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J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Let's go ahead and go on the record. Good morning. This is Case Number ET-2018-0132 In The Matter Of The Application Of Uni on Electric Company Doing Business As Ameren Mssouri For Approval of Efficient Electrification Program

My name is Nancy Di ppell. I'mthe Regul at ory Law Judge assi gned to this hearing. And we are going to begin with entries of appearance. And then we di scussed, before going on the record, that we' re going to try to take up the stipulation for the Iine extension policy first and then go into the contested issues.

So let's begin with entries of appearance by Ameren.

MS. TATRO: Wendy Tatro, 1901 Chout eau Avenue, St. Loui s, M ssouri 63103.

MR. LOWERY: James B. Lowery; Smith, Lewi s, LLP, 9-- PO Box 918, Col unbi a, M ssouri 65205 on behal f of Ameren Mssouri.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Commi ssion Staff.
MS. MERS: Ni cole Mers appearing on
behal f of the Commission Staff. And my information has been provi ded to the court reporter.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Office of Public Counsel.
MR. CLI ZER: John Clizer on behal f of the Office of Public Counsel. And my information has been provi ded to the court reporter as well.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Renew M ssouri.
MR. OPI TZ: For Renew M ssouri, I'mTim Opitz. And I've al so provi ded my information to the court reporter.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoint.
MR. COMEY: Good morning, Judge Di ppell.
Appearing on behal f of ChargePoint, Inc., I et the record reflect the entry of Mark W Conl ey, Newman, Comey and Ruth. Our business address is 601 Mbnroe, Suite 301, Jefferson City, M ssouri.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Energy.
MR. LANAHAN: Thank you, Your Honor. M chael Lanahan, here on behal f of the Division of Energy. Address 301 West Hi gh Street, 6-- for Suite 680, J efferson City, M ssouri 65102.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Spi re? Is there anyone here for Spire? And Si erra Club?

MR. ROBERTSON: For Si erra Cl ub -- for Si erra Cl ub and the Natural Resources Defense Council,

Henry Robertson, Great Rivers Envi ronmental Law Center, 319 North Fourth Street, Suite, 800, St. Loui s 63102.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Kansas City Power \& Li ght and GMD? They had actually asked to be excused from the hearing today.

Empi re?
MS. CARTER: Di ana Carter with Brydon, Swearengen and Engl and for the Empire District El ectric Company. My contact information is on the written entry provi ded to the court reporter.

J UDGE DI PPELL: And M EC had al so asked to be excused. All right. Did l miss anyone?

Okay. Seei ng none, we tal ked al so bef ore we went on the record about a couple of scheduling issues. So we were going to move up -- well, let me say first, we are going to follow the order of witnesses and openi ng statements and cross-examination that you all filed in your -- on your issues list and so forth, but -- with the exception of l believe M. Kelley for Division of Energy needs to go today and Mr. Owen for -- needs to go on Wednesday and Mr. Ellis probably Thursday morning.

So if other scheduling issues come up as we go, pl ease let me know. If you deci de you don't
have cross-examination for those witnesses, please let me know when you know as a group. And we had premarked exhi bits and the court reporter l believe has all the pre-filed and premarked exhi bits.

So we are goi ng to begi $n$ then with -- oh, I had one other preliminary matter. We had a motion to file an amicus brief by the Petrol eum Marketers and Conveni ence Store Associ ation; was filed on November 30th. They asked for a quick ruling on that. Do we anticipate that there would be any opposition to that amicus brief being filed?

MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, we' ve been focused on preparing for the hearing, to be perfectly honest with you. The ten days in order to, you know, respond to the motion doesn't run until Mbnday. I know they asked for an expedited ruling, but the transcript's not available until Dovem- Decenber 12th and the briefs aren't due til January 7th.

So what l'd ask the Commission to do is allow us to figure out what our position is or isn't and we'll either file something on Mbnday -- we'll file something Mbnday either not opposing or if we have opposition, we'll make that clear. And then the Commission can rule on the next agenda if it's not goi $n g$ to be ruled on by del egation. That's what ।
request.
J UDGE DI PPELL: All right. Well, I will
certainly give you time to respond to the motion.
That was just -- I wanted to bring that up.
Were there any ot her pendi ng notions or preliminary matters before we begin with the stipulation hearing -- or presentation of the sti pul ation?

Okay. I don't see any. Then if we could just -- l'll start by asking Ameren if you could gi ve us a summary of the stipulation and then we'll just go through the parties and ask if you have any ot her statements or information you want to present on that. ME. Tatro.

MS. TATRO: Certainly. Thank you, Your Honor. Ameren Mssouri's current line extension tariff -- and we're tal king about non-resi dential customers here -- says that line extension costs not covered by revenues during the first year are paid by the customer as a contribution in ai d of construction. So either up front, sometimes over a 12-month period.

The stipulation implements a different process. It noves to a margi nal cost method. So when a non-resi dential customer requests a line extension, Ameren Mssouri will compare the extension cost,
that's the estimated installed cost, to the extension al I owance, whi ch is margi nal revenue di vi ded by the cost-of-service factor, over a five-year vi ew. The customer pays for any extension costs that are above the extensi on allowance.

Now, we think this approach is superior in that it recogni zes customers may contribute additional revenue, whi ch can be used to pay for the line extension. And requiring customers to pay amounts above the extension allowance prevents other customers fromsubsi dizing and prevents upward rate pressure. Customers who are not required to pay a Ii ne extension cost under this methodol ogy or who pay the required extension costs will exert a downward or neutral i mpact on customer rates.

Now, the second stipulation contains exemplar tariffs, and that is the only difference bet ween the first stipulation and the second stipulation. And all si gnatories agree it should be filed by Ameren Mssouri and approved by the Cormi ssi on.

The stipulation modifies Ameren Mssouri's original proposal in three ways. First, it clarifies that we'll use a five-- five years of revenue in cal culating the extension al lowance.

Second, it imposes several reporting obligations on Ameren Mssouri desi gned to provide Staff and other parties with information on how well the tariff functions in terms of estimating the break-even point and whet her or not any tweaks should be made to the tariff going forward.

And then finally, Ameren Mssouri agrees to withdrawits non-residential existing infrastructure incentive option fromthe request.

So we -- we think this stipulation represents an improvement in our line extension tariff and we will ask the Commission to order the exemplar tariffs to be filed for approval.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Mr. Chai rman, did you have any questions about that?

I just had one. And was there a timing issue on those -- the filing of those tariffs and --

MB. TATRO. For once, there is not. When we file it, l think we will be asking for a February 1st effective date of the tariffs. And that is so that Ameren M ssouri can do some training, make sure everyone in the di visions understands how to cal culate it and we can make sure it's done uniformy across the company.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. I s there anything
further about the stipul ation from Renew M ssouri?
MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: From Char gePoi nt?
MR. COMEY: Nothing, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Si er ra Cl ub or NRDC?
MR. ROBERTSON: No, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Empi re?
MS. CARTER: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Ener gy?
MR. LANAHAN: No, thank you, Your Honor.
J UDGE DI PPELL: And Office of Public
Counsel ?
MR. CLI ZER: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: St aff?
MG. MERS: St aff woul d just echo Ameren's comments on it. The GMD model, which this is based on, has been something that Staff has encouraged all of the utilities to move towards, and that has happened. And so l think that the important goal of consistency anong the utilities is al so being met with the stipulation and that it is going to be better able to ensure that customers are benefiting fromthe line extensi ons that are being approved and the margi nal cost test will ensure that, so.

JUDGE DI PPELL: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Chai rman, did you have any questions for Staff
CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: No.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. I do have some questions from Cormi ssioner Hall, who is unfortunately not able to be here today because of the M SO board meetings. So let's see.

Okay. So with first -- with regard to the Iine extensi on for Ameren, how -- Cormi ssioner wants to know how does this work with the EV charging stations? How does the line extension policy coordi nate with those?

MG. TATRO: Well, the -- the tar-- so if a charger company wanted to, you know, ask for service -- and I guess presuming for a moment that its -- needs a line extension owner to provi de that service, we would first calcul ate that amount. But whet her -- but then on to-- so that would occur first, but then the EV charging incentives would kick in, pay the line extension costs.

I mean, essentially those parties aren't -- so the rate is set by the line extension tariff and then the programis on top of it and pays, dependi ng upon whi ch I evel we're looking at, whether it's Around Town or the hi ghway or whatever programit is, it pays according to that tariff.

J UDGE DI PPELL: And so what's the benefit of the approach for Ameren of that approach?

MS. TATRO: For line extensi on or for -J UDGE DI PPELL: For this line extension. Mb. TATRO: The line extension tariff just says what anount the customers pays or what amount -- you know, what the cost of it is above what the revenues -- the margi nal revenues that this customer's going to bring in. But then the EV charger tariff's going to sit on top of that and it's going to cover those costs.

I mean the real benefit of the line extension tariff, l'mn--it wasn't designed for the EV chargers necessarily. It was desi gned broader for all non-residential customers to make sure that we're charging them nore fairly. I think it does a better job of capt uring the costs and the revenue than our current policy does.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. And I'mjust goi ng to ask this. You may have al ready just answered this, but his question is, why not just have the line extensi on subsidized for EV charging stations instead of the proposed upfront payment incentives of the Charge Ahead program

Mb. TATRO: Well, I'm sure we will get
into this when we talk about the Charge Ahead programs. We thi nk that merel y paying for line extension costs is insufficient to attract enough EV charging stations into the state of Mssouri.

Now, just -- nmybe this wasn't clear from my prior answer, but the incentives can be used to pay for line extensi on costs in the EV charging case. So those line extensi on costs can be covered under that program but just paying that cost and not having the ability to further pay for the cost of part of the charging unit itself is probably not sufficient to incent the chargers that we need in the state of M ssouri .

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. And di d Ameren consi der owning and operating the charging stations thensel ves? That's his question.

ME. TATRO: We did. I -- back when thi s case was filed, l believe -- and l'Il talk about this in my opening, but part of the reason we came up with this mechani smis we had filed a case a couple years ago in order to own and operate EV chargi ng systems on I-70. The Commission told us that that was not something within their jurisdiction, and that was still in effect when this case was filed.

Si nce that time, the Court of Appeal s
rul ed in a KCP\&L case that it can be el ectric plant. So we had a di scussion about whether or not to change our approach, but we al so heard in that case two years ago concern about utility competition agai nst private entities who might be havi ng chargers and we deci ded that our incentive approach was a good approach and we were goi ng to stick with it. I don't know that that means in the future we're prohi bited fromowning charging stations if that's what we deci de to do, but in this case we' re asking for incentives.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any ot her responses that anyone wants to make to Cormi ssi oner's questions? Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

Well, then l believe we can go ahead then and go into opening statements for the contested issues in this case. And again, l do want to thank you all for working out at least a stipulation on the Iine extensi on policy. I know the Commissioners all appreciate it when the parties can come to a reasonable sol ution.

So we can begi $n$ with Ameren whenever
you're --
MS. TATRO: Where woul d you like thi s set up?

J UDGE DI PPELL: I guess just right there and l'Il put it up on the screen hopef ully.

MS. TATRO: Okay.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Go ahead when you' re ready.

MS. TATRO: Good morning. And good morni ng, Chai rman Silvey. I don't think I've had the pl easure of being in front of you yet, so ni ce to meet you.

So the question today, how do you we effectively manage load in a beneficial manner? So we all know that MEEIA is part of the answer to that question. Ri ght? We work to reduce peak demand. But there are other ways to manage load in a way that can be beneficial to our customers and to our system

And we're here today because of two i nnovative and uni quel y beneficial prograns that we bel ieve do just that. Collectively we call these programs our Charge Ahead program One of them promotes el ectric vehicle charging and the ot her encourages the adoption of certain el ectrical business equi prent. In both cases, these will benefit our customers, the envi ronment and Areren Mssouri.

So stepping back a bit and returning to the Commissi oner -- Cormíssi oner Hall's question that
he asked earlier, the roots of both of these programs, but especially the el ectric vehicle charger program are found in File Number ET- 2016-0246. And that is where the Company sought to construct and own EV charging stations al ong the l-70 corridor.

Now, we didn't get permission to do that in that case, but Ameren M ssouri heard di scussion amongst the Commissioners about whether a make-ready tariff, meani ng one that subsidize or offsets line extensi on costs, could provi de the same boost to the el ectric vehicle market as utility ownership.

So we took that back. We started
thi nking about how we can implement that concept in a way that benefits customers. We took this question very seriously and we did our homework to make sure we addressed it in a thoughtful and innovative manner.

The Company issued a request for information through which we solicited input fromand di scussion with compani es engaged in the business of el ectric vehi cle charging. Compani es that have firsthand know edge of the barriers to EV adoption and about EV charging infrastructure depl oyment.

We recei ved comments from we had conversations with five different compani es to hear their vi ews on what it would take to depl oy a
sufficient number of EV charging stations in M ssouri in order to break down the si gnificant barriers to EV adoption that exist today. We took that input. We studi ed utility prograns in other states and we got to work oursel ves. The outcone of that work is our Charge Ahead EV program

Now, at the same time we recogni ze that some of the innovations and the benefits rel evant to el ectric vehicles could al so be found with other el ectric equi prent. And that opportunity is sometimes known as beneficial el ectrification or eficient el ectrification.

Agai $n$, doing our homework, we engaged a I eadi ng consultant, ICF Resources, to study the market and devel op a programthat we call Charge Ahead Business Sol utions. Mr. Pi ckl es of ICF was invol ved in that work and is here to talk to you about it today.

So obvi ously the case bef ore you is broader than that I-70 corridor case, but the Commission order and di scussi on in that case was the starting point from which Ameren M ssouri devel oped thi s approach.

Now, both of these prograns will provide cost effective new load on Ameren M ssouri's system
through improved grid utilization. This ultimately reduces the unit cost of such infrastructure. This can have a powerful impact on rates, hel ping to keep them as low as possi ble because they produce incremental load and the Company is able to spread its fixed cost across more sal es, leading to lower rates. But beyond those benefits, there's an ad- - the added fact that the programs are good for the envi ronment due to materially lower emissions as compared to intertal -- internal conbustion engi nes. EVs are good for customers in that they provide increased choi ce in vehicle types and better local air quality, which will improve even more as solar and wi nd generation are added to our resource mix.

Further, these prograns provide a uni que benefit that makes themin the public interest. They are the missing piece to the puzzle that will enable transformations that are otherwi se gai ni ng momentumin the energy space. Specifically that transformation is the increasing adoption of renewable resources and di stributed generation resources.

These resources are cl ean and increasingly affordable, but they are al so intermittent. That intermittency can be a challenge for integrating theminto the el ectric grid. And the

I oads pronoted by Charge Ahead are part of the
sol ution to that pro-- to that challenge because most end uses of el ectricity draw energy fromthe grid in real time as they provi de their service to customers. EVs and many efficient el ectrification measures in the Busi ness Sol utions prograns invol ve battery storage, so they can charge when it's best for the grid and use the energy when the customer needs it. Building this type of flexibleload is an i mportant part of the transition of the el ectric grid to supporting a cleaner, nore di stributed generation mix.

So let's turn to the specific programs in front of you. First, Charge Ahead el ectric vehicles. Because Ameren -- because Mssouri's el ectric vehicle infrastructure is underdevel oped, our program encourage EV charging stations at workpl aces, at public places around town, at multi-family dwelling units, as well as interstate and hi ghway installations. These incentives can be used to pay for line extension costs and al so pay additional amounts to cover some or all of the components of the charging stations thensel ves.

Experience in other states and the RFI that we conducted indicate that we simply are not
goi $n g$ to be able to change the charta-- l'msorry, incent the charging that we need without this type of flexi bility.

The goal is to devel op a holistic network of EV chargers across our service territory to ensure that Mssourians who drive EVs have access to the charging they need and the security to know that they can recharge, so that they can get to and from where they are going. Only then will more potential car buyers be confortable enough to bypass internal conbustion engi nes in favor of buying an EV.

I mportantly, the Company's proposal was crafted so that it would be consi stent with and supportive of some broader work bei ng done by the M ssouri EV Collaborative. This is a group of i nvestor-owned, cooperative, municipal utilities and ot her s whi ch have devel oped a mi ni mum practical statewi de network of hi ghway corridor fast charging stations.

And when I say mini mum practical stat ewi de network, I mean the min num number of fast charging stations that need to be located al ong M ssouri's maj or hi ghways to renove the si gnificant barrier to wi despread EV adoption.

Now, to be clear, and as others have
poi nted out, there are some WWtrust fund available to support some of these stations, but those funds are far less than what is needed to install the min mum practical network. And this remains true even though El ectrify America, which is a subsidiary of Vol kswagen charged with implementing a portion of the Vol kswagen settlement, they have plans to install six stations in Mssouri, leaving 33 more that will need to be installed. And let me illustrate this point for you.

So this map is very similar to one that can be found as Schedule PJ-04-10 to the Direct Testi mony of Pat Justis. We' ve used a lighter-col ored background and we' ve enl arged the dots to make it a little bit easier for viewing in the hearing room

So this map represents the Mssouri EV Collaborative's plan for a mi mumpractical network of hi ghway fast charging; a vision that DNR has endorsed and for whi ch a working group has al ready started. In fact, I thi nk they met last week. The Mssouri EV Collaborative, Ied by one of our witnesses, Pat Justis, is coordinating the efforts of the collaborative.

So looking at this map, you can see the proposed fast charger locations and the different col ors represent different IOUs or muni ci palities or
co- ops. So to be specific, where you see a red dot, that represents the fast charging locations that need to be built within Ameren Mssouri's service territory. The dark bl ue dots are the charging stations that need to be built within KCP\&L, KCP\&L/GMD service territory. The green dots are those needed in Empi re's testimny. Gray dots are co-ops and the light bl ue dops -- dots are municipalities.

So this plan is devel oped with the know edge that Electrify America would be building some fast charging stations in Mssouri and there could even be some additional VWtrust money made available from DNR. But even with those dollars, we will fall far short of the min mumpractical network of 40 stations that are shown on this map.

Now, the -- Electrify Arerica has bought some of the -- has installed some of the stations al ready; so in Mbunt Vernon, in Lebanon and in Sullivan. I believe all three of these stations have al ready begun constructed. The three that I believe have not yet been constructed are going to be in St. Charles, Boonville and Kansas City.

Now, you'll note one of them was on -- so sore of those are constructed, the ones on the bottom line, and sone of them have not been constructed. One
is Boonville, which is an Ameren Mssouri service territory location. So in our program we woul dn't be -- have to build the Boonville one. But all of the ot her red dots and bl ue dots and green dots are not goi ng to be constructed with WW money. And if you want that network built, then you need a programlike Ameren Mssouri's Charge Ahead program

Now, Ameren Mssouri is the first
el ectric utility to ask this Commission to support its efforts. Your ruling in this case will significantly i mpact whet her this mi nimpractical net work is ever constructed. Particularly as your decision is likely to send a si gnal to KCP\&L, GMD and Empi re about whether they should construct service stations within their service territories as you see on the map.

Agai n, as I said, Ameren M ssouri witness
Pat Justis is leading this effort and he will be on the stand and happy to answer your questions about the V-- VWsettlement, El ectrify Mssouri and the Mssouri EV Col I abor ative.

Now, of course more el ectric vehicles in
Ameren Mssouri's service territory will result in more el ectricity being sold. And that additional Ioad will benefit the entire Ameren M ssouri system especially if it occurs during non- peak hours.

So what time of day is that load expected? To answer that question, we should be looking at what happened in other states with more advanced EV charger net works and more el ectric vehi cles. Looking at that, we have compel Iing empirical evi dence that the maj ority of the EV charger Ioad, at least 80 percent, will be off peak. So why is that? Because most of the charging is expected to happen at home once customers get home from work and after running errands or going out for di nner.

So look at the second chart. I would call your attention to the bl ue line on this chart. It reflects the findings of a residential EV charging study conducted in California by ICF, the firmfor whi ch our witness, David Pickles, works. This was a met ered study. And the results of the study are similar to three other studi es cited by Mr. Wells in his -- Mr. Wills in his Direct Testimony.

Ameren Mssouri's systemtypically peaks during hour 17, which is bet ween 4:00 and 5:00 p.m So fromhere to here (indi cating). As you can see in the chart before you, resi dential EV charging Ioad begi ns to increase in the afternoon, but it substantially increases more in the eveni ngs, and EV charging load appears to peak around 8: $00 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$

Consequently, while EV charging may add some load to system peak, the vast maj ority of the added Ioad has no impact on the systempeak, meani ng it causes no additional capacity cost. And keep in mind, Mr. Wills has al ready accounted for this mi niml increase in capacity cost. And according to his anal ysis, the margin added fromeach EV is still si gni ficantly positive.

Now, Staff Wtness Sarah Lange provides a multitude of charging scenarios in her Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testimony. But she will tell you herself that she isn't testifying that any of her scenarios are likely to occur. She di dn't even predict what is most likely to occur. Her scenarios are what-ifs without a way to judge the likelihood of any of those ifs. And thus, her scenario cannot be used to judge the viability of Ameren Mssouri's proposal.

Back to the chart for an illustration of this fact. We al ready know the bl ue line represents actual EV charging Ioan -- I oad observed at another utility. So l call your attention to the orange bar. That represents the peak charging load of the average of Ms. Lange's resi dential scenarios fromher Rebuttal.

Now, note if l were to show you a chart
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based on the average of her Surrebuttal residential scenarios, the orange bar would be three times taller. I didn't have a pi ece of paper big enough for that.

She then uses that estimation to impact net margi ns by looking at the capacity costs associated with that level of peak Ioad. Now, she will admit that her scenarios are not based on empirical data. And Mr. Wills' Surrebuttal denonstrates her scenarios are so far froma plausible expectation when compared to actual customer behavi or as to be usel ess in the eval uation of Ameren Mssouri's proposal.

Looking at the empirical evi dence, which is represented by the bl ue line, it is clear her extreme results are simply not going to occur and that a hi gh percentage of charging will occur at a time ot her than peak. Mr. Wills has extensi ve anal ysis on this topic in his testimony and will be happy to di scuss it and ME. Lange's anal ysis with you.

The second half of the Charge Ahead programis called Busi ness Sol utions. The programis sometimes referred to as efficient el ectrification or beneficial el ectrification. It invol ves incenting busi nesses to adopt el ectrically-powered equi pment instead of using certain fossil fuel-powered
equi pment; so forklifts, truck refrigeration units used in loadi ng and unl oadi ng trucks, truck stop el ectrification to power truck cabs overni ght while the driver is sleeping, airport ground units, push- backs, tugs.

The Direct Testimony of Ameren Mssouri
Wtness David Pickles fromlCF explains how this program works. And as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Pickles and his team conducted a potential study in Ameren Mssouri's service territory to determine if there were cost effective opportunities for this program

As part of the study, they conducted primary market research. They went out and tal ked to users and vendors of the equi pment to hear firsthand how they make deci sions about the equi pment that is purchased or what is sold. As it turns out, even with the current level of el ectric powered equi pment that exi sts today, the potential to grow the usage of el ectrically-powered equi pment is still significant.

All of the incentive equi pment is cost effective and ultimately benefits the system by adding load primarily in non- peak hours. Just like EVs, these technol ogi es represent a winfor all of our customers, our shared environment and for Ameren

M ssouri.
So how will the costs of this programbe recovered? Ameren Mssouri is asking for the program costs to be tracked and recovered through an anortization of those costs over time, starting in a rate case. The Company is not asking to add a return for this amount or for any financing cost to be i ncl uded in rates.

Instead, we propose to finance this i nvestment using the positive regul at ory Iag associ ated with load growth promoted by these prograns bet ween rate cases. Of course, during a rate case the revenues will offset other costs and will result in lower rates for all customers.

Now, this creates an incentive for Ameren Mssouri to operate its programefficiently. We only recover our financing costs if we create the very benefits that will permanently accrue to all customers after a rate case. If the Charge Ahead programfails to incent customers to take actions they otherwi se woul d not, meani ng purchase an EV or purch-- or nove to el ectrical business equi pment, then the positive regul atory Iag does not occur and Ameren M ssouri does not recover its financing costs or earn on the regul atory asset.

This process effectively returns the positive regul at ory I ag to customers even before those additional revenues have been included in rates in that it covers Ameren Mssouri's cost of capital that woul d otherwi se have to be included in rates charged to customers. And as we sai d, once revenues are incl uded in rates, the cost of capital has been recovered and the downward rate pressure is placed upon rates. So we' ve come up with a sol ution that al igns the interests of the Company with its customers whet her or not they partici pate in Charge Ahead.

So what do you, as Commissi oners, need to bel ieve in order to approve this program Parties may throw up what-ifs or bring up unlikely scenarios in an attempt to keep the programfrom being approved, but a lack of a guarantee of a particular outcone is not a reason to reject the programs.

As Ameren Mssouri Witness Tom Byrne testifies, there are many reasons to move ahead with the programeven if the results cannot be predicted with absol ute certainty. And let's be realistic.

That's true for al most every deci si on you ever make. You cannot know how much power a wi facility is goi $n g$ to generate when you grant the CCN. There's al ways uncertainty. You base your deci si ons upon
reasonable estimates and anal ysis.
And that's what you have before you today. The Charge Ahead programs are based upon conservative assumptions and even with those assumptions, result in benefits to the entire system whi ch means in actuality that the benefits may far outstrip the level s set forth in our testimony.

Additionally, you should take confort from the fact that other states -- these concepts are not untested. They're model ed after prograns in other states and the risks to customers is limited. The Company's starting with a modest program spending 11 million dollars on EV charging and 7 million dollars on efficient el ectrification. They are Iimited in time. And don't forget, as I explained earlier, we have tied the recovery of -- of our cost of capital to finance the prograns to the success of the programs.

It would appear to me, Cormissioners and Chai rman, that you should want and expect your utilities to innovate and find these types of prograns and opportunities for customers. I know that our customers have that expectation.

And you should not forget that not taki ng action al so has a very real cost. In his Direct

Testimony, Mr. Justis listed just a few of the auto manuf act urers that have announced an impressive and growing list of coming EV offerings. But even since that time, the transformation of the aut omotive sector towards el ectric transportation has continued to accel er ate.

ME. Kelley of the Di vi si on of Energy referenced Ford's pledge to invest 4.5 billion dollars over five years on all el ectric vehicles and General Mbtors pl an for an all el ectric future.

And I'msure you' ve heard the news I ast week that General Mbtors announced the closure of several of its plants and di scontinuation of the maj ority of their gasoline- powered sedans fromtheir product offerings. They're even canceling the production of Volt, which is a pl ug-in hybrid EV that has gas back-up because they are moving towards that all electric future.

In the not too distant future, EVs are goi ng to represent a larger and Iarger share of vehicles on the market that Mssourians will shop in to buy their cars. This reality creates a very serious bi as and need for action. Alack of proactive i nvestment in charging will leave Mssourians with either a lack of access to some of the nost exciting
new vehicle ma-- on the market or an inability to use their cars to the greatest extent possible. EV si mply cannot be adopted until the general public believes they can drive themlike it can drive internal conbustion cars to which they are accustomed.

Other states are recognizing this.
Mr. Byrne's Surrebuttal Testimony references one quarter of a billion and the three-quarter of a billion dollar invest ments in EV charging infrastructure that has been recently announced or approved in New York and Cal ifornia respectivel $y$.

Many of these invest ments will be made by using incentives to third parties who will own and operate the charging infrastructure, whi ch is exactly what Ameren Mssouri's proposing to do in its Charge Ahead EV program

And the list of states goes on. New Jersey announced over 300 million dollars for EV charging infrastructure. In its Report and Order approving AEP Ohi o's EV charging i nvest ment, whi ch incidentally looks a lot like our program the Ohio PC sai d, and l quote, It is essential that drivers of el ectric vehicles being confortable that there are accessible places to charge their el ectric vehicles whet her the driver is a resident of Ohio or traveling
to or through Ohi o.
In another place in the order they said, We' ve encouraged AEP Ohio and other el ectric distribution utilities to be proactive in their i mpl ementation of smart grid technol ogi es and the repl acement of aging di stribution infrastructure to support such -- such technol ogi es.

This Commission must al so be proactive in recognizing and preparing for new technol ogi es. Other states are moving forward. The risk of inaction, as Mr. Wills testifies, is high. Without a strong plan, the state of Mssouri will miss out on a more devel oped EV market. We will miss out on the associated and environmental benefits and our customers will miss out on the downward pressure that these prograns can provi de you.

Our prograns are well bal anced. They are in the public interest and they are reasonably cal cul ated to si gni ficantly advance forward thi nking energy policy in the state of Mssouri. Your Honor, Mssouri does not have to pay the price for inaction. You can approve the Ameren Mssouri Charge Ahead program Any questions?

J UDGE DI PPELL: Mr. Chai rman?
I just have a couple for you. Are
there -- you mentioned several times what other states are doing. Are there legal issues bet ween what other states are doi ng and what the Mssouri Commission can do?

MS. TATRO: There are certainly different I aws in different states, so yes, there could be.

J UDGE DI PPELL: And what about the Iegality of -- Public Counsel has a proposal for performance based recovery mechani sm

MS. TATRO: So that would be the proposal where we don't recover the costs for five or ten years depending on when rate cases are filed. Is that the program you' re referring to?

J UDGE DI PPELL: Yes.
MS. TATRO: The issue I have with that programis the huge del ay in recovery of absol utely prudently expended dollars. I don't -- I thi nk -setting aside legalities for a moment, I don't think that's the type programthat incents the utility to pursue something like this if we have to make an i nvestment and get absol utel y no return for five years or maybe even Ionger.

Al so, I think it risks not having recovery of prudently incurred costs if the utility can't tie exactly what EV cha-- EV charger incented
what car, whi ch l don't know if that's how we can do -- right?

The pro-- the appropriate way to vi ew thi s programis that you have to have this net work. You have to have a systemthat allows people to have the confort to know that they can charge if they travel. But tying exactly what car was purchased and knowi ng how you do that seens somewhat problematic to пе.

So I think there are lots of problems with Public Counsel's -- the programthat they offer. And I think Mr. Wils responds to that in his Surrebuttal Testimny and I encourage you to have a conversation with him when he's on the stand.

JUDGE DI PPELL: But specifically with regard to any legal issues -- I mean a lot of that was policy other than perhaps the non-recovery of --

Mb. TATRO: I think --
J UDGE DI PPELL: -- appropriate policy.
ME. TATRO. I thi nk that's -- standi ng here right now, and I'm-- might think of something more later I suppose, but right now I thi nk that's one of the bi ggest issues is the opportunity to recover our prudently incurred expenses.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Thank you.

MS. TATRO: Anyt hi ng el se?
J UDGE DI PPELL: That will be all. Thank
you.
MB. TATRO: Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Renew M ssouri?
MR. OPI TZ: May it pl ease the Commission. Good morning. I'mTim Opitz for Renew Mssouri. Renew Mssouri supports these prograns and offerings as another way to further encourage investment in renewable resources. That investment will be conti nued to be dri ven by economics, by customer preference and by statut ory requi rements.

It's our view that EVs, or electric vehi cles, will continue to play a role in modernizing the grid, battery devel opment and enable efficient use of the additional renewable and distributed renewable resources that we see coming in the future. It's clear to us that regul ated utilities have a si gni ficant role to play in devel oping EV charging infrastructure, whether it be through ownership directly, rate design, or incentives as here.

In this case, Renew M ssouri supports the Company's efforts and asks the Commission to issue an order permitting themto move forward with their Charge Ahead prograns. Mr. Oven will be available.

He pre-filed testimony in this case. He'll be available Wednesday afternoon. I'm happy to answer any questions.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Mr. Chai rman?
I don't bel ieve there are any questions.
MR. OPI TZ: Thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you.
Char gePoi nt.
MR. COMLEY: May it please the
Commi ssion, Mr. Chai rman. My nare is Mark Comley and I represent ChargePoint and it is pleased to be an intervenor in this proceeding.

As you will find explai ned in greater detail in the testimony that ChargePoint will offer in this hearing, ChargePoint is the I eading manuf act urer of el ectric vehicle charging equi prent and a provider of net work mai nt enance and associ ated services.

Essentially, ChargePoint is engaged in the business of engi neering, manufacturing and selling the equi pment and network servi ces necessary for EV charging station owners to provi de charging services to drivers who visit their properties.

In al most all cases, ChargePoi nt does not own the hardware. The site host, as the ouner and operator of the charging station, is free to set the
price to el ectric vehicle owners who use the charging station, or they may offer that service for free. ChargePoi nt desi gns, devel ops and depl oys resi dential and commercial AC I evel 2 and DC fast charging stations. It desi gns, devel ops and depl oys software applications, data anal ytics and rel ated customer and driver servi ces ai med at creating a robust, scal eable, el ectric vehicle charging ecosystem

Custoners who use ChargePoi nt products and services operate more than 57,000 level 2 and DC fast charging spots, incl udi ng more than 1,300 publicly available workpl aces, commercial and private residential charging spots in Mssouri.

ChargePoint offers a completeline of I evel 2 and DC fast charging products and services, incl uding the CT 4, 000 family of level 2 charging stations for public and workplace charging. It offers ChargePoi nt Hone for single-family residential use. It offers ChargePoint Multi-family for commercial, multi-unit dwellings. It offers ChargePoint Fleet in both 24 kilowatt and 50 kilowatt $D C$ fast charging station for rabbit charging -- rabid -- excuse me, rapid charging needs.

For drivers, ChargePoint provides a uni on unified mobile and web application for all aspects of
public, workpl ace and home el ectric vehi cle charging. ChargePoi nt drivers have access to real-time information, payment and support services through the information available on the screen of the charging station in their mobile application via e-mail and text notifications are on the ChargePoint website.

ChargePoi nt al so provi des services to drivers free of charge, which allow themto easily find and access el ectric vehicle charging infrastructure provi ded by station owners -- owners through a mobile application or in-vehicle --in-vehicle navi gation and on the ChargePoi nt website.

