

**BEFORE THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF KANSAS**

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT

OF

LARRY WILKUS

WESTAR ENERGY

DOCKET NO. 18-WCNE-107-GIE

I. INTRODUCTION

1

2 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME.**

3 A. Lawrence ("Larry") M. Wilkus.

4 **Q. ARE YOU THE SAME LARRY WILKUS WHO FILED REBUTTAL**
5 **TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET?**

6 A. Yes.

7 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS**
8 **PROCEEDING?**

9 A. I am providing testimony on behalf of Kansas Gas and Electric
10 Company d/b/a Westar (Westar), Kansas City Power & Light
11 Company (KCP&L), Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.
12 (KEPCo) (together as the "Wolf Creek Owners") and Wolf Creek
13 Nuclear Operating Corporation (WCNOC) in support of the
14 Settlement Agreement between the Wolf Creek Owners, WCNOC,

1 and the Staff of the Kansas Corporation Commission (Staff), which
2 was submitted for Commission approval on June 22, 2018. The
3 Settlement Agreement recommends that the Commission adopt a
4 specified estimate of Wolf Creek decommissioning costs to be used
5 to determine annual contribution amounts and accrual levels for the
6 respective owner utilities' decommissioning trust accounts and a
7 recommended escalation factor (inflation rate).

8 I will provide some background information regarding the
9 Settlement Agreement, summarize the terms of the Agreement, and
10 address the Commission's standards for review of settlements with
11 respect to the Settlement Agreement in this case.

12 II. BACKGROUND

13 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE HISTORY OF THIS DOCKET AND THE 14 SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

15 A. On September 1, 2017, WCNOC filed its 2017 decommissioning
16 financing plan for the Wolf Creek Generating Station, in accordance
17 with the Commission's December 9, 1992 Order in Docket No.
18 163,561-U and the Commission's June 13, 2013 Order in Docket No.
19 13-WCNE- 204-GIE. The December 9, 1992 Order directed the filing
20 of a decommissioning cost study every three years after September
21 1, 1993. The June 13, 2013 Order directed WCNOC and the owning
22 utilities to update the estimates of the total capital costs of the

1 Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (“ISFSI”) project at Wolf
2 Creek as part of the triennial decommissioning cost study filings.

3 The decommissioning financing plan filed with the Application
4 in this docket included a decommissioning cost study prepared by
5 TLG Services, Inc. that provided cost estimates for decommissioning
6 Wolf Creek. That cost study included estimates for three different
7 decommissioning methods – the DECON method, the DECON
8 Alternative with Long-Term Spent Fuel Management (DECON-
9 LTSFM) method and the SAFSTOR method. Based on the cost
10 study, the estimated costs to decommission Wolf Creek under the
11 DECON method total \$813.7 million in 2017 dollars. The estimated
12 costs under the DECON-LTSFM and the SAFSTOR methodologies
13 total \$1.088 billion and \$1.093 billion in 2017 dollars, respectively.

14 In previous triennial dockets, Staff has recommended and the
15 Commission has accepted the DECON method as the appropriate
16 methodology when determining a cost estimate for decommissioning
17 Wolf Creek. However, in this docket Staff determined that it is more
18 reasonable to use the cost estimate for the DECON-LTSFM method
19 because the DECON method does not include any costs associated
20 with long-term storage for spent fuel. Staff believes that because the
21 federal government is not currently making any progress on meeting
22 its obligation to deal with spent fuel, it is appropriate to include the

1 costs of long-term storage in the cost estimates and, consequently,
2 in the amounts contributed to the Wolf Creek Owners' trust funds.

3 As part of the initial application in this docket, the Wolf Creek
4 Owners proposed an inflation rate to be used to convert the cost
5 estimates in 2017 dollars into the dollar amount needed for
6 decommissioning when the plant is closed. Staff agreed that the
7 inflation rate recommended by the Wolf Creek Owners was
8 reasonable.

9 **III. TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

10 **Q. CAN YOU DESCRIBE THE TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT**
11 **AGREEMENT?**

12 A. Yes. The parties to the Settlement Agreement agree that (1) the cost
13 for decommissioning is \$1.088 billion in 2017 dollars based on the
14 cost estimate for the DECON-LTSFM method provided in TLG's cost
15 study and that this number will be used by the Wolf Creek Owners in
16 separate dockets to set a funding level for each company's
17 decommissioning trust fund; and (2) the escalation rate of 2.91% per
18 year should be used to escalate the 2017 decommissioning cost
19 estimate of \$1.088 billion from 2017 dollars to the appropriate dollar
20 amount in the year that the costs will be incurred.

21 **Q. IF THE COMMISSION APPROVES THE SETTLEMENT**
22 **AGREEMENT, WHAT WILL THE NEXT STEPS BE TO ADJUST**
23 **RATES?**

1 A. If the Commission approves the cost estimate for decommissioning
2 the plant and an inflation rate in this docket, the next step will be for
3 the individual owners to propose an annual funding amount for their
4 decommissioning trust funds and related rate recovery either through
5 base rates or some other mechanism. For Westar, those issues are
6 being addressed in its general rate case currently pending in Docket
7 No. 18-WSEE-328-RTS. For KCP&L, they are being addressed in
8 its general rate case in Docket No. 18-KCPE-480-RTS.

