



Evergy Missouri West
Case Name: 2023 Fuel Adjustment Clause MO West 11th Prudence Audit
Case Number: EO-2023-0277

Requestor Mantle Lena -
Response Provided January 08, 2024

Question:8064

On pg. 12, ln. 7, Ms. Messamore states “This doesn’t mean these assets can’t dispatch to cover retail energy when needed”. Is it Ms. Messamore’s testimony that Evergy West’s assets could cover the energy requirements of its retail customers? If yes, please provide the basis for Ms. Messamore’s belief along with workpapers and documentation that supports her position.

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

Confidentiality: PUBLIC

Statement: This response is Public. No Confidential Statement is needed.

Response:

SPP’s Resource Adequacy Requirements outline the amount of capacity that an LRE must maintain to meet its load and planning reserve obligations. These requirements define the amount of “capability to produce energy” (i.e., capacity) needed to meet those obligations, while factoring in different risks related to resource availability which could impact their capability to produce energy at any given time, as well as the risk created by fluctuations in customer load which changes the amount of energy needed at any given time. This assessment is done through the Loss of Load Expectation study described in response to DR 8062. EMW has met and plans to meet these requirements, as outlined in response to 8047.

More simplistically, using Tables 1 and 2 from the 2023 EMW IRP. EMW’s retail sales (MWh) were 8,666,707 MWh. EMW’s renewable fleet produced 3,081,251 MWh of energy over the same period. That leaves a remaining net “short” position of 5,585,456 MWh. The capacity (MW) of EMW’s dispatchable fossil fleet (coal, natural gas, and oil) is 1,637 MW. That equates to a total annual energy production potential of 14,340,120 MWh (1,637 MW x 8,760 hours in a year). That means that EMW’s fossil fleet was theoretically capable of producing over 2.5 times EMW’s 2022 energy short position on an annual basis (note that this assumes no generator outages, but even assuming only 50% availability for EMW’s entire fossil fleet, the theoretical potential would still have been 1.3 times EMW’s energy short position). However, as I explained in testimony, the reason these resources were not dispatched (i.e., did not produce energy) was because market energy was more cost-effective on a marginal basis.



Information provided by: Kayla Messamore

Attachment(s):

Missouri Verification:

I have read the Information Request and answer thereto and find answer to be true, accurate, full and complete, and contain no material misrepresentations or omissions to the best of my knowledge and belief; and I will disclose to the Commission Staff any matter subsequently discovered which affects the accuracy or completeness of the answer(s) to this Information Request(s).

Signature /s/ *Brad Lutz*
Director Regulatory Affairs