

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

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

RONALD A KLOTE

**ON BEHALF OF EVERGY METRO, INC., EVERGY KANSAS
CENTRAL, INC. AND EVERGY KANSAS SOUTH, INC.**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF EVERGY KANSAS CENTRAL, INC.,
EVERGY KANSAS SOUTH, INC., AND EVERGY METRO, INC. FOR
DETERMINATION OF THE RATEMAKING PRINCIPLES AND TREATMENT
THAT WILL APPLY TO THE RECOVERY IN RATES OF THE COST TO BE
INCURRED FOR CERTAIN ELECTRIC GENERATION FACILITIES UNDER
K.S.A. 66-117.**

Docket No. 25-EKCE-____-PRE

November 6, 2024

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

RONALD A. KLOTE

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE**

2 **Q: Please state your name and business address.**

3 A: My name is Ronald A. Klotz. My business address is 1200 Main, Kansas City, Missouri
4 64105.

5 **Q: By whom and in what capacity are you employed?**

6 A: I am employed by Evergy Metro, Inc. I serve as Senior Director – Regulatory Affairs for Evergy
7 Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Kansas Metro (“EKM”), Evergy Kansas Central, Inc. and Evergy
8 South, Inc., collectively d/b/a as Evergy Kansas Central (“EKC”), Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a as
9 Evergy Missouri Metro (“EMM”), and Evergy Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West
10 (“EMW”), the operating utilities of Evergy, Inc.

11 **Q: On whose behalf are you testifying?**

12 A: I am testifying on behalf of EKC and EKM (together as “Evergy” or “the Company.”)

13 **Q: What are your responsibilities?**

14 A: My responsibilities include the coordination, preparation and review of financial information
15 and schedules associated with rate case filings, compliance filings and other regulatory filings.

16 **Q: Please describe your education, experience and employment history.**

17 A: In 1992, I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accountancy from the University of
18 Missouri-Columbia. In May 2016, I completed my Master of Business Administration

PUBLIC

1 Degree from the University of Missouri – Kansas City. I am a Certified Public Accountant
2 holding a certificate in the State of Missouri. In 1992, I joined Arthur Andersen, LLP holding
3 various positions of increasing responsibilities in the auditing division. I conducted and led
4 various auditing engagements of company financial statements. In 1995, I joined Water
5 District No. 1 of Johnson County as a Senior Accountant. This position involved operational
6 and financial analysis of water operations. In 1998, I joined Overland Consulting, Inc. as a
7 Senior Consultant. This position involved special accounting and auditing projects in the
8 electric, gas, telecommunications and cable industries. In 2002, I joined Aquila, Inc.
9 (“Aquila”) holding various positions within the Regulatory department until 2004 when I
10 became Director of Regulatory Accounting Services. This position was primarily responsible
11 for the planning and preparation of all accounting adjustments associated with regulatory
12 filings in the electric jurisdictions. As a result of the acquisition of Aquila by Great Plains
13 Energy Incorporated (“GPE”), I began my employment with Kansas City Power & Light
14 Company (“KCP&L”) as Senior Manager, Regulatory Accounting in July 2008. In April
15 2013, I joined the Regulatory Affairs department as a Senior Manager remaining in charge
16 of Regulatory Accounting responsibilities. In December 2015, I became Director, Regulatory
17 Affairs continuing my Regulatory Accounting responsibilities. In addition, I was responsible
18 for the coordination, preparation and filing of rate cases and rider filings in our electric

1 jurisdictions. In October 2021, I became Senior Director of Regulatory Affairs and I
2 continue in that position today with Evergy.

3 **Q: Have you previously testified in any proceedings before the Kansas Corporation**
4 **Commission (“Commission” or “KCC”) or before any other utility regulatory agency?**

5 A: Yes. I have testified before the KCC, the Missouri Public Service Commission (“MPSC”),
6 the California Public Utilities Commission, and the Public Utilities Commission of Colorado.

7 **Q: What is the purpose of your testimony?**

8 A: The purpose of my testimony is: (1) to describe the rate impacts of the new generating facilities
9 addressed in the Company’s Application, (2) to discuss how the costs of construction of those
10 assets will be included in the Company’s rates, and (3) to discuss the accounting process the
11 Company will implement for the jointly owned natural gas facilities in order to ensure costs
12 are appropriately allocated according to each affiliate’s ownership interest.

