Exhibit No.:	
Issue:	Accounting Adjustments
Witness:	Patrick Aron Branson
Type of Exhibit:	Rebuttal Testimony
Sponsoring Party:	Evergy Missouri Metro
Case No.:	ER-2026-0143
Date Testimony Prepared:	August 11, 2026

MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

CASE NO.: ER-2026-0143

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

PATRICK ARON BRANSON

ON BEHALF OF

EVERGY MISSOURI METRO

Kansas City, Missouri
August 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

PATRICK ARON BRANSON

Case No. ER-2026-0143

I. INTRODUCTION

Q: Please state your name and business address.

A: Patrick Aron Branson. 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. ("Evergy Metro") and serve as Manager - Regulatory Accounting for Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri Metro ("Evergy Missouri Metro," "EMM," or the "Company") and Evergy Metro, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Kansas Metro ("EKM") (collectively, "Evergy Metro"), Evergy Missouri West, Inc. d/b/a Evergy Missouri West ("EMW"), and Evergy Kansas Central, Inc. and Evergy South, Inc., collectively d/b/a as Evergy Kansas Central ("EKC"), the operating utilities of Evergy, Inc. ("Evergy").

Q: Are you the same Patrick Aron Branson who previously filed direct 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 rebuttal testimony is to respond to testimony from various witnesses from the Missouri Public Service Commission Staff ("Staff"). Specifically, I respond to the following:

Topic	Witness
Depreciation Rates	Staff – Amanda Arandia
Infrastructure for Large Load Customers	Staff – Matthew R. Young
Uplight	Staff – Matthew R. Young
Reserve Adjustment	Staff – Matthew R. Young & Amanda Arandia
Prepayments	Staff – Lindsey Smith
Regulatory Assessments	Staff – Lindsey Smith
Lease Expense	Staff – Sydney Ferguson
Energy Allocator	Staff – Alan J. Bax & Claire Eubanks

Please note that the Company has attempted to address all substantive issues raised by Staff, OPC, or other parties which the Company contests. If the Company inadvertently failed to address an issue raised by any party, the absence of a response does not constitute agreement by the Company with the party, and the Company may respond on the topic in subsequent testimony including at hearing.

II. DEPRECIATION RATES

Q: Are there any assets that have been added since the Direct filing that will need an authorized depreciation rate?

A: Yes, there are new assets for specific units at some locations since our Direct Filing that the Company would need an authorized rate in this proceeding. (1) Plant Account 312002 for Iatan 1, the Company proposes using 7.82% and (2) Plant Account 312002 for Iatan 2, the Company proposes using 3.14%. These rates were provided by company witness John Spanos which are based on the life parameters in effect for Account 312002 for each specific unit. These new accounts at the specific unit/location have occurred post depreciation study.

Q: Is there any other depreciation issue in Staff's EMS?

A: Yes. In Staff's EMS, Schedule 5, there is a rate provided to depreciate short-term and long-term incentive disallowance adjustments using a rate of 2.87% for short-term which was based on the average depreciation rate of all plant in Company's Direct case. The Company agrees to include an adjustment to plant and depreciation expense for short-term incentive related to EPS in its True-up filing based on the actual amounts capitalized provided in response to data request 168T. However, for consistency purposes, the Company proposes to amortize the disallowance amounts for both short-term and long-term capitalized incentive over a 20-year period or in other words use a 5% rate in the Depreciation annualization, as well as, in calculating the associated plant reserve at a point in time. This approach is consistent with Staff's 5.00% for its long-term incentive compensation disallowance in this case and with the methodology both the Company and Staff used in case ER-2022-0129 for long-term and in case ER-2024-0189 for both short-term and long-term. Using a common 5% rate for both disallowances would simplify future updates and provide consistent treatment across both Evergy Missouri jurisdictions.

Q: What is the Company proposing for Amortizing short-term and long-term incentive plant disallowances?

A: The Company proposes to amortize both short-term and long-term incentive disallowances using the same methodology. In the most recent MO West rate case ER-2024-0189, Staff's final true-up EMS and Company's true-up reflected 5% annually, for both disallowances. Adopting a defined amortization period, such as 20-years or 5% annually, would provide consistent treatment for both Evergy Missouri jurisdictions and between short-term and long-term incentive compensation disallowances. It would also simplify future updates by eliminating the need to recalculate an average depreciation rate in each rate case filing.

Q: What is the Company proposing to include for the Reserve associated with the short-term incentive disallowance?

A: The Company would propose to not reflect a Plant Reserve adjustment in this case for the short-term incentive disallowance and begin depreciating with the effective day of new rates in this case for simplicity and to be consistent with the treatment used when long-term incentive disallowance amortization began established in 2018 rate case. The long-term incentive disallowance amortization started with the effective day of new rates out of the 2018 rate case for capitalization that occurred from 2015-2018.

