NEWMAN, COMLEY & RUTH
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW
MONROE BLUFF EXECUTIVE CENTER
601 MONROE STREET, SUITE 301
P.O. BOX 537
JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102-0537

ROBERT K. ANGSTEAD
MARK W. COMLEY
CATHLEEN A. MARTIN
STEPHEN G. NEWMAN
JOHN A. RUTH
D. GREGORY STONEBARGER

TELEPHONE: (573) 634-2266
FACSIMILE: (573) 636-3306

June 26, 2000

The Honorable Dale Hardy Roberts
Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge
Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0360

FILED[2]
JUN 26 2000
Missouri Public Service Commission

Re: Case No. EM-2000-292

Dear Judge Roberts:

Enclosed for filing in the above referenced matter, please find the original and eight copies of a Statement of Position on Issues of St. Joseph Light & Power Company.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this filing. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

NEWMAN, COMLEY & RUTH P.C.

By: Mark W. Comley
Mark W. Comley
comleym@ncrpc.com

MWC:ab
Enclosure
cc: Office of Public Counsel
General Counsel's Office
Gary L. Myers
James C. Swearengen
Stuart W. Conrad
Karl Zobrist
Shelley A. Woods
William J. Niehoff
Jeffrey A. Keevil

FILED[2]

JUN 2 6 2000

Missouri Public Service Commission

BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the matter of the Joint Application of UtiliCorp United Inc. and St. Joseph Light & Power Company for authority to merge St. Joseph Light & Power Company with and into UtiliCorp United Inc. and, in connection therewith, certain other related transactions.	)	Case No. EM-2000-292

STATEMENT OF POSITION ON ISSUES OF ST. JOSEPH LIGHT & POWER COMPANY

I. Does the proposed merger and related transactions and proposals satisfy the not detrimental to the public interest standard required for the approval of mergers by the Commission?

Yes. The proposed merger and related transactions and proposals satisfy the not detrimental to the public interest standard.

Merger Costs/Benefits

(1) Under reasonable assumptions, do estimated merger savings exceed estimated merger costs?

Yes. St. Joseph Light & Power Company (SJLP) believes that merger savings exceed merger costs.

(2) If under reasonable merger assumptions, estimated merger savings do not exceed estimated merger costs should the merger be approved as being not detrimental to the public interest?

SJLP supports Utilicorp United, Inc. 's (UCU) separate statement of position on this issue.

Regulatory Plan - Overall:

(1) Should the Companies' proposed regulatory plan for treating merger related savings and costs in rates be adopted in total as not detrimental to the public interest?

Yes. SJLP believes the regulatory plan is not detrimental to the public interest.

(2) Should SJLP be placed under a rate "moratorium" for Years 1-5 after the closing of the merger?

Yes. This is a component of the overall regulatory plan, which benefits SJLP's customers.

Acquisition Adjustment:

(1) Should the amortization of one-half of the acquisition adjustment and the return on the unamortized portion of one-half of the acquisition adjustment be treated above-the-line for rate purposes in Years 6-10 following the closing of the merger as the Companies propose?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan.

(2) Should the amortization of the acquisition adjustment begin at the closing of the merger between SJLP and UCU?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan, and is required by sound accounting principles.

(3) Should any portion of the acquisition adjustment ever be included in rates for (a) "recovery of" the acquisition adjustment (amortization of the acquisition adjustment) and (b) "return on" the acquisition adjustment (rate base component of the unamortized balance of the acquisition adjustment)?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan.

Estimated Merger Savings:

(1) Should the Companies' estimate of merger savings and merger costs be relied upon by the Commission in its findings regarding the Merger Application?

Yes.

(2) Does the Companies' estimate of generation/joint dispatch savings reflect only impacts directly attributable to the merger?

Yes. SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(3) Does the Companies' estimate of merger savings reflect the expected operation of the UCU and SJLP pension plans following closing of the merger?.

Yes.

Savings Tracking/Benchmark

(1) Should the Companies' proposal for utilizing a savings tracking system for identifying and quantifying merger related savings in Years 6-10, after the closing of the merger, be adopted?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan.

(2) If the Commission finds that establishing a merger savings tracking system is necessary, should this tracking system be in place for Years 1-5, as well as for Years 6-10, after the closing of the merger?

SJLP believes that this is an issue for future ratemaking proceedings.

(3) Should the Companies' proposal for establishing a guaranteed merger revenue requirement benefit to SJLP customers of at least $1.6 million for each year of Years 6-10, following the closing of the merger, be adopted?

Yes. SJLP supports this proposed component of the regulatory plan.

