the test
20 period. Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 1027a states that the **

Direct Testimony of
Ted Robertson
Case No. EM-96-149
EARP II Year III

1 **** Public Counsel**

2 recommends that this amount not be allowed as an expense in the calculation of the earnings
3 sharing credit because the costs should have been recorded below the line for regulatory
4 accounting purposes.

5
6 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

7 A. Yes, it does.

**CASE PARTICIPATION
OF
TED ROBERTSON**

Company Name	Case No.
Missouri Public Service Company	GR-90-198
United Telephone Company of Missouri	TR-90-273
Choctaw Telephone Company	TR-91-86
Missouri Cities Water Company	WR-91-172
United Cities Gas Company	GR-91-249
St. Louis County Water Company	WR-91-361
Missouri Cities Water Company	WR-92-207
Imperial Utility Corporation	SR-92-290
Expanded Calling Scopes	TO-92-306
United Cities Gas Company	GR-93-47
Missouri Public Service Company	GR-93-172
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company	TO-93-192
Missouri-American Water Company	WR-93-212
Southwestern Bell Telephone Company	TC-93-224
Imperial Utility Corporation	SR-94-16
St. Joseph Light & Power Company	ER-94-163
Raytown Water Company	WR-94-211
Capital City Water Company	WR-94-297
Raytown Water Company	WR-94-300
St. Louis County Water Company	WR-95-145
United Cities Gas Company	GR-95-160
Missouri-American Water Company	WR-95-205
Laclede Gas Company	GR-96-193
Imperial Utility Corporation	SC-96-427
Missouri Gas Energy	GR-96-285
Union Electric Company	EO-96-14
Union Electric Company	EM-96-149
Missouri-American Water Company	WR-97-237
St. Louis County Water Company	WR-97-382
Union Electric Company	GR-97-393
Missouri Gas Energy	GR-98-140
Laclede Gas Company	GR-98-374
United Water Missouri Inc.	WR-99-326
Laclede Gas Company	GR-99-315
Missouri Gas Energy	GO-99-258
Missouri-American Water Company	WM-2000-222
Atmos Energy Corporation	WM-2000-312
UtiliCorp/St. Joseph Merger	EM-2000-292
UtiliCorp/Empire Merger	EM-2000-369
Union Electric Company	GR-2000-512
St. Louis County Water Company	WR-2000-844
Missouri Gas Energy	GR-2001-292
UtiliCorp United, Inc.	ER-2001-672