In the Matter of:

SPIRE MISSOURI, INC.'s d/b/a SPIRE REQUEST FOR AUTHORITY, etc.

GR-2021-0108, VOL. X

August 02, 2021



www.tigercr.com 573.999.2662

1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	STATE OF MISSOURI
3	
4	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
5	Evidentiary Hearing via WebEx & In Person
6	August 2, 2021
7	Volume 10
8	
9	In The Matter Of Spire Missouri Inc.'s) d/b/a Spire Request for Authority to) Case No. GR-2021-0108
10	Implement a General Rate Increase for) Increase for Natural Gas Service)
11	Natural Gas Service) Natural Gas Service Provided in the) Company's Missouri Service Areas)
12	company b Mibboari bervice meab
13	CHARLES HATCHER, Presiding Regulatory Law Judge
14	RYAN SILVEY, Chairman JASON HOLSMAN,
15	GLEN KOLKMEYER, Commissioners
16	
17	
18	REPORTED BY:
19	Sherry Marshall, CCR 486 TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
APPEARANCES
                       Vol. X
 2
         Mr. MATTHEW APLINGTON
         MS. GOLDIE BOCKSTRUCK
         SPIRE MISSOURI INC.
         700 Market Street, 6th Floor
         St. Louis, Missouri 63101
 4
         314.342.0785
     FOR: Spire Missouri Inc.
 5
         MR. JOHN CLIZER
 6
         Department of Commerce & Insurance
 7
         200 Madison Street
         P.O. Box 2230
         Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
 8
         573.751.5324
     FOR: Missouri Office of the Public Counsel
 9
         MR. KEVIN THOMPSON
10
         MS. KAREN BRETZ
         Department of Economic Development
11
         200 Madison Street, Suite 800
         PO Box 360
12
         Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360
     FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission
13
14
         ANDREW J. LINHARES
15
         Renew Missouri
         3115 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 600
         St. Louis, Missouri 63118
16
     FOR: National Housing Trust
17
         John Coffman
18
         871 Tuxedo Boulevard
         St. Louis, Missouri 63119
19
     For: Consumers Council of Missouri
         Paul A. Barrs
2.0
         4232 Forest Park Avenue
21
         St. Louis, Missouri 63108
     For: Legal Services of Eastern Missouri
22
          Richard Brownlee
23
          Richard Brownlee Law Firm
          RSBIII, LLC
24
          121 Madison Street
          Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
     For: Missouri School Boards Association
25
```

1	INDEX		
2		PAGE	
3	COMPANY'S WITNESS:		
4	JOHN SPANOS Direct Examination by Ms. Bockstruck	59	
5	MICHELLE ANTRAINER	33	
6	Direct Examination by Ms. Bockstruck	108	
7	STAFF'S WITNESS:		
8	DAVID BUTTIG Direct Examination by Ms. Azland	110	
9	Cross-Examination by Ms. Aziand Cross-Examination by Ms. Bockstruck Cross-Examination by Mr. Clizer	110 112 115	
10	CIOSS-EXAMINACION Dy MI. CIIZEI	113	
11	OPC's WITNESS:		
12	JOHN A. ROBINETT		
13	Direct Examination by Mr. Clizer		
14	(Testimony was not able to be transcribed.) Redirect Examination by Mr. Clizer	117	
15		117	
16	SPIRE'S WITNESS:		
17	TIMOTHY KRICK Direct Examination by Mr. Cooper	133	
18	Questions by Judge Hatcher Redirect Examination by Mr. Cooper	135 135 138	
19	Redirect Examination by Mr. Cooper	136	
20	STAFF'S WITNESS:		
21	MATTHEW YOUNG	140	
22	Direct Examination by Mr. Thompson Cross-Examination by Mr. Cooper	142 144	
23	Cross-Examination by Mr. Clizer Questions by Judge Hatcher	156 160	
24	Cross-Examination by Mr. Cooper Redirect by Mr. Thompson	166 170	
25			

GR-2021-0108, Vol. X

1	OPC's WITNESS:
2	ROBERT SCHALLENBERG
3	Direct Examination by Mr. Clizer 174 Questions by the Court 177
	Redirect Examination by Mr. Clizer 183
4	
5	EXHIBIT INDEX
6	PAGE
7	COMPANY'S EXHIBITS:
8	1 - Michelle Antrainer's testimony 109
9	2 - Michelle Antrainer's testimony 109 3 - Michelle Antrainer's testimony 109
1.0	15 - Timothy Krick's testimony 135
10	16 - Timothy Krick's testimony 135 17 - Timothy Krick's testimony 135
11	35 - John Spanos's rebuttal testimony 61 36 - John Spanos's surrebuttal testimony 61
12	30 - John Spanos's Suffeductal testimony 01
13	STAFF'S EXHIBITS:
14	46 - E-mail exchange 169
15	125 - Matthew Young's rebuttal testimony 143 128 - David Buttig's surrebuttal testimony 112
16	140 - Matthew Young's surrebuttal testimony 143
17	OPC's EXHIBITS
18	203C - Robert Schallenberg's testimony 175 204C - Robert Schallenberg's testimony 175
19	205C - Robert Schallenberg's testimony 175
20	204P - Robert Schallenberg's testimony 175
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

2.5

THE COURT: My name again is Charles Hatcher. I will be the regulatory law judge presiding over this hearing. Today's date is August 2, 2021. The Commission has set this day to begin an evidentiary hearing in file number GR-2021-0108.

For the record we were having a hybrid hearing, meaning that some participants are physically in person here in courtroom 310. Others will be in participating via WebEx, a videoconferencing Internet application. The WebEx participants will be using a monitor which is showing the live stream.

WebEx participants will have all the same abilities and responsibilities as those viewing in person. The WebEx video will not be a part of the record and will not be viewable on the PSC live stream. They will only be viewable by those on the WebEx. Their broadcast audio, however, will be taken down by the court reporter as part of the record.

Some further WebEx announcements. Everyone on WebEx, if you could please mute yourself. The Commission and the regulatory law judge will be proceeding slowly at every point to allow for unmuting.

The WebEx chat function is not private. It is not part of the record, and I highly recommend that you

do not use it because other people can see it.

2.5

Phone users on WebEx, to unmute yourself please press *6 when you need to speak.

For the record I want to state that we have two watch rooms. These are rooms providing for additional social distancing for witnesses that do not have an office in the Governor Office Building. Playing in there will be the normal web stream, and any witnesses that are in that room, we will, of course, pause and give them time to make it across to our courtroom.

For the record I also want to state we do have one extra room. I envisioned this for any quick conferences or negotiation. I don't want to parcel out this room, so I'll let parties make any requests for access as they need it and that's really to eliminate any web parties in the room without any notice.

Counselors with clients in the same room or with at least one other person in the WebEx participating area, I just want to note, computer microphones these days are good enough to hear whispered conversations. That includes between attorneys and their clients when they're in the same room on a WebEx call. Heads up.

I think that is my end of announcements.

