

Energy Forecast (Total Delivered)	Forecast Retail Revenue (\$1000)	¢/Therm (forecast)	5-6-2010 Final Order Adj.	Adjusted Retail Revenue (\$1000)	Avg. Retail Rate (¢/Therm)	% Increase Limit	¢/Therm Limit	Ameren Spending Limit (\$1000)	Staff Spending Limit Calculation (\$1000)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
117,590,384	\$ 1,006,038	85.6		\$ 1,006,038	85.6	0.0%	0.0	\$ -	\$ -
116,919,357	\$ 1,148,636	98.2		\$ 1,148,636	98.2	0.0%	0.0	\$ -	\$ -
118,744,606	\$ 915,885	77.1		\$ 915,885	77.1	0.0%	0.0	\$ -	\$ -
118,469,977	\$ 918,632	77.5	(1.3)	\$ 902,962	76.2	0.0%	0.0	\$ -	\$ -
120,944,475	\$ 942,761	77.9	(1.3)	\$ 926,763	76.6	2.0%	1.5325	\$ 18,535	\$ 18,855
122,228,429	\$ 961,059	78.6	(1.3)	\$ 944,891	77.3	2.0%	1.5461	\$ 18,898	\$ 19,221
122,918,961	\$ 976,676	79.5	(1.3)	\$ 960,417	78.1	2.0%	1.5627	\$ 19,208	\$ 19,534
								\$ 56,641	\$ 57,610

Notes:

Col (1): Total delivered dekatherms, excluding those exempt in Section 8-104(m) of the Public Utility Act

Col (2): Base Revenue Forecast, excluding adjustment due to May 2010 Gas Rate Case Order

Col (3): Col (1) ÷ Col (2)

Col (4): May 2010 Natural Gas General Rate Case Order adjustment on per therm basis ----- (-\$20,448,418 ÷ 1,545,899,676 therms) * 100¢ per \$1

Col (5): Retail Revenue, adjusted for Rate Case Order

Col (6): Adjusted Average Retail Rate

Col (7): Statutory percentage increase limit

Col (8): Spending Limit expressed on a ¢/therm basis

Col (9): Ameren Spending Limit Calculation, including Rate Case Order adjustment---- Col(5) * Col(7)

Col (10): Staff Calculation based on response to DR RZ 1.01, excluding Col(4) adjustment ---- Col(2) * Col(7)

Table A

Estimated Natural Gas Deliveries (Therms)		
During the 36 Months Ending May 31, 2014		
Excluding Therms of sub-section 8-104 (m) customers		
associated with ...	and delivered to	
Gas purchased from	<i>Small Customers</i>	<i>Large Customers</i>
<i>Utility (PGA)</i>	1,698,170,217	812,991,012
<i>Certified AGS</i>	N/A**	N/A**
<i>Uncertified AGS</i>	N/A	1,149,757,425
DR RZ 1.01		3,660,918,654

Table B

Estimated Utility Revenues (\$)		
During the 36 Months Ending May 31, 2014		
Excluding revenues from sub-section 8-104 (m) customers		
associated with ...	and delivered to	
Gas purchased from	<i>Small Customers</i>	<i>Large Customers</i>
<i>Utility (PGA)</i>	\$1,944,497,843	\$845,961,700
<i>Certified AGS</i>	N/A**	N/A**
<i>Uncertified AGS</i>	N/A	\$90,036,646
DR RZ 1.01		\$ 2,880,496,189

Applying \$/therm rate Order Adjustment to retail revenue	\$	(0.013)
--	-----------	----------------

Table B*

Estimated Utility Revenues (\$)		
During the 36 Months Ending May 31, 2014		
Excluding revenues from sub-section 8-104 (m) customers		
associated with ...	and delivered to	
Gas purchased from	<i>Small Customers</i>	<i>Large Customers</i>
<i>Utility (PGA)</i>	\$1,922,035,263	\$835,207,846
<i>Certified AGS</i>	N/A**	N/A**
<i>Uncertified AGS</i>	N/A	\$74,828,207
Ameren Exhibit 4.2		\$ 2,832,071,316
Difference		\$ 48,424,873
% Difference		1.7%

Note: Tables A and B are replications of tables from Staff data request RZ 1.01
Table B* provides an update to Table B by applying the 1.3¢/therm adjustment

**ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION STAFF RESPONSE TO
AMEREN UTILITIES' DATA REQUESTS
DOCKET NO. 10-0568**

AIC-ST 1.4

In lines 97-100, Mr. Tolsdorf recommends “to modify Riders EDR and GER to include specific language that requires the Company to provide testimony in a reconciliation proceeding addressing the reasonableness and prudence of costs recovered through the Riders.”

(a) Please explain the difference(s) between what Mr. Tolsdorf recommends and what is presently required during the reconciliation proceedings.

(b) Does Mr. Tolsdorf have concerns regarding what is presently required during the reconciliation proceedings? If yes, please identify those concerns and explain why the present process for reconciliation proceedings does not adequately address the stated concerns regarding prudence and reasonableness of incurred costs.

(c) Please explain with specificity the scope and depth of the testimony that Mr. Tolsdorf seeks to require Ameren Illinois to file pursuant to his proposed rider modification language.

Response:

(a) The difference between what Mr. Tolsdorf recommends and what is presently required by the current Rider EDR/GER during the reconciliation is to explicitly require in the tariffs what is required by statute. As stated in Mr. Tolsdorf's direct testimony (ICC Staff Ex. 3.0 at page 5), the Public Utilities Act allows for only the recovery of prudently and reasonably incurred costs. The Company has provided nothing for the evidentiary record that the costs recovered in the reconciliation proceeding for program years 1 or 2 were prudently and reasonably incurred. The current tariff language only requires that the Annual Energy Efficiency Reports be verified by an officer of the Company. The verified statements for program years 1 and 2 do not offer any assurance that the costs in the respective reconciliations were either reasonably or prudently incurred.

(b) Yes. Mr. Tolsdorf is concerned that the Company should provide evidence regarding the reasonableness and prudence of costs recovered through Riders EDR and GER.

(c) The manner by which the Company elects to provide such evidence is a decision to be made by the Company in each reconciliation proceeding.

Prepared by: Scott Tolsdorf
Date Requested: November 8, 2010
Date Submitted: November 9, 2010