

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

7 Evidentiary Hearing  
8 June 11, 2008  
9 Jefferson City, Missouri  
10 Volume 25  
11

12 In the Matter of the Joint )  
Application of Great Plains Energy )  
13 Incorporated, Kansas City Power & )  
Light Company, and Aquila, Inc., ) Case No. EM-2007-0374  
14 for Approval of the Merger of )  
Aquila, Inc., with a Subsidiary of )  
15 Great Plains Energy Incorporated )  
And for Other Related Relief )  
16

17 HAROLD STEARLEY, Presiding,  
18 REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

19 CONNIE MURRAY,  
ROBERT M. CLAYTON III,  
20 TERRY JARRETT,  
COMMISSIONERS.  
21

22

23 REPORTED BY:

24 KELLENE K. FEDDERSEN, CSR, RPR, CCR  
MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES  
25

## 1 APPEARANCES:

2 WILLIAM G. RIGGINS, Attorney at Law  
3 CURTIS D. BLANC, Managing Attorney - Regulatory  
4 Kansas City Power & Light  
5 P.O. Box 418679  
6 1201 Walnut, 20th Floor  
7 Kansas City, MO 64106  
8 (816)556-2483  
9 curtis.blanc@kcpl.com

10 JAMES M. FISCHER, Attorney at Law  
11 Fischer & Dority  
12 101 Madison, Suite 400  
13 Jefferson City, MO 65101  
14 (573)636-6758  
15 jfischerpc@aol.com

16 KARL ZOBRIST, Attorney at Law  
17 Sonnenschein, Nath & Rosenthal, LLP  
18 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100  
19 Kansas City, MO 64111  
20 (816)460-2400  
21 kzobrist@sonnenschein.com

22 FOR: Great Plains Energy Incorporated.  
23 Kansas City Power & Light.

24 PAUL A. BOUDREAU, Attorney at Law  
25 JAMES C. SWEARENGEN, Attorney at Law  
26 Brydon, Swearengen & England, P.C.  
27 312 East Capitol  
28 P.O. Box 456  
29 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456  
30 (573)635-7166  
31 paulb@brydonlaw.com

32 RENEE PARSONS, Attorney at Law  
33 20 West 9th Street  
34 Kansas City, MO 64105  
35 (816)467-3297  
36 renee.parsons@aquila.com

37 FOR: Aquila, Inc.

38

39

40

1     MARK W. COMLEY, Attorney at Law  
2         Newman, Comley & Ruth  
3         601 Monroe, Suite 301  
4         P.O. Box 537  
5         Jefferson City, MO 65102  
6         (573)634-2266  
7         comley@ncrpc.com  
8  
9             FOR: City of Kansas City, Missouri.  
10            Cass County, Missouri.  
11  
12     DAVID WOODSMALL, Attorney at Law  
13         Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson  
14         428 East Capitol, Suite 300  
15         Jefferson City, MO 65101  
16         (573) 635-2700  
17         dwoodsmall@fcplaw.com  
18  
19             FOR: Industrial Intervenors.  
20  
21     DAVID BROWN, Attorney at Law  
22         Lathrop & Gage  
23         314 East High Street  
24         Jefferson City, MO 65101-3213  
25         (573)761-5004  
26         dbrown@lathropgage.com  
27  
28             FOR: Black Hills Corp.  
29  
30     LEWIS R. MILLS, JR., Public Counsel  
31         P.O. Box 2230  
32         200 Madison Street, Suite 650  
33         Jefferson City, MO 65102-2230  
34         (573)751-4857  
35  
36             FOR: Office of the Public Counsel  
37                 and the Public.  
38  
39     NATHAN WILLIAMS, Deputy General Counsel  
40         P.O. Box 360  
41         200 Madison Street  
42         Jefferson City, MO 65102  
43         (573)751-3234  
44  
45             FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public  
46                 Service Commission.  
47  
48  
49

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

2 (EXHIBIT NOS. 56 AND 57 WERE MARKED FOR  
3 IDENTIFICATION BY THE REPORTER.)

4 JUDGE STEARLEY: Good morning. It is  
5 Wednesday, June 11, 2008, and the Commission has convened  
6 this hearing to reopen the record in Case No.  
7 EM-2007-0374, in the matter of the joint application of  
8 Great Plains Energy, Incorporated, Kansas City Power &  
9 Light and Aquila, Incorporated for approval of the merger  
10 of Aquila, Incorporated with a subsidiary of Great Plains  
11 Energy, Incorporated and for other related relief.

12 My name is Harold Stearley. I am the  
13 Regulatory Law Judge presiding over today's hearing. Our  
14 court reporter this morning is Kellene Feddersen. And we  
15 will begin by taking entries of appearance, starting with  
16 Great Plains Energy/KCPL.

17 MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Judge. Let the  
18 record reflect the appearance of James M. Fischer, Karl  
19 Zobrist, Bill Riggins, Curtis Blanc, for purposes of this  
20 case representing Great Plains Energy, Incorporated and  
21 Kansas City Power & Light Company.

22 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Fischer.  
23 Aquila, Incorporated?

24 MS. PARSONS: Yes, your Honor. Renee  
25 Parsons with Aquila, Inc., and Paul Boudreau and Jim

1     Swearengen with Brydon, Swearengen & England. And let the  
2     record reflect that our addresses are already part of the  
3     record.

4                     JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Ms. Parsons.  
5     Black Hills Corporation?

6                     MR. BROWN: David Brown, the law firm  
7     Lathrop & Gage, appearing on behalf of Black Hills. Our  
8     address is also part of the record.

9                     JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Brown.  
10    Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission?

11                    MR. WILLIAMS: Nathan Williams, P.O.  
12    Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

13                    JUDGE STEARLEY: Office of the Public  
14    Counsel? Thank you, Mr. Williams.

15                    MR. MILLS: On behalf of the Office of the  
16    Public Counsel and the public, my name is Lewis Mills. My  
17    address is P.O. Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

18                    JUDGE STEARLEY: Ag Processing, Praxair and  
19    SIEU?

20                    MR. WOODSMALL. Thank you, your Honor.  
21    Appearing on behalf of the Industrial Intervenors, David  
22    Woodsmall with the firm Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson. Our  
23    address has previously been noted for the record.

24                    JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Woodsmall.  
25    Do we have any other of our intervenors appearing today?

1                   MR. COMLEY: Good morning, Judge Stearley.  
2     Let the record reflect the entry of appearance of Mark W.  
3     Comley today on behalf of the City of Kansas City, and  
4     also on behalf of Cass County. My business address is  
5     Newman, Comley & Ruth, PC, 601 Monroe, Jefferson City,  
6     Missouri 65101. The record will also reflect other  
7     attorneys who entered their appearance on behalf of the  
8     parties I just mentioned, but I will let the record speak  
9     for itself.

10                  JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Comley.  
11     Anyone else that I might have missed? And you-all have  
12     heard me say at numerous times throughout this particular  
13     hearing, any party who did not enter an appearance will be  
14     considered to have waived any examinations of today's  
15     witnesses.

16                  A few housekeeping matters. As per usual,  
17     I need to instruct you-all to shut off all electronic  
18     devices, cell phones, Blackberries. That can interfere  
19     with our recording and webcasting.

20                  As far as our witness list today, I have  
21     Mr. Terry Bassham, Mr. Brent Davis and Mr. Michael Cline;  
22     is that correct?

23                  MR. ZOBRIST: That's correct, Judge.

24                  JUDGE STEARLEY: Very well.

25                  MR. ZOBRIST: And I guess perhaps to

1 clarify, the applicant, Great Plains Energy and KCPL,  
2 intend to put Mr. Bassham on the stand and I'll conduct  
3 direct examination. Then we plan to tender Mr. Davis and  
4 Mr. Cline for questioning beginning with Mr. Woodsmall.

5 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Zobrist.  
6 Were the parties wanting to make opening statements this  
7 morning?

8 MR. ZOBRIST: Not on behalf of Great Plains  
9 Energy or KCPL.

10 MR. WOODSMALL: Your Honor, given the  
11 nature of this proceeding, no prefiled testimony, very  
12 little discovery, I'll just save my comments for my  
13 closing statement.

14 JUDGE STEARLEY: All right. Mr. Mills?

15 MR. MILLS: That's fine with me.

16 JUDGE STEARLEY: Mr. Williams?

17 MR. WILLIAMS: That's fine.

18 JUDGE STEARLEY: Mr. Comley?

19 MR. COMLEY: That's fine.

20 JUDGE STEARLEY: Mr. Brown?

21 MR. BROWN: I'll waive argument or opening.

22 JUDGE STEARLEY: Are there any other  
23 preliminary matters we need to address before we begin?

24 (No response.)

25 JUDGE STEARLEY: Hearing none, Mr. Zobrist,

1 you may call your first witness.

2 MR. ZOBRIST: Great Plains Energy and  
3 Kansas City Power & Light Company call Terry Bassham to  
4 the stand.

5 JUDGE STEARLEY: Mr. Bassham, since I  
6 excused you at our previous hearing, I will need to swear  
7 you in again.

8 (Witness sworn.)

9 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Bassham.  
10 You may be seated, and you may proceed.

11 MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you, Judge.

12 TERRY BASSHAM testified as follows:

13 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRIST:

14 Q. Please state your name.

15 A. Terry Bassham.

16 Q. And by whom are you employed?

17 A. Kansas City Power & Light, Great Plains  
18 Energy.

19 Q. And what are your positions with each of  
20 those companies?

21 A. I'm the executive vice president/chief  
22 financial officer for Great Plains Energy, chief financial  
23 officer for Kansas City Power & Light.

24 Q. Now, Mr. Bassham, are you a member of the  
25 Executive Oversight Committee that has been discussed in



1 previous hearings before the Commission in this case?

2 A. I am.

3 Q. And what is the Executive Oversight  
4 Committee?

5 A. Executive Oversight Committee is the  
6 committee that was formed to oversee all of the projects  
7 related to our Comprehensive Energy Plan, to hear about  
8 progress with regard to their construction, budgets,  
9 regulatory processes, everything related to completion of  
10 those projects.

11 Q. Does that include the projects at Iatan 1  
12 and Iatan 2?

13 A. It does.

14 Q. Now, on or about May 23, 2008, were you on  
15 your way to an EOC meeting?

16 A. I was.

17 Q. Would you describe the events of that  
18 morning, please.

19 A. Yes. We had an EOC meeting scheduled for  
20 the site at 8:30. I was headed to the meeting slightly  
21 before 8 o'clock, when I got a call as I was driving out  
22 that there had been an accident at the site involving one  
23 of the cranes on the site.

24 Q. And would you describe for the Commission  
25 generally the nature of the accident and what happened to

1 the best of your knowledge?

2 A. Generally what occurred is I believe around  
3 7:15, after 7 o'clock, the crew had -- the crews had gone  
4 out and a crew on the, what I will call the north side of  
5 Unit 1 -- Unit 1 is on the north side of the construction  
6 for Unit 2. We have a map. I can describe as we go along  
7 if you'd like.

8 MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, for the benefit of the  
9 record, I have had marked as Exhibit 56 a diagram of the  
10 plant, and we've had a blowup placed on the board in back  
11 of the witness.

12 BY MR. ZOBRIST:

13 Q. Mr. Bassham, if I can interrupt you, would  
14 you describe Exhibit 56?

15 A. Exhibit 56 is a 3D conceptual drawing of  
16 pieces of Units 1 and 2 which would be the -- ultimately  
17 the entire Iatan site once the construction is complete.

18 Q. Now, is there a portion of Exhibit 56 that  
19 is labeled OSHA -- I think it's actually misspelled, it  
20 says O-H-S-A, it should be O-S-H-A -- exclusion zone.  
21 What does that refer to?

