

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of Union Electric Company)	
d/b/a Ameren Missouri's Tariffs to)	<u>Case No. ER-2012-0166</u>
Increase Its Annual Revenues for)	
Electric Service.)	

SECOND JOINT REVISED HEARING SCHEDULE

COMES NOW the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, by and through counsel, and on behalf of all the parties, tenders this *Revised Hearing Schedule*:

Thursday, September 27, 2012

Mark Exhibits
Entries of Appearance
Motions and Outstanding Matters
Opening Statements:
 Ameren Missouri
 Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission
 Office of the Public Counsel
 Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers
 Barnes-Jewish Hospital
 Natural Resources Defense Council, Renew Missouri and Sierra Club
 AARP & Consumers Council of Missouri
 Missouri Retailers Association
 Midwest Energy Consumer Group
 Missouri Department of Natural Resources
 KCP&L and KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company
 IBEW Locals 2, 309, 649, 702, 1439, 1455 and IUOE Local 148

- 1. Regulatory Policy and Economic Considerations**
- Baxter (Ameren Missouri) (Policy)
 - Reed (Ameren Missouri) (Regulatory & Economic Policy)
 - Weiss (Ameren Missouri) (Earned Returns)
 - Brosch (MIEC) (Regulatory Lag)
 - Brubaker (MIEC) (Policy)

Gorman (MIEC) (Earnings Attrition)¹
Kliethermes (Staff) (Economic Considerations)
Meisenheimer (OPC) (Economic Considerations)

Friday, September 28, 2012

2. Cash Working Capital

A. Should the collection lag be calculated using the CURST 246 Report for the 12-month period ending October 31, 2010, or the Accounts Receivable Breakdown Report?

B. Should the income tax calculation be removed from Ameren Missouri's cash working capital requirement?

C. What is the proper calculation of the expense lag for Gross Receipts tax?

Adams (Ameren Missouri)
Meyer (MIEC)
Boateng (Staff)

Monday, October 1, 2012

3. Plant-in-Service Accounting ("PISA")

Should the Commission grant Ameren Missouri accounting authority to accrue a return on invested capital and to defer depreciation for non-revenue-producing plant additions in a regulatory asset during the period between the date when those plant additions begin serving customers until the date they are reflected in rate base in a later rate case?

Barnes (Ameren Missouri)
Brosch (MIEC)
Gorman (MIEC)²
Cassidy (Staff)
Robertson (OPC)

4. Income Tax & ADIT & NOL

A. Should a portion of the \$2.8 Million income tax benefit realized on dividends paid on Ameren Corporation shares held in Employee Stock Ownership Plan ("ESOP") accounts be a reduction to Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?:

B. Should CWIP-related ADIT balances be included as an offset to rate base?

Warren (Ameren Missouri)

¹ Mr. Gorman is not available on this date. Cross-examination of Mr. Gorman will take place when the Return on Equity issue is tried.

² Mr. Gorman is not available on this date. Cross-examination of Mr. Gorman will take place when the Return on Equity issue is tried.

Brosch (MIEC)
Cassidy (Staff)

5. Rate Case Expense

What is the appropriate amount to include in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement for Rate Case Expense?

Barnes (Ameren Missouri)
Hanneken (Staff)
Robertson (OPC)

Tuesday, October 2, 2012

6. Property Tax Refund

What portion of the \$2.9 Million property tax refund for Tax Year 2010 received by Ameren Missouri should be credited to ratepayers. If an amount should be credited, over what period should the credit be amortized?

Weiss (Ameren Missouri)
Meyer (MIEC)
Carle (Staff)

7. Property Taxes

What property tax rates should be used in calculating the allowance for property tax expense to include in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?

Cudney (Ameren Missouri)
Meyer (MIEC)
Carle (Staff)

8. Renewable Energy Standard ("RES") Costs

A. Should the Commission order Ameren Missouri to include a base level of RES costs in permanent rates? If so, what is the base amount to include in permanent rates and should the level included in permanent rates in this case be netted against any future deferred expenditures that occur beyond the July 31, 2012, true-up date?

B. Over what period of years should the Commission order Ameren Missouri to amortize the deferred RES costs incurred from January 1, 2010, through July 31, 2012?

C. Should the Commission order Ameren Missouri to include the unamortized RES deferred regulatory asset balance from January 1, 2010, through July 31, 2012, in rate base?

Weiss (Ameren Missouri)
Meyer (MIEC)
Beck (Staff)
Cassidy (Staff)

Wednesday, October 3, 2012

9. Fuel Adjustment Clause ("FAC")

Should the sharing percentage in Ameren Missouri's fuel adjustment clause be changed to 85%/15%?

Mantle (Staff)

Barnes (Ameren Missouri)

Haro (Ameren Missouri)³

Neff (Ameren Missouri)

10. FAC Tariff

A. Should the MISO schedule costs that are allowed to flow through the FAC be listed on the FAC tariff sheets?

B. Should the definition of Factor PP in Ameren Missouri's FAC tariff be modified to state, "Only transmission costs incurred for the purchase or sale of electricity shall be included"?

C. Apart from transmission costs addressed in Item B, should Ameren Missouri be permitted to flow through the FAC MISO transmission charges and associated transmission revenues?

D. Should Ameren Missouri be permitted to flow through the FAC transmission charges associated with transmission service in a term in excess of one year?

E. If the Commission determines that the MISO transmission charges and revenues addressed in Item C should not be flowed through the FAC should they be deferred in a transmission cost and revenue tracker using the trued-up test year sum for those charges and revenues as the base against which changes will be tracked, with sums above the base to be booked to a regulatory asset and sums below the base to be booked to a regulatory liability? If so, how should the amortization of the regulatory asset or regulatory liability be handled?⁴

F. Should hedging gains and losses be excluded from Ameren Missouri's FAC except for hedging gains and losses associated with mitigating volatility in its fuel costs and allowances for SO₂ and NO_x emissions?

