

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

Noranda Aluminum, Inc., et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	
v.)	
)	Case No. EC-2014-0224
Union Electric Company,)	
d/b/a Ameren Missouri,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

CONTINENTAL CEMENT COMPANY, L.L.C.’s
STATEMENT OF POSITION

COMES NOW Continental Cement Company, L.L.C. (hereinafter sometimes “Continental Cement”), by and through counsel, and submits this statement of position on the list of issues filed by the parties in this case on June 4, 2014:

Issue 1. Is Noranda experiencing a liquidity crisis such that it is likely to cease operations at its New Madrid smelter if it cannot obtain relief of the sort sought here?

b. If so, can the Commission lawfully grant the requested relief?

Position: **The Commission is subject to strict limitations on approving discriminatory rates. Based upon the facts and circumstances of this matter, it would be unlawful, unjust and unreasonable for the Commission to grant the relief requested in the complaint.**

Issue 3. Would it be more beneficial to Ameren Missouri’s ratepayers other than Noranda for Noranda to remain on Ameren Missouri’s system at the requested reduced rate than for Noranda to leave Ameren Missouri’s system entirely?

Position: **To the extent a reduced rate(s) for Noranda fails to recover Ameren’s cost of service to Noranda, and the rates of Ameren’s other customers are increased to recover that cost, there is no benefit to the public interest and there is no benefit to Ameren Missouri ratepayers.**

Issue 4. Is it appropriate to redesign Ameren Missouri’s tariffs and rates on the basis of Noranda’s proposal, as described in its Direct Testimony and updated in its Surrebuttal Testimony?

Position: To the extent Noranda's proposed rate design would lower its rate(s) for service below Ameren's cost of serving Noranda, and in turn increase the rates of Ameren's other customers to cover that cost, Noranda's rate design proposal is inappropriate.

d. If so, should the resulting revenue deficiency be made up by other rate payers in whole or in part?

Position: Ameren's other rate payers should be held harmless from any rate design modification approved in this case that results in a revenue deficiency for Ameren.

Issue 6. Should Noranda be served at a rate materially different than Ameren Missouri's fully distributed cost to serve them? If so, at what rate?

Position: Noranda should not be served by Ameren at a rate below Ameren's true cost of serving Noranda, which in turn results in increased rates for Ameren's other customers.

Continental Cement takes no position on the other issues set out by the parties, without impairment of its right to brief and argue those issues to the Commission as the evidence may unfold at hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark W. Comley

Mark W. Comley #28847
NEWMAN, COMLEY & RUTH P.C.
601 Monroe Street, Suite 301
P.O. Box 537
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0537
(573) 634-2266
(573) 636-3306 (FAX)

Attorneys for Continental Cement Company, L.L.C.

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was sent via e-mail on this 6th day of June, 2014, to:

General Counsel's Office at staffcounsel@psc.mo.gov;
Office of Public Counsel at opcservice@ded.mo.gov;
Kevin Thompson at kevin.thompson@psc.mo.gov;
Stephanie S. Bell at sbell@blitzbardgett.com;
Thomas r. Schwarz at tschwarz@blitzbardgett.com;
Edward F. Downey at efdowney@bryancave.com;
Diana M. Vuylsteke at dmvuylsteke@bryancave.com;
Lisa C. Langeneckert at llangeneckert@att.net;
Marcos Barbosa at barbosa@bscr-law.com;
Rick D. Chamberlain at rchamberlain@okenergylaw.com;
Russ Mitten at rmitten@brydonlaw.com;
James B. Lowery at lowery@smithlewis.com;
Michael R. Tripp at tripp@smithlewis.com;
Thomas M. Byrne at AmerenMOService@ameren.com;
Carl Lumley at clumley@lawfirmemail.com;
Leland B. Curtis at lcurtis@lawfirmemail.com;
John B. Coffman at john@johncoffman.net.

/s/ Mark W. Comley