

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)	<u>Case No. ER-2007-0002</u>
Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers)	Tariff No. YE-2007-0007
in the Company's Missouri Service Area.)	

ORDER CLARIFYING ORDER ADOPTING PROCEDURAL
SCHEDULE AND TEST YEAR

Issue Date: October 11, 2006

Effective Date: October 11, 2006

On September 12, 2006, the Commission issued its Order Adopting Procedural Schedule and Test Year in this case (Procedural Order). On September 22, 2006, the Commission issued a notice clarifying statutory requirements for filing electronic documents. The September 22nd notice also corrected a typographical error in the Procedural Order, by changing the date for the list of issues to be circulated to all parties, from January 27, 2007, to January 26, 2007.

Two parties to this case¹ have expressed concern that the Commission's Procedural Order did not include an ordered paragraph expressly requiring the parties to this case to comply with modifications to standard discovery methodology agreed to by those same parties in their Jointly Proposed Procedural Schedule and Request for Other Procedural Items, filed on August 29, 2006 (Joint Proposal). The Commission acknowledged the modifications in question on page 2 of its Procedural Order which reads in pertinent part:

¹ On September 20, 2006, Noranda Aluminum, Inc., filed an Application for Rehearing or Reconsideration of Order Of September 12, 2006; On October 10, 2006, the Commission's Staff filed a motion in support, in part, of Noranda Aluminum, Inc.'s September 20, 2006 Application.

The proposed procedural schedule contains some unusual features. After January 31, 2007, the parties have agreed to shorten the interval allowed for responding to discovery. The parties have also agreed to serve copies of Data Requests upon all parties. The parties have also made arrangements as to the provision of copies of work papers and of electronic copies of prefiled testimony.

Since these procedural and discovery modifications were agreed to by all parties, the Commission did not specifically set them out in an ordered paragraph.

The Commission would expect the parties to comply with their mutually agreed upon procedural and discovery modifications. However, to alleviate party concerns, the Commission will specifically order compliance with those modifications.

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. In addition to the procedural requirements contained in the Commission's September 22, 2006 Order Adopting Procedural Schedule and Test Year, all parties to this case will comply with the procedural requirements set out in paragraphs 3. (c), (d), (e) and (g) of the Jointly Proposed Procedural Schedule and Request for Other Procedural Items, filed in this case on August 29, 2006.

2. This order shall become effective on October 11, 2006.

(S E A L)

BY THE COMMISSION

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

Colleen M. Dale
Secretary

Cherlyn D. Voss, Regulatory Law Judge,
by delegation of authority pursuant to
Section 386.240, RSMo 2000.

Dated at Jefferson City, Missouri,
on this 11th day of October, 2006.