

Exhibit No.:
Issue: Environmental Regulations –
La Cygne Generating Station
Witness: Paul M. Ling
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony
Sponsoring Party: Kansas City Power & Light Company
Case No.: ER-2014-0370
Date Testimony Prepared: May 7, 2015

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2014-0370

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

PAUL M. LING

ON BEHALF OF

KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

**Kansas City, Missouri
May 2015**

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

PAUL M. LING

Case No. ER-2014-0370

1 **Q: Please state your name and business address.**

2 A: My name is Paul M. Ling. My business address is 1200 Main Street, Kansas City,
3 Missouri 64105.

4 **Q: Are you the same Paul M. Ling who pre-filed Direct Testimony in this matter?**

5 A: Yes, I am.

6 **Q: What is the purpose of your Rebuttal Testimony?**

7 A: The purpose of my testimony is to respond to portions of the Direct Testimony filed by
8 Sierra Club witness Rachel S. Wilson related to environmental regulations considered by
9 Kansas City Power & Light Company (“KCP&L” or the “Company”) in connection with
10 its decision to undertake the environmental retrofit of the La Cygne Generating Station
11 (“La Cygne Environmental Project”).

12 **Q: What specific issues will you be addressing in this testimony?**

13 A: I will address the following issues:

- 14 • significant environmental regulations finalized as of 2011,
15 • significant environmental regulations that require the emission control equipment
16 installed at La Cygne Generating Station, and
17 • significant environmental regulations at the time of the 2011 predetermination at
18 the Kansas Corporation Commission in Docket No. 11-KCPE-581-PRE.

1 **Q: On page 4, lines 13-16 of her Direct Testimony, Sierra Club witness Wilson**
2 **mentions that a number of environmental regulations were “proposed” as of 2011.**
3 **How do you respond?**

4 A: There were significant environmental regulations *finalized* as of 2011 that required the
5 emission control equipment at La Cygne Generating Station to be installed for
6 compliance. These finalized environmental regulations included the following:

- 7 • the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) finalized amendments (also
8 referred to as the Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) Rule) to the 1999
9 Regional Haze Rule in June 2005;
- 10 • the EPA approved the Kansas Regional Haze State Implementation Plan (“SIP”)
11 in December 2011, and KCP&L was required to comply with the Regional Haze
12 SIP with the emission control equipment installed at the La Cygne Generating
13 Station;
- 14 • the EPA finalized the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (“MATS”) Rule in
15 December 2011, and the emission control equipment installed at the La Cygne
16 Generating Station will also allow the Station to comply with the MATS rule;
- 17 • the EPA finalized the Cross-State Air Pollution (“CSAPR”) rule in July 2011, and
18 the emission control equipment installed at the La Cygne Generating Station
19 allows the Station to comply with the CSAPR rule;
- 20 • the EPA strengthened the primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard
21 (“NAAQS”) for sulfur dioxide (“SO₂”) in June 2010, and the emission control
22 equipment installed at the La Cygne Generating Station will allow the Station to
23 comply with the SO₂ NAAQS.

1 **Q: On page 5, lines 13-17 of her Direct Testimony, Sierra Club witness Wilson**
2 **mentions a number of environmental regulations with which the La Cygne**
3 **Environmental Project will enable KCP&L to achieve compliance. How do you**
4 **respond?**

5 A: Although I agree that the La Cygne Environmental Project will enable KCP&L to comply
6 with regulations she mentions here, there are additional regulations either proposed or
7 finalized but not yet implemented by EPA that will also be met by KCP&L because the
8 Company has already undertaken the La Cygne Environmental Project. These
9 regulations include those that address utility water discharge and waste regulations that
10 may require the emission controls already installed as part of the La Cygne
11 Environmental Project which include dry handling of coal combustion residuals.

12 **Q: On page 11, lines 7-10 of her Direct Testimony, Sierra Club witness Wilson**
13 **mentions a number of environmental regulations existing in 2011 when KCP&L**
14 **requested predetermination from the Kansas Corporation Commission for the La**
15 **Cygne Environmental Project in Docket No. 11-KCPE-581-PRE. How do you**
16 **respond?**

17 A: Although I agree that the La Cygne Environmental Project will enable KCP&L to comply
18 with regulations she mentions here, there are additional regulations either proposed or
19 finalized but not yet implemented by EPA that will also be met by KCP&L because the
20 Company has already undertaken the La Cygne Environmental Project. These
21 regulations include those that address utility water discharge and waste regulations that
22 may require the emission controls already installed as part of the La Cygne
23 Environmental Project which include dry handling of coal combustion residuals.

1 Q: Does that conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?

2 A: Yes, it does.

