

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

In the Matter of Requests for Customer) **File No. EO-2024-0002**
Account Data Production)

EVERGY’S RESPONSE TO MOTION TO COMPEL

COME NOW Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro (“EMM”) and Evergy Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West (“EMW”) (collectively, the “Company”), by and through their counsel and, for their *Response to the Motion To Compel* filed by Staff (“Staff”) for the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) on January 3, 2024, (“Motion”) states as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

1. On August 30, 2022, the Company filed a *Stipulation and Agreement* (“Stipulation”) in its last rate case, File Nos. ER-2022-0129 and ER-2022-0130.
2. On September 22, 2022, the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) issued its *Order Approving Four Partial Stipulations and Agreements* (“Order”) which encompassed approval of the Stipulation referenced above.
3. Per the approved Stipulation, the Company agreed to the following:

Data Retention:

- a) Prior to July 1, 2023, the Company will identify and provide the data requested in the direct testimony of Sarah Lange. If the requested data is not available or cost-prohibitive to produce, the Company will file a motion to establish an EO docket. In that docket the Company will provide the reason why it cannot provide the requested data and its individual estimate of the cost to provide each set of requested data, for the further consideration of the parties and the Commission.^{1, 2} (emphasis added)

¹ See, Stipulation, p. 12, Rate Design and Program Settlement, §4(a).

² The massive amount of data requested by Staff witness Sarah Lange in the last rate case is detailed in witness Lange’s direct testimony on p. 62, ln. 1 through p. 64, ln. 28 in File Nos. ER-2022-0129 and ER-2022-0130. For a listing of the requested data, see pages 3-5 of the Direct Testimony of Bradley D. Lutz filed on November 1, 2023, in this proceeding.

4. Pursuant to the terms of the Stipulation, Evergy evaluated the data requested by Staff and assessed the feasibility of producing the data. If the data were not on hand, Evergy examined the level of effort and timeline associated with securing and generating the data. Generally, the data requested resides in disparate systems and is not easily available for direct query. To locate, access, download, and assimilate (i.e. create) the required data to provide the data requested by Staff, it is expected that external expertise will be needed to supplement Evergy's internal capabilities. In some cases, the data was not believed to be available to satisfy the Staff's request and organizational process changes would be required to begin generating the requested data. To estimate the cost of obtaining the requested data, Evergy consulted with internal staff and consultants familiar with some of the Company's major systems to consider a range. Absent a detailed scope of work, precision is not possible, but all expert opinions have determined that it will be a costly effort that would be material, **exceeding more than \$100 million dollars** and requiring significant time to complete. Precise estimates of cost and duration will only be possible once detailed scope of work with exact requirements are fully known and understood.

5. After careful and extensive study of Staff's requests for data and the substantial cost of creating and producing it, Evergy filed its *Motion To Establish Docket For Further Consideration Of Data Production* to establish this proceeding. As stated in the Stipulation, the primary purpose of this proceeding is to allow the Company to "provide the reason why it cannot provide the requested data and its individual estimate of the cost to provide each set of requested data, for the further consideration of the parties and the Commission."³

³ See, *Stipulation*, p. 12, Rate Design and Program Settlement, §4(a).

6. On November 1, 2023, after further study of the issues associated with the Staff's data requests, Evergy filed the direct testimony of Bradley D. Lutz, Director of Regulatory Affairs for Evergy, Julie Dragoo, Senior Director, Customer Strategy & Support for Evergy, and Sean P. Riley, an outside accounting and information systems expert from PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP.

7. On January 8, 2023, these same witnesses provided surrebuttal testimony. The direct and surrebuttal testimony of Bradley D. Lutz and his Confidential Schedule BDL-1, and the testimony of Julie Dragoo provide detail about the availability and cost of the requested data. The issues associated with development and production of the Staff's data request information varied across the data requests. Given the complexity and detail of the data requested, the Company has prepared a summary table of the assessment, provided as Confidential Schedule BDL-1 attached to the Direct Testimony of Bradley D. Lutz, detailing the respective requests, providing a response for each concerning the,

- Availability - Is the requested data present in the Company systems?
- Deliverability - Can the data be extracted and processed/formatted in a manner consistent with the request?
- Estimated Cost to provide - the cost to produce the data in the format, interval, and other criteria set within the request as specified by the Company through analysis of the request.
- Applicable Notes - additional information informative to the assessment.

