BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

JARED R. ROBERTSON

ON BEHALF OF THE KROGER CO.

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
EVERGY KANSAS CENTRAL, INC. AND
EVERGY KANSAS SOUTH, INC. FOR APPROVAL TO MAKE
CERTAIN CHANGES IN THEIR CHARGES FOR ELECTRIC SERVICE
PURSUANT TO K.S.A. 66-117.

DOCKET NO. 25-EKCE-294-RTS

JUNE 6, 2025

Introduction

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Jared R. Robertson. My business address is 111 East Broadway, Suite 1200, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am a Senior Consultant at Energy Strategies, LLC. Energy Strategies is a private consulting firm specializing in economic and policy analysis applicable to energy production, transportation, and consumption.

Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding?

A. I am testifying on behalf of The Kroger Co. ("Kroger"). Kroger is one of the largest grocery retailers in the United States and operates approximately forty-seven grocery stores in the Evergy Kansas Central ("EKC" or "the Company") service territory. Kroger's facilities purchase more than 130 million kWh of electricity from EKC annually, primarily under rate schedule Medium General Service ("MGS").

Q. Please describe your professional experience and qualifications.

A. I hold a Bachelor of Science in Economics from Brigham Young University - Idaho and have completed the majority of the coursework for a Master of Arts in Economics with a concentration in public utility policy and regulation from New Mexico State University. Prior to my employment with Energy Strategies, I was a member of the Regulatory Accounting Department for Dominion Energy Services, LLC ("DES"). I was employed by DES as a Regulatory Specialist and developed revenue requirement models for generation riders, provided expert witness

testimony regarding the calculation of the models, and contributed to various projects and analyses related to the generation fleet.

I joined Energy Strategies in 2024 as a Senior Consultant. In this role, I analyze and provide expert witness testimony on various regulatory and ratemaking matters, including revenue requirements, cost of service, and rate design. I also provide regulatory and technical support on a range of electric industry issues.

Q. Have you ever testified before this Commission?

A. No, this is my first opportunity.

Q. Have you testified before any other State Utility Regulatory Commissions?

A. Yes. I have testified in regulatory proceedings on the subjects of utility rates and regulatory policy before state utility commissions in Virginia, and Indiana.

Overview and Conclusions

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

A. My testimony addresses EKC's proposed rate design for the MGS rate class.

Q. What recommendations do you present in your testimony?

A. I recommend modifications to the energy and demand components of the MGS rate design to better align these charges with the underlying cost causation. Specifically, EKC's proposed rate design underestimates demand-related charges while overstating energy-related charges, relative to the underlying costs as provided in the COSS. Improving the alignment between rate components and the underlying costs will improve price signals, encourage more efficient grid usage, and reduce intra-class subsidies among customers.

At this time, I am not taking a position on the Company's proposed cost of service study methodologies or revenue allocation. However, to the extent that other parties propose changes to the proposed cost of service or revenue allocation, I reserve the right to address those proposals.

MGS Rate Design

Q. Please describe EKC's MGS rate schedule.

A. The MGS rate schedule is available to customers with loads between 200 kW and 1,500 kW who take service from existing distribution facilities. This rate schedule includes a customer charge, demand charge, and summer and winter energy charges.

Q. Does the Company propose changes to class revenues that are reflective of an equalized rate of return?

A. No. According to the Company's witness Marisole Miller, the results of the COSS broadly inform the proposed class increases. However, while revenue shifts are positively correlated with the resulting relative rates of return, they are not applied directly.[1] As a result, the Company's rate design assigns a range of class rate increases from 14.96% to 11.96% relative to the system average rate increase of 13.59%.[2]

Q. How does the proposed rate increase for the MGS class compare to the Company's COSS results?

[1] Direct Testimony of Marisole E. Miller, pg. 17.
[2] *Id*. pg. 18.

A. According to the Company's COSS, the MGS rate class would require an 18.4% rate *decrease* to achieve an equalized rate of return.[3] The Company is proposing a rate increase for the MGS class of 11.96%, which is approximately 88% of the proposed system average rate increase.[4] This proposal would result in revenues that are significantly above the cost to serve the MGS class.