(4) If "yes" to question 3 above, what period of time should be used as a "baseline" for the purpose of measuring future merger savings?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(5) Should actual or budgeted amounts be used for purposes of establishing a savings tracking "baseline"?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(6) If a baseline using actual amounts is adopted, what baseline and what adjustments to the "baseline" are appropriate for this purpose?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Frozen Capital Structure:

(1) Should SJLP divisional customer rates in Years 6-10, after the closing of the merger, be calculated, as proposed by the Companies, using the stand-alone SJLP capital structure advocated by the Staff in Case No. ER-99-247?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan.

Corporate Allocations:

(1) Does the Companies' allocation of escalated corporate overhead costs to the SJLP division represent a reasonable assumption as to an escalation rate to be applied to these allocated costs?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan.

(2) Following the closing of the merger, should MPS divisional customer rates be calculated using levels of UCU corporate overhead allocated costs that assume the non-inclusion of SJLP in the UCU corporate structure?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan.

MPS Savings Assignment:

(1) Should no or very little merger savings and costs be reflected in the MPS divisional customer rates after the closing of the merger, as proposed by the Companies?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan.

Electric Allocations Agreement:

(1) How should the energy costs and profits from off-system sales associated with the joint dispatch of MPS and SJLP power supply resources be allocated

between these two post-merger UCU divisions?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(2) Should the Electric Allocations Agreement include the specific calculations for estimating energy cost savings from joint dispatch and increased profits from off-system sales?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Transaction Costs:

(1) Should the Companies recover in rates the transaction costs associated with the merger?

Yes. This should be adopted since it is a component of the regulatory plan

(2) If yes to question 1, over what period of time should these costs be amortized into cost of service?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(3) If yes to question 1, what portion of transaction costs should be assigned to nonregulated operations?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Costs to Achieve:

(1) Should the Companies recover in rates the "costs to achieve" associated with executive severance payments?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(2) Should the Companies recover in rates the costs of the "paid advisory board"?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(3) Should the Companies recover in rates the costs associated with full funding of SJLP's Supplemental Executive Retirement Plan?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(4) For those "costs to achieve" that are deemed eligible for rate recovery, how should they be accounted for pending consideration in a future general rate proceeding?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Market Power

(1) Will a post-merger UCU possess more horizontal, vertical, or retail market power?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(2) If the answer to Question 1 is yes, will the additional vertical or retail market power possessed by a post-merger UCU be detrimental to the public interest and will the risk of additional horizontal market power possessed by a post-merger UCU be detrimental to the public interest?

(3) Will the merger allow the Companies to take valuable, limited transmission capacity necessary for other Missouri utilities to maintain deliveries under their purchased power contracts?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Transmission Access and Reliability:

(1) Have the Companies conducted and provided adequate studies of the impact of the proposed merger upon transmission facilities within, and interconnecting with, the State of Missouri, and upon all providers of electric service in the State, to prove that the proposed merger is not detrimental to the public interest?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(2) Will the proposed merger provide the Companies the ability to gain unduly preferential priority of access to limited transmission facilities and/or exercise their post-merger transmission access anti-competitively, to the detriment of other customers in the State and therefore to the detriment of the public?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(3) Could a post-merger UCU refunctionalize its transmission facilities in anti-competitive ways to the detriment of the public?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(4) Do the companies being merged adhere to a single, consistent set of standards for designing and operating their transmission facilities and, if not, would not adhering to a single, consistent set of standards for designing and operating their transmission facilities be detrimental if the merger is approved?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Stranded Costs:

(1) Would ratepayers be harmed if UCU were allowed to include any portion of the acquisition adjustment in its future calculation of stranded costs?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Synergies In Unregulated Operations:

(1) Are some of the synergies (e.g., generation) included in the 10-year merger synergy calculations likely to accrue primarily to shareholders if electric restructuring occurs in Missouri prior to the end of the 10-year period used to calculate the merger synergies?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(2) Will UCU receive additional benefits from the proposed merger that are not reflected in the 10-year merger synergy calculations?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Affiliate Transactions:

(1) Will UCU's affiliate transactions, as a result of the proposed merger, increase in size and scope and thus become more complex and difficult to monitor, while at the same time it will become more important to monitor such transactions to ensure compliance with standards?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Steam/Gas Service:

(1) For the steam/gas customers of SJLP, does the analysis of the Companies show that the costs of the proposed merger exceed the savings of the proposed merger?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Energy Efficiency:

(1) Will the proposed merger have a detrimental impact on low-income weatherization and therefore on the public?

No.

(2) Will the proposed merger have a detrimental impact on other energy efficiency assistance and therefore on the public?

No.

(3) Will the proposed merger have a detrimental impact on the use of renewable energy resources and therefore the public?

No.

