

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

In the Matter of the Determination)
of Carrying Costs for the Phase-In) **ER-2012-0024**
Tariffs of KCP&L Greater Missouri)
Operations Company)

RESPONSE AND OBJECTION TO MOTION

COMES NOW Ag Processing Inc a Cooperative (AGP) and responds in opposition to the Motion to Suspend Procedural Schedule filed by KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company (GMO). Not only should the motion not be granted as requested, but the Commission should not proceed further with this case in any fashion so as to be in compliance with established Missouri law, court orders, and several of its own rules, including 4 CSR 240-2.080(15) and 4 CSR 240-2.080(16) among others.

A. The Commission's Efforts To Schedule or Process This Case Violate The Court's Writ of Review.

1. Issuance of a writ of review by the reviewing court removes the Commission's jurisdiction over the case being reviewed. *State ex rel. Kansas City v. Public Service Com.*, 360 Mo. 339, 349 (Mo. 1950); *State ex rel. Campbell Iron Co. v. Public Serv. Comm.*, 317 Mo. 724, 296 S.W. 998 (1927).

2. GMO applied for a writ of review of Case No. ER-2010-0356 on June 24, 2011 in Cole County Circuit Court Case No. 11AC-CC00415 which was issued on June 29, 2011. AGP obtained a

writ of review from the same court on July 5, 2011 in Case No. 11AC-CC00432. This Commission is well aware of both cases, having filed a Motion to Consolidate them on July 7, 2011. AGP's writ of review directed "that said Commission take no further action in such cause save compliance with this Writ of Review."

3. This Commission is fully aware of the issue that AGP has with the Commission's ER-2010-0356 Report and Order, namely that the Commission unlawfully directed a phase-in which in the aggregate exceeds the amount of the increase in the rates requested by GMO. Multiple Applications for Rehearing to that effect were filed by AGP and denied by the Commission.

4. Yet the Commission has now adopted another case number, ER-2012-0024, in which to try to implement the phase-in for the St. Joseph district. Both this case number and the earlier case, ET-2012-0017, were initiated after the writs of review were issued.^{1/}

5. Indeed, as recently as August 23, the Commission continued to ignore the court's writ of review by entering yet another order, this time directly in the ER-2010-0356 case.

6. This is nothing more than playing with case numbers and will not suffice to frustrate judicial review. This case was initiated after both GMO's and AGP's writs of review were issued. A Writ of Review is an equitable proceeding in which the Commission is directed to send up the record in the

^{1/} Case No. ET-2012-0017 was initiated on July 18, 2011. The writs of review were issued on June 29 and July 5, respectively.

case for review. The Commission may not avoid the implications of a writ of review simply by shifting to a new case number and continuing proceedings under a new number. The listing of filings in the ER-2012-0024 case are replete with pleadings copied from the ER-2010-0356 case, making it clear that the Commission is simply trying to avoid the implications of the writs of review by shifting to a new case number.^{2/}

7. It is apparent that the Commission wishes to give GMO additional rate relief. Unfortunately, it appears willing to disregard governing law, directions from the courts, and its own rules to do so. The Commission has now determined that this new case, ER-2012-0024, is to proceed as a rate case.^{3/} Yet, there has been no showing that GMO could not make a new rate case filing. The Commission's actions are a transparent attempt to shortcut the required filing requirements, possible time limits, the law, the court's orders, ratepayer rights and the inconvenience of a rate case.

^{2/} A copy of the ER-2012-0024 docket listing from EFIS is attached.

^{3/} In its July 25, 2011 Notice Closing File in the ET-2012-0017 the Commission stated:

The Commission has determined that this matter **should be classified as a rate case rather than as a tariff case.** Therefore, File No. ER-2012-0024 has been opened and will contain all filings that would have occurred in this file.

Notice Closing Case, p. 1 (emphasis added).

8. The Commission seems insouciant to the admonitions of the courts of this state. Having now determined that ER-2012-0024 is a rate case and having adopted a procedural schedule that includes a hearing, this case is a contested case and the Commission must follow the associated law.^{4/} The Commission now must support any order setting future rates by competent and substantial evidence on the whole record after considering all relevant factors.

9. Referring evidence from the under-review ER-2010-0356 case into this case file does not make those materials competent evidence. In addition to violating statutes and rules regarding how administrative notice is to be taken of such materials, these extra-judicial statements are insufficient to meet the Constitutional standard of review. "Cases are legion that hearsay evidence does not rise to the level of 'competent and substantial evidence' within the ambit of Mo. Const. Art. V, § 18." *State ex rel. Marco Sales, Inc., et al. v. Public Service Commission*, 685 S.W.2d 216, 220 (Mo. App. 1984).