Q. Please describe EKC's proposed MGS rate design.

A. EKC's proposed MGS rate design is summarized in Table JRR-1 below.

Table JRR-1
EKC Proposed MGS Rates

Description	Units	Current Rate	Proposed Rate
Customer Charge	month	$ 131.77	$ 147.53
Demand	kW	$ 17.970	$ 20.119
Energy			
Summer	kWh	$ 0.01610	$ 0.01803
Winter	kWh	$ 0.01223	$ 0.01369

Q. Have you performed an assessment to compare the proposed Schedule MGS rate design to the underlying cost components?

A. Yes. I have conducted an analysis comparing the proposed revenues by classification to the corresponding cost of service components — specifically, customer-related, demand-related, and energy-related costs.

Q. In your rate design analysis, please explain how you account for the differences between the class revenue allocation and the cost of service study results?

A. As I explain above, the class cost of service results are not aligned with the underlying cost components. This misalignment is primarily due to the fact that

[3] *Id*. pg. 15.
[4] *Id*. pg. 18.

the proposed revenues for the MGS class are approximately 125% greater than the cost to serve the class. Therefore, my analysis compares each component as a percentage of the respective total, i.e. the energy related costs as a percentage of the total costs and the energy-related revenues as a percentage of the total revenues.

Q. What is your assessment of the proposed Schedule MGS rate design?

A. EKC's proposed rate design for Schedule MGS understates the demand-related charges for this rate schedule, while overstating the energy-related charges. This results in a misalignment between the rates and the underlying cost of service. Table JRR-2 illustrates the proportional classification of revenues compared to the underlying cost of service for EKC's proposed rate design.

Table JRR-2
EKC Proposed MGS Charges Relative to Costs by Classification
At EKC's Proposed Revenue Requirement

Classification	Cost of Service % of Total	EKC Proposed % of Total
Customer	0.7%	1.4%
Demand	82.2%	77.7%
Energy	17.2%	20.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

As can be seen in Table JRR-2 above, EKC's proposed MGS rate design understates the demand revenues while overstating the energy revenues relative to the underlying cost causation.

Q. From a customer's perspective, why does it matter if EKC proposes demand charges that do not fully recover its demand-related costs?

A. When a utility sets demand charges below the actual cost of providing demand-related services, it typically compensates by increasing recovery through other rate components, most often by setting energy charges above the cost of

energy. For a given rate schedule, such as MGS, this mismatch can result in intra-class subsidies, where customers with higher load factors (i.e., more consistent usage) end up subsidizing those with lower load factors (i.e., more variable usage).

Q. How do you define higher load factor customers?

A. For purposes of this discussion, I use this term to refer to customers whose load factors are greater than the average for the rate schedule.

Q. Why is it important for rate design to be representative of underlying cost causation?

A. Aligning rate design with underlying cost causation improves efficiency because it sends proper price signals. For example, setting a demand charge below the cost of demand understates the economic cost of demand-related assets, which in turn distorts consumption decisions, and calls forth a greater level of investment in fixed assets than is economically desirable.

At the same time, aligning rate design with cost causation is important for ensuring equity among customers, because properly aligning charges with costs minimizes cross-subsidies among customers. As I stated above, if demand costs are understated in utility rates, the costs are made up elsewhere — typically in energy rates. When this happens, higher-load-factor customers (who use fixed assets relatively efficiently through relatively constant energy usage) are forced to pay the demand-related costs of lower-load-factor customers. This amounts to a cross-subsidy that is fundamentally inequitable.

Q. What do you recommend regarding the MGS rate design?

A. Ideally, the demand-related charges, energy-related charges, and customer-related charges would be aligned with the underlying costs. However, in some cases, full movement towards cost-based rates in a single step should be tempered in order to mitigate potential intra-class rate impacts and take into consideration the well-accepted rate making principle of gradualism. Therefore, I propose a moderate increase to the demand charge and a corresponding, revenue-neutral decrease to the energy charge. This change will make some progress towards aligning the rate design with the underlying cost causation while also mitigating the intra-class rate impacts that would result from a more significant movement towards cost-based rates at this time.

The revenue verification for my proposed rate design is presented in Exhibit JRR-1 and summarized in Table JRR-3 below.

