Exhibit No.:
Issue: Fuel Prices and Fuel Inventory
Witness: JP Meitner
Type of Exhibit: True-Up Rebuttal Testimony
Sponsoring Party: Evergy Missouri Metro
Case No.: ER-2026-0143
Date Testimony Prepared: September 18, 2026

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2026-0143

TRUE-UP REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JP Meitner

ON BEHALF OF

EVERGY MISSOURI METRO

Kansas City, Missouri
September 2026

TRUE-UP REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JP MEITNER

Case No. ER-2026-0143

Q: Please state your name and business address.

A: My name is JP Meitner. My business address is 818 South Kansas Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

Q: Have you previously filed testimony in this proceeding?

A: Yes. I adopted the direct testimony of Jessica Tucker, which was filed on February 6, 2026, I filed rebuttal testimony on August 11, 2026, and I filed surrebuttal testimony on September 10, 2026.

Q: On whose behalf are you testifying?

A: I am testifying on behalf of Evergy Missouri Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro ("EMM" or the "Company").

Q: What is the purpose of your True-Up Rebuttal testimony?

A: I will respond to Missouri Public Service Commission ("MPSC") Staff witness Antonija Nieto's Surrebuttal / True-Up Direct Testimony regarding:

- Natural gas prices

I will also address the following topics:

- Staff's treatment of coal prices in their production cost model at True-Up.
- Staff's treatment of coal inventory at True-Up.

I. Natural Gas Prices

Q: How does Staff witness Nieto respond to Company witness Foo's rebuttal testimony regarding natural gas prices?

A: Staff witness Nieto disagrees with the Company's recommendation regarding natural gas prices used in the Company's production cost model. At True-Up, Staff recommends using a twelve-month weighted average of actual natural gas commodity costs through June 30, 2026, after excluding prices associated with Winter Storm Fern. Staff contends that the Company's use of forward market prices is inconsistent with the Matching Principle, and the Known and Measurable Principle.

Q: Do you agree with Staff witness Nieto's characterization of the Company's natural gas pricing methodology?

A: No. Staff characterizes the Company's methodology as replacing actual costs with speculative forward prices. That does not accurately describe the Company's true-up methodology. At True-Up, the Company updated its natural gas price assumptions using actual prompt-month pricing from January 2025 through June 2026, and forward market prices as of July 1, 2026, for the remaining eighteen months of the three-year normalization period. Actual variable transportation costs were then added to determine the natural gas price applicable to each gas-fired generating station. Accordingly, the Company's methodology incorporates actual information through the end of the true-up period and uses then-current forward market information only for the portion of the normalization period for which actual prices are not yet available.

Q: Why does the Company include forward market prices in its normalization?

A: The purpose of normalization is to develop a representative level of natural gas prices for use in determining normalized fuel and purchased power costs. Historical prices provide useful information, but do not necessarily represent the market conditions expected during the period rates will be in effect. The Company's methodology incorporates both actual prices through True-Up and then-current market information regarding future prices, rather than relying exclusively on a historical twelve-month average.

Q: Staff witness Nieto characterizes forward natural gas prices as speculative. Do you agree with that characterization?

A: No. While forward prices are not a guarantee of the future spot price of natural gas, they are observable market prices available as of a specific date. They represent prices at which market participants can enter into transactions for future delivery or settlement of natural gas. Staff witness Nieto acknowledges that a futures contract allows a buyer and seller to commit today to a set price for delivery or settlement at a future date[1]. These prices are therefore not hypothetical or assumed values developed by the Company; they are observable prices established through market transactions.

Q: Do you consider those forward prices to be known and measurable?

A: Yes. The forward prices used by the company are known and measurable as of the date they are observed. The price quoted by the market on that date is objectively available and verifiable. The Company is not asserting that the forward price guarantees what the future spot price will be. Rather, it uses observable market pricing, together with actual pricing through True-Up, to develop a reasonable normalized natural gas price.

---

[1] See. A. Nieto (Staff) Surrebuttal/True-Up Direct at 3, n. 6

Q: What does Staff's treatment of Winter Storm Fern demonstrate regarding the use of historical actual prices?

A: It demonstrates that the use of actual historical data does not eliminate the need for normalization. Staff themselves determined that certain actual prices experienced during the true-up period should be excluded because they were not representative of ongoing conditions. I agree with the general principle that abnormal conditions should not dictate the normalized level. The disagreement is therefore not whether normalization is appropriate, but which methodology produces a more representative natural gas price for purposes of the production cost model.

Q: Do you agree that Staff's twelve-month historical average is preferable because it is based entirely on actual data?

A: No. The fact that a price was experienced does not necessarily mean that it is representative of the conditions expected during the period new rates will be in effect. Staff's twelve-month average is inherently backward-looking and gives weight to historical market conditions simply because they occurred during the selected period. The Company's methodology incorporates actual information through True-Up while also recognizing current market information for the remaining normalization period.

