

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

FILED
January 8, 2024
Data Center
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF DENISE W. ALLEGRI

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Denise W. Allegri

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF RHONDA BERG

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


Rhonda Berg

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF DAVID J. BERG

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EEIS by:



David J. Berg

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF REBEKAH L. MARSH

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:

/s/ Rebekah L. Marsh
Rebekah L. Marsh

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF MARK A. HILL

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy's "Highway 13 Fayetteville" project ("Project"), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff's investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission ("PSC") to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to 'order any just outcome.'

The PSC must provide 'due process of law', which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities' compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility's violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Mark A. Hill

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF GLEN WOLFE

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


Glen Wolfe

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF DWAYNE MARSH

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Dwayne Marsh

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF AARON R. COLLETT

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Aaron R. Collett

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF COLETTE COLLETT

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Colette Collett

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF CHARLES E. BRACKEN

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Charles E. Bracken

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF SUSAN G. BRACKEN

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Susan G. Bracken

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF TERESA HOWARD

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Teresa Howard

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY P. ALLEGRI

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Timothy P. Allegri

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF NORMAN HOWARD

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy's "Highway 13 Fayetteville" project ("Project"), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff's investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission ("PSC") to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to 'order any just outcome.'

The PSC must provide 'due process of law', which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities' compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility's violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


Norman Howard

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF CHERYL A. HEDDEN

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Cheryl A. Hedden

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF LETHA SUE BOLAND

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy's "Highway 13 Fayetteville" project ("Project"), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff's investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission ("PSC") to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to 'order any just outcome.'

The PSC must provide 'due process of law', which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities' compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility's violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF BETHANN C. HILL

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy's "Highway 13 Fayetteville" project ("Project"), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff's investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission ("PSC") to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to 'order any just outcome.'

The PSC must provide 'due process of law', which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities' compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility's violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


Bethann C. Hill

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF KENDRA B. BUTNER

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy's "Highway 13 Fayetteville" project ("Project"), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff's investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission ("PSC") to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to 'order any just outcome.'

The PSC must provide 'due process of law', which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities' compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility's violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


Kendra B. Butner

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF VICTOR BUTNER

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy's "Highway 13 Fayetteville" project ("Project"), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff's investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission ("PSC") to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to 'order any just outcome.'

The PSC must provide 'due process of law', which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities' compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility's violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Victor Butner

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF CANDACE K. ROBERTSON

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


Candace K. Robertson

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF STEPHEN L. ROBERTSON

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:



Stephen L. Robertson

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF BETTY BEYERS

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy's "Highway 13 Fayetteville" project ("Project"), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.

Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff's investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission ("PSC") to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to 'order any just outcome.'

The PSC must provide 'due process of law', which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities' compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility's violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


Betty Beyers

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF AMY WOLFE

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy’s “Highway 13 Fayetteville” project (“Project”), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff’s investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission (“PSC”) to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to ‘order any just outcome.’

The PSC must provide ‘due process of law’, which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities’ compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility’s violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


Amy Wolfe

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

Timothy Allegri, et al.,)	
)	
Complainants,)	File No. EC-2024-0015
)	
Evergy Missouri West, Inc.,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

POSITION STATEMENT OF DAVID A. HANDLY

I am a Complainant and property owner in [REDACTED] whose highway-frontage land is involved in Evergy's "Highway 13 Fayetteville" project ("Project"), along with many neighboring landowners. This same project is also involved in an eminent domain proceeding in circuit courts.


Evergy has not provided sufficient data to prove a need for the excessive land-taking they claim the rights to for their project, nor has it met all legal requirements for eminent domain, as well as its abuse of discretion in exceeding the bounds of CCN #9470 orders and Missouri eminent domain law. I concur with the PSC Staff's investigative *Report and Recommendations* in this matter.

It is the responsibility of the Commission ("PSC") to exercise their authority in overseeing a utility and their Orders under RSMo. Chapters 393 and 386. Has this been accomplished? The circuit courts assume that the PSC has done their job *prior to* an eminent domain lawsuit being filed. Given the broad authority the PSC possesses under RSMo. Section 393.140(5), my neighbors and I have been failed by the disregard of PSC jurisdiction over a utility under its supervision, and the legislation allowing it to 'order any just outcome.'

The PSC must provide 'due process of law', which is the promise of legality and fairness. What specifically does the PSC do to ensure utilities' compliance with CCN orders and why it has denied pursuing an *Injunction* with circuit courts to suspend proceedings until all PSC orders have been met? Holding Evergy accountable to CCN orders per Chapters 393 and 386, *prior to* any circuit court proceedings on eminent domain, has been denied us by the PSC, to date.

Failure to Prosecute - Is the PSC ready to share liability for eminent domain land loss due to a utility's violation of Commission orders made in accordance with Missouri law, should that occur? The original Commission complaint, as well as my small formal complaint, *states my position* with regard to this case and I expect *all* information and questions posed to be addressed and answered in the upcoming evidentiary hearing.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of January, 2024 to all parties via EFIS by:


David A. Handly