22 A. Yes. The OSHA, Occupational --

23 Q. Safety.

24 A. -- Safety.

25 Q. Health Administration?

1           A.       Yes. They obviously did an investigation,  
2 as they do with any industrial accident like this, and  
3 when they came out to begin that, they set up a zone where  
4 we were to monitor and protect all materials with regard  
5 to the accident and ensure that nothing was moved, changed  
6 or otherwise altered until they had finished completing  
7 their investigation.

8           Q.       And is Exhibit 56 a true and accurate  
9 depiction of the Iatan site with that OSHA exclusion zone  
10 indicated in there?

11          A.       It is.

12                   MR. ZOBRIST: Your Honor, I move the  
13 admission of Exhibit 56.

14                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Any objections to the  
15 admission of Exhibit 56?

16                   (No response.)

17                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Hearing none, it shall be  
18 received and admitted into evidence.

19                   (EXHIBIT NO. 56 WAS RECEIVED INTO  
20 EVIDENCE.)

21          BY MR. ZOBRIST:

22          Q.       Mr. Bassham, would you then continue with  
23 your discussion -- your description of the accident on the  
24 morning of May 23, 2008?

25          A.       Yes. As I discussed, the area within the

1 OSHA exclusion zone, there existed a Manitowoc 18000, a  
2 very large crane which was placed there by -- as part of  
3 the Alstom contract to install environmental equipment as  
4 part of their contract on Unit 1. It was located about  
5 where the green tubular looking thing stands. This is  
6 again the design of what it will look like once it's  
7 completed. It was situated about there (indicating), and  
8 it was doing its initial test in the morning for wind.  
9 They test to determine whether or not it's too windy to  
10 lift certain pieces of equipment.

11 That day they were lifting pieces of the  
12 ductwork for the SCR. You can see in the circle the  
13 number 7, 6, 5 and 4, those are four pieces of ductwork  
14 that had to be placed for the SCR.

15 Q. And if I can interrupt you, that circle is  
16 just above the green cylinder on the left side of  
17 Exhibit 56?

18 A. It is. And the numbers are intended to  
19 show that there are four different pieces that had to be  
20 placed there. The plan was to lift one of those pieces on  
21 that morning. Again, they were testing for wind speed and  
22 whether or not it was safe to operate the crane.

23 As the crane reached its test height, it  
24 was determined, in fact, it was too windy, and without  
25 load, as the crane then began to drop back down, the

1 accident occurred, and all I guess I can probably say at  
2 this point is at that point it collapsed.

3                   When it collapsed, it fell, if you see to  
4 the -- would be to the back end of the unit, there are two  
5 kind of horizontal green tubes. Those would ultimately be  
6 some sort of tanks. It fell that direction, and would  
7 have then laid flat from say the green vertical tube to  
8 the two horizontal tubes on the ground at that point.

9           Q.       Now, do you have a copy of the photograph  
10 before you that's been marked Exhibit 57?

11          A.       I do.

12          Q.       Would you describe Exhibit 57 for the  
13 record?

14          A.       This is -- this is a picture of the crane  
15 after it had fallen and, in fact, a picture of the OSHA  
16 zone up until probably yesterday. As of yesterday, we got  
17 authority to begin to move some of this equipment out of  
18 the zone, but it has stayed in this condition since the  
19 accident. So this would be basically what it looked like  
20 that morning.

21                   In fact, I was there that morning, so I saw  
22 this. And the two at the very top, you know, the far  
23 right-hand side you'll see the two white tanks there on  
24 the far end. Those are the two tanks I mentioned which  
25 would be in green on the 3D drawing.

1           Q.       And is Exhibit 57 a true and accurate  
2 depiction of the crane after it fell over?

3           A.       It is.

4                   MR. ZOBRIST: Your Honor, I move the  
5 admission of Exhibit 57.

6                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Any objections to the  
7 admission of Exhibit 57?

8                   MR. MILLS: Judge, I don't know if it's an  
9 exhibit (sic) per se, but we were talking about this  
10 before we went on the record. It appears as though  
11 there's a portion of this photograph that's been whited  
12 out sort of along the left margin toward the top, and I  
13 don't know what the purpose of that is.

14                   THE WITNESS: Actually, it's not, I don't  
15 believe. If you look on the very bottom right-hand corner  
16 of what looks like may be whited out, you see it's kind of  
17 silver, I think that's the top of the building. So I  
18 don't -- we didn't alter the photograph, I guess is the  
19 point. It's the sunshine off the -- and so in that  
20 regard, this would have been the back end of Unit 1. So I  
21 don't believe we've altered the photograph in any way. It  
22 may be the way the reflection came off the top of the  
23 building.

24                   MR. MILLS: Given that explanation, I have  
25 no objection.

1 JUDGE STEARLEY: Any other objection?

2 (No response.)

3 JUDGE STEARLEY: Hearing none, Exhibit 57

4 shall be received and admitted into evidence.

5 (EXHIBIT NO. 57 WAS RECEIVED INTO

6 EVIDENCE.)

7 BY MR. ZOBRIST:

8 Q. Now, was anyone hurt in the accident,

9 Mr. Bassham?

10 A. Yes, sir. Unfortunately, four people were  
11 injured, one fatally. Had the crane operator, a safety  
12 engineer who worked for Aerotech and two Alstom employees.  
13 The three that were injured were taken to the hospital and  
14 released ultimately that same day, but unfortunately one  
15 individual was killed.

16 Q. And Alstom refers to Alstom Power,

17 Incorporated; is that correct?

18 A. Yes, who had the contract for the work.

19 Q. And just describe for the Commission who  
20 Alstom is and who -- I think you said Maxum Crane. What's  
21 the relationship of those two?

22 A. Alstom Power is the entity we have  
23 contracted for to do the environmental work on Unit 1 and  
24 environmental work on Unit 2 as well as the boiler for  
25 Iatan 2. So they are a very large part of the overall

1 construction process for both units. They had a  
2 subcontract for this crane with an entity called Maxum,  
3 who then had, I don't know the contractual arrangements,  
4 but purchased and/or leased from Monitowoc, which was the  
5 name of the actual crane.

6 Q. What then happened post accident? What  
7 investigations, if any, began and what was done at the  
8 scene?

9 A. Sure. Well, obviously we did not have our  
10 EOC meeting as scheduled. Instead, the team then was  
11 moved into the mode of managing through employee and  
12 accident issues. First thing that happened obviously is  
13 work shut down at the site and all employees were asked to  
14 leave the site to protect the accident scene and to deal  
15 with the injured employees.

16 Obviously EMT and sheriffs office, other  
17 folks that were appropriately notified were -- the team on  
18 the site for Kansas City Power & Light put together an  
19 immediate group to bring together all of the teams onsite  
20 to make sure employees were taken care of, removed, be  
21 sure that the right people had been notified, OSHA,  
22 county, those kind of folks. And then immediately began  
23 to process what needed to be done to protect the accident  
24 site so that nobody else would get hurt and that all the  
25 materials and accident evidence, if you will, was



1     preserved.

2             Q.       Now, what day of the week was May 23?

3             A.       This is a Friday, Friday morning.

4             Q.       And this was Memorial Day weekend that was  
5     coming up?

6             A.       Friday before Memorial Day weekend. The  
7     plant had not planned to work over the weekend but  
8     obviously didn't as a result of this. Our team worked  
9     over the weekend to again give notice to the right folks,  
10    to obtain crane experts to do a lot of the work that  
11    needed to be done to get the incident investigation under  
12    way.

13            Q.       So the next business day would have been  
14    Tuesday, May 27?

15            A.       Correct.

16            Q.       What happened that day?

17            A.       All the contractors on the property were  
18    informed on Tuesday to have safety meetings. So people  
19    did return to work, and they had safety meetings, give  
20    people an idea what had happened and to go over safety  
21    rules in general. And then work in earnest began the next  
22    day on both Unit 1 and Unit 2.

23            Q.       So on May 28th, construction activities  
24    resumed?

25            A.       Yes.

1 Q. Now, what about the operation of Unit 1?

2 A. Unit 1 continued to operate throughout the  
3 process. The crane did -- characterize this correctly,  
4 but it did nick the back end of the precipitator, hole  
5 about the size of a basketball, but it didn't do any  
6 damage that would keep the unit from running. The unit  
7 continued to run, continues to run today, and we expect to  
8 be able to fix the small amount of damage done to Unit 1  
9 once we're able to get into the site area and there's a  
10 brief outage that occurs.

11 Q. Was the Commission Staff notified of this  
12 incident?

13 A. They were.

14 Q. Have they visited the incident since the  
15 accident of May 23?

16 A. They have. I believe -- I believe they  
17 came out the Wednesday after Memorial Day and I think have  
18 another scheduled visit in the next few days or week.

19 Q. Now, did OSHA continue with its  
20 investigation for the next few days?

21 A. It did, and it has and continues. They've  
22 done all the work necessary on the site as it is, and the  
23 next step again is to remove the crane and put it at  
24 another site, and so they've released the site as of, I  
25 think, yesterday to begin that removal, and then they'll

1 continue to work on the evidence after that.

2 Q. Now, since this time, has the EOC had a  
3 meeting?

4 A. Yes. We met yesterday actually. We waited  
5 until we had the results of the Alstom recovery plan work  
6 to see the status of Alstom's plans around the crane, and  
7 we met yesterday to talk about those plans and its effect  
8 on our schedule and budget.

9 Q. And with regard to the Iatan crane  
10 accident, what effect was reported to the EOC that this  
11 incident would have on scheduling and cost and the  
12 construction plan?

13 A. Our discussions yesterday were that Alstom  
14 has several options for doing the work that would have  
15 been done by this crane. The size of the crane was  
16 initially engineered based upon its plan of lifting these  
17 pieces to be put on the SCR and Unit 1. They provided a  
18 recovery plan which could either replace the crane and do  
19 the work as originally planned or also do the work through  
20 the use of other cranes that would do the work  
21 differently.

22 But as a result, the initial review of the  
23 work is that they believe they can maintain the current  
24 schedule and, as a result, cost of the Iatan 1 outage.  
25 And so at this point we believe there's a very good

1 opportunity for one of those alternatives to provide us to  
2 remain on schedule and on budget.

3 Q. What, if any, effect will the accident have  
4 on the cost and schedule for Iatan Unit 2?

5 A. This should not impact Unit 2. As you can  
6 see from the 3D drawing, this crane was specifically  
7 intended to work on what would be the north end of  
8 Iatan 1, and it doesn't affect what would be Iatan 2,  
9 which is the taller building in brown on the other side of  
10 Iatan 1. And probably as importantly, you can see in the  
11 colors are intended to show construction, so if it's in  
12 gray, it already stands. If it's in color, it's to build.  
13 As you can see --

14 Q. Could you say that again? If it's in  
15 color, it means what?

16 A. If it's colored, it shows that there's  
17 construction, new construction there. Whereas, for  
18 example, under the brown top of Iatan 1 where the numbers  
19 in the circle are, underneath that's gray. Well, that's  
20 the existing Unit 1 unit.

21 But my point would be, is at this back end,  
22 this -- this -- where the red tower is, the red tubular,  
23 is the environmental back end of both units, and the crane  
24 on the far north side doesn't affect and hasn't affected  
25 the ongoing work there. So currently we don't believe and

1 don't have reason to believe it would affect and hasn't  
2 affected so far the actual work on Unit 2.

3 Q. Now, let me ask you about any discussions  
4 you've had with credit agencies. Have you personally had  
5 any discussions with the credit rating agencies, either  
6 Standard & Poor's or Moody's, since the accident of  
7 May 23?

