

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

In the Matter of the Application of Evergy )  
Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri )  
West for Permission and Approval of ) **File No. EA-2024-0292**  
Certificates of Convenience and Necessity )  
Authorizing It to Construct, Install, Own )  
Operate, Manage, Maintain, and Control )  
Two Solar Generation Facilities )

**RENEW MISSOURI STATEMENT OF POSITIONS**

**COMES NOW**, Renew Missouri Advocates d/b/a Renew Missouri, by and through the undersigned counsel, and for its *Statement of Positions* states as follows:

**A. Does the evidence establish that the 65 megawatt (“MW”) solar generation facility to be constructed in Wilson County, Kansas (“Sunflower Sky”) and the 100 MW solar generation facility to be constructed in Jasper County, Missouri (“Foxtrot”) (collectively, “Projects”) for which Evergy Missouri West is seeking a certificate of convenience and necessity (“CCN”) is necessary or convenient for the public service?**

Response: Yes, the totality of the of evidence provided by Evergy Missouri West, Inc d/b/a Evergy Missouri West (EMW or “the Company”) shows that there is a need for the service, that the Projects are economically feasible, that EMW can finance the Projects and is qualified to construct the Projects. The meeting of these four *Tartan Factors*, as well as the numerous benefits of renewable generation, satisfy the public interest factor.

**1. Should the Commission find that the Projects satisfy the first *Tartan* Factor of need?**

Response: Yes. Renewable generation, such as the Projects, are vitally important to the diversification and sustainability of EMW’s operating fleet.<sup>1</sup> Solar projects are an efficient,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Surrebuttal Testimony of Cody VandeVelde*, p. 3, l. 3-11.

economical, and sustainable way to meet any capacity needs EMW may have in the future.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, development timelines are shorter under renewable generation, which make these Projects an attractive and quick way of meeting planning reserve margins required by the Southwest Power Pool.<sup>3</sup> Finally, there is ample customer demand to support the Projects. EMW's current subscription programs are filled and are not available for large customers.<sup>4</sup> Additionally, current programs may not be suited for commercial and industrial (C&I) customers' needs.<sup>5</sup> Allowing the Projects to go forward to meet some portion of C&I's need for renewable generation and renewable energy credits (RECs) fulfills clearly stated customer desire, and as discussed later, also benefits all ratepayers by providing no fuel cost energy to all while offsetting a portion of costs by those interested in joining the Green Solutions Program (GSP).<sup>6</sup>

**2. Should the Commission find that the Projects satisfy the second *Tartan* Factor of economic feasibility?**

Response: Yes. Project modeling shows that the Projects will result in a lower net present value of revenue requirement (NPVRR).<sup>7</sup> The Projects, unlike other potential assets, remain comparable to the cost estimates utilized in not only the initial *Application*, but EMW's 2024 and 2025 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) results.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the potential for the GSP and REC sales to offset the cost of the Projects provide a significant financial benefit to all ratepayers.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, the Projects should qualify for tax credits,

---

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at p. 3, l. 20- p. 4, l. 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Direct Testimony of Jason Humphrey*, p. 16, l. 21-p. 17, l. 4.

<sup>4</sup> *Rebuttal Testimony of James Owen*, p. 4, lines 13-20.

<sup>5</sup> *Direct Testimony of Kimberly H. Winslow*, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> *Rebuttal Testimony of James Owen*, p. 5, l. 18- p. 6, l. 5.

<sup>7</sup> *Direct Testimony of Cody VandeVelde*, p. 6.

<sup>8</sup> *Surrebuttal Testimony of John Carlson*, p. 6-7, *Surrebuttal Testimony of Cody VandeVelde*, p. 8-9.

<sup>9</sup> *Rebuttal Testimony of James Owen*, p. 11, l. 21- p. 12, l. 2.

enhancing the economic feasibility of the Projects.<sup>10</sup> Finally, solar as a zero fuel cost resource, and a resource that would not require control technology for emission compliance in the future, the Projects are an economically feasible investment into the future as well.<sup>11</sup>

**3. Should the Commission find that the Projects satisfy the third *Tartan* Factor of ability to finance?**

Response: Yes. No party raised an issue as to the ability of EMW to finance the Projects.

**4. Should the Commission find that the Projects satisfy the fourth *Tartan* Factor of qualified to construct?**

Response: Yes. No party raised an issue as the ability of EMW to construct the Projects.

**5. Should the Commission find that the Projects are in the public interest and satisfies the fifth *Tartan* Factor?**

Response: Yes. The evidence in this case shows that all the previous four conditions are met, which leads to a showing that the public interest prong has been met.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, the public has an interest in a low emission, sustainable future.<sup>13</sup> Additionally, the stated desire of C&I customers in the availability of such offerings as the GSP and the Projects encouraged economic development in the state, which benefits the public interest of all Missourians.<sup>14</sup>

**B. If the Commission grants the CCN for the Projects, what conditions, if any, should the Commission impose on the CCN?**

---

<sup>10</sup> *Surrebuttal Testimony of Jason Humphrey*, p. 6.

