# BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF GREAT	)
PLAINS ENERGY INCORPORATED, KANSAS CITY	)
POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, AND WESTAR	)
ENERGY, INC. FOR APPROVAL OF THE MERGER OF	) DOCKET NO. 18-KCPE-095-MER
WESTAR ENERGY, INC. AND GREAT PLAINS	)
ENERGY INCORPORATED.	)

#### TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF

#### NON-UNANIMOUS STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT

PREPARED BY

JEFFREY D. McCLANAHAN

**UTILITIES DIVISION** 

KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION STAFF

March 12, 2018

- 1 Q. Please state your name and business address.
- 2 A. Jeffrey D. McClanahan, 1500 SW Arrowhead Road, Topeka, Kansas.
- 3 Q. Are you the same Jeffrey D. McClanahan that filed direct testimony in this
- **Docket on January 29, 2018?**
- 5 A. Yes.

A.

#### 6 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

I am testifying on behalf of the Staff of the Kansas Corporation Commission (Staff and Commission, respectively) in support of the comprehensive non-unanimous settlement of the issues outlined in the Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement (Agreement) between Westar Energy, Inc. and Kansas Gas and Electric Company (collectively Westar), Great Plains Energy Incorporated (GPE), Kansas City Power & Light Company (KCP&L) (Westar, KCP&L, and GPE collectively referred to herein as Applicants), Staff, the Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board (CURB), Sunflower Electric Power Corporation (Sunflower), Mid-Kansas Electric Company, Inc. (Mid-Kansas), Kansas Power Pool (KPP), Midwest Energy, Inc. (Midwest), and Brightergy, LLC (Brightergy) (Applicants, Staff, and the abovenamed intervenors are collectively referred to herein as the "Signatories" or, individually, as a Signatory). I also note that Wal-mart Stores, Inc. (Walmart) has indicated it does not oppose the terms of this Agreement, while the remaining intervenors are either opposed or undecided as of the drafting of this testimony.

My testimony will also introduce the other Staff witnesses providing testimony in support of the Agreement, provide a broad overview of the Agreement, discuss why Staff believes the Agreement is in the public interest, and discuss the

1		five-element test the Commission uses to aid in the review of settlement
2		agreements.1
3		
4		I. Introduction of Staff's Witnesses
5		
6	Q.	Who will be offering testimony on behalf of Staff?
7	A.	I will introduce Staff's witnesses testifying in support of the Agreement
8		along with a brief description of their testimony and the specific Merger Standard(s)
9		each witness will address. The witnesses are as follows:
10		Justin Grady: Mr. Grady provides testimony in support of Merger Standards (a)
11		(i), (a) (ii), (a) (iii), (a) (iv), (c), (d), and (e). Mr. Grady's testimony discusses the
12		financial aspects of the merger, the Earnings Review and Sharing Plan, and the
13		Topeka headquarters commitment.
14		Leo Haynos: Mr. Haynos provides testimony in support of Merger Standards (a)
15		(iii), (b), (c), (f), and (h). Mr. Haynos' testimony discusses the safety, reliability,
16		and service quality commitments included in the Agreement. Mr. Haynos'
17		testimony also discusses the Capital Reporting Plan.
18		Robert Glass, Ph.D.: Dr. Glass provides testimony in support of Merger Standards
19		(a) (v), (c), and (g). Dr. Glass' testimony addresses the economic impact of the
20		proposed merger and the impact on competition.
21		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Order Approving Contested Settlement Agreement at 5-6, Application of Atmos Energy for Adjustment of Its Natural Gas Rates in the State of Kansas, Docket No. 08-ATMG-280-RTS (May 12, 2008).

#### 1 II. OVERVIEW OF THE NON-UNANIMOUS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT 2 3 Q. Please provide an overview of the Agreement. 4 A. The Agreement reflects in large part the recommendations and conditions 5 outlined in Staff's Direct Testimony, so much so that Staff's Direct Testimony 6 provides much of the support for this Agreement. That being said, Staff witnesses 7 Mr. Grady, Mr. Haynos, and Dr. Glass all provide additional testimony in support 8 of the Agreement and will describe how the Agreement meets each of the 9 Commission's Merger Standards. 10 The Agreement is extensive so I will not attempt to provide a detailed 11 summary. However, a high-level overview is as follows: 12 1) The Agreement provides upfront bill credits of \$50 million allocated across all 13 jurisdictions. The allocation is based upon twelve months of FERC energy data 14 ended December 31, 2016. The jurisdictional allocations are: 15 \$23.07 million a. Westar 16 b. KCP&L-KS \$ 7.51 million c. KCP&L-MO \$ 9.95 million 17 \$ 9.47 million 18 d. GMO 19 2) The Agreement provides guaranteed annual bill credits for each year 2019 20 through 2022 based on an incremental Kansas share of \$75 million as described 21 below and allocated based upon twelve months ended December 31, 2016 22 FERC energy data as follows: 23 a. Westar \$34.60 million, which is \$8.65 million annually

# Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan $\underline{Docket\ No.\ 18\text{-}KCPE\text{-}095\text{-}ACQ}$

1	b. KCP&L-KS \$11.27 million, which is \$2.82 million annually
2	3) Signatories agree to recommend and support in the Applicants' 2018 Kansas
3	general rate reviews of Westar and KCP&L the following:
4	a. Inclusion of all merger-related savings achieved at the update date with
5	such update date to occur 60 days after the filing of each respective rate
6	case. If it is determined to be a shortfall from the amounts below, then
7	an additional adjustment will be made at the update date to impute into
8	retail rates the shortfall to achieve a total (some such savings are/will be
9	already reflected in the Applicants rate review filing) of merger related
10	savings benefiting Kansas retail rates as follows:
11	i. Westar: \$22.5 million
12	ii. KCP&L-KS: \$ 7.5 million
13	b. Westar second step rate increases in February 2019 related to an
14	expiring wholesale contract with Mid-Kansas Electric Company, LLC
15	(MKEC) recovered through the Retail Energy Cost Adjustment as
16	proposed in the direct testimony of Westar witness Fowler in Docket
17	18-WSEE-328-RTS; Exhibit RAF-1 and the expiration of production
18	tax credits related to Central Plains and Flat Ridge Wind Farms.
19	c. Signatories will agree to recommend a 9.3% ROE to be utilized in the
20	2018 cases, and if including a range, testimony will not recommend
21	greater than 20bps below or above the 9.3% recommended ROE.
22	d. Applicants agree to forego their ability to demonstrate underearning at
23	the time of the federal tax law change as an offset to benefits otherwise

### Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan Docket No. 18-KCPE-095-ACQ

1 due to customers from January 1, 2018, through the effective date of 2 new retail rates as a result of the 2018 rate cases. Such gross benefits 3 will be distributed to customers as determined in each respective rate 4 case. 5 4) Signatories agree that recovery of transition costs shall be limited to \$50 million 6 on a total company basis and the Kansas jurisdiction portion shall be deferred 7 and recoverable through amortization over ten years beginning when the 2018 Kansas base rate review rates become effective. 8 9 a. Westar: \$23.2 million, which is \$2.32 million annually 10 b. KCP&L-KS \$7.7 million, which is \$0.77 million annually 11 5) The moratorium period will expire, for Westar and KCP&L-KS, five years from 12 the final order date of KCP&L's 2018 base rate review. Any base rate review 13 filing cannot change rates until after that date, but a filing or show cause may 14 be commenced as long as the resulting base rate adjustment becomes effective 15 after the moratorium date. In the event the ROE authorized in either 2018 rate 16 case is below 9.3%, the moratorium period shall be reduced to three years for 17 the respective company. 18 6) The moratorium period does not preclude the Applicants from changing rates 19 and tariffs under their respective riders and surcharges. The Agreement also 20 allows the Applicants to file an application with the Commission in the event 21 of changes in law or regulations or the occurrence of events outside the control 22 of Westar or KCP&L that result in a material adverse impact to Westar or

