## In the Matter of:

# UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY, d/b/a AMEREN MISSOURI'S TARIFFS, etc.

## ER-2019-0335, VOL. III

October 16, 2019



www.tigercr.com 573.999.2662

1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	STATE OF MISSOURI
3	
4	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
5	Discovery Conference
6	October 16, 2019
7	Jefferson City, Missouri
8	Volume 3
9	
10	In The Matter Of Union )
11	Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren ) Missouri's Tariffs To Decrease ) File No. ER-2019-0335 Its Revenue For Electric Service )
12	its Revenue for Electric Service )
13	
14	
15	
16	NANCY DIPPELL, Presiding SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
17	SENIOR REGULATORI LAW GODGE
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	REPORTED BY:
25	Lisa M. Banks, CCR TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

1		APPEARANCES
2	JAMES B.	LOWERY, Attorney at Law Smith Lewis
3		Smith Lewis 111 South Ninth Street, Suite 400 Columbia, Missouri 65201 573.443.3141
	705.	
5		Ameren Missouri
6 7	CALEB HA	ALL, Senior Counsel Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 650
8		P.O. Box 2230 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 573.526.1445
9 10	FOR:	Office of the Public Counsel
11	JEFFREY	A. KEEVIL, Legal Counsel
12		Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 800 P.O. Box 360
13		Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360 573.751.7431
14	FOD:	Staff of the Missouri Public Counsel Commission
15	FOR:	Stall of the Missoull Public Counsel Commission
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	JUDGE DIPPELL: We can go ahead and go on the
2	record. This is File Number ER-2019-0335 in The Matter of Union
3	Electric Company Doing Business As Ameren Missouri's Tariff to
4	Decrease Its Revenues For Electric Service. My name is Nancy
5	Dippell. I'm the regulatory law judge assigned to this file and
6	we are here for a discovery conference on October 16th, 2019.
7	I would like to begin with entries of
8	appearance. Can I start with the Company?
9	MR. LOWERY: Jim Lowery, Smith Lewis, LLP,
10	appearing on behalf of Ameren Missouri. The court reporter has
11	my information.
12	JUDGE DIPPELL: And Staff?
13	MR. KEEVIL: Yes, appearing on behalf of the
14	Staff of the Public Service Commission, Jeff Keevil. The court
15	reporter has my information.
16	JUDGE DIPPELL: And Public Counsel?
17	MR. HALL: Caleb Hall, appearing on behalf of
18	the Office of Public Counsel. My contact has also been provided
19	to the court reporter.
20	JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. So Staff filed a
21	letter of or a statement of concern and disagreement. And
22	I'll start by asking are these all still pending?
23	MR. KEEVIL: No, Judge.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: Has anything been worked out?
25	MR. KEEVIL: We've got let's see, I think

it's the first -- okay, A is worked out, which was Number 309. 1 2 C, is worked out, which was 17 and 168. So we're just left with B, which DRs 318 and 329. 3 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. I have seen your 4 5 response and the discovery request. 6 MR. LOWERY: So, Your Honor, if I may? 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. 8 MR. LOWERY: You know, we objected to --9 partially objected to 318 and 329 on September 30th and the 10 basis of the objection was we've gotten similar DRs to this in 11 the past. The basis of the objection was if we were going to 12 literally comply, we're going to have to pull around 600 -individually pull 600 different invoices. We indicated at that 13 time that we thought that weighing the burden of doing so 14 15 against any marginal relevance of it would have mitigated in 16 favor that the objection ought to be obstained. I didn't hear 17 anything about this until Friday when this statement was filed. 18 I contacted Mr. Keevil on Monday, not 19 remembering that they were not working. But anyway, I contacted 20 him by letter on Monday, indicated that we had -- we had pulled 21 four invoices to just see how much time it was going take us. 22 And it took about six minutes per invoice to actually get them 23 out of the system, get them downloaded, get them in a position 24 that we could actually provide them. So it's going to take 25 something like 55 to 60 hours if we literally had to pull all of

these invoices.

