

Exhibit No.:  
Issues: Other  
Witness: Martin R. Cohen  
Sponsoring Party: State of Missouri  
Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony  
Case No.: ER-2008-0318

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

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF  
MARTIN R. COHEN**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**STATE OF MISSOURI**

August 28, 2008

**NP**

1 **Q. Please state your name and address.**

2 A. My name is Martin R. Cohen. I reside at 2633 W. Sunnyside Avenue, in Chicago,  
3 Illinois.

4 **Q. What is your position?**

5 A. I am the sole proprietor of Martin Roth Cohen and Associates, a public policy  
6 consulting firm also located at the above address.

7 **Q. What is your professional background?**

8 A. From 1985 to 2005 I was employed by the Citizens Utility Board (CUB), an  
9 organization created by the Illinois General Assembly to represent the interests of  
10 residential and small business customers of investor-owned utilities in matters  
11 pertaining to the regulation of electricity, natural gas, water, and telecommunications  
12 services. I served as CUB's Executive Director from 1991 to 2005. From 2002 to  
13 2005 I also served as an officer of the National Association of State Consumer  
14 Advocates. In September, 2005, I was appointed by Governor Rod Blagojevich to be  
15 Chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, the state utility regulatory agency,  
16 and I served in that capacity until November, 2005. I was appointed Director of  
17 Consumer Affairs by Governor Blagojevich in January, 2006, and served in that  
18 position through February, 2008. Martin Roth Cohen and Associates was formed in  
19 March, 2008.

20 **Q. Have you testified in other proceedings in Missouri?**

21 A. No. I have testified in two pending proceedings in Illinois, dockets 07-0566 and 07-  
22 0585. During my 14-year tenure as the head of the Citizens Utility Board I supervised

1 the development of expert testimony in dozens of proceedings, many of which  
2 implicated issues similar to those I am addressing here.

3 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

4 A. I address the request by AmerenUE (the Company) for imposition of a Fuel  
5 Adjustment Clause (FAC). I discuss general regulatory policies regarding rider  
6 treatment of utility costs as well as the specific circumstances of AmerenUE that  
7 pertain to its request. I respond to and/or reference portions of the Direct Testimony  
8 of Mr. Lyons, Mr. Voss, Mr. Finnell, Mr. Arora, Dr. Morin, Mr. O'Bryan and Mr.  
9 Neff.

10 **Q. Please describe your testimony and its conclusions.**

11 A. My testimony describes how traditional test year regulation protects the interests of  
12 consumers by providing utilities with positive incentives for cost minimization. I  
13 explain my concern about the singling out of one set of costs for special recovery and  
14 how that distorts a utility's decision making and puts consumers at risk. I lay out the  
15 criteria that should be used to determine whether or not a rate rider such as a Fuel  
16 Adjustment Clause is warranted. I discuss the many tools a utility can use to manage  
17 price risk and the lack of similar opportunities for most consumers. I examine current  
18 trends in fuel prices and show that prices have declined substantially in recent months.  
19 I describe how a new line item on bills would confuse consumers unless it is well  
20 explained.

1 I conclude that the FAC request of AmerenUE should be denied by the Commission. I  
2 recommend that, if the Commission decides to approve the request, certain of its  
3 terms and conditions be modified to achieve a better balance between the interests of  
4 the Company and its Missouri ratepayers.

5 **Q. How are utility rates determined?**

6 A. Utility rates are generally set at fixed levels based on the cost of service during a test  
7 year, as proven during a general rate case. These costs include all prudently incurred  
8 reasonable operating expenses, depreciation of plant and equipment, and taxes. A rate  
9 of return commensurate with the utility's cost of capital is applied to the "ratebase" –  
10 the net value of assets used to provide service after accumulated depreciation has been  
11 subtracted from original cost – and the sum of all the allowed expenses plus the return  
12 on ratebase becomes the revenue requirement. Rates are set at levels calculated to  
13 recover the amount of the revenue requirement.

14 **Q. What is a test year?**

15 A. A test year is a 12-month period, usually chosen by the utility, used to calculate all the  
16 aforementioned expenses and revenues for ratemaking purposes. In Missouri, a  
17 historic year is generally used as the test year in a general rate case. In this case,  
18 AmerenUE has chosen a 12-month period ending March 31, 2008. The Company has  
19 asked that this data be adjusted for known and measurable changes through  
20 September 30, 2008.

21 **Q. Why is it important that all revenues and expenses reviewed in a rate case be**  
22 **based on the same time period?**

1 A. The requirement that all data be compared over the same time period is necessary to  
2 avoid a mismatch of revenue and expenses which could allow rates to be set at a level  
3 that would provide an excessive return to the utility. Both costs and revenues are  
4 constantly in flux and neither can ever be predicted with certainty. Some costs may be  
5 going up, while others may be going down. Revenue may be higher or lower than  
6 forecast due to shifts in customer usage, abnormal weather, and other factors.

