Exhibit No.:	
Issue(s):	Rate Design for large load customers
Witness:	Dr. Carolyn A. Berry
Type of Exhibit:	Direct Testimony (Rate Design)
Sponsoring Party:	Google LLC
File No.:	ER-2026-0143
Date Testimony Prepared:	July 14, 2026

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

FILE NO. ER-2026-0143

DIRECT TESTIMONY – RATE DESIGN

OF

DR. CAROLYN A. BERRY

ON BEHALF OF

GOOGLE LLC

JULY 14, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Carolyn A. Berry. I work at Bates White Economic Consulting ("Bates White"). My business address is 2001 K Street NW, North Building, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Q. On whose behalf are you submitting this testimony?

A. I am submitting this testimony on behalf of Google LLC ("Google").

Q. Are you the same Carolyn A. Berry that filed direct testimony on the revenue requirement in this proceeding?

A. Yes.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

A. My testimony addresses Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro's ("Evergy") proposed 15.19 percent increase to the Large Load Power Service ("LLPS") rates in this proceeding.[1] This proposal represents an increase over the LLPS rates that were agreed to in the Non-Unanimous Global Stipulation and Agreement ("2025 LLPS Settlement") approved by the Commission in LLPS tariff proceeding — File No. EO-2025-0154 — on November 13, 2025.[2]

Q. Are you sponsoring any schedules or exhibits as part of your direct testimony?

A. Yes, I am sponsoring the following exhibits/schedules:

- Schedule CB-2 – Evergy's Response to Google Data Request No. G-E 2.3.
- Schedule CB-3 – Evergy's Response to Google Data Request No. G-E 2.1.

[1] Direct Testimony of Graham Jaynes, 48:2 ("Jaynes Direct Testimony").

[2] Report and Order, File No. EO-2025-0154, p. 46 (Nov. 13, 2025); Non-Unanimous Global Stipulation and Agreement, Ex. A (Sept. 25, 2025) ("Settlement Agreement").

II. RECOMMENDATION

Q. What is your recommendation in the Rate Design phase of this proceeding?

A. I recommend that the Commission reject Evergy's proposed increase to the Large Load Power Service ("LLPS") rates approved by the Commission in the 2025 LLPS Settlement and not approve any increase to LLPS rates at this time.

III. THE DETERMINATION OF LLPS RATES

Q. What LLPS rates were agreed to in the 2025 LLPS Settlement?

A. The agreed-upon LLPS rates are specified in Exhibit A of the 2025 LLPS Settlement. These rates are about 15-17 percent higher than the currently effective LPS rates depending on the customer's interconnection voltage and load size.[3] For example, a 300 MW load connecting at transmission voltage would pay approximately $19.2 million per year more under LLPS rates than under LPS rates.

Q. According to the 2025 LLPS Settlement how should LLPS rates be determined in the current rate case?

A. Under the 2025 LLPS Settlement, LLPS initial pricing must remain consistent with the pricing established in Exhibit A.[4] The settlement also establishes a revenue reallocation mechanism that applies until the first general rate case reflecting a Schedule LLPS customer of 75 MW or greater in the test year. Until that time, the difference between revenues collected under the LLPS rate schedule and the revenues that would have been

[3] Evergy has made public statements that "Data centers must pay a premium rate that is as much as 20% higher than existing large customer demand rates." See "Data Center Facts and FAQs" posted on the City of Edgerton, Kansas website, *available at* https://edgertonks.org/wp-content/uploads/EVERGY-Data-Center-FAQ-2025_-Final.pdf.

[4] Settlement Agreement, ¶ 14(i).

collected from the same customers under the LPS schedule will be identified and reallocated to non-Schedule LLPS customers, solely for Class Cost of Service ("CCOS") Study purposes in determining the sufficiency of class cost recovery.[5]

Q. How does this provision apply to the current rate case?

A. In the current rate case, there are no LLPS customers reflected in the test year. Therefore, this provision is fully triggered and must be applied.

Q. Can you explain what "consistent with the pricing in Exhibit A" means?

A. While I am not an attorney and am not offering a legal opinion, it is my opinion, from a commercial and regulatory perspective, that this phrase simply means that the LLPS rates set forth in Exhibit A of the 2025 LLPS Settlement must stay the same in this proceeding.

Q. Does Evergy agree with this interpretation?

A. No. Evergy proposes to increase the rates of all customer classes by 15.19 percent, including the LLPS rates established in Exhibit A of the 2025 LLPS Settlement.[6]

Q. How would Evergy's proposal impact the hypothetical example you outlined earlier?

A. Applying Evergy's proposed 15.19 percent increase would widen the gap between LLPS and standard LPS rates. Using the prior example of a hypothetical 300 MW load interconnecting at transmission voltage, the customer would pay approximately $22.1 million more under the LLPS rate schedule than under the LPS rate schedule.

