

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In Re: Union Electric Company's 2005)	
Utility Resource Filing Pursuant to)	Case No. EO-2006-0240
4 CSR 240—Chapter 22)	

**INTERVENORS REPLY TO AMERENUE'S RESPONSE TO THEIR MOTION
TO COMPEL FURTHER DISCLOSURE**

Come now Sierra Club, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Mid-Missouri Peaceworks and ACORN (the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now), and state:

1. In their Motion to Compel Further Disclosure, Interveners listed the redacted portions of Ameren's Public Version of the IRP to allow Ameren to respond with the particularity required by the Protective Order. Ameren still has not done so.

2. Ameren asserts that it has fully complied with the Commission's Order of Jan. 26. On the contrary, that Order states that the redacted version is merely the "starting point from which to resolve any disputes about what specific information can be released to the public" (p. 4).

3. At the conference held Feb. 22 in compliance with the Commission's Order, Ameren promised to determine which parts of the IRP were derived from subscription services. Now, in ¶ 6 of its Response, Ameren makes a general assertion that "AmerenUE used information from subscription sources for portions of the IRP filing."

4. The Response, ¶ 2, is not completely accurate as to what the public can view; for example, pp. 126–31 of Document 3 are completely blacked out in the Public

Version.

5. Ameren touts its offer to allow one internal expert (assuming there is one) from each Intervener to have access to the IRP. This would mean one person from each group would still be unable to tell anyone else what s/he had seen; it does not address the issue of public access.

6. From ¶ 10 to the end, the Response is largely devoted to impugning the Interveners' motives. This does not deserve a lengthy response and Interveners are sure the Commission does not want to read one. In seeking public disclosure Interveners have been supported by the OPC and DNR, as noted in ¶ 3 of the Jan. 26 Order, and have not been opposed by PSC Staff.

7. It is true that Interveners do not want expensive and polluting power plants to be built if this can be avoided by means of conservation, energy efficiency and renewable generation. This is a legitimate interest, and to try to convince Ameren of it despite their determined opposition is a perfectly legitimate role in the IRP process.

8. Such sarcasms as "what is perhaps obvious to those who understand the electric utility business" (Response ¶ 10) reflect an attitude which is not unique to Ameren. Utilities seem to want the PSC to be a closed shop, open only to industry insiders. This would be cozy, but inconsistent with the rules on intervention and the PSC's mission to represent the public interest.

CONCLUSION

Movants ask the Commission to direct Ameren to make further disclosures in keeping with the Commission's findings and conclusions based on the specific

objections in the Motion to Compel Further Disclosure; or to require that Ameren respond to these objections with particular reasons why the matters it is withholding from public view are genuinely proprietary or highly confidential.

/s/Henry B. Robertson

Henry B. Robertson (Mo. Bar No. 29502)

Kathleen G. Henry (Mo. Bar No. 39504)

Bruce A. Morrison (Mo. Bar No. 38359)

Great Rivers Environmental Law Center

705 Olive Street, Suite 614

St. Louis, Missouri 63101

(314) 231-4181

(314) 231-4184

khenry@greatriverslaw.org

hrobertson@greatriverslaw.org

Attorneys for Intervenors

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct PDF version of the foregoing was sent by email on this 24th day of March, 2006, to the parties listed currently on the Service List for this case according to the Public Service Commission web site.

/s/Henry B. Robertson

Henry B. Robertson