2.5

Mr. Keevil called me yesterday about noon and --what -- as I understood the issue with Staff is trying to make sure that they have the date when the service, and like when the coal's delivered or the urea is delivered, that date on the front end and also the date on the back end, that is the payment. I think this relates to cash working capital to determine leads and lags for cash working capital study.

I don't really understand what the problem is here. I've got the response to 318 here. That is for oil. 329 is for basically coal related commodities, urea, limestone, coal, coal delivery. I think there might be one more, activated carbon. I've got the response to that. And our folks had pulled out of the fuel accounting system, a listing of every single one of these. Here's the activity date, which is the response indicates. That's the date we got delivery of the coal. Here's the payment date. Here's the amount that was paid. And so I don't see the reason why we should have to spend 55 to 60 hours pulling all of these invoices.

Mr. Keevil and I did discuss and I would still be open to this, if they wanted to go through and say, you know, give me ten -- they can pick them. I don't care. Give me ten coal transportation. Give me ten coal commodity, give me ten urea invoices of their choice. You know, that's going to take some time, you know, but if they've got some concern about the

```
date, but I don't understand -- certainly they haven't done this
1
 2
     in past cases. We've always had cash working capital. I think,
    you know, relevance for purposes of discovery is not just
 3
     logically relevant. Part of that is weighing the prejudice of
 4
 5
     the party in terms of having to actually spend the time.
 6
     think this is so marginal that our objection is well taken.
 7
                      JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Keevil, do you want to
 8
    respond to the --
9
                      MR. KEEVIL: Sure.
                      JUDGE DIPPELL: -- number of Data Requests.
10
11
    read the number of invoices and so forth.
                                                Is there --
12
                      MR. KEEVIL: Yes. One second. Well, first of
    all, Judge, the -- Mr. Lowery is correct in this does relate to
13
14
     cash working capital, capitalization, more specifically it's
15
     expense lag related. In this case Ameren Missouri has proposed
     shortening of expense lags, I believe, by about four days, which
16
     is a fairly significant difference in expense lag. And when I
17
18
     say difference in four days, I mean from the past cases.
19
    Mr. Lowery says, you know, we've had cash working capital in
20
    past cases that is true, but we did not have proposal by Ameren
21
     to shorten the expense lags by four days.
22
                      In terms of the number of invoices, one of them
23
     I believe it is the coal, the coal additives like the urea,
24
     limestone, carbon, the Data Request that we submitted to Ameren
25
    already is only asking for a sample of those invoices rather
```

1 than all of the invoices. So we've built in a sampling 2 procedure in the request itself and Ameren didn't like the sampling that we have suggested. So they said, no, that is 3 4 still too many. 5 As far as the oil invoices, which by the way, the coal is, I believe, is DR 329 and additives are also in 329. 6 7 And then the coal -- excuse me the oil is 318. In the oil DR, 8 it's my understanding that Ameren's witness who is proposing 9 this four-day shortening of expense lag used approximately 10 280-some-odd of the roughly 300 oil invoices. So you know, they used them in their calculation, so we don't see why we shouldn't 11 12 be allowed to use them in ours. He also mentioned the receive dates. I don't 13 14 know where those receive days are from. They are not in the 15 responses that I looked at to 318, or excuse me 329 and 318. 16 Because the -- calculating the lags you need both the bill date, 17 the date they received the bill and the date it was paid. 18 responses that I looked at yesterday when Mr. Lowery and I were 19 on the phone, the responses only contained the payment date, no 20 bill received date in the responses that I looked at in 318 and 21 329. So if he has different responses that's perhaps a 22 different ball of wax there. 23 Again, I mean, what these are is these are 24 invoices underlying the source documents for the transactions 25 themselves. You know, Ameren talks about, well, we'll give you

-- we'll let you look at this, which we made based on the invoices and that is basically what they're saying is, trust our -- trust us to have actually transcribed everything from these invoices over to the general ledger and don't worry about the underlying source documents themselves. And if -- Ameren has access to them -- had access to them in preparation of this case, and there's no reason why we shouldn't also have -- if they are going to stick with his proposed four-day shortening of expense lag.

If that -- if they want to go back to the expense lag they had in the last rate case, that's -- you know, we can probably work something out fairly quickly here. But as long as they are sticking with this proposed four-day shortened expense lag, we feel like we need to see the documents from which that was taken.

MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, there are several things Mr. Keevil said that are inaccurate. First of all, our folks did not pull these invoices and look at the invoices. Our folks used the same information that we'd given to Staff in the Data Request response. Pulling the -- the invoices come in, they're processed. There is a system called Fuel Works where the data is inputted. That system rolls up ultimately in the general ledger in the financial statements. There are accounting controls in place to ensure that that's done accurately.

1	I can't sit here and tell you that a human being
2	would never make a mistake, but you know, Sarbanes-Oxley and so
3	on, we've got good reasons why our accounting systems needs to
4	be accurately. And Staff certainly doesn't verify every figure
5	in a rate case and every figure from our financial records.
6	They and we have to rely upon those systems. So it's not we
7	did not pull these invoices. We pulled the same information out
8	of the system that were given to the Staff for the cash working
9	capital.
10	Another clarification, in case you have a
11	misunderstanding about this, with the sampling process that they
12	attempted to limit their DR to, that's 577 invoices.
13	MR. KEEVIL: No, in total perhaps, but not on
14	that one.
15	MR. LOWERY: In total, these two DRs are still
16	asking us to provide 577 invoices. In terms of I don't know
17	I pulled the DRs up this morning and I printed the DRs in
18	total. Here they are. There's the activity date. There's the
19	payment date. The DRs explain that the activity date is the
20	shipment received date in both cases. I don't know what
21	Mr. Keevil is looking at, but I pulled them up this morning and
22	I printed them.
23	So you know, I don't think anything that Mr.
24	Keevil says changed changes the equation here. Staff does
25	not need to see 577 invoices to figure out the leads and lags.

```
If they don't like the four-day change and they want to propose
 1
 2
    a different change or they look at this and say we've done a
    miscalculation, then they can certainly make that point when my
 3
     they file their case. But they don't need for us to spend 60
 5
    hours pulling 577 invoices to do that.
                      JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Keevil, is there any smaller
 6
 7
     sample -- well, if what Mr. Lowery says is accurate, which I'm
 8
     taking him at his word that they didn't use any different
 9
     information --
10
                      MR. LOWERY: I spoke to the witness yesterday
11
     who prepared to cash working capital study. They did not look
12
     at the invoices. They did not pull the invoices.
13
                      JUDGE DIPPELL: I don't know if you have
14
     specifically asked that question in your Data Request?
15
                      MR. KEEVIL: Oh, if they looked at invoices
     versus something else? I don't think it was --
16
17
                      MR. LOWERY: They didn't ask that question, no.
18
                      JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any lesser number of
19
     invoices that the Staff could look at the physical invoices?
20
                      MR. KEEVIL: Well, perhaps, but only to an
21
     extent. We'd have to look at -- again, I don't -- may I see the
22
     response?
23
                      MR. LOWERY: Absolutely.
24
                      MR. KEEVIL: You are saying activity date is --
25
                      MR. LOWERY: As it says on the response.
```

```
Shipment receive date, i.e., activity date.
1
 2
                      MR. KEEVIL: Okay.
                      MR. LOWERY: The response explains it.
 3
                      MR. KEEVIL: So it's not the bill -- that is the
 4
     oil. Okay.
 5
 6
                     MR. LOWERY: Same thing for the coal, as the
 7
     response itself says.
 8
                      MR. KEEVIL: Honestly Judge, when I looked at
 9
     this yesterday -- not this, but looked at the response
10
     yesterday, there were two columns. There was the counter-party
11
     column and there was -- well, actually I take that back.
12
     may have been three columns. There may be invoice number
     column, but there was no activity. It was just payment. So we
13
14
     obviously need -- to go back to your question. We need the date
15
     that the bills were received as well as the dates that the bills
     were paid. So we can't sample that.
16
17
                      MR. LOWERY: For cash working capital study you
18
    need the date that the service was provided, i.e. when we got
19
     the coal, when we got the urea. The invoice date doesn't have
20
     any meaning, I don't believe, to that calculation. I think if
21
     you check with your witness they would agree with that. Invoice
22
    may follow a week after we got the coal. In fact, we take title
23
     of coal at the mines. When they load the railcar, that's when
24
     we get the coal. It's our coal at that point. When we pay it,
2.5
     that's a relevant date because that is when the cash went out
```