9 **IV. COMMISSION STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF SETTLEMENT**
10 **AGREEMENTS**

11 **Q. WHAT IS THE STANDARD THE COMMISSION APPLIES TO**
12 **DETERMINE WHETHER TO APPROVE SETTLEMENT**
13 **AGREEMENTS?**

14 A. The Commission determines:

15 1. Whether each party had an opportunity to be heard on its
16 reasons for opposing the Stipulation;
17 2. Whether the Stipulation is supported by substantial competent
18 evidence;
19 3. Whether the Stipulation conforms with applicable law;
20 4. Whether the Stipulation results in just and reasonable rates;
21 and
22 5. Whether the results of the Stipulation are in the public interest.

23 **Q. WHO ARE THE PARTIES TO THIS DOCKET?**
24
25
26
27

1 A. The Parties to the docket are the Wolf Creek Owners, WCNOG,
2 CURB and Staff. All of those parties except for CURB are signatories
3 to the Settlement Agreement.

4 **Q. DID ALL OF THE PARTIES HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO BE**
5 **HEARD WITH RESPECT TO THE TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT**
6 **AGREEMENT?**

7 A. Yes. All of the parties, including CURB, participated in the settlement
8 conference. Additionally, CURB will have the opportunity to file
9 testimony in opposition to the Settlement Agreement and participate
10 at the evidentiary hearing.

11 **Q. IS THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT SUPPORTED BY**
12 **SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD AS A WHOLE?**

13 A. Yes. The cost estimates are supported by the TLG cost study and
14 TLG is an expert in the field. No party in the docket challenged the
15 validity of the cost estimates provided. Staff witness Haynos
16 supports the decision to utilize the DECON-LTSFM method in his
17 direct testimony and no party has challenged the basis for which he
18 provided for that recommendation. Jim Gilligan of KCP&L filed
19 testimony on behalf of the Wolf Creek Owners proposing an inflation
20 rate and Staff witness Gatewood supports the estimate in his direct
21 testimony. As a result, the Settlement Agreement is supported by
22 substantial evidence.

1 **Q. DOES THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT CONFORM TO**
2 **APPLICABLE LAW?**

3 A. The Settlement Agreement addresses the issues required to be
4 decided by the Commission in the triennial dockets required by
5 Commission order and by K.S.A. 66-128m. I also understand that
6 the Commission has previously recognized that settlements are
7 favored by the law.

8 **Q. WOULD THE RATES IMPLEMENTED PURSUANT TO THE**
9 **SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BE JUST AND REASONABLE?**

10 A. Yes. Although rates will not change as a direct result of the
11 Settlement Agreement in this docket, the Agreement ensures that
12 the rates that will be established in the individual owners' specific
13 dockets will be reasonable.

14 The cost estimate adopted by the Commission in the last
15 triennial docket was \$765,060,000, based on the DECON method.
16 For Westar, this was the basis for establishing an annual funding
17 amount of \$5,772,700, which is currently in rates. For KCP&L, an
18 annual funding amount of \$2,036,230 is currently in rates. As
19 indicated above, the cost estimate from TLG's 2017 cost study for
20 the DECON method was \$813.7 million in 2017 dollars. The
21 estimated costs under the DECON-LTSFM are \$1.088 billion in 2017
22 dollars. Westar and KCP&L estimate that the annual funding
23 requirement associated with the updated DECON method estimate

1 would be the same as the amount currently in rates. If the
2 Commission adopts the DECON-LTSFM methodology, Westar
3 expects the annual contribution required will increase by
4 approximately \$2 million. In other words, the impact to Westar's
5 revenue requirement from the change in decommissioning method
6 recommended by Staff and agreed to by the Wolf Creek Owners
7 would be approximately \$2 million, which is about a one-tenth of one
8 percent increase to Westar's revenue requirement to be collected
9 from customers. The impact on KCP&L's rates is expected to be
10 similar.

11 **Q. ARE THE RESULTS OF THE AGREEMENT IN THE PUBLIC**
12 **INTEREST?**

13 A. Yes. The Kansas legislature and this Commission have found that it
14 is in the public interest to ensure adequate funding for the
15 decommissioning of Wolf Creek and that the rate impact of building
16 that fund should be spread across the generations of customers
17 benefitting from the plant. By adopting the DECON-LTSFM method,
18 the Settlement Agreement recognizes the need to address funding
19 for storage for spent fuel now because the federal government is not
20 making progress in meeting its obligations to handle the spent fuel.
21 It recognizes the benefit of beginning to fund that expense now,
22 obtaining the benefit of the trust fund earning interest over time,
23 requiring less overall contribution from customers. The Settlement

1 Agreement also results in spreading the cost associated with storing
2 the spent fuel across more generations of customers that benefit
3 from the plant, rather than waiting until the end to address the issue
4 and placing the burden of funding on the customers at that time.
5 Thus, the Agreement is in the public interest and should be approved
6 by the Commission in its entirety.

7 **Q. THANK YOU.**