

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

Exhibit No.: **065NP**  
Issues: Emission Allowances  
Witness: Maureen Borkowski  
Sponsoring Party: Union Electric Company  
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony  
Case No.: ER-2007-0002  
Date Testimony Prepared: February 27, 2007

**MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**CASE NO. ER-2007-0002**

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**MAUREEN BORKOWSKI**

**ON**

**BEHALF OF**

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

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

**Ameren** Exhibit No. **65NP**  
Case No(s). **ER-2007-0002**  
Date **3-26-07** Rptr **45**

## 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 held by Dynegy. Mr. Moehn indicated that Dynegy's representative had linked the  
2 emissions allowance options to Dynegy's desire to resolve the two FERC cases. Because  
3 the FERC cases involved transmission-related issues for Illinois Power Company d/b/a  
4 AmerenIP, and were within my area of responsibility, Mr. Moehn contacted me.

5 **Q. What occurred?**

6 A. I communicated to Mr. Moehn how AmerenIP would be willing to resolve  
7 those cases and he negotiated a settlement for both of these FERC cases based upon that  
8 communication which resulted in a settlement agreement with AmerenIP. A copy of the  
9 settlement agreement with Dynegy relating to these cases is attached as Schedule  
10 MAB-1.

11 **Q. Mr. Kind, in his Rebuttal Testimony, suggests that the linkage**  
12 **between another case (which he believed was a reactive power case) and the Dynegy**  
13 **options was some sort of affiliate abuse. Please comment?**

14 A. There was certainly no negative impact on AmerenUE as a result of  
15 AmerenIP settling two transmission cases with Dynegy. In fact, the settlement did not  
16 result in any benefit to AmerenUE or any detriment to AmerenIP, because AmerenIP  
17 received a fair settlement at a level that AmerenIP would have accepted and received  
18 without regard to any considerations relating to the emission allowances.

19 **Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?**

20 A. Yes.

**SCHEDULE MB-1**  
**HAS BEEN DEEMED**  
**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL**  
**IN ITS ENTIRETY**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**


In the Matter of Union Electric Company     )  
d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File     )  
Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric     )     Case No. ER-2007-0002  
Service Provided to Customers in the     )  
Company's Missouri Service Area.     )

**AFFIDAVIT OF MAUREEN A. BORKOWSKI**


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

Maureen A. Borkowski, being first duly sworn on her oath, states:

1.     My name is Maureen A. Borkowski. I work in the City of St. Louis, Missouri, and I am employed by Ameren Services Company as Vice President of Transmission.
2.     Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE consisting of   2   pages and Schedule MAB-1, all of which have been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the above-referenced docket.
3.     I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded are true and correct.

  
Maureen A. Borkowski

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007.

  
Notary Public

My commission expires: May 19, 2008

