BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

]

1

]

]

]

IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION] INTO ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION **REGARDING THE FEBRUARY 2021** WINTER WEATHER EVENTS, AS CONTEMPLATED BY DOCKET NO. 21-GIMX-303-MIS.

KCC DOCKET NO. 21-ATMG-333-GIG

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

JOSH FRANTZ

ON BEHALF OF

THE CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD

FEBRUARY 24, 2022

Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board

Q.	Please state your name and business address.
А.	My name is Joshua (Josh) P. Frantz. My business address is 1500 SW Arrowhead Road,
	Topeka, Kansas 66604.
Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
А.	I am employed by the Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board (CURB) as a Senior Regulatory
	Analyst.
Q.	Please describe your educational and professional background.
A.	I earned a Bachelor of Business Administration degree from Washburn University in
	Topeka, Kansas. My undergraduate majors were finance, marketing, and management.
	Additionally, I earned a Master of Business Administration degree, also from Washburn
	University.
	From August 2015 through April 2019, I was employed by the Kansas Corporation
	Commission (KCC or "Commission"). I began my employment with the KCC in the
	Utilities division as a Senior Research Economist and was ultimately promoted to
	Managing Rate Analyst. I have served in my current position as Senior Regulatory Analyst
	with CURB since April 2019.
Q.	Have you previously testified before the Commission?
A.	Yes. On behalf of CURB, I testified in Docket Nos. 19-ATMG-525-RTS, 21-WCNE-103-
	GIE, 21-BHCG-334-GIG, and 21-KGSG-332-GIG. During my prior employment as a
	А. Q. A. Q. А.

Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board

1		member of KCC Staff, I offered testimony in seven proceedings before the Commission as
2		well as over thirty Report and Recommendations for the Commission's consideration. A
3		list of those filings is available, upon request.
4		
5	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
6	A.	My testimony supports the Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") filed within the Joint
7		Motion to Approve Settlement Agreement ("Joint Motion") in Docket No. 21-ATMG-333-
8		GIG ("Docket 21-333") on February 9, 2022, regarding Atmos Energy Corporation's
9		("Atmos" or "Company") Plan to Minimize the Financial Effects of the 2021 Winter
10		Weather Event ("Financial Plan").
11		
12	Q.	Please provide a brief background of this proceeding.
13	A.	In mid-February 2021, Winter Storm Uri (also referred to as the "Weather Event") imposed
14		extreme and unprecedented freezing weather conditions across the U.S. It caused
15		widespread infrastructure and operational problems for facilities necessary for the
16		production and delivery of natural gas, leading to sudden and sustained natural gas supply
17		disruptions and substantially higher than normal wholesale natural gas prices.
18		In response to Winter Storm Uri, on February 15, 2021, the Commission issued its
19		Emergency Order in Docket No. 21-GIMX-303-MIS ("Emergency Order"), which
19 20		<i>Emergency Order</i> in Docket No. 21-GIMX-303-MIS ("Emergency Order"), which acknowledged the Governor's State of Disaster Emergency Proclamation, the higher-than-

1 to prolonged cold weather.¹

In its Emergency Order, the Commission ordered jurisdictional natural gas and 2 electric utilities to do everything necessary to ensure continued provision of service.² 3 Additionally, the Commission authorized jurisdictional natural gas and electric utilities to 4 defer into a regulatory asset any extraordinary costs associated with ensuring that their 5 customers, or the customers of interconnected Kansas utilities that are non-jurisdictional 6 to the Commission, continued to receive utility service during Winter Storm Uri.³ The 7 Commission required the deferral accounts to be segregated by detailed cost category and 8 to contain enough detail for the Commission to perform a subsequent review for prudence 9 and reasonableness.⁴ The Emergency Order also provided that the deferral is for 10 accounting purposes only, and that decisions related to ratepayer recovery would be 11 addressed in future proceedings.⁵ 12

13 Soon after, the Commission opened company-specific dockets (with Docket 21-14 333 being assigned to Atmos) to document issues raised in the Commission's investigation 15 of each major jurisdictional utility's reactions to and performance during Winter Storm 16 Uri, as well as to record the eventual company-specific filings for financial impact plans.

