BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Staff of the Missouri Public Service)
Commission,)
Complainant,))
v.)
Missouri Pipeline Company, LLC, Missouri Gas Company, LLC, et.al.) Case No. GC-2006-0491
Respondents.))
)
)

RESPONDENTS' POSITION STATEMENTS AND ORDER OF CROSS-EXAMINATION

COME NOW the Respondents, and for their Position Statements and proposed Order of Cross state as follows;-

Issues:

1. Did MPC and MGC violate the terms of their tariffs and Commission affiliate transactions rules (4 CSR 240-40.016) by permitting Omega Pipeline Company to use confidential customer information in a discriminatory manner for each of Omega's contracts with customers served by MPC and MGC?

Respondents Position:

Respondents did not violate the terms of their tariffs or the Commission affiliate transaction rules and did not permit Omega Pipeline Company, LLC (Omega) to use confidential customer information in a discriminatory manner. Omega was consistently charged the highest transportation rate under Respondents' tariffs and therefore Omega could not

possibly have improperly used confidential customer information. Staff has failed to provide any competent and substantial evidence to support the allegation raised by this issue.

2.	Did MGC and MPC violate their	tarif	fs by tran	sport	ing natural	gas to O	mega
customers	**	**	without	an	executed	transport	ation
agreement?							
Resp	pondents Position:						
Resp	pondents did not violate their tariffs by	/ tran	sporting r	atura	l gas to On	nega custo	mers
**	** withou	t aı	n execute	ed t	ransportatio	on agreer	nent.
Respondent	s did not transport gas on behalf of any	y shij	oper witho	ut a 1	ransportation	on contrac	t. **
	** were not	ship	pers on R	lespo	ndents syst	ems. The	e gas
supply con	tracts between two non-regulated e	entitio	es are be	yond	the juriso	diction of	this

3. Did MPC and MGC provide transportation service to its affiliate, Omega, at a discounted rate and if so, should this rate become the maximum rate that MPC and MGC could charge for any of its non-affiliated customers for similar services?

Respondents' shippers in contradiction to Respondents' written agreements. Staff has failed to

provide any competent and substantial evidence to support the allegation raised by this issue.

Similarly there is no lawful authority to arbitrarily determine who are

Respondents Position:

Commission

Respondents charged Omega rates higher than any shippers so rates to other customers' cannot be modified retroactively. Staff should not be permitted to: (i) disregard the contracts between Respondents and their shippers; i) attack Respondents for shared personnel with Omega after such had been fully disclosed;. (iii) disregard agency contracts between non-regulated parties (iv) misinterpret tariff provisions;(v) compare Respondents' rates without

applying the tariff required load factor;; or (vi) request refunds not lawfully mandated. Staff has failed to provide any competent and substantial evidence to support the allegations raised by this issue.

. a) If the above issues are answered in the affirmative, should MPC and MGC issue refunds for overcharges.

Respondents Position;

See foregoing statement.

b) If the above issues are answered in the affirmative, should MPC's and MGC's current charges be reduced so that the rates charged to non-affiliated shippers for transportation is the same as the rates charged to Omega.

Respondents Position;

See foregoing statement.

4. Did MPC and MGC violate their tariffs by failing to report their offer of discounted transportation service to its affiliate, Omega, in its second quarter and third quarter 2003 reports to the Commission's Energy Staff?

Respondents Position;

Respondents did not charge Omega rates lower than non affiliates, but rather charged Omega rates higher than any other shipper on the Respondents' pipelines. Any required reports of any discount to Omega were properly reported to the Commission's Energy Staff and thus no tariff violation occurred. Staff has failed to provide any competent and substantial evidence to support the allegations raised by this issue.

5. Did MGC construct a lateral line for ** _____** to benefit its affiliate,

Omega, without demanding reimbursement from either Omega or **____** in

violation of its tariff?

