Page 199

Fax: 314.644.1334

STATE OF MISSOURI

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Hearing

June 29, 2016

Jefferson City, Missouri Volume 7

In the Matter of The
Empire District Electric)
Company for Authority to)
File Tariffs Increasing) Case No. ER-2016-0023
Rates for Electric Service)
Provided to Customers in)
The Company's Missouri)
Service Area)

KIM S. BURTON, Presiding, REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.

DANIEL Y HALL, Chairman STEPHEN M. STOLL, WILLIAM P. KENNEY, SCOTT T. RUPP, COMMISSIONERS.

REPORTED BY:

KELLENE K. FEDDERSEN, CSR, RPR, CCR NO. 838 MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES

		Page 200
1	APPEARANCES:	
2	DIANA C. CARTER, Attorney at Law	
3	Brydon, Swearengen & England, P.C. 312 East Capitol	
4	P.O. Box 456 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456	
5	(573)635-7166 paulb@brydonlaw.com	
6	rmitten@brydonlaw.com	
7	FOR: The Empire District Electric Company.	
8	STUART CONRAD, Attorney at Law 3100 Broadway	
9	1209 Penntower Officer Center	
10	Kansas City, MO 64111 (816)753-1122	
11	stucon@swclaw.net	
12	FOR: Midwest Energy Users Association.	
13	DAVID WOODSMALL, Attorney at Law	
14	Woodsmall Law Office 807 Winston Court	
15	Jefferson City, MO 65101 (573)797-0005	
16	david.woodsmall@woodsmalllaw.com	
17	FOR: MECG.	
18	MARC ELLINGER, Attorney at Law Blitz, Bardgett & Deutsch	
19	308 East High Street, Suite 301 Jefferson City, MO 65101-3237	
20	(573)634-2500 Sbell@bbdlc.com	
21	FOR: City of Joplin.	
22	ALEXANDER ANTAL, Attorney At Law Missouri Division of Energy	
23	P.O. Box 1157 Jefferson City, MO 65102	
24	FOR: Division of Energy	
25		

		Page 201
1	CYDNEY MAYFIELD, Deputy Public Counsel Office of the Public Counsel	
2	P.O. Box 2230 200 Madison Street, Suite 650	
3	Jefferson City, MO 65102-2230 (573)751-4857	
4	FOR: Office of the Public Counsel	
5	and the Public.	
6	KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel JAMIE MYERS, Legal Counsel	
7	Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360	
8	200 Madison Street Jefferson City, MO 65102	
9	(573)751-3234	
10	FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission.	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		Page 202
1	PROCEEDINGS	
2	(WHEREUPON, the on-the-record	
3	presentation began at 9:18 a.m.)	
4	JUDGE BURTON: Let's go on the record	
5	in the matter of the Empire District Electric	
6	Company's request for authority to implement a	
7	general rate increase for electric service. This	
8	is File No. ER-2016-0023. I believe we already	
9	have all the parties' appearances on record at this	
10	time.	
11	The Commission has set this date, and	
12	it is currently 9:18 on June 29th, 2016, for an	
13	on-the-record presentation by the parties on the	
14	proposed Stipulation & Agreement, and I believe,	
15	with the joinder by MEUA, this is a Unanimous	
16	Stipulation & Agreement that has been submitted by	
17	the parties; is that correct?	
18	Now, I believe that the parties have	
19	indicated that their counsels will be available to	
20	answer any questions from the Commission, and that	
21	if the Commissioners should request a specific	
22	attorney appear and answer questions or present a	
23	specific issue, that they'd be happy to do so.	
24	So at this time I will turn it over	
25	to the Chairman and see if he has any questions.	

Page 203 1 CHAIRMAN HALL: Are there any opening 2 remarks? 3 MR. ELLINGER: No. 4 CHAIRMAN HALL: Good morning. Let me 5 start with a couple of questions, and I guess -- I guess I'll direct these at you, Mr. Thompson, and 6 others can --(Laughter.) 9 MR. WOODSMALL: We previously agreed that all questions go to Kevin. 10 11 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Page 3 of the 12 stipulation concerning rate case expense, noting 13 that the parties agreed to the same mechanism that was used in 2014-0370, recovery of rate case --14 15 linking the recovery of rate case expense to the 16 percentage of its rate increase request found or 17 agreed to be just and reasonable. So the amount that the parties agreed 18 19 to as a revenue requirement increase was 20,000 -excuse me -- 20.39 million; is that correct? 20 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 21 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. What was the 22 23 initial request? 24 MR. THOMPSON: I don't have that with 25 me, sir.

Page 204 MR. WOODSMALL: I believe it was 1 2 32.3. 3 CHAIRMAN HALL: 32.3? 4 MR. WOODSMALL: So it's about 5 67 percent, two-thirds of the initial request. CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. And I find 6 7 that quite reasonable. 8 Okay. Moving down to page 3 --9 moving down on page 3 concerning discontinued 10 trackers, the vegetation/infrastructure tracker, could you or someone explain, going forward, what 11 12 will be the amount in rates to cover that 13 particular line item expense? 14 MR. THOMPSON: Well, the settlement 15 stipulates to a particular amount of revenue 16 requirement, and within that amount of revenue 17 requirement there was not a particular amount designated as vegetation or infrastructure. 18 19 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Don't you have 20 on page 3 of your stip and it says \$436,481 shall be amortized annually over a period of five years? 21 MR. THOMPSON: That's going to be 22 amortized out of the balance of the tracker that's 23 24 being discontinued. 25 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Because that's

Page 205

- 1 not going -- okay.
- 2 MR. THOMPSON: That's different from
- 3 whatever amount might be available to pay ongoing
- 4 expenses in that area.
- 5 MR. WOODSMALL: The vegetation
- 6 management tracker was discontinued in the last
- 7 case, but there was still a balance that was
- 8 tracked that needed to be recovered. The
- 9 unamortized amount of that tracker is now
- 10 2.18 million and will be amortized over an
- 11 additional five years. So the tracker was
- 12 discontinued last case, and this is just kind of a
- 13 catchup.
- 14 CHAIRMAN HALL: So is that on top of
- 15 the revenue requirement?
- 16 MR. WOODSMALL: There is an amount in
- 17 the revenue requirement, not a specified amount,
- 18 for vegetation management as well as all other
- 19 expenses, and this is an amount from previous
- 20 periods that's over and above that.
- 21 MS. CARTER: These numbers do not
- 22 increase the revenue requirement, if that was the
- 23 question.
- 24 CHAIRMAN HALL: Moving to page 5, the
- 25 disclaimer language that's related to the solar

Page 206 rebates, who was advocating for this disclaimer? 2 MS. MAYFIELD: Chairman Hall, that 3 would be Office of Public Counsel. 4 CHAIRMAN HALL: Why was OPC 5 advocating for that disclaimer? 6 MS. MAYFIELD: That was proposed by 7 Dr. Geoff Marke. He is in the room if you have a specific question about it. But I believe there 9 are other jurisdictions in the United States that have this particular disclaimer. So it puts 10 individuals who have these PV systems on notice 11 12 that even though there was a fixed investment up 13 front and this is the way this investment is currently treated, that future rate cases and 14 changes may impact the overall cost of that PV 15 16 system. 17 CHAIRMAN HALL: Do you know whether or not that disclaimer or language similar to this 18 19 disclaimer is included in tariffs for any other 20 utility? DR. MARKE: Chairman Hall, we 21 borrowed the language from Arizona. 22 CHAIRMAN HALL: I meant in Missouri. 23 24 DR. MARKE: No.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Is there any concern