7 Test year regulation prevents any cost or revenue factor from being considered in  
8 isolation. The crucial purpose of defining a test year is to match income and expenses  
9 over a consistent period in order to make them comparable for the purpose of setting  
10 just and reasonable rates. Under test year principles, all costs and revenues must be  
11 looked at in their totality, without any being viewed in isolation or selected for special  
12 treatment.

13  
14 As long as the overall costs and revenues remain approximately in balance, the rates  
15 that are set based on the test year provide an opportunity for a utility to earn a  
16 reasonable return on its invested capital. The actual earnings of the utility rise and fall  
17 between rate cases as the balance between revenue and expenses ebbs and flows. If  
18 overall expenses grow faster than revenue such that the authorized rate of return  
19 becomes unachievable despite its best efforts, a utility may seek higher rates by filing  
20 a new rate request with the Commission. Conversely, if revenues outpace expenses  
21 sufficiently to allow excessive utility earnings, the Commission on its own motion or  
22 any party may attempt to prove that rates should be reduced.

1 **Q. Wouldn't it be preferable to allow rates to change automatically as utility**  
2 **expenses and revenues move up and down over time instead of going through the**  
3 **expense and effort of conducting periodic rate cases based on a test year?**

4 A. No, periodic rate cases are well worth the effort because automatic changes in rates  
5 would remove a primary incentive for a utility to operate efficiently. The fact that  
6 rates are fixed between rate cases means that a utility has the opportunity to maximize  
7 its earnings by improving its productivity. Although this concept is sometimes  
8 disparagingly referred to as "regulatory lag," the risks and opportunities borne by  
9 utilities operating under fixed rates is the primary motivation for them to optimize  
10 their performance. The test year concept and its corollary, regulatory lag, therefore  
11 serve to align the interests of utilities and consumers to minimize the cost of service to  
12 customers while allowing utilities to realize their financial potential.

13 **Q. Has AmerenUE made a request in its rate filing that would allow its rates to**  
14 **change without an examination of its overall expenses and revenue?**

15 A. Yes. The Company has requested the imposition of a "Fuel Adjustment Clause."

16 **Q. What is a Fuel Adjustment Clause?**

17 A. A Fuel Adjustment Clause (FAC) is a separate line item (commonly called a rider)  
18 added to customer bills for the purpose of altering rates between general rate cases to  
19 compensate the utility for fluctuations in the costs of fuel and purchased power,  
20 without regard to overall costs and revenues. The amount of the rider would  
21 eventually be reconciled and reviewed by regulators, but not until months or even  
22 years after being paid by customers. A FAC is a form of single issue ratemaking, in

1 which a particular expense is taken out of context and used by itself to justify changes  
2 in rates. Single issue ratemaking is a violation of the test year principles I described  
3 earlier.

4 **Q. Why is single issue ratemaking objectionable?**

5 A. Under traditional regulatory principles all costs are treated equally and measured  
6 against all revenue. To set rates based on one expense alone, while ignoring  
7 potentially offsetting changes in other costs and revenue puts customers at risk of  
8 paying too much for utility service. For example, an increase in the cost of fuel could  
9 be matched or exceeded by decreases in other costs, such as the cost of debt during a  
10 period of declining interest rates. Cost increases could be further offset by increased  
11 sales revenues. If fuel costs were singled out for special recovery, customers could  
12 pay higher rates at a time when the utility is already achieving higher than authorized  
13 returns. Such a result is neither just nor reasonable, but it is a potential outcome of  
14 single issue ratemaking.

15 **Q. Do you have concerns about the imposition of a Fuel Adjustment Clause on**  
16 **AmerenUE customers?**

17 A. Yes. In addition to violating test year principles and reducing incentives for efficient  
18 utility operation, the FAC would have the effect of shifting risk for fuel and purchased  
19 power costs from the utility to its customers. A utility has many ways to manage  
20 these risks, including the following:

- 1           •       A utility can protect its fuel portfolio through such activities as negotiating  
2                    long-term contracts, purchasing fuel in forward markets, and employing  
3                    financial hedging strategies.
- 4           •       A utility can engage in long-term planning and alter its resource mix in  
5                    response to changing conditions.
- 6           •       A utility can upgrade its facilities and improve its operations to cut costs  
7                    and save fuel.
- 8           •       A utility can strive to increase its sales revenues.
- 9           •       A utility can advocate rate designs that flatten load shapes and make the  
10                   native load less expensive to serve.

