Exhibit No.:

Issues: Class Cost of Service Witness: William M. Warwick
Sponsoring Party: Union Electric Company
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony

Case No.: ER-2007-0002

Date Testimony Prepared: February 27, 2007

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO. ER-2007-0002

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

WILLIAM M. WARWICK

ON

BEHALF OF

UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a AmerenUE

> St. Louis, Missouri February, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY UPDATES	.1
II.	RESPONSES TO OTHER PARTIES' REBUTTAL TESTIMONY	.3

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY
2		\mathbf{OF}
3		WILLIAM M. WARWICK
4		CASE NO. ER-2007-0002
5	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
6	A.	My name is William M. Warwick. My business address is One Ameren
7	Plaza, 1901	Chouteau Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63166-6149.
8	Q.	Are you the same William M. Warwick that filed Direct and Rebuttal
9	Testimony in	this proceeding?
10	A.	Yes, I am.
11	Q.	What is the purpose of your Surrebuttal Testimony in this proceeding?
12	A.	The purpose of my Surrebuttal Testimony is to present the Company's
13	updated clas	s cost of service (CCOS) study. I will also be responding to CCOS Rebuttal
14	Testimony o	f other parties. My failure to address a particular witness' position or argument
15	should not be	e construed as endorsement of that position or argument.
16		I. <u>CLASS COST OF SERVICE STUDY UPDATES</u>
17	Q.	Have you updated your CCOS study?
18	A.	Yes. I have updated Company's CCOS study to reflect modifications made
19	since the fili	ng of my Direct Testimony.
20	Q.	What are the modifications that you have made?
21	A.	First, I updated the Company's CCOS study presented in my Direct
22	Testimony to	o reflect the Company's updated Missouri jurisdictional cost of service rate base
23	and expense	items as prepared by Company witness Gary S. Weiss and discussed in his

19

20

21

- 1 Supplemental Direct Testimony. Secondly, I updated the class revenues in the Company's 2 CCOS study. This update reflects the proposed levels of such revenues, adjusted for weather and customer growth, as agreed to by Company and the Missouri Public Service Commission 3 4 Staff (Staff) at the time of the filing of this Surrebuttal Testimony. Deviations, if any, from 5 these class revenues should be minimal and should not greatly affect the CCOS results. 6 However, it should be noted that these revenues do not match those utilized in the previously 7 mentioned jurisdictional cost of service study prepared by Company witness Mr. Weiss. 8 Lastly, I have revised the class allocation of off-system sales revenues to reflect the 9 Company's revised position as described in my Rebuttal Testimony. The expense portion of 10 off-system sales revenues was credited to each class' Production Operations and 11 Maintenance expense by use of the Company's energy allocator. The margin portion was 12 allocated to the classes based on the Company's fixed production capacity allocators that 13 used the Average and Excess 4NCP method. 14 What are the summary results of the modifications you have made to the Q. 15 CCOS? 16 A. The summary results of the modifications to the CCOS are contained in 17 Schedule WMW-E4 and Schedule WMW-E5. Schedule WMW-E4 illustrates the results at 18 Company's present rate levels. Schedule WMW-E5 was derived from WMW-E4 and
 - from each customer class at the Company's proposed level of Missouri electric retail revenues.

reflects the class revenues necessary for the Company to realize equalized rates of return

1	II.	RESPONSES TO OTHER PARTIES' REBUTTAL TESTIMONY						
2	Q.	Do you agree with the Office of the Public Counsel (OPC) witness						
3	Ms. Meisenho	eimer's assertion that there is not a customer component of the primary						
4	portion of Ac	ecounts 364, 365, 366 and 367?						
5	A.	No. As stated in my Rebuttal Testimony it is a generally accepted industry						
6	practice to rec	eognize a customer component in the primary distribution Accounts 364, 365,						
7	366 and 367.	Staff, Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers (MIEC), The Commercial Group						
8	8 (TCG) and the Company all recognize a customer component of Accounts 364, 365, 366 ar							
9	367.							
10	Q.	What is Ms. Meisenheimer's basis for not including a customer						
11	component of	f the primary portion of these distribution accounts?						
12	A.	Ms. Meisenheimer's argument is that the National Association of Regulatory						
13	Utility Comm	issioners' (NARUC) Electric Utility Cost Allocation Manual (Manual), on						
14	page 20, defin	es customer-related costs as costs directly related to the number of customers						
15	and since prin	nary distribution facilities are typically shared facilities, Ms. Meisenheimer						
16	argues that the	ey cannot be directly related to the number of customers and thus do not satisfy						
17	NARUC's det	finition. Ms. Meisenheimer is unaware of or ignores NARUC's definitive						
18	recognition or	n page 90 of the NARUC Manual that there is a customer component to these						
19	accounts direc	ctly related to the number of customers on a utility's system.						

