

**BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF KANSAS**

In the Matter of the Joint Application of Great     )  
Plains Energy Incorporated, Kansas City     )  
Power & Light Company and Westar Energy,     )  
Inc. for Approval of the Acquisition of Westar     ) Docket No. 16-KCPE-593-ACQ  
Energy, Inc. by Great Plains Energy     )  
Incorporated.     )

**STAFF’S MOTION REQUESTING THE COMMISSION TAKE  
ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE OF CERTAIN FILES AND RECORDS**

The Staff of the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas (“Staff” and “Commission,” respectively) files this motion respectfully requesting the Commission take administrative notice of certain documents as specified herein. In support of its Motion, Staff states as follows:

1. On June 28, 2016, Great Plains Energy Incorporated (GPE), Kansas City Power & Light Company (KCP&L), and Westar Energy, Inc. and Kansas Gas and Electric Company (Westar), (collectively referred to as “Joint Applicants”) filed an application seeking approval for GPE to acquire 100% of the stock of Westar in a transaction valued at approximately \$12.2 billion, including assumed debt.<sup>1</sup>

2. On Monday, January 30, 2017, the Commission commenced the Evidentiary Hearing in this matter. The Evidentiary Hearing concluded on February 7, 2017.

3. On February 22, 2017, an order was issued by the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri (Missouri PSC) which exercises jurisdiction over the proposed transaction subject to this docket and may impact certain issues in this docket. Specifically, the Missouri

---

<sup>1</sup> Joint Application, ¶6 (June 28, 2016).

PSC found GPE to be in violation of the Missouri PSC's July 31, 2001 Order Approving Stipulation and Agreement and Closing File, issued in Missouri Docket No. EM-2001-464, and directed GPE to file an application for the Missouri Commission's approval of the Agreement and Plan of Merger and a determination on whether the proposed merger with Westar is detrimental to the public interest. As such, Staff moves the Commission to take administrative notice of Missouri PSC Docket EC-2017-0107, including all existing and future filings and orders within the docket. A copy of the February 22, 2017 Missouri PSC order<sup>2</sup> is attached hereto as Attachment A.

4. The Missouri PSC order notes the issue of GPE's/KCP&L's request for variance of Missouri Commission's affiliate transaction rules, which was an issue of concern raised by Staff in its September 9, 2016 Reply to Joint Applicants' Verified Response to Commission's Order on Merger Standards.<sup>3</sup> The Missouri PSC order does not dispose of this issue, and it is logical to conclude that a decision on the request for variance could follow the Missouri Commission's decision on the merger.<sup>4</sup>

5. K.A.R. 82-1-230(h) states that, "[i]n addition to matters that are required or permitted to be judicially noticed by K.S.A. 60-409 and amendments thereto, the presiding officer may take administrative notice of commission files and records in deciding matters pending before it." During the course of the evidentiary hearing, the Commission has taken administrative notice of orders of other public utility commissions addressing issues relevant to this docket.

---

<sup>2</sup> Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri, Docket No. EC-2017-0107, Report and Order (Feb. 22, 2017).

<sup>3</sup> Staff's Reply to Joint Applicants' Verified Response to Commission's Order on Merger Standards, ¶11 (Sept. 9, 2016).

<sup>4</sup> An evidentiary hearing on GPE's/KCP&L's request for variance had been scheduled to be held March 15 through 17, 2017; *see* State of Missouri Public Service Commission, Docket No. EE-2017-0113, Order Adopting Procedural Schedule (Dec. 6, 2016).

6. Due to the direct nexus with this docket, Staff requests the Commission take administrative notice the Missouri PSC Docket EC-2017-0107, including all existing and subsequent filings and orders therein.

WHEREFORE, Staff respectfully requests the Commission take administrative notice of the above-described documents.

Respectfully Submitted,


A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amber Smith", is written over a horizontal line.

Amber Smith, #23911  
Andrew French, #24680  
Michael Neeley, #25027  
Kansas Corporation Commission  
1500 S.W. Arrowhead Road  
Topeka, Kansas 66604  
Phone: 785-271-3110  
Fax: 785-271-3167

ATTORNEYS FOR STAFF

STATE OF MISSOURI  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

At a session of the Public Service  
Commission held at its office  
in Jefferson City on the 22<sup>nd</sup>  
day of February, 2017.



Midwest Energy Consumers Group,

Complainant,

v.

Great Plains Energy Incorporated,

Respondent.

File No. EC-2017-0107

---

## REPORT AND ORDER

---

Issue Date: February 22

Effective Date: March 4, 2017

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Appearances .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Procedural History .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Findings of Fact .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Conclusions of Law .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Decision .....</b>	<b>20</b>

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

Midwest Energy Consumers Group,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
v.	)	File No. EC-2017-0107
	)	
Great Plains Energy Incorporated,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**REPORT AND ORDER**

**PARTIES**

**Midwest Energy Consumers Group**

David Woodsmall  
308 East High Street  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

**Office of the Public Counsel**

Lera Shemwell  
200 Madison Street  
P.O. Box 2230  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

**Consumers Council of Missouri**

John Coffman  
871 Tuxedo Blvd.  
St. Louis, Missouri 63119

**Staff**

Kevin Thompson  
200 Madison Street, Suite 800  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102

**Great Plains Energy**

Karl Zobrist  
Dentons US LLP  
4520 Main Street, Suite 1100  
Kansas City, Missouri 64111

**Great Plains Energy**

Robert Hack  
Kansas City Power & Light Company  
1200 Main Street  
Kansas City, Missouri 64105

**Great Plains Energy**

James Fischer  
Fischer & Dority  
101 Madison, Suite 400  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

**SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE: Kim S. Burton**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

Midwest Energy Consumers Group,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	File No. EC-2017-0107
	)	
Great Plains Energy Incorporated	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**REPORT AND ORDER**

Issue Date: February 22, 2017

Effective Date: March 4, 2017

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On October 11, 2016, the Midwest Energy Consumers Group ("MECG") filed a complaint with the Missouri Public Service Commission (the "Commission") against Great Plains Energy Incorporated alleging that the holding company is violating the Commission's *Order Approving Stipulation and Agreement and Closing Case*, in Case No. EM-2001-464. The Commission issued a *Notice of Contested Case and Order Directing Filing*. Great Plains Energy Incorporated submitted an answer and a motion to dismiss. The Consumers Council of Missouri filed an uncontested application to intervene, which was granted by the Commission on November 9, 2016. On December 21, 2016, the Commission conducted oral arguments on Great Plains Energy Incorporated's motion to dismiss. The Midwest Energy Consumers Group filed its

*Second Amended Complaint* (hereinafter, the "Complaint") on December 28, 2016.<sup>1</sup> On January 4, 2017, the Commission issued its *Order Denying Motion to Dismiss and Scheduling Evidentiary Hearing*, which directed Great Plains Energy Incorporated to file an answer to the Complaint and set a February 1 evidentiary hearing date.<sup>2</sup> Great Plains filed its *Answer to Second Amended Complaint and Affirmative Defenses of Great Plains Energy Incorporated*.<sup>3</sup>

On January 18, 2017, MEEG, Great Plains Energy Incorporated, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission ("the Commission's Staff"), and Consumers Council of Missouri submitted a *Joint Stipulation of Facts and List of Issues, Request to Take Official Notice, Motion to Cancel Hearing and Oral Argument and to Establish Briefing Schedule, and Motion for Expedited Treatment* (the "Joint Motion").<sup>4</sup> In the Joint Motion, the signatories stated that based on stipulated facts, they did not intend to call any witnesses or conduct any cross-examination. The four signatories indicated that the Commission could determine the legal questions in the Complaint based on the stipulated facts and matters identified by the parties for official notice by the Commission. In the Joint Motion, the parties also waived their right under Section 386.390, RSMo 2000, to an evidentiary hearing and requested expedited treatment.