For site hosts, Char gePoi nt provi des subscriptions to a cloud-based platform This provi des the station site host with everything needed to manage el ectric vehicle charging operations, incl uding access control, billing and payment processing, dri ver queuing and advanced Ioad management, and onl ine management tools for charging utilization data collection and anal ysis.

Stations are connected to the ChargePoint cl oud over a secure payment card, industry-compliant cellular data network, allowing station owners to manage all thei $r$ charging operations froma single dashboard.

ChargePoi nt's customers incl ude
workpl aces; governments; hotel s; colleges and uni versities; hospitals; el ectric utilities, some in M ssouri; and other energy compani es; parki ng garages; ai rports; multi-family housing units; auto deal ershi ps; and ot her busi nesses.

ChargePoi nt is sponsoring the testimny of one witness. Mr. James Ellis, seni or director for utility sol utions at ChargePoint will be testifying in support of Ameren's application and the accompanying tariff sheets, particularly for Charge Ahead el ectric vehicles.

His testimony on the Charge Ahead
el ectric vehicles programis di vided into three sections. First, he summarizes Ameren's proposed rebates that are part of this program Next, he details ChargePoint's principles for utility i nvest ment in el ectric vehicle charging infrastructure, focusing on the foundation of the con-- competitive market for charging equi pment in M ssouri. Last, he descri bes how the proposed Charge Ahead el ectric vehicles programaligns with ChargePoi nt's principles for investment.
It is Mr. Ellis's concl usi on that Charge

Ahead as proposed by Areren will support the
competitive market for el ectric vehicle charging throughout the state, and additionally and very i mportantly, will mitigate risk to ratepayers in depl oying charging infrastructure.

In summary, ChargePoint's position is that Ameren's application and accompanying tariffs shoul d be approved.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Any
questions? Thank you, Mr. Conlley.
Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chai rman, Judge, I'm Henry Robertson on behalf NRDC and Si erra Cl ub. We support the Charge Ahead program especially the el ectric vehicle part. Third time's the charm This is the third time that EVs have been before the Commission and this is a carefuly desi gned program that used stakehol der input from the rel evant busi ness communities and was obvi ously informed by what's gone bef ore.

Auto manuf acturers are maki ng maj or commitments to el ectrification, GM most recently. And so we are on the verge of a transformation in the transportation sector and we're not ready for it. With . 06 percent of registered vehicles in Mssouri bei ng EVs, the necessary and expected competitive
market in charging has not happened.
Some empl oyers do provi de workplace charging as an empl oyee benefit. Some busi nesses like banks, car deal ershi ps and some retailers provide it as a customer amenity, but these are not intended to be available to the general public. The WWsettlement will make 6 million dollars available for hi ghway corridor charging, but this is only a start.

And as for multi-family, Staff's unfounded assertion that this will only benefit a single tenant in each building will be a self-fulfilling prophecy if more isn't done.

ChargePoint's Witness Ellis said that I andl ords can offer charging much the same way that they offer coin-operated laundry, but l expect that it will be done much more with smartphone apps than quarters.

Home charging will take care of itself. That where's we continue to expect most charging to be done. But more options are necessary to make EVs a realistic option for most drivers.

And the potential benefits are great. El ectric vehicles compl et el y el imate the ground I evel tailpi pe pollution that we breathe in every day; the fine particl es that lodge deep in the lungs, the
snog precursors, nitrous oxi de and vol atile organic compounds. So there's a tremendous public health benefit.

And for that reason, by the way, we support Division of Energy's recommendation that some of these services be made available in low-income communities, even though they may not immedi ately be able to take advantage of EVs until a market in used EVs devel ops.

Because el ectric notors are so much more efficient than internal conbustion engines, the greenhouse gas emissions are more than a third less and will be lower still as Ameren continues to add renewables to its system as we are confident it will.

In Iarge numbers, EVs act as a di stributed energy resource in that they can be net worked to provi de the ki nd of flexible loads that will make the grid more reliable in the future. And of course, this programwill have the immedi ate benefit of lowering rates by spreading fixed costs over a large number of kilowatt hours.

It's the -- only a pilot, so it will utilize exi sting systeminfrastructure more fully rather than requiring new supply side resources at this point.

Now, Staff and OPC say there is no need for this project. Need is not legal requi rement, but it's certai nly something to consi der. And in the context of certificates of conveni ence and necessity, necessity means not that the service is essential, but that the -- that the investment justifies the cost. Wbuld it be better to make the investment than not to make it? And the answer here is it would be better to make it.

OPC says there is no need for this because it's load building. That's a non-sequitur. Sometimes a load needs to be built to replace even at the expense of an existing fuel; in this case, oil. You can understand -- we can all understand why el ectric utilities are interested in a big new market, but el ectrification stands to be truly beneficial to all of us if it's done with renewable energy.

The Charge Ahead programis a small but necessary step down the road to wi der EV adoption. Thank you. And can I answer any questions?

JUDGE DI PPELL: Any questions,
Mr. Chai rman? No, thank you.
Anything from Empi re?
MS. CARTER: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Energy?

MR. LANAHAN: Mr. Chai rman, Your Honor, may it please the Commission. I'mMchael Lanahan and I represent the Division of Energy as the acting general counsel for the M ssouri Department of Economic Devel opment.

According to its mission statement, the Di vision of Energy assists, educates and encourages M ssourians to advance the efficient use of diverse energy resources to drive economic grouth, provide for a healthi er envi ronment and achi eve greater energy security for future generations. This vision of the future is to pronote effici ency of use, ensure affordability, di versify and promote security and suppl y, undertake regul at ory i mprovements and stimulate innovation in emerging technol ogies and job creation.

These goals and the Di vision's actions are informed by the Comprehensi ve State Energy Plan, or CSEP. One of the issues bef ore the Commission today is whether or not to approve Ameren's Charge Ahead program and what, if any, conditions to add to such approval.

The Division sponsored the Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testimonies of Mb. Cheryl yn Kelley, who's one of the Division's energy policy anal ysts.

ME. Kelley's testimony describes how utility support for the depl oyment of el ectric vehicle or EV charging stations is important for a number of reasons.

These reasons incl ude provi di ng the charging infrastructure necessary for current Ameren customers and those customers who will travel through the state, the benefit to ratepayers fromthe increased and flexi ble load brought by EVs, the retention of Mssourian's dollars in local economies, and the additional economic devel opment benefits and health benefits enabled by EVs.

As stated in Mb. Kelley's testimony, in 2017, nearly 1, 600 peopl e worked in the EV sector in M ssouri -- the EV job sector in M ssouri; a 31 percent increase over 2016. Businesses with sustai nability goal s may be more likel y to locate in Ameren's territory because of greater support for EVs. And those driving through Mssouri shoul d have access to safe and adequate servi ce for their EV charging needs.

There's a role for utilities to fill the gaps in charging infrastructure, both through support for EVCS devel opment and market competition and, in addition, through direct utility ownership of EVCSs.

DE supports Ameren's Charge Ahead program
and it recommends a few conditions on its approval.
First, DE recommends allocating at least 10 percent of charging station incentives to low-income and di sadvant aged communities. This recommendation would ensure equitable access to el ectrify transportation resources. As part of this condition, DE al so recomends that education outreach should be emphasized in low-income and di sadvantaged areas in addition to the general population.

Second, it may be appropriate to create a working group to eval uate additional barriers to el ectrification in low-incone areas. Such a working group may eval uate concerns such as first mile/last mile connection challenges -- first mile/last mile meani ng gaps on either end of a public transit trip that is not within wal king di stance.

The working group could al so assist in identifying additional funding sources to expand transportation el ectrification efforts in these communities.

Thank you, and I'mhappy to answer any questions you may have.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Mr. Chai rman?
CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: I have a question.
Thank you.

You talk about conditions that you would like to see added. Can you tell me by what specific stat ute or rule you believe this authority has the Commi ssion to implement those [sic]?

MR. LANAHAN: I woul d defer to -- no, I cannot of $f$ hand.

CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: Okay. Thank you.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Al I right. Thank you
very much.
Public Counsel.
MR. CLI ZER: I've prepared a presentation. No signal. Do l have it on the right one? No, I don't.

JUDGE DI PPELL: I have it on my screen.
MR. CLI ZER: It's because l didn't put it all the way to the right screen.

All right. May it pl ease the Cormission. Good morning. John Clizer on behal f of the Office of Public Counsel. The case currently before the Commi ssion concerns Ameren's suggested proposal for three separate tariffs. The first, as we' ve al ready ki nd of discussed, is the line extension program l'm not goi ng to say much on this other than we just ask the Cormi ssi on to approve the unani mous stipul ation that we' ve al ready addressed.

The other two issues are the el ectric vehi cle program and the Busi ness Sol utions program Now, the OPC has adopted very different recommendations regarding these two prograns. Specifically, we would ask the Commi ssi on approve the el ectric vehicle program but it do so by incorporating the OPC's proposed performance based metric modification. With regard to the Busi ness Sol utions program we' re asking the Commission reject this proposal.

So to start with, the el ectric vehicle program I believe as Ameren al ready kind of expl ai ned in their opening, the idea behi nd this programis to encourage greater EV adoption. Now, to be clear, the OPC is not necessarily agai nst encouragi ng additional EV adoption. However, the probl emis that Ameren has suggested to do this by subsi di zing the devel opment of additional EV charging stations. And this is where the OPC di sagrees.

Thi s is because all of the empirical evi dence and case studi es that we' ve I ooked at strongly suggest that subsidi zing EV charging station construction is not the best way to encourage further EV adoption.

However, we al so recognize that there's a
potential that Ameren should just be allowed to attempt its program provided that it does so in a manner that makes sure that its ratepayers are hel d harmess in the event that they aren't able to fulfill their goal.

In order to -- to that end, the OPC has devel oped what it terns the performance based metric, which is ai med at ensuring that ratepayers are hel d harmess. The fundament al idea behind this is very si mple. Because Ameren's goal is to induce additional EV adoptions, its ability to recover its programcosts is made dependent on the number of additional EV adoptions that they actually induce.

Now, I'mgoing to go over the nuts and bolts of how this works in just a second, but before l do, I want to bring three thi ngs to the Corminsion's attention. First, all of the numbers that were used in devel oping our program come di rectly from Ameren itself. We didn't want to get into a fight over whether or not any of thei $r$ estimates were right or wrong, even though we were sometimes skeptical of them So we chose to take Ameren at its word regar ding all of its estimates.

Second, we recognize that this program will increase the risk on Ameren. So to compensate
for that, we' ve actually increased the amount that they will actually be able to recover. And this means -- and I really can't stress this enough -Ameren stands to make more money under our program than under thei $r$ own proposal.

Third, collection under our proposal is dependent on Ameren's decision to file a rate case. This means that Ameren's entirely in the driver's seat when it comes to determing when it collects money. Now, this is an important pos-- point because Ameren has highly mischaracterized our proposal in the openi ng -- in the response to the question posed by I bel i eve Commissi oner Hall.

To be clear, under both our proposal and Areren's proposal, a rate case is necessary before collection can begin. That's mostly because you can't introduce new rates without interimrate mechani sm-a statutory interimrate mechanism So you would have to wait for a rate case to begin collection under either proposal.

Mbreover, our proposal looks at whether or not Ameren has met target numbers and it doesn't really care what date those target numbers are set or reached. That means that if Ameren were to meet its target proposals by the time it filed its first rate
case, it could collect the entire amount it spent in that first rate case.

Finally, l would al so point out that Ameren's proposal is -- intends to amortize their expenses over a seven-year period. Ours amortizes it over a five-year period. So if Ameren were to meet its goal in that first rate case, they would actually be collecting faster under our proposal than under thei $r$ own proposal.

So l'mgoing to move on to ki nd of di scussing how it works. And the first issue that l want to deal with is how do you determine the number of induced EVs that this -- Ameren's proposal actually will generate. We're going to do that by first determining what the number of EVs in Ameren's territory at the time of the rate case filing is. We can do that by looking at the records of the Department of Revenue who keeps track of EV regi strations.

Fromthis, we would subtract the number of EV that are al ready in the general population prior to the start of the program Because they're al ready in the program they don't need to be counted. Ameren can't induce those.

We would al so renove the number of EVs
that Ameren predicted would be adopted absent thei $r$ program Agai n, Ameren has al ready cl ai med that these EVs will be induced regardless of whether or not the program goes into effect, so they woul dn't be able to count those. That would leave us with the last -- the actual number of e-- of el ectric vehicle adoptions that Ameren's program would induce.

Now, Ameren has clai med in its testimeny
that they -- this number needs to equal 7,500, in essence, for the programto pay for itself. So the underlying objective of our performance based metric is si mply to say how many EVs out of that 7, 500 target have you successfully induced? And make your recovery dependent on that.

So kind of looking at how it's -- the nuts and bolts. To start off with, all prudently incurred spending that Ameren would have would be booked into a deferred account. This is just like thei $r$ current program Al so like their current program the spending would be subject to the same 11 million dollar cap that they have proposed. We're not changing any part of that.

The one difference with our program
however, is that Ameren would actually begin incurring or accruing interest on this money in the deferred
account. Now, we' ve proposed that they incur interest at the rate equal to their short termcost of debt -cost of short-termdebt at the time they make their expenditure. We believe this is mainly-- this is appropriate due to the size of the investment being made.

Once they have the money in there, how do they get it back out? Well, during any rate case that they file, you would essentially look at the number of induced EVs at the time filing for that rate case, di vide that by 7,500 , and then multiply that by the amount in the deferred account and that's what they'd be allowed to collect.

Agai $n$, all these collections would be anortized over a five-year period and it would $j u s t$ be treated as amor-- amortization expense. Plus, all the money that was left in the deferred account would continue to be eligible for future collection in any fu-- ot her rate case and would continue earning interest. So they don't lose anything if they don't collect all of it in the first rate case. They can still keep trying in each subsequent rate case.

I did mention -- I did forget to mention, I apologize -- our proposal calls for all of this within a ten-year wi ndow. They have ten years'
opportunity to collect that money. That was, agai $n$, a proposal that was actually put forward in Ameren's own testimny, but we support that idea as a good time frame to look at to determine whether or not EV adoptions are actually being induced by the program

But that brings me to my larger point. Under our program if Ameren manages to induce 7, 500 EVs at any point within that ten-year wi ndow, they would collect all of the money. That incl udes both the program costs and the carrying costs that they had -- ot herwi se were goi ng to gi ve up.

Pl us, we' ve even incl uded an emer gency provi sion sort of to ensure that if there's money left over in the account after that ten-year period, then Ameren has a chance to collect at any subsequent rate case based on the numbers that are in place in year ten. Thi s is to make sure that Ameren doesn't have to come in in year ten in order to collect. They can collect it any time afterwards. They just use the numbers in year ten.

Putting all this together, it means that the onl y way that Ameren would not be able to collect its full programexpenses under our proposal is if they were unable to induce 7, 500 EV adoptions over a ten-year period, which we believe is rather generous.

And I al so want to stop and address
somet hi ng. Ameren has ki nd of suggested that it has skin in the game with regard to its own proposal and it's done that by pointing to the fact that it will -it's going to rely on the positive regul at ory lag to pay for its carrying coasts. I believe that's a term they used.

I just want to point out that that means that the onl y thing that they're risking is a percentage recovery of the total programcosts. That percentage recovery essentially representing whatever carrying costs they would have had.

So if we assume that this is going to be financed with short-term debt, which is a good assumption based on the size, that would be roughl y about 2 percent. So they're really only risking about 2 percent annually of the 11 million dollars that they're willing to spend.

It al so means that they onl $y$ have to achi eve about 2 percent of their overall goal in order to be made whole. That's where OPC thinks that its programis superior, because it requires themto actually achi eve the full benefit that they've promi sed customers bef ore they, thensel ves, get their money back.

That ki nd of wraps up the EV program and I'mgoing to instead start tal ki ng about the Charge Ahead busi ness --

J UDGE DI PPELL: Let me interrupt you bef ore you I eave that subj ect.

MR. CLI ZER: Absol ut el $y$.
J UDGE DI PPELL: So are the legal issues then with regard to OPC's proposed performance based recovery, is that just a matter of a rate case? Is that the onl y legal i mpedi ment to --

MR. CLI ZER: I don't see any I egal i mpedi ment. Can you hel p me out?

J UDGE DI PPELL: Well, l'maski ng you.
MR. CLI ZER: Well, I don't see any legal i mpedi ments. As everyone knows, the Company is provi ded an opportunity to recover its costs and this provi des the Company with that opportunity. The Company's never guaranteed to recover all of its costs.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay.
MR. CLI ZER: That's it.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Al I right.
MR. CLI ZER: Were there any ot her questions regarding the el ectric vehicle program

J UDGE DI PPELL: Did you have any ot her
questions, Comm- Chai rman?
CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: Not at thi s time.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you.
Go ahead.
MR. CLI ZER: So the ot her programthat we're here for is the Charge Ahead Busi ness Sol utions program And here the OPC thi nks that this should just be rej ected.

First of all, the OPC has some hi gh-l evel concerns regarding the interaction bet ween this program and some ot her policies, incl uding Ameren's MEEI A program as well as the Comission's prohi bition on certain pronotional practice rules.

But speaking more generally, we believe that this programis si mply poorly designed. And to kind of march through why that is, the first part of the program deals with what's called material handling el ectrification. This mostly invol ves el ectrification of things like forklifts with some truck stop el ectrification and refrigerated trucking thrown in as well .

The problemis the data in the market shows that more than half of the participants within Ameren's market already use el ectric forklifts.

That means that most people are buying these thi ngs
without any incentive in place. So most of the people who buy under Ameren's programare goi ng to be free riders. They al ready purchase these thi ngs without Ameren's incentives.

In addition, the administrative costs of this programexceed 40 percent of the total program costs. Essentially for every dollar that Ameren intends to give away as a subsidy under this program, they'd be spending an additional 80 cents just running the program And we thi nk that's extremel y high, especially gi ven the fact that compared to the el ectric vehicle program that only has a 9 percent cost of administrative cost compared to the total costs.

The ot her program Ameren suggested, the airport el ectrification, it's not any better. Ameren has maintai ned that this is going to affect several different ai rports, but if you look at the actual programpartici pation projections they' ve shown, they are very, very small; strongly suggesting they're really only targeting one airport, whi ch would most likel y be Lambert International.

This is concerning because the administrative costs for the airport el ectrification exceed 50 percent of the total programcosts. Meaning
that for every dollar Ameren intends to gi ve away, they' re going to spend an additional dollar and four cents just trying to gi ve that money away, whi ch we think is ridicul ously hi gh if you're dealing with one ai r port.

Pl us, there's a significant agent princi ple problemin play here because the same party who devel oped thei $r$ busi ness case study and who proposed the administrative costs is the party who's going to admini ster the program whi ch means they have a perverse incentive to make those administrative costs, well, rather high. And it's for all these reasons that we just think that this is a poorly desi gned program and the Cormi ssi on should not approve it.

So just to summarize, once again, we are asking the Cormission approve the Iine extension programas agreed to in the stipulation; that they approve the el ectric vehicle program but with our charge -- performance based metric modification; and that they di sapprove the Busi ness Sol utions program whi ch we consider to be poorly desi gned.

I thank you all for listening. And । strongly encourage you to ask my expert witness, Marke -- Dr. Marke any questions. He is very well
versed in all this. He spent a lot of time working on this and he can speak at length to all of these topics. Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Mr. Chai rman, do you have any questions?

CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: Not at thi s time.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Cormi ssi oner Kenney?
COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: Thank you. No
questions. Can I get a copy of your Power Poi nt presentation?

MR. CLI ZER: I can. It will take me a minute, but l will make sure to get you one.

COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: That's fine. Just by the end of the day would be great.

MR. CLI ZER: I will. Thank you very much.

COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Why don't we go ahead --
COMM SSI ONER KENNY: I i magi ne all of us --

J UDGE DI PPELL: Oh, go ahead,
Cormi ssi oner.
Why don't we go ahead and mark your presentation as an exhi bit for -- not as evi dentiary,
just as --
MR. CLI ZER: What ever works for you.
Just let me know what number I should mark it as.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Your next number is 20--
MR. CLI ZER: 3. No, 202.
J UDGE DI PPELL: 202. So just as a
demonstrative exhi bit. And then if you could make copi es and bring one for the court reporter and one for each of the Commissioners and myself and any attorneys that --

MR. CLI ZER: Okay. One for each of the Cormi ssi oners, the court reporter and any attorneys.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Yes.
MR. CLI ZER: l'Il just assume -- l'II just gi ve a copy to everyone.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you.
MR. CLI ZER: Thank you very much.
I believe l put this back on -- too far -- TV. No, I don't. It was AV 1. The perils of technol ogy.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you.
MR. CLI ZER: I thi nk that's right.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Staff?
MS. MERS: Good morning, Commi ssi oner, good morning, Judge. You'll have to bear with me.

May it pl ease the Cormission. My name is Nicole Mers and I amappearing on behal f of Staff.

And on behal f of Staff, I would like to state that regardless of the representations of the other parties, Staff is not opposed to el ectric vehicles. Staff is not opposed to innovation. Staff is not opposed to new technol ogy.

What Staff does believe is in the absence of reliable assumptions under pi nning a robust cost-benefit anal ysis, that the captive customer base, many of whi ch who are low income customers that the I uxury of an el ectric vehicle is out of reach, they should be shi el ded fromas much unnecessary risk as possi ble.

In other words, when Staff cannot be assured that non- participants will benefit from prograns, that all customers will benefit, Staff takes a skeptical view of those programs, especially prograns that are not necessary for the utility to provi de safe and adequate service.

But does the skepticismmean that there's
no path forward, no middle ground to provide infrastructure for potential el ectric vehicle market but al so protect ratepayers? No, it does not. The parties were able to find a path forward in the recent

KCPL and GMD rate cases by creating a charging class station whi ch would be responsi ble for covering the costs to serve the charging station.

Thi s followed the fundament al cost causation principle. Those who request an additional service bear the cost of those additional services. Thi s principle was followed in the recent Ameren green tariff case and by the Commity Sol ar Prograns of both KCPL and Ameren.

Another path forward is the use of a risk sharing mechani smto put utility and sharehol der skin in the game to ensure that all parties are motivated to make the programa successful one. OPC proposed a ri-- risk sharing mechani smin this case where recovery of funds is linked to the number of el ectric vehicles in Ameren's service territory.

Although not Staff's primary
recommendation, if the Commission would approve the application as filed, Staff would recommend adopting this risk sharing mechani smas well but with a cap to -- with a cap to not exceed 100 percent recovery of costs.

Ameren rejects this risk sharing approach, stating in testimony that the number of el ectric vehicles that will be installed in their
service territory cannot be known with certainty. And OPC and Staff are in agreement on that. That's the contention that we' ve made in testimony.

Ameren seens more than willing to ganble with the uncertainty of the realization of increased EV adoption and, thus, the uncertainty of benefits for al I ratepayers, incl udi ng non- partici pants being realized, if the gamble is with ratepayer money. But when asked to put skin in the game, Ameren calls the betting on the adoption rate of $E V s$ an unworkable and un- - and a radi cal decision.

The third path forward is outlined in Staff Witness Robin Kliethermes' testimony. It does not require Ameren to share risk. Staff's suggestion to move forward is simply a collaborative process with stakehol der input to devel op a make-ready tariff that properly incentivizes increased EV adoption through public access to EV charging, the mimization of free ridership and the maximization of potential benefits to non- partici pating ratepayers by increased margi nal revenues from both EV charging stations and additional home charging revenues.

Beneficial outcomes to this approach woul d incl ude improvements over the current tariff prograns in areas such as port sharing, better and
more defined budgets and caps, limiting what is consi dered make-ready to leave more budget for what is necessary and essential for charging stations whi ch overall allows more ports, and limitation on ports with charging rates above 60 kW due to the potential for increased system cost.

Any of these alternatives would be better than the prograns Ameren asked you to approve today. Instead, Ameren asked you to approve a set of prograns ai med at incentivizing an al ready incented market, the Charge Ahead Busi ness Sol ution program and a set of prograns that either have non-ratepayer funded al-alternatives available or have such ill-defined budgets and parameters that Ameren's own witnesses have testimony that concl udes that prograns will not incent the number of EVs required to cover the costs.

The Charge Ahead el ectric vehi cle prograns and the four sub-prograns are that part. So starting with Business Sol utions, this programis ripe with free ridership. The forklift market al one is 54 percent el ectric. This is not a situation in which ratepayer funds are needed to jumpstart a market.

This is a market with a clear direction towards el ectrification.

The truck stop el ectrification and the
truck refrigerator unit el ectrification are prograns with a hi gh likelihood of free ridership as well as. Not only do deal ers report that 20 percent of truck refrigeration units are electric, but there are new DNR rules that have limitations on idling, which will not only cut down on emissions, but will al so incentivize these I ong haul truckers to switch to that technol ogy that will allow themto run their air conditioning and their heating units without idling. And that's all without the use of customer funds.

The WWmitigation trust is al so
incentivizing a similar el ectrification program Not onl y is the Business Sol ution programriddled with potential free ridership, the cost effectiveness of the programis questionable.

The positive cost-benefit anal ysis result that hinge on assumptions regarding the number of pi eces of el ectric equi pment installed under various incentive types, so the number of el ectric forklifts, the number of ground support equi prent, all have been assumed and -- in coming to the positive results. But the tariff is not designed to produce those results because the tariff doesn't cap the amount of budget spent on any one product type.

Another concern of Staff's is the high
percent of budget that has been allocated to ICF. It's the employer of Ameren's consultant, Mr. Pickles, for the administrative costs. That's 44 percent of the budget dedi cated to programadministration, whi ch I eaves only 3.8 million dollars for the actual incentives that are purported to provide the benefits to all customers.

Because this programis not a good utilization of ratepayer funds due to the hi gh probability of free ridership and the uncertain assumptions behind the cost-benefit anal ysis and due to the direct competition this tariff would have with the CNG provisions found in Spire Mssouri East vehicular fuel rate tariff and Spire Mssouri West's I arge general gas service, I arge vol ume gas service and small general gas service tariff sheets, Staff does not bel ieve Ameren has shown good cause to support a wai ver of the entirety of the Commission's promotional practice rules.

So moving to the four prograns under the Charge Ahead el ectric vehicle program El ectrify America will be building charging stations al ong M ssouri's major hi ghways, which will enable inter-intrastate travel without ratepayer funds.

As of Decenber 3rd, 2018, I believe you
saw this on the map, Electrify America has installed three DC fast chargers on Interstate 44 and the remmi ning chargers will be cited between interstate-on Interstate 70 between St. Louis and Kansas City.

The WW mitigation trust has al so set aside 6 million dollars for a corridor program and that's without the use of ratepayer funds. Utilizing ratepayer funds to create a corridor is redundant and an inefficient use of those funds. The corridor programshould be rejected.

However, if the Commi ssi on would approve the program that approval should be conditioned on the charging stations being placed in accordance with the assi gned charging stations that you saw on the map, the red dots. That condition aligns Ameren's representations about the corridor programbeing part of Ameren Mssouri's commitment as part of the EW [sic] collaborative, but that condition -- or those pl acements are present in the proposed tariff today.

Turning to multi-family. Staff has repeatedly expressed its concerns regarding this programto Ameren. The Iargest concern regards the $m$ - regarding the multi-family programis that subsi di es can be available for private assigned parki ng spaces.

Staff al -- has numbers -- numerous concerns about these assumptions regarding charging, capacity costs, benefits, budgets, margi nal revenues among other thi ngs for all of the programs. But regardless of Staff's numerous concerns, taking Ameren's own provided figures at face val ue,
hi ghlights the prograns would not provi de benefits to non- partici pants.

Mr. Wills' revi sed construction allowance is 1,200. For a budget of 4.4 mili on dollars, 3,600 EVs would need to result fromthis programto be cost ef fective.

Mr. Justis testified that the program would enable about 800 ports. A private assigned parking space with a charging poi nt -- port will only be useable by one tenant and, therefore, only spur adoption of one eltric vehicle. That means that this programis more likely to spur 800 new EVs, a far cry fromthe 3, 600 needed to make the program cost effective. In fact, to provi de benefits to non- partici pants, four to five el ectric vehicles per port must be enabled.

That's the Staff's same concern with the workpl ace charging program Staff, in its Rebuttal, noted that workpl ace charging programs needed a
reasonable utilization rate of at least two vehicles charging at each port per day or the revenue fromthe charging station would be overstated.

Agai n , even under Ameren's assumptions, the construction allowance of 1,200 , the budget of 1. 1 million needs to produce 946 EVs to be cost effective. M. Justis testified that thi s program wou-- would enable 136 ports.

Ameren Witness Steve Wills stated if drivers are going to be required to move thei $r$ cars around at lunch to share a charger, they probably will either not buy the car or will si mply fail to take the action that would otherwi se ensure Ms. Lange's idea of reasonable utilization of the workplace charging is met.

So that means, by his own statement, that each workpl ace charging point -- port would only enable one EV, for a total of 136 EVs, about 800 too short to provi de benefits to all customers. In fact, each workpl ace port would have to enable six to seven EVs per port to provi de benefits to all customers.

Thi s anal ysis does not take into account that Ameren's tariff allows for level 2 chargers of up to 20 kW whi ch increases cost, yet thei $r$ workplace cost benefit anal ysis was based on 6.6 kW charging.

Accounting for that difference requires 1,000 EVs to be produced to make the programcost effective.

Further, the proposed tariff allows for HVDC charging of a minimof 500 kW with no limit on the upper range with -- whi ch has significant system demands and dubi ous val ue if the workplace charging practices are as testified by Mr. Wlls.

Finally, turni ng to public charging, this programis conceptually cl osest to what Staff is recomending as a positive outcome fromthe collaborative process. However, it's only 1.1 million dollars of the total budget and al so lacks robust tariff that encourages port sharing or even identifies Iocations, numbers of ports or administrative costs for Staff to truly eval uate the cost effectiveness of the program and if it appropriately improves public accessibility of EV charging, minimes free ridership, and maximizes potential benefits to other ratepayers through additional marginal revenues.

Al so, under Ameren's tariff designthis program can ultimatel y be unf unded al together as the total 11 million dollar budget can be realigned at Ameren Mssouri's sole di scretion.

On the topic of cost recovery, Ameren M ssouri has not demonstrated how these expenses are
extraordi nary, uni que, nonrecurring or unusual to pass the Commission's threshold for an AAO.

Even assuming for a moment that Ameren had adequately supported its request for a deferral, instead of si mply just requesting one, the expense in question is approxi mately 18 milli on dollars in total. This amount does not approach the 5 percent impact on net annual income materiality standard, which is the second prong to be met to recei ve an AAO.

Even if Ameren was just requesting a tracker -- tracking mechani sminstead of an AAO, these costs are not new costs imposed by a new law or rule, they're not new costs which are difficult to predict and they're not costs that are unusually vol atile. At least one of those standards should be present to justify using extraordinary single-issue rate-naking mechani sns like trackers.

However, if the Commission did approve a deferral in this case, all Ameren's requests for rate- making determination should be deni ed. The courts have clearly stated that AAOs are not a guarantee of recovery. They're not rate-naking. They' re not a return -- a guarantee of return of all or even any of the amount def erred.

The Cormission has foll owed this gui dance
set forth in Mssouri Gas Energy versus the Public Servi ce Commission, which is a Western District case from 1998, and State Ex Rel Office of Public Counsel versus Public Cormíssion Service -- Public Service Cormi ssion of Mssouri, which is a 1993 Western District case.

An AAO simply allows a utility to defer costs and later, as part of that rate case, to collect those costs that examines all rel evant factors, they can argue that that deferred cost can be consi dered by the Commission in rates. That rate case is the appropriate time to determine amortization links, the amount and ot her rate-making determinations.

So to concl ude, the Commissi on should reject the Charge Ahead Busi ness Sol ution programin its entirety and reject the Charge Ahead Electric Vehicle programand order parties to collaborate on an appropriate make-ready incentive model tariff cons-consistent with Staff's recommendations in its report.

And that goes back to a question that Cormissioner Hall posed to Ameren and that is what Staff believes is the appropriate way to incentivize el ectric -- el ectric vehicle chargers through a nake-ready line extension tariff model.

The AAO shoul d be denied. And with the

AAO deni ed, the question of rate- making treat ment becomes moot. Thank you. And Staff Witnesses Sarah Lange, Robin Kli ethermes, Mark Oigschl aeger and Byron Murray will be available to answer any of your quest i ons.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Mr. Chai rman, di d you have questions?

CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: I do. Thank you.
So you mention in your opening the idea of di ctating basi cally the -- where those charging stations should be on -- matching up with the map that was provi ded.

MS. MERS: Yes.
CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: Okay. l'Il ask you the same question I asked the Division of Energy, whi ch is by what stat ute or rule do you believe we have the authority to direct up front investment as opposed to determining prudence after the investment was made?

MS. MERS: I think that we see in many
cases -- I think the Grain Belt case contai ned examples of conditions. The rate cases sometimes contain conditions, MEEIA cases contain conditions.

So I can't point you to the stat utory authority right now and l'mhappy to brief that for you. But it is something the Commission has done. I
thi nk at that point it is up to the utility in question to look at those conditions and decide if they can live with it or not. So if they don't want to follow those conditions, they can withdraw the program and not move forward. But if they'd like to nove forward, they have a gui del ine of parameters that they have to meet.

So it ultimatel y comes down to what they're willing to live with and how much val ue they put on the programif those conditions would out wei gh that value.

CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: But if we' re si mply looking at right now whet her or not to set up an AAO, how -- how woul d that work that we would set conditions. Because the AAO is not guaranteed recovery, so why are we setting conditions?

MS. MERS: Well, I think then it hel ps when you look at an AAO in the rate case and determine the prudency to see if it is allowable in rates. If you can look at locations and find themto be consistent with Ameren's testimony on what the corridor charging programis, then l think it hel ps build that case for prudency in the rate case.

CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: Okay. If you could brief me an answer to that question --

MS. MERS: Sure.
CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: -- about stat ut ory or rule authority.