Fax: 314.644.1334

25

Page 207

- 1 that this language might disincentivize potential
- 2 ratepayers from attempting to utilize such a
- 3 system?
- 4 MS. MAYFIELD: To my knowledge, I
- 5 don't believe that is the case. I think we -- the
- 6 intention behind the notice is to just put them on
- 7 notice that --
- 8 CHAIRMAN HALL: I know that's the
- 9 intention, but I'm just wondering if that might
- 10 serve to dis-- I guess I might look at the Division
- 11 of Energy for whether they believe that that could
- 12 disincentivize a ratepayer from putting in such a
- 13 system.
- 14 MR. ANTAL: I think theoretically it
- 15 possibly could. I don't have any analytical data
- 16 to show that such notices have. In the grand
- 17 scheme of things, this is something that we could
- 18 live with.
- 19 CHAIRMAN HALL: This is a general
- 20 question, and it may illustrate some ignorance on
- 21 my part, but I don't remember as much MEEIA issues
- 22 in other rate cases, and I'm wondering why in this
- 23 rate case we're setting forth what the MEEIA
- 24 programs are to be, costs, how to be treated,
- 25 et cetera, and why this is different than other

Page 208

- 1 rate cases.
- 2 MS. CARTER: Empire does not have a
- 3 MEEIA program in place.
- 4 CHAIRMAN HALL: So this is in lieu of
- 5 having a separate MEEIA program?
- 6 MS. CARTER: Yes. These aren't
- 7 actually MEEIA programs. They're DSM programs.
- 8 CHAIRMAN HALL: Got you. That makes
- 9 complete sense. Okay. So turning to page 7,
- 10 paragraph F of 13, all the parties here agree that
- 11 all these programs will have a term of not less
- 12 than two years so they can't be discontinued
- 13 unilaterally by the utility, unlike other utilities
- 14 within the MEEIA programs, correct?
- MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.
- MS. CARTER: Correct.
- 17 CHAIRMAN HALL: That makes sense.
- 18 Okay. Turning to the FAC on page 8 and 9. I'm
- 19 wondering how -- how this FAC treats transmission
- 20 compared to Ameren and KCP&L.
- MR. WOODSMALL: It's the same
- 22 mechanism. It's the same mechanism in that it
- 23 looks at the percent of transmission used for
- 24 off-system sales versus native load. The
- 25 percentages are different, but it's the same

Page 209 formula. 1 CHAIRMAN HALL: Where does it say 3 that? How is that to be extrapolated from? 4 MR. WOODSMALL: Well, it --5 MS. CARTER: It's the top of page 9. MR. WOODSMALL: Right. The sentence 6 7 going from the bottom of page 8 to the top of page 9 talks about the percentage of the MISO 9 transmission versus the SPP transmission costs. CHAIRMAN HALL: And so those 10 particular percentages, 50 and 34, correlate to the 11 12 same formula that we used in Ameren and KCP&L? 13 MR. WOODSMALL: Correct. CHAIRMAN HALL: So we are going to 14 allow transmission costs to flow through the FAC if 15 16 they are purchased power to serve native load and 17 true off-system sales; is that correct? MS. CARTER: That is the intent. 18 19 MR. WOODSMALL: The percentages are 20 the same as in the last case because the numbers haven't changed much, but it is the same formula. 21 CHAIRMAN HALL: Turning to rate 22 23 design, there's two provisions here that I'm 24 wondering how they are to be reconciled. One says 25 for the LP class, the volumetric energy charges

Page 210

- 1 shall not be increased as part of this case. And
- 2 then a couple of paragraphs later on page 10 it
- 3 says, after these adjustments, including setting
- 4 the residential customer charge, all remaining
- 5 rates within each class shall be increased by the
- 6 same percentage. How are those -- how are those
- 7 reconciled?
- 8 MR. WOODSMALL: I can see a little
- 9 bit of confusion, discrepancy there. I can tell
- 10 you the way that it has been handled within the
- 11 tariffs, if you look at the tariffs that were filed
- 12 yesterday -- or was that Monday? Anyway, the
- 13 tariffs that were filed for the LP class, the
- 14 energy charges remain the same, and the entirety of
- 15 the rate increase is on the other components.
- 16 CHAIRMAN HALL: And I've not reviewed
- 17 those tariffs, but I assume that those tariffs
- 18 would show and this agreement contemplates
- 19 declining block rates in the -- in the winter
- 20 season for residential; is that correct?
- 21 MR. WOODSMALL: I don't know what the
- 22 numbers are, but it maintains the current rate
- 23 design and says that the parties will study it.
- 24 CHAIRMAN HALL: Which is?
- 25 MS. CARTER: It maintains the same

Page 211

- 1 one step down that we discussed last time we were
- 2 before you, 2 to 3 cents.
- 3 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. But the
- 4 parties have agreed for the next rate case to study
- 5 the issue and develop an analysis regarding
- 6 responsible energy use as related to residential
- 7 block rates? I assume that's what the parties are
- 8 focused on there. So there's at least an
- 9 acknowledgement by the parties to consider some
- 10 kind of level or possible declining block rates in
- 11 order to promote conservation. Is that how --
- MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.
- MS. MAYFIELD: Correct.
- 14 MR. ANTAL: That's our understanding.
- 15 CHAIRMAN HALL: Good. One more thing
- 16 I like. Okay. I do have another question about on
- 17 page 7, paragraph 13H, it says, If the Commission
- 18 orders a low-income rate pilot program in this
- 19 case, the cost of the program will receive
- 20 regulatory asset rate case treatment as specified
- 21 in paragraph 15.
- To me, that looks like -- well, it's
- 23 an agreement by the parties as to how to fund a
- 24 program if the Commission so orders one, correct?
- MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

Page 212

- 1 CHAIRMAN HALL: Is it realistic --
- 2 and maybe I need to -- I'll start with Mr. Thompson
- 3 and then go to Ms. Carter and go from there. But
- 4 is it possible that, should the Commission order a
- 5 low-income rate pilot program, that the parties
- 6 could put one together in time for us to approve it
- 7 when we approve the stipulation?
- 8 MR. THOMPSON: I believe the parties
- 9 probably could.
- 10 MS. CARTER: I think it would be hard
- 11 to get it ready in time to approve this stip. We
- 12 were discussing before we went on the record,
- 13 because if you don't approve this stip, then we
- 14 have to have a hearing. But I think we could put
- 15 something together before you need to approve the
- 16 tariffs.
- 17 If you could approve the stipulation
- 18 and direct us to create a low-income pilot tariff
- 19 program, we then would have time before compliance
- 20 tariffs would need to be approved.
- 21 CHAIRMAN HALL: Judge, does that make
- 22 sense?
- JUDGE BURTON: Yes.
- MR. WOODSMALL: The only thing I'd
- 25 add is, as far as doing a low-income pilot, I think

Page 213

- 1 that can be done. As you heard in the last
- 2 hearing, the problem is, would it be an efficient
- 3 low-income pilot? That's the problem we have is
- 4 how to structure it so that it's efficient, so that
- 5 it meets whatever goals it's designed to do.
- 6 Empire was saying the last hearing
- 7 that we previously had a low-income pilot and it
- 8 was terminated because it wasn't efficient. And I
- 9 don't know how you measure efficiencies. But the
- 10 problem is structuring one to meet whatever goals,
- 11 policies you may set forth.
- 12 CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, if the -- if
- 13 the goal is affordability, which I -- I mean, I
- 14 think that is the overall goal of a low-income
- 15 tariff. If that's the goal and we let the parties
- 16 try to work one out, then we see if it works and
- 17 that's the definition of a pilot.
- 18 I mean, speaking for myself, I would
- 19 not want to require a low-income pilot if the
- 20 parties could not agree to one.
- 21 MR. WOODSMALL: At this point we
- 22 haven't agreed to one, just because we are
- 23 uncertain -- I can't say just because, but I think
- 24 in part because we are uncertain as to what the
- 25 Commission wants policy-wise with a low-income

Page 214

- 1 program. There was talk, I believe Dr. Marke was
- 2 talking in the last case, and it might have been
- 3 Empire was talking in the last case that there were
- 4 problems when people exited the low-income pilot
- 5 being less able to pay their bills.
- 6 So, I mean, what are we trying to
- 7 accomplish here? If we're trying to accomplish
- 8 just throwing money at it and make rates more
- 9 affordable for some people, that's easy to do. If
- 10 we're trying to accomplish more help them through a
- 11 rough time, make them better able going forward to
- 12 pay these rates, that takes something more.
- 13 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. It's the
- 14 first. It's not the second from my perspective. I
- 15 don't know -- I don't think it's possible to
- 16 formulate one that accomplishes your second goal
- 17 there.
- 18 MR. WOODSMALL: And I don't have any
- 19 thoughts on that either. I don't know.
- 20 CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, we don't need
- 21 to resolve the issue here if the -- if the
- 22 Commission were to decide to ask the parties to put
- 23 one together, then we could see what comes out of
- 24 that and then make a decision.
- MR. WOODSMALL: When you say see what

