

# Chapter 10 - Appendix A

## Preferred Plan Selection Scorecard<sup>1</sup>

Ameren Missouri 2014 IRP Preferred Plan Selection Scorecard							
Planning Objectives, Weights and Measures							
	Category	Environmental/ Renewable/ Resource Diversity	Financial/ Regulatory	Customer Satisfaction	Economic Development	Cost	Overall Assessment
Plan	Category Weight	20%	20%	20%	10%	30%	100%
R	600MW CC in 2034, MAP, Balanced	3	4	4	4	5	4.10
I	600MW CC in 2034, RAP, Balanced	3	5	5	2	4	4.00
E	800MW Wind in 2034, 352MW SC in 2034, 600MW CC in 2034, RAP	3	4	5	2	4	3.80
G	600MW CC in 2034, MAP	2	4	4	3	5	3.80
A	600MW CC in 2034, RAP	2	5	4	2	4	3.60
C	704MW SC in 2034, RAP	1	5	4	1	5	3.60
S	600MW CC in 2034, MAP EE Only	2	4	3	3	5	3.60
H	169MW Nuke in 2034, 600MW CC in 2034, RAP, Balanced	4	3	4	3	3	3.40
F	1200MW CC in 2034, RAP EE Only	2	4	3	2	4	3.20
D	600MW Pumped Hydro in 2034, RAP	2	4	4	2	3	3.10
Q	169MW Nuke in 2034, MAP, Balanced	3	2	4	4	3	3.10
P	169MW Nuke in 2025, 600MW CC in 2025, 1200MW CC in 2034, RAP, Balanced, RI Ret 12/31/2024	5	2	3	4	2	3.00
B	450MW Nuke in 2034, 600MW CC in 2034, RAP	3	3	2	3	3	2.80
O	169MW Nuke in 2025, 1800MW CC in 2024, 1200MW CC in 2034, RAP, Balanced, LAB Ret 12/31/2023	5	1	3	4	1	2.50
N	600MW CC in 2025, 1200MW CC in 2034, MAP, RI Ret 12/31/2024	3	2	2	4	2	2.40
K	600MW CC in 2023, 600MW CC in 2031, 600MW CC in 2034, MEEIA1, Balanced	2	3	2	1	2	2.10
M	1800MW CC in 2024, 1200MW CC in 2034, MAP, LAB Ret 12/31/2023	3	2	2	4	1	2.10
J	169MW Nuke in 2031, 600MW CC in 2023, 1200MW CC in 2034, MEEIA1, Balanced	3	2	1	2	2	2.00
L	3300MW Wind in 2023, 3300MW Wind in 2027, 6600MW Wind in 2034, MEEIA1	1	2	1	5	1	1.60

  

Scoring Guide		Overall Assessment Guide	
Significant Advantage	5	Top-tier Plan	
Moderate Advantage	4	Mid-tier Plan	
No Advantage or Disadvantage	3	Bottom-tier Plan	
Moderate Disadvantage	2		
Significant Disadvantage	1		

  

Notes on Scores by Policy Objective	
Environmental/Diversity	Inclusion of MAP or RAP energy efficiency; new nuclear; combined cycle; additional coal retirement beyond Meramec and Sioux; additional renewables; and/or pumped hydro were viewed as advantageous.
Financial Regulatory	Financial and regulatory risks associated with new nuclear; additional coal retirement beyond Meramec and Sioux; cessation of energy efficiency programs; implementation of overly aggressive energy efficiency programs; and/or vast amounts of wind generation were viewed as disadvantageous, as were large negative impacts on cash flow.
Customer Satisfaction	Lower levelized annual rate increases, inclusion of energy efficiency and demand response, and inclusion of renewables were viewed as advantageous.
Economic Development	Plans were rated on a relative scale based on direct jobs (FTE-years) including both construction and operation.
Cost (PVR)	Plans were rated on a relative scale based on present value of revenue requirements (PVR).

  

Key to Abbreviations	Balanced = Balanced plan (solar, wind, hydro)	CC = Combined Cycle Gas Turbine Generator
EE = Energy Efficiency Only, No Demand Response	LAB = Labadie Energy Center	MAP = Maximum Achievable Potential DSM Portfolio
MEEIA = Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act Cycle 1	MW = Megawatts	RAP = Realistic Achievable Potential DSM Portfolio
RES = Renewable Energy Standard	RI = Rush Island Energy Center	Ret = Retirement

<sup>1</sup> 4 CSR 240-22.010(2)(C); 4 CSR 240-22.010(2)(C)1 through 3; 4 CSR 240-22.070(1); 4 CSR 240-22.070(1) (A) through (D)

**Compliance References**

4 CSR 240-22.010(2)(C) ..... 1  
4 CSR 240-22.010(2)(C)1 through 3 ..... 1  
4 CSR 240-22.070(1) ..... 1  
4 CSR 240-22.070(1) (A) through (D) ..... 1