Exhibit No.

Volume No. 8 Official Stenographers Report

ORIGINAL

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before the

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NO:

AMEREN ENERGY GENERATING
COMPANY AND UNION ELECTRIC
COMPANY

EC03-0053-000

FILED³

APR 2 0 2007

Missouri Public Service Commission

LOCATION: WASHINGTON, D.C.

PAGES: 455-708

DATE: WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2003

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters

1120 G Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 347-3700

NATIONWIDE COVERAGE

OPC Exhibit No. 440

Case No(s). EL-2007-0002

Date 3/23/07 Rote MV

202-347-3700

25

PROCEEDINGS

PRESIDING JUDGE: We have some preliminary 2 Did you work out an agreement for the stipulated 3 matters. 4 issues? MR. COCKRELL: Your Honor, it's my 5 understanding from, I think it was, NRG, they would prefer 6 that we take the time tomorrow when we close down at 3:30. 7 MR. WAIKART: We've given all our feedback to 8 9 Staff's list, and I think NRG is reviewing it, and I think 10 EPSA, too. But that sounds okay to us. 11 MR. COCKRELL: Could I ask your Honor, are you 12 going to be using this room when we shut down tomorrow? 13 PRESIDING JUDGE: No. 14 MR. COCKRELL: So we could stay another half 15 hour or so tomorrow. 16 PRESIDING JUDGE: We're also working on video 17 conferencing capabilities for Friday morning. At least 18 one of NRG's is here, so let's get started then. Oh, 19 you're not NRG. 20 MR. EISENSTAT: Sorry to disappoint. 21 PRESIDING JUDGE: Let's get started. We'll go 22 to Staff when you get done if NRG is not here. 23 Good morning, Mr. Voytas. I remind you that you're still under oath. 24

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

THE WITNESS: Yes, Judge.

Whereupon,

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RICHARD A. VOYTAS

resumed the stand and, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. WENTWORTH:

Q Good morning, Mr. Voytas. I will be much shorter with you today than we were yesterday. I invite your attention to EPSA Exhibit 16 at page 206. Are you there, Mr. Voytas?

A Yes, I am.

Q This is a letter from Mr. David Brueggeman on Ameren Energy Marketing -- or to Mr. David Brueggeman of Ameren Services from Andrew M. Serri, vice president of sales and marketing for Ameren Energy Marketing; is that correct?

A Correct.

Q And this is a letter responding -- well, actually, can you read the first paragraph of Mr. Serri's letter?

A *This letter is in response to your recent inquiry regarding the availability of our combustion turbine generating assets. Ameren Energy Marketing is pleased to follow up on our September 19th proposal by including our Gibson City energy center among those assets

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

MR. WENTWORTH: Your Honor, we would like to 1 2 ask for the opportunity for some limited recross. PRESIDING JUDGE: That's a violation of my rules. MR. WENTWORTH: I understand, your Honor. PRESIDING JUDGE: Okay. We'll waive the rules for the limited purpose of letting you redirect. How limited is it? MR. WENTWORTH: I'm hoping maybe about 10 or 15 10 minutes. 11 PRESIDING JUDGE: Okay. No longer than that, 12 okay. Yes, you will have the right to redirect. 13 MR. WAIKART: Re-redirect? PRESIDING JUDGE: Right. Go ahead. 14 RECROSS EXAMINATION 1 BY MR. WENTWORTH: 1 One thing I wanted to clear up, Mr. Voytas, I 1 think you mentioned in your redirect that for the summer of 2003 AEM elected not to invoke its rights under the 1 20 joint dispatch agreement? Α That's correct. Is AEM a signatory to the joint dispatch 22 agreement? I would have to pull that out. AEM is agent for AEG. It's a matter of semantics. AEM is the

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage

1	marketing arm of AEG.
2	Q What rights did it not invoke?
3	A On section 6.04 of the JDA
4	MR. WAIKART: Your Honor, I want to clarify.
5	Is this in response to a question that I asked or in
6	response to an earlier question?
7	MR. WENTWORTH: It may be in response to Staff.
8	MR. WAIKART: That's still not kosher, your
9	Honor. We're doing recross, I guess. He has to limit his
10	questions to questions that I've just asked. I didn't ask
11	anything about the JDA.
12	PRESIDING JUDGE: That's true. Go ahead.
13	MR. WENTWORTH: Fair enough.
14	BY MR. WENTWORTH:
15	Q Was it your testimony on redirect that Ameren
16	was only interested in assets within its control area?
17	A Yes.
18	Q When you mailed out the 2001 RFP, did you only
19	send it to parties with plants located within Ameren's
20	control area?
21	A No.
22	Q Why did you send out an RFP to parties outside
23	of the control area if you were only interested in assets
24	within the Ameren control area?
25	A Because we are considering the tolling option