On September 14, 2021, Atmos filed its Financial Plan, as well as supporting testimonies, in this docket. Settlement discussions were held, beginning January 27, 2022, and, on February 9, 2022, a settlement agreement was filed.

¹ See Emergency Order, ¶1, Docket No. 21-GIMX-303-MIS (Feb. 15, 2021).

² *Emergency Order*, ¶3, Docket No. 21-GIMX-303-MIS (Feb. 15, 2021).

³ *Emergency Order*, ¶4, Docket No. 21-GIMX-303-MIS (Feb. 15, 2021).

⁴ Emergency Order, ¶4, Docket No. 21-GIMX-303-MIS (Feb. 15, 2021).

⁵ Emergency Order, ¶4, Docket No. 21-GIMX-303-MIS (Feb. 15, 2021).

1		
2	Q.	Which parties have been granted intervention in this docket?
3	A.	CURB and the Kansas Attorney General's Office ("AG's Office") have been granted
4		intervention in this docket.
5		
6	Q.	Has a settlement agreement been reached regarding the Company's Financial Plan?
7	A.	Yes, an Agreement regarding the Company's Financial Plan was filed in this docket on
8		February 9, 2022. Atmos, KCC Staff, and CURB (the "Signatories" or "Joint Movants")
9		are signatories to the Agreement and the Kansas AG's Office has indicated it does not
10		oppose the Agreement.
11		
12	Q.	Please outline the key terms of the Agreement.
13	A.	The key terms of the Agreement can be summarized as follows:
14		Extraordinary Costs
15		• Atmos should be allowed to recover \$102,517,847 of qualified extraordinary costs
16		incurred due to the Weather Event ("Extraordinary Costs"), subject to true-up and
17		verification. A categorized list of these costs is included in Appendix A of the
18		Agreement.
19		Securitization
20		• If approved to go forward with securitization, Atmos will apply for a Financing Order
21		in a separate docket, pursuant to the applicable provisions contained in the Utility
22		Financing and Securitization Act ("Act") passed by the Kansas Legislature in 2021.

1	The requested Financing Order would authorize the issuance of Securitized Utility
2	Tariff Bonds ("Securitized Bonds") to finance the Extraordinary Costs.
3	• Determination of certain details regarding the Securitized Bonds (e.g., the term of the
4	bonds and how the surcharge will be applied among Atmos's sales customers) will be
5	deferred to the Financing Order proceeding.
6	• The Extraordinary Costs, including carrying charges, will be trued-up and verified as
7	part of Atmos's separate filing to obtain the Financing Order. Any reconciliation
8	proposal shall also consider both the deferred tax liability associated with the
9	extraordinary gas cost recoveries, as well as the corresponding and offsetting deferred
10	tax asset associated with the net operating loss carryforward created by the
11	Extraordinary Costs.
12	• If Atmos receives or recovers any payments as a result of any subsequent federal or
13	state governmental relief in the form of profit disgorgement, civil suit relief, market
14	manipulation findings, etc., resulting from the Weather Event, it shall pass those
15	payments on to its customers through its Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA), even if
16	those payments may be received or recovered after the expiration of the Securitized
17	Utility Tariff Charge.
18	Carrying Charges
19	• Carrying charges applicable to the Extraordinary Costs will be calculated using a rate
20	of 2.0% until the issuance of Securitized Bonds.

21

Other Provisions

- All penalty payments received by Atmos from marketers or transportation customers
 (identified in the confidential Appendix B of the Agreement) that are received prior to
 the filing of the separate application for a Financing Order will be used by Atmos to
 reduce the Extraordinary Costs to be recovered using the Securitized Bonds. All
 penalty amounts received after that filing will be credited by Atmos to its sales
 customers, annually, through the PGA/Annual Cost Adjustment (ACA).
- Provided it is allowable under the Act, any Atmos sales customer who intends on • 8 becoming an Atmos transportation customer during the period in which the Securitized 9 Utility Tariff Charge is being recovered shall be required to pay Atmos a conversion 10 fee prior to becoming a transportation customer. The conversion fee owed by the 11 customer shall be based on the present value of the expected charges the customer 12 would have paid as a sales customer over the remaining period in which the Securitized 13 Utility Tariff Charge is being recovered. This conversion fee will be credited to 14 Atmos's other sales customers, annually, through the PGA. 15
- Atmos agrees to meet with KCC Staff and CURB to discuss programs that Atmos has
 implemented in other states to assist low-income customers, in order to determine if
 those programs could be used to assist low-income customers in Kansas.
- 19
- Q. What criteria does the Commission generally consider when reviewing settlement
 agreements?
- A. The Commission has accepted settlement agreements if the following five criteria are met:

1) the agreement conforms with applicable law; 2) there was an opportunity for opposing 1 parties to be heard on their reasons for opposition to the agreement; 3) the agreement is 2 supported by substantial competent evidence; 4) the agreement results in just and 3 reasonable rates or charges; and 5) the results of the agreement are in the public interest.⁶ 4 However, in dockets with proposed unanimous settlement agreements, such as this 5 Agreement, the Commission has approved settlement agreements on the basis of just the 6 last three criteria. Since this Agreement is unanimous, I will now discuss those three 7 criteria, in detail. 8

9

10 Q. Is the Agreement supported by substantial competent evidence?

11 A. In my opinion, the Agreement is supported by substantial competent evidence in the record. 12 The initial Application was supported by the direct testimony of several witnesses on behalf 13 of the Company. There was extensive vetting of these matters through a multitude of data 14 requests ("DRs") and information sharing ahead of the settlement discussions. The 15 Agreement is supported by my testimony and, I expect, will be supported by the testimony 16 of the other Signatories.

To my knowledge, it is undisputed that Winter Storm Uri prompted health and safety concerns, sudden and sustained natural gas supply disruptions, and widespread infrastructure and operational failures at facilities that were necessary for the delivery of natural gas. This has already been acknowledged by the Commission.

⁶ See Order Approving Contested Settlement Agreement, ¶11, Docket No. 08-ATMG-280-RTS (May 12, 2012).

1		Through review of the facts contained in the Company's testimony and responses
2		to the DRs in this docket, as well as discussions with the Company and KCC Staff, I believe
3		the agreed-upon calculation of Extraordinary Costs is reasonably reflective of the
4		extraordinary costs that were incurred by the Company to serve customers during February
5		2021. Furthermore, I believe the agreed-upon application of carrying charges is reasonably
6		reflective of the Company's costs associated with financing the Extraordinary Costs until
7		the issuance of Securitized Bonds.
8		
9	Q.	Will the Agreement result in just and reasonable rates/charges?
10	A.	Yes, I believe approval of the Agreement would result in just and reasonable rates/charges.
11		I will discuss the reasonableness of specific provisions of the Agreement in detail:
12		Extraordinary Costs
13		Nearly every state in the Midwest is now facing unprecedented, extraordinary
14		natural gas costs due to the effects of Winter Storm Uri. In Texas, highly publicized,
15		widespread utility service disruptions even led to the loss of life. In the KCC's Emergency
16		Order, all jurisdictional utilities were ordered to "do all things possible and necessary to
17		ensure natural gas and electricity utility services continue to be provided to their customers
18		in the State." ⁷ In spite of the volatility of the natural gas market conditions and other issues
19		outside of the Company's control, Atmos was able to deliver reliable service to 99.99% of
20		its Kansas customers for the full duration of the event. ⁸

⁷ Emergency Order, pg. 3 §B, Docket No. 21-GIMX-303-MIS (Feb. 15, 2021).

⁸ Direct Testimony of Barton W. Armstrong, pg. 18, Docket No. 21-ATMG-333-GIG (Sep. 14, 2021).

