

1
2
3
4 STATE OF MISSOURI
5 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
6

7 IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT APPLICATION OF GREAT PLAINS
8 ENERGY, INCORPORATED, KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
9 AND AQUILA, INC., FOR APPROVAL OF THE MERGER OF
AQUILA, INC. WITH A SUBSIDIARY OF GREAT PLAINS ENERGY
INCORPORATED AND FOR OTHER RELATED RELIEF

10 Case No. EM-2007-0374
11
12

13 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

14 PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

15 VOLUME 8

16 FEBRUARY 28, 2008
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1

2

STATE OF MISSOURI

3

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

4

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

5

Pre-Hearing Conference

6

February 28, 2008

7

Jefferson City, Missouri

8

Volume 8

9

10

In the Matter of the Joint)
Application of Great Plains)
Energy Incorporated, Kansas City)
Power & Light Company and)
Aquila, Inc., for Approval of) Case No. EM-2007-0374
13 the Merger of Aquila, Inc. with)
a Subsidiary of Great Plains)
14 Energy Incorporated and for)
Other Related Relief)

15

16

NANCY DIPPELL, Presiding,
DEPUTY CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

17

18

19

20 REPORTED BY:

21

Patricia A. Stewart
RMR, RPR, CCR
Midwest Litigation Services
3432 West Truman Boulevard, Suite 207
23 Jefferson City, Missouri 65109
(573) 636-7551

24

25

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 FOR GREAT PLAINS ENERGY AND KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT
COMPANY:

4 James M. Fischer, Attorney at Law
Fischer & Dority, P.C.
5 101 Madison, Suite 400
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
6 (573) 636-6758

7 AND

8 FOR KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY:

9 Curtis Blanc
Kansas City Power & Light Company
10 1201 Walnut, 20th Floor
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
11 (816) 556-2483

12

FOR AQUILA, INC.:

13

Renee Parsons
14 Aquila, Inc.
20 West 9th Street
15 Kansas City, Missouri 64105
(816) 467-3297

16

AND

17

Paul Boudreau, Attorney at Law
18 James Swearngen, Attorney at Law
Brydon, Swearngen and England
19 312 East Capitol Avenue
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
20 (573) 635-7166

21

FOR BLACK HILLS CORPORATION:

22

Paul Deford, Attorney at Law
23 Lathrop & Gage
2345 Grand Boulevard
24 Kansas City, Missouri 64108
(816) 292-2000

25

1 APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

2

FOR PRAXAIR, AGP AND SIEUA:

3

David Woodsmall, Attorney at Law
4 Stuart Conrad, Attorney at Law
Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson
5 420 East Capitol, Suite 300
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
6 (573) 635-2700

7

FOR CITY OF KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI AND CASS COUNTY,
8 MISSOURI:

9

Mark W. Comley, Attorney at Law
Newman, Comley & Ruth, P.C.
10 601 Monroe Street, Suite 301
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
11 (573) 634-2266

12

FOR CITY OF INDEPENDENCE:

13

Alan Robbins
14 Jennings, Strouss and Salmon
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest
15 Washington D.C. 20006
(202) 371-9030

16

AND

17

B. Allen Garner
18 Dayla Schwartz
Law Department
19 111 East Maple Street
Independence, Missouri 64050

20

21 FOR DOGWOOD ENERGY:

22

Carl Lumley, Attorney at Law
Curtis, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe
23 130 South Bemiston, Suite 200
Clayton, Missouri 63105
24 (314) 725-8788

25

1 APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

2

FOR IBEW LOCALS:

3

Jane Williams, Attorney at Law
4 Blake & Uhlig
753 State Avenue, Suite 475
5 Kansas City, Kansas 66101

6

FOR SOUTH HARPER RESIDENTS:

7

John Coffman, Attorney at Law
8 871 Tuxedo Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63119
9 (573) 424-6779

10

FOR OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL:

11

Lewis Mills, Public Counsel
12 P. O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
13 (573) 751-4857

