

In the Matter of the Resource Plan of )  
KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company ) Case No. EO-2013-0538

COMES NOW Dogwood Energy, LLC (“Dogwood”) and respectfully submits its Comments and Request for Hearing in this proceeding pursuant to 4 CSR 240-22.080, as follows:

1. On June 20, 2013, KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations (GMO) submitted information pursuant to the Commission’s Electric Utility Resource Planning (Chapter 22) reporting requirements.
2. GMO’s filing consists of an annual update which it erroneously asserts complies with the Joint Filing made between it and stakeholders, including Dogwood, regarding its prior triennial IRP submitted in File No. EO-2012-0324.
3. GMO now seeks acknowledgement of its 2012 triennial IRP filing as amended by its 2013 annual update filing, pursuant to 4 CSR 240-22.080(17).
4. On December 19, 2012, in File No. EO-2012-0324, the Commission issued its Order Regarding 2012 Integrated Resource Plan regarding the triennial integrated resource plan filed by GMO. In its Order, the Commission stated that “since GMO will be revising a substantial portion of the IRP in its 2013 annual update report as part of the proposed remedies” for the deficiencies and concerns identified by Dogwood and the other stakeholders, “the Commission concludes it would be premature to make a determination on whether the IRP complies with Chapter 22 of the Commission rules or to schedule a hearing at this time on the unresolved deficiencies and concerns alleged by the parties.” Further, the

Commission stated “given the continuous nature of the IRP filings, the Commission will require GMO to address these unresolved deficiencies and concerns in its 2013 annual update report.” Accordingly, the Commission approved the remedies proposed in the Joint Filing submitted by the parties and also ordered GMO to address the remaining deficiencies and concerns for which no remedy had yet been developed.

5. In the Joint Filing approved by the Commission, among other things, GMO agreed with Dogwood and the other stakeholders to address the deficiencies in the supply-side analysis of GMO’s IRP that had been identified by Dogwood in its Report submitted in File No. EO-2012-0324 on September 6, 2012 (which Report is incorporated herein by reference). Specifically, GMO agreed “to conduct analysis of at least one alternative resource plan to quantify the effect of minority ownership in the Dogwood facility.” GMO also agreed to “provide at least one alternative resource plan that simulates the impact of a retirement of the Crossroads plant.” GMO agreed to conduct such analyses “using the same analytical method and assumed regulatory treatment applied to all other retirement alternatives in the 2013 Annual IRP Update, and including the same net capacity additions as the other plans to which they are compared.” GMO was to conduct such analyses to address violations of the Commission’s IRP rules and prior orders that had resulted from its failure to use minimization of net present value revenue requirement (“NPVRR”) as the primary selection criteria, failure to fully evaluate supply-side resource options, and failure to address concerns raised about prior IRP submittals. (Joint Filing p. 9-15).

6. In agreeing to the Joint Filing approved by the Commission, Dogwood reserved all rights to seek relief from the Commission for any breach of the Joint Filing regarding GMO’s triennial IRP as well as all rights regarding annual update submittals. (Joint Filing p. 9-15).

7. GMO's June 20, 2013 annual update filing does not meet the requirements of the Joint Filing or the Commission's Order approving the Joint Filing, regarding the deficiencies identified by Dogwood.

8. Contrary to the requirements of the Joint Filing and Commission order, GMO did not analyze the supply side options of acquiring a minority interest in the Dogwood facility and/or retiring the Crossroads plant in a manner that used the same methods, assumptions and net capacity additions as the other alternative resource plans that it studied. Instead, it skewed its analysis by artificially inflating the NPVRR of the alternative plan involving the Dogwood plant as a resource and of the alternative plan examining retirement of Crossroads. In particular, GMO did not analyze these alternatives using the same methods, assumptions and net capacity additions as it used in developing its preferred plan, thereby precluding an accurate determination as to which of the plans should be selected as preferred in accordance with the Commission's IRP rules. For example, it assumed replacement of the Crossroads plant with 79 MW of excess capacity rather than on a one-to-one basis or on the basis of needed capacity. It also did not consider Dogwood as a potential replacement for Crossroads. Nor did it consider plant retirements and conversions that it is otherwise planning to make according to its "preferred plan". Likewise, in its study of the Dogwood plant, it did not consider plant retirements and conversions on the same schedule as indicated by its other studies or that otherwise should have been considered in light of assumed capacity needs.

9. GMO has not complied with the Joint Filing and the Commission's Order approving it, and GMO's IRP submittals do not comply with the Commission's IRP rules. GMO continues to fail to use minimization of NPVRR as the primary criterion for selecting a

preferred alternative resource plan and continues to fail to fully evaluate supply-side resource options. As a result, it continues to fail to develop a sound plan to protect and serve the public interest.

