Exhibit No.: - 3 Issues:	Class Cost of Service
FILED Witness: Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit:	Lena M. Mantle
MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMN	MISSION
UTILITY OPERATIONS DIVISI	ION
REBUTTAL TESTIMONY	
OF	
LENA M. MANTLE	
UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY o	d/b/a
AMERENUE	
CASE NO. ER-2007-0002	
Jefferson City, Missouri February, 2007	
	<u>Staff_cultibil wa 220</u> ata <u>3/12/17</u> Casa No. <u>2202</u> -000 eporter

- -- -

•

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Union Electric Company) d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File) Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric) Service Provided to Customers in the) Company's Missouri Service Area.)

Case No. ER-2007-0002

AFFIDAVIT OF LENA M. MANTLE

STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss COUNTY OF COLE)

Lena M. Mantle, of lawful age, on her oath states: that she has participated in the preparation of the following Rebuttal Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of 4 pages of Rebuttal Testimony to be presented in the above case, that the answers in the following Rebuttal Testimony were given by her; that she has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true to the best of her knowledge and belief.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this $2^{n\alpha}$ day of February, 2007



SUSAN L. SUNDERMEYER My Commission Expires September 21, 2010 Callaway County Commission #06942086

My commission expires $\frac{g-2}{-10}$

1	REBUTTAL TESTIMONY	
2	OF	
4 5	LENA M. MANTLE	
6 7	UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a	
8 9	AMERENUE	
10 11	CASE NO. ER-2007-0002	
12 13	Q. Please state your name and business address.	
14	A. My name is Lena M. Mantle and my business address is Missouri Public	
15	Service Commission, P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.	
16	Q. Are you the same Lena M. Mantle who has filed prepared direct testimony in	
17	this case?	
18	A. Yes, I am. I also filed rebuttal testimony in this case on January 31, 2007	
19	regarding Demand-Side Management goals for Union Electric Company d/b/a	
20	AmerenUE (AmerenUE) and its weatherization program.	
21	Q. Would you summarize this rebuttal testimony?	
22	A. AmerenUE witness Robert J. Mill submitted direct testimony regarding the	
23	Voluntary Green Program (VGP) and presented the proposed tariff sheet which describes	
24	the program. (Mill direct, pg. 13-14) Staff supports cost-effective renewable energy.	
25	5 However, Staff does not agree that AmerenUE providing a way for customers to purchase	
26	6 Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) is where AmerenUE should be expending its	
27	efforts to include renewables in its portfolio of resources. Staff believes that	
28	AmerenUE's show a much tangible support of renewables such as development of a wind	
29	farm or biomass generation plant.	

_

1

Rebuttal Testimony of Lena M. Mantle

Q. What is a REC?

A. According to Mr. Mill, "A REC is defined as the environmentally beneficial component of renewable energy and is equivalent to 1,000 kWh." (Mill direct, pg 13, ln. 6-8) In other words, a renewable energy provider (e.g., wind farm, biomass plant) is credited with one REC or green tag for each 1,000 kilowatt hours (kWh) of electricity it produces. As the renewable energy MWh is created, there is an accompanying REC which can be sold on the open market. Several organizations attempt to ensure that RECs are actually created, correctly tracked, verified and not double counted.

9 Q. Do you recommend that the Missouri Public Service Commission 10 (Commission) approve the VGP?

- A. No.
- 12

11

1

Q. Why shouldn't the Commission approve the VGP?

13 A. RECs are a market mechanism that represent the environmental benefits 14 associated with generating electricity from renewable energy resources. Staff has no 15 problem with the REC market but it is Staff's position that if AmerenUE is serious about 16 the development and integration of renewable power into its resource portfolio, it should 17 be spending its resources on developing renewable power, not selling RECs. In its recent resource plan filing, AmerenUE only analyzed a minimal amount of wind resources and 18 then restricted the generation of the wind resources to its service territory in Missouri. 19 20 Given these constraints, it is not surprising that wind resources were not shown to be cost 21 effective resources. Even with this limited analysis, wind was analyzed more than any 22 other renewable resource even though Staff is aware of a St. Louis metro area landfill that has had numerous communications with AmerenUE attempting to build a relationship 23

Rebuttal Testimony of Lena M. Mantle

that could result in construction of a power plant that would use presently available
 landfill gas as its fuel source.

In addition, Staff thinks that it would be likely for there to be serious confusion on the part of customers purchasing a REC to believe that when they purchase a REC, they are purchasing renewable energy.

6

Q. If a REC is purchased, is it the same as purchasing renewable energy?

A. No. Purchasing a REC is a method of supporting renewables. It is not the same as purchasing renewables. The renewable power that the REC is associated with may be generated in another state. It may have already been generated or it may be generated anytime in the next year. Purchasing a REC is not the same as purchasing renewable energy.

12 An analogous example would be if McDonald's sells "hamburger credits," can 13 someone who buys one of the credits satisfy his or her hunger with the hamburger credit? 14 The only way to satisfy hunger is to purchase the cheeseburger and consume it. Whoever 15 purchases a cheeseburger credit will just be supporting cheeseburgers. There is nothing 16 wrong with this as long as the goal of the purchaser was to support hamburgers not to 17 meet his or her actual needs. In the same way the purchase of a REC does not mean that the consumer is receiving renewable power. It simply means that the consumer is 18 19 supporting renewable power.

20

Q. Is this type of program offered elsewhere?

A. Yes, this type of program is offered nationwide. While there are utilities that have programs that offer RECs to their customers, RECs are also available for purchase without a sponsoring utility, i.e., supporting renewable energy through the purchase of

3

Rebuttal Testimony of Lena M. Mantle

REC can easily be done regardless of whether it is a part of an electric utility program.
 There are web sites that anyone can go to and purchase RECs.

Q. So is Staff against the purchase of RECs?

A. No. It is one tool that encourages the development of renewable energy.
However, Staff does not believe that AmerenUE should offer the program. RECs are
available to AmerenUE's customers even if AmerenUE does not offer the VGP. I do
recognize that many of AmerenUE's customers do not know about RECs and that
publicity and support from AmerenUE through such a program would likely result in
more customers buying RECs. However, the potential for customer confusion is great.

If AmerenUE wants to support renewable energy through a program of this type,
then AmerenUE might suggest that Ameren Corporation offer this product to through an
unregulated subsidiary.

13

3

Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

A. This concludes my testimony for the class cost-of-service and rate design
rebuttal filing of this case.