

**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	)	<u>File No. ER-2026-0143</u>
to Implement a General Rate Increase for	)	
Electric Service	)	

**AMENDED JOINT LIST AND ORDER OF ISSUES AND WITNESSES,
AND ORDER OF CROSS-EXAMINATION**

COMES NOW, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission ("Staff"), for itself and on behalf of the parties to this case, and submits the following Amended Joint List and Order of Issues and Witnesses, and Order of Cross-Examination. The parties have retained the initial issue numbering. We attempted to group related issues, accommodate witness availability and consider travel and lodging efficiencies in the schedule. The parties remain open to adjustment as needed.¹

¹ The parties appreciate the patience of Judge Clark and Commissioners as you awaited this schedule. Our settlement efforts, while extended, were not in vain. A total of 77 issues and sub-issues have been addressed across multiple stipulations as a result of our efforts.

I. LIST AND ORDER OF ISSUES² AND WITNESSES

TUESDAY OCTOBER 6, 2026:

Google witness Berry available on all issues for this date.³

Large Load Power Service Issues

3. Other Revenues (EMM: Gunn⁴, Jaynes; Staff: Lange, Luebbert (also adopting Rucker); Google: Berry; MECG: Meyer; OPC: Ron Nelson⁵)

- A. What is the appropriate level of net revenue to reflect in the cost of service and other models for Large Load Power Service (“LLPS”) and other large customers?
 - i. What is the appropriate revenue adjustment for expected future revenues from Schedule LLPS customers in the cost of service model?

31. Large Load Power Service Tariff and Reporting (EMM:., Gunn, Ives, Lutz, Nunn, Meitner⁶; Staff: Lange, Eubanks; Google: Berry; OPC: Geoff Marke)

- A. What tariff changes or clarifications, if any, should be made to the Large Load Power Service tariff?
- B. What reporting requirements are appropriate concerning new large loads and load growth?

25. Fuel Adjustment Clause — Large Load Power Service (EMM: Nunn, Ives, Gunn, Meitner⁷, Foo,; Staff: Mastrogianis, Lange; Google: Berry; OPC: Angela Schaben)

- A. Should changes be made to the FAC to address LLPS customers?
- B. What, if any, new FAC reporting requirements should the Commission order?
- C. Should EMM have a separate FAC base factor for LLPS customers?

² Each party does not necessarily agree with the wording of some issues or inclusion of all of the issues set out herein. The inclusion of an issue and a party’s position thereon in the list below does not mean all parties agree with such issue’s characterization, that such issue identified is actually in dispute, and/or that a Commission decision on such issue is proper or necessary in this case.

³ List issues for Berry

⁴ EMM witness Gunn not available Wednesday October 7, 2026.

⁵ Ron Nelson is available virtually as follows:

	CST
10/5-10/6:	10:30-6
10/7:	10:30-4
10/8 and 10/9 -	OOO
10/13:	10:30-6
10/15:	Unavailable
10/16:	10:30-4

⁶ EMM witness Meitner to be taken out of order for all issues on Wednesday October 7, 2026.

⁷ EMM witness Meitner to be taken out of order for all issues on Wednesday October 7, 2026.

37. Revenue Sharing (EMM: Gunn, Ives, Klote; Staff: Bolin; Google: Berry; MEEG: Meyer; OPC: Ron Nelson)

- A. Should the Commission implement a mechanism to review or share earnings attributable to Schedule LLPS customers, and if so, how should it be designed?

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 7, 2026:

EMM Witness Meitner available on all issues for this date.

Non-LLPS FAC Issues

22. Fuel Adjustment Clause — Structure and Base Factor (EMM: Nunn, Ives, Meitner⁸, Foo; Staff: Mastrogiannis; Google: Berry; OPC: Angela Schaben)

- B. Should the general construct of EMM's FAC be changed?
- C. What value should the FAC base factor be set at the conclusion of this case?
- D. What sharing ratio between EMM and its customers should the Commission order as an incentive mechanism in EMM's FAC?

23. Fuel Adjustment Clause — Included Costs (EMM: Nunn, Ives, Meitner⁹, Foo; Staff: Mastrogiannis, Lange; OPC: Angela Schaben)

- A. What SPP transmission costs should be included in the FAC?
- C. What FAC subaccounts should be included in the FAC?¹⁰
- D. Should EMM include long-term capacity purchases and sales for recovery in its FAC?

