

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a)
AmerenUE for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing)
Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers)
In the Company's Missouri Service Area)

Case No. ER-2011-0028

CONCURRING OPINION OF COMMISSIONER TERRY M. JARRETT

Because I have no substantive objection to allowing the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Missouri Coalition for the Environment d/b/a Renew Missouri to intervene, I concur in the result, but once again I am compelled to write because the applications to intervene do not comply with the Commission's intervention rules. I believe our standard procedure should be to allow the applicants to cure such deficiencies when we receive such applications.¹

My Dissenting Opinion in Case ER-2010-0036 details the requirements for an application to intervene as well as the standard for granting intervention. Additionally, my concerns regarding deficient applications to intervene, and the granting of such deficient applications by the Commission, are also discussed in my Dissent.

Apparently, our intervention rules as promulgated are too difficult for some attorneys licensed in this state to follow, given the multiple times I have pointed out deficiencies in applications to intervene.² I am hopeful that the proposed rewrite of the intervention rules in the AX-2011-0094 docket will fix this reoccurring problem.

Respectfully Submitted,



Terry M. Jarrett

Submitted this 27th day of October, 2010.

¹ See *Dissenting Opinion of Commissioner Terry M. Jarrett*, Case ER-2010-0036, September 17, 2009.

² Most attorneys who practice before the Commission do scrupulously follow the rules, and this Commissioner appreciates all who make every effort to follow our rules.