BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a	)	
Ameren Missouri's Tariffs to Increase Its	)	Case No. ER-2012-0166
Revenues for Electric Service	)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF
MISSOURI INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS

Comes now the Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers ("MIEC") and provides its Position Statement. The MIEC's positions are set forth in order of the issues listed in *Joint List of Issues, List and Order of Witnesses, Order of Cross-Examination, and Order of Opening Statements*, as follows:

1. Advertising

A. What amount of advertising expense should be included in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?
B. What amount, if any, of the costs incurred by Ameren Missouri for its Clean Air Advertising campaign should be included in revenue requirement?
C. What amount, if any, of the costs incurred by Ameren Missouri for Taum Sauk Open House inserts should be included in revenue requirement?
D. What amount, if any, of the costs incurred by Ameren Missouri for its Mr. Efficiency radio advertisement should be included in revenue requirement?
E. What amount, if any, of the costs incurred by Ameren Missouri for its Louie the Lightning Bug balloon should be included in revenue requirement?

ANSWER:

2. Dues, including EEI Dues

What amount should be included in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement for dues, including EEI dues?

ANSWER:

3. Cash Working Capital

A. Should the collection lag be calculated using the CURST 246 Report for the 12-month period ending October 31, 2010, or the Accounts Receivable Breakdown Report?

ANSWER:

The CURST 246 Report for the 12-month period ending October 31, 2010 should be used to calculate the collection lag, as it supports the same conclusion as the result produced by the CURST 246 Report for the 12-month period ending March 31, 2010.

B. Should the income tax calculation be removed from Ameren Missouri's cash working capital requirement?

ANSWER:

Yes. If Ameren Missouri does not incur current income tax expense, the CWC requirement should reflect no income tax effect.

C. What is the proper calculation of the expense lag for Gross Receipts tax?

ANSWER:

The appropriate revenue collection lag for cash working capital is 21.1 days.

4. Income Tax & ADIT & NOL

A. Should a portion of the $2.8 Million income tax benefit realized on dividends paid on Ameren Corporation shares held in Employee Stock Ownership Plan ("ESOP") accounts be a reduction to Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?:

ANSWER:

Yes. The Missouri allocated share of benefits arising from Ameren's ESOP dividends paid tax income tax deduction should be recognized in calculating Ameren's Missouri revenue requirement. This income tax deduction results from an employee benefit program that is made available to Ameren Missouri and Ameren Services employees, where the 401(k) plan investment options include Ameren Corporation common stock. The revenue requirement includes costs of compensation for employees who elect to contribute a share of such compensation to the 401(k) plan. The revenue requirement also includes the costs of Ameren Missouri's "match" contributions to the 401(k) plan. The revenue requirement also includes a return on equity that is sufficient to allow Ameren Missouri to pay upstream dividends to its parent, Ameren Corporation, that in turn pays dividends on outstanding stock including shares held in employees' 401(k) accounts. Ameren has made no showing that it incurs any costs or risks that justify retaining for the sole benefit of shareholders the tax savings arising from the ESOP dividends paid deduction.

B. Should CWIP-related ADIT balances be included as an offset to rate base?

ANSWER:

Yes. Ameren's accumulated deferred income taxes (or "ADIT") that have historically been included in its Missouri rate base <u>include the CWIP-related ADIT amounts and there are no changed circumstances that now justify rate base exclusion of these ADIT balances as proposed by Ameren</u>. The Company argues that ADIT amounts associated with its Construction Work in Progress (or "CWIP") have grown to be quite large and should now be excluded from rate base…solely because CWIP is not included in rate base. What this proposal ignores is that ratepayers pay a fully compensatory return on CWIP investment through the accounting procedure known as Allowance for Funds Used During Construction (or "AFUDC"). This means that excluding CWIP from rate base does not deny Ameren a full return on the CWIP investments that have been made by the Company. It is quite significant that the AFUDC procedures, that are prescribed by very specific FERC regulations, do <u>not</u> account for CWIP-related ADIT benefits. Therefore, it is necessary to continue to include CWIP-related ADIT balances in rate base. If the Company's removal of CWIP-related ADIT from rate base was approved by the Commission, it would be essential that AFUDC procedures be revised to account for such CWIP-related ADIT as a reduction to the investment amounts allowed to earn AFUDC. Ameren completely ignores the AFUDC return that is allowed for CWIP investments. Similarly, Ameren has proposed no conforming adjustments to reduce AFUDC if the CWIP-related deferred taxes are no longer included in rate base. CWIP-related ADIT balances must continue to be included in rate base, as has been done historically in Missouri and is done currently in Ameren's Illinois and FERC regulatory jurisdictions.

