ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 09-_____

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MARK R. LIVASY

SUBMITTED ON BEHALF

OF

CENTRAL ILLINOIS LIGHT COMPANY
d/b/a AmerenCILCO

CENTRAL ILLINOIS PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY
d/b/a AmerenCIPS

ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY
d/b/a AmerenIP

THE AMEREN ILLINOIS UTILITIES

June 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION....1

A. WITNESS IDENTIFICATION....1

B. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND IDENTIFICATION OF EXHIBITS....2

II. DISALLOWED PLANT ADDITIONS....2

III. SUPPORT FOR ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS....9

A. CONTRACTOR INVOICING....12

B. CONSIGNMENT INVENTORY....16

C. SIGHT DRAFTS....17

IV. CONCLUSION....18

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 09-_____

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MARK R. LIVASY

Submitted on Behalf of

The Ameren Illinois Utilities

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Witness Identification

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Mark Livasy. My business address is 3490 Rupp Parkway, Decatur, Illinois 62526.

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

A. I am employed by Ameren Services Company (Ameren Services or AMS) Superintendent - Energy Delivery Illinois.

Q. What are your current duties and responsibilities?

A. My duties and responsibilities include warehousing and stores operations, including personnel development, performance management and administration for the Ameren Illinois Utilities (AIUs).

Q. Please describe your educational background and relevant work experience.

A. Please see my Statement of Qualifications, attached as an Appendix to this testimony.

B. Purpose, Scope and Identification of Exhibits

Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony?

A. My direct testimony discusses and explains the processes employed by the AIUs to substantiate records and invoices of plant additions disallowed in previous rate cases.[1]

Q. Will you be sponsoring any exhibits with your direct testimony?

A. Yes, I am sponsoring the following exhibits:

Ameren Exhibit 19.1	June 13, 2008 Correspondence
Ameren Exhibit 19.2	Plant Additions Memo and attached records
Ameren Exhibit 19.3	2004 Audit Report
Ameren Exhibit 19.4	2004 Illinois Power Sarbanes-Oxley audit workpapers
Ameren Exhibit 19.5	Sample Contractor Invoice record

II. DISALLOWED PLANT ADDITIONS

Q. Please explain the process of providing documentation for plant additions that were disallowed in the AIUs' 2006 Rate Case and 2007 Rate Case.

A. Following the 2007 Rate Case, the AIUs chartered a team to investigate Illinois Commerce Commission (Commission) disallowances for plant additions. The team reviewed plant records and assembled support to justify the AIUs' investments in plant. The team started working in mid-October 2008 and continued through May 2009. Initially, the team identified all records and charges related to plant additions that had been disallowed by the Commission Orders because supporting documentation had not been provided or had not been accepted. The team then assigned groups of records to team members knowledgeable with accounts payable

[1] *Ameren Illinois Utilities*, ICC Docket Nos. 07-0585 through 07-0590 consol. (Sept. 24, 2008) ("2007 Rate Case") and *Ameren Illinois Utilities*, ICC Docket Nos. 06-0070 through 06-0072 consol. (Nov. 21, 2006) ("2006 Rate Case")

and archive practices at the individual AIUs. Team members examined archive records, project records, procurement card (credit card) and expense account records and, in some instances, supplier records to obtain copies of invoices and receipts. Team members also documented and justified plant records that were not directly represented by supplier invoices and receipts. The team tracked progress and by mid-April 2009 completed their work for the records in question.

Q. What was your involvement with the team?

A. I was the team leader responsible for the project.

Q. What plant additions were disallowed by the Commission in the 2007 Rate Case?

A. In the 2007 Rate Case, the Commission's Final Order disallowed certain plant additions since the 2006 Rate Case, by applying a Staff recommended disallowance percentage to projects with costs greater than $500,000.[2] This disallowance amounted to $13,614,000.

In addition, the 2007 Rate Case disallowed $39,554,000 attributable to plant additions that had been contested and previously disallowed in the 2006 Rate Case. The total 2007 Rate Case disallowance amounted to $53,168,000.

