

**Exhibit No.:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Issues(s):** Accounting Order

**Witness/Type of Exhibit:** Schallenberg/Direct

**Sponsoring Party:** Public Counsel

**Case No.:** EC-2019-0200

**DIRECT TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**ROBERT E. SCHALLENBERG**

**Submitted on Behalf of  
the Office of the Public Counsel**

**Case No. EC-2019-0200**

**\*\***

**\*\***

**Denotes Confidential Information that has been redacted**

**April 23, 2019**

**Non-Proprietary**

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

The Office of the Public Counsel and The Midwest )  
Energy Consumers Group, )

Complainants, )

v. )

KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company, )

Respondent. )

Case No. EC-2019-0200

**AFFIDAVIT OF ROBERT E. SCHALLENGER**

STATE OF MISSOURI )

) ss


COUNTY OF COLE )

Robert E. Schallenberg, of lawful age and being first duly sworn, deposes and states:

1. My name is Robert E. Schallenberg. I am a Director of Policy for the Office of the Public Counsel.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my direct testimony.

3. I hereby swear and affirm that my statements contained in the attached testimony are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.



Robert E. Schallenberg  
Director of Policy

Subscribed and sworn to me this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of April 2019.



JERENE A. BUCKMAN  
My Commission Expires  
August 23, 2021  
Cole County  
Commission #13754037



Jerene A. Buckman  
Notary Public

My Commission expires August 23, 2021.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY**  
**OF**  
**ROBERT E. SCHALLENBERG**  
**KCP&L GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY**  
**CASE NO. EC-2019-0200**

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

2 A. My name is Robert E. Schallenberg. My business address is Post Office Box 2230,  
3 Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.

4 **Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

5 A. I am the Director of Policy at the Office of the Public Counsel (“OPC”).

6 **Q. Please describe your educational background, professional credentials, and**  
7 **work experience.**

8 A. I have worked in Missouri utility regulation both at the state and federal level for forty-  
9 two years. I also worked in Kansas on utility regulation for eight months. My  
10 educational background, professional credentials, and work experience are contained  
11 in Schedule RES-D-1 and Schedule RES-D-2.

12 **Q. Do you have specific experience relative to this matter?**

13 A. Yes. When I began my career in November 1976, my initial assignments consisted  
14 of interim rates, electric fuel clauses, and rate case audits as my primary  
15 assignments. I was involved in the rate cases when the issue of how Sibley 3  
16 rehabilitation costs were to be treated with an accounting authority order was

1 determined, EO-91-358/EO-91-360. These cases are used to establish the criteria  
2 to evaluate subsequent accounting authority order cases. I have been involved with  
3 accounting orders allowing the utility to defer expenses to be considered in future  
4 rate cases. Another common regulatory mechanism is a rate case tracker where an  
5 amount is included in the cost of service to establish customer rates and actual costs  
6 are tracked for comparison to the amount included in rates. As actual costs exceed,  
7 or are less than, the amount included in customer rates, the difference is recorded  
8 for its ultimate treatment in the next rate case. I recall accounting authority orders  
9 (AAO) for major infrastructure additions (e.g. Wolf Creek and Callaway),  
10 programs (e.g. gas service line replacement) and Commission rule or order  
11 mandating utility action (e.g. cold weather rule). Construction accounting is another  
12 way to defer costs for consideration in future rate cases as was used in KCP&L's  
13 Comprehensive Energy Plan (CEP). OPC's request in this case is consistent with  
14 the principles of prior AAOs and trackers to modify regulatory accounting to  
15 support future rate case deliberations.