Page 215

- 1 comes out of that, that's a problem. What are we
- 2 trying to measure? If the goal is solely
- 3 affordability, why measure anything? I mean, by
- 4 its very nature, you give someone money, you're
- 5 making it easier for them to pay their bills. When
- 6 you say see what comes out of that, what do you
- 7 want us to measure?
- 8 CHAIRMAN HALL: Similar to what we
- 9 ordered in the Missouri American case, I think we
- 10 would be looking to see how many -- how many
- 11 ratepayers participated, what the cost of the
- 12 program was, what the impact was on bad debt, and
- 13 then also an understanding -- well, and then also
- 14 looking at how many people had their service cut
- 15 off, what the costs were related to that. I mean,
- 16 think there's a whole host of things that we could
- 17 learn from it that would be a value.
- 18 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Mr. Chairman,
- 19 can I --
- 20 CHAIRMAN HALL: Absolutely.
- 21 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: We discussed
- 22 this earlier, the questions that the Chairman just
- 23 had. Didn't Empire say that they -- that their
- 24 findings when they did their pilot program, that
- 25 when those that were on the program got back off

Page 216

- 1 the program, that their bad debt situations
- 2 increased? I mean, you had more -- so the
- 3 determination was there was no cause and effect.
- 4 MS. CARTER: It was say you take a
- 5 person here, their situation in terms of paying
- 6 their bills improves while they're on the program,
- 7 but then after the program, they drop to below
- 8 their starting point on ability to pay.
- 9 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: There was no --
- 10 MR. WOODSMALL: There's no going-
- 11 forward benefit for the other ratepayers.
- 12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Just used the
- 13 money somewhere else. So when the money wasn't
- 14 there, they'd gotten established in using that
- money elsewhere, so they didn't pay their bills?
- MS. CARTER: From Empire's
- 17 standpoint, I would say what we would be looking
- 18 for, since there wasn't consensus, and we spent a
- 19 lot of time trying for consensus on this issue so
- 20 we could put something forward. All the parties
- 21 worked very hard to find that, and we didn't reach
- 22 it. What we would be looking for from the
- 23 Commission is an order, a directive to do and
- 24 possibly a certain amount of money, and then
- 25 possibly put it to us to design how it works within

Page 217

- 1 those directives. If you were to give us, you have
- 2 to do this with this dollar amount, then I think
- 3 the parties could work together on how to design
- 4 that.
- 5 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Dr. Marke, was
- 6 it your testimony that we shouldn't jump into
- 7 something like this? I can't recall what you had
- 8 talked about. I know in past cases you had some
- 9 testimony.
- DR. MARKE: Yes, Commissioner, that
- 11 was my general sentiment. If I may, we have been
- 12 in discussions based off of the feedback that we
- 13 received from the last on-the-record from
- 14 Commissioner Rupp about the low-income on-bill
- 15 financing program. We're actually set to meet as a
- 16 collaborative on July 5th to discuss that program
- 17 going forward. And we received interest from the
- 18 Federal Government as well, the Federal Department
- 19 of Energy, as far as possible assistance in that.
- 20 So I would offer that there is being
- 21 -- there is work being done on our side
- 22 collectively to at least address part of the
- 23 low-income.
- MS. CARTER: And that's in our DSM
- 25 section, that's one of the new pro-- possible new

Page 218

- 1 programs to begin on January 1st.
- 2 COMMISSIONER RUPP: So what I'm
- 3 hearing is you can't come to an agreement, you want
- 4 an order from us that says go do this and this is
- 5 what it should look like or here's the parameters,
- 6 and then you think you can come to an agreement or
- 7 we tell you, here's what it should look like, go do
- 8 it?
- 9 MS. CARTER: If the Commission wants
- 10 us to do something beyond what we've already agreed
- 11 to do, which is what Dr. Marke was explaining that
- 12 we already have put in place in response to our
- 13 last time appearing before you. To try and have
- 14 the time to work it out, that's how we have it
- 15 structured on the new DSM programs is to give us
- 16 until January 1st, 2017 to craft the new programs
- 17 so we don't have to come back in for another case.
- 18 COMMISSIONER RUPP: So can you just
- 19 give me a shorter answer here? Are you going to
- 20 come up with a program?
- 21 MS. CARTER: That is the goal.
- 22 COMMISSIONER RUPP: That's a nice
- 23 goal, but the way I read the stip, it says if the
- 24 Commission, and then your comments earlier were
- 25 that we cannot come up with an agreement and we're

Page 219

- 1 looking for you to tell us to do this.
- 2 MS. CARTER: Two separate parts. We
- 3 responded to your particular questions last time we
- 4 were before you with regard to the PAYS program,
- 5 and so that is already in the works. And assuming
- 6 it works for Empire, and that's why we're having
- 7 the meetings, and works for everyone else, then
- 8 that would be put in place on January 1st, 2017.
- 9 That is not a straight low-income pilot program.
- 10 If the Commission is also wanting
- 11 more like what happened in Missouri American Water
- 12 Company's case where it's more just a straight
- 13 discount for people who qualify for that based on
- 14 income, that is something we would need you to
- 15 order the parties to do.
- 16 COMMISSIONER RUPP: So in the absence
- 17 of us issuing an order ordering you to do PAYS, are
- 18 you going to do something of that nature if it
- 19 actually works for everyone?
- MS. VUYLSTEKE: Yes.
- 21 COMMISSIONER RUPP: So you will be
- 22 doing something of that nature?
- 23 MS. CARTER: It is already in motion
- 24 to see what exactly will work for Empire and
- 25 Empire's customers.

Page 220

- 1 COMMISSIONER RUPP: And you're
- 2 confident that you can get an agreement on that
- 3 program to move forward?
- 4 MS. CARTER: Yes. We already have
- 5 that agreement.
- 6 CHAIRMAN HALL: Commissioner Stoll?
- 7 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Not on this
- 8 issue specifically.
- 9 CHAIRMAN HALL: If we were to
- 10 instruct the parties to put together a low-income
- 11 pilot, what is a dollar amount that the company
- 12 believes is reasonable?
- MS. CARTER: I do not have that. The
- 14 company did not give me a number that they thought
- 15 was reasonable in order for me to answer that
- 16 question right now. That is something certainly we
- 17 could look into and I could do some sort of
- 18 pleading to answer that.
- 19 CHAIRMAN HALL: Why do you believe
- 20 that it's necessary for us, for the Commission to
- 21 set that dollar amount? Why couldn't that dollar
- 22 amount also be subject to the negotiation of the
- 23 parties?
- MS. CARTER: We certainly could do
- 25 that. Just based on the discussions we had,

Page 221

- 1 agreement wasn't reached. Different interests from
- 2 different parties, and it seemed like this was
- 3 something that was going to need to come from the
- 4 Commission.
- 5 CHAIRMAN HALL: Is there any -- does
- 6 any lawyer in the room believe that if the
- 7 Commission were to order the parties to put
- 8 together a low-income tariff, that that is in any
- 9 way inconsistent with the stipulation, the
- 10 agreement amongst all the parties set forth in this
- 11 agreement?
- MR. WOODSMALL: I wouldn't say it's
- 13 inconsistent. If the Commission came out and said
- 14 we want a low-income program that costs
- 15 \$20 million, we might have some pushback then, but
- 16 reasonable numbers, I don't think it would be
- 17 inconsistent.
- 18 I know your next question's going to
- 19 be, well, what is a reasonable number? I don't
- 20 know. I'll know it when I see it. But I think if
- 21 it's consistent in magnitude with what was done in
- 22 previous cases, which we agreed to, I think it
- 23 would be consistent with the spirit of this
- 24 stipulation.
- 25 MR. ELLINGER: Unless there was some