Annually, Atmos files Gas Purchase Reports (GPR) with the Commission in 1 Docket No. 02-GRLG-364-GPR and presents the reports to KCC Staff and CURB for 2 review before the winter season. The unprecedented weather, supply, demand, and pricing 3 conditions that developed during the Weather Event could not reasonably have been 4 anticipated at the time Atmos entered into its GPR-planned contracts, months in advance 5 of the Weather Event. It is important to recognize that the plans in Atmos's GPR are 6 designed to cover the entirety of the heating season, and, at the time of the Weather Event, 7 there were nearly two months remaining in the season. Yet, during the Weather Event, for 8 several days in succession, natural gas index prices vastly exceeded any previously 9 10 fathomable price. Atmos did not have any control over the market price of gas that was available 11 during the Winter Event. Atmos competitively bids its supply contracts in advance of the 12 13 winter months and these contract prices are tied to a market index. The unprecedented

spike in natural gas index prices during the Weather Event has, understandably, lead to 14 concerns over price gouging, profiteering and market manipulation. Duly, these concerns 15 are being investigated by the Kansas AG's Office under its statutory and common law 16 authority to enforce: (1) the Kansas Consumer Protection Act (KCPA), K.S.A. 50-623, et 17 seq. and to protect consumers from suppliers who commit deceptive and unconscionable 18 acts and practices; (2) K.S.A. 50-6,106 (the unconscionable act of profiteering from a 19 disaster); and (3) the Kansas False Claims Act, K.S.A. 75-7501, et seq., which prohibits 20 making a fraudulent claim upon the State government or any political subdivision of the 21

1	State. ⁹ Under the Agreement, any form of federal or state governmental relief in the form
2	of profit disgorgement, civil suit relief, market manipulation findings, etc., resulting from
3	the Weather Event, would be passed to customers through the PGA/ACA.
4	In a later phase of this docket, the Company, KCC Staff, and CURB will examine
5	the lessons learned from the Weather Event and discuss how to better manage such a
6	situation in the future (e.g., potential tariff revisions, process improvements, etc.).
7	However, I do believe, when viewing Atmos's actions during the Weather Event without
8	the lens of hindsight, the Company responded adequately to an unprecedented crisis.
9	Therefore, the Extraordinary Costs should be considered to be prudently incurred.
10	Securitization
11	The details regarding securitization of the Extraordinary Costs (e.g., term duration,
12	interest rate, etc.) have not yet been thoroughly examined and finalized — that process will
13	commence when the Company requests a Financial Order, assuming the Agreement is
14	approved. Generally, though, I expect the securitization process will result in just and
15	reasonable rates and I believe it is the most appropriate, low-cost path forward to finance
16	the Extraordinary Costs incurred by Atmos. The initial projections for the Securitized
17	Bond rates presented by Atmos, circa September 2021, indicate rates in the range of 1.88%
18	for 10-year bonds to 2.36% for 15-year bonds. ¹⁰
19	Carrying Charges

There is no specific methodology identified in the Agreement detailing the

⁹ See Petition to Intervene of Kansas AG's Office, Docket No. 21-ATMG-333-GIG (Jul. 19, 2021). 10 Direct Testimony of Jason L. Schneider, Exhibit JLS-3, Docket No. 21-ATMG-333-GIG (Sep. 14, 2021).

calculation of the negotiated carrying charge rate of 2.0% (reduced from the initially proposed 8.396%), so each party may have a different understanding of the concessions made to produce this result. I believe the rate of 2.0%, for the period starting when the Extraordinary Costs were incurred through the issuance of Securitized Bonds, is reasonably reflective of the short-term financing rates incurred by the Company to cover its Extraordinary Costs and, therefore, I support this provision of the Agreement.

Although the use of short-term debt and reflection of a carrying charge in this 7 extraordinary circumstance will add costs for ratepayers, doing so allows ratepayers the 8 opportunity to spread the financial impacts of the Weather Event over a longer period, 9 10 reducing monthly bill impacts. The alternative proposals to the Agreement are to either recover the extraordinary costs through a separate rider over three years, as laid out in the 11 initial Application, or to flow the costs through the Company's PGA, as typically done for 12 13 such costs. Both alternatives would likely have shorter collection periods, but larger impacts on customers' bills each month. CURB views the Commission's decision to 14 accept plans for mitigating the financial impact on ratepayers as an emphasis on the 15 importance of easing the direct financial burden imposed by the Weather Event. To that 16 end, including carrying charges allows access to financing instruments to extend collection 17 periods. 18