To aid in examination of the assessment, the Company has used traffic signal coloring to represent the relative comparisons. For the convenience of the Commission and the Regulatory Law Judge, **Confidential Schedule BDL-1** is attached.

8. As explained in the Direct Testimony of Mr. Lutz, the assessment summary table was prepared to capture the efforts of a team of Company subject matter experts to provide the data. Given the breadth of data being requested, a cross functional team was assembled to respond to the availability of the requested data. The team included representatives of Evergy's Customer Operations, Customer Analytics, Customer Systems, Application Systems, Property Accounting, Geographic Information Services Support, Engineering & Analytics, Support Services Departments. This team included individuals with direct administrative and operational knowledge of Company Billing, Mapping, Work Management, Plant Accounting, and Meter Data Management systems. These individuals have direct experience with managing the data within the systems. Some individuals on the team have been involved with this work since the first data requests were received from Staff with the complete team beginning formal work in September 2022 shortly after the 0129/0130 Stipulation was filed. Work to provide the data requested continued until June 2023 when it was clear that that the data would not be provided by the July 1, 2023 target date. Work then focused on this docket and documenting the data availability and deliverability.⁴

9. Ms. Drago also explains the Company systems, detailing the data relationships and providing further support for the cost estimates detailed in Mr. Lutz's testimony. She has responsibility for many of the Company systems related to these data retention requests.

10. As an expert in utility accounting, Mr. Riley offers insights into industry practices and confirmation that Evergy is following normal practice with its systems and data management. He also offers reaction to select Staff data retention requests.

11. The testimony from these witnesses demonstrates that the data requested by Ms. Lange has never been required for the myriad of rate design cases or rate cases that have been

⁴ See Direct Testimony of Bradley D. Lutz, pp. 6-7.

processed by the Commission. Particularly, the data requests for granular cost data by voltage and rate code is unprecedented and problematic, and would be very expensive to produce.

12. Over the years, innovative rate designs have been approved by the Commission, including the Time-of-Use rate structures that were approved for Evergy, Ameren Missouri, and Liberty in their last rate cases. But in none of those cases was it necessary to develop and create the granular data being requested by Ms. Lange in this case. In his surrebuttal testimony, Mr. Lutz discusses the fact that residential customers on TOU rates will be included in EMW's next rate case to be filed in February, 2024, but such residential TOU customers will have a minimal impact and it will not result in significant change in the Company supporting documentation. In any future rate cases, Evergy would expect to continue to file suitable detail in the billing determinants and support for the revenues⁵ without the need for the granular data being requested by Staff in this case.

13. In general, the cost to configure or customize computer systems can vary dramatically. Precise estimates require detailed specifications to account for all required modifications. Absent these specifications, there is variability in the final cost results. With the summary table Company provides informative cost estimates to facilitate examination in this docket, but asserts that precision is not possible at this stage. Company witnesses Julie Dragoo and Sean Riley further make this assertion in their respective testimonies.

14. Ms. Lange is requesting the data required to determine: line transformer costs and expenses by rate code; primary distribution costs and expenses by voltage; secondary distribution costs and expenses by voltage; primary voltage service drop costs and expenses; line extension costs, expenses, and contributions by rate code and voltage; and meter costs by voltage and rate code.

⁵ Lutz Surrebuttal, pp. 8-9.

15. This first set of data is perhaps the most problematic, and the most expensive to create and produce. Neither capital investments nor maintenance expenses are currently tracked by voltage class or rate code. In some instances, current capital investments and expenses impact multiple primary voltages and rate codes. While the amounts to produce this data are contained in more detail in Confidential Schedule BDL-1, at a high level, it is estimated that this request alone would **cost in the range of \$80-100 million to comply with this request.**

16. A second set of data includes the number of customers served at each voltage level on the first day of the month and the last day of the month for each rate schedule on which customers may take service at various voltages. A third set of data includes the sum of customers' interval meter readings, by 15-minute interval and by voltage, for each rate code on which customers may take service at various voltages. A fourth set of data is designed to develop the determinants for assessment of an on-peak demand charge to replace the current monthly billing demand charge, and for potential implementation for customers not currently subject to a demand charge. Presumably, Staff wants to develop demand charges or other rate elements for the residential, small commercial, and other classes where such charges do not presently exist.

