BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

| In the Matter of the Application of Aquila, |) | |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| Inc. d/b/a KCP&L Greater Missouri |) | |
| Operations Company for Approval |) | Case No. ER-2009-0090 |
| to Make Certain Changes to its Charges |) | |
| for Electric Service. |) | |

DOGWOOD ENERGY, LLC'S RESPONSE OPPOSING MOTION TO STRIKE DOGWOOD SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

COMES NOW Dogwood Energy, LLC ("Dogwood") and for its Response Opposing the Motion to Strike Dogwood Surrebuttal Testimony that was filed by KCP&L – Greater Missouri Operations Company ("GMO") states to the Commission:

- 1. GMO filed its Motion to Strike on April 22, 2009. On April 23, 2009 the Commission shortened the standard 10-day response time and directed that responses be filed by April 30, 2009.
- 2. As GMO indicates in its Motion, it filed direct testimony regarding its proposal to include the Crossroads plant located in Mississippi in its Missouri ratebase. (Rooney Direct, p. 23-28). That testimony included less than two pages of high level summary of GMO's analysis of responses to a 2007 RFP, through which it determined that it should rely on the Crossroads plant to meet capacity needs. (Rooney Direct, p. 24-25).
- 3. As GMO admits in its Motion, it then filed rebuttal testimony regarding its Crossroads proposal. (B. Crawford Rebuttal, p. 1-14). In that testimony, GMO provided much more specific information concerning its 2007 RFP analysis, including a copy of a

- 27-page presentation it made to staff in October 2007. (B. Crawford Rebuttal, p. 1-14 and Schedule BLC-1).
- 4. GMO correctly states that Dogwood filed rebuttal testimony that responded to GMO and Staff direct testimony. (Janssen Rebuttal).
- 5. Dogwood also exercised its rights to respond to the more detailed information that GMO chose to introduce in its rebuttal testimony. (Rose Surrebuttal). Dogwood's surrebuttal testimony expressly states that it "responds to the rebuttal testimony of Burton Crawford submitted on March 13, 2009 on behalf of ... GMO." (Rose Surrebuttal, p. 4). Further, Dogwood's witness states: "Specifically, I respond to his [Crawford's] claim that the Crossroads Energy Center provided the lowest 20-year Net Present Value of Revenue Requirements (NPVRR) including the cost of transmission service in the GMO 2007 Request for Proposal (RFP). My analysis indicates the opposite, namely the Dogwood offer had lower costs than the Crossroads peaking plant in 2007, and has even a greater advantage based on the March 13, 2009 testimony of Robert Janssen of Dogwood Energy in which he presents a lower price for Dogwood supply." (Rose Surrebuttal, p. 4).
- 6. Commission rule 4 CSR 240-2.130(7)(D) allows surrebuttal testimony which is responsive to matters raised in another party's rebuttal testimony.
- 7. GMO should direct its complaints back onto itself. It could have included all the detail provided by Mr. Crawford about the 2007 RFP in its direct testimony that was filed in September 2008, but instead chose to wait until the rebuttal round. Dogwood has a right to respond to that rebuttal testimony by means of surrebuttal.

- 8. Dogwood indicated in rebuttal that it agreed with Staff's opposition to GMO's direct case proposal to include Crossroad in ratebase based on the 2007 RFP process, but then demonstrated that there was a real alternative solution (the Dogwood plant) to address GMO's capacity needs, instead of Staff's hypothetical proxy peaker. (Janssen Rebuttal).
- 9. When GMO made the tactical decision to provide substantial detail regarding its 2007 RFP analysis in rebuttal testimony, it should have anticipated that parties such as Dogwood might then provide a detailed response in surrebuttal.
- 10. There is no basis for GMO's motion to strike. Dogwood had the right to respond to GMO's direct testimony as it deemed necessary, and then had the further right to respond to GMO's more detailed rebuttal testimony as it deemed necessary. GMO is not in a position to control the evidence in this case by putting whatever it wants in rebuttal and then attempting to muzzle other parties through artificial and self-serving limits on surrebuttal. Nothing precluded GMO from having Mr. Crawford provide his information about the 2007 RFP in direct testimony, but instead GMO chose to wait until rebuttal. As a result, it cannot legitimately object to Dogwood response by surrebuttal. GMO appears to claim the right to have the last word in this case, but in truth it agreed to a procedural schedule under which all parties had the right to file simultaneous surrebuttal. Thus, neither GMO nor any other party had the sole opportunity to have the last word.