Page 222

- 1 provision in the low-income program would violate
- 2 some other provision in the stipulation, such as
- 3 maybe it would have an impact upon weatherization,
- 4 on energy efficiency, things of that type, because
- 5 those programs can inherently have a negative
- 6 impact on some of those provisions.
- 7 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: When we ordered
- 8 that in the Ameren case, I think the testimony was
- 9 based off of LIHEAP, and I think they said they had
- 10 about 17,000 individuals encompassing their entire
- 11 service territory. And I know we set it up, for
- 12 instance, to come up with a certain area.
- Now, does Empire have an idea of, in
- 14 some of your communities that have a higher
- 15 percentage of LIHEAP individuals, what that might
- 16 be numbers in certain areas?
- MS. CARTER: Empire is a little
- 18 different than Missouri American Water Company
- 19 because Empire doesn't have so many different
- 20 service areas. It would be a little harder to pick
- 21 out a particular community, unless you went with,
- 22 for example, Reed Spring or Joplin. It would
- 23 probably be more of their customers involved. They
- 24 do LIHEAP obviously, and I think the last time we
- 25 were here Division of Energy had those numbers

Page 223

- 1 perhaps.
- 2 MR. ANTAL: So the poverty rates for
- 3 the counties that Empire serves are in the
- 4 testimony of DE witness Sharlet Kroll, the average
- 5 for those counties is just over 19 percent, which
- 6 is higher than the state average, which is 15.4, I
- 7 believe, maybe 15.5.
- 8 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I just have a
- 9 couple questions. First of all, on page 7D on the
- 10 PAYS program, is legislation needed in Missouri for
- 11 this to go forward or has that legislation already
- 12 been passed? Is there some -- is legislation
- 13 needed to adopt a PAYS program? If I had thought
- 14 of this earlier, I would have looked it up. Does
- 15 anybody know? Maybe not. I mean --
- MR. WOODSMALL: I don't think so.
- 17 COMMISSIONER STOLL: You don't think
- 18 so?
- MR. WOODSMALL: Especially if the
- 20 parties all agree to it in this case. I don't
- 21 think it's necessary.
- 22 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Because I
- 23 recall we had a -- our Mid America Regulatory
- 24 meeting a couple weeks ago in Bismarck, and there
- 25 was a presentation made about the PAYS program, and

Page 224

- 1 I -- I recall that there were certain states that
- 2 had authorized, maybe set up this program, but I --
- 3 it was just general question and I'll look it up
- 4 myself and see if it is required. So to your
- 5 knowledge, Commissioner Kenney, are you aware of
- 6 that?
- 7 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I'm aware. I'm
- 8 trying to think about what was in my packet of
- 9 information that I put together.
- 10 MR. WOODSMALL: I'm 99 percent
- 11 certain there is no legislation that deals with
- 12 PAYS currently in Missouri. The question then
- 13 becomes whether we need that legislation. To
- 14 implement what we're doing here, I don't think so.
- 15 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Well,
- 16 when you do make that presentation, I like the
- 17 idea. The presentation that we had at our MARC
- 18 meeting was very good, and it seems like the
- 19 program will accomplish a number of things in
- 20 demand side management. So I'll look forward to
- 21 hearing about that when you -- when a presentation
- 22 is made at a Commission agenda.
- The other question I have would be,
- 24 on page 3, under depreciation, it says Empire -- in
- 25 the last sentence, Empire will no longer engage in

Page 225

- 1 the process of discontinuing depreciation on assets
- 2 when reserves are equal to or higher than original
- 3 costs. I think I know what that means, but could
- 4 somebody explain that to me? Anyone.
- 5 MR. WOODSMALL: I'll take a shot at
- 6 it. I'm no depreciation expert, that's for sure.
- 7 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I'm always glad
- 8 to hear that, that people that I think know an
- 9 awful lot have difficulty with these.
- 10 MR. WOODSMALL: Well, I don't even
- 11 know an awful lot.
- 12
- 13 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Go right ahead.
- MR. WOODSMALL: So what happens is,
- 15 let's say you have an asset that is \$100 when it's
- 16 originally constructed, and you depreciate it over
- 17 ten years. The company receives depreciation
- 18 expense of \$10 a year. Well, what happens then in
- 19 the 11th year if that asset is still around? You
- 20 have \$10. Do you stop depreciating it at the --
- 21 when it gets to zero?
- 22 What was happening before, as I
- 23 understand it, was Empire would stop depreciation
- 24 on that asset when it reached the initial plant in
- 25 service amount. What this -- and if you stop

Page 226

- 1 depreciation, you have a lesser expense, you have
- 2 profits go up.
- 3 So what this says is that the company
- 4 will no longer stop depreciation. The reserve will
- 5 continue to grow so that the reserve is greater
- 6 than the original plant in service amount. That
- 7 leads to questions. What do you do with that
- 8 excess reserve in future cases? Do you apply it to
- 9 other accounts?
- 10 Those questions aren't addressed
- 11 here. It just says that they will continue
- 12 depreciation on that asset until the Commission
- 13 does something.
- 14 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Thanks
- 15 for that explanation.
- 16 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: That's an
- 17 approved accounting method? Looking back there at
- 18 the --
- MR. WOODSMALL: I'm going to need
- 20 some help on that one.
- 21 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Yeah. That's
- 22 why I'm looking --
- MR. OLIGSCHLAEGER: Yes. The
- 24 standard depreciation accounting followed by most
- 25 utilities in the state is they keep on booking

Page 227

- 1 amounts to depreciation even if the account it
- 2 question or the category of -- broad category of
- 3 accounts in question is fully depreciated. And
- 4 that is necessary to make sure customers get the
- 5 benefit of all amounts they pay in to the company
- 6 in the form of depreciation expense. Just because
- 7 an asset may be fully depreciated on its books
- 8 doesn't mean the customers stop paying depreciation
- 9 on it at that exact time. Basically it would have
- 10 to wait until the next rate case to reflect that
- 11 change.
- 12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.
- 13 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I failed to look
- 14 over to the left and realize that we do have a
- 15 depreciation expert in the room, Mr. Oligschlaeger.
- MR. OLIGSCHLAEGER: There's
- 17 Mr. Robinett here, too.
- 18 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Thank you
- 19 very much. I have no additional questions.
- 20 JUDGE BURTON: I just had a few
- 21 follow-up questions. It looks as if all the
- 22 parties agree to the admission of prefiled
- 23 testimony. Nothing was excluded, correct?
- MR. WOODSMALL: And that's contingent
- 25 on approval of the stipulation. If we have to go

Page 228

- 1 to hearing, then that will all happen later.
- 2 And this may be a good time. As I
- 3 understand it, the Commission set aside next
- 4 Tuesday for a hearing. So we need to know quickly
- 5 if the Commission has problems with the
- 6 stipulation.
- JUDGE BURTON: Thank you,
- 8 Mr. Woodsmall. As a follow-up for the potential
- 9 for a pilot program for low-income, could someone
- 10 identify what the amount was that was set aside in
- 11 the prior Empire pilot program for low-income?
- DR. MARKE: Your Honor, it's in the
- 13 report. I want to say it's in the annual budget of
- 14 roughly half a million. It never got close to that
- 15 amount in any given year. So that money just
- 16 rolled over each successive year.
- JUDGE BURTON: Thank you, Dr. Marke.
- 18 And there was obviously discussion about --
- DR. MARKE: And -- I'm sorry. That
- 20 money there, just to be clear for some of the other
- 21 programs, that was half ratepayer dollars and half
- 22 shareholder dollars.
- JUDGE BURTON: Thank you for that
- 24 clarification. And there was discussion about the
- 25 potential in the settlement agreement for a