10. Neither may the Constitutional requirement to support a decision by competent and substantial evidence on the whole record be evaded by assertions of impulse or expediency. *State ex rel. Martigney Creek Sewer Co. v. Public Service Commission*, 537 S.W.2d 388, 394 (Mo. 1976); *State ex rel. Missouri Water Co. v. Public Service Com.*, 308 S.W.2d 704, 719-720 (Mo.

^{4/} This should not be taken to express agreement that setting a hearing is necessary to establish a contested case under Missouri law.

1957). Due process requires no less. *State ex rel. Fischer v. Public Service Commission*, 645 S.W.2d 39, 43 (Mo App. 1982). In *State ex rel. Marco Sales, Inc., et al. v. Public Service Commission*, 685 S.W.2d 216, 220 (Mo. App. 1984) the court stated:

Indiscriminate approval of orders and decisions of the Commission, without subjecting them to the rigors of Mo. Const. Art. V, § 18, is an abdication of judicial responsibility. Unbridled bureaucracy is the subtle destroyer of people's rights and Mo. Const. Art. V, § 18, is their response.

B. The Continued Handling of This Case By the Commission Violates Applicable Law In That It Fails to Consider All Factors Relevant To The Establishment of Rates.

1. The Commission has now determined to treat this matter as a rate case,^{5/} established a procedural schedule that includes an evidentiary hearing, and set it as a contested case involving future rate levels in the St. Joseph district.

2. *State ex rel. Utility Consumers Council of Missouri, Inc., Petitioner--Appellant, and William M. Barvick, Public Counsel, Intervenor--Appellant, v. Public Service Commission of Missouri*, 585 S.W.2d 41, 56 (Mo. 1979) plainly states that in setting rates, the Commission must consider all relevant factors.

Section 393.270 empowers the commission . . . to fix maximum rates after hearing and investigation upon consideration of **all relevant factors**. (Emphasis added)

^{5/} See footnote no. 3, *supra*.

3. Even if rates are not suspended, the Commission must still consider all relevant factors before setting rates. *Id.*, at 49.

4. Were we to assume solely for the purpose of argument that GMO made an appropriate filing of new rates to initiate a rate case (which it did not, violating other Commission rules), the Commission actions heretofore evidence that the Commission will not consider all relevant factors. The caption of this case demonstrates that the Commission has attempted to limit consideration to what it believes is the appropriate "carrying cost" for its "phase-in" program. Fully a year is proposed to elapse before additional rates would go into effect. Absolutely no analysis has been directed to any changes that might have occurred in the interim. What, for example, is the test year by which the reasonableness of these rates may be evaluated? What is the rate base and what is the level of depreciation that should be allowed as a reduction to that rate base? Is the rate base for GMO the same as it was in ER-2010-0356? Have there been changes in utility capital structure? Have there been any recent changes in the financial markets? There are a multitude of other relevant factors to the setting of rates that the Commission is simply ignoring.

5. GMO may file another rate case whenever it chooses. If, however, GMO can get the Commission to become its advocate, it apparently need not do so.

C. The Commission's Granting of the GMO Motion Without Providing a Time for Response Violates The Commission's Own Rules.

1. The Commission has not been reluctant to enforce its own rules, even *sua sponte*. On August 3, 2011, in Case No. WR-2012-0337, the Commission ordered four intervenors who had neither appeared at a prehearing conference nor sought to be excused from appearing, to show cause why their interventions should not be dismissed and a penalty imposed.^{6/} The Commission cited its own rules and a statute, 4 CSR 240-2.090(5), 4 CSR 240-2.116(3), and Section 386.570.1, respectively. There was no motion made by any party present at the prehearing conference nor was such a motion later filed. The Commission acted entirely on its own.

2. It appears, however, that when a utility such as GMO seeks the complete suspension of an established procedural schedule, Commission rules are ignored. Here GMO filed a motion to suspend the procedural schedule, reciting only that the Commission Staff was agreeable. According to EFIS, this motion was filed on August 16, 2011 at 4:22:37 p.m. Some 20 hours later (overnight), the Commission issued an order granting that motion, which according to EFIS, was issued at 8/17/2011 1:13:16 p.m.

3. Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.080(15) specifies the time period for a party to respond to a motion. It states, apparently clearly:

^{6/} Notice of Noncompliance and Order to Show Cause, WR-2012-0337, August 3, 2011.