8 A. I personally have not had any conversations  
9 since the accident.

10 Q. Since the hearings adjourned, I believe on  
11 May 1, have you had any discussions with the credit rating  
12 agency?

13 A. We have. We had our, what we would call  
14 our annual meeting with both agencies. We normally do  
15 that a little earlier in the year, but given the fact that  
16 we had hearings going on, we held it a little later  
17 because of timing. But we had our normal annual update in  
18 New York, visited both agencies and basically went through  
19 the current status of our financial condition based upon  
20 the information that we had presented to the Commission.

21 Q. And were there any indications or any  
22 questions about the reforecast at those meetings?

23 A. Well, the reforecast was included in the  
24 information we provided to the agencies, and it was part  
25 of our overall presentation, so we discussed that along

1 with every other update and ongoing items with regard to  
2 the company.

3 Q. Have either S&P or Moody's changed either  
4 Great Plains Energy or KCPL's credit rating since that  
5 meeting of May 15?

6 A. No. The meeting -- the meeting went well.  
7 It was constructive, and as a result there was no  
8 indication of any change in our credit profile or credit  
9 ratings.

10 Q. And since that meeting, describe what if  
11 anything has happened on the sale of Strategic Energy.

12 A. We were able a week ago Monday to close the  
13 Strategic Energy transaction as we discussed in the  
14 hearings. The purchase price was \$300 million plus a  
15 working capital adjustment. Strategic Energy had a good  
16 first quarter, and so there was a positive working capital  
17 adjustment, and the ultimate closing number was  
18 305 million, I believe, and we closed that a week ago  
19 Monday.

20 Q. Now, based upon the information that  
21 came to the EOC and to you as the chief financial officer  
22 of both Great Plains Energy and KCPL, do you believe that  
23 there will be any material change in the financial  
24 assumptions relied upon by the credit agencies as a result  
25 of this accident?

A. No, I don't believe as a result of this

1 accident we will -- we will see any material impact that  
2 would affect our information we provided the rating  
3 agencies and, as a result, not impact our credit rating.

4 MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, that's all I have  
5 right now.

6 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Zobrist.  
7 Cross-examination, Aquila?

8 MS. PARSONS: No questions.

9 JUDGE STEARLEY: Black Hills?

10 MR. BROWN: No questions, your Honor.

11 JUDGE STEARLEY: City of Kansas City?

12 MR. COMLEY: No questions. Thank you.

13 JUDGE STEARLEY: Same for Cass County,  
14 Mr. Comley?

15 MR. COMLEY: Yes, sir.

16 JUDGE STEARLEY: Industrials, Ag  
17 Processing?

18 MR. WOODSMALL: Thank you. I'll be brief.

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WOODSMALL:

20 Q. Good morning, sir.

21 A. Good morning.

22 Q. You discussed in your questioning an  
23 Executive Oversight Committee meeting that occurred  
24 yesterday. Do you recall that?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1           Q.       Can you tell me who from the project team  
2 was in attendance at that meeting?

3           A.       Sure. We had -- in attendance by telephone  
4 we had Carl Churchman, Brent Davis, and we had two or  
5 three other folks on the phone. Those were the two main  
6 speakers from the project itself. And then Bill Downey  
7 and the EOC team was -- were in a room in Kansas City.

8           Q.       And at that meeting, were any decisions  
9 made on any issues or any points that needed decisions?

10          A.       I don't believe. I believe we got an  
11 update on everything. I don't believe there was a  
12 specific decision point that I can recall.

13          Q.       This was more of an informative meeting,  
14 then?

15          A.       We had not met as a committee to get an  
16 update on the Alstom recovery plan, and so it was an  
17 update to us on what work had been done with regard to the  
18 scope of the work and the budget and dollar, schedule  
19 impact.

20          Q.       At this EOC meeting, did you discuss the  
21 outage or the scheduling of the outage for the Iatan unit?

22          A.       Yes.

23          Q.       And can you tell me what was decided on  
24 that outage?

25          A.       Well, it was -- what was decided is what I



1 discussed before, and that is that the current Alstom plan  
2 is not complete, but that they had several options. They  
3 were working to figure out which one of those options  
4 worked best, and the result of that was currently we  
5 believe that we're on track for the current schedule and  
6 current budget.

7 Q. When you say current schedule, are you  
8 referring to the schedule for the completion of Iatan 1 or  
9 the schedule for the commencement of the outage in the  
10 fall or both?

11 A. Both. I'm referring to both.

12 Q. Okay. You mentioned credit rating  
13 agencies. When you say that you have had annual meetings,  
14 I think you called them, with the credit rating agencies,  
15 did you have meetings with the entities or individuals  
16 that are part of the Moody's RUS or S&P RES teams?

17 A. Well, we didn't meet with them in that  
18 context. We met with the team that rates us. Some of  
19 those folks would be assigned to an RES or RUS assignment.  
20 I don't know exactly whether or not any of those people --  
21 I think there were some of those people that were on our  
22 RUS or RES assignment. So we didn't meet with them for  
23 that purpose. There were some of those individuals that  
24 would be on that kind of team if we had hired them to do  
25 that.

1           Q.       Since January of 2008, you have not hired  
2 RES or RUS to give an update; is that correct?

3           A.       Correct.

4           Q.       Okay.

5           A.       I mean, at this point we wouldn't need to  
6 because they're reviewing all our numbers. If we did  
7 that, we'd give them what we were given.

8           Q.       But the last pronouncement of RES or RUS  
9 was done in January of 2008; is that correct?

10          A.       And I would say -- yes, and I would say  
11 effectively confirmed by our meeting last month.

12                   MR. WOODSMALL: No further questions.  
13 Thank you.

14                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Woodsmall.  
15 Office of the Public Counsel, Mr. Mills?

16                   MR. MILLS: Thank you. Just a few.

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MILLS:

18          Q.       Mr. Bassham, do you have a copy of  
19 Exhibit 57, the photograph?

20          A.       I do.

21          Q.       There are on the right-hand side, there's a  
22 series of letters and it looks like someone has drawn in  
23 with a marker a series of zones. What do those signify?

24          A.       Just work areas so you could see if they  
25 were -- if you wanted to identify something, where it's

1 at, and then ultimately there may be some other purpose  
2 for moving, but if you wanted to identify where something  
3 was, you could do it by zone.

4 Q. Were those work areas established before  
5 the crane accident or after?

6 A. No. No. These -- these -- the indications  
7 on this picture are for accident purposes, not for work  
8 purposes.

9 Q. Now, with respect to Exhibit 56, you  
10 said that the -- the material drawn in in color is  
11 anticipated -- or was anticipated construction at the time  
12 this drawing was produced?

13 A. For the most part. There's some gray  
14 scattered other places.

15 Q. The large red stack, is that the new stack  
16 for Iatan 2?

17 A. It's actually the new stack for Iatan 1  
18 and 2.

19 Q. That's what I was going to ask. It looks  
20 like it's a dual stack.

21 A. Exactly. When that happens, the old gray  
22 stack won't be used.

23 Q. Will it still stay there, it just won't be  
24 used?

25 A. There is a cost associated with it, but we

1 ultimately would like to take down the old stack. There's  
2 some environmental issues in process we'll have to work  
3 through, but ultimately we would hope that there would  
4 only be one stack.

5 Q. Now, with respect to the rating agency  
6 presentation that you made in the middle of May, were you  
7 the primary presenter?

8 A. Mr. Cline and I were, but I led the  
9 presentation, yes.

10 Q. Who prepared the PowerPoint that you-all  
11 used?

12 A. Well, Mr. Cline and Mr. Tony Corino, who is  
13 our senior director of treasury, would have prepared, and  
14 I would have reviewed it before presenting it to the  
15 agencies.

16 Q. Well, let me -- and I believe it's  
17 marked -- do you have a copy of it?

18 A. No, I'm sorry, I don't.

19 Q. I believe it's marked as highly  
20 confidential. I'm going to try to ask you just a couple  
21 of questions that are not going to, hopefully, lead you to  
22 release any highly confidential information.

23 A. Sure.

24 MR. MILLS: Judge, this is a document that  
25 was provided in discovery. I don't anticipate making it

1 an exhibit, but I would like to ask the witness a couple  
2 of questions about it. May I approach?

3 MR. ZOBRIST: I could give him a copy,  
4 Mr. Mills.

5 MR. MILLS: That would be great. Thank  
6 you.

7 JUDGE STEARLEY: You certainly may  
8 approach. If you have additional copies for the Bench,  
9 that would be appreciated.

10 MR. MILLS: I do not. This stuff came -- a  
11 large volume of material came in late yesterday. I was  
12 barely able to make copies of some of it for myself.

13 There will just be a couple of questions and I  
14 think this will be fairly self explanatory.

15 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Mills.

16 BY MR. MILLS:

17 Q. Mr. Bassham, can you turn to page 12?

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. This is a table that you had some  
20 conversation with -- or at least similar to a table that  
21 you had some conversations with Mr. Dottheim during the  
22 hearings in this case; is that correct?

23 A. It is.

24 Q. Is this -- is this -- and in particular the  
25 bottom right-hand box, has that changed at all from the

1 earlier presentations?

2 A. I don't know. I'd have to look at the old  
3 ones. I don't recall making a change to it.

4 Q. You're not aware of making any changes to  
5 that?

6 A. I'm not aware. I just don't recall.

7 Q. And then there's a section about KCPL  
8 operations, and if I can get you to turn to page 22.

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Does the bar chart in the upper left, is  
11 that -- at least one section of the bar is intended to --  
12 does that show revenues or margins from wholesale sales?

13 A. The left-hand margin shows revenues.

14 Q. Okay. So you can't derive from this  
15 diagram in itself what the margins are; is that correct?

16 A. No.

17 MR. MILLS: Okay. Judge, I think the rest  
18 of my questions will probably be directed to Mr. Cline.

19 JUDGE STEARLEY: All right. Thank you,  
20 Mr. Mills. Cross-examination, Staff?

21 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Judge.

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS:

23 Q. Mr. Bassham, you indicated that the  
24 accident happened on the 23rd of May, I believe, and that  
25 construction restarted on the 28th?

1           A.       Wednesday the 28th, yes.

2           Q.       So how many work days were lost?

3           A.       Well, really only one. Well, two, I guess.

4       Again, we didn't plan to work the holiday weekend, and  
5       obviously we didn't work the day of the accident, sent  
6       everybody home, and although we had folks back and talked,  
7       had safety meetings on Tuesday, we didn't -- I don't think  
8       a lot of work happened, so I'd say two.

9           Q.       And in response to questions earlier, you  
10       indicated that things were remaining on budget. What  
11       budget were you referring to, the budget created after the  
12       reforecast or the original control budget?

13          A.       The reforecast.

14          Q.       And is Alstrom currently on schedule  
15       regarding the work it's performing for Iatan 1?

16          A.       They are either -- well, to the extent  
17       they're not, they have a plan to remain on the final  
18       schedule. Whether or not they're exactly today on their  
19       current plan, I don't -- I don't believe so. I think  
20       they're somewhat behind, but they have a plan to be on  
21       schedule, and we have reviewed that plan and we're  
22       comfortable with that plan.

23          Q.       Are they -- is Alstrom currently on  
24       schedule on the work it's performing for Iatan 2?

25          A.       Yes, I believe so. Again, if they are not

1 specifically on schedule, they have a plan to remain on  
2 schedule for the ultimate due date.

3 Q. And have you gotten any updated predictions  
4 about what S&Ps and Moody's credit ratings would be if  
5 Great Plains Energy goes forward with the acquisition of  
6 Aquila, what the ratings would be for Kansas City Power  
7 and Light Company and Great Plains Energy post that  
8 acquisition in light of or post the accident that occurred  
9 on May 23rd?