```
1
               Let's get to our entry of appearances.
 2
               For Spire.
               MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Good morning, Judge. For in
 3
    house counsel for Spire, Goldie Bockstruck. Matthew
 4
 5
    Aplington and Rachel Niemeier.
               COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
 6
 7
               MS. BOCKSTRUCK: I can hear it.
 8
               THE COURT: It's coming through the WebEx.
 9
    We're all hearing it. It sounds as though callers being
10
    added into the WebEx so hopefully that will subside in
11
     just a moment.
12
               COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
               THE COURT: That was Goldie Bockstruck
13
14
     speaking. Last name is B-o-c-k-s-t-r-
15
               COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
16
               COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Madam Court Reporter,
17
    we can hear you. I think we have dropped the room
18
     apparently and the Judge.
19
               Judge Hatcher, if you can hear us we cannot
20
    hear you.
21
               (Connection disruption.)
22
              COMMISSIONER SILVEY: This is Commissioner
23
     Silvey. I just spoke with the office and I'm just going
24
     to sit tight for a little bit until we figure out what
25
     is going on.
```

1	(Off the record to handle connection and
2	technical audio issues.)
3	000
4	(Afternoon session starting at 1 p.m.)
5	THE COURT: We had a false start with our
6	hearing getting underway this morning. We are
7	restarting again. My name is Charles Hatcher. I am the
8	regulatory law judge presiding over this hearing. Today
9	is August 2nd. The Commission has set this day for an
10	evidentiary hearing in file number GR-2021-0108. I will
11	not repeat our announcements, however, I've had a
12	request from the parties to have a certain witness who
13	has a time sensitive flight to catch this evening, that
14	he be allowed to go first prior to opening statements.
15	Are there any objections to that procedural
16	schedule change?
17	Hearing and seeing no objections, the witness
18	can go ahead and come forward. Mr. Spanos.
19	MR. WOODSMALL: Your Honor, were you going to
20	complete entries of appearance, and if not, may I ask on
21	the record to be excused?
22	THE COURT: Granted on your excusal. I'll
23	make a note of that. No, we're not going to do that
24	right now just because of the time crunch.
25	MR. WOODSMALL: Understand.