5. Plant-in-Service Accounting ("PISA")

Should the Commission grant Ameren Missouri accounting authority to accrue a return on invested capital and to defer depreciation for non-revenue-producing plant additions in a regulatory asset during the period between the date when those plant additions begin serving customers until the date they are reflected in rate base in a later rate case?

ANSWER:

No. The Company's proposed PISA mechanism should be rejected by the Commission. In support of PISA, Ameren argues that it faces unacceptable levels of regulatory lag in Missouri. The Company relies upon calculations of the historical difference between its earned versus authorized return on equity to support the premise that an open-ended new regulatory asset should be allowed for continued "Plant in Service Accounting" or "PISA". Through PISA, the Company proposes to defer a return on investment and depreciation on newly completed construction projects between rate cases, with such deferred costs to be included in revenue requirements in future Ameren rate cases. No other utilities in Missouri have such open-ended PISA deferral authority. In fact, the record will show that no utilities in the country have been granted such broad authority.

MIEC urges rejection of Ameren's PISA proposal for many reasons. First, the Company's historical earnings analysis is not presented on a ratemaking basis of accounting and overstates the extent of alleged under-earning, relative to authorized levels of ROE. Thus, Ameren has failed to demonstrate any real financial need for the PISA mechanism. Conceptually, PISA is piecemeal, single-issue ratemaking which is poor regulatory policy that should be rejected. Additionally, the PISA proposal is flawed in its construction by ignoring the substantial growth in accumulated deferred income taxes associated with adding new plant that serves to offset the costs of such new investment. PISA is also improper in ignoring the operational benefits that arise from new plant construction and would add regulatory complexity and costs to the responsibilities of Staff and other parties, particularly if this regulatory sweetener is approved for Ameren and the other utilities in the State clamor for, and are granted, similar benefits. For all of these and other reasons explained by MIEC witness Brosch, the PISA proposal should be rejected.

6. Rate Case Expense

What is the appropriate amount to include in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement for Rate Case Expense?

ANSWER:

7. Property Tax Refund

What portion of the $2.9 Million property tax refund for Tax Year 2010 received by Ameren Missouri should be credited to ratepayers. If an amount should be credited, over what period should the credit be amortized?

ANSWER:

The entire amount of $2.9 Million should be refunded to ratepayers over a 2-year period.

8. Property Taxes

What property tax rates should be used in calculating the allowance for property tax expense to include in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?

ANSWER:

The actual property taxes paid by Ameren Missouri in 2011 should be used to set rates in this case.

9. Renewable Energy Standard ("RES") Costs

A. Should the Commission order Ameren Missouri to include a base level of RES costs in permanent rates? If so, what is the base amount to include in permanent rates and should the level included in permanent rates in this case be netted against any future deferred expenditures that occur beyond the July 31, 2012, true-up date?

ANSWER:

No. The Commission should not order Ameren Missouri to include a base level of RES costs in permanent rates, consistent with 4 CSR 240-20.100.

B. Over what period of years should the Commission order Ameren Missouri to amortize the deferred RES costs incurred from January 1, 2010, through July 31, 2012?

ANSWER:

The deferred RES costs incurred from January 1, 2010, through July 31, 2012, should be amortized over six years.

C. Should the Commission order Ameren Missouri to include the unamortized RES deferred regulatory asset balance from January 1, 2010, through July 31, 2012, in rate base?

ANSWER:

Yes. The Commission should order Ameren Missouri to include the unamortized RES deferred regulatory asset balance from January 1, 2010, through July 31, 2012, in rate base in conjunction with a six year amortization. A shorter amortization period should result in no rate base inclusion.

10. Miscellaneous Expenses

A. What amount if any of the costs incurred for a right-of-way assessment and nest box study should be included in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?

B. Should expenses related to environmental retrofitting of Meramec be included in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?

ANSWER:

11. Entergy Refund

A. What amount if any of the $30.6 Million Entergy equalization cost refund should be credited to ratepayers?

B. If the Commission orders an amount to be credited to ratepayers would a three-year amortization period be appropriate?