Q. Why were these plant additions disallowed?

A. In the 2007 Rate Case, the Staff sought to evaluate the reasonableness of the AIUs' proposed plant additions by reviewing the AIUs' records and supporting documentation. To that end, Staff conducted a sampling process in which it reviewed those documents that the AIUs provided in response to a Staff data request seeking documentation of the selected sample of projects with costs greater than $500,000. Staff's final recommendation to the Commission in the 2007 Rate Case was for all plant addition costs that it recommended for exclusion to be

[2] 2007 Rate Case, Order at 43.

permanently written off by the AIUs. However, the Commission decided in its Final Order: ". . . given the incentive AIU should have to have cost included in rate base, it is possible it would expend sufficient effort between the conclusion of this case and the beginning of its next rate case to uncover adequate documentation of costs disallowed here."[3] The AIUs have expended considerable effort to provide the Commission with the documentation it has requested, and has presented its findings in a format designed to make the review and verification of the records as easy as possible

Q. What were the concerns identified by Staff with regard to plant records in the 2007 Rate Case?

A. According to Staff testimony in the 2007 Rate Case, there were seven reasons relating to plant records (*i.e.*, documentation of plant additions) that led to their recommendation to disallow related amounts:

1. Duplicate invoices.
2. Billings to wrong company.
3. Invoices not found that correspond to the list of invoices provided.
4. Amounts on invoices that did not correspond to the listing.
5. Project not determinable from the invoice or the invoice is not related to the project.
6. Illegible invoices.
7. Certain AmerenIP project amounts that were paid via electronic transfer without a supporting invoice.[4]

[3] 2007 Rate Case, Order at 45.

[4] 2007 Rate Case, Order at 25.

Q. Were any reasons provided for the disallowance of plant additions in the 2006 Rate Case?

A. Yes. In the 2006 Rate Case, Staff expressed similar reasons for disallowing proposed plant additions.[5] In that case, plant additions were disallowed for reasons which included missing records, illegible supporting documents, uncopied expense vouchers, no image available to print from an electronic system, lack of third-party invoices and discrepancies between the support provided and project cost listing provided.[6]

Q. How many records were involved and what were the results?

A. The following table, Table 1, shows the number of records involved and their corresponding cost or amount. The table shows the results for 2,620 records that relate to disallowances for plant additions the 2007 Rate Case, and the results for 539 records that relate to disallowances for plant additions which were disallowed in the 2006 Rate Case. Combined, 98.81% of the amounts relating to disallowed records have been supported.

Table 1:

Value in $000's	Disallowed		Supported	
	Records	Value	Records	Value
Records from 2007 Rate Case	2,620	$7,315	2,566	$7,274
Records from 2006 Rate Cases	539	$2,672	440	$2,593
Total	3,159	$9,986	3,006	$9,868

Q. What information was compiled for "Supported" Plant Additions?

[5] 2006 Rate Case, Order at 10.

[6] 2006 Rate Case, Ebrey Direct, Staff Ex. 2.0,p. 16-20, Sch. 2.02.

A. Of the total information compiled, 1,442 records (45.65% of disallowed line items) which were not supported by an invoice or expense report have now been supported directly by an invoice or expense report. Some records were supported in other ways. For example, 441 records (13.96% of disallowed line items) involving purchasing overhead allocations (purchase adders) and taxes have now been explained and supported. Purchase adders and use taxes were calculated and applied by accounting systems based upon associated invoice values and Ameren Corporation's (Ameren) policies and regulatory requirements. In another example, 1,047 Illinois Power Company (referred to as IP prior to Ameren ownership) transactions (33.14% of disallowed line items) associated with contractor billings, stores issues and sight drafts are supported by documenting the tightly controlled processes created to improve cost controls and efficiencies, with appropriate record retention, as further explained in my testimony. The remaining portion of disallowed line items that are now supported is associated with transactions where discounts were realized for paying invoices within certain terms (76 line items or 2.41% of disallowed line items).

Q. Were the AIUs able to support the records contained in the sample population of records selected by the Staff?

A. The AIUs successfully supported 99.72% of Staff's sample. The AIUs supported $42.204 million of the disallowed plant additions from the $42.323 million included in the sample population selected by Staff.[7]

Q. Why was the AIUs' team unable to provide further support for some of the plant additions?

[7] 2007 Rate Case, Staff Ex. 14.0; Sch. 14.03; 2006 Rate Case, Staff Ex. 14.0, Sch. 14.07.

A. The team was unable to support 153 transactions, amounting to $118,699, or 1.19% of the total $9,986,315 in disallowed plant additions. The reasons the AIUs were unable to support those transactions are as follows:

- 35 records were among records that were inadvertently destroyed at AmerenCILCO's Pioneer Park Operating Center. The destruction of these records was reported to the ICC on June 13, 2008. The June 13 Correspondence is attached to my testimony as Ameren Exhibit 19.1.