II. If the adoption of conditions by the Commission cannot in the view of particular parties eliminate in total the situation that the proposed merger is detrimental to the public interest, but regardless of this view of particular parties, the Commission decides to approve the proposed merger, should the Commission adopt any or all of the following conditions, as part of its approval of the Companies' merger?

Stranded Costs Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed condition regarding elimination of the acquisition adjustment from future stranded cost calculations be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Pension Funds Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed condition requiring maintaining the pre-merger funded status of SJLP's pension fund for calculating FAS 87 pension cost, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Access to Book and Records Condition:

(1) Should the OPC's condition that the merged entity be required to allow OPC and the Staff access to its books, records, employees and officers and those of its wholly owned subsidiaries, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Affiliate Transactions Condition:

(1) Should the OPC's condition that the merged entity be required to agree to comply with the Commission's affiliate transaction rules, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Income Taxes Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed condition regarding customer protections in the event the merger is treated as a "taxable" transaction be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Surveillance Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed conditions regarding continued submission of separate "surveillance" reports for UCU and SJLP, following closing of the merger, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Customer Service Indicators Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed conditions regarding measurement, reporting and potential imposition of remedial action concerning certain customer service indicators be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Gas Supply RFP Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed condition regarding use of "request for proposals" for MPS and SJLP gas supply, following closing of the merger, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Gas Peak Load Study Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed condition regarding performance of a peak design day study for SJLP's gas operations, following closing of the merger, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Market Power Conditions:

(1) Respecting vertical market power, should the Staff's condition that the Companies be required to commit to join a single regional transmission entity before the October 15, 2000 deadline of FERC Order No. 2000, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(2) Respecting horizontal market power, should the Staff's condition that at the time retail competition becomes lawful in Missouri the Companies be required to agree to submit a study showing what percentage of load throughout their merged service territory can be served from competitive generation sources, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(3) Respecting horizontal market power, should OPC's condition that, the Companies be required to agree that they will be subject to the same Horizontal Market Power Provisions that were approved by the Commission in Case No. EM-97-515 be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(4) Respecting vertical market power, should OPC's condition that the Companies be required to agree to join a Regional Transmission Organization (RTO) under the same Vertical Market Power Provisions that were approved by the Commission in Case No. EM-97-515 be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(5) Respecting retail market power, should OPC's condition that the Companies be required to agree that they will be subject to the same Retail Market Power Provisions that were approved by the Commission in Case No. EM-97-515 be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(6) Respecting horizontal, vertical, and retail market power, should OPC's

condition that the Companies be required to agree that they will be subject to the same Market Power Legislation Provisions that were approved by the Commission in Case No. EM-97-515 be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(7) Respecting transmission capacity, should Springfield's proposed conditions regarding Transmission Access and Reliability (which are set forth in detail herein under the heading "Transmission Access and Reliability Conditions") be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Transmission Access and Reliability Conditions:

(1) (a) Should the Commission order the Joint Applicants to conduct production cost, load flow and stability studies of the impact of the proposed merger upon transmission facilities within, and interconnecting with, the State of Missouri, and upon all providers of electric service in the State, prior to approval of the merger and if so, what should such studies contain? (b) Should the Joint Applicants be ordered to provide these studies in hard copy and electronic form to the other parties, and should the Commission keep this case open until such time as the studies have been completed and all parties have been allowed sufficient time to review/analyze and file comments in this case on such studies? (c) Should the Joint Applicants be required to construct and/or upgrade, at their expense, transmission facilities necessary to insure that their integrated operation will not adversely impact others? (d) If the answer to (c) is yes, what transmission facilities?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(2) Should the Commission impose conditions on the merger such that:

- The Joint Applicants be required by the Commission to commit that with respect to any and all generating resources associated with any one of their existing four control areas (including purchased generating resources) serving load in any other control area of the merging companies, the merging companies should waive or not assert: (i) native load priority on scheduling and curtailing non-firm network transmission service; (ii) the native load preference arguably accorded to bundled retail loads over wholesale loads under the decision in Northern States Power Co. v. FERC, 176 F.3d 1090 (8th Cir. 1999); and (iii) use of any native load priority that will enable any one of the merging companies to import power through constrained interfaces so as to free up its local generating resources for off-system sales?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

- The Joint Applicants not be allowed to combine any or all of their existing control areas without first submitting their plans for such combinations to peer group review and approval by the SPP ISO/RTO and the affected regional reliability councils?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

- The merged companies be required to schedule all power flows and/or reserve transmission capacity on the relevant OASIS for purposes of carrying out any internal dispatch between what are now four geographically isolated pockets of load and generation in four separate control areas of the merging companies, to implement real-time monitoring of intra-company flows associated with internal dispatch, to report continuously the amount of such flows on its OASIS and to make all reasonable efforts to limit internal dispatch to levels at or below the transmission capacity reserved for purposes of carrying it out?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