Page 229

- 1 presentation in the future to the Commission on the
- 2 PAYS program. It's indicated that this would be
- 3 part of any program that would be implemented to go
- 4 into effect on January 1st, 2017.
- If the PAYS or any other comparable
- 6 program is submitted by the company, when is the
- 7 company projecting to actually have a presentation
- 8 on this?
- 9 MS. CARTER: We have not gotten that
- 10 far.
- 11 JUDGE BURTON: So it would probably
- 12 be in the fall?
- MS. CARTER: Yes. The idea would be
- 14 for 30-day tariff filings for the new DSM programs,
- 15 with the hope that those would just go into effect
- 16 then in 30 days, and we would have a presentation
- 17 to the Commission around that same time period.
- 18 JUDGE BURTON: Okay. Thank you. Are
- 19 there any further questions from the Commission?
- 20 Would the parties like to add any final comments?
- 21 All right. Seeing none.
- Then I will just go ahead and say, I
- 23 know that next Monday is the 4th of July, and as
- 24 you were discussing, Mr. Woodsmall, we actually
- 25 have July 5th as a potential date. I believe there

Page 230 will be some discussion with the Commissioners, and 2 the next agenda is the 6th, I believe. So we'll go 3 ahead, and I'll issue a notice on this, cancel the 4 5th for any potential hearing date, and we'll make sure that the parties are notified if there is any 5 need for an evidentiary hearing after this. 6 Are there any additional matters that we need to address while we are on the record? All 9 right. Then that concludes today's hearing, and I think everyone for their appearance, and I hope you 10 have a very lovely holiday. Off the record. 11 12 (WHEREUPON, the on-the-record presentation concluded at 9:57 a.m.) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

		Page 231
1		
2	CERTIFICATE	
3	STATE OF MISSOURI)) ss.	
4	COUNTY OF COLE)	
5	I, Kellene K. Feddersen, Certified	
6	Shorthand Reporter with the firm of Midwest	
7	Litigation Services, do hereby certify that I was	
8	personally present at the proceedings had in the	
9	above-entitled cause at the time and place set	
10	forth in the caption sheet thereof; that I then and	
11	there took down in Stenotype the proceedings had;	
12	and that the foregoing is a full, true and correct	
13	transcript of such Stenotype notes so made at such	
14	time and place.	
15	Given at my office in the City of	
16	Jefferson, County of Cole, State of Missouri.	
17	Kellene K. Feddersen, RPR, CSR, CCR	
18	Reffere R. Feddelsen, RFR, CBR, CCR	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

A	227:22	appear 202:22	218:17 226:17	C
a.m 202:3	agreed 203:9,13	appear 202.22	bad 215:12	C 200:2 202:1
230:13	203:17,18	230:10	216:1	
	211:4 213:22	appearances	balance 204:23	231:2,2 cancel 230:3
ability 216:8	218:10 221:22	200:1 202:9	205:7	
able 214:5,11	agreement	appearing	Bardgett 200:18	Capitol 200:3
above-entitled 231:9	202:14,16	218:13	based 217:12	caption 231:10
	210:18 211:23	apply 226:8	219:13 220:25	Carter 200:2
absence 219:16	218:3,6,25	approval 227:25	222:9	205:21 208:2,6
Absolutely	220:2,5 221:1	approve 212:6,7	Basically 227:9	208:16 209:5
215:20	221:10,11	212:11,13,15	began 202:3	209:18 210:25
accomplish	228:25	212:17,13,13	believe 202:8,14	212:3,10 216:4
214:7,7,10	ahead 225:13	approved	202:18 204:1	216:16 217:24
224:19	229:22 230:3	212:20 226:17	206:8 207:5,11	218:9,21 219:2
accomplishes	ALEXANDER	area 199:13	212:8 214:1	219:23 220:4
214:16	200:22	205:4 222:12	220:19 221:6	220:13,24
account 227:1	allow 209:15	areas 222:16,20	223:7 229:25	222:17 229:9
accounting	Ameren 208:20	Arizona 206:22	230:2	229:13
226:17,24	209:12 222:8	aside 228:3,10	believes 220:12	case 199:11
accounts 226:9	America 223:23	asset 211:20	benefit 216:11	203:12,14,15
227:3	American 215:9	225:15,19,24	227:5	205:7,12 207:5
acknowledge	219:11 222:18	226:12 227:7	better 214:11	207:23 209:20
211:9	amortized	assets 225:1	beyond 218:10	210:1 211:4,19
add 212:25	204:21,23	assistance	bills 214:5 215:5	211:20 214:2,3
229:20	205:10	217:19	216:6,15	215:9 218:17
additional	amount 203:18	Association	Bismarck	219:12 222:8
205:11 227:19	204:12,15,16	200:12	223:24	223:20 227:10
230:7	204:17 205:3,9	assume 210:17	bit 210:9	cases 206:14
address 217:22	204.17 203.3,9	211:7	Blitz 200:18	207:22 208:1
230:8	216:24 217:2	assuming 219:5	block 210:19	217:8 221:22
addressed		O		226:8
226:10	220:11,21,22	attempting	211:7,10	catchup 205:13
adjustments	225:25 226:6	207:2	booking 226:25	category 227:2,2
210:3	228:10,15	attorney 200:2,8	books 227:7	cause 216:3
admission	amounts 227:1,5	200:13,17,22	borrowed	231:9
227:22	analysis 211:5	202:22	206:22	CCR 199:22
adopt 223:13	analytical	authority	bottom 209:7	231:17
advocating	207:15	199:11 202:6	Box 200:3,23	Center 200:9
206:1,5	annual 228:13	authorized	201:2,7	cents 211:2
affordability	annually 204:21	224:2	broad 227:2	certain 216:24
213:13 215:3	answer 202:20	available 202:19	Broadway 200:8	222:12,16
affordable	202:22 218:19	205:3	Brydon 200:2	224:1,11
214:9	220:15,18	average 223:4,6	budget 228:13	certainly 220:16
agenda 224:22	ANTAL 200:22	aware 224:5,7	BURTON	220:24
230:2	207:14 211:14	awful 225:9,11	199:15 202:4	Certified 231:5
ago 223:24	223:2	B	212:23 227:20	certify 231:7
agree 208:10	anybody 223:15		228:7,17,23	cetera 207:25
213:20 223:20	Anyway 210:12	back 215:25	229:11,18	Chairman

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

199:16 202:25	202:11,20	210:15	Court 200:14	224:24 225:1,6
203:1,4,11,22	211:17,24	concern 206:25	cover 204:12	225:17,23
204:3,6 205:14	212:4 213:25	concerning	craft 218:16	226:1,4,12,24
205:24 206:2,4	214:22 216:23	203:12 204:9	create 212:18	227:1,6,8,15
206:17,21,23	218:9,24	concluded	CSR 199:22	Deputy 201:1
206:25 207:8	219:10 220:20	230:13	231:17	design 209:23
207:19 208:4,8	221:4,7,13	concludes 230:9	current 210:22	210:23 216:25
208:17 209:2	224:22 226:12	confident 220:2	currently	217:3
209:10,14,22	228:3,5 229:1	confusion 210:9	202:12 206:14	designated
210:16,24	229:17,19	CONRAD 200:8	224:12	204:18
211:3,15 212:1	Commissioner	consensus	customer 210:4	designed 213:5
212:21 213:12	204:19,25	216:18,19	customers	determination
214:13,20	215:18,21	conservation	199:12 219:25	216:3
215:8,18,20,22	216:9,12 217:5	211:11	222:23 227:4,8	Deutsch 200:18
220:6,9,19	217:10,14	consider 211:9	cut 215:14	develop 211:5
221:5	218:2,18,22	consistent	CYDNEY 201:1	DIANA 200:2
change 227:11	219:16,21	221:21,23		different 205:2
changed 209:21	220:1,6,7	constructed	D	207:25 208:25
changes 206:15	222:7 223:8,17	225:16	D 202:1	221:1,2 222:18
charge 210:4	223:22 224:5,7	contemplates	DANIEL 199:16	222:19
charges 209:25	224:15 225:7	210:18	data 207:15	difficulty 225:9
210:14	225:13 226:14	contingent	date 202:11	direct 203:6
Chief 201:6	226:16,21	227:24	229:25 230:4	212:18
City 199:8 200:4	227:12,13,18	continue 226:5	DAVID 200:13	directive 216:23
200:9,14,19,21	Commissioners	226:11	david.woodsm	directives 217:1
200:23 201:3,8	199:18 202:21	correct 202:17	200:15	dis 207:10
231:15	230:1	203:20,21	days 229:16	disclaimer
clarification	communities	208:14,16	DE 223:4	205:25 206:1,5
228:24	222:14	209:13,17	deals 224:11	206:10,18,19
class 209:25	community	210:20 211:13	debt 215:12	discontinued
210:5,13	222:21	211:24 227:23	216:1	204:9,24 205:6
clear 228:20	company 199:11	231:12	decide 214:22	205:12 208:12
close 228:14	200:7 220:11	correlate 209:11	decision 214:24	discontinuing
Cole 231:4,16	220:14 222:18	cost 206:15	declining 210:19	225:1
collaborative	225:17 226:3	211:19 215:11	211:10	discount 219:13
217:16	227:5 229:6,7	costs 207:24	definition	discrepancy
collectively	Company's	209:9,15	213:17	210:9
217:22	199:13 202:6	215:15 221:14	demand 224:20	discuss 217:16
come 218:3,6,17	219:12	225:3	Department	discussed 211:1
218:20,25	comparable	Counsel 201:1,1	217:18	215:21
221:3 222:12	229:5	201:4,6,6	depreciate	discussing
comes 214:23	compared	206:3	225:16	212:12 229:24
215:1,6	208:20	counsels 202:19	depreciated	discussion
comments	complete 208:9	counties 223:3,5	227:3,7	228:18,24
218:24 229:20	compliance	County 231:4,16	depreciating	230:1
Commission	212:19	couple 203:5	225:20	discussions
199:2 201:7,10	components	210:2 223:9,24	depreciation	217:12 220:25