- 84 records were expense account or purchasing card transactions where receipts were normally retained at local offices. Unclear marking of records, faded records and lack of personnel familiar with the methods of filing and storage used when CILCO was owned by The AES Corporation are reasons.

- 34 records are missing without an apparent explanation regarding where they are or may be found. It is possible these records have been misfiled.

Those line items are summarized in the following Table 2:

Table 2:

	Current Missing Transactions							
	Total Missing		Pioneer Park		Invoice		Expense/Pcard	
	Line Items	Amount	Line Items	Amount	Line Items	Amount	Line Items	Amount
2007 Rate Case	54	$40,379	21	$24,761	2	$4,236	31	$11,382
2006 Rate Case	99	78,320	14	21,518	32	34,091	53	22,711
Total	**153**	**$118,699**	**35**	**$46,279**	**34**	**$38,327**	**84**	**$34,093**

Q. Did the team have any other objectives dealing with disallowed plant records?

A. Yes. The team was responsible for developing a format for presentation of plant records to support plant additions that would be clearer and easier to understand when reviewed by the Commission, Staff or any other parties.

Q. How was that objective met?

A. The team reviewed issues raised by Staff in the 2006 Rate Case and the 2007 Rate Case that dealt with plant records and reviewed records for plant additions that had been disallowed. The team then developed a draft format based upon their review and observations regarding how the process could be improved.

Q. Have the AIUs submitted any additional information to Staff since the last rate case?

A. Yes. Additional records were submitted to Staff after the team was satisfied that the new format for the presentation of plant records addressed concerns stated by Staff in the 2007 and 2006 Rate Cases, including concerns that the AIUs failure to produce the records in the manner requested amounted to a violation of Part 420 and Part 510 of the Commission's rules.[8] The AIUs submitted records in support of the disallowed plant additions, along with a document titled, "Plant Additions Memo" dated April 7, 2009. The Plant Additions Memo first provided explanations for understanding the new record format. Second, it provided more detailed explanations for certain types of records, such as purchasing rate adder and use tax. It also outlined some policies and processes to aide in the understanding some record types. A copy of the Plant Additions Memo that was submitted in April 2009 is attached to my testimony as Ameren Exhibit 19.2. As described in the testimony of Ameren witness Michael Getz, the documentation accompanying the Plant Additions Memo was provided in "packets" which corresponded to each disallowed project number. (Ameren Exhibit 7.0.) For purposes of my testimony, the supporting information has been provided with Ameren Exhibit 19.2. While this

[8] 2007 Rate Case, Order at 28, *citing* 83 Ill. Admin. Code 420, 83 Ill. Adm. Code 510; *see also* 2006 Rate Case, Ebrey Dir., Staff Ex. 2.0, p. 17.

testimony is the same for the AIUs filings, the documentation supporting the disallowed plant in each filing is specific to each utility.

III. SUPPORT FOR IP ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS

Q. In the 2007 Rate Case, $1.45 million in charges which were paid by IP via electronic transactions were disallowed. Please describe the transactions which were rejected as unsupported.

A. There were three types of transactions involved.

- 95 of those records accounted for $987,397 in contractor charges. The contractor charges were generated primarily through an application referred to as Contractor Invoicing at IP, based on timesheet information provided by contractors. A similar application, the Forestry System, generated billings of $18,741 for 8 invoices, which are part of the contractor charges. The Forestry System operated similarly to the Contractor Invoicing system and was subject to the same controls.

- 825 records accounting for $448,070 in charges were initiated from stores issue transactions of supplier consigned material.

- 22 records were generated for $11,172 in expenditures from sight drafts by Real Estate and Claims personnel.

Q. Are these three types of IP electronic transactions included as part of those transactions described as "Supported" in your earlier testimony and in Table 1 to your testimony?

A. Yes. As I have stated, the AIUs are supporting the 1,047 IP transactions associated with contractor billings, consignment materials and sight drafts with documentation of tightly controlled processes created to improve cost controls and efficiencies, with appropriate record retention. I will now describe each of those processes in detail and explain how those processes ensure that the costs associated with these transactions are valid and legitimate, and why the

records generated from each process may reasonably be relied upon to support the reasonableness of the AIUs plant additions.

Q. How are you familiar with accounting and systems controls?

A. I was a Senior Internal Auditor for IP, specializing in data systems controls. In addition, I was an Accountant in IP's accounting department working in accounts payable and stores accounting. I also investigated the control and audit reviews conducted during the 2000 – 2004 timeframe.

