BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Aquila, Inc., d/b/a)	
Aquila Networks - MPS and Aquila)	
Networks - L&P for Authority to)	
Transfer Operational Control of Certain)	Case No. EO-2008-0046
Transmission Assets to the Midwest)	
Independent Transmission System)	
Operator, Inc.)	

PUBLIC COUNSEL'S STATEMENT OF POSITIONS

COMES NOW the Office of the Public Counsel and for its Statement of Positions on the agreed-upon list of issues states as follows:

1. Is "not detrimental to the public interest" the appropriate standard for the Commission to use in making its determinations in this case?

Yes.

- 2. Should the Commission determine that Aquila's application to join MISO is not detrimental to the public interest? What considerations should the Commission take into account in making its determination?
- No. The Commission should determine that Aquila's application to join MISO is detrimental to the public interest at this time. Considerations that the Commission should take into account in making its determination with respect to the public interest standard include:
 - The Company's RTO cost benefit study shows that the customer benefits from its participation in an RTO are expected to be much greater if Aquila participates in the SPP RTO rather than the MISO RTO.
 - There is a high degree of uncertainty regarding whether any potential benefits to Missouri customers might be achieved from Aquila's participation in MISO. This uncertainty is due to: (1) AmerenUE's re-evaluation of whether it wishes to continue to participate in MISO; (2) the continuing uncertainty about whether Aquila will be acquired by KCPL's parent company, Great Plains Energy (GPE) and whether if this acquisition does occur, the generating units of KCPL and Aquila will be jointly dispatched to serve the combined native loads of KCPL and Aquila; and (3) the possibility that MISO will develop and offer more favorable terms under which former Mid-Continent Area Power Pool (MAPP) members

may be allowed to participate in MISO markets and uncertainty about whether these same terms would be made available to Aquila as a new member.

3. If the Commission approves Aquila's application to join MISO, should the Commission make its approval subject to certain conditions? If so, what are the conditions?

Any such approval should be contingent upon all seven of the conditions that are summarized in the list that begins on page 37 of Staff witness Proctor's rebuttal testimony.

4. In making its determination whether to grant Aquila's application to join MISO, should the Commission compare Aquila's membership in MISO to other alternatives? If so, what are the alternatives and what do the comparisons of the alternatives show?

Yes. In making its determination whether to grant Aquila's application to join MISO, the Commission should compare Aquila's membership in MISO to other alternatives that are currently available or may become available in the foreseeable future. These alternatives include the stand-alone option, the SPP option, and the possible development of more favorable terms under which former MAPP members may be allowed to participate in MISO markets (the MISO Module F option). The CRA cost-benefit study shows that participating in the SPP RTO is expected to provide the most beneficial long-term impacts on Aquila's cost of service so any other choices would be detrimental to the public interest.

- 5. To what extent should the Commission take into account the following in its determination of whether or not to approve Aquila's application to join MISO?
- a. The CRA International, Inc. cost-benefit study sponsored by Aquila;

The Commission should take into account the projections of the CRA study showing that the benefits from participating in the SPP RTO are expected to be greater than the benefits from participating in the MISO RTO.

b. Cost-benefit analyses sponsored by parties other than Aquila;

Public Counsel takes no position on this issue at this time.

c. Costs and/or benefits not included in the CRA International cost-benefit study sponsored by Aquila or cost-benefit analyses sponsored by parties other than Aquila;

Public Counsel takes no position on this issue at this time.

d. Aquila's current relationships with MISO and SPP;

Public Counsel takes no position on this issue at this time.

e. Differences in the development of electricity markets between MISO and SPP;

Public Counsel takes no position on this issue at this time.

f. The proposed acquisition of Aquila by Great Plains Energy that is the subject of Case No. EM-2007-0374;

If the Commission approves Aquila's application to join MISO and if Great Plains Energy (GPE) is able to complete its acquisition of Aquila, Missouri consumers may be harmed by constraints and/or extra costs that could arise if attempts to create additional efficiencies in the operations of its KCPL and Aquila operating companies are frustrated by having the two operating companies in different RTOs.

g. Union Electric Company's continuing membership in MISO;

While Public Counsel believes that the Commission has sufficient evidence to determine that Aquila's participation in the MISO RTO would be detrimental to the public interest, the Commission should be careful not to approve participation in the MISO RTO prior to having the current uncertainties resolved regarding AmerenUE's continued participation in MISO.

h. Aquila's obligation to MISO made in FERC Docket No. ER02-871 to file and support Aquila's application to join MISO;

This obligation is not relevant to the Commission's determination of whether or not to approve Aquila's application to join MISO.

