Exhibit No.: Issues: Witness: Sponsoring Party: Type of Exhibit: Case No.: Date Testimony Prepared:

Variable Fuel Expense LaCygne In-service M Shawn E. Lange Serv MO PSC Staff True-up Direct Testimony ER-2014-0370 July 7, 2015

Filed July 28, 2015 Data Center Missouri Public Service Commission

#### **MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

#### **REGULATORY REVIEW DIVISION**

#### **TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY**

#### OF

#### **SHAWN E. LANGE**

#### **KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

#### **CASE NO. ER-2014-0370**

Jefferson City, Missouri July 2015

\*\* Denotes Highly Confidential Information \*\*

Staff Exhibit No 255-NP Date 7/20/15 Reporter Jenni File No ER-2014-0370



#### **BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

#### **OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of Kansas City Power & ) Light Company's Request for Authority to ) Implement a General Rate Increase for ) Electric Service )

Case No. ER-2014-0370

#### **AFFIDAVIT OF SHAWN E. LANGE**

STATE OF MISSOURI ) ) ss COUNTY OF COLE )

COMES NOW, Shawn E. Lange and on his oath declares that he is of sound mind and lawful age; that he contributed to the attached True-up Direct Testimony; and that the same is true and correct according to his best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

Shawn E. Lange

Subscribed and sworn to before me this  $7^{\text{th}}$  day of July, 2015.



Notary

| 1     | TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY                     |
|-------|--|
| 2     | OF   |
| 3     | SHAWN E. LANGE                               |
| 4     | <b>KANSAS CITY POWER &amp; LIGHT COMPANY</b> |
| 5     | CASE NO. ER-2014-0370                        |
| 6     | TABLE OF CONTENTS                            |
| 7     | Variable Fuel Expense 1                      |
| 8     | La Cygne In-Service                          |
| 9     | Project Description                          |
| 10    | In-Service Criteria                          |
|       | · ·  |
|       |  |
| :     |  |
|       |  |
|       |  |
|       |  |
|       |  |
|       |  |
|       |  |
|       |  |
| -<br> |  |

i

| 1    | TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY  |
|------|---|
| 2    | OF  |
| 3    | SHAWN E. LANGE  |
| 4    | KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY   |
| 5    | CASE NO. ER-2014-0370   |
| 6    | Q. Please state your name and business address.   |
| 7    | A. My name is Shawn E. Lange and my business address is Missouri Public                   |
| 8    | Service Commission, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102.                               |
| 9    | Q. Are you the same Shawn E. Lange who contributed to Staff's Cost of Service             |
| 10   | Report filed in this case?  |
| 11   | A. Yes, I am.   |
| 12   | Q. What is the purpose of your True-up direct testimony?                                  |
| 13   | A. The purpose of my True-up direct testimony is to provide the variable fuel and         |
| 14   | purchased power expense incorporating all known and measurable changes as of May 31,      |
| 15   | 2015, as well as to discuss the in-service of the La Cygne Environmental Retrofit Project |
| 16   | ("LERP").   |
| 17   | At the time direct testimony was filed in this case, the LERP evaluation was not          |
| 18   | complete. Subsequent to the filing of direct testimony, LERP has satisfactorily met the   |
| 19   | established in-service criteria and should be considered "fully operational and used for  |
| 20   | service."   |
| 21   | VARIABLE FUEL EXPENSE   |
| . 22 | Q. How have you revised your production model for true-up?                                |
|      |   |
|      |   |