16 **Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony?**

17 A. The purpose of my direct testimony is to support OPC's request for an accounting  
18 order (AO) to reflect all of the costs associated with the generation units at Kansas  
19 City Power & Light Greater Missouri Operations (GMO)'s Sibley station that  
20 customers are currently paying in base rates to operate the station despite the fact  
21 that the station was effectively removed from service on November 13, 2018. This

1 retirement was before new rates took effect in December 6, 2018, but after the true-  
2 up date in that case. By year end, GMO had recorded an approximately \$160  
3 million regulatory asset regarding future recovery of alleged Sibley 3 retirement  
4 costs. OPC's AO is needed because the full picture of the Sibley station retirement  
5 costs including Sibley 3 will be essential for the Commission to determine whether  
6 the totality of these costs is unrecovered or over- recovered when this issue is  
7 presented to the Commission in a future rate case

8 **Q. What is an AO and what purpose does it serve?**

9 A. An AO is a Commission order directing a utility to account for a specific activity,  
10 event, item, program, or transaction in a manner different from that required by the  
11 Uniform System of Accounts (USOA) absent the order. The purpose of an  
12 accounting order is to capture data for a specific cost objective. This information  
13 will then be available to assist in the determination of a potential issue in a future  
14 rate case. The cost objective in this case is the aggregation of recovery of any of  
15 the financial impacts regarding the Sibley Generation Station retirement to provide  
16 for consideration of cost over or under recovery in GMO's next general rate case.  
17 The AO is needed now to provide a full picture of the Sibley retirement when GMO  
18 seeks recovery of approximately \$160 million of alleged unrecovered plant  
19 investment caused by the accelerated retirement of Sibley 3.

20 **Q. What is the ratemaking impact of such an accounting order?**

1 A. There is no ratemaking impact in an accounting order.<sup>1</sup> Customer rates are  
2 unchanged whether the Commission approves the accounting order or not.  
3 Customer rates will only be impacted when the Commission decides the issue in  
4 the next rate case based on information that would not be available without the AO.  
5 Orders of this nature generally state that no ratemaking decisions have been made  
6 in an AO. The impact of an AO is to preserve cost information to be considered in  
7 the next rate case.

8 **Q. Why do you believe that the Commission should order an AO in this case?**

9 A. I believe there are five separate reasons why this AO should be granted:

- 10 1) GMO has already established a \$159.9 million regulatory asset in  
11 relation to the retirement of the Sibley generating units, which shows  
12 GMO is accounting for alleged costs but not for savings.  
13  
14 2) The aggregate financial impact of the retirement of the Sibley  
15 generating units exceeds at least 5% of GMO's reported net income;  
16  
17 3) GMO does not regularly retire generating plants, and has not done so in  
18 at least three decades;  
19  
20 4) The Sibley station was retired far before the end of its projected  
21 remaining life; and  
22  
23 5) Despite being retired, the costs associated with the Sibley units are still  
24 included in base rates and those costs are currently being collected from  
25 GMO's customers.  
26

27 I am of the opinion that all the relevant criteria for the AO request are satisfied, and  
28 that the need for the AO to ensure the entire scope of recovered and unrecovered

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Report and Order*, EU-2014-0077 (Aug. 29, 2014).

Sibley retirement costs will be available for determination of this matter in the future is well established.

**Q. Regarding the first reason you stated, did GMO indicate to the OPC or Missouri Energy Consumer Group (MECG) that they would seek to recover unrecovered plant investment related to the Sibley Generation Station retirement?**

**A.** No. MECG's data request 1-41 specifically asked GMO:

At the time of retirement of Sibley Unit 1, Sibley Unit 2, Sibley Unit 3 and Sibley Common Facilities, if those separate units of investment are not fully depreciated, will GMO establish a regulatory asset for the unrecovered investment at: (1) time of retirement or (2) some future period in time? If no, please explain in detail. If GMO indicates that it will seek a regulatory asset in the future, please indicate the approximate date.

GMO responded:

GMO objects to this data request as it seeks information that is not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the retirement of Sibley Station and its units is unusual, abnormal, and significantly different from the ordinary and typical operations of the Company where it would be appropriate for the Commission to impose deferral accounting, and the quantification of any such deferral if ordered by the Commission. Additionally, GMO objects to data requests 1.36, 1.39, and 1.41 as they call for speculation.