II. LIST OF RELEVANT ISSUES IN THIS CASE

17. From the Company perspective, the issues in this case are straightforward:
- a) Should the Commission order Evergy to create, prepare and produce the data requested in the direct testimony of Staff witness Sarah Lange in File Nos. ER-2022-0129 and ER-2022-0130 as detailed in witness Lange's direct testimony on p. 62, ln. 1 through p. 64, ln. 28?
 - b) Should the Company expend the cost to create, and produce the data requested by Staff?

- c) If the Commission orders the creation and production of the data requested by Staff, should the Commission also order the deferral of all costs of creation, preparation, and production for possible recovery in a future rate case?

III. EVERGY RESPONSE TO MOTION TO COMPEL

18. On January 3, 2024, Staff filed its Motion To Compel which seeks discovery of much of the same data that was identified in the testimony of Sarah Lange in the Company's last rate case. Not surprisingly, the conditions leading to much of the data requested by Ms. Lange in the motion to compel being unavailable is still in effect and the data is still unavailable. In most cases, absent expending a cost to create, the data cannot be produced. The Motion To Compel includes much of the same data which the Commission will have to consider in the evidentiary hearing that is scheduled to begin on January 30, 2024.

19. For the most part, the extensive data requested in the Motion To Compel is of questionable relevance to the three issues listed above: (a) should the data be produced; (b) should the cost to produce be expended; and (c) whether there should be a deferral of the costs if the Commission orders the data to be produced.

20. Notwithstanding the questionable relevance of the extensive data being requested by Staff at this time, Evergy has endeavored to answer more than 180 data requests with many sub-parts. In fact, at the insistence of Staff, the Company reluctantly agreed to a shorten turn-around time for answering these data requests to only 10 days. However, at the time of the agreement to shorten the turn-around time, the Company did not expect to be immediately inundated with such extensive and burdensome discovery from Staff witness Lange. When the Company requested a short extension of the time to answer some of the more difficult data requests, Staff counsel declined

to grant the Company any minimal accommodation. Nevertheless, the Company made an extensive effort to comply with Staff's requests.

21. As reflected in EFIS in this case, the Company has now answered approximately 183 data requests that were submitted by Staff. If the Commission or the Regulatory Law Judge reviews the responses to these requests in EFIS, they will ascertain that extensive data has been provided to Staff. However, the amount of time and effort to complete the discovery in this case has amounted to many man-weeks of efforts by Evergy personnel. At this time, the Company does not have an estimate of the cost in dollars or labor-hours that Staff's discovery has required for Evergy to answer the extensive discovery, but it is estimated to be quite significant. Simply put, the Staff's data requests in this case have been onerous, burdensome, and seemingly intended to obtain the very data the Company has stated is not available. Much of the discovery has moved beyond the realm of reasonable discovery, especially in light of the straightforward issues that need to be addressed by the Commission in this unprecedented proceeding.

IV. RULES OF DISCOVERY

22. As the Commission considers Staff's Motion to Compel, it should consider the purposes and restrictions on discovery. Commission Rule 20 CSR 4240.090 provides that: "Discovery may be obtained by the same means and under the same conditions as in civil actions in the circuit court."

23. Rule 56.01 governs the scope of discovery in civil actions in the circuit court, and generally, "[p]arties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action...."⁶ Relevance, for purposes of discovery, is

⁶ Rule 56.01(b)(1); Ratcliff v. Sprint Missouri, Inc., 261 S.W.3d 534, 546-47 (Mo.App.W.D. 2008).

“broadly defined to include material “reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.”⁷ The party seeking discovery shall bear the burden of establishing relevance.⁸

24. Rule 58.01 limits production of documents or electronically stored information to that which is “in the responding party's possession, custody, or control” and/or “kept in the usual course of business.” Mo. Sup. Ct. R. 58.01(a) and (c).

