

A. Since 1970, KCPL has spent \$166 million on governmentally-imposed environmental systems, two-thirds of which was for clean air. In addition to the ownership costs, these systems cost approximately \$5 million annually to operate and maintain. The total annual cost of owning and operating these facilities exceeds \$38 million, equal to about nine percent of the Company's charges to its customers.

Q. You have made a case for scrubbers being unnecessary when low-sulfur coal is burned. You also said they were costly. How costly?

A. KCPL's next power plant is planned to be 650 megawatts in size and to burn low-sulfur Wyoming coal. If it were to be completed this year, it would cost about \$422 million, including the cost of a precipitator. Adding a scrubber to that plant would increase its cost by \$65 million, or 15 percent, to \$487 million. On the unnecessary \$65 million cost of the scrubber, KCPL's annual ownership costs would be more than \$13 million and the annual operating costs would be conservatively estimated at some \$7.5 million, or more than \$20 million per year which our customers should not have to bear just to protect the high-sulfur coal markets in the East. Incidentally, KCPL's next plant is not planned for completion until the early 1990's. With inflation, that unnecessary \$20 million per year customer cost because of the scrubber would more than double.

Q. Wouldn't the scrubber require a lot of manpower and also waste natural resources?

A. Yes. It would require 24 employees to operate the scrubber with a payroll of \$750,000 a year at today's labor rates. The scrubber would evaporate 52,000 gallons of water each hour in quenching hot flue gases, enough to supply a city of 12,500 people. The scrubber would require enough electricity to serve 11,700 homes. It would also use some 70,000 tons of coal annually just to operate the scrubber.

Q. Why is KCPL calling the attention of the public to this situation?

A. We have the duty to meet the governmentally-imposed environmental protection requirements. We also have a responsibility to our customers to keep electric service rates as low as reasonably possible. This type of public action on our part is appropriate when we are convinced that the governmental requirements are excessive and unnecessary and will have a substantial impact on our customers' electric bills.

If you share this belief, contact your Congressman and ask him for his help.

Even though we are taking this action on behalf of our customers, requests of this type are considered political. For that reason, the costs of this communication are not being charged to customers, but are being paid by KCPL out of its stockholder-designated funds.

Your Immediate Action is Needed.



Paid for by the Stockholders of
Kansas City Power & Light Company

*Ed from Bill
Webb*

Facts about the Clean Air Act presented by
Kansas City Power & Light Company

Clean Air!

You want it.

KCPL wants it.

**But, you shouldn't
have to pay more than
is necessary to get
clean air.**

Q. Do you mean consumers are being "overcharged" for clean air?

A. The 1970 Clean Air Act established a feasible program to accomplish the goals of health and welfare protection. However, amendments in 1977 added severe, unnecessary and extremely costly requirements. The costs for these unnecessary requirements will be paid by all Americans in higher prices for goods and services.

Q. Can anything be done about that?

A. Yes! The Clean Air Act is up for reauthorization this year. However, the Congress could extend the present Act without change. No hearings have been scheduled by the U. S. House of Representatives Subcommittee on Health & the Environment. Such hearings should be set as soon as possible. Wasteful and unnecessary requirements, unsupported by reliable scientific evidence, should be revised or deleted.

Q. Is there anything consumers can do?

A. Yes. You can write or call the local office of your Congressman. Ask him to request that the Subcommittee schedule hearings as soon as possible. If you write, send a copy of your letter to the Subcommittee Chairman,
The Honorable Henry A. Waxman
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Without strong public urging, that Subcommittee may refuse to hold any hearings on the Act.

Q. What about the Clean Air Act; give me an example of an unnecessary and extremely costly requirement?

A. The Clean Air Act was amended in 1977 to require the use of scrubbers on all new power plants, including those which burn low-sulfur coal. This was required even though the emissions from **unscrubbed** low-sulfur coal are less than emissions from **scrubbed** high-sulfur coal! In our Midsection of this country, the sulfur emission standards protect the public health and welfare and can be met by burning low-sulfur coal in power plants equipped with electrostatic precipitators, which are much less expensive than scrubbers to install and operate. Therefore, the additional scrubbing requirement is an unnecessary and costly expense.

Q. Why did Congress require scrubbers on all new power plants including those burning low-sulfur coal?

A. The main reason for this 1977 amendment was **not** to improve the environment but to protect the markets for high-sulfur coals east of the Mississippi. The Environmental Protection Agency recognized that scrubbing of low-sulfur coal was not needed for health and welfare protection when it exempted Eastern anthracite coal from the 1977 scrubbing requirement because this coal, similar to Wyoming coal, has a low-sulfur content.

Q. How did the 1977 amendment change the law?

A. Prior to 1977, the Clean Air Act had imposed both emission standards and national ambient air quality standards. Strict limits were placed on the levels of a pollutant a new or modified plant could emit. How these emission and air quality standards were to be met was not specified. Coal-burning electric utilities had two options. They could burn high-sulfur coal and install expensive scrubbers, or they could burn low-sulfur coal with much less costly precipitators, but without scrubbers, and still meet the standards.

Q. Which option did KCPL choose?

A. Both. During the late 1960's and early 1970's, we pioneered scrubber technology in constructing our La Cygne No. 1 unit in order to burn high-sulfur (over 5%) coal available from mines adjacent to the plant. Also, since 1977, we have burned about 9.3 million tons of Wyoming low-sulfur (less than ½%) coal at our La Cygne No. 2 unit, which is equipped with an electrostatic precipitator, but no costly scrubber because it was existing prior to the 1977 amendment. As a result, sulfur and ash emissions from our La Cygne units are well below the applicable sulfur emission standards which protect the public health and welfare from the environmental effects of these pollutants.

Q. What impact does KCPL's environmental protection program have on its electric customers?