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

A

- where we are willing to consider assets outside the Ameren 1 2 control area. I was referring to the build or bias sets within the Ameren control area statement. 3 And when was the -- and so that was a part of Q 5 the decision that was reached in January of 2002? What was a part of the decision? 6 The decision to limit yourself to Ameren's 7 control area for buy and build. 8 9 I am not aware that AmerenUE has ever built a plant outside its control area. So the statement that 10 that's when that decision was made or that policy was 11 made, I don't think is a true statement. 12 Does anything in the RFP say that you were 13 limiting yourself to buying or building inside the control 14 area? 15 I don't believe so. 16 A 17 Now, there's nothing in the Missouri Stipulation that would prohibit AmerenUE from owning 18 assets outside of its control area, is there? 19 No, there's not. 20 A Does anything in the RFP, the August 2001 RFP 21 indicate that you had a commercial operating need for 22 capacity in 2003 and the offers had to satisfy the summer 23 24 of 2003?
 - ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

That was the whole reason for issuing the RFP

Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

1 for the time period 2002 through 2011. We do not issue an 2 RFP because we don't need capacity. If we needed capacity 3 beyond 2003, we would have stated that. 4 Would you go outside the control area for Q 5 purchase power agreements or tolling agreements, but only 6 for the purchase of assets -- let me strike that. 7 So would you go outside the control area for purchase power agreements and tolling agreements, but not 8 9 for the purchase of assets within the control area? I think your question's got two parts. The 10 Α 11 first part, would we go outside the control area, and we 12 did that with American Electric Power. Now, what's the 13 second part of your question. Your testimony is that you would not go outside 14 Q the control area to purchase assets? 15 To purchase, that's correct. 16 A When you went back to the short list of bidders 17 in the RFP, at that point had you made the determination 18 19 that you were only going to acquire assets? 20 A Yes. And did you tell them that? Q 21 MR. WAIKART: Your Honor, I object. I don't 22 recall any questions on the short list of bidders in my 23 24 redirect.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

MR. WENTWORTH: Your Honor, the redirect

Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

1	discussed the reasons for not offering for not offering
2	a new RFP, and that's what I'm inquiring into.
3	PRESIDING JUDGE: Overruled. Go ahead.
4	THE WITNESS: Please repeat the question.
5	(The reporter read the record as requested.)
6	THE WITNESS: We informed the unsuccessful
7	bidders that they were unsuccessful.
8	BY MR. WENTWORTH:
9	Q But you never told Reliant Shelby that you were
10	unsuccessful and were looking instead to buy hard assets,
11	did you?
12	A That's a two-part question. Did we tell
13	Reliant Shelby that they were unsuccessful? We told them
14	that they were successful, and we entered into a one-year
15	power purchase agreement with them.
16	Q But you did not tell them that you were
17	interested in buying or acquiring assets, did you?
18	A We told them that we were only interested in a
19	one-year power purchase agreement.
20	Q So your answer would be no?
21	A Correct.
22	Q Now, with respect to the GenPower proposal, you
23	indicated that they were unknown to AmerenUE, and that was
24	the reason you rejected their offer; is that true?
25	A I recall indicating that they were very little

1 known to AmerenUE. I don't recall that that was the 2 reason for rejecting their offer. 3 0 Did AmerenUE do anything to investigate 4 GenPower and its track record for constructing generation? 5 AmerenUE looked at the portfolio of assets that 6 GenPower had. In our November 2001 briefing sessions, we 7 talked about their capabilities in terms of staffing that 8 they had, and it became very apparent that they were very thin and that they contracted most of their work out. 9 10 In fact, they contracted a lot of their work to General Electric Power Systems, didn't they? 11 I don't remember. 12 13 Are you familiar with General Electric Power 14 Systems? A I know who General Electric is. 15 So are you familiar with General Electric Power 16 O 17 Systems? What do you mean by "familiar"? 18 A 19 Are you familiar -- do you have any knowledge concerning the abilities or capabilities of General 20 Electric Power Systems to construct power plants? 21 I have never met with a General Electric 22 Α representative. 23 So you didn't investigate whether -- you didn't 24 investigate the ability of General Electric to build a 25

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

power plant that was a part of the offer for GenPower, did
you?