Table JRR-3
Kroger's Proposed MGS Rates
At EKC's Proposed Revenue Requirement and Revenue Allocation

Description	Units	Current Rate	EKC Proposed Rate	Kroger Proposed Rate
Customer Charge	month	$ 131.77	$ 147.53	$ 147.53
Demand	kW	$ 17.970	$ 20.119	$ 21.077
Energy				
Summer	kWh	$0.01610	$0.01803	$ 0.01484
Winter	kWh	$0.01223	$0.01369	$ 0.01127

Q. How does your recommended rate design improve the alignment between charges and the underlying cost components?

A. My proposed rate design improves the alignment between the demand and energy revenues and costs by increasing the proportion of Schedule MGS revenues

recovered through demand charges, and decreasing the revenues recovered through energy charges, relative to the Company's proposal. My recommended modifications do not result in cost-based rates, but they make a step in the right direction towards improving the relative alignment between the charges and underlying costs for the MGS rate schedule.

The alignment between charges and costs for my recommended MGS rate design compared to EKC's proposed rate design is shown in Table JRR-4.

Table JRR-4
Kroger and EKC Schedule MGS Charges Relative to Costs by Classification
At EKC's Proposed Revenue Requirement

Classification	Cost of Service % of Total	EKC Proposed % of Total	Kroger Proposed % of Total
Customer	0.7%	1.4%	1.4%
Demand	82.2%	77.7%	81.4%
Energy	17.2%	20.9%	17.2%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Q. Have you prepared a bill impact analysis for your recommended changes to the Schedule MGS rate design?

A. Yes, I have. My bill impact analysis is presented in Exhibit JRR-2 and is summarized below in Table JRR-5. My bill impact analysis demonstrates that my proposed modifications would result in a reasonable range of bill impacts for MGS customers with differing load profiles, with a range of approximately 4.8%, or 2.4% in either direction for the various load profiles that I have analyzed. These bill impacts represent the change in base rates at the Company's proposed revenue requirement. To the extent that the Commission approves a lower or higher revenue requirement, the actual bill impacts would be lower or higher.

Table JRR-5
Summarized MGS Bill Impacts
Kroger's Proposed Rate Design at EKC's Proposed Revenue Requirement

kW Load	kWh	Summer Change	Winter Change
200	30,000	14.2%	14.9%
200	70,000	11.3%	12.4%
200	110,000	9.1%	10.5%
300	45,000	14.3%	14.9%
300	100,000	11.5%	12.6%
300	150,000	9.5%	10.9%
500	100,000	13.4%	14.2%
500	175,000	11.3%	12.4%
500	275,000	9.0%	10.5%
700	175,000	12.7%	13.6%
700	250,000	11.2%	12.4%
700	350,000	9.5%	10.9%
1,000	220,000	13.1%	14.0%
1,000	350,000	11.3%	12.4%
1,000	500,000	9.5%	10.9%

Q. Your proposed rate design results in differing bill impacts for customers with different load profiles. Is this a reasonable result?

A. Yes, it is a reasonable result. My proposed rate design reflects a cost-based difference while providing gradual movement towards cost-based rates. EKC's proposed rate design has a misalignment between the costs and charges based on its own cost of service study, which results in an intra-class subsidy from higher load factor customers to lower load factor customers. It is important to note that I am not proposing full movement towards cost-based rates in this case. Instead, my proposed rate design makes gradual movement towards aligning rates with cost causation and reduces the existing intra-class subsidy. This is a reasonable result

because it strikes a balance between two important rate-making principles – improving the alignment between rates and the underlying cost causation while also employing gradualism.

Q. Your proposed Schedule MGS rate design was calculated using EKC's proposed revenue requirement. How should your proposed rate design be implemented if the Commission adopts a base rate revenue requirement that is different than EKC's request?

A. To the extent that the Commission approves a revenue target for Schedule MGS that is less than the revenue target EKC is seeking, I recommend that all Schedule MGS rate components should be reduced proportionately to recover the final approved revenue requirement.

Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF KANSAS

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF EVERGY KANSAS CENTRAL, INC. AND EVERGY KANSAS SOUTH, INC. FOR APPROVAL TO MAKE CERTAIN CHANGES IN THEIR CHARGES FOR ELECTRIC SERVICE PURSUANT TO K.S.A. 66-117.	**DOCKET NO. 25-EKCE-294-RTS**

Texas NT
COMMONWEALTH OF ~~VIRGINIA~~)
Fort Bend NT)
~~CHESTERFIELD~~ COUNTY)

Jared Robertson, being first duly sworn, deposes and states that:

1. He is a Senior Consultant with Energy Strategies. L.L.C., in Salt Lake City, Utah;

2. He is the witness who sponsors the accompanying testimony entitled "Direct Testimony of Jared Robertson;"

3. Said testimony was prepared by him and under his direction and supervision;

4. If inquiries were made as to the facts and schedules in said testimony he would respond as therein set forth; and

5. The aforesaid testimony and schedules are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.

Jared Robertson

Jared Robertson

Subscribed and sworn to or affirmed before me this 6th day of June, 2025, by Jared Robertson.

Nandi Turner

Notary Public

NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF TEXAS

Nandi Turner
ID NUMBER
13246911-2
COMMISSION EXPIRES
May 7, 2028

Electronically signed and notarized online using the Proof platform.

EXHIBITS

Kroger Exhibit JRR-1
Kroger Proposed Schedule MGS Revenue Verification
At EKC Proposed Revenue Requirement and Revenue Allocation

		Present		Evergy Proposed		Kroger Proposed	
	Units	**Price**	**Revenue**	**Price**	**Revenue**	**Price**	**Revenue**
Schedule MGS							
Customer Charge	16,604	$ 131.77	$ 2,187,940	$ 147.53	$ 2,449,563	$ 147.53	$ 2,449,563
All kW	6,653,127	$ 17.970	119,556,695	$ 20.119	133,852,734	$ 21.077	$ 140,225,734
Summer kWh	876,134,343	$ 0.01610	14,105,763	$ 0.01803	15,792,465	$ 0.01484	$ 12,997,603
Winter kWh	1,476,613,911	$ 0.01223	18,058,988	$ 0.01369	20,218,399	$ 0.01127	$ 16,640,260
Total			$ 153,909,386		$ 172,313,161		$ 172,313,161

Kroger Exhibit JRR-2
Typical Bill Impact Analysis
At Kroger Proposed Base Rates for MGS Class

		Summer				Winter			
kW		Monthly Billing		Change		Monthly Billing		Change	
Load Size	kWh	Present	Proposed	$	%	Present	Proposed	$	%
200	30,000	$4,209	$4,808	$599	14.2%	$4,093	$4,701	$608	14.9%
	70,000	$4,853	$5,401	$549	11.3%	$4,582	$5,152	$570	12.4%
	110,000	$5,497	$5,995	$498	9.1%	$5,071	$5,602	$531	10.5%
300	45,000	$6,247	$7,138	$891	14.3%	$6,073	$6,978	$905	14.9%
	100,000	$7,133	$7,954	$821	11.5%	$6,746	$7,597	$852	12.6%
	150,000	$7,938	$8,696	$758	9.5%	$7,357	$8,161	$804	10.9%
500	100,000	$10,727	$12,169	$1,443	13.4%	$10,340	$11,813	$1,473	14.2%
	175,000	$11,934	$13,282	$1,348	11.3%	$11,257	$12,658	$1,401	12.4%
	275,000	$13,544	$14,766	$1,221	9.0%	$12,480	$13,785	$1,305	10.5%
700	175,000	$15,528	$17,497	$1,969	12.7%	$14,851	$16,873	$2,022	13.6%
	250,000	$16,736	$18,610	$1,874	11.2%	$15,768	$17,718	$1,950	12.4%
	350,000	$18,346	$20,094	$1,748	9.5%	$16,991	$18,845	$1,854	10.9%
1,000	220,000	$21,644	$24,488	$2,844	13.1%	$20,792	$23,703	$2,911	14.0%
	350,000	$23,737	$26,417	$2,680	11.3%	$22,382	$25,168	$2,786	12.4%
	500,000	$26,152	$28,642	$2,490	9.5%	$24,217	$26,859	$2,642	10.9%

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was served by electronic service on this 6th day of June, 2025, to the following:

/s/ Kurt J. Boehm
Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

JAMES G. FLAHERTY, ATTORNEY
ANDERSON & BYRD, L.L.P.
216 S HICKORY, PO BOX 17
OTTAWA, KS 66067-0017
jflaherty@andersonbyrd.com

ELIZABETH A. BAKER, ATTORNEY AT LAW
BAKER, STOREY, & WATSON
1603 SW 37TH STREET
TOPEKA, KS 66611
ebaker@bakerstorey.com

