FILED
November 9, 2026
Missouri Public
Service Commission

Exhibit No. 4

Evergy Missouri Metro – Exhibit 4
Surrebuttal Testimony of Albert R. Bass, Jr.
Case No. ER-2026-0143

Exhibit No.:
Issue: Weather Normalization; 365-day Year Adjustment; Rate Switchers and Customer Growth; Energy Efficiency Annualization
Witness: Albert R. Bass, Jr.
Type of Exhibit: Surrebuttal Testimony
Sponsoring Party: Evergy Missouri Metro
Case No.: ER-2026-0143
Date Testimony Prepared: September 10, 2026

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2026-0143

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

ALBERT R. BASS, JR.

ON BEHALF OF

EVERGY MISSOURI METRO

Kansas City, Missouri
September 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1
II. RESPONSE TO STAFF WITNESS M. STAHLMAN 2
A. LARGE POWER WEATHER NORMALIZATION 2
B. SMALL GENERAL SERVICE PRIMARY ADJUSTMENT 3
III. RESPONSE TO STAFF WITNESS K. COX 4
IV. C ONCLUSION 4

SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

ALBERT R. BASS, JR.

Case No. ER-2026-0143

I. INTRODUCTION

Q: Please state your name and business address.

A: My name is Albert R. Bass, Jr. My business address is 1200 Main, Kansas City, Missouri 64105.

Q: By whom and in what capacity are you employed?

A: I am employed by Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a as Evergy Missouri Metro ("Evergy Missouri Metro," "EMM," or the "Company"). I serve as Sr. Manager of Energy Forecasting and Analytics.

Q: Are you the same Albert R. Bass, Jr. who previously filed direct and rebuttal testimony in this case?

A: Yes.

Q: On whose behalf are you testifying?

A: I am testifying on behalf of Evergy Missouri Metro.

Q: What is the purpose of your testimony?

A: The purpose of my surrebuttal testimony is to respond to the rebuttal testimony of the following witnesses from the Staff of Missouri Public Service Commission ("Staff").

1. Michael L. Stahlman, Senior Economist, regarding his descriptions of grouping Large Power weather normalization and the adjustment to Small General Service ("SGS") primary class.

2. Kim Cox, Senior Research/Data Analyst regarding customer growth by class.

II. RESPONSE TO STAFF WITNESS M. STAHLMAN

A. LARGE POWER WEATHER NORMALIZATION

Q: Do you agree with Mr. Stahlman's assessment that there is an issue with grouping all Large Power customers together in one regression model?[1]

A: No. Weather normalization is intended to look at and estimate what the total class sales would have been under normal weather conditions. It is not the intent to only identify customers that are weather sensitive.

Mr. Stahlman assumes that non-weather sensitive customers should be removed and adjusted on a case-by-case-basis since it would distort the weather relationship. The reality is that non weather sensitive customer usage is part of the over class and pay based on the same rate code as weather sensitive customers.

Q: Can you provide an example?

A: Yes. If you have multiple types of businesses within the same customer class, they all can have different seasonality patterns for the weather.

For example:

You have customer A who is highly sensitive to the weather.

You have customer B who is moderately sensitive to the weather.

You have customer C who has seasonal sensitivity to the weather.

And you have customer D who has very little weather sensitivity.

For this example, the class weather response would be:

Class Weather Response = A + B + C + D

[1] See M. Stahlman Rebuttal at 2.

Where C and D would have all or some months with a weather response of approximately zero.

Including C and D would not distort the relationship between all the customers, rather it would correctly reflect that a portion of customer C and D sales that are non- weather sensitive.

Q: Is individual-customer analysis inherently better than class-level analysis?

A: No. A fundamental benefit of class-level weather normalization is that:

- customer-specific operational changes tend to offset each other,
- random anomalies average out,
- the underlying temperature relationship becomes more stable.

B. SMALL GENERAL SERVICE PRIMARY ADJUSTMENT

Q: Staff witness Stahlman indicated the most significant adjustment he made to Mr. Bass' regression analysis was to annualize the customer growth that occurred in mid-December 2025 in the SGS Primary customer class. Do you agree with the adjustments made by Mr. Stahlman?

A: No.[2] The growth in the SGS Primary customer class is a temporary fluctuation as the result of the construction power for customer A. The construction power is not expected to continue in perpetuity and should not be annualized in the SGS Primary customer class.

[2] See M. Stahlman Rebuttal at 2-3.

III. RESPONSE TO STAFF WITNESS K. COX

Q: Staff witness Ms. Cox criticizes EMM's use of combined rate code groupings when calculating customer growth adjustments. Do you agree with Staff's criticism?

A: No.[3] The Company's use of grouped rate codes is reasonable and reflects the realities of customer growth and customer migration among related tariffs. Individual rate codes may experience temporary fluctuations because of rate design changes or movement between rate options. Evaluating those rate codes separately can produce volatility that does not reflect underlying customer growth within the broader customer class. The Company's approach mitigates this issue by evaluating customer growth at an appropriate aggregate level and is consistent with the use of aggregated class growth adjustments in prior rate cases. The Company's methodology focuses on the overall growth of the customer population being served rather than attempting to assign separate growth trends to every individual rate code. This approach is consistent with the Company past filings.

IV. C ONCLUSION

Q: Please summarize your testimony.

A: In summary, Staff's proposed modifications to the Company's weather normalization and customer growth adjustment methodologies do not provide a more representative measure of normal sales. Weather normalization is intended to estimate total class sales under normal weather conditions, not to isolate only those customers that exhibit weather sensitivity. Evaluating the Large Power class as a whole appropriately reflects the aggregate sales experience of all customers taking service under the same rate

[3] See K. Cox Rebuttal at 9-10.

classification, while allowing customer-specific anomalies and operational changes to offset one another and produce a more stable and reliable weather relationship.

Similarly, Staff's proposed annualization of the temporary SGS Primary load increase associated with construction power would overstate ongoing customer growth because the usage is not expected to continue on a permanent basis. Adjustments intended to reflect normal conditions should be based on sustainable, recurring load rather than temporary fluctuations.

Finally, the Company's use of aggregated rate code groupings for customer growth adjustments is reasonable and consistent with prior practice. Analyzing growth at an appropriate class level reduces volatility caused by customer migration among related tariffs and better reflects the overall growth of the customer population being served.

Q: What is the Company's recommendation to the Missouri Public Service Commission?

A: The Company's methodologies provide a more accurate, stable, and representative basis for estimating normalized sales and customer growth than the alternative approaches proposed by Staff.

My recommendation is to adopt the Company's adjustments for Large Power, SGS Primary and customer growth.

Q: Does that 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 ALBERT R. BASS, JR.

STATE OF MISSOURI)
) ss
COUNTY OF JACKSON)

Albert R. Bass, Jr., being first duly sworn on his oath, states:

1. My name is Albert R. Bass, Jr.. I work in Kansas City, Missouri and I am employed by Evergy Metro, Inc. as Sr. Manager of Energy Forecasting and Analytics.

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.

Albert R. Bass, Jr.

Subscribed and sworn before me this 10th 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