F. What other changes should be made to Ameren Missouri's FAC tariff?

Haro (Ameren Missouri)

Mantle (Staff)

³ Not all parties agree with this order of witnesses.

⁴ Staff and MIEC do not agree this is a proper issue for this case, and reserve the right to so argue as part of the outstanding motions portion of the evidentiary hearings.

Dauphinais (MIEC)

Thursday, October 4, 2012

11. Low Income Weatherization, including MDNR Program Administration Costs

A. Should the next evaluation of Ameren Missouri's low income weatherization program consider the effect on natural gas usage as well as electric usage by customers receiving weatherization?

B. How often should Ameren Missouri conduct evaluations of its low income weatherization program?

C. Can the Commission order Ameren Missouri to direct ratepayer funds to MDNR to cover costs of administering the Low Income Weatherization Program?

D. If so, should Ameren Missouri's low-income weatherization funding level be increased by \$120,000, with that amount to be authorized for reimbursement of MDNR's costs of providing weatherization program administration?

Bickford (MDNR)

Kind (OPC)

Warren (Staff)

Lovett (Ameren Missouri)⁵

Friday, October 5, 2012

12. Return on Common Equity ("ROE")

In consideration of all relevant factors, what is the appropriate value for Return on Equity ("ROE") that the Commission should use in setting Ameren Missouri's Rate of Return?

Hevert (Ameren Missouri)

Martin (Ameren Missouri) (Cost of Debt & Capital Structure)

Gorman (MIEC)

Murray (Staff)

Monday, October 8, 2012

State Holiday

⁵ Not all parties agree with this order of witnesses.

Tuesday, October 9, 2012

13. Coal Inventory, including Coal in Transit

Should the value of Ameren Missouri's coal inventory include the value of coal in transit?

Meyer (MIEC)
Hanneken (Staff)
Neff (Ameren Missouri)⁶

Wednesday, October 10, 2012

14. Severance Costs and VS 11

Should Ameren Missouri be authorized to amortize to rates over three years the approximately \$25.8 Million in costs incurred in its VS 11 voluntary employee separation program?

Barnes (Ameren Missouri)
Carver (MIEC)
Ferguson (Staff)

15. Storm Costs Tracker

Should the Commission establish a two-way storm restoration cost tracker whereby storm-related non-labor operations and maintenance ("O&M") expenses for major storms would be tracked against the base amount with expenditures below the base creating a regulatory liability and expenditures above the base creating a regulatory asset, in each case along with interest at the Company's AFUDC rate?

Barnes (Ameren Missouri)
Wakeman (Ameren Missouri)
Meyer (MIEC)
Boateng (Staff)

16. Storm Costs

A. If the Commission does not establish a two-way storm restoration costs tracker, then what is the appropriate amount to include in revenue requirement for major storm restoration costs?

B. If the Commission does establish a two-way storm restoration costs tracker, then what is the appropriate base level of major storm restoration Operations and Maintenance ("O&M") costs to include in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?

Barnes (Ameren Missouri)
Meyer (MIEC)

⁶ Not all parties agree with this order of witnesses.

Boateng (Staff)

17. Storm Assistance Revenues

A. If the Commission authorizes a two-way storm restoration cost tracker for Ameren Missouri, should storm assistance revenues received from other utilities be included in the tracker or annualized and normalized and included as an offset in revenue requirement?

B. What amount of storm assistance revenue should be included in the cost of service?

Wakeman (Ameren Missouri)

Meyer (MIEC)

Cassidy (Staff)

18. Vegetation Management and Infrastructure Inspection Tracker

A. Should the unamortized balance for the regulatory asset associated with the Vegetation Management and Infrastructure Inspection Tracker be adjusted for all amortization through December 31, 2012, and amortized over two years?

B. Should the vegetation management and infrastructure inspection trackers be continued?

Barnes (Ameren Missouri)

Wakeman (Ameren Missouri)

Meyer (MIEC)

Grissum (Staff)

Thursday, October 11, 2012

19. Class Cost of Service, Revenue Allocation and Rate Design

A. What methodology should the Commission use to allocate generation fixed costs among customer classes?

B. How should the non-fuel, non-labor components of production, operation and maintenance expense be classified and allocated?

C. How should any rate increase be collected from the several customer classes?

D. What should the Residential Class customer charge be?

E. What should the Small General Service Class customer charge be (single-phase and three-phase)?

F. Should the Commission address declining block rate design either by opening a separate docket on rate design or by ordering Ameren to address the rate design in its next general rate case?

Warwick (Ameren Missouri)

Cooper (Ameren Missouri)

Davis (Ameren Missouri)

Brubaker (MIEC)

Smith (MIEC/Noranda)

Morgan (NRDC)⁷

Scheperle (Staff)

Kind (OPC)

Meisenheimer (OPC)

Friday, October 12, 2012

If Needed

WHEREFORE, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission and the other parties hereto jointly tender this *Revised Hearing Schedule*.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Kevin A. Thompson

KEVIN A. THOMPSON

Missouri Bar Number 36288

Chief Staff Counsel

Missouri Public Service Commission

P.O. Box 360

Jefferson City, MO 65102

573-751-6514 (Voice)

573-526-6969 (Fax)

kevin.thompson@psc.mo.gov

Attorney for the Staff of the Missouri
Public Service Commission.

⁷ Ms. Morgan will stand cross examination early on September 28, 2012.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served, either electronically or by hand delivery or by First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on this **27th day of September, 2012**, to the parties of record as set out on the official Service List maintained by the Data Center of the Missouri Public Service Commission for this case.

s/ Kevin A. Thompson