14

FOR STAFF OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION:

15

Steven Dottheim, Chief Deputy General Counsel
16 Kevin Thompson, General Counsel
Nathan Williams, Deputy General Counsel
17 Sarah Kliethermes, Assistant General Counsel
P. O. Box 360
18 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
(573) 651-8702

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 JUDGE DIPPELL: This is Case
3 No. EM-2007-0374 in the matter of the joint application of
4 Great Plains Energy Incorporated, Kansas City Power &
5 Light and Aquila, Inc., for approval of the merger of
6 Aquila, Inc. with a subsidiary of Great Plains Energy
7 Incorporated and for other related relief.

8 My name is Nancy Dippell, and I'm the
9 regulatory law judge assigned to this case, and we've come
10 here today for a pre-hearing conference.

11 I believe I've already ordered for you to
12 file either a joint procedural schedule or the procedural
13 schedule that the parties who do not agree with the one
14 that has already been proposed, to file your proposals,
15 and I believe that deadline is Monday.

16 Is it Monday or Tuesday?

17 MR. DOTTHEIM: Tuesday, I believe,
18 March 4th.

19 JUDGE DIPPELL: March 4th, yes.

20 I'd like to go ahead then and begin with
21 entries of appearance, and I'm just going to go down my
22 list.

23 So Great Plains Energy.

24 MR. FISCHER: Yes. Let the record reflect
25 the appearance of James M. Fischer and Curtis Blanc this

1 morning for Great Plains and Kansas City Power & Light
2 Company. Our addresses will be reflected on written
3 entries.

4 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.

5 Aquila.

6 MS. PARSONS: Yeah. This is Renee Parsons
7 with Aquila, and we also have James Swearngen and Paul
8 Boudreau with Brydon, Swearngen and England, representing
9 Aquila today.

10 JUDGE DIPPELL: And KCP&L.

11 MR. FISCHER: Yes, James Fischer and Curtis
12 Blanc.

13 JUDGE DIPPELL: Black Hills Corporation.

14 MR. DEFORD: Paul DeFord with the law firm
15 of Lathrop & Gage, 2345 Grand Boulevard, Kansas City,
16 Missouri 64108, appearing on behalf of Black Hills
17 Corporation.

18 JUDGE DIPPELL: And Mr. DeFord and those of
19 you that aren't sitting near a microphone, if we get into
20 anything beyond entries of appearances that the parties on
21 the phone might need to actually hear, I think you'll have
22 to come up and speak into a microphone. For now that's
23 fine.

24 Staff.

25 MR. DOTTHEIM: Steven Dottheim, Kevin

1 Thompson, Nathan Williams, Sarah Kliethermes, Post Office
2 Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102, appearing on
3 behalf of the Staff of the Missouri Public Service
4 Commission.

5 JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel.

6 MR. MILLS: On behalf of the Public Counsel
7 and the public, my name is Lewis Mills. My address is
8 Post Office Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

9 JUDGE DIPPELL: AG Processing, Praxair and
10 Sedalia Industrial.

11 MR. WOODSMALL: Yes, Your Honor. Let the
12 record reflect the appearance of David Woodsmall and
13 Stu Conrad of the firm of Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson.
14 Our address has previously been noted in the record.

15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Dogwood Energy.

16 MR. LUMLEY: Carl Lumley of the law firm of
17 Curtis, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe, 130 South Bemiston,
18 Suite 200, Clayton, Missouri 63105.

19 JUDGE DIPPELL: City of Independence.

20 MR. ROBBINS: Good morning, Your Honor.
21 Alan Robbins with the law firm of Jennings, Strouss and
22 Salmon, 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, Washington
23 D.C. 20006, on behalf of the City of Independence.