25. In the *Order Regarding The Office of the Public Counsel’s Motion to Compel, Re Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren UE*, Case No. ER-2010-0165 (March 16, 2010), 2010 WL 1178770, the Commission also stated:

The discovery process’ purpose is to give parties access to relevant, non-privileged information while reducing expense and burden as much as is feasible.” “The circuit court must ascertain that the process does not favor one party over another by giving it a tactical advantage: ‘The discovery process was not designed to be a scorched earth battlefield upon which the rights of the litigants and the efficiency of the justice system should be sacrificed to mindless overzealous representation of plaintiffs and defendants.’”⁹

26. Another very important principle of discovery that is particularly relevant to this proceeding is that a public utility is not required to create documents that do not exist or perform analysis of data that has not been performed. If the Company does not have the document or has not performed the analysis, the Commission has not expected it to somehow create it.¹⁰ Much of the Staff’s discovery falls into this category. The Commission’s practice in this regard is consistent with the discovery allowed in Missouri Courts. The Missouri Supreme Court has held that “[o]ur Rule 58.01(a) is identical to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34(a).” *Hancock v. Shook*, 100 S.W.3d

⁷ *State ex rel. Wright v. Campbell*, 938 S.W.2d 640, 643 (Mo. App. E.D. 1997); *State ex rel. Pooker v. Kramer*, 216 S.W.3d 670, 672 (Mo. banc 2007).

⁸ *State ex rel. Collins v. Roldan*, 289 S.W.3d 780, 786 (Mo.App. W.D, 2009).

⁹ See *State ex rel. American Standard Ins. Co. v. Clark*, 243 S.W.3d 526, 529 (Mo. App. 2008).

¹⁰ During the Discovery Conference held on November 21, 2023, Staff witness Lange conceded that “I agree that typically under discovery rules, we – we can’t ask them [Evergy] to do an analysis...” (Tr.28).

786, 796 (Mo. 2003). “A document is not in a party's possession, custody, or control if the document does not exist.” Weisman v. Barnes Jewish Hosp., No. 4:19-CV-00075 JAR, 2022 WL 850772, at *3 (E.D. Mo. Mar. 22, 2022).

V. RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC STAFF ALLEGATIONS

27. In paragraph 6 of Staff’s Motion, Staff claims that the Regulatory Law Judge “ordered Staff Counsel to file this *Motion to Compel*.” Contrary to Staff’s assertion that the Regulatory Law Judge “ordered Staff Counsel to file this Motion to Compel,” a fairer reading of the transcript reflects that the Judge Hatcher merely suggested that Staff may (i.e. had the option to file) file a motion to compel. (Tr. 41-42) Evergy does not believe Judge Hatcher was “ordering” Staff to file a Motion to Compel.

28. Turning to the specifics of Staff’s motion, Staff has the burden of establishing relevance of its data requests. Staff has not done so in this motion. Staff has not demonstrated that its massive discovery is likely to lead to admissible evidence relevant to the issues in this case.

29. Staff also has the burden of showing that data request responses are “insufficient, incomplete, and inadequate,” as it alleges in Paragraph 7. Merely listing a large number of DR numbers, as Staff has done in Paragraphs 7 and 8 in its motion, does not meet Staff’s burden to demonstrate that Evergy’s responses are somehow insufficient, incomplete or inadequate.

30. In Paragraph 8, Staff states that the reason for compelling Evergy responses to Staff data requests is: “Evergy would have had to compile the information or obtain the data requested by Staff in order to prepare their respective witnesses’ testimony.” This statement is not true. Evergy did not base its estimate on “component costs,” compiling an estimate. Instead Evergy considered the costs of other large data projects and it prepared Evergy’s estimate based on comparisons to similar data efforts. Through the discovery, Staff seeks to compel the Company to fit into its

expectation for producing the estimate. Since the Company utilized different approaches, the data aligning with Staff's expected approach is simply not available.

31. Staff also asserts in Paragraph 8, "Furthermore, in order to comply with the August 2022 Stipulation and Agreement, Evergy would have to currently be in possession of the data requested by these DRs." This statement is not true and is without any foundation or support. In Paragraph 9, Staff makes a similar assertion: "Much of the information requested by Staff in the listed DRs is information that the Company stipulated it would provide to Staff when it entered into the August 2022 Stipulation and Agreement. . . Staff is merely requesting information through the listed DRs to obtain information about those promises made by the Company." In response, Evergy does possess many elements of the data but not in the format or context requested by the Staff in discovery. This is a fundamental element of the Company's testimony explaining to the Commission the reasons the requested data is not available.

