Exhibit No.:Issue:Crossroads and Fuel and Purchased PowerWitness:Wm. Edward BlunkType of Exhibit:Surrebuttal TestimonySponsoring Party:KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations CompanyCase No.:ER-2012-0175Date Testimony Prepared:October 10, 2012

Filed November 30, 2012 Data Center Missouri Public Service Commission

#### MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

#### CASE NO.: ER-2012-0175

#### SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

#### WM. EDWARD BLUNK

#### **ON BEHALF OF**

#### KCP&L GREATER MISSOURI OPERATIONS COMPANY

Kansas City, Missouri October 2012

\*\*\* Designates "Highly Confidential" Information Has Been Removed.
Certain Schedules Attached To This Testimony Designated "Highly Confidential" Have Been Removed
Pursuant To 4 CSR 240-2.135.

Gno Exhibit No 104 Datelo-3 2 Reporter 25

# SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

# OF

# WM. EDWARD BLUNK

# Case No. ER-2012-0175

1	Q:	Please state your name and business address.
2	A:	My name is Wm. Edward Blunk. My business address is 1200 Main Street, Kansas City,
3		Missouri 64105.
4	Q:	Are you the same Wm. Edward Blunk who pre-filed Direct and Rebuttal Testimony
5		in this matter?
6	A:	Yes, I am.
7	Q:	On whose behalf are you testifying?
8	A:	I am testifying on behalf of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company ("GMO" or
9		the "Company") for St. Joseph Light & Power ("L&P") and Missouri Public Service
10		("MPS") territories.
11	Q:	What is the purpose of your Surrebuttal Testimony?
12	A:	I will refute certain parts of Missouri Public Service Commission Staff ("Staff") witness
13		Cary G. Featherstone's Rebuttal Testimony regarding Crossroads Energy Center natural
14		gas transportation costs. I will also show that when taken in context, a single question
15		and answer taken from my testimony in another case has a very different meaning than
16		that suggested in the Rebuttal Testimony of Staff Witness V. William Harris. Finally, I
17		will explain why sales between Kansas City Power & Light Company ("KCP&L") and
18		GMO have increased significantly since Great Plains Energy Incorporated ("GPE")
19		acquired Aquila in 2008 and how that has benefited GMO.

1		I. Crossroads Energy Center Natural Gas Transportation Costs
2	Q:	Why does GMO have firm natural gas transportation for its various natural gas-
3		fired facilities?
4	A:	Southwest Power Pool's CRITERIA Section 2.4.2 Fuel Supply says:
5 6 7 9 10 11		Assurance of having desired generating capacity depends, in part, on the availability of an adequate and reliable fuel supply. Where contractual or physical arrangements permit curtailment or interruption of the normal fuel supply, sufficient quantities of standby fuel shall be provided. Due to the dependence of hydroelectric plants on seasonal water flows, this factor shall be taken into consideration when calculating capacity for capacity margin requirements. <sup>1</sup>
12	Q:	At page 43 of Mr. Featherstone's Rebuttal Testimony, he said that several of
13		GMO's natural gas-fired units do not have firm transportation. Why don't those
14		units have firm natural gas transportation?
15	A:	Greenwood and Lake Road do not need firm natural gas transportation because they have
16		oil back-up. At 71 MWs Ralph Green is the smallest of GMO's natural gas-fired
17		facilities. Ralph Green is small enough we have been able to get released capacity to
18		provide firm transportation to it.
19	Q:	Do Goose Creek and Raccoon Creek have oil back-up?
20	A:	No. Like the 317 MW South Harper facility, the 684 MW Goose Creek Energy Center
21		and the 456 MW Raccoon Creek Energy Center <sup>2</sup> do not have oil back-up.
22	Q:	Would the lack of oil storage and dual fuel capability at Goose Creek and Raccoon
23		Creek affect the value of those plants?
24	A:	Yes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Southwest Power Pool, *CRITERIA*, pp. 2-5, http://www.spp.org/publications/SPP%20Criteria%20and%20Appendices%20Jan.%202012.pdf <sup>2</sup> VENTYX, Velocity Suite, Power Plant Report Analyst, Goose Creek Energy Center and Raccoon Creek Energy Center nameplate capacity.

