Exhibit No.:

Issues:

Load Forecast

Witness:

David C. Roos

Sponsoring Party:

MO PSC Staff

Type of Exhibit:

Surrebuttal Testimony

Case No.:

EO-2011-0271

Date Testimony Prepared:

November 30, 2011

# MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION REGULATORY REVIEW DIVISION

#### SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

**OF** 

#### **DAVID C. ROOS**

### UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a AMEREN MISSOURI

CASE NO. EQ-2011-0271

Jefferson City, Missouri November 2011

Staff	_Exhibit No_	13
	Report	
File No	•	

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Compa	he Matter of Union Electric any's 2011 Utility Resource Filing	,	Case No.: EO-2011-0271
Pursua	ant to 4 CSR 240 - Chapter 22	,	
	AFFIDAVIT C	F DAV	TD C. ROOS
STAT	TE OF MISSOURI )		
COUN	) ss NTY OF COLE )		
consist that the knowle	ration of the following Surrebuttating of 3 pages of Surrebuttatine answers in the following Surrebu	al Test Testim ttal Te	h states: that he has participated in the mony in question and answer form, ony to be presented in the above case, stimony were given by him; that he has ers; and that such matters are true to the
			Dan O Chon
		_	David C. Roos
Subscr	ribed and sworn to before me this 2	orn <sub>da</sub>	y of November, 2011.
	LAURA HOLSMAN Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: June 21, 2015		Notary Public

1 2		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY		
3		OF		
5		DAVID C. ROOS		
6 7		UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a AMEREN MISSOURI		
8		CASE NO. EO-2011-0271		
10 11 12	Q.	Please state your name and business address.		
13	A.	My name is David C. Roos, and my business address is Missouri Public		
14	Service Commission, P. O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.			
15	Q.	What is your present position at the Missouri Public Service Commission?		
16	Α.	I am a Regulatory Economist in the Energy Department of the Utility		
17	Operations Division.			
18	Q.	Are you the same David C. Roos that contributed to Staff's Report on Electric		
19	Utility Resource Planning Compliance Filing filed on June 23, 2011 and rebuttal testimony is			
20	this case?			
21	Α.	Yes, I am.		
22	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?		
23	A.	I address certain rebuttal testimony of Missouri Department of Natural		
24	Resources' (DNR) witness John P. Davulis related to Union Electric Company d/b/a Amerer			
25	Missouri's (Ameren Missouri's or Company's) construction of the household income variable			
26	used in Ameren Missouri's residential sales forecast; and the validity of Ameren Missouri's			
27	end-use load profiles.			
28	Q.	What is Mr. Davulis' concern with Ameren Missouri's construction of the		
29	income varial	ble used in the Company's residential sales forecast?		

# Surrebuttal Testimony of David C. Roos

A. Mr. Davulis is concerned that Ameren Missouri's forecast of average household income is too high and results in an upward bias of the Company's residential sales forecast. Mr. Davulis suggests a method to calculate average household income which results in a forecast for average household income that by the year 2030 is about 8.7% lower than Ameren Missouri's average household income forecast. Based on the reasonable premise that a portion of household energy usage can be explained by the level of average household income, a lower average household income drives a lower household energy usage, all else equal.

- Q. Is Staff concerned that this issue remains unresolved in this case?
- A. No. Staff found no Rule CSR 4 CSR 240-22.030 Load Analysis and Forecasting deficiency with Ameren Missouri's integrated resource planning process. The Commission's resource planning rules require the development of high, base and low-case forecasts that are used for integrated resource analysis, risk analysis and strategy selection. This gives the utility's decision-makers the opportunity to assess the impact that load uncertainty has on the resource plan the utility selects as its preferred resource plan. Further, if the Company were to adjust the residential sales forecast to correct for an upward bias, the result would be a lower residential sales forecast. The Company's preferred plan first calls for construction of a new generating facility in 2029. This time frame gives the Company several opportunities to refine its load forecast prior to making any final decision to construct a new generating facility. Staff is expecting Ameren Missouri, in its 2012 annual update filling, to update its load forecasts to reflect recent changes in customers' usages.
- Q. What is Mr. Davulis' alleged deficiency related to Ameren Missouri's end-use load profiles?

## Surrebuttal Testimony of David C. Roos

A. It is Mr. Davulis' position that "Ameren Missouri has not provided convincing evidence that the end-use load profiles it uses are appropriate for its service territory<sup>1</sup>." In his rebuttal testimony Mr. Duvalis compares Ameren Missouri's residential and commercial cooling end-use contributions to peak demand with similar variables from studies by others (Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) and KEMA, Inc.). These comparisons suggest that Ameren Missouri may have undervalued the residential non-cooling efficiency measures and commercial cooling and lighting energy efficiency measures in its study.

- Q. What is Staff's response to Mr. Davulis' analysis?
- A. The potential for certain energy efficiency measures to be undervalued is a valid concern, but it does not make Ameren Missouri's study deficient under Rule 4 CSR 240-22.030 Load Analysis and Forecasting.
  - Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
  - A. Yes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rebuttal Testimony of John P. Davulis at page 2; lines 20 and 21.