11   **Q. What can a residential or small volume commercial customer do to manage fuel**  
12   **and purchased power risks?**

13   A. Very little, if anything. In a state without retail competition, such as Missouri, a  
14   residential or small volume commercial customer can attempt to use less electricity in  
15   response to higher prices, but otherwise has no effective way to mitigate the effects of  
16   exposure to electricity-related markets.

17   **Q. Could a pass-through of fuel and purchased power costs distort the Company's**  
18   **decision making with regard to certain investments?**

19   A. Yes. Automatic and immediate recovery of fuel and purchased power costs would  
20   diminish AmerenUE's incentive to invest in technology or personnel that would  
21   reduce these costs, because the Company would achieve no return of or on such  
22   investment until the next general rate case. Meanwhile, the risk of increases in fuel or



1 purchased power costs would be borne by customers. Therefore, the Company would  
2 be less likely to make capital investments in facilities that use no fuel, such as wind  
3 turbines, or in improving the fuel efficiency at existing power plants. And it would  
4 have less reason to optimize its hedging strategies. The FAC would allow the  
5 Company to increase earnings by shifting its investment and operational priorities to  
6 projects that would improve its productivity in areas where all of the benefits flow to  
7 shareholders. The result would be that customers pay more for electricity even as the  
8 Company makes more money.

9 **Q. Wouldn't the required prudence review protect consumers?**

10 A. A prudence review is not designed to catch these sorts of subtle changes in  
11 management priorities, which would be very difficult to prove and to quantify for the  
12 purpose of a disallowance. In my experience I have rarely seen a prudence  
13 disallowance of energy costs for any reason and the distant threat of such a  
14 disallowance is certainly no substitute for the incentives that are at the core of  
15 traditional regulation.

16 **Q. Do you have additional concerns about the addition of a Fuel Adjustment Clause**  
17 **to customers' monthly bills?**

18 A. Yes. A Fuel Adjustment Clause serves to make fixed rates no longer fixed. Instead,  
19 under the recovery method proposed by AmerenUE, rates may change three times per  
20 year. A new element of unpredictability added to electric bills would not be regarded  
21 by consumers as a welcome development.

1 In addition, a new line item would cause misunderstanding and confusion for many  
2 customers. Mr. Lyons includes a facsimile sample residential billing statement  
3 attached to his Direct Testimony showing how a "postcard" bill would reflect the Fuel  
4 Adjustment Clause (Schedule MJL-E4, Attachment A-1). The bill, which is shown as  
5 having previously contained a single line item with total amount due, now includes a  
6 second line item called "Rider FAC Adjustment," which appears on the bill without  
7 explanation. Very few customers would understand what this means. In my  
8 experience, consumers often assume that extra line items on their utility bills are  
9 government imposed taxes and surcharges. This misapprehension is reinforced by the  
10 lack of information about the line-item charge on the bill.

11 **Q. Would the imposition of a FAC lead to fewer regulatory proceedings and**  
12 **decreased regulatory burdens on utilities, parties, and the Commission?**

13 A. No. Unfortunately, the opposite is more likely. Under the Commission's rules  
14 (detailed at 4 CSR 240-3.161), the FAC would require monthly filings and complex  
15 proceedings to true-up and audit the accounts and review the prudence of costs  
16 incurred. Periodic general rate cases would still be necessary as well, to look closely  
17 at all the other costs and revenue in order to maintain just and reasonable base rates.  
18 In fact, there might be more general rate cases than in the past, because the rules  
19 require that a utility with a Fuel Adjustment Clause file a new rate case within four  
20 years.

21 **Q. But wouldn't a Fuel Adjustment Clause reduce the need for another AmerenUE**  
22 **rate case in the near future?**

1 A. No. In fact, Mr. Voss testifies that the Sioux Plant scrubber is scheduled to come on  
2 line near the end of 2009, when “the rising costs we are facing will very likely  
3 necessitate another rate case.” (Direct Testimony of Thomas R. Voss, page 20, line  
4 20). As an order in the extant case is not likely to be issued until close to the  
5 suspension expiration date of March 1, 2009, a new rate case may commence within  
6 months of the completion of this one, regardless of outcome. The fact that the  
7 Company already intends to file another rate case on the heels of this one undermines  
8 its claim that a FAC is necessary at this juncture.

9 **Q. Are there circumstances under which a rider, such as a FAC, should be**  
10 **approved by the Commission, despite the fact that it is single issue ratemaking,**  
11 **violates test year principles, distorts incentives, exposes customers to charges**  
12 **that have not yet been reviewed by regulators, and may cause problems for**  
13 **consumers?**

14 A. Yes, there are certain extraordinary circumstances under which imposition of a rider  
15 can be justifiable. A rider should only be used when:

- 16 • the costs in question are large enough that significant under-recovery poses  
17 a threat to the financial health of the utility;
- 18 • the costs are beyond the ability of the utility to control or to mitigate  
19 sufficiently through prudent risk management; and
- 20 • the costs are volatile enough that they are unlikely to stay within an  
21 acceptable range over a reasonable time period..