Since the Office of the Public Counsel is automatically a party in any action before the Commission,<sup>5</sup> an order was issued setting a deadline for the Public Counsel to submit a response to the Joint Motion. The Commission also set a deadline for

---

<sup>1</sup> EFIS Item No. 26.

<sup>2</sup> EFIS Item No. 27.

<sup>3</sup> EFIS Item No. 28, Answer to Second Amended Complaint and Affirmative Defenses of Great Plains Energy Incorporated.

<sup>4</sup> EFIS Item No. 29.

<sup>5</sup> 4 CSR 240-2.010(10).



parties to file objections to the admission of the documents identified for official notice in the Joint Motion as exhibits in the record.

On January 20, 2017, the Office of the Public Counsel filed a response stating that it did not object to the request to cancel the hearing set for February 1, 2017. No objections to the admission of identified documents as exhibits were received. The Commission canceled the previously scheduled hearing set for February 1, 2017,<sup>6</sup> admitted exhibits into the record, and set a briefing schedule for the parties.<sup>7</sup> Great Plains Energy Incorporated, MEGG, and the Commission's Staff filed their initial briefs on January 31, 2017. That same day, Spire, Inc. filed its *Petition of Spire, Inc. for Leave to File Amicus Curiae Brief*.<sup>8</sup> MEGG and the Commission's Staff filed reply briefs on February 6, 2017.<sup>9</sup> The Commission issued its *Order Granting Petition for Leave to File Amicus Curiae Brief* on February 8, 2017.<sup>10</sup>

The case was submitted on stipulated facts and briefs.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Kansas City Power & Light Company ("KCPL") is a vertically integrated public utility that generates, transmits, and sells electrical energy to residential customers in Missouri.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> EFIS Item No. 33, Order Canceling Hearing.

<sup>7</sup> EFIS Item No. 34, Order Admitting Exhibits and Setting Briefing Schedule.

<sup>8</sup> EFIS Item No. 44.

<sup>9</sup> EFIS Items No. 47 and 48.

<sup>10</sup> EFIS Item No. 50.

<sup>11</sup> Exhibit 2, pg. 5.

2. In 2001, KCPL filed an application with the Commission seeking approval to reorganize into a holding company structure, with Great Plains Energy, Incorporated ("GPE") becoming the new holding company, and KCPL existing as its subsidiary.<sup>12</sup>

3. The Commission conducted two on-the-record hearings on KCPL's uncontested application.<sup>13</sup> During the July 5, 2001 hearing, representatives for KCPL and GPE testified regarding KCPL's proposed reorganization.<sup>14</sup> Commissioners also questioned attorneys for the parties about the terms of the *First Amended Stipulation and Agreement* (the "2001 Agreement"), a settlement agreement reached by the Commission's Staff, the Office of the Public Counsel ("OPC"), GPE, KCPL and Great Plains Power, Incorporated.<sup>15</sup>

4. The 2001 Agreement included a section captioned "Prospective Merger Conditions" (hereinafter, "Section 7"), which stated the following:

GPE agrees that it will not, directly or indirectly, acquire or merge with a public utility or the affiliate of a public utility, where such affiliate has a controlling interest in a public utility unless GPE has requested prior approval for such transaction from the Commission and the Commission has found that no detriment to the public would result from the transaction. In addition, GPE agrees that it will not allow itself to be acquired by a public utility, or the affiliate of a public utility, where such affiliate has a controlling interest in a public utility, unless GPE has requested prior approval for such a transaction from the Commission and the Commission has found that no detriment to the public would result from the transaction.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Case No. EM-2001-464.

<sup>13</sup> Exhibits 3 and 4.

<sup>14</sup> Exhibit 3.

<sup>15</sup> Exhibit 1. Other parties to the case did not joint in signing the 2001 Agreement, but did not object to its approval either.

<sup>16</sup> Exhibit 1.

5. During the July 5, 2001 hearing, the following interaction occurred between Commissioner Connie Murray, James Fischer, Counsel for KCPL and GPE, and Ruth O'Neill, Counsel for OPC:

*Commissioner Murray:* All right. My last question is somewhat related, I suppose. It's Section 7, prospective merger conditions where GPE agrees, and I would like to know if the parties believe that that gives the Commission jurisdiction over an unregulated holding company that it would otherwise not have?

*Mr. Fischer:* Your Honor, from the Company's perspective, I would say it's inconsistent, in my opinion, with your holdings on other holding company mergers of parents. However, again, as a negotiated item, in order to get a stipulation between the Staff, the Public Counsel and the Company, we have agreed to this provision.

...

*Commissioner Murray:* Before you respond, Ms. O'Neill, I just have a quick follow-up for Mr. Fischer. Who has the authority to bind GPE?

*Mr. Fischer:* Your Honor, I failed to also enter my appearance on behalf of GPE. I'm speaking on behalf of the Great Plains Energy Company as well.

*Commissioner Murray:* Thank you. Go ahead, Ms. O'Neill.

