



Energy Outcomes

Bottom-line, the proposed 895mw coal plant is not about Kansas' energy needs. At least 80% of the electricity produced will be owned and claimed by out-of-state interests.

Claims that Kansas must build this coal plant in order to get transmission for wind energy are simply not factual.

And it's not about "keeping the lights on." In fact, Tri-State Generation & Transmission (the plant's Colorado owner) doesn't have a need for additional base load electricity until 2026, and Sunflower Electric (the plant's Kansas host) has only a modest need for electricity in next 10-15 years.

In any event, the Colorado owners of the proposed plant do not anticipate construction *starting* until 2016 at the earliest, meaning it won't be operational before 2020. **So much for keeping the lights on.**

There are far better, cheaper, and quicker options for meeting Sunflower's small short-term energy needs than an unnecessary, risky, oversized, and polluting coal plant. Finney County (where Holcomb is located) sits nearly on top of the fifth largest natural gas field in the United States (the Hugoton Field)ⁱ and in the midst of the second best wind energy potential in the countryⁱⁱ.

Both wind and natural gas power capacity at the same level as the proposed coal plant would get permitted and built (and put Kansans to work) prior to 2016.

- According to information from Black & Veatchⁱⁱⁱ, combined cycle natural gas plants are faster and less expensive to build than super-critical pulverized coal plants.
- Combined cycle natural gas plants cost \$5.00/mmBTU and high-capacity wind farms are the same as low-carbon-cost coal at \$8.00/mmBTU.

Two 500mw combined cycle natural gas plants and 200mw of wind energy capacity would produce more electricity every year, cost less to build, be operational sooner, pollute far less, provide distributed landowner revenue, and create demand for Kansas natural gas.

The presence of 895mw of coal-fired electrical capacity on the state's grid will likely retard further development of wind energy in the state.

- The coal plant will have fuel purchase agreements with Wyoming coal mines to purchase and import a huge amount of coal every year. That paid-for fuel source isn't going to sit unused in favor of wind.
- Electrons from the Holcomb plant headed to Tri-State in Colorado will flood available transmission and crowd out new wind-generated electrons. Wind developers may look elsewhere to build wind capacity.
- Tri-State acknowledges publicly that they haven't begun planning for transmission related to Holcomb, which will take years to complete - further confirmation that there won't be a new coal plant at Holcomb Station until at least 2020.



THE GREAT PLAINS ALLIANCE FOR CLEAN ENERGY

- Kansans have yet to see plans for moving either coal-fired or wind energy to other markets (as mandated in the 2009 settlement agreement).
- Tri-State has none prepared, even as it continues to develop renewable resources in other states.
- Proposed high-voltage lines in southern and western Kansas (the so-called V-plan) needed to access the state's prime wind energy resources are moving forward independent of plans for the coal plant.^{iv}

Tri-State G&T of Colorado has modeled twenty-two resource scenarios as part of their resource planning^v.

- *Only one* (high energy demand, no carbon cost, limited demand side management or energy efficiency) included any need to build new coal-fired generation prior to 2029.
- The coal-fired generation needed would be smaller than recently projected at 302mw and would not start operation until 2026.
- Even in this unlikely scenario, Tri-State would build two new natural gas plants before building the coal plant.

In figures reported to the Kansas Corporation Commission by the utilities themselves, Sunflower Electric and MKEC show no immediate need for base load capacity until 2018, when they may need 14.5mw.^{vi}

- In 2023 they show a 182.1mw need.
- In 2028 they indicate a 217.4 need.
- These figures include a 12% "capacity margin" or reserve cushion required by the Southwest Power Pool (not actual demand) and demand growth assumptions that are much higher than reality.
- They do not include any demand side management (energy efficiency) - which would reduce demand.

According to the organizations' own reporting, neither Sunflower Electric nor Tri-State Generation & Transmission have indicated significant increased demand or need for coal power within the last ten years.^{vii viii}

Sunflower Electric had a permit to construct the 660mw Sand Sage coal plant, and received an extension on that permit.^{ix}

- Sunflower let the permit expire in 2005.
- Had that plant been built, it would be operational and producing energy by now.
- It would have provided much-needed construction jobs during the worst economic recession in generations.
- And it would have avoided the costly and time-consuming battle over the current ill-conceived proposal.

ⁱ http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/state/state_energy_profiles.cfm?sid=KS

ⁱⁱ http://www.kcc.state.ks.us/energy/wind_maps.htm



THE GREAT PLAINS ALLIANCE FOR CLEAN ENERGY

iii <http://www.gpace.org/wp-content/B&VWEBINARNOV09%20.pdf>

iv <http://www.hdnews.net/Story/powerline070410>

v [http://www.tristategt.org/ResourcePlanning/documents/T-S Public Meeting Presentation June-10-2010.pdf](http://www.tristategt.org/ResourcePlanning/documents/T-S%20Public%20Meeting%20Presentation%20June-10-2010.pdf)

vi <http://www.kcc.state.ks.us/energy/chart.htm>

vii <http://www.sunflower.net/annualreport2007.aspx>

viii <http://www.tristategt.org/Financials/annual-report.cfm>

ix http://www.kdheks.gov/download/Application_Timeline.pdf