Respondents Position;

Respondents did not improperly build or pay for a new delivery meter station on Missouri Gas Company's system. The subject construction project was for the benefit of MGC not Omega. There has been no tariff violation. The prudence of Respondents' business judgment to additional business by paying for (entirely by its stakeholders at their sole financial risk) additional pipeline facilities cannot be attacked in the context of this complaint case. Staff has failed to provide any competent and substantial evidence to support the allegations raised by this issue.

6. Did MPC and MGC violate their respective tariffs by providing preferential terms of payment to their affiliate, Omega?

Respondents' Position:

Omega paid its invoices from the Respondents faster than any other shipper. Staff has failed to provide any competent and substantial evidence to support the allegations raised by this issue. Staff Witness Schallenberg in his Surrebuttal testimony, filed on November 17, 2006 represented that Staff has dropped this count from its complaint.

.ORDER OF CROSS-EXAMINATION

Witness Schallenberg

Ameren UE, Federal Executive Agencies, Public

Counsel, MGCM, MGC &MPC

Witness Imhoff Same

Witness Massman Same

Witness John Ameren UE, Federal Executive Agencies, Public

Counsel, MGCM, Staff

Witness Smith Same

Witness Reis Same

Respectfully submitted,

LATHROP & GAGE, L.C.

/s/ Paul S. DeFord_

Paul S. DeFord Mo. #29509

Suite 2800

2345 Grand Boulevard

Kansas City, MO 64108-2612 Telephone: (816) 292-2000 Facsimile: (816) 292-2001

raesimile. (810) 292-2001

Aimee DG. Davenport Mo. #50989

314 E. High Street

Jefferson City, MO 65101 Phone: (573) 893-4336 FAX: (573) 893-5398

Email: adavenport@lathropgage.com

Attorneys for Respondents

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Respondents' Position Statements and Order of Cross-Examination has been transmitted by e-mail or mailed, First Class, postage prepaid, this 1st day of December, 2006, to:

* Case No. GC-2006-0491

Name of Company Name of Party	Email Phone Fax	Mailing Address	Street Address	City	State	Zip
Missouri Public Service Commission General Counsel Office	GenCounsel@psc.mo.gov 573-751-2690 573-751-9285	P.O. Box 360	200 Madison Street, Suite 800	Jefferson City	MO	65102
Office of Public Counsel Mills Lewis	opcservice@ded.mo.gov 573-751-1304 573-751-5562	P.O. Box 2230	200 Madison Street, Suite 650	Jefferson City	МО	65102
AmerenUE Durley, Colly	Durley@smithlewis.com 573-443-3141 Ext 234 573-442-6686	P.O. Box 918	111 S. Ninth St., Suite 200	Columbia	МО	65205- 0918
AmerenUE Lowery James	lowery@smithlewis.com 573-443-3141 573-448-6686	P.O. Box 918	111 S. Ninth St., Suite 200	Columbia	МО	65205- 0918
AmerenUE Byrne Thomas	tbyrne@ameren.com 314.554.2514 314.554.4014	P.O. Box 66149 (MC 1310)	1901 Chouteau Avenue	St. Louis	MO	63166- 6149
Missouri Public Service Commission Shemwell Lera	Lera.Shemwell@psc.mo.gov	P.O. Box 360	200 Madison Street, Suite 800	Jefferson City	MO	65102
Municipal Gas Commission of Missouri Woodsmall David	dwoodsmall@fcplaw.com 573-635-2700 573-635-6998		428 E. Capitol Ave., Suite 300	Jefferson City	MO	65102
Municipal Gas Commission of Missouri Conrad Stuart	stucon@fcplaw.com 816-753-1122 816-756-0373		3100 Broadway, Suite 1209	Kansas City	MO	64111

Municipal	dkincheloe@mpua.org	2407 W.	Columbia	MO	65203
Gas	573-445-3279	Ash			
Commission	573-445-0680				
of Missouri					
Kincheloe					
Duncan					

/s/ Paul S. DeFord

Attorney for Respondents