

Direct Testimony

Melanie & James Coney

Q: Please state your name and address?

A: Melanie L Coney 504 NW Magnolia Circle Grain Valley, MO 64029

Q: What short forms will be used?

A: We will use the following forms:

“Commission” for the Missouri Public Service Commission;

“Staff” for the staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission;

“KCPL” or “Company” for Kansas City Power and Light Company;

“GMO” for KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company;

“Installer” for the Solar Units – American Home Services Company;

Q: What is the purpose of your direct testimony?

A: I present that in the overview of the results found by the Staff, where they had requested all information from KCPL in regards to our case, that there were pieces missing. Between when I sent in my initial application to KCPL (in June 2014), there was a matter of approximately 3-4 phone conversations between myself and KCPL, and my installer and KCPL. Two of those conversations were between the installer of our solar units and KCPL, and two conversations were between myself and KCPL. After the “staff” of the commission had requested all documents and conversations from KCPL, it was found that those four phone conversations went unrecorded.

Q: What was involved with the conversations in question?

A: The two conversations that the installer had with KCPL indicated that not only would we qualify for the rebates, but that we qualified at the \$2.00/per watt. They also spoke to someone who advised that we would receive a credit, or a monthly reimbursement for any overage we produced beyond the amount of excess we used. This was presented as a package to us when we purchased the air conditioner and furnace that accompanied the solar units. This was presented this way to the installer from KCP&L, so they passed that information to us.

One of the conversations that I had with KCPL was to ensure I went to the right location to download the solar application and rebate forms. I was directed to the website where I downloaded the form and mailed it in. When I didn't receive a response within a couple weeks I placed another call to ensure they had received my application. The person who answered advised it was received, however, it was at the bottom of a stack of applications received. I requested to know if she could confirm if we would still qualify for the rebate. She said yes, but that it would be at the \$1.50/per watt rate since our application was received after November 30, 2014.

Q: Had you already installed your solar unit prior to application?

A: Yes, we had our units installed prior to our application being submitted, because both the installer and I had been informed that all we had to do was install, and send in the application. We would then have the net meter installed, and rebate received within 30 days, as long as our application was received prior to June 30, 2014. Our units were installed on 05/26/14.

Q: Please summarize your testimony.

A: I submitted the application for net metering and solar rebate under the understanding from the KCPL personnel that I would receive a net meter and a rebate within 30 days of application acceptance. It turned out that whoever spoke to the installer and myself, gave false information. So, under this

promise we had installed our units. It was then too late to remove the units. Throughout the next 10 months we went back and forth with the engineer (Ryan) and the front end staff (Elena & Samantha) at KCPL. Each time a denial was sent there was a different set of things that were advised that we were missing. My installer had never installed anything like this prior, so they did not have the ability to help provide the missing pieces. Being that I am not an engineer, it was a process that I had to deduce down what was being requested each time. At one point it was a matter of one decimal point, and number that were out of place.

I presented in February 2015 my formal complaint to the Commission for review, since in August 2014 when I called as a verbal complaint, I received no response. Upon review of our formal complaint the Commission put it to KCP&L to respond. They responded to indicate that they did not feel that they were liable for these allegations and said it was by fault of my application being incorrectly submitted, that this was the reason the process took so long, and why the net meter was not yet installed. I find it interesting that it was put upon my shoulders to come up with how to fill out the paperwork to submit the requested information, and yet, when it came down to the net metering being installed there was nothing changed on the units that have been on my roof since May 2014. (only added stickers)

In March when I submitted the last form requested (the "SREC"), all of a sudden we were then approved. The KCPL worker then came out to review our equipment. The representative indicated in his report that no one was home at the time he came, so he rejected the visual review, indicating that there was "No signage on the equipment, and no access". I was home all that week (because I work from home full time), and the units were accessible without having to go beyond a fence. I then received a call from the KCPL representative after I sent a response email to the denial, requesting clarification of what the "no access" meant. He then advised he could come back the next day, however, initially I had been told one year prior, that when KCPL was ready for final inspection, that I would be given notice to have the installer on the property at the same time. I advised (Paul) of this, and he advised I could call the

installer and see if he could come that next day. I called the installer and he was not available to come until the following day.

So, on May 22nd 2015, we finally had a face to face conversation with the KCPL representative (Paul) and his supervisor (Nathan). During our meeting Nathan called to speak to Ryan (the engineer who had approved our application), but he got his supervisor instead. It was then clarified that those in the office were aware that there were Lennox air conditioner units, which were solar ready, (being installed by air conditioner companies), but that they had neglected to advise the field representatives of this. It was then clarified to the installer that there were stickers missing from the disconnect and the meter box. It was also recommended that the disconnect switch be changed to a lever disconnect versus the version originally installed. Once the meeting was over the installer was advised which two stickers were missing and what the disconnect looked like. A little over one week later on June 1st 2015 our installer brought out the requested stickers and changed out the disconnect. Later that day another KCPL representative came out to take photos of the updated information. As of approximately 9am on June 2nd 2015 our net meter was installed, just prior to the pre-hearing.

Q: What are you looking to accomplish by presenting this case?

A: My intent is to ensure that there is a better system in place to help not only installers who may want to install this unit, but also for the customers who may be asked to fill in all of the information without full knowledge/understanding of the proper steps. If there was a liaison at KCPL in the solar area whose main purpose was to answer questions regarding how to find the watts, KwH and voltage etc, related to a person's system, this would save the customer multiple application denials. Then it would also allow someone the ability to explain the proper steps to the customer so that the Engineers at KCPL aren't burdened with re-looking at the same application multiple times.

My other intent is that, as a customer, I was promised up front a rebate equal to \$2.00/per watt and was advised I would be paid for any overage that I produce that would be considered excess. This would be excess "bought by KCPL" at the tariff rate designated each time the tariffs are updated. In almost every state there is the option for this, but I have not found this specified for sure in Missouri. The form (MO700 Sheet No. 102) lists the rate for purchases made by company. The amount I would see fit to cover my rebate of \$2/per watt equals \$8640.00. (16 units @ 270 watts each x \$2/per watt = \$8640) If this is not being honored then I would ask the question, why is it still listed on the application as an option? (The net metering rider Sheet No. 118 is for GMO area.)

Respectfully submitted,

Melanie L Coney