Exhibit No.:
Issue(s): Transmission Revenues
Witness: Greg M. Gudeman
Sponsoring Party: Union Electric Company
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony
Case No.: ER-2011-0028
Date Testimony Prepared: March 25, 2011

# MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## CASE NO. ER-2011-0028

# REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

# OF

# GREG M. GUDEMAN

# ON

# BEHALF OF

# UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY
# d/b/a Ameren Missouri

**St. Louis, Missouri**
**March, 2011**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**GREG M. GUDEMAN**

## I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

**Q. Please state your name and business address.**

A. My name is Greg M. Gudeman. My business address is: One Ameren Plaza, 1901 Chouteau, St. Louis, MO 63103.

**Q. By whom and in what capacity are you employed?**

A. I am Managing Supervisor - Transmission Regulation and Policy in the Transmission Policy Department at Ameren Services Company ("Ameren Services"). Ameren Services provides various kinds of corporate support and services to the operating subsidiaries owned by Ameren Corporation, including the planning and operation of Ameren Missouri's transmission system. My particular duties and responsibilities include participating in the development of transmission policy and strategy and performing analysis relating to the transmission assets operated by these subsidiaries. I am also responsible for supervising the contractual process regarding interconnections with other utilities and new generators.

**Q. Please summarize your educational and professional background.**

A. I graduated from Illinois State University with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Finance in 1987. In 1993, I also received a Masters in Business Administration from Illinois State University. I began working for Illinois Power Company ("Illinois Power") in 1988. While employed by Illinois Power, I held the positions of Rate Analyst, Senior Rate Analyst and Rate Specialist in the company's Rate Department, Business Leader in the company's Financial Services Group and Director of Investor Relations. Following Illinois Power's merger with Dynegy, I held the positions of Senior Specialist in Business Development Services, Account Manager in Customer Value Management, Manager-Transmission Analytics and Senior Forecasting Specialist in Energy Supply Management. Following Ameren Corporation's acquisition of Illinois Power, I began working in Ameren Service's Transmission Department as a Transmission Performance Specialist. I was promoted to Supervisor - Transmission Regulation and Policy in June 2007. I was promoted to my current position in January 2008.

**Q. Have you previously sponsored testimony before regulatory commissions?**

A. Yes. I have testified before the Illinois Commerce Commission on several occasions concerning electric and gas cost of service and unbundled delivery service tariffs. I have also submitted testimony in the following Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") cases regarding revenue requirement and rate design issues relating to the Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc. ("Midwest ISO"): Docket No. ER04-1091, Docket No. ER05-72, Docket No. ER08-15, Docket No. ER08-209, and Docket No. ER11-2104.

## II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

**Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

A. The purpose of this testimony is to respond to the direct testimonies of Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers' ("MIEC") witness James Dauphinais and Staff witness Kofi Boateng regarding their proposed adjustments to transmission revenue. I will also discuss the impact on Schedule 1 revenue resulting from a recent FERC order.

**Q. Are you sponsoring any schedules?**

A. Yes. I am sponsoring Schedule Nos. GMG-ER1 through GMG-ER4.

## III. REBUTTAL TO MR. DAUPHINAIS

**Q. Do you agree with the transmission revenue adjustments relating to Midwest ISO Schedules 7, 8 and 9 as proposed in Schedule JRD-6 by Mr. Dauphinais?**

A. While I agree adjustments would need to be made to take into account changes to the data since this case was originally filed, I have three concerns with Mr. Dauphinais' calculations. My concerns are in large measure driven by the fact that he has essentially taken data from the end of the test year (12 months ending March 31, 2010) and tried to modify that data to reflect a change that occurred after March 31, 2010 to the Ameren Missouri transmission rate. This transmission rate change was effective June 1, 2010. By using data through the end of the true-up period (12 months ending February 2011), much of his adjustment becomes unnecessary. However, I believe it is important to identify my concerns with his original calculation, which I outline below. After identifying those concerns, I will present the correct level of transmission revenues under Schedules 7, 8, and 9 for inclusion in the revenue requirement in this case.