C. Should all or part of the amount credited to ratepayers be credited through the FAC adjustment mechanism?

ANSWER:

12. Coal Inventory, including Coal in Transit

Should the value of Ameren Missouri's coal inventory include the value of coal in transit?

ANSWER:

The value of Ameren Missouri's coal inventory should not include the value of coal in transit.

13. Low Income Weatherization, including MDNR Program Administration Costs

A. *Should the next evaluation of Ameren Missouri's low income weatherization program consider the effect on natural gas usage as well as electric usage by customers receiving weatherization?*
B. *How often should Ameren Missouri conduct evaluations of its low income weatherization program?*
C. *Can the Commission order Ameren Missouri to direct ratepayer funds to MDNR to cover costs of administering the Low Income Weatherization Program?*
D. *If so, should Ameren Missouri's low-income weatherization funding level be increased by $120,000, with that amount to be authorized for reimbursement of MDNR's costs of providing weatherization program administration?*

ANSWER:

14. Sioux Construction Accounting

Should Ameren Missouri be authorized to continue construction accounting for the Sioux Scrubbers in order to recover a return on the $13.5 Million cost not included in rate base in Ameren Missouri's last rate case and to defer associated depreciation expense?

ANSWER:

15. Severance Costs and VS 11

Should Ameren Missouri be authorized to amortize to rates over three years the approximately $25.8 Million in costs incurred in its VS 11 voluntary employee separation program?

ANSWER:

No. Subsequent to the test year, Ameren Missouri incurred $25,755,000 associated with the VS11 offering which the Company proposes to amortize over three-year period, or $8.585 million per year.

While Ameren Missouri has annualized the ongoing reduction to labor expense, benefit expense and payroll tax expense resulting from the implementation of VS11, those ratemaking adjustments were quantified on a prospective only basis. In other words, these annualization adjustments do not capture or reflect the expense reductions arising between the implementation of VS11 and the effective date of rates in this proceeding. As a result, the Company and its shareholders will retain these interim savings, not the Company's ratepayers who are being asked to pay for the implementation costs through the three-year amortization. There is no question that Ameren Missouri incurred upfront costs to implement VS11, and that VS11 has resulted in expense reductions or savings. Ameren Missouri's proposed three-year amortization of the one-time VS11 costs and prospective annualization expense reduction fail to recognize the significant offsetting cost savings that will be realized in 2011 and 2012 for the sole benefit of its shareholders, while the Company proposes to recover the "cost" of this program a second time through future rates – via its three-year amortization proposal.

The retained cost savings should more than cover the one-time costs of VS11. As a result, Ameren Missouri's proposed amortization neither represents the net cost incurred by the Company nor ongoing expense levels. Acceptance of the Company's proposed amortization adjustment will improperly overstate the ongoing cost of providing utility service.

Since the Company's proposed ratemaking treatment will not recognize any VS11 savings realized and retained prior to January 2013, it would be inappropriate and unfair to saddle ratepayers with any portion of Ameren Missouri's cost to implement the program in a way that does not recognize the offsetting savings realized during this same interim period. Otherwise, the amortization mechanism proposed by Ameren Missouri would provide a one-sided opportunity for the Company to retain all savings realized prior to the implementation of new rates and then explicitly recover all of the costs incurred to produce those savings at ratepayer expense.

None of the arguments presented in the rebuttal testimony of Company witness Lynn Barnes (pages 15-17) convey a compelling case for the Commission to allow Ameren Missouri to double recover the VS11 costs – once through retained savings and again through the three-year amortization. Surely, Ameren is not suggesting that current rates should be increased to allow the Company to recover some labor and benefit costs it claims to have under-recovered in prior years.

The Company's proposed amortization and annualize approach violates two of the most fundamental concepts underlying the utility ratemaking process – the matching principle and the prohibition against retroactive ratemaking. The Company's rebuttal testimony on this issue would have this Commission ignore the matching principle by intentionally not matching costs with benefits. And, by suggesting that the Staff and MIEC should "recognize the fact that over the past 3 years the Company has significantly under-recovered its payroll costs", it appears that the Company may be seeking a current consideration of claimed under-recoveries of past costs that run afoul of the retroactive ratemaking prohibition.

16. Return on Common Equity ("ROE")

In consideration of all relevant factors, what is the appropriate value for Return on Equity ("ROE") that the Commission should use in setting Ameren Missouri's Rate of Return?