A No, that's not true. In looking at these assets, again, we've got a variety of people to talk to, and we do talk to our engineering and construction arm of our business, and we do get information from them.

Q Did you receive any information that

GenPower -- I'm sorry, that General Electric Power Systems

was not capable of developing the project proposed by

GenPower?

MR. WAIKART: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I asked him a question about GenPower. I didn't say anything about General Electric, and I believe his answer had to do with the size of GenPower. Now we've had five or six questions on General Electric. I don't see where this is within the scope of my redirect.

MR. WENTWORTH: Your Honor, in the -- and I can point to it in EPSA-16, but the offer that was put in by GenPower, part of the offer or one of the offers was for a sale of the facility, and then the turnkey to construction of the generation facility by General Electric Power Systems.

MR. WAIKART: That's fine, but I didn't ask him about that. Are we going to go through cross-examination all over again? I thought it had to be limited to the

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

1	scope of my redirect.
2	PRESIDING JUDGE: Is it related to the scope of
3	his redirect?
4	MR. WENTWORTH: Absolutely.
5	PRESIDING JUDGE: Yeah. Overruled. Go ahead.
6	MR. WENTWORTH: I'm sure you don't remember the
7	last question.
8	THE WITNESS: You're absolutely right.
9	MR. WENTWORTH: If we can ask the court
10	reporter to read it back.
11	PRESIDING JUDGE: Can you read it back.
12	(The reporter read the record as requested.)
13	THE WITNESS: No.
14	BY MR. WENTWORTH:
⊥ ₩	
15	Q Isn't it true that you essentially rejected the
16	GenPower bid because you couldn't imagine how it could
17	provide Ameren with a better deal than Ameren could have
18	built itself or provided itself?
19	A That's one consideration.
20	Q How do you know that?
21	A How do I know that? Because I know what
22	AmerenUE can do and has done, and I don't know what
23	GenPower can do or has done. They have not done business
24	with AmerenUE in the past.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC. Nationwide Coverage

And how would you know how any other party

202-347-3700

might be able to do in comparison to AmerenUE without 1 holding an RFP for new construction? 2 How will I know what any other supplier can do? 3 A Without holding an RFP to find out. 0 The technology costs are costs; correct? I Α 5 mean, if we're talking about technology, if we're talking 6 about installing GE frame 7 machines at point A or point 7 B, the costs are the costs. 8 Then why are there independent power producers 9 Q building power plants in the United States today if the 10 regulated utilities can do it better than they can? 11 I think the independent power producers are 12 probably asking themselves that same question. I think 13 that's why we're seeing so many go out of business, so 14 many trying to sell their assets, so many in bankruptcy. 15 So why would you even ask for acquisition --16 0 construction or acquisition of plants in the RFP if you 17 18 knew you could do it better? Construction or acquisition of plants if we 19 knew we could do it better? Again, that goes back to the 20 requirement for significant capacity in the summer of 2002 21 22 and beyond. That capacity was needed immediately. were to build it, we could not build it in time to meet 23 that need. 24 25 Q In the August 2001 RFP, it's your testimony

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

1 that it included -- it was soliciting offers for the construction or acquisition of new generation; right? 2 3 Α Right. 4 Why would you have put that in the RFP if you 5 knew that Ameren could do it better than any bidder might bid? 6 7 Ameren had not built capacity to meet its needs for summer of 2002. So it put that in the RFP so it could 8 9 acquire capacity for summer 2002. 10 Q So is it true, then, that you were only interested in the other bidders for purposes of short-term 11 12 sales? 13 No. Α 14 You were interested in them for building Q 15 plants, too? We were interested in other bidders for those 16 who had assets that were already within the Ameren control 17 18 area. So is it your contention that the August 2001 19 RFP did not solicit bids for new construction? 20 The August 2001 RFP, the first requirement 21 Α product stated was to purchase or buy assets. 22 And does it say only existing assets? 23 MR. WAIKART: Your Honor, could I have a 24 25 reference?