22 In order for a rider to be justifiable, all three of the above conditions must be met.

1 **Q. Has the Commission employed standards like these in the past?**

2 A. Yes, these standards are similar to those which the Commission used in Docket ER-  
3 2007-002 to evaluate AmerenUE's earlier request for imposition of a Fuel Adjustment  
4 Clause. In that Order, the Commission determined that "a cost or revenue change  
5 should be tracked and recovered through a fuel adjustment clause only if that cost or  
6 revenue change is:

7 1. Substantial enough to have a material impact upon revenue requirements and  
8 the financial performance of the business between rate cases;

9 2. beyond the control of management, where utility management has little control  
10 over experienced revenue or cost levels; and

11 3. volatile in amount, causing significant swings in income and cash flows if not  
12 tracked."<sup>1</sup> (Case ER-2007-0002 Order, page 20)

13 **Q. What did the Commission decide with regard to the FAC issue in Docket ER-**  
14 **2007-0002?**

15 A. The Commission rejected the request by AmerenUE for imposition of a FAC,  
16 concluding that "AmerenUE's fuel and purchased power costs are not volatile enough  
17 [to] justify the implementation of a fuel adjustment clause at this time."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Report and Order, Case No. ER-2007-0002, "In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE's Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Company's Missouri Service Area."

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, page 26.

1 Of course, the Commission must make its decision in this docket based solely on the  
2 evidence presented in the extant case. However, the regulatory principles and  
3 standards that should apply to this issue have not changed.

4 **Q. Have the facts presented by AmerenUE changed sufficiently since the Order in**  
5 **Case No. ER-2007-0002 was issued on May 22, 2007 to warrant a different**  
6 **decision by the Commission in the extant case?**

7 A. No. A revenue requirement may be set in this general rate case that includes all  
8 known and measurable cost changes, including fuel and purchased power costs,  
9 through September, 2008. While the updated costs of fuel and purchased power may  
10 be large, they can be managed by AmerenUE as they have been before, without  
11 resorting to imposition of a rider.

12  
13 In Case ER-2007-0002, the Commission found that AmerenUE's fuel and purchased  
14 power costs met the "substantial enough" test, but did not find that these costs were  
15 sufficiently beyond control of management nor volatile enough to warrant rider  
16 treatment. As I will discuss further, neither the markets in question nor the capability  
17 of the Company to manage its risks have changed in such a way as to warrant a  
18 different decision by the Commission in this case.

19 **Q. Mr. Lyon testifies that most other vertically integrated utilities in non-**  
20 **restructured states have FACs in place. Is that a reason for the Commission to**  
21 **reverse its policy with regard to AmerenUE?**

1 A. No. The fact that other utilities, whether in Missouri or elsewhere, have seen FACs  
2 approved does not justify approval of such a rider for AmerenUE. The Company's  
3 particular costs and circumstances with regard to fuel and purchased power must be  
4 assessed by the Commission. My conclusion is that the facts do not warrant  
5 imposition of a Fuel Adjustment Clause at this time.

6 **Q. Mr. Lyons refers in his Direct Testimony to the Commission's approval of a FAC**  
7 **for Aquila in Case No. ER-2007-0004. Should this case have any bearing on the**  
8 **request of AmerenUE for a FAC?**

9 A. No. That the Commission approved a FAC for another Missouri utility provides no  
10 basis for approval of AmerenUE's request. Moreover, as the Commission noted in its  
11 order in ER-2007-0004, Aquila is heavily reliant on both gas-fired generation and  
12 purchased power. These facts make its situation dramatically different from  
13 AmerenUE, which as I will discuss, relies heavily on coal-fired generation and is a net  
14 exporter of power.

15 **Q. Which cost factor has the most significant effect on the Company's fuel costs?**

16 A. Mr. Voss testifies that more than 76% of AmerenUE's energy is generated from coal-  
17 fired plants (Voss Direct, p. 17, line 23). This makes the Company's fuel mix far  
18 more coal intensive than the national average of 49% coal, as reported by the Energy  
19 Information Administration in the "Annual Energy Outlook" for 2008.<sup>3</sup> As a  
20 relatively coal intensive utility, AmerenUE is less exposed than most of its peer  
21 companies to fluctuations in the price of natural gas and oil fuel.

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/aeo/electricity.html>

1 **Q. How much of the Company's fuel costs are coal-related?**

2 A. Mr. Neff testifies that the test year cost of delivered coal is approximately \$556  
3 million (Direct Testimony of Robert K. Neff, Page 3, line 10). This cost represents  
4 approximately 82% of fuel costs totaling approximately \$678 million prior to  
5 normalization, as testified to by Mr. Finnell (Direct Testimony of Timothy D. Finnell,  
6 Attachment A-2). The delivered cost of coal therefore represents the largest portion  
7 of the Company's gross fuel costs.