the door. But the invoice date doesn't have anything to do with 1 2 the leads and lags. MR. KEEVIL: Whether it's the invoice date or --3 MR. LOWERY: But you got the receipt. 4 5 MR. KEEVIL: Pull it out of the --6 MR. LOWERY: You got the date we got the coal. 7 MR. KEEVIL: Maybe we do, maybe we don't. I --8 like I said, this is the first -- I looked at this thing 9 yesterday on the computer and there was no activity date column. 10 Okay. So we'll have to check that. We need that. And sampling 11 will not suffice to replace that. Now, as far as the sampling 12 to confirm that they didn't, you know, make a mistake, that 13 possibly we could take the smaller number just to confirm that 14 they did it -- transposed it over quickly and all that good 15 stuff. But certainly not as -- I mean, I haven't heard 16 17 any counter on Mr. Lowery's letter to me on Monday said -- was 18 the first time they mentioned the sampling. There is no number 19 of sampling or process or anything. This morning was the first 20 I heard an actual number, and I think probably just pulled that 21 one out of the air when he was talking about ten of these and 22 ten of those. So we would have to know how many we're talking 23 about here. 24 MR. LOWERY: Let's be clear, Judge. I made this 25 objection on September 30th and Mr. Keevil neither picked up the

phone or sent me an e-mail explaining what the real issue was or 1 2 that he didn't see these activity dates when we went to the DR. Actually, until I had to write a letter on Monday in response to 3 the filing. Now, Staff's perfectly free to file notices of 4 5 disagreement and not call me up. The rule's been waived. And 6 I'm not even asking for a formal, hey, let's have a 22.090, 7 whatever. I'm not even asking for that. But I take a lot of 8 the umbrage to the idea that, well, I just now came up with this 9 today. 10 I reached out one business day after we got 11 notice that they had an issue with our objection. I did make a 12 proposal this morning. I said we do ten of each commodity. I 13 said you can pick the invoices. 14 JUDGE DIPPELL: I think that the ten is the 15 number that Mr. Keevil was referring to. 16 MR. KEEVIL: Yeah. I don't think ten is going 17 to cut it. But if I can respond briefly to the inflammatory 18 statements Mr. Lowery was just making. September -- he seems 19 quite proud of this September -- his objection on September the 20 That was less than two weeks before the statement of 21 discovery concern was due, which we filed. And he's more than 22 correct when he says we don't have to tell them anything about 23 the discovery concerns prior because it has been waived. However, what I would like to point out is we 24 25 have been required to send -- not required, but we've been felt

compelled to extend them weekly updates of the Data Request that 2 they are overdue in responding to in this case. That includes both the ones that are overdue according to the Commission's 3 rule as well as the ones that are overdue according to the 4 5 relevant question extensions they sent. In other words, they 6 haven't even been meeting the requested extensions that they 7 have been setting for themselves, which we have not objected to 8 so far.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So for us to -- it is like we're almost babysitting Ameren in the response to this case. Okay, Ameren, your responses are overdue. Where are they? And it's like we shouldn't have to be doing this. This is Ameren we're talking about. This is not Bill and Sue's Water Company in Podunk, Missouri. This is Ameren. They should be able to respond to Data Requests in a timely manner, and in a complete manner. And you know, for them to come in and say, well, you know, because we didn't get a call six days before the discovery notice was -it's just disingenuous, Judge. And frankly, I'm as offended as Mr. Lowery seems to be that I didn't call him Friday before a holiday and tell him, oh, by the way, you know, where is your stuff.