Q: What do you recommend?

A: I recommend that the Commission use the Company's natural gas price assumptions. The Company's methodology incorporates actual information through True-Up, incorporates current market information for periods for which actual prices are not yet available, and produces normalized prices that are consistent with recent actual market experience. In my opinion, this provides a more representative basis for determining normalized fuel costs, purchased power costs, off-system sales revenues, and overall net system costs than Staff's twelve-month historical average.

II. Coal Prices

Q: How did Staff develop their coal prices used in their production cost model at True-Up?

A: Staff witness Nieto calculated a composite delivered coal price using coal deliveries made during the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2026. Staff's methodology weights the delivered price by tons received under the applicable coal supply and transportation arrangements during that period.

Q: How did the Company develop their coal prices at True-Up?

A: The Company used actual June 2026 coal pricing where available. If no coal deliveries occurred during June, the Company used actual pricing from the nearest month in which a delivery occurred.

Q: Do you agree with Staff's approach to determining coal prices?

A: No. I believe the more appropriate approach is to use the actual delivered coal price from June 2026, the final month of the true-up period, where available. Coal supply and transportation costs can change as contracts expire, new contracts become effective, and applicable pricing provisions change A twelve-month average incorporates pricing from earlier periods that may not reflect the contractual arrangements in effect at the end of the true-up period. In contrast, using the most recent actual delivered price better reflects the coal supply and transportation arrangements in effect as of the true-up date and provides a more representative estimate of the costs expected when new rates are in effect.

Q: Why does Staff's approach understate coal price?

A: Staff's methodology blends earlier coal deliveries with deliveries made under the coal supply and transportation arrangements in effect at the end of the true-up period. Because certain earlier deliveries were made at lower prices, including pricing from those contracts reduces Staff's composite delivered coal price. As a result, Staff's methodology produces a normalized coal price below the most recent actual delivered cost and does not fully reflect the pricing associated with the coal supply and transportation arrangements in effect as of June 30, 2026.

III. <u>Coal Inventory</u>

Q: How did Staff handle Coal Inventory in its True-Up?

A: Staff used modeled burns to calculate coal inventory tons. In this case, using modeled burns results in a significantly lower ending inventory value than actuals.

Q: Do you agree with Staff's approach regarding coal inventory in their true-up testimony?

A: No, Staff witness Antonija Nieto's states in testimony that Fuel Inventory was updated. However, the method for calculating coal inventory was unchanged. For coal inventory calculations, I believe Staff should use the target inventory values provided in RB-74 rather than modeled burns. RB-74 reflects the inventory levels EMM plans and manages to maintain at the plant throughout the year and is therefore more consistent with the assumptions with how the Company operates. By contrast, using modeled burns alone effectively assumes inventory is reduced solely by consumption and does not account for the target inventory levels that are actively maintained through fuel procurement and inventory management decisions. As a result, the RB-74 values provide a more accurate representation of expected coal inventory.

Q: Why is it inappropriate to calculate coal inventory requirements using normalized burn assumptions?

A: Coal inventory management and fuel burn forecasting serve different purposes and should not be conflated. A normalized burn assumption is intended to estimate expected fuel consumption under average operating conditions. Coal inventory requirements, however, are established to ensure that generating stations can continue operating reliably despite uncertainties in fuel deliveries, commodity markets, transportation disruptions, weather events, unit dispatch variability, and changes in system operating conditions.

By definition, a normalized burn projection reflects an average expectation and does not account for the operational risks that inventory policies are intended to mitigate. Inventory targets are established specifically to provide protection against those risks. Replacing established inventory targets with normalized burn assumptions effectively eliminates the reliability margin incorporated into the Company's fuel inventory practices.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A: Yes, it does.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro's Request for Authority to Implement A General Rate Increase for Electric Service	))))	Case No. ER-2026-0143

AFFIDAVIT OF JP MEITNER

STATE OF MISSOURI)
) ss
COUNTY OF JACKSON)

JP Meitner, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:

1. My name is JP Meitner. I work in Topeka, Kansas, and I am employed by Evergy Kansas Central, Inc. as Director of Market Operations.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my True-Up Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of Evergy Missouri Metro consisting of seven (7) pages, having been prepared in written form for introduction into evidence in the above-captioned docket.

3. I have knowledge of the matters set forth therein. I hereby swear and affirm that my answers contained in the attached testimony to the questions therein propounded, including any attachments thereto, are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

James P Meitner
JP Meitner

Subscribed and sworn before me this 23rd day of September 2026.

Notary Public

My commission expires: April 26, 2029

ANTHONY R WESTENKIRCHNER
NOTARY PUBLIC - NOTARY SEAL
STATE OF MISSOURI
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES APRIL 26, 2029
PLATTE COUNTY
COMMISSION #17279952