GMO also provided the same objection and response to the following questions:

- 1) Data Request 1-39, which asked whether "GMO anticipate[s] seeking recovery of any unrecovered investment in Sibley Unit 1, Sibley Unit 2, Sibley Unit 3 and / or Sibley common costs in a future rate case?", and
- 2) Data Request 1-36, which wanted to know "(a) [w]ill the Commission's issuance of an Accounting Authority Order in this case affect GMO's decision to retire either Sibley Unit 1, Sibley Unit 2 or Sibley Unit 3? (b) [i]f yes, please describe in

1 detail GMO's plans regarding each unit in response to the  
2 Commission's decision to grant an Accounting Authority  
3 Order."  
4

5 Further GMO indicated affirmatively in its response to the following MEGC data  
6 request 1-40:  
7

8 Does GMO believe that it can establish a regulatory asset, with  
9 Commission approval, for any unrecovered investment in Sibley  
10 Unit 1, Sibley Unit 2, Sibley Unit 3 and / or Sibley common  
11 facilities?  
12

13 As of the timing of this testimony, GMO has not requested Commission approval  
14 for the establishment of a regulatory asset for any unrecovered investment in Sibley  
15 Unit 1, Sibley Unit 2, Sibley Unit 3 and / or Sibley common facilities retirement.  
16

17 **Q. Did you find any uncertainty or speculation as to whether GMO would**  
18 **establish a regulatory asset related to the Sibley Station retirement?**

19  
20 **A.** No. Contrary to the data request responses GMO provided, it has already  
21 established a regulatory asset related to the Sibley generating station's retirement.  
22 Page 41 of Evergy's (GMO's parent company) 2018 10 K filed with the Security  
23 and Exchange Commission (SEC) includes a statement that:

24  
25 Evergy's regulatory assets increased by \$243.4 million primarily  
26 due to the reclassification of retired generating plant of \$159.9  
27 million related to GMO's Sibley No. 3 Unit from property, plant and  
28 equipment, net to a regulatory asset upon the retirement of the unit  
29 in 2018.



1 This Evergy 2018 10K filing was made on February 22, 2019. On page 34 of this  
2 filing, it was further noted that the utility's philosophy regarding regulatory assets  
3 and liabilities was as follows:

4 **Regulatory Assets and Liabilities**

5 Evergy has recorded assets and liabilities on its consolidated balance  
6 sheets resulting from the effects of the ratemaking process, which  
7 would not otherwise be recorded under GAAP. **Regulatory assets**  
8 **represent incurred costs that are probable of recovery from**  
9 **future revenues.** Regulatory liabilities represent future reductions  
10 in revenues or refunds to customers. **Management regularly**  
11 **assesses whether regulatory assets and liabilities are probable of**  
12 **future recovery or refund** by considering factors such as decisions  
13 by the MPSC, KCC or FERC in Evergy's rate case filings; decisions  
14 in other regulatory proceedings, including decisions related to other  
15 companies that establish precedent on matters applicable to Evergy;  
16 and changes in laws and regulations. If recovery or refund of  
17 regulatory assets or liabilities is not approved by regulators or is no  
18 longer deemed probable, these regulatory assets or liabilities are  
19 recognized in the current period results of operations. Evergy's  
20 continued ability to meet the criteria for recording regulatory assets  
21 and liabilities may be affected in the future by restructuring and  
22 deregulation in the electric industry or changes in accounting rules.  
23 In the event that the criteria no longer applied to all or a portion of  
24 Evergy's operations, the related regulatory assets and liabilities  
25 would be written off unless an appropriate regulatory recovery  
26 mechanism were provided. Additionally, these factors could result  
27 in an impairment on utility plant assets. See Note 5 to the  
28 consolidated financial statements for additional information.