**Q. What is your first concern?**

A. On line 4 of Schedule JRD-6, Mr. Dauphinais intended to show the Ameren Missouri transmission rate that was in effect for each month. On line 5 he shows the rate that became effective June 1, 2010 and from these two lines he tries to calculate the resulting increase in transmission revenues. On line 4, he shows an existing rate of $725.41 per megawatt ("MW")-month for April, May and June 2009. He then lists a rate of $861.14 per MW-month for each of the remaining nine months. Based on the rate of $1,020.95 per

MW-month that became effective June 1, 2010, he shows that the rate increased 40.7% (1.407 times $725.41) for April through June and 18.6% (1.186 times $861.14) for each of the remaining nine months. This is incorrect. The rate changes are effective June 1 each year, so for the month of June on line 4, he should have used the $861.14 rate resulting in an 18.6% increase in June rather than a 40.7% rate increase. However, by using the trued-up test year figures through February 2011, this concern will no longer be material.

**Q. What is your second concern with Mr. Dauphinais' calculations?**

A. The second concern is the assumption that the percent increase in Ameren Missouri's Schedule 7, 8 and 9 *rate* directly leads to the same increase in transmission *revenues* received by Ameren Missouri. Assuming no changes in load levels, this would be true for Schedule 9. However, the Schedule 7 and 8 revenue received from the Midwest ISO is related to "Drive-Through and Out" transactions that are priced at a single Midwest ISO system-wide rate based on all Transmission Owners' revenue requirements and all Midwest ISO load. Thus, any increase in the Ameren Missouri rate has only limited impact on the total Midwest ISO rate and resulting revenue. As posted on the Midwest ISO OASIS and based on the combined data from all pricing zones within the Midwest ISO footprint, the Midwest ISO Drive-Through and Out rate under Schedules 7 and 8 actually increased only 4.2% (not 18.6%) in June 2010. Furthermore, the Midwest ISO collects this revenue and distributes it to the Transmission Owners based on the revenue distribution process contained in the Transmission Owner's Agreement. For these types of transactions, revenue is generally distributed in two parts: 50% is based on the modeled flow of the underlying reservation while the other 50% is based on the gross book value of each transmission owner's transmission plant compared to the total transmission plant. Ameren Missouri's share of the total gross book value actually decreased 0.1% from the beginning of 2010 to the end of 2010. In other words, even though the Ameren Missouri transmission *rate* increased, its percentage share of the *revenue pot* actually decreased. This effectively lowers the 4.2% rate increase to a 4.1% revenue increase. Therefore, Mr. Dauphinais' adjustment for increased revenue should be only 4.1% for Schedule 7 and 8 revenue from the Midwest ISO; not 18% or 41%. As I noted, the 18.6% increase in the rate only impacts Schedule 9 revenue, assuming no changes in load level.

**Q. What is your third concern with Mr. Dauphinais' testimony?**

A. The third concern is Mr. Dauphinais' statement that Ameren Missouri's FERC transmission rate will likely increase again on June 1, 2011 due to increases in expenses and transmission rate base. However, this assumption ignores one of the most significant factors causing the June 2010 rate increase, which was the extremely low 2009 12 coincident peak ("CP") demand load. This was likely the result of mild weather, a poor economy, and for Ameren Missouri, the significant drop in Noranda Aluminum, Inc.'s load for most of 2009. The transmission rate is calculated each year by dividing the transmission revenue requirement by the prior year 12 CP demand load. Ameren Missouri's 12 CP had been very constant, near 7,000 MW from 2006 through 2008. However, in 2009 the 12 CP dropped to 6,400 MW. Almost half of the 18.6% increase in the transmission rate is attributed to the decrease in the 12 CP load divisor from 2008 to 2009. While the new transmission rates to be effective June 1, 2011 have not been calculated yet, it is possible to identify the impact of the two most significant changes expected in the calculation: the increase in transmission plant and the change in load, both of which are already known. The 2010 12 CP load and transmission plant and accumulated depreciation balances as of December 31, 2010 can be inserted into the current calculation to determine the potential change. Ameren Missouri had a $45 million increase in gross transmission plant in 2010 resulting in about a $27 million increase in net transmission plant. This change alone would increase the transmission rate by approximately 4%. However, the Company's 2010 load is almost 10% higher than 2009 and very much in line with the loads for 2006, 2007 and 2008. This load change increases the divisor in the rate calculation and by itself would decrease the transmission rate by approximately 9%. The net impact of these two changes is that the June 2011 transmission rate would decrease by 5.3% to $967 per MW-month. Schedule GMG-ER1 shows that this would reduce Schedule 9 revenue by almost $100,000. However, since this rate change will not occur until after the true-up period, Ameren Missouri is not proposing to reflect this adjustment in its rebuttal revenue requirement.