32. Staff's assertions in Paragraph 8 also totally ignores the important provision of the Stipulation (which serves as a major caveat) that the Company would evaluate the availability and cost of providing the data, and file a motion to open this docket if the data were not available or cost prohibitive to produce. (The cost estimates contained in Evergy's direct testimony clearly demonstrate that the creation and production of the Staff's requested data is cost prohibitive.)

33. In Paragraph 8(b), Staff asserts that "the information requested by Staff is information that is (a) properly discoverable, (b) necessary to evaluate the reasonableness of the "alternative data" that Evergy witness Brad Lutz references in his testimony, and (c) necessary to discuss the reasonableness and cost-effectiveness of other data alternatives to compare to the cost of the data Evergy did provide in its direct testimony." As Evergy has already discussed, the issues in this case are straightforward, and most of the disputed data requests are not designed to lead to

admissible evidence in this case. Mr. Lutz has suggested in his direct testimony that alternative data could be used to establish rates in the future that would be readily available and cost-effective. However, no specific “alternative data” was specified in Mr. Lutz’s testimony. It is unreasonable to argue, as Staff does in Paragraph 8, that the massive amounts of data demanded from Evergy are necessary to assess the reasonableness of Mr. Lutz’ testimony. Evergy assumes Staff wants this data for other reasons, perhaps for use in future Evergy rate cases. Evergy would also point out that no questions were asked by Staff that explored Evergy’s cost estimates.

34. In Paragraph 9, Staff asserts that “Much of the information requested by Staff in the listed DRs is information that the Company stipulated it would provide to Staff when it entered into the August 2022 Stipulation and Agreement.” This is not true. Most of the Staff’s data requests ask for Evergy to provide the data requested, a sample of similar data, or to provide estimates that Evergy has not prepared. In the Stipulation, Evergy agreed to research the availability and cost of producing the extensive data demanded by Sarah Lange, but after extensive consideration, Evergy personnel found that much of the granular data was not available and would be extremely costly to create and produce. Evergy never committed to create the data, as Staff suggests, no matter the availability or the cost of creation and production. Staff also ignores the part of the provisions of the Stipulation where Evergy committed to file this EO- docket if the data was not available or cost-prohibitive to create and produce.

35. In Paragraph 10, Staff again oversimplifies the terms of the Stipulation by incorrectly asserting that “Evergy committed to identify and provide data required to determine line transformer costs, expenses by voltage, secondary distribution costs, expenses by voltage, primary voltage service drop costs and expenses, line extension costs expenses, contributions by rate code and voltage, and meter cost by voltage and rate code, among other data.” This statement is not accurate.

Contrary to the Staff's unqualified, blanket assertion, Evergy agreed to provide the data and if the data were unavailable, provide an estimate of the cost of providing the data. Evergy has now done so and the cost estimates are contained in Evergy's testimony in this proceeding.

36. In Paragraph 11, Staff discusses the fact that Staff requested 10 years of accounting data for numerous items. In some cases, Staff requested as much as ten-years' worth of data on the following subjects: Gross plant, depreciation reserve, net plant and depreciation expenses (DR Nos. 10 and 81); for line transformers (DR Nos. 12 and 83), land and land rights, structures and improvements, poles, towers, and fixtures, overhead conductors and devices, underground conduit and devices, installations on customers' premises (DR Nos. 18 and 89), for each distribution maintenance and operations account (DR Nos. 19 and 90), overhead and services (DR Nos. 27 and 90), meters. The Staff also requested ten (10) years of data on the number of line transformers, poles (DR Nos. 30 and 101), feet of underground conduit (DR No. 34 and 105), number of feet of overhead (DR Nos. 38 and 109) and underground conductor (DR Nos. 34 and 105), number of overhead (DR Nos. 48 and 119) and underground devices (DR Nos. 43 and 114), and number of meters (DR Nos. 64 and 135).