ANSWER:

MIEC believes a fair ROE for Ameren Missouri in this case is 9.3%, the midpoint of its recommended range of 9.2% to 9.4%. This ROE reflects fair compensation and will maintain Ameren Missouri's financial integrity.

A significant reduction in Ameren Missouri's ROE is appropriate in this case due to the clear and material decline in capital market costs since Ameren Missouri's last rate case. MIEC evidence in this case demonstrates that bond yields have declined by 1.1% for "A" rated utility bonds and 0.71% for "Baa" utility bonds. These declines in bond yields provide clear illustrations and observable proof that capital market costs are much lower today than they were during Ameren Missouri's last rate case.

MIEC's evidence also shows that an ROE in the range of 9.2% to 9.4% represents a conservative estimate of fair compensation for Ameren Missouri in this case. The high end of this estimated range is based on MIEC's highest DCF return estimate of three separate detailed DCF models. The low end of this range is based on a risk premium study reflecting a widening of the equity risk premiums relative to utility bond yields, and Treasury bond yields relative to historical averages. Hence, the low end of MIEC's recommended range (9.2%) reflects a widening of the yield spread, and a more conservative estimate of utilities' cost of capital in today's marketplace.

MIEC's evidence also shows that the Company's recommended ROE of 10.75% materially overstates its cost of equity in today's low-cost capital market environment. Ameren Missouri's witness overstated DCF return estimates by using growth rates that exceed reasonable estimates of long-term sustainable growth. The Ameren Missouri witness also employed a multi-stage growth model which reflects an inflated GDP growth compared to the market participant's clear GDP growth outlook. This flawed multi-growth DCF model also reflects an acceleration of cash flows received by investors which inflates the return estimates. The Company's CAPM is also upwardly biased because it reflects unreliable and biased adjustments to the market and firm specific risk factors. Proper adjustments to all of these models would result in the Company's own cost of equity studies that would support MIEC's proposed 9.2% ROE in this proceeding.

17. Net Base Fuel Costs

A. Should Ameren Missouri's Net Base Fuel Costs include an increase in the cost of delivered coal expected to take effect on January 1, 2013?

B. Should a positive adjustment be made to account for the margin realized on bilateral transactions and financial swaps?

C. Should an adjustment be made to account for load and generation forecast deviations?

D. *What is the amount of fuel expense, purchased power expense, and off-system sales to be used in setting Ameren Missouri's Net Base Fuel Costs?*

ANSWER:

18. Fuel Adjustment Clause ("FAC")

Should the sharing percentage in Ameren Missouri's fuel adjustment clause be changed to 85%/15%?

ANSWER:

MIEC supports an 85%/15% FAC sharing percentage.

19. FAC Tariff

A. *Should the MISO schedule costs that are allowed to flow through the FAC be listed on the FAC tariff sheets?*

ANSWER:

To avoid any future confusion, the specific MISO Schedule and MISO Attachment costs and revenues that are flowed through the FAC should be explicitly listed in the FAC tariff sheets. Ameren Missouri should be permitted to file with the Commission between its base rate cases for permission to modify that list as MISO Schedules and Attachments are modified. However, Ameren Missouri should not be permitted to use such filings to seek to flow through its FAC costs and revenues that were not authorized for recovery through its FAC in its most recently completed base rate case.

B. *Should the definition of Factor PP in Ameren Missouri's FAC tariff be modified to state, "Only transmission costs incurred for the purchase or sale of electricity shall be included"?*

ANSWER:

MIEC supports this proposed tariff clarification.

C. *Apart from transmission costs addressed in Item B, should Ameren Missouri be permitted to flow through the FAC MISO transmission charges and associated transmission revenues?*

ANSWER:

For the reasons detailed in the Surrebuttal Testimony of MIEC witness James R. Dauphinais, MIEC opposes the flow through Ameren Missouri's FAC of any MISO transmission charges and revenues associated with transmission service of a term greater than one year.

D. Should Ameren Missouri be permitted to flow through the FAC transmission charges associated with the transmission service in a term in excess of one year?

ANSWER:

For the reasons detailed in the Surrebuttal Testimony of MIEC witness James R. Dauphinais, Ameren Missouri should not be permitted to flow through the FAC any transmission charges associated with transmission service of a term in excess of one year.