24 And I'd like to also enter the appearance of
25 Allen Garner and Dayla Schwartz on behalf of the City of

1 Independence.

2 Do I need to enter their addresses in the
3 record, that we previously entered, of course?

4 JUDGE DIPPELL: I think I can get those
5 addresses to the court reporter.

6 MR. ROBBINS: Okay. I do have them handy if
7 you'd like them.

8 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Go ahead with them.

9 MR. ROBBINS: The Law Department, 111 East
10 Maple Street, Independence, Missouri 64050.

11 JUDGE DIPPELL: City of Kansas City.

12 Is there anyone?

13 MR. COMLEY: Yes, there is.

14 JUDGE DIPPELL: Excuse me, Mr. Comley.

15 MR. COMLEY: Let the record reflect the
16 entry of Mark W. Comley today of Newman, Comley and Ruth
17 for the City of Kansas City and also for Cass County.

18 And the record will reflect that there are
19 other attorneys that represent both entities, and for the
20 sake of my voice, I'm just going to let the record speak
21 as it is for those other attorneys, if that's all right.

22 JUDGE DIPPELL: I appreciate that,
23 Mr. Comley. Sorry that you're not feeling well today.

24 IBEW Locals.

25 MS. WILLIAMS: This is Jane Williams on

1 behalf of all of the IBEW locals from the law firm of
2 Blake and Uhlig. The address is 753 State Avenue,
3 Suite 475, Kansas City, Kansas 66101.

4 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
5 City of St. Joseph.
6 Seeing neither Ms. Young or Mr. Steinmeier.
7 City of Lee's Summit.
8 South Harper Residents. Mr. Coffman, are
9 you --

10 MR. COFFMAN: Yes. On behalf of the
11 individuals identified as the South Harper Residents, my
12 name is John B. Coffman. My address is 871 Tuxedo
13 Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63119.

14 JUDGE DIPPELL: The U.S. Department of
15 Energy, Nuclear Security Administration.

16 Seeing no one for them.
17 Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility
18 Commission.

19 Mr. Stewart actually notified me by e-mail
20 that he had a conflict and would not be attending today.

21 All right. Is there anyone else that I
22 missed?

23 All right then. Well, like I say, we
24 basically came here today to get this case moving again.

25 I've been asked to find out from some of the

1 Commissioners your thoughts on the timing of this and
2 whether or not there are known objections to the
3 procedural schedule that has been proposed by the Company
4 at this point.

5 Mr. Mills, do you have any comments on that?

6 MR. MILLS: Well, given the Commission's
7 schedule and the Commission's apparent desire to move this
8 along fairly quickly, as well as the joint applicants'
9 desire, I don't know that I have any real alternative to
10 the hearing dates that the joint applicants have proposed.
11 We're going to have some discussion today about some of
12 the intervening events.

13 But the end game, the hearing dates, I think
14 we're willing to live with that that the joint applicants
15 have proposed.

16 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Mr. Woodsmall,
17 do you have any comments on that?

18 MR. WOODSMALL: Your Honor, I would agree
19 with what Mr. Mills said. I think later on in this
20 proceeding we're going to be talking about the
21 possibilities of some depositions.

22 So long as the joint applicants make such
23 deponents available and provide us with access to records
24 and those individuals, we will agree to the hearing dates.

25 If something changes as far as the

1 availability of those witnesses, we will be seeking to
2 change those hearing dates.

3 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Does anyone else have
4 comments they'd like to share?

5 Mr. Dottheim.

6 MR. DOTTHEIM: Yes. I would like to
7 indicate similarly, as Mr. Mills and Mr. Woodsmall
8 indicated, so long as the Staff obtains timely responses
9 from the joint applicants to discovery by the Staff, data
10 requests, and as Mr. Woodsmall indicated, depositions that
11 the Staff is going to propose, the evidentiary hearing
12 dates of April 21 to May 2 will be acceptable to the
13 Staff, but we're looking forward to discussing that with
14 the joint applicants this morning.

15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Are there any other
16 comments about the current proposed procedural schedule?