37. While the Company objected to these data requests as vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome and irrelevant,¹¹ it spent hours and hours attempting to comply with Ms. Lange's requests. The Company did provide five (5) years of data for most of these items. The Company let

¹¹ The Company objected on the following grounds:

"The Company objects to the Data Requests as vague, overly broad, unduly burdensome, calling for speculation and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and not relevant or material to the subject matter of this proceeding. To the extent that a Data Request ask for analysis or calculations that have not been performed by the Company, the Company will not be providing a response to that Data Request.

In addition, some of the Data Requests appear to request information that is the subject matter of this docket-whether the Company has to provide the information requested by Staff." Until the docket is resolved by the Commission, the Company will not be providing a response to such Data Request.

The Company will provide responses to these Data Requests subject to the objections asserted above." (Evergy Objection letter to Staff counsel, Carolyn Kerr dated November 7, 2023.

Staff know that for the majority of the property records data requests above 10 years of data is potentially available but some of the data requests will take several weeks as they involve a manual process to access an additional five years of data. Before the Company undertakes the work to provide the additional 5 years of data, it needs to understand the relevancy of the request. The Company does not believe that Staff has shown how this additional information is relevant. Staff has not met its burden to demonstrate that this massive amount of data is relevant or necessary to resolve the issues in this case.

38. In Paragraph 12, Staff questions why the Company might reply that some of the proffered information was based upon the Company's property records which may not be completely reliable for purposes of setting rates. In a very limited number of responses, Evergy pointed out that accounting data may not always exactly match certain information in the Company mapping systems or inventory records.

IV. CONCLUSION

39. In summary, the Commission should reject Staff's motion in its entirety. Staff has failed to show the relevance of its discovery to the limited issues that are presented in this case. Staff has not shown that this discovery is likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Staff is attempting to do an end run around the evidentiary hearing process by requesting the information through a discovery motion that is virtually the same information that the Commission is being asked to evaluate and determine if it is cost-prohibitive to create and produce. The Commission will be in a better position to evaluate these issues after the full evidentiary hearing scheduled to commence on January 30, 2024.

40. At the conclusion of this docket, the Company will seek to obtain specific guidance from the Commission on what data, if any, the level of effort, and what cost is reasonable to address Staff's stated need for such information.

WHEREFORE, for all of these reasons discussed herein, the Commission should deny Staff's motion to compel the massive amounts of data that Staff is requesting at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Roger W. Steiner

Roger W. Steiner, MBN 39586
Phone: (816) 556-2314
E-mail: roger.steiner@evergy.com
Evergy, Inc.
1200 Main – 16th Floor
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Fax: (816) 556-2110

James M. Fischer, MBN 27543
Fischer & Dority, P.C.
2081 Honeysuckle Lane
Jefferson City, Missouri 65109
Phone: (573) 353-8647
jfischerpc@aol.com

**Attorneys for Evergy Missouri Metro and
Evergy Missouri West**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was served upon counsel for all parties on this 10th day of January 2024 by either e-mail or U.S. Mail, postage prepaid.