*Ms. O'Neill:* Yes. We recognize that the Commission has taken certain positions regarding jurisdiction on some other cases. However, we do believe that the Commission does have the ability to exercise jurisdiction over matters relating to public utilities....We believe it is appropriate, however, to include this term within this agreement. We believe that GPE, who is a signatory to this agreement, can agree to be bound on those matters which are significantly related to Commission jurisdiction and oversight to not oppose our request for jurisdiction and not impede our ability to challenge any claim that there isn't jurisdiction.<sup>17</sup>

6. In its July 31, 2001 *Order Approving Stipulation and Agreement and Closing File*, the Commission approved KCPL's application to reorganize and establish GPE as a publicly traded holding company, with KCPL becoming a wholly-owned

---

<sup>17</sup> Exhibit 3, pg. 33, ln. 14 - pg. 35, ln. 6.

subsidiary of GPE.<sup>18</sup> The Commission also approved the 2001 Agreement<sup>19</sup> and directed KCPL and GPE to comply with its terms. The *Order Approving Stipulation and Agreement and Closing File* was not appealed.<sup>20</sup>

7. Presently, GPE is a Missouri corporation and the parent holding company for the stock of Missouri-based public utilities KCPL and KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company ("GMO").<sup>21</sup>

8. On May 29, 2016, GPE entered into an *Agreement and Plan of Merger*, whereby GPE will acquire all of the capital stock of Westar Energy, Inc. ("Westar") in a transaction valued at approximately \$12.2 billion, which is expected to close in the Spring of 2017.<sup>22</sup>

9. Westar is a Kansas corporation headquartered in Topeka, Kansas. Westar is authorized to conduct business by the Kansas Corporation Commission as an electric public utility in the State of Kansas.<sup>23</sup> Westar is not a Missouri-based public utility, nor is it regulated by the Missouri Public Service Commission.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Exhibit 2, Order Approving Stipulation and Agreement and Closing File in Case No. EM-2001-464.

<sup>19</sup> Exhibit 1.

<sup>20</sup> Case No. EM-2001-464.

<sup>21</sup> EFIS Item No. 28, Answer to Second Amended Complaint and Affirmative Defenses of Great Plains Energy Incorporated, pg 2.

<sup>22</sup> EFIS Item No.29; Joint Stipulation of Facts and List of Issues, Request to Take Office Notice, Motion to Cancel Hearing and Oral Argument and to Establish Briefing Schedule, and Motion for Expedited Treatment, ¶1. See also, EFIS Item No. 15; Motion to Dismiss of Great Plains Energy Incorporated and Suggestions in Support. Statement of Facts, pg. 3.

<sup>23</sup> EFIS Item No. 28, Answer to Second Amended Complaint and Affirmative Defenses of Great Plains Energy Incorporated, pg 2.

<sup>24</sup> EFIS Item No. 29; Joint Stipulation of Facts and List of Issues, Request to Take Office Notice, Motion to Cancel Hearing and Oral Argument and to Establish Briefing Schedule, and Motion for Expedited Treatment, ¶ 2 and 3. Although Westar is not a public utility regulated by this Commission, it does own 100% of the stock of Westar Generating, Inc., which in turn owns an undivided 40% share of the State Line Combined Cycle Generating Facility located within the State of Missouri near Joplin. This Commission granted Westar Generating, Inc., a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for the State Line Combined Cycle Generating Facility. However, Westar Generating, Inc. does not sell electricity to or provide any service to a member of the public in Missouri. See also, EFIS Item No. 28, Answer to Second Amended Complaint and Affirmative Defenses of Great Plains Energy Incorporated, pg 1.

10. On May 31, 2016, GPE's President and Chief Executive Officer Terry Bassham, notified the Commission and OPC via email of GPE's *Agreement and Plan of Merger*. Mr. Bassham informed the Commission that GPE did not believe the proposed merger with Westar was subject to the Commission's approval since it would occur at the parent corporation/holding company level by entities that are not electrical corporations in Missouri subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.<sup>25</sup>

11. Midwest Energy Consumers Group ("MECG") is an incorporated entity that represents large commercial and industrial power customers.<sup>26</sup> MECG filed a Complaint alleging GPE's failure to seek the Commission's approval of the Westar merger is a violation of the terms of the 2001 Agreement.<sup>27</sup>

12. As of the time of this order, GPE has not sought the Commission's approval to acquire Westar.<sup>28</sup>

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Based in Topeka, Kansas, Westar is a public utility that provides electricity to customers in the State of Kansas. The parties agree that while Westar is a Kansas-based public utility, subject to the oversight of the Kansas Corporation Commission,<sup>29</sup> Westar is not regulated by this Commission. MECG's Complaint asserts that under the terms of the 2001 Agreement, GPE is required to obtain the Commission's approval

---

<sup>25</sup> EFIS Item No. 29; Joint Stipulation of Facts and List of Issues, Request to Take Office Notice, Motion to Cancel Hearing and Oral Argument and to Establish Briefing Schedule, and Motion for Expedited Treatment, ¶9.

<sup>26</sup> EFIS Item No. 26.

<sup>27</sup> The Complaint was later amended to the Second Amended Complaint on December 28, 2016, which will be referred to as the "Complaint" throughout this order. EFIS Item No. 26.

<sup>28</sup> See EFIS Item No.29;Joint Stipulation of Facts and List of Issues, Request to Take Office Notice, Motion to Cancel Hearing and Oral Argument and to Establish Briefing Schedule, and Motion for Expedited Treatment, ¶10.

<sup>29</sup> The Kansas Corporation Commission is the state agency tasked with regulating public utilities in the State of Kansas.

before it can acquire Westar (the "Westar Merger"). GPE, on the other hand, maintains that MCEG's position would improperly expand the Commission's jurisdiction to include the acquisition of non-Missouri regulated utilities by Missouri-based holding companies. This, GPE contends, would grant the Commission a power never contemplated by Missouri law. For the reasons set forth below, the Commission disagrees with GPE's position.

### ***Commission's Jurisdiction to Consider Complaint***

At its most basic level, this case is a complaint alleging failure to comply with a prior Commission order. The Commission is an agency created by the legislature.<sup>30</sup> It possesses only those powers expressly granted or necessarily implied by statute.<sup>31</sup> Section 386.390.1, RSMo,<sup>32</sup> authorizes a complaint to be made by any person, corporation, or commercial association that sets forth any act done or omitted to be done by a corporation, person, or public utility, in violation of any law or order of the Commission.<sup>33</sup> MCEG is invoking the Commission's jurisdiction under this general complaint statute to determine if a violation of a previously issued Commission order occurred.

MCEG argues that GPE violated the Commission's order directing GPE to comply with the terms of the 2001 Agreement.<sup>34</sup> More specifically, MCEG argues that GPE violated and continues to violate the conditions set in Section 7 by failing to file an

---

<sup>30</sup> See Section 386.010, Public Service Commission Law.

<sup>31</sup> *State ex rel. & to Use of Kansas City Power & Light Co. v. Buzard*, 168 S.W.2d 1044, 1046 (Mo. banc 1943).

<sup>32</sup> All statutory references are to the 2000 Missouri Revised Statutes, as cumulatively supplemented.

<sup>33</sup> Section 386.390.1, RSMo. All statutory references are to the 2000 Missouri Revised Statutes, as cumulatively supplemented.

<sup>34</sup> Exhibit 2. July 31, 2001 Order Approving Stipulation and Agreement and Closing File in Case No. EM-2001-464

application for the Commission's approval of the Westar Merger. By statute, the Commission is authorized to hear MEGC's Complaint.