17 We've got some interference on the phone
18 over there.

19 MR. FISCHER: Your Honor, on behalf of Great
20 Plains and Kansas City Power & Light, we certainly would
21 like to work with the parties to resolve the procedural
22 questions.

23 We have not been approached about any
24 outstanding requests for depositions or DRs, but we'd
25 certainly be willing to work with the folks to try to get

1 that taken care of so that we can have a timely hearing.
2 It appears that Missouri may be the last to be reviewing
3 this particular transaction.

4 JUDGE DIPPELL: Does anyone anticipate
5 asking this case to be closed and a new one opened after
6 reviewing the additional supplemental testimony?

7 I'm not seeing any comments in that way.

8 With the proposal that the -- or the
9 revisions to the earlier proposal that the company has put
10 forward, I realize you've only had a couple days to look
11 at it, not even that, but are there -- can you give me
12 your sense of the issues that remain outstanding?

13 Is it still the -- I guess my question is,
14 have the issues been lessened by these filings?

15 Mr. Mills.

16 MR. MILLS: Well, certainly that's one of
17 the things that we hoped to talk to the joint applicants
18 about today, but, you know, we can go through the list of
19 issues that were originally proposed and I can tell you at
20 least my take on whether or not those are still at issue.

21 The overview, I mean, that was never really
22 a contested issue per se.

23 Merger Synergy Savings, the sharing
24 proposal, the sharing proposal may certainly be different
25 than it was initially proposed. I think there still needs

1 to be something in the record, and whether or not it's a
2 contested issue or not, with regard to Synergy Savings,
3 because if they're not Synergy Savings, then it's going to
4 be more difficult for the joint applicants to prove that
5 the transaction is not detrimental. So I think we still
6 need to be talking about Synergy Savings.

7 In terms of transaction cost recovery, I
8 think that is still an issue as I read the second or
9 third -- whatever the most recent supplemental direct
10 testimony is. I think the transaction cost recovery is
11 still at issue.

12 Actually debt cost recovery, I think that
13 one may be off the table, as I read the testimony, but,
14 again, we'll need to firm that up.

15 The additional amortization mechanism, that
16 one is a little more questionable. I mean, it doesn't
17 seem to be a request in the same way that it was
18 originally requested. It's still discussed in Mr. Giles'
19 testimony. So whether or not that's an issue I think is
20 still up in the air.

21 Affiliate transactions rule waiver, I think
22 that is still an issue.

23 Service quality, I think regardless of how
24 anything else goes, service quality is always going to be
25 an issue.

1 And then with respect to -- and I'm looking
2 at the original list of issues, and I'm up to Roman
3 Numeral VIII. There are a number of issues, VIII, IX, X
4 and XI, that are really issues more towards -- that
5 were -- that were pushed, for lack of a better word, by
6 the intervenors, and I'm not going to address those. Most
7 of them are on the phone or here and can address that.

8 The legal issues, certainly some of the
9 legal issues are still very much at issue. No. 1, for
10 example, have the joint applicants received approval from
11 the Board for the integration of operations? I think that
12 is an open question.

13 Whether they've sought authorization for the
14 integration of operations I think is still an open
15 question.

16 No. 3 under legal issues, I think that's
17 still an open question.

18 The net detrimental test, certainly that is
19 still an issue. And the transaction -- affiliate
20 transaction rule, I think those are all still issues.

21 And, you know, some of them may certainly be
22 different or lessened than the original ones, and they
23 may, in fact, not even be contested. But I think they're
24 still issues that will ultimately need to be decided by
25 the Commission.

1 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Thank you for
2 going through that for me.

3 Mr. Woodsmall, I'm coming to you guys first,
4 because in the original hearing it seemed that you-all and
5 Staff were the sort of lead on some of these major issues.

6 So would you agree with Mr. Mills at this
7 point?

8 MR. WOODSMALL: I would agree that
9 Mr. Mills' characterization is accurate. It may change
10 based upon what we talk about today and what we discuss.