| 1 🛛  | A. I have updated the time periods reflected in certain model assumptions to   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2  | change the ending period from the update cut off to the true-up cut off. I have also made  |  |  |  |
| 3  | certain modifications to the modeling associated with the La Cygne generating unit to account  |  |  |  |
| 4  | for the presence of the air quality control system ("AQCS") equipment.   |  |  |  |
| 5  | Q. What is the value of the variable fuel and purchased power expense?   |  |  |  |
| 6  | A. The Staff estimates the variable fuel and purchased power expense for Kansas  |  |  |  |
| 7  | City Power & Light ("KCPL") for known and measureable changes through May 31, 2015, to   |  |  |  |
| 8  | be \$197,859,946 total Company basis.  |  |  |  |
| 9  | Q. What is your recommendation?  |  |  |  |
| 10   | A. I recommend that the Commission adopt the updated variable fuel and   |  |  |  |
| 11   | purchased power expense that Staff modeled.  |  |  |  |
| 12   | LA CYGNE IN-SERVICE  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 13   | Project Description  |  |  |  |
| 13<br>14                                     | Project DescriptionQ.Please describe the project designated as the LERP.   |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 14   | Q. Please describe the project designated as the LERP.   |  |  |  |
| 14<br>15                                     | <ul><li>Q. Please describe the project designated as the LERP.</li><li>A. Westar and KCPL jointly own the La Cygne site with each company owning a</li></ul>   |  |  |  |
| 14<br>15<br>16                               | <ul> <li>Q. Please describe the project designated as the LERP.</li> <li>A. Westar and KCPL jointly own the La Cygne site with each company owning a 50% ownership share. The La Cygne site consists of two units. La Cygne Unit 1 is rated at</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |
| 14<br>15<br>16<br>17                         | <ul> <li>Q. Please describe the project designated as the LERP.</li> <li>A. Westar and KCPL jointly own the La Cygne site with each company owning a 50% ownership share. The La Cygne site consists of two units. La Cygne Unit 1 is rated at 840 MW and utilizes a supercritical cyclone boiler. A Selective Catalytic Reduction ("SCR")</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |
| 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                   | <ul> <li>Q. Please describe the project designated as the LERP.</li> <li>A. Westar and KCPL jointly own the La Cygne site with each company owning a 50% ownership share. The La Cygne site consists of two units. La Cygne Unit 1 is rated at 840 MW and utilizes a supercritical cyclone boiler. A Selective Catalytic Reduction ("SCR") system was installed on La Cygne Unit 1 to reduce NOx emissions in 2007 and was included</li> </ul>   |  |  |  |
| 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19             | <ul> <li>Q. Please describe the project designated as the LERP.</li> <li>A. Westar and KCPL jointly own the La Cygne site with each company owning a 50% ownership share. The La Cygne site consists of two units. La Cygne Unit 1 is rated at 840 MW and utilizes a supercritical cyclone boiler. A Selective Catalytic Reduction ("SCR") system was installed on La Cygne Unit 1 to reduce NOx emissions in 2007 and was included in rate base in Case No. ER-2007-0291. La Cygne Unit 2 is rated at 710 MW and utilizes</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |
| 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20       | <ul> <li>Q. Please describe the project designated as the LERP.</li> <li>A. Westar and KCPL jointly own the La Cygne site with each company owning a 50% ownership share. The La Cygne site consists of two units. La Cygne Unit 1 is rated at 840 MW and utilizes a supercritical cyclone boiler. A Selective Catalytic Reduction ("SCR") system was installed on La Cygne Unit 1 to reduce NOx emissions in 2007 and was included in rate base in Case No. ER-2007-0291. La Cygne Unit 2 is rated at 710 MW and utilizes radiant opposed-fired pulverized coal boiler.</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |
| 14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21 | <ul> <li>Q. Please describe the project designated as the LERP.</li> <li>A. Westar and KCPL jointly own the La Cygne site with each company owning a 50% ownership share. The La Cygne site consists of two units. La Cygne Unit 1 is rated at 840 MW and utilizes a supercritical cyclone boiler. A Selective Catalytic Reduction ("SCR") system was installed on La Cygne Unit 1 to reduce NOx emissions in 2007 and was included in rate base in Case No. ER-2007-0291. La Cygne Unit 2 is rated at 710 MW and utilizes radiant opposed-fired pulverized coal boiler.</li> <li>The LERP includes AQCS equipment installed on both La Cygne Unit 1 and La</li> </ul> |  |  |  |

2

. ..