III. INFRASTRUCTURE FOR LARGE LOAD CUSTOMERS

Q: Staff witness Young discusses infrastructure investments associated with large load customers. Does Evergy generally agree with his observations?

A: Yes. Staff recognizes that certain facilities were constructed to provide service to large load customers and that those customers are expected to make capital contributions that offset the cost of providing that service. Evergy agrees with that overall framework. In fact, the Company has been working to identify and track those projects separately so that the ultimate ratemaking treatment properly reflects the associated customer contributions.

Q: How does Staff propose to address those investments in this case?

A: Staff states that, as of the update period, the Company's plant and reserve balances reflected investments associated with large load customers that did not yet reflect the anticipated customer funding. Based on that understanding, Staff reduced the rate base value of those investments to zero pending additional discovery and indicated that the adjustment would be updated at true-up

Q: Did the Company provide information identifying projects associated with large load customers during discovery?

A: Yes. Through discovery, including Data Request 237, the Company identified projects associated with serving large load customers and provided information regarding the expected funding arrangements. That information assists in determining which projects should ultimately be offset by customer contributions and in what amounts.

Q: What will Evergy do in its true-up testimony regarding these projects?

A: Evergy intends to update its analysis using the most current project information and customer contribution amounts available at the time of true-up which is reflected in the response to Data Request 237.4. In addition, the Company will ensure that the treatment of those projects is synchronized with any related PISA adjustments reflected in the true-up filing so that the various ratemaking schedules consistently reflect the same underlying project population and associated customer funding arrangements.

IV. UPLIGHT

Q: Please summarize Staff witness Matthew Young's testimony regarding Uplight.

A: Staff witness Matthew Young takes the position that the costs of EMM's Uplight software should be reallocated away from 100% Missouri operations to reflect what he views as its actual usage across all Evergy jurisdictions, utilizing customer count as an allocation methodology.

Q: Do you agree with Mr. Young's recommendation?

A: I agree with the general principle that costs should be assigned to the customers that cause and benefit from those costs. However, I disagree with Staff's proposed adjustment because it ignores the distinction between the separate implementation phases of the Uplight deployment. Company Witness Julie Dragoo describes the benefits provided through each phase and explains which customers received those benefits.

The issue is not whether Kansas customers currently receive benefits from Uplight. They do. The issue is whether Kansas customers should be assigned implementation costs that were incurred before Kansas customers had access to or could utilize the platform.

Q: How is the Uplight software accounted for on the Company's books and records?

A: The Uplight software is split into different phases. Phase 1 is recorded on EMM's books and records similar to how most common software packages are recorded. As with many common software packages, the Uplight software is part of the common use billing process and billed to EMW. Phase 2 is recorded on EMM's books and commonly billed across all Evergy jurisdictions, Kansas and Missouri, based on a customer allocator.

Q: What is the Company's position regarding the allocation of Uplight costs?

A: The Company's position is that Phase 1 implementation costs should remain allocated to Missouri customers, while Phase 2 implementation costs should be allocated across all Evergy jurisdictions that benefit from the broader deployment. This approach aligns costs with the customers who caused and benefited from each phase of the implementation.

Q: Why should Phase 1 implementation costs remain allocated solely to Missouri?

A: Phase 1 was undertaken to create and deploy Uplight functionality for Missouri customers. At that time, the relevant benefits were being provided to Missouri customers. Kansas customers could not access those capabilities simply because Phase 1 existed; additional implementation work was required before those capabilities could be extended to Kansas customers. Accordingly, the Phase 1 costs were caused by and incurred for Missouri operations and were properly allocated to Missouri customers.

Q: Why are Phase 2 costs allocated across all Evergy jurisdictions?

A: Phase 2 enabled Kansas customer participation and also expanded and enhanced the services provided by the platform across Evergy's regulated jurisdictions. Because customers in both Missouri and Kansas benefit from Phase 2, allocating those costs across all benefiting jurisdictions is consistent with the principle that those who benefit from the investment should pay for the costs.

V. RESERVE ADJUSTMENTS

Q: Please describe Staff's proposed reserve adjustment.

A: Staff witness Amanda Arandia recommends adjustments to accumulated depreciation reserves for certain general plant amortization accounts. According to Staff, these adjustments are intended to align recorded reserve balances with the reserve levels indicated by Staff's depreciation study and amortization calculations. Staff witness Matthew Young then incorporated the resulting reserve adjustment into his revenue requirement calculation and proposed amortizing the balance over five years.

Q: Does the Company support the concept of a reserve adjustment?