E. If the Commission determines that the MISO transmission charges and revenues addressed in Item C should not be flowed through the FAC should they be deferred in a transmission cost and revenue tracker using the trued-up test year sum for those charges and revenues as the base against which changes will be tracked, with sums above the base to be booked to a regulatory asset and sums below the base to be booked to a regulatory liability? If so, how should the amortization of the regulatory asset or regulatory liability be handled?

ANSWER:

MIEC does not agree this is a proper issue for this case and reserves the right to so argue as part of the outstanding motions portion of the evidentiary hearing.

If despite MIEC's motions, the Commission allows this issue to be argued, MIEC opposes Ameren Missouri being granted a deferred transmission cost and revenue tracker. Ameren Missouri's request for such tracker was not timely in that it was not made in its direct case in this proceeding but rather in its sur-surrebuttal case in this proceeding. As such, MIEC and the other parties in this proceeding have not been given a reasonable opportunity in their testimony in this proceeding to respond to this new proposal of Ameren Missouri. Regardless, Ameren Missouri has not reasonably demonstrated a need for such a cost deferral tracker and Ameren Missouri's request for one should be denied. MIEC's position is that rate trackers in general should be avoided except when a true need for one has been reasonably demonstrated. In general, the use of trackers allows a utility to pursue single issue ratemaking since it allows a utility to receive additional revenue in its rates due to an increase in a tracked expense or a decrease in a tracked revenue without consideration of whether that utility would simultaneously be receiving offsetting decreases in expenses or increases in revenues for those expenses and revenues that are not being tracked. In addition, the use of a tracker eliminates the incentive a utility has to minimize expenses and maximize revenues between base rate proceedings. The incentive over time works to keep electric rates lower than they otherwise would be. For these reasons, it is MIEC's position that a utility should not be granted a tracker unless a utility reasonably demonstrates to the Commission that the expenses and revenues in question are:

- Large enough to present a threat to the financial well being of the utility;
- Volatile; and
- Cannot be reasonably managed by the utility.

It is MIEC's position that Ameren Missouri has not reasonably demonstrated even one of these three prerequisites apply to the long-term transmission costs and revenues in question, never mind reasonably demonstrating all three are met for these costs and revenues. Ameren Missouri's proposed deferred transmission costs and revenues tracker should be denied.

F. Should hedging gains and losses be excluded from Ameren Missouri's FAC except for hedging gains and losses associated with mitigating volatility in its fuel costs and allowances for SO2 and NOx emissions?

ANSWER:

MIEC does not oppose the flow through the FAC of Ameren Missouri's prudently incurred hedging gains and losses that are associated with hedging Ameren Missouri's fuel costs, emission costs, purchased power costs and off-system sales revenues. MIEC opposes the flow through the FAC of any hedging gains or losses not associated with its fuel costs, emission costs, purchased power costs and off-system sales revenues.

G. What other changes should be made to Ameren Missouri's FAC tariff?

ANSWER:

MIEC is not at this time proposing any other changes be made to Ameren Missouri's FAC tariff beyond those discussed above in A. through F.

20. Storm Costs Tracker

Should the Commission establish a two-way storm restoration cost tracker whereby storm-related non-labor operations and maintenance ("O&M") expenses for major storms would be tracked against the base amount with expenditures below the base creating a regulatory liability and expenditures above the base creating a regulatory asset, in each case along with interest at the Company's AFUDC rate?

ANSWER:

No storm costs tracker should be established in this rate case.

21. Storm Costs

A. If the Commission does not establish a two-way storm restoration costs tracker, then what is the appropriate amount to include in revenue requirement for major storm restoration costs?

ANSWER:

The appropriate amount to include in revenue requirement for major storm restoration costs is $6.5 million.

B. If the Commission does establish a two-way storm restoration costs tracker, then what is the appropriate base level of major storm restoration Operation and Maintenance ("O&M") costs to include in Ameren Missouri's revenue requirement?

ANSWER:

Same as A.

22. Storm Assistance Revenues

A. If the Commission authorizes a two-way storm restoration cost tracker for Ameren Missouri, should storm assistance revenues received from other utilities be included in the tracker or annualized and normalized and included as an offset in revenue requirement?

ANSWER:

If the Commission authorizes a two-way storm restoration cost tracker for Ameren Missouri, it should also track storm assistance revenues.

B. What amount of storm assistance revenue should be included in the cost of service?

ANSWER:

Cost of Service should include a normalized level of storm assistance revenue of $800,000.