1	Q.	Q. Do you agree with Ms. Meisenheimer's criticisms of the zero-intercept						
2	method for	identifying and classifying a portion of distribution Accounts 364, 365, 366,						
3	and 367 as c	customer-related?						
4	A.	No. In fact, Ms. Meisenheimer's position is confusing. On one hand Ms.						
5	Meisenheimer is critical of the method, but on the other hand she offers no alternative and							
6	goes on to us	goes on to use the results of the Company's zero-intercept to assign a portion of these						
7	secondary di	stribution costs in her CCOS as customer-related.						
8	Q.	Is the zero-intercept method for classifying distribution costs as						
9	customer-re	elated appropriate and generally accepted industry practice.						
10	A.	Yes. The NARUC Manual describes two methods as being appropriate, the						
11	Minimum Si	ze Method and the Minimum-Intercept Method (zero-intercept). The Staff and						
12	MIEC used t	he results of the Company's zero-intercept analysis in their respective CCOS.						
13	TCG also ag	rees with the Company's use of such method.						
14	Q.	Do you have any comments with regard to Ms. Meisenheimer's claim that						
15	the use of re	eproduction costs, as opposed to booked costs, in pricing out distribution						
16	plant in the	zero-intercept analysis disproportionately assigns cost to Residential and						
17	Small Gener	ral Service customers?						
18	A.	The Company has reviewed its distribution study and corresponding expert						
19	witness testin	mony that was provided in a prior case. The distribution study correctly uses						
20	reproduction	costs in determining the customer-related portion of the total costs of each						
21	distribution a	account. The use of readily available reproduction costs to establish the relative						
22	relationships	of customer, secondary and primary investment does not result in any over-						
23	allocation of	these components but, rather, produces percentages to apply to book costs. The						

21

22

- 1 customer component ratio, or percentage, developed using reproduction costs is appropriately 2 applied to booked costs in classifying customer-related costs. 3 Q. Ms. Meisenheimer and AARP witness Mr. Binz have only included costs 4 associated with services, meters, meter installations and customer accounts expenses in 5 the Customer Charge component of the class' rates, do you agree? 6 No. The proposed Customer Charge for each rate class should be based upon A. 7 all costs determined to be customer-related costs for each class. 8 Q. Why is it important to include all customer-related costs in the 9 determination of the Customer Charge component? 10 A. Since customer-related costs do not vary with energy or demand associated 11 with the electrical consumption of the customers in each class, these costs should be 12 recovered through application of fixed monthly customer charges. Failure to apply this 13 method of cost recovery will result in rate structures which are unnecessarily unfair and 14 inequitable to customers within a rate class. Shifting fixed customer-related costs from a flat 15 monthly charge to a consumption-related charge, energy or demand, will result in above 16 average use customers subsidizing below average use customers. 17 Q. Do you agree with The Commercial Group witness Mr. Higgins' 18 recommendation that the Company be encouraged to develop data bases necessary to 19 directly assign distribution plant cost responsibility to its customer classes? 20
 - A. No. The Company does not currently have such capability and the acquisition and administration of such data bases is likely to be costly and burdensome, with the likelihood that it would provide no meaningful improvement to the results of the current

Surrebuttal Testimony of William M. Warwick

- 1 allocation method. As a consequence, acquiring and maintaining data at this level of
- 2 granularity would not likely be cost effective.
- **Q.** Does this conclude your Surrebuttal Testimony?
- 4 A. Yes, it does.