A: Yes. The Company supports the objective of ensuring that accumulated depreciation reserves are appropriately reflected based on the underlying plant balances and remaining amortization periods. In fact, the Company identified this issue during the course of the case, and the Company appreciates that Staff's analysis recognizes the need for a reserve adjustment.

Q: Does the Company agree with Staff's proposed adjustment?

A: While the Company agrees that a reserve adjustment is appropriate, the Company does not agree with Staff's calculation of the adjustment or the resulting revenue requirement impact. The dispute is not whether an adjustment should be made, but rather how that adjustment should be calculated. Company witness John Spanos addresses the calculation of the reserve adjustment and explains the Company's recommended treatment.

VI. PREPAYMENTS

Q: Please summarize Staff witness Lindsey Smith’s testimony with regards to Prepayments.

A: Staff witness Lindsey Smith explains that Staff reviewed the Company's prepayment balances to determine the appropriate level of prepayments to include in rate base. As part of that review, Ms. Smith removed the prepaid balance associated with the Company's Edison Electric Institute ("EEI") membership dues. Ms. Smith explains that this adjustment is consistent with Staff witness Nathan Bailey's recommendation to disallow a portion of the Company's EEI dues from the cost of service.

Q: Do you agree with Ms. Smith's recommendation to remove the prepaid EEI balance from rate base?

A: No. Ms. Smith's adjustment is based entirely on Staff witness Bailey's recommendation regarding the recoverability of EEI membership dues. As explained by Company witness Darcie Kramer, the Company's treatment of EEI dues is appropriate, and those dues provide benefits to customers through improved utility operations, reliability, emergency preparedness, cybersecurity, and other operational activities. Because the underlying EEI dues are properly recoverable, I likewise believe the associated prepaid balance should remain in rate base.

VII. REGULATORY ASSESSMENTS

Q: Please summarize Staff witness Lindsey Smith's testimony with regards to Regulatory Assessments.

A: Staff witness Lindsey Smith explains that staff's regulatory assessments reflect the most current MOPSC and FERC assessment information available at the time of her filing. She also testified that Staff did not include the OPC assessment because it had not yet been billed.

Q. Do you have any comments regarding the OPC assessment discussed by Ms. Smith?

A. Yes. While Ms. Smith indicated that Staff would update the adjustment at True Up, she did not speak directly to the OPC assessment. Evergy received the OPC assessment on June 26, 2026, accordingly, Evergy recommends that the OPC assessment be included in the true-up revenue requirement.

VIII. LEASE EXPENSE

Q: Please summarize Staff witness Sydney Ferguson's testimony regarding Lease Expense.

A: Staff witness Sydney Ferguson explains that Staff reviewed the lease expenses in the test period 12 months ending June 30, 2025, as well as through December 31, 2025. Staff reviewed whether the leases were currently in effect, included in test year, and would remain in effect at the same rate. Staff then recommended using 12 months ending December 2025 expense level.

Q: Do you agree with Staff's lease expense adjustment and calculation?

A: No, the Company does not agree with using 12 months ending December 2025. It would be more appropriate to annualize December 2025 lease payments to ensure the appropriate rate was used in setting the revenue requirement.

Q: Will the Company update lease expense at True-Up?

A: Yes, the Company will update lease expense based on the annualized amount of actual June 2026 lease payments. The Company believes Staff's calculation, which was based off of December 2025 data, should also be updated at true-up using June 2026 annualized amounts.

IX. ENERGY ALLOCATOR

Q: Does the company propose any adjustments to the Energy Allocator?

A: No. However, this case is unique because the Company and Staff are proposing annualization adjustments for two large customers (Customers A and B). These adjustments will affect net fuel cost modeling, as well as transmission revenues and expenses. Because these costs and revenues are specific to Missouri operations, while the ratemaking process is performed on a total-company basis and then allocated between Missouri and Kansas, annualizing these two customers will change the level of Missouri-related costs and energy usage reflected in the allocation process. Accordingly, the Energy Allocator should be updated to reflect the resulting changes and ensure that Missouri-specific costs and revenues are appropriately assigned to Missouri rather than being inadvertently allocated to Kansas.

Q: Does this 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 PATRICK ARON BRANSON

STATE OF MISSOURI)
) **ss**
COUNTY OF JACKSON)

Patrick Aron Branson, being first duly sworn on his oath, states:

1. My name is Patrick Aron Branson. I work in Kansas City, Missouri and I am employed by Evergy Metro, Inc. as Manager – Regulatory Accounting.

2. Attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes is my Rebuttal Testimony on behalf of Evergy Missouri Metro consisting of eleven (11) 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.

Patrick Aron Branson

Patrick Aron Branson

Subscribed and sworn before me this 11th day of August 2026.

Anthy R. Westenkirchner

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