

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the 2009 Resource Plan of)
KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company)
Pursuant to 4 CSR 240-22)

Case No. EE-2009-0237

MAY STAKEHOLDER MEETING SUPPLEMENTAL FILING

Pursuant to the Nonunanimous Stipulation and Agreement signed by KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company (“GMO”), the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Staff”), the Office of Public Counsel (“OPC”), the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (“MDNR”), and Dogwood Energy, LLC (“Dogwood”) (collectively, the “Signatories”), GMO hereby submits to the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) this filing of data presented and discussed in the May Stakeholder Meeting. Sedalia Industrial Energy Users’ Association (“SIEUA”), the City of Kansas City, Missouri (“KCMO”), and the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission (“MJMEUC”) intervened in this case but they were not signatories to this agreement.

In support hereof, GMO offers as follows:

AGENDA

1. From Appendix A of the Nonunanimous Stipulation and Agreement, the following agenda was proposed for the May Stakeholder Meeting.

May 2010 stakeholder meeting

- a. Cost of Wind Generation
- b. Menu of End-Use Measures
- c. Alternative Levels of DSM Program Implementation
- d. Alternative Rate Structures
- e. DSM cost recovery proposals and modeling
- f. Retirements, Wind Integration and Contingency Planning
- a. Distribution of Future Values of Uncertain Factors Load Forecasting

- b. DSM Programs/20-year plan
- c. Menu of End-Use Measures
- d. Alternative Levels of DSM Program Implementation

Information was provided at the meeting in power point presentations and other handouts. This information is attached to this filing as Appendices 1 through 10.

2. Appendix 1: Load forecasting: GMO presented information regarding its latest budget load forecast and compared it to the load forecast used in the GMO IRP filed August 5, 2009. Differences in the drivers of the two load forecasts were discussed at the meeting. The load forecast used in the IRP was completed in January 2009. The load forecast used in the 2010-2014 budget forecast was completed during the summer of 2009. The budget forecast incorporates the following changes:

a. Changes in 2010-2014 Budget vs IRP Load Forecasts

- 1. More recent historical kwh sales and customer count data. The IRP used monthly historical customer and kwh sales billing data through December 2008. The budget forecast used data through May 2009.
- 2. More recent economic forecast from Moody's economy.com. The IRP was based on Moody's November 2008 forecast for the US economy whereas the budget was based on the May 2009 economic forecast.
- 3. Updated end-use data and projections from the US DOE for the West North Central region. The IRP was based on end-use data and projections from the US DOE available in 2008 for the West North Central region where as the budget used DOE results available in 2009.
- 4. IRP forecast used Class Cost Of Service (CCOS) models, budget forecast used revenue class models. Aquila stipulated to using class cost of service

classes for the IRP forecast whereas the budget forecast uses revenue classes. CCOS categories are residential, Small General Service, Large General Service, Large Power and Lighting. Revenue classes are residential (including private area lights), Commercial (including private area lights), Industrial and Lighting. MPS also includes a Public Authority revenue class.

b. Comparison of New Budget Load forecast to GMO IRP Forecast

1. The new forecast was within the critical factor limits for load risk. This factor would not have necessitated a review of the Preferred Plan from the August 5 filing.
3. Appendix 2: Comparison of Economic Drivers used in the IRP and Budget Load Forecasts. GMO presented a graphical comparison of the most important economic drivers used in the IRP and budget load forecasts. The drivers were compared for both the KC metro area (used in the MPS load forecast) and the St Joseph metro area (used in the SJLP load forecast).
4. Appendix 3: Issues regarding distribution of future values of uncertain factors that affect supply-side resource costs.
5. Appendix 4: Supply-Side topics including load and capacity table, load and capacity table expanded, tabulations of supply-side and demand-side resources considered in developing alternative resource plans, and Sibley 3 background information.
6. Appendix 5: Projected installed wind farm costs.
7. Appendix 6: Current solar strategy.
8. Appendix 7: A preliminary draft of a menu of end-use measures.

9. Appendix 8: Twenty-year DSM demand and energy savings impacts.
10. Appendix 9: Review of alternative rate structures.
11. Appendix 10: Review of alternative rate structures appendix.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ James M. Fischer
James M. Fischer, MBN 27543
Fischer & Dority, P.C.
101 Madison Street—Suite 400
Jefferson City, MO 65101
Phone: 573-636-6758
Fax: 573-636-0383
Email: jfischerpc@aol.com

Counsel for KCP&L Greater Missouri
Operations Company

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served on all counsel of record either by electronic mail or by first class mail, postage prepaid, on this 16th day of June, 2010.

/s/ James M. Fischer
James M. Fischer