MS. MERS: Yes.
CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Commi ssi oner Kenney,
anyt hi ng?
COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: I have no
questions. Thank you very much.
MS. MERS: Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Wait just one noment, ME. Mers. I wanted to ask you the same question that I had asked Ameren and OPC and that is, are there any other legal impedi ments to OPC's performance based recovery mechani smother than the potential for a lack of recovery?

MS. MERS: I -- I don't bel i eve so. Ri sk sharing mechani sms aren't something new that -- the Commi ssi on has seen them before. I thi nk they were just ordered in the KCPL rate case. In situations where there is risk for the consumers, I think it's a mechani smthat's been used before. So I can't think of anything that -- that would legally prohi bit that.

And as counsel for OPC was stating that for all costs, there's a potential that they may not
be recovered. So that's -- that's a risk they -- any utility faces.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Is there an inherent risk in that type of recovery mechani smthat -- because of the question of tying those specific costs to the specific incentives?

MS. MERS: I actually think that it would work in an opposite way, because with -- with a normal cost, you could come in for a rate case and -- and the whol e thing could be di sallowed because you're not sure; there's no sharing. But implicit in the sharing mechani smthere is the -- the promise that if they meet that threshold, that they can collect those rates -- or those expenses.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. I'msorry. Ms. Tatro, did you have a comment?

MS. TATRO: I did. I was going to request that you mark the two documents that l put up, not necessarily for evi dentiary purposes, but so that those are in the transcript. And I will have copi es of those for you.

JUDGE DI PPELL: I was about to get to that myself. So l want to incl ude the two exhi bits that ME. Tatro used in her openi ng statement as
denonstrative exhi bits. And those will be -- the first one, whi ch was the Mssouri map showing charging station locations? Is that an adequate description?

MG. TATRO: I think so.
JUDGE DI PPELL: That will be Exhi bit 8. And Exhi bit 9 is the graph -- what was the title of that graph, ME. Tatro?

MS. TATRO: Let's call it EV Usage Map -- Graph.

JUDGE DI PPELL: Okay. And that will be Exhi bit 9 for denonstrative purposes. And if you woul d get copi es of those to us and the court reporter specifically.

Mb. TATRO: I will. Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Now we sai d we were goi ng to follow the order with the exception of ME. Kelley was going to testify today. Are we going to begin with the first witness or are we going to begin with ME. Kell ey?

MR. LOWERY: I think it's the Company's preference -- pardon me, Your Honor -- to go ahead with Mr. Byrne and -- and make a judgment at some poi nt during the day whether ME. Kel ley needs to be taken out of order in order to get on today is what we woul d prefer.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. That's what we will do then. So let's go ahead and take a break until -- well, let's take a break -- let's see. Let's go until about 10 till, so not quite 15 minutes. And we'll begin with the first witness when we return. Thank you. Let's go off the record.
(A recess was taken.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. We are back on the record after our break and M. Byrne has al ready graci ously cone to the stand. l'Il let -- ME. Tatro, do you want to --

MS. TATRO. It's going to be Mr. Lowery.
J UDGE DI PPELL: I'msorry. Mr. Lowery, I was --

ME. TATRO: That's all right. I
appreci ate that.
J UDGE DI PPELL: l'II go ahead and swear in Mr. Byrne then.
(Witness sworn.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. You can go ahead, Mr. Lowery.

MR. LOWERY: Thank you, Your Honor.
TOM BYRNE, being first duly sworn, testified as foll ows:

DI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MR. LOWERY:
Q. Pl ease state your nane for the record.
A. My nare is Tom Byrne.
Q. M. Byrne, did you cause to be prepared for filing in this docket any pre-filed testimony?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And it was Surrebuttal Testimony; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. It's been marked as Exhi bit 1?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any corrections to that
testimony?
A. I do not.
Q. If I were to pose the questions in that testimony to you today, would your answers be the same as gi ven in the testimon?
A. Yes, they would.
Q. So those answers are true and correct to the best of your know edge and bel $i$ ef?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you, M. Byrne.

MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, l'd move for the admission of Exhi bit 1 and tender Mr. Byrne for cross- exami nation.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbul d there be any
obj ection to Exhi bit Number 1?
Seei ng none, then l will admit that.
(Exhi bit 1 was recei ved into evi dence.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: Is there any
cross-exami nation for Mr. Byrne from Renew M ssouri?
MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoi nt?
MR. COMLEY: None. Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Ener gy?
MR. LANAHAN: None, Your Honor.
J UDGE DI PPELL: I'msorry. I ski pped
Empi re.
MG. CARTER: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: And Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: None, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Of fice of Publ ic Counsel ?
MR. CLI ZER: Yes. Bri efly.
CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MR. CLI ZER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Byrne.
A. Good morni ng.
Q. Just real qui ck, it is correct that the Company is not intending to issue any new long-term debt to pay for the cost of this program-- the EV charging program Correct?
A. That's correct.

MR. CLI ZER: That was my onl y question.
JUDGE DI PPELL: All right then. Anything
from St aff ?
CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MS. MERS:
Q. Good morning, M. Byrne.
A. Good morning.
Q. Are you familiar with the two- part test the Comm ssi on eval uates AAO requests under?
A. Yes, I am
Q. Okay. And what are those standards?
A. Well, l think -- let me say it this way.

I thi nk there's a difference between a hi storic AAO where you deal with a like -- something like a storm that happened in the past as opposed to a -- an ongoi ng tracker. So I thi nk the standard is different for those.
Q. Okay. Wbuld you agree for an AAO that you uni que, unusual or non-reoccurring is the first prong?
A. I think for something like a stormthat happened in the past, that -- that would be the st andar d.
Q. For an Accounting Authority Order?
A. For a stormthat happened in the past, yes.
Q. Ubuld you agree that material is the second?
A. I -- yes, for a storm-- for a stormthat happened in the past, materiality would be a standard.
Q. All right. Can you turn to page 5 of your Surrebuttal?
A. I'mthere.
Q. Li nes 18 through 19 state, Third, the magnitude of the particul ar prograns proposed in this case is quite small in the scheme of things.

Is that an accurate readi ng?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And if we look at line 23 and then would continue to 1 -- line 1 through 3 of the next page, This compares to an annual retail revenue requi rement for Aneren Mssouri of approxi mately 2.7 billion, making the maxi mum potential cost of these prograns onl $y$ about one-tenth of 1 percent of Ameren Mssouri's revenue requi rement.

Is that an accurate readi ng?
A. Yes.
Q. And one-tenth of 1 percent is less than 5 percent. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. So you' d agree, by your own statement,
that this programs magnitude is quite small and that the impact would be less than one-tenth of 1 percent, that this program has an immaterial impact?
A. I don't know if l'd characterize it as immaterial. It -- it -- it's --
Q. Yes or no.
A. -- one-tenth of 1 percent so you can -you can characterize it however you want.
Q. Do you know Aneren's Iast authorized ROE?
A. For the el ectric business, l think it was 9. 53 percent.
Q. Are you familiar with Areren's quarterly surveillance reports?
A. Yes.

MS. MERS: Okay. I thi nk we have to go in-camera for the next question.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. If you'll hol d on just one second, we will go in-camera. I will ask that anyone in the room who is not authorized to hear confidential information, if the attorneys could help me police that.
( REPORTER' S NOTE: At thi s poi nt, an in-camera sessi on began, which is contai ned in Vol ume 3, pages 97 through 99.)

TI GER COURT REPORTI NG, LLC

TI GER COURT REPORTI NG, LLC

TI GER COURT REPORTI NG, LLC
( REPORTER' S NOTE: At this point, public sessi on resumed.)

MS. MERS: Actually, I was correct. I do have no further questions. Sorry for the fake-out.

THE WTNESS: That's okay.
JUDGE DI PPELL: All right then.
THE WTNESS: No need to be sorry about that.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Mr. Chai rman, do you have questions?

CHAI RMAN SI LVEY: Yeah, I have a coupl e quest i ons.
QUESTI ONS BY CHAI RMAN SI LVEY:
Q. So does the Company have the ability to track how much el ectricity is being used by EVs?
A. Currently we -- we don't entirely. We don't have smart meters, AM meters which would allow us to track it. So I thi nk if a residential customer -- you know, it's possible to just charge your el ectric vehicle by pluging it into a pl ug on your -- at your residence. And I don't think -unl ess there's a separate meter there, I don't think we have the ability to separately track that.
Q. But you would be able to track from the chargers that you would be installing through
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## Char gePoi nt?

A. Yes.
Q. So what -- in your projections, what -what do you need to hit on the ChargePoint chargers to denonstrate -- if you got your 75-- under your proposal to get 7, 500 new EVs, you have to have projected how much would be used on ChargePoint chargers, how much nould be hone, how much would be -I mean you have to have projections for that, I would assume?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Okay. So on the ones that you could track, you know how much el ectricity needs to be sold thr ough that net nork.
A. | -- I mean l thi nk -- I thi nk based on -- and l mean Mr. Wills is probably a better witness to ask about this than me, but l thi nk based on our projections and the way we see things, at the very most, only, you know, like -- like 15 percent of the -- of the charging would ever be done at outside charging stations. So I don't think, in -- in our opi ni on, the chargers could ever pay for thensel ves based on the charging that's being done there.
Q. But you woul d have benchmarks that if we hit $\mathbf{7 , 5 0 0}$, we expect this much to be done so --
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through the trackable charging stations at Char gePoi nt .
A. I beli eve we do.
Q. So while it woul dn't be directly verifiable, you could project that if you're hitting that or more on the ones that you can track and you' ve seen an increase in load overall, that some of that is probably coming from EVs. I mean would that be a reasonable assumption?
A. Sure. I think -- yes, I thi nk you could -- you could make assumptions and educated guesses or educated projections about how much of the EVs were charged at home.

I guess one of the things l'd like to say is, you know, other parties focused on the 7,500. And we do -- we do bel ieve by having this programand havi ng chargers installed, it will remove a barrier. And we do believe that more el ectric vehicles will be purchased if this programs approved. But it's -- but it's -- that's not the onl y reason to approve this program

We -- regardl ess of whether vehicles are incentivized by the exi stence of these el ectric vehi cle charging stations, we have customers who have el ectric vehicles who need chargi ng. So even -- even
for customers whose cars were not -- whose car purchasing deci si ons were not affected by this -- by this, they still need charging.

Just like -- you know, an anal ogy we thought of is when air conditioning care al ong and peopl e-- we weren't incentivizing air conditioning, but we had to devel op infrastructure to serve the needs of our customers. This is a new need of our customers and we need to devel op infrastructure to serve it.

And we do believe additional cars will be incentivized, but even if no cars were incentivized, we still need to build this infrastructure to serve our -- our customers with el ectric vehicles.
Q. Okay. So OPC suggested the performance incentive based on the number of EVs sol d. Wbuldit be possible to tweak that performance metric to kil owatt hours?
A. I -- I don't believe the performance metric's appropriate at all. In my opinion, this should be treated like other el ectric plant that's built. We -- it's up to us to come up with a prudent plan and it's up to us to execute that plan in a prudent manner. But -- but if we do that, we should be able to recover the costs.
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And like I said, even if -- even if not any el ectric vehicles were -- were incentivized by this, which I think is not at all true -- of course they will be -- but even if not a single el ectric vehicle was incentivized by this and we onl y had the 25, 000 that are projected in our IRP, this is still a I egitimate expense. We're -- we're serving those customers who have a new el ectric need just like -just like air conditioning was a new el ectric need in the 1950's. We should be -- we should be building thi s infrastructure anyway.
Q. Okay. And I appreci ate that you don't believe that a performance netric is necessary, but I'II rephrase the question. Does the information and tracking ability exist to devel op a perfornance metric on kilowatt hours as opposed to cars sol d?
A. You'd have to make an educated assumption about home charging, and you could do that. You could probably -- you could probably do that, but there's no metering right now that would -- that would tell you exactly what it is.

## Q. Okay. Thank you.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Cormi ssi oner Kenney?
COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: Thank you.
QUESTI ONS BY COMM SSI ONER KENNEY:
Q. I just -- I know we' ve dealt with this -the EV stations in years past. Can you direct ne to Company testi mony whi ch shous the number of EV vehi cles sol d and increases or decreases si nce about 2000 and al so what the projections are? Do you have -- I thought I saw that somewhere, but I --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- might be going back to a couple years ago.
A. $\quad$ - - you mean -- you' re tal ki ng about testimony in the previ ous case?
Q. No, this case.
A. In this case. I -- I think Pat Justis is the witness. He's got some inf ormation in his testimony. I -- I believe the latest inf ormation that we have is there's about 5,000 el ectric vehicles and hybrids in the state of M ssouri as of right now, but -- but --
Q. Do you know how many in your servi ce territory?
A. I -- I think you'd be better of $f$ asking Pat Justis that since he's the person who studi es this.
Q. Okay. Next question, currently if a homeowner has an el ectric vehicle, is there anything
that prevents them from having their own charging station in their house right now with their own --
A. No, no. They all -- every -- every el ectric vehicle ouner has a -- has a method of charging in thei $r$ house.
Q. I knowit mentioned about th- does this program -- what does this program do for that homeowner?
A. Well, l think range anxi ety is a big problem It's a big barrier.
Q. No, I understand. I -- I meant -- okay. Let me -- let me rephrase my question. Because I underst and that scenario.
A. Okay.
Q. Makes compl ete sense. And I remenber you had one guy with a Chevy Volt or something tal king about trying to get to Jeff City from St. Louis and it was like four stops or something.
A. He -- he's here today. Steve Wills, one of our witnesses. And he did not drive his Volt here today.
Q. For the homeowner and thei $r$ personal charging station, does this have any effect on them this legi slation -- or this -- legislation -- that's not goi ng back.
A. It -- I mean no, not directly. I mean we' re not -- we' re not --
Q. Taking out the time for -- for conveni ence and travel and things like that, this doesn't affect --
A. It does-- it doesn't affect the -- the infrastructure at home. It does not --
Q. Doesn't affect the --
A. -- affect the infrastructure at home.
Q. -- homeouners for j ust what they have at thei $r$ house?
A. Right. This is all outside your house.
Q. Okay. I just wanted to clarify that.

Thank you very much.
A. Yeah.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Are there any further cross-examination based on Comission questions? We'll start with Renew. Sorry.

MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoi nt ?
MR. COMLEY: None, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: None.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Empi re?
MS. CARTER: No, thank you.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Energy?
MR. LANAHAN: No, thank you, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Of fice of Public Counsel ?
MR. CLI ZER: Yes. Thank you.
CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MR. CLI ZER:
Q. M. Byrne, in response to a question that

Kenney just posed you, I believe you stated that this would have no affect on indi viduals at home who have el ectric vehicles at home. Did limhear that?
A. Vell, l -- you know, none -- none of these -- these are all the four -- the four types of charging stations that we' re proposing to incentivize, none of themare at -- at your home.
Q. Yes. But the programis bei ng -- all of your ratepayers nould be paying for the program Correct? The -- the --
A. They woul d -- they would be paying for it and they would be reaping the benefits of -- of it as well 1.
Q. And those benefits arise fromthe adoption of new EVs. Correct?
A. | -- | think that's one benefit. As | said, I al so think this is an emerging -- regardless of whet her we incentivize any new el ectric vehicles, this is a need of our customers. Even -- even the

25, 000 el ectric --
Q. It's a need of all your customers?
A. No. It's a need of the customers that have el ectric vehicles.
Q. For the customers who don't have el ectric vehi cles, the benefit stens fromthe increased load.

## Correct?

A. That's true. It's -- it's very similar to when air conditioning first came on our system Not every customer had ai r conditioni ng, but -- but yes, they were --
Q. So whet her or not new EVs is adopted is

## i mport ant?

A. Yes, it's somewhat important. That's -it's an important factor.
Q. Thank you.
A. Not the only one.
Q. No further questions.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Any further
cross-examination from St aff based on Commission questions?

CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MS. MERS:
Q. In response to some questioning from Chai rnan Silvey, you were tal king about projections that you guys had done. Where are those projections?
A. I think Chairman Silvey sai d could you do projections.
Q. I -- maybe I misheard, but I thought your response to him was that yes, those did exist, you had at least some of that inf or nation.
A. To the extent we have some of that information, I guess Mr. Justis has it, but l don't -I don't.
Q. So you believe M. Justis has it; you' re not sure of that?
A. He has sore projections. It depends on what projection you want.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

JUDGE DI PPELL: Is there redirect?
MR. LOWERY: Just a few questions, Your
Honor.
REDI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MR. LOWERY:
Q M. Byrne, Ms. Mers asked you some questions about Accounting Authority Orders. Do you remenber those?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the Company asking for an Accounting Authority Order in this case?
A. We're asking for deferred accounting.
Q. And -- and is another way of saying that
we' re asking that the Comission authorize a tracker?
A. Yes.
Q. Is a tracker and an Accounting Authority Order, gi ven the Commission's practice in the last several years in the orders that it issued, are they the same thing?
A. I don't thi nk so. Agai n, l -- as l tried to say to Mb. Mers, if you're tal king about an Accounting Authority Order for an historic storm for example, that happened in the past, they -- they apply a standard of it has to be extraordinary and material, all the thi ngs Mb. Mers was tal king about.

In the case of a tracker, I don't -- you know, the -- the history of the Commission is they al low trackers under different standards than that.
Q. Are you aware of some trackers the Commissi on has act ually approved for the Company that woul d be anal ogous?
A. Sure. They' ve approved any number of trackers. We -- we have an pensi on and OPEB tracker. There's nothing extraordinary about pension and OPEB expenses. The -- the -- they're a normal expense of business, but -- but for policy reasons, the Cormi ssi on's approved a tracker. We had a tracker for veget ation management expenses. Agai n, you know,
they -- it wasn't -- they weren't extraordi nary, they weren't unpredi ctable. They weren't -- they weren't subj ect to the stam - same standards as an AAO for a storm was subj ect to.
Q. Pre- MEEIA energy effici ency charge tracker. Do you remenber that?
A. Sure. That's another example. There are -- there are really many exampl es where the Cormi ssion has approved trackers.
Q. And is the magnitude or materiality of the amount to be tracked, has that been rel evant to these prior trackers that have been approved?
A. No, it has not.
Q. You were asked some questions about the sur vei II ance.

MR. LOWERY: And I'm not going to go into any numbers, so l don't thi nk we have to go into in-camera, Your Honor. BY MR. LOWERY:
Q. But you were asked some questions about the surveillance reports. Are -- are you aware of whether or not the figures that were cited, whether or not they' re weather normalized?
A. I know they're not weather normalized.
Q. Did they take into account the fact that
no Cal laway out age had taken place during that 12- month peri od?
A. They did not.
Q. Did they take into account ot her adj ust ments that would need to be made to determine whet her or not on a regul at ed basis that ROE has anything to do with your actual earnings?
A. No, they di dn't. And there was a foot note on the -- on the report that said that. And one of the other things that was in the foot note was incore tax -- the effect of the incone tax reduction.

So we -- on the el ectric side, Ameren M ssouri, pursuant to Senate Bill 564, has accounted for the full amount of federal income tax reduction, but I think there are timing differences that make it not all appear in that year. So that may be part of what the return is attributable to. And there can be other factors. It's -- you know.

## Q. Based on a question lthink Comissi oner

 Kenney asked, M. Clizer asked you a question about benefits to non- participants; in other nords, people who are not at least now buyi ng an EV. Do you remenber that question?A. $\quad \mathrm{d}$ d.
Q. Back in the ' 50 s when some f ol ks were
buyi ng ai $r$ conditioners but ot hers weren' $t$, do you have an opi ni on about whet her everyone on the system eventually benefited fromthe fact that the comCompany invested infrastructure to allow those early adopters of air conditioners to -- to use air condi ti oni ng?
A. Event ually everybody benefited because of the use of -- it -- over the long-termincreased use on the system whi ch spread out the fixed costs. I got to say, one other difference -- one other way people benefit is the environmental benefits. So to my mind, the -- even the customers -- even the customers who don't have el ectric vehicles get to breathe cleaner ai $r$ and reap the envi ronment al benefits.
Q. I think I just have one last question. The very first question $\mathbf{I}$ hi nk on cross-exami nation you were asked was whether or not the Company's going to issue any specific additional long-term debt to finance these prograns. Do you remenber that?
A. Yes.
Q. Does the cost of the capital the Company depl oys, whether it had to issue bonds to get it today or whether it takes it out of its treasury, does the cost of that capital depend on whether it issued new

I ong-t er m debt?
A. No, it doesn't. And I thi nk the cost of the capital too over a long period of time is much more our -- our wei ghted average cost of capital than -- than debt. So, you know, if -- if you look at a -- if you look at a debt that's a year or less, maybe that's short-term debt, but l thi nk if -- over a longer period of time, the more appropriate measure of the cost of capital is our wei ghted average cost of capital.
Q. Do you have an understanding of whet her or not, if the Company's advancing these expenditures and deferring them and then -- for consideration of a rate case later, do you have an expectation about whet her that's goi ng to be a long-termor short-term peri od?
A. I would expect it to be a long-term period for this program

MR. LOWERY: Thank you, Your Honor.
That's all l have.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Byrne. I bel i eve that concl udes your testimony.

Ameren want to call its next witness?
MS. TATRO: Patrick Justis.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Mr. Justis, if you'd please rai se your right hand.
(Witness sworn.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: You mæy go ahead,
ME. Tatro, when you're ready.
MS. TATRO: Thank you.
PATRI CK JUSTIS, bei ng first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MG. TATRO:
Q. Good norning. Coul d you please state your name and busi ness address for the Comi ssi on?
A. Yes. Good morning. Pat Ju-- Patrick Justis, busi ness address is 1901 Chouteau Avenue, St. Loui s, M ssouri 63103.
Q. And are you the same Patrick Justis that pre-filed Direct and Surrebuttal Testinony inthis case?
A. Yes, I am
Q. Do you have any corrections or additions to make to that testimony?
A. I do.
Q. Which piece of testimony are we starting in?
A. Start with Direct.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Hol d on just one moment.

BY ME. TATRO:
Q. And if you'll start by giving the page and line number, that will hel p--
A. Sure.
Q. -- everyone find it.
A. Direct Testimony page 15, it's Table 2, the row for Rocky Mbuntain Power Utah. In that EV Program Description col um, I have fast charging incentive is 5 percent of cost up to 63, 000 .

That should be 75 percent of cost.
Q. Okay.
A. Next is page 17, Table 2, col um is Total Budget for Ameren M ssouri row. The 10.5 should read 11 M
Q. Any ot her in your Di rect Testimony
A. One more. Page 36, there's a table gi vi $n g$ the incentives and the number of ports expected. So that col um for Number of Ports Expected, if you look for the Long Distance Corridor, that's the second row from the bottom of that table. It says 10 to 12 . That is 10 to 12 islands . So really to correspond to the ports expected, that should be 20 to 24 DC and 20 to 24 L2 or level 2 ports.
Q. Okay. Then Surrebuttal, did you have

## corrections for that?

A. Yes, I do have --

J UDGE DI PPELL: I'msorry. Let me --
would you restate the -- how should it read on that I ast change?

THE WTNESS: For the charging islands, the I ast one? That col um Number of Expected -Number of Ports Expected for the Long Distance Corridor row, it says 10 to 12 . That should read 20 to -- 20 to 24 or 20-24 DC and 20-24 L2.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Thank you. Go ahead.

THE WTNESS: You're wel cone.
And then in Surrebuttal, let's go to page 6 and this refers to the Electrify America charging stations that you referenced on the map. On Iine 14, and sentence begins on Iine 13 at the end of that, Wth the seven. That seven should be six.

And, therefore, if we go to the next Iine, 15, that 33 should be 34 . And then based on that same error, if we look at page 8, line 7, the 33 should be 34 again. And where it says 40 mins the 7 , that should be 40 minus the 6 . And then finally, on Iine 10, a few words in you see 33 . That should be 34. And I -- I believe that catches all of those
changes.
BY MS. TATRO.

## Q. So with those changes, if l were to ask

 you the questions that are in your Di rect and Surrebuttal Testimony, would your answers be substantially the same?A. Yes.

Mb. TATRO: So I bel ieve Mr. Justis's
Di rect Testimny has been I abel ed 002 . Hi s confidential Surrebuttal is 3 C and his public version of his Surrebuttal is 3P for public. I move for admission and tender Mr. Justis for cross.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbuld there be any objection to Exhi bits 2 and 3, both public and confi dential ?

Seei ng none, I will admit those exhi bits.
(Exhi bits 2, 3-P and 3-C were recei ved
into evi dence.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: All right. Is there cross-exami nation from Renew?

MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoi nt?
MR. COMLEY: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: No, Your Honor.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Empi re?
MS. CARTER: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Ener gy?
MR. LANAHAN: No, Your Honor.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Office of Public Counsel ?
MR. CLI ZER: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: St aff?
MG. MERS: Yes.
CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MS. MERS:
Q. If we start with your Di rect Testimony,
is it accurate to say that pages 23 through 27, a paragraph on page 31 and a table on page 36 in your testimony are the onl y places the Charge Ahead EVs are di scussed by sub-program? And l'II gi ve you time to go through them and --
A. Yeah. Could you repeat the pages $j u s t ~ t o$ make sure l've got them right?
Q. Sure. 23 through 27.
A. Okay.
Q. Page 31 -- there's a paragraph on page
31.
A. And?
Q. And then the table on page 36.
A. And the questi on was?
Q. Are those the onl y pl aces in your
testimony where the Charge Ahead EV prograns are di scussed by sub- prograns?
A. You know, it -- that may be. I would probably need to read the entire document to say definitivel $y$.
Q. Sure. In the pages mentioned, are the sub- program budgets di scussed?
A. The sub- program budgets are somewhat outlined in 36. The charging incentives make the bulk of the budget for the prograns. So the 10 million you see on that table on page 36 would al so be suppl emented with a million dollars for marketing and awareness, outreach.
Q. Are there sub- program RIM resul ts provi ded?
A. I did not do anal ysis on RIMtesting in my testi mony, no.
Q. Is there any quantification or di scussion of the number of EVs expected to be enabl ed by each sub- program So in the indi vidual, not the aggregate.
A. Ri ght. No. My testimony focuses on the merits of the programand how it should be accompl i shed.
Q. Okay. Will you please turn to page 8, Iine 11 of your Surrebuttal?

MS. TATRO: I'msorry, what page?
MS. MERS: Page 8, line 11.
MS. TATRO: Thank you.
THE WTNESS: Okay.
BY ME. MERS:
Q. You state the network install cost for the statew de programis 12 milion dollars; is that correct?
A. Well, I did, but what -- could you repeat the page?
Q. Sure. Page 8, line 11.
A. Okay. I was in-- yes. Okay. I'm
there.
Q. Okay. And there are 6.8 mili on dollars available through the WWtrust fund. Correct?
A. No. There are dollars that the DNR, the beneficiary for the Vol kswagen trust money that comes to Mssouri, they have allocated the full 15 percent based on proposal by the M ssouri EV Collaborative and with public support to put that towards EV charging in a corridor map that ME. Tatro showed.
Q. Okay.
A. So it's approxi matel y -- it's 15 percent of about 41 million. It's about 6 million dollars that the VWtrust has earmarked.
Q. Okay. So 6 milion?
A. Yes.
Q. So then that leaves, according to your testimony then, a milion dollar shortfall to compl ete the statewi de ne-- stat ewi de net work. Correct?
A. That's accurate.
Q. And the EV collaborative is a vol untary associ ation. Correct?
A. It's an informal group of utilities, environmental groups and el ectric transportation advocates, yes.
Q. And it's compromised of how many part ners?
A. Approxi matel y 10 . I'd have to count them
Q. Wbulditincl ude Empire, Kansas City Power \& Li ght, Kansas City Power \& Li ght Greater M ssouri Operations, Ki rkwood El ectric, Col unbia Witer \& Li ght, and City Utilities of Springfield, among ot hers?
A. Yes. It includes all those utilities, pl us Si erra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council.
Q. Okay. And at line 13 of your Surrebuttal you testified that utilities will match funding.

## Correct?

A. It's on the same page you're referencing?
Q. Yes. On the same page.
A. Yes. The M ssouri EV Collaborative recom-
Q. A yes or no is sufficient. Thank you. So out of $f$ the $\mathbf{6 m i l i}$ on dollar shortfall, Aneren Mssouri ratepayers will be contributing 4.4 milion as part of the cari-corridor program which is about 84 percent of the funds needed to compl ete a statewide utility corridor charging net work; is that correct?
A. I would have to figure the math. What we have put in the -- in the --
Q. If you don't know--
A. -- testimony is --
Q. -- that's sufficient. Your -- your counsel will be able to redirect you.

Can you please pa-- turn to page 13 of your Surrebuttal? You have a figure comparing EV adoption rates in various cities; is that correct?
A. These are the Figure 4 are you
ref er enci ng?
Q. Yes.
A. This is sal es growth.
Q. Sal es grouth. Okay.
A. So it's sal es rates.
Q. Sure. Okay. So then in quarter 1 and quarter 2 of 2017, it represents that there was an 80 percent increase in sal es grouth for the Kansas City area; is that accurate?
A. Approxi mately, yes.
Q. Okay. And then in quarter 4 of 2017, it dropped to what looks to be about 55 percent, which if that's correct, uould be about a 25 percent decline; is that correct?
A. Yes. I would say there's a decline that's in measure with others. But this is a growth rate so you don't expect it to continue to climb.
Q. Wére you anare KCPL offered free charging for the first two years of the Cl ean Charge Net work?
A. Yes, l'maware of that.
Q. And were you aware that this free chargi ng ended December 2017, whi ch con-- coi nci des with the decline in EV adoption?
A. I know it did for some sites. The host sites could determine if they wanted to continue to offer it for free is what l understood.
Q. On page 14 of your Surrebuttal you have some testi nony regarding the $\mathbf{C l}$ ean Charge Network.

And to summarize, it con- it concl udes that resulted more EVs in the Kansas City area, caused beneficial load grouth for the grid, and downward pressure on customer rates. Is that an accurate summary? Pro-I'mlooking at lines 1 through 7.
A. On page 14, yes, I thi nk that's -- sure.
Q. All right.
A. That's accurate.
Q. In examining KCPL, were you aware that KCPL, in its most recent rate case, asked for an increase in rates?
A. I'mnot familiar with their recent rate case.
Q. Okay. Were you aware that KCPL $\mathbf{~ W}$ tness Darrin lves stated flat or declining load as the reason behi nd the rate case?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q. Wére you aware in researching the $\mathbf{C l}$ ean Charge Net nork that KCPL Wtness M. Darrin Ives stated flat or declining load as the reason behi nd the rate-- thei $r$ most recent rate increase request?
A. l'm not aware of that statement. That doesn't surprise me.

MS. MERS: l'd like to mark two exhi bits.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Staff's next exhi bit
numbers are 107 and 108.
(Exhi bits 107 and 108 were marked for
identification.)
BY ME. MERS:
Q. You in your Surrebuttal critique both Staff and OPC for not providing constructive criticism So do you recognize these e-nails? Ve can mark that as the -- I believe it nould be Staff Exhi bit 107.
A. I don't recall them but I don't have any reason to believe l -- it's not an e-mail that l've seen.
Q. Are you in the CC Iine of those e-nails?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Okay. And do you recogni ze the second itemthat l've handed you as the agenda that was contai ned in the Power Poi nt that was presented at the July 13th techni cal conference?
A. Yes.
Q. And were you at that technical conf er ence?
A. Yes. I presented.
Q. And that agenda shows that the parties were to go over additional anal ysis requested by the parties and issues raised with the corridor charging
and multi-family properties. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So to create this agenda and run additional anal ysis, at some point Staff and OPC had to, in some manner, share concerns; isn't that correct?
A. Say that agai n.
Q. So to create an agenda and to run additional anal ysis, at some point Staff and OPC would have had to express to the Company issues they had with the program is that correct?
A. Issues, yes; but constructive concerns or suggestions, no.
Q. Okay. And if we turn to the August 7th e-nail, is it accur ate to summarize that e-nail as stating that Areren Mssouri woul d not be addressing the Charge Ahead EV program at the August techni cal conf er ence as it bel i eved there were too nany outstanding issues to di scuss?
A. Can you di rect me to where it says that?
Q. I believe it's the second -- second page of that e-nail bunch -- or second attachnent, I should say.
A. Second attachment.
Q. Yeah, the last page.
A. Okay. And what was the question agai $n$ ?
Q. Is it accurate to state that that e-mail, as a summary, that Aneren Mssouri stated it noul d not address the Charge Ahead EV program at the August technical conference as it bel ieved there were too many outstanding issues to di scuss?
A. Yes. Too many out st anding i ssues, not necessarily constructive.
Q. Al right. Did you attend the August techni cal conf er ence?
A. I bel ieve I attended all three.
Q. Al right. So constructive is in the eye of the behol der, but for Ameren to know that there were too many outstanding issues to address, at sone poi nt Staff had to provi de feedback of some sort and concerns, and OPC as well, to Aneren. Correct?
A. Pl ease repeat.
Q. So for Aneren to know that there were too nany issues to address at that techni cal conference I think parties nay qui bble about constructive, it's probabl y subj ective - but at some point Staff and OPC had to provi de some sort of feedback and concerns to Areren for them to nake that statement; is that correct?
A. Well, l woul d read it as too many issues
are -- is a polite way of saying there's basically an adversarial or obstructive approach that was being taken. So we wanted to nove on and be constructive with time and get the line extension resol ved.
Q. Okay. Uell, thank you for that col orful char acterization.

MS. TATRO. Obj ection. She's badgering
the witness.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Ms. Mers, proceed.
MS. MERS: Thank you.
BY ME. MERS:
Q. And in the August and July techni cal conference, those were bef ore parties filed Rebuttal. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And there were no further techni cal conferences after August. Correct?
A. That's correct.

MS. MERS: So at this time I'd like to
nove to enter those exhi bits.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbul d there be any objection to Exhi bits 107 and 108?

MR. COMLEY: Can you describe whi ch one is 107?

J UDGE DI PPELL: Oh, I'msorry. The
e-mail conversations is Exhi bit 107, and the agenda froman August 17th techni cal conference number 3 is Exhi bit 108.