10 A. If you're asking whether or not we've gone  
11 to the agency and asked for anything, the answer is no.  
12 We have received confirmation of our current rating  
13 expectations post Aquila closure, which is what we talked  
14 about before, and we've had conversations with at least  
15 Moody's and, as I testified before, do not expect any  
16 impact as a result of the single crane incident. So I  
17 would say post accident we don't expect there to be any  
18 difference from our current ratings.

19 Q. So you've gotten feedback that the  
20 predicted ratings for KCP&L and Great Plains Energy post  
21 acquisition of Aquila would not be impacted by this  
22 incident; is that what you're saying?

23 A. We have met with both agencies and are  
24 comfortable that the initial recommendations for ratings  
25 that we reported earlier are still accurate, still will



1 hold true. We have not asked for specific rendering, if  
2 you will, of any impact of this event, but we are very  
3 comfortable that there will be none. In fact, we have  
4 spoken to Moody's and they've stated that they wouldn't,  
5 as we've testified before, wouldn't make a change in a  
6 rating based on a single event that didn't affect the  
7 long-term credit of a company.

8 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. No further  
9 questions.

10 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Williams.  
11 Questions from the Bench, Commissioner Murray?

12 COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I don't have any  
13 questions. Thank you.

14 JUDGE STEARLEY: Commissioner Clayton?

15 COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: No questions, Judge.  
16 Thank you.

17 JUDGE STEARLEY: Commissioner Jarrett?

18 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: I don't have any  
19 questions either. Thank you.

20 JUDGE STEARLEY: Okay. We can dispense  
21 with recross. Any redirect?

22 MR. ZOBRIST: Nothing further, Judge.

23 JUDGE STEARLEY: Mr. Bassham, you may step  
24 down, and you are excused.

25 THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.

1 JUDGE STEARLEY: And Mr. Woodsmall, you may  
2 call your first witness.

3 MR. WOODSMALL: Thank you, your Honor.  
4 Call Brent Davis, please.

5 JUDGE STEARLEY: Mr. Davis, if you'd please  
6 raise your right hand?

7 (Witness sworn.)

8 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you. You may  
9 proceed, Mr. Woodsmall.

10 MR. WOODSMALL: Thank you.

11 BRENT DAVIS testified as follows:

12 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WOODSMALL:

13 Q. Good morning, sir. You are the Unit 1  
14 project manager for KCP&L; is that correct?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. In that role, it's my understanding you're  
17 responsible for the environmental upgrades that are taking  
18 place at the Iatan 1 generating station; is that true?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. The contractor that is responsible for the  
21 construction of the Iatan environmental upgrades is  
22 Alstrom; is that correct?

23 A. A majority of it, yes.

24 Q. What parts aren't they responsible for?

25 A. The electrical portion for an example is

1 under another contractor.

2 Q. The environmental upgrades that are being  
3 done on Iatan 1 in my understanding consists of three  
4 projects, the SCR, the fabric filter and the absorber/wet  
5 scrubber; is that true?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. The absorber wet scrubber is designed to  
8 reduce SO2 emissions; is that right?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. And the fabric filter is designed to reduce  
11 particulate emissions?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. And the SCR reduces the nitrogen oxide  
14 emissions?

15 A. That's right. I would add that there is  
16 some common equipment to both units that has to be  
17 completed for all of that equipment to operate.

18 Q. Okay. Now, just so I understand how this  
19 all acts, each of these devices is placed in the path of  
20 the flue gases as they exit the boiler; is that true?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Now, tell me as the flue gases leave the  
23 boiler and after passing the superheaters, reheaters and  
24 economizer, which one of these environmental devices will  
25 the flue gases first encounter?

1           A.       The SCR.

2           Q.       And what will be encountered second?

3           A.       The fabric filter.

4           Q.       So the last thing will be absorber/wet

5 scrubber; is that true?

6           A.       Other than the chimney, that is correct.

7           Q.       As I understand the working of the SCR, it

8 relies upon the injection of ammonia into -- the injection

9 of ammonia with the aid of a catalyst to convert nitrogen

10 oxide to the nitrogen and water; is that correct?

11          A.       Yes.

12          Q.       And in order to install the SCR, you must

13 lift the various aspects of the catalyst chamber into

14 place in order to route the flue gas through the chamber;

15 is that right?

16          A.       You actually load catalyst into the

17 catalyst box, and that catalyst is replenishable. You

18 replace it periodically.

19          Q.       The catalyst box is what is lifted up and

20 placed -- duct -- and flue gases ducted through the

21 catalyst box, is that right?

22          A.       That's correct.

23          Q.       And I believe on Exhibit 56 we see -- yes,

24 56, we see a picture of where that catalyst box is. Can

25 you point out where that will go?

1           A.       (Indicating) this is the catalyst box.

2           Q.       And that's the brown right -- just to the  
3 right of the 7, 6, 5, 4 numbers?

4           A.       That's correct. And this is the inlet  
5 ductwork represented by the 7, 6, 5, 4 numbers.

6           Q.       Okay. And once the catalyst box, the SCR  
7 is installed, how high up will it be off the ground?

8           A.       I don't recall the exact elevation. It is  
9 taller than the boiler, and it's above 200 feet.

10          Q.       Now, up until now, the work on the  
11 environmental upgrades has proceeded while Iatan 1 was  
12 still operational and generating electricity; is that  
13 true?

14          A.       That's true.

15          Q.       But in order to finish the environmental  
16 upgrades, you will need to have an outage at Iatan 1; is  
17 that correct?

18          A.       That's correct.

19          Q.       And why is that?

20          A.       You have to redivert the flue -- the flue  
21 gas from the current flow path through the precipitator to  
22 the new environmental equipment.

23          Q.       Can you tell me at the time of the  
24 accident -- you see the 7, 6, 5, 4 on Exhibit 56 referring  
25 to different pieces of ductwork? At the time of the

1 accident, how much of that ductwork had been completed?

2 THE WITNESS: Can you hear me if I point to  
3 the --

4 JUDGE STEARLEY: Certainly.

5 THE WITNESS: This ductwork, there's a  
6 corner piece right here that was set. None of these four  
7 pieces were set, and about half of this box was completed.  
8 All the structural steel you see here was completed. So  
9 we've got half of this box, this ductwork. There's some  
10 ductwork you can -- that goes down and connects to the  
11 economizer outlet that you can't really see on this  
12 picture, that will be installed during the outage.

13 So the majority of it are these four  
14 pieces, the top half and, of course, all the catalyst and  
15 the catalyst support internal to this box.

16 Q. What about exit ductwork, is there any exit  
17 ductwork associated with this?

18 A. Yeah. All of the -- the flue gas actually  
19 has to go back to the inlet of the air heater. That  
20 ductwork's basically all in place, and the outlet ductwork  
21 out of the air heater, in fact it's this piece you can see  
22 right here, that's already erected out to a point out  
23 here. The inlet duct down to the fabric filter, which you  
24 can see right here, is not installed yet.

25 Q. And you said this will not be operational

1     until you do an outage to divert the flue gas, put in new  
2     ductwork to divert the flue gas through these  
3     environmental upgrades; is that right?

4             A.       That's correct.

5             Q.       It's my understanding that the outage was  
6     originally scheduled to occur on September 20th; is that  
7     correct?

8             A.       Yes.

9             Q.       And that was originally scheduled to last  
10    through November 13th; is that correct?

11            A.       13th or the 16th. I don't recall the exact  
12    date.

13            Q.       You were involved in a recent reforecast of  
14    the budget and schedule for Iatan 1; is that correct?

15            A.       Yes.

16            Q.       Since that reforecast, the outage date for  
17    Iatan 1 has been delayed from September 19th to  
18    October 19th; is that correct?

19            A.       That's correct.

20            Q.       So the start of the outage has been delayed  
21    by 30 days; is that true?

22            A.       Yes.

23            Q.       The end date for the outage was originally  
24    scheduled to be November 13th or 16th; is that correct?

25            A.       Yes.

1           Q.       And as a result of the reforecast, the  
2     current end date for the Iatan 1 outage is December 30th;  
3     is that correct?

4           A.       That's correct.

5           Q.       So the end of the outage has been delayed  
6     approximately 45 days; is that right?

7           A.       45 from the original. I'd have to do the  
8     math, but I think that's correct.

9           Q.       Okay. Originally the Iatan 1 unit upgrades  
10    were planned to be accepted and available for service on  
11    December 16th; is that correct?

12          A.       Yes.

13          Q.       And as a result of the reforecast, these  
14    environmental upgrades will not be accepted now until  
15    February 1; is that correct?

16          A.       That's correct.

17          Q.       So the in-service date for the Iatan 1  
18    environmental upgrade has been delayed by 45 days; is that  
19    true?

20          A.       Yes.

21          Q.       One of the reasons for the delay in the  
22    Iatan 1 outage and acceptance date is because of delays  
23    associated with Alstom's completion of the SCR; is that  
24    correct?

25          A.       It was mainly due to other environmental



1 equipment, the preparatory equipment on the west end we  
2 call it, and I might point to that area (indicating).  
3 It's the reagent prep area back here (indicating) that was  
4 our major concern at the time of the reforecast.

5 Q. Okay. And Alstrom was responsible for that  
6 reagent prep area; is that correct?

7 A. Largely responsible for that, yes.

8 Q. Are you involved in the preparation of  
9 what's called a strategic infrastructure investment status  
10 report that's given to the parties of the regulatory plan?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay. In the May 15th report, KCP&L notes  
13 that at the beginning of the first quarter of this year,  
14 Alstrom's field construction of certain air quality control  
15 system components was 12 weeks behind schedule; is that  
16 correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And even though Alstrom improved their  
19 performance during the first quarter, at the beginning of  
20 the second quarter Alstrom remained approximately eight  
21 weeks behind schedule; is that correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, I don't want to  
24 object, and that's why I'm making my statement right now,  
25 but I understood that the purpose of this hearing was to

1 relate to the accident, not to the reforecast, and I just  
2 sort of inquire of counsel, are we going to get back to  
3 the accident, because I don't think the purpose of this  
4 hearing was to go back and talk about the reforecast?

5 JUDGE STEARLEY: I'm assuming Mr. Woodsmall  
6 is going to tie this all together for us shortly.

7 MR. WOODSMALL: I will, in fact, I think in  
8 two questions.

9 BY MR. WOODSMALL:

10 Q. In that same strategic infrastructure  
11 report, KCP&L notes that, quote, while the pace of  
12 Alstom's work has increased, so have the demands in the  
13 baseline schedule, so Alstom's recovery effort has largely  
14 been necessary to maintain its planned pace of work and  
15 not lose additional ground; is that true?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Isn't it true that Alstom's inability to  
18 complete the Iatan 1 components in a timely fashion could  
19 ultimately lead to a cascading effect on Iatan 2's  
20 schedule?

21 A. That potential can exist, yes.

22 Q. Were you at the Iatan generating station on  
23 May 23rd?

24 A. Yes, I was.

25 Q. That is the day of the crane collapse; is

1     that right?

2             A.     Yes.

3             Q.     What was the model of the crane that  
4     collapsed?

5             A.     Monitowoc 18000.

6             Q.     In a recent webcast, Bill Downey called  
7     this the second largest crane available in the United  
8     States. Is that consistent with your understanding?

9             A.     Of that type, yes.

10            Q.     As I understand, the crane was owned and  
11    operated by Maxum Crane Works; is that right?

12            A.     That's correct.

13            Q.     Can you tell me who Maxum is?

14            A.     It's my understanding they're a crane  
15    supplier. They were subbed by Alstrom.

16            Q.     Can you tell me who Marino Crane is?

17            A.     Marino Crane is a contractor who is going  
18    to be involved in the cleanup effort and moving the crane  
19    over to the new location for storage for forensic  
20    examination.