8 **Q. What are the most important factors influencing the delivered cost of coal?**

9 A. The two key factors determining delivered coal costs are the commodity cost of coal  
10 and the expense of transporting it by rail from Wyoming's Powder River Basin, where  
11 96% of AmerenUE's coal originates.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Lyons testifies that the cost of coal  
12 transportation represents \*\* [REDACTED] \*\* of the delivered price of coal (Lyons Direct, p. 18,  
13 line 11).

14 **Q. What has been the recent trend with respect to the Company's delivered cost of  
15 coal?**

16 A. Mr. Neff testifies that delivered costs of coal in the updated test year ending June 30,  
17 2008 are expected to be \$1.48 per million BTU, an increase of 12% over the delivered  
18 coal costs of \$1.32/million BTU since the last AmerenUE rate case (Neff Direct, page  
19 2, line 12). He further testifies that the spot price of 8800 PRB coal rose from \$11.20

---

<sup>4</sup> This number is calculated from the chart on page 4 of the Direct Testimony of Mr. Neff, which shows that all but 968,000 tons of the 23,231,000 tons used during the test year is PRB coal.

1 on November 1, 2007 to \$17.00 at the end of February, 2008 (Neff Direct, page 20,  
2 line14).

3 **Q. What is the present trend with respect to the cost of PRB coal?**

4 A. As reported by the Energy Information Administration, the spot price for that same  
5 PRB 8,800 BTU/lb coal was \$11.00 per ton as of late August, 2008<sup>5</sup>, a drop of about  
6 35% over the course of those five months.

7 **Q. What is the present trend with respect to coal transportation surcharge costs?**

8 A. Mr. Neff identifies the Energy Information Administration's On-Highway Diesel  
9 price as determinative of the amount of fuel surcharges charged by the railroads  
10 which transport the Company's coal (Neff Direct, page 13, line 17). This price has  
11 fallen from an average nationwide high of 4.723 dollars per gallon as of late May,  
12 2008, to 4.145 per gallon in late August<sup>6</sup>, which amounts to a drop of 12% in three  
13 months.

14 **Q. What is the present trend with regard to natural gas costs?**

15 A. The Henry Hub spot price, as traded on the New York Mercantile Exchange, has  
16 fallen from about \$12/MMBtu in late May, 2008, to about \$8/MMBtu in late August,  
17 a drop of 33%<sup>7</sup>.

18 **Q. Are these price trends you cite evidence of extreme volatility that would justify**  
19 **approval of a Fuel Adjustment Clause?**

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.eia.doe.gov/cneaf/coal/page/coalnews/coalmar.html#spot>

<sup>6</sup> [http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/oog/info/wohdp/diesel\\_detail\\_report\\_combined.asp](http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/oog/info/wohdp/diesel_detail_report_combined.asp)

<sup>7</sup> <http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/oog/info/ngw/ngupdate.asp>, EIA Natural Gas Weekly Update



1 A. No. I cite these recent trends to show that it is normal for these prices to move up and  
2 down over time.

3 **Q. Is it normal for all businesses to face fluctuations in their costs?**

4 A. Yes, all businesses, whether in regulated industries or not, face changes in the cost of  
5 inputs and must develop strategies to manage price risk. Most firms face markets in  
6 which they cannot successfully raise the prices of their own products in response to  
7 fluctuations in short term costs. Instead, they must address these costs through a  
8 combination of increased efficiency and effective hedging strategies.

9 **Q. Does AmerenUE have effective means to address fluctuations in coal market  
10 prices?**

11 A. Yes, the company maintains an extensive hedging program, as described by Mr. Neff.  
12 He testifies that **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\*** of coal purchases are hedged for 2009 and **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\*** are  
13 hedged for 2010. These numbers, assuming an equal amount of coal is purchased for  
14 each year, produce an average of **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\*** for the two-year period. More than  
15 **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\*** of coal purchases are already hedged through the end of 2010. The  
16 company, of course, can avail itself of the opportunity to modify its hedging strategies  
17 in response to changing conditions and prices.

18 **Q. Does AmerenUE also hedge its coal transportation costs?**

19 A. Yes, Mr. Neff testifies that the Company's coal transportation costs are hedged for  
20 2009 at **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\*** and for 2010 at **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\***. These numbers produce an average of  
21 **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\*** for the two-year period, a similar proportion to the coal purchase hedges.

22 **Q. Does the Company hedge its exposure to Diesel Fuel Surcharges?**

1 A. Yes, Mr. Neff testifies that **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\*** of the Diesel Fuel Surcharges are presently  
2 hedged **\*\*[REDACTED]\*\***. The Company may elect to expand this hedging program to  
3 reduce its future exposure to Diesel Fuel Surcharges.

