

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of the Application of Kansas City)	
Power & Light Company for Approval to Make)	
Certain Changes in its Charges for Electric)	Case No. ER-2006-0314
Service to Begin the Implementation of its)	
Regulatory Plan)	

CITY OF KANSAS CITY’S REPLY POST HEARING BRIEF

Mr. Dias’ Post Hearing Brief.

The City of Kansas City (the City) will first note that in the eighty or so pages of his brief, Mr. Dias raises many issues outside of the official statement of the issues filed in this case. The City submits that much of what Mr. Dias has argued is beyond the scope of the issues.

At page 78 of Mr. Dias’ brief which appears on the Commission’s “EFIS” website¹ he asserts:

It is even questionable if low-income customers are getting any lasting benefit from KCPL’s existing [energy efficiency or weatherization] programs because the same customers come back for help year after year. The Commission has to change this now.

The City first disputes the logic of the argument. The fact that there is a continuing demand for this service and applicants who may be turned away is no indication that it is not meeting its mission. The program is known for its waiting lists.

Most importantly, this assertion is baseless. Of the evidence submitted in this hearing that bore on an evaluation of the weatherization program, the only conclusion conceivable is that it is being administered faithfully in accordance with the Stipulation approved in Case No. EO-2005-0329 and is directly benefiting KCPL customers. As Mr. Jackson testified in response to

¹ Although Mr. Dias certifies that a copy of his brief was delivered via email to all parties of record, none was emailed to the City.

Commissioner Appling, in the twelve month period up to the date of hearing, the City was approaching between 700 to 800 homes weatherized with another 200 to 250 in progress.² (Tr. 1582, lines 1-5). Of those homes weatherized, approximately 95% are in the KCPL service area. (Tr. 1585, lines 14-15).

The City believes that the other proper issues raised in Mr. Dias' brief have been addressed adequately either by the City in its initial post hearing brief or by other parties in their separate filings.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark W. Comley

Mark W. Comley #28847
NEWMAN, COMLEY & RUTH P.C.
601 Monroe Street, Suite 301
P.O. Box 537
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0537
(573) 634-2266
(573) 636-3306 (FAX)

Attorneys for City of Kansas City, Missouri

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was sent via email on this 27th day of November, 2006, to all parties of record.

/s/ Mark W. Comley

Mark W. Comley

² Ms. Anita Randolph provided a loose estimate of the number of homes she thought had been weatherized in the KCPL service area—presumably in a year's time although the question and answer are not clear on the time period. (Tr. 1554). With sincere respect to Ms. Randolph, the City suggests that Mr. Jackson's report of weatherization activity is a more accurate count under the circumstances.