

**STATE OF MISSOURI  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

At a session of the Public Service  
Commission held at its office in  
Jefferson City on the 26th day  
of January, 2006.

In Re: Union Electric Company's 2005     )  
Utility Resource Filing Pursuant to     )  
4 CSR 240 - Chapter 22                     )

**Case No. EO-2006-0240**

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO POSTPONE MEETINGS**

Issue Date: January 26, 2006

Effective Date: January 26, 2006

On December 5, 2005, Union Electric Company, d/b/a AmerenUE, submitted an Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) as required by the Commission's rules, specifically 4 CSR 240 - Chapter 22. That rule provides that the Commission's Staff, as well as other interested parties, is to submit reports within 120 days of that filing regarding whether AmerenUE's IRP complies with the requirements of the regulation.

AmerenUE has filed its entire IRP as highly confidential, meaning that none of that document is available to the public. Sierra Club, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Mid-Missouri Peaceworks, and the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), intervenors in this case, have filed a motion asking the Commission to require AmerenUE to make its IRP more available to the public by specifying those portions of the IRP that truly are entitled to protection from disclosure. The movants ask that all other portions of the IRP be designated as public information. That motion is currently pending before the Commission.

On January 17, Sierra Club, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Mid-Missouri Peaceworks, and ACORN filed a motion asking the Commission to order AmerenUE to postpone scheduled meetings regarding the IRP until after the Commission rules on the motion challenging AmerenUE's designation of the entire IRP as highly confidential. The motion indicated that the first such meeting was held on January 11, and that additional meetings were scheduled for January 20, January 27, and February 1. Because the next meeting was scheduled to take place on January 20, just three days after the movants filed their motion, the Commission directed that any party wishing to respond to the motion to postpone the meetings do so by January 19.

The Office of the Public Counsel filed a response on January 18, indicating that it does not object to continuing the meetings until after the Commission has resolved the questions about the confidentiality of AmerenUE's IRP. The Commission's Staff filed a response on January 19. Staff did not take a position on whether the meetings should be postponed, but did reveal that AmerenUE postponed the January 20 meeting at the request of Staff for reasons unrelated to the motion.

AmerenUE also filed a response on January 19. AmerenUE explained that the series of four meetings were discussed by the parties at the prehearing conference held on January 3. AmerenUE indicates that the four meetings are designed to facilitate answers to the parties' questions about the IRP, while reducing the need for the use of formal discovery. AmerenUE points out that it is under no obligation to hold these meetings, but that it is willing to do so for the benefit of all the parties.

The meetings that the movants have asked the Commission to delay have been scheduled by AmerenUE entirely on its own initiative, with no involvement by this

Commission. The Commission's rules do not require that such meetings take place, nor do they give the public, or any party, the right to attend. It is in AmerenUE's own interest to make these meetings as accessible to the parties as possible because by doing so it hopes to reduce the demands of formal discovery. Furthermore, AmerenUE, no doubt, wants to take the opportunity to try to convince the other parties of the correctness of its IRP. Therefore, it is certainly in the interest of AmerenUE to work out a schedule of meetings that will be acceptable to all parties. However, simply put, these are AmerenUE's meetings and the Commission has no reason to tell AmerenUE when it can, or when it cannot, meet with whomever it chooses.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

1. That the Motion to Continue Meetings Filed by Intervenors Sierra Club, Missouri Coalition for the Environment, Mid-Missouri Peaceworks, and Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) is denied.
2. That this order shall become effective on January 26, 2006.

**BY THE COMMISSION**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Colleen M. Dale', written over a horizontal line.

Colleen M. Dale  
Secretary

(S E A L)

Davis, Chm., Murray, Gaw, Clayton,  
and Appling, CC., concur.

Woodruff, Deputy Chief Regulatory Law Judge