For this reason, the Commission will determine if, as asserted by the Complaint, GPE violated the Commission's directive to comply with the terms of the 2001 Agreement by failing to file an application for Commission-approval of the Westar Merger. As the complainant, MEGC bears the burden of proof.<sup>35</sup>

***Commission's Authority to Approve KCPL's Reorganization***

Before determining what obligations exist under the terms of the 2001 Agreement, we must first consider the Commission's authority to order GPE's compliance. GPE correctly states that the Commission's jurisdiction cannot exceed what is statutorily authorized and that subject matter jurisdiction cannot be conferred by consent or agreement of the parties.<sup>36</sup> Simply put, the inclusion of a condition in an agreement does not in and of itself create within the Commission enforcement authority.<sup>37</sup>

Absent statutory authority to place conditions on GPE's potential merger actions, GPE's prior consent to Section 7 would be unenforceable by the Commission.<sup>38</sup> However, as MEGC correctly points out, the Commission has the requisite authority to enforce Section 7 through its ability to set conditions on the reorganization of KCPL in 2001.

It is undisputed that KCPL was (and remains) an electrical corporation regulated as a public utility. In 2001, when KCPL wanted to become the subsidiary of a newly

---

<sup>35</sup> *State ex rel. GS Technologies Operating Co., v. Public Service Comm'n*, 116 S.W.3d 680, 693 (Mo.App. 2003).

<sup>36</sup> *State Tax Com'n v. Administrative Hearing Com'n*, 641 S.W.2d 69 (Mo. 1982).

<sup>37</sup> *Livingston Manor, Inc. v. Department of Social Services*, 809 S.W.2d 153, 156 (Mo.App. W.D. 1991).

<sup>38</sup> *Tetzner v. Department of Social Services*, 446 S.W.3d 689, 692 (Mo.App. W.D. 2014).

formed holding company, it was statutorily required to first obtain the Commission's consent. Section 393.250, RSMo, states as follows:

1. Reorganizations of...electrical corporations...shall be subject to the supervision and control of the commission, and no such reorganization shall be had without the authorization of the commission.
- ...
3. Any reorganization agreement before it becomes effective shall be amended so that the amount of capitalization shall conform to the amount authorized by the Commission. **The Commission may by its order impose such condition or conditions as it may deem reasonable and necessary.** (Emphasis added.)

The Commission is tasked with acting in the public interest.<sup>39</sup> The Commission's ability to impose "reasonable and necessary" conditions on the reorganization of an electrical corporation was the Legislature's way of ensuring the Commission could accomplish that task. Reorganizing the corporate structure of a public utility can impact the debt structure and cost of capital for the resulting companies well past the closing of the transaction. Review of proposed public utility reorganizations by the Commission is needed to minimize the potential risks to both present and future ratepayers. GPE does not challenge the Commission's ability to set "reasonable and necessary" conditions. GPE does, however, argue that the Commission's authority under Section 393.250 can never extend to an electrical corporation located outside of Missouri. GPE's argument confuses the Commission's authority over KCPL – the electrical corporation at issue in the 2001 reorganization case – with authority over Westar. Ultimately, the Commission's ability to enforce the terms of the 2001 Agreement does not depend on the location of

---

<sup>39</sup> *State ex rel. Gulf Transport Co. v. Public Service Com'n*, 658 S.W.2d 448, 456 (Mo.App. 1983).



GPE's acquisition, but rather, whether the conditions included in Section 7 were "reasonable and necessary" under Section 393.250.3.

When KCPL sought Commission approval to adjust its corporate structure, it was statutorily obligated to seek approval for the type of merger currently contemplated by GPE.<sup>40</sup> Setting a requirement to obtain Commission approval on prospective mergers was both a reasonable and necessary way of ensuring that KCPL – through its future iterations – would not evade the level of Commission scrutiny mandated by Section 393.190, RSMo. It was a reasonable and necessary way to protect the ratepaying public from harmful acquisitions at the holding company level.<sup>41</sup>

The Commission cannot enforce, construe or annul contracts,<sup>42</sup> nor can it declare or enforce principles of law or equity.<sup>43</sup> However, the "Commission is entitled to interpret its own orders and to ascribe to them a proper meaning and, in so doing, the Commission does not act judicially but as a fact-finding agency."<sup>44</sup> Section 7 was a Section 393.250.3 condition agreed to by the parties and fixed by the Commission before approval was granted for KCPL's reorganization in 2001. Therefore, the Commission is not exceeding its authority by enforcing the reasonable and necessary conditions of Section 7.

### ***Principles of Contract Construction Apply to the 2001 Agreement***

---

<sup>40</sup> Section 393.190, RSMo, requires an electrical corporation to secure the Commission's authority before it can directly or indirectly merge or consolidate with any other corporation, person or public utility.

<sup>41</sup> Under Section 386.510, RSMo 2000, parties at the time the July 31, 2001 Order Approving Stipulation and Agreement and Closing File in Case No. EM-2001-464 was issued were able to request a rehearing before appealing the order. However, no parties requested a rehearing or appealed that Commission order.

<sup>42</sup> *Wilshire Const. Co. v. Union Elec. Co.*, 463 S.W.2d 903, 905 (Mo. 1971).

<sup>43</sup> *State ex rel. Cass County v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 259 S.W.3d 544, 547 (Mo. App. 2008).

<sup>44</sup> *State ex rel. Beaufort Transfer Co. v. Public Service Commission of Missouri*, 610 S.W.2d 96, 100 (Mo. App. 1980).

In the 2001 Agreement, GPE agreed in Section 7 that it would not directly or indirectly acquire or merge with a public utility or the affiliate of a public utility unless it had requested prior approval for the transaction from the Commission. Since the Commission has the statutory authority to enforce the 2001 Agreement, the Commission must determine if the Westar Merger is subject to the conditions set in Section 7. It is undisputed that GPE has yet to file an application for Commission-approval of the Westar Merger.

The parties disagree on the meaning of the term “public utility” within Section 7. MEEG asserts that, as used in the agreement, “public utility” is not limited to entities located within Missouri. Therefore, Westar is considered a public utility for which GPE must seek Commission approval before acquiring. GPE contends that, as used in the 2001 Agreement, the term “public utility” can only mean a public utility based in Missouri, since by statute, the Commission’s authority only applies to a public utility within the state.