(15) Parties shall be allowed not more than ten (10) days from the date of filing in which to respond to any pleading unless otherwise ordered by the commission.

4. Although no order was issued shortening the time for response, this was certainly "expedited" relief. But CSR 4 240-2.080(16) specifies the assertions required if a party seeks expedited consideration of a motion.

(16) Any party seeking expedited treatment in any case shall include in the title of the pleading the words "Motion for Expedited Treatment." The pleading shall also set out with particularity the following:

(A) The date by which the party desires the commission to act;

(B) The harm that will be avoided, or the benefit that will accrue, including a statement of the negative effect, or that there will be no negative effect, on the party's customers or the general public, if the commission acts by the date desired by the party; and

(C) That the pleading was filed as soon as it could have been or an explanation why it was not.

5. GMO's Motion contains no explicit request for expedited treatment (as would seem to be required by 4 CSR 240-2.080(16)), either in the title of the motion or elsewhere in the GMO motion, and certainly does not comply with the above Commission Rule. GMO's motion contains: no statement "setting out with particularity" the date by which the Commission is requested to act; no statement of harm or benefit that will accrue from such action or would be avoided by such action; and no explana-

tion as to why the pleading was not and could not have been filed earlier.

6. No waiver of these rules was requested nor claimed to be justified by GMO.


7. Moreover, GMO's motion does not state that it has even attempted to contact other parties to the proceeding and obtain their acquiescence or opposition even though they are well known to GMO, and, for that matter, to Commission Staff. Indeed, per the motion, only GMO and the Commission Staff were involved. It also appears from the motion that negotiations have been going on between GMO and Commission Staff without notice to or seeking the involvement of the other parties. But all this apparently does not matter when the party requesting the relief is a utility. Apparently other parties such as ratepayers are not even to be considered.

8. Again, within less than 24 hours, AGP filed a notice with the Commission that it intended to respond. Of course, by then the Commission had already acted to grant the GMO motion.

WHEREFORE, the Commission's ruling on GMO's August 16, 2011 motion should be set aside as improvidently granted without compliance with Commission rules. Further proceedings on this matter should be discontinued forthwith as in violation of court orders and existing Missouri law, save rejecting GMO's tariffs as having been filed without compliance with applicable Commission rules and governing law.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, CONRAD & PETERSON, L.C.




Stuart W. Conrad Mo. Bar #23966
3100 Broadway, Suite 1209
Kansas City, Missouri 64111
(816) 753-1122
Facsimile (816)756-0373
Internet: stucon@fcplaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR AG PROCESSING INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing Application to Intervene on the designated attorneys or representatives of each party in accord with Commission Orders and the service list maintained in this proceeding by the Secretary of the Commission on EFIS.

Dated: August 25, 2011



Stuart W. Conrad, an attorney for
within applicant

Missouri Public Service Commission

Docket Sheet

Date: 8/24/2011

Case No. ER-2012-0024

Company Name(s) Commission-(All)
KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric)

Style of Case In the Matter of the Determination of Carrying Costs for the Phase-In Tariffs of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company

Tracking No. ER-2010-0355, ER-2010-0356, YE-2011-0608, YE-2011-0609, YE-2011-0610

Status Open

Assigned Judge Pridgin Ron

Assigned Attorney Williams Nathan

Consolidated To

Consolidated From

Appealed To

| Item No. | Date Filed | Title of Filing | Filed on Behalf Of | In Response to Item No. |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
| 61 | 8/17/2011 | Notice of Intent to Respond | AG Processing, Inc-(All) | |
| 60 | 8/17/2011 | Order Granting Motion to Suspend Procedural Schedule | Commission-(All) | |
| 59 | 8/16/2011 | Motion to Suspend Procedural Schedule | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) | |
| 58 | 8/10/2011 | Summary of Communication (August 8-9 EPA Meeting) | Ameren Missouri-Investor(Electric) Ameren Missouri-Investor(Gas) Union Electric Company-Investor(Electric) Union Electric Company-Investor(Gas) | |