1 KCP&L. If such occurs, Westar and KCP&L, as applicable, may file an 2 application with the Commission proposing methods to address the impact of 3 the events, including the possibility of changes in base rates. 4 7) Westar and KCP&L will make a mandatory base rate review filing so that rates 5 become effective the day after the expiration of the moratorium period. In the 6 event that the moratorium period is three years for either company pursuant to 7 other provisions of this agreement, such mandatory rate review for that 8 company shall be two years after the end of its rate moratorium. However, 9 Applicants can delay their mandatory base rate review filings with the approval 10 of Staff. 11 8) The Agreement includes the Earnings Review and Sharing Plan (ERSP) 12 recommended by Staff and specifically addressed by Mr. Grady in both his 13 Direct Testimony and Testimony in Support. 14 9) The Agreement includes Quality of Service reporting, minimum reliability 15 performance metrics, penalties for failure to perform, and a requirement that the 16 Applicants, CURB, and Staff participate in a compliance docket that will jointly 17 develop an update of the reliability reporting requirements outlined in Docket No. 02-GIME-365-GIE. The compliance docket will also evaluate setting 18 19 permanent reliability standards for the post-merger operating areas. 20 10) The Agreement includes a Capital Plan Reporting compliance docket to be 21 created to provide capital plan reports similar to the template included as 22 Attachment 6 to the Agreement. The primary purpose of the Capital Plan 23 Report is to provide Staff and the Commission with the information and data

# Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan $\underline{Docket\ No.\ 18\text{-}KCPE\text{-}095\text{-}ACQ}$

1	necessary to understand forecasted capital expenditures over a five-year period.
2	The capital expenditures to be reviewed include generation, environmental,
3	transmission, distribution, and information technology. The compliance docket
4	will include the Applicants, CURB, and Staff and will also determine if or when
5	the reporting will sunset.
6	11) The Agreement extends the five-year operating headquarters for Westar to ten
7	years, with certain additional conditions relating to a possible change in the
8	location in Topeka of the operating headquarters after five years and the level
9	of employees in the headquarters.
10	12) The Agreement also address the following broad categories:
11	a. Financing Conditions;
12	b. Ratemaking, Accounting, and Related Conditions;
13	c. Affiliate Transactions and Cost Allocation Manual Conditions;
14	d. Notice Regarding Generation Plant Retirements;
15	e. Reporting and Access to Records;
16	f. Financial Conditions Remaining From Docket No. 01-KCPE-701-MIS;
17	and
18	g. Other Parent Company Conditions.

1		III. THE AGREEMENT MEETS THE COMMISSION'S ESTABLISHED MERGER
2		STANDARDS AND IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST
3		
4	Q.	What is the Public Interest Standard and how is it applied in merger
5		dockets?
6	A.	I discuss the Public Interest Standard and how it is applied in merger
7		dockets in my Direct Testimony at pages 5 through 8 where I conclude on pages 7
8		and 8 that:
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Based on the above statements, it is clear that the merger standards are entrenched as "the beginning criteria to be used when evaluating a merger application, and are to be supplemented by any other considerations that are relevant given the circumstances existing at the time of the merger proposal." Moreover, the Commission confirmed that the merger standards are the primary determination of whether a proposed merger promotes the public interest when it stated, "The Commission adopts the following list of factors [merger standards] it will weigh and consider in determining whether the proposed Transaction promotes the public interest." It is also clear that whether the public interest is promoted is based on "whether the public interest is served by approving the merger as determined by the specific facts and circumstances of each case."
24	Q.	Does the Agreement promote the public interest?
25	A.	In my Direct Testimony at page 8, I stated:
26 27 28 29 30		So long as the Commission orders, and the Applicants accept, additional conditions, then Staff believes this MOE is in the public interest. A review of each Staff witnesses' testimony will indicate that every merger standard has been either met based on case specific facts or can be met with additional merger conditions.

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  Docket No. 97-WSRE-676-MER, Order on Merger Application at  $\P$  18.  $^3$  Docket Nos. 172,745-U and 174,155-U, Order at p. 35.  $^4$  Docket No. 97-WSRE-676-MER, Order on Merger Application at  $\P$  18.

### Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan Docket No. 18-KCPE-095-ACQ

1 Because the Commission uses the merger standards as guidance as 2 to whether a transaction promotes the public interest, successfully 3 meeting all of the merger standards is a strong indication that the 4 public interest will be promoted by approving the Transaction. 5 6 A review of the Agreement will show that the Applicants have accepted 7 the majority of Staff's recommended conditions, which were recommended in 8 order to address deficiencies in meeting the Merger Standards. This fact, coupled 9 with additional conditions the Applicants have accepted, is a strong indication that 10 the Agreement is in the Public Interest. Staff witnesses Mr. Grady, Mr. Haynos, 11 and Dr. Glass provide the details of how the Agreement meets each specific 12 Merger Standard. 13 IV. DISCUSSION ON THE FIVE ELEMENT TEST USED BY THE COMMISSION TO 14 15 AID IN THE REVIEW OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS 16 17 Q. Has the Commission previously addressed the elements it uses to review 18 **Settlement Agreements?** 19 Yes. The Commission's Order in Docket No. 08-ATMG-280-RTS discusses A. these five elements for reviewing Stipulation and Agreements<sup>5</sup>. These five 20 21 elements are as follows: 22 1. Whether there was an opportunity for the opposing party to be heard on 23 their reasons for opposition to the stipulation and agreement;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Order Approving Contested Settlement Agreement, p. 5, Docket No. 08-ATMG-280-RTS (May 12, 2008).

# Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan <u>Docket No. 18-KCPE-095-ACQ</u>

1		2. Whether the stipulation and agreement is supported by substantial
2		competent evidence in the record as a whole;
3		3. Whether the stipulation and agreement conforms with applicable law;
4		4. Whether the stipulation and agreement results in just and reasonable rates;
5		and
6		5. Whether the results of the stipulation and agreement are in the public
7		interest, including the interest of the customers represented by the parties
8		not consenting to the agreement.
9		Each of these five elements is discussed individually below.
10		
11	Q.	Please address whether each party had an opportunity to be heard on its
12		reasons for opposing the Agreement.
13	A.	There are several intervenors who directly oppose this Agreement. These
14		intervenors include Kansas Industrial Consumer Group (KIC) and Kansas Electric
15		Power Cooperative, Inc. (KEPCo) and may include other parties. All parties that
16		were granted full intervention status were notified of the starting time of the formal
17		settlement negotiations that began on February 27, 2018, in accordance with the
18		Procedural Schedule Order in this Docket. An open conference call number was
19		provided to any intervenors who did not wish to attend in person. Detailed
20		conversations and negotiations began at 9:00 A.M. on Tuesday, February 27th and
21		continued off and on daily through Friday, March 2 <sup>nd</sup> when an agreement was
22		reached. At the conclusion of each negotiating session, a time was provided for the
23		next session to all parties in attendance, including those participating by phone. A

### Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan Docket No. 18-KCPE-095-ACQ

roll call was taken of each party participating in each negotiating session and in any given session, it was apparent that there were several parties choosing not to participate.

Negotiations were tough, thorough, and included substantive discussion of the issues and a number of offers and counter-offers. In the end, each participating party recognized that there were areas of compromise that each was willing to accept in order to achieve a resolution of the issues in this case.

Regardless of whether any of the intervenors granted full participation in this Docket choose to participate in settlement negotiations or not, they will have an opportunity to oppose the Agreement and file testimony in opposition on March 12<sup>th</sup>, as well as participate in the evidentiary hearing scheduled for the week of March 19th.

A.

# Q. Please address whether the Stipulation is supported by substantial competent evidence in the record as a whole.

The Agreement is supported by substantial competent evidence in the record as a whole. The Agreement is also supported by the Applicants' Application, including direct and rebuttal testimony. Staff thoroughly analyzed the Application and presented its recommendations in direct testimony. In addition, CURB, KIC, KEPCo, and other intervenors reviewed the filing and stated their positions in direct testimony. These filed positions constitute the body of evidence that the Commission would rely on to make a determination of the issues presented by this case, if the case were to go to a full hearing. The parties also relied on this

### Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan Docket No. 18-KCPE-095-ACQ

evidence in negotiations and eventually arrived at an agreed upon resolution of the issues. It is Staff's position that the terms of this Agreement, taken as a whole, are comparable with what one could expect if the case were to be fully litigated.

A.

#### Q. Please address whether the Stipulation conforms to applicable law.

I am not an attorney, but Staff did negotiate this Agreement consistent with its understanding of applicable laws. Part of Staff's understanding is based on the Commission's citation of case law that, generally, the law favors compromise and settlement of disputes when parties enter into an agreement intelligently and in good faith.<sup>6</sup> In addition, Staff was represented throughout the settlement process by Litigation Counsel, which helps ensure that the Stipulation conforms to applicable laws. Staff counsel will be available at the hearing to address any specific issues or questions that the Commission may have regarding the Stipulation's conformity to applicable law.

A.

