Company Name: KCP&L
Case Description: KCPL Integrated Resource Plan (IRP)
Case: EO-2012-0323

Response to fisk Shannon Interrogatories – Set Sierra Club_20120813
Date of Response: 08/30/2012

Question No. :18

Refer to Volume 7, page 3 of the IRP. With regards to your claim referenced therein that the "'Aggressive' D-level of DSM is not considered to be realistically achievable":

a. Explain why you contend that the aggressive D-level of DSM is "not realistically achievable."

b. Produce any documents or analyses created or reviewed by KCP&L regarding the contention that the aggressive D-level of DSM is "not realistically achievable."

c. Identify the annual energy savings in kWh that would be achieved if the aggressive D-level of DSM were successfully implemented.

d. Identify the annual peak reduction in MW that would be achieved if the aggressive D-level of DSM were successfully implemented.

RESPONSE: (do not edit or delete this line or anything above this)

a.
KCP&L considers the A-level of DSM to be an aggressive plan. However, we consider it to be realistically achievable. The D-level of DSM was created to comply with an arbitrary level of DSM that we were required to evaluate because the stakeholders requested it and the commission ordered it. The D-level of DSM is an additional amount of DSM that is equal to the sum of all of the DSM programs from the A-level of DSM. That is we doubled the DSM from the A-level plan. Since the D-level of DSM does not actually exist as a known list of programs or measures, KCP&L does not consider it to be a realistically achievable plan.

b.
No documentation exists beyond the explanation above.

c. & d.
Refer to the workpaper “KCPL IRP A E R Powell Mar 27 2012 Vol 6(4)B1245” that was provided with the filing. The D-level of MWs and MWhs are located in the tab named “D”.

Attachment: Q18 MO Verification.pdf