4 **Q. Isn't AmerenUE exposed to volatility in the natural gas market?**

5 A. Yes, however the effect of natural gas prices on AmerenUE's total fuel costs is very  
6 small. Mr. Finnell testifies that gas combustion turbine generation for 2007 totaled  
7 889,692 MWh out of total generation of 50,310,199 MWh. Thus, CTG generation  
8 represents just 1.77% of the total energy output of AmerenUE, whereas natural gas  
9 fuels 21.5% of overall U.S. electricity production<sup>8</sup>. This is a key distinction between  
10 AmerenUE and most other utility companies that substantially reduces its exposure to  
11 high natural gas prices. And high natural gas prices tend to raise the market prices of  
12 electricity, which may increase the Company's revenue from off-system sales.

13 **Q. Isn't AmerenUE also exposed to volatility in the market price of purchased**  
14 **power?**

15 A. Yes, but because the Company both buys power and also sells it, its exposure is  
16 reduced. AmerenUE is a net seller of power, that is, its purchased power costs of \$54  
17 million are offset by off-system sales revenues of \$435 million (Supplemental Direct  
18 Testimony Timothy Finnell, page 3, line 10). While the effect of off-system  
19 transactions on net fuel costs is a function of when power is purchased, when it is  
20 sold, and the variable costs including fuel at those times, it is generally the case that,  
21 because natural gas plants are often at the margin and therefore tend to set market

---

<sup>8</sup> See: [http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/energy\\_in\\_brief/electricity.cfm](http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/energy_in_brief/electricity.cfm)

1 electricity prices, a coal-intensive generator will have opportunities for higher sales  
2 margins when natural gas prices are high. These margins would tend to reduce  
3 exposure to high purchased power costs and may be sufficient to partially offset fuel  
4 cost increases as well.

5 **Q. Mr. Cohen, do you agree with the Company's witnesses that fuel costs are likely**  
6 **to be increasing over time?**

7 A. I do not dispute that there has been an upward trend in fuel costs in recent years, and I  
8 agree that the long term trend in fuel costs may indeed be upward. But that likelihood  
9 is not justification for imposition of an FAC, which, as I have discussed, is only  
10 justifiable if short term costs are likely to be so volatile as to deny the Company an  
11 opportunity to earn a reasonable return. Only extreme fluctuation of costs that are  
12 beyond the utility's control and which cannot be effectively managed causes need for  
13 such a rider, not the magnitude or direction of overall cost trends. The Company's  
14 hedging program can sufficiently reduce its exposure to short-term market prices so as  
15 not to necessitate exposure of customers to a Fuel Adjustment Clause and all its  
16 attendant problems. Moreover, it is significant that the Company has requested that its  
17 base fuel price to be included in rates be updated to reflect changes as of September  
18 30, 2008, which would make rates fully trued up and reflective of all known and  
19 measurable costs at that time.

20 **Q. Have you reviewed Mr. Arora's testimony regarding his "uncertainty" analysis?**

21 A. Yes. Mr. Arora employs a probabilistic model, "RTSim," to project a wide range of  
22 possible outcomes for future costs of fuel and purchased power and to estimate the

1 chances of their occurrence. He finds that the model shows significant “uncertainty”  
2 regarding future unhedged costs for the period of 2009-2012. He finds that  
3 uncertainty increases the farther out into the future the costs are projected. He finds  
4 that historical “uncertainty factors” using data from 1999-2007 are generally higher  
5 than forward looking simulated annual uncertainty factors.

6 **Q. How do you respond to Mr. Arora’s analysis?**

7 A. It is reasonable that when uncertain variables are combined over time, the total  
8 “uncertainty factor” will tend to increase as you attempt to track it further into the  
9 future. That is the nature of uncertainty. The fact that the model shows relatively high  
10 uncertainty in recent years (for example, coal costs show a simulated annual  
11 uncertainty factor of \*\*          \*\* for 2012, compared to 31% for 1999-2007) indicates  
12 that AmerenUE has been able to manage its fuel and purchased power costs  
13 reasonably well during a period of high uncertainty and without a Fuel Adjustment  
14 Clause.

15 **Q. Please describe your understanding of how the FAC would work.**

16 A. As Mr. Lyons describes it in his Direct Testimony, the general rate case would  
17 establish a test year net base fuel cost level equaling the sum of all normalized fuel,  
18 purchased power and related costs, less the normalized off-system sales revenues.  
19 This amount would be divided by the normalized energy sales to derive a per  
20 kilowatt-hour rate that would be the net base fuel cost. Total net deviations from the  
21 net base fuel cost accrued over four-month periods would flow through in overlapping  
22 12-month recovery periods. The sum would appear on customer billing statements.

