

**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)	Case No. EA-2026-0343
For Permission and Approval of Certificates of)	
Convenience and Necessity Authorizing them to)	
Construct, Install, Own, Operate, Manage,)	
Maintain, and Control Natural Gas and Solar)	
Electrical Production Facilities and a Battery)	
Energy Storage System)	

APPLICATION TO INTERVENE

1. **COMES NOW** Jayson A. Watkins esq. (“Intervenor”), and hereby files this Application to Intervene in the above-captioned proceeding pursuant to the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Commission”) Rule 20 CSR 4240-2.075 and in support thereof states as follows:

IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROCEEDING

2. On June 1, 2026, 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 “Applicants”) filed a Notice of Intended Case Filing with the Commission, stating their intent to file a joint application for certificates of public convenience and necessity (“CCN”) under Section 393.170.1, RSMo, and 20 CSR 4240-20.045.
3. On August 31, 2026, Evergy filed its Application and direct testimony in support of its application seeking CCNs authorizing it to construct, install, own, operate, manage, maintain, and control, among other things, the Buchanan Bluffs Energy Center Unit 2 (“Buchanan Bluffs Unit 2” or “the Facility”), a proposed approximately 710 megawatt (“MW”) advanced-class combined-cycle gas turbine (“CGT”) electric generating facility to be located on an approximately 170-acre site in Buchanan County, Missouri, near Frazier, Missouri, along State Route E SE (the “Johnson 1” site).
4. The Facility is proposed to be owned 50% by EMM and 50% by EMW, with a targeted commercial operation date before summer 2032. The Facility would be co-located with the Buchanan Bluffs Energy Center Unit 1, a separate facility proposed for Evergy’s Kansas affiliate, Evergy Kansas Central. Buchanan Bluffs Units 1 and 2 would share certain common plant infrastructure, including water supply and water treatment facilities.

INTERVENOR’S INTEREST AND BASIS FOR INTERVENTION

5. Intervenor is a landowner whose real property is located in Buchanan County, Missouri, in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Buchanan Bluffs Unit 2 site. Intervenor’s

property is located within close proximity to the Johnson 1 site where Evergy proposes to construct and operate the 710 MW combined-cycle gas turbine facility.

6. Missouri Commission Rule 20 CSR 4240-2.075 provides that any person may file an application to intervene in a Commission proceeding.
7. Intervenor has a direct, substantial, and legally cognizable interest in this proceeding that is distinct from the interests of the general public. As a landowner in the immediate vicinity of the proposed Facility, Intervenor will be directly and specifically affected by the Commission's determination of whether to grant CCNs for the Buchanan Bluffs Unit 2 at the proposed Johnson 1 site. Intervenor's particularized interests include, but are not limited to:
 - (a) Direct impacts on the value of Intervenor's real property resulting from the construction and operation of a 710 MW gas turbine facility in close proximity to Intervenor's land;
 - (b) Direct exposure to air emissions, noise, light pollution, and other operational and construction impacts from the Facility, given that the proposed site is located within approximately .25 miles from his location and within one mile of up to 50 other residences, and approximately 20 houses would be within one-half (0.5) mile of the Facility;
 - (c) Impacts on the use and enjoyment of Intervenor's property, including adverse effects on quality of life from continuous operation of the gas turbine facility, increased traffic during construction and operation, and visual impacts;
 - (d) Concerns regarding the availability of water resources for Intervenor's own property, given the local water district's stated inability to supply the water needed for the proposed Facility, the impact on water rates within the local water district; and
 - (e) A direct interest in ensuring that the Commission fully evaluates the suitability of the proposed site—including its water supply infrastructure, residential proximity, and the availability of alternate sites—before granting CCNs that would authorize construction at this location.
8. Intervenor's interests may not be adequately represented by any existing party to this proceeding. The Applicants, as the proponents of the Facility, have interests adverse to Intervenor's. The Office of the Public Counsel and the Commission Staff, while representing the broader public interest, do not represent the particularized interests of individual landowners in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site. No other party to this proceeding can be expected to present the specific evidence and arguments that Intervenor intends to raise regarding the impacts of the Facility on nearby landowners and the surrounding community.

ISSUES TO BE RAISED

9. Intervenor intends to participate fully in this proceeding and to present evidence on the following issues, which are directly relevant to the Commission's determination of whether the proposed Facility is "necessary or convenient for the public service" under Section 393.170.1, RSMo:

Water Supply Deficiency

10. The documentary record establishes a detailed and unresolved water-supply deficiency. On June 19, 2026, Evergy's Conventional Generation Project Supervisor, Mike Joseph, first contacted Paula Johnson, District Clerk of Public Water Supply District No. 1 of DeKalb County ("PWSD #1 of DeKalb County"), regarding water-line easements near the Johnson 1 site, across the street from 10950 SE State Rte. E, Agency, Missouri 64401. On July 24, 2026, Evergy formally inquired about water-service availability and requested information regarding the maximum water-supply capacity in gallons per minute ("GPM"), the size and location of the nearest water main, limitations affecting future service, and planned system upgrades. On July 28, 2026, Mike Joseph stated that Evergy's minimum water need was 100 GPM. That same day, Ethan Henry, Evergy's Conventional Generation Project Manager, clarified that construction, anticipated to begin in mid-2027, would require approximately 150 GPM or a daily maximum of approximately 216,000 gallons, and that during peak commercial operations with both units running on a hot day, usage could reach up to 500 GPM. PWSD #1 responded on July 28 that the most it could offer was a standard residential meter flowing 10 to 15 GPM—a tiny fraction of Evergy's stated requirements. On July 30, 2026, PWSD #1 warned Evergy in writing that "the District's available water capacity is significantly below the volume required" and that "providing the requested flow could place an unacceptable and potentially catastrophic strain on the water distribution system." On August 5, 2026, the Board of Directors of PWSD #1 of DeKalb County formally determined that "the volume of water requested is well beyond the scope and capacity of the District's rural water system," that "the District is unable to supply the quantity of water requested," and that, although the District was "designed and developed to provide safe clean drinking water," the requested quantity "would have a significant impact on the District's water supply and infrastructure."
11. On August 20, 2026, Ethan Henry acknowledged that the available water supply was insufficient, stating that Evergy would need to "pivot and explore alternative sources for water supply." Evergy is now attempting to secure water from a water company that does not currently operate in the area where the Facility would be sited. That proposal raises additional unresolved questions regarding the feasibility and cost of extending service into a new area, the cost ultimately borne by ratepayers, the reliability of infrastructure that does not currently exist, the environmental and permitting implications of constructing or extending that infrastructure, and whether the proposed alternative can provide a reliable and sufficient long-term supply for a 710 MW combined-cycle gas turbine facility without further harm to the residents of the area.
12. This email exchange reveals that: (a) Evergy did not confirm water availability before selecting the Johnson 1 site or filing its siting study—the first documented water inquiry

occurred in June 2026, after site selection; (b) the gap between the 10 to 15 GPM PWSD #1 can provide and the 100 to 500 GPM Everygy requires is enormous, with the District able to supply less than 3% of the Facility’s peak water demand; (c) PWSD #1 warned that the requested demand could cause “potentially catastrophic” consequences to the existing water system serving area residents, raising concerns about impacts on existing water service for local homeowners, including Intervenor; (d) Everygy acknowledged that it must “pivot” to alternative water sources, but no alternative water-supply arrangement has been presented to the Commission; and (e) these emails are attached as Exhibit A to this Application.

13. In addition to the known water limitations of the PWSD, the PWSD has contractual loan obligations with the USDA that further restrict water alternatives in the district. The PWSD minutes from August 18 are attached as Exhibit B to this Application.

14.

Proximity to Residential Properties

15. The proposed Facility would be located within one (1) mile of up to 50 residences, and approximately 20 houses would be within one-half (0.5) mile of the Facility. This is a quasi-residential, rural residential area—not an industrial zone—and this dense residential proximity to a 710 MW gas turbine operation raises significant concerns regarding:

- (a) Air quality and emissions impacts on the health and well-being of nearby residents;
- (b) Noise impacts from the continuous operation of the gas turbine, steam turbine, heat recovery steam generator, and associated equipment;
- (c) Diminution in the value of residential properties and agricultural land in the surrounding area;
- (d) Possible health and safety concerns for nearby residents, including vulnerable populations;
- (e) Quality of life impacts, including visual impacts from the industrial-scale facility, light pollution from nighttime operations, and substantially increased traffic on local roads during the multi-year construction period and ongoing operations; and
- (f) Whether adequate mitigation measures have been proposed, or can be imposed as conditions, to protect the health, safety, property values, and quality of life of nearby residents.

Availability of Alternate Sites

16. Everygy’s own siting study, conducted by 1898 & Co., evaluated 25 candidate sites across Missouri and Kansas in its original 2025 study. A revised study in 2026 added the Johnson 1 site by addendum, bringing the total to 26 candidate sites. Multiple alternate sites identified in the study may have adequate water supply, fewer residential impacts, and more contiguous usable area than Johnson 1. Notably, the original shortlisted sites—designated “Buchanan (MO)” and “Buchanan-Sparta (MO)” —were abandoned due to

“permitting concerns,” only for Evergy to select Johnson 1, a site with even more significant infrastructure deficiencies. The Johnson 1 site’s own principal weakness, as identified in the siting study, is its limited contiguous usable area (only approximately 41 contiguous acres of 169 total acres).

17. The Commission should require Evergy to demonstrate why the Johnson 1 site is necessary for this Facility when 25 other candidate sites were evaluated and multiple alternate sites may offer adequate water supply, fewer residential impacts, and more contiguous usable area. Evergy should also explain why it abandoned Buchanan and Buchanan-Sparta for “permitting concerns” yet selected Johnson 1 despite the documented water-supply deficiency and limited contiguous acreage. The availability of alternatives that may better serve the public interest is directly relevant to the Commission’s determination under Section 393.170.1, RSMo.