```
1
               THE COURT: Thank you very much,
 2
    Mr. Woodsmall.
               And, Spire, this is your witness.
 3
               Let me swear in the witness.
 5
               Mr. Spanos, would you please raise your right
    hand?
 6
 7
               (Witness sworn.)
 8
               THE COURT: Please state and spell your last
 9
     name for the record.
               THE WITNESS: John J. Spanos. J-o-h-n Spanos,
10
11
     S-p as in Paul a-n-o-s.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you.
13
               And go ahead.
14
               MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Thank you, Judge.
15
                            JOHN SPANOS,
     called on behalf of the Company, being sworn, testified
16
17
     as follows:
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
18
19
     BY MS. BOCKSTRUCK::
20
               You already stated your name for the record,
21
     can you please state your.
               COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
22
23
     BY MS. BOCKSTRUCK:
24
               Can you state your business address?
          O.
25
          Α.
               207 Senate Avenue, Camp Hill, Pennsylvania
```

1	17011.
2	Q. By whom are you employed and what is your
3	title?
4	A. I'm employed by Gannett Fleming Valuation Rate
5	and Consultants, LLC and I'm the president.
6	Q. Are you the same John Spanos who offered
7	rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony in this proceeding on
8	June 17, 2021 and July 14, 2021 effectively?
9	A. Yes, I am.
10	Q. Did you also (connection disruption) Schedules
11	JJS-R1 and JJS-R2?
12	A. Yes, I did.
13	Q. Do you have any additions or corrections to
14	make to your testimony or schedule at this time?
15	A. No, I do not.
16	Q. If I asked you the same questions today that
17	are in your rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony would
18	your answers be the same?
19	A. Yes, they would.
20	Q. Thank you.
21	MS. BOCKSTRUCK: I move the Commission to
22	enter Mr. Spanos's rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony
23	into the record as Exhibits 35 and 36.
24	THE COURT: Are there any objections to the
25	admission of Exhibit 35 and 36 onto the record?

GR-2021-0108, Vol. X

1	Hearing no objections it's so admitted.
2	Go ahead.
3	Did you have any further questions? I'm
4	sorry.
5	MS. BOCKSTRUCK: No, I do not.
6	THE COURT: Thank you. Refer to my order of
7	cross-examination. First we go to Staff.
8	MR. THOMPSON: Kevin Thompson for Staff. I
9	have no questions.
10	THE COURT: Next is the School Board
11	Association.
12	MR. BROWNLEE: Richard Brownlee.
13	B-r-o-w-n-l-e-e. I have no questions.
14	THE COURT: National Housing Trust. Okay.
15	MR. LINHARES: Apologies, Judge. We have no
16	questions. Thank you.
17	THE COURT: Thank you very much. I appreciate
18	that.
19	And Renew Missouri has previously been asked
20	to be excused.
21	Legal Services of Eastern Missouri.
22	MR. BARRS: Paul Barrs, B-a-r-r-s for Legal
23	Services. No questions.
24	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Barrs.
25	And for Consumers Council.

1	MR. COFFMAN: Yeah. Good afternoon. This is
2	John Coffman, C-o-f-f-m-a-n on behalf of the Consumers
3	Council of Missouri and