LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT C. JOHNSON

720 OLIVE STREET SUITE 2400 ST. LOUIS, MO 63101 FAX: (314) 588-0638

Robert C. Johnson

DIRECT: (314) 345-6436

E-MAIL: bjohnson@bspmlaw.com

Lisa C. Langeneckert DIRECT: (314) 345-6441

E-MAIL: llangeneckert@bspmlaw.com

January 31, 2001

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

FILED³
FEB 0 1 2001

Missouri Public Service Commission

Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge
Missouri Public Service Commission
Governor Office Building
200 Madison Street, Ste. 100
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0360

Re:

Case No.: EM-96-149

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Pursuant to the Stipulation and Agreement dated July 12, 1996, and on behalf of the Missouri Energy Group, Daimler Chrysler et al, I enclose herewith an original and eight copies of the Recommendations of the Missouri Energy Group with respect to whether or not the Experimental Alternative Regulation Plan should be continued.

I will appreciate your bringing this filing to the attention of the Commission.

Yours very truly

Robert C. Johnson

RCJ/gmw Enclosures

cc: All parties of record

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

FEB 0 1 2001

Union Electric Company for an order authorizing (1) certain merger transactions involving Union Electric Co.; (2) the transfer of certain assets, real estate, leased property, easements and contractual agreements to Central Illinois Public Service Company; and (3) in connection therewith, certain other related transactions.	T 4 04 1 0		7 EB 0 1 2001
(2) the transfer of certain assets, real estate,) leased property, easements and) contractual agreements to Central Illinois) Public Service Company; and) (3) in connection therewith, certain)	In the matter of the application of)	
(2) the transfer of certain assets, real estate,) leased property, easements and) contractual agreements to Central Illinois) Public Service Company; and) (3) in connection therewith, certain)	Union Electric Company for an order)	Senissouria
(2) the transfer of certain assets, real estate,) leased property, easements and) contractual agreements to Central Illinois) Public Service Company; and) (3) in connection therewith, certain)	authorizing (1) certain merger)	Cornra.
leased property, easements and) contractual agreements to Central Illinois) Public Service Company; and) (3) in connection therewith, certain)	transactions involving Union Electric Co.;)	**************************************
contractual agreements to Central Illinois) Public Service Company; and) (3) in connection therewith, certain)	(2) the transfer of certain assets, real estate,)	Case No.: EM-96-149
Public Service Company; and) (3) in connection therewith, certain)	leased property, easements and)	
(3) in connection therewith, certain	contractual agreements to Central Illinois)	
	Public Service Company; and)	
other related transactions.	(3) in connection therewith, certain)	
,	other related transactions.)	

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MISSOURI ENERGY GROUP REGARDING THE EXPERIMENTAL ALTERNATIVE REGULATION PLAN

The Missouri Energy Group ("MEG"), Daimler Chrysler, et al, submits herewith its recommendations regarding the Experimental Alternative Regulation Plan ("EARP"), pursuant to the provisions of the Stipulation and Agreement, dated July 12, 1996, and previously entered into by the parties to the above matter.

1. Primary Recommendation

It is the primary recommendation of the Missouri Energy Group that the EARP be permanently discontinued. It is the position of MEG that the customers of Union Electric Company ("UE") have received no benefit from the EARP, because they are paying electric utility rates that are significantly higher than they would pay if UE were regulated by the Commission in a manner consistent with the Commission's past practices, even after taking into account the refunds paid and adjustments made to rates. We know for example that under the EARP, UE is achieving a return on equity ("ROE") almost certainly in excess of 13 percent. This ROE is significantly higher than other electric utilities are achieving under traditional

regulation. Furthermore, the EARP has led to numerous disputes, multiple hearings before the Commission, and now litigation with no closure in the foreseeable future. Clearly, the EARP has not been beneficial to the customers.

It is our further recommendation that the Commission promptly initiate a full rate case proceeding dealing with revenue and rate design issues and establish future rates for UE customers in accordance with the traditional regulatory standards and procedures.

2. Alternative Recommendations

If the Commission determines to continue the EARP in the future, it is the MEG recommendation that the EARP be substantially revised from its present form. Among other things, we recommend that the base-line return on equity should be substantially lower and no higher than the ROE presently being allowed comparable electric utilities under traditional regulatory standards and practices. In addition, a more favorable percentage of any refund should be payable to the customers, particularly with respect to the refund payable from revenues attributable to the initial two (2) percent of ROE in excess of the baseline ROE.

It is our further recommendation that market-based interest should be charged and paid to the customers on all customer refunds that are not paid within sixty days after the close of the fiscal year with respect to which the refund is being determined. The failure to charge interest on refunds, in our judgment, has led to prolonged disputes and litigation as the utility has no incentive to promptly settle the amount of any allowed refund with its customers. In effect, the utility is using customer money for its operations, which in a sense is free money, and to the end that the utility has no economic incentive to promptly resolve disputes over the amount of any customer refund. To the contrary, the incentive is to delay refunds as long as possible.

In addition, if the Commission determines to continue the EARP, we strongly recommend that the Commission, prior to establishing the format for any new plan, conduct a full rate case proceeding for this utility.

Dated: January 31, 2001

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Johnson

Phone: (314) 345-6436 E-Mail: <u>bjohnson@bspmlaw.com</u> Lisa C. Langeneckert #49781

Phone: (314) 345-6441

E-Mail: llangeneckert@bspmlaw.com

720 Olive St., Suite 2400 St. Louis, MO 63101-2396

Fax: (314) 588-0638

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned counsel hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been mailed or hand delivered to the parties named on the attachment hereto, on this 31st day of January 2001.

CASE NO.: EM-96-149

General Counsel

Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

James J. Cook

Union Electric Company P.O. Box 66149 (MC1310 St. Louis, MO 63166

James M. Fischer

James M. Fischer PC 101 W. McCarty St., Suite 215 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Michael C. Pendergast

Laclede Gas Co. 720 Olive St., Room 1520 St. Louis, MO 63101

William G. Riggins

Kansas City Power & Light Company 1201 Walnut St., P.O. Box 418679 Kansas City, MO 64141

Jeremiah W. Nixon/Ronald Molteni

221 W. High Street P.O. Box 899 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Robin E. Fulton

Schnapp, Fulton, Fall, McNamara & Silvey 135 E. Main St., P.O. Box 151 Fredericktown, MO 63645

Diana M. Vulysteke

Bryan Cave LLP One Metropolitan Square 211 North Broadway, Suite 3600 St. Louis, MO 63102

Office of the Public Counsel

P.O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Gary W. Duffy/James Swearengen

Brydon, Swearengen & England PC 312 E. Capitol Ave., P.O. Box 456 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Charles Brent Stewart

Stewart & Keevil L.L.C. 1001 Cherry Street, Suite 302 Columbia, MO 65201

William A. Spencer

216 E. Capitol Ave. P.O. Box 717 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Paul S. DeFord

Lathrop & Gage 2345 Grand Blvd., Suite 2500 Kansas City, MO 64108

Marilyn S. Teitelbaum

Schuchat, Cook & Werner 1221 Locust St., 2nd. Floor St. Louis, MO 63103

Paul H. Gardner

Goller, Gardner & Feather 131 East High Street Jefferson City, MO 65101