

## Exhibit No. 56

Exhibit No.: 056  
Issue(s): Billing Units and Tariffs  
Witness: Kelsey Ann Klein  
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony  
Sponsoring Party: Union Electric Company  
File No.: GR-2021-0241  
Date Testimony Prepared: November 5, 2021

**MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**FILE NO. GR-2021-0241**

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**KELSEY ANN KLEIN**

**ON**

**BEHALF OF**

**UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY**

**D/B/A AMEREN MISSOURI**

**St. Louis, Missouri  
November 5, 2021**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	BILLING UNITS UPDATED THROUGH TRUE-UP PERIOD .....	1
III.	SPECIAL CONTRACTS.....	2

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**KELSEY ANN KLEIN**

**FILE NO. GR-2021-0241**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1

2 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

3 A. My name is Kelsey Ann Klein. My business address is One Ameren Plaza,  
4 1901 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.

5 **Q. Are you the same Kelsey Ann Klein that submitted direct and rebuttal**  
6 **testimony in this case?**

7 A. Yes, I am.

8 **Q. To what testimony or issues are you responding?**

9 A. I provide true-up summary revenues from our customer billing units. I also  
10 respond to Staff witness Joel McNutt's rebuttal testimony concerning documentation  
11 requirements for current and future Special Contract customers.

12 **II. BILLING UNITS UPDATED THROUGH TRUE-UP PERIOD**

13 **Q. How are the billing units adjusted for true-up?**

14 A. The billing units were updated to reflect the actual customer counts from May  
15 – September 2021 in our updated test year. Based on the actual customer counts for each rate  
16 class that were updated, there was an overall decrease in total normalized revenues of \$150,814  
17 as summarized in Table 1 on the following page.

1

**Table 1 – Billing Unit True-Up Revenue Summary**

<b>Rate Class</b>	<b>Updated Test Year Revenues thru April 2021</b>	<b>True-Up Normalized Revenues</b>	<b>Difference in Normalized Revenues</b>
<b>Residential</b>	\$45,542,921	\$45,478,115	(\$64,805)
<b>General Service</b>	\$15,607,858	\$15,548,270	(\$59,587)
<b>Interruptible Service</b>	\$401,190	\$369,245	(\$31,945)
<b>Standard Transport</b>	\$8,827,679	\$8,825,828	(\$1,851)
<b>Large Transport</b>	\$4,990,735	\$4,998,110	\$7,375
<b>Special Contract</b>	\$395,667	\$395,667	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$75,766,049</b>	<b>\$75,615,235</b>	<b>(\$150,814)</b>

2

**Q. In the Interruptible Service rate class, why were all of the Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company ("Panhandle Eastern") customers removed from the corresponding billing unit workpaper?**

3

4

5

**A.** Since May 2021, all three of the Panhandle Eastern Interruptible Service customers either switched to the General Service customer class or closed their account. The customer who ceased service had their usage through the updated test year removed. The two customers that switched to the General Service class had their usage through the updated test year moved to the General Service billing unit data. These changes are highlighted in both the General Service and Interruptible Service billing unit workpapers provided to Staff in response to Data Request MPSC 0285 TU.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

**III. SPECIAL CONTRACTS**

13

**Q. Does the Company support the increased customer qualifications for Special Contracts proposed by Staff?**

14

15

**A.** No. In accordance with the Company's commitment in the First Amended Nonunanimous Stipulation and Agreement from the Company's last gas rate review case, File

16

1 No. GR-2019-0077, the Company provides evidence of needs of Special Contracts in each  
2 future rate case, which is really confirmation that no material change in circumstances (such as  
3 the location of the nearby pipeline offering a viable bypass option) has occurred. The Company  
4 has existing, long-term contracts with each Special Contract customer that do not include any  
5 special documentation provisions. To try to impose such new documentation requirements as  
6 "a detailed estimate of the cost to bypass" be provided by the customer to the Company,  
7 especially when confirmation that no material change in circumstances has occurred is  
8 already being provided by the Company, is likely to trigger confusion by customers and  
9 customer concerns of arbitrary new requirements being forced upon them without any new  
10 benefit to them.

11 Each potential Special Contract customer has individual needs and requirements in  
12 order to agree to stay on our system, which are assessed when the Special Contract is  
13 initiated. It is in the Company's own interest to ensure customers, at a minimum, have  
14 marginal revenues that meet or exceed marginal costs. Customers' marginal costs are  
15 already evaluated and assessed on a case-by-case basis to ensure a negotiated, discounted  
16 rate agreed to is still marginally beneficial to the Company and its other customers if we  
17 were to keep the customer on the system. Staff does not allege that such marginal benefits  
18 to other customers disappear over time.

19 **Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?**

20 A. Yes, it does.