GPE relies on the definitions used in the Public Service Commission Law, specifically, Section 386.020. GPE contends that even though the term “public utility” is not defined in the 2001 Agreement, the only reference to any state law in the agreement is to Missouri law. This, according to GPE, means that “public utility” can only be interpreted as it is meant in Missouri statutes. Specifically, the Commission, as a creature of statute, only has jurisdiction over “the manufacture, sale, or distribution of...electricity for light, heat and power, *within the state*, and to persons or corporations owning, leasing, operating, or controlling the same....” (Emphasis added).<sup>45</sup> However,

---

<sup>45</sup> Section 386.250(1), RSMo.

settlement agreements are not akin to rules or regulations, which routinely rely on statutes to define terms or phrases.<sup>46</sup> Unless an agreement expressly defines the meaning of a term, the Commission will use the principles of contract law to interpret the agreement's meaning.<sup>47</sup>

Under principles of contract construction, the Commission first examines the plain language of the agreement to determine whether it is clear or if an ambiguity exists. When contract language is clear, we discern intent from the document alone.<sup>48</sup> The 2001 Agreement does not state that as used in the agreement, terms would have the same meaning as they do under Missouri law. GPE's argument that the statutory definition of "public utility" should apply ignores the cardinal rule for interpreting an agreement – to ascertain and give effect to the parties' intentions.<sup>49</sup> This is accomplished by giving words their plain, ordinary, and usual meaning.<sup>50</sup> That is, the meaning that a person of average intelligence, knowledge, and experience would deem reasonable.<sup>51</sup>

Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines "public utility" as "a business organization deemed by law to be vested with public interest usually because of monopoly privileges and so subject to public regulation such as fixing of rates, standards of service and provision of facilities."<sup>52</sup> The term "public utility" does not

---

<sup>46</sup> *Union Elec. Co. v. Dir. Of Revenue*, 425 S.W.3d 118 (Mo.banc 2014) Stating that terms in rules and regulations of a state agency are invalid if they are beyond the scope of authority conferred upon the agency, or if they attempt to expand or modify statutes.

<sup>47</sup> *Withers v. City of Lake St. Louis*, 318 S.W.3d 256, 261(Mo.App. E.D. 2010).

<sup>48</sup> *J.E. Hathman, Inc. v. Sigma Alpha Epsilon Club*, 491 S.W.2d 261, 264 (Mo. banc 1973).

<sup>49</sup> *Park Lane Medical Center of Kansas City, Inc. v. Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Kansas City*, 809 S.W.2d 721 (Mo.App.W.D. 1991).

<sup>50</sup> *Chochorowski v. Home Depot U.S.A.*, 404 S.W.3d 220, 226 (Mo. banc 2013).

<sup>51</sup> *Farmland Industries, Inc. v. Republic Insurance Company*, 941 S.W.2d 505, 508 (Mo. banc 1997).

<sup>52</sup> WEBSTER'S THIRD NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY 1836 (1986).

distinguish entities based on locale. Westar is a public utility under the laws of the State of Kansas. Consequently, it is reasonable to conclude that, by its plain language, the term “public utility” clearly and unambiguously encompasses all public utilities, including those in the State of Kansas. However, were the Commission to conclude an ambiguity exists, GPE’s argument would still fail.

Unless the context of an agreement makes clear that a technical or special meaning was intended or the words have a special meaning in the parties’ trade or business, the Commission interprets the words used as having their common and ordinary meaning.<sup>53</sup> GPE may argue that the term “public utility” *did* have a technical or special meaning to the parties who drafted the 2001 Agreement, since the parties were aware of the statutory restriction placed on the Commission’s jurisdiction as being over the sale or distribution of electricity within the state, and to persons or corporations owning, leasing, operating, or controlling the same. However, GPE’s argument would fail for two reasons. First, it is not supported by the stated intentions of the parties at the time the agreement was entered. Second, it would render the Section 7 condition at issue meaningless.

When interpreting the 2001 Agreement, the Commission will consider what the parties were attempting to accomplish.<sup>54</sup> GPE argues that at the time the agreement was created the parties intended for the Section 7 condition to only apply to Missouri public utilities. However, this contradicts the statements made at the on-the-record hearing before the Commission. In the reorganization case, counsel for KCPL and GPE acknowledged that the Commission would maintain jurisdiction over prospective

---

<sup>53</sup> *State ex rel. Vincent v. Schneider*, 194 S.W.3d 853, 859-60 (Mo. banc 2006).

<sup>54</sup> *Glass v. Mancuso*, 444 S.W.2d 467 (Mo. 1969).

mergers involving the holding company and a public utility.<sup>55</sup> Attorneys for Staff and the Office of the Public Counsel agreed with that pronouncement. Normally, unsworn statements by counsel are not evidence of the facts asserted, unless the facts are conceded to be true by other parties.<sup>56</sup> Counsel for OPC and Staff did not disagree on the meaning of Section 7. As counsel for KCPL and GPE admitted, “as a negotiated item, in order to get a stipulation between the Staff, the Public Counsel and the Company, we have agreed to this provision.”<sup>57</sup>

In circumstances such as these, where the parties are disputing the terms of a settlement agreement, the statements by counsel for KCPL and GPE regarding the meaning of Section 7 and why it was included in the 2001 Agreement establishes the intent of the parties when drafting the agreement. Therefore, it weakens the credibility of GPE’s current claims that the term “public utility” was never meant to apply to entities outside of Missouri, because at the time of the agreement, GPE’s attorney acknowledged it was a condition negotiated by the parties for settlement purposes.

Furthermore, Section 393.190.1 already requires a regulated electrical corporation obtain the Commission’s approval before selling, transferring, or merging its system with any other corporation, person or public utility.<sup>58</sup> This statute grants the Commission authority to review the merger of any Missouri regulated electrical

---

<sup>55</sup> Exhibit 3, pg. 33, ln. 14 - pg. 35, ln. 6.

<sup>56</sup> *State ex rel. Dixon v. Darnold*, 939 S.W.2d 66, 69 (Mo.App. S.D. 1997).

<sup>57</sup> Staff’s brief also makes a credible equitable estoppel argument, based on the reliance of the parties in the 2001 KCPL reorganization case on the statements of KCPL, GPE and their representatives. There are three elements to equitable estoppel: an admission, statement, or act inconsistent to claim afterwards asserted; action by other party in reliance upon such admission, statement or act; and injury to that other party as result of allowing first party to contradict admission, statement, or act. *Pinnell v. Jacobs*, 873 S.W.2d 925, 927 (Mo.App. E.D. 1994).

<sup>58</sup> Section 393.190.2 also requires Commission approval before an electrical corporation directly or indirectly acquires the stock or bond of other corporations engaged in the same or similar business. The statutory requirement to obtain Commission approval also applies to a gas corporation, water corporation, and sewer corporation.

corporation with GPE. GPE's interpretation of Section 7 - that it only applies to Missouri-based public utilities - would merely result in a duplication of the Commission review for a merger transaction under Section 393.190. It is unreasonable to assume the parties that negotiated Section 7 only intended for GPE to replicate what is already statutorily required, Commission approval for the merger of GPE and a Missouri-based public utility.<sup>59</sup> The terms of the 2001 Agreement should be construed to avoid a result that renders terms meaningless.<sup>60</sup> For this reason, GPE's arguments are not persuasive.

*Prior Commission Decisions Concerning Public Utility Holding Companies*

GPE points out that, in the past, the Commission has consistently found that it does not have jurisdiction over transactions at the holding company level. Even if true, it has no import in this case. The manner in which the Commission has in the past or may in the future handle holding company merger cases is not relevant to the specific facts before us.

