1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	STATE OF MISSOURI
3	
4	
5	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
6	Procedural Conference
7	June 28, 2011
8	Jefferson City, Missouri
9	Volume 48
10	
11	
12	
13	In The Matter Of the)
14	Application Of KCP&L Greater) File No. ER-2010-0356
15	Missouri Operations Company for)
16	Approval To Make Certain)
17	Changes In Its Charges For)
18	Electric Service)
19	
20	NANCY M. DIPPELL, Presiding
	DEPUTY REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
21	
22	
	REPORTED BY:
23	Tracy Taylor, CCR No. 939
	TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES
2	JAMES M. FISCHER, Attorney at Law
	Fischer & Dority, PC
3	101 Madison, Suite 400
	Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
4	573.636.3758
5	STUART W. CONRAD, Attorney at Law
	Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson
6	3100 Broadway, Suite 1209
	Kansas City, Missouri 64111
7	816.753.1122
	FOR: Ag Processing
8	
	LEWIS R. MILLS, JR., Public Counsel
9	CHRISTINA BAKER, Senior Public Counsel
	PO Box 2230
10	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
	573.751.4857
11	FOR: Office of Public Counsel
12	KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel
	STEVE DOTTHEIM, Chief Deputy Counsel
13	NATHAN WILLIAMS, Deputy Counsel
	PO Box 360
14	Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
	573.751.8700
15	FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

- 1 JUDGE DIPPELL: This is Case No.
- 2 ER-2010-0356 in the matter of the application of KCP&L
- 3 Greater Missouri Operations Company for approval to
- 4 make certain changes in its charges for electric
- 5 service.
- 6 My name's Nancy Dippell. I'm the
- 7 Regulatory Law Judge assigned to this case. And today
- 8 we have come here for a procedural conference to talk
- 9 about how to go forward on the outstanding tariffs
- 10 regarding the phase-in part of this case.
- 11 So I'm going to begin by letting the
- 12 attorneys make entries of appearance. And we can
- 13 begin with you, Mr. Thompson or Staff, Mr. Williams,
- 14 whoever.
- 15 MR. THOMPSON: We certainly can. Kevin
- 16 Thompson, Steve Dottheim and Nathan Williams for the
- 17 staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, PO
- Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
- 19 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Go ahead,
- 20 Public Counsel.
- 21 MS. BAKER: Thank you. Christina Baker,
- PO Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102, appearing
- on behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel and the
- 24 ratepayers.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: And Company?

- 1 MR. FISCHER: On behalf of the Company,
- 2 let the record reflect the appearance of James M.
- 3 Fischer, Fischer and Dority, PC, 101 Madison, Suite
- 4 400, Jefferson City, Missouri.
- 5 JUDGE DIPPELL: And Mr. Conrad?
- 6 MR. CONRAD: Yes, ma'am. On behalf this
- 7 morning of AG Processing, Inc., a cooperative, Stuart
- 8 W. Conrad, law firm is Finnegan, Conrad and Peterson,
- 9 3100 Broadway, Suite 1209, Kansas City, Missouri.
- 10 JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there
- anyone else who needed to make an entry of appearance?
- 12 I don't see anyone.
- I had e-mails from several parties,
- including DNR, Ameren, Dogwood, St. Joseph, Empire,
- 15 MGE, Missouri Retailers Association, AARP and the
- 16 Consumer Councils of Missouri all asking to be
- 17 excused, and that's fine. Of course, anything agreed
- 18 to, I'm not going to let those parties hold up any
- show since they didn't come here today to talk times
- or dates. And of course, anything else that gets
- 21 decided, they're just not here to deal with. So --
- 22 but that's fine.
- 23 Like I said in the beginning, basically
- 24 asked you all to come here today to talk about
- 25 procedural schedule for the remainder of this case,

