Exhibit No.: Issue: Witness: Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit: Case No.: Date Testimony Prepared:

Paperless Bill Credit; Error Corrections Erin M. Carle MoPSC Staff Rebuttal Testimony ER-2016-0179 January 20, 2017

## MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## **COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION**

# **AUDITING DEPARTMENT**

### **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

OF

# ERIN M. CARLE

## UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a Ameren Missouri

## CASE NO. ER-2016-0179

Jefferson City, Missouri January 2017

\*\* <u>Denotes Highly Confidential Information</u> \*\*

| 1<br>2  | TABLE OF CONTENTS                                |
|---------|--|
|         | TABLE OF CONTENTS                                |
| 3       | OF THE REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF                     |
| 4       | ERIN M. CARLE                                    |
| 5<br>6  | UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY,<br>d/b/a Ameren Missouri |
| 7       | CASE NO. ER-2016-0179                            |
| 8       | PAPERLESS BILL CREDIT                            |
| 9<br>10 | CORRECTIONS TO DIRECT FILING                     |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |
|         |  |

| 1      |  | <b>REBUTTAL TESTIMONY</b>   |  |
|--------|--|---|--|
| 2      |  | OF  |  |
| 3      |  | ERIN M. CARLE   |  |
| 4<br>5 |  | UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY<br>d/b/a Ameren Missouri                               |  |
| 6      |  | CASE NO. ER-2016-0179   |  |
| 7      | Q.   | Please state your name and business address.                                  |  |
| 8      | А.   | Erin M. Carle, 111 N. 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 105, St. Louis, MO 63101. |  |
| 9      | Q.   | By whom are you employed and in what capacity?                                |  |
| 10     | А.   | I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") as a   |  |
| 11     | Utility Regulatory Auditor in the Auditing Department of the Commission Staff Division.            |   |  |
| 12     | Q  | Are you the same Erin M. Carle who contributed to the Missouri Public Service |  |
| 13     | Commission Staff's ("Staff") Revenue Requirement Cost of Service Report ("Staff Report"),          |   |  |
| 14     | filed December 9, 2016?  |   |  |
| 15     | А.   | Yes, I am.  |  |
| 16     | Q.   | What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony in this proceeding?            |  |
| 17     | А.   | My rebuttal testimony will respond to the direct testimony of Ameren Missouri |  |
| 18     | ("Company")  | witness Tara K. Oglesby regarding the proposed paperless bill credit while    |  |
| 19     | supplying more information about the credit itself. I will also be explaining two corrections that |   |  |
| 20     | were discovered in my direct filed workpapers. The first one was on my Insurance Expense           |   |  |
| 21     | workpaper and the second one was on my Rents and Leases workpaper.                                 |   |  |
| 22     | PAPERLESS BILL CREDIT  |   |  |
| 23     | Q.   | Did Ameren Missouri include an adjustment as part of its direct filed case to |  |
| 24     | reduce revenu  | es to account for the proposed paperless bill credit?                         |  |

Page 1

Rebuttal Testimony of Erin M. Carle

- A. Yes. On workpaper LMM-WP-211, Ameren Missouri witness Laura Moore
   reflects an adjustment to reduce revenues by \$907,099.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Q. How did Ameren Missouri calculate the \$907,099 adjustment?

A. Per Ameren Missouri witness Tara Oglesby's direct testimony, the \$907,099 represents the cost savings Ameren Missouri receives for not having to issue a paper bill to 188,979 Missouri electric ratepayers that are currently enrolled in paperless billing. Each ratepayer enrolled in paperless billing would receive a \$0.40 per month credit on his/her electric bill. The \$0.40 credit is the difference in the cost to mail a paper bill and the cost to issue an e-bill.

Q. Is Ameren Missouri proposing in this case to reduce revenues any further beyond
the \$907,000 amount referenced above?

A. Staff is not sure. On the top of page 6 of her direct testimony, Ameren Missouri witness Tara Oglesby includes a chart that proposes to reduce revenues another \$580,320, which is currently not reflected in Ameren Missouri's overall cost of service direct filed case. This value represents the cost savings that Ameren Missouri would realize if an additional 120,000 ratepayers above the current level enrolled in paperless billing.

Q. How will Ameren Missouri's proposal affect the overall cost of service?

A. By reducing revenues, the overall cost of service would increase for all ratepayers. All ratepayers would be required to cover a portion of the credit as part of their tariffed rates each month, not just those ratepayers that are enjoying the benefit of the bill credit.

Q. If ordered by the Commission, with the credit included as a part of rates, would
all customers enrolled in paperless billing really receive the \$0.40 credit?

# Rebuttal Testimony of Erin M. Carle

A. No. Since the credit would be included as a part of the overall cost of service that is spread amongst all Ameren Missouri ratepayers, each ratepayer will be covering a portion of the increase in the revenue requirement due to this proposal as part of his/her monthly bill. Therefore, ratepayers enrolled in paperless billing most likely will not receive the full \$0.40 credit per month.

