

**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.)	

**SECOND REVISED STATEMENT OF POSITION OF THE MISSOURI
JOINT MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

COME NOW the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission (“MJMEUC”), by and through their attorney Douglas L. Healy, and hereby states the following with regard to the revised list of issues submitted by the parties on January 25 and the position that MJMEUC 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 17, 2011, not detrimental to the public interest?*

No, such an extension on the terms and conditions outlined above would be 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?*

MJMEUC adopts the position as set forth by The Empire District Electric Company in their First and Second Revised Statement of Position.

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?*

MJMEUC 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?*

MJMEUC takes no position on this issue.

5. *Can the Commission condition Ameren Missouri's participation in MISO on the application of the existing terms and conditions applied to Ameren Missouri transmission assets (e.g., Section 5.3 of the Service Agreement and paragraphs (b) through (h) at pages 9-14 of the Ameren Missouri Verified Application in File No. EO-2011-0128) to any affiliate to which Ameren Missouri seeks to transfer transmission assets? If so, should the Commission do so as recommended at page 22, lines 3-27 of the Rebuttal Testimony of Adam C. McKinnie?*

MJMEUC takes no position on this issue.

6. *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?*

MJMEUC supports the position of Mr. Vrbas, and states that any party to this case should be allowed the future opportunity to petition the MoPSC to open a docket to investigate an event that could cause continued participation in MISO by Ameren Missouri to be detrimental to the public interest.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Douglas L. Healy

Douglas L. Healy

Missouri Bar No. 51630

Healy & Healy, LLC

939 Boonville, Suite A

Springfield, Missouri 65802

Telephone: (417) 864-8800

Facsimile: (417) 869-6811

Email: dhealy@mpua.org

ATTORNEY FOR MJMEUC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing application to intervene out of time was served by e-mailing a copy to all parties on the Commission's Service List this 27th day of January, 2012.

/s/ Douglas L. Healy

DOUGLAS L. HEALY