Now, as far as the sampling, like I said, I'll have to check with my people. I'm pretty sure ten is not going to cut it. We were talking about 300 -- roughly 300 responses here. And again, I -- he mentioned is it possible for people to

make mistakes. Yeah, it is. In fact, that goes to -- I mean, 1 2. one of the DRs that was on my list for today's conference, which has now been corrected and was that Number 17, which they were 3 ordered to respond to at the last discovery conference, they 4 still, when they were originally responding to it, they -- all 5 it was was a copy of the calendar. Someone's calendar. And 6 they missed two months. They missed two months out of six 7 8 months. They gave owed us roughly six months of the calendar. 9 They only copied four months. So we get things like that and 10 then they ask us to just rely on the way we transpose these 11 invoices into the ledger system because we wouldn't make a 12 mistake on something like that. Well, you know, we have proof that they make mistakes when they -- and it's understandable. 13 14 Everybody makes mistakes. I'm not saying that people don't. 15 But when we have proof like that, that they do 16 make mistakes, have made mistakes in the discovery in this case, for them to come in and say, well, just trust us when we tell 17 you that the invoices reflect what we -- what our ledger says it 18 19 does, is just -- it goes against the entire premise of an audit. 20 As far as the sampling, like I said, I'll just 21 have to check to see how many we need. It's gonna be more than 2.2 ten I'm fairly sure, but you know, I'll check on that. 23 MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, very briefly. A 24 paralegal made a mistake when she scanned a document. It was 25 sent to them on September 24th. Again, we didn't hear anything

2.

2.2

about it. A simple, 30-second e-mail to me saying, hey, you're missing two pages and they would've it had the next day. But be that as it may -- also we have done significantly better in terms of our time limits on DRs. We've done about twice as well as we have the last time that we've been here. We're continuing to work on that. That has nothing to do with the validity of the objection or lack thereof at whatever. That's nothing more than an effort by Mr. Keevil to sort of try and make us look bad and hope that you'll rule on the objection in our -- in his favor because of that tactic. I don't really need to say anything else.

JUDGE DIPPELL: So I've let you guys have your back and forth because that, frankly, is why we are here because it's better for you guys to get this out now, than like I say, to get to hearing and Staff doesn't have what it needed and Ameren says, well, we had a legitimate reason. But once we get to hearing, it's too late for all of that. That's why we're here.

It sounds to me like if Staff now has the dates that they need on the ledger, that that will be sufficient. However, it seems reasonable that Staff would want to actually double check with the physical invoices to make sure that the ledger is being entered correctly. I can see complete relevance there. 600 or 597 or whatever the number was, sounds a little burdensome. I'm not really sure because I don't know where

1	these invoices are kept or who has to retrieve them or whatever.
2	But if Staff could do with fewer, that seems reasonable as well.
3	I think you're going to have to give up some of
4	them so that they can do their audit. So I'm going to let you
5	guys talk that out and see if you can reach an agreement as to a
6	reduced number of invoices. If you cannot, then let me know and
7	I will make a formal ruling on the discovery dispute.
8	MR. KEEVIL: Fair enough.
9	JUDGE DIPPELL: Will that work?
10	MR. LOWERY: Yep. Absolutely. Thank you.
11	JUDGE DIPPELL: Any other Mr. Jones, did you
12	have any to add today?
13	MR. HALL: No. Public Counsel has none at this
14	time. I do have one question for Mr. Lowery, but it's not
15	necessarily for the record.
16	JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. It sounds like we
17	have everything on the record that needs to be on the record and
18	we can conclude. We'll off the record.
19	(OFF THE RECORD.)
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

#### CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Lisa M. Banks, CCR within and for the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