6

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Q. How would the paperless bill credit program work?

A. Per the response to Staff Data Request No. 525, Ameren Missouri would begin implementing the credit in August or September 2017 if authorized to do so by the Commission. All current paperless bill customers would receive the credit, and as customers newly enroll in paperless billing, they will also receive a \$0.40 credit on their bill for each month they are enrolled. There is currently no policy in place to limit the number of enrollees to receive the credit nor is there a timeline specifying the length of time the paperless bill credit program will last.

Q.

Would all Ameren Missouri ratepayers benefit from such a program?

A. No. There would be an overall increase in the revenue requirement mentioned above, as well as Ameren Missouri has many elderly and/or low income ratepayers that may not have the capability to take advantage of the paperless bill credit due to lack of internet access or ratepayers that live in rural areas with unreliable to no internet connectivity. In order to receive a paperless bill, the ratepayer would have to go online and log into their Ameren Missouri account. These ratepayers would be required to pay for credits as part of their overall Ameren Missouri utility bill that they would never be capable of receiving a benefit from.

Q. Has Ameren Missouri performed any type of analysis to determine the percentageof its ratepayers that would fall into the above groups?

# Rebuttal Testimony of Erin M. Carle

A. No. Per the response to Staff Data Request No. 524, Ameren Missouri has not performed an analysis showing which customers are capable or incapable of participating in the paperless bill program. Ameren Missouri tracks the number of accounts eligible for paperless bills based on the type of account, but does not take into consideration elderly and/or low income status or internet connection and availability.

Q. Staff witness Lisa Kremer discusses focus groups in her rebuttal testimony, addressing research that Ameren Missouri has performed on paperless billing. Has Staff made an adjustment to remove any focus group expenses related to making customers aware of the paperless billing option?

A. No. Staff has not made an adjustment to remove any focus group expenses related to paperless billing. Staff did make an adjustment to remove \$19,050 from cost of service that is related to social media advertising for the paperless bill credit, as provided in response to Staff Data Request No. 427.

Q. What is Staff's position in regards to Ameren Missouri's paperless bill credit proposal?

A. Staff has determined that the paperless bill credit, or reduction to revenue, should not be included in Ameren Missouri's cost of service calculation. When a ratepayer enrolls in paperless billing, Ameren Missouri is saving \$0.40 per paperless bill customer each month by not having to issue a paper bill to that customer. By providing a credit of \$0.40 each month to these ratepayers, Ameren Missouri is giving away any cost savings it would achieve by enrolling customers in paperless billing, while also increasing the revenue requirement that all customers must pay through a reduction in revenue which reflects the cost savings it is giving away. Ameren Missouri's proposal forces all ratepayers, regardless of ability to enroll in paperless

Rebuttal Testimony of Erin M. Carle

3

7

8

9

11

18

19

21

1 billing or not, to cover the revenue requirement effect of attempting to incent customers to enroll 2 in paperless billing.

# **CORRECTIONS TO DIRECT FILING**

4 Q. Please explain the correction that has been made to Staff's Insurance Expense 5 workpaper.

6 In its direct filed Insurance Expense workpaper, Staff made an adjustment to A. allocate 4% of the Workers' Compensation premium to gas; however, the amount supplied in response to Staff data request 363 had already been allocated. Essentially Staff calculated a removal for the gas allocation twice. Staff made a correction to include the 4% removed back into Ameren Missouri's cost of service. 10

> Q. What was the value of this correction?

12 The correction to insurance expense increases Staff's direct revenue requirement A. by \*\* \*\*. 13

14 Q. Please explain the correction that was made on Staff's Rents and Leases 15 workpaper.

16 A. In its Rents and Leases workpaper, Staff had a calculation error that affected the 17 test year value for IT leases.

What is the value of this correction? Q.

A. The correction to rents and leases increases Staff's direct revenue requirement by

- 20 \*\* \*\*.
  - Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony? Q.
- 22 Yes it does. A.

### **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 Increase Its Revenues for Electric Service

Case No. ER-2016-0179

### **AFFIDAVIT OF ERIN M. CARLE**

| STATE OF MISSOURI | ) |     |
|-------------------|---|-----|
|                   | ) | SS. |
| CITY OF ST. LOUIS | ) |     |

**COMES NOW ERIN M. CARLE** and on her oath declares that she is of sound mind and lawful age; that she contributed to the foregoing Rebuttal Testimony; and that the same is true and correct according to her best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

Ein M. Carle ERIN M. CARLE

#### JURAT

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the City of St. Louis, State of Missouri, at my office in St. Louis, on this  $\underline{/\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{H}}}$  day of January, 2017.

LISA M. FERGUSON Notary Public - Notary Seat State of Missouri Commissioned for St. Louis County My Commission Expires: June 08, 2020 Commission Number: 16631502

Notary Public Notary Public