



Organization of MISO States

100 Court Avenue, Suite 315
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Phone: 515-243-0742
Fax: 515-243-0746
www.misostates.org

April 24, 2015

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20426

RE: Docket No ER10-1791-003

Dear Ms. Bose:

After the OMS filed Comments in this docket on April 22, 2015, the Michigan PSC, an OMS member, requested additional clarification of its position in this docket. That clarification is included as footnote 13 on the attached revised page 4 of the pleading.

Please replace page 4 of the filing with the revised page 4 which is attached.

Very truly yours,

William H. Smith, Jr.

William H. Smith, Jr.
Executive Director
Organization of MISO States
100 Court Avenue – Suite 315
Des Moines, IA 50309

Attachment – corrected page 4

The OMS submits this pleading because the following members, which represent a majority, generally support the contents:

Arkansas Public Service Commission
Iowa Utilities Board
Kentucky Public Service Commission
Michigan Public Service Commission¹³
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
Mississippi Public Service Commission
Missouri Public Service Commission
Montana Public Service Commission
City of New Orleans
North Dakota Public Service Commission
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
Public Utility Commission of Texas
Wisconsin Public Service Commission

The Louisiana Public Service Commission, Manitoba Public Utilities Board and City of New Orleans abstained. The Illinois Commerce Commission does not support these comments.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tanya Paslawski

Tanya Paslawski
Deputy Executive Director
Organization of MISO States
E-mail: tanya@misostates.org
Tel: 515-243-0742

Dated: April 22, 2015

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing document upon each person designated on the official service list compiled by the Secretary in this proceeding.
Dated at Carmel, Indiana, on this 22nd day of April, 2015.

Tanya Paslawski

¹³ Notwithstanding the Michigan Public Service Commission's objection to the existing MVP methodology, it recognizes the US Court of Appeals' finding that all beneficiaries, including users in PJM, must shoulder a reasonable portion of MVP costs.