11 And, certainly, if there are changes, that
12 will be reflected either in our procedural schedule or in
13 some other list of issues or something to the Commission.

14 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Thank you.

15 And Mr. Dottheim.

16 MR. DOTTHEIM: Yes, I would agree with
17 Mr. Mills.

18 In particular, I might note on Issue No. V,
19 additional amortization mechanism, that, in particular,
20 the issue that may still be involved with that item, even
21 with the testimony that was filed on Monday of this week,
22 is the applicability of the Missouri Supreme Court
23 decision in 2003, the State ex rel AG Processing decision,
24 which I think in one manner or another is possibly covered
25 under the legal issues, which is under Section XII also.

1 Actually, there may be an additional issue
2 that will be addressed this morning that is not on the
3 list that has arisen in the intervening time that I think
4 various of the parties want to broach with the joint
5 applicants, which are the reason in particular for the
6 depositions that have been mentioned, is an item that
7 various of the parties will add to the list of issues, and
8 will either be jointly agreed to or will be submitted by
9 individual parties on next Tuesday with the filing of that
10 schedule for March 4.

11 So there's at least one, and I think it may
12 be only one additional issue, that will be presented to
13 the Commission that is not on the listed issues that was
14 filed with the Commission on November 21, 2007.

15 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Thank you,
16 Mr. Dottheim.

17 For the parties who represent the cities and
18 the other intervenors that had sort of individual issues,
19 are there any additions or any issues that have been
20 resolved by the additional testimony?

21 MR. ROBBINS: Your Honor, Alan Robbins for
22 the City of Independence.

23 JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.

24 MR. ROBBINS: We have ongoing discussions
25 that may affect the issues that concern us, but, you know,

1 those discussions remain ongoing. So I cannot predict
2 the -- you know, what the resolution, if any, might be.

3 Putting that aside, I'm not aware of
4 anything in the filings that alter the scope of issues as
5 far as the City is concerned.

6 Separately from the scope of issues -- if
7 I'm a little untimely with this discussion, I apologize --
8 but I do have one comment on the proposed schedule.

9 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.

10 MR. ROBBINS: Should I raise that now?

11 JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes, go ahead.

12 MR. ROBBINS: And that is that the proposal
13 of starting the hearing the week starting April 21st, as I
14 understand it, and, of course, that's the week following
15 the week for which hearings in the pending case involving
16 Aquila's application to participate in MISO will be held.

17 And it would certainly be helpful to have
18 more than a day or two in between the two hearings. And I
19 would think that if Your Honor and other parties agree,
20 that it might be well to consider slipping the
21 commencement of this hearing by one week, so that there's
22 at least one full week in between those two hearings,
23 those proceedings, where efforts relating to them are
24 going to overlap necessarily in certain respects, but
25 having the hearing room back to back, you know, adds to

1 the difficulty, and that's one part that I think could be
2 avoided.

3 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. I'm going to -- I
4 mean, that's the kind of thing I was wanting to know, if
5 there was going to be some opposition to those weeks.

6 And so I will let you all discuss that part
7 and again make either a joint recommendation or your
8 opposition to that, and we'll let the Commission decide
9 it.

10 Mr. Mills, you look like you want to say
11 something.

12 MR. MILLS: The only thing I was going to
13 add to that is I'm certainly -- because I'm going to be in
14 that MISO hearing as well, but if you start pushing in any
15 different direction, things pop up somewhere else.

16 And if you push it back a week, then you
17 butt up against the beginning of the Empire rate case
18 hearing, which many of us will be involved in.

19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Right.

20 MR. MILLS: I would love to have time off
21 between those two, but it's not always going to work out
22 as well as we'd like it to. There is just going to be a
23 lot of hearings right in a row.

24 JUDGE DIPPELL: Right. And if you all can't
25 reach an agreement, then, like I say, you'll just have to

1 bring those -- because that's the kind of thing you'll
2 have to bring to the Commission's attention, and
3 ultimately if you can't agree to those particular weeks,
4 then the Commission will have to make the decision.