#### Q. Does Staff believe that the Stipulation will result in just and reasonable rates?

This Docket is directly related to approving a merger of equals between Westar and KCP&L. However, the approval of this merger will have a long-term impact on the future rates of both entities. The Applicants estimate that there will be in excess of \$500 million in merger-related savings and approximately \$250 million in non-merger related savings from plant closures in KCP&L's generation

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> In Commission Orders approving numerous prior settlements, the Commission has often cited *Bright v. LSI Corp.*, Kan. 853, 858, 869 P. 2d 686 (1994).

#### Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan Docket No. 18-KCPE-095-ACQ

1

21

portfolio. These savings will reduce or offset future rate requests. Moreover, the 2 Agreement provides upfront guaranteed bill credits that will offset the overall rates 3 paid by customers during the five-year moratorium period. In addition, paragraph 4 9 of the Agreement states: 5 The Signatories are convinced that combining these two companies 6 under the proper terms will be beneficial to stabilizing electric prices 7 in Kansas after experiencing significant price increases in Kansas, similar to those experienced across the country, over the last decade. 8 9 Many surrounding states have already taken this step and experienced cost benefits for their states as a result. To this end, 10 Applicants and Staff have decided to conduct a review (either jointly 11 12 or individually) to identify the major differences between 13 surrounding states' rates and the Applicants' rates in order to better 14 understand and document the major contributors to any 15 differences... 16 17 Based on the above, it is Staff's opinion that approval of this Agreement 18 will have a high probability of achieving lower future base rates for the Applicants' 19 customers and providing the Commission and customers a better understanding of 20 how Kansas' rates compare to those of the Region. 22 Q. Does Staff believe the results of the Agreement are in the public interest, 23 including the interest of the customers represented by the parties not 24 consenting to the Agreement? 25 A. Yes. I have previously addressed the public interest standard and the fact 26 that the merger standards have either been met by case specific facts or acceptance 27 of additional conditions, which is a strong indication that the Agreement is in the 28 public interest.

# Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan $\underline{Docket\ No.\ 18\text{-}KCPE\text{-}095\text{-}ACQ}$

1		Regarding the interest of customers represented by the parties not
2		consenting to the Agreement, Staff asserts:
3		➤ The Agreement results in a combined entity that is at least as financially strong,
4		if not stronger, post-merger;
5		> The Agreement provides immediate rate relief through the pending rate cases
6		and through future bill credits;
7		> The Agreement provides a high probability of achieving lower future base rates
8		for the Applicant's customers post-moratorium and it will provide the
9		Commission and customers a better understanding of how Kansas' rates
10		compare to those of the Region; and
11		> As discussed previously in the overview of the Agreement, there are a wide
12		range of protections through conditions covering multiple areas.
13		Based on these assertions, Staff believes the Agreement is in the public interest for
14		all of the Applicants customers.
15		
16	Q.	Should the Commission accept the Agreement as a reasonable resolution of
17		the issues in this Docket?
18	A.	Yes. The Agreement represents a resolution that meets the Commission's
19		Merger Standards, is supported by substantial competent evidence, and meets the
20		public interest standard. Moreover, the Agreement, while not unanimous, resolves
21		a complex case through an agreement with a number of the parties to this case.
22		

Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement of Jeffrey D. McClanahan  $\underline{Docket\ No.\ 18\text{-}KCPE\text{-}095\text{-}ACQ}$ 

- 1 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 2 A. Yes.

STATE OF KANSAS	)
	) ss.
COUNTY OF SHAWNEE	)

#### **VERIFICATION**

Jeffrey D. McClanahan, being duly sworn upon his oath deposes and states that he is the Director of Utilities for the Kansas Corporation Commission of the State of Kansas, that he has read and is familiar with the foregoing *Staff Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement*, and attests that the statements contained therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.

Jeffrey D. McClanahan Director of Utilities

State Corporation Commission of the

State of Kansas

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12th day of March, 2018.