Q. What kind of controls were in place for the IP systems utilized for the three types of transactions challenged in the 2007 Rate Case?

A. The following summarizes the unique controls that were in place for the IP systems used for each of the three types of transactions:

- Contractor Invoicing:
  - Contract rates controlled by IP
  - Time sheet entry controls including verification reviews
  - Approval of charges by authorized personnel
- Consignment Inventory
  - Material Prices controlled by IP
  - Stores receipt and issue controls
  - Physical inventory controls
  - Supplier inventory controls
  - Only trained and authorized personnel could conduct stores transactions
- Sight Drafts
  - Signature approval by authorized personnel
  - Bank Reconciliation/Bank Balance

Q. Were the controls for the IP systems effective in promoting system security, integrity, and oversight of plant addition costs?

A. Yes, in my opinion the IP systems had appropriate controls. In addition to the controls that were unique to each of the applications used for Contractor Invoicing, Consignment Inventory and Sight Drafts, as described above, all IP applications used for electronic transactions had appropriate access security. Programs and data were appropriately secured preventing unauthorized alteration. Accounting verification was required and provided in each system. Disbursement controls were adequate. Interface controls existed and were appropriately monitored. Systems were reviewed annually as part of the external auditors annual review associated with the company's annual report. Internal auditors also assisted external auditors in their reviews and periodically conducted their own assessments. IP also employed commercial auditors that conducted general accounts payable reviews, as well as specific vendor audits.

Q. What were the results of the audits?

A. Auditors found adequate controls over IP's AP systems and the associated feeder systems and processes. Commercial auditors, while incented to find duplicate payments or other payment issues, found very few payment issues. A copy of a 2004 audit report is attached to my testimony as Ameren Exhibit 19.3.

In addition, as part of the review performed by the team in compiling and verifying plant addition records, I found 2004 Sarbanes-Oxley Act compliance work papers and assessments performed by IP's internal auditors which were designed to identify risks and assess controls around the company's disbursement processes, which I have attached as Ameren Exhibit 19.4 to my testimony. These documents show that auditors were aware of and satisfied with IP's controls.

A. Contractor Invoicing

Q. Are you familiar with how electronic transactions for contractor payment were created and stored at IP?

A. Yes. In my former positions as Director – Supply Chain Services, which I held from 1999 through 2001, and Senior Director – Utility Services, which I held from 2001 through 2003 at IP, my job duties included functional responsibilities for Accounts Payable ("AP"). These responsibilities required me to become familiar with, and understand, how electronic payment transactions associated with plant additions were created and kept by IP. The business records maintained and used by IP for electronic payment transactions to contractors were created and stored according to a two-step process.

Q. Please describe the first step in the process for the Contractor Invoicing system.

A. First, a contractor that had completed work for a plant addition would submit a paper timesheet for manpower and equipment to IP. The contractor or an IP employee would enter the information contained in the time sheet into an electronic database called Contractor Invoicing. If the information was entered by a contractor, an IP employee would review the information entered, comparing it to the timesheets. The information entered into Contractor Invoicing included the time the contractor spent working on a particular project, any reimbursable costs incurred by the contractor for work on the project, a work order number to identify the project for which the work was done and a vendor number to identify the contractor. The information entered into Contractor Invoicing accurately reflected the information contained in the contractor timesheet, and was regularly kept and maintained by IP in the Contractor Invoicing database in the ordinary course of business.

Q. Please describe the second step in the process.

A. Second, an IP supervisor would review the contractor timesheet information contained in Contractor Invoicing, and approve or reject the records for payment. This supervisor would have been involved in the project and knowledgeable about the contractor's work performance. Once approved, the timesheet information contained in Contractor Invoicing would be transferred on a nightly basis into an electronic database known as the AP system. Use of the AP system was part of the regular business protocol for IP. The transfer was accomplished through a computer program designed to collect and transfer the information in Contractor Invoicing. The information transferred to AP included the amount due to the contractor for time and costs incurred for working on a particular project, a work order number to identify the project for which the work was done, an invoice number, an invoice date and a vendor number to identify

the contractor. The information transferred into AP accurately reflected the billing information contained in Contractor Invoicing, and was regularly stored and maintained by IP in the AP database in the ordinary course of business.

Q. What happened next?

A. Once the business record information from Contractor Invoicing was transferred into AP, the contractor would be paid, usually by an electronic funds transfer.