NICK SMITH, MANAGER OF KANSAS REGULATION
BLACK HILLS ENERGY CORPORATION
601 North Iowa Street
Lawrence, KS 66044
nick.smith@blackhillscorp.com

ROB DANIEL, Director of Regulatory
BLACK HILLS/KANSAS GAS UTILITY COMPANY LLC D/B/A Black Hills Energy
601 NORTH IOWA STREET
LAWRENCE, KS 66044
rob.daniel@blackhillscorp.com

DOUGLAS LAW, ASSOC. GENERAL
BLACK HILLS/KANSAS GAS UTILITY CO., LLC D/B/A BLACK HILLS ENERGY
1731 WINDHOEK DRIVE
LINCOLN, NE 68512
douglas.law@blackhillscorp.com

JOSEPH R. ASTRAB, CONSUMER COUNSEL
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD
TOPEKA, KS 66604
Joseph.Astrab@ks.gov

TODD E. LOVE, ATTORNEY
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD
TOPEKA, KS 66604
Todd.Love@ks.gov

SHONDA RABB
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD
TOPEKA, KS 66604
Shonda.Rabb@ks.gov

DELLA SMITH
CITIZENS' UTILITY RATEPAYER BOARD
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD
TOPEKA, KS 66604
Della.Smith@ks.gov

MELISSA M. BUHRIG, Exec. Vice President, Gen. Counsel & Secretary
CVR REFINING CVL, LLC
2277 Plaza Dr., Ste. 500
Sugar Land, TX 77479
mmbuhrig@CVREnergy.com

JASON T GRAY, ATTORNEY
DUNCAN & ALLEN
1730 Rhode Island Ave., NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
jtg@duncanallen.com

Justin Bieber
ENERGY STRATEGIES, LLC
PARKSIDE TOWERS
215 S STATE ST STE 200
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111
jbieber@energystrat.com

CATHRYN J. DINGES, SR DIRECTOR & REGULATORY AFFAIRS COUNSEL
EVERGY KANSAS CENTRAL, INC
818 S KANSAS AVE, PO BOX 889
TOPEKA, KS 66601-0889
Cathy.Dinges@evergy.com

LESLIE WINES, Sr. Exec. Admin. Asst.
EVERGY KANSAS CENTRAL, INC
818 S KANSAS AVE, PO BOX 889
TOPEKA, KS 66601-0889
leslie.wines@evergy.com

COLE A BAILEY, CORPORATE COUNSEL DIRECTOR
EVERGY KANSAS SOUTH,
INC. D/B/A EVERGY KANSAS CENTRAL
818 S KANSAS AVE, PO Box 889
TOPEKA, KS 66601-0889
cole.bailey@evergy.com

DARRIN IVES, VP - REGULATORY AFFAIRS
EVERGY METRO, INC D/B/A EVERGY KANSAS METRO
One Kansas City Place
1200 Main St., 19th Floor
Kansas City, MO 64105
DARRIN.IVES@EVERGY.COM

RONALD A. KLOTE, DIRECTOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS
EVERGY METRO, INC D/B/A EVERGY KANSAS METRO
ONE KANSAS CITY PLACE
1200 MAIN, 19TH FLOOR
KANSAS CITY, MO 64105
ronald.klote@evergy.com

DAVID BANKS, CEM, CEP
FLINT HILLS ENERGY CONSULTANT
117 S PARKRIDGE
WICHITA, KS 67209
david@fheconsultants.net

DANIEL J BULLER, ATTORNEY
FOULSTON SIEFKIN LLP
7500 COLLEGE BOULEVARD, STE 1400
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66201-4041
dbuller@foulston.com

MOLLY E MORGAN, ATTORNEY
FOULSTON SIEFKIN LLP
1551 N. Waterfront Parkway, Suite 100
Wichita, KS 67206
mmorgan@foulston.com

LEE M SMITHYMAN, ATTORNEY
FOULSTON SIEFKIN LLP
7500 COLLEGE BOULEVARD, STE 1400
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66201-4041
lsmithyman@foulston.com

JAMES P ZAKOURA, ATTORNEY
FOULSTON SIEFKIN LLP
7500 COLLEGE BOULEVARD, STE 1400
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66201-4041
jzakoura@foulston.com