MR. COMEY: Thank you.
MS. TATRO: No obj ection.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Seei ng no obj ection, then I will -- l will admit those.
(Exhi bits 107 and 108 were recei ved into evi dence. )

MS. MERS: Thank you. I have no further questions.

J UDGE DI PPELL: All right. Is there -are there any questions fromthe Bench? Mr. Chai rman? Commi ssi oner Kenney?

COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: Yes, thank you. QUESTI ONS BY COMM SSI ONER KENNEY:
Q. Good norning, M. Justis. Yeah, it's still morning.
A. Mbrning.
Q. Staff counsel asked you a question regarding the -- Mssouri and their charging stations where -- are you aware that Kansas Comi ssi on deni ed their request to put charging stations into rate-base?
A. l'm not closely familiar, but l'm--
Q. Familiar --
A. -- somewhat aware, yes.
Q. -- familiar that Mssouri made the same similar deci si on?
A. For --
Q. For the charging --
A. -- for the west side of the state.
Q. And I -- I know Kan- - I know KCPL made
the determination or statement was that they would not build any more charging stations in Mssouri or Kansas. Are you aware of that?
A. I believe they stopped installing, yes.
Q. I'dilike to ask you a question regarding your charts on your Di rect Testi mony pages 10, 11, 12 and 13. And I'II be very brief.
A. Okay. Sure. I'mthere.
Q. So if I read that chart right, you have 51 -- 50 states and UAshi ngton, DC.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Page 10 of it shows the six states that are greater than 1 percent of EV sal es could -compared to di rect vehicle sal es for 2016. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And they' re California at 3.52 percent and Oregon at 1.87 percent and they scale down?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. The remai ni ng 40-- what do we have -46 -- 45 states nould be under 1 percent; is that correct?
A. Yes. As of through 2016, yes.
Q. And then in -- Mssouri is at . 29 percent, ranked 34th in states. In 2016, we sold 890 EV vehi cles compared to 308, 000 total sal es; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have projections of -- by -- if -if -- if Aneren is granted permission, your request on these charging stations, what the projections are for -- I didn't find it in here -- for future EV sal es going for ward?
A. Commi ssi oner, I don't -- I have not done projections.
Q. Okay. You have not done?
A. No. I mean the -- the onl $y$ projections that I'maware of that we have are in the IRP. And Winess Steve Wills, my colleague, l think references those. But I would not say we have really strong forecasts noving forward.
Q. So what's the need for the charging stations?
A. Well, what l do know is that if we don't
do this, we will continue tolag and we will not get the ki nd of adoption and, theref ore, the benefits that -- that we ought to get. We ought to be going after these. And this is the way to do it.
Q. Are you familiar with what California's done?
A. Somewhat familiar. It's --
Q. $\quad \mathbf{W} \boldsymbol{t h}$ their - -
A. -- very aggressi ve.
Q. I'mtal ki ng about being very -- yes, very progressi ve. They - each one of their three naj or utilities have a substantial anount of ratepayer subsidy. Substantial. And obvi ously they' re selling a lot nore vehicles.
A. Yes, sir. And that's - that's why they're on the top of the list and -- and l cite--
Q. California-- it's Californiatoo. I grew up there, so.
A. I cite-- yeah. Well, it's an i nteresting case because the, you know, Commission at first said, Utilities, you stay out. This is all private sector.

Q Right.
A. They weren't reaching goals. The state was very interested in reaching goals and they said we
need to reverse this. Utilities, you need get i nvol ved. Please provi de us pilot prograns. So I even use that as an example on why we need to get started here. It's a rel atively modest level proposal, but I think --
Q. Yeah. They'rein-- they' re in the hundreds of miliions for --
A. Yeah. Ri ght.
Q. -- at least tho of their utilities.
A. Ri ght.
Q. And they' ve $j$ oi ned -- yeah, they al low the private compani es to be -- participate, so.
A. Right. And we' d like permission for 11 million to try to move this market formard. We've done a lot of research to figure out is this the right approach and really improved fromour last case. Really heard what you all said and listened to the market pl ace too. We reached out to the market to say what is it goi ng to take? And that's what you have in front of you.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. Thank you

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you.
Are there any further recross from--
regar di ng Commissi oner questions from Renew M ssouri?
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MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoi nt ?
MR. COMEY: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Empi re?
MS. CARTER: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Ener gy?
MR. LANAHAN: No, thank you, Judge.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Office of the Public
Counsel ?
MR. CLI ZER: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Staff?
MS. MERS: No, thank you.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Is there redirect?
MS. TATRO: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
REDI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MB. TATRO:
Q. So, M. Justis, early on M. Mers asked you questions about quantification of EVs that would be enabl ed by each sub-program Do you remenber that di scussi on?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that the appropriate way to
eval uate -- to -- to frame an eval uation of your proposed program and if not, why?
A. No. I'm-- what we have proposed is this hol istic net work. You don't really -- while it's fair to critique an indi vidual sub- program these all come toget her to create this holistic charging net work that will allow both EV users currently to better utilize thei $r$ electric vehicles, but very importantly, prospective EV buyers to see what's happeni ng in the market, to benefit fromthe charging and feel confortable that they can drive their vehicle.

So it not only raises awareness, but it enables themto travel. For example, it's not just range anxi ety to try to get across the state. It is actual lack of charging. You cannot do it in most el ectric vehicles today. And really Tesla is the exception to that and they have thei $r$ own long- di stance network because they knew they had to do that in order to sell those long-range vehicles.

So you have to look at the programin its entirety. You should not focus on one single measure at a time in this case. That's appropriate in some types of prograns, but not in this one.
Q. After that, ME. Mers tal ked to you about the WWtrust and the dollars coming fromthat. Do you recall those questions?
A. Yes.

## Q. Can you expl ai n to the Commissi on how the

## WWtrust morks?

A. Yeah. And maybe a little di scussion of the timeline would be hel pful. And if you bear with me, we -- we had an EV peer exchange that Kansas City Power \& Li ght hosted in the fall of 2016. And at that meeting we di scussed the WWsettlement and that money was coming to the states, incl uding M ssouri. And about 41 milli on dollars was coming and possibly some of that could be used for electric vehicle infrastructure.

So that got us interested and we -- we deci ded to follow that, talk with DNR, who's the beneficiary of that money. And through their public process, we ended up provi ding some comments.

The Mssouri EV Collaborative that l'm Ieading of all those entities that Mb. Mers mentioned, and it's listed in my -- in my Direct Testimony, came toget her with a vision for how that money could be used to hel p the whole state. And that's the plan with the big Mssouri map, the white map with the col ored dots that ME. Tatro referenced.

So we' ve put a vision toget her. We recogni zed when we put that vision together that El ectrify America would be coming through with some
stations. It turns out there's six of them And that we wouldn't duplicate that effort. We al so knew that there would be some WW money if we coul d convi nce DNR that this was a good way to use the money, a statewi de net work, it's public, it's available to everyone. It would allow anyone with an EV that has a 100-mile range to travel fromany point in the state to any ot her point.

And one of the things that we recommended in that plan was that, you know, the utilities are uni quel y positioned to hel p this happen. So we're the ones that will benefit frommost of the charging that happens, which is at ni ght. It won't happen at these charging stations as much. It's mostly goi ng to happen at ni ght, and so at homes. And so we put forth that that should probably be a match by utilities or commities where these charging stations woul d -woul d go in.

And so that's the -- the rel ationship bet ween utility or EV collaborative invol vement, the WWtrust funds that come to Mssouri and Mssouri can choose how to spend, and the Electrify America program whi ch -- whi ch WW thei r subsidiary, El ectrify America, gets to control.

## Q. So explainto me what DNR's roleis with

the WWtrust dollars.
A. WWis the beneficiary. So the trust
requires that each state define who -- who will manage that fundi ng. And in M ssouri, it's the M ssouri Department of Natural Resources.
Q. And do you know what categories of awards DNR is able to make?
A. Yes. I -- I can't gi ve you the formal off the top of my head, but it's basically -there's -- there's lots of categories. One is el ectric vehicle charging infrastructure. Another is diesel retrofits or el ectrification of trucks. It can be some of the equi prent we tal ked about earlier, whether it's -- but -- but the hope -- all the measures point to the same thing, which is NOX reductions. That's what the WW trust is all about.
Q. So the allocation of dollars that -- that DNR has -- is DNR able to nove the allocation around bet ween the award cat egori es?
A. Yes. DNR has a plan currently for -- for the money. And, for example, the 6 milli on that they' ve earmarked for el ectric vehicle charging infrastructure is not in budget yet. Mssouri has chosen to make sure that -- that each year the WW trust funds that they want to spend go through the
appropriations process, even though it's a pass-through.

And so each year that's going to have to be approved. Ri ght now they have not put any el ectric vehi cle infrastructure money -- none of the 6 million is in budget. They're going to try to do it next year. So while that's DNR's plan is to try to make this vision happen, it's not -- it's not a done deal, if you will. It's -- it has to go through appropriations.

And so that money could be moved -- in fact, they' ve al ready moved some money. They moved money from-- through that appropriations process, they -- they put a million of the truck dollars got earmarked for Corrections and that was not in the original pl an from DNR. So there are changes that can be made to it.
Q. All right. So I think what you' re saying is that there's legislative approval of what allocations actually occur?
A. Yes. That's correct.
Q. So the indi vidual legi slators, do they have the ability to change DNR's allocations if they so desire?
A. Yes. As long as -- as long as -- l
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should put a caveat. As long as it's within what the WWtrust says is okay.
Q. Okay.
A. In those categories.
Q. So tell me what guarantees there are that the 6 milion dollars is going to end up being al located to EV chargers.
A. There -- there is no guarantee. I would say it's likely, but -- but it's not a guarantee.
Q. And assuming for a moment that the 6 milion dollars is allocated to EV chargers, why does that not result in a sufficient network of EV charging in the state of Mssouri?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q. So assume for a moment the 6 milicon dol $I$ ars from the trust fund --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- is used for EV charging.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Why does that -- why is that not sufficient to create a network of EV chargers in the state of Mssouri?
A. Well, the vision we' ve put toget her is for a minimpractical network. So to do that you have to have approxi matel y 40 of these charging
islands around the state. DNR's money that they would bring forward would take care of basically half of that, not all of it.

And so that's why we need, you know, utilities or other -- even private sector -- maybe the cost of it can come down through some private sector contribution. We -- we intend to find that out through a competitive auction process, reverse auction basically. And find out how much incentive do you need in order to build one of these corridor sites in a competitive way, competitive -- through a competitive process.

So we -- it's basically half from WW
trust and we need to come up with the ot her half through utilities or commities.
Q. So then ME. Mers asked you about a table on page 13, I think it was. She tal ked about fourth quarter 2018, there being a drop in the grouth rate. Do you remember that conversation?
A. In Surrebuttal, yes.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I remenber.
Q. What does -- and it's label ed grouth

## rate. What does that nean?

A. That means the -- and you'll see
percentage on the left-hand side. That means the percent age growth compared to what you have ye-- and it's year over year. So you woul dn't expect to sustain a constantly increasing growth rate.

So if you have a good growth rate this year and then it stays the same or even drops a little bit next year, that means you're still growing. Your growth just isn't accel erating as fast, but you're still growing each year.
Q. Then Mb. Mers asked you some questions about the KCP\&L rate case. Do you recal lhose questions?
A. Yes.
Q. Wbuld you expect -- well, first of all -yeah, woul d you expect KCPSL's EV charging load grouth to offset other revenues?
A. I would absol utel y not --
Q. Or excuse me, expenses.
A. I would not expect, especially a
rel atively new programto offset all of the efficiency in renewables that are coming onto our systems in Kansas City's case or in Ameren's case. These are not overni ght sol utions where you put themin pl ace and just within a few years you've -- you' ve creat ed that much Ioad growth.
Q. So when testi mony from Aneren Mssouri tal ks about downward rate pressure, what does that mean?
A. Downward rate pressure in my mind means rates are lower than they otherwi se would be. So our rates will do something in the absence of this program If the programis approved, you can expect that rates would be lower than they otherwi se would have been. That doesn't mean they woul d go down.
Q. Then M. Mers had a couple exhi bits, 107 and 108, which were some e-mails and an agenda. Do you still have those documents?
A. Yes.
Q. Al right. Mr. Justis, in your opi ni on, did Staff work constructively to find a way to make the EV charger program work?
A. No.
Q. So when there were di scussi ons -- well, expl ain to me why you say no.
A. Well, l'Il give you one example, if that's hel pful. I was actually surprised in the first techni cal conference that as soon as we headed into trying to tell the background and the story behind what we have proposed, we were basically inter rupted asking, Where's this going? This is not -- you know,
let's get into the details, ABC. And we were just trying to get the basis and the background out. And so I -- I was taken aback by that, thought that this is not constructive. This is going to be difficult.
Q. Did Staff provide changes to the programp Did they propose changes to the programp
A. During the techni cal conference?
Q. Un-huh.
A. No. At least not that I recall.
Q. Just a monent.

I have no further questions. Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Justis. I believe that concl udes your testimony.

THE WTNESS: Thank you.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Just on a scheduling note, I was going to try to go till about 12:30 or so before we break again for lunch. So we'll see what cones up as a conveni ent stopping point.

Ameren's next witness?
MR. LOWERY: Call David Pi ckl es to the st and.
(Witness sworn.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Go ahead,
M. Lowery.

DAVI D PI CKLES, bei ng first duly sworn, testified as foll ows:

DI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MR. LOMERY:
Q. Wbuld you please state your name for the record?
A. David Pickl es.
Q. M. Pi ckles, did you causes to be prepared for filing inthis doc-- docket two pieces of testinnony premarked as Exhi bits 4 and 5, Di rect and Surrebuttal Testimony respect fully?
A. I did.
Q. Do you have any corrections to your testimony -- your pre-filed testinnies?
A. I do have some corrections to my Direct Testimony, yes.
Q. Pl ease go ahead.
A. There were some transcription and copy/ paste errors in the origi nal spreadsheet for some of the measures that caused a few of the numbers to change very slightly. None of them change any of the fundamental concl usions or directions of the -- of the Direct Testimony.

I apologize. It's a fairly long list.
There are 13 changes. The first is on page 6, line 8.

The number 1.63 shoul d be number 1.81. On page 7, Iine 17, the number 152,536 should be $142,503$.

J UDGE DI PPELL: I'msorry, Mr. Pi ckl es. I -- I pulled out the wrong testimony. Can you just repeat those two? I --

THE WTNESS: Sure. It's in my Direct Testimony, page 6, line 8 is the first one. And I do have them on a piece of paper if that would be -- if that would be hel pful to di stribute.

But the first one, page 6, line 8 is 1.63 becomes 1.81. Page 7, line 17, 152, 536 becomes 142,503. And 892 becomes 833 . On page 7, line 18, 32, 663 becores 30,615 . Page 7 , line 19, 353, 153 becomes 331, 017.

Page 8, line 16, the 1.63 agai $n$ becomes 1. 81. Page 8, line 17, 11. 4 becomes 13. 9.

Page 9, Iine 1, 3. 47 becomes 3. 39. Page 9, I ine 2, 74.9 becomes 68.7.

On page 16, that entire Table 2, all the numbers in there, adj ust slightly and I do have a revi sed Table 2.

Page 19, Iine 10, 630, 488 becomes 596, 774.

MR. CLI ZER: I'msorry. Could you repeat that?

THE WTNESS: 630, 488 becomes 596, 774.
Page 19, Iine 11, 1. 9 becomes 1.4. Page 19, I ine 12, 1.63 becomes 1.81. And the last one, page 19, Iine 12, 3.47 becomes 3.49 -- I'msorry 3. 39 .

And I would note that all those numbers are -- were previ ously provi ded to parties in the stakehol der working group and through the di scovery process and they're all correct in my Rebuttal Testimny. So it's all been provided previously.

J UDGE DI PPELL: And I'msorry. You had a new Table 2?

MR. LOWERY: Yeah. Wbul d you like us to go ahead and mark that? We can get more copies if we need to, but go ahead and mark it so that --

JUDGE DI PPELL: Yes, I woul d.
MR. LOWERY: May I approach the witness?
J UDGE DI PPELL: Yes. Let's mark that as Exhi bit 10, corrected Table 2.

MR. LOWERY: We do have a few copi es here, Your Honor. So l'Il go ahead and give one to the court reporter and the rest to you and we'll get nore. Exhi bit 10 you said, Your Honor?

J UDGE DI PPELL: Yes.
(Exhi bit 10 was marked for
identification.)

J UDGE DI PPELL: So that's corrected Table 2 frompage 16 of Mr . Pickles' Di rect Testimony. BY MR. LOWERY:

Q And, M. Pickles, you -- in your -- in your description $j$ ust a mite ago, you indicated that this information had been gi ven to the parties in the case. Do you know about when that was? Whs that last sumer?
A. It was.
Q. And $\mathbf{j}$ ust to -- $\mathbf{j u s t ~ t o ~ m a k e ~ s u r e ~ I ~}$ understood, and in your Surrebuttal Testi mony you use these updated numbers. So your Surrebuttal Testimony numbers are consi stent with what had been gi ven to fol ks back last summer?
A. That's correct.
Q. Any ot her corrections?
A. No.
Q. Wth those corrections, if I were to ask you the questions that are posed in -- in Exhi bits 4 and 5, woul d your answers be the same today?
A. They woul d.

MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, with that, I
would offer the admission of Exhi bits 4 and 5 and al so Exhi bit 10 reflecting the corrections to the one table, and tender Mr . Pickles for cross-examination.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbul d there be any obj ections to Exhi bits 4 and 5 and 10?

Seei ng none, I will admit those three
exhi bits.
(Exhi bits 4, 5 and 10 were recei ved into evi dence. )

MR. CLI ZER: Four is Direct?
J UDGE DI PPELL: I'msorry. Four is the Direct Testimony, 5 is the Surrebuttal Testimony, and 10 is that corrected table.

All right then. Is there
cross-exami nation from Renew M ssouri?
MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoi nt ?
MR. COMLEY: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Empi re?
MS. CARTER: None. Thank you, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Energy?
MR. LANAHAN: No, thank you, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Office of Public Counsel?
MR. CLI ZER: Yes, judge.
CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY NR. CLI ZER:
Q. By my watch it $\mathbf{j}$ ust became afternoon, so
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I'II say good afternoon, M. Pickles.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. You' re empl oyed by ICF Resources, LLC.

## Correct?

A. Yes.
Q. And ICF Resources, LLC has entered into a contract with Ameren to carry out the proposed beneficial el ectrification program Correct?
A. Just for one year. So not for the entire program but for the first year, that's correct.

MR. CLI ZER: Judge, l'd like to mark an exhi bit. I believe it should be OPC 203.

J UDGE DI PPELL: That is correct.
Dr. Marke, if you have enough copi es there, could you go ahead and gi ve me copies for the ot her Commi ssi oners?

DR. MARKE: Yes.
(Exhi bit 203-C was marked for identification.)

J UDGE DI PPELL: And this is -- al so appears to be confidential ; is that true?

MS. TATRO: Yes.
MR. CLI ZER: Yes.
J UDGE DI PPELL: And do we need to go
in-camera for questions about it?

MR. CLI ZER: Lat er.
J UDGE DI PPELL: All right. Pl ease let me
know.
MR. CLI ZER: Eventually. I will.
JUDGE DI PPELL: And I'Il ask the parties
to let me know if we need to go in-camera.
BY MR. CLI ZER:
Q. This is the copy of the contract signed bet ween ICF and Ameren. Correct? I'II gi ve you a moment to revi ewit.
A. To -- to the -- to the best of my know edge. I don't -- I would have to verify it, but yes.

MR. CLI ZER: I'd like to of fer this
exhi bit.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbul d there be any
obj ection to Exhi bit 203-C?
MR. LOWERY: No obj ection.
J UDGE DI PPELL: All right. I will admit that into the record then.
(Exhi bit 203-C was recei ved into
evi dence. )
MR. CLI ZER: Thank you. BY MR. CLI ZER:
Q. M. Pickles, do you have a copy of your
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surrebuttal and Di rect Testimony handy?
A. I do.
Q. Thank you. Could you pl ease turn to page 11 of your Surrebuttal Testimony for me?
A. I have it.
Q. On page 11 you have a Figure 1 that you describe sort of as a composite bet ween Figures 4 and 5 from Dr. Marke's testinony; is that accurate?
A. That's correct.
Q. The -- and I apol ogize. M ne' s black and white. But the larger dashed line that's label ed Diffusi on Shape, that cones from Dr. Marke's Table 5. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. You would agree with me that that's -that shape has no correl ation to the $X$ axis upon which the graph shows?
A. Yes. As l -- as l specify in my Foot note 8 on page 12, that -- the line as represented comes from Mr. Marke's testimony that did not have specific years al ong the X axis, but did indeed show the progression of time. And my point in superimposing it on the actual market share was to demonstrate that --
Q. That's okay.
A. -- at no point does the actual share --
Q. A simple yes or no will be -- suffice. MR. LOWERY: I don't thi nk he asked hima si mpl e yes or no question.

MR. CLI ZER: I asked himif it had no correl ation. The answer is apparently yes, it has no correl ation.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Continue. BY MR. CLI ZER:
Q. M. Pi ckles, there's a snaller dashed Iine Iabel ed Ameren and on the graph it says 4.96. Do you see what l'mreferring to?
A. I do.
Q. There's no citation anywhere in your Surrebuttal to the source of that 4.96, is there?
A. That's -- that's incorrect. There is a citation.
Q. Could you direct me to that citation?
A. Wile I read for it, I can -- l can tell you it was taken fromthe actual market share within the counties served by Ameren for 2017 and 2018. And I bel ieve it says that in the text, solet me see if l can find the --
Q. You have not incl uded a citation for that information, have you, or provided it as an attachment?
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A. Well, I -- I say somewhere in the text that it was cited to the Industrial Truck Associ ations so yes, l believe I do. And it's the same citation that Dr. Marke uses for the -- that he incl udes actually a -- a screenshot of in his testimony, Industrial Truck Associ ation provides all the statistics. So mine are simply more recent and for the Ameren-specific service territory.
Q. Dr. Marke provi ded testinony for the entire North Anerican di strict, but you took just Aneren's?
A. I looked at both the entire North

American, but for the purposes of my testimony, trying to understand what was happening within the Ameren-specific -- within the Ameren service territory and rel evant to this program I used the same national data source, but l refined it to reflect the counties that are served by Ameren and the number of Ameren customers within each county. And al so adj usted it to excl ude Cl ass III forklifts, which are not eligible for the programand should not be included in any market share anal ysis.
Q. That actually -- that brings me to my next question actually. On page 10 of your testimony, roughl y lines 3 through 13, that paragraph, you
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criticize Dr. Marke's anal ysis by suggesting that he inappropriatel $\mathbf{y}$ incl uded Cl ass lll el ectric forklifts and that his 66 percent, which actually shows up on the prior page, should actually be about 50.4 percent. Wbuld you characterize that as a correct assessment?
A. The 50.4 reflects the internal conbustion tarket [sic] share that should be targeted. So the actual el ectric market share is the uni verse of that or the -- the 49.6.
Q. So you' re saying that the national market is 49. 6 for electric forklifts?
A. Depends upon what year, but in general, approxi mately the market share is roughly $50 / 50$.
Q. Could you turn to page -- actually it's a schedul e, Schedule DP- D2-14 in your Di rect Testimony? I'll give you a mute tolet you find that.
A. Thank you. I have that.
Q. You would agree with me that that shovs that the local forklift population -- and I assume local meaning Aneren's service territory -- is at 54 percent el ectric?
A. I'msorry. I have DPD-2-14.
Q. 12. I'msorry. I misspoke, 12.
A. I apologize. DPD-2-12. I'msorry. The question agai $n$ ?
Q. You would agree with me that that -- the illustration on the -- near the bottom of that page indi cates that the local forklift popul ation -- and agai $n$, I assume local means Ameren' s service territory -- shows 54 percent el ectric?
A. Indeed, yes. As is mentioned in the data sources slide there --
Q. Again, a simple yes or no.
A. -- that is 54 percent in 2016, whi ch is --
Q. A simple yes or no -J UDGE DI PPELL: Mr. Pi ckles, just yes or no for now.

THE WTNESS: Okay.
J UDGE DI PPELL: And if you need to be redirected, your counsel will do so.

THE WTNESS: Okay.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Or "I don't know' is al ways appropriate as well.

THE WTNESS: Okay. It says 54 percent there, yes. BY MR. CLI ZER:
Q. Returning to your Surrebuttal Testimony, page 13.
A. I have it.
Q. You identify a number of barriers to entry into the electric forklift market. Correct?
A. There are barriers to adoption of el ectric forklifts, yes.
Q. Fair enough. Excellent. The first one you identify; price. You would agree that that is not a new or recent devel opment. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And the second one, unf amiliarity, you would agree that that too is not a new or recent devel opment?
A. I would agree.
Q. And skepticismand fear, once agai $n$, you woul d agree with ne that that's not a new or recent devel opnent -- a new barrier to entry or adoption?
A. Yes, I would agree with that.
Q. And as for the fourth one, again, dealer desire to cl ose the sale qui ckly, you would agree that that's not a new or recent devel opment?
A. I would.
Q. Thank you. Okay. Turning to pages 14, 15 and 16, there's a di scussion on free ridershi $p$ and I'd like to ask you sone questions. Before I do, I just want to make sure that we have ki nd of an agreement, understanding of what the term "free rider"
means. So l'mgoing to gi ve you a bit of a hypothetical here just to nake sure we have an underst andi ng.

If l were to-- if we were to say take a owner of a warehouse who nanages a fleet of forklifts, al I internal combustion, and he deci ded he had some problens with several of his and he decided that he was going to repl ace those with an el ectric forklift or retrofit two of them-- Iet's say two of them with el ectric -- el ectric components.

If he were to call up his deal er of
forklifts and say, I need tho el ectric forklifts. And the deal er or manuf act urer were to say, That's great. Oh, by the way, I can get you an incentive program I can get you some money through this program Aner en is offering, and the owner agrees with that.

If I were to pose it to you, if we assume that this forklift owner was going to purchase el ectric forklifts regardless of whether or not Aneren offers incentives and did so and recei ved incentives, that forklift owner would be a free rider to this system Correct?
A. If the person would have purchased the el ectric forklift in the absence of the program yet they did partici pate in the program they went through
the qualification process and screening, if they recei ved an incentive, then in that case, yes, that would be the definition of a free rider.
Q. All right. Thank you. On page 17 -- and this is part of your anal ysis of the free rider problem on RIM-- on the RIMtests. Li nes 1 through 2 you state, Indeed, in order for the RIMtest to drop bel ow 1. 0 , the free ridership rate woul d have to exceed 54 percent, a hi ghly unlikel y outcone.

Wbuld you agree that's a correct reading?
A. That is a correct reading.
Q. So based on what we just di scussed, in order for the RIManal ysis to drop bel ow 1 percent, 54 percent of the participants in this program nould have to purchase an el ectric forklift -- or nould have purchased an el ectric fork lift regardless of whether the incentive program was offered?
A. You -- your construct is correct; however, it's physically impossi ble and mathematically i mpossible gi ven the design of the programfor that to happen due to the precl usions in the programthat prohi bit people who have existing forklifts repl acing them with el ectric forklifts. So your construct is correct, but it does not reflect the program
Q. It is impossible for 54 percent of the

161
TI GER COURT REPORTI NG, LLC
people who apply for repl acement of an existing industrial conbustion engi ne forklift to have wanted to purchase an electric forklift, regardless of the program?
A. Yeah, l'msorry. Can you say that agai $n$ ?
Q. It is impossible for indi viduals who own industrial -- internal conbustion forklifts -- for 54 percent of the indi vi dual s who own internal conbustion forklifts to have wanted to repl ace those and nould have repl aced those with el ectric forklifts regardl ess of the program?
A. Gi ven what we know about the market and the way that purchasing behavior has been exhi bited through the market shares that we' ve seen, yes, I bel ieve my statement is correct.
Q. Can you turn to page 19 of your Sur rebuttal ?
A. I have it.
Q. You identify that you believe Dr. Marke is mistaken when he only predicts one participant, that being St. Loui s International Airport. That's a correct assessment of your testimony, woul d you say?
A. Dr. Marke suggested that the program administrative costs were hi gh for a programthat would have one participant. And I was reacting to his
char acterization there, yes.
Q. You expected there are multiple, as nany as 12, partici pants within Lambert and potentially more beyond that?
A. That's correct.
Q. According -- can I ask you to turn to Schedul e DP- D2-29 of your Di rect Testi nony?
A. I have it.
Q. This is the med- this is the anal ysis, the Medi um Incentive Program which is ultinately what you recommended adoption of . Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then the table al ong the bot tom very I ast row is I abel ed Gross Program Participants. Cor rect?
A. That's correct.
Q. If we were tolook at, say, belt I oaders under Airport GSE, that number is 11. Correct?
A. lt is.
Q. With 12 potential recipients at Lambert, are you expecting each one will need or require only one --
A. No. The --
Q. -- belt loader?
A. -- the programis requi red to outreach to
all 12, I would assume. And onl y a subset of those will be -- will be convi nced by the programs efforts to make that conversion. So I think the marketing and outreach would address all 12 and potentially ot her ai rports that you mentioned. Actual participation is antici pated to be a subset of those -- those or gani zation.
Q. Based on the corrections that you wal ked us through at the begi nning of your testimony, you have updated the RIMtests in your Sur rebuttal. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you update the narket sat uration of the el ectric potential that is now two years old as wel I ?
A. I made no updat es to the market potential estimates in that, no.
Q. Could there have been -- there coul d have been further el ectrification of that market since your initial study. Correct?
A. No. I tal ked to the airport yesterday and they have not done anything additional with respect to ground support el ectrification.
Q. And what about forklifts?
A. In forklifts, the most recent data I have
is fromJune of this year and that was reflected in the actual declining share of el ectric morklifts -forklift so far this year. So actually the potential for the program has increased as -- as -- as the industrial -- or internal conbustion has gai ned a greater market share recently.
Q. Thank you very much. No further questions.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Any
cross-examination by St aff
CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MG. MERS:
Q. Good afternoon, M. Pickles.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Are you being paid for your testi mony today?
A. $\quad \mathrm{l}$ am
Q. And how much are you being paid for your testimony today?
A. I honestly don't recall.

MS. MERS: Okay. And I would refer to the contract, so l think we need to go in-camera for a moment.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Hol d on j ust one moment. We'll go ahead and go in-camera.
( REPORTER' S NOTE: At thi s poi nt, an
in-camera sessi on began, whi ch is contai ned in Vol ure 3, pages 167 through 171.)
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( REPORTER' S NOTE: At this point, public sessi on resumed.)

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. We're back on the public session. And I allowed Ameren to ask their redirect questions as a follow up to any Staff in-camera questions.

So let's go ahead then, ME. Mers. I apologize for the inter uption in your flow.

MS. MERS: That's okay.
BY Mb. MERS:
Q. On page 19 of your Surrebuttal, you state that there are 12 indi vi dual airline tenants who lease gates from Lambert.

To clarify, are those 12 airlines separatel y metered?
A. I do not know the answer to that.
Q. Okay. If -- we'll make the assumption, since you don't know, that Lanbert is the customer and the account hol der. If they' re not separately metered, that would be correct. Ri ght?

MR. LOWERY: l'm going to object that it assumes facts not in evi dence. If she' s asking him hypothetically if that's the case, she can ask him that, but she can't assume facts that are not in evi dence.

BY ME. MERS:
Q. I -- I phrased my hypothetical poorly then. Hypothetically, if they are not separately metered, that nould make Lanbert the customer or the account hol der for -- or nake Lambert the custoner or account hol der for Aneren Mssouri. Correct?
A. I suppose.
Q. Okay. And the Busi ness Sol ution tariff onl y allows one incentive per measure per customer. Correct?
A. Give me a moment. l'Il read the tariff.
Q. Sure.
A. Can you point me to the provision you're citing?
Q. Yes. If you look under the availability section, it should be the last sentence.
A. I think the -- the implication of that sentence or the way it was intended to be read is that each measure, each forklift or ground supportive equi pment can only recei ve one incentive, as opposed to three or four incentives for the same -- for the same measure.
Q. Yes. I think that's my understanding as well. So that would mean then each custoner could onl $y$ get one incentive for a forklift. Correct?
A. For each forklift, yes.
Q. A customer being Lambert in this hypot hetical.
A. In your hypothetical, yes.
Q. Yes. If you look at the tariff under

Eligible Measures and Incentive, it lists each measure as a category; is that correct?
A. I'msorry. Can you point me to what you' re readi ng?
Q. Sure. If you would look at the chart on si $x$-- Sheet Number 166. 1.
A. Okay.
Q. Under Eligi ble Measures and Incenti ves, the chart has the category of measure and then the type of measure.
A. The col um headi ngs are -- is measure, yes. I -- I was conf used by category. I apol ogize.
Q. Okay.

J UDGE DI PPELL: I'msorry, ME. Mers.
You're referring to the tariff that was filed with --
MS. MERS: With the application, yes.
J UDGE DI PPELL: And -- but those aren' t -- aren't attached to his testimpny is that correct?

MS. MERS: No, they are -- they're
attached to the application of the Company. We're more than happy to enter themin as exhi bits if it's necessary.

JUDGE DI PPELL: I don't think it is right at this point, but l just wanted to clarify that on the record because -BY MS. MERS:
Q. So I guess goi ng back to your statement, you -- you read the tariff as you only recei ve one incentive per forklift, but you can recei ve multiple forklifts and receive multiple incentives per cust omer?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Okay. Do you believe that there could be ambi guity in the way the tariff was worded in the one incentive per measure?
A. I -- when I personally read that, I don't percei ve any anbi guity.
Q. Do you believe incentivizing multiple measures, one incentive per measure but multiple forklifts, would lead to issues of free ridershi p?
A. No. I think those are compl et el y di sconnected i ssues.
Q. Is there a cap on the number of incentives any one customer can recei ve?
A. There's not a cap at the moment.
Q. Okay. If we turn back to page 19 of your Surrebuttal, you, in part, justify the anount of admini strative costs by stating that Cape Girardeau and the Spirit of St. Louis, al ong with ot her regi onal ai rports, nay apply; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And if you could turn to your Di rect Schedul e DP- D2, page 14.
A. I have it.
Q. Okay. You for data sources, that box at the top, state that St. Louis Airport is the only medi um hub in Aneren service territory and that ai rports with less than 25 percent of total US passenger enplanements will not have significant potential.