Cost of Capital

1. Cost of Capital (EMM: Bulkley, Ley; Staff: Won; Google: Berry; OPC: David Murray)

- A. What is the appropriate capital structure to use for ratemaking in this proceeding?
- B. What cost of debt should be used for determining rate of return?
- C. What return on common equity should be used for determining rate of return?
- D. What is the appropriate rate of return to use for ratemaking in this proceeding?

⁸ EMM witness Meitner to be taken out of order for all issues on Wednesday October 7, 2026.

⁹ EMM witness Meitner to be taken out of order for all issues on Wednesday October 7, 2026.

¹⁰ Sub C is resolved by stipulation but for subaccounts 555006 and 447016.

Income Taxes

15. Income Taxes (EMM: Hardesty; Staff: Young; OPC: John Riley)

- A. How much income tax expense should be included in rates?
 - i. Should income tax expense be reduced by a normalized disposition loss deduction?
- C. What amount of net operating loss deferred tax assets should be included in rate base?

Fuel and Purchased Power

5. Fuel and Purchased Power (EMM: Foo, Meitner¹¹; Staff: Niemeier, Nieto, Luebbert adopting Tevie; OPC:)

- A. What should be adopted as the variable fuel and purchased power cost for this case?
- B. What fuel prices should be included in the cost of service?
- C. What normalized market prices should be used to determine the revenue requirement in this case?
- D. What level of Transmission Congestion Rights (“TCR”) revenue, not TCR margin, should be included in the cost of service?

Programs II

39. Green Button Connect (EMM: McDonald,; Staff: Shawn Lange; Renew: Wyszkowski; OPC: Geoff Marke)

- A. Should the Commission order EMM to implement Green Button Connect (“GBC”) in this rate case?
- B. If the Commission orders EMM to implement GBC, should the Commission order the tariff proposed by Renew Missouri related to GBC?
- C. If the Commission orders EMM to implement GBC, should the Commission adopt Renew Missouri’s revenue requirement recommendation?
- D. If the Commission orders EMM to implement GBC, should Renew Missouri’s recommended revenue requirement for studying a regional data hub be ordered by the Commission?

40. Customer Battery Programs (EMM:, Lutz; Staff: Shawn Lange; Renew: Fracica; OPC: Geoff Marke)

- A. Should the Commission order the adoption of Renew Missouri’s proposed battery programs?

¹¹ EMM witness Meitner to be taken out of order for all issues on Wednesday October 7, 2026.

41. Income-Eligible Solar Program (EMM:, Lutz; Staff took no position; Renew: Fracica; OPC: Geoff Marke)

- A. Should the Commission order the adoption of Renew Missouri's proposed evaluation and expansion of the Income-Eligible solar program?

42. MEEIA Margin Rates (EMM: Jaynes,; Staff: H. Poudel; ~~OPC:~~)

- A. What methodology should be used to calculate the net marginal rate for each rate class?

THURSDAY OCTOBER 8, 2026:

PISA

18. Plant in Service Accounting (EMM:, Kramer; Staff: Young; OPC: Paul Alvarez¹², Dave Shapley¹³)

- B. What amount of PISA deferral should be reflected in rate base?

Ratebase and Asset Management

20. Rate Base Components

- B. What amount of construction work in progress is appropriate to reflect in rate base? (EMM: Gunn, Klote; Staff: Young; OPC: Geoff Marke; John Riley)
- C. How much of EMM's current rate base has been retired, and should a rate of return be applied to this amount? (EMM: Ives, Klote, Mulvany, Spanos; Staff: Young; OPC:)
- E. If construction work in progress is included in rate base, what rate of return should be applied to it? (EMM: Ley; Staff: Young; OPC: David Murray)

12 Paul Alvarez is available virtually as follows:

	CST
10/5-9	9-5
10/13	9-5
10/15	9-1
10/16	9-3

13 Dave Shapley is available virtually as follows:

	CST
10/5/26	7-9am, 12-2pm
10/6/26	7-9am, 12-2pm
10/7/26	7-9am, 12-2pm
10/8/26	7-9am
10/9/26	7-9am, 12-2pm
10/13/26	7-9am, 12-2pm
10/15/26	12-2pm
10/16/26	7-9am