19

20

21

Methodology aside, the lower carrying charge percentage agreed upon by the Signatories would drastically reduce the carrying charges over the aforementioned period from approx. \$9.47 million to approx. \$2.56 million, producing a savings of approx. \$7.21 million when compared to the Company's initial proposal.¹¹

Because CURB has no filed position in response to the Company's initial proposal 2 in this Docket, I will now address the Company's initial request for the application of a 3 carrying charge rate at the weighted average cost of capital (WACC), approx. 8.4%, on the 4 Extraordinary Costs. I believe that an application of Atmos's WACC would be 5 inappropriate in this circumstance and would not be reasonably reflective of actual 6 financing charges associated with the Extraordinary Costs. Allowance of an unreasonably 7 high carrying charge could result in a windfall for the Company stemming from a 8 disastrous event. Meanwhile, utility customers face severe financial consequences from 9 10 the emergency Weather Event. To reiterate, I am supportive of the reduced carrying charges proposed in the Agreement, but I am strongly opposed to the Company's initial 11 proposal to apply its WACC as the carrying charge for the Extraordinary Costs. 12

13

1

14 Q. Are the results of the Agreement in the public interest?

A. Yes, I believe the Agreement is in the public interest. There is a wide range of
 representation among the parties: the Company; CURB, representing residential and small
 commercial customers; and KCC Staff, representing all interests including the public,
 generally.

19

20

Under the Agreement, the Company would recover the Extraordinary Costs it incurred to provide gas to customers during the Winter Event, plus the inclusion of

¹¹ Settlement Agreement, ¶10, Docket No. 21-ATMG-333-GIG (Feb 9, 2022).

reasonable carrying charges until the issuance of Securitized Bonds. Furthermore, provisions of the Agreement provide customer protections in the form of potential future relief that could come through the investigations of the Kansas AG's Office, or other governmental agencies, into predatory pricing issues. Additionally, a provision of the Agreement ensures that individual customers will not be able to circumvent the Surcharge by switching from a sales class to transportation.

Lastly, Atmos has agreed to discuss with CURB and KCC Staff, in earnest, the 7 potential implementation of programs to assist low-income customers. Low-income 8 programs are ratemaking mechanisms which, generally, CURB supports and believes 9 10 would be in the interest of the public, at large. It is well documented that energy burden (percentage of household income spent on energy costs) is a critical issue for low-income 11 customers and any surcharges resulting from the Weather Event will further exacerbate the 12 13 financial hardships faced by low-income households. Therefore, I believe this docket has provided a fitting forum for CURB to negotiate the inclusion of this provision into the 14 Agreement. Although the provision in the Agreement regarding low-income programs is 15 quite broad, I certainly believe it is a step in the right direction. 16

17

18 Q. Does the Agreement resolve all issues in this docket?

A. No. I feel it is important to emphasize there are multiple phases of this docket. If this
 Agreement is approved, the details of securitization will be discussed in a subsequent
 phase. Additionally, another phase of this docket will explore potential revisions to tariff
 provisions and a discussion of lessons learned from the Weather Event.

1	
Т.	

2 **Q.** Do you have any additional concerns you wish to discuss?

A. Yes, I would like to express CURB's concerns regarding the approx. \$9.56 million of
Negotiated Gas Penalties that are expected to be charged to Atmos by Kansas Gas Service
(KGS). This penalty amount has been negotiated in Docket No. 21-KGSG-332-GIG
("Docket 21-332"), which is the Weather Event docket for KGS, and that settlement
agreement is currently pending Commission approval.

As already mentioned, the Commission's February 15, 2021, Emergency Order required utilities to do everything necessary to ensure natural gas and electricity service continue to be provided to their customers in Kansas. The Commission Order was issued to safeguard the reliability, integrity, and continued functionality of the gas delivery system for the citizens of Kansas during the Weather Event. Atmos was not only obligated to protect its own system, but also to ensure that its actions would not potentially place the reliability of other utility systems in Kansas at risk.