29 Evergy, Inc. 2018 10K page 34 (emphasis added). Note 5 to the Evergy 2018 10  
30 K consolidated financial statements, pages 95 thru 101, are contained in Schedule  
31 RES-D-3. Included in Note 5 is this statement regarding regulatory assets and  
32 liabilities:

**Regulatory Assets and Liabilities**

The Evergy Companies have recorded assets and liabilities on their consolidated balance sheets resulting from the effects of the ratemaking process, which would not otherwise be recorded if they were not regulated. **Regulatory assets represent incurred costs that are probable of recovery from future revenues.** Regulatory liabilities represent future reductions in revenues or refunds to customers. **Management regularly assesses whether regulatory assets and liabilities are probable of future recovery or refund** by considering factors such as decisions by the MPSC, KCC or FERC in Westar Energy's, KCP&L's and GMO's rate case filings; decisions in other regulatory proceedings, including decisions related to other companies that establish precedent on matters applicable to the Evergy Companies; and changes in laws and regulations. If recovery or refund of regulatory assets or liabilities is not approved by regulators or is no longer deemed probable, these regulatory assets or liabilities are recognized in the current period results of operations. The Evergy Companies continued ability to meet the criteria for recording regulatory assets and liabilities may be affected in the future by restructuring and deregulation in the electric industry or changes in accounting rules. In the event that the criteria no longer applied to any or all of the Evergy Companies' operations, the related regulatory assets and liabilities would be written off unless an appropriate regulatory recovery mechanism were provided. Additionally, these factors could result in an impairment on utility plant assets.

(emphasis added).

**Q. What conclusions do you draw from this information?**

A. This information shows the basis for the Company, including GMO, to recognize regulatory assets and liabilities. These assets and liabilities are created based on Management assessment and discretion. Commission approval is not needed. Such was the process for the \$160 million Sibley 3 retirement that will be the subject of future rate proceedings as GMO works to recover the \$160 million from GMO's

1 customers. OPC has no such authority to record potential liabilities to offer a  
2 complete picture of the matter in hand. However, the Commission has the authority  
3 to order GMO to complete the picture by deferring the monies collected from a  
4 plant and its costs placed in their rates and retired before those rates became  
5 effective. I would recommend the Commission use its authority in this case.

6 **Q. Moving to the second reason that you cite for why the Commission should**  
7 **grant the requested AO in this case, why does the fact that the aggregate**  
8 **financial impact of the retirement of the Sibley generating units exceed at least**  
9 **5% of GMO's reported net income matter?**

10 A. When reviewing requests for deferral accounting, or accounting authority orders,  
11 the Commission has often relied on the USOA. The USOA provides basic  
12 accounting instructions for utilities to report in their annual reports, and includes  
13 instructions on accounting for what it deems "extraordinary" events. This  
14 "extraordinary" standard is the same standard that I use to support OPC's request  
15 for an AO, and the fact that the aggregate financial impact of the retirement of the  
16 Sibley generating units exceed at least 5% of GMO's reported net income explains  
17 why the retirement of the Sibley generating units should be considered  
18 extraordinary.

19 **Q. What do you mean by "extraordinary"?**

20 A. I am referring to the USOA's instructions as to deferral accounting. The  
21 Commission adopted the USOA's standards via 4 CSR 240-20.030. USOA

1 Instruction 7 spells out when a utility should defer certain costs or revenues  
2 associated with extraordinary items. Restated, the USOA says:

3 It is the intent that net income shall reflect all items of profit and loss  
4 during the period with the exception of prior period adjustments as  
5 described in paragraph 7.1 and long-term debt as described in  
6 paragraph 17 below. Those items related to the effects of events and  
7 transactions which have occurred during the current period and  
8 which are of unusual s nature and infrequent occurrence shall be  
9 considered extraordinary items. Accordingly, they will be events  
10 and transactions of significant effect which are abnormal and  
11 significantly different from the ordinary and typical activities of the  
12 company, and which would not reasonably be expected to recur in  
13 the foreseeable [sic] future. (In determining significance, items  
14 should be considered individually and not in the aggregate.  
15 However, the effects of a series of related transactions arising from  
16 a single specific and identifiable event or plan of action should be  
17 considered in the aggregate. To be considered as extraordinary  
18 under the above guidelines, an item should be more than  
19 approximately 5 percent of income, computed before extraordinary  
20 items. Commission approval must be obtained to treat an item of  
21 less than 5 percent, as extraordinary. (See accounts 434 and 435.)