**Q. Will these adjustments be necessary once the new transmission revenue data is provided through February 2011?**

A. The first concern is eliminated entirely since June 2009 data will no longer be included. The revised adjustment to Schedule 7 and 8 revenue will only be needed for March, April and May 2010. In summary, Schedule GMG-ER1, line 14 shows the appropriate level of transmission revenues, based on data for the 12 months ending February 2011 and accounting for the corrections I describe above. Consequently, subject to any final adjustments based upon actual true-up data,[1] the Schedule 7, 8 and 9 transmission revenues should be set for ratemaking purposes in this case at $14.77 million, which increases those revenues from the level included in the revenue requirement when this case was filed by

[1] The figures I have used include unaudited data for February 2011. The true-up data the Company will provide the parties on April 5 could contain slight changes, which will be captured in the true-up phase of this case.

$2.10 million. Mr. Dauphinais' larger $2.92 million adjustment is in error and should not be adopted.

## IV. <u>REBUTTAL TO MR. BOATENG</u>

**Q. Do you agree with Staff witness Kofi Boateng's proposed adjustment to transmission revenue under schedule 2?**

A. I agree that there should be an adjustment to Schedule 2 revenue, but I disagree with Mr. Boateng's specific adjustment. I agree an adjustment should be made because on March 31, 2010, Ameren Missouri filed a reactive power revenue requirement tariff (under Schedule 2) at the FERC on behalf of its generating facilities in Docket No. ER10-962. While these rates are not updated annually, they did become effective in June 2010. This led to an increase in Schedule 2 revenue distribution from the Midwest ISO above that reflected in the test year figures used when this rate case was filed.

**Q. You indicated that you disagreed with Mr. Boateng's specific adjustment. What is your concern with it?**

A. Mr. Boateng used revenue data based on the twelve months ending December 31, 2010. This data would have reflected increased Schedule 2 revenue for seven months, from June to December. Mr. Boateng attempted to annualize this increase by adding the difference in revenue during the seven months compared to the first five months. There are two problems with this method of annualization. First, there is no reason to conclude that additional revenue for a five month period *before* the rate changed would be equal to the additional revenue received over the following seven month period *after* the rate changed. I suspect that he may have mistakenly assumed that both the before and after period each consisted of six months. If this were true, his adjustment would have been more reasonable.

However, it would still not be a valid assumption as load and transmission related revenue tends to peak from June through September, so one cannot assume a consistent revenue increase each month of the year. Rather, one must account for month-by-month variations in load, and in particular, the seasonal variation seen in the summer.

**Q. How should Mr. Boateng's Schedule 2 adjustment be modified to correct these problems?**

A. I have compared the Schedule 2 revenue from January and February 2010 under the prior rate to Schedule 2 revenue from January and February 2011 under the new rate. For these two months, Schedule 2 revenue increased 455.6%. I have applied this level of increase to March, April and May 2010 to estimate the additional revenue due to the rate change. This adjustment is shown on Schedule GMG-ER2. Consequently, the Schedule 2 revenues should be set for ratemaking purposes in this case at $9.35 million, which increases those revenues from the level included in the revenue requirement when this case was filed by $7.89 million. Mr. Boateng's larger $12.11 million adjustment is in error and should not be adopted

## V. CHANGE IN SCHEDULE 1 REVENUE DISTRIBUTION

**Q. Has there recently been a change in the Midwest ISO Schedule 1 revenue distribution?**

A. Yes, on January 14, 2011, the FERC issued an order in Docket No. ER11-2113, which changed the Schedule 1 revenue distribution effective January 1, 2011. While the Midwest ISO has not been able to implement the new revenue distribution yet, the order requires retroactive resettlements back to January 1, 2011.

