One Ameren Plaza 1901 Chouteau Avenue PO Box 66149 St. Louis, MO 63166-6149 314.621.3222

314.554.2237 314.554.4014 (fax) JJCOOK@AMEREN.COM

April 30, 2001

VIA HAND DELIVERY



Mr. Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge Missouri Public Service Commission 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, MO 65101

Re: MPSC Case No. EM-2001-233

FILED³
APR 3 0 2001

Missouri Public Service Commission

Dear Mr. Roberts:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Union Electric Company, d/b/a AmerenUE, in the above matter, please find an original and eight (8) copies of its Response to Public Counsel's Motion in Support of Staff's Response to AmerenUE's Request For Leave to Withdraw Application For Transfer of Assets and Public Counsel's Further Request for an Order Establishing a Competitive Bidding Process.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this filing by stamping a copy of the enclosed letter and returning it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

Very truly yours,

James J. Cook

Managing Associate General Counsel

JJC/mlh Enclosures

CC:

Ms. Nancy Dippell

James J. Cook/sh

Parties on Attached Service List

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED ³	
APR 8 0 2001)

)	Service Commission Case No. EM-2001-233
)	
))))))

RESPONSE OF UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY TO PUBLIC COUNSEL'S MOTION IN SUPPORT OF STAFF'S RESPONSE TO COMPANY REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO WITHDRAW APPLICATION AND PUBLIC COUNSEL'S FURTHER REQUEST FOR AN ORDER ESTABLISHING A COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROCESS

COMES NOW Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE ("the Company" or "UE") and submits this Response to Public Counsel's ("OPC") Motion in Support of Staff's Response to the Company's March 29, 2001 filing ("Application") requesting leave to dismiss the instant proceeding and OPC's Further Request for an Order Establishing a Competitive Bidding Process ("Motion").

The Company strongly opposes the requests made by OPC in its filing.

Just as in Staff's filing, OPC does not provide any guidance to the Commission concerning whether the Commission should dismiss the instant case. Rather, just as Staff did in its filing, OPC expresses its unfocused concern about the status of the energy market in Missouri, and makes broad unhelpful requests to the Commission.

First, OPC indicates its support of the Staff's "requested relief" in the Staff's April 9, 2001 filing. Of course, neither Staff nor OPC even suggest that the "requested relief" has anything to do with the Company's request to dismiss the case.

142

Nor does OPC provide any real guidance as to how the "requested relief" is supposed to help AmerenUE's customers "have access to affordable and competitively priced electric supplies." Rather, like Staff, OPC seems more interested in punishing the Company for the transmission constraints that exist currently. In fact, OPC asks that AmerenEnergy Marketing Company's market based rate authority be revoked, while the Staff asked that AmerenUE's authority be revoked! Clearly, Staff's and OPC's unfocused effort to punish has outpaced their ability to adequately explain why such punishment should be imposed and what it has to do with the Company's request to dismiss this case.

OPC's other request appears to be for the Commission to open yet another docket, or undefined "process to obtain competitively priced power to serve its needs for the next ten years." OPC then provides a few thoughts on what that process should be like. Those suggestions, frankly are "Monday morning quarterbacking" ideas that may now seem appropriate because of the experience obtained in the recent RFP process. Frankly, the Company can, and will modify its RFP process, as appropriate, based on updated information obtained from the last RFP and a variety of other sources, all without the benefit of another Commission docket.

In addition, as indicated in OPC's filing, the process included in the Stipulation in EA-2000-37 already includes active participation by Staff and OPC in the RFP process. In fact, both actively participated in the RFP process just recently completed. Obviously, Staff and OPC will be invited to participate in future efforts, as well. The Company certainly intends to abide by its prior Stipulations and Agreements.

There are several Orders and Stipulations and Agreements already in place that provide the Staff and OPC with opportunities to participate at a level that all parties found appropriate.

The Company intends to continue to abide by those Commission directives, and sees no reason to reopen all of them, which would be the effect of OPC's request.

The Company maintains that the existing laws, rules, regulations, orders, stipulations and agreements, as well as the informal meetings and submissions that are a part of those more formal processes, are adequately providing the guidance and direction that the Company needs to meet, and exceed its obligations. The punitive suggestions of the Office of Public Counsel should be rejected by the Commission.

This case should be dismissed, forthwith.

Dated April 30, 2001

Respectfully submitted, Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE

Bv:

James J. Cook, MBE #22697 Ameren Services Company One Ameren Plaza 1901 Chouteau Avenue P. O. Box 66149 (MC1310)

rames G. Cook / sh

St. Louis, MO 63166-6149

314-554-2237

314-554-4014 (fax)

jjcook@ameren.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served on the following parties of record via U.S. First-Class Mail on this 30th day of April, 2001:

General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission P. O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Office of the Public Counsel P. O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, MO 65102

Diana M. Vuylsteke Bryan Cave LLP One Metropolitan Square 211 North Broadway, Suite 3600 St. Louis, MO 63102-2750

Robert C. Johnson Attorney at Law 720 Olive Street, Suite 2400 St. Louis, MO 63101

Robin E. Fulton Schnapp, Fulton, Fall, McNamara & Silvey 135 E. Main Street P.O. Box 151 Fredericktown, MO 63645

James J. Cook /sh