www.midwestlitigation.com MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES
Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

	1	1	1	1
disincentivize	214:3 215:23	explaining	formulate	221:3,18
207:1,12	219:6,24	218:11	214:16	226:19
District 199:10	222:13,17,19	explanation	forth 207:23	going- 216:10
200:6 202:5	223:3 224:24	226:15	213:11 221:10	good 203:4
Division 200:22	224:25 225:23	extrapolated	231:10	211:15 224:18
200:24 207:10	228:11	209:3	forward 204:11	228:2
222:25	Empire's 216:16		214:11 216:11	gotten 216:14
doing 212:25	219:25	F	216:20 217:17	229:9
219:22 224:14	encompassing	F 208:10 231:2	220:3 223:11	Government
dollar 217:2	222:10	FAC 208:18,19	224:20	217:18
220:11,21,21	energy 200:11	209:15	found 203:16	grand 207:16
dollars 228:21	200:22,24	failed 227:13	front 206:13	greater 226:5
228:22	207:11 209:25	fall 229:12	full 231:12	grow 226:5
Dr 206:7,21,24	210:14 211:6	far 212:25	fully 227:3,7	guess 203:5,6
214:1 217:5,10	217:19 222:4	217:19 229:10	fund 211:23	207:10
218:11 228:12	222:25	Feddersen	further 229:19	
228:17,19	engage 224:25	199:22 231:5	future 206:14	<u>H</u>
drop 216:7	England 200:2	231:17	226:8 229:1	half 228:14,21
DSM 208:7	entire 222:10	Federal 217:18		228:21
217:24 218:15	entirety 210:14	217:18	G	Hall 199:16
229:14	equal 225:2	feedback 217:12	G 202:1	203:1,4,11,22
	ER-2016-0023	File 199:11	general 202:7	204:3,6 205:14
<u>E</u>	199:11 202:8	202:8	207:19 217:11	205:24 206:2,4
E 202:1,1 231:2	Especially	filed 210:11,13	224:3	206:17,21,23
231:2	223:19	filings 229:14	Geoff 206:7	206:25 207:8
earlier 215:22	established	final 229:20	give 215:4 217:1	207:19 208:4,8
218:24 223:14	216:14	financing	218:15,19	208:17 209:2
easier 215:5	et 207:25	217:15	220:14	209:10,14,22
East 200:3,18	evidentiary	find 204:6	given 228:15	210:16,24
easy 214:9	230:6	216:21	231:15	211:3,15 212:1
effect 216:3	exact 227:9	findings 215:24	glad 225:7	212:21 213:12
229:4,15	exactly 219:24	firm 231:6	go 202:4 203:10	214:13,20
efficiencies	example 222:22	first 214:14	212:3,3 218:4	215:8,20 220:6
213:9	excess 226:8	223:9	218:7 223:11	220:9,19 221:5
efficiency 222:4	excluded 227:23	five 204:21	225:13 226:2	handled 210:10
efficient 213:2,4	excuse 203:20	205:11	227:25 229:3	happen 228:1
213:8	exited 214:4	fixed 206:12	229:15,22	happened
either 214:19	expense 203:12	flow 209:15	230:2	219:11
electric 199:10	203:15 204:13	focused 211:8	goal 213:13,14	happening
199:12 200:6	225:18 226:1	follow-up	213:15 214:16	225:22
202:5,7	227:6	227:21 228:8	215:2 218:21	happens 225:14
ELLINGER	expenses 205:4	followed 226:24	218:23	225:18
200:17 203:3	205:19	foregoing	goals 213:5,10	happy 202:23
221:25	expert 225:6	231:12	going 204:11,22	hard 212:10
Empire 199:10	227:15	form 227:6	205:1 209:7,14	216:21
200:6 202:5	explain 204:11	formula 209:1	214:11 217:17	harder 222:20
208:2 213:6	225:4	209:12,21	218:19 219:18	hear 225:8
1				

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

			I	I
heard 213:1	222:15	jurisdictions	left 227:14	210:13
hearing 199:6	information	206:9	Legal 201:6	
212:14 213:2,6	224:9	K	legislation	
218:3 224:21	infrastructure		223:10,11,12	M 199:17
228:1,4 230:4	204:18	K 199:22 231:5	224:11,13	Madison 201:2
230:6,9	inherently 222:5	231:17	lesser 226:1	201:8
help 214:10	initial 203:23	Kansas 200:9	let's 202:4	magnitude
226:20	204:5 225:24	KCP&L 208:20	225:15	221:21
High 200:18	instance 222:12	209:12	level 211:10	maintains
higher 222:14	instruct 220:10	keep 226:25	lieu 208:4	210:22,25
223:6 225:2	intent 209:18	Kellene 199:22	LIHEAP 222:9	making 215:5
holiday 230:11	intention 207:6	231:5,17	222:15,24	management
Honor 228:12	207:9	Kenney 199:17	line 204:13	205:6,18
hope 229:15	interest 217:17	204:19,25	linking 203:15	224:20
230:10	interests 221:1	215:18,21	Litigation	MARC 200:17
host 215:16	investment	216:9,12 217:5	199:22 231:7	224:17
T	206:12,13	222:7 224:5,7	little 210:8	Marke 206:7,21
$\frac{I}{I}$	involved 222:23	226:16,21	222:17,20	206:24 214:1
idea 222:13	issue 202:23	227:12	live 207:18	217:5,10
224:17 229:13	211:5 214:21	Kevin 201:6	load 208:24	218:11 228:12
identify 228:10	216:19 220:8	203:10	209:16	228:17,19
ignorance	230:3	KIM 199:15	longer 224:25	matter 199:10
207:20	issues 207:21	kind 205:12	226:4	202:5
illustrate 207:20	issuing 219:17	211:10	look 207:10	matters 230:7
impact 206:15	item 204:13	know 206:17	210:11 218:5,7	MAYFIELD
215:12 222:3,6		207:8 210:21	220:17 224:3	201:1 206:2,6
implement		213:9 214:15	224:20 227:13	207:4 211:13
202:6 224:14	JAMIE 201:6	214:19 217:8	looked 223:14	mean 213:13,18
implemented	January 218:1	221:18,20,20	looking 215:10	214:6 215:3,15
229:3	218:16 219:8	222:11 223:15	215:14 216:17	216:2 223:15
improves 216:6	229:4	225:3,8,11	216:22 219:1	227:8
included 206:19	Jefferson 199:8	228:4 229:23	226:17,22	means 225:3
including 210:3	200:4,14,19,23	knowledge	looks 208:23	meant 206:23
income 219:14	201:3,8 231:16	207:4 224:5	211:22 227:21	measure 213:9
inconsistent	joinder 202:15	Kroll 223:4	lot 216:19 225:9	215:2,3,7
221:9,13,17	Joplin 200:21		225:11	MECG 200:16
increase 202:7	222:22	language 205:25	lovely 230:11	mechanism
203:16,19	Judge 199:15	206:18,22	low-income	203:13 208:22
205:22 210:15	202:4 212:21	200.18,22	211:18 212:5	208:22 MEELA 207:21
increased 210:1	212:23 227:20	Laughter 203:8	212:18,25	MEEIA 207:21
210:5 216:2	228:7,17,23	Law 199:15	213:3,7,14,19	207:23 208:3,5
Increasing	229:11,18	200:2,8,13,13	213:25 214:4	208:7,14
199:11	July 217:16	200:2,8,13,13	217:14,23	meet 213:10
indicated	229:23,25	lawyer 221:6	219:9 220:10	217:15
202:19 229:2	jump 217:6	leads 226:7	221:8,14 222:1	meeting 223:24 224:18
individuals 206:11 222:10	June 199:7 202:12	learn 215:17	228:9,11	
200.11 222:10	202.12	104111 213.17	LP 209:25	meetings 219:7
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