21            Q.     The crane, Monitowoc or -- the crane, was  
22    being used to support Alstrom's construction of the SCR;  
23    is that correct?

24            A.     Yes.

25            Q.     Was the crane being used in construction of

1 the fabric filter or the absorber/wet scrubber?

2 A. No.

3 Q. So this crane was devoted solely to the  
4 completion of the SCR?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. The crane collapsed at approximately  
7 7:30 a.m., is that right?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. As a result of the collapse, it's my  
10 understanding all construction personnel were sent home on  
11 May 23rd; is that true?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. When did the construction personnel return  
14 to work?

15 A. That following Tuesday, after Memorial Day.

16 Q. So that would be May 27th. Once the  
17 construction personnel returned on May 27th, how much time  
18 was spent in safety training or otherwise discussing the  
19 crane collapse?

20 A. It was somewhat dependent on which  
21 contractor. Alstrom spent all day and into the next day  
22 with various safety and training issues since it was  
23 mainly their people involved.

24 Q. Okay. So at least as it applies to Alstrom  
25 personnel, the entirety of May 28th was spent in safety

1 meetings; is that true?

2 A. Safety meetings and/or walk-downs of the  
3 site, ensuring the site was safe to go back to work.

4 Q. And a portion of May 29th was also spent  
5 with safety meetings or walk-down?

6 A. A portion was, yeah.

7 JUDGE STEARLEY: Mr. Woodsmall, did I get  
8 off a date there? I thought you started with May 27th.

9 MR. WOODSMALL: 27th was a Tuesday, it's my  
10 underst -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but just to answer  
11 your question, 27th was a Tuesday. They returned to work  
12 and were involved in safety meetings -- I think I was off  
13 a date, and so a portion of the 28th.

14 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

15 MR. WOODSMALL: Okay. So I was off a date.  
16 Thank you.

17 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you for the  
18 clarification.

19 BY MR. WOODSMALL:

20 Q. So the week after the crane collapse  
21 occurred, a day and a portion of a second day were devoted  
22 by Alstrom personnel to safety or walk downs?

23 A. That's correct.

24 Q. Did OSHA perform an inspection of the  
25 collapsed crane?

1           A.       Yes, they did.

2           Q.       Has OSHA completed their inspection?

3           A.       They have released the site. During the  
4 demolition process, we have -- they have requested two  
5 hold points to come back and witness two events that will  
6 occur during the demolition.

7           Q.       And tell me what the demolition process is.

8           A.       If you refer to the -- if you refer to the  
9 picture.

10          Q.       Exhibit 57?

11          A.       Yeah. This picture's taken from up on the  
12 boiler on Unit 1 to kind of orient you. I think Terry did  
13 a good job, but the individual that took this picture was  
14 probably up about this level pointing down this way.

15                   And to answer Mr. Mills' earlier question  
16 about the light spot, that is the precipitator box, and  
17 it's silver, so the reflection off of that is what's  
18 causing that to look like that. And the damage Terry  
19 referred to is at the upper corner, the top part of that  
20 very bright area up there.

21                   But as far as the crane site's concerned,  
22 the demolition that is going to occur, you can see the  
23 letters that are marked A, B, C, D and E. Those are kind  
24 of areas and roughly coincide to cut points that they're  
25 going to do on that boom. There is still -- this crane

1 obviously is not in its normal position, so there's a lot  
2 of stress points.

3                   Safety is very important and a big key to  
4 this whole endeavor. That's one of the reasons OSHA  
5 quarantines the site and we quarantined the site. But one  
6 of the hold points OSHA is going to want is when this cab  
7 is uprighted and to enter the cab and inspect that, and  
8 the other one you see a Conex box, that red box kind of  
9 left central of the page.

10                   MR. ZOBRIST: Could you spell that for the  
11 record, Mr. Davis?

12                   THE WITNESS: I believe it's C-O-N-E-X.

13 BY MR. WOODSMALL:

14                   Q. And when you referred to that, are you  
15 referring to the box in area B?

16                   A. Yeah. It's right -- right there  
17 (indicating). That -- that is where the records of this  
18 crane are kept. So OSHA has requested to be present on  
19 both of those.

20                   Q. So it's my understanding that the crane,  
21 the crane today still sits as we see it in this picture;  
22 is that correct?

23                   A. That's correct.

24                   Q. And you have not been able to work in this  
25 area; is that correct?

1           A.       We have done various inspections. We've  
2 done a 3D image of the site. Late yesterday we began  
3 removing non-incident-related debris from the site to  
4 clear the area to start the demolition process. In the  
5 demolition process, dismantling process probably is a  
6 better term, should begin later this week.

7           Q.       To clarify my last question, then, you have  
8 not been able to get other cranes into this area to  
9 continue business as normal; is that correct?

10          A.       That is correct.

11          Q.       Has the reason for the collapse been  
12 determined?

13          A.       No.

14          Q.       Do you have any opinion as to the reason  
15 for the collapse?

16          A.       No.

17          Q.       When did OSHA release the site to KCP&L?

18          A.       I believe it was last Wednesday.

19          Q.       That would be June 4th?

20          A.       And once -- once they released it, we had a  
21 predetermined process to let other parties' experts view  
22 the site. We agreed to a protocol to dismantle it, et  
23 cetera, and have begun that process, like I said,  
24 yesterday.

25          Q.       And what do you anticipate the damaged



1 crane will be completely removed?

2 A. Obviously there are some unknowns as you're  
3 dismantling this, but our current process calls for 10 to  
4 12 days, working days.

5 Q. 10 to 12 days from when?

6 A. From today.

7 Q. Today? So approximately June 21st?

8 A. Yeah.

9 Q. Has a replacement crane been identified  
10 yet?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Do you know when a replacement crane will  
13 be identified?

14 A. It has been an effort that has been ongoing  
15 since the day after the collapse. We are -- we feel like  
16 we're very close.

17 Q. We're now 19 days since the crane collapse.  
18 In that time, has any more of the ductwork or the  
19 completion of the SCR box been completed?

20 A. There's been welding work and various steel  
21 work that was already up in place that has been continued  
22 on. There have been no lifts made up in that area.

23 Q. When do you anticipate, then, that the next  
24 lift will be able to occur?

25 A. We are looking at various alternatives for

1     that now, and some of those alternatives include lifting  
2     from this north side and also taking a crane from the  
3     south side to work in this box area. Those are some of  
4     the various alternatives that Terry alluded to during his  
5     testimony that are currently being investigated to figure  
6     out what the best option is.

7             Q.     But you don't know yet when those lifts  
8     will be able to occur?

9             A.     Our current schedule is mid July.

10            A.     Mid July. So that would represent  
11     approximately a month and a half delay from when the crane  
12     collapsed; is that true?

13            A.     That's correct.

14            Q.     Can you tell me what is the impact of the  
15     crane collapse on the Iatan 1 budget?

16            A.     I don't feel like there is an impact.

17            Q.     Will the crane collapse lead to greater use  
18     of the contingency in the Iatan 1 budget?

19            A.     I don't know that at this point.

20            Q.     You haven't analyzed that?

21            A.     We have looked at the schedule, and at this  
22     point we -- we feel like the contingency is adequate.  
23     Don't know the level of usage.

24            Q.     What is the impact of the crane collapse on  
25     the Iatan 1 schedule?

1           A.       We feel like at this point the Tiger Team  
2     schedule is still doable.

3           Q.       Doable -- what will have to occur in order  
4     to make that doable?

5           A.       The crane availability is obviously a big  
6     piece. The construction industry is very congested right  
7     now. I might point out the piece of ductwork that is in  
8     the picture with the crane boom over it.

9           Q.       Uh-huh.

10          A.       That coincides to ductwork No. 6 on your  
11     other diagram. The ability to reuse that ductwork, which  
12     we won't know until we can do a detailed inspection, is an  
13     important piece. We feel like it's a low probability that  
14     we won't be able to use that ductwork. And weather, to be  
15     quite honest, has been a detriment with all the rain. So  
16     those three factors are very important.

17          Q.       You say on the day of the collapse this  
18     crane was lifting ductwork piece 7; is that right?

19          A.       It was preparing, and I don't know that  
20     they were doing it this day, but they were preparing to  
21     lift that ductwork piece that that was over. The crane  
22     had no load on it at the time of the incident.

23          Q.       Absent the crane collapse, would you -- did  
24     you have planned to have 7, 6, 5 and 4 pieces of ductwork  
25     in place, all four of those?

1           A.       Not at this time.

2           Q.       How far along did you anticipate that you  
3 would be?

4           A.       I don't understand the question.

5           Q.       If the crane hadn't collapsed, how many of  
6 those four pieces of ductwork did you anticipate would  
7 have been in place by now?

8           A.       The -- the current schedule had those all  
9 placed by in the August time frame.

10          Q.       But you didn't know if there would be three  
11 of the four done by here as we sit in June?

12          A.       No.

13          Q.       You say the current Iatan schedule may be  
14 affected by the ability to get a replacement crane; is  
15 that true?

16          A.       That's right.

17          Q.       And when will you know if you'll get a  
18 replacement crane?

19          A.       Any day.

20          Q.       Absent the availability of the replacement  
21 crane, will the Iatan 1 schedule slip?

22          A.       Ask the question again.

23          Q.       If you're unable to get a replacement  
24 crane, will the Iatan 1 schedule slip?

25          A.       That's when we will -- there are several

1 configurations of cranes that you could use to accomplish  
2 this work. These are engineered lifts that were  
3 engineered for this specific crane. So to use an example,  
4 that piece of ductwork you see in the picture, you could  
5 do this with a different crane, but it would require  
6 reconfiguring that ductwork, cutting it in half, cutting  
7 it in thirds. So there are several options that are being  
8 looked at to accomplish that work with several different  
9 crane combinations, depending on the availability of  
10 cranes.

11 Q. If you were unable to get a single  
12 replacement crane that can lift this entire piece of  
13 ductwork, will there be a delay in the Iatan 1 schedule?

14 A. Yeah. You cannot build what's left without  
15 a crane or some kind of lifting device.

16 Q. Has there been any items placed on the risk  
17 and opportunities table associated with this crane  
18 collapse?

19 A. Not at this point.

20 Q. When do you anticipate that will be  
21 reviewed?

22 A. I don't know of any to put on it at this  
23 point.

24 Q. Has there been any change orders submitted  
25 associated with the crane collapse?

1           A.       Not that I'm aware of.

2           Q.       To date, have any additional costs been  
3 incurred associated with the crane collapse?

4           A.       We are accruing costs because of the  
5 collapse. To give you an example, the lay-down yard, we  
6 built that lay-down yard to expedite the process so that  
7 it was ready to receive these parts. The parties agreed  
8 to accrue all their costs, keep track of them, and that  
9 will be settled at a later date.

10          Q.       You mentioned the possibility that the  
11 portion of ductwork that is shown in Exhibit 57 may not be  
12 able to be used again; is that correct?

13          A.       That's correct.

14          Q.       If you were unable to use that ductwork,  
15 will there be a delay in the Iatan 1 schedule?

16          A.       Don't know that at this point.

17          Q.       You have a plan for a replacement piece of  
18 ductwork?

19          A.       That's being looked at currently also.

20                   MR. WOODSMALL: I have no further  
21 questions.

22                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Woodsmall.  
23 Examination by Staff, Mr. Williams?

24                   MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

25 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS:

1           Q.       Is Alstom currently on schedule on the  
2 construction activity that's responsible for -- at Iatan  
3 Unit 1?

4           A.       They are somewhat behind schedule.

5           Q.       Do you know how much behind schedule they  
6 are currently?

7           A.       That west end area that we were discussing  
8 earlier, they're in the neighborhood of eight weeks behind  
9 the schedule as it -- the Tiger Team schedule as it  
10 currently exists, and they have a recovery plan in place  
11 that they are comfortable with.