22 Thus, the USOA has determined that an event is extraordinary if its financial  
23 impacts are 5% or more than the entity's income.

24 **Q. Does GMO retiring Sibley meet the USOA's five percent threshold?**

25 A. Yes, by a wide margin. I employed a two-step analysis of the test to determine  
26 whether the Sibley retirement meets the USOA's threshold 5% test for  
27 extraordinary. First, I developed an estimate of the amount of money customers are  
28 either paying in base rates or are otherwise paying through surcharges associated  
29 with the operation of the Sibley Generation Station that GMO retired ignoring the  
30 fact that this facility was included in customer rates. The criteria used to perform

the 5% test was to identify the items that are in base rates and impacted by the Sibley retirement. To transform these number to recognize their income impact, a state and federal income tax of rate of 25.4482542% was applied to develop the income effect of these numbers. The total income effect of these financial items is over \*\* \*\*. <sup>2</sup> Table 1 below shows each item used and the amount associated with the item.

Table 1: Aggregate Customer Payments to Operate the Sibley Station

Non-Labor O & M	\$12,414,468
Labor	\$14,706,742
Depreciation Expense	\$10,362,079
Increase in Fuel Expense	** **
Total Pre-Income Tax Effect	** **
Total Income Effect	** **

By dividing the \*\* \*\* Total Income Effect found in Table 1 by 5%, the result shows GMO would need income in excess of \*\* \*\* for this AO value to not be considered “extraordinary” under the USOA. Once I had determined the proper amount of net income that GMO would need to meet the USOA’s 5% threshold, I examined the net income/losses GMO had reported in the annual reports it submits to the Commission and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for 2017 and 2016. I could not examine net

<sup>2</sup> This value does not include deferred income taxes, fuel inventories, cash working capital, or property taxes, as these numbers were not readily available to me.

1 income from 2018 because this annual report is not yet available, as GMO has asked  
2 for an extension for filing its 2018 annual report. GMO's 2016 net income was  
3 \$60.8 million. In 2017, GMO reported a loss. Therefore, the money customers are  
4 paying in base rates and other surcharges associated with costs that GMO is no  
5 longer incurring because of retirement of the Sibley generation facility exceeds 5%  
6 of GMO's net income for the past two annual report years. Consequently, the AO  
7 exceeds the 5% income test.

8 **Q. On what information did you rely in developing your numbers?**

9 A. In Schedule RES-D-3 I have included all of the documentation regarding of the  
10 source of the dollar amount used for each item.

11 **Q. You also previously listed the fact that GMO has not retired a generating**  
12 **facility in over three decades as a reason for why this AO should be granted;**  
13 **do you consider GMO's history regarding plant retirements to also mean that**  
14 **this retirement should be considered extraordinary?**

15 A. Yes. Despite having worked for the Public Service Commission for over forty  
16 years, I do not recall the last time GMO or one of its predecessor companies shut  
17 down a major generating facility. In fact, GMO indicated in its response to MECG  
18 data request 1-34 that; "[n]o generating units were retired within the past 30 years".  
19 The response also indicates GMO's last retirement was Edmond Street around  
20 1987, and that Ralph Green Units 1 and 2 were retired in November 1982. I have  
21 included this data request and response as Schedule RES-D-3 for ease of reference.

1 The long time frame for GMO not retiring a generating plant is somewhat  
2 predictable given that generating plants are not retired until they are no longer  
3 needed for system reliability and are uneconomic to operate compared to other  
4 generating sources. This is why one often sees significant investment in  
5 rehabilitation, retro-fits, and environmental upgrades before actual retirements.  
6 This trend is also likely to extend into the future as rehabilitation has been more  
7 economic and reliable than relying on the market or building new generation. The  
8 Sibley generating facility was a dominant generating unit station of GMO's fleet  
9 which makes its retirement an extraordinary change to GMO's system.