<sup>11</sup> *Surrebuttal Testimony of Cody VandeVelde*, p.5, l. 22 – p. 6, l. 4.

<sup>12</sup> “Generally speaking, positive findings with respect to the other four standards will in most instances support a finding that an application for a certificate of convenience and necessity will promote the public interest.” *In re Tartan Energy Co.*, 1994 WL 762882 (1994).

<sup>13</sup> *Rebuttal Testimony of James Owen*, p. 7, l. 14-21.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at p. 9, l. 7-14.

Response: Renew Missouri does not take a position at this time at on all conditions that could be imposed upon the Projects. However, EMW in its surrebuttal testimony appears to accept some of the conditions recommended by the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Staff”) and the Office of Public Counsel (OPC).<sup>15</sup> Renew Missouri would find the resolutions agreed to by those parties on those particular conditions to be an appropriate imposition on the Company.

**C. Is this an appropriate proceeding for the Commission to review Evergy Missouri West’s Green Solution Connections Program?**

Response: Yes. The Commission has in the past found it appropriate to review and establish new rate offerings outside of rate cases in the past. For example, Union Electric Company d/b/a as Ameren Missouri (“Ameren Missouri”) has had renewable subscription programs established outside of rate cases. Most recently, this occurred when Ameren Missouri established the similar Renewable Solutions Program.<sup>16</sup> The Commission found:

Under Subsection 393.140(11), RSMo., the Commission has general authority to review any new tariffed programs and associated charges, such as the Renewable Solutions Program and its associated pricing. OPC suggests that this is not an appropriate proceeding for the Commission to review the RSP. OPC does not cite to any authority that requires a separate proceeding, but rather, OPC witness Dr. Marke suggests that the Company's pending electric rate case, File No. ER-2022-0337, is a "better venue" for review of the RSP because the cost of service data used to establish the Renewable Benefits Credit is expected to be updated in the pending case. Because the RSP is interrelated with the CCN and Ameren Missouri’s electric rate case is operating on a separate and distinct procedural schedule, the Commission finds the most efficient and effective review of the RSP is during the course of this case.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See generally, *Surrebuttal Testimony of John Carlson*.

<sup>16</sup> In the Matter of the Application of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for a Solar Facility, Approval of a Subscription-Based Renewable Energy Program, and Authorization to Establish Tracking Mechanism, File No.EA-2022-0245.

<sup>17</sup> *Id. Report and Order*, p. 32.

**1. If so, should the Commission find that the Green Solution Connections Program proposed by Evergy Missouri West is just, reasonable, and not unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential, and otherwise is lawful?**

Response: Yes. The Commission has approved similar programs designed at allowing certain classes of customers to participate in subscription programs, from C&I customers in Ameren Missouri's RSP, to the residential and smaller classes in EMW's current solar subscription program. Furthermore, all customers will benefit from the GSP, including a near \$50 million dollars during the initial phases.<sup>18</sup>

**D. If the Commission approves the Green Solution Connections Program proposed by Evergy Missouri West what, if any, conditions should the Commission impose on such approval?**

Response: Renew Missouri does not take a position on this issue at this time.

**E. Is this CCN docket the appropriate case to determine whether Evergy Missouri West's decision to acquire, construct, own and operate the Projects is prudent under Section 2(C) of Commission Rule 20 CSR 4240-20.045?**

Response: Renew Missouri does not take a position on this issue at this time.

**1. If this is the appropriate docket, should the Commission grant Evergy Missouri West's request that its decision to acquire, construct, own and operate the Projects is prudent under Section 2(C) of Commission Rule 20 CSR 4240-20.045?**

Response: Renew Missouri does not take a position on this issue at this time.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Direct Testimony of Kimberly Winslow*, p. 31-32.

**F. Should the Commission grant Evergy Missouri West's requested variances from Commission Rules 20 CSR 4240-20.045(3)(C), 6(I), and 6(J) so that Evergy Missouri West's plans for restoration of safe and adequate service, as well as as-built drawing, can be provided closer to the time when the Projects will commence commercial operations?**

Response: Yes. No party has opposed this request.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Nicole Mers

Nicole Mers, Bar No. 66766  
501 Fay Street, Suite 206  
Columbia, MO 65201  
T:314-308-2729  
[nicole@renewmo.org](mailto:nicole@renewmo.org)

GENERAL COUNSEL FOR RENEW  
MISSOURI ADVOCATES

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been emailed to all counsel of record this  
21st day of May 2025.

/s/ Nicole Mers