/s/ Roger W. Steiner _____

Roger W. Steiner

DATA REQUEST ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

<u>DATA REQUEST #</u>	<u>DATA REQUESTED</u>	<u>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>DELIVERABILITY ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>ESTIMATED COST TO PROVIDE</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
1	Prior to the next rate case, the Company will identify and provide the data required to determine: line transformer costs and expenses by rate code; primary distribution costs and expenses by voltage; secondary distribution costs and expenses by voltage; primary voltage service drop costs and expenses; extension costs, expenses, and contributions by rate code and voltage; and meter costs by voltage and rate code. If the required data is not readily available, the Commission should order Evergy to file an EO docket explaining why it cannot provide the data, and its individual estimate of the cost to provide each set of data described, for the further consideration of the parties and the Commission.	NOT AVAILABLE Neither capital investments nor maintenance expenses are currently tracked by voltage class or rate code. In some instances current capital investments and expenses impact multiple primary voltages and rate codes.	COMPLEX DELIVERABILITY Neither capital investments nor maintenance expenses are currently tracked by voltage class or rate code. In some instances current capital investments and expenses impact multiple primary voltages and rate codes.		For distribution system costs that are attributable to specific individual customers and rate schedule/code would require an overhaul of the entire cost tracking and work management recording processes and systems. Individual systems are separate and have singular purposes with no natural alignment that would enable syncing and connection. As such, it would require consultation with system experts to not only configure the individual systems for linkage, but also assist with creating dynamic integrated processes to allow for the tracking and reporting of the data being requested. To support this request, Evergy would also likely need to hire on-going resources to sustain these processes to support an expectation of continual creation, tracking, storing, and reporting of this data.
2	For each rate code, provide the total number of customers served on that rate schedule on the first day of the month and the last day of the month; a. For each rate schedule on which customers may take service at various voltages, the number of customers served at each voltage on the first day of the month and the last day of the month (this is only applicable if rate codes are not used to delineate the voltage at which customers are served)	AVAILABLE The data exists in MDM/CCB at individual customer and meter level.	PLAUSABLE DELIVERABILITY This still requires work to pull out, aggregate and validate based on specific requirements. See questions in notes.		Based on total number of active service agreements on each rate code.
3	For each rate code, the number of customers served on that rate schedule on the first day of the month and the last day of the month for which interval meter readings are obtained; a. For each rate code on which customers may take service at various voltages, the number of customers served at each voltage on the first day of the month and the last day of the month which interval meter readings are obtained (this is only applicable if rate codes are not used to delineate the voltage at which customers are served);	AVAILABLE The data exists in MDM/CCB at individual customer and meter level.	PLAUSABLE DELIVERABILITY This still requires work to pull out, aggregate and validate based on specific requirements. And will require components from both CCB/MDM to complete. See questions in notes.		Based on total number of active service agreements with meters that can collect interval data. i.e. AMI meters.
4	For each rate code for which service is available at a single voltage, the sum of customers interval meter readings, by interval; a. For each rate code on which customers may take service at various voltages, the sum of customers interval meter readings, by interval and by voltage (this is only applicable if rate codes are not used to delineate the voltage at which customers are served);	PARTIALLY AVAILABLE Interval meter reading is stored at an individual meter level in MDM. The aggregate suggested is not stored in MDM or the data hub. (interval by rate code).	PLAUSABLE DELIVERABILITY Data recording processes currently exist to capture summarized hourly interval data by class. Such processes could be explored to be modified to capture individual rate codes. Currently processes, capture hourly data only.		Based on hourly intervals.
5	If any internal adjustments to customer interval data are necessary for the company's billing system to bill the interval data referenced in parts 4. and 4.a., such adjustments should be applied to each interval recording prior to the customers data being summed for each interval	NOT AVAILABLE The data hub does not reflect any updates to interval usage information.	COMPLEX DELIVERABILITY Do not believe this to be a report ask, but believe this to be a process and system change for data hub.		Evergy's MDM/CCB systems house corrections/updates of data in near real time. Data is posted to the Data Hub, the source for reporting, periodically. Modifications to align data within these systems would require extensive configuration and the utilization of MDM/CCB/Data Warehouse consultants to enable.
6	From time to time the Commission may designate certain customer subsets for more granular study. If such designations have been made, the information required under parts 1 – 5 should be provided or retained for those instances.	PARTIALLY AVAILABLE For the items in 1-5 above where the Company can provide the data, it will be retained for data availability.	COMPLEX DELIVERABILITY Ability to comply with an unknown future request of additional more granular data cannot be proactively ensured.		See comments for Items #1 through #5.
7	Individual customer interval data shall be retained for a minimum of fourteen months. If individual data is acquired by the Company in intervals of less than one hour in duration, such data shall be retained in intervals of no less than one hour.	AVAILABLE Evergy retains interval data for individual customers as billing standards require in the CCB/MDM systems.	NOT APPLICABLE		Evergy retains interval data for six years in MDM, and summarized usage is retained the data hub. Data hub aggregations began in January of 2020.
8	a. Retain individual hourly data for use in providing bill-comparison tools for customers to compare rate alternatives.	AVAILABLE Evergy retains interval data for individual customers as billing standards require in the CCB/MDM systems.	NOT APPLICABLE		Based on retaining individual hourly data. Evergy via a third party, offers a customer facing tool creating bill comparisons for residential customers (with qualifying data). The individual analysis for rate compares is dynamic and Evergy does not store or retain these individual comparisons.

