

Sundermeyer, Susan

From: Dietrich, Natelle*
Sent: Wednesday, November 10, 2010 3:01 PM
To: Sundermeyer, Susan
Subject: FW: Data for Missouri potential study
Attachments: DataRequestBaseline1_AmerenMissouri.xls

From: Costenaro, Dave M [mailto:DCostenaro@ameren.com]
Sent: Friday, October 08, 2010 2:58 PM
To: Thomas.Franks@kema.com
Cc: Dietrich, Natelle*; Rogers, John; Suggett, Gaye L; Kidwell, Steve M; Tatro, Wendy K; Wood, Warren; Voytas, Rick A
Subject: RE: Data for Missouri potential study

Hello Tom,

Thanks for getting in touch with us about this. Please see our in-line responses below in red, as well as the attached spreadsheet.

Editorially, most of the inputs and process items that we've seen in your distributions to date are framework-type things that may be overwhelmed by the assumptions made at one critical analysis step: that of estimating achievable potential from the identified economic potential. In your kick-off presentation, you mentioned the possibility of using "incentive vs. participation" curves, but we haven't seen any workpapers yet. This is the project element that we would argue is most important to base on Missouri-specific sources rather than secondary sources. Considering the aggressive schedule of the project, it may be worthwhile to get this item into the discussions sooner rather than later.

Thanks,

Dave.

.....

DAVE COSTENARO
Senior DSM Planning Consultant
Corporate Planning
T 314.554.4550
E dcostenaro@ameren.com

.....

Ameren Services
1901 Chouteau Ave, M.C. 1400
St. Louis, MO 63103
www.amerenenergyefficiency.com

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Franks, Thomas G. [mailto:Thomas.Franks@kema.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2010 12:42 PM
To: Costenaro, Dave M; Suggett, Gaye L

11/17/2010

Cc: natelle.dietrich@psc.mo.gov

Subject: Data for Missouri potential study

Dear Dave,

The PSC has forwarded Ameren's comments, presented by Gaye Suggett, on the measure list we provided and will consider them. We will not reply directly, but will document adjustments made to the final measure files when delivered.

With regard to the potential study files you provided, it appears that the Global Energy Partners (GEP) analysis uses units of energy. Our tool uses savings percentage. In order to compare the two, we would need to know GEP's assumed baseline for each measure. We would find it most helpful to have the baseline for each measure, and the full set of measure characterization inputs, in a format that can be easily manipulated, such as MS Excel. This would increase the degree to which we could compare the two sets of data within the limited time available for this particular task. The measure characteristics we are seeking are as follows:

- Measure savings - annual, for both energy and capacity, broken out by building type in terms of unit savings or percentage;
- Measure cost - differentiating between incremental and full, in terms of unit costs;
- Measure life;
- Measure incentives broken out by sector, segment, and building type;
- Measure applicability - the fraction of a particular market segment where a specific technology at any efficiency level, may be applied;
- Technology saturation – a units based indicator (# of TV's per home) of the actual installation of a particular technology regardless of efficiency level;
- Not Complete – The percentage of saturation that is not currently high efficiency.
- Tabulated PDF versions of much of the information you are looking for can be found in Appendix B to our Potential Study, which I sent to you several weeks back (Sep 8, 2010) in the email titled: "RE: Missouri potential study info - Email 2 of 4 - PDFs of Potential Study Vol 4 appendices (A thru F)".
- Please also see baseline and segment information in the actual report, Volume 3, tables 3-3, 3-9, and 3-13. Delivered in the email titled: "RE: Missouri potential study info - Email 1 of 4 - PDFs of Potential Study report documents (4 volumes)"
- Unfortunately, the information requested above is not readily available in a spreadsheet format. It is largely embedded in Global Energy Partners' proprietary LoadMap model; inside numerous lookup tables, hidden/embedded databases, and cross-linked files. To lift the information out of it in such a way that would be timely and also preserve our contractual understanding with GEP would be a very significant effort, and may not fit into the scope and schedule of the project. We can definitely discuss further if appropriate.

We have found that some of these terms are not consistently defined across the industry. For example, penetration and saturation often seem to be used as equivalent, even within one document. Please let me know if any of the brief descriptions above require more explanation.

We are scheduled to deliver an interim memo on additional data, including the economic inputs to the model, on October 11. If Ameren can provide, once again in readily manipulated format, the following key inputs in advance of that memo it might reduce the number of questions you have regarding our memo:

- Utility discount rate: For the GEP study, we used 7.67% nominal (including 3% inflation). AKA 4.53% real
- Customer discount rate, by sector/segment if it varies; Same as utility discount rate
- Assumed inflation rate; 3% inflation
- Line loss rate;

	Energy	Peak Demand
Loss Factor-Residential	6.72%	7.57%
Loss Factor-Commercial	5.83%	6.84%
Loss Factor-Industrial	3.76%	4.80%
Loss Factor-Systemwide	5.24%	6.51%

- Definition of costing periods, including name, hours per year, and to which months each is applicable;
- Avoided energy costs by costing period, by year, for the forecast period (30 yr max);
Avoided costs are based on market projections which we treat as competition sensitive and highly confidential. Our attorney is following up with Steve Reed at Staff to discuss how best to provide this.
- Avoided demand costs by costing period, by year; and Avoided costs are based on market projections which we treat as competition sensitive and highly confidential. This would require further discussion. Our attorney is following up with Steve Reed at Staff to discuss how best to provide this.
- Customer energy and demand rates, by sector/segment and year. Please refer to our webpage where up-to-date rate tariffs are outlined with all applicable costs and schedules by rate class: <http://www.ameren.com/sites/ae/Rates/Pages/ratesAMUEMO.aspx>

Thank you in advance for your cooperation,

Best regards,

Tom

Tom Franks, Senior Consultant
KEMA, Inc.
67 South Bedford Street, Suite 201E
Burlington MA 01803
Tel: (781) 418-5751
Mobile: (802) 246-7937
Fax: (781) 273-0713
thomas.franks@kema.com

Please visit our website www.kema.com

This message may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the addressee, please return the message to its sender and delete it from your files.

The information contained in this message may be privileged and/or confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any

dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Note that any views or opinions presented in this message are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Ameren. All e-mails are subject to monitoring and archival. Finally, the recipient should check this message and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Ameren accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. If you have received this in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the message and deleting the material from any computer.

Ameren Corporation