13 **Q: Briefly summarize the new generating facilities addressed in the Company’s Petition.**

14 A: Yes. The Company is seeking predetermination of ratemaking principles related to three
15 separate generation projects intended to assist in fulfilling the Company’s capacity and
16 energy needs through 2030. First, the Viola Generating Station is a 710 MW combined-
17 cycle combustion turbine that would be located in Viola, Kansas, co-owned with EMW (each
18 with a 50% ownership share) with an anticipated total project cost excluding allowance for
19 funds used during construction (“AFUDC”) of ****[REDACTED]****. Second, the McNew
20 Generation Station is also a 710 MW combined-cycle combustion turbine that would be
21 located in Hutchinson, Kansas, potentially jointly owned with one of EKC’s affiliate utility
22 companies or solely owned by EKC with an anticipated total project cost excluding AFUDC
23 of ****[REDACTED]****. Finally, the Kansas Sky Solar Facility is a 200 MW_{DC} (159 MW_{AC})

1 solar farm located in Douglas County, Kansas with an anticipated total project cost excluding
2 AFUDC of ****[REDACTED]****. Company witnesses, Kyle Olsen and John Carlson, describe
3 these projects in more detail.

4 **II. RATE IMPACT FROM PROPOSED NATURAL GAS FACILITIES**

5 **Q: How will the costs of construction of the proposed natural gas plants impact customer**
6 **rates for EKC?**

7 A: Costs of the proposed natural gas plants will impact customer rates through (1) a Construction
8 Work in Process rider (“CWIP Rider”) and (2) inclusion in the rate base by way of a general
9 rate case. In my testimony, I discuss the estimated rate impacts associated with EKC’s
10 investment in 50% of the Viola plant and 50% of the McNew plant. In the event that the
11 second 50% of the McNew plant remains allocated to EKC after the Company submits its
12 supplemental information in February described in Mr. Ives’ Direct Testimony, I will
13 submit supplemental testimony at that time to update the calculation of the rate impact.

14 **Q: Please describe the CWIP Rider authorized by K.S.A. 66-1239, as amended during**
15 **the 2024 legislative session by Kansas H.B. 2527.**

16 A: The CWIP Rider is a rate mechanism that is now permitted by the recent revisions to K.S.A.
17 66-1239(c)(6)(A). In simple terms, the statute permits EKC to recover the return on 100%

1 of amounts recorded to construction work in progress on EKC's books up to the definitive
2 cost estimate through a CWIP Rider. The statute provides that:

- 3 • The return to be applied is the weighted average cost of capital without offset,
4 adjustment or reduction for any other issue or consideration, except that the return is
5 in lieu of any otherwise applicable allowance for funds used during construction;
- 6 • The rate adjustment mechanism – or CWIP Rider – shall become effective not sooner
7 than 365 days after construction of the generation facility commences and within 60
8 days of the filing for establishment of the mechanism;
- 9 • As the balance of construction work in progress grows, the Rider shall be subject to
10 periodic increases, no more frequently than once every six months;
- 11 • EKC's customers shall be charged pursuant to the Rider until new base rates
12 reflecting EKC's investment in the generation facility take effect; and
- 13 • When base rates reflecting the investment take effect, those base rates shall include
14 a deferral for depreciation expense incurred and carrying costs on any unrecovered
15 portion not included in the Company's CWIP rider of such investment at EKC's
16 weighted average cost of capital that is determined in the proceeding setting such
17 base rates, accumulated between the time the generation facility is placed in-service
18 and rates reflecting the investment become effective.

19 **Q: When does EKC plan to implement a CWIP Rider for its investment in the two**
20 **proposed natural gas facilities?**

21 **A:** We plan to propose the tariff that will establish the CWIP Rider in our next general rate
22 case, expected to be filed at the end of January 2025. In that tariff, we will ask that recovery
23 under the Rider begin 365 days after construction of each of the generating facilities

1 commences and continue until the investments are reflected in base rates, with adjustments
2 to the amounts being recovered in the Rider occurring every six months.