**Q. Please explain the purpose of Midwest ISO Schedule 1?**

A. Schedule 1 of the Midwest ISO Tariff is an ancillary service that recovers the Midwest ISO transmission owners' expenses to manage the reliability coordination function and to monitor, assess and operate the transmission system in real time to maintain safe and reliable operation. The rate for Schedule 1 service is a single, system-wide postage stamp rate based on the total revenue requirements and load of all transmission owners. Schedule 1 service is provided, and Schedule 1 revenue is generated, when a transmission customer purchases transmission service under Schedules 7, 8 or 9.

**Q. How has Schedule 1 revenue been distributed in the past?**

A. Since the Midwest ISO was formed, revenue generated from Schedule 1 service has been allocated to each Midwest ISO transmission owner on the same basis as the underlying base transmission service revenues under Schedules 7, 8, or 9. Under this methodology, Schedule 1 revenues collected from transmission customers taking Schedule 9 service were distributed primarily to the host pricing zone while Schedule 1 revenues collected from transmission customers taking Schedule 7 and 8 service were distributed 50 percent based on transmission investment and 50 percent based on power flows.

Furthermore, section 37.3(a) of the tariff provides that when Midwest ISO transmission owners like Ameren Missouri take NITS under Schedule 9 to serve their bundled load, they shall not pay charges pursuant to Schedules 1, 3 through 6, and 9 of the Midwest ISO Tariff.

**Q. Who proposed the change to the Schedule 1 revenue distribution and why?**

A. A minority of transmission owners proposed the change. The exemption under section 37.3(a), as well as distributing the Schedule 1 revenue on the same basis as the underlying base transmission revenue, resulted in some transmission owners not recovering their Schedule 1 revenue requirement. This was especially true for transmission owners with higher Schedule 1 revenue requirements per unit of zonal load and independent transmission companies that do not have retail customers.

**Q. Please explain the new revenue distribution that FERC approved?**

A. First, all Schedule 1 revenues associated with transmission service under Schedules 7, 8 and 9 will be distributed based on each transmission owner's pro rata share of the sum of all transmission owners' Schedule 1 revenue requirements. Second, when determining the revenue distribution, the Midwest ISO will impute Schedule 1 revenues for each transmission owner attributable to, but not collected for, their bundled load. In other words, the Midwest ISO will multiply the Ameren Missouri bundled load by the single system-wide rate and will assume that this amount was charged and collected from bundled retail customers. The Midwest ISO will then add the imputed revenues to the Schedule 1 revenues actually collected to form a total set of Schedule 1 revenues (collected and imputed) before the pro rata shares are calculated.

**Q. Did Ameren Missouri object to the proposed change?**

A. Yes. Ameren Missouri and several other transmission owners filed a joint competing proposal at FERC in an attempt to improve the revenue distribution.

**Q. Why did Ameren Missouri participate in a competing proposal?**

A. Because we realized that the previous revenue distribution was not ideal. My understanding is that it was agreed to about the time of the formation of the Midwest ISO. The transmission owners initially proposed zonal rates for Schedule 1. However, FERC preferred and approved a single system-wide rate for Schedule 1 resulting in possible cost shifts between pricing zones. The Schedule 1 revenue distribution has become a more significant issue over time as some transmission owners' or pricing zones' per unit costs have become significantly higher than others which intensified the problem. While we understand the desire for all transmission owners to recover their revenue requirement, several potential solutions could have addressed the problem. However, the proposal approved by FERC will essentially result in a cost shift to Ameren Missouri's bundled customers and to the bundled customers of other transmission owners' with lower Schedule 1 revenue requirements.

