

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

In the Matter of the Application of Evergy Metro,)
Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro and Evergy)
Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West) File No. EO-2025-0154
for Approval of New and Modified Tariffs for)
Service to Large Load Customers)

POSITION STATEMENT OF GOOGLE LLC

Pursuant to the Order Setting Procedural Schedule issued by the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) on May 13, 2025, Google LLC (“Google”) hereby files its Position Statement on issues identified in the Jointly Proposed List of Issues, as filed by the parties on September 18, 2025. As noted in the Jointly Proposed List of Issues, the inclusion of an issue in the list does not mean that all parties agree with the characterization of the issue or that the matter identified is actually in dispute and/or that a Commission decision on the issue is proper or necessary in the case.

I. Position Statement

- A. Should the Commission adopt Evergy’s or Staff’s conceptual tariff, rate structure, and pricing in order to comply with Mo. Rev. Stat. Section 393.130.7?*

The Commission should adopt the conceptual structure of the tariff, rate structure, and pricing presented by Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro (“EMM”) and Evergy Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West (“EMW”) (collectively, “Evergy” or “Company”) with the modifications set forth in the Rebuttal Testimony of Dr. Carolyn A. Berry. The Commission should reject Staff’s conceptual tariff, rate structure, and pricing as insufficiently supported, unduly discriminatory, not based on costs, and impractical to implement, as further explained in the Surrebuttal Testimony of Dr. Berry.

- B. Can the Commission establish terms and conditions to exclude otherwise eligible customers from receiving EDR discounts?*

Google does not currently have a position on this issue but reserves the right to take a position during or after the evidentiary hearing and in its post-hearing briefs.

- C. What should be the threshold demand load in megawatts (“MW”)/criteria for a large load power service (“LLPS”) customer to receive service under a Commission approved LLPS tariff?*

Google recommends reducing the LLPS class applicability threshold to 70 MW from the Company’s proposed 100 MW to better balance the range of customer sizes and cost characteristics of large load customers, reduce cost differentiation within both the existing Large Power Service (“LPS”) and the proposed LLPS classes, and align more closely with cost causation principles.

- a. To the extent the threshold captures existing customers, should a grandfathering provision for such customer be adopted?*

Google does not currently have a position on this issue but reserves the right to take a position during or after the evidentiary hearing and in its post-hearing briefs.

- D. What other existing programs and riders should or should not be available to LLPS customers, if any?*

Google recommends, as a general rule, that all existing programs and riders be available to qualifying LLPS customers.

- E. Should the LLPS customer bear reasonability for its interconnection and related non-FERC transmission infrastructure costs?*

The LLPS customer should bear all costs of investment dedicated solely to serving such customer and also bear its allocated share of responsibility for extensions of transmission or substation facilities required to serve such LLPS customer and available for use by others.

- a. How should such interconnection and related non-FERC transmission infrastructure costs be accounted for or tracked, if at all?*

Google does not currently have a position on this issue but reserves the right to take a position during or after the evidentiary hearing and in its post-hearing briefs.

- F. What minimum term of service should be required for a LLPS customer to receive service under the Commission approved LLPS tariffs?*

Google recommends shortening the contract term from 15 years to an 8 to 10-year range, with an optional load ramping period of up to 4 years that would extend the term, as this provides greater flexibility for large load customers in a dynamic market while still allowing Evergy to manage its capacity position and mitigate risk, consistent with other utility practices.

- G. What collateral or other security requirements should be required for a LLPS customer to receive service under the Commission approved LLPS tariffs?*

Google supports the Data Center Coalition's positions on this issue.

- H. What termination fee (exit fee) provision should a LLPS customer be subject to under the Commission approved LLPS tariffs?*

Google recommends that LLPS customers be allowed to reduce capacity by up to 20% without a penalty, and that the tariff language be modified to include payments to customers for the realized value of reduced capacity beyond 20%, that a dispute resolution process for capacity reductions be required in Schedule LLPS, and that these provisions apply to both Missouri West and Missouri Metro. These changes offer greater flexibility to large load customers with minimal stranded cost risk to the Company, while mitigation and dispute resolution procedures ensure equitable treatment and fair compensation for released capacity.

Google also recommends modifying Evergy's exit fee proposal to include reassignment options and dispute resolution procedures similar to those for reductions in contract capacity, as this ensures equitable treatment for full contract termination, maximizes efficient resource use, and provides necessary flexibility for customers operating in dynamic markets

- I. Should any limit be placed on Evergy concerning the amount of LLPS load that it may serve?*

No.

- J. Should the Commission approve Evergy's "Path to Power" approach?*

Yes, but Google recommends increasing the limit on the number of projects to be considered together in the advanced study and scoping phase of the interconnection process from four (4) to eight (8), as this allows for greater efficiency and project flow if needed.

- a. What components of the proposed "Path to Power," if any, should be included in the Commission's approved tariff sheets?*

Google does not currently have a position on this issue but reserves the right to take a position during or after the evidentiary hearing and in its post-hearing briefs.

- K. Are changes needed for the Emergency Energy Conservation Plan tariff sheet and related tariff sheets to accommodate LLPS customers?*

No. The Commission should reject Staff's proposal to add the language, "Customers taking service under Schedule LLPS may be interrupted during grid emergencies under the same circumstances as any other customer." Many LLPS customers provide essential services. The current Emergency Conservation Plan tariff sheet and related tariff sheets adequately accommodate LLPS customers.

- L. What studies should be required for customers to take service under the LLPS tariff?*

Google does not currently have a position on this issue but reserves the right to take a position during or after the evidentiary hearing and in its post-hearing briefs.

- M. Should a form customer service agreement be included in the Commission approved LLPS tariffs resulting from this case?*

While Google does not believe that a form customer agreement should be included in the commission approved LLPS tariff, Google recognizes that transparency will be an important element to successful engagement with regulatory stakeholders at the MPSC.

- N. Should Evergy be required to disclose information about prospective customers?*

Evergy should not be required to disclose any confidential customer-specific information about prospective customers.

- a. If so, what review should the Commission have of prospective customers and terms applicable to specific customers?*

Not applicable.

- b. In what case should said review occur?*

Not applicable.

- O. Should LLPS customers be included in the FAC?*

Yes. The Commission should reject Staff's proposal to separate LLPS customers from other customers requiring they be registered with a separate Southwest Power Pool ("SPP") commercial pricing node and excluded from the FAC. The Commission should adopt the conceptual structure of the tariff, rate structure, and pricing presented by the Company with the modifications set forth in the Rebuttal Testimony of Dr. Carolyn A. Berry.

a. What, if any, changes should be made to Evergy's existing FAC tariff sheet?

None.

b. When/in what case should these changes be made?

Not applicable.

c. What if any FAC related costs should the Commission order track?

None.

P. Should LLPS customers be registered with a separate Southwest Power Pool ("SPP") commercial pricing node (subject to SPP support) or alternatively should Evergy be required to provide the Staff-recommended data (Appendix 2, Schedule 2) node?

No. The Commission should reject Staff's proposal as unduly discriminatory in its treatment of large load customers as a separate commercial pricing node and assigning charges based on that node and imposing additional new charges on large load customers that are not imposed on other customers taking embedded cost service.

Q. Should LLPS customers be a subclass of Evergy's Large Power Service ("LPS") or be a stand-alone class?

Google does not currently have a position on this issue but reserves the right to take a position during or after the evidentiary hearing and in its post-hearing briefs.

R. What treatment is needed to address revenues from LLPS customers occurring between general rate cases?

No treatment is needed. The Commission should reject Staff's proposed adjustments and provisions to address revenues from LLPS customers

occurring between general rate cases for the reasons put forward in the Surrebuttal Testimonies of Steven Wills and Kevin Gunn.

- S. Should the Commission approve the Evergy System Support Rider or take other steps to address cost impacts to non-LLPS customers?*

Google recommends rejecting the SSR entirely because Evergy has failed to establish a need for it, there are significant conceptual and methodological flaws, there is no established basis in cost of service, the process to update the SSR lacks necessary strictures, it results in inequitable allocation of charges among LLPS customers, and it adds significant regulatory burden.

- T. Should the proposed additional riders be authorized by the Commission at this time?*

- a. The Customer Capacity Rider?*

Yes. Google further recommends that the Commission require the Company to offer a tariff similar to NV Energy's Clean Transition Tariff ("CTT") as a more comprehensive and effective option than the proposed Optional Customer Capacity Rider ("CCR") and the Clean Energy Rider ("CER"). A CTT-like tariff would better empower LLPS customers to bring their own resources and assume financial risk to meet capacity needs (addressing the CCR's limited options) and enable them to actively participate in strategic clean energy investments that further their 24/7 carbon-free energy goals and achieve better alignment of energy consumed with green attributes (addressing the CER's limitations). This approach would align customer investment with overall grid needs, accelerate decarbonization by enabling strategic clean energy investments, and provide a clear pathway to 24/7 carbon-free energy without shifting costs to non-participants.

- b. The Demand Response & Local Generation Rider?*

Yes.

- c. The Renewable Energy Program Rider?*

Yes.

- d. The Green Solution Connections Rider?*

Yes.

- e. The Alternative Energy Credits Rider?*

Yes.

f. The Clean Energy Choice Rider?

Yes. But see comment above regarding Issue T.a.

U. Should the Commission order a community benefits program as described in the testimony of Dr. Geoff Marke?

Google does not currently have a position on this issue, but reserves the right to take a position during or after the evidentiary hearing and in its post-hearing briefs.

[Remainder of page intentionally blank]

II. Conclusion

Google respectfully requests that the Commission consider the foregoing Position Statement, which is largely based upon the Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testimony of Dr. Carolyn A. Berry, in its adjudication of Evergy's proposed LLPS Tariff.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI PC

By: /s/ Frank A. Caro

Frank A. Caro, Jr. (#42094)
Andrew O. Schulte (#62194)
Polsinelli PC
900 W. 48th Place
Suite 900
Kansas City, Missouri 64112
(816) 572-4754
fcaro@polsinelli.com
aschulte@polsinelli.com

Sean Pluta (#70300)
Polsinelli PC
7676 Forsyth Blvd
Suite 800
St. Louis, MO 63105
spluta@polsinelli.com

ATTORNEYS FOR GOOGLE LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been emailed to all parties of record this 22nd day of September, 2025.

/s/ Frank A. Caro
Frank A. Caro