Q. How is the contractor invoice information that is stored in AP retrieved so that it can be reviewed?

A. That information is retrieved using a tool called Bi-Query. The AP database was archived on April 1, 2005, following Ameren's purchase of IP the previous year. The Bi-Query tool can be queried to "read" the archived AP database and retrieve any information contained in AP. The information can be formatted or printed for review in various ways. The information retrieved from AP using the Bi-Query tool accurately reflects the electronic information maintained and kept by IP in the AP database in the ordinary course of business.

Q. Please describe Ameren Exhibit 19.5.

A, Ameren Exhibit 19.5 to my testimony is a sample invoice generated from the Contractor Invoicing System.

Q, What does the first page of that invoice show?

A. The first page of the invoice identifies the contractor name, PAR. It also shows a "Date Created" and "Invoice Date" of 6/29/2004. This is the date when either an authorized IP employee or the contractor entered the contractor timesheet information into Contractor Invoicing. The specific project that is the subject of the invoice is identified by an "Invoice #"

(0010406440), a "Work Request Number" (9566200172), a "Job #" (1341008), and a "Description" of the work completed by the contractor (RT. 159 RELOCATION PROJECT – REPLACE TWO STRUCTURES ON L3452 FOR ROAD WIDENING).

Q. What does the second page of that invoice show?

A. The second page of the invoice displays the "Position" and "Description" of each contracting employee who completed the work for which payment was made. It also shows the "Qty." of work completed. This is the number of hours that each contracting employee spent on the job. In addition, the second page shows the "Value/Unit," or the contract price for the work completed (the contract price was pre-programmed into Contractor Invoicing and could not be altered by a contractor who entered timesheet information into the system). The "Total Value" of the work completed by each contracting employee is also displayed, and represents the number of hours spent by each contracting employee multiplied by the contract price for the work completed.

Q. What does the third page of the invoice show?

A. The third page of the invoice shows: a "Description" of the equipment charged to the project; the "Qty." or units of equipment charged; the "Value/Unit" or value per unit of that equipment; and the "Total Value" of equipment costs for the project. In addition, the third page shows the "Total Job Cost," which represents the sum of the dollar value of the time spent by each contracting employee and the total dollar value of equipment costs for the project. Finally, the third page displays the "Approval Trail" for the electronic invoice. The "Approval Trail" lists the name of the IP employee who entered the timesheet information into Contractor Invoicing (Vickie Kelly), the name of an IP employee who reviewed the timesheet information

prior to approval by a supervisor (Jerry Moore), and the name of the IP supervisor who approved the invoice for payment (Ron Roof). It also shows the date when the electronic invoice record was transferred to the AP system for final payment to the contractor.

Q. What does the fourth page show?

A. On page 4, the invoice displays a "Work Order" number, or numbers, and corresponding dollar amounts that show project costs for plant additions. Work Order numbers 58949 and 18949 represent $955.56 and $7731.33 of plant additions, respectively.

Q. Why did IP use the Contractor Invoicing system?

A. The primary reason was to ensure that contractor billings were using negotiated contract rates. By limiting the contractors' input into the Contractor Invoicing system to work completed, and pre-programming the appropriate contract rates in house at IP, IP was able to ensure a high level of compliance with contracted rates. The Contractor Invoicing system permitted a consistent level of rigor, control, and accuracy over contractor costs that would otherwise be hard to maintain with hardcopy invoicing.

B. Consignment Inventory

Q. How were records of consignment materials work kept?

A. When consignment materials were issued from stores, IP's applications would generate a payment record to the owner of the material (supplier) based on the quantity issued and the cost on file. The cost on file was controlled by IP Supply Chain personnel based on agreed pricing with the supplier. The total issues for a particular supplier for a business period (normally a day) were then aggregated into one payment and paid to the supplier.

An accompanying summary of all transactions for the period corresponding to the total paid was also sent to the supplier for reconciliation and inventory adjustment.

Q. Was this similar to other stores transactions and payments to suppliers?

A. Yes. Typically, upon receipt of non-consigned material, a receiving record was created that was used to pay the supplier. Upon issue of non-consigned material, records would be generated to charge a project or other accounting. In the case of an issue of consigned material, the receipt for payment and issue to project was completed in one transaction, resulting in payment and accounting records being generated. The invoice record sent to AP from the store's system included the accounting the material was charged to—in this case a plant project. This approach provided efficiencies in the form of labor savings and record reduction in stores and in AP.