Is that an accurate readi ng of that data source box?
A. That is accurate. | -- | believe true si gnificant technical potential --
Q. Thank you.
A. -- is not comprehensi ve of everybody who may apply.
Q. I have no question pendi ng, but thank you.

Did you consi der those airports in your cost-benefit anal ysis?
A. We did not incl ude them in the potentials, no.
Q. Okay. But your claimis that you consi dered the travel and other di rect costs associ ated with those airports in your devel opment of the appropriate budget as stated on page 19 of your Sur rebuttal?
A. I used them as an example to illustrate the point that there is more than one customer and that there are significant costs and unusual costs associated with this programthat may be applicable, so that's how that was used.
Q. Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Cormi ssi oner Kenney, did you have any questions?

COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: Yeah. J ust briefly. I'mjust trying to understand this. QUESTI ONS BY COMM SSI ONER KENNEY:
Q. Good afternoon, M. Pi ckl es.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Just a question regarding the compani es. How nany compani es do you say there are at Lambert
that have the potential to use el ectric forklifts?
A. Electric ground support equi pment.
Q. Ground support equi pment.
A. Twel ve.
Q. And there's currently one company that does so?
A. No. There are currently zero.
Q. Oh, zero. Okay.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And how woul d the Charge Ahead program benefit those 12 compani es?
A. So --
Q. Are there incentives that --
A. We are proposing in this programto offer a combi nation of incentives, techni cal support trai ning anal ysis, and decision support to get them conf ortable with the fact that that technol ogy could be a benefit to them There are al so a lot of issues around where you site the equi pment. Do you site it on the ramp? Do you put it in the bag room Are there -- is there sufficient el ectrical capacity within the airport to support that charging --
Q. So a whole lot more to do than j ust the el ectricity?
A. There's a whole lot more to do than --
it's not like an energy efficiency program where somebody is going to be buying an air conditioner and all we're trying to do is get themto go from you know, 16 SEER to a 17 SEER.
Q. And currently there's -- like on a forklift operation, they'll be using nat ural gas?
A. Currently the market is about 50 percent internal conbustion, 50 percent el ectric. That internal combustion, the vast maj ority is diesel and propane. About . 3 percent is gasoline.
Q. So they' re still -- interior diesel ? Inside di esel or out?
A. Well, outside.
Q. Okay. But all the interior would be pr opane?
A. One shoul dn't, but there's plenty of peopl e that ri-- that use di esel inside. But one shoul dn't.
Q. These compani es, do they have thei $r$ own warehouse space? I know you nentioned that there' s only -- is there -- is there currently only one meter, one neeted -- metered company at Lambert, which is Lambert?
A. Well, I -- I think the -- the di stinction, as । -- as । understood it, that -- that

Lambert is a -- is a mastered metered account essentially and that the tenants l believe will probably pay a sub- metered prorated share of thei $r$ el ectricity.
Q. So they have their own tariff? Is Lambert on thei $r$ own separate tariff? Is that -what -- what classification is that?
A. | -- । don't know what tariff Lambert's on di rectly.
Q. That's fine. So -- but you don't know if these indi vi dual compani es have warehouse space, if they have -- pay rent or --
A. Well, they -- they certainly pay rent and they have -- yes, they have baggage rooms and they have other facilities.
Q. Place to store thei r-- store thei $r$ equi pment?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. So there's nothing right now that prevents themfrom getting a-- an EV forklift or EV equi pment and charging it thensel ves. Correct?
A. They coul d certainly make that -- that deci si on.
Q. I mean, is there anything that prevents themfrom doing it? Just like a homeowner with a car.
A. Other than the barriers that l outline in tern® of the cost and, you know, the techni cal el ements.
Q. Vell, it's not that -- very much, is it? What's the co-- well, but you're going to different areas. So -- but if someone wanted to charge their -put in a charging station for their forklift, if that's all they had, they could do that?
A. They could. They could indeed, yes.
Q. And they' re not going to be benefiting froma Charge Ahead station where you have different charging poi nts on l-70. Correct? Or anywhere el se in the state?
A. They -- they woul dn't benefit fromthat, but, of course, we would be putting it in this program
Q. And you' re maki ng separate -- you' re cutting out certain things for different ni che groups?
A. That's right. That's right. There are still charging stations that would need to go at the ai rport ramp to support the ground support equi prent.
Q. Not if they had their own charging stations.
A. Yeah, but they don't.
Q. That's what I'msaying. But they have --
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they have -- currently today they have the capability to do that?
A. They -- absol utel y .
Q. That's all I wanted to get to.
A. Yes.
Q. Today they can do that. You' re just
offering other incentive packages to try to encourage themto do it?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Is there any further
cross-exam nation based on the Commissioner's questions from Renew Mssouri?

MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoint?
MR. COMLEY: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Empi re?
Mb. CARTER: None.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Ener gy?
MR. LANAHAN: No, thank you, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Office of Public Counsel ?
MR. CLI ZER: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Staff?
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MS. MERS: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Is there further redi rect from Aner en?

MR. LOWERY: Yes, there is, Your Honor. FURTHER REDI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MR. LOWERY:
Q. M. Pickles, I want to clear up what I thinkis a little bit of potential conf usioninthe room And part of it l think is M. Mers would ask you about forklifts and tal king about the airport and -- and Comm ssi oner Kenney I thi nk pi cked up on that.

But $\mathbf{j u s t ~ t o ~ b e ~ c l ~ e a r , ~ t h i s ~ d e b a t e ~ a b o u t ~}$ whet her there's 1 customer, 12 customers or what ever really doesn't have anything to do with the forklift measure inthis program Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. When you made your statements in your Surrebuttal Testimony about there being 12 potential customers, you' re tal king about 12 potential custoners for ground support equi prent, that category, that measure. Correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, I think what Mb. Mers was suggesting is that the airport's master metered and so there's really only one el ectric customer and, therefore,

Lanbert can onl y get one bel t loader. Right? That was the suggestion. Did you understand that?
A. That was the suggestion, although that's not my reading of the tariff.
Q. When you desi gned the program did -- was your intention to offer incentives to the airport that may happen to house the 12 airlines or offer incenti ves to the $\mathbf{1 2}$ airlines?
A. Ultimately to the 12 airlines.
Q. So let me-- l'mgoing to gi ve you a hypothetical. Hypothetically let's inagine that the Commission has some concern that the tariff isn't crystal clear on this point in some fashion.
Consistent with the design of the program couldn't we just fix the tariff language to conformto your intention and we wouldn't have this issue at all?
A. Ve could.
Q. At the end of the day, there are 12 different airlines you' re going to have to deal with if you want to try to get all 12 of themto switch to el ectric ground support equi pment. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Just at Lambert al one?
A. That's correct.
Q. You were asked questions both by
M. Mers and M. Clizer about free ridershi p. Do you remenber those?
A. I do.
Q. And M. Clizer pointed out that you had indi cated that free ridership that would be problematic for the program-- by problematic I mean it would make it not cost effective -- was highly unlikel $y$. Do you remember that?
A. I do.
Q. And you al so, I think, indicated that there were sone free ridership scenarios lthink he was trying to take you through that you -- you -- you thought were impossi ble; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you -- can you -- do you -- do you
have in mind what the -- sort of the worst case scenario or what a -- or what a bad case scenario for free ridership would be on this programp If you really -- if a lot of free riders slipped through, what woul d that look like?
A. It would be at nost, 33 percent.
Q. Can you -- can you expl ai n--
A. Sure.
Q. -- that 33 percent?
A. You know, it may be easier if l draw a
pi cture. Can I -- can I use the chart to draw a pi cture?
Q. You can -- you can either use ELMD or there' s an old-fashi oned easel with some pens over there if you want to use that. Which-- which- whi chever you prefer. It's your picture.
A. The easel would be fine for me, if that's okay.

## Q. I'Il -- I'II get the easel.

MR. LOWERY: Is thi s goi ng to work, J udge, do you think?

JUDGE DI PPELL: We'll see.
MR. LOWERY: Try to get it -- it's hard
to get it for the Bench and the lawyers to all see at the same time.

COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: No stick figures.
Okay?
THE WTNESS: I'ma terrible artist, but this -- this hel-- I talk better with my hands hopef ully. So thank you. So --

J UDGE DI PPELL: Hang on $j$ ust one moment.
Let me see if l can get the camera on that.
MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, I' m goi ng to ki nd of switch this mic and see if it will pick up hi s voice. I don't know if it will or not. He's sort
of soft spoken, unlike me, but --
J UDGE DI PPELL: Hol d on just a second.
Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Pickles. Let's try that.
THE WTNESS: So when we -- when we thi nk about the entirety of the forklift market, we know a couple of things. We know that roughly hal fis el ectric and half is internal conbustion. So take the market and di vide it in two. We' ve got roughl y 50 percent that's currently el ectric, another 50 percent that's internal conbustion.

Internal combustion is al most all diesel and propane, as l -- as I mentioned. Gasoline's about . 3 percent and -- and CNG is too small to -- to measure. It really doesn't exist.

We al so know that -- based on our di scussions with the deal ers -- that roughl y half of the market is for repl acing exi sting pi eces of equi pment. So this is repl acement. And roughl $y$ the ot her half of the market is for expansion. By expansion I mean expansion of an existing fleet at a facility and construction at a new facility.

And I thi nk people are, you know, nat urally concerned about free ridership. I think it's a very legitimate question to ask, well, what about this 50 percent? Doesn't that mean that

50 percent of the people participating in the program woul d have done it anyway, you know? Why should we be paying people for doing the things that they're doing?

That's not the way the programis
desi gned. The tariff says we're going to go out and we' re going to physically inspect the site. And if they' ve got el ectrics al ready and they're just adding more el ectrics, they're al ready bel ievers, they're ineligible to participate in the program So this whole quadrant of people are precl uded from partici pating in the programjust by the nat ure of its design and the inspections that Ameren and ICF does.

We al so know that these people down here, when we go out and we see that they' ve got internal combustion, we see that they don't have a battery room and they really can't be consi dering el ectricity, we know that those are good partici pants, right, they're good net peopl e.

Now, when we look at the expansions, it's a little bit more difficult, but we al so know that the expansion market again is split roughly $50 / 50$ bet ween exi sting facilities and new facilities. These are all exi sting and these are new. So again, we know if we go out -- they say they're expanding their fleet from 60 to 70 forklifts, but they're all currently internal
conbustion, they're not batteries. We know that these people are likely to be ki nd of the good participants, the -- that we want to have.

BY MR. LOWERY:

## Q Just to clarify, when you say good

 partici pant, you mean one that, by definition, can't be a free rider?A. That's right. Is not a free rider.

So we al so know that when we go out -- if we can't inspect a facility but if it's an expansion, what we typi cally do is, Show us the plans for your new buil di ng. Do you have a battery roomin there? Have you -- have you run the el ectric infrastructure? We ask thema variety of questions that screen themto really demonstrate that no, thi s person was not considering el ectric. They really would have been going internal combustion. So there's some -some techni ques that we can use in inspection, thi ngs to say that the people in this quadrant are similarly net -- net participants.

So the fol ks that we really need to be worried about and sensitive to are the fol ks in this quadrant. Ri ght? These are the people who we can't tell exactly what they're doing because they're expanding thei $r$ fleet and they ot herwi se would have
gone -- gone el ectric.
And so -- so in the worst case, to answer your question, if we look at the amount of partici pants we get, we' ve got -- we first add our net participants, the people that we like. That's this 25 percent, that's this 12 and a half percent, that's this 12 and a half percent. So we' ve got 50 partici pants who add val ue.

And if we can't excl ude these people from the program we' ve got a gross participation rate of 75 percent because we got to pay these people because we haven't excl uded them And then 50 over 75 is 66. 6. So that's 66 percent net to gross ratio. That means, you know, the inverse of that is the definition of free rider.

So of all these people that we have to pay to partici pate in the program even if we can't excl ude any of these people, our worst case is 33 percent free ridership, which is where -- how I get there.

Now what we can certainly do is try to excl ude these people and not target or recruit themto the extent that we can. So, you know, right now the tariff says if you're expanding a fleet, you can participate. If we -- if we were really worried about
this, we could say, If you're expanding a fleet, you can partici pate so long as you can prove to the programs satisfaction that you woul dn't ot herwise be -- be goi ng el ectric.

And what we typi cally do in a case like that is, you know, if it's Wal-Mart, we know what thei r -- thei r cor porate, you know, purchasing priorities are so we can look around the country and we can do some -- some investi gati on to see what they -- what they mi ght well have doi ng.

As well as in the case of the new, look at the construction pl ans, say maybe -- people do pl ans for their buil di ngs a long time bef ore they order their forklifts, right? So we got that opportunity to get in there and see what's going on.

So what I did in my anal ysis is I assumed that we were -- we were able to excl ude about hal f of that amount, so 12 and a half percent. So -- so in the anal ysis I provi ded, what we had was we' ve got -you' ve got 50 over 62 and a half, which is an 80 percent net to gross ratio or a 20 percent free ri der shi $p$.

So I assumed our controls were effective at excluding some of these people. You can't excl ude all of them because it makes the programso draconi an
and difficult to participate in, you'll alienate these people, so you got to let some of themin. So that's -- that's how 1 get the 20 percent. So for me, the range is -- is -- is 20 to 30 percent. And when you do that, even if -- even if you believe the 33 percent net to gross ratio, the programis still very, very cost effective. Does that answer your quest i on?

Q I think it does. And you assume -- you assume just 20 percent free ridership based on the assumption that the tariff would allow you to crosshat ch out that last quadrant you just -- you just no-- you $\mathbf{j}$ ust drews is that correct?
A. Well, in -- in -- in part. Al so remenber that the -- it's -- that's a blended net to gross ratio for the entire portfolio. So all of the other measures have much less of a potential issue with -with -- with free ridership. So that the overall program benefit cost ratio benefits fromthat as well as the -- the opportunity to excl ude these people.
Q. This was an illustration using forklifts, for exampl e?
A. Thi s was -- this was for forklifts. The other -- you know, the other ones have a much lower market share so the issue of free ridership is --
is -- is much less concerning. And this has been a very stable number for 20 years. I mean the -- । thi nk it's fairly nat ural to assume that -- or to wonder isn't the forklift market share growing? But it hasn't. It's been fluctuating at about 50 percent for 15 years. There's really no evi dence that it's -that it's drifting and free ridership is becoming more of a problem
Q. Thank you, M. Pi ckl es.

MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, I thi nk for the record we should mark that as Exhi bit -- I believe it's 11.

J UDGE DI PPELL: I believe you are correct and agree.

MR. LOWERY: And I'd like to ask that it be admitted.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Wbuld there be any obj ection to what -- l'mgoing to mark the hearing roomtestimny pie chart for lack of a better title that -- of Mr. Pickles as Exhi bit Number 11. Wbul d there be any objection to that?

MR. CLI ZER: Is it bei ng introduced as -is it being introduced as demonstrative or --

MR. LOWERY: No.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Mr. Lowery actually
offered it as evidence. It was part of his testimny basically.

MR. CLI ZER: No obj ections.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbul d there be any
obj ect i on?
All right. Seeing none, I will enter that.
(Exhi bit 11 was recei ved into evi dence.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: And I will ask Mr. Lowery
if he can reduce that to --
MR. LOWERY: We'll find a way.
JUDGE DI PPELL: -- a document that we can
easily --
MR. LOWERY: It's probably going to be a pi cture and then we'll print it out. How about that if we can do that?

J UDGE DI PPELL: I thi nk that's accept able.

THE WTNESS: No stick men, like । promi sed.

JUDGE DI PPELL: All right. Are -- do you have further questions, Mr. Lowery?

MR. LOWERY: Just a little bit l think on one topic.

BY MR. LOWERY:
Q. M. Pickles, at the very begi nni ng of the cross-exami nation from M. Clizer there was alot of di scussi on about -- I think it's the diffusi on curve Mster -- or Dr. Marke had injected that into the case in his Rebuttal and then you responded in Surrebuttal. There was a lot of di scussi on about numbers and I heard 49.6 and I heard 50.4 and I heard 50 percent. You renenber all of that?
A. I do.
Q. And M. Clizer asked you a question about whether or not you had given a citation to -- was it 49 poi nt -- you probably know better than I do. There's a particular figure. It's the figure using actual data from 2018 in Ameren Mssouri's service territory. 49.6 percent. You were asked whether you had given a citation for that. Do you remenber that?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you expl ai $\mathbf{n}$ where the 49.6 came -percent cane fromin your Sur rebuttal Testimony?
A. I did.
Q. Is it your understanding that your work papers that underlie your Surrebuttal Testi mony were provided to the other parties shortly after you filed that Surrebuttal Testinony?
A. They were indeed. And there was a screen
grab in that work paper that provided the ITA data that I used for the Cl ass III adj ustment that was made to his data.

MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, l need to get an exhi bit marked. I think it will be 12 .

J UDGE DI PPELL: Yes. Exhi bit 12.
(Exhi bit 12 was marked for
identification.)
BY MR. LOWERY:
Q M. Pickles, l've handed you what's been marked as Exhi bit 12 and I'd ask you if you can identify that document?
A. This is the work paper that l filed as a part of my Surrebuttal Testimony.
Q. And the first two pages of that work paper pertain to this issue of, you know, what -where the 49.6 percent came from and the 50.4 and the vari ous sources of these market share figures you were di scussing with M. Clizer; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And j ust so the record is clear, the 49. 6 percent shown on the first page of Exhi bit 12, that is actual data in Aneren Mssouri's service territory of the market share of forklifts eligible for this programas of June of 2018; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And to al so be clear, the data in the third col um on the first page that's Iabel ed North American without Cl ass III, that datais taken from the second page of Exhi bit 12; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And is the data on the second page of Exhi bit 12 exactly the same data that Dr. Marke referenced in his testimony fromthe -- what is it, the Inter national Truck Associ ation?
A. It -- it is a detail of what Dr. Marke used. So on page 19 of the presentation that Dr. Marke cite-- cited, it gave the combi nation of the motorized -- of the Cl ass I and II and III trucks. This is from page 17 of that same presentation, which breaks out the I, II and III market share. So it's the -- it's fromthe same presentation. It's not from the same page of that presentation.
Q. Uell, his data source where I think he had -- I believe it was 60 -- he had posited that 60 percent of -- 66 percent of the forklift narket is el ectric. His source of that data and your source of the data are exactly the same. Right?
A. Correct.
Q. What he' d done is he' dincl uded some
forklifts that are not eligible for the program you have proposed. Ri ght?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then on page 2 of Exhi bit 12, you did the nath to cone up with what is the percentage of the Cl ass I and II forklift market that is el ectric today. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I think in response to questions or -- you know, and I think this sort of went to the free ridershi $p$. There -- you' d made some statements suggesting that we really haven' $t$ seen the market nove very much in quite a number of years and it's really sort of been trendi ng around in kind of a narrow range. Is there something in Exhi bit 12 that illustrates that?
A. It is. If you look at the red line on the front page of Exhi bit 12, that is the market share of forklifts that are eligi ble for this programsince 1994. And you can see that it's been pretty constant bet ween 40 and 50 percent. And that's why 1 believe that there is a significant opportunity to provide servi ces to that remaining 50 percent and do it in a way that doesn't engage too many of the people who woul d be doing it otherwise.
Q. M. Clizer al so asked you a question about this -- is diff-- is diffusion curve the right term this bl ue dotted line?
A. It is.
Q. And I think -- I think what he was getting at was, well, you know, you can't really -l'II -- l'Il probably goof this up, but you can't really tie a temporal el ement to the shape. It doesn't fit any particular time -- duration or time period. Is that the point he was making as you underst ood it?
A. As -- as best l understood it.
Q. How -- how I ong have the typical $\mathbf{C l}$ ass I and II forklifts that I thi nk we' re all pretty familiar with that we' re probably tal king about here, how long have those been in operation?
A. Well, the -- the first el ectric forklift was introduced to the market l think in -- in -- in 1913. Forklifts as we know themtoday, el ectric forklifts have been around for 30 years perhaps. They' ve made i mprovements over time, technol ogy has evol ved a little bit. But basically they've been around for 30 years.
Q. Given that they' ve been around for 30 years, nould you expect themto be at a
si gnificantly difference place on this diffusion curve if this diffusi on curve theory actually applied to this market?
A. Well -- well, I would. And I thi nk what -- what's denonstrated by the actual partici pation rate is that for this technol ogy, the diffusion curve theory is not an appropriate way to -to forecast market share.

The diffusion theory is -- is -- or was origi nally devel oped in the '60s to forecast the penetration of significant new innovations. It does not do a good job of looking at competition bet ween exi sting sol utions to that same problem

So the same way -- since there is
competition for el ectric forklifts from-- from-frominternal conbustion forklifts, diffusi on theory doesn't work well for it. Nor does diffusi on theory do a good job of handling interventions as -- as Ameren is proposing here in terns of marketing and techni cal support and -- and incentives. It just do-is not a framework that lends itself to this kind of anal ysis.

MR. LOWERY: And I ast question I thi nk, Judge. I probably should never say that. Then I am made a liar.
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BY MR. LOWERY:
Q. But we have this discussion of free ridership backing up to the other di scussi on a mide. And -- and does this work paper al so address this free ridership issue in some way? And l'mpointing in particular to page 3.
A. It -- it does. The information on page 3 supports the area of my testimony where l said even if free ridership was significant, the el ectric forklift measure would still be cost effective. And so the first line of that provides the net to gross ratio, that is the number of partici pants that are -- would or would not have done it without the program as । illustrate right there -- the free ridership there.

In my example, you can run free ridership up to 54 and a half percent, whi ch again, I think is somet hi ng which l believe to be impossi ble, but even if it got that high, the TRC of -- of an indi vi dual forklift measure would still be above one.

Q Meaning it would still be cost effective?
A. Meaning it would still be cost effective.
Q. And just to make sure the record's cl ear, so if I have a net to gross of 70 percent, that i mplies free ridership of $\mathbf{3 0}$ percent?
A. That's correct.

MR. LOWERY: Thank you, Your Honor. And, Your Honor, I would like to move the admission of Exhi bit 12 and that's all the questions I have.

J UDGE DI PPELL: And I have Exhi bit 12, whi ch is a work paper from Mr. Pickles' Surrebuttal Testimony.

MR. LOWERY: That's correct.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbul d there be any obj ection to that coming into the record?

MR. CLI ZER: Yes, Your Honor.
JUDGE DI PPELL: What's your objection?
MR. CLI ZER: The col umm I abel ed Ameren on page 1 still contai ns no source for the numbers included in that. For example, page 2, for instance, at the bottom of the table there's a list label ed source, Industrial Truck Associations. There is no similar information provi ded to describe where the numbers are coming fromin the col um label ed Ameren. There's been no foundation laid for that portion of this docurent.

MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, may I respond?
J UDGE DI PPELL: Go ahead.
MR. LOWERY: If the obj ection is lack of foundation, the sworn witness of the testimony [sic] today said where the number came from And they can
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argue the wei ght, they can argue whet her --
MR. CLI ZER: He has not stated where it
came from
J UDGE DI PPELL: Excuse me. One at a time, please. Let Mr. Lowery finish.

MR. LOWERY: Well, I just asked hi mthe question as to whether or not it was Ameren Mssouri primary data as of June 30, 2018 and he confirmed that it was.

JUDGE DI PPELL: All right. Thank you.
Did you have further response,
Mr. Clizer?
MR. CLI ZER: No.
JUDGE DI PPELL: I will overrule the objection and admit Exhi bit 12.
(Exhi bit 12 was recei ved into evi dence.)
JUDGE DI PPELL: All right then. I thi nk we are past due to take a lunch break so we will do so. Return at 2: 15 and we will begin agai $n$ with Ameren's last witness, l believe. Let's go ahead and go off the record.
(A recess was taken.)
(Exhi bit 202 was marked for identification.)
(Exhi bits 8, 9 and 11 were marked for
identification.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. We' re back on the record after our break for lunch. And we' re ready to begin with Ameren's next witness. l'll go ahead and swear you in.
(Wtness sworn.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you.
STEVEN W LLS, bei ng first dul y sworn, testified as follows:

DI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MG. TATRO:
Q. Good afternoon. Could you state your name and busi ness address for the Comissi on, pl ease?
A. My name is Steven M Wills. My busi ness address is 1901 Chouteau Avenue, St. Loui s, M ssouri 63103.
Q. And are you the same Steven Wils that pre-filed Direct and Surrebuttal Testinony that's been marked Exhi bits 6 and 7 in this case?
A. Yes, I am
Q. Do you have any corrections or additions to make to your testimony?
A. Yes. Just a few. In my Direct

Testimony -- and these all relate to the corrections that Mr. Pickles made earlier today. I cited some of the numbers from his testimony in mine.

So at page 37, on line 18 where I reported a RIMtest result of 1.63 , it should be 1.81 . On the next line where I said, Every dollar spent in the programis expected to produce one $\$ 1.63$ in benefits, that should be \$1. 81.

On the next page, page 38, on line 20 where I was tal king about the partici pant cost test and I said that the results ranged from 1.0-- from just above 1.0 to all the way up to $4.7,4.7$ should now be 3.7.

And on the following page, 39, both of the references to 3.47 on lines 1 and 2 should now be 3. 39 for the TRC test results.

And so that's all for my Direct
Testimony, and I have one very, very minor correction in my Surrebuttal Testimony.
Q. And, M. WIIs, just to make sure l'm clear, on line 2 of page 39, the $\$ 3.47$ now becones \$3. 39?
A. That's correct, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Should I go onto my next --
Q. Yes.
A. In my Surrebuttal Testimony on page 35, Foot note 9, the very last two words where I said this
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is referenced in Foot note 8 above, it shoul d have been in Footnote 5 above.
Q. Is the I oad shape reference to Foot note 8

## correct?

A. Well, load -- Foot note 8 refers back to

Foot note 5. It refers -- but it doesn't actually --
Foot note 8 is the right load shape, but it doesn't actually say the name of the study. So this one was referring back to Footnote 5 that actually said the name of the study, since I was trying to provide a cite.

## Q. Okay.

A. It should -- there's kind of a chai $n$ of foot note rel ationshi ps there.
Q. But both ei ghts don't need to be changed in that foot note?
A. Oh, right. Correct.
Q. Just the first one?
A. Yes. Sorry.
Q. Okay.

J UDGE DI PPELL: So in Foot note 9 there's j ust one change. Ri ght?

THE WTNESS: That's correct.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Thank you.
BY MS. TATRO:
Q. Any ot her corrections or additions?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So with those corrections and additions, would -- if I asked you the questions that are in your Di rect and Surrebuttal Testimony, would your answers be substantially the same?
A. Yes, they would.
Q. And are those answers true and correct to the best of your bel i ef?
A. Yes.

MS. TATRO. All right. I move Exhi bits 6 and 7 into the record and tender the witness for cross.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbuld there be any obj ection to Exhi bit 6, the Direct Testimony of Steven WIIs, and Exhi bit 7, the Surrebuttal Testimony of Steven Wills?

Seei ng none, I will admit those into the record.
(Exhi bits 6 and 7 were recei ved into evi dence. )

JUDGE DI PPELL: Is there
cross-examination from Renew M ssouri?
MR. OPI TZ: Yes, Judge.
CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MR. OPI TZ:
Q. M. Wills, you were in the room during openi ng statements; is that correct?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And do you recall seeing a chart? It had a blue line and then a orange bar on it. I believe it nas narked as Exhi bit 9.
A. Yes. I was here and I saw that.
Q. Do you have a copy of that or do you want ne to put that big chart up?
A. I have a copy of it.
Q. You have a copy of that. Okay. So as I understand, this is a load shape from another utility's EV program is that correct?
A. Yes. The blue line was a study associated with Southern Cal ifornia Edi son's Charge Ready program a metering study of residential charging behavi or.
Q. And so I -- I'munsure what this orange bar is. Can you tell me what that orange bar is?
A. Yeah. Sure. So in -- in both my
testimony and ME. Lange's testimony of Staff, we talk about how much net margin each el ectric vehicle produces -- or will create for the Company that we'll earn. And in order to estimate that, you have to know how much energy you assume that we're going to supply
to that vehicle and how much capacity you're going to supply to that vehicle. Because energy and capacity are the categories of cost.
l testified in my-- in my Surrebuttal
Testimony that if you look at the work papers of Mb. Lange's anal ysis of net margins, while it's not explicitly stated, you can infer that it's -- it has to be mathematically -- and, in fact, l'd be happy to ki nd of walk through the math on that, but it's -there's a lot of numbers so l thought l might do -- go to the white board like Mr. Pickles did just to ki nd of track those numbers. Is that --
Q. So you --
A. If you want -- if you're interested in seei ng how that's derived.
Q. And you' re describing the -- the way that you' ve cal cul at ed --
A. Right.
Q. So this orange bar is -- is based on a cal cul ation that you made?
A. It is. It is. And I -- it's -- so I characterized it as being implicit in Mb. Lange's numbers, but you won't find the 2.05 kilowatts of demand in her testimony or work paper, but it is derived -- it can be derived from numbers in her work
paper. And I do have a work paper that I filed with the case that wal ks through that calculation. I could -- l'mgoing to be -- if you're interested in understanding how that worked, I can demonstrate that for you.
Q. Yeah, I think that would be hel pf ul to hel p me understand what -- what that orange bar is.
A. But again, there's a lot of -- some numbers so l thi nk it would be best to ki nd of do it ill ustratively.

MR. OPI TZ: Judge -- Judge, do you have any -- is that all right?

J UDGE DI PPELL: I'm goi ng to -- I' m goi ng to ask -- first of all, this Exhi bit 9 is not an evi dentiary exhi bit. It's not been admitted. It was part of ME. Tatro's opening statement. So if there's --

MR. OPI TZ: So -- okay. So can I, I guess, have an opportunity to lay the foundation for this?

J UDGE DI PPELL: Go ahead.
BY NR. OPI TZ:
Q. So, M. Wils, you' ve -- you are familiar with this Exhi bit 9?
A. Every number of it is frommy testimony.
Q. And the bl ue line tracks information that was in your testimony; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And --
A. Well, let me -- let me clarify that.

It's -- it's in my testimony that -- this pattern, but I adj usted it to match the amount of energy consumption that a vehicle using Mb. Lange's assumptions from Rebuttal Testimn would be . But it's cal culated by me and it's consistent with the -the load shape in my testimony.
Q. And I understand that you' re telling me that you're familiar with the basis for this orange bar there?
A. Yes. I cal cul ated that based of $f$ of numbers in ME. Lange's testimony and work papers.
Q. And does this Exhi bit 9 accuratel y reflect the information that -- that you had cal cul at ed?
A. Yes.

MR. OPI TZ: Judge, I'd move to offer
Exhi bit 9.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbul d there be any obj ection to Exhi bit 9 coming into evi dence?

Okay. Seei ng none, then I will admit
that.
(Exhi bit 9 was recei ved into evi dence.)
BY NR. OPI TZ:
Q. M. Wils, you were -- I guess would you be able to expl ain the cal cul ation you nade to cone up with that 2.0I guess kilowatt of denand?
A. Sure. Li ke । said, । think -- । think it's easier to followif l can write some numbers and illustrate it. Is that --
Q. That's --

J UDGE DI PPELL: I'monly hesitant because while it's easy for us to follow here in the hearing room when we go back and read the transcript, it's not so easy to follow. So I don't want this to -- । don't want this entire record to be a drawing on a white board that's difficult to deci pher.

THE WTNESS: Well, I think I can explain it and see if that --

J UDGE DI PPELL: Can we start with an expl anation and then if it's necessary, we can try the white board agai $n$ ?

THE WTNESS: Sure. l'mjust afraid that it's hard to follow a lot of numbers, but l think that --

J UDGE DI PPELL: I understand.
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THE WTNESS: -- we can make it clear that this is all based on math based on ME. Lange's anal ysis and testimony numbers.

So it started out by Iooking at -- if you I ook at ME. Lange's testimony in her Rebuttal Testimny at page 6, there's a table on line 8 that's -- that says that the result of her -- of her anal ysis of certain scenarios, and she's reporting in that that this -- that this net margin -- this average margin is, you know, something that ought to be consi dered in this case and it's based on -- if you Iook at the line that says average cost increase per year, \$195. 27 per year.

So the categories of cost that are incl uded in her anal ysis are energy, capacity, transmission, and distribution. So each one of those costs makes up some portion of $\$ 195.27$ in cost per vehi cle.

So if we want to decompose that into its pi eces, that's not explicitly done in the testimony, but the information needed to infer it is in the testimony. So the way to do that is you al solook in her -- on that same table on page 6 , line 8 and she states that her assumption is that an el ectric vehicle will use 265 kilowatt hours per month.
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Because I want to compare it to the average cost increase per year down bel ow, l'mgoing to multiply it by 12 months to get to a number of kilowatt hours per year. And so the result of multiplying that by 12 -- and in the work paper there's a little bit of rounding so the math -- what l say, it -- ties out to the work paper and it's very close to what you would get looking at the numbers on the page -- 3, 185.8 kilowatt hours per year.

Now, for the cost assumptions that
Ms. Lange used, it's found a little bit later in her testimony. She tal ks about using assumptions from Ameren M ssouri's 2017 IRP, using the 2019 forward cost curves for energy, capacity, transmission, and di stribution.

So if you look at the 2.6 kilowatt hours per -- per 2 point -- sorry 2.6 cents per kilowatt energy price and you know that we're serving 3, 185 kilowatt hours, you can derive that there must be $\$ 87.37$ cents in energy costs. So that's the amount of energy that a vehicle consumes over the course of a year.