DATA REQUEST ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

<u>DATA REQUEST #</u>	<u>DATA REQUESTED</u>	<u>AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>DELIVERABILITY ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>ESTIMATED COST TO PROVIDE</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
8	b. Retain coincident peak determinants for use in future rate proceedings.	AVAILABLE Eversgy retains interval data for individual customers as billing standards require in the CCB/MDM systems.	COMPLEX DELIVERABILITY If this requirement suggests providing a 15 minute view of system peak, this data cannot be delivered in the format suggested.		Eversgy can provide hourly data by rate class for all hours of the day for every day of the year as is currently provided in rate cases. As noted in item 4, an aggregated view of hourly data by rate code can be pursued. 15 minute interval data is not currently stored in the Data Hub and therefore cannot be aggregated as described.
8	c. 1) the information described in part 1;	NOT AVAILABLE Neither capital investments nor maintenance expenses are currently tracked by voltage class or rate code. In some instances current capital investments and expenses impact multiple primary voltages and rate codes.	COMPLEX DELIVERABILITY Neither capital investments nor maintenance expenses are currently tracked by voltage class or rate code. In some instances current capital investments and expenses impact multiple primary voltages and rate codes.		See Item #1
8	c. 2) a minimum of 12 months of the data described in parts 2-5;	SEE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ABOVE	SEE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ABOVE		
8	c. 3) for rate codes with more than 100 customers, a sample of individual customer hourly data, and identified peak demands for those 100 customers in the form requested at that time (i.e. monthly 15 minute non-coincident, annual 1 hour coincident);	AVAILABLE The data exists in MDM/CCB at individual customer and meter level.	PLAUSABLE DELIVERABILITY Configuration would be needed to facilitate/extract data.		Based on delivery of hourly data for sample of 100 customers.
8	c. 4) for rate codes with 100 or fewer customers, individual customer hourly data, and identified peak demands for those customers in the form requested at that time (i.e. monthly 15 minute non coincident, annual 1 hour coincident).	AVAILABLE The data exists in MDM/CCB at individual customer and meter level.	PLAUSABLE DELIVERABILITY Configuration would be needed to facilitate/extract data.		Based on delivery of hourly data for sample of 100 customers.
8	d. For purposes of general rate proceedings, Eversgy shall provide all data described above for a period of not less than 36 months, except that Staff does not request individual customer data for 36 months except as described in part 8.c.3.	SEE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ABOVE	SEE INDIVIDUAL ITEMS ABOVE		The creation of a sustainable dynamic process that captures all of the data above, that retroactively corrects/modifies based on downstream/future changes, and the incorporation of individual capture and manual intervention to facilitate sampling at any/all intervals based on later clarification for a 36 month period is likely not possible without extensive system/process overhaul and configuration as detailed in the individual items above.
9	Staff recommends that EMM and EMW be ordered to develop the determinants for assessment of an on-peak demand charge to replace the current monthly billing demand charge, and for potential implementation for customers not currently subject to a demand charge. At this time, Staff recommends that in summer months the period be noon – 10 pm, and during non-summer months the period be 6 am – 10 pm, but Staff welcomes the input of other parties to refine this time periods. Staff does not recommend that weekends and holidays be excluded. Second, Staff recommends the EMM and EMW begin to retain and study data related to the reactive demand requirements of each rate code, and sample customers within each rate code. While in recent history reactive demand has not been a determinant in CCOS studies or a rate element for many customers, emerging system conditions associated with changes in regional generation fleets may occasion further study of reactive demand requirements.	PARTIALLY AVAILABLE Data is being retained to develop an on peak charge. Determinants are being retained for rates where reactive demand is a component. Expanded determinants dependent on study design.	PLAUSABLE DELIVERABILITY Configuration would be needed to facilitate/extract data to develop an on peak charge. Reactive demand data is currently provided as part of rate design process. Expanded reporting dependent on study design.		Currently, MDM systems collect meter interval data for all hours of the day, 365 days of the year for customers with AMI meters. Configuration would be needed to create reporting for the collection of hourly kw during any peak period identified. Eversgy does not have a study design in place to inform the portion of the is data request related to reactive demand.