

3. Following the on-the-record portion of the prehearing conference, the Parties met and determined that the best way to proceed would be to hold a technical conference addressing not only the federal standard that is the subject of this case, but also the federal standards

addressed in Case Nos. EO-2006-0494, EO-2006-0495, EO-2006-0496 and EO-2006-0497, respectively. The technical conference is expected to chart a course for each of the standards at issue. Following the technical conference the Parties will be in a better position to advise the Commission regarding the type of additional proceedings that may be necessary in each case to comply with the requirements of the Act, and when possible, to recommend a more detailed procedural schedule for specific cases. It is very possible that consolidation of some cases and/or a recommendation to close some cases could result. Unanimity as to how best to proceed may not be achieved by the technical conference. All Parties retain their rights to present to the Commission their positions on these matters.

4. Accordingly, the Parties request that the Commission order a technical conference to take place on Friday, September 22 beginning at 10:00 a.m. in Room 315 of the Commission's offices in the Governor Office Building in Jefferson City.

5. At the August 4th prehearing conference, the Parties also discussed Staff's suggestion that the technical conference might be more productive if Party positions on certain procedural matters were known in advance. Staff proposed to develop a list of questions for each case and to make a request that the Commission order the Parties in each case to file responses no later than one week prior to the technical conference. Since no Parties were opposed to this proposal, the Parties request that the Commission order the Parties to this proceeding to respond to each of the following questions:

- a) Can this case be closed based on "prior state actions" as provided in Section 1251 (b)(3) of the Act [16 U.S.C. 2622(d)], and why or why not?
- b) Can this case be consolidated with any, some or all of the following cases—EO-2006-0494, EO-2006-0495, EO-2006-0496 and EO-2006-0497—because the issues addressed in one or more of these cases are similar, and why or why not?
- c) What type of proceeding (e.g., rulemaking, rate case implementation, etc.) should the Commission use to address the issues in this case in order to meet the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 ("PURPA") Section 111(a) and 111(b)

“consideration and determination” requirements [16 U.S.C. 2621(a), 2621(b)], and why?

6. Counsel for the Parties as identified on the attached service list have authorized counsel for the Staff to make the representations contained herein.

WHEREFORE, the Staff requests leave to late-file the jointly proposed procedural schedule. In addition, the Parties in this case jointly request: 1) that the Commission establish a technical conference on Friday, September 22, 2006 to address the federal standards and further proceedings in this case and those in Case Nos. EO-2006-0494, EO-2006-0495, EO-2006-0496 and EO-2006-0497; and 2) that the Commission order the Parties in this case to respond to the Staff questions posed in this pleading no later than one week prior to the technical conference to ensure that all Parties have adequate time to consider the responses before the technical conference.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dennis L. Frey by SD

Dennis L. Frey

Senior Counsel

Missouri Bar No. 44697

Attorney for the Staff of the
Missouri Public Service Commission

P.O. Box 360

Jefferson City, MO 65102

573-751-8700 (telephone)

573-751-9285 (fax)

e-mail: denny.frey@psc.mo.gov

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been mailed by first-class mail, hand-delivered, transmitted by facsimile or e-mailed to all counsel of record this 16th day of August 2006.

/s/ Steven Dottheim