3 **Q: Will there be benefits for customers as a result of EKC's use of the CWIP Rider?**

4 A: Yes. Mr. Grace discusses these benefits in greater detail in his Direct Testimony. The benefits
5 of timely recovery of costs utilizing the CWIP rider include reducing the overall project cost
6 by minimizing the amount of allowance for funds used during construction ("AFUDC")
7 included in rates. Reducing AFUDC in turn will also reduce the total nominal value of related
8 revenue requirements customers pay over the life of these generating facilities.

9 **Q: Are you able to estimate the impact on customer bills from the use of the CWIP Rider
10 from EKC's investment in 50% of the Viola plant and 50% of the McNew plant?**

11 A: Yes. The estimated all-in impact on customer bills from use of the CWIP Rider will vary
12 over several years, as the CWIP Rider is updated to reflect additional investments. The
13 range of the overall bill impacts, based on EKC's 50% investment in the Viola plant and
14 50% investment in the McNew plant, will vary from approximately .58% to approximately
15 3.82% from rates currently in effect.

16 This calculation was developed based on estimated project costs at this time and
17 does not consider any other change in customer rates that might occur between now, with
18 the current rates that are in effect, and the time when these projects are reflected in rates,
19 after the in-service dates in 2029 and 2030. Many other intervening factors could impact
20 this estimate over the time period between now and when the CWIP Rider becomes
21 effective and throughout the years when the CWIP Rider is being utilized. As stated earlier,
22 these cost estimates will be updated with supplemental direct testimony later in this
23 proceeding if necessary, depending on the results of the allocation of the second 50% of

1 the McNew plant and on the update to the definitive cost estimate to include final EPC
2 costs.

3 **Q: Can you describe how the Company plans to request to include costs of the project in**
4 **the rate base through a general rate case?**

5 A: After each of the natural gas plants are placed in-service, EKC will seek to recover the
6 costs of those plants in base rates through a general rate case. As indicated above, those
7 base rates shall include a deferral for depreciation expense incurred and carrying costs on
8 any unrecovered portion not included in the Company's CWIP rider of such investment at
9 EKC's weighted average cost of capital that is determined in the proceeding setting such
10 base rates, accumulated between the time the generation facility is placed in-service and
11 rates reflecting the investment become effective. As part of this predetermination request,
12 EKC is asking that the Commission find that recovery of costs up to the definitive cost
13 estimate to be approved by the Commission will be permitted through general rate case(s).
14 Costs above the definitive cost estimate that EKC seeks to include in rate base in a future
15 rate case will be subject to prudence review, based on a comparison to the costs of plants
16 of similar vintage and design. Therefore, the process will continue to be transparent and
17 open, and the Commission will still be able to review EKC's costs for prudence and
18 reasonableness moving forward.

19 **Q: What is EKC's estimate for cost of the natural gas plants addressed in this Petition?**

20 A: The initial cost estimate for EKC's 50% interest in each of the two natural gas plants is
21 ****** _____ ****** which
22 excludes AFUDC. This estimate is discussed in more detail in Mr. Olson's Direct Testimony.

1 As Mr. Olson explains, EKC will submit its final definitive cost estimate to the Commission
2 in supplemental testimony in February.

3 **Q: What is the Company's estimate for when the natural gas plants addressed in this**
4 **Application will be placed into service?**

5 A: As Mr. Olson explains, EKC estimates the Viola plant will be placed in-service January 1,
6 2029 and the McNew plant will be placed in-service January 1, 2030.

7 **Q: Given the estimated cost and timeline of the project, does the Company have an**
8 **estimate for the customer rate impact related to EKC's 50% interest in each of these**
9 **two natural gas generating facilities?**

10 A: Yes. We have estimated the impact on customer rates that will occur as a result of these two
11 investments based on current rates. As discussed previously, these new generation facilities
12 would be placed in rates after they go in service in 2029 for the Viola plant and 2030 for the
13 McNew plant. Based on current estimates from rates currently in effect, each plant is
14 anticipated to cause an approximate all-in bill impact of 4.3% for EKC customers overall.