**Q. What is the impact on Ameren Missouri?**

A. On Schedule GMG-ER3, I calculated the impact on Ameren Missouri to be a reduction in Schedule 1 revenue of $3.4 million. Of course, since the actual Schedule 1 revenue for the twelve months ending ("TME") February 2011 was approximately $750,000, this revenue reduction can actually be considered an increased cost.

**Q. Please explain Schedule GMG-ER3.**

A. The first line shows that Ameren Missouri received $754,249 in Schedule 1 revenue for the TME February 2011.

The remainder of the Schedule calculates the impact of the new revenue distribution. Lines 2 through 4 show the cost that Ameren Missouri submits to the Midwest ISO for inclusion in Schedule 1. Lines 5 through 9 calculate the imputed revenue by multiplying the Ameren Missouri bundled load times the Schedule 1 rate in effect. Line 10 subtracts the imputed revenue from the Schedule 1 costs that Ameren Missouri has submitted to the Midwest ISO. Thus, imputing Schedule 1 revenue will cost Ameren Missouri almost $2.9 million. In addition, Ameren Missouri's share of Schedule 1 revenue related to point-to-point transmission reservations will also decrease to $188,915 as shown on line 15.

Therefore, the total Ameren Missouri revenue from Schedule 1 will be -$2.68 million, or a $3.44 million reduction from the previous revenue distribution.

## VI. TOTAL TRANSMISSION REVENUE

**Q. What is Ameren Missouri's total adjusted transmission revenue?**

A. As shown on Schedule GMG-ER4, the total transmission revenue for the twelve months ending February 28, 2011 was $27.26 million. The adjustments I describe above for Schedules 1, 2, 7 and 8 decrease the revenue by $1.86 million for a total of $25.4 million. This is a $6.07 million increase from the amount included in the revenue requirement when this case was filed ($19.33 million).

**Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?**

A. Yes, it does.

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| In the Matter of Union Electric Company<br>d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File<br>Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric<br>Service Provided to Customers<br>In the Company's Missouri Service Area. | )<br>)<br>)<br>)<br>) | Case No. ER-2011-0028 |

**AFFIDAVIT OF GREG M. GUDEMAN**

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

Greg M. Gudeman, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:

1. My name is Greg M. Gudeman. I work in the City of St. Louis, Missouri, and I am employed by Ameren Services Company as Managing Supervisor, Transmission Regulation and Policy.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of Ameren Missouri consisting of 12 pages, and Schedules GMG-ER1 through GMG-ER4, 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.

Greg M. Gudeman
Greg M. Gudeman

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 25 day of March, 2011.

Amanda Tesdall
Notary Public

My commission expires:

Amanda Tesdall - Notary Public
Notary Seal, State of
Missouri - St. Louis County
Commission #07158967
My Commission Expires 7/29/2011

