BRYAN CAVE

Diana M. Vuylsteke
Voice: 259-2543
dmvuylsteke@bryancave.com

March 10, 2003

BY FEDERAL EXPRESS

FILED[3]
MAR 1 0 2003
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge
Missouri Public Service Commission
Governor Office Building
St. Louis, Missouri 65101

Re: Case No. EO-2003-0271

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Enclosed for filing are an original and eight (8) copies of the Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers' Statement of Opposition to the Procedural Schedule Proposed by Union Electric Company.

Please "file-stamp" the additional copies.

Thank you for your assistance in bringing this filing to the attention of the Commission.

Very truly yours,

Diana M. Vuylsteke

Diana M. Vuylsteke

DMV:rms
Enclosures

Bryan Cave LLP
One Metropolitan Square
211 North Broadway, Suite 3600
St. Louis, MO 63102-2750
Tel (314) 259-2000
Fax (314) 259-2020
www.bryancave.com

Hong Kong
Irvine
Jefferson City
Kansas City
Kuwait
Los Angeles
New York
Overland Park
Phoenix
Riyadh
Shanghai
St. Louis
United Arab Emirates
Abu Dhabi
Dubai
Washington, DC

In Association With
Bryan Cave (Illinois)
Chicago

and Bryan Cave,
A Multinational
Partnership
London

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In re: Application of Union Electric Company For Authority to Participate in the Midwest ISO through a Contractual Relationship with Grid America	))))	Case No. EO-2003-0271

MISSOURI INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS' STATEMENT OF OPPOSITION TO THE PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE PROPOSED BY UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY

Comes now Alcoa Foil Products, Anheuser-Busch Companies, Inc., The Boeing Company, DaimlerChrysler, Ford Motor Company, General Motors Corporation, Hussmann Refrigeration, Monsanto Company, Pharmacia, Recoat Metals, Procter & Gamble Manufacturing, Nestlé Purina and Solutia, hereafter referred to as the Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers ("MIEC"), and files its statement in opposition to the alternative procedural schedule proposed by Union Electric Company ("UE") on March 7, 2003. For its response, the MIEC states as follows:

1. UE filed its Motion for Adoption of Expedited Procedural Schedule on February 13. Staff filed an alternative proposed schedule on February 24. The MIEC filed its response on February 24. The MIEC's response supported the Staff's alternative proposed schedule and opposed UE's proposed procedural schedule. UE filed its alternative procedural schedule on March 7.
2. The MIEC opposes the March 7 alternative schedule proposed by UE. The MIEC's witness Jim Dauphinais is unavailable on the hearing dates of June 26 and 27 proposed in that schedule. Mr. Dauphinais would be available during the prior week or the following week.
3. Counsel for the Commission Staff has informed the MIEC that the Staff supports the need for a procedural schedule which would accommodate Mr. Dauphinais.

4. The MIEC continues to support the alternative procedural schedule supported by the Commission Staff.

WHEREFORE, the MIEC requests that the Commission reject the alternative procedural schedule proposed by UE and adopt the alternative schedule proposed by the Commission Staff.. If the Commission nevertheless adopts the alternative procedural schedule proposed by UE, the MIEC requests that the Commission adjust the hearing dates to permit Mr. Dauphinais' appearance at the hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

BRYAN CAVE, LLP

By: Diana M. Vuylsteke

Diana M. Vuylsteke, #42419
211 N. Broadway, Suite 3600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
Telephone: (314) 259-2543
Facsimile: (314) 259-2020
E-mail: dmvuylsteke@bryancave.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been mailed to all parties on the Commission's service list by first class United States Mail this 10th day of March, 2003.

Diana M. Vuylsteke