VICKI D. JACOBSEN

Notary Public - State of Kansas

My Appt. Expires 6-30-18

Vicu D. Jacobsen Notary Public

My Appointment Expires:

June 30, 2018

#### 18-KCPE-095-MER

I, the undersigned, certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Staff Jeff McClanahan's Testimony in Support of Non-Unanimous Settlement Agreement was served via electronic service this 12th day of March, 2018, to the following:

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

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

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

TODD E. LOVE, ATTORNEY
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD
TOPEKA, KS 66604
Fax: 785-271-3116
t.love@curb.kansas.gov

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

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

CARY CATCHPOLE, ACCOUNTANT/ECONOMIST CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 Fax: 785-271-3116 c.catchpole@curb.kansas.gov

STACY HARDEN, SENIOR REGULATORY ANALYST CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604 Fax: 785-271-3116 s.harden@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

18-KCPE-095-MER

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

DOROTHY BARNETT
CLIMATE & ENERGY PROJECT
PO BOX 1858
HUTCHINSON, KS 67504-1858
barnett@climateandenergy.org

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

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

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

JOHN GARRETSON, BUSINESS MANAGER IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 304 3906 NW 16TH STREET TOPEKA, KS 66615 Fax: 785-235-3345 johng@ibew304.org DELLA SMITH
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD
TOPEKA, KS 66604
Fax: 785-271-3116
d.smith@curb.kansas.gov

JONATHAN LESSER
CONTINENTAL ECONOMICS, INC.
6 REAL PLACE
SCANDIA PARK, NM 87047
jlesser@continentalecon.com

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

DARRELL MCCUBBINS, BUSINESS MANAGER IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 1464 1760 UNIVERSAL AVENUE KANSAS CITY, MO 64120 Fax: 816-483-4239 kwhiteman@ibew1464.org

JASON IANACONE
IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 225
IBEW Local 225
PO Box 404
Burlington, KS 66839
jason.ianacone@gmail.com

BRAD MILLER, EAST END ASST. BUS. MGR. IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 304
IBEW Local Union No. 304
3906 NW 16th Street
Topeka, KS 66615
bradm@ibew304.org

18-KCPE-095-MER

RANDY ADAMS, BUSINESS MANAGER IBEW LOCAL UNION NO. 412 1760 UNIVERSAL AVENUE KANSAS CITY, MO 64120

Fax: 816-231-5515

business.manager@ibew412.org

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

ANDREA I. SARMENTERO GARZON JENNINGS, STROUSS & SALMON, P.L.C 1350 I Street, NW Suite 810 WASHINGTON, DC 20005 Fax: 202-371-9025 asarmentero@jsslaw.com

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

DARRIN R. IVES, VICE PRESIDENT, REGULATORY
AFFAIRS
KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 31ST FLOOR (64105
PO BOX 418679
KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679
Fax: 816-556-2110
darrin.ives@kcpl.com

NICOLE A. WEHRY, SENIOR REGULTORY COMMUNICATIONS SPECIALIST KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 31ST FLOOR (64105 PO BOX 418679 KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679 Fax: 816-556-2787 nicole.wehry@kcpl.com JOHN KRAJEWSKI, PRESIDENT J K ENERGY CONSULTING LLC 650 J STREET STE 108 LINCOLN, NE 68508 Fax: 402-438-4322 jk@jkenergyconsulting.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

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

ROBERT J. HACK, LEAD REGULATORY COUNSEL KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 31ST FLOOR (64105 PO BOX 418679 KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679 Fax: 816-556-2787 rob.hack@kcpl.com

ROGER W. STEINER, CORPORATE COUNSEL KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 31ST FLOOR (64105 PO BOX 418679 KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679 Fax: 816-556-2787 roger.steiner@kcpl.com

ANTHONY WESTENKIRCHNER, SENIOR PARALEGAL KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY ONE KANSAS CITY PL, 1200 MAIN ST 31ST FLOOR (64105 PO BOX 418679 KANSAS CITY, MO 64141-9679 Fax: 816-556-2787 anthony.westenkirchner@kcpl.com

18-KCPE-095-MER

BRIAN G. FEDOTIN, DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION 1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027

Fax: 785-271-3354 b.fedotin@kcc.ks.gov

MICHAEL NEELEY, LITIGATION COUNSEL KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION

TOPEKA, KS 66604-4027 Fax: 785-271-3167 m.neeley@kcc.ks.gov

1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD

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

JAMES GING, DIRECTOR ENGINEERING SERVICES KANSAS POWER POOL 100 N BROADWAY STE L110 WICHITA, KS 67202

Fax: 888-431-4943 jging@kpp.agency

ROBERT V. EYE, ATTORNEY AT LAW KAUFFMAN & EYE

4840 Bob Billings Pkwy, Ste. 1010 Lawrence, KS 66049-3862

Fax: 785-749-1202 bob@kauffmaneye.com

KENNETH M. HOLMBOE, ATTORNEY AT LAW

KENNETH HOLMBOE

1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE NW

SUITE 700

WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3155

Fax: 202-289-8450 kh@duncanallen.com 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