10 **Q. Could you please explain why you claim that the Sibley Station was retired far**  
11 **before the end of its projected remaining life?**

12 A. Certainly. The principle unit at the Sibley Generation Station is Sibley 3. The  
13 current GMO depreciation rates for Sibley 3 are based on a 2040 retirement date.

14 **Q. Why is GMO's decision to retire the Sibley Station far before the end of its**  
15 **projected remaining life relevant?**

16 A. The retirement of Sibley 3 in 2018, despite GMO's previous indication that the  
17 plant should last until 2040, is another reason why the decision should be  
18 considered extraordinary. This is especially true considering the inadequate level  
19 of information the Company has supplied to support that decision. The data  
20 supporting this over twenty year advancement of Sibley 3's retirement would be  
21 expected to address this significant change in the service life of Sibley 3, which

1 would have far-reaching effects. For example, GMO's \$160 million regulatory  
2 asset must necessarily be impacted by the depreciation reserve deficiency caused by  
3 retiring a sizable unit twenty-two years in advance of the 2040 retirement date used  
4 to establish the units' depreciation rates.

5 In other words, it is extraordinary that a unit's planned retirement was advanced  
6 twenty-two years without a catastrophic change to normal factors, extensive  
7 reliability concerns, or cost analysis justifying early retirement. The retirement is  
8 made even more extraordinary by the fact that action has resulted in GMO  
9 representing nearly \$160 million in future costs.

10 **Q. Has OPC previously raised concerns about GMO's modeling regarding the**  
11 **retirement of the Sibley Station?**

12 A. Yes. As a regulated electrical utility, GMO is required to submit a triennial  
13 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) to the Commission. The planning period for this  
14 IRP is 20 years. Based on past submitted IRPs, the retirement of Sibley 3 was not  
15 considered in the evaluation of GMO's system until 2017 because GMO considered  
16 it beyond the twenty year planning horizon. Schedule RES-D-4 contains OPC 2017  
17 and 2018 GMO Integrated Resource Plan comments.

18 **Q. What did those comments say?**

19 A. The comments addressed the risks associated with the Sibley 3 retirement, based  
20 in part, on the fact that GMO has an increasing customer base load.



1 **Q. Your earlier table shows the costs associated with the Sibley units that are still**  
2 **in base rates. Why should this be considered extraordinary?**

3 A. It is extraordinary for GMO to include in customer rates a significant amount of  
4 costs to operate a facility that was retired before the rates went into effect. Rate  
5 cases are done to give utilities a return on and of their investments to serve their  
6 customers, but GMO's customers are paying GMO for a now non-existent  
7 investment that is not even serving them.

8 **Q. Would you please summarize your testimony?**

9 A. The retirement of the entire GMO's Sibley Generation Station is an extraordinary  
10 event with significant financial implications that will not be known until the next  
11 GMO rate case. GMO has already claimed that it still needs approximately \$160  
12 million from its customers from the Sibley Station retirement, specifically Sibley  
13 3's retirement, but there are other facts surrounding GMO's regulatory asset that  
14 are being omitted. Specifically, GMO is omitting facts concerning the cost savings  
15 it will receive in the Sibley retirement that will benefit GMO's financials to the  
16 detriment of its customers. OPC recognizes this flaw in GMO's regulatory position  
17 and has requested an AO, which will allow the costs savings to at least be  
18 considered as an offset to the \$160 million asset GMO intends to recover from its  
19 customers. This is the best possible way for the Commission to be able to determine  
20 the actual amounts that GMO should eventually be allowed to recover from its  
21 customers. By allowing the total Sibley Station retirement economic consequences

1 to be known, the real financial impacts can be used to analyze the retirements'  
2 effects on Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act (MEEIA), GMO's Fuel  
3 Adjustment Clause (FAC), and economic value of new generation to satisfy GMO's  
4 growing load requirements.

5 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony on this matter?**

6 **A.** Yes.