BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Cancellation of the)
Certificate of Convenience and Necessity) File No. ED-2019-0309
Originally Approved in File No. EA-2005-0180)
and the LTS Rate Schedule.)

AMEREN MISSOURI'S RESPONSE TO MECG'S OBJECTIONS

COMES NOW Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri ("Company" or "Ameren Missouri"), pursuant to 4 CSR 240-2.080(13), and hereby responds to the Objection to [Staff] Affidavit and Objection to Ameren Affidavit (collectively, the "Objection") filed by the Midwest Energy Consumers Group ("MECG") on June 24, 2019, and for its response states as follows:

- 1. For the reasons outlined in the Company's June 17, 2019 Response in Opposition to the "Consumers" Motion for Hearing, this case is not a contested case under the Missouri Administrative Procedure Act ("MoAPA"), which is codified in Chapter 536 of the Revised Statute of Missouri.
- 2. As such, MECG's Objection, which invokes a claimed "statutory right to cross-examine" the affiant (which would have to be based on the APA and specifically, § 536.070(2), RSMo. (2016)) fails as a matter of law because there is no statutory right to cross-examine anyone in a noncontested case. Moreover, by its express terms, §536.070 only applies to contested cases: "In any contested case: . . . (2) Each party shall have the right to call and examine witnesses [and] to cross-examine opposing witnesses"
- 3. Similarly, MECG's claim that Ameren Missouri's verification (both on its Application in this case and its above-referenced Response) (and Staff's affidavit) must constitute "substantial and competent evidence" within the meaning of §536.070(12) is also incorrect as a matter of law for two reasons. First, the Commission can decide this case without reliance on

substantial and competent evidence at all, as outlined in the Company's above-referenced Response. Second, as just explained §536.070 (including subdivision (12)) does not apply to this noncontested case.

4. This Commission has previously rejected the same argument made by the same party. See Order Denying MECG's Objections and Request for Hearing, In the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light Company's Request for Authority to Implement al. a General Rate Increase for Electric Service, 2015 WL 5785591 (Sept. 29, 2015) ("Approval of the compliance tariffs is not a contested case, so the legal requirements of a contested case in Sections 536.140 and 536.070(12) are not applicable."). ¹

5. MECG's Objection should be ignored as it is not well-taken as a matter of law and imposes no constraint on the Commission's ability to resolve this noncontested case without a hearing.

WHEREFORE, Ameren Missouri respectfully requests the Commission issue its order overruling Consumers' Objection.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ James B. Lowery
James B. Lowery, #40503
SMITH LEWIS, LLP
PO Box 918
Columbia, MO 65205-0918
(573) 443-3141 (phone)
(573) 442-6686 (fax)
lowery@smithlewis.com

opinion finding that the appeal was moot that in a noncontested case any contested case procedures in Chapter 536 do not apply. *Midwest Energy Consumers' Group v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 509 S. W. 24.757, 780, 87 (Ma. App. W.D. 2017).

¹ MECG appealed the Commission's rejection of its request for a hearing and objection, and MECG's appeal was dismissed as moot. However, the Court of Appeals made very clear in its

Wendy K. Tatro, #60261 Director & Assistant General Counsel Ameren Services Company P.O. Box 66149, MC 1310 St. Louis, MO 63166-6149 (314) 554-3484 (phone) (314) 554-4014 (fax) AmerenMOService@ameren.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on the Staff of the Commission and the Office of the Public Counsel via electronic mail (e-mail) on this 3rd day of July, 2019.

/s/ James B. Lowery
James B. Lowery