2

# Q: How would you expect the lack oil storage and dual fuel capability at Goose Creek and Raccoon Creek to affect the value of those plants?

- 3 A: If Goose Creek and Raccoon Creek had oil storage and duel fuel capability they would 4 not need firm natural gas transportation. As I discussed in my Rebuttal Testimony at 5 pages 2 and 3, pipeline reservation charges to support a 300 MW natural gas-fired facility 6 like Crossroads at the Goose Creek site would be \$9.1 million per year and \$8.8 million 7 per year for the Raccoon Creek site. Those costs would affect the total value of the plants 8 because they represent an annual cost difference of about \*\* \*\* between 9 Crossroads and either Goose Creek or Raccoon Creek.
- 10Q:At pages 43-44 of Mr. Featherstone's Rebuttal Testimony it appears that he is11claiming that the construction date of a power plant may affect the cost of natural12gas transportation service to that plant. Do either Southern Star Central Gas13Pipeline ("SSCGP") or Panhandle Eastern Pipeline ("PEPL") have adjustments in14their tariffs for natural gas transportation service based on the construction date of15a plant?
- 16 A: No. The construction date of a power plant does not affect either SSCGP or PEPL's
  17 tariff rates for natural gas transportation service.

1	Q:	Also at pages 43-44 Mr. Featherstone suggests that cost of supplying natural gas to
2		Sedalia may be substantially less than the costs you reported for expanding South
3		Harper. What would you expect natural gas transportation costs to be if
4		Crossroads either had been or could be relocated to Sedalia like Mr. Featherstone
5		suggests?
6	A:	The annual reservation charges for a 300 MW natural gas-fired facility at Sedalia would
7		be at least as much as the <b>**</b>
8	Q:	Why would the annual reservation charges to Sedalia be at least as much as the
9		** set the source of the south Harper site?
10	A:	Attached as Schedule WEB-3 is a letter from SSCGP which shows SSCGP's estimated
11		cost to provide incremental firm transportation service to power plant facilities in Sedalia,
12		MO. The <b>**</b> cost estimate for adding the necessary capacity to SSCGP's
13		system is <b>*************************</b> ***********
14		used when estimating the costs for the South Harper site.
15	Q:	What would be the annual pipeline capacity charges for locating 300 MW of natural
16		gas-fired units like Crossroads in Sedalia, MO?
17	A:	Using the rate estimate from SSCGP shown in Schedule WEB-3, the annual pipeline
18		capacity charge for locating natural gas-fired capacity like Crossroads in Sedalia, MO
19		would be **
20	Q:	Is that another example of the "location, location, location" aphorism you
21		referenced in your Rebuttal Testimony?
22	A:	Yes. Location is a major factor in fuel transportation costs and as I discussed in my
23		Rebuttal Testimony that must be considered with the value of a power plant.

2

Specifically, a power plant with lower cost fuel transportation options is worth more than a plant with higher fuel transportation costs.

3 Q: At page 44 Mr. Featherstone said that it is not certain whether an expansion at
4 South Harper would require year-round firm transportation for natural gas. How
5 likely is it that year-round firm transportation would be required?

A: The requirement for year-round service is not merely a function of GMO's needs.
SSCGP does not offer seasonal firm transportation. PEPL does offer seasonal service
assuming there is capacity available, but as I discussed at page 26 of my Direct
Testimony neither SSCGP nor PEPL have the forward haul capacity necessary to serve
any additional units at South Harper.

# 11 Q: At page 44 Mr. Featherstone argues that the cost estimates in your Direct Testimony 12 are speculative. Are the pipeline capacity costs you have testified to reasonable?

A: I have testified to many different pipeline capacity costs in this case. The \$9.1 million
and \$8.8 million annual pipeline reservation charges for Goose Creek and Raccoon Creek
respectively were calculated using the published tariff rates for Trunkline Gas Co.
("Trunkline") and Natural Gas Pipeline Company ("NGPL"). The Trunkline and NGPL
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") approved published tariffs are not
speculative.

