Exhibit No.:

Issue(s): Highway Right-of-Way

Usage Policy Revision

Witness: Alan J. Bax
Sponsoring Party: MoPSC Staff

Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony

*Čase Nos.:* ER-2024-0189

Date Testimony Prepared: September 10, 2024

# MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION INDUSTRY ANALYSIS DIVISION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT

#### SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

**ALAN J. BAX** 

EVERGY MISSOURI WEST, INC. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West

CASE NO. ER-2024-0189

Jefferson City, Missouri September 2024

1		SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY			
2		OF			
3		ALAN J BAX			
4		EVERGY MISSOURI WEST, INC.			
5		d/b/a Evergy Missouri West			
6		Case No. ER-2024-0189			
7	Q.	Please state your name and business address.			
8	A.	Alan J. Bax, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.			
9	Q.	Are you the same Alan J. Bax that has previously filed Direct Testimony			
10	in this Case?				
11	A.	Yes.			
12	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY				
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?			
14	A.	I am responding to the Rebuttal Testimony of Evergy Missouri West ("EMW")			
15	witness Darrin R. Ives, specifically on page 38, regarding a discussion of EMW's right-of-way				
16	("ROW") po	licy.			
17	<u>HIGHWAY</u>	RIGHT-OF-WAY USAGE POLICY			
18	Q.	Despite the evidence provided in your Direct Testimony illustrating that EMW			
19	had indeed revised its ROW policy, 1 preferring the installation of transmission and distribution				
20	facilities on private land parcels in lieu of using highway ROWs, Mr. Ives asserts that there has				
21	been no change in its historical practices. What is your response?				
	<sup>1</sup> The ROW pol in December 20	licy was attached to my Direct Testimony in Schedule AJB-d4. It is indicated to have been revised 022.			

1	A. EMW revised its ROW usage policy in such a manner that is inconsistent with				
2	its historical practices. Mr. Ives's asserts in his rebuttal testimony that:				
3 4 5 6 7	[T]here is no revised policy as the Company has used both public and private easements throughout its history. Evergy's practice is to first look at placing facilities in the highway or public utility ROW when it is appropriate from a safety and operational perspective (emphasis added).				
8	Mr. Ives's assertion that EMW tries to use highway ROWs first contradicts EMW's Response				
9	to Staff Data Request No. 296 in this case. In this Response, EMW provided its revised				
10	"Transmission Engineering Policy Road Right-of-Way" policy, dated December 21, 2022.				
11	Paragraph 1.2 of this policy states:				
12 13 14 15 16	**  This is in addition to EMW's Response to Data Request No. 3 in an ongoing complaint,				
17	Case No. EC-2024-0015, in which EMW states, ** "				
17 18	Case No. EC-2024-0015, in which EMW states, ** "				
	Case No. EC-2024-0015, in which EMW states, ** "				
18	Case No. EC-2024-0015, in which EMW states, ** "  ." ** (emphasis added). So, this policy				
18 19					
18 19 20	." ** (emphasis added). So, this policy				
18 19 20 21	." ** (emphasis added). So, this policy appears to also apply to existing lines currently routed in highway ROWs as well as new lines.				
18 19 20 21 22	." ** (emphasis added). So, this policy appears to also apply to existing lines currently routed in highway ROWs as well as new lines.  Q. In your opinion, does EMW's ROW policy, as illustrated in EMW's Response				
18 19 20 21 22 23	." ** (emphasis added). So, this policy appears to also apply to existing lines currently routed in highway ROWs as well as new lines.  Q. In your opinion, does EMW's ROW policy, as illustrated in EMW's Response to Staff Data Request No. 296, depart from Mr. Ives characterization of EMW's utilization of				
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	." ** (emphasis added). So, this policy appears to also apply to existing lines currently routed in highway ROWs as well as new lines.  Q. In your opinion, does EMW's ROW policy, as illustrated in EMW's Response to Staff Data Request No. 296, depart from Mr. Ives characterization of EMW's utilization of highway ROWs contained in his Rebuttal Testimony?				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> EMW's Response to Staff Data Request No. 296 was attached to my Direct Testimony as Schedule AJB-d4.

## Surrebuttal Testimony of Alan J. Bax

- 1 property in its installation of such facilities. Utilities would only acquire additional private
- 2 property if there are specific identifiable needs. EMW's stated policy revision contradicts its
- 3 historical standard practices, and the testimony of Mr. Ives. Therefore, Staff recommends
- 4 EMW provide Staff with a revised Transmission Engineering Policy Road Right-of-Way policy
- 5 that is consistent with Mr. Ives's testimony.
  - Q. Does this conclude your surrebuttal testimony?
    - A. Yes, it does.

6

7

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

### OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Evergy Missouri d/b/a Evergy Missouri West's Red Authority to Implement A Genera Increase for Electric Service	quest for )	Case No. ER-2024-0189	
AFI	FIDAVIT OF ALAN	N J. BAX	
STATE OF MISSOURI )	SS.		
COUNTY OF COLE )			
COMES NOW ALAN J. BAX age; that he contributed to the foreg and that the same is true and correct	going Surrebuttal / T		
Further the Affiant sayeth not.			
	ALAN J. B	Jak Sax	
	JURAT		
Subscribed and sworn before m	e, a duly constituted	and authorized Notary Public, in	and for
the County of Cole, State of Misso	uri, at my office in Je	efferson City, on this 3rd	day
of September 2024.			
D. SUZIE MANKIN  Notary Public - Notary Seal  State of Missouri  Commissioned for Cole County	Notary Pub	escellankin	

D. SUZIE MANKIN
Notary Public - Notary Seal
State of Missouri
Commissioned for Cole County
My Commission Expires: April 04, 2025
Commission Number: 12412070