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

1	THE WITNESS: Yeah, that would be helpful.
2	MR. WENTWORTH: I believe the RFP is AS-6.
3	PRESIDING JUDGE: Do you need to look at the
4	RFP, sir?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
6	PRESIDING JUDGE: Go ahead. I heard somebody
7	saying AS-13?
8	MR. WENTWORTH: Yes, I believe that would be
9	correct.
10	PRESIDING JUDGE: Go ahead. Do you have it
11	before you?
12	THE WITNESS: No, Judge. I was going to ask
13	counsel if he has a copy, if I could review it.
14	MR. RAYBUCK: May I approach the witness, your
15	Honor?
16	PRESIDING JUDGE: Yes. Put a copy of AS-13 in
17	front of you.
18	THE WITNESS: I have AS-13 in front of me.
19	BY MR. WENTWORTH:
20	Q Page 5 of AS-13, 7.2, is it your testimony that
21	7.2 solicits bids for ownership in new facilities?
22	A It's my testimony that AS-13, page 3 of 11,
23	states "proposals must be for: (1) ownership in new or
24	existing generating facilities."
25	Q So why would you solicit bids for ownership in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

new facilities if you knew that AmerenUE could build facilities better than anybody else out there? Again, I state proposals must be for ownership A in new or existing generating facilities. Again, this was a broad-brush RFP to see what was out there. truly needed was generating capacity for the summer of 2002 and beyond. And where in this RFP does it tell bidders 0 that? At the sake of being redundant, I go to page 3 of 11, line 1. *Proposals must be for: (1) ownership in new or existing generating facilities." Okav. I think we understand your analysis. Now, you indicate that one of the advantages to building a

A That's an option.

Q Isn't the point of your acquiring hard assets in order to meet your reserve capacity? So if you sell it, then aren't you going to reduce your reserve capacity?

power plant is that you can sell it if the market is up.

A That's true. A regulated utility like AmerenUE is not in the business of building and selling capacity. It's primarily in the business of serving its native load as a vertically integrated utility. But that option should exist. Should some -- something come along where a swap or trade or something comes up, you've got that

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

1	option. It's a hypothetical question, but AmerenUE
2	typically does not sell its existing generating assets.
3	Q Does AmerenUE retain the right, if you will,
4	under Missouri law, Missouri Stipulation to sell these
5	plants, Kinmundy and Pinckneyville?
6	A Whenever AmerenUE decides to change its
7	resource plan, it is required to notify Missouri Public
8	Service Commission staff of what it is doing, its reasons
9	for doing it, and its process for doing it.
10	Q Does it have to get advance approval before it
11	would sell these plants?
12	A I don't know the exact answer to that question.
13	Q Who would know?
14	A I would defer to an AmerenUE regulatory
15	attorney.
16	Q Can the Missouri Public Service Commission
17	staff ever bind the Public Service Commission itself?
18	MR. WAIKART: I object, your Honor. I believe
19	that calls for a legal conclusion.
20	MR. WENTWORTH: The witness's knowledge, your
21	Honor.
22	PRESIDING JUDGE: Sustained.
23	THE WITNESS: I don't know.
24	BY MR. WENTWORTH:
25	Q If Staff were to tell you, the Missouri Public

202-347-3700

Service Commission were to tell AmerenUE to spend \$100 million on a new headquarters that would be approved by the Missouri Public Service Commission staff, would you just go ahead and do it?

A That's a hypothetical question that I can't answer. The Missouri Public Service Commission does not give AmerenUE preapproval to do anything. AmerenUE does it and includes it in a cost-of-service study, and the Missouri Public Service Commission staff reviews the prudency. I can't answer that question. As a hypothetical, that doesn't reflect any reality that I know.

Q Let me ask you this hypothetical that hopefully reflects your reality. If the Missouri Public Service Commission staff told you to wire a generating plant and AmerenUE determined that it was imprudent to do so, would you still follow the direction of the Missouri Public Service Commission staff?

A If Ameren -- if the Missouri Public Service Commission staff told AmerenUE to do something?

Q Yes.

MR. WAIKART: What ---

THE WITNESS: I can't answer it. It doesn't work that way.