| | | | |
|----|-----------|---|---|
| 57 | 8/10/2011 | Motion to Withdraw of The Empire District Electric Company | Empire District Electric Company, The-Investor(Electric) |
| 56 | 8/9/2011 | Withdrawal of Counsel | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 55 | 8/4/2011 | Notice of Meeting | Ameren Missouri-Investor(Electric) Ameren Missouri-Investor(Gas) Union Electric Company-Investor(Electric) Union Electric Company-Investor(Gas) |
| 54 | 7/26/2011 | Notice Closing File (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 25, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 53 | 7/26/2011 | Motion to Withdraw (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 22, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 52 | 7/26/2011 | Summary of Diversity Day Presentation (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 20, 2011) | Ameren Missouri-Investor(Electric) Ameren Missouri-Investor(Gas) Union Electric Company-Investor(Electric) Union Electric Company-Investor(Gas) |
| 51 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Extra-Record Communication (Chairman Kevin D. Gunn, Vice Chairman Rober M. Clayton III, Commissioner Jeff N. Davis, Commissioner Terry M. Jarrett, and Commissioner Robert S. Kenney) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 14, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 50 | 7/26/2011 | Proposed Procedural Schedule (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 14, 2011) | AARP-(All) AG Processing, Inc-(All) Ameren Missouri-Investor(Electric) City of Kansas City, Missouri-(All) City of Lee's Summit, Missouri-(All) City of St. Joseph, Missouri-(All) Consumers Council of Missouri-(All) Dogwood Energy, LLC-(All) Empire District Electric Company, The-Investor(Electric) Federal Executive Agencies-(All) IBEW Local Union 1464-(All) IBEW Local Union 1613-(All) |

| | | | |
|----|-----------|---|---|
| | | | IBEW Local Union 412-(All) KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company- Investor(Electric) Lee's Summit Medical Center- (All) Liberty Hospital-(All) Missouri Department of Natural Resources-(All) Missouri Gas Energy- Investor(Gas) Missouri Retailers Association- (All) MO PSC Staff-(All) North Kansas City Hospital-(All) Research Belton Hospital-(All) Saint Luke's East - Lee's Summit-(All) Saint Luke's Northland Hospital - Smithville Campus-(All) Sedalia Industrial Energy Users Association-(All) Southern Union Company- Investor(Gas) St. Mary's Medical Center-(All) Union Electric Company- Investor(Electric) |
| 49 | 7/26/2011 | Staff Status Report on Advanced Coal Tax Credits (NP and HC) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 13, 2011) | MO PSC Staff-(All) |
| 48 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Meeting (Ameren Diversity Day) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 13, 2011) | Ameren Missouri- Investor(Electric) Ameren Missouri-Investor(Gas) Union Electric Company- Investor(Electric) Union Electric Company- Investor(Gas) |
| 47 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Communication (Commissioner Robert S. Kenney and Policy Advisor/Legal Counsel Joshua Harden) (Originally filed in ER- 2010-0356 on July 7, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 46 | 7/26/2011 | Transcript - Volume 48 (6-28-11 Procedural Conference) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 7, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 45 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Communication (Commissioner Terry M. Jarrett) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on July 6, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 44 | 7/26/2011 | Order Denying Applications for | Commission-(All) |

| | | | |
|----|-----------|---|--|
| | | Rehearing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 29, 2011) | |
| 43 | 7/26/2011 | Public Counsel's Application for Rehearing of Order Approving Tariff Sheets and Setting Procedural Conference (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 24, 2011) | Office of the Public Counsel-(All) |
| 42 | 7/26/2011 | Corrected Service Certificate (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 24, 2011) | AG Processing, Inc-(All) |
| 41 | 7/26/2011 | Application for Rehearing by Ag Processing Inc., a Cooperative (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 24, 2011) | AG Processing, Inc-(All) |
| 40 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Communication (Commissioner Robert S. Kenney and Policy Advisor/Legal Counsel Joshua Harden) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 16, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 39 | 7/26/2011 | Notice Regarding Tariff No. YE-2011-0607 (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 15, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 38 | 7/26/2011 | Order Approving Tariff Sheets and Setting Procedural Conference (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 15, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 37 | 7/26/2011 | Reply of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company to Staff Response to Order Directing Filing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 14, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 36 | 7/26/2011 | Response to KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company to Order Directing Filing Issued on June 14, 2011 (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 14, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 35 | 7/26/2011 | Staff's Response to Order Directing Filing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 14, 2011) | MO PSC Staff-(All) |
| 34 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Communication (Commissioner Jeff Davis) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356) | Commission-(All) |