12          Q.       And for the construction on the Iatan  
13 Unit 2 that Alstom's responsible for, is it on schedule in  
14 performing that?

15          A.       Basically, yes.

16          Q.       The recovery plan that Alstom has for  
17 returning to schedule in Iatan Unit 1, does that include  
18 additional labor shifts or longer labor shifts?

19          A.       It includes two shifts and some 6/10s.

20          Q.       Has that implemented that yet?

21          A.       They are in the process of implementing  
22 that.

23          Q.       In order to keep the Tiger Team schedule  
24 for completion of the construction of Iatan 1, when would  
25 you need to have the replacement crane on site?

1           A.       Middle of July.

2           Q.       When you said you didn't believe the crane  
3 collapse would affect the Iatan 1 budget, why not?

4           A.       The -- the contractual relationship with  
5 Alstom is an MPC engineering procured construct contract,  
6 and their contractual relationship with Maxum was -- we  
7 don't know what that was, but at this point we see no  
8 responsibility for the crane accident.

9           Q.       No responsibility for whom?

10          A.       For Kansas City Power & Light.

11          Q.       You mean financial responsibility?

12          A.       Yes.

13          Q.       What will it cost to demolish the crane?

14          A.       Once again, that's a contract between  
15 Marino and Maxum, so I can't answer that question.

16          Q.       You don't know?

17          A.       I don't know.

18          Q.       And is that one of the things that you  
19 believe is not a responsibility of Great Plains Energy or  
20 Kansas City Power & Light Company?

21          A.       We have no contractual obligation.

22          Q.       Will Alstom going to double shifts increase  
23 labor costs?

24          A.       Yes, it will.

25          Q.       And will those labor costs be borne by



1 Kansas City Power & Light Company?

2 A. A portion will, yes.

3 Q. And will that portion be based on the  
4 ownership of the Iatan units?

5 A. I don't understand.

6 Q. Well, you said a portion of it will. Who  
7 else will bear a portion, or what percentage will it be?

8 A. Well, those costs were included in the cost  
9 to reforecast. Does that answer your question?

10 Q. I'm not sure if it does or not. I mean,  
11 you're saying there will be additional costs. Who's going  
12 to bear those additional costs? You indicated a portion  
13 of them would be borne by, as I understood it, KCP&L/Great  
14 Plains Energy?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. And how is that portion determined, is my  
17 question?

18 A. It's a negotiated settlement between us and  
19 Alstom.

20 Q. So it won't be a doubling of the cost?

21 A. No.

22 MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.

23 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Williams.  
24 Public Counsel, Mr. Mills?

25 MR. MILLS: Thank you.

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MILLS:

2 Q. Mr. Davis, have you been out to the site of  
3 the crane collapse?

4 A. Yes, I have.

5 Q. Have you looked at the piece of ductwork  
6 that's under the crane?

7 A. From afar, yes.

8 Q. It looks, at least from this photograph, to  
9 be at least somewhat dented on the top; is that correct?

10 A. Yeah.

11 Q. But you haven't done a detailed inspection  
12 of how severe the damage is?

13 A. No one has because of the safety aspect of  
14 that boom laying over the top.

15 Q. Now, with respect to the crane itself,  
16 there are a number of foreign rectangles scattered about  
17 around the base of the cab. Do you see those?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. What are those?

20 A. Those are counterweights.

21 Q. And how were they deployed when the crane  
22 tipped over?

23 A. It's kind of difficult to see, but those  
24 square boxes right there on either side were where those  
25 counterweights were.

1           Q.       Okay.  So if the crane had been upright,  
2     those are trays, if you will, in which you stack  
3     counterweights?

4           A.       That's correct.

5           Q.       And when the train -- and when the crane  
6     fell over, those weights dropped out and ended up where  
7     you see them in the picture?

8           A.       That's correct.

9           Q.       And in the lower left-hand corner of the  
10    picture, there's a large original structure.  What is  
11    that?

12          A.       It's called a maximizer.

13          Q.       And what does that do?

14          A.       That adds more counterweight when you're  
15    taking certain engineered lifts if you require them.

16          Q.       So that could be connected to the cab of  
17    the crane somehow to provide additional counterweight?

18          A.       That is correct.

19          Q.       Was it connected at the time of the crane  
20    collapse?

21          A.       No, it wasn't.

22          Q.       Should it have been?

23          A.       Not with no load.

24          Q.       Now, just -- I believe you answered in  
25    response to some questions from Mr. Woodsmall that you

1 think that the current Tiger Team schedule for Iatan 1 is  
2 doable. Is that your word?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. In order to make what's doable actually  
5 happen, will that take an increased level of involvement  
6 from KCPL management?

7 A. We are working closely with Alstom on -- on  
8 many of these issues.

9 Q. Would you dispute that it will be  
10 challenging to make what's doable actually happen?

11 A. This is a doable challenge.

12 Q. But it's not going to be easy?

13 A. No.

14 MR. MILLS: Those are all the questions I  
15 have.

16 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Mills.

17 Cross-examination by Cass County or Kansas City?

18 MR. COMLEY: Thank you, Judge. We have no  
19 questions.

20 JUDGE STEARLEY: Black Hills?

21 MR. BROWN: None, your Honor.

22 JUDGE STEARLEY: Aquila?

23 MS. PARSONS: No questions.

24 JUDGE STEARLEY: Great Plains/KCPL?

25 MR. ZOBRIST: I just had a couple of

1 questions.

2 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRIST:

3 Q. Mr. Davis, when you talked about Terry, you  
4 meant Terry Bassham who testified earlier today, correct?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. And when you had a reference, I believe in  
7 response to one of Staff's questions about shift, you said  
8 there were some 6/10s. Do you remember that?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. What do you mean by that?

11 A. Six days a week, ten hours a day, two  
12 shifts.

13 Q. And I believe when Mr. Woodsmall was asking  
14 you about the reagent preparation area to the west end of  
15 the construction site, do you recall that question?

16 A. Yes, I do.

17 Q. Was that at all affected by the crane  
18 accident?

19 A. No, it was not.

20 MR. ZOBRIST: That's all we have, Judge.

21 Thank you.

22 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Zobrist.

23 Questions from the Bench, Commissioner Murray?

24 COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Just very briefly.

25 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER MURRAY:

1           Q.       Mr. Davis, you indicated that you didn't  
2 think that there was any liability on the part of KCP&L  
3 regarding the crane incident; is that what you said?

4           A.       Subject to the findings of the ultimate  
5 investigation.

6           Q.       And are you referring to -- are you  
7 including in that any potential liability for lawsuits for  
8 injuries or wrongful death or anything beyond the initial  
9 costs that you're talking about?

10          A.       I can't answer that question, I was just  
11 referring to the incident itself.

12                   COMMISSIONER MURRAY: Thank you.

13                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Commissioner Clayton?

14                   COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: I don't have any  
15 questions. Thank you.

16                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Commissioner Jarrett?

17                   COMMISSIONER JARRETT: No questions. Thank  
18 you.

19                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Any recross-examination  
20 based upon Commissioner Murray's questions? Any further  
21 examination, Mr. Woodsmall?

22                   MR. WOODSMALL: No, thank you.

23                   JUDGE STEARLEY: You may step down,  
24 Mr. Davis. Thank you for your testimony, and you are  
25 excused.

1                   Mr. Woodsmall, you may call your next  
2     witness.

3                   MR. WOODSMALL: Thank you, your Honor.  
4     Call Michael Cline.

5                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Good morning, Mr. Cline.  
6                   (Witness sworn.)

7                   JUDGE STEARLEY: You may be seated, and you  
8     may proceed, Mr. Woodsmall.

9                   MR. WOODSMALL: Thank you, your Honor. I'm  
10    going to be very brief.

11   MICHAEL CLINE testified as follows:

12   DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WOODSMALL:

13   A        Q.       As I understand it, the last report that  
14   you have from RUS or RES was provided in January of 2008;  
15   is that correct?

16            A.       I need to clarify. It's RAS is the  
17   Moody's, Service. RES is S&P, and that's correct.

18            Q.       The last report that you have from those  
19   entities is January 2008; is that correct?

20            A.       From those services, yes.

21            MR. WOODSMALL: I have no further  
22   questions. Thank you.

23            JUDGE STEARLEY: Examination by Staff?

24            MR. WILLIAMS: No questions.

25            JUDGE STEARLEY: Public Counsel?

1 MR. MILLS: Just a few.

2 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MILLS:

3 Q. And just to follow up on that, probably  
4 won't come out in the transcript, but in your answer it  
5 sounded as though you emphasized from those services.  
6 Have you gotten any similar analyses from other services?

7 A. What I'm attempting to do is differentiate  
8 between the hypothetical ratings that we requested from  
9 those services in January versus, as Mr. Bassham indicated  
10 earlier, the ongoing rating evaluation that the agencies  
11 prepare.

12 Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, Moody's Investor  
13 Service provides periodic comments; is that correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And did they, in fact, provide one on  
16 the -- after the sale of Strategic Energy on April 2nd,  
17 2008?

18 A. After we announced that we were going to be  
19 selling, yes.

20 MR. MILLS: May I approach, Your Honor?

21 JUDGE STEARLEY: You may.

22 BY MR. MILLS:

23 Q. Mr. Cline, I don't mean to hover over you  
24 but I wanted to be closer to this microphone so that it  
25 will pick up.



1                   Do you recognize this as the comment on  
2 April 2nd from Moody's?

3           A.       Yes, I do.

4           Q.       And does it not in part indicate that the  
5 debt, that Aquila is currently rated at BA3 senior  
6 unsecured on review for possible upgrade?

7           A.       Yes, it does.

8           Q.       And seeing as how this was issued on  
9 April 2, 2008, that's obviously premerger; is that  
10 correct?

11          A.       Correct.

12          Q.       So is it your understanding that Aquila is  
13 on review for a possible upgrade regardless of the merger?

14          A.       I believe they are on review for upgrade  
15 because of the merger.

16          Q.       Do you know whether or not they are on  
17 review for possible upgrade if the merger does not happen?

18          A.       Well, whenever a company is put in -- on  
19 review status, it means that the agency has an obligation  
20 to close the review in some fashion within a reasonable  
21 period of time, so there would be closure on that pre or  
22 post.

23          Q.       And do you have any knowledge of when that  
24 status will change for Aquila with respect to Moody's?

25          A.       It will be relatively soon after the

1 transaction, if the transaction is approved. Otherwise, I  
2 couldn't say for certain, but it would be, again, within a  
3 reasonable period of time. They feel they have that  
4 obligation to their investors.

5 Q. Now, are you familiar with Standard &  
6 Poor's liquidity surveys?

7 A. Yes, I am.

8 Q. Do you prepare those for Standard & Poor's  
9 or do they prepare those for you?

10 A. The company prepares them. I don't prepare  
11 them directly.

12 MR. MILLS: Judge, may I approach again?

13 JUDGE STEARLEY: You may.

14 MR. MILLS: Judge, the documents that I've  
15 handed the witness are marked highly confidential, and  
16 after discussion with counsel for KCPL/GPE, they advise me  
17 that these questions probably should be in camera.

18 JUDGE STEARLEY: All right. Very well. We  
19 will go into in-camera.

20 (REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an  
21 in-camera session was held, which is contained in  
22 Volume 26, pages 3208 through 3211 of the transcript.)