Lank Sank S

Lisa M. Banks, CCR No. 1081

	90:4	built 88:1	Commission's 95:3
1	activated 86:12	burden 85:14	commodities 86:11
<b>168</b> 85:2	<b>activity</b> 86:15 90:18, 19 91:24 92:1,13 93:9	<b>business</b> 84:3 94:10	<b>commodity</b> 86:23 94:12
<b>16th</b> 84:6	94:2		Company 84:3,8
<b>17</b> 85:2	actual 93:20		95:13
2	additives 87:23 88:6	calculating 88:16	compelled 95:1
	<b>agree</b> 92:21	calculation 88:11 92:20	complete 95:15
<b>2019</b> 84:6	ahead 84:1	Caleb 84:17	<b>comply</b> 85:12
<b>22.090</b> 94:6	<b>air</b> 93:21	call 94:5 95:17,19	computer 93:9
<b>280-some-odd</b> 88:10	allowed 88:12	called 86:2 89:21	concern 84:21 86:25
3	<b>Ameren</b> 84:3,10 87:15,20,24 88:2,25	capital 86:7,8 87:2,	94:21 concerns 94:23
	89:5 95:10,12,14	14,19 90:9 91:11 92:17	conference 84:6
<b>300</b> 88:10 95:24	Ameren's 88:8	capitalization 87:14	<b>confirm</b> 93:12,13
<b>309</b> 85:1	amount 86:17	carbon 86:13 87:24	contact 84:18
<b>30th</b> 85:9 93:25 94:20	appearance 84:8	care 86:22	contacted 85:18,19
<b>318</b> 85:3,9 86:10 88:7, 15,20	<b>appearing</b> 84:10,13,	case 87:15 89:7,11	contained 88:19
<b>329</b> 85:3,9 86:10 88:6,	approximately 88:9	90:5,10 91:4 95:2,10	controls 89:24
15,21	assigned 84:5	<b>cases</b> 87:2,18,20 90:20	<b>correct</b> 87:13 94:22
5	attempted 90:12	cash 86:7,8 87:2,14,	Counsel 84:16,18
<u> </u>		19 90:8 91:11 92:17,	counter 93:17
<b>55</b> 85:25 86:19	В	25	counter-party 92:10
<b>577</b> 90:12,16,25 91:5	babysitting 95:10	<b>change</b> 91:1,2	<b>court</b> 84:10,14,19
6	back 86:6 89:10	changed 90:24	<b>cut</b> 94:17 95:24
	92:11,14	<b>check</b> 92:21 93:10 95:23	D
<b>60</b> 85:25 86:19 91:4	<b>ball</b> 88:22	<b>choice</b> 86:24	
<b>600</b> 85:12,13	based 89:1	clarification 90:10	data 87:10,24 89:20,
Α	basically 86:11 89:2	<b>clear</b> 93:24	22 91:14 95:1,15
	<b>basis</b> 85:10,11	<b>coal</b> 86:11,12,17,23	<b>date</b> 86:4,5,6,15,16,17 87:1 88:16,17,19,20
Absolutely 91:23	begin 84:7	87:23 88:6,7 92:6,19, 22,23,24 93:6	90:18,19,20 91:24 92:1,14,18,19,25 93:1,
access 89:6	<b>behalf</b> 84:10,13,17	coal's 86:5	3,6,9
accounting 86:14 89:24 90:3	<b>bill</b> 88:16,17,20 92:4 95:13	<b>column</b> 92:11,13 93:9	dates 88:13 92:15
accurate 91:7	<b>bills</b> 92:15	<b>columns</b> 92:10,12	94:2 day 94:10
accurately 89:25	briefly 94:17	Commission 84:14	uay 34.10