Q. What justification does Evergy offer for proposing a 15.19 percent increase to the LLPS rates established in Exhibit A of the 2025 LLPS Settlement?

[5] *Id*.

[6] Jaynes Direct Testimony, at 48:2.

A. Evergy contends that until a Schedule LLPS customer of 75 MW or greater is reflected in the test year, the LLPS rate should align with LPS rate — and claims this position is supported by the 2025 LLPS Settlement. However, based on my review of the 2025 LLPS Settlement and Evergy's response to Google Data Request No. G-E 2.3 (Schedule CB-2), the "support" the Company relies on is limited entirely to the phrase "consistent with the pricing in Exhibit A."

Q. Is there additional record evidence that further supports your position?

A. Yes. Evergy's response to Google Data Request No. G-E 2.1 (Schedule CB-3) provides important context that underscores how recently the LLPS rates were established. According to that response, the final and effective LLPS tariff sheets were not yet available for incorporation into the general rate case filing package at the time of Evergy's initial filing. This is corroborated by the fact that, by Evergy's own admission, no proposed clean or redline version of the LLPS tariff was included as part of the initial filing — an omission that is particularly notable given that such a redline constitutes a minimum filing requirement. I will leave the legal implications of that omission to counsel.

The significance of this point, from a regulatory perspective, is straightforward: the LLPS tariff rates are so newly enacted that they could not even be finalized for inclusion in the rate case filing at the time of its submission. Proposing a 15.19 percent increase on top of rates that were the product of a negotiated settlement — and that have barely taken effect — is not supported by the record.

Q. What do you conclude?

A. First, there is nothing in the 2025 LLPS Settlement that requires LLPS rates to increase in lockstep with the LPS rates as proposed by Evergy in this proceeding. Second, the amount of large load included in this rate case is very small and has no associated fixed costs, so there is little cost support for increasing LLPS rates beyond the increase already reflected in the settled rates.

Q. How would approving an LLPS rate consistent with the pricing in Exhibit A address the potential over-recovery of revenues caused by rapid large-load growth?

A. As I explained in my Direct Testimony addressing the revenue requirement, the revenues collected from LLPS customers during the new rate-effective period will be far greater than those accounted for in the CCOS and will likely outstrip any increases in the cost to serve them in this period.[7] Rejecting Evergy's proposed LLPS rate increase will directly reduce the excess revenues collected.

Q. What do you recommend?

A. I recommend that the Commission consider and balance these critical factors affecting ratepayers and shareholders when determining the final LLPS rate:

- The negotiated terms established in the 2025 LLPS Settlement;
- The substantial revenue premium LLPS customers pay over LPS rates; and
- The impact that further LLPS rate increases will have on the excess revenues collected due to expected rapid load growth during the new rate-effective period.

Balancing these factors, I recommend that the Commission reject Evergy's proposed increase to LLPS rates and not approve any increase to LLPS rates at this time.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.

[7] Revenue Requirement Direct Testimony of Dr. Carolyn Berry, 14:7–15:8.

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.	))))	File No. ER-2026-0143

AFFIDAVIT OF CAROLYN A. BERRY

1. My name is Carolyn A. Berry, and I am a Partner at Bates White Economic Consulting. My business address is 2001 K Street NW, North Building, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20006.

2. I have read the above and foregoing direct testimony and the statements contained therein are true and correct to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

3. Under penalty of perjury, I declare that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Carolyn A. Berry

Carolyn A. Berry
Partner
Bates White Economic Consulting

Date: July 14, 2026

Schedule CB-2

Evergy Missouri Metro
Case Name: 2026 Evergy MO Metro Rate Case
Case Number: ER-2026-0143

Requestor Jevons Jared -
Response Provided July 10, 2026

Question: G-E 2.3

Please reference the Direct Testimony of Graham Jaynes at p. 49, where he states "Per the settlement agreement from Evergy's Missouri LLPS tariff case (EO-2025-0154), LLPS still remains under the 'initial pricing' requirement. Until there is at least one LLPS customer over 75MW the LLPS rates will maintain their relationship to LPS."

a. Please explain what is meant by the "'initial pricing' requirement."
b. Please explain what is meant by "LLPS rates will maintain their relationship to LPS." Specifically, is it Evergy's position that LLPS rates must move in lockstep with LPS rates? If so, please explain how the EO-2025-0154 settlement agreement supports of that position.

RESPONSE: (do not edit or delete this line or anything above this)

Confidentiality: PUBLIC
Statement: This response is Public. No Confidential Statement is needed.