AmerenUE MISSOURI ELECTRIC OPERATIONS ELECTRIC COST OF SERVICE ALLOCATION STUDY 12 MONTHS ENDED JUNE 2006

TITLE: SUMMARY		MICCO		RESIDENTIAL		SMALL GEN SERV		LARGE GEN SERV		SMALL PRIMARY		LARGE PRIMARY		LARGE TRANS
		<u> </u>	<u>MISSOURI</u>	KE	SIDENTIAL	_	JEIN JERV	_	GEN SERV		KIIVIAKT	PRIMARY		IKANS
1	BASE REVENUE	\$	1,979,902	\$	850,079	\$	229,070	\$	425,106	\$	179,399	\$	160,595	\$ 135,652
2	OTHER REVENUE	\$	59,477	\$	31,010	\$	6,075	\$	10,126	\$	4,399	\$	4,717	\$ 3,148
3	LIGHTING REVENUE	\$	27,250	\$	13,610	\$	3,111	\$	5,153	\$	2,122	\$	2,027	\$ 1,227
4	SYSTEM REVENUE	\$	179,904	\$	82,881	\$	20,195	\$	35,702	\$	15,423	\$	14,946	\$ 10,757
5	RATE REVENUE VARIANCE	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$ (0)
6	TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	\$	2,246,533	\$	977,580	\$	258,452	\$	476,087	\$	201,343	\$	182,285	\$ 150,785
7														
8	TOTAL PROD, T&D, CUST, AND A&G EXP	\$	1,337,318	\$	588,427	\$	138,995	\$	261,855	\$	123,769	\$	124,910	\$ 99,362
9	TOTAL DEPR AND AMMORT EXPENSES	\$	387,631	\$	198,165	\$	44,891	\$	72,431	\$	28,932	\$	27,427	\$ 15,784
10	REAL ESTATE AND PROPERTY TAXES	\$	99,877	\$	51,018	\$	11,565	\$	18,670	\$	7,460	\$	7,076	\$ 4,089
11	INCOME TAXES	\$	231,344	\$	115,544	\$	26,414	\$	43,747	\$	18,013	\$	17,209	\$ 10,417
12	PAYROLL TAXES	\$	19,727	\$	9,409	\$	2,108	\$	3,677	\$	1,734	\$	1,703	\$ 1,096
13	FEDERAL EXCISE TAX	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -
14	REVENUE TAXES	\$		\$	-	\$		\$		\$	-	\$		\$
15														
16	TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	\$	2,075,897	\$	962,563	\$	223,973	\$	400,379	\$	179,909	\$	178,325	\$ 130,747
17														
18	NET OPERATING INCOME	\$	170,636	\$	15,017	\$	34,478	\$	75,708	\$	21,434	\$	3,960	\$ 20,038
19														
20	GROSS PLANT IN SERVICE	\$	11,262,122	\$	5,751,785	\$	1,303,776	\$	2,105,169	\$	841,610	\$	798,332	\$ 461,449
21	RESERVES FOR DEPRECIATION	\$	4,495,358	\$	2,334,228	\$	523,579	\$	833,607	\$	324,208	\$	306,470	\$ 173,266
22														
23	NET PLANT IN SERVICE	\$	6,766,764	\$	3,417,557	\$	780,197	\$	1,271,562	\$	517,403	\$	491,862	\$ 288,184
24														
25	MATERIALS & SUPPLIES - FUEL	\$	231,109	\$	84,649	\$	22,799	\$	49,912	\$	24,720	\$	25,461	\$ 23,568
26	MATERIALS & SUPPLIES -LOCAL	\$	21,786	\$	13,392	\$	2,737	\$	3,619	\$	1,078	\$	930	\$ 29
27	CASH WORKING CAPITAL	\$	(32,602)	\$	(14,345)	\$	(3,389)	\$	(6,384)	\$	(3,017)	\$	(3,045)	\$ (2,422)
28	CUSTOMER ADVANCES & DEPOSITS	\$	(14,952)	\$	(6,360)	\$	(4,488)	\$	(2,723)	\$	(861)	\$	(520)	\$ -
29	ACCUMULATED DEFERRED INCOME TAXES	\$	(1,117,530)	\$	(570,840)	\$	(129,398)	\$	(208,896)	\$	(83,475)	\$	(79,174)	\$ (45,748)
30														
31	TOTAL NET ORIGINAL COST RATE BASE	\$	5,854,574	\$	2,924,053	\$	668,458	\$	1,107,091	\$	455,848	\$	435,513	\$ 263,611
32							,							•
33	RATE OF RETURN		2.915%		0.514%		5.158%		6.838%		4.702%		0.909%	7.601%