davs 87:16.18.21 explains 92:3 **hear** 85:16 88:14 95:17 Κ extend 95:1 heard 93:16,20 Decrease 84:4 extensions 95:5.6 **hey** 94:6 **Keevil** 84:13,14,23,25 delivered 86:5 85:18 86:2,20 87:7,9, **extent** 91:21 holiday 95:20 12 89:17 90:13,21,24 **delivery** 86:12,16 Honestly 92:8 91:6,15,20,24 92:2,4,8 determine 86:8 F 93:3,5,7,25 94:15,16 **Honor** 85:6 89:16 difference 87:17,18 hours 85:25 86:19 fact 92:22 L **Dippell** 84:1,5,12,16, 91:5 **fairly** 87:17 89:12 20,24 85:4,7 87:7,10 human 90:1 **lag** 87:15.17 88:9 91:6,13,18 94:14 favor 85:16 89:9,11,14 disagreement 84:21 feel 89:14 ı **lags** 86:8 87:16,21 94:5 **felt** 94:25 88:16 90:25 93:2 **discovery** 84:6 85:5 **i.e.** 92:1,18 **figure** 90:4,5,25 law 84:5 87:3 94:21,23 95:17 **idea** 94:8 file 84:2,5 91:4 94:4 leads 86:8 90:25 93:2 **discuss** 86:20 inaccurate 89:17 filed 84:20 85:17 ledger 89:4,23 disingenuous 95:18 includes 95:2 94:21 left 85:2 documents 88:24 filing 94:4 individually 85:13 89:5,14 lesser 91:18 financial 89:23 90:5 inflammatory 94:17 door 93:1 **letter** 84:21 85:20 **folks** 86:13 89:18,19 information 84:11,15 93:17 94:3 downloaded 85:23 89:19 90:7 91:9 **follow** 92:22 **Lewis** 84:9 **DRS** 85:3,10 90:15, inputted 89:22 17,19 formal 94:6 limestone 86:11 invoice 85:22 92:12, 87:24 **due** 94:21 four-day 88:9 89:8,13 19,21 93:1,3 91:1 limit 90:12 invoices 85:13,21 Ε **frankly** 95:18 **listing** 86:14 86:1,19,24 87:11,22, free 94:4 25 88:1,5,10,24 89:2, literally 85:12,25 e-mail 94:1 4,18,20 90:7,12,16,25 **Friday** 85:17 95:19 **LLP** 84:9 Electric 84:3.4 91:5,12,15,19 94:13 front 86:6 **load** 92:23 end 86:6 **issue** 86:3 94:1,11 fuel 86:14 89:21 logically 87:4 **ensure** 89:24 J long 89:13 entries 84:7 G looked 88:15,18,20 equation 90:24 **Jeff** 84:14 91:15 92:8,9 93:8 general 89:4,23 **ER-2019-0335** 84:2 **Jim** 84:9 **lot** 94:7 **give** 86:22,23 88:25 **excuse** 88:7,15 judge 84:1,5,12,16, **Lowery** 84:9 85:6,8 **good** 90:3 93:14 20,23,24 85:4,7 87:7, **expense** 87:15,16,17, 87:13,19 88:18 89:16 10,13 91:6,13,18 92:8 21 88:9 89:9,11,14 90:15 91:7,10,17,23, 93:24 94:14 95:18 25 92:3,6,17 93:4,6,24 Н explain 90:19 94:18 95:19 explaining 94:1 Hall 84:17 **Lowery's** 93:17

		position 85:23	rate 89:11 90:5
M	0	possibly 93:13	reached 94:10
made 89:1 93:24	<b>objected</b> 85:8,9 95:7	prejudice 87:4	<b>read</b> 87:11
make 86:3 90:2 91:3	objection 85:10,11,	preparation 89:6	<b>real</b> 94:1
93:12 94:11	16 87:6 93:25 94:11, 19	prepared 91:11	reason 86:18 89:7
making 94:18	obstained 85:16	pretty 95:23	reasons 90:3
manner 95:15	October 84:6	printed 90:17,22	receipt 93:4
marginal 85:15 87:6	offended 95:18	<b>prior</b> 94:23	receive 88:13,14 92:1
Matter 84:2	Office 84:18	problem 86:9	received 88:17,20
meaning 92:20	oil 86:10 88:5,7,10	procedure 88:2	90:20 92:15
meeting 95:6	92:5	process 90:11 93:19	record 84:2
mentioned 88:13 93:18 95:25	<b>open</b> 86:21	processed 89:21	records 90:5
mines 92:23	<b>overdue</b> 95:2,3,4,11	proposal 87:20 94:12	referring 94:15
minutes 85:22		propose 91:1	regulatory 84:5
miscalculation 91:3	P	proposed 87:15 89:8,	relate 87:13
Missouri 84:10 87:15	paid 86:18 88:17	13	related 86:11 87:15
95:14	92:16	proposing 88:8	relates 86:7
Missouri's 84:3	<b>Part</b> 87:4	<b>proud</b> 94:19	relevance 85:15 87:3
mistake 90:2 93:12	partially 85:9	<b>provide</b> 85:24 90:16	relevant 87:4 92:25 95:5
misunderstanding	party 87:5	provided 84:18 92:18	rely 90:6
90:11	past 85:11 87:2,18,20	Public 84:14,16,18	remembering 85:19
mitigated 85:15	<b>pay</b> 92:24	<b>pull</b> 85:12,13,25 89:18 90:7 91:12 93:5	replace 93:11
<b>Monday</b> 85:18,20 93:17 94:3	payment 86:7,17 88:19 90:19 92:13	pulled 85:20 86:14	reporter 84:10,15,19
morning 90:17,21		90:7,17,21 93:20	request 85:5 87:24
93:19 94:12	pending 84:22 people 95:23,25	<b>pulling</b> 86:19 89:20	88:2 89:20 91:14 95:1
	perfectly 94:4	91:5	requested 95:6
N	-	purposes 87:3	Requests 87:10
Nancy 84:4	phone 88:19 94:1	Q	95:15
<b>noon</b> 86:2	physical 91:19		required 94:25
<b>notice</b> 94:11 95:17	pick 86:22 94:13 picked 93:25	<b>question</b> 91:14,17 92:14 95:5	respond 87:8 94:17 95:14
notices 94:4	place 89:24	quickly 89:12 93:14	responding 95:2
number 84:2 85:1	Podunk 95:13		response 85:5 86:10,
87:10,11,22 91:18 92:12 93:13,18,20		R	13,16 89:20 91:22,25
94:15	<b>point</b> 91:3 92:24 94:24	railcar 92:23	92:3,7,9 94:3 95:10
		ialicai 92.23	responses 88:15,18,
	T. Control of the Con	T. Control of the Con	