MR. WENTWORTH: It's a hypothetical question.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

1	I think the witness can answer, your Honor.
2	MR. WAIKART: Your Honor, my objection is what
3	is the second part of the question. What was the second
4	part of the question?
5	MR. WENTWORTH: Yes, if the court reporter can
6	read it back.
7	(The reporter read the record as requested.)
8	PRESIDING JUDGE: I think it was to build
9	generation, a generating plant, not to wire. Is that
10	correct?
11	MR. WENTWORTH: Yes, your Honor.
12	THE WITNESS: If AmerenUE, if the Missouri
13	Public Service Commission staff told me to build something
14	and said and we will give you 100 percent cost recovery,
15	I'd do it.
16	BY MR. WENTWORTH:
17	Q Can the Missouri Public Service Commission
18	staff give you 100 percent cost recovery?
19	A I thought that's where we've been through.
20	There's no preapproval process. Prudency is reviewed at
21	the time a rate filing is made. Can they? Yes.
22	Q The Missouri Public Service Commission staff?
23	A If AmerenUE built an asset, the Missouri Public
24	Service Commission staff could grant 100 percent cost
25	racovery.

1	Q Isn't it the Commission that has to grant cost
2	recovery?
3	A You're correct. It's the Commission.
4	Q So the Missouri Commission staff can't direct
5	you to do anything that's imprudent, can they?
6	A That's correct.
7	Q In fact, the Missouri Commission staff can't
8	direct AmerenUE to do anything, period, can they?
9	MR. WAIKART: Your Honor, I object as
10	repetitive. I think counsel indicated 15 minutes of
11	recross, and we're already at 20 minutes and still going
12	strong.
13	PRESIDING JUDGE: Are you almost done?
14	MR. WENTWORTH: If I can get an answer to this
15	question.
16	PRESIDING JUDGE: Overruled. Answer the
17	question.
18	THE WITNESS: Please repeat the question.
19	(The reporter read the record as requested.)
20	THE WITNESS: That's not the world that I
21	operate in or know. The world I operate in and know is we
22	work with the Missouri Commission staff and work on
23	consensus. They don't tell us how to do it or what to do.
24	We present our ideas
25	MR. WENTWORTH: I move to strike the answer.

202-347-3700

1	MR. WAIKART: I object to the motion to strike.
2	I think it was responsive.
3	MR. COCKRELL: I would agree with Mr. Waikart.
4	I think it was a responsive answer.
5	PRESIDING JUDGE: Denied. Are you done?
6	MR. WENTWORTH: I'm done, your Honor.
7	MR. MOONEY: Your Honor, I'd like just very
8	limited recross.
9	PRESIDING JUDGE: How limited are you?
10	MR. MOONEY: I have two
11	MR. WAIKART: I object, your Honor. I didn't
12	ask any questions
13	PRESIDING JUDGE: No, but I'm going to let him
14	go. From now on, I will follow you can redirect. I'm
15	saying I'm going to let him go, and from this afternoon
16	on, after you redirect, we go back to my original rules.
17	No exceptions for anybody.
18	MR. WAIKART: I just want to clarify, though.
19	I don't know how you apply your rules, but I did not ask
20	any redirect on questions posed by NRG.
21	MR. MOONEY: I'm asking a question regarding
22	some of the statements on redirect that were just made.
23	MR. WAIKART: You're allowing multiple recross
24	by counsel in areas that they didn't ask originally, your
25	Honor, and that I didn't redirect on.

i	PRESIDING DUDGE: He's saying that it's
2	directed to the redirect.
3	MR. MOONEY: Redirect. It's nothing to do with
4	something we've talked about before.
5	MR. WAIKART: I did redirect on EPSA's
6	questions, not NRG's questions.
7	MR. MOONEY: This is on one of the EPSA
В	questions.
9	MR. WAIKART: I know that, but you're counsel
10	for NRG. You're not counsel for EPSA.
11	PRESIDING JUDGE: Overruled. Let him ask the
12	questions. Go ahead.
13	RECROSS EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. MOONEY:
15	Q You've indicated that Ameren can build, develop
16	plants, in your opinion, better than other people can;
17	correct? That's one of the things you said in your
18	redirect?
19	MR. WAIKART: I object, your Honor, as being
20	outside the scope of my redirect based on questions from
21	counsel for EPSA.
22	PRESIDING JUDGE: Overruled. He did say that.
23	Go ahead.
24	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. You didn't let me
25	answer your question.

