Exhibit No.: 113

Issue(s):
Witness:
Sponsoring Party:

DSM/Energy Efficiency Daniel G. Laurent Union Electric Company Surrebuttal Testimony

Type of Exhibit: Surret
Case No.: ER-20
Date Testimony Prepared: April

ER-2011-0028 April 15, 2011

2011 Filed May 19, 2011 Data Center

Missouri Public
Service Commission

### MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Case No. ER-2011-0028

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY** 

**OF** 

DANIEL G. LAURENT

ON

**BEHALF OF** 

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a Ameren Missouri

St. Louis, Missouri April, 2011

Tatro Exhibit No. 1/3

Date 5/5/11 Reporter Ala

File No. ER - 2011-0028

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I</b> .	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY	1
III.	FUTURE OF AMEREN MISSOURI ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS	2
IV.	RECOVERY OF LIGHTING & APPLIANCE PROGRAM COSTS	6
VI.	SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY AND CONCLUSIONS	6

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY	
2		OF	
3		DANIEL G. LAURENT	
4		CASE NO. ER-2011-0028	
5		I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.	
7	A.	My name is Daniel G. Laurent. My business address is One Ameren Plaza,	
8	1901 Choute	au Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63103.	
9	Q.	By whom and in what capacity are you employed?	
10	A.	I am employed by Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri ("Ameren	
11	Missouri" or	"Company") as Manager Energy Efficiency and Demand Response.	
12	Q.	Are you the same Daniel G. Laurent who filed rebuttal testimony in this	
13	case?		
14	A.	Yes, I am.	
15		II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY	
16	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?	
17	A.	Ameren Missouri has successfully developed and implemented cost-effective	
18	energy effici	ency programs for the benefit of our residential and non-residential customers. The	
19	purpose of my testimony is to respond to portions of the rebuttal testimony of Missouri Public		
20	Service Commission Staff member John Rogers, to provide clarification on Ameren Missouri's		
21	energy efficiency expenditures and to briefly discuss future program design that coincides with		
22	the energy efficiency regulatory mechanisms described in Company witnesses Richard Mark and		
23	William Davis' testimony		

Q. Based on your experience implementing energy efficiency programs to date, what is your perspective on the future of customer-focused energy efficiency programs at Ameren Missouri?

A. Energy efficiency programs have provided a constructive opportunity for the Company's customers to manage their energy costs and to develop more sustainable methods of meeting their energy needs. Ameren Missouri would like to take advantage of the significant progress made by the Company, trade allies, retailers, contractors and customers and continue these efforts to capture the additional energy savings that energy efficiency offers. Approving the constructive regulatory policies and mechanisms outlined by Mr. Mark and Mr. Davis will allow Ameren Missouri to leverage the energy efficiency momentum that currently exists in the marketplace and capture additional energy savings.

## III. FUTURE OF AMEREN MISSOURI ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS

- Q. Mr. Rogers testifies that Ameren Missouri should be encouraged to file for approval of its energy efficiency programs, either under the upcoming MEEIA rules or under Section 393.1075, RSMo. Does Ameren Missouri agree?
- A. No. According to Ameren Missouri's legal department there is no reason that Ameren Missouri's programs cannot be approved as a part of this case, which would meet the requirement of the MEEIA statute that programs be approved by the Commission. The programs are proven and have demonstrated their ability to achieve cost effective energy savings at a lower cost than the Company had originally anticipated. The Company does not plan to significantly deviate from its current programs in the next couple of years.
- Q. How much did Ameren Missouri spend on its electric energy efficiency programs in 2010?

1	A. Ameren Missouri spent approximately \$23.3 million on electric energy efficiency
2	programs in 2010. That amount is different than the \$28 million indicated by Mr. Rogers in his
3	rebuttal testimony on page 4, lines 16-18. The \$28 million quoted by Mr. Rogers included
4	interest on the regulatory asset account and the Lighting and Appliance Program costs that were
5	deferred in Case No. ER-2010-0036.
6	Q. What electric energy efficiency programs are currently offered under the
7	Company's existing residential and business energy efficiency tariffs?
8	A. The existing residential electric energy efficiency programs include:
9	Lighting and Appliance Program
10	Social Marketing Distribution Program
11	Multi-Family Income Qualified Program
12	HVAC CheckMe! Program
13	Refrigerator Recycling Program
14	The existing business electric energy efficiency programs include:
15	Standard Incentive Program
16	Custom Incentive Program
17	New Construction Incentive Program
18	Retro-Commissioning Program
19	Q. Have the existing programs been evaluated by an independent Evaluation,
20	Measurement and Verification ("EM&V") contractor?