15 This calculation was developed based on estimated project costs at this time and
16 does not consider any other change in customer rates that might occur between now, with
17 the current rates that are in effect, and the time when these projects are reflected in rates,
18 after the in-service dates in 2029 and 2030. Many other intervening factors could impact
19 this estimate over the five-year period before base rates are set to begin to include these
20 investments. As stated earlier, these cost estimates will be updated with supplemental
21 direct testimony later in this proceeding, if necessary, depending on the results of the
22 allocation of the second 50% of the McNew plant and on the update to the definitive cost
23 estimate to include final EPC costs.

1 **III. RATE IMPACT FROM PROPOSED SOLAR GENERATION**

2 **Q: What ratemaking treatment is EKC proposing for the Kansas Sky Solar generation**
3 **facility?**

4 A: EKC is proposing a levelized revenue requirement for Kansas Sky, much like the rate-
5 making treatment the Commission approved for the Western Plains Wind Farm in Docket
6 No. 18-WSEE-328-RTS and the Persimmon Creek Wind Farm in Docket No. 23-EKCE-
7 775-RTS. Under the approach, we propose that customers will pay a stable price for this
8 generation resource over the initial book life of the solar farm, 30 years. This approach
9 will remove the drastic swing in revenue requirements when the production tax credits
10 expire and the 10-year property tax exemption for the renewable resource expires.

11 Also, just as in previous Commission orders, in the event of changes in law or
12 regulations, or the occurrence of events outside the control of EKC that result in a material
13 adverse impact to EKC with respect to recovery of the Kansas Sky revenue requirement,
14 EKC, as applicable, would request the ability to file an application with the Commission
15 proposing methods to address the impact of the events.

16 Mr. Grace addresses how we calculated the levelized revenue requirement for
17 Kansas Sky and the benefits associated with the use of a levelized revenue requirement in
18 detail in his Direct Testimony.

19 **Q: What is the levelized revenue requirement for Kansas Sky and when will it be**
20 **included in customer rates?**

21 A: The levelized revenue requirement developed by Mr. Grace for Kansas Sky is approximately
22 ****[REDACTED]****. We proposed to include this amount in EKC's revenue requirement in
23 EKC's first general rate case following the date Kansas Sky is placed in-service.

1 **Q: Given the estimated cost and timeline of the Kansas Sky Solar project, does the**
2 **Company have an estimate for the customer rate impact related to this asset?**

3 A: Yes. We have estimated the impact on overall customer rates based on current rates. This
4 new generation facility would be placed in rates after it goes in service at the end of 2026.
5 Based on current estimates from rates currently in effect, the impact on rates from the
6 Kansas Sky solar plant is anticipated to be an approximate all-in bill increase of 0.70% for
7 EKC customers.

8 This calculation was developed based on estimated project costs at this time and
9 does not consider any other change in customer rates that might occur between now, with
10 the current rates that are in effect, and the time when this project is reflected in rates, after
11 the in-service date in 2026. Many other intervening factors could impact this estimate over
12 the time period before base rates are set to begin to include these investments.

13 **Q: Are there any other requests EKC is making in regards to the Kansas Sky solar project?**

14 A: Yes. Since there will be a delay between the date the Kansas Sky solar project goes into
15 service and when the levelized revenue requirement will be reflected in rates, EKC is
16 requesting a regulatory asset deferral and recovery of the plant's pretax rate of return,
17 depreciation expense, and actual operating and maintenance expenses, offset by the value
18 of the production tax credits that occur during this time period. Recovery of the regulatory
19 asset will begin in the next general rate case after inclusion of the levelized revenue
20 requirement in rates and recovered over the life of the plant. Mr. Ives discusses the basis
21 for this request in additional detail in his Direct Testimony.

1 **IV. ACCOUNTING FOR JOINTLY OWNED PLANTS**

2 **Q: How will the Company formalize its operating and accounting approach for the**
3 **natural gas facilities that will be jointly owned?**

4 A: Similar to our other jointly owned facilities, including Jeffrey Energy Center, LaCygne
5 Energy Center, and Iatan Energy Center, Evergy will put in place a Joint Ownership and
6 Operating Agreement (“JOA”) for the Viola plant (and the McNew plant if a 50% interest is
7 allocated to an entity other than EKC). Evergy is still in the process of developing the JOA
8 but, because it will be an affiliate agreement, Evergy will submit the executed version of the
9 agreement to the Commission once it is finalized and signed. We expect the structure of the
10 JOA to be very similar to the most recent agreement executed for a dispatchable, jointly
11 owned plant, which was for the Iatan Energy Center. Because the two combined cycle
12 natural gas plants will be located in Kansas, EKC will be the operator for the two plants and
13 the JOA will outline its responsibilities as operator, as well as the accounting approach for
14 all costs to be incurred during construction and after the plants are placed in-service.

