Exhibit No.:

Issue: Fuel Model Witness: Charles T. Poston

Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: True-Up Direct Testimony

Case No.: ER-2016-0285

Date Testimony Prepared: March 1, 2017

# MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION COMMISSION STAFF DIVISION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS UNIT

## TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY OF CHARLES T. POSTON

KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

CASE NO. ER-2016-0285

Jefferson City, Missouri March 2016

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS OF			
2	TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY			
3	OF			
4	CHARLES T. POSTON			
5	KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY			
6	CASE NO. ER-2016-0285			
7	Changes to Staff's Production Cost Model for True-Up			
8	Impact of Changes to Hourly Load Shape			

1		TRUE-UP DIRECT TESTIMONY		
2		$\mathbf{OF}$		
3		CHARLES T. POSTON		
4		KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY		
5		CASE NO. ER-2016-0285		
6	Q.	Please state your name and business address.		
7	A.	My name is Charles T. Poston and my business address is Missouri Public		
8	Service Com	nmission, 200 Madison Street P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, MO 65102		
9	Q.	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?		
10	A.	I am employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission as a Utility		
11	Regulatory Engineer I.			
12	Q.	Are you the same Charles T. Poston who, on November 30, 2016, filed direct		
13	testimony as a part of Staff's Revenue Requirement Cost of Service Report?			
14	A.	Yes, I am.		
15	Q.	What is the purpose of your true-up testimony?		
16	A.	The purpose of my true-up testimony is to provide the fuel and purchased		
17	power exper	nse from Staff's production cost model, as well as to discuss how changes to		
18	hourly load	shape could impact model results.		
19	Changes to Staff's Production Cost Model for True-Up			
20	Q.	Has Staff's production cost model been revised for true-up?		
21	A.	Yes. The time period considered for certain model assumptions was changed		
22	to reflect the	true-up date of December 31, 2016. Additionally, energy purchased from the		
23	Osborn wind	I farm was accounted for in the updated model.		

1	Q.	What is the value of Staff's fuel and purchased power expense?
2	A.	For known and measurable changes through December 31, 2016, Staff
3	estimates the	fuel and purchased power expense for Kansas City Power and Light Company
4	("KCPL") to	be \$222,724,170.
5	Impact of Ch	nanges to Hourly Load Shape
6	Q.	What do you mean when you refer to "changes to hourly load shape" for true-
7	up?	
8	A.	In this testimony, the term "changes to hourly load shape" refers to the changes
9	in shapes of h	ourly energy demand that are associated with MEEIA Cycle 2 energy efficiency
10	programs.	
11	Q.	Has the hourly load shape used in Staff's production cost model changed due
12	to energy effic	ciency programs?
13	A.	No. KCPL does not have hourly load shapes for MEEIA Cycle 2 programs.
14	Q.	Does the hourly energy demand from the net system input analysis used in
15	Staff's produc	etion cost model include any savings from energy efficiency programs?
16	A.	Yes. The total kWh values used by Staff witness Michael Stahlman were
17	adjusted for the	he energy savings from MEEIA Cycle 2. Staff witness Seoung Joun Won used
18	Mr. Stahlman	's results for the net system input analysis that was one of the inputs to the total
19	hourly energy	demand used in Staff's production cost model.
20	Q.	Will a change to hourly load shape impact the costs of coal, natural gas, oil, or
21	nuclear fuel th	nat are calculated by Staff's production cost model?
22	A.	No. Power plant fuel costs are calculated based upon the amount of energy
23	generated at e	ach power plant and each power plant's efficiency. Power plants are dispatched

- against the price of energy within the integrated marketplace and not against hourly energy demand. A change to the hourly load shape would not result in a change in how the power plants were dispatched into the market or to the resulting fuel costs.
  - Q. Will a change to hourly load shape impact the cost of energy purchased through renewable energy contracts?
  - A. No. The total amount of generation and the energy generation shape calculated for renewable energy facilities is based upon historical data. That generation is included as an input file to Staff's production cost model and is treated as a "must take" energy resource. A change to the hourly load shape will not change the contents of the input files that define the hourly generation at renewable energy facilities. The costs of renewable energy are governed by the price that was agreed to within each contract and will not be impacted by a change to hourly load shape.
  - Q. Will a change to hourly load shape impact the revenues or expenses related to energy sales and purchases within the integrated marketplace?
  - A. Yes. In each hour that is simulated in Staff's production cost model the sum total of all energy sources is compared against the energy demand. If the sum of available energy from conventional power plants and renewable energy facilities is greater than the energy demand in that hour, the excess energy is treated as a sale into the integrated marketplace. If the sum of available energy is less than the energy demand, energy is purchased from the integrated marketplace to ensure that demand is met. A change in hourly load shape would change the amount of energy being used at specific times of the day. The timing of any such changes would determine if total energy sales or purchases were increased or decreased.

- Q. How would changing hourly load shape impact the results of Staff's production cost model?
- A. Without specific information about how the hourly load shape would be changed during every hour being modeled, it is not possible for Staff to accurately determine if any such changes would result in an increase or decrease in the costs necessary to meet load or to determine the magnitude of any changes in total costs. Since market prices vary on an hourly basis, the additional revenue or costs from changes in hourly energy demand due to energy efficiency programs would likewise vary on an hourly basis. The value of a megawatt-hour during an afternoon in July is much different than the value of a megawatt-hour during the early hours of the morning in March.
- Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 12 A. Yes.

## <u>DEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION</u> <u>OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI</u>

In the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light	t )
Company's Request for Authority to	Case No. ER-2016-0285
Implement A General Rate Increase for	r )
Electric Service	)

## AFFIDAVIT OF CHARLES T. POSTON, P.E.

STATE OF MISSOURI	)	
	)	SS
COUNTY OF COLE	)	

**COMES NOW** Charles T. Poston and on his oath declares that he is of sound mind and lawful age; that he contributed to the foregoing True-Up Direct Testimony; and that the same is true and correct according to his best knowledge and belief.

Further the Affiant sayeth not.

Charles T. Poston, P.E.

### **JURAT**

Subscribed and sworn before me, a duly constituted and authorized Notary Public, in and for the County of Cole, State of Missouri, at my office in Jefferson City, on this 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2017.

JESSICA LUEBBERT Notary Public - Notary Seal State of Missouri Commissioned for Cole County My Commission Expires: February 19, 2019 Commission Number: 15633434

Notary Public