

In the Matter of Ameren Missouri's 2017 Utility Resource Filing Pursuant to 4 CSR 240 – Chapter 22)) File No. EO-2018-0038

II. COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS WHEN REVIEWING ALLEGED DEFICIENCIES AND CONCERNS

4. Attached to this pleading as Exhibit A is Ameren Missouri's detailed response to each of the alleged deficiencies and concerns set forth in the parties' February 28th filings unless they have been otherwise resolved. This pleading will not go into the details of that response, but will address several overarching themes that the Company asks the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Commission") to keep in mind as it considers the alleged deficiencies and concerns.

5. First, the Commission should recognize that the purpose of the IRP rules is not to reach a "perfect" plan with the perfect answer to every potential question. Rather, as the Commission itself stated in one of the Company's previous IRP filings, "The purpose of the IRP filing is to demonstrate that [the Company] has engaged in a planning process that complies with the requirements of the rule."² More recently, the Commission has held that the focus of the rules should be "...on the planning process itself rather than on the particular plans or decisions that results from that process." As the content of Exhibit A demonstrates, Ameren Missouri has more than adequately complied with the requirements of the Commission's rules. Ameren Missouri's IRP filing reflects a thorough and robust analysis which should be found by the Commission to demonstrate compliance with the IRP rules.

6. Secondly, the Commission must weed out the alleged deficiencies that are nothing more than a party's view of how some aspect should be valued or how some analysis should be conducted, as opposed to a deficiency in the Company's planning process. Different parties will

² File No. EO-2007-0409, *Final Order Regarding AmerenUE's 2008 Integrated Resource Plan*, February 29, 2009, p. 1.

view the planning process differently. If the Company did not undertake some required analysis, there is no doubt that would be a deficiency. However, if the alleged deficiency is that Ameren Missouri should have used a different value for a particular aspect of its analysis, then it is not a deficiency. It is a difference of opinion. With the diversity of parties (and their associated agendas) involved in Ameren Missouri's IRP process, it is likely that there could not be an IRP which could gain 100% agreement. The appropriate question, as stated above, is whether the Company engaged in a planning process that complies with the requirements of the rules.

7. The third concept the Company suggests that the Commission consider is one of a practical nature. Please presume for a moment that Ameren Missouri's filing contains a deficiency. Before ordering Ameren Missouri to redo its analysis, the Commission should ask whether the change being proposed would change the Company's selection of its Preferred Resource Plan and, perhaps most importantly, whether it would change the Company's Implementation Plan (which is the next three years, until the Company files a new IRP). IRP filings under the Commission's rules represent a snapshot in time. There will always be an input that could be updated, but if re-running the analysis is not going to result in a change to the Preferred Plan selection or to the Company's Implementation Plan, then it does not make sense for the Commission to order the Company to spend its time and resources re-working that aspect of the IRP filing.

8. Additionally, the Commission's revised IRP rules contemplate an update process, set forth in 4 CSR 240-22.080(6), including annual updates. This addition to the IRP rules obviates the need for the Commission to order the Company to update its assumptions on an ad hoc basis, as the Commission has already created a process whereby this must regularly occur.

9. Finally, filed current with this pleading is a Joint Filing between all parties who filed comments on February 28th, which resolves the vast majority of issues raised. While there are remaining concerns, none of them rise to a level that would make the Company's IRP analysis flawed. Accordingly, under 4 CSR 240-22.080(17), Ameren Missouri requests that the Commission acknowledge its Preferred Resource Plan as reasonable at this time.

WHEREFORE, Ameren Missouri asks the Commission to find that its September 25, 2017, IRP filing complies with the requirements of 4 CSR 240-22, and acknowledge the Company's Preferred Resource Plan as reasonable at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY,
d/b/a AMEREN MISSOURI

/s/ Wendy K. Tatro

Wendy K. Tatro, #60261
Director & Assistant General Counsel 1901
Chouteau Avenue
P.O. Box 66149, MC-1310 St.
Louis, MO 63166-6149
(314) 554-3484 (Telephone)
(314) 554-4014 (Facsimile)
AmerenMOService@ameren.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Ameren Missouri Response to Alleged Deficiencies and Concerns was served on all parties of record via electronic mail (e-mail) on this 30th day of April, 2018.

/s/ Wendy K. Tatro
Wendy K. Tatro