6. If the Commission authorizes Aquila to join MISO, should the Commission determine now whether all future FERC-approved administrative fees Aquila is assessed by MISO and all future costs Aquila incurs from MISO in making prudent purchases of capacity and/or energy to serve its bundled retail load should be considered to be prudently incurred expenses for purposes of including them in Aquila's cost of service in Aquila's next general electric rate case before this Commission?

No. The Commission should, and can lawfully only, make these ratemaking determinations in a rate case where all relevant factors can be taken into account contemporaneous with the ratemaking decisions.

WHEREFORE, Public Counsel respectfully submits this Statement of Positions.

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICE OF THE Public Counsel

/s/ Lewis R. Mills, Jr.

By:_____

Lewis R. Mills, Jr. (#35275) Public Counsel P O Box 2230 Jefferson City, MO 65102 (573) 751-1304 (573) 751-5562 FAX lewis.mills@ded.mo.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been emailed to all parties this 18th day of March 2008.

General Counsel Office
Mils Lewis
Missouri Public Service
Commission
200 Madison Street, Suite 800
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102
GenCounsel@psc.mo.gov
Mills Lewis
Office Of Public
200 Madison S
P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City,
opcservice@de

Mills Lewis Office Of Public Counsel 200 Madison Street, Suite 650 P.O. Box 2230 Jefferson City, MO 65102 opcservice@ded.mo.gov Williams Nathan Missouri Public Service Commission 200 Madison Street, Suite 800 P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102 Nathan.Williams@psc.mo.gov

Parsons Renee Aquila, Inc. 20 West 9th Street Kansas City, MO 64105 renee.parsons@aquila.com

Boudreau A Paul Aquila, Inc. 312 East Capitol Avenue P.O. Box 456 Jefferson City, MO 65102 PaulB@brydonlaw.com Bishop Schwartz Dayla City of Independence, Missouri 111 E. Maple St. Independence, MO 64050 dschwartz@indepmo.org

Garner B. Allen City of Independence, Missouri 111 E. Maple Street Independence, MO 64050 agarner@indepmo.org

Robbins I Alan City of Independence, Missouri 1700 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Suite 500 Washington, DC 20006 arobbins@jsslaw.com

Roby D Debra City of Independence, Missouri 1700 Pensylvania Ave., NW Suite 500 Washington, DC 20006 droby@jsslaw.com

Teuwen B Elizabeth City of Independence, Missouri 1700 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 500 Washington, DC 20006 eteuwen@jsslaw.com

Lumley J Carl Dogwood Energy, LLC 130 S. Bemiston, Ste 200 St. Louis, MO 63105 clumley@lawfirmemail.com Curtis Leland Dogwood Energy, LLC 130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200 St. Louis, MO 63105 lcurtis@lawfirmemail.com

Blanc D Curtis Kansas City Power & Light Company 1201 Walnut, 20th Floor Kansas City, MO 64106 Curtis.Blanc@kcpl.com

Comley W Mark Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, 424 Summer Top Lane 601 Monroe Street., Suite 301 P.O. Box 537 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0537 comleym@ncrpc.com

Linton C David Southwest Power Pool, Inc. Fenton, MO 63026 djlinton@charter.net

Starnes H Heather Southwest Power Pool, Inc. 415 North McKinley, Ste. 140 Little Rock, AR 72205-3020

Powell J William Union Electric Company 111 South Ninth Street Suite 200, City Centre Building Columbia, MO 65205-0918 powell@smithlewis.com

Lowery B James Union Electric Company 111 South Ninth St., Suite 200 P.O. Box 918 Columbia, MO 65205-0918 lowery@smithlewis.com

Sullivan R Steven Union Electric Company 1901 Chouteau Avenue P.O. Box 66149 (MC 1300) St. Louis, MO 63166-6149 srsullivan@ameren.com

Byrne M Thomas Union Electric Company 1901 Chouteau Avenue P.O. Box 66149 (MC 1310) St. Louis, MO 63166-6149 tbyrne@ameren.com

Burns A Beth Union Electric Company 1901 Chouteau Avenue P.O. Box 66149 (MC 1300) St. Louis, MO 63166-6149 bburns@ameren.com

/s/ Lewis R. Mills, Jr.