

**FILED<sup>3</sup>**  
APR 16 2007  
Missouri Public  
Service Commission

Exhibit No.: 039  
Issues: Dollar More, Low Income  
Energy Efficiency programs  
Witness: Richard J. Mark  
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**

**RICHARD J. MARK**

**ON**

**BEHALF OF**

**UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY  
d/b/a AmerenUE**

**St. Louis, Missouri  
February, 2007**

Ameren Exhibit No. 39  
Date 3-16-07 Case No. ER-2007-  
Reporter RF 0002

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	DOLLAR MORE.....	1
II.	LOW INCOME WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM.....	2



1 includes 39 agencies in our service territory. The agencies act as the social service experts  
2 and make the determination of who is or is not eligible for the program. AmerenUE does not  
3 play a role in their decision.

4 **Q. As a component of AmerenUE's revised FAC/OSS proposal, is the**  
5 **Company willing to provide additional funding to its Dollar More program?**

6 A. Yes. Various parties in this case have expressed concerns about the impact  
7 upon low-income customers of a rate increase and of the Company's proposed FAC. In  
8 recognition of these concerns and as part of its revised FAC/OSS proposal, AmerenUE is  
9 willing to commit to providing shareholder-funded contributions to Dollar More in an  
10 amount of \$2 million annually. If the Company's proposal is adopted by the Commission,  
11 the donations would be made on June 30<sup>th</sup> of each year, beginning June 30, 2007. This  
12 funding would continue until the effective date of new rates resulting from AmerenUE's next  
13 rate case or complaint case.

14 **II. LOW INCOME WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM**

15 **Q. Your Direct Testimony also discussed low-income weatherization. Can**  
16 **you provide a short explanation of that program?**

17 A. In recent years, AmerenUE has funded a program to provide weatherization  
18 services to low-income customers in its service territory. The program has been administered  
19 by the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (EIERA), a division of  
20 the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, and is operated in accordance with specific  
21 laws and regulations established by Congress and the Department of Energy. Participating in  
22 the program administered by EIERA ensures these dollars are used most effectively and  
23 efficiently to provide weatherization services to our low-income customers.

1           **Q.     Is AmerenUE obligated to continue funding this program under the**  
2           **Settlement Agreement approved by the Commission in Case No. EC-2002-1?**

3           A.     No. All agreed upon funding has been provided to EIARA. AmerenUE has  
4           made no commitment to provide additional contributions.

5           **Q.     As a component of its revised FAC/OSS proposal, is the Company willing**  
6           **to provide additional funding for the low-income weatherization program?**

7           A.     Yes. As part of its revised FAC/OSS proposal, the Company is willing to  
8           adopt the recommendation of Staff witness Lena Mantle, who recommended that the  
9           Company fund the low-income weatherization program at a level of \$1.2 million per year.  
10          Ms. Mantel recommended that half of the \$1.2 million per year cost be included in rates and  
11          the other half be paid for by the Company's shareholders.

12          **Q.     Do you have anything else to add?**

13          A.     Yes. For both the Dollar More and the low-income weatherization  
14          commitments AmerenUE is making, it is important to recognize that the funding of these  
15          programs is not required by Missouri law, statute or any previous agreement. The Company  
16          makes these commitments as part of its effort to demonstrate that it has been and continues to  
17          listen to concerns expressed by the various parties in this case about the impact of the FAC  
18          and OSS proposals may have upon its low-income customers. We believe these efforts  
19          provide a fair balance between the interests of shareholders and the needs of our customers.

20          **Q.     Does this conclude your Surrebuttal Testimony?**

21          A.     Yes, it does.

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. )

**STATE OF MISSOURI**                 )  
  ) ss  
**CITY OF ST. LOUIS**                 )

of February, 2007.

**CAROLYN J. WOODSTOCK**  
Notary Public - Notary Seal  
STATE OF MISSOURI  
Franklin County  
**My Commission Expires: May 19, 2008**