Validity of the Siting Study

18. Whether the conclusions of the 1898 & Co. siting study remain valid given the local water district’s subsequent written notification that it cannot supply water to the Facility. The study included “water availability” as a criterion under Site Development, weighted at 20% of the total score, but Evergy did not confirm actual water availability with PWSD #1 until after selecting Johnson 1. PWSD #1’s written refusal and the documented mismatch between available and required capacity undermine the assumptions underlying Johnson 1’s score and warrant a re-evaluation of the study.
1. Intervenor further intends to examine the completeness and reliability of the 1898 & Co. site-selection study. First, the study included “water availability” as a criterion under Site Development, weighted at 20% of the total score, yet Evergy did not actually confirm water availability with PWSD #1 until after Johnson 1 had been selected. The study’s scoring therefore appears to have rested on assumptions now proven false by PWSD #1’s written refusal. Second, the study’s “nearest receptor” criterion should have flagged the dense residential proximity at Johnson 1—up to 50 residences within one mile and approximately 20 houses within one-half mile—in a quasi-residential, rural residential area rather than an industrial or purely agricultural zone. If residential proximity was scored, the Commission should require disclosure of how Johnson 1 scored relative to the other candidate sites on that criterion; if it was not meaningfully scored, the study is incomplete. Third, the study evaluated “community conflict” as a criterion, yet the water district’s refusal and the density of nearby residences constitute precisely the type of community conflict the study should have identified but apparently did not. Fourth, Johnson 1 was not part of the original 2025 study; it was added by addendum in 2026 only after “permitting concerns emerged” at the originally shortlisted sites. That late addition raises questions about whether Johnson 1 received the same depth of analysis as the original 25 candidate sites. Finally, the study’s composite scoring cannot be relied upon when a fundamental input—water availability—has been proven invalid. The Commission should require a re-evaluation of the siting study or, at minimum, require Evergy to disclose the site-specific water-availability data used to score each candidate site.

Public Interest Determination

2. Whether the proposed Facility, at the proposed Johnson 1 site location, is “necessary or convenient for the public service” under Section 393.170, RSMo. Intervenor submits that the Commission must carefully evaluate whether this particular site—given the documented water supply deficiency, the dense residential proximity, the limited contiguous usable acreage, and the availability of alternate sites—is an appropriate location for a 710 MW gas turbine facility. The Commission’s CCN determination must consider the totality of the circumstances, including the impact on nearby landowners and the surrounding community.

INTERVENTION WILL NOT UNDULY DELAY OR PREJUDICE

3. Intervenor’s participation in this proceeding will not unduly broaden the issues, cause undue delay, or prejudice any party. The issues Intervenor intends to raise—water supply adequacy, residential proximity impacts, site suitability, and the availability of alternate sites—are directly relevant to the Commission’s statutory obligation to determine whether the proposed Facility is “necessary or convenient for the public service.” These are matters that the Commission should consider in any event in fulfilling its obligations under Section 393.170.1, RSMo.
4. This Application to Intervene is timely filed. Evergy filed its direct testimony on August 31, 2026, and no procedural schedule has yet been established in this proceeding that would be disrupted by Intervenor’s participation.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

5. **WHEREFORE**, Intervenor Jayson A. Watkins, respectfully requests that the Commission:
 - (a) Grant this Application to Intervene and permit Intervenor to participate as a full party in this proceeding, with all rights attendant thereto, including the right to present testimony and other evidence, conduct cross-examination of witnesses, file pleadings and briefs, and participate in all hearings and conferences;
 - (b) Consider the evidence presented by Intervenor regarding the water supply deficiency, the proximity of the proposed Facility to residential properties, the validity of the siting study, and the availability of alternate sites in rendering its decision on Evergy’s CCN application;
 - (c) Deny the CCN for the Buchanan Bluffs Energy Center Unit 2 at the proposed Johnson 1 site, or, in the alternative, impose such conditions as are necessary and appropriate to protect Intervenor and other nearby landowners from the adverse impacts of the Facility, including but not limited to conditions addressing air quality, noise mitigation, water supply reliability, property value protection, and construction-period impacts; and

- (d) Require Evergy to produce the complete, unredacted 1898 & Co. siting study, currently filed under confidential seal as Schedule JKO-3, for review by Intervenor, subject to an appropriate protective order;
- (e) Grant such other and further relief as the Commission deems just and reasonable.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jayson A. Watkins
Jayson A. Watkins MO # 61434
11100 State Route E
Agency, Missouri 64401
816-294-2734
watkins@brownandwatkins.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that true and correct copies of the foregoing Application to Intervene have been served by electronic mail to all parties on the service list of record in Case No. EA-2026-0343, this 15 day of September, 2026.

/s/ Jayson A. Watkins
Jayson A. Watkins