5 But thank you, Mr. Robbins. That's the kind
6 of thing I was wanting to know about.

7 MR. ROBBINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 JUDGE DIPPELL: And was there anyone else on
9 the phone that had comments about the pending issues?

10 MS. WILLIAMS: This is Jane Williams for the
11 Union. I would echo what Mr. Robbins said about my
12 clients as well. We have ongoing talks and nothing has
13 necessarily been resolved, so I cannot predict the outcome
14 of that either.

15 However, you know, nothing has changed with
16 regard to the outstanding issues that you all have talked
17 about. I mean, we don't have any more or less interest in
18 any of those.

19 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right.

20 Anyone else on the phone?

21 All right then.

22 MR. DOTTHEIM: Judge Dippell.

23 JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes, Mr. Dottheim.

24 MR. DOTTHEIM: Maybe I just might broach
25 this, and maybe somebody can correct me if I'm mistaken.

1 But I thought back in December when we were
2 in hearings, we were getting very close to, the parties
3 that had issues, VII, VIII, IX, X and XI -- that is
4 transmission and RTO/ISO criteria, municipal franchise and
5 energy audit, quality of service plan and earnings sharing
6 mechanism and future rate case, we were on the verge of, I
7 thought, agreeing to submit that to the Commission on the
8 record that had been created.

9 So I don't know if those talks can be
10 revived again and whether some agreement might be able to
11 be reached.

12 Also, I hesitatingly broach this. I've
13 indicated that from the Staff's perspective, with timely
14 responses to discovery and agreement on depositions, the
15 hearing dates proposed by the joint applicants are okay
16 with the Staff.

17 Hopefully we can fit it into two weeks.
18 Based upon how fast we were moving back in December, maybe
19 we should even look at a third week. I haven't looked to
20 see if the Commission's schedule is open for a third week,
21 but that's maybe something we should even discuss when we
22 break.

23 But those are the only other thoughts that
24 the Staff has.

25 JUDGE DIPPELL: Well, certainly any

1 stipulations with regard to submitting testimony, and if
2 there is not a request by the Commission for those
3 witnesses to appear, that will certainly speed things up.

4 Yes, I think we set some kind of slow-pace
5 record for the first four days of hearing on this, but I
6 have faith that because of that, things will move along a
7 little more efficiently when we get to starting this
8 hearing again.

9 Well, that brings me to, were there any
10 other comments about the issues? Anyone else?

11 MR. FISCHER: Judge, I haven't really
12 commented.

13 Certainly our intention when we filed the
14 motion for leave to file additional supplemental direct
15 testimony and notice to withdraw certain regulatory plan
16 request was to take three of the most hotly contested
17 issues off the table and try to resolve those and simplify
18 the hearing, and we would hope that that will indeed move
19 the process forward in a more expeditious way.

20 I'd also like to let the Commission know
21 that yesterday the joint applicants did file a joint
22 motion and settlement agreement in the Kansas
23 jurisdiction.

24 And it appears that the other jurisdictions
25 that have reviewed the Black Hills' transaction have also

1 moved forward, and it looks like Missouri will be the last
2 jurisdiction to deal with this particular transaction.

3 So we would like to move it forward
4 expeditiously and get the transaction closed as soon as we
5 can.

6 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Let me -- that
7 just brings up the motion to file the supplemental
8 testimony.

9 Would there be any objection to that motion?

10 I'm not hearing any, and I'm going to grant
11 that motion.

12 MR. WOODSMALL: Your Honor, along those
13 lines, not an objection to filing it, of course, there may
14 be objections to what's in it and --

15 JUDGE DIPPELL: It's not being admitted into
16 evidence.

17 MR. WOODSMALL: And there is questions about
18 whether it truly consists of direct testimony, but those
19 can be addressed at the hearing.