In this docket, a portion of Atmos's Extraordinary Costs includes penalties 15 expected to be charged by KGS to Atmos for Atmos's role as a transportation customer of 16 KGS during the Weather Event. Atmos was short on its gas deliveries to KGS over the 17 course of the Weather Event, and, under the proposed 21-332 settlement, the gas Atmos 18 received from KGS is valued at a much lower price (via the penalty) than the market price 19 Atmos would have likely paid had Atmos purchased gas from other sources. This is largely 20 because the calculation of the Negotiated Gas Penalty includes gas purchased by KGS 21 under its Gas Daily Daily (GDD) callable contracts. If the 21-332 settlement is approved, 22

1		Atmos sales customers will actually benefit from Atmos being short on its gas deliveries
2		to KGS at a cost to KGS sales customers.
3		In the corresponding Evidentiary Hearing in Docket 21-332, CURB expressed its
4		concerns regarding the methodology used to calculate the Negotiated Gas Penalty amounts.
5		Although CURB did not oppose the settlement in Docket 21-332 nor the settlement in this
6		case, it seems contrary to the concept of a penalty to reward a utility with a lower charge
7		than had the utility complied with the pertinent tariff. For consistency, I believe it is
8		appropriate for CURB to echo its concerns here, even though Atmos sales customers
9		benefit from the settlement proposed in Docket 21-332.
10		Despite its concerns, CURB acknowledges that the circumstances of this event
11		were unique and unprecedented for all gas and electric utilities in Kansas and hopes that in
12		a later phase of this docket, the parties can determine how to better protect utility systems
13		from the effects of future storms. Indeed, CURB looks forward to working with the parties
14		in this docket, as well as parties in all of the other Weather Event dockets, to ensure these
15		issues do not arise again.
16		
17	Q.	What is your final recommendation?
18	A.	I support the Agreement and believe it satisfies the Commission's established criteria for
19		approval of a settlement agreement. Therefore, I recommend the Commission reject
20		Atmos's initial proposed Financial Plan and, instead, approve the Agreement as filed.

1 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

2 A. Yes, it does.

VERIFICATION

SS:

STATE OF KANSAS

COUNTY OF SHAWNEE

I, Josh Frantz, of lawful age and being first duly sworn upon my oath, state that I am a consultant for the Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board; that I have read and am familiar with the above and foregoing document and attest that the statements therein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

shreat.

Josh Frantz

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 24th day of February, 2022.

DELLA J. SMITH Notary Public - State of Kansas My Appt. Expires January 26, 2025

Notary Public,

My Commission expires: 01-26-2025.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

21-ATMG-333-GIG

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was served by electronic service on this 24th day of February, 2022, to the following:

JAMES G. FLAHERTY, ATTORNEY ANDERSON & BYRD, L.L.P. 216 S HICKORY PO BOX 17 OTTAWA, KS 66067 <u>iflaherty@andersonbyrd.com</u>

SHELLY M BASS, SENIOR ATTORNEY ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION 5430 LBJ FREEWAY 1800 THREE LINCOLN CENTRE DALLAS, TX 75240 <u>shelly.bass@atmosenergy.com</u>

ATTN: GAS SERVICE CONTACT ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION 5420 LBJ FWY STE 1600 (75240) P O BOX 650205 DALLAS, TX 75265-0205 jennifer.ries@atmosenergy.com

KATHLEEN R OCANAS, DIVISION VP OF RATES & REGULATORY AFFAIRS ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION 25090 W 110TH TERR OLATHE, KS 66061 Kathleen.Ocanas@atmosenergy.com

MELANIE S. JACK, Assistant Attorney General KANSAS ATTORNEY GENERAL Consumer Protection Division 120 SW 10th Ave., 2nd Flr. Topeka, KS 66612 <u>Melanie.Jack@ag.ks.gov</u>

DEREK SCHMIDT, Kansas Attorney General KANSAS ATTORNEY GENERAL Consumer Protection Division 120 SW 10th Ave., 4th Flr. Topeka, KS 66612 <u>Derek.Schmidt@ag.ks.gov</u>

BRIAN G. FEDOTIN, GENERAL COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 b.fedotin@kcc.ks.gov

WALKER HENDRIX, LITIGATION COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 w.hendrix@kcc.ks.gov

TERRI PEMBERTON, CHIEF LITIGATION COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 <u>t.pemberton@KCC.KS.GOV</u>

Della Smith Senior Administrative Specialist