FILED
November 6, 2026
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No. 11

Evergy Missouri Metro – Exhibit 11
Surrebuttal Testimony of JP Meitner
Case No. EA-2026-0154

Exhibit No.:	
Issue:	Stipulation and Agreement — natural gas fuel supply plan, natural gas transportation arrangements, fuel-availability reporting, and contingency planning for Mullin Creek #2
Witness:	JP Meitner
Type of Exhibit:	Surrebuttal Testimony
Sponsoring Party:	Evergy Missouri Metro
Case No.:	EA-2026-0154
Date Testimony Prepared:	October 5, 2026

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO. EA-2026-0154

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JP MEITNER

ON BEHALF OF

EVERGY MISSOURI METRO

Kansas City, Missouri
October 2026

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

JP MEITNER

Case No. EA-2026-0154

I. INTRODUCTION

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: Are you the same JP Meitner who filed direct testimony in this case?

A: Yes. I am employed by Evergy Kansas Central, Inc. and serve as Director of Market Operations for Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro ("EMM" or the "Company") and the other operating utilities of Evergy, Inc. ("Evergy"), and I filed direct testimony in this case on May 14, 2026.

Q: What is the purpose of your surrebuttal testimony?

A: The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to discuss the Non-Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement ("Agreement") signed by the Company, Staff of the Commission ("Staff"), Renew Missouri Advocates d/b/a Renew Missouri, and Midwest Energy Consumers Group ("MECG") (collectively the "Signatories"), filed in this case before the Missouri Public Service Commission (the "Commission"), and to explain why the Commission should approve it as supported by the paragraphs within my direct testimony, which concern the Company's natural gas fuel supply, natural gas transportation arrangements, fuel-availability reporting, and contingency planning for the Mullin Creek #2 Energy Center ("Mullin Creek #2" or the "Project").[1]

[1] See Agreement at ¶¶ 10–12, 17, 19, Case No. EA-2026-0154 (EFIS No. 56; Oct. 2, 2026).

II. THE STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT

A. Overview

Q: What is the Agreement?

A: The Signatories have filed the Agreement to resolve all issues in this case between the Signatories, which requests that the Commission grant EMM a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("CCN") to construct Mullin Creek #2, subject to the conditions set out in the Agreement, and to approve the Agreement without modification.[2] My surrebuttal testimony supports the paragraphs of the Agreement that address the Company's natural gas fuel supply and related matters.[3]

Q: How will the Company develop its natural gas fuel supply plan for the Mullin Creek #2 project?

A: The Company has agreed to collaborate with Staff and the Office of the Public Counsel ("OPC") in developing a Natural Gas Fuel Supply Plan (the "Fuel Supply Plan"), to file the results of that plan as a compliance filing in the compliance docket, and to meet annually with Staff and OPC to discuss potential revisions to the plan until Mullin Creek #2 is placed in service.[4] As discussed in my direct testimony, Evergy is developing a more robust, forward-looking natural gas fuel supply plan for its new natural gas generation, and conversations on that forward strategy have already begun with Staff and OPC.[5] I further explained that this new plan continues to be developed and that the Company will continue those collaborative conversations.[6]

[2] Id. at ¶ 2.
[3] Id. at ¶¶ 10–12, 17, 19.
[4] Id. at ¶ 10.
[5] See Meitner Direct at 6.
[6] Id. at 10–11.

Q: What has the Company agreed to do to address its longer-term, forward natural gas supply needs for the facility?

A: The Company has agreed that no later than two years before the facility's in-service date, it will file a case addressing its forward natural gas supply plans in light of then-current circumstances, gas commodity prices and volume risks, and the new load, and will include the Fuel Supply Plan in the annual compliance filing.[7] The Signatories agree that forward-planning commitment is reasonable and prudent given the long lead time involved in securing natural gas supply for new generation. As discussed in my direct testimony, the need for a new, forward-looking fuel supply plan for the Company's new natural gas generation was previously identified and continues to be developed.[8]

Q: What has the Company agreed to provide regarding the natural gas transportation arrangements for the project?

A: The Agreement directs the Company to file in the compliance docket copies of all natural gas transportation arrangements for Mullin Creek #1 and Mullin Creek #2 within thirty days after those agreements are finalized and executed, including the precedent agreement, the transportation agreements, the related interstate and intrastate pipeline evaluations, and the Company's gas procurement and transportation evaluations.[9] While providing this documentation on a defined timeline is more prescriptive than the Company's ordinary practice, the Company regards it as reasonable in the context of the Stipulation as a whole. As discussed in my direct testimony, Mullin Creek #2 will use the same transportation pipelines, interconnection, and receipt points being established for Mullin Creek #1, whose provider was selected through a competitive process, making common usage more cost-effective for

[7] See Agreement at ¶ 11.
[8] See Meitner Direct at 10–11.
[9] See Agreement at ¶ 12.

customers of both units.[10] I also explained that the Company will use the results of that competitive process to support Mullin Creek #2 and that the precedent agreement remains under negotiation.[11]

Q: What has the Company agreed to do if a gas generating unit cannot operate because of fuel availability?

A: The Agreement directs the Company to notify the Commission, through a separate filing in the Commission's Electronic Filing and Information System ("EFIS"), when a gas unit larger than 100 MW cannot operate due to fuel availability, and to report any such outage under the Commission's outage-reporting rule.[12] The Company recognizes the importance of timely transparency when a large generating unit cannot run on its primary fuel, and this notification is a reasonable means of addressing that concern. As discussed in my direct testimony, fuel firming is critical because it provides higher confidence that generation will be able to produce when it is needed, and the resource-adequacy rules of the Southwest Power Pool, Inc. ("SPP") place significant weight on resources that minimize outages caused by fuel unavailability.[13]

Q: How has the Company agreed to address contingency planning and the potential need for its own natural gas lateral?

A: The Agreement directs the Company to evaluate contingency plans and to evaluate the cost of owning and operating its own lateral to supply natural gas to the Mullin Creek facilities if the transportation rate on the lateral exceeds $0.135 per million British thermal units ("MMBtu"), and to file that evaluation in this case.[14] As discussed in my direct testimony, Mullin Creek #2 will use the same lateral being developed for Mullin Creek #1, and both units will have the

[10] See Meitner Direct at 6.
[11] See Meitner Direct at 9–10.
[12] See Agreement at ¶ 17; 20 CSR 4240-3.190.
[13] See Meitner Direct at 8.
[14] See Agreement at ¶ 19; Sommerer Rebuttal at 5.

option to run on liquid fuel from an on-site tank sized for forty-eight hours at full load, which minimizes the need to procure transportation contracts beyond the lateral and provides contingency against fuel-availability risk.[15]

III. CONCLUSION

Q: What is your recommendation to the Commission regarding these provisions of the Agreement?

A: The provisions within my subject-matter expertise reasonably address the Company's natural gas fuel supply, transportation, and contingency planning for Mullin Creek #2, and are consistent with and supported by my direct testimony; accordingly, the Commission should approve the filed Agreement.[16]

Q: Does that conclude your surrebuttal testimony?

A: Yes, it does.

[15] See Meitner Direct at 6, 10.
[16] See Agreement at ¶¶ 10–12, 17, 19; Meitner Direct at 6, 10–11.

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 for Permission and Approval of a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Authorizing it to Construct, Install, Own, Operate, Manage, Maintain, and Control a Natural Gas Electrical Production Facility	)))))))	Case No. EA-2026-0154

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 Kansas City, Missouri and I am employed by Evergy Metro, Inc. as Director of Market Operations.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Surrebuttal Testimony on behalf of Evergy Missouri Metro consisting of five (5) 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 5th day of October 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