1 Annual true-ups would account for any over or under-collections. Any annual  
2 amounts in excess of 2.5% of gross jurisdictional revenues would be rolled over into  
3 subsequent years, as the law<sup>9</sup> requires.

4 **Q. Would the full amount of any deviation from net base fuel costs flow through the**  
5 **Fuel Adjustment Clause?**

6 A. No. AmerenUE proposes to flow through 95% of any deviations from net base fuel  
7 costs. The remaining 5% would be “eaten” by the Company if actual fuel costs are  
8 higher than net base fuel costs and “kept” by the Company if actual fuel costs are  
9 lower than net base fuel costs.

10 **Q. Would the adjustments include interest payments?**

11 A. Yes, the Company would accrue interest on any actual net fuel costs that are above  
12 the net base fuel costs, while customers would be paid interest in the opposite case. In  
13 either case, the interest rate would equal AmerenUE’s cost of short-term debt, which  
14 Mr. O’Bryan testifies is an annual rate of 3.384% (Supplemental Direct Testimony of  
15 Michael G. O’Bryan, page 4, line 18).

16 **Q. Is a typical customer’s cost of short term debt equal to the Company’s cost?**

17 A. No. The typical customer has a cost of short-term debt equal to the interest paid on  
18 credit card debt. The average rate for such debt is 12.26% as of August 13, 2008,  
19 according to Indexcreditcard.com, a credit card monitoring service, a rate that is  
20 almost four times as high as the Company’s cost of short-term debt. I am aware that  
21 under Section 386.266 of the Missouri Revised Statutes, the interest rate for rider true-

---

<sup>9</sup> Missouri Revised Statutes, Chapter 386, Section 386.266.

1 up is set at the utility's cost of short-term debt. However, the fact that this amount is  
2 not commensurate with customers' actual costs means that the Commission should be  
3 cautious when constructing a FAC mechanism.

4 **Q. Without a Fuel Adjustment Clause in place, customers would receive no credit**  
5 **whatsoever when actual costs are less than base fuels costs. Aren't consumers**  
6 **better off getting something than getting nothing?**

7 A. The possibility of a portion of fuel savings being passed through to customers by  
8 operation of the FAC is a potential benefit that is overwhelmed by the potential harm  
9 that accompanies wholesale transference of risk from the Company to its customers.

10 **Q. Do you agree that if the Commission were to approve a FAC, it should include**  
11 **less than full pass-through of deviations from net base fuel costs?**

12 A. Yes. I have testified earlier as to how the establishment of a FAC would remove a key  
13 incentive for the utility to minimize its fuel and purchased power costs, and why on  
14 balance it should not be approved by the Commission. But in the event a FAC is  
15 established, a mechanism should be included that attempts to provide incentives for  
16 optimized procurement and efficient operation. Indeed, the law authorizing the  
17 Commission to establish cost-tracking mechanisms such as a FAC specifically allows  
18 "features designed to provide the electrical corporation with incentives to improve the  
19 efficiency and cost-effectiveness of its fuel and purchased-power procurement  
20 activities." As I will discuss, however, the incentive mechanism proposed by the  
21 Company is inadequate to the task and unfair to consumers.

1 Q. Please describe your additional concerns with regard to the specific attributes of  
2 the FAC as proposed?

3 A. I am concerned that for AmerenUE to be responsible for absorbing just 5% of any  
4 costs it incurs above the net base fuel costs would provide insufficient incentive. For  
5 example, Mr. Lyons testifies that in 2009, the delivered cost of coal (the Company's  
6 largest fuel expense) is expected to increase by [REDACTED]\*\* (Lyons Direct, page  
7 10, line 18) over the test year. If the company is responsible for 5% of that amount, its  
8 costs at risk are limited to \*\*[REDACTED]\*\*. That amount represents \*\*[REDACTED]  
9 [REDACTED]\*\* of the \$334 million earnings recommendation of  
10 Dr. Morin, and just \*\*[REDACTED]  
11 [REDACTED]\*\* of the Total Revenue Requirement recommended by Mr. Weiss (Schedule  
12 GSW-E19). To put this in perspective, it is the equivalent of someone with an annual  
13 gross income of \$50,000 being at risk for about \*\*[REDACTED]\*\*.

14  
15 The Company argues that being "on the hook" for 100% of any costs above the net  
16 base fuel costs (as it is today and has been for a long time) will make it almost  
17 impossible to achieve its authorized rate of return. If the Commission agrees, then the  
18 question should be: What percentage below guaranteed 100% recovery will provide  
19 an opportunity for the company to achieve its authorized return while protecting  
20 consumers from all the negative consequences of a FAC that I have discussed earlier?  
21 Clearly this is a judgment call with no way to calculate the perfect number. But in my  
22 opinion, limiting the Company's maximum exposure to 5% of the increase over base

1 fuel costs does not leave enough of its “skin in the game” to counter the perverse  
2 incentive that the FAC would provide for the Company to skimp on investments and  
3 operational efficiencies that would reduce net fuel costs and focus its attention instead  
4 on other ways to grow earnings.