- F. What amount of transmission investment since EMM's last rate case should be included in rate base? (EMM: Rietcheck¹⁴, Ives; Staff took no position but witnesses Bowman and T. Rucker; OPC: Paul Alvarez; Dave Shapley)
- H. Should rate base be reduced to remove Evergy Kansas Central's investment in transmission to serve Panasonic allocated to EMM? (EMM: Rueter; Staff took no position; OPC: Paul Alvarez; Dave Shapley)

19. Distribution Investment (EMM: Mulvany, Alexander, De Stigter, Rietcheck, Gunn; Staff took no position on A, Bowman on B; OPC: Paul Alvarez; Dave Shapley)

- A. What level of distribution capital investment should be reflected in rate base?
- B. Is EMM's asset prioritization methodology a reasonable basis for the investment reflected in this case?

Programs I

16. Income-Eligible Programs (EMM: McDonald; Staff: Eichholz, King, Huber, Lange, Mastrogriannis, Ferguson; OPC: Geoff Marke)

- A. What level of Critical Medical Needs and Rehousing Programs expense should be included in the revenue requirement?
- B. What level of economic relief pilot program ("ERPP") expense should be included in the revenue requirement?
- C. Should the pilot designation be removed from EMM's ERPP tariff?
- D. Should EMM be required to provide a summary of the Rehousing Program administration, reporting, and evaluation by email to Staff and the Office of the Public Counsel at the conclusion of each year of the Program as described in its currently approved tariff?
- E. Should the Commission approve the creation of a low-income rate or assistance program that waives EMM's customer charge for qualifying customers in this case, or should such a program continue to be developed in the Affordability Workshop?
 - i. If such a program is approved, should late fees be waived for qualifying customers?
 - ii. If such program is approved, how should the waived revenues be recovered?
- F. Should EMM be required to file quarterly Rehousing Program reports in EFIS in addition to the existing year-end report?
- G. What changes, if any, should be made to the ERPP tariff to permit broader enrollment or to allow unused program funding to be transferred to other income-eligible programs?
- H. What level of Low-Income Weatherization Program expense, if any, should be included in the revenue requirement?

¹⁴ EMM witness Rietcheck not available until the second week.

38. Energy Burden Analysis (EMM: McDonald, Lutz; Staff took no position; OPC: Geoff Marke)

- A. Should the Commission order a 3rd party energy burden analysis for EMM that does not exceed \$150K in costs?

FRIDAY OCTOBER 9, 2026:

OPC witness Nelson is available for all issues on this date.

Rates and Revenue Responsibility

29. Non-Residential Rate Design (EMM: Jaynes, Lutz; Lange; MECG: York; ~~OPC:~~)

- A. Should the rates of the non-residential non-lighting customers be restructured in this case?
- i. What are the appropriate periods for each time-related element?
 - ii. Should the Large General Service (“LGS”) and Medium General Service (“MGS”) classes be subject to reactive demand charges?
 - iii. What are the appropriate charges for each rate element for each class?
 - iv. Should EMM be ordered to promptly conduct a billing determinants and customer impact study?
 - v. What customer education is appropriate?
 - vi. What date should restructured rates take effect?
- B. Should the non-residential non-lighting opt-in time based rates proposed by EMM be implemented?

30. Other Rate Schedules (EMM: Jaynes, Lutz; Staff: Lange; Google: Berry; MECG: York; OPC: Geoff Marke)

- A. How should all other applicable rates in this case be increased, including lighting, Large Load Power Service, Electric Vehicle Charging, and Time Related Pricing, if applicable?
- i. Should the TRP (Time Related Pricing) rate schedule be eliminated?
 - ii. Should Schedule LLPS rates be increased in this proceeding, and if so, by how much?

32. Revenue Apportionment and Implementation (EMM: Jaynes, Lutz, Gunn, Ives; Staff: Lange; Google: Berry; MECG: York; OPC: Ron Nelson; Geoff Marke)

- A. How should revenue responsibility, including any net revenues from LLPS customers and any reduction to revenues from any income-eligible customer discounts, be apportioned among the customer classes, if at all?

- i. What is the appropriate classification of customer-classified distribution system cost of service for any class cost of service study relied upon in this case?
- ii. What is the appropriate allocation of production-related cost of service for any class cost of service study relied upon in this case?
- B. How should customer affordability, including for low- and moderate-income households, be reflected in the rates ordered in this case?
- C. Should EMM's surrebuttal proposal to implement the rate increase by bill cycle in this case be permitted?
- D. How should revenue responsibility for construction work in progress be assigned or allocated among the customer classes?

