

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In the Matter of Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro and Evergy Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West for Certificates of Convenience and Necessity to Construct and Operate Generating Facilities
Case No. EA-2026-0343

OBJECTION TO JOINT PROPOSED PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE AND REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED TREATMENT

COMES NOW Joseph R. Leslie, an individual property owner and applicant for intervention in this matter, and respectfully objects to the Joint Proposed Procedural Schedule filed October 14, 2026, particularly its request for expedited Commission action by October 15, 2026, and its proposed initial discovery conference on October 26, 2026. In support, I state as follows:

1. Interest in the proceeding. As explained in my Application for Intervention, I do not seek to arbitrarily obstruct infrastructure development, regional energy reliability, or economic progress. My concern is that decisions affecting neighboring rural properties be made only after meaningful consideration of industrial noise, nighttime lighting, agricultural land, rural character, quality of life, property values, and practical, enforceable mitigation. The cumulative impacts of Buchanan Bluffs Units 1 and 2 and their shared infrastructure warrant careful review.

2. The after-hours filing and requested next-day order would unnecessarily constrain review. The Joint Proposed Procedural Schedule was filed on October 14, 2026, at 8:28 p.m., according to the docket filing timestamp. It asks the Commission to adopt the schedule and public-hearing arrangements no later than October 15, 2026. This leaves no full business day between submission and the requested ruling date for an individual property owner to review the proposal, assess its consequences, seek guidance, and submit a meaningful response. The joint filing states that expedition would preserve proposed public-hearing dates and avoid renegotiating them. While timely notice and efficient scheduling are legitimate concerns, the convenience of preserving negotiated dates should not take precedence over a reasonable opportunity for affected participants to be heard.

3. The October 26 discovery conference compounds the problem. The first discovery conference is scheduled for October 26, 2026, only twelve calendar days after the joint filing. This is a substantial proceeding involving a major generating facility and potential impacts beyond the utility customers who will receive notice. Individual property owners may need time to obtain and review technical submissions, understand procedural requirements, identify appropriate questions, and arrange meaningful participation. The proposed timetable places these residents at a practical disadvantage compared with institutional parties that have counsel, technical staff, and advance involvement in developing the schedule. Public hearings on November 16 and 17 do not fully resolve the concern that procedural decisions and discovery preparations will already be underway.

4. Agreement by Commission Staff is not approval by the Commission. I acknowledge that the schedule was jointly submitted by Evergy, the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, the Office of the Public Counsel, and Renew Missouri. Commission Staff's participation in that agreement is not the same as approval

by the Commission itself. The commissioners retain responsibility for independently evaluating the proposal and determining whether it provides a fair process for all affected interests. Likewise, although the Office of the Public Counsel represents consumer interests, the agreement of institutional parties does not establish that the distinct concerns of neighboring property owners were addressed or that those owners had a meaningful opportunity to participate in negotiating the schedule. I respectfully ask the Commission to evaluate the proposed deadlines independently rather than treat the parties' agreement as sufficient grounds for immediate adoption.

5. The Commission's stated purpose calls for an evenhanded process. In its public information document, Who Does the PSC Regulate?, the Commission states: "The PSC works to balance the needs of customers who pay utility bills and the companies that provide these services." The Commission's stated commitment to balancing interests is relevant to the fairness of its process. The interests of the utility and the institutional parties, including requests to expedite, should not eclipse the interests of residents who may experience lasting noise, lighting, visual, agricultural, and property impacts.

6. An expedited order risks creating an appearance of preferential treatment. Granting an order by October 15 on a joint proposal filed at 8:28 p.m. on October 14, without a meaningful opportunity, less than one business day, for affected individuals to respond, could reasonably create an appearance that the procedural preferences of the utility and other established parties are receiving greater weight than those of neighboring property owners. I do not allege that the commissioners have already agreed to the schedule or acted with bias. Rather, I ask the Commission to avoid a process that could create that perception and undermine public confidence in the impartiality of its review. Staff's agreement with the proposal does not remove the need for independent consideration or a fair opportunity for other interested persons to be heard.

7. Requested relief. I respectfully request that the Commission: (a) decline to enter an order adopting the entire proposed schedule by October 15, 2026; (b) provide a reasonable opportunity for affected intervenors and intervention applicants to submit procedural objections or alternatives; (c) defer the October 26 discovery conference or provide an additional, accessible early discovery conference after affected participants have sufficient preparation time; (d) preserve adequate notice and meaningful access to the November local public hearings, adjusting dates if necessary rather than treating them as controlling; and (e) establish a schedule that permits meaningful review of cumulative site impacts, proposed mitigation, and the evidence supporting any certificate conditions. I remain willing to support a fair and efficient process. My objection is to unnecessary haste that could compromise the ability of affected residents to participate in decisions with lasting consequences for their homes, land, and community.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph R. Leslie

Individual property owner and applicant for intervention 6930 SE Ajax Rd Saint Joseph, MO 64507

Dated: October 14, 2026

Referenced document: Missouri Public Service Commission, Who Does the PSC Regulate?, introductory discussion of balancing customer and utility interests.