So if we know the total cost is 195 dollars and the energy -- suppl ying the energy is -costs 87 dollars, then all of the remai ni ng cost
categories have to cost $\$ 107.89$. And all of the rest of these categories, capacity, transmission and distribution, are stated in dollars per kilowatt year.

And Mb. Lange never states how many kilowatts of capacity. And that -- the kilowatt, what that means is it's the peak demand that a vehicle woul d place on our system at the hour that the system peaks, so it's really what stresses our systemthe most.

And so while she never says how many kilowatts it is, we know that it costs on -- in aggregate $\$ 107.89$ and we have the prices that she used per kilowatt in that table, capacity of $\$ 22.74$, transmission costs of $\$ 6$. 82 , di stribution costs of \$17. 93.

I will say there is -- I should have mentioned on the energy costs -- on both of these costs there's an adj ustment in the work paper for Ioses and reserves that's an appropriate adj ustment. But those numbers are not found in the testimony. They're just in work papers.

But addi ng up those dollar per kilowatt year costs, there's a total of $\$ 47.50$ is the cost of each kilowatt hour and the prices that she assumed. If you take the 107 dollars we tal ked about before
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that's going to be incurred by -- for each vehi cle and di vide it by 47 dollars per kilowatt year, we know that approxi matel y 2 kil owatts per vehicle is what is assumed that we woul d have to pay -- and the way we pay for capacity is we pay it to MSO, the -- the regi onal transmissi on organi zation.

So the -- the onl $y$ way that this math works is if we're buying at least two kilowatts of demand for each vehi cle for the net margin per vehi cle in this -- to work out to this number.

And that on Exhi bit 9-- so what we see from that, the two kilowatts, if you compare it to the empirical evi dence in Southern Cal ifornia Edi son's Char ge Ready program where they were using at the -our system peak where we incur those capacity costs is usual ly the hour ended at 5:00 p.m

Where those customers in Cal iforni a charging pattern woul d apply, we would have somewhere ar ound a half of a kil owatt of demand. The number underlying Staff's anal ysis is over 2. So you can see it on that exhi bit that it's roughly four times as hi gh as the empi rical evi dence that we' ve presented would suggest it ought to be.

BY MR. OPI TZ:
Q. So al l of that I guess boils down to you
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came up with this denand that would be requi red under Staff's assumptions. Aml correct to understand that by overlaying this orange bar over the ICF charging study, it's demonstrating that the Staff's figures are unr easonabl $e$ ?
A. Yes. I think that it's -- it's hi ghly unrealistic to assume that we would ever incur on an av-- on an average across all of the vehicles on our systemincur two kilowatts of demand per vehicle.

And you can see on the Exhi bit 9, the note there, you know, suggests that if you're incurring 2 kilowatts of capacity and many of the vehicles are charging at 6.6 kilowatts, which was al so an assumption that both Ms. Lange and I shared, that there was -- there would be 31 percent of EVs charging during that peak hour.

But the other interesting point about it I think that's important to note is that if that much energy is bei ng consumed in that hour, it has to come away fromsomewhere el se. So it's basically all the rest of the hours would have to get pushed down subst antially.

And you'd have to believe that people were actually charging in hour -- in that one hour over -- over double what they are in any other hour of
the day, regardless of the speed of the charging that they' re actually using Just to get that much energy, to get that much capacity requi rement, they' d have to consume al most a quarter of the energy needs of any indi vi dual vehicle on a daily basis in one hour of the day and then do the rest of the 75 spread out over all these other hours.

It's -- it's frankly just unrealistic to assume that charging would be that concentrated, especially gi ven the evi dence we have. And, you know, I thi nk that it just speaks to the -- to the usef ul ness of those margin estimates and informing how much an el ectric vehicle is going to cost us to serve.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. OPI TZ: That's all I have, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Is there cross-exami nati on from Char gePoi nt ?

MR. COMLEY: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Ener gy?
MR. LANAHAN: No, thank you, Your Honor.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Office of Public Counsel ?
MR. CLI ZER: Yes, just briefly.
CROSS- EXAM NATI ON MR. CLI ZER:
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Q. M. Wills, in devel oping your Direct Testimony you relied on the 2017 IRP filings that Ameren made. Correct?
A. For -- for a number of assumptions, yes.
Q. And that has a hi gh, a low and a base adoption rates. Correct?
A. For vehicle adoptions?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You would agree that EV adoption rates are al ready on track to meet the base level predi cted in the 2017 IRP. Correct?
A. I would agree that they're -- that they are tracking currently around that. I woul dn't say that they necessarily will con-- that leads us to bel ieve that in ten years we'll know where they'll be.
Q. And you would agree that the EV program as you proposed is expected to lead to even higher adoption rates. Correct?
A. Even hi gher than what woul d otherwi se happen, but not necessarily even hi gher than the base case.
Q. Just a second.

MR. CLI ZER: That's all. Thank you.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Staf ?

CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MB. MERS:
Q. Good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Are you familiar with the data requests that Aneren Mssouri prepared in this case?
A. Man- - I have seen probably all of them l've prepared some of them My familiarity varies depending on whi ch one you're asking about.

Q All right. Well, we'll ask and see how familiar you are then.

MG. MERS: l'd like to mark an exhi bit.
I bel i eve that we are on 109.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Yes. 109.
MS. MERS: And if I coul d approach.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Yes. Does that data
request have a number?
MS. MERS: Yes. It is 1 actually.
(Exhi bit 109 was marked for
i dentification.)
BY MS. MERS:
Q. And you prepared the answer to this data request; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you read the response?
A. There was no EV l oad shape i nvol ved in
the devel opment of the margin cal cul ations in testi mony. As such, no such load shape is available to provi de.
Q. Did you update this DR response?
A. No, I did not. But l -- well, not in the form of the data response, but we did provide updated inf ormation regar ding load shapes to Staff in the course of the case, yes. But we didn't submit it through -- I don't believe we submitted it through this.
Q. Were those load shapes used in your Di rect -- updated I oad shapes, did you correct your Di rect Testi mony with that or --
A. No. Because I think the way --
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. Okay.
Q. All right. And another data request.

Thi s one is kind of -- if l can find it. I apol ogize. One notion.

MS. MERS: If I may approach agai n.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Yes.
ME. TATRO: Do you have a copy for me?
MS. MERS: l'mnot going to be offering that. I'mgoing to be offering exhi bits rel ated to the DR.
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J UDGE DI PPELL: Can you show it to the -his attorney?

MS. MERS: Yes. I apol ogize for that.
Yes.
ME. TATRO: Thank you.
MG. MERS: I apol ogi ze.
BY Mb. MERS:
Q. And you prepared the answer to that DR as wel I?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. And then for the purpose of your nargi nal revenue anal ysis, you assumed that 20 percent of EV charging woul d occur on peak; is that correct? I think if you look towards the last sentence of the DR response, that's what that implies.
A. The last sentence of the whole response? On the back?
Q. I believe so.
A. So l just want to clarify, when we say on peak, the -- can mean it -- the IPL study that's the subject of this, looked at a peak period. And we -and I used it to infer an amount of energy for a peak hour.

So it -- what it says is, This further suggests that 20 percent assumption of CP , which is
coi nci dent peak is what that reans, i mpact is
reasonable and even conservative. So I don't -- maybe if you restate the question, l could answer it more preci sely.
Q. I believe that you have answered it -A. Okay.
Q. -- actually, so thank you.
A. Okay.
Q. And in that DR, Staff had asked for you to please provide the time periods identified as on peak with the reference to the assumption that 20 percent of the EV charging would be on peak. Correct? And that's the IPL study I thi nk you were just referencing.
A. Well, the question does say to provide that, yes.
Q. And your response I believe is the US Department of -- or at least starts, The US Departnent of Energy study titled Eval uating Electric Vehicle Charging Impacts and Customer Charging Behavi ors, Experi ences from Six Snart Grid Invest ment Grant Projects relied upon and cited as Foot note 8 in your testimony, did not specify the on peak period of the subject utility, Indian- - Indi anapolis Power and Li ght, IPL.

Aneren Mssouri utilized the $\mathbf{2 0}$ percent finding by IPL noted in the DOE study as an assumption to determine the coi nci dent peak impact of charging. The on peak period for IPL is extremely likely to encompass -- encompass, excuse me, Ameren's Mssouri's coi nci dent peak hour and the energy consumption in the peak periods which contain the CP hour is a reasonable proxy for the impact of charging within the CP hour.

Given the lack of other specific data available regarding peak charging behavi or, Aneren Mssouri consi ders this to be a reason- - reasonable assumption.

Is that a correct statement of your answer?
A. It -- well, you read it preci sely, so yes.
Q. Great. So in other nords, you model ed your assumptions about charging behavi or in Aneren's territory on the charging load shape of IPL?
A. Frommy Direct Testimony, that's what । di d.

```
Q. And this has impact on capacity cost assumptions, among ot her things?
A. That's -- yes, that's exactly what it has an i mpact on.
```

Q. Did you revi ew the IPL programp
A. Just in the -- in the study that l
reference, the -- the write-up of it that was incl uded in the US Department of Energy study.
Q. Okay.

MS. MERS: This I will mark as an
exhi bit.
J UDGE DI PPELL: That will be Exhi bit 110.
(Exhi bit 110 was marked for
identification.)
BY Mb. MERS:
Q. All right. l'Il let you take a moment to familiarize yourself with the document, but does this document indicate that it is a rate EVX tine of service for el ectric vehicle charging on customer premises tariff?
A. That's what the heading appears to say it is, yeah.
Q. Okay. And if you could look at the second page of the document, does it state what times are on peak?
A. It looks like 2:00 p.m to 7:00 p.m
Q. And that's for the summer. Correct?
A. Yes. That is correct.
Q. And then for non- summer nont hs?
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A. 8: 00 a.m to 8: 00 p.m
Q. Okay. And can you tell what is the rate difference for charging on peak in the summer versus of $f$ peak in the summer?
A. On peak is 12.15 cents and off peak is
2. 33 cents.
Q. Okay. And then what is the rate difference for charging on peak in the summer versus of $f$ peak in the -- of $f$ peak -- on peak in the winter versus of $f$ peak in the winter, excuse ne?
A. On peak is 6.9 cents and off peak is 2.7.

I left off trailing decimals if that's okay, but --
Q. That -- that is fine.

ME. MERS: Okay. And at this timel'd Iike to offer Exhi bit 110.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbul d there be any objection to Exhi bit 110, which is the Indi anapolis Power and Li ght Company rate EVX time of use service for electric vehicle charging on customer premises?

I see no objection. I will admit it.
(Exhi bit 110 was recei ved into evi dence.)
BY MG. MERS:
Q. Currently is Aneren Mssouri's charge for residential energy after 7:00 $\mathbf{p} \mathbf{m}$ in the summer two cents?
A. No, it is not.
Q. Is Ameren Mssouri's charge currently for
residential energy after 8: $00 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$ in the winter less than three cents?
A. No, it is not.
Q. So Aneren Mssouri's custoners don't have the same incentive to charge of $f$ peak versus on peak like IPL customers do; is that correct?
A. If all of the customers that were i ncl uded --
Q. I believe that's a yes or a no question.
A. It's a maybe.
Q. It's maybe?
A. Or it's an l don't know.
Q. Okay.
A. Because l don't know if the numbers in the study were all derived from--
Q. "I don't know' is a perfectly acceptable answer.
A. Okay. Okay. I don't know.
Q. Do you know does the -- I believe it was Southern California Utility that was referenced in Exhi bit 9, do they have time of use?
A. I'm-- I think they have a time of use of fering.

MB. MERS: Okay. I thi nk that should be enough for everybody up here. And I'd apol ogize these are not stapled, but l'd like to mark another exhi bit, if l could approach.

JUDGE DI PPELL: It would be Exhi bit 11-111.

MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, may I inqui re about whether 109 was offered and admitted or not? I might have missed it.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Exhi bit 109 has not been of $f$ er ed.

MR. LOWERY: Okay.
MG. MERS: Is that the --
J UDGE DI PPELL: That was Data Request Number 1.

MS. MERS: Oh, l can go ahead and offer it at this time if anybody has --

JUDGE DI PPELL: I guess Data Request Number 1, which is marked as Exhi bit 109, has been offered. Wbuld there be any objections to that coming into the record?

Seei ng none, I will admit Exhi bit 109.
(Exhi bit 109 was recei ved into evi dence.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. I'msorry,
Ms. Mers. The Iast document that you handed me were
the same as the -- right? Thi s is all Exhi bit 111? MS. MERS: Yes. Additional copi es for the Commi ssi oners not present.

J UDGE DI PPELL: And it al so indi cates that it's confidential; is that correct?

MS. MERS: Yes. So we will go in-camera, have to.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. I will mark that as confidential as well. Hang on just one moment.

MS. MERS: Sure.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. We will go
in-camera for the next bit of questions. If there's anyone in the hearing room who is not an authorized person to hear confidential information, l'd ask you to leave.

MB. TATRO: Looks fi ne.
( REPORTER' S NOTE: At thi s poi nt, an i n- camera sessi on began, whi ch is contai ned in Vol ume 3, pages 230 through 234.)
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( REPORTER' S NOTE: At thi s point, public sessi on resumed.) BY ME. MERS:
Q. Okay. If we turn to your Direct Testimony on page 35 -- l'II gi ve you a chance to get there.
A. Okay. I happen to be really cl ose since my correction was on 37, so there we go.

Q All right.
J UDGE DI PPELL: And I don't think I made it clear for the court reporter, but we' re back in the regul ar public session.

BY Mb. MERS:
Q. So you state, In addition, the Unani mous Stipul ation and Agreement approved by the Company in the Company's last general rate proceedi ng, whi ch was File Number ER- 2016-0179 incl uded a commitment by the Company to make nodifications in its next general rate proceeding to the Company's residential time of use rate offering with a goal of, among other things, encouraging of $f$ peak vehi cle charging.

Is that an accurate reading of that?
A. You read it correctly.
Q. All right. And if we go to your Surrebuttal though on page 46 and give you -- both of
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us actually a chance to get there -- could I have you read lines 10 through 15 into the record, please?
A. Di d you say on page 46 ?
Q. Yes.
A. Li nes?
Q. Starting with, However.
A. However, based on the procedural schedule in this case, Charge Ahead could not possi bly begi $n$ until a few months into 2019 and program benefits will take time to accumul ate fromthat point.

Do you want me to keep goi ng?
Q. Yes.
A. Just tell me when to stop.
Q. Okay.
A. Under the rate moratoriumthat does not allow rates to be changed until April 1st, 2020, consi dering the 11-month process that must be undertaken, a rate filing is possible as early as May 2019, just a couple of months into the potential initiation of Charge Ahead.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. I assume you're familiar with the stipulation that was filed in ER- 2016-0179?
A. $\quad \mathrm{lam}$
Q. Do you happen to have a copy up there with you?
A. I do not.

MS. MERS: Al I right. If I could
approach.
BY ME. MERS:
Q. Handing you a copy of that stipulation.
A. Okay.
Q. So if you turn to page 18 of the stipul ation, Section $\mathbf{N}$ states, Ti me of use rates. Aneren Mssouri agrees to publicize its time of use rates on its website and agrees to file a proposed amendment to its residential time of use rates in its next general rate case after revi ewing the results fromexi sting studies and soliciting input from i nterested stakehol ders.

Is that an accurate readi ng?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What input has Ameren Mssouri
solicited frominterested stakehol ders to devel op time of use rates?
A. We have had a few workshops on residential rate design; there was some limited di scussion of time use rates. We were initially focused primarily on some of the other features of
this stipulation that required us to look at inclining bl ock rates and other－－other rate structures，but there was some di scussion of time of use rates in that－－in－－in those workshops．

Q．Do you recall when those workshops were hel $d$ ？

A．There was one I ast Novenber somet ime． There was a second maybe January，n⿴囗十ybe February． don＇t know．

Q．Okay．
A．Of this year．I think there were two different times we got together with the groups pursuant to the stipulation．

Q．Okay．I＇II take my copy back of the stipul ation．Thank you．

Are you familiar with the USOA definition of extraor di nary？

A．Not－－not really explicitly．l＇ve probably heard it di scussed around me and I probably have s－－well，l have some familiarity，but l don＇t thi nk l could recite it．

Q．Okay．Ubuld－－does this sound familiar then，that the USOA definition is that extraordi nary refers to events that are of unusual nature and infrequent in nature and events that are of
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si gnificant effect which are abnornal and si gnificantly different fromthe ordinary and typical activities of the company and would not be reasonably expected to reoccur in the reasonable [sic] future?
A. I mean without -- । would -- । trust that you read it correctly. l've seen that you can read accurately pretty well here today, so l trust your readi ng.
Q. I was going to say I actually have the USOA, so I should have asked -- or entered this first. That might have made thi ngs easier. So l'II go ahead and do that now

MS. MERS: I'd like to mark another
exhi bit.
JUDGE DI PPELL: It's 112.
MR. CLI ZER: Judge, while she's handing these out, do we have a name for this exhi bit?

MB. MERS: Portion of the USOA rel ating to extraordi nary itens, Instruction 7.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Can you give me a cite specifically? I see it's part 1017.1 through --

MS. MERS: I think it's just 7.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Oh, okay.
(Exhi bit 112 was marked for
identification.)

BY Mb. MERS:
Q. Do you recognize this as excerpt from the USOA, specifically Instruction 7 rel ating to extraordi nary itens?
A. Based on your representation, l do -- I have no reason to doubt that that's what it is, l guess.
Q. The -- the USOA is several hundred pages so we can make that available to you, but I thought l'd try tolint --
A. I accepted your representation, so.
Q. All right. Okay. Do you agree with this definition of extraordinary?
A. I don't have -- it applies to an accounting setting. I don't really have an opi ni on of what constitutes an extraordi nary accounting event. I'mnot an accountant.
Q. Okay. So you're not an expert in accounting?
A. No.
Q. You don' t have a CPA?
A. I do not. I have --
Q. Not an auditor?
A. No. I think I said as much in my
testimony. I acknow edged I was not an accountant.
Q. So are you familiar, even with the lack of formal accounting know edge, with the USOA's directive that net income shall reflect all itens of profit and loss during the current period? I believe you can find that --

MS. TATRO. I'm goi ng to obj ect that she's calling for a legal concl usion.

MS. MERS: It's the USOA. It's not a I egal --

JUDGE DI PPELL: Can you -- can you restate your question Ms. Mers? I'msorry. l'mjust asking you to repeat it for me.

MS. MERS: Sure. I had asked that -- if he was familiar with the USOA directive, the accounting directive, that net income shall reflect all itens of profit and loss during the current peri od?

J UDGE DI PPELL: l'Il allow himto answer if he knows.

THE WTNESS: My explic-- I'mnot explicitly familiar with that. It sounds like somet hi ng accountants may -- may val ue in putting into thei r rul es, but -BY ME. MERS:
Q. If I gi ve you a monent to read the
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definition under extraordinary itens, Instruction 7, could you confirmthat that's the first sentence?
A. Okay. That's the first sentence, I thi nk. I mean it sounds like what you said.
Q. Do you think the Comission is correct in following the USOA on this matter?
A. If any extraordi nary itens come up, I thi nk they probably ought to follow that. I don't think the Charge Ahead has any extraordi nary itens in it, so.
Q. Okay.
A. So I don't know that it's rel evant to anything that I amproposing in this case, but I think when those things happen, they probably should follow the USOA.
Q. All right. And would you agree a tracker mechani smis a mechani smthat measures actual expendi tures agai nst a baseline anount set in rates to track and potentially incl ude in rates any regul atory liability or asset resulting fromthe under- or over-collection compared to the basel ine anount?
A. As a non-accountant, that sounds about like what I thi nk of a tracker as doing.
Q. And are you familiar with Staff's criteria for the authorization of a tracker mechanismp
A. No.
Q. Okay. I believe it's in our position statement, but the criteria is --

MS. TATRO. Now she' s testifying, so l'm goi ng to have to obj ect. BY MS. MERS:
Q. Okay. So you' re not aware of the criteria, so you woul dn' $t$ be aware of any Comission deci si ons that follow that criteria?
A. No. I mean not explicitly aware of any.
Q. And you woul dn't be avare then if that criteria is different fromthe extraordinary standard di scussed in your Surrebuttal for cost deferrals in general ?
A. I assume it's something different, but I don't know what it is that's different, so.
Q. Okay. Is Ameren Mssouri actually requesting a tracker mechanismbe approved in this case?
A. Yes. I di dn't use the word "tracker," but what I described in my testimony is what I think of as a tracker.
Q. And you were the only witness to file testimony on this accounting request?
A. I believe I was.
Q. And you di dn't, when formulating that testimony, revi ew any prior deci sions of the Commission or testimony to know what Staff's criteria mas?
A. I didn't review to look for Staff's criteria, no. I -- I -- I did revi ew some orders to confirmthat the Commission had authorized deferral accounting authority.
Q. Okay. On page 56 of your Surrebuttal Testi nony you di scuss a stormtracker requested by Aneren M ssouri approved by the Commission in ER- 2012-0166. Do you know if staff opposed that storm tracker?
A. I do not know. If they opposed it? Is that -- was that your question?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, I don't know.

MS. MERS: If I could approach.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Go ahead.
BY MR. MERS:
Q. I'II be handing you the Di rect Testimony of Staff Winess John Cassady in that case. And if you could read lines 8 and 9.
A. After the first period --
Q. Yes.
A. $\quad-\quad$ starting there?

The Staff is opposed to the Company's proposed pl ant and servi ce accounting mechani smand two- way stormtracker. The Staff's --
Q. Okay.
A. That -- that's enough?
Q. Yeah, that's enough. Thank you.

Al right. And do you knowif Staff
continued to oppose that stormtracker in Aneren's next rate case, ER-2014-0258?
A. I don't specifically remenber on that.
Q. I'mgoing to hand you the 2014 testimony of John Cassady. And does lines 1 and 2 state that St aff opposes the two- way stormtracker?
A. It recommends di scontinuation of that. I guess l would characterize that as opposition to it.
Q. Okay.
A. Do you want that back?
Q. Thank you. And were you aware that in the 2014 case the Comissi on di sconti nued the storm tracker?
A. I probably was aware. I don't specifically remenber that. I was around in that time. I -- so if that's the case, then l probably heard about it at the time.
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## Q. Okay.

A. I can't verify it independently that it happened.
Q. I've got the Report and Order. Al right. So l'II gi ve you a moment to read through pages 44 and 46 just to refresh your recollection.
A. Sorry. I was just readi ng. Page 44 was on here twi ce, so I was just reading a duplication. Sorry.
Q. I apol ogize for that. Hopef ully page 46 was --
A. $\quad 46$ is not on here.
Q. All right. Well, l'II just ask you about page 44 then. Does the Commission state, you know, in their -- that one of the reasons for elimination is that they have a general skepticism of trackers?
A. It's -- it states that in the last case, they expressed a general skepticism So I -- I don't know if that's what they based their decision on or not, but.
Q. Okay. Turning back to your testi mony on page 56, you di scuss a 2014 Empi re cost tracker proposal in your Surrebuttal Testimony. Do you know what specific cost Empire was seeking to track in that proceedi ng?
A. I did read it. I know it had rel ated to the conversion of -- of a unit to ga-- to gas, । believe, if l'mremembering it correctly. I don't remember the -- there may have been a -- । -- I have general familiarity, but l don't know -- I can't specifically describe all of the costs that were at i ssue.
Q. Okay. I'mgoing to hand you the Di rect Testinony. It is a public version since there is hi ghly confidential infornation from another utility. And the portion rel ating to the tracker request, so.
A. So there's multiple pages of the tracker -- the generating unit upgrade section --
Q. I believe --
A. -- or where?
Q. -- the tracker request was for a new Ri verton 12 mai ntenance contract. So if you could l ook through that and see if the document refreshes your recollection about the costs they were seeking to track.
A. I think it starts a little bit in here, it looks like.

Okay. l've read it.
Q. So nould you agree that it's a tracker for a new nai nt enance contract?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And since it was a new nai ntenance contract, it was a new cost. Correct?
A. Presumably, yes.
Q. And then I believe you stated in your testimony that it was hi ghl y -- highly variable. Correct?
A. Yes. I said that, yeah.
Q. So as a new cost that was highly variable, isn't it true that the cost would be difficult to predict for the purpose of setting rates?
A. Probably so.
Q. What was the val ue of Aneren Mssouri's rate-base at the time of its last general rate proceedi ng in Case Number ER- 2016-0179?
A. | -- | can't rattle the nunber off -- of $f$ hand.
Q. Wbuld you agree it was over 7 billion?
A. I expect so.
Q. Wbuld you consider a capital expenditure of approximatel $\mathbf{1 8}$ milion to be naterial in comparison with a rate-base anount of 7 billion?
A. I don't --

MB. TATRO. I'm going to object. Is she asking for the accountant's definition, for Mr. Rate

Desi gn's sign's definition? I'm not sure what she's asking here. It's unclear. BY Mb. MERS:
Q. I will be asking for $\mathbf{j}$ ust the pl ain meani ng si gnificant impactful, you -- not -- yeah, as -- as you meant the material as you wrote your testimony.
A. Absol utely. I think 18 million dollars is material to the Company.
Q. Okay. You were part of the recent Ameren Mssouri case, EA 2018-0202. Correct?
A. The -- is that the wi nd? Yeah.
Q. Yes.
A. Yes, l was a part of that.
Q. Are you familiar with the reply brief your counsel filed in that case?
A. I -- I may have seen it. I don't remember the specifics of what's included in it.
Q. I'mgoing to be handing you a copy of that reply brief. I promisel'mnot going to be asking you any scary legal questions.

So on page 6 the statement is made, ls OPC arguing that in adopting PISA, the General Assembly wanted to encourage nore frequent rate cases? If one is going to speculate about legislative intent,
the Company respectfully subnits that no rational legislat or would want nore frequent rate cases and the resulting constituent commini cations that those rate cases al nost certai $\mathbf{n l} y$ generate.

Is that an accurate readi ng?
A. I think you read it accurately.
Q. Wbuld you agree that that implies the General Assenbly wanted to decrease the frequency of rate cases by adopting PI SA?
A. No.
Q. Do you agree with this statement?
A. Which statement?
Q. The one I just read.
A. The -- that if one were -- you mean the
statement if one were going to specul ate about I egi slative intention, the Company respectfully submits that no rational legislator would want more frequent rate cases?
Q. The entire thing, but yes, that portion as well.
A. I -- I generally agree with the Company's assertion on that.
Q. Okay. Al ot her thi ngs being equal, do you believe a utility re-- will report hi gher earnings under the PI SA provisions of SB 564 than if it was not

## able to utilize PISA?

A. In what time per-- I -- I know there are some accounting conventions that -- that get to the recognition of earnings. I don't thi nk re-- l'ma little bit out of my depth. I don't thi nk imediatel y that we -- we would, but l could be mistaken since l'm not an accountant. I think at some point in time there might be earnings that we will recognize that we ot her wi se woul dn't have.
Q. Okay. And if you know, does Aneren Mssouri plan to file a general rate case on the earliest date possible under the PISA rate noratorium provi si on of SB 564?
A. I do not know of any plans to do that at this point.
Q. Do you know of any plans of when you currently might file your next rate case?
A. I know that there's a wi ndow within -within which we will file, because there's a moratori umthat we coul dn't file l think because of the PISA moratorium by May -- until May -- around May 1st of next year. And there's a en- - as Iong as we want to keep a fuel adj ustment clause, there's an end deadline of when we would have to file that is sometime in the summer of the next year, I think. You
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know, unl -- ot herwi se we would I ose our fuel adj ustment clause. So we'll be eval uating the timing within that wi ndow.

## Q. Okay. Thank you so much for your time

 and I have no further questions for you.J UDGE DI PPELL: I show that we di dn' t -were you goi ng to offer Exhi bit 112, whi ch was the USOA Section 7 definition of extraordinary?

MS. MERS: Yes. I apol ogize. I'd like to offer Exhi bit 112.

J UDGE DI PPELL: WII there by any
obj ection to that?
MS. TATRO: Yes, there will be. I don't bel i eve she's laid sufficient foundation. Mr. Wills is not an accountant. He said he' d never seen it bef ore, that he' d only take it on her word that it was part of the USOA. If she wants to take notice of it, but I don't think it can be admitted as an exhi bit.

MS. MERS: Can I respond?
J UDGE DI PPELL: Go ahead.
MS. MERS: As M. Wills is the only person testifying on the deferral, the fact that he's not an account ant -- I mean if -- if they wanted an accountant to testify about accounting matters, it was their duty to provi de one. I am making due with the
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closest that I have and the available witness that is available to re.

MS. TATRO: That doesn't provi de
foundation. That's an argument she can make in her bri ef.

JUDGE DI PPELL: I tend to agree with Ms. Tatro that I don't believe that we can admit it as evi dence based on his foundation. However, if you would like to ask that l take official notice of that are publication -- this is a regul ation. Correct?

MS. MERS: Yes, it is. Yeah, official notice would be fine.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Wbuld there be any objection to the Commission taking official notice of USA -- USOA -- and is there a full citation? It's part 101, but part 101 of --

MR. LOWERY: There is, but l'm not -- । don't know it.

J UDGE DI PPELL: That will be good enough.
MS. MERS: We can get that to you
certai nl y , J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: It's USOA, part 101 of the code there somewhere. Section 7 is the definition of extraordinary. Wbuld anyone have an objection to the Commission taking official notice of that
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definition?
MB. TATRO: We do not.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Then in that case, the Commission will take official notice. And that has been marked as Exhi bit 112, just for reference.

ME. TATRO: Your Honor, I am presuming that we'll get the actual citation so that we all know exactly -- l'msure that Mark can gi ve that to us.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Yeah. We will get that bef ore we concl ude this hearing.

Are there any questions fromthe Bench?
Cormí ssi oner Kenney?
COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: Thank you.
QUESTI ONS BY COMM SSI ONER KENNEY:
Q. Good afternoon, M. Wills.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Are you having a good day?
A. Reasonabl y well. Yeah. Reasonably good, yeah.
Q. You get to go home toni ght ?
A. We'll see.
Q. I thi nk you will after you' re done here so -- unl ess you' re going to do something in Jeff City.

## I have a question for you. Are you

familiar with M. Justis's Di rect Testinony, those -that -- those charts he has regarding -- on pages 10 , 11, 12 and 13 of his Di rect Testi mony?
A. I'msure I am Can l pull them up really qui ckl y?
Q. Sure.
A. Can I get there?
Q. Yeah.
A. I do have his testi mony.
Q. It's on the $\mathbf{5 0}$ states and the District of Col unbia. It's just percentages of EV vehicles versus percentages of regi stered vehicles and vehicles sold in 2016.
A. Yes. I amthere.
Q. He told me -- he told me to ask you a question.
A. Okay. I was -- I was -- I was here, but I don't remenber the exact question so you can ask agai $n$.
Q. Well, l notice that in -- it's the pattern of the number of EV vehi cles through 2016 compared to the regi stered vehicles of 2016 is about si $x$ and a hal f per 10, 000 according to these numbers on his --
A. Are you tal king about just in Mssouri?
Q. Just in Mssouri.
A. Are you tal king about the M ssouri
number? And where --
Q. Li ne 34 --
A. Okay.
Q. -- on page 12.
A. Yeah. I'mjust getting there. I'm sorry.
Q. If you take the 3524 and di vide it by the 5. 46 milion, you get about six and a half. And l'm just pointing to the trends. And then in 2016, of those vehi cl es -- EV vehi cl es sol d compared to standard vehicles, it's about 28 per 10, 000 . So that's about -- a little over four times greater than then -- than j ust the number of vehicles. So to me, that would show a trend that we' re selling -- people are purchasi ng more EV vehi cles -- not many --
A. I think -- I think that there is a growth in EV vehicles.
Q. Well, that's what l want to ask you. Have you done any projections of what you feel the EV narket -- or do you have any numbers that could di rect me that would show ne that in Mssouri, there are -or in the Aneren territory, excuse me, that Aneren Mssouri projects an increase of EV vehicle sal es?
A. Yes. So -- and I think Mr. Justis referenced that this comes out of our IRP. We do it -- we have a forecast as a part of our load forecast that looks at the range of EV adoption as one of the drivers of --
Q. Is that anywhere in the testimony?
A. Yes. Yes. I can find it.
Q. Is that in your testimons?
A. Yes, it's in my Direct Testimony. And it doesn't have, you know, all the year by year val ues, but I -- I pulled some data points out of that that I can --

## Q. Is it Direct or is it --

A. Direct.
Q. Okay.
A. So around page 30 it looks like or -around page 30. So I -- I said -- there's a question there, Gi ven the considerable uncertainty and ultimate adoption rates of vehicles, please discuss the range of outcomes that could be realized based on hi gh base and I ow adoption forecasts incl uded in the 2017 IRP. And throughout there I talk a little bit about it.

And then Table 30 -- or page -- Table 6 on page 31 actually has a few of the val ues fromthe I ow base and high adoption scenarios, how many
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vehicles we would expect on average over the next ten years.
Q. That's what I wanted to ask you about.
A. Okay.
Q. I mean, because those numbers, even on the low adoption, is twice as many as we even have in the state right now
A. Yeah. We -- we expect adoption to accel erate and we expect it to accel erate even more if it's enabled by a programlike -- like Charge Ahead. You know, actually right bel ow this table, there's some -- some external references to some projections that are -- that are out in the public.
Q. Right.
A. You know, and I thi nk l -- let -- let me gi ve you a little bit of context for it too al so, because I think this is -- this is really important. You know, I -- I -- if l recall correctly, you mingt not have been here during Mb. Tatro's openi ng, but she tal ked about sone of the points that --
Q. I was not, you' re correct.
A. -- we' ve -- we' ve made here is that the auto manufacturers are increasing thei $r$ invest ment si gni ficantly in these vehicles. And not only are they bringing out new -- new product lines, but
they' re al so displ acing -- di spl aci ng gasol ine product lines. If you -- you probably heard the news Iast week that General Mbtors is doing away with most of their gasoline sedans.

