

In the Matter of the 2014 KCP&L )  
 Greater Missouri Operations Company ) **File No. EO-2014-0257**  
 Annual IRP Update Report )

COMES NOW the Missouri Department of Economic Development – Division of Energy (“DE”) by and through counsel, pursuant to 4 CSR 240-22.080(3)(D), and submits its comments on the KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company (“GMO”) 2014 Integrated Resource Plan Annual Update Report (“Update Report”).

1. GMO submitted its 2014 Update Report in Case No. EO-2014-0257 on March 20, 2014.
2. GMO followed up its Update Report with an update meeting on April 9, 2014 and filed a notice of no changes made to the 2014 IRP annual report on April 21, 2014 as a result of the discussion at the update meeting.
3. GMO has provided a detailed Update Report with new analysis that communicated the major changes that have taken place in the utility's preferred plan and resource acquisition strategy since its last annual update filing. Based on DE's limited review of GMO's 2014 Update Report and

participation in the annual update workshop, GMO appears to have done an adequate job in updating its 2014 IRP to generally comply with applicable Chapter 22 rules. However, DE has identified one significant instance where GMO's Update Report may not comply with applicable Chapter 22 rules. In addition, DE questions the value of the additional "combined" resource plans under a KCP&L/GMO joint company scenario.

4. Pursuant to 4 CSR 240-22.080(3)(B), "the depth and detail of the annual update report shall generally be commensurate with the magnitude and significance of the changing conditions since the last filed triennial compliance filing or annual update filing".

5. GMO requested on September 4, 2013 that the Commission authorize GMO to suspend solar rebates payments in Case No. EO-2014-0059.

6. GMO and signatories including DE filed a non-unanimous stipulation and agreement on October 30, 2013 which capped GMO's solar rebate payments at \$55 million incurred subsequent to August 31, 2012.

7. Combined with the implementation of HB 142, this solar rebate settlement will have significant impacts on both RES compliance and long-term solar energy resources planning and development. GMO's Update Report lacks a detailed analysis of impacts of this significant changing condition after its last annual update filing. In particular, the accumulated

generating capacity and associated S-RECs from its customer solar generators as a result of the solar rebate settlement should have been assessed and reported. The absence of this analysis calls into question whether the Update Report complies with the “depth and detail” scope required by 4 CSR 240-22.080(3)(B), and raises concerns with GMO’s process for choosing options for near-term compliance with the 2% solar requirement in the RES, and with justifying the size and timing of additional utility-scale solar projects in future years, as identified in its Update Report.

8. In addition, this Update Report is the first time under the Commission’s revised IRP rules that GMO has filed a detailed analysis of alternative resource plans based on GMO as a stand-alone company. However, GMO also provided the additional analysis of resource plans under a KCP&L/GMO joint company scenario in its Update Report. Even though GMO stated its belief “this element of planning – planning that includes a joint company view – is an important element of resource planning for both companies”, DE continues to hold the concerns expressed in its comments on GMO’s 2013 IRP Annual Update Report (Case No. EO-2013-0538) with GMO’s continued adherence to the jointly determined resource acquisition strategy. Moreover, DE notes that the analysis of resource plans under a joint company approach in its 2014 Update Report appears to provide little

added value to this planning exercise due to the fact the joint alternative resource plans appear to be simply a linear addition of corresponding plans for KCP&L and GMO based on the individual stand-alone companies. Thus, the “combined company” resource plans, which are based on the results of stand-alone company analysis, are not truly plans from a joint company viewpoint regarding choosing the preferred resource plan and resource acquisition strategy.

9. In the end, DE emphasizes the necessity of an extensive analysis of various options to comply with coming Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) regulations in KCP&L’s 2015 triennial IRP filing. The EPA will issue proposed carbon pollution standards and guidelines for modified and existing power plants on June 2, 2014. On April 29, 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed the U. S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit’s opinion vacating EPA’s Cross-State Air Pollution Regulations (“CSAPR”). EPA is currently reviewing the opinion and is expected to make a determination of next steps in the coming months. With the anticipated final action on regulation of coal combustion residues, these three major environmental regulations will likely have significant impacts on both supply-side and demand-side resource planning. In its 2015 triennial IRP filing, GMO should collect available information on those federal regulations and corresponding state regulations and conduct a thorough analysis on how

to comply with those proposed regulations using both supply-side and demand-side resources.

WHEREFORE, the Missouri Department of Economic Development – Division of Energy respectfully provides these comments.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jose S. Caldera  
Jose S. Caldera  
MO Bar # 63742  
Associate General Counsel  
Missouri Department of Economic  
Development  
P.O. Box 1157  
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102  
Phone: 573-751-2148  
Fax: 573-526-7700  
Email: Jose.Caldera@ded.mo.gov

**Attorney for Missouri Department  
of Economic Development –  
Division of Energy**

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been transmitted electronically to all counsel of record this 21<sup>st</sup> day of May 2014.

/s/ Jose S. Caldera  
Jose S. Caldera