| | | | |
|----|-----------|--|--|
| | | on June 14, 2011) | |
| 33 | 7/26/2011 | Order Directing Filing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 14, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 32 | 7/26/2011 | Response of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company to Order Further Suspending Tariff Sheets (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 13, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 31 | 7/26/2011 | Order Further Suspending Tariff Sheets (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 10, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 30 | 7/26/2011 | Clarification of Staff Response to Order Suspending Tariff Sheets and Directing Filing (NP) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 10, 2011) | MO PSC Staff-(All) |
| 29 | 7/26/2011 | Reply of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company To Clarification of Staff Response To Order Suspending Tariff Sheets And Directing Filing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 10, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 28 | 7/26/2011 | Clarification of Staff Response to Order Suspending Tariff Sheets and Directing Filing (HC) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 9, 2011) | MO PSC Staff-(All) |
| 27 | 7/26/2011 | Reply of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company to Public Counsel's and AGP's Responses (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 9, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 26 | 7/26/2011 | Public Counsel's Response to Application for Rehearing and Response to Order Directing Filing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 8, 2011) | Office of the Public Counsel-(All) |
| 25 | 7/26/2011 | Supplemental Response to Order Suspending Tariff Sheets (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 8, 2011) | AG Processing, Inc-(All) |
| 24 | 7/26/2011 | Non-Prejudicial Response to Order (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 8, 2011) | AG Processing, Inc-(All) |
| 23 | 7/26/2011 | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company's | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company- |

| | | | |
|----|-----------|---|--|
| | | Response to Order Directing Filing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 8, 2011) | Investor(Electric) |
| 22 | 7/26/2011 | Staff Response to Order Suspending Tariff Sheets and Directing Filing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 7, 2011) | MO PSC Staff-(All) |
| 21 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Communication (Summary of Energy Learning Center Event) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 6, 2011) | Ameren Missouri-Investor(Electric) Ameren Missouri-Investor(Gas) Union Electric Company-Investor(Electric) Union Electric Company-Investor(Gas) |
| 20 | 7/26/2011 | Application for Rehearing and Motion for Clarification of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 3, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 19 | 7/26/2011 | Application for Rehearing by AG Processing Inc A Cooperative (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | AG Processing, Inc-(All) |
| 18 | 7/26/2011 | Application for Rehearing of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 17 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Communication (Commissioner Robert S. Kenney and Policy Advisor/Legal Counsel Joshua Harden) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 16 | 7/26/2011 | Order Suspending Tariff Sheets and Directing Filing (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 15 | 7/26/2011 | Concurrence in Public Counsel's Tariff Objection by AG Processing Inc. A Cooperative (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | AG Processing, Inc-(All) |
| 14 | 7/26/2011 | Staff Recommendation to Approve Tariff Sheets (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | MO PSC Staff-(All) |
| 13 | 7/26/2011 | Transcript Volume 47 (May 26, | Commission-(All) |

| | | | |
|----|-----------|---|--|
| | | 2011) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | |
| 12 | 7/26/2011 | Public Counsel's Objections to Tariffs (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | Office of the Public Counsel-(All) |
| 11 | 7/26/2011 | Response of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company to Suggestions Regarding Fuel Adjustment Clause Compliance Tariffs (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 2, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 10 | 7/26/2011 | Substitute Tariff Sheets (YE-2011-0606, YE-2011-0607) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 1, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |
| 9 | 7/26/2011 | Public Counsel's Notice of Objections to Tariffs (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 1, 2011) | Office of the Public Counsel-(All) |
| 8 | 7/26/2011 | Staff Reply to Response of Industrial Intervenors (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 1, 2011) | MO PSC Staff-(All) |
| 7 | 7/26/2011 | Response to Staff's Suggestions Regarding Effective Date of FAC Tariffs (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on June 1, 2011) | AG Processing, Inc-(All) Sedalia Industrial Energy Users Association-(All) |
| 6 | 7/26/2011 | Staff Suggestions Regarding Order of Clarification and Modification (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on May 31, 2011) | MO PSC Staff-(All) |
| 5 | 7/26/2011 | Notice of Meeting and Draft of Meeting Agenda (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on May 31, 2011) | Ameren Missouri-Investor(Electric) Ameren Missouri-Investor(Gas) Union Electric Company-Investor(Electric) Union Electric Company-Investor(Gas) |
| 4 | 7/26/2011 | Tariff Submission Pursuant to Commission's Order of Clarification and Modification Dated 5/27/2011. Please process according to the effective dates in the 5/27/2011 Order. (YE-2011-0606; YE-2011-0607; YE-2011-0608; YE-2011-0609; YE-2010-0610) (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on May 31, 2011) | KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company-Investor(Electric) |

- | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|------------------|
| 3 | 7/26/2011 | Order of Clarification and Modification (Originally filed in ER-2010-0356 on May 27, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 2 | 7/25/2011 | Order Opening a New File and Adopting Procedural Schedule (Originally filed in ET-2012-0017 on July 22, 2011) | Commission-(All) |
| 1 | 7/25/2011 | Notice Opening File | Commission-(All) |