33. Critical Peak Rate (EMM: Jaynes, Lutz; Staff: Lange; OPC:)

- A. Should the Critical Peak Rate recommended by Staff be implemented?
 - i. If not implemented, are other accommodations needed to address high market cost events and establish offsetting revenues to be applied through the FAC?
- B. Should EMM have a separate line on its fuel adjustment rate tariff to account for critical peak pricing?

MONDAY OCTOBER 12, 2026 – no hearing

TUESDAY OCTOBER 13, 2026:

EMM witness Spanos is available for all issues on this date.

EMM witness Wyszowski is available for all issues on this date.

Trackers

36. Critical Infrastructure Protection and Cyber Security (EMM: Klote, Gunn, Charles King; Staff: Lyons; OPC: Angela Schaben)

- A. What level of critical infrastructure protection ("CIP") and cyber security expense should be included in the revenue requirement?
- B. Should EMM implement a tracker for CIP and cyber security costs?

Depreciation

17. Depreciation¹⁵ (EMM: Spanos; MCEG: Andrews; Staff: Arandia; ~~OPC:~~)

- A. Which depreciation rates should be used?

¹⁵ Issue 17.A. is preserved for MCEG regarding the adjustments of MCEG witness Andrews only.

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 14, 2026 – no hearing

THURSDAY OCTOBER 15, 2026 – overflow, if needed

FRIDAY OCTOBER 16, 2026 – overflow, if needed

II. ORDER OF CROSS-EXAMINATION

Cross-examination of each party’s witnesses will proceed in the order listed under that party. The sponsoring party examines last.

EMM Witnesses	Staff Witnesses	OPC Witnesses
1. Google LLC	1. OPC	1. Staff
2. Velvet Tech	2. MECG	2. MECG
3. MIEC	3. MIEC	3. MIEC
4. Renew Missouri	4. Renew Missouri	4. Renew Missouri
5. MECG	5. Velvet Tech	5. Velvet Tech
6. Staff	6. Google LLC	6. Google LLC
7. OPC	7. EMM	7. EMM

MECG Witnesses	Google LLC Witnesses	Renew Missouri Witnesses
1. MIEC	1. MECG	1. MECG
2. Renew Missouri	2. MIEC	2. MIEC
3. Velvet Tech	3. Renew Missouri	3. Velvet Tech
4. Google LLC	4. Velvet Tech	4. Google LLC
5. Staff	5. Staff	5. Staff
6. OPC	6. OPC	6. OPC
7. EMM	7. EMM	7. EMM

The order of cross-examination for Class Cost of Service/Rate Design issues will be as listed below. This order will apply to issues under the heading Rates and Revenue Responsibility (Issues: 29, 30, 32, and 33).

EMM Witnesses	Staff Witnesses	OPC Witnesses
1. Google LLC	1. OPC	1. Staff
2. Velvet Tech	2. Renew Missouri	2. Renew Missouri
3. MIEC	3. Velvet Tech	3. Velvet Tech
4. MEGC	4. Google LLC	4. Google LLC
5. Renew Missouri	5. MIEC	5. MIEC
6. OPC	6. MEGC	6. MEGC
7. Staff	7. EMM	7. EMM

MEGC Witnesses	Google LLC Witnesses	Renew Missouri Witnesses
1. MIEC	1. Velvet Tech	1. MEGC
2. EMM	2. EMM	2. MIEC
3. Velvet Tech	3. MIEC	3. Velvet Tech
4. Google LLC	4. MEGC	4. Google LLC
5. Renew Missouri	5. Renew Missouri	5. EMM
6. OPC	6. OPC	6. OPC
7. Staff	7. Staff	7. Staff

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Tracy D. Johnson

Tracy D. Johnson, MO Bar 65991

Deputy Counsel

P.O. Box 360

Jefferson City, Mo 65102-0360

(573) 526-5343 (Telephone)

(573) 751-9285 (Fax)

Email: tracy.johnson@psc.mo.gov

**Attorney for the Staff of the
Missouri Public Service Commission**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing have been transmitted by electronic mail to counsel of record on this 5th day of October 2026.

/s/ Tracy D. Johnson