		I	I	
meets 213:5	228:4 230:6,8	217:13 230:12	204:13,15,17	personally
method 226:17	needed 205:8	ongoing 205:3	206:10 209:11	231:8
MEUA 202:15	223:10,13	OPC 206:4	219:3 222:21	perspective
Mid 223:23	negative 222:5	opening 203:1	parties 202:13	214:14
Midwest 199:22	negotiation	order 211:11	202:17,18	pick 222:20
200:11 231:6	220:22	212:4 216:23	203:13,18	pilot 211:18
million 203:20	never 228:14	218:4 219:15	208:10 210:23	212:5,18,25
205:10 221:15	new 217:25,25	219:17 220:15	211:4,7,9,23	213:3,7,17,19
228:14	218:15,16	221:7	212:5,8 213:15	214:4 215:24
MISO 209:8	229:14	ordered 215:9	213:20 214:22	219:9 220:11
Missouri 199:1	nice 218:22	222:7	216:20 217:3	228:9,11
199:8,13	notes 231:13	ordering 219:17	219:15 220:10	place 208:3
200:22 201:7	notice 206:11	orders 211:18	220:23 221:2,7	218:12 219:8
201:10 206:23	207:6,7 230:3	211:24	221:10 223:20	231:9,14
215:9 219:11	notices 207:16	original 225:2	227:22 229:20	plant 225:24
222:18 223:10	notified 230:5	226:6	230:5	226:6
224:12 231:3	noting 203:12	originally	parties' 202:9	pleading 220:18
231:16	number 220:14	225:16	parts 219:2	point 213:21
MO 200:4,9,14	221:19 224:19	overall 206:15	passed 223:12	216:8
200:19,23	numbers 205:21	213:14	paulb@brydo	policies 213:11
201:3,8	209:20 210:22		200:5	policy-wise
Monday 210:12	221:16 222:16	<u>P</u>	pay 205:3 214:5	213:25
229:23	222:25	P 199:17 202:1	214:12 215:5	possible 211:10
money 214:8		P.C 200:2	216:8,15 227:5	212:4 214:15
215:4 216:13	<u> </u>	P.O 200:3,23	paying 216:5	217:19,25
216:13,15,24	O 202:1	201:2,7	227:8	possibly 207:15
228:15,20	obviously	packet 224:8	PAYS 219:4,17	216:24,25
morning 203:4	222:24 228:18	page 203:11	223:10,13,25	potential 207:1
motion 219:23	off-system	204:8,9,20	224:12 229:2,5	228:8,25
move 220:3	208:24 209:17	205:24 208:9	Penntower	229:25 230:4
moving 204:8,9	offer 217:20	208:18 209:5,7	200:9	poverty 223:2
205:24	office 200:13	209:8 210:2	people 214:4,9	power 209:16
MYERS 201:6	201:1,4 206:3	211:17 223:9	215:14 219:13	prefiled 227:22
	231:15	224:24	225:8	present 202:22
N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	Officer 200:9	paragraph	percent 204:5	231:8
N 202:1	okay 203:11,22	208:10 211:17	208:23 223:5	presentation
native 208:24	204:6,8 205:1	211:21	224:10	202:3,13
209:16	208:9,18 211:3	paragraphs	percentage	223:25 224:16
nature 215:4	211:16 223:22	210:2	203:16 209:8	224:17,21
219:18,22	224:15 226:14	parameters	210:6 222:15	229:1,7,16
necessary	227:18 229:18	218:5	percentages	230:13
220:20 223:21	Oligschlaeger	part 207:21	208:25 209:11	Presiding
227:4	226:23 227:15	210:1 213:24	209:19	199:15
need 212:2,15	227:16	217:22 229:3	period 204:21	previous 205:19
212:20 214:20	on-bill 217:14	participated	229:17	221:22
219:14 221:3	on-the-record	215:11	periods 205:20	previously
224:13 226:19	202:2,13	particular	person 216:5	203:9 213:7
	l	l	l	l

m MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES m Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

		Ī	I	
prior 228:11	221:15	210:19 211:7	request 202:6,21	saying 213:6
pro 217:25	put 207:6 212:6	211:10 214:8	203:16,23	says 204:20
probably 212:9	212:14 214:22	214:12 223:2	204:5	209:24 210:3
222:23 229:11	216:20,25	reach 216:21	require 213:19	210:23 211:17
problem 213:2,3	218:12 219:8	reached 221:1	required 224:4	218:4,23
213:10 215:1	220:10 221:7	225:24	requirement	224:24 226:3
problems 214:4	224:9	read 218:23	203:19 204:16	226:11
228:5	puts 206:10	ready 212:11	204:17 205:15	Sbell@bbdlc.c
proceedings	putting 207:12	realistic 212:1	205:17,22	200:20
199:5 231:8,11	PV 206:11,15	realize 227:14	reserve 226:4,5	scheme 207:17
process 225:1	1 1 200.11,13	reasonable	226:8	SCOTT 199:18
profits 226:2	0	203:17 204:7	reserves 225:2	season 210:20
program 208:3	qualify 219:13	220:12,15	residential	second 214:14
208:5 211:18	question 205:23	220.12,13	210:4,20 211:6	214:16
211:19,24	206:8 207:20	rebates 206:1	resolve 214:21	section 217:25
, and the second	211:16 220:16	recall 217:7	responded	see 202:25 210:8
212:5,19 214:1	224:3,12,23	223:23 224:1	219:3	
215:12,24,25	227:2,3			213:16 214:23
216:1,6,7	question's	receive 211:19	response 218:12	214:25 215:6
217:15,16	221:18	received 217:13	responsible	215:10 219:24
218:20 219:4,9	questions	217:17	211:6	221:20 224:4
220:3 221:14	202:20,22,25	receives 225:17	revenue 203:19	Seeing 229:21
222:1 223:10	202:20,22,23	reconciled	204:15,16	sense 208:9,17
223:13,25	215:22 219:3	209:24 210:7	205:15,17,22	212:22
224:2,19 228:9	223:9 226:7,10	record 202:4,9	reviewed 210:16	sentence 209:6
228:11 229:2,3	,	212:12 230:8	right 209:6	224:25
229:6	227:19,21 229:19	230:11	220:16 225:13	sentiment
programs		recovered 205:8	229:21 230:9	217:11
207:24 208:7,7	quickly 228:4	recovery 203:14	rmitten@bry	separate 208:5
208:11,14	quite 204:7	203:15	200:5	219:2
218:1,15,16	R	Reed 222:22	Robinett 227:17	serve 207:10
222:5 228:21	R 202:1 231:2	reflect 227:10	rolled 228:16	209:16
229:14	rate 202:7	regard 219:4	room 206:7	serves 223:3
projecting 229:7	203:12,14,15	regarding 211:5	221:6 227:15	service 199:2,12
promote 211:11	203:16 206:14	regulatory	rough 214:11	199:13 201:7
proposed		199:15 211:20	roughly 228:14	201:10 202:7
202:14 206:6	207:22,23 208:1 209:22	223:23	RPR 199:22	215:14 222:11
Provided 199:12	210:15,22	related 205:25	231:17	222:20 225:25
provision 222:1		211:6 215:15	Rupp 199:18	226:6
222:2	211:4,18,20 212:5 227:10	remain 210:14	217:14 218:2	Services 199:22
provisions		remaining 210:4	218:18,22	231:7
209:23 222:6	ratepayer	remarks 203:2	219:16,21	set 202:11
Public 199:2	207:12 228:21	remember	220:1	213:11 217:15
201:1,1,4,5,7	ratepayers	207:21		220:21 221:10
201:10 206:3	207:2 215:11	report 228:13	S	222:11 224:2
purchased	216:11	REPORTED	S 199:15 202:1	228:3,10 231:9
209:16	rates 199:12	199:21	sales 208:24	setting 207:23
pushback	204:12 210:5	Reporter 231:6	209:17	210:3