- which mainly involves determining the carrying costs
- 2 for the phase-in portion. Does anyone have any
- 3 questions for me or anything they'd like to bring up
- 4 this morning? Mr. Williams?
- 5 MR. WILLIAMS: Are you looking for
- 6 hearing dates and pre-filed testimony?
- 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: Yeah. Pretty much. I
- 8 don't think that this has to be a long, drawn out
- 9 thing. I think we just need to focus -- there were
- several opinions about what carrying costs should be
- 11 and how those should be determined. So that's what
- we're looking for a hearing on.
- So I don't think that it has to be
- 14 significant, but probably is -- pre-filed is probably
- as good as live when you're talking about numbers and
- 16 calculations and so forth so I would prefer that.
- 17 MR. CONRAD: Judge, just so the record is
- 18 clear and so -- primarily out of respect for you
- 19 because I don't want to mislead you or anybody else.
- 20 We have submitted an Application for Rehearing, which
- I see on the proposed agenda is to be dealt with in
- some way, shape or form on Wednesday.
- 23 But without regard to that, I think this
- is probably a matter that's going to be destined for
- 25 the courts. And our point on that is very simple and

- 1 that is the Commission does not have authority
- 2 lawfully to grant an increase, whether it is made up
- 3 of rates or carrying charges or anything else that
- 4 exceeds what the company originally applied for. And
- 5 that's -- that's pretty simple and straightforward.
- Now, I -- we can -- we can debate it if
- 7 you -- if you like, but I think it's going to be
- 8 resolved in the courts.
- 9 JUDGE DIPPELL: Well, I don't want to
- 10 debate it here, but I would like to ask -- so just --
- 11 just thinking out so if -- if the Commission were to
- 12 deny your rehearing and Ag Processing or someone else
- files their appeal with the courts, are you
- 14 envisioning that there would be a writ that would
- 15 prohibit the Commission from going any further while
- that's being determined?
- 17 MR. CONRAD: That would be a matter,
- 18 ma'am, that would be up to the court. I can't -- I
- 19 can't speak and it would be inappropriate for me to do
- so right now as to what relief might be requested.
- 21 That could be included, but that would be a matter for
- 22 the court.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: And there hasn't already
- 24 been any writ that I'm not aware of that is filed with
- regard to any appeals on these matters?

- 1 MR. FISCHER: Judge, I think for full
- disclosure, the company did file with the Cole County
- 3 a review request, which I don't know that it's been
- 4 acted on at the Cole County related to the Motion for
- 5 Rehearing that was denied within the last month or so
- from -- related to the company's revenue requirement
- 7 issues, which I believe is a final order. And so,
- 8 therefore, under the statute, it was necessary to take
- 9 steps to file that in order to preserve that since a
- 10 rehearing was not granted.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Williams?
- 12 MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, Staff was served
- with a writ that was filed by the company with regard
- to I believe it was two applications for rehearing in
- 15 the rate case.
- 16 JUDGE DIPPELL: But was there an order
- 17 from the court on those?
- MR. WILLIAMS: Just served with a copy
- 19 for a petition asking for it.
- JUDGE DIPPELL: So I guess as part of
- 21 this, what I would ask the parties to do is to keep me
- 22 informed in case I'm not aware that -- if the court
- 23 issues anything that would prohibit the Commission
- 24 from taking any additional action.
- 25 And would there be any other questions?

1	I think you all can debate the merits of setting up a
2	procedural schedule, but I would like you to go ahead
3	with such a schedule.
4	And Mr. Conrad, certainly it's your
5	participation is not acquiescence that you do not
6	agree with the legalities.
7	MR. CONRAD: And we're happy to do that
8	and participate as long as it is understood that that
9	is without prejudice to any position that might have
10	served with respect to the rate increase for
11	St. Joseph.
12	JUDGE DIPPELL: Anything else that
13	anybody else would like to put on the record this
14	morning?
15	All right. Seeing nothing further then,
16	I will leave you all to discussions. I didn't bring
17	down a copy of the Commission's calendar, but I can do
18	that if you'd like. If you need something, you can
19	come see me in my office.
20	Go ahead then and go off the record.
21	(Whereupon, hearing was concluded.)
22	
23	
24	

1	
2	ERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	
4	I, Tracy Thorpe Taylor, CCR No. 939, within the
5	State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the
6	testimony appearing in the foregoing matter was duly
7	sworn by me; that the testimony of said witnesses was
8	taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter
9	reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am
10	neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
11	of the parties to the action in which this matter was
12	taken, and further, that I am not a relative or
13	employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the
14	parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise
15	interested in the outcome of the action.
16	
17	
18	Tracy Thorpe Taylor, CCR
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	