Response:

a. The concept of initial pricing was detailed in the Direct testimony of Brad Lutz in Docket EO-2025-0154 filed on February 14, 2025. Starting on page 22, Mr. Lutz describes how bill determinants to inform LLPS rate design were unavailable and instead the Company relied on alignment with the LPS rates as a reasonable starting point for its pricing.

b. It is Evergy's position that until a customer receives service under Schedule LLPS and sufficient billing and cost information is available to inform rate design, the best approach is to remain aligned with the original design approach describe in part a above. It is Evergy's position that paragraph 14 of the Non-Unanimous Stipulation and Agreement filed on September 25, 2025, in the EO-2025-0154 titled "Initial Pricing" supports this expectation.

Information provided by: Brad Lutz, Regulatory Affairs

Attachment(s):

Missouri Verification:

I have read the Information Request and answer thereto and find answer to be true, accurate, full and complete, and contain no material misrepresentations or omissions to the best of my knowledge and belief; and I will disclose to the Commission Staff any matter subsequently discovered which affects the accuracy or completeness of the answer(s) to this Information Request(s).

Signature /s/ *Brad Lutz*
Director Regulatory Affairs

Schedule CB-3

Evergy Missouri Metro
Case Name: 2026 Evergy MO Metro Rate Case
Case Number: ER-2026-0143

Requestor Jevons Jared -
Response Provided July 10, 2026

Question: G-E 2.1

Page 3 of GAJ-11 of Graham Jaynes' Direct Testimony provides a table of proposed monthly pricing increases for LLPS customers. Additionally, Evergy's response to increase to Schedule LLPS. As discussed in Direct Testimony of Graham A. Jaynes, Evergy is proposing to increase all classes by 15.19%." Despite those assertions, Evergy does not appear to have filed revised tariff sheets for Schedule LLPS customers reflecting the proposed increase in LLPS rates in this proceeding or included the LLPS customer class in the schedules filed to satisfy the minimum filing requirements of 20 C.S.R. 4240-3.030(3)(B). Given the preceding:

a. Please confirm that Evergy has not filed revised tariff sheets for Schedule LLPS reflecting the proposed increase in LLPS rates in this proceeding

b. Please confirm that it is Evergy's intent to increase Schedule LLPS rates by 15.19% in this proceeding.

c. If Evergy did not file revised tariff sheets for Schedule LLPS reflecting the proposed increase in LLPS rates in this proceeding and Evergy intends to increase the Schedule LLPS rates in this proceeding, please explain why Evergy did not file revised tariff sheets reflecting the proposed increase in LLPS rates in this proceeding.

d. If Evergy intends to increase the Schedule LLPS rates in this proceeding, please explain why Evergy did not include the LLPS customer class in the schedules filed to satisfy the minimum filing requirements of 20 C.S.R. 4240-3.030(3)(B).

RESPONSE: (do not edit or delete this line or anything above this)

Confidentiality: PUBLIC
Statement: This response is Public. No Confidential Statement is needed.

Response:

A. Correct. Tariff schedule LLPS was not included in the revised tariff package filed Feb 6, 2026.

B. Correct. A 15.19% increase across all rate classes is Evergy's proposal. In addition to the minimum filing requirements, the Direct Testimony of Graham A. Jaynes provides clarification that LLPS is treated as a subclass of LPS as it is a developing customer group materializing in real time. Therefore, discussion of LPS rate increase encompasses the LLPS subclass.

C. At the time of submitting the MFR and Direct Testimony in docket ER-2026-0143, a separate docket where the LLPS final form was being resolved was underway, EO-2025-0154. This omission is the product of conflicting timelines as the record from EO-2025-0154 shows 2/5/2026 tariff revisions are issued, 2/6 an order directing filing, followed by substitute tariffs, Staff recommendation to approve on 2/18, and an order approving tariffs on February 25, 2026. As no tariff was final approved for LLPS, to produce a redline would be confusing the records between these two dockets.

D. As described in the supporting Direct Testimony, this case involves a transitional period setting up the framework for LLPS incorporation in a general rate case. At the time of filing, final/effective LLPS tariff sheets were not yet available for incorporation into the general rate case filing package.

   For purposes of class cost of service study, revenue allocation, and rate design in this case, LLPS was addressed as a subclass of LPS rather than a standalone customer class. The handling of the rate increase is addressed through direct testimony and work papers highlighted in Schedule GAJ-11.

   Complete compliance tariffs are expected to be filed at the resolution of this case. To the extent the Commission determines that revised LLPS tariff sheets should have been included with the February 6 filing, the Company submits that any such issue is procedural and capable of being addressed through supplementation and/or waiver for good cause under 20 CSR 4240-3.030(4).

Information provided by: Graham A. Jaynes, Manager Regulatory Affairs

Attachment(s): None

Missouri Verification:

I have read the Information Request and answer thereto and find answer to be true, accurate, full and complete, and contain no material misrepresentations or omissions to the best of my knowledge and belief; and I will disclose to the Commission Staff any matter subsequently discovered which affects the accuracy or completeness of the answer(s) to this Information Request(s).

Signature /s/ *Brad Lutz*
Director Regulatory Affairs