,

| 1      | • Wet Flue Gas Desulfurization system ("FGD" or "Scrubber")                               |  |  |
|--------|---|--|--|
| 2      | <ul> <li>Induced Draft Fans ("ID fans")</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| 3      | The LERP for La Cygne Unit 2 includes the following equipment:                            |  |  |
| 4      | • Over Fire Air ("OFA")   |  |  |
| 5      | • Low NOx Burners   |  |  |
| 6      | • SCR   |  |  |
| 7      | • PAC   |  |  |
| 8<br>9 | <ul><li>Baghouse</li><li>Wet Scrubber</li></ul>   |  |  |
| 10     | <ul> <li>ID fans</li> </ul>   |  |  |
| 11     | Also included in the project are common facilities for both units. The common             |  |  |
| 12     | facilities include, but may not be limited to the following equipment:                    |  |  |
| 13     | • Water treatment building and equipment  |  |  |
| 14     | • Warehouse(s)  |  |  |
| 15     | • Dual-flue chimney   |  |  |
| 16     | • Reagent preparation building and equipment  |  |  |
| 17     | Dewatering building and equipment   |  |  |
| 18     | • Electrical buildings  |  |  |
| 19     | <ul> <li>Limestone storage pile and handling equipment</li> </ul>                         |  |  |
| 20     | Gypsum storage pile and handling equipment  |  |  |
| 21     | • Air quality control system maintenance building   |  |  |
| 22     | Q. Have you personally visited the facility being considered in this testimony?           |  |  |
| 23     | A. Yes. I visited the site on April 24, 2013, September 26, 2013, February 23,            |  |  |
| 24     | 2015, and May 18, 2015. During the visits, walk-through tours were conducted, equipment   |  |  |
| 25     | inspections performed, and operating equipment observations were accomplished. During the |  |  |
| 26     | May 18, 2015, site visit, both generating units and AQCS equipment were observed during   |  |  |
| 27     | normal operation.   |  |  |
| -      |   |  |  |

,

| 1                                      | IN-SERVIC                    | E CRITERIA   |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| 2                                      | Q                            | What are in-service criteria?  |
| 3                                      | A. I                         | n-service criteria are a set of operational tests or operational requirements  |
| 4                                      | developed by t               | he Staff to determine whether a new unit is "fully operational and used for  |
| 5                                      | service."                    |  |
| 6                                      | Q. 1                         | Where does the phrase "fully operational and used for service" come from?  |
| 7                                      | A. 7                         | The phrase comes from Section 393.135, RSMo. 2000, a statute that was  |
| 8                                      | adopted by Init              | tiative, Proposition No. 1, on November 2, 1976. Section 393.135, RSMo.  |
| 9                                      | 2000, provides               | as follows:  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16 | c<br>i<br>c<br>r<br><u>u</u> | Any charge made or demanded by an electrical corporation for service,<br>or in connection therewith, which is based on the costs of construction<br>n progress upon any existing or new facility of the electrical<br>corporation, or any other cost associated with owning, operating,<br>naintaining, or financing any property before it is <u>fully operational and<br/>used for service</u> , is unjust and unreasonable, and is prohibited.<br>Emphasis added) |
| 17                                     | Q. V                         | Were in-service criteria developed for LERP?   |
| 18                                     | A. Y                         | Yes. Staff and KCP&L agreed to in-service criteria for LERP.   |
| 19                                     | Q. H                         | Has the Staff evaluated LERP utilizing the established in-service criteria?  |
| 20                                     | A. Y                         | res.   |
| 21                                     | Q N                          | What were the results of those evaluations?  |
| 22                                     | A. 7                         | The results are consistent with the established in-service criteria. The results   |
| 23                                     | of the evaluation            | ns are summarized in Schedule SEL-1.   |
| 24                                     | Q. V                         | What is your conclusion regarding in-service criteria for LERP?  |
| 25                                     | A. E                         | Based on my review and analysis of the data and inspection of the facilities,  |
| 26                                     | LERP has met                 | all of the required in-service criteria effective April 30, 2015, for La Cygne   |

1 unit 1 and effective March 24, 2015, for La Cygne Unit 2 and common. Therefore, I

2 recommend that LERP be considered fully operational and used for service.

- Q. Does this conclude your True-up direct testimony?
- 4 A. Yes, it does.

# Schedule SEL-1 Is Deemed Highly Confidential In Its Entirety