- If the burdens on Springfield attributable to internal dispatch of the Joint Applicants turn out to be substantial (i.e., a substantial increase in curtailments of Springfield's firm schedules from Montrose), the merged company be required to reimburse Springfield for the incremental costs to Springfield of re-dispatching Springfield's generating resources that are attributable to the post-merger integrated operations of the Joint Applicants' separate systems?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

- The merged company be required to put all of its transmission facilities in Missouri and Kansas under the control of the SPP ISO/RTO in a single zone under the SPP transmission tariff and that the merged company join - and maintain membership in - the SPP ISO/RTO and be required to file an integrated open access transmission tariff ("OATT") and an integrated transmission rate for their four control areas in Missouri and Kansas?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

- UCU be required to (i) not set aside transmission capacity for Capacity Benefit Margins (CBM) and Transmission Reserve Margins (TRM) and (ii) to waive any future claims for CBM and TRM?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(3) Should UCU be required to not seek refunctionalization of any currently categorized transmission lines of the merging companies that operate at or above 69 kV?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(4) Should the Joint Applicants be required (i) to establish and implement a single standard for transmission system design and operation for the entirety of the merged company and (ii) to comply with the Southwest Power Pool Criteria?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Load Research Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed conditions regarding production of load research data, following closing of the merger, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Tariff Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed condition regarding changes to SJLP's current tariffs, following closing of the merger, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Gas Safety Program Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed condition regarding continuation of SJLP's current gas yard line replacement program, following closing of the merger, be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Fuel Energy Cost Information Condition:

(1) Should the Staff's proposed condition regarding the continued provision of separate MPS and SJLP fuel and energy cost information following closing of the merger be adopted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Energy Conditions:

(1) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must enter into a partnership with MDNR and other interested parties to market and leverage funds for the development of energy efficiency programs?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(2) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must develop or retain low-income service packages to meet customer needs, reduce energy costs and provide a return to UCU?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(3) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must offer additional renewable energy options to Missouri customers?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(4) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must target outreach to customers that are income eligible and encourage them to take advantage of the opportunity to reduce energy consumption and to

improve home affordability?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(5) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must amend the cooperative agreement between UCU and Kansas City, Missouri to permit averaging unit cost within the agreement to maximize the opportunity to assist customers?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(6) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must eliminate tying the dollar amount to specific measures to maximize the energy conservation measures installed in each home? Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that any energy efficient measure that is deemed cost-effective as a result of computer analysis, as stated in the agreement between UtiliCorp and Kansas City, Missouri, shall be permitted?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(7) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must permit energy-efficiency assistance to all eligible households? Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must allow funds to be spent on non-electric appliances?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(8) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must implement a 25-site Benefit Outreach and Screening Software (BOSS) pilot project, and must expand the program, as appropriate, if found to successfully deliver benefits to low-income customers?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(9) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must implement a base load and space heating electric energy efficiency program directed toward high use payment-troubled low-income customers?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(10) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must implement a pilot solar energy program directed toward high use low-income customers?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(11) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must implement a periodic survey process through which the merged company will take pro-active efforts to identify which of its payment-troubled customers represent low-income households?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

(12) Should the Commission approve DNR's proposed condition that UCU must implement an Outcome-based Performance Reporting System (OPRS) through which the customer service outcomes to low-income customers can be systematically tracked over time?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

OPC Regulatory Plan Condition:

(1) If the Commission approves the proposed merger, should OPC's regulatory plan be approved?

SJLP supports UCU's separate statement of position on this issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary L. Myers #26896
Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary
St. Joseph Light & Power Company
520 Francis Street
P.O. Box 998
St. Joseph, MO 64502

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 St. Joseph Light & Power Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was sent by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, or hand delivered, on this 26th day of June, 2000, to:

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

James C. Swearengen
Brydon, Swearengen & England
P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456

Karl Zobrist and Christine Egbarts
Blackwell Sanders Peter Martin
Two Pershing Sq., Suite 1100
2300 Main St.
Kansas City, MO 64108

Stuart W. Conrad
Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson
3100 Broadway, Suite 1209
Kansas City, MO 64111

Shelley A. Woods
Mo. Attorney General's Office
P.O. Box 899
Jefferson City, MO 65102

General Counsel's Office
Mo. Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102

William J. Niehoff
Ameren Services Co.
(MC 1310)
PO Box 66149
St. Louis, MO 63166-6149

Jeffrey A. Keevil
Stewart & Keevil
1001 Cherry St., Suite 302
Columbia, MO 65201

Mark W. Comley