So we think M ssourians are going to be faced with a -- a vehicle purchase market where there's a lot more el ectric option and a lot fewer gasol ine. And so two -- I thi nk two things are i mportant because of that. One is that if we don't have charging infrastructure, people are goi ng to have really limited choi ce on what vehicles they're going to purchase.

But secondly, even with limited charging infrastructure, we' re going to see some adoption and accel eration of EV. So we -- we do thi nk that the pace with -- without our programwill accel erate it some and with our programcan accel erate even more. And since we think that EVs bring net benefits to the system they're good for rates.
Q. Is that due to -- is that due to a number of events like the mileage restrictions and -- I mean when you're selling a lot more SUNs and you have to get that mileage down to -- you know, the overall mileage has to go up by federal lans. Is that part of it or --
A. I -- l think that might be --
Q. You said you' re--
A. I think that might be a very small part of it. I think there's a lot of -- you know, as consumers are experiencing EVs, I think consumer preferences are moving towards it. And I al so think that the -- you know, you' ve got a number of countries and states that are putting in EV either goals or explicitly prohi biting. You know, if you look at some of the European countries, they're prohi biting gasoline vehicles in certain countries after a certain year.
Q. My -- my wife wanted to buy an EV vehicle I ast -- about a year ago and I told her no. I said -I mean --
A. Me-- your wife and my wife might get -get al ong wel.
Q. She has -- no, she has a -- she has a C- Max, her second one. But I said the fact that the Commissi on, we def eated the charging stations in Kansas City, you can't get around.
A. You're -- don't let her talk to my wife then because I -- I have an el ectric vehicle. I have a Leaf.
Q. A Leaf?
A. Yes. And she would --
Q. Is that like the $\mathbf{2 5}$ - mile one or
something?
A. No, it's about 100 miles.
Q. Okay. That's not bad.
A. And we were out and I -- you know, she was about to go on an errand and l sent it -- sent her in it when it was about half charged. And I got a really angry phone call on my way back -- on her way back and she was really scared she wasn't going to make it. So I think your -- I understand where your wife's concern is coming from
Q. No, no. It wasn't her concern. She manted to do it.
A. Oh, okay.
Q. She has a C-Max, which is one of those I mean, it's a gasoline but it runs on -- it's got the battery packs in it so -- and it's efficient; 41, 42 miles a gallon. But she wanted an all el ectric.
A. Yeah. And I -- well, and one of the ot her trends I think driving it -- and I saw a report on this recently and I apol ogize, I can't remenber who put out the report -- but I thi nk that the hybrids that have the batteries and the el ectric motor are -at least some fol ks have said -- and I -- you know,
thi s is a study that I saw, that it's going to be more cost effective to have either a motor or an internal combustion engi ne, but not to mai ntain all the parts of both in there. So I think that might be driving some of the nove towards all el ectric al so, but there's a lot of factors.
Q. So you guys are like the Field of Dreans. Right?
A. Yeah.
Q. No, I mean that. Don't think -- I mean, you have to look at what l said. What's the Fi eld of Dreans?
A. If you build it, they will come.

MR. LOWERY: It's a great movie.
THE WTNESS: Yeah. I --
BY COMM SSI ONER KENNEY:
Q. That's your -- maybe that should be your sl ogan.
A. I think if -- if we build it, they'll -they'II come even nore. Because I think some are goi ng -- some are coming. Ri ght? But I think they'll -- they will come in great --
Q. You $j$ ust said they' re not -- they' re not going to come if you don't have a pl ace they can charge.
A. Not in -- not in nearly as great -- l mean, people like me might go ahead and buy one and make their wife, you know, go through that experience, but we'll get a lot more people if we buildit.
Q. Thank you.
A. Uh-huh.

QUESTI ONS BY J UDGE DI PPELL:
Q. M. Wils, I just have a couple questions mysel f, but and that -- I apol ogize if I should have asked these earlier of M. Justis, but will the -will the EV chargers that Aneren's planni ng proposing in this, will they have -- will they be capable of time of use rates?
A. So we -- we don't have a requi rement that they be capable, but most of the ones that we expect to be installed would be capable of them as long as we have -- you know, if we have the rate offerings and have the metering to build a time of use rate, I think most of them would probably be -- well, l -- many of theml know will be. My expectation is it's most, but Ms-- Mr. Justis would probably have had a better sense of how much that is. But -- but we do not -- we don't require themto be capable of it.
Q. And will they have battery storage

## capabilities?
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A. I don't think the chargers thensel ves would, but l think they could be -- l thi nk you could put in a battery near it if you -- you know, in fact, in our list of eligible costs for incentives, if a customer wants to use a battery to mitigate like a demand charge that they may incur due to hi gh demand charging, we considered a battery as an eligi ble cost.

So they could pair it with batteries, but I don't think it would be necessarily integrated into the charger if that was your question.

```
Q. And if the -- are there actually chargers with that capability available on the narket now?
A. The capability of ?
Q. To do a battery --
A. Well, l -- l -- l don't thi nk -- like ।
```

said, I don't think they're integrated in it, but l thi nk you can put a battery near the charger and, you know, feed -- feed the vehicle fromit.
Q. But there are chargers available with a time of use?
A. There's one in my garage.
Q. Okay. Okay. Thank you.

JUDGE DI PPELL: Is there further questions, recross based on Bench questions from--

COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: I -- excuse me.

J UDGE DI PPELL: I'msorry.
COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: I have one more question I failed to ask earlier and l wasn't at the openi ngs in case it was addressed and I apologize. FURTHER QUESTI ONS BY COMM SSI ONER KENNEY:
Q. On your -- what are they, type 1, type 2 charging units?
A. Yeah.
Q. What are the -- and I remenber I sawit sonewhere. What's the ratio on the ones projected on the hi ghway?
A. So the hi ghway I thi nk they would be at min num 50 kil owatts and I think they could be -- I mean they could be substantially hi gher, but I think we thi $n k$ there might be 150 kilowatts in the -- or what we might be expecting as -- as -- you know, it's going to be -- so the way we propose the hi ghway is it's subject to proposals of devel opers.

But I thi nk maybe it could be -- it will definitely be a min num of 50 , could be 150, and it's possi ble some devel opers may even try to go to hi gher charging speeds, but that will be based on their own assessment of trade- offs between, you know, the speed of charging and the costs they're goi ng to occur, you know, further demand charges that we have in our rates
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and thi ngs like that.
Q. Thank you.
A. Uh-huh.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Is there
further cross-exani nation based on Commission
questions from Renew Mssouri?
MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoint?
MR. COMLEY: None. Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Si erra Cl ub?
MR. ROBERTSON: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Di vi si on of Energy?
MR. LANAHAN: No, thank you, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Office of Public Counsel ?
MR. CLI ZER: Bri ef.
RECROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MR. CLI ZER:
Q. Comissi oner Kenney asked you a question regarding the numbers in your IRP filing. I think he was ki nd of trying to get to see whet her those numbers were in your testimony at some point. That -- do you agree with that?
A. I recall that question.
Q. Yes. You would agree that those numbers are -- have been incl uded with the OPC's Suppl emental Rebuttal as well?
A. I believe that a number fromthat was used in the Suppl emental Rebuttal. I don't necessarily agree with howit's bei ng used, but l agree that the number came out of -- actually -- ac--in-- well, yes, okay. You're -- yes, I do agree with -- that the number is found in this table.

## Q. Okay. Thank you very much. That was my

 onl y question.J UDGE DI PPELL: St aff?
MS. MERS: No, thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Is there redirect?
MS. TATRO Yes.
JUDGE DI PPELL: Is there going to be extensi ve redi rect? l'mlooking at taki ng another short break before we finish up.

Mb. TATRO: I woul d really appreci ate a break.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Let's take a ten-minute break and come back at a quarter till.
(A recess was taken.)
J UDGE DI PPELL: Bef ore we start with redirect, I just wanted to do a little bit of housekeeping. My plan for the rest of the day was to finish up Mr. Wills and then have Di vision of Energy's witness core up because her availability issues. But
before we do that, are there going to be cross-exam nation questions for DE's witness?

MR. CLI ZER: Maybe just one or two very short ones.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Okay. Then we will proceed with that and then we'll talk a little more housekeeping at the very end.

So go ahead, Mb. Tatro.
MB. TATRO: Thank you.
REDI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MB. TATRO:
Q. So M. Wils, let's go back to the questions that the Office of Public Counsel asked you when he tal ked about the 2017 IRP and the hi gh, I ow and base case for EV adoptions. Do you recall those questions?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, could you expl ain to the Comission what could cause the Iow case to happen in absence of our program
A. Well, I think there's a lot of barriers to EV adoption, and Mr. Justis identified several of those in -- in his Direct Testimony originally. You know, it's about a number of things. Battery costs are still -- it's still hi gher up front costs because of the price of batteries.

If -- certainly, you know, without Charge Ahead, if we're in that world, range anxi ety is going to be a maj or barrier. We tal ked about how -- with Commissioner Kenney a moment ago how difficult it can be to get where you're going if you don't have this -if you don't have this infrastructure that we're proposing to build.

So when you're trying to establish a basel ine to measure grouth agai nst, that's got to be in a pre-Charge Ahead world. I thi nk the Iack of charging infrastructure would be a maj or factor that would cause you to go to the low end.

And then there's consumer familiarity.
You know, right now, you know, it's just not on peopl e's minds to buy an el ectric vehicle. They don't understand the benefits of them

So there's -- there's numerous factors that can -- that -- and all kind of beyond the scope of our program Some of themwithin and some of them beyond the scope of our programthat could keep adoption Iow.

Q. So let's assume for a monent that the Iow case comes true.

A. Okay.
Q. And Iet's al so assume that the Comm ssi on
has adopted OPC's performance incentive mechani sm
A. Okay.
Q. Are you familiar with that performance
incentive nechani smp
A. Yes. I've revi ewed it.
Q. So in order to obtainthe performance i ncentive, how much -- how much -- many more vehi cles will Aneren Mssouri have to incentivize?
A. Well, if -- if the -- if the true baseline -- and I guess we'll never really observe -but if you're saying that without our program we would have been at the low case and there would have been 11,346 vehicles in 2028 in our -- in our table here, so without our program assume that.

And then if we -- doctor if we had to get to 7,500 above the base case of 24,000 , we would have to add close to 20,000 vehi cles through our program for -- because, again, you know -- and l mentioned to the Office of Public Counsel's question that I di sagreed with how they used our base case number because they took it as kind of a point estimate of what -- what will happen without our program And we have a broad range of outcomes that could happen wi thout our program Adoption could be very low or very hi gh.

And your point is if it's going to be very low without our program then if they' ve based our in-- our performance mechanismon an assumption that we would have achi eved the base case, we have to make up all the difference fromthe low to the base and then go up another 7,500 vehicles. We' d have to, you know, really have made over 20,000 vehicles happen just to get any cost recovery.
Q. Then Staff, Ms. Mers, asked you some questions and she tal ked about -- I thinkit's Exhi bit 109, whi ch you may have up there with you, whi ch was Staff's Data Request 1 that tal ked about load shapes. Do you recall that di scussi on?
A. Yeah, I recall it. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you indi cated that you had provi ded updated inf or nation during the course of the case. And she then asked you if you updat ed the Ioad shapes used to -- in your Di rect Testimony.
A. And the answer is we -- we updated some anal ysis in Surrebuttal Testimony, but there was not -- I think she asked me if I had any -- if -- why I di dn't correct my Direct Testimony because I got new I oad shapes.

And I di dn't think my -- my Direct
Testimny was incorrect. I just thi nk that we found
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suppl ement al information with whi ch to refine our estimates in Surrebuttal. And I thi nk they're even more accurate, but I don't thi nk they were incorrect and warranted a correction to my Di rect Testimony.
Q. Okay. So in your opi ni on, didit impact the validity of your Direct Testimony on that topic?
A. No.
Q. Then M. Mers took you through -- I don't have what exhi bit number it was, but it was Data Request Number 2 and it dealt with IPL and this 20 percent on peak. Do you recall those questions?
A. I do.
Q. Did you rely sol el $y$ on the IPL curve and experience in devel oping your position inthis case?
A. In Di rect Testimony, that was the only reference that we had. But in Surrebuttal, we've introduced a lot of evi dence that actually corroborates that the true peak impact is si gnificantly less than what we used of $f$ of the IPL st udy.

So, you know, the IPL -- agai n, I -- । ki nd of took some shortcuts just to say that if 20 percent of the energy was during a peak period, then let's conservati vel y assume that, you know, 20 percent of the vehicles are charging during the
peak hour. I think that was substantially
conservative even -- and I recognize that the fact that they're on time of use rates is rel evant to under standi ng what the peak impact would be, but al so the -- the evi dence that Mb. Mers gave me was that the peak period was five hours long.

So if 20 percent of the energy was consumed over five hours, then the aver age hour had about 4 percent of the energy. So we were not only conservative, we were extremely conservative with how we applied that.

But better yet, we went on and we ki nd of -- when Staff ki nd of questioned us using just that study, we went out and found more information in the Southern California Edi son study. We got ahold of the Progress Energy study that I cited. And then we used an NREL si mul ation to look at charging Ioad shapes that was al so -- that we found and was available.

## Q. Did those studi es incl ude time of use

 rates?A. I don't beli-- so l'mgoing to address each one to the extent that l knowit. For the -I'Il start with the progress because l know for a fact that one -- there was a control group with no time of use rates and a study -- test group with time of use
rates. And we used the load shape that was fromthe control group that did not have time of use rates. So that load shape is based on customers that have no rate incentive to shift their load.

And then the Southern California Edi son, my understanding and recall, that's one that we got fromlCF that Mr. Pickles, who testified earlier, works for. One of his colleagues gave me that -- that load shape. And in my discussion with him he said it was a sample of the whole population. There might have been a few customers on a time of use rate, but by and large, they were customers on the regul ar rate.

And incidentally, if you look at the
Progress Energy, whi ch we know was not with time of use rates, and the Southern California Edi son curve, they -- vi sually they are al most identical. So I mean, they're -- they're very corroborating of -- of the charging patterns that -- that would be expected.

## Q. And I think the Iast one you tal ked about

 you said NREL. What is that?A. Oh, l'msorry. That's the National

Renewable Energy Laboratory. And the Ioad shape we got fromthem was not actually a metering study, so I -- I gave it a little bit less wei ght. But it al so was based of $f$ of a simulation tool that they put a lot
of -- I can't rattle off all the factors they put in, but it was -- it was a pretty robust engi ne that looked at a lot of different factors about when people are goi ng to charge and si mul at ed that I oad shape that was shown in my -- and that l don't believe -- well, I -- I don't recall if they mentioned what rate design they would be on, but l don't believe it was assuming a time of use rate.
Q. And how did that result compare to, for example, the progress load shapes?
A. It actually had -- it was -- actually it had a little bit more peak impact than the other ones, but it was still not so much to make our program not cost effective. It was still well within the real mof cost effectiveness.
Q. Okay. And then Exhi bit 110, which is the time of use rate for IPL, do you have that up there with you?
A. I'msure I do. I just have to find it. Okay.
Q. And she asked you if IPL customers had a different incentive because they have this time of use rate and you answered, I don't know Do you recal I that?
A. Yes. I recall that.
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## Q. Why don't you know?

A. Well, I thi nk customers who are on this tariff do have that, but l believe that that -- । don't know whether the study was all customers that are on this rate or not all customers that are on this rate. So l don't know if this applied or to what extent, if at all, this applied to the customers in that study.
| -- | see that they have the rate, but I don't know how it interacted with the customers who were incl uded in this study. So l think if -- if a customer was on this rate, they would have an incentive to charge off peak. I just don't know if that's represented in the data that -- that we -- we got fromout of their study.
Q. And is it possible there could be other reasons customers might not want to be on the rate?
A. Absol ut-- well, I pre-- I assume that this -- well, there -- there certai nl y could -- yes, there could be. I -- there could be a lot of scenarios and I'm-- l'd have to study the rate in more detail to kind of come up with the best examples, but there are certai nly reasons fol ks might not want to be on a -- on a gi ven rate design.
Q. And the next exhi bit that M. Mers handed
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you was Data Request 18 and it was confidential, but I don't think l'mgoing to talk about anything confidential so we don't need to go in-camera.

I think it was I abel ed Exhi bit 111.
A. Okay.
Q. And I just want -- the question is at what level charging typi cally occurs at home?
A. The -- the typical home charger that I've -- that l'mfamiliar with, like the one l have in my garage and the one that I thi nk that is the most common on the market place is a 6.6 kilowatt charger.

A lot of other fol ks might actually just pl ug straight into the wall if they don't -- if they don't need to charge fast. So that would be even -even slower. I think it's one or two kilowatts if you just plug into the wall. The -- by far l think in the market the most common is the 6 to 7 kilowat charger.
Q. Then M. Mers tal ked to you about the I ast rate case and the Stipulation and Agreenent as it applies to time of use rates. Do you remenber that conversation?
A. I do.
Q. Do you think that Ameren Mssouri has vi ol ated the terns of that Stipul ation and Agreement as it rel ates to time of use rates?
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A. No, I don't.
Q. Okay. Does the stipul ation have a timing requi rement as to when all of this, you knows conversations with S-- taking input from Staff and other parties is supposed to occur?
A. Just before we file the case. So not knowi ng when the case is, there's no hard deadline right now.
Q. Does Aneren Mssouri have a 60-day notice pending for a rate case?
A. No.
Q. Is there anything preventing -- well, first of all, l thi nk you indi cated there had al ready been some di scussi ons?
A. Yes. We -- we had two sessions of -the -- there's some other issues that we had to di scuss in terns of rate design and we did di scuss time of use in some -- in -- to some degree in those di scussions. We' ve had two meetings with a broad group of stakehol ders from-- fromthat case.

And then we' ve still got, you know, like you said, significant time that we can continue di scussi ons on the -- those time of use provisions beyond what we' ve al ready done.
Q. So is it your opini on that you have
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# completel fulfilled the requi rement in the Stipul ation and Agreement? 

A. Not yet.
Q. Then M. Mers tal ked to you about the USOA and the definition of extraordi nary. Right? And she' s tal king about our cost recovery proposal. Do you remenber that di scussi on?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Are you familiar with how other states recover costs rel ated to EV charger incentive programs?
A. Certainly l amfor the -- for the prograns that we cited in testimony that we were familiar with. The Rocky Mbuntain Power in Utah, they' re collecting costs through a surcharge adder. That's an outside of rate kind of rider mechanismthat gets added to the bill.

And AEP Ohio's el ectric vehicle charging incentive, they're being recovered through what they call a Smart City Rider, whi ch is again a -- kind of a single issue outsi de of a rate case type of approach that's added to the bill.

And then in Massachusetts, the National Grid was the programthat we looked at there. I'm pretty -- you know, I don't remember the name like of
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a rider, but l'mpretty sure that it was outside of rates there. I may be able to double check that in my testimony.
Q. Does Aneren Mssouri have the ability to collect these charges outside of base rates in a rate case?
A. It's my understanding that we can't do that in Mssouri as a single issue rate-making type of -- of problem
Q. And after that, M. Wills, there were quite a few questions about Staff criteria for a tracker and positions Staf has taken in various cases. Do you remember those conversations?
A. $\quad \mathrm{l}$ do.
Q. Can you explainto me the difference, in your opi ni on, between a Staff position and a Commissi on order?
A. Sure. Well, I think -- I mean it's al most on its face, you know, the -- a Staff position is something that they -- you know, one party to a rate case has asserted. A Commission order is something that's been affirmatively endorsed by the Commi ssion and put into pl ace. So whet her or not we co-- you know, consistent with past Staff positions isn't really, l thi nk, the germane question to -- to
the Cormi ssion.
Q. M. Mers asked you about the Empi re cost tracker. Do you remember that conversation?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Is there a public policy reason to track new costs? Or could there be, I should say?
A. Sure. If you're -- if you're going to undertake a new investment or a new programand those costs are not in rates, that -- the -- the fact that they're not in rates can be an impedi ment to a utility undertaking that investment or program So a tracker can be used as a -- kind of a bridge to put something -- until something can be put into rates event ual ly.
Q. And is there a public policy reason why the Comm ssi on should track the costs for Charge Ahead?
A. Absol utely. I think -- you know, this is a beneficial programfor our customers, but if we're unable to track them al most -- most of the program costs will most likely be lost to Ameren Mssouri entirel y despite the fact that we're maki ng prudent i nvestments that are going to hel p build infrastructure for our customers that, frankly, we -financially won't make sense for us to make those
i nvest ments if we're going to lose most of them because they don't -- never show up in a rate case or make it timely into rates.
Q. So how do you thi nk that position impacts a utility's willingness to try new and innovative programs?
A. I think it's -- it's significant. And when you speak of new and innovative prograns, there's a programwe got approval of this -- this summer called the Renewable Choi ce Programthat was -- that is, I think, recognized as a new and innovative program

And it has some tracking mechanisms built into it because there are costs that are going to be new and there's a number of reas-- l don't think there's any costs that -- that are going to go through that tracker that meet an extraordinary definition. And I don't thi nk that, you know, they're particularly vol atile.

There's just reasons that that programis goi ng to devel op new costs that need to be put into one bucket or another in between rate cases, and we're going to do that as a part of that innovative program
Q. So what's the public policy -- or public interest benefit of Charge Ahead?
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A. The public interest benefit is -- it's -it's -- there's many thi ngs in the public interest. I thi nk most di rectly rel evant what we' ve -- what we' ve tal ked about is the fact that this new load, when it's added in -- and it's not going to have a substantial peak impact, it's going to be largely during of f peak -- it will spread the fixed costs of our system over a greater amount of usage. Si nce usage is the denom nat or of a rate calculation, the rates are lower if we have hi gher levels of usage.

But beyond that, I think there's a really i mportant public policy consideration and what that is, is -- we' ve tal ked about it a couple times today -- that el ectric vehicles are going to make up a I arger and Iarger share of -- of the el ectric vehi cle market. And Mssourians are going to be shopping in that market and they're -- they're going to be not able to access the best vehicles or the newest vehi cles and some of the conventional gasoline-fired options are goi ng away.

So if we don't build that infrastructure, our customers don't have the same level of choi ce that customers in other state who are participating in this market have. So I think that regardless of whet her we' ve caused the adoption, the fact that we invest the
money that we're going to earn fromthose vehicles charging, even if it's, you know, at home and it's not through these chargers, support -- is supportive of the costs that we're going to incur on their behalf to provi de that.

I could go on on more benefits though.
There's, you know, the emissions reductions that we' ve tal ked about at length. There's the -- you know, well, l did talk about the consumer choi ce. There is the performance of the vehicles is outstanding. I'ma driver, it's a great -- it's a great driving experi ence.

And on the Busi ness Sol ution side, there's additional benefits in terms of safety and productivity of the workplaces that Mr. Pi ckl es tal ked about in his Direct Testimony. So l think there's myriad benefit, public policy benefits that are worth doing a little tracker to cau-- to -- to -- to make sure that we recover the costs of the program
Q. Now still say-- staying with the public policy benefits that this programcan bring, have you heard the phrase "efficient utilization"?
A. Yeah. I think I said it about a hundred times in my written testimony.
Q. So -- so what does that mean to you?
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A. Wat it means is that -- and again, it's -- there's some el aboration on this in my testimony at length, but -- in my written testimny.

But we build a largely fixed cost system And once we build it to meet a certain anount of demand, those costs aren't goi ng away. So what we want to do is make sure that we're us-- we' re using that infrastructure as much as we can to spread those costs out across more usage. Because that way on a per unit basis, that infrastructure is more cost effective for our customers.
Q. And that happens when load is added at -at what times?
A. Frankly, it's any time but the system peak hour that -- for which we plan our capacity. So it's -- as long as it's outside of anything that's goi ng to i mpact what we have to build capacity for, which is our hi ghest load of any gi ven year, any time you're outside of that it's largely going to be benef icial.
Q. Has Aneren Mssouri's peak Ioad changed over the years?
A. Is it the magnitude of it or the --

MS. MERS: I'd like to object. I'mnot
sure I know what this line of questioning is being
tied back to for both questions fromthe Bench or questions from-- from other parties.

ME. TATRO: Well, ME. Mers asked a lot of questions about IPL and the amount that Ioad will -peak load could be impacted. That was the 20 percent number that was di scussed. She al so tal ked about the Empire case and the fact that it's a tracker and it was for a new cost, which he said there were public policy reasons for doing so. And I -- this question is a conbi nation dealing with both of those issues.

J UDGE DI PPELL: I'm goi ng to -- I'mgoing to allowit, but if we could keep answers to questions brief. I'mhearing a lot of, well, it's in my testimony. And if it's in your testimony, then it's al ready in the record.

So proceed, Ms. Tatro.
BY ME. TATRO:

## Q. Has -- I thi nk the question was, has

 Aneren Mssouri's peak load, what we build the system to serve, has that need changed over time?A. Yes. It's changed. And there's been times in history where it grew si gnificantly, there's been times when it's gone down due to either, you know, like a customer like Noranda goi ng out of busi ness or energy effici ency prograns that reduce
peak demand or just general Iack of I oad growth. So it's gone both up and down over time.
Q. Okay. I have no further questions.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Thank you very
much. Mr. Wills, I believe that concl udes your testi mony.

THE WTNESS: Thank you.
J UDGE DI PPELL: We can go ahead. We're going to take things a little out of order then and take Division of Energy's witness next.

MR. LANAHAN: Thank you, Judge. I call
Cher yl yn Kelley to the stand.
(W)tness sworn.)

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you.
CHERYLYN KELLEY, bei ng first duly sworn, testified as foll ows:

DI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MR. LANAHAN:
Q. Wbuld you pl ease state your name and busi ness address for the record?
A. Cheryl yn Kelley. And it's 301 West High Street, Jefferson City, M ssouri 65102.
Q. Thank you. Did you cause to be filed two itens of Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testinony marked as Exhi bits 300 and 301?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you have any additions or corrections to that testimon?
A. No.
Q. If I asked you the questions posed in your Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testi mony agai $n$, woul d they be the same today?
A. Yes.
Q. Are the answers true and correct to the best of your know edge?
A. Yes.

MR. LANAHAN: I woul d offer Exhi bits 300 and 301 for admission into the record and tender any cross-exami nation.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Wbul d there be any objection to Exhi bit Number 300, whi ch is the Rebuttal Testimony of Cherylyn Kelley, and 301, whi ch is the Surrebuttal Testimony of Cheryl yn Kelley?

Seeing none, I will admit those into the record.
(Exhi bits 300 and 301 were recei ved into evi dence. )

J UDGE DI PPELL: Is there any cross-examination for ME. Kelley by Staff? CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MG. MERS:
Q. Good eveni ng, M. Kelley.
A. $\quad \mathrm{Hi}$.
Q. In regards to your 10 percent low incone proposal, would DE be open to working with parties and examining the utilization rates of the Kansas City Power \& Li ght Cl ean Charge Net work chargers and correl ating that with low income areas in KCPL to see if there's any lessons we can learn to both locate chargers in lowincome areas but al so have a probability of those chargers bei ng utilized?
A. Sure.
Q. All right. That's all I have. Thank you.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Office of Public Counsel? MR. CLI ZER: Yes, briefly.

CROSS- EXAM NATI ON BY MR. CLI ZER:
Q. Good afternoon -- or good eveni ng.
A. Hello.
Q. As St aff $\mathbf{j u s t}$ indicated, you have recommended a 10 percent of the overall incentives be paid -- or utilized for lowincone commities. That's correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Just out of curiosity -- or why exactly do you feel -- or why does DE feel it's important for low incone custoners to have charging stations?
A. Well, in my testimony l say not only I ow-income but al so those who are underserved. So it's my belief that if all customers are going to be paying for this program then there should be an attempt made to hel p all of these customers -- these I ow-i ncome and under served customers -- have the time to take advantage of the financial incentives as the market progresses a little bit more.

## Q. And how did DE come to its 10 percent

## figure?

A. $\quad 10$ percent came from when I was looking around at what was going in ot her utilities. Eversource allocated 10 percent to envi ronmental justice commities, and so that can incl ude I ow-income customers as well as many others. But I wanted to specifically target those I considered I ow-income and underserved.

## Q. And I'mjust unfamiliar with Eversource.

 That would be --A. Massachusetts.
Q. Thank you.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. I have no further questions.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Thank you. Is there any
cross-examination fromthe Si erra Cl ub?
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MR. ROBERTSON: No, Your Honor.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoi nt? Sorry.
Mr. Conh ey stepped out.
Renew M ssouri?
MR. OPI TZ: No, thank you, J udge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Amer en?
MS. TATRO: No questions.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Anything fromthe
Commi ssi on? Commi ssi oner Kenney?
COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: No. Thank you, Ms. Kelley.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Is there any redirect?
MR. LANAHAN: No, thank you, Judge.
J UDGE DI PPELL: All right then. I
bel i eve that concl udes your testimny, Ms. Kelley. I'msorry you had to wait all day for that.

THE WTNESS: It was wonderful. Thank you.

J UDGE DI PPELL: You may step down.
All right. Wile l was feeling that thi ngs were slowing down there and that we weren't goi ng to get any farther today, but then -- so l had onl y planned to go that far today. If that --

COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: Keep goi ng.
J UDGE DI PPELL: Keep goi ng?
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COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: Anybody want to obj ect to keep goi ng?

J UDGE DI PPELL: The next witness on the Iist is actually Mr. Owen and he is not available until tomorrow. And ChargePoint wi-- ChargePoint's witness I believe the parties had indicated that they did not have any questions or at least l was told that by Mr. Comley during a break that you don't have any questions but there are some Commission questions. And so if there's no objection, l'mgoing allow himto appear by phone tonorrow morning first thing as our first witness.

MS. TATRO: And I'msorry. Who was that?
J UDGE DI PPELL: Char gePoi nt's witness, Mr. Ellis.

MS. TATRO: Okay. Thank you. I --
J UDGE DI PPELL: And took Mb. Kel I ey. And Dr. Marke would be our next witness and I allowed him to go home because of a sick child.

So I believe that -- Conmi ssi oner, I know you'd like to keep going, but I think we're going to have to call it a day.

COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: All right. I'mthe onl y one that wants to work around here.

MR. LOWERY: But we' re goi ng to be done
way before Friday.
COMM SSI ONER KENNEY: I woul d hope
tomor row.
MR. LOWERY: I would -- I woul d thi nk -I would thi nk your hope will come true.

J UDGE DI PPELL: Okay. Well, with that then, is there any other witness availability or issues with regard to that?

MR. LANAHAN: Just a note, Judge. Seei ng as the Division of Energy has no further witnesses and no cross-exami nation for the remai ni ng witnesses, । woul d ask to be excused for the remmi nder of the hearing.

J UDGE DI PPELL: And -- and you may. And any other party that has previ ously told me or ot her wi se may be excused. I just give my usual caveat that if you're not in the hearing room then you are wai vi ng your right to object to whatever may happen in this room

So -- okay. Well, I believe then we can get started again in the morning at 8: 30 . Is there anyt hi ng further?

I would like to ask you all to look at what exhi bits you might have tomorrow and make a lot of copi es of them I need a copy for myself and the

Commi ssi oners, even if they are not in the roomat the time so that they can have a copy and revi ew it later. Obvi ously if it's something you hadn't pl anned for, l under stand, but l'd like you to try to get some copi es.

I al so wanted to say -- and I meant to say this on the record when everyone was here this morning. I wanted to thank Staff especially for thei $r$ position statement, which actually followed the rules, whi ch were cite to your testimny for your -- for your statement of positions. And so l will expect all of you to follow that rule in your briefs, if you would please cite to the record when we get to that point.