15 **Q: How is Evergy handling the incurrence of costs related to the jointly owned natural**
16 **gas plants before the JOA is finalized?**

17 A: Evergy executed the early agreements related to the natural gas plant construction in the
18 name of Evergy Services, Inc. and any related costs from those agreements will be allocated
19 to the affiliate owners based on their ownership percentages. For the Reservation
20 Agreements for each of the two Kansas plants, EKC will execute the agreements with
21 Mitsubishi, as described by Mr. Olson, because EKC will be the operator for those two
22 plants. The costs will then be allocated to the affiliate owners based on their ownership
23 percentages. EKC and EMW have executed an agreement that outlines their respective

1 responsibility for the costs incurred as a result of the Reservation Agreement for the Viola
2 plant as 50-50 owners of that plant. That agreement between EKC and EMW will be
3 provided along with the other workpapers in support of Mr. Olson's testimony.

4 **Q: How will the Company account for costs related to the jointly owned natural gas**
5 **plants in order to ensure they are assigned appropriately based on ownership**
6 **interest?**

7 A: We will handle the accounting for costs related to the jointly owned natural gas plants in
8 the same manner that we handle costs for the other plants that are jointly owned by affiliates
9 today – Iatan, LaCygne, and Jeffrey Energy Centers. For example:

- 10 • Construction costs, removal costs, and/or net salvage incurred by EKC as the
11 operator will be accounted for in accordance with the FERC Uniform System of
12 Accounts and Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”).
- 13 • The Joint Owners will share all construction costs, removal costs, and/or net
14 salvage in proportion to their ownership share.
- 15 • Cost of construction, removal and salvage will be specifically identified and EKC
16 will record and track costs directly assignable to each of the jointly owned natural
17 gas plants in separate and distinct projects within its accounting system, to allow
18 for appropriate and accurate reporting and allocations to the co-owners. Allocation
19 of costs will occur on a monthly basis when books are closed and we will use
20 intercompany accounts to record the payables and receivables between affiliates.
- 21 • Once the jointly owned plants are in-service, EKC, as the operator, will operate the
22 natural gas plants pursuant to the JOA and will incur expenses associated with
23 operating and maintaining those plants. EKC will record and track labor and other

1 costs directly assignable to the jointly owned natural gas plants in separate and
2 distinct projects within its accounting system to allow for appropriate and accurate
3 reporting and allocations to the co-owners. Allocation of costs will occur on a
4 monthly basis when books are closed and we will use intercompany accounts to
5 record the payables and receivables between affiliates.

- 6 • Each co-owner will report to the appropriate taxing authority its ownership share,
7 subject to real estate and personal property taxes and will make timely payment of
8 all taxes levied thereon. Each co-owner will record its property tax expense directly
9 on its own books.
- 10 • Each co-owner will own an interest in the inventory of materials and supplies in
11 proportion to its ownership share. At the time of purchase, inventory items will be
12 identified for the natural gas plant they relate to. The associated cost of inventory
13 will be allocated to each co-owner based on the respective percentage of ownership
14 share.

15 Just as we do for the other jointly owned plants, we will ensure that the accounting for any
16 capital or expense related to a jointly owned natural gas plant will be handled in a way that
17 ensures the appropriate allocation of the responsibility of costs to each ownership based on
18 its ownership share.

19 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

20 **A:** Yes, it does.

PUBLIC

STATE OF KANSAS)
) ss:
COUNTY OF SHAWNEE)

VERIFICATION

Ronald A Klote, being duly sworn upon his oath deposes and states that he is the Sr Director Regulatory Affairs, for Evergy, Inc., that he has read and is familiar with the foregoing Testimony, and attests that the statements contained therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief.

Ronald A Klote
Ronald A Klote

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6th day of November 2024.

Leslie R. Wines
Notary Public

My Appointment Expires *May 30, 2026*