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage

2

7

8

19

20

21

22

23

24

BY MR. MOONEY:

- Q I apologize.
- A I said Amerenue would have to look at the value
 of what another person could do that's better than what
 Amerenue can do. I did not say that Amerenue could do it
 absolutely better than anyone else.
 - Q Okay. Now, sir, can you tell me, you recently completed a facility called the Peno Creek facility?
- 9 A That's correct.
- 10 Q And can you tell me what the cost of that
 11 installed kilowatts was?
- 12 A Yes. The cost was approximately \$550 a kW.
- Q And sir, in your rebuttal testimony, didn't you testify that -- excuse me, Peno Creek, is that a CGT?
- 15 A It is.
- Q Didn't you testify in your rebuttal testimony
 that it should only cost approximately plus or minus \$450
 per installed kilowatt, isn't that true, sir?
 - A That testimony was based on CTGs that were added in response to a data request, and the Peno Creek CTGs were not included in that number.
 - Q But you did say that, sir?
 - MR. WAIKART: Your Honor, I object. I asked no questions about Peno Creek in my redirect.
- MR. MOONEY: This is a facility that was built

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

202-347-3700

24

25

1	by Ameren. He mentioned that he thought that Ameren, as
2	he qualified it, can do a good job building plants.
3	PRESIDING JUDGE: Overruled. Go ahead and
4	answer the question.
5	THE WITNESS: I believe the question was didn't
6	the Peno Creek or what was the cost of the Peno Creek
7	plant, and I indicated a price of \$550 a kW approximately.
8	BY MR. MOONEY:
9	Q And you also stated in your rebuttal testimony
LO	that it should cost approximately \$450 an installed
1	kilowatt to build a CTG; isn't that correct?
L 2	A That's correct.
L3	Q Sir, last question. Sir, AEG builds these
4	plants, correct, not AmerenUE; correct? They built
. 5	Panckneyville and Kinmundy, AEG did?
L 6	A AmerenUE built the Peno Creek facility that you
L 7	just referenced. Ameren built the Venice CTG 2 facility
18	that you just mentioned, and there's a host of other CTGs
.9	that it built.
20	Q AEG built Kinmundy and Pinckneyville; correct?
21	A That's correct.
22	Q And sir, those are merchant plants; correct?
23	A Those are not merchant plants in the sense of a

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Nationwide Coverage

800-336-6646

serve a native load, and they're dedicated through a power

typical IPP. Those plants are designated resources to

1 purchase agreement to that native load through 2006. 2 are those merchant plants? It's a hybrid would be my 3 response. 4 MR. MOONEY: Okay. Thank you. I have no other 5 questions. 6 PRESIDING JUDGE: Okay. Counsel, redirect? 7 MR. WAIKART: I hesitate to engage in any. 8 PRESIDING JUDGE: No, there's not going to be 9 any more recross. Go ahead. 10 MR. WAIKART: I have a couple questions, your 11 Honor, just quickly. 12 FURTHER REDIRECT EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. WAIKART: 14 In terms of AmerenUE's preference for assets 15 within its control area, is that an absolute preference, 16 or would you characterize that as a strong business 17 preference? 18 I would characterize that as a 'strong business 19 preference. Generally, generation and load are located 20 in relative coast proximity to each other. 21 Q Okay. And in terms of AmerenUE's ability to 22 construct generation facilities, I suppose it would always 23 be possible that you could be pleasantly surprised by 24 someone else who could add value in terms of that exercise 25 over and above what UE can do; is that true?

ACE-FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.
Nationwide Coverage

1	A That's true. One other point that I would like
2	to make on that, when you construct facilities, the Peno
3	Creek facility, for instance, was put in in 12 months. To
4	make a time frame like that requires additional overtime,
5	additional accelerated schedule that has costs associated
6	with that. So you have to look at the parameters that
7	were involved in building a particular plant.
8	MR. WAIKART: That's all the questions, your
9	Honor.
10	PRESIDING JUDGE: Okay. Let me remind
11	everybody that after the lunch break, we are only doing
12	cross and redirect, end of the issue, no waivers. Okay?
13	MR. WAIKART: Thank you, your Honor.
14	PRESIDING JUDGE: Don't even get up to ask for
15	a waiver.
16	Is it Nelson that's coming up next?
17	MR. WAIKART: Mr. Pfeiffer will be our next
18	witness.
19	MR. STATMAN: Mr. Pfeiffer is here, your Honor.
20	PRESIDING JUDGE: Come back at 1:00.
21	(Whereupon, at 12:09 p.m., the hearing was
22	recessed, to be reconvened at 1:00 p.m. this same day.)
23	
24	
25	