WHEREFORE, the Commission should deny GMO's Motion to Strike Dogwood's Surrebuttal Testimony.

Respectfully submitted,

CURTIS, HEINZ, GARRETT & O'KEEFE, P.C.

/s/ Carl J. Lumley

Carl J. Lumley, #32869 130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200 St. Louis, Missouri 63105 (314) 725-8788 (314) 725-8789 (FAX) Email: clumley@lawfirmemail.com

Attorneys for Dogwood Energy, LLC

Certificate of Service

A true and correct copy of the foregoing was served upon the parties identified on the attached service list on this 30th day of April, 2009, by either placing same in the U.S. Mail, postage paid, by fax or email transmission.

/s/ Carl J. Lumley

General Counsel Office Missouri Public Service Commission 200 Madison, Suite 800 P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102 gencounsel@psc.mo.gov

Lewis Mills
Office of Public Counsel
200 Madison Street, Suite 650
P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, MO 65102
opcservice@ded.mo.gov

Nathan Williams Missouri Public Service Commission 200 Madison Street, Suite 800 P.O. Box 360 Jefferson City, MO 65102 nathan.williams@psc.mo.gov

David Woodsmall 428 E. Capitol Ave., Suite 300 Jefferson City, MO 65101 dwoodsmall@fcplaw.com

Stuart Conrad 3100 Broadway, Suite 1209 Kansas City, MO 64111 stucon@fcplaw.com

James B. Lowery
Ameren UE
111 South Ninth Street, Suite 200
P.O. Box 918
Columbia, MO 65205-0918
lowery@smithlewis.com

Constance L. Shidler
Bothwell Regional Health Center
750 Commerce Plaza
7400 W. 110th Street
Overland Park, KS 66210
shidler@smizak-law.com

James Zakoura
Bothwell Regional Health Center
750 Commerce Plaza II
7400 West 110th Street
Overland Park, KS 66210
jim@smizak-law.com

William Geary City of Kansas City, Missouri 2700 City Hall 414 E. 12th Street Kansas City, MO 64016 Bill Geary@kcmo.org

Mark Comley 601 Monroe Street, Suite 301 P.O. Box 537 Jefferson City, MO 65102 comleym@ncrpc.com

Steven Jones Federal Executive Agencies 1104 SE Talonia Drive Lees Summit, MO 64018

Shayla McNeill Federal Executive Agencies 139 Barnes Ave., Suite 1 Tyndall AFB, FL 32403 shayla.mcneill@tyndall.af.mil

Jane Williams
IBEW Local Union 1464
753 State Avenue, Suite 475
Kansas City, KS 66101
jlw@blake-uhlig.com

Richard J. Waers IBEW Local Union 1464 753 State Avenue, Suite 475 Kansas City, KS 66101

Charles Hatfield 230 W. McCarty Street Jefferson City, MO 65101 chatfield@stinson.com James Fischer 101 Madison Street, Suite 400 Jefferson City, MO 65101 jfischerpc@aol.com

Larry Dority 101 Madison Street, Suite 400 Jefferson City, MO 65101 lwdority@sprintmail.com

Curtis Blanc 1201 Walnut, 20th Floor Kansas City, MO 64106 curtis.blanc@kcpl.com

William Riggins 1201 Walnut Kansas City, MO 64141 bill.riggins@kcpl.com

Karl Zobrist 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO64111 kzobrist@sonnenschein.com

Roger Steiner 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO 64111 rsteiner@sonnenschein.com

Shelley Woods
Missouri Department of Natural
Resources
P.O. Box 899
Jefferson City, MO 64105
shelley.woods@ago.mo.gov

Thomas Byrne
Union Electric Company
1901 Chouteau Avenue
P.O. Box 66149 (MC 1310)
St. Louis, MO 63166
amerenueservice@amerenc.com