So with that being said, we can adjourn for the day and ret urn at 8: 30 in the morning. Thank you.
(WHEREUPON, the hearing was adj ourned until Decenber 5, 2018 at 8: 30 a.m)
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| 56:11,12 65:18 | 63:14 250:4 | 91:2,4,6,17,20 | 21:21 23:9,10 | 273:21 275:4 |
| 133:13 239:4 | generating | 96:15,18 | 23:10,19 25:7 | 277:2 281:7,23 |
|  | 247:13 | 112:16,17 | 31:1,9 33:21 | 282:1,14,16,21 |
| G | generation | 116:4 118:11 | 34:5 35:10 | 282:23 283:5,6 |
| ga-- 247:2 | 29:14,21 30:11 | 118:14,19 | 37:15 40:24 | 283:14,16,17 |
| gained 165:5 | generations | 120:15 127:24 | 42:20 59:23 | 283:20 284:1,4 |
| gaining 29:18 | 56:11 | 139:18 140:25 | 61:14 63:10,14 | 285:6,17,19 |
| gallon 261:19 | generous 66:25 | 141:9 145:9 | 66:11 67:5,13 | 286:11,11,24 |
| gamble 76:4,8 | Geoff 298:21,23 | 146:18,25 | 68:2 70:2,17 | 287:9 290:3,12 |
| game 67:3 75:12 | germane 280:25 | 147:17 149:13 | 71:2,10 82:10 | 291:22,24,25 |
| 76:9 | getting 180:20 | 149:14,20 | 89:18 90:15,17 | 292:2,10,21,21 |
| gaps 57:22 | 199:6 256:7 | 152:15,24 | 90:17,18 91:12 | 292:25 |
| 58:15 | Girardeau 176:4 | 153:6 165:21 | 105:8 106:25 | good 14:6 15:12 |
| garage 26 | give 18:3,10 | 165:24,24 | 112:16 114:18 | 25:6 26:6,6 |
| 277:10 | 66:11 70:8 | 172:7 179:3 | 115:15 133:14 | 29:8,11 47:7 |
| garages 51:4 | 71:1,3 73:15 | 181:20 187:3 | 134:3 135:19 | 59:18 66:3 |
| gas 42:17 54:12 | 120:14 140:8 | 188:5,14,24 | 139:14 141:3,6 | 67:14 73:24,25 |
| 79:15,15,16 | 145:20 149:20 | 189:9 202:22 | 142:6 145:25 | 79:8,17 93:19 |
| 85:1 179:6 | 152:15 153:9 | 203:20,21 | 146:4,18 160:1 | 93:20 94:5,6 |
| 247:2 | 157:16 160:1 | 204:4 205:22 | 160:8,18 | 116:10,12 |
| gasoline 179:10 | 173:11 184:10 | 209:10 210:21 | 172:21 175:8 | 131:17 139:4 |
| 259:1,4,8 | 235:5,25 | 212:13 228:16 | 179:2 181:5,10 | 144:5 152:1,2 |
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| green 33:6 34:4 | 142:9 | handy 154:1 | hearing 11:6 | 161:9 185:7 |
| 75:7 | guaranteed | Hang 186:21 | 14:11 16:6 | 217:6 247:10 |
| greenhouse | 68:18 87:15 | 229:9 | 17:13 18:7 | 248:6,6,9 |
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| 49:18 50:1 | 216:16 217:16 | 66:3 82:13 | 36:3 37:4 84:7 | 201:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 53:18 76:22 | 217:19,24,24 | 86:9 | 96:2,3 223:1 | impressive 42:2 |
| 101:8 102:13 | 217:25 218:5 | identical 274:16 | 224:3,8,22,25 | improve 29:13 |
| 104:18 107:7,9 | 222:23 224:6,7 | identification | 272:5,18 273:4 | improved 29:1 |
| 108:8,9,13 | 224:8 273:1,8 | 14:3 127:3 | 275:12 283:6 | 135:16 |
| 254:20 277:7,8 | 285:15 | 149:25 152:19 | 285:17 | improvement |
| 284:2 292:19 | hours 34:25 | 196:8 203:24 | impacted 286:5 | 20:11 |
| homeowner | 38:23 54:21 | 204:1 220:19 | impactful 249:5 | improvements |
| 105:25 106:8 | 103:18 104:16 | 225:10 239:25 | impacts 223:20 | 56:14 76:24 |
| 106:22 180:25 | 213:25 214:4,9 | identified | 282:4 | 199:21 |
| homeowners | 214:16,19 | 223:10 268:21 | impediment | improves 83:16 |
| 107:10 | 217:21 218:7 | identifies 83:13 | 68:10,12 | in-- 267:5 271:3 |
| homes 139:15 | 273:6,8 | identify 159:1,6 | 281:10 | in-camera 96:16 |
| homework | house 106:2,5 | 162:19 196:12 | impediments | 96:18,23 |
| 27:15 28:13 | 107:11,12 | identifying | 68:15 88:14 | 112:18 152:25 |
| honest 17:14 | 184:7 | 58:18 | implement | 153:6 165:21 |
| honestly 165:19 | housekeeping | idling 78:5,9 | 27:13 59:4 | 165:24 166:1 |
| Honor 15:18 | 267:23 268:7 | ifs 36:16 | implementation | 172:6 229:6,12 |
| 17:12 18:16 | housing 51:5 | II 197:14,16 | 44:5 | 229:18 277:3 |
| 21:10 44:20 | hub 176:13 | 198:6 199:14 | implementing | 295:9,18,18,23 |
| 56:1 90:21 | huge 45:16 | III 156:20 157:2 | 32:6 | in-vehicle 50:11 |
| 91:22 92:22 | hundred 240:8 | 196:2 197:4,14 | implements | 50:12 |
| 93:10 110:16 | 284:23 | 197:16 | 18:22 | inability 43:1 |
| 112:18 115:19 | hundreds 135:7 | ill-defined 77:13 | implication | inaction 44:10 |
| 119:25 120:4 | HVDC 83:4 | illustrate 32:9 | 173:17 | 44:21 |
| 136:16 149:20 | hybrid 42:16 | 177:10 201:14 | implicit 89:11 | inappropriately |
| 149:22 150:22 | hybrids 105:17 | 212:9 | 209:22 | 157:2 |
| 183:4 186:23 | 261:23 | illustrates | implies 201:24 | incent 24:12 |
| 193:10 196:4 | hypothetical | 198:16 | 222:15 250:7 | 31:2 39:20 |
| 202:1,2,10,21 | 160:2 173:2 | illustration | important 21:19 | 77:16 |
| 218:22 228:7 | 174:3,4 184:11 | 36:18 158:2 | 30:10 57:3 | incented 45:25 |
| 254:6 291:1 | hypothetically | 192:21 | 62:10 109:13 | 77:10 |
| hope 140:14 | 172:23 173:3 | illustratively | 109:14,15 | incenting 37:23 |
| 293:2,5 | 184:11 | 210:10 | 217:18 258:17 | incentive 20:9 |
| hopefully $26: 2$ |  | imagine 72:20 | 259:9 283:12 | 25:6 38:21 |
| 186:20 246:10 | I | 184:11 | 289:24 | 39:15 70:1 |
| hospitals 51:3 | I-70 24:22 27:5 | immaterial 96:3 | importantly | 71:11 78:19 |
| host 48:24 50:15 | 28:20 181:12 | 96:5 | 31:12 52:3 | 85:18 103:16 |
| 125:21 | ICF 28:14,16 | immediate | 137:6 | 117:9 143:9 |
| hosted 138:6 | 35:14 38:7 | 54:19 | imposed 84:12 | 160:14 161:2 |
| hosts 50:13 | 79:1 152:3,6 | immediately | imposes 20:1 | 161:17 163:10 |
| hotels 51:2 | 153:9 188:12 | 54:7 251:5 | impossible | 173:9,20,25 |
| hour 35:20 | 217:3 274:7 | impact 19:15 | 161:19,20,25 | 174:6 175:10 |
| 215:7,24 | idea 60:13 61:9 | 29:3 34:11 | 162:6185:13 | 175:16,20 |
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| 182:7 227:7 | 235:17 249:18 | 246:2 | 105:14,15 | input 27:18 28:3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 270:1,4,7 | 257:21 266:24 | INDEX 295:1 | 110:5,7 150:6 | 52:17 76:16 |
| 274:4 275:22 | 276:11 | 297:1 | 155:24 201:7 | 237:15,19 |
| 276:13 279:10 | includes 66:9 | Indian-- 223:24 | 202:17 211:1 | 278:4 |
| 279:19 | 123:22 156:4 | Indianapolis | 211:18 213:21 | inquire 228:7 |
| incentives 22:18 | including 49:11 | 223:24 226:17 | 221:7 229:14 | inside 179:12,17 |
| 23:23 24:6 | 49:16 50:17 | 298:14 | 247:10 271:16 | inspect 188:6 |
| 25:10 30:20 | 69:11 76:7 | indicate 30:25 | 272:1 273:14 | 189:10 |
| 43:13 47:21 | 138:8 | 225:14 | informed 52:18 | inspection |
| 58:3 70:4 79:6 | income 84:8 | indicated 150:5 | 56:18 | 189:18 |
| 89:6 117:17 | 113:11,11,14 | 185:5,10 | informing | inspections |
| 121:9 160:20 | 241:3,15 | 271:15 278:13 | 218:12 | 188:12 |
| 160:20 173:21 | incorporating | 289:18 292:6 | infrastructure | install 32:3,7 |
| 174:13 175:11 | 60:7 | indicates 158:3 | 20:9 27:22 | 122:6 |
| 175:25 178:13 | incorrect 155:15 | 229:4 | 29:2 30:16 | installations |
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| 226:18 235:16 | 236:16 237:10 | 161:11 174:9 | 126:20 127:11 | 161:2 194:8 |
| 235:18,20 | 237:12,13,21 | 176:17 184:4 | 240:6 281:5,15 | 203:16 207:20 |
| 236:15,18 | 237:24 238:2,3 | 235:22 237:17 | reason-- 224:11 | 212:2 226:21 |
| 237:14,23 | 242:18,19 | 239:8 246:7,8 | reasonable | 228:23 288:20 |
| 238:2 245:10 | 248:11 257:19 | 250:5 | 25:21 41:1 | recess 91:7 |
| 248:14,25 | 259:19 263:13 | ready $26: 5$ 52:23 | 82:1,14 102:9 | 203:22 267:20 |
| 249:24 250:2,3 | 265:25 273:3 | 116:5 204:3 | 223:2 224:7,11 | recharge 31:8 |
| 250:9,18 | 273:20,25 | 208:16 216:14 | 239:4 | recipients |
| 251:11,12,17 | 274:1,2,15 | real 23:12 30:4 | reasonably | 163:20 |
| 263:17,18 | 277:20,25 | 41:25 93:21 | 44:18 239:3 | recite 238:21 |
| 274:4,11,12 | 280:2,5 281:9 | real-time 50:2 | 254:18,18 | recognition |
| 275:6,8,17,23 | 281:10,13 | realigned 83:22 | reasons 40:19 | 251:4 |
| 276:5,6,9,12 | 282:3 283:9 | realistic 40:21 | 57:3,4 71:13 | recognize 28:7 |
| 276:17,21,24 | 289:4 | 53:21 | 111:23 246:15 | 60:25 61:24 |
| 277:19 278:10 | ratio 190:13 | reality 42:22 | 276:17,23 | 127:7,15 240:2 |
| 278:17 279:16 | 191:21 192:6 | realization 76:5 | 282:20 286:9 | 251:8 273:2 |
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| recognized | recovered 39:3,4 | 227:22 257:2 | 266:18 | relatively 135:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 138:24 282:11 | 40:8 89:1 | references 43:7 | regardless 64:3 | 144:20 |
| recognizes 19:7 | 279:19 | 133:20 205:12 | 74:4 81:5 | relevant 28:8 |
| recognizing 43:6 | recovery 41:16 | 258:12 | 102:22 108:23 | 52:17 85:9 |
| 44:9 | 45:9,16,24 | referencing | 160:19 161:16 | 112:11 156:16 |
| recollection | 64:13 67:10,11 | 124:2,23 | 162:3,11 218:1 | 242:12 273:3 |
| 246:6 247:19 | 68:9 75:15,21 | 223:14 | 283:24 | 283:3 |
| recom-- 124:5 | 83:24 84:22 | referred 37:22 | regards 80:22 | reliable 54:18 |
| recommend | 87:16 88:15,16 | referring 45:13 | 289:2 | 74:9 |
| 75:19 | 89:4 271:8 | 155:11 174:20 | regional 176:5 | relied 219:2 |
| recommendati... | 279:6 | 206:9 | 216:6 | 223:22 |
| 54:5 58:4 | recross 135:24 | refers 118:15 | registered 52:24 | rely 67:5 272:13 |
| 75:18 | 264:24 | 206:5,6 238:24 | 255:12,22 | remainder |
| recommendati... | Recross-Exam... | refine $272: 1$ | registrations | 293:12 |
| 60:4 85:19 | 266:16 295:25 | refined 156:17 | 63:19 | remaining 80:3 |
| recommended | recruit 190:22 | reflect 15:14 | regular 235:12 | 133:1 198:23 |
| 139:9 163:11 | red 33:1 34:4 | 156:17 161:24 | 274:12 | 214:25 293:11 |
| 289:19 | 80:15 198:17 | 211:18 241:3 | regulated 47:18 | remains 32:4 |
| recommending | redirect 110:14 | 241:15 | 113:6 | remember |
| 83:10 | 110:17 124:18 | reflected 165:1 | regulation | 106:15 110:20 |
| recommends | 136:15,17 | reflecting | 253:10 | 112:6 113:23 |
| 58:1,2,7 | 172:5 183:2,5 | 150:24 | regulatory $11: 17$ | 114:20 136:20 |
| 245:15 | 267:11,14,22 | reflects 35:13 | 14:11 39:10,23 | 143:19,22 |
| record 14:6,13 | 268:10 291:12 | 157:6 | 39:25 40:2 | 185:2,8 192:14 |
| 15:14 16:15 | 295:12,15,18 | refresh 246:6 | 56:14 67:5 | 195:8,16 |
| 91:6,9 92:1 | 295:19 | refreshes 247:18 | 242:19 | 245:11,23 |
| 147:6 153:20 | redirected | refrigerated | reject 40:17 60:9 | 247:4 249:18 |
| 175:6 193:11 | 158:16 | 69:20 | 85:15,16 | 255:18 261:22 |
| 196:21 202:9 | reduce 26:13 | refrigeration | rejected 69:8 | 265:9 277:20 |
| 203:21 204:3 | 194:10 286:25 | 38:1 78:4 | 80:10 | 279:7,25 |
| 207:12,19 | reduced 300:9 | refrigerator | rejects 75:23 | 280:13 281:3 |
| 212:15 228:21 | reduces 29:2 | 78:1 | Rel 85:3 | remembering |
| 236:2 286:15 | reduction | regard 22:7 | relate 204:23 | 247:3 |
| 287:19 288:12 | 113:11,14 | 46:16 60:8 | related 49:6 | remove 31:23 |
| 288:19 294:7 | reductions | 67:3 68:8 | 221:24 247:1 | 63:25 102:17 |
| 294:13 | 140:16 284:7 | 293:8 | 279:10 300:10 | Renew 12:22,24 |
| record's 201:22 | redundant 80:8 | regarding 60:4 | relates 277:25 | 15:7,8 21:1 |
| records 63:17 | refer 165:20 | 61:23 68:24 | relating 239:18 | 47:5,7,8,22 |
| recover 39:17,24 | reference 206:3 | 69:10 78:17 | 240:3 247:11 | 93:5 107:18 |
| 45:11 46:23 | 223:11 225:3 | 80:21,23 81:2 | relationship | 119:20 135:25 |
| 61:11 62:2 | 254:5 272:16 | 125:25 131:21 | 139:19 | 151:12 182:13 |
| 68:16,18 | referenced 42:8 | 132:12 135:25 | relationships | 207:23 266:6 |
| 103:25 279:10 | 118:16 138:22 | 177:24 221:7 | 206:14 | 291:4 299:7 |
| 284:19 | 197:9 206:1 | 224:10 255:2 | relative 300:12 | renewable 29:20 |
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| 47:10,16,16 | 112:21 | 278:3 279:1 | 110:4 198:9 | 19:25 23:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55:17 274:22 | represent 32:25 | requirements | 203:11 220:24 | 63:18 82:2 |
| 282:10 | 38:24 42:20 | 47:12 | 221:4,6 222:15 | 95:15,19 |
| renewables | 48:11 56:3 | requires 67:22 | 222:16 223:17 | 222:12 |
| 54:14 144:21 | representation | 83:1 140:3 | 298:17 | revenues 18:19 |
| rent 180:12,13 | 240:5,11 | requiring 19:9 | responses 25:12 | 23:8,8 39:13 |
| reoccur 239:4 | representations | 54:24 | responsible 75:2 | 40:3,6 76:21 |
| repeat 120:16 | 74:4 80:16 | research 38:14 | rest 149:21 | 76:22 81:3 |
| 122:9 126:17 | represented | 135:15 | 215:1 217:21 | 83:19 144:16 |
| 129:17 142:14 | 37:14 154:19 | researching | 218:6 267:23 | reverse 135:1 |
| 148:5,24 | 276:14 | 126:18 | restate 118:4 | 143:8 |
| 241:12 | representing | reserves 215:19 | 223:3 241:11 | review 153:10 |
| repeatedly 80:21 | 67:11 | residence 100:21 | restrictions | 225:1 244:2,5 |
| rephrase 104:14 | represents 20:11 | resident 43:25 | 259:21 | 244:6 294:2 |
| 106:12 | 32:15 33:2 | residential 35:13 | result 34:22 | reviewed 270:5 |
| replace 55:12 | 36:19,22 125:4 | 35:22 36:23 | 39:13 41:5 | reviewing |
| 160:8 162:9 | request 18:1 | 37:1 49:3,13 | 78:16 81:11 | 237:14 |
| replaced 162:10 | 20:9 27:17 | 49:18 100:18 | 142:12 205:2 | revised 81:9 |
| replacement | 75:5 84:4 | 208:16 226:24 | 213:7 214:4 | 148:21 297:18 |
| 44:6 162:1 | 89:19 126:21 | 227:3 235:19 | 275:9 | RFI 30:24 |
| 187:18 | 131:23 133:11 | 237:13,23 | resulted 126:1 | ri-- 75:14 179:17 |
| replacing 161:22 | 220:16,22 | resolved 130:4 | resulting 242:20 | riddled 78:13 |
| 187:17 | 221:17 228:14 | resource 29:14 | 250:3 | rider 159:25 |
| reply 249:15,20 | 228:18 243:24 | 54:16 | results 35:16 | 160:21 161:3,5 |
| report 43:19 | 247:11,16 | resources 12:20 | 37:15 40:20 | 189:7,8 190:15 |
| 78:3 85:19 | 271:12 272:10 | 15:25 28:14 | 78:21,22 | 279:16,20 |
| 113:9 246:4 | 277:1 298:13 | 29:20,21,22 | 121:14 205:8 | 280:1 |
| 250:24 261:21 | 298:17 | 47:10,17 54:24 | 205:13 237:14 | riders 70:3 |
| 261:23 297:23 | requested | 56:9 58:6 | resumed 100:2 | 185:19 |
| reported 11:20 | 127:24 244:10 | 123:23 140:5 | 172:2 235:2 | ridership 76:19 |
| 205:2 | requesting 84:5 | 152:3,6 | retail 95:15 | 77:20 78:2,14 |
| reporter 14:4 | 84:10 243:18 | respect 164:23 | retailers 53:4 | 79:10 83:18 |
| 15:2,6,10 | requests 18:24 | respectfully | retention 57:9 | 159:22 161:8 |
| 16:11 17:3 | 84:19 94:8 | 147:11 250:1 | retrofit 160:9 | 175:21 185:1,5 |
| 73:8,12 90:12 | 220:4 | 250:16 | retrofits 140:12 | 185:11,18 |
| 149:21 235:11 | require 76:14 | respectively | return 39:6 | 187:23 190:19 |
| 300:2 | 163:21 263:23 | 43:11 | 45:21 84:23,23 | 191:22 192:10 |
| REPORTER'S | required 19:12 | respond 17:15 | 91:5 113:17 | 192:18,25 |
| 96:22 100:1 | 19:14 77:16 | 18:3 202:21 | 203:19 294:15 | 193:7 198:11 |
| 165:25 172:1 | 82:10 163:25 | 252:19 | returning 26:24 | 201:3,5,9,14 |
| 229:17 235:1 | 217:1 238:1 | responded 195:5 | 158:23 | 201:15,24 |
| reporting 11:21 | requirement | responds 46:12 | returns 40:1 | ridiculously |
| 20:1 213:8 | 55:2 95:15,19 | response 62:12 | Reubttal 298:1 | 71:4 |
| reports 96:13 | 218:3 263:14 | 108:6 109:23 | revenue 19:2,8 | right 16:13 18:2 |
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| 21:25 25:14 | 291:14,20 | rooms 180:14 | 164:13 | 189:15 195:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26:1,13 46:2 | 292:23 293:18 | roots 27:1 | saw 80:1,14 | screening 161:1 |
| 46:21,22 59:8 | RIM 121:14,16 | roughly 67:15 | 105:6 208:7 | screenshot 156:5 |
| 59:12,16,17 | 161:6,6,7,13 | 156:25 157:13 | 261:21 262:1 | seat 62:8 |
| 61:20 68:22 | 164:10 205:2 | 187:6,8,16,18 | 265:9 | second 19:16,18 |
| 73:22 86:24 | ripe 77:19 | 188:21 216:21 | say-- 284:20 | 20:135:11 |
| 87:13 91:15 | risk 44:10 52:3 | rounding 214:6 | saying 110:25 | 37:20 58:10 |
| 94:2 95:5 | 61:25 74:13 | row 117:7,13,20 | 130:1 141:18 | 61:15,24 84:9 |
| 100:6 104:20 | 75:10,14,20,23 | 118:9 163:14 | 157:10 181:25 | 95:2 96:18 |
| 105:17 106:2 | 76:14 88:17,21 | rule 17:24 59:3 | 270:11 | 117:20 127:15 |
| 107:12 116:2 | 89:1,3 | 84:12 86:16 | says 18:18 23:6 | 128:21,21,22 |
| 119:19 120:17 | risking 67:9,16 | 88:3 294:12 | 55:10 117:21 | 128:24 159:9 |
| 121:21 126:7 | risks 41:11 | ruled 17:25 25:1 | 118:9,22 | 187:2 197:5,7 |
| 129:9,12 | 45:23 | rules 69:13 78:5 | 128:20 142:2 | 219:23 225:20 |
| 131:12 132:16 | River 12:18 | 79:19 241:23 | 155:10,21 | 238:8 260:19 |
| 134:23 135:8 | Rivers 16:1 | 294:9 | 158:20 188:5 | secondly 259:13 |
| 135:10,13,15 | Riverton 247:17 | ruling 17:9,16 | 190:24 213:7 | section 173:16 |
| 141:4,18 | road 55:19 | 34:10 | 213:12 215:10 | 237:10 247:13 |
| 145:14 151:11 | ROBERSTON | run 17:15 78:8 | 222:24 | 252:8 253:23 |
| 153:2,19 161:4 | 12:18 | 128:3,8 189:13 | SB 250:25 | sections 51:15 |
| 172:20 175:4 | Robertson 15:24 | 201:15 | 251:13 | sector 42:4 |
| 180:19 181:19 | 16:1 21:6 | running 35:10 | scale 132:24 | 52:23 57:13,14 |
| 181:19 183:15 | 52:11,12 93:15 | 70:9 | scaleable 49:7 | 134:22 143:5,6 |
| 184:1,21 | 107:23 119:25 | runs 261:17 | scared 261:10 | secure 50:22 |
| 185:13 188:17 | 136:5 151:17 | Ruth 15:15 | scary 249:21 | security $31: 7$ |
| 189:8,23 | 182:18 218:20 | RYAN 11:18 | scenario 36:16 | 56:11,13 |
| 190:23 191:14 | 266:11 291:1 |  | 106:13 185:17 | sedans 42:14 |
| 194:6,21 | 295:4 | S | 185:17 | 259:4 |
| 196:25 197:5 | Robin 76:13 | S 12:1 | scenarios 36:10 | see 18:9 22:6 |
| 197:23 198:2,7 | 86:3 298:5 | s-- 238:20 278:4 | 36:12,14,23 | 32:23 33:1 |
| 199:2 201:14 | robust 49:7 74:9 | safe 57:19 74:20 | 37:2,7,9 40:14 | 34:15 35:21 |
| 203:10,17 | 83:12 275:2 | safety 284:14 | 185:11 213:8 | 47:17 59:2 |
| 206:7,17,22 | Rocky 117:7 | sale 159:18 | 257:25 276:21 | 68:11,14 86:19 |
| 207:11 209:18 | 279:14 | sales 29:6 | schedule 32:11 | 87:19 91:3 |
| 210:12 220:9 | ROE 96:9 113:6 | 124:25 125:1,2 | 157:15,15 | 101:18 118:24 |
| 221:17 225:12 | role 47:14,19 | 125:5 132:20 | 163:7 176:9 | 121:11 137:7 |
| 229:1 235:9,24 | 57:21 139:25 | 132:21 133:7 | 236:7 | 143:25 146:19 |
| 237:4 240:12 | room 32:14 | 133:13 256:25 | scheduling | 155:11,21 |
| 242:16 245:8 | 96:19 178:20 | sample 274:10 | 16:15,24 | 186:12,14,22 |
| 246:5,13 258:7 | 183:8 188:15 | Sarah 36:9 86:2 | 146:17 | 186:24 188:14 |
| 258:11,14 | 189:12 193:19 | 297:25 298:7 | scheme 95:10 | 188:15 191:9 |
| 262:8,21 | 208:1 212:13 | satisfaction | scope 269:18,20 | 191:15 198:20 |
| 269:14 278:8 | 229:13 293:17 | 191:3 | screen 26:2 50:4 | 212:18 216:11 |
| 279:5 289:11 | 293:19 294:1 | saturation | 59:14,16 | 216:20 217:10 |
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| 220:9 226:20 | serious 42:23 | 34:19 53:6 | 268:4 | 31:23 38:20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 239:21 247:18 | seriously 27:15 | 138:7 | short-term 65:3 | 47:19 71:6 |
| 254:21 259:14 | serve 75:3 103:7 | seven 82:20 | 67:14 115:7,15 | 83:5 176:15,20 |
| 266:19 276:9 | 103:10,13 | 118:18,18 | shortcuts 272:22 | 177:12 198:22 |
| 289:6 | 218:13 286:20 | seven-year 63:5 | shortfall 123:4 | 200:11 201:9 |
| seeing 16:14 | served 155:20 | shape 154:12,16 | 124:8 | 239:1 249:5 |
| 93:2 119:16 | 156:18 | 199:8 206:3,7 | shortly 195:23 | 278:22 282:7 |
| 131:6 151:3 | service 11:1 13:6 | 208:12 211:11 | show 36:25 | significantly |
| 194:6 207:18 | 22:14,16 30:4 | 220:25 221:2 | 154:21 189:11 | 34:10 36:8 |
| 208:4 209:15 | 31:5 33:3,6 | 224:19 274:1,3 | 222:1 252:6 | 44:19 200:1 |
| 211:25 228:22 | 34:1,14,15,22 | 274:9,22 275:4 | 256:16,23 | 239:2 258:24 |
| 288:18 293:9 | 38:10 49:2 | shapes 221:7,11 | 282:2 | 272:19 286:22 |
| seeking 246:24 | 55:5 57:19 | 221:12 271:12 | showed 122:21 | Silvey 11:18 |
| 247:19 | 74:20 75:6,16 | 271:18,23 | showing 90:2 | 22:2 26:7 |
| seen 88:19 102:7 | 76:1 79:15,15 | 273:17 275:10 | 297:14 | 58:24 59:7 |
| 127:12 162:14 | 79:16 85:2,4,4 | share 42:20 | shown 33:15 | 69:2 72:7 86:8 |
| 198:12 220:6 | 105:19 156:8 | 76:14 82:11 | 70:19 79:17 | 86:14 87:12,24 |
| 239:6 249:17 | 156:15 157:20 | 128:5 154:23 | 196:22 275:5 | 88:2,5 100:11 |
| 252:15 | 158:4 176:13 | 154:25 155:19 | shows 69:23 | 100:13 109:24 |
| SEER 179:4,4 | 195:14 196:23 | 156:22 157:7,8 | 105:3 127:23 | 110:1 295:10 |
| self-fulfilling | 225:15 226:18 | 157:13 165:2,6 | 132:19 154:17 | similar 32:10 |
| 53:12 | 245:3 298:15 | 180:3 192:25 | 157:3,18 158:5 | 35:17 78:12 |
| sell 137:17 | services 48:17 | 193:4 196:18 | sic 59:4 80:18 | 109:8 132:3 |
| selling 48:19 | 48:20,21 49:7 | 196:24 197:16 | 157:7 202:24 | 202:17 |
| 134:13 256:16 | 49:10,15 50:3 | 198:18 200:8 | 239:4 | similarly 189:19 |
| 259:22 | 50:7 54:6 75:6 | 283:15 | sick 292:19 | simple 61:10 |
| Senate 113: | 198:23 | shared 38:25 | side 54:24 | 155:1,3 158:8 |
| send 34:13 | serving 104:7 | 217:14 | 113:12 132:6 | 158:11 |
| senior 11:17 | 214:18 | shareholder | 144:1 284:13 | simply 30:25 |
| 51:8 | session 96:23 | 75:11 | Sierra 12:20 | 37:15 43:2 |
| sense 106:15 | 100:2 166:1 | shares 162:14 | 15:23,24,25 | 64:12 69:15 |
| 263:22 281:25 | 172:2,4 229:18 | sharing 75:11,14 | 21:5 52:10,12 | 76:15 82:12 |
| sensitive 189:22 | 235:2,12 | 75:20,23 76:25 | 93:14 107:22 | 84:5 85:7 |
| sent 261:7,7 | sessions 278:15 | 83:13 88:18 | 119:24 123:23 | 87:12 156:7 |
| sentence 118:17 | set 22:21 $25: 24$ | 89:11,11 | 136:4 151:16 | simulated 275:4 |
| 173:16,18 | 41:7 48:25 | Sheet 174:11 | 182:17 218:19 | simulation |
| 222:14,16 | 62:23 77:9,11 | sheets 51:11 | 266:10 290:25 | 273:17 274:25 |
| 242:2,3 | 80:5 85:1 | 79:16 | sign's 249:1 | single 50:24 |
| separate 59:21 | 87:13,14 | shielded 74:13 | signal 34:13 | 53:11 104:4 |
| 100:22 180:6 | 242:18 | shift 274:4 | 59:12 | 137:19 279:21 |
| 181:17 | setting 45:18 | shop 42:21 | signatories | 280:8 |
| separately | 87:16 240:15 | shopping 283:16 | 19:19 | single-family |
| 100:23 172:15 | 248:11 | short 33:14 65:2 | signed 153:8 | 49:18 |
| 172:19 173:3 | settlement 32:7 | 82:19 267:15 | significant 28:2 | single-issue |
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| 84:16 | 14:21 | 291:2,16 | speculate 249:25 | 81:1,24 83:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sir 134:15 | smog 54:1 | 292:13 | 250:15 | 83:15 85:22 |
| 287:25 289:22 | soft 187:1 | sort 66:13 | speed 218:1 | 86:2 94:3 |
| sit 23:10 | software 49:5 | 129:15,22 | 265:23 | 109:20 120:7 |
| site 48:24 50:13 | solar 29:13 75:8 | 154:7 185:16 | speeds 265:22 | 127:6,8 128:4 |
| 50:15 178:19 | sold 34:23 38:17 | 186:25 198:10 | spend 67:18 | 128:9 129:15 |
| 178:19 188:6 | 101:13 103:16 | 198:14 | 71:2 139:22 | 129:21 131:20 |
| sites 125:21,22 | 104:16 105:4 | sought 27:4 | 140:25 | 136:13 145:15 |
| 143:10 | 133:6 255:12 | sound 238:22 | spending 41:12 | 146:6 165:10 |
| situation 77:21 | 256:12 | sounds 241:21 | 64:17,20 70:9 | 172:5 182:25 |
| situations 88:20 | sole 83:23 | 242:4,22 | spent 63:172:1 | 208:21 219:25 |
| $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i x }} 32: 782: 20$ | solely $272: 13$ | source 155:14 | 78:24 205:3 | 221:7 223:9 |
| 118:18 132:19 | solicited 27:18 | 156:17 176:18 | Spire 15:22,23 | 244:12,22 |
| 139:1 174:11 | 237:20 | 197:19,22,22 | 79:13,14 | 245:2,8,14 |
| 223:21 255:23 | soliciting 237:15 | 202:13,16 | Spirit 176:5 | 267:9 271:9 |
| 256:10 | solution 25:21 | sources 58:18 | split 188:21 | 273:13 278:4 |
| size 65:5 67:15 | 30:2 40:9 | 158:7 176:11 | spoken 187:1 | 280:11,12,16 |
| skeptical 61:21 | 77:11 78:13 | 196:18 | sponsored 56:23 | 280:19,24 |
| 74:18 | 85:15 173:8 | South 12:3 | sponsoring 51:7 | 288:23 289:18 |
| skepticism 74:21 | 284:13 | Southern 208:15 | spots 49:11, 13 | 294:8 297:22 |
| 159:13 246:16 | solutions 28:16 | 216:13 227:22 | spread 29:5 | 297:23 |
| 246:18 | 30:6 37:21 | 273:15 274:5 | 114:9 218:6 | Staff's 53:9 |
| skin 67:3 75:11 | 51:9 60:2,9 | 274:15 | 283:7 285:8 | 75:17 76:14 |
| 76:9 | 69:6 71:21 | space 29:19 | spreading 54:20 | 78:25 81:5,23 |
| skipped 93:11 | 77:19 144:23 | 81:15 179:20 | spreadsheet | 85:19 126:25 |
| sleeping 38:4 | 200:13 | 180:11 | 147:19 | 216:20 217:2,4 |
| slide 158:7 | somebody 179:2 | spaces 80:25 | Springfield | 242:24 244:3,5 |
| slightly 147:21 | somewhat 46:8 | speak 72:2 282:8 | 123:20 | 245:4 271:12 |
| 148:20 | 109:14 121:8 | speaking 69:14 | spur 81:16,18 | stakeholder |
| slipped 185:19 | 132:1 134:7 | speaks 218:11 | St 12:6,19 14:20 | 52:17 76:16 |
| slogan 262:18 | soon 145:22 | specific 30:13 | 16:2 33:22 | 149:7 |
| slower 277:15 | sorry 31:1 89:16 | 33:1 59:2 89:5 | 80:4 106:17 | stakeholders |
| slowing 291:21 | 91:13 93:11 | 89:6 114:19 | 116:13 162:21 | 237:16,20 |
| small 55:18 | 100:4,7 107:18 | 154:20 224:9 | 176:5,12 | 278:20 |
| 70:20 79:16 | 118:3 122:1 | 246:24 | 204:14 | stam-- 112:3 |
| 95:10 96:1 | 130:25 148:3 | specifically | stable 193:2 | stand 34:18 |
| 187:13 260:3 | 148:24 149:4 | 29:19 46:15 | staff 13:614:24 | 46:14 91:10 |
| smaller 155:9 | 149:10 151:8 | 60:5 90:13 | 15:1 20:3 | 146:23 287:12 |
| smart 44:5 | 157:22,23,24 | 239:21 240:3 | 21:14,15,17 | standard 84:8 |
| 100:17 223:21 | 162:5 174:8,19 | 245:11,23 | 22:1 36:9 55:1 | 94:15,22 95:4 |
| 279:20 | 206:19 214:17 | 247:6 290:16 | 73:23 74:2,3,5 | 111:11 243:12 |
| smartphone | 228:24 241:11 | specifics 249:18 | 74:6,6,8,15,17 | 256:13 |
| 53:16 | 246:7,9 256:8 | specify $154: 18$ | 75:19 76:2,13 | standards 84:15 |
| Smith 12:2 | 265:1 274:21 | 223:23 | 79:16 80:20 | 94:10 111:15 |
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