5 **Q. What is a perverse incentive?**

6 A. Because regulators cannot and should not attempt to manage the operations of  
7 utilities, effective regulation includes the application of incentive mechanisms  
8 designed to align the interests of customers with those of utility shareholders and  
9 reduce the cost of service. Such positive incentives reward a utility with higher  
10 earnings if it acts in the interests of customers. Earlier I described the positive  
11 incentives for cost minimization and efficiency that are inherent in fixed rates and the  
12 operation of regulatory lag. A perverse incentive occurs when a regulatory mechanism  
13 inadvertently serves to misalign the interests of customers and shareholders, and  
14 encourages the utility to increase its earnings at the expense of customers rather than  
15 through improved productivity.

16 **Q. Do you have recommendations for improving the FAC mechanism, should the**  
17 **Commission decide to approve a Fuel Adjustment Clause for AmerenUE?**

18 A. Yes. As I have explained, my core recommendation is that the Commission deny  
19 AmerenUE’s request to establish a Fuel Adjustment Clause at this time. However, if a  
20 FAC is approved, I would make the following recommendations:

- 21 1) Modify the incentive mechanism:



1 A. Make the Company retain responsibility for 20% of deviations from net  
2 base fuel costs, with customers covering 80%.

3 B. Alternatively, make the risk sharing feature asymmetrical. In the event  
4 that actual net fuel costs exceed the base rate, give the company  
5 responsibility for 85% of such deviation. In the event that actual net fuel  
6 costs are lower than base costs, leave the 95% customer portion as  
7 proposed.

- 8 2) Require the Company to provide regular information to consumers  
9 explaining the FAC. This information should accompany the billing  
10 statements, or be printed on the billing statement itself, as might be  
11 necessary in the case of a postcard bill.

12 **Q. Why should the incentive mechanism proposed by AmerenUE be altered?**

13 A. If the Commission sees fit to approve a FAC, it should seek to retain to the greatest  
14 extent possible the positive incentives inherent in traditional cost of service  
15 regulation. Today, the Company bears 100% of the risk of changes in fuel costs  
16 between rate cases. I have explained why I believe that is appropriate, given the  
17 nature of the costs and the tools the Company can employ to manage them. To  
18 reverse this policy overnight and transfer 95% of the fuel risk to consumers, who have  
19 no way to manage it, goes too far in the opposite direction. The Company ought to  
20 bear a portion of any costs above the net base fuel costs sufficient to provide it an  
21 opportunity to earn a reasonable return while leaving it with enough responsibility to  
22 eliminate the perverse incentives associated with a pass-through FAC.

1 Implementation of Recommendation 1(A) above would effectively remove 80% of  
2 the Company's "problem" while imposing less of a burden on consumers. Thus it  
3 would more fairly balance the interests of AmerenUE and its customers than the  
4 Company's proposal.

5  
6 My alternative recommendation 1(B) would leave AmerenUE with reasonable  
7 incentives to keep a lid on fuel and purchased power costs, while responding to the  
8 concern I described earlier that customers' cost of debt is generally far higher than the  
9 Company's. If the Commission approves the FAC, then it presumably agrees with the  
10 Company's contention that fuel and purchased power costs are beyond the  
11 Company's control. Allowing the Company to retain 5% of savings if the Company  
12 achieves costs lower than base rates and bear 15% of additional costs would provide a  
13 more effective incentive to AmerenUE to drive fuel and purchased power costs as low  
14 as possible, while not excessively rewarding it for being the beneficiary of falling  
15 market prices.

16 **Q. Mr. Cohen, does this conclude your Direct Testimony?**

17 A. Yes.

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

In the Matter of Union Electric Company, d/b/a )  
AmerenUE's Tariffs to Increase Its Annual ) **Case No. ER-2008-0318**  
Revenues for Electric Service ) **Tariff Nos. YE-2008-0605**

**AFFIDAVIT OF MARTIN COHEN**

**STATE OF ILLINOIS** )  
 )ss  
**COUNTY OF COOK** )

Martin R. Cohen, of lawful age, on his oath states: that he has participated in the preparation of the above Direct Testimony in question and answer form, consisting of 25 pages of Direct Testimony to be presented in the above case, that the answers in the above Direct Testimony were given by him; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth in such answers; and that such matters are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

*Martin R. Cohen*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Martin R. Cohen

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of August, 2008.

*Elena Huertas*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

My commission expires 12/13/10

