

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Ag Processing, Inc.,)	
)	
)	
Complainant,)	
)	
v.)	File No. HC-2012-0259
)	[Consolidated with
KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations)	HC-2010-0235]
Company,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

AGP STATEMENT REGARDING PROCEDURAL DATES

COMES NOW AG PROCESSING INC A COOPERATIVE ("AGP") and respectfully states:

1. Certain of the procedural dates relevant to this matter were the subject of an agreed motion that was filed on July 12, 2013. The active parties agreed in that Motion to adjust certain dates (not including the hearing) forward by roughly three days.

2. Although the motion was agreed and filed as stated, no Commission order resulted. AGP moved forward and acted upon those agreed dates in the filing of supplemental rebuttal testimony. AGP had assumed that, given the parties agreement, issuance of an order may have been overlooked in the press of other Commission business or was otherwise deemed unnecessary in that the dates adjusted were not dates that would have caused the Commission to alter its hearing schedule.


3. AGP counsel was alerted to confusion about this status this morning when an e-mail communication was received from Staff counsel querying the filing date for a statement of issues. Upon calling counsel for GMO (Karl Zobrist), AGP counsel was advised that GMO intended to file such a statement of issues today (7/29) that being the date for such filing under the original schedule.

4. Again, by e-mail from Staff counsel, we became aware that the Commission was taking the position that it lacked jurisdiction to proceed during the pending appeal of Court of Appeals Case No. WD76353, initial briefing on which is due on July 30, but may be extended further to accommodate counsel for Triumph.

5. Accordingly, with this new information from Staff counsel, it appears that the agreed procedural schedule as well as the original procedural schedule has been effectively suspended pending resolution of the pending appeal noted above. At such time, it appears that it will be necessary for the parties to reconvene and develop a new procedural schedule and, potentially, a new date for hearing. Accordingly, despite earlier statements made in the absence of this information, submission of a list of issues on or prior to August 1, 2013 would appear premature.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, CONRAD & PETERSON, L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stuart W. Conrad", is written over a horizontal line.


Stuart W. Conrad Mo. Bar #23966
3100 Broadway, Suite 1209

Kansas City, Missouri 64111
(816) 753-1122
Facsimile (816) 756-0373
Internet: stucon@fcplaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR AG PROCESSING INC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have today served a copy of the foregoing pleading upon all parties hereto at their respective via e-mail at their respective e-mail addresses as shown on the Commission EFIS.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stuart W. Conrad", written over a horizontal line.

Stuart W. Conrad, an attorney for
Ag Processing Inc a Cooperative

Dated: July 29, 2013