Constance Chan, Senior Category Manager - Electricity & Business Travel
HF SINCLAIR EL DORADO REFINING LLC
2323 Victory Ave. Ste 1400
Dalla, TX 75219
constance.chan@hfsinclair.com

Jon Lindsey, Corporate Counsel
HF SINCLAIR EL DORADO REFINING LLC
550 E. South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84102
jon.lindsey@hfsinclair.com

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

PATRICK HURLEY, CHIEF LIT. COUNSEL
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD
TOPEKA, KS 66604
Patrick.Hurley@ks.gov

CARLY MASENTHIN, LITIGATION COUNSEL
KANSAS CORPORATION COMMISSION
1500 SW ARROWHEAD RD
TOPEKA, KS 66604
Carly.Masenthin@ks.gov

LORNA EATON, MANAGER OF RATES AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
KANSAS GAS SERVICE, A DIVISION OF ONE GAS, INC.
7421 W 129TH STREET
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66213
lorna.eaton@onegas.com

LORNA EATON, MANAGER RATES & REGULATORY - OKE01026
KANSAS GAS SERVICE, A DIVISION OF ONE GAS, INC.
7421 W 129TH STREET
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66213
invoices@onegas.com

ROBERT E. VINCENT, MANAGING ATTORNEY
KANSAS GAS SERVICE, A DIVISION OF ONE GAS, INC.
7421 W. 129TH STREET
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66213
robert.vincent@onegas.com

VALERIE SMITH, ADMIN.. ASSISTANT
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY
800 SW JACKSON, SUITE 1310
TOPEKA, KS 66612-1216
vsmith@morrislaing.com

TREVOR WOHLFORD, ATTORNEY
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY
800 SW JACKSON, SUITE 1310
TOPEKA, KS 66612-1216
twohlford@morrislaing.com

GLENDA CAFER, MORRIS LAING LAW FIRM
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY
CHTD
800 SW JACKSON STE 1310
TOPEKA, KS 66612-1216
gcafer@morrislaing.com

RITA LOWE, PARALEGAL
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY
CHTD
300 N MEAD STE 200
WICHITA, KS 67202-2745
rlowe@morrislaing.com

WILL B. WOHLFORD, ATTORNEY
MORRIS LAING EVANS BROCK & KENNEDY
CHTD
300 N MEAD STE 200
WICHITA, KS 67202-2745
wwohlford@morrislaing.com

TIM OPITZ
OPITZ LAW FIRM, LLC
308 E. HIGH STREET, SUITE B101
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101
tim.opitz@opitzlawfirm.com

ANNE E. CALLENBACH, ATTORNEY
POLSINELLI PC
900 W 48TH PLACE STE 900
KANSAS CITY, MO 64112
acallenbach@polsinelli.com

FRANK A. CARO, ATTORNEY
POLSINELLI PC
900 W 48TH PLACE STE 900
KANSAS CITY, MO 64112
fcaro@polsinelli.com

JARED R. JEVONS, ATTORNEY
POLSINELLI PC
900 W 48TH PLACE STE 900
KANSAS CITY, MO 64112
JJEVONS@POLSINELLI.COM

Greg Wright
Priority Power Mgt.
12512 Augusta Dr
Kansas City, KS 66109
gwright@prioritypower.com

KACEY S MAYES, ATTORNEY
TRIPLETT, WOOLF & GARRETSON, LLC
2959 N ROCK RD STE 300
WICHITA, KS 67226
ksmayes@twgfirm.com

TIMOTHY E. MCKEE, ATTORNEY
TRIPLETT, WOOLF & GARRETSON, LLC
2959 N ROCK RD STE 300
WICHITA, KS 67226
TEMCKEE@TWGFIRM.COM

JOHN J. MCNUTT, General Attorney
U.S. ARMY LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY
REGULATORY LAW OFFICE
9275 GUNSTON RD., STE. 1300
FORT BELVOIR, VA 22060-5546
john.j.mcnutt.civ@army.mil

KEVIN K. LACHANCE, CONTRACT LAW ATTORNEY
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
ADMIN & CIVIL LAW DIVISION
OFFICE OF STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE
FORT RILEY, KS 66442
kevin.k.lachance.civ@army.mil