23. Vegetation Management and Infrastructure Inspection Tracker

A. Should the unamortized balance for the regulatory asset associated with the Vegetation Management and Infrastructure Inspection Tracker be adjusted for all amortization through December 31, 2012, and amortized over two years?

ANSWER:

No. The unamortized balance for the regulatory asset associated with the Vegetation Management and Infrastructure Inspection Tracker for deferred expenses incurred from February 28, 2011 through July 31, 2012, should be amortized over three years.

B. Should the vegetation management and infrastructure inspection trackers be continued?

ANSWER:

No. The vegetation management and infrastructure inspection trackers should be discontinued.

24. Class Cost of Service, Revenue Allocation and Rate Design

A. What methodology should the Commission use to allocate generation fixed costs among customer classes?

ANSWER:

The Commission should continue to utilize the Average and Excess ("A&E") method, with four class non-coincident peaks, to allocate generation fixed costs among customer classes. The A&E method appropriately considers class energy usage, class maximum demands and class load factor, as well as the diversity between individual class peaks and the system peak. The Commission should continue to affirm use of this methodology as it has in prior Ameren Missouri rate cases.

B. How should the non-fuel, non-labor components of production, operation and maintenance expense be classified and allocated?

ANSWER:

The non-fuel, non-labor, components of generation operation and maintenance expense are essentially fixed costs and do not vary with the amount of energy generated. The Commission should classify these costs as fixed and allocate them to classes using the generation fixed costs allocator (i.e., the familiar "expenses follow plant" method), which is consistent with how Commission Staff and MIEC have treated these costs.

C. How should any rate increase be collected from the several customer classes?

ANSWER:

MIEC proposes a three-step approach to the allocation of any revenue increase. First, in order to recognize the fact that residential rates and lighting rates are significantly below cost of service, while other rates are above cost of service (as shown by all of the cost of service studies presented by Ameren Missouri, Commission Staff and MIEC), a modest step toward the cost of service should be made in this case. Specifically, the Residential class and Lighting class should receive a modest 2% revenue increase, offset by a revenue neutral decrease of approximately 1.75% to all other customer classes. Second, in order to recognize the responsibility for energy efficiency ("EE") program costs by customer class, and to ensure that customers who have opted-out of participation in the programs are not required to bear the costs of the programs, the EE costs (both

MEEI and pre-MEEIA) should be specifically assigned by customer class. Third, the allocation of any remaining amount of rate increase should be allocated as an equal percentage on base rates of all customer classes.

Regardless of the revenue allocation approach adopted, the increase to the LTS Class must be at least 4.0 percentage points less than the system average percentage increase. This is required in order to recognize that this customer has, in accordance with the MEEIA statute and Commission rules, opted out of the utility sponsored EE programs. Any greater increase would effectively allocate part of these EE costs to the LTS customer.

[See the following testimonies of Maurice Brubaker: July 19, 2012 Direct Testimony at pages 37-43 and Schedule MEB-COS-7; August 14, 2012 Rebuttal Testimony at pages 16-21; and September 7, 2012 Surrebuttal Testimony at pages 2-9]

D. What should the Residential Class customer charge be?

ANSWER:

MIEC takes no position.

E. What should the Small General Service Class customer charge be (single- phase and three-phase)?

ANSWER:

MIEC takes no position.

F. Should the Commission address declining block rate design either by opening a separate docket on rate design or by ordering Ameren to address the rate design in its next general rate case?

ANSWER:

MIEC takes no position.

25. Keeping Current Customer Assistance Program

A. Should Ameren Missouri's Keeping Current customer assistance program be continued until Ameren Missouri's next general rate case, by which time the working group will have reviewed the third party evaluation of the program?

B. *If Ameren Missouri's* Keeping Current *customer assistance program is continued, should the customer contribution remain the same?*

ANSWER:

The MIEC reserves the right to assert additional positions or respond to positions asserted by the other parties.

Respectfully submitted,

BRYAN CAVE, LLP

By: */s/ Diana Vuylsteke*

Diana M. Vuylsteke, # 42419
211 N. Broadway, Suite 3600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
Telephone: (314) 259-2543
Facsimile: (314) 259-2020
E-mail: dmvuylsteke@bryancave.com

Attorney for
The Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been emailed this 24th day of September, 2012, to all parties on the Commission's service list in this case.

/s/ Diana Vuylsteke