Moreover, the examples referenced by GPE in its *Initial Brief* are not comparable to the facts presented here. GPE cites cases where the Commission stated that nothing in the statutes conferred jurisdiction over the merger of two non-regulated parent corporations.<sup>61</sup> The current case is distinguishable from those examples because this dispute involves the Commission's authority to enforce the terms of a prior Commission order and a settlement agreement in a reorganization case where Section 393.250 required Commission approval. For reasons already discussed, the Commission does have statutory authority to enforce its prior orders and the 2001 Agreement.

---

<sup>59</sup> Section 393.190, RSMo.

<sup>60</sup> *Dunn Indus. Group v. City of Sugar Creek*, 112 S.W.3d 421, 428 (Mo. banc 2003).

<sup>61</sup> See *Initial Brief of Great Plains Energy Incorporated*, pg. 10.

GPE is the holding company for two Missouri public utilities, KCPL and GMO. An acquisition of the magnitude of the Westar Merger may have far-reaching financial ramifications on current and future customers of both KCPL and GMO. The merger scenario at issue is the type of transaction anticipated by Section 7 for Commission review.

### ***Public Policy***

GPE's position is troublesome from a public policy perspective. At the time of the 2001 Agreement, the Commission and the parties relied on KCPL's and GPE's assurances that Section 7 authorized the Commission's oversight over the future holding company. The Commission ordered the parties to comply with the terms of the agreement. Were the Commission to agree with GPE's analysis, it would render the terms of a negotiated stipulation and agreement meaningless and unenforceable; a result that should be avoided. For public policy reasons, all sides have a vested interest in maintaining trust in the settlement process. Parties must be confident that when they enter into a settlement agreement, each party can be relied upon to comply with the terms included, and that the Commission will indeed enforce all conditions. Should trust in the settlement process falter, the ultimate victims will be the ratepayers who will be forced to pay for the resulting lengthy litigation.

### **Decision**

In making this decision, the Commission has considered the positions and arguments of all of the parties. Applying law to the facts in reaching its conclusion, the Commission finds that based on competent and substantial evidence, MECG met its burden of proof. GPE violated the terms of the 2001 Agreement and the Commission

order approving the 2001 Agreement by failing to seek Commission approval for the Westar Merger.

GPE did submit a joint application for a variance from the Commission's affiliated transactions rule.<sup>62</sup> However, that filing is not sufficient to meet the public detriment review required by Section 7. The public detriment standard is higher than the "for good-cause" showing required before the granting of a variance from a Commission rule. Moreover, in the variance case, GPE and its subsidiaries KCPL and GMO request the regulatory restrictions on transactions with Westar be waived *after* Westar becomes an affiliate. This would not permit the Commission to evaluate the potential public detriment before the merger is authorized. It would only allow the Commission to grant relief after the Westar Merger is a *fait accompli*.

The Commission will direct GPE to comply with the terms of Section 7 of the 2001 Agreement and file an application for prior approval of the Westar Merger, requesting the Commission's determination that the Westar Merger is not detrimental to the public interest.

The purpose of this decision is not to impede GPE's potential merger, which is expected to occur in the Spring of 2017.<sup>63</sup> The parties requested an expeditious determination on the Complaint.<sup>64</sup> For this reason, the Commission will allow this order to become effective in less than thirty days. This will allow time for GPE to make the necessary filing, and after proper notice is given, a hearing can be held promptly.

---

<sup>62</sup> File No. EE-2017-0113; In the Matter of the Joint Application of Great Plains Energy Incorporated, Kansas City Power & Light Company and KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company for a Variance from the Commission's Affiliate Transactions Rule, 4 CSR 240-20.015.

<sup>63</sup> EFIS Item No. 7; Motion to Dismiss of Great Plains Energy Incorporated and Suggestions in Support, Statement of Facts.

<sup>64</sup> EFIS Item No. 15; Proposed Procedural Schedule.



**THE COMMISSION ORDERS THAT:**

1. The Commission finds that GPE is in violation of the Commission's July 31, 2001 *Order Approving Stipulation and Agreement and Closing File*, issued in Case No. EM-2001-464.
2. No later than March 4, 2017, GPE shall file an application for the Commission's approval of the *Agreement and Plan of Merger* and a determination on whether the Westar Merger is detrimental to the public interest
3. This order shall go into effect on March 4, 2017.



**BY THE COMMISSION**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Morris L. Woodruff".

Morris L. Woodruff  
Secretary

Hall, Chm., Stoll, Kenney, Rupp, and  
Coleman, CC., concur.

Burton, Senior Regulatory Law Judge.

**VERIFICATION**

**16-KCPE-593-ACQ**

STATE OF KANSAS                     )  
  ) ss.  
COUNTY OF SHAWNEE            )

Amber Smith, of lawful age, being duly sworn upon her oath deposes and states that she is Chief Litigation Counsel for the State Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas; that she has read and is familiar with the foregoing *Staff's Motion Requesting the Commission take Administrative Notice of Certain Files and Record*, and attests that the statements therein are true to the best of her knowledge, information and belief.



---

Amber Smith, S. Ct. #23911  
Chief Litigation Counsel  
The State Corporation Commission  
of the State of Kansas

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 23<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2017.

---

Notary Public

My Appointment Expires: June 30, 2018

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

16-KCPE-593-ACQ

I, the undersigned, certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Staff's Motion Requesting the Commission Take Administrative Notice of Certain Files and Records was served via electronic service this 23rd day of February, 2017, to the following:

W. ROBERT ALDERSON, JR., ATTORNEY  
ALDERSON ALDERSON WEILER CONKLIN BURGHART &  
CROW LLC  
2101 SW 21ST STREET (66604)  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
Fax: 785-232-1866  
boba@aldersonlaw.com

MICHAEL E. AMASH, ATTORNEY  
BLAKE & UHLIG PA  
SUITE 475 NEW BROTHERHOOD BLDG  
753 STATE AVE.  
KANSAS CITY, KS 66101  
Fax: 913-321-2396  
mea@blake-uhlig.com

KURT J. BOEHM, ATTORNEY  
BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY  
36 E SEVENTH ST STE 1510  
CINCINNATI, OH 45202  
Fax: 513-421-2764  
kboehm@bklawfirm.com

JODY KYLER COHN, ATTORNEY  
BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY  
36 E SEVENTH ST STE 1510  
CINCINNATI, OH 45202  
Fax: 513-421-2764  
jkylercohn@bklawfirm.com

MARTIN J. BREGMAN  
BREGMAN LAW OFFICE, L.L.C.  
311 PARKER CIRCLE  
LAWRENCE, KS 66049  
mjb@mjbregmanlaw.com