23

24

25

1 JUDGE STEARLEY: We are back in the public  
2 session.

3 And Mr. Mills has concluded his  
4 examination. Any examination from Cass County or Kansas  
5 City?

6 MR. COMLEY: No questions.

7 JUDGE STEARLEY: Black Hills?

8 MR. BROWN: No, your Honor.

9 JUDGE STEARLEY: Aquila?

10 MS. PARSONS: No questions.

11 JUDGE STEARLEY: Great Plains/KCPL?

12 MR. ZOBRIST: Just briefly, Judge.

13 CROSS-EXAMINATION MR. ZOBRIST:

14 Q. I believe Mr. Mills asked you about any  
15 contacts with Moody's in the spring of this year. Do you  
16 recall that?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Is Moody's the only credit rating agency  
19 that you had a conversation with after the Iatan crane  
20 accident?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And what was the nature of that  
23 communication?

24 A. It was really in two parts. I received an  
25 e-mail from our analyst who covers us at Moody's the date

1 the crane incident occurred, expressing his condolences  
2 and hoping that my colleagues and I were holding up well  
3 after the fact, and indicated that he would call me in the  
4 near future. That was the only written communication I've  
5 had with the agencies with respect to the incident.

6 The analyst at Moody's did then, in fact,  
7 follow up with a phone call on June 4, left me a message.  
8 We talked on June 5th, and he again reiterated his  
9 sentiments about the incident. Asked how things were  
10 going. I -- at that point I indicated to him, I  
11 essentially restated what was in paragraph 10 of our June  
12 2nd filing, that we had no reason to believe that there  
13 would be any change in the cost to schedule related to  
14 the -- the project.

15 The analyst went on to say that -- well,  
16 obviously he would appreciate staying in touch with any  
17 material changes to that viewpoint, that this would not be  
18 a factor that would cause them to take a look at the  
19 long-term credit rating of the company.

20 Q. And since the accident, has Moody's or S&P  
21 issued any comment with regard to the accident and the  
22 credit ratings that have been previously issued to the  
23 companies?

24 A. They have not.

25 Q. So there's been no change?

1           A.       There's been no change.

2                   MR. ZOBRIST:   That's all I have, Judge.

3                   JUDGE STEARLEY:   Thank you, Mr. Zobrist.

4   Questions from the Bench, Commissioner Murray?

5                   COMMISSIONER MURRAY:   Just one.

6   QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER MURRAY:

7           Q.       Regarding the S&P liquidity reports or

8   whatever they were called, I don't think it would be

9   highly confidential, can you just tell me those two dates

10   that were being compared?

11          A.       Certainly, December 31st, 2007 and

12   March 31st, 2008.   We prepare these on a quarterly basis.

13                  COMMISSIONER MURRAY:   Thank you.

14                  THE WITNESS:   You're welcome, Commissioner.

15                  JUDGE STEARLEY:   Commissioner Clayton?

16                  COMMISSIONER CLAYTON:   No questions, Judge.

17   Thank you.

18                  JUDGE STEARLEY:   Commissioner Jarrett?

19                  COMMISSIONER JARRETT:   No questions.

20                  JUDGE STEARLEY:   Any redirect?   Any

21   additional examination, Mr. Woodsmall?

22                  MR. WOODSMALL:   No, your Honor.

23                  JUDGE STEARLEY:   All right.   You may be

24   excused, Mr. Cline.   And I believe that concludes our

25   witness list today.   Commission was going to hear closing

1 arguments. I would suggest at this point we take a short  
2 recess, give my court reporter a break and give you guys a  
3 short opportunity for any preparation you may wish. Is 20  
4 minutes acceptable, or do you wish to have any additional  
5 time for closing arguments?

6 Very well. We will go back on the record  
7 at approximately 9:50, 9:55.

8 (A BREAK WAS TAKEN.)

9 JUDGE STEARLEY: Okay. We are back on the  
10 record, and we are picking up with closing arguments.  
11 First let me ask, Mr. Comley, I'm assuming you don't have  
12 any intention of arguing any?

13 MR. COMLEY: Your assumption is correct,  
14 Judge. I have no remarks.

15 JUDGE STEARLEY: All right. How about  
16 Aquila or Black Hills?

17 MS. PARSONS: No, your Honor.

18 JUDGE STEARLEY: Very well.

19 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, for the record,  
20 Black Hills would join in the argument of Great Plains.

21 JUDGE STEARLEY: Staff, Mr. Mills, are you  
22 also wanting to argue, or since the Industrials called  
23 this session today, I'm assuming we're going to have them  
24 and GPE arguing.

25 MR. MILLS: I'd like to make a few remarks.

1 JUDGE STEARLEY: Very well. Mr. Williams?

2 MR. WILLIAMS: Probably just a couple of  
3 brief remarks.

4 JUDGE STEARLEY: All right. And what order  
5 do you want to proceed?

6 MR. WOODSMALL: It doesn't matter.

7 MR. ZOBRIST: Mr. Woodsmall said that I  
8 should go first, and I said if I have the right to  
9 rebuttal, then I'd be glad to go first.

10 JUDGE STEARLEY: Very well. We'll go with  
11 GPE, Staff, Public Counsel, Industrials, and a short  
12 rebuttal then from GPE. Beginning with you, Mr. Zobrist.

13 MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you, Judge. Just  
14 briefly before I make my argument, I just want to note the  
15 passing of our colleague, Paul DeFord. He died quite  
16 suddenly a week ago Saturday. A number of us went to his  
17 funeral on Friday. And he ably represented Black Hills  
18 and many other companies before the Commission, and I just  
19 want to express our sorrow at his passing. He was a great  
20 colleague and a gentleman and he will be sorely missed.

21 We believe that the evidence presented here  
22 today by Mr. Bassham and Mr. Davis as well as Mr. Cline  
23 indicate that it is likely that there will be no further  
24 delay in the construction schedule and no material  
25 additional costs will be incurred by KCPL and, in fact,

1     that it may remain entirely within the reforecast that was  
2     presented to the Commission at the end of April and the  
3     beginning of May.

4                     There should be absolutely no effect on  
5     Iatan Unit 2. The effect on Unit 1, while some aspects  
6     remain to be seen as the witnesses have testified today  
7     here, appear to be able to be managed well within the  
8     reforecast of schedule and costs. Therefore, the crane  
9     incident does not appear to materially change the  
10    financial assumptions relied upon by the credit agencies,  
11    and there should be no impact on the credit rating  
12    agencies, either company. And we have seen, in fact,  
13    there was no communication with Standard & Poors either  
14    way. The brief communication with Moody's indicated that  
15    Moody's was not going to and has not affected any change  
16    in the credit ratings, and as the unrebutted testimony  
17    indicated, an incident like this normally is not cause for  
18    a change in the credit ratings.

19                    Therefore, today we cannot see any cost or  
20    delay of an additional amount that would create either a  
21    credit downgrade or other issue for Great Plains Energy or  
22    KCPL that would give the Commission a reason to find that  
23    the acquisition of Aquila is detrimental to the public  
24    interest.

25                    Therefore, we respectfully request that the



1 joint application as modified by the revised regulatory  
2 ask presented to the Commission in April and May be  
3 approved expeditiously by the Commission. Thank you.

4 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Zobrist.  
5 Mr. Williams?

6 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you. The evidence  
7 you've heard today shows but another example of how Kansas  
8 City Power & Light Company and Great Plains Energy needs  
9 to focus its attention on its Comprehensive Energy Plan  
10 and getting its construction projects completed, and that  
11 if it acquires Aquila and begins integrating the two  
12 companies as it's proposed, that that focus will be  
13 detracted from, which in turn the Staff believes will have  
14 an adverse impact on the credit ratings of the companies  
15 post merger. Thank you.

16 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you. Mr. Mills?

17 MR. MILLS: Thank you. In a similar vein  
18 to Mr. Williams, one of the points that we've argued in  
19 this case is that at a time when KCPL needs to be focusing  
20 its attention on the Comprehensive Energy Plan  
21 construction programs projects, that this merger is simply  
22 a distraction, is taking away the attention of management,  
23 which of course is a finite resource. Management can't do  
24 everything all the time. They need to focus on certain  
25 things and try to get those right.

1                   Mr. Davis admitted that, although he says  
2   that the -- that it's doable to stay on schedule with  
3   Iatan 1, that it will be challenging. It will require  
4   additional attention from management in the best of times,  
5   and that's exactly what management doesn't need right now.

6                   So while there isn't any clear evidence  
7   today that this particular incident will have any  
8   measurable impact on the cost or budget for Iatan 1, that  
9   it will certainly have the subjective effect of requiring  
10  more and more attention of KCPL and Great Plains  
11  management at a time when they're asking for you to  
12  authorize them to devote a considerable amount of their  
13  time and energy to managing the integration.

14                  I think -- I think that's exactly the wrong  
15  thing to do is to, when they should be working on this  
16  construction program all the time, to authorize them to go  
17  ahead with the integration that they've requested.

18                  And with respect to the specific incident  
19  that led to this hearing today, Mr. Davis testified that  
20  within a matter of days the company will know whether or  
21  not it's able to get a replacement crane that will be able  
22  to do the engineered lifts that were planned for the crane  
23  that collapsed.

24                  He conceded that if that replacement crane  
25  is not available, that the remaining lifts will have to be

1 re-engineered, will be considerably more challenging, and  
2 I believe he was much less confident that, if that is the  
3 case, that maintaining the schedule will be -- will be  
4 doable.

5                   So I would recommend that the Commission  
6 hold open for at least a couple of days the record in this  
7 case to have a late-filed exhibit from KCPL saying whether  
8 or not the replacement Manitowoc 18000 crane is going to  
9 be available, and if not, whether the alternatives would  
10 indicate that the schedule is still doable. Thank you.

11                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Mills.  
12 Mr. Woodsmall?

13                   MR. WOODSMALL: Thank you, your Honor. I  
14 would note that I agree with everything that Staff and  
15 Public Counsel said, and I agree with the idea of leaving  
16 the record open at least to see what happens with the  
17 replacement crane.

18                   That said, I'm going to take a broader view  
19 of this whole picture. Let's face it, we're here today  
20 because of the issue of creditworthiness. You might say  
21 that there are numerous issues in this case. There's an  
22 issue of merger synergies. There's an issue regarding  
23 transaction costs.

24                   While that is true, the insurmountable  
25 obstacle, the 800-pound gorilla in the corner is the

1 parties' differing positions on the joint applicants'  
2 creditworthiness. You see, the issue of merger synergies  
3 and transaction costs ultimately boils down to a  
4 discussion of KCPL's cash flow, and according to the  
5 rating agencies, cash flow is what drives credit agencies.  
6 So when you read about a rating agency's negative outlook  
7 on this company's credit rating, you will inevitably see  
8 stated concerns with corporate cash flow and skepticism  
9 that the merger synergies will not be adequate to drive  
10 increased cash flow.

11                   Thus you see statements out of S&P like,  
12 quote, the incremental cash flow contributed by Aquila's  
13 remaining Missouri utility assets plus synergies that the  
14 company expects to achieve will not sufficiently offset  
15 the \$1 billion of increased debt being assumed by GXP.

16                   In their Briefs, the Staff, Public Counsel  
17 and Industrial Intervenors spent dozens of pages examining  
18 the precarious financial condition of these companies. In  
19 contrast, and despite the overarching importance of this  
20 issue, the Joint Applicants devote a mere three pages to  
21 their Brief -- in their Brief to a discussion of credit  
22 quality.

23                   Joint Applicants fail to see a problem with  
24 this issue because they simply refuse to look. In fact,  
25 if you read their Brief, the Joint Applicants rely solely

1 on the, quote, confidence, unquote, of their chief  
2 financial officer and treasurer for their contention that  
3 the combined company will maintain an investment grade  
4 credit rating.