# Ameren Missouri Transmission Revenues

## Adjustments to Schedule 7, 8 & 9 Revenue Due to Rate Changes
## TME February 28, 2011

| | | 2011 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr** | **May** | **Jun** | **Jul** | **Aug** | **Sep** | **Oct** | **Nov** | **Dec** | **TOTALS** |
| 1 | Schedule 7 & 8 | $582,123 | $587,413 | $738,798 | $655,711 | $738,033 | $826,386 | $861,360 | $842,244 | $886,752 | $855,134 | $1,386,090 | $680,068 | **$9,640,112** |
| 2 | Schedule 9 | $459,904 | $378,607 | $302,722 | $290,320 | $348,243 | $529,060 | $542,044 | $573,622 | $428,741 | $376,983 | $378,572 | $437,204 | **$5,046,020** |
| 3 | Total | $1,042,027 | $966,020 | $1,041,520 | $946,031 | $1,086,276 | $1,355,446 | $1,403,404 | $1,415,866 | $1,315,492 | $1,232,117 | $1,764,662 | $1,117,272 | **$14,686,132** |
| 4 | Initial Rate | $1,020.95 | $1,020.95 | $861.14 | $861.14 | $861.14 | $1,020.95 | $1,020.95 | $1,020.95 | $1,020.95 | $1,020.95 | $1,020.95 | $1,020.95 | |
| 5 | End Rate | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | $967.30 | |
| 6 | 7&8 Increase | 1.000 | 1.000 | **1.041** | 1.041 | 1.041 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | |
| 7 | 9 Increase | 0.947 | 0.947 | 1.123 | 1.123 | 1.123 | 0.947 | 0.947 | 0.947 | 0.947 | 0.947 | 0.947 | 0.947 | |
| 8 | Schedule 7 & 8 | $582,123 | $587,413 | $769,112 | $682,615 | $768,315 | $826,386 | $861,360 | $842,244 | $886,752 | $855,134 | $1,386,090 | $680,068 | **$9,727,612** |
| 9 | Schedule 9 | $435,734 | $358,709 | $340,038 | $326,108 | $391,170 | $501,255 | $513,557 | $543,475 | $406,208 | $357,171 | $358,676 | $414,227 | **$4,946,327** |
| 10 | Total | $1,017,857 | $946,122 | $1,109,150 | $1,008,723 | $1,159,486 | $1,327,641 | $1,374,917 | $1,385,719 | $1,292,960 | $1,212,304 | $1,744,766 | $1,094,295 | **$14,673,940** |
| 11 | Schedule 7 & 8 | $0 | $0 | $30,314 | $26,905 | $30,282 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | **$87,501** |
| 12 | Schedule 9 | ($24,170) | ($19,898) | $37,316 | $35,788 | $42,928 | ($27,805) | ($28,487) | ($30,147) | ($22,533) | ($19,812) | ($19,896) | ($22,977) | **($99,693)** |
| 13 | Total | ($24,170) | ($19,898) | $67,630 | $62,692 | $73,210 | ($27,805) | ($28,487) | ($30,147) | ($22,533) | ($19,812) | ($19,896) | ($22,977) | ($12,192) |
| 14 | Total Schedule 7, 8 and 9 revenue excluding Schedule 9 adjustment | | | | | | | | | | | | | **$14,773,633** |

| Midwest ISO Drive-Through and Out Rate - $/MW-YR | |
|---|---|
| April 2010 Rate | $28,151.31 |
| August 2010 Rate | $29,339.96 |
| | **4.2%** |

| Decrease Gross Book Value for Revenue Sharing | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | May 2010 | Dec 2010 | |
| MISO Total | $16,737,300 | $17,610,667 | |
| Am Miss | $626,929 | $639,495 | |
| Am Miss% | 3.75% | 3.63% | **-0.1%** |

| AMMO Schedule 9 NITS Rate | |
|---|---|
| February 2010 Rate | $861.14 |
| June 2010 Rate | $1,020.95 |
| June 2011 Estimated Rate | $967.30 |

Ameren Missouri
Case No. ER-2011-0028
Schedule GMG-ER1

## Ameren Missouri Transmission Revenues

### Adjustments to Schedule 2 Revenue Due to June 2010 Rate Increase
### (Schedule 2 rates do not automatically update each year)
### TME February 28, 2011

| | | 2011 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr** | **May** | **Jun** | **Jul** | **Aug** | **Sep** | **Oct** | **Nov** | **Dec** | **TOTALS** |
| 1 | Monthly Revenue | $775,627 | $707,169 | $128,252 | $98,309 | $99,284 | $944,760 | $1,026,243 | $1,055,256 | $860,729 | $673,559 | $676,719 | $818,220 | **$7,864,127** |
| 2 | Percent Increase | 0.0% | 0.0% | 455.6% | 455.6% | 455.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | |
| 3 | Dollar Increase | $0 | $0 | $584,322 | $447,901 | $452,344 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 | **$1,484,567** |
| 4 | Total | $775,627 | $707,169 | $712,573 | $546,210 | $551,628 | $944,760 | $1,026,243 | $1,055,256 | $860,729 | $673,559 | $676,719 | $818,220 | **$9,348,694** |
| 5 | Adjustment | | | | | | | | | | | | | **$1,484,567** |