12

13

18

19

20

21

- 1 Yes. All of the programs have received at least one impact evaluation and one A. process evaluation, except for the Residential HVAC CheckMe! program. The HVAC 2 CheckMe! program was implemented July 28, 2010, and has not undergone an impact 3 4 The Cadmus Group conducted the independent evaluation on the residential 5 portfolio of programs and ADM Associates, Inc. conducted the independent evaluation on the The evaluations have all been sent to the regulatory 6 business portfolio of programs. 7 stakeholders.
- 8 Q. What information did the evaluations provide?
- A. The independent evaluations indicate that Ameren Missouri's portfolio of residential and business energy efficiency programs have achieved substantial, cost effective energy savings at a lower cost than the Company had originally anticipated.
  - Q. When do the electric energy efficiency services offered under the existing tariffs expire?
- 14 A. The electric energy efficiency services offered under the existing tariffs end on 15 September 30, 2011.
- Q. What energy efficiency programs is Ameren Missouri planning to provide after that date?
  - A. Ameren Missouri would like to continue its current slate of programs. If the constructive regulatory policies and mechanisms outlined by Mr. Mark and Mr. Davis are approved Ameren Missouri asks the Commission to extend the existing tariffs through 2013 and allow the Company to update the tariffs to reflect current market conditions. The Commission

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Impact evaluation is determining the energy and demand savings of the program. Process evaluation is assessing the effectiveness of the program implementation processes.

- should take this action, consistent with the language of the Missouri Energy Efficiency
- 2 Investment Act ("MEEIA") and with the suggestion of Mr. Rogers that the Company seek
- 3 approval under the MEEIA statute.
- 4 Q. Assuming the Commission approves the constructive energy efficiency
- 5 regulatory policies and mechanisms the Company proposed what are the Company's plans
- 6 for the future electric energy efficiency programs?
- A. As I stated, the Company's 2012 and 2013<sup>2</sup> electric energy efficiency programs
- 8 are a continuation of the existing programs, which have been proven successful. The programs
- 9 will be improved reflecting current market conditions and valuable input from the program
- 10 implementation and evaluation contractors. For example, due to the expected impact of the
- 11 Energy Independence and Security Act 2007 (EISA) standards, the business portfolio of
- 12 programs will begin utilizing fluorescent T-8s as the new lighting baseline and the residential
- portfolio of programs will begin to shift emphasis away from standard CFLs towards specialty
- bulbs. Although some details will change, the programs will remain essentially the same.
- Ameren Missouri proposes to file new program tariffs reflecting these improvements no
- later than August 15, 2011, with a proposed effective date of October 1, 2011, to ensure
- 17 continuity with the services offered under the existing program tariffs. The portfolio of
- programs will be designed to achieve energy savings of 136,524 MWhs in 2012 and 120,965
- 19 MWhs in 2013, consistent with the constructive regulatory policies and mechanisms proposed by
- 20 Mr. Mark and Mr. Davis. As it has done previously, the Company will have the programs
- 21 evaluated by an independent EM&V contractor on an annual basis and the evaluation reports will
- be forwarded to the regulatory stakeholders for review.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Additionally, the Company would continue the programs between September 30 through the end of 2011.

#### 1 IV. RECOVERY OF LIGHTING & APPLIANCE PROGRAM COSTS 2 O. Have any evaluation results for the Lighting & Appliance Program changed 3 since your rebuttal testimony? Upon further input from our evaluators, The Cadmus Group, the TRC for the 4 A. Lighting & Appliance Program has been recalculated and is 2.68 instead of 2.63. 5 6 Q. Does this change impact your argument that the costs of the Lighting & 7 Appliance Program should be recovered? 8 No, the TRC results are better than those I cited in my rebuttal testimony. A. 9 VI. SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY AND CONCLUSIONS 10 Q. Please summarize your testimony and conclusions. Ameren Missouri is seeking constructive regulatory treatment so that it may 11 A. 12 continue aggressively pursuing electric energy efficiency. The Company spent approximately 13 \$23.3 million on the portfolio of electric energy efficiency programs in 2010. Ameren Missouri 14 asks the Commission to approve: 15 The constructive regulatory policies and mechanisms outlined by 16 Company witnesses Richard Mark and Bill Davis; 17 The Company's request to extend the existing tariffed programs through 18 2013; and 19 The inclusion of the Residential Lighting & Appliance Program costs in 20 rates. 21 This will allow Ameren Missouri to leverage the energy efficiency momentum that currently 22 exists in the marketplace and capture additional significant energy savings in the future.

Surrebutal Testimony of Daniel G. Laurent

- 1 Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
- 2 A. Yes, it does.

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Union Electric Cond/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to F Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Company's Missouri Service Area.	le ) Case No. ER-2011-0028				
AFFIDAVIT OF DANIEL G. LAURENT					
STATE OF MISSOURI ) ) ss					
CITY OF ST. LOUIS )					
Daniel G. Laurent, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:					
1. My name is Daniel C	Laurent. I work in the City of St. Louis, Missouri,				
and I am employed by Union Electr	ic Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri as Manager,				
Energy Efficiency and Demand Res	ponse.				
	made a part hereof for all purposes is my Surrebuttal				
Testimony on behalf of Ameren Missouri consisting of pages, all of which have					
been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the above-referenced					
docket.					
3. I hereby swear and a	ffirm that my answers contained in the attached				
testimony to the questions therein p	ropounded are true and correct.				
	Daniel G. Laurent				
Subscribed and sworn to before me this $\frac{15}{100}$ day of April, 2011.					
	amande Tesdell				
My commission expires:					
	Amanda Tesdall - Notary Public Notary Seal, State of Missouri - St. Louis County Commission #07158967 My Commission Expires 7/29/2011				