Q. Were there other efficiencies to this approach?

A. Yes. Since suppliers were responsible for maintaining adequate levels of inventory for IP's use, IP gained efficiencies in not having to create and process typical supply documents—requisitions, purchase orders, receiving reports and invoices from suppliers.

C. Sight Drafts

Q. How did the sight draft process work?

A. The sight draft program permitted IP claims and real estate personnel to carry and issue sight drafts to immediately settle small claims and right-of-way transactions. Following the issue of a sight draft, IP personnel would enter information about the sight draft in an application designed to capture cost, accounting, payee, date, and other information. The application would then transfer information to the AP system. The AP system provided a method of generating records to the general ledger to properly account for the sight drafts. AP personnel would then

transfer funds to the bank sight draft account to replenish the account based on the sight draft transactions processed. Although there was an AP invoice record created, no disbursements were made from AP to the sight draft payee, since the payee was paid by presenting the sight draft at a bank. The AP system was used to facilitate accounting transactions to the general ledger / plant accounting ledger. Sight drafts issued may be reviewed from bank records showing cancelled sight drafts, including endorsements.

Q. Do you believe that the processes you describe and the controls that were in place at IP provide sufficient support for the records of electronic transactions related to IP plant additions?

A. Yes, the processes and systems IP used had adequate controls. As my testimony shows, the processes were developed to guard against many of the concerns voiced by the Staff in their recommended rejection of the records in the 2007 Rate Case. Both independent and internal audits confirm that the controls are effective in preventing control issues such as duplicate payments, discrepancies with the general ledger, inadequate consigned inventory tracking, and unauthorized expenditure. The plant addition records that are generated by these systems should be accepted in support of the reasonableness of the IP plant additions.

IV. CONCLUSION

Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS
MARK R. LIVASY

My name is Mark R. Livasy. I am the Superintendent – Energy Delivery Illinois in the Supply Chain Operations Department of Ameren Services Company ("AMS"), a subsidiary of Ameren Corporation.

I received a Bachelor degree in Management from Millikin University in 1977. I earned Advanced Supply Chain Management Certification from St. Louis University in 2007.

I began my career at Illinois Power Company in 1978 as an Accountant in the accounting department, which included direct supervision of personnel in Accounts Payable. Over the next 21 years, I worked 13 different positions in 7 different departments:

- Accountant, Accounting
- Benefits Analyst, Employee Relations
- Labor Relations Analyst, Employee Relations
- Senior Internal Auditor, Internal Auditing
- Stores Coordinator, Service Area Operations
- Supervisor – Material Control, Purchasing and Material Control
- Director – Material Control, Purchasing and Material Control
- Director – Contract Administration, Purchasing and Material Control
- Director - Purchasing, Purchasing and Material Control
- Director – Customer Business Strategies, Customer Business Strategies
- Director – Central Dispatch, Energy Delivery
- Director – Energy Delivery Process & Technology, Energy Delivery
- Manager – Energy Delivery Operations, Energy Delivery

In 1999, I began working as the Director - Supply Chain Services, as the department head of the Supply Chain Services department. The duties included the leadership and administrative responsibilities for Purchasing, Stores and Warehousing, Stock Control, Strategic Sourcing, Accounts Payable, Material Logistics and Distribution. In 2001, I became the Senior Director of Operations Support, which included the leadership and administrative responsibilities for the following Energy Delivery / support departments: Supply Chain Services (which included Accounts Payable), Central Dispatch, Safety & Training, Environmental Programs, Fleet, Central Meter Shop, Administrative Services and Energy Delivery Process & Technology. In 2002, my title changed to Senior Director – Utility Services, and my responsibilities were expanded to include strategic services development.

In 2003, I became the Director – Asset Performance and Compliance Management, responsible for the leadership and administration of Electric Reliability, Electric Planning, Electric Standards, Gas Planning and Gas Standards.

In 2004, I returned to Supply Chain Services when Ameren purchased Illinois Power as the Director – Supply Chain Services with the same responsibilities I held earlier (1999 – 2001). By April of 2005, I had facilitated the transfer of responsibilities and systems for purchasing, stock control, sourcing and accounts payable to their respective Ameren departments. My title changed to Superintendent – AmerenIP Stores, and my responsibilities were focused on stores operations, warehousing and material distribution for AmerenIP. In 2005, I assumed similar additional responsibilities for AmerenCILCO Stores. In 2006, I became employed by AMS and assumed additional responsibilities for AmerenCIPS Stores. My title also changed at that time to Superintendent – Energy Delivery Illinois, which is my current position.