AmerenUE MISSOURI ELECTRIC OPERATIONS EQUALIZED CLASS RATES OF RETURN ANALYSIS 12 MONTHS ENDED JUNE 2006

	TITLE: SUMMARY EQUAL ROR (\$000's)	QUAL ROR (\$000's) MISSO		RESIDENTIAL		SMALL GEN SERV		LARGE GEN SERV		SMALL PRIMARY		LARGE PRIMARY		LARGE <u>TRANS</u>	
1	BASE REVENUE	\$	2,329,256	\$	1,095,545	\$	253,832	\$	447,370	\$	198,307	\$	195,269	\$	138,933
2	OTHER REVENUE	\$	59,477	\$	31,010	\$	6,075	\$		\$	4,399	\$	4,717	\$	3,148
3	LIGHTING REVENUE	\$	27,250	\$	13,610	\$	3,111	\$	5,153	\$	2,122	\$	2,027	\$	1,227
4	SYSTEM REVENUE	\$	179,904	\$	82,881	\$	20,195	\$	35,702	\$	15,423	\$	14,946	\$	10,757
5	RATE REVENUE VARIANCE	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)	\$	(0)
6	TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE	\$	2,595,887	\$	1,223,046	\$	283,213	\$	498,351	\$	220,252	\$	216,960	\$	154,066
7															
8	TOTAL PROD., T&D, CUSTOMER, AND A&G E	\$	1,339,417	\$	590,250	\$	139,104	\$	261,894	\$	123,788	\$	125,019	\$	99,362
9	TOTAL DEPR. AND AMMOR. EXPENSES	\$	387,631	\$	198,165	\$	44,891	\$	72,431	\$	28,932	\$	27,427	\$	15,784
10	REAL ESTATE AND PROPERTY TAXES	\$	99,877	\$	51,018	\$	11,565	\$	18,670	\$	7,460	\$	7,076	\$	4,089
11	INCOME TAXES	\$	229,583	\$	114,665	\$	26,213	\$	43,414	\$	17,876	\$	17,078	\$	10,337
12	PAYROLL TAXES	\$	19,727	\$	9,409	\$	2,108	\$	3,677	\$	1,734	\$	1,703	\$	1,096
13	FEDERAL EXCISE TAX	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
14	REVENUE TAXES	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$		\$		\$		\$	
15															
16	TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	\$	2,076,235	\$	963,507	\$	223,881	\$	400,085	\$	179,791	\$	178,303	\$	130,668
17															
18	NET OPERATING INCOME	\$	519,652	\$	259,539	\$	59,332	\$	98,265	\$	40,461	\$	38,656	\$	23,398
19															
20	GROSS PLANT IN SERVICE	\$	11,262,122	\$	5,751,785		1,303,776		2,105,169	\$	841,610	\$	798,332	\$	461,449
21	RESERVES FOR DEPRECIATION	\$	4,495,358	\$	2,334,228	\$	523,579	\$	833,607	\$	324,208	\$	306,470	\$	173,266
22															
23	NET PLANT IN SERVICE	\$	6,766,764	\$	3,417,557	\$	780,197	\$	1,271,562	\$	517,403	\$	491,862	\$	288,184
24															
25	MATERIALS & SUPPLIES - FUEL	\$	231,109	\$	84,649	\$	22,799	\$	49,912	\$	24,720	\$	25,461	\$	23,568
26	MATERIALS & SUPPLIES -LOCAL	\$	21,786	\$	13,392	\$	2,737	\$	3,619	\$	1,078		930	\$	29
27	CASH WORKING CAPITAL	\$	(32,602)	\$	(14,345)	\$	(3,389)	\$	(6,384)	\$	(3,017)	\$	(3,045)	\$	(2,422)
28	CUSTOMER ADVANCES & DEPOSITS	\$	(14,952)	\$	(6,360)	\$	(4,488)		(2,723)	\$	(861)	\$	(520)	\$	-
29	ACCUMULATED DEFERRED INCOME TAXES	\$	(1,117,530)	\$	(570,840)	\$	(129,398)	\$	(208,896)	\$	(83,475)	\$	(79,174)	\$	(45,748)
30															
31	TOTAL NET ORIGINAL COST RATE BASE	\$	5,854,574	\$	2,924,053	\$	668,458	\$	1,107,091	\$	455,848	\$	435,513	\$	263,611
32															
33	RATE OF RETURN		8.876%		8.876%		8.876%		8.876%		8.876%		8.876%		8.876%

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

01 1111 011111 01 111111 01
In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Company's Missouri Service Area. Case No. ER-2007-0002 Case No. ER-2007-0002
AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM M. WARWICK
STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss
CITY OF ST. LOUIS)
William M. Warwick, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:
1. My name is William M. Warwick. I work in St. Louis, Missouri and I am
employed by Ameren Services Company as Managing Supervisor of Rate Engineering.
2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Surrebuttal
Testimony on behalf of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE consisting of 6 pages, and
Schedules WMW-E4 through WMW-E5, all of which have been prepared in written form for
introduction into evidence in the above-referenced docket.
3. I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to
the questions therein propounded are true and correct. **Milliam M. Warwick**
Subscribed and sworn to before me this day of February, 2007. Notary Public
My commission expires: May 19, 2008
CAROLYN J. WOODSTOCK Notary Public - Notary Seal STATE OF MISSOURI

Franklin County

My Commission Expires: May 19, 2008