ANDREW J ZELLERS, GEN COUNSEL/VP REGULATORY  
AFFAIRS  
BRIGHTERGY, LLC  
1712 MAIN ST 6TH FLR  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108  
Fax: 816-511-0822  
andy.zellers@brightergy.com

GLEND A CAFER, ATTORNEY  
CAFER PEMBERTON LLC  
3321 SW 6TH ST  
TOPEKA, KS 66606  
Fax: 785-233-3040  
glenda@caferlaw.com

TERRI PEMBERTON, ATTORNEY  
CAFER PEMBERTON LLC  
3321 SW 6TH ST  
TOPEKA, KS 66606  
Fax: 785-233-3040  
terri@caferlaw.com

THOMAS J. CONNORS, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
Fax: 785-271-3116  
tj.connors@curb.kansas.gov

DAVID W. NICKEL, CONSUMER COUNSEL  
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
Fax: 785-271-3116  
d.nickel@curb.kansas.gov

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

16-KCPE-593-ACQ

DELLA SMITH  
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
Fax: 785-271-3116  
d.smith@curb.kansas.gov

SHONDA SMITH  
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604  
Fax: 785-271-3116  
sd.smith@curb.kansas.gov

DANIEL R. ZMIJEWSKI  
DRZ LAW FIRM  
9229 WARD PARKWAY STE 370  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64114  
Fax: 816-523-5667  
dan@drzlawfirm.com

ASHLEY M. BOND, ATTORNEY  
DUNCAN & ALLEN  
1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE NW  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3155  
Fax: 202-289-8450  
amb@duncanallen.com

KEN HOLMBOE, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
DUNCAN & ALLEN  
1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE NW  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3155  
Fax: 202-289-8450  
kh@duncanallen.com

GREGG D. OTTINGER, ATTORNEY  
DUNCAN & ALLEN  
1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE NW  
SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3155  
Fax: 202-289-8450  
gdo@duncanallen.com

SHANNON FISK, ATTORNEY  
EARTHJUSTICE  
1617 JOHN F KENNEDY BLVD  
SUITE 1675  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103  
sfisk@earthjustice.org

KEVIN HIGGINS  
ENERGY STRATEGIES, LLC  
PARKSIDE TOWERS  
215 S STATE ST STE 200  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111  
Fax: 801-521-9142  
khiggins@energystrat.com

WILLIAM R. LAWRENCE  
FAGAN EMERT & DAVIS LLC  
730 NEW HAMPSHIRE SUITE 210  
LAWRENCE, KS 66044  
Fax: 785-331-0303  
wlawrence@fed-firm.com

ALI NELSON, PARALEGAL  
FAGAN EMERT & DAVIS LLC  
730 NEW HAMPSHIRE SUITE 210  
LAWRENCE, KS 66044  
Fax: 785-331-0303  
anelson@fed-firm.com

SARAH STEELE  
GILMORE & BELL, P.C.  
ONE MAIN PLACE  
100 NORTH MAIN, STE. 800  
WICHITA, KS 67202  
sstele@gilmorebell.com

DOUGLAS L. HEALY, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
HEALY LAW OFFICES, LLC  
3010 E BATTLEFIELD STE A  
SPRINGFIELD, MO 65804  
doug@healylawoffices.com

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

16-KCPE-593-ACQ

TERRY M. JARRETT, ATTORNEY AT LAW  
HEALY LAW OFFICES, LLC  
3010 E BATTLEFIELD STE A  
SPRINGFIELD, MO 65804  
terry@healylawoffices.com

DARRELL MCCUBBINS, BUSINESS MANAGER  
IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 1464  
PO BOX 33443  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64120  
Fax: 816-483-4239  
kwhiteman@ibew1464.org

DUANE NORDICK, BUSINESS MANAGER  
IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 1523  
609 N BROADWAY  
WICHITA, KS 67214  
duane\_nordick@sbcglobal.net

DAVID PINON, BUSINESS MANAGER  
IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 1613  
6900 EXECUTIVE DR  
SUITE 180  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64120  
local1613@earthlink.net

RAYMOND ROGERS, BUSINESS MANAGER  
IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 225  
PO BOX 404  
BURLINGTON, KS 66839-0404  
rcrogers@cableone.net

JOHN GARRETSON, BUSINESS MANAGER  
IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 304  
3906 NW 16TH STREET  
TOPEKA, KS 66615  
Fax: 785-235-3345  
johnng@ibew304.org

BILL MCDANIEL, BUSINESS MANAGER  
IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 412  
6200 CONNECTICUT  
SUITE 105  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64120  
Fax: 816-231-5515  
business.manager@me.com

JOHN KRAJEWSKI, PRESIDENT  
J K ENERGY CONSULTING LLC  
650 J STREET STE 108  
LINCOLN, NE 68508  
Fax: 402-438-4322  
jk@jkenergyconsulting.com

RICHARD S. HARPER  
JENNINGS, STROUSS & SALMON, P.L.C  
1350 I Street, NW  
Suite 810  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
Fax: 202-371-9025  
rharper@jsslaw.com

ALAN I. ROBBINS, ATTORNEY  
JENNINGS, STROUSS & SALMON, P.L.C  
1350 I Street, NW  
Suite 810  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
Fax: 202-408-5406  
arobbins@jsslaw.com

DEBRA D. ROBY, ATTORNEY  
JENNINGS, STROUSS & SALMON, P.L.C  
1350 I Street, NW  
Suite 810  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
Fax: 202-371-9025  
droby@jsslaw.com

JOHN R. WINE, JR.  
410 NE 43RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66617  
Fax: 785-246-0339  
jwine2@cox.net

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

16-KCPE-593-ACQ

SUSAN ALIG, ASSISTANT COUNSEL  
KANSAS CITY KANSAS BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
701 N 7TH STREET  
KANSAS CITY, KS 66101  
Fax: 913-573-5243  
salig@wycokck.org

ANDREW FERRIS, DIRECTOR OF ELECTRIC SUPPLY  
PLANNING  
KANSAS CITY KANSAS BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
312 N 65TH STREET  
KANSAS CITY, KS 66102  
aferris@bpu.com

ANGELA LAWSON, SENIOR COUNSEL  
KANSAS CITY KANSAS BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
540 MINNESOTA AVENUE  
KANSAS CITY, KS 66101-2930  
alawson@bpu.com

ROBERT J. HACK, LEAD REGULATORY COUNSEL  
KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 19th FLOOR (64105)  
PO BOX 418679  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679  
Fax: 816-556-2787  
rob.hack@kcpl.com

DARRIN R. IVES, VICE PRESIDENT, REGULATORY  
AFFAIRS  
KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 19th FLOOR (64105)  
PO BOX 418679  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679  
Fax: 816-556-2110  
darrin.ives@kcpl.com

ROGER W. STEINER, CORPORATE COUNSEL  
KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 19th FLOOR (64105)  
PO BOX 418679  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679  
Fax: 816-556-2787  
roger.steiner@kcpl.com