5                   Reading further, one notices, however, that  
6 this, quote, confidence is an illusion. When asked  
7 directly if they were confident enough to ensure that --  
8 insure the ratepayers against the disastrous effects of a  
9 credit downgrade, neither the CEO nor the chief operating  
10 officer would provide such assurances. Rather than  
11 tangible evidence, the Joint Applicants' assurances of  
12 continued creditworthiness are pinned to nothing more than  
13 a hope and a prayer.

14                   Let's take a look at the other side of the  
15 creditworthiness coin. The Staff, Public Counsel and  
16 Industrial Intervenors provide ample support for their  
17 assertion that this acquisition will have a detrimental  
18 effect on the company's credit rating and debt cost.

19                   Let's look at the facts. In January 2007,  
20 S&P and Moody's were asked to provide an assessment of the  
21 credit rating of Great Plains and the utility's  
22 subsidiaries following the merger. Noting the significant  
23 demands on the limited amount of available cash, cash to  
24 pay for the acquisition, cash to pay for the dividends now  
25 due to Aquila shareholders, cash associated with covering

1 the increased debt load, and cash to finance the ongoing  
2 capital program, both Moody's and S&P forecast negative  
3 outlooks for these companies. In fact, Moody's candidly  
4 forecasts a downgrade for KCPL's credit rating.

5                   During the postponement of the hearing in  
6 this matter, Great Plains attempted to alleviate the cash  
7 flow concerns expressed by Moody's and S&P. In order to  
8 increase the amount of cash on hand, Great Plains sold its  
9 deregulated subsidiary, Strategic Energy. The cash  
10 received from this sale was not enough to alleviate the  
11 fears, however.

12                   Moody's and S&P still forecast negative  
13 outlooks for these companies. For instance, Moody's  
14 suggests a change in outlook from stable negative.  
15 In addition -- and there's many other citations in my  
16 Brief over the concerns that Moody's and S&P have  
17 regarding this transaction and the effect it will have on  
18 cash flow. Those are all highly confidential, and I'll  
19 ask you to look at my Brief for those portions.

20                   In addition to selling Strategic Energy,  
21 KCP&L has taken other significant measures in an effort to  
22 preserve the available cash on hand. KCP&L has recently  
23 postponed the environmental upgrades on the Lacine  
24 generating station. Those upgrades were called for in the  
25 regulatory plan and were unilaterally postponed by KCPL.

1                   Furthermore, KCPL has recently deferred the  
2     construction of additional wind resources. Despite an IRP  
3     study which emphasized the economics of adding additional  
4     wind generation in 2008, KCPL unilaterally deferred these  
5     environmental investments.

6                   All of these actions are consistent with a  
7     company that is struggling to preserve the limited amount  
8     of cash on hand. Moody's notes, however, that the  
9     likelihood of cash flow problems are not reduced by the  
10    acquisition. Rather, the cash flow problems are further  
11    exasperated by the merger. Moody's notes that these cash  
12    flow concerns will not go away because they are, quote,  
13    materializing concurrent with the execution risk involved  
14    in the merger with Aquila, unquote.

15                  Have any other recent events occurred to  
16    dampen the cash flow concerns expressed by S&P and  
17    Moody's? No. Virtually across the board, every  
18    assumption made by Great Plains has proven invalid.  
19    Contrary to its assumptions, Great Plains has not been  
20    able to raise cash through the issuance of hybrid  
21    securities. Contrary to its assumptions, Aquila will not  
22    be permitted to increase cash flow by recovering its  
23    actual debt costs. Contrary to its assumptions, Aquila  
24    will not be permitted to increase cash flow through the  
25    utilization of a regulatory amortization mechanism.

1                   Nothing has dampened the cash flow  
2 concerns. In fact, recent events have only served to  
3 heighten the cash flow concerns. Contrary to its initial  
4 assumptions, the costs of the Iatan 1 and 2 capital  
5 projects continue to suffer and place additional cash  
6 demands on the company.

7                   In early May, KCP&L released the results of  
8 its reforecasted effort of the Iatan capital projects.  
9 That reforecast indicates the costs of Iatan 1 have  
10 increased by 33 percent, and the costs of Iatan 2 have  
11 increased by 19 percent. Still further threatening KCPL  
12 and Aquila's earnings, the in-service date for the Iatan 1  
13 environmental upgrades has slipped by two months.

14                  Financial pressures and further demands on  
15 the company's limited cash flow do not end, however.  
16 Events occur on a daily basis that may place increased  
17 pressures on the limited availability of cash. On  
18 May 23rd, a crane collapsed at the Iatan site. This  
19 collapse has further, quote, challenged the budget and  
20 schedule of Iatan 1.

21                  Now, I'm not here to say that the crane  
22 collapse will in and of itself lead to a downgrade for  
23 these companies. Rather, it is just another piece of  
24 straw that will eventually break this camel's back. The  
25 crane collapse is just a further example of the type of



1 difficulties that are faced by companies undergoing large  
2 capital projects. In times of such high financial  
3 demands, utilities must stay financially nimble. Risk of  
4 the financial health of the utility can occur at any time.

5               Rather than maintaining a focus on these  
6 construction demands, these companies seek to devote their  
7 limited cash resources and management oversight to  
8 finalizing the merger.

9               At the beginning of this case, the  
10 Commission's Chairman asked the company's CEO, if this is  
11 such a good deal and will lead to synergies and reduce  
12 costs, why are all the customer groups so universally  
13 opposed to the merger? The company was unable to answer  
14 that question then, and is still unable to answer that  
15 question now.

16              The answer, however, is obvious. The  
17 customer groups have only one interest in mind, the  
18 electric rates that they pay. Whether you are a small  
19 residential customer using electricity to cool a home or a  
20 large industrial customer using electricity 24 hours a day  
21 to run an assembly line, your concern is your electric  
22 rates. Customers don't care whether the electricity is  
23 provided by KCPL, Aquila, a municipality or a coop.  
24 Customers did not get involved in this case merely for the  
25 thrill of opposing a large corporate acquisition.

1                   In this case, all these customers care  
2   about is their electric rates. These customers clearly  
3   see what Moody's and S&P sees and what the company refuses  
4   to see. This acquisition will lead to financial pressures  
5   that will eventually be passed through in rates. For this  
6   reason, the acquisition should be rejected. Thank you.

7                   JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Woodsmall.  
8   Mr. Zobrist?

9                   MR. ZOBRIST: I'm glad I reserved a little  
10   time for rebuttal. I thought we were here to talk about  
11   the crane accident. Despite the fact that the scheduling  
12   order does not provide for reply brief, we've apparently  
13   heard Mr. Woodsmall read the Industrials' reply brief.

14                   I'm not going to go back and challenge all  
15   of the assumptions and arguments that he made. The  
16   Commissioners will recall that we answered a number of  
17   these questions with regard to the reforecast during April  
18   and May.

19                   As far as Chairman Davis' question to  
20   Mr. Chesser back in December, December of 2007, that was a  
21   different deal. We have modified the regulatory ask and  
22   removed the controversial portions of that several months  
23   ago. So Mr. Woodsmall's comments for the most part do not  
24   deal with the record as it stands before this Commission.

25                   And I would say that as far as the

1 liquidity reports that Mr. Mills inquired into, it  
2 actually showed that the cash flow position of the  
3 companies, Great Plains Energy and KCPL, have improved as  
4 of March 31, 2008 versus the end of 2007. So there is no  
5 evidence that the reforecast cannot be met.

6                   There has been no evidence presented to the  
7 Commission today that there will be a delay in the  
8 schedule or in the costs that will exceed either the  
9 contingency or the other numbers in the reforecast. There  
10 is simply no basis for this Commission to hold up the  
11 record in this case indefinitely.

12                   If Staff or the other parties have  
13 questions, they can be answered in the regulatory plan  
14 procedures and in the meetings that are held relating to  
15 the Comprehensive Energy Plan. Kansas City Power & Light  
16 has no desire to withhold facts. We're trying to be as  
17 transparent as we can. As Mr. Davis or Mr. Bassham  
18 testified, Staff has visited the Iatan site once already.  
19 I believe that a visit is scheduled in the next couple of  
20 weeks.

21                   There is simply no basis in the record to  
22 show that any of the effect of the crane accident should  
23 have an adverse effect on either the schedule or the delay  
24 or, most importantly, on the credit rating of the  
25 companies, and there is no reason to believe that there is

1 a detriment here that should cause this application to be  
2 disapproved by the Commission. Indeed, there are  
3 detriments. There are merger synergies that have been  
4 pointed out again and again.

5 The application should be approved, and it  
6 should not be in any way adversely affected or the case  
7 diminished by virtue of the crane incident. Thank you  
8 very much.

9 JUDGE STEARLEY: Thank you, Mr. Zobrist.  
10 That concludes our taking of additional evidence and  
11 closing arguments for today. With regard to the request  
12 that the record be held open, the Commissioners seated can  
13 either make a decision on that at this moment for an  
14 additional filing from the company or tomorrow at their  
15 scheduled case discussion they can take that issue up  
16 then. I'll defer to the Commissioners on that.

17 COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I am neutral as to  
18 whether we do it today or tomorrow. How do the other two  
19 feel?

20 COMMISSIONER CLAYTON: I'm comfortable with  
21 closing the record at five o'clock tonight or tomorrow  
22 morning after agenda, but we need to close it.

23 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER MURRAY: I agree.

25 JUDGE STEARLEY: Very well. At the

1 conclusion of today's hearing, the record will be closed  
2 and the case will be deemed submitted.

3 Are there any other additional matters we  
4 need to take up at this time? Very well, then. We stand  
5 adjourned, hearing in Case No. EM-2007-0374. Our  
6 additional taking of evidence on the crane incident is  
7 closed, and as I stated, the record is now submitted for  
8 the Commission's decision. Thank you all very much. We  
9 stand adjourned.

10 WHEREUPON, the hearing of this case was  
11 concluded.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## I N D E X

## KCPL/GPE'S EVIDENCE:

## TERRY BASSHAM

Direct Examination by Mr. Zobrist	3149
Cross-Examination by Mr. Woodsmall	3164
Cross-Examination by Mr. Mills	3167
Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams	3171

## INDUSTRIALS' EVIDENCE:

## BRENT DAVIS

Direct Examination by Mr. Woodsmall	3175
Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams	3196
Cross-Examination by Mr. Mills	3199
Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	3202
Questions by Commissioner Murray	3203

## MICHAEL CLINE

Direct Examination by Mr. Woodsmall	3204
Cross-Examination by Mr. Mills	3205
(In-Camera Session)	
Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	3212
Questions by Commissioner Murray	3214

## MICHAEL CLINE (IN-CAMERA SESSION - VOLUME 26)

Cross-Examination by Mr. Mills	3209
--------------------------------	------

1	EXHIBITS INDEX		
2		MARKED	RECEIVED
3	EXHIBIT NO. 56 Diagram of Site	3145	3152
4	EXHIBIT NO. 57 Photograph	3145	3156
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

## 1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2

3 STATE OF MISSOURI )

4 ) ss.

5 COUNTY OF COLE )

6

7 I, Kellene K. Feddersen, Certified

8 Shorthand Reporter with the firm of Midwest Litigation

9 Services, and Notary Public within and for the State of

10 Missouri, do hereby certify that I was personally present

11 at the proceedings had in the above-entitled cause at the

12 time and place set forth in the caption sheet thereof;

13 that I then and there took down in Stenotype the

14 proceedings had; and that the foregoing is a full, true

15 and correct transcript of such Stenotype notes so made at

16 such time and place.

17 Given at my office in the City of

18 Jefferson, County of Cole, State of Missouri.

19

20

21

22 Kellene K. Feddersen, RPR, CSR, CCR

23 Notary Public (County of Cole)

24 My commission expires March 28, 2009.

25