20 JUDGE DIPPELL: It's merely a motion to
21 file the testimony and make amendments to their case
22 basically.

23 All right. And, also, we still have --
24 Mr. Woodsmall, there is still a pending motion for partial
25 summary determination.

1 In light of the new revised testimony, do
2 you believe that that motion is still relevant?

3 MR. WOODSMALL: I'm not -- I can't give you
4 a definitive answer right now. I think after we have
5 discussions here today, I'll know more.

6 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.

7 MR. WOODSMALL: We'll certainly let you know
8 if that needs to be dismissed based upon what they've put
9 in their testimony and what we agree to. We'll certainly
10 do that.

11 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Yeah. That's one of
12 the things that I will need to know is whether that motion
13 is being revived or whether it's now moot.

14 All right. And I think I might have cut
15 somebody else off on the phone earlier. Was there someone
16 else that was going to make a statement?

17 Okay. Not hearing any.

18 Well, I think that's all of the questions
19 and items I wanted to bring up, except that if we do go
20 forward with the hearing, then we'll try to stick with our
21 exhibit numbering scheme that we had going. If you have
22 questions about what number you're on, you can ask me. I
23 do actually have a coherent list.

24 If you have questions about what is highly
25 confidential and what is not, I also actually have that

1 figured out.

2 Mr. Mills.

3 MR. MILLS: I can tell you right now I would
4 appreciate getting that list. I think that would be very
5 helpful.

6 JUDGE DIPPELL: I'll publish a list of
7 the hearing list exhibits, as well as the formal rulings
8 from the last -- that's sort of my master list of that,
9 and that will make it a little easier for you all to
10 pre-mark your exhibits and stuff for the hearing going
11 forward.

12 MR. MILLS: Great. Thank you.

13 MR. ROBBINS: Your Honor, this is Alan
14 Robbins for the City of Independence.

15 JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.

16 MR. ROBBINS: This may be more for the
17 parties than Your Honor, but in response to an earlier
18 comment, if I heard it correctly, and I'm not sure who the
19 speaker was, but there was an indication that the parties
20 may have been close on certain issues, including RTO,
21 criteria participation I think was described.

22 I just want it noted that I'm not aware of
23 that. I'm not voicing an objection, but I'm not sure what
24 that reference is to. And we'd be happy at the
25 appropriate time to engage in discussions about that with

1 the parties. But since it was mentioned on the record, I
2 just wanted to clarify that.

3 I'm not sure that the City of Independence
4 is familiar with whatever discussion or nearness there may
5 be there.

6 JUDGE DIPPELL: I think that was
7 Mr. Dottheim's comment, and I believe what he was
8 referencing was that there were some discussions during
9 the hearing of submitting that testimony as it was and not
10 having formal cross and so forth. I don't believe it was
11 as to an actual resolution of the issues but as to the
12 procedure to get that evidence on the record.

13 MR. ROBBINS: Thank you.

14 JUDGE DIPPELL: Are there any other issues
15 that should be brought to my attention or the Commission's
16 attention at this time?

17 All right. I appreciate you all coming in
18 or appearing by phone. I will say that the phone line is
19 open until 5:00 as long as two parties stay on it. It is
20 not secure, in that you don't have to have a password to
21 get in it, but I only gave the number out to parties. So
22 unless some party has given it out, it should only be the
23 parties on the line.

24 Seeing nothing further then, that should
25 conclude the on-the-record portion of the hearing, and we

1 can go off the record.

2 WHEREUPON, the on-the-record portion of the
3 Prehearing Conference was concluded.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

4

5

I, Patricia A. Stewart, RMR, RPR, CCR, a

6

Certified Court Reporter in the State of Missouri, do

7

hereby certify that the testimony that appears in the

8

foregoing transcript was taken by me to the best of my

9

ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me; that

10

I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any

11

of the parties to the action in which this hearing was

12

taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of

13

any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto,

14

nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of

15

the action.

16

17

18

Patricia A. Stewart

19

20

CCR No. 401

21

22

23

24

25