MARY TURNER, DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIR  
KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 19th FLOOR (64105)  
PO BOX 418679  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679  
Fax: 816-556-2110  
mary.turner@kcpl.com

BRIAN G. FEDOTIN, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL  
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027  
Fax: 785-271-3314  
b.fedotin@kcc.ks.gov

ANDREW FRENCH, SENIOR LITIGATION COUNSEL  
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027  
Fax: 785-271-3314  
a.french@kcc.ks.gov

DUSTIN KIRK, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL  
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027  
Fax: 785-271-3354  
d.kirk@kcc.ks.gov

MICHAEL NEELEY, LITIGATION COUNSEL  
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027  
Fax: 785-271-3167  
m.neeley@kcc.ks.gov

AMBER SMITH, CHIEF LITIGATION COUNSEL  
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION  
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD  
TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027  
Fax: 785-271-3167  
a.smith@kcc.ks.gov

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

16-KCPE-593-ACQ

MARK DOLJAC, DIR RATES AND REGULATION  
KANSAS ELECTRIC POWER CO-OP, INC.  
600 SW CORPORATE VIEW (66615)  
PO BOX 4877  
TOPEKA, KS 66604-0877  
Fax: 785-271-4888  
mdoljac@kepco.org

CATHRYN J DINGES, CORPORATE COUNSEL  
KANSAS GAS & ELECTRIC CO.  
D/B/A WESTAR ENERGY  
818 S KANSAS AVE  
PO BOX 889  
TOPEKA, KS 66601-0889  
Fax: 785-575-8136  
cathy.dinges@westarenergy.com

LARRY HOLLOWAY, ASST GEN MGR OPERATIONS  
KANSAS POWER POOL  
100 N BROADWAY STE L110  
WICHITA, KS 67202  
Fax: 316-264-3434  
lholloway@kansaspowerpool.org

JOHN MICHAEL ADRAGNA ESQ.  
MCCARTER ENGLISH, LLP  
1015 15TH STREET, NW  
12TH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
Fax: 202-296-0166  
jadragna@mccarter.com

WILLIAM DOWLING, VP ENGINEERING & ENERGY  
SUPPLY  
MIDWEST ENERGY, INC.  
1330 CANTERBURY ROAD  
PO BOX 898  
HAYS, KS 67601-0898  
Fax: 785-625-1487  
bdowling@mwenergy.com

ANNE E. CALLENBACH, ATTORNEY  
POL SINELLI PC  
900 W 48TH PLACE STE 900  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64112  
Fax: 913-451-6205  
acallenbach@polsinelli.com

WILLIAM G. RIGGINS, GENERAL COUNSEL  
KANSAS ELECTRIC POWER CO-OP, INC.  
600 SW CORPORATE VIEW (66615)  
PO BOX 4877  
TOPEKA, KS 66604-0877  
Fax: 785-271-4884  
briggins@kepco.org

JEFFREY L. MARTIN, VICE PRESIDENT, REGULATORY  
AFFAIRS  
KANSAS GAS & ELECTRIC CO.  
D/B/A WESTAR ENERGY  
818 S KANSAS AVE  
PO BOX 889  
TOPEKA, KS 66601-0889  
jeff.martin@westarenergy.com

CURTIS M. IRBY, GENERAL COUNSEL  
KANSAS POWER POOL  
LAW OFFICES OF CURTIS M. IRBY  
200 EAST FIRST ST, STE. 415  
WICHITA, KS 67202  
Fax: 316-264-6860  
cmirby@sbcglobal.net

KIMBERLY BRICKELL FRANK ESQ.  
MCCARTER ENGLISH, LLP  
1015 15TH STREET, NW  
12TH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
Fax: 202-296-0166  
kfrank@mccarter.com

EARNEST A. LEHMAN, PRESIDENT & GENERAL  
MANAGER  
MIDWEST ENERGY, INC.  
1330 Canterbury Rd  
PO Box 898  
Hays, KS 67601-0898  
elehman@mwenergy.com

FRANK A. CARO, JR., ATTORNEY  
POL SINELLI PC  
900 W 48TH PLACE STE 900  
KANSAS CITY, MO 64112  
Fax: 816-753-1536  
fcaro@polsinelli.com

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

16-KCPE-593-ACQ

SUNIL BECTOR, ATTORNEY  
SIERRA CLUB  
2101 WEBSTER, SUITE 1300  
OAKLAND, CA 94312-3011  
Fax: 510-208-3140  
sunil.bector@sierraclub.org

HOLLY BENDER  
SIERRA CLUB  
133 S BUTLER ST, STE. 106  
MADISON, WI 53703  
Fax: 608-257-3513  
holly.bender@sierraclub.org

JAMES P. ZAKOURA, ATTORNEY  
SMITHYMAN & ZAKOURA, CHTD.  
7400 W 110TH ST STE 750  
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66210-2362  
Fax: 913-661-9863  
jjim@smizak-law.com

RENEE BRAUN, CORPORATE PARALEGAL, SUPERVISOR  
SUNFLOWER ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION  
301 W. 13TH  
PO BOX 1020 (67601-1020)  
HAYS, KS 67601  
Fax: 785-623-3395  
rbraun@sunflower.net

JAMES BRUNGARDT, REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
ADMINISTRATOR  
SUNFLOWER ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION  
301 W. 13TH  
PO BOX 1020 (67601-1020)  
HAYS, KS 67601  
Fax: 785-623-3395  
jbrungardt@sunflower.net

DAVIS ROONEY, VICE PRESIDENT AND CFO  
SUNFLOWER ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION  
301 W. 13TH  
PO BOX 1020 (67601-1020)  
HAYS, KS 67601  
Fax: 785-623-3395  
hrooney@sunflower.net

AL TAMIMI, VICE PRESIDENT, TRANSMISSION PLANNING  
AND POLICY  
SUNFLOWER ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION  
301 W. 13TH  
PO BOX 1020 (67601-1020)  
HAYS, KS 67601  
Fax: 785-623-3395  
atamimi@sunflower.net

MARK D. CALCARA, ATTORNEY  
WATKINS CALCARA CHTD.  
1321 MAIN ST STE 300  
PO DRAWER 1110  
GREAT BEND, KS 67530  
Fax: 620-792-2775  
mcalcara@wcrf.com

TAYLOR P. CALCARA, ATTORNEY  
WATKINS CALCARA CHTD.  
1321 MAIN ST STE 300  
PO DRAWER 1110  
GREAT BEND, KS 67530  
Fax: 620-792-2775  
tcalcara@wcrf.com

DAVID L. WOODSMALL  
WOODSMALL LAW OFFICE  
308 E HIGH ST STE 204  
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101  
Fax: 573-635-7523  
david.woodsmall@woodsmalllaw.com

/s/ Vicki Jacobsen

---

Vicki Jacobsen