BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Union Electric Company, d/b/a)	
AmerenUE's Tariffs to Increase Its Annual)	
Revenues for Electric Service.)	File No. ER-2010-0036

RESPONSE OF KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY TO OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL

Kansas City Power & Light Company ("KCP&L") responds to the Office of the Public Counsel's ("OPC") October 29, 2009 Response in Opposition to KCP&L's application to intervene out of time:

1. OPC claims that KCPL has not shown that it has an interest different from that of the general public¹ which may be adversely effected in the case. On the contrary, KCP&L has shown that as one of only four investor owned electric utilities regulated by the Commission it has a direct and specific interest in how revenue and expense items are decided in this case. For example, AmerenUE seeks the recovery of demand side management ("DSM") costs in this case and has scheduled workshops concerning different approaches to the recovery of these costs. KCPL wishes to participate in these DSM workshops as it has introduced non-traditional ratemaking treatment for DSM costs in another docket.

In Case No. EE-2008-0034, KCP&L sought non-traditional rate making treatment associated with expenditures for DSM costs in its recent integrated resource plan. Due to the late introduction of proposed non-traditional treatment in that case, Staff and OPC were not able to thoroughly evaluate KCP&L's proposed ratemaking treatment. Pursuant to a stipulation in Case

21421925°V-3

OPC equates the "general public" with "other regulated utilities" when it states on p.2 that "KCP&L's interest is no greater than any other regulated utility." This is not the intervention standard in 4 CSR 240-2.075. Indeed, the Commission regularly grants intervention to utilities in the rate cases of other utilities. See, ER-2009-0090, ER-2006-0315 and ER-2006-0314.

No. EE-2008-0034, KCP&L and Staff agreed that additional discussions must take place before agreement can be reached and that these discussions would not be limited to the resource planning process. To facilitate the needed future discussions, KCP&L agreed to withdraw its request for non-traditional rate treatment for DSM programs included in KCP&L's IRP filing. Staff agreed not to object to KCP&L's pursuit of non-traditional rate treatment in proceedings outside the IRP process but did not endorse the adoption of KCP&L's alternative ratemaking proposal. AmerenUE's DSM workshops are an ideal place where parties can have discussions on DSM cost recovery. Given the fact that KCP&L has recently sought recovery of DSM costs, the Commission's determination of how DSM costs are to be recovered by AmerenUE in this docket will have an effect on KCP&L's future efforts to recover its DSM costs. KCP&L's interests are different than the general public and cannot be represented by any other party.

Moreover, the Commission recently ordered a hearing on AmerenUE's interim rate relief request. Should KCP&L seek recovery of interim rates in the future, the Commission's interim rate decision in this case will be of great importance as it is the most recent decision on this issue. KCP&L should be able to participate to give its perspective on this issue.

- 2. KCP&L intervention, contrary to OPC's assertion, is also in the public interest since it will allow the Commission to hear from another regulated utility regarding recovery of DSM costs, interim rates and other issues. The Commission has recognized that participation in a case by another utility serves the public interest. See, In the matter of the Application of Weber Gas Energy, LLC for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, Case No. GA-2007-0271 (March 14, 2007).
- 3. In its application to intervene, KCP&L indicated that it met the "good cause" standard of 4 CSR 2.075(5) by indicating that it may be able to provide its perspective on various

accounting and regulatory issues raised in this case. OPC believes that the good cause

requirement pertains to showing a reason why KCPL did not file by the intervention deadline.

KCP&L submits that it was not aware until October 7 that the Commission would hold a hearing

on AmerenUE's request for interim rate relief. As the Commission is aware, interim rate relief is

a relatively rare occurrence. KCP&L is interested in ensuring the timely recovery of its

prudently incurred costs. Once it became aware of the upcoming hearing, KCP&L, after internal

discussions, sought intervention to participate in this case.

4. KCP&L's intervention application was not late-filed for any improper purpose or

designed to delay the case. As indicated in its application to intervene, KCP&L accepts the

record as it currently exists. Therefore, no party, including OPC, will be prejudiced by the

Commission's approval of KCPL's intervention request.

WHEREFORE, KCP&L respectfully requests that the Commission approve its

application to intervene in the above-referenced case.

/s/ Roger W. Steiner

Karl Zobrist, MO #28325

Roger W. Steiner, MO #39586

Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP

4520 Main Street, Suite 1100

Kansas City, MO 64111

Telephone: (816) 460-2545

Facsimile: (816) 531-7545

Email: kzobrist@sonnenschein.com

Email: rsteiner@sonnenschein.com

Attorneys for Kansas City Power & Light Company

- 3 -

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was e-mailed on this 6 th	day
of November, 2009, to the persons on the Commission's service list in this case.	

/s/ Roger W. Steiner
Attorney for Kansas City Power & Light Company