19,20,21 95:11,24	<b>spoke</b> 91:10	title 92:22	weeks 94:20
Revenues 84:4	Staff 84:12,14,20 86:3	today 94:9	weighing 85:14 87:4
rolls 89:22	89:19 90:4,8,24 91:19	total 90:13,15,18	<b>word</b> 91:8
roughly 88:10 95:24	Staff's 94:4	transactions 88:24	<b>words</b> 95:5
rule 95:4	<b>start</b> 84:8,22	transcribed 89:3	work 89:12
rule's 94:5	<b>statement</b> 84:21 85:17 94:20	transportation 86:23	worked 84:24 85:1,2
s	<b>statements</b> 89:23 94:18	transposed 93:14 true 87:20	<b>working</b> 85:19 86:7,8 87:2,14,19 90:8 91:11 92:17
<b>sample</b> 87:25 91:7	stick 89:8	trust 89:2,3	Works 89:21
92:16	sticking 89:13		worry 89:4
<b>sampling</b> 88:1,3 90:11 93:10,11,18,19	<b>study</b> 86:8 91:11	U	write 94:3
95:22	92:17	ultimately 89:22	
Sarbanes-oxley	stuff 93:15 95:21	umbrage 94:8	Υ
90:2	submitted 87:24	underlying 88:24	yesterday 86:2 88:18
<b>send</b> 94:25	<b>Sue's</b> 95:13	89:5	91:10 92:9,10 93:9
<b>September</b> 85:9 93:25 94:18,19	suffice 93:11	understand 86:9 87:1	
service 84:4,14 86:4	suggested 88:3	understanding 88:8	
92:18	<b>system</b> 85:23 86:14 89:21,22 90:8	understanding 66.6	
setting 95:7	<b>systems</b> 90:3,6	Union 84:2	
<b>shipment</b> 90:20 92:1		updates 95:1	
shorten 87:21	T	urea 86:5,11,24 87:23	
shortened 89:13	taking 91:8	92:19	
<b>shortening</b> 87:16 88:9 89:8	talking 93:21,22 95:12,24	v	
significant 87:17	talks 88:25	verify 90:4	
similar 85:10	Tariff 84:3	verny 90.4 versus 91:16	
single 86:15	ten 86:22,23 93:21,22	<b>Versus</b> 91.10	
<b>sit</b> 90:1	94:12,14,16 95:23	W	
<b>smaller</b> 91:6 93:13	terms 87:5,22 90:16		
<b>Smith</b> 84:9	thing 92:6 93:8	waived 94:5,23	
<b>source</b> 88:24 89:5	things 89:17	wanted 86:21	
specifically 87:14	thought 85:14	<b>Water</b> 95:13	
91:14	time 85:14,21 86:25	wax 88:22	
<b>spend</b> 86:18 87:5 91:4	87:5 93:18	week 92:22	
J	timely 95:15	weekly 95:1	