10. The Commission should schedule a hearing pursuant to Rule 22.080 regarding the still-unresolved deficiencies of GMO's IRP submittals and its related violation of the Commission's Order approving the Joint Filing. After conducting such hearing, the Commission should order GMO to conduct new analyses in compliance with the IRP rules and remedy deficiencies in its resource planning.

WHEREFORE, Dogwood respectfully requests that the Commission set a prehearing conference, direct the parties to submit a proposed procedural schedule, and set this matter for hearing to address deficiencies in GMO's attempts to comply with the Commission's IRP rules, 4 CSR 240-22, and grant such other relief as the Commission determines to be just and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

CURTIS, HEINZ,  
GARRETT & O'KEEFE, P.C.

/s/ Carl J. Lumley

---

Carl J. Lumley, #32869  
130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200  
Clayton, Missouri 63105  
(314) 725-8788  
(314) 725-8789 (Fax)  
clumley@lawfirmemail.com

Attorneys for Dogwood Energy, LLC

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

A true and correct copy of the foregoing document was either mailed, faxed, or emailed this 20th day of August 2013, to the persons listed on the below service list.

/s/ Carl J. Lumley

---

Missouri Public Service Commission  
General Counsel Office  
P.O. Box 360  
200 Madison Street, Suite 800  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
[Staffcounsel@psc.mo.gov](mailto:Staffcounsel@psc.mo.gov)

Office of the Public Counsel  
Lewis Mills  
P.O. Box 2230  
200 Madison Street, Suite 650  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
[opc@ded.mo.gov](mailto:opc@ded.mo.gov)

Brubaker & Associates, Inc.  
Maurice Brubaker  
P.O. Box 412000  
St. Louis, MO 63141-2000  
[mbrubaker@consultbai.com](mailto:mbrubaker@consultbai.com)

Brubaker & Associates, Inc.  
Greg Meyer  
P.O. Box 412000  
St. Louis, MO 63141-2000  
[gmeyer@consultbai.com](mailto:gmeyer@consultbai.com)

Kansas City Power & Light Company  
Don Frerking  
P.O. Box 418679  
Kansas City, MO 64141-9679  
[Don.frerking@kcpl.com](mailto:Don.frerking@kcpl.com)

KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations  
Company  
James Fischer  
101 Madison Street, Suite 400  
Jefferson City, MO 65101  
[jfischerpc@aol.com](mailto:jfischerpc@aol.com)

Kansas City Power & Light Company  
Lois Liechti  
P.O. Box 418679  
Kansas City, MO 64141-9679  
[lois.liechti@kcpl.com](mailto:lois.liechti@kcpl.com)

Kansas City Power & Light Company  
Marisol Miller  
P.O. Box 418679  
Kansas City, MO 64141-9679  
[marisol.miller@kcpl.com](mailto:marisol.miller@kcpl.com)

Kimiko Narita  
20 N. Wacker Dr., Suite 1600  
Chicago, IL 60606  
[knarita@nrdc.org](mailto:knarita@nrdc.org)

Kansas City Power & Light Company  
Tim Rush  
P.O. Box 418679  
Kansas City, MO 64141-9679  
[tim.rush@kcpl.com](mailto:tim.rush@kcpl.com)

Kansas City Power & Light Company  
Roger Steiner  
P.O. Box 418679  
Kansas City, MO 64141-9679  
[roger.steiner@kcpl.com](mailto:roger.steiner@kcpl.com)

Missouri Department of Natural Resources  
Jessica Blome  
P.O. Box 899  
221 W. High Street  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
[Jessica.Blome@ago.mo.gov](mailto:Jessica.Blome@ago.mo.gov)

Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers  
(MIEC)  
Diana M. Vuylsteke  
211 N. Broadway, Suite 3600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
[dnvuylsteke@bryancave.com](mailto:dnvuylsteke@bryancave.com)

Missouri Public Service Commission  
Steve Dottheim  
P.O. Box 360  
200 Madison Street, Suite 800  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
[Steve.Dottheim@psc.mo.gov](mailto:Steve.Dottheim@psc.mo.gov)

Henry B. Robertson  
705 Olive Street, Suite 614  
St. Louis, MO 63101  
[hrobertson@greatriverslaw.org](mailto:hrobertson@greatriverslaw.org)

Renew Missouri  
Andrew J. Linhares  
910 E. Broadway, Suite 205  
Columbia, MO 65201  
[Andrew@renewmo.org](mailto:Andrew@renewmo.org)

Sierra Club  
Thomas Cmar  
5042 N. Leavitt St., Suite 1  
Chicago, IL 60625  
[tcnar@earthjustice.org](mailto:tcnar@earthjustice.org)

Sierra Club  
Shannon Fisk  
1617 John F. Kennedy Blvd., Suite 1675  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
[sfisk@earthjustice.org](mailto:sfisk@earthjustice.org)