**Schedule 2 Revenue Increase in January and February**

| | Jan | Feb | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| **2010** | $147,063 | $119,816 | $266,879 |
| **2011** | $775,627 | $707,169 | $1,482,796 |
| | | | 455.6% |

Ameren Missouri
Case No. ER-2011-0028
Schedule GMG-ER2

## Ameren Missouri Schedule 1 Revenue

**TME 2/28/2011**

Based on Midwest ISO MR and MC Invoices and TSBC NITS Invoices

| | | 2011 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | TOTALS |
| | **Prior Revenue Distribution** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | **Schedule 1 Revenue from MISO** | **$54,336** | **$55,004** | **$69,148** | **$52,708** | **$59,115** | **$71,381** | **$79,277** | **$82,944** | **$65,748** | **$54,112** | **$52,186** | **$58,290** | **$754,249** |
| | **New Revenue Distribution** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | **Ameren Missouri Bundled Load** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Cost Included in MISO Sch 1 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $799,388 | $799,388 | $799,388 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | |
| 3 | Days in Month | 31 | 28 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 365 |
| 4 | Monthly Cost Included in Sch 1 | $144,576 | $130,585 | $67,893 | $65,703 | $67,893 | $139,912 | $144,576 | $144,576 | $139,912 | $144,576 | $139,912 | $144,576 | $1,474,693 |
| 5 | Bundled Load - MW | 6,689 | 6,588 | 5,364 | 5,147 | 6,916 | 7,913 | 7,986 | 8,408 | 6,695 | 4,960 | 5,534 | 6,681 | 78,882 |
| 6 | Annual MISO Rate in Effect $/MW-Yr | $629.22 | $629.22 | $657.43 | $657.43 | $657.43 | $669.44 | $669.44 | $669.44 | $669.44 | $669.44 | $669.44 | $677.08 | |
| 7 | Days in Month | 31 | 28 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 30 | 31 | 365 |
| 8 | Monthly Rate - $/MW-mo | $53.44 | $48.27 | $55.84 | $54.04 | $55.84 | $55.02 | $56.86 | $56.86 | $55.02 | $56.86 | $55.02 | $57.51 | |
| 9 | Imputed Revenue | $357,464 | $318,009 | $299,488 | $278,136 | $386,143 | $435,415 | $454,060 | $478,066 | $368,377 | $282,015 | $304,501 | $384,218 | $4,345,892 |
| 10 | Net Imputed Revenue for Bundled Load | ($212,888) | ($187,424) | ($231,595) | ($212,433) | ($318,250) | ($295,503) | ($309,484) | ($333,490) | ($228,464) | ($137,439) | ($164,588) | ($239,642) | ($2,871,199) |
| | **Schedule 7 & 8** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | Total MISO Cost Included in Sch 1 | $55,289,122 | $55,289,122 | $56,024,514 | $56,024,514 | $56,024,514 | $57,791,751 | $57,791,751 | $57,791,751 | $57,791,751 | $57,791,751 | $57,791,751 | $57,791,751 | |
| 12 | Ameren Missouri Cost Included in Sch 1 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $799,388 | $799,388 | $799,388 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | $1,702,268 | |
| 13 | Percent of Total | 3.1% | 3.1% | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1.4% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | |
| 14 | Total MISO Sch 1 Revenue from Sch 7/8 | $572,839 | $477,151 | $750,607 | $637,146 | $622,793 | $657,238 | $723,282 | $715,085 | $605,641 | $518,772 | $514,741 | $607,414 | $7,402,710 |
| 15 | New Ameren Missouri Revenue Share | $17,637 | $14,691 | $10,710 | $9,091 | $8,886 | $19,359 | $21,304 | $21,063 | $17,839 | $15,281 | $15,162 | $17,891 | $188,915 |
| 16 | **Net Revenue from Schedule 1** | **($195,251)** | **($172,733)** | **($220,885)** | **($203,342)** | **($309,363)** | **($276,144)** | **($288,179)** | **($312,427)** | **($210,625)** | **($122,158)** | **($149,426)** | **($221,750)** | **($2,682,284)** |
| 17 | Adjustment - Net Change in Schedule 1 | ($249,587) | ($227,737) | ($290,033) | ($256,050) | ($368,478) | ($347,525) | ($367,457) | ($395,371) | ($276,373) | ($176,270) | ($201,612) | ($280,040) | ($3,436,533) |

Ameren Missouri
Case No. ER-2011-0028
Schedule GMG-ER3

**Ameren Missouri Transmission Revenues**
**TME 2/28/2011**
Based on Midwest ISO MR and MC Invoices and TSBC NITS Invoices

## MISO REVENUES:

| | | 2011 | 2011 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | 2010 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Schedule** | **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr** | **May** | **Jun** | **Jul** | **Aug** | **Sep** | **Oct** | **Nov** | **Dec** | **TOTALS** | **Adjustment** | | **FINAL** |
| 1 | 1 | $54,336 | $55,004 | $69,148 | $52,708 | $59,115 | $71,381 | $79,277 | $82,944 | $65,748 | $54,112 | $52,186 | $58,290 | **$754,249** | **($3,436,533)** | 1/ | **($2,682,284)** |
| 2 | 2 | $775,627 | $707,169 | $128,252 | $98,309 | $99,284 | $944,760 | $1,026,243 | $1,055,256 | $860,729 | $673,559 | $676,719 | $818,220 | **$7,864,127** | **$1,484,567** | 2/ | **$9,348,694** |
| 3 | 7 & 8 | $582,123 | $587,413 | $738,798 | $655,711 | $738,033 | $826,386 | $861,360 | $842,244 | $886,752 | $855,134 | $1,386,090 | $680,068 | **$9,640,112** | **$87,501** | 3/ | **$9,727,612** |
| 4 | **Subtotal** | **$1,412,086** | **$1,349,586** | **$936,197** | **$806,728** | **$896,432** | **$1,842,527** | **$1,966,880** | **$1,980,444** | **$1,813,229** | **$1,582,805** | **$2,114,996** | **$1,556,578** | **$18,258,487** | **($1,864,465)** | | **$16,394,022** |

## NITS REVENUES:

| | **Schedule** | **Jan** | **Feb** | **Mar** | **Apr** | **May** | **Jun** | **Jul** | **Aug** | **Sep** | **Oct** | **Nov** | **Dec** | **TOTALS** | **Adjustment** | **FINAL** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 9 | $459,904 | $378,607 | $302,722 | $290,320 | $348,243 | $529,060 | $542,044 | $573,622 | $428,741 | $376,983 | $378,572 | $437,204 | **$5,046,020** | **$0** | **$5,046,020** |
| 6 | 11 | $299,201 | $299,201 | $345,852 | $359,509 | $355,846 | $355,846 | $304,696 | $345,616 | $345,616 | $339,284 | $294,177 | $305,733 | **$3,950,579** | **$0** | **$3,950,579** |
| 7 | **Subtotal** | **$759,105** | **$677,808** | **$648,574** | **$649,829** | **$704,089** | **$884,906** | **$846,740** | **$919,238** | **$774,357** | **$716,267** | **$672,748** | **$742,937** | **$8,996,599** | **$0** | **$8,996,599** |
| 8 | **Total** | **$2,171,191** | **$2,027,394** | **$1,584,771** | **$1,456,557** | **$1,600,521** | **$2,727,433** | **$2,813,621** | **$2,899,682** | **$2,587,586** | **$2,299,072** | **$2,787,744** | **$2,299,515** | **$27,255,087** | **($1,864,465)** | **$25,390,621** |

1/ - *See Schedule GG-3*
2/ - *See Schedule GG-2*
3/ - *See Schedule GG-1*

Ameren Missouri
Case No. ER-2011-0028
Schedule GMG-ER4