midwest Litigation services gation.com Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

www.midwestlitigation.com

settlement	231:3,16	Suite 200:18	216:14	209:9,9,15
204:14 228:25	states 206:9	201:2	thing 211:15	treated 206:14
shareholder	224:1	sure 225:6 227:4	212:24	207:24
228:22	Stenotype	230:5	things 207:17	treatment
Sharlet 223:4	231:11,13	Swearengen	215:16 222:4	211:20
sheet 231:10	step 211:1	200:2	224:19	treats 208:19
shorter 218:19	STEPHEN	system 206:16	think 207:5,14	true 209:17
Shorthand	199:17	207:3,13	212:10,14,25	231:12
231:6	stip 204:20	systems 206:11	213:14,23	try 213:16
shot 225:5	212:11,13		214:15 215:9	218:13
show 207:16	218:23	T	215:16 217:2	trying 214:6,7
210:18	stipulates	T 199:18 231:2	218:6 221:16	214:10 215:2
side 217:21	204:15	231:2	221:20,22	216:19 224:8
224:20	stipulation	take 216:4 225:5	222:8,9,24	Tuesday 228:4
similar 206:18	202:14,16	takes 214:12	223:16,17,21	turn 202:24
215:8	203:12 212:7	talk 214:1	224:8,14 225:3	turning 208:9
sir 203:25	212:17 221:9	talked 217:8	225:8 230:10	208:18 209:22
208:15 211:12	221:24 222:2	talking 214:2,3	Thompson	two 208:12
211:25	227:25 228:6	talks 209:8	201:6 203:6,21	209:23 219:2
situation 216:5	Stoll 199:17	tariff 212:18	203:24 204:14	two-thirds
situation 216.3	220:6,7 223:8	213:15 221:8	203.24 204.14 204:22 205:2	204:5
solar 205:25	223:17,22	229:14	204.22 203.2	type 222:4
	223.17,22 224:15 225:7	tariffs 199:11	211:25 212:2,8	type 222.4
solely 215:2	225:13 226:14	206:19 210:11	,	U
somebody 225:4 sorry 228:19		210:11,13,17	thought 220:14 223:13	unamortized
sort 220:17	227:13,18	210:17,13,17		205:9
	stop 225:20,23 225:25 226:4	212:20	thoughts 214:19	Unanimous
speaking 213:18 specific 202:21	227:8	tell 210:9 218:7	throwing 214:8 time 202:10,24	202:15
202:23 206:8		219:1	· ·	uncertain
	straight 219:9	ten 225:17	211:1 212:6,11	213:23,24
specifically	219:12	term 208:11	212:19 214:11	understand
220:8	Street 200:18	terminated	216:19 218:13	225:23 228:3
specified 205:17	201:2,8	213:8	218:14 219:3	understanding
211:20	structure 213:4	terms 216:5	222:24 227:9	211:14 215:13
spent 216:18	structured	territory 222:11	228:2 229:17	unilaterally
spirit 221:23	218:15	testimony 217:6	231:9,14	208:13
SPP 209:9	structuring	217:9 222:8	today's 230:9	United 206:9
Spring 222:22	213:10	223:4 227:23	top 205:14 209:5	use 211:6
ss 231:3	STUART 200:8	Thank 227:12	209:7	Users 200:11
Staff 201:6,10	stucon@swcla	227:18 228:7	tracked 205:8	utilities 208:13
standard 226:24	200:10		tracker 204:10	226:25
standpoint	study 210:23	228:17,23 229:18	204:23 205:6,9	utility 206:20
216:17	211:4	729:18 Thanks 226:14	205:11	208:13
start 203:5	subject 220:22		trackers 204:10	208:13 utilize 207:2
212:2	submitted	theoretically 207:14	transcript 199:5	uunize 207.2
starting 216:8	202:16 229:6	207:14 thereof 231:10	231:13	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
state 199:1	successive		transmission	value 215:17
223:6 226:25	228:16	they'd 202:23	208:19,23	, aide 213.17
		<u></u>	<u> </u>	

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES www.midwestlitigation.com Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

vegetation	207:9,22	100 225:15	4th 229:23	9:57 230:13
204:18 205:5	208:19 209:24	1157 200:23	-	99 224:10
205:18	Woodsmall	11th 225:19	5	
vegetation/inf	200:13,13	1209 200:9	5 205:24	
204:10	203:9 204:1,4	13 208:10	50 209:11	
versus 208:24	205:5,16	13H 211:17	573)634-2500	
209:9	208:21 209:4,6	15 211:21	200:19	
violate 222:1	209:13,19	15.4 223:6	573)635-7166	
Volume 199:8	210:8,21	15.5 223:7	200:4	
volumetric	212:24 213:21	17,000 222:10	573)751-3234	
209:25	214:18,25	19 223:5	201:9	
VUYLSTEKE	216:10 221:12	1st 218:1,16	573)751-4857	
219:20	223:16,19	219:8 229:4	201:3	
	224:10 225:5		573)797-0005	
W	225:10,14	2	200:15	
wait 227:10	226:19 227:24	2 211:2	5th 217:16	
want 213:19	228:8 229:24	2.18 205:10	229:25 230:4	
215:7 218:3	work 213:16	20 221:15		
221:14 228:13	217:3,21	20,000 203:19	6	
wanting 219:10	218:14 219:24	20.39 203:20	64111 200:9	
wants 213:25	worked 216:21	200 201:2,8	650 201:2	
218:9	works 213:16	2014-0370	65101 200:14	
wasn't 213:8	216:25 219:5,6	203:14	65101-3237	
216:13,18	219:7,19	2016 199:7	200:19	
221:1	wouldn't 221:12	202:12	65102 200:23	
Water 219:11		2017 218:16	201:8	
222:18	X	219:8 229:4	65102-0456	
way 206:13		2230 201:2	200:4	
210:10 218:23	Y	29 199:7	65102-2230	
221:9	Y 199:16	29th 202:12	201:3	
we'll 230:2,4	Yeah 214:13		67 204:5	
we're 207:23	226:21	3	6th 230:2	
214:7,10	year 225:18,19	3 203:11 204:8,9		
217:15 218:25	228:15,16	204:20 211:2	7	
219:6 224:14	years 204:21	224:24	7 199:8 208:9	
we've 218:10	205:11 208:12	30 229:16	211:17	
weatherization	225:17	30-day 229:14	7D 223:9	
222:3	yesterday	301 200:18	8	
weeks 223:24	210:12	308 200:18		
went 212:12		3100 200:8	8 208:18 209:7	
222:21	Z	312 200:3	807 200:14	
WILLIAM	zero 225:21	32.3 204:2,3	816)753-1122	
199:17	0	34 209:11	200:10	
Winston 200:14		360 201:7	838 199:22	
winter 210:19	1		9	
witness 223:4	10 210:2 225:18	4	9 208:18 209:5,8	
wondering	225:20	436,481 204:20	9:18 202:3,12	
	223.20	456 200:3	7.10 202.3,12	
	•	•	•	•

midwest Litigation services n.com Phone: 1.800.280.DEPO(3376)

www.midwestlitigation.com