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

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

LARRY HOLLOWAY, ASST GEN MGR OPERATIONS

KANSAS POWER POOL 100 N BROADWAY STE L110

WICHITA, KS 67202 Fax: 888-431-4943 Iholloway@kpp.agency

ASHLEY M. BOND, ATTORNEY

KENNETH HOLMBOE

1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE NW

SUITE 700

WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3155

Fax: 202-289-8450 amb@duncanallen.com

GREGG D. OTTINGER, ATTORNEY

KENNETH HOLMBOE

1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE NW

SUITE 700

WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3155

Fax: 202-289-8450 gdo@duncanallen.com

18-KCPE-095-MER

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

POLSINELLI PC

900 W 48TH PLACE STE 900 KANSAS CITY, MO 64112 Fax: 913-451-6205

acallenbach@polsinelli.com

BORIS STEFFEN RMS US LLP 1861 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE SUITE 400 MCLEAN, VA 22102

boris.steffen@rsmus.com

ANDREW J. FRENCH, ATTORNEY AT LAW SMITHYMAN & ZAKOURA, CHTD. 7400 W 110TH ST STE 750 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66210-2362

Fax: 913-661-9863 andrew@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 KIMBERLY BRICKELL FRANK ESQ. MCCARTER ENGLISH, LLP 1015 15TH STREET, NW 12TH FLOOR

WASHINGTON, DC 20005 Fax: 202-296-0166 kfrank@mccarter.com

ROBERT MUIRHEAD, REGULATORY-VICE-PRES

CUSTOMER SERVICE MIDWEST ENERGY, INC. 1330 Canterbury Rd PO Box 898

Hays, KS 67601-0898

bmuirhead@mwenergy.com

FRANK A. CARO, JR., ATTORNEY

POLSINELLI PC

900 W 48TH PLACE STE 900 KANSAS CITY, MO 64112 Fax: 816-753-1536

fcaro@polsinelli.com

SUNIL BECTOR, ATTORNEY

SIERRA CLUB

2101 WEBSTER, SUITE 1300 OAKLAND, CA 94312-3011

Fax: 510-208-3140

sunil.bector@sierraclub.org

JAMES P. ZAKOURA, ATTORNEY SMITHYMAN & ZAKOURA, CHTD. 7400 W 110TH ST STE 750

OVERLAND PARK, KS 66210-2362

Fax: 913-661-9863 jim@smizak-law.com

JAMES BRUNGARDT, MANAGER, REGULATORY

**RELATIONS** 

SUNFLOWER ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION

301 W. 13TH

PO BOX 1020 (67601-1020)

HAYS, KS 67601 Fax: 785-623-3395

jbrungardt@sunflower.net

18-KCPE-095-MER

DAVIS ROONEY, VICE PRESIDENT AND CFO SUNFLOWER ELECTRIC POWER CORPORATION 301 W. 13TH

PO BOX 1020 (67601-1020) HAYS, KS 67601

hrooney@sunflower.net

Fax: 785-623-3395

AMY FELLOWS CLINE, ATTORNEY TRIPLETT, WOOLF & GARRETSON, LLC 2959 N ROCK RD STE 300 WICHITA, KS 67226 Fax: 316-630-8101 amycline@twgfirm.com

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

CATHRYN J. DINGES, SENIOR CORPORATE COUNSEL WESTAR ENERGY, INC.
818 S KANSAS AVE
PO BOX 889
TOPEKA, KS 66601-0889
Fax: 785-575-8136
cathy.dinges@westarenergy.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

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

TIMOTHY E. MCKEE, ATTORNEY TRIPLETT, WOOLF & GARRETSON, LLC 2959 N ROCK RD STE 300 WICHITA, KS 67226 Fax: 316-630-8101

atamimi@sunflower.net

temckee@twgfirm.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

JEFFREY L. MARTIN, VICE PRESIDENT, REGULATORY AFFAIRS WESTAR ENERGY, INC. 818 S KANSAS AVE PO BOX 889 TOPEKA, KS 66601-0889 jeff.martin@westarenergy.com

/s/ Vicki Jacobsen

Vicki Jacobsen