

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

In the Matter of the Application of)	
Union Electric Company for Authority)	
To Continue the Transfer of)	Case No. EO-2011-0128
Functional Control of Its Transmission)	
System to the Midwest Independent)	
Transmission System Operator, Inc.)	

**STATEMENT OF POSITION OF
MIDWEST INDEPENDENT TRANSMISSION SYSTEM OPERATOR, INC.**

Pursuant to the Commission’s Order Establishing Procedural Schedule of July 1, 2011, Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc. (“MISO”) states the following with regard to the list of issues submitted by the parties on November 14 and the positions that MISO is taking, if any, on those issues:

LIST OF ISSUES

1. *Is an extension of the term of the Commission’s permission for Ameren Missouri to transfer functional control of Ameren Missouri’s transmission system to the Midwest ISO, on the terms and conditions set out in the Non-unanimous Stipulation and Agreement filed in this docket on November 27, 2011, not detrimental to the public interest?*

Yes, such an extension, as recommended by Mr. Arora in his surrebuttal testimony, is not detrimental to the public interest.

2. *What constitutes proving “not detrimental to the public interest” in File No. EO-2011-0128?*

(a) What “public” is the appropriate public?

(b) What “interest” is the appropriate interest?

(c) How is “not detrimental” measured?

MISO concurs with the positions taken by Ameren Missouri.

3. *May the Commission impose the conditions on such a transfer that are reflected at page 12, lines 22 - 28 of the Rebuttal Testimony of Ryan Kind? If so, should the Commission do so?*

MISO takes no position on this issue.

4. *May the Commission impose the conditions on such a transfer that are reflected at page 17, lines 1 – 3 of the Rebuttal Testimony of Ryan Kind? If so, should the Commission do so?*

MISO takes no position on this issue.

5. *If the Commission agrees that such extension of the term for Ameren Missouri to transfer functional control of Ameren Missouri’s transmission system to the Midwest ISO should be granted on the terms outlined at page 19, line 19 to page 21, line 2 of Ajay Arora’s surrebuttal testimony, should the conditions as proposed by Marlin Vrbas in his testimony, pp. 13-16, be required of Ameren Missouri before any continued transfer of authority is granted? What continuing opportunities and mechanisms for re-examining Ameren Missouri’s participation in MISO, if any, should be granted to the parties in this case?*

No. There are sufficient “opportunities and mechanisms” to review Ameren Missouri’s membership in MISO under the current terms and conditions approved by this Commission, as well as in the terms and conditions proposed by Mr. Arora in his surrebuttal testimony.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Karl Zobrist

Karl Zobrist MBN 28325
Lisa A. Gilbreath MBN 62271
SNR Denton US LLP
4520 Main Street, Suite 1100
Kansas City, MO 64111
(816) 460-2400
(816) 531-7545 (fax)
karl.zobrist@snrdenton.com
lisa.gilbreath@snrdenton.com

Matthew R. Dorsett
Attorney, Legal Department
Midwest Independent Transmission System
Operator, Inc.
720 City Center Drive
Carmel, IN 46032
(317) 249-5400
mdorsett@midwestiso.org

Attorneys for Midwest Independent Transmission
System Operator, Inc.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was e-mailed on this 17th day of November, 2011, to the persons on the Commission's service list in this case.

/s/ Lisa A. Gilbreath

Attorney for Midwest Independent Transmission
System Operator, Inc.