19 The **\*\*** annual cost estimate for service to the South Harper site 20 via SSCGP is very close to SSCGP's current tariff rate for firm service from the 21 production area to the plant. Using those FERC approved published tariff rates the 22 annual capacity charge would be \$10.3 million. SSCGP's FERC approved published 23 tariff rates are not speculative. 1Q:At page 45 Mr. Featherstone says "it is likely that other customers on the pipeline2would benefit from such upgrades" and the pipelines "may make allowances to3what costs GMO would actually have to pay for the upgrades." Would the pipelines4make allowances to the costs GMO would have to pay for any upgrades that5benefited other customers?

A: We would expect that the pipelines would offer to include any customer that was willing
to pay for their share of an expansion in the expansion project. Assuming there are
economies of scale that would benefit all of the parties that committed to pay for the
upgrade. Since those other customers can at any time pursue an upgrade independent of
GMO, it is speculative to think their need would coincide with GMO's. I doubt there are
any customers just waiting and hoping they would be able to share in the economies of
scale from joining in a larger expansion project.


Q: At page 45 Mr. Featherstone says the point of your testimony on the pipeline costs is
"to show what a bargain Crossroads is." He goes on to say "the Commission should
be leery of such presentation when it considers the Crossroads valuation and related

16 costs." Do you think the Commission should be "leery"?


17 A: No, as shown above, the arguments in my testimony are fully supported by tariffs or cost
18 estimates provided by a pipeline.


1		II. GMO Off-System Sales ("OSS")
2	Q:	At pages 6-7 of Mr. Harris' Rebuttal Testimony, he attempts to use your testimony
3		from Case No. EO-2011-0390 as evidence that GMO lacks incentive to make OSS
4		margin. Did Mr. Harris take your testimony out of context?
5	A:	Yes. The single question and answer quoted by Mr. Harris were taken out of context.
6		When taken in context they have a very different meaning.
7	Q:	Given that the issue in Case No. EO-2011-0390 was hedging and not fuel or power
8		purchases, how would you characterize that part of your testimony which Mr.
9		Harris quoted in light of his allegation at page 6 that it demonstrates a lack of
10		incentive for GMO to make OSS margin?
11	A:	Mr. Harris quoted the following dialogue from my testimony:
12 13		Q. From the shareholder perspective, assuming that you have an FAC in place, do you care if a Katrina hits?
14 15 16		A. As a share – well, from the company's perspective, its risk goes through the fuel clause, so no. As a ratepayer, I'm a GMO ratepayer, I do care. <sup>3</sup>
17		That dialogue was part of a lengthy discussion about GMO's hedging program. These
18		questions in particular dealt with hedging against a natural disaster that induced a spike in
19		the price of natural gas like the one caused by Hurricane Katrina. My answer was
20		explaining how such market price risk is managed for both the Company and ratepayers.
21		I had just reviewed an example of how a hedge acted as insurance against
22		skyrocketing prices. I was explaining how the Company's exposure to market price risk
23		is managed by having a fuel adjustment clause ("FAC") in place, but without a hedge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Tr. Vol. 4, p. 130, ll. 9-16, Case No. EO-2011-0390.



HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL





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

In the Matter of KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company's Request for Authority to Implement General Rate Increase for Electric Service

Case No. ER-2012-0175

#### **AFFIDAVIT OF WILLIAM EDWARD BLUNK**

# STATE OF MISSOURI ) ) ss COUNTY OF JACKSON )

William Edward Blunk, appearing before me, affirms and states:

1. My name is William Edward Blunk. I work in Kansas City, Missouri, and I am employed by Kansas City Power & Light Company as Supply Planning Manager.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of KC&PL Greater Missouri Operations Company consisting of  $\pm e_{n}$ . (<u>10</u>) pages, having been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the above-captioned docket.

3. I have knowledge of the matters set forth therein. I hereby affirm and state that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded, including any attachments thereto, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

William Edward Blunk

Subscribed and affirmed before me this  $10^{+-}$  day of October, 2012.

Micos A. Lee Notary Public

My commission expires: Feb 4 2015

NICOLE A. WEHRY
Matony Cublic - Notary Seal
STATE OF PRESSUUE
Commissioned for Jackson County ly Commission Expires: February 04, 2015 Commission Number: 11391200
Commission Number 11391200
COMMINSAION ISSUEDAL

# SCHEDULE WEB-3 THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC