

**Exhibit 53**  
**MPSC Case No. ES-2007-0474**  
**Taum Sauk December 14, 2005 event**

During the hearing on August 6, 2007, Mr. Mills from the Office of Public Counsel and the Public requested that Mr. Voss provide a list of all “errors in judgment” that were made regarding the Taum Sauk December 14, 2005 event.

**Response:**

Mr. Voss believes that the following mistakes, errors, and/or errors in judgment were made regarding the December 14, 2005 event:

1. Poor communication between the engineering and operating groups – The engineering and operating groups did not communicate as effectively as they should have. For example, only certain people had information about the low point of the parapet wall at the upper reservoir, and that information was not effectively communicated to all necessary personnel.
2. Lack of a proper understanding of the design basis – AmerenUE operations and engineering personnel did not have a good understanding of the design basis for the upper reservoir. For example, individuals did not fully understand the original design’s requirement of 2 foot of free board. In addition, changes were made to instrumentation and computer programs without an analysis of design basis implications.
3. Failure to recognize the severity of problems and to act in a conservative manner – Operations and engineering personnel did not recognize the severity of the gage piping problem that was identified in the fall of 2005, and they did not take sufficiently conservative steps in response to the problem. For example, while people believed that lowering the operating level of the reservoir by 2 feet was sufficient at the time, that judgment was not sufficiently conservative. Likewise, the determination that the gage piping problem was not a safety issue that necessitated an immediate outage was not sufficiently conservative.
4. Problems with initial construction – The various investigations have determined that the original construction of the upper reservoir was not consistent with the design.

Mr. Voss’s response is based on information he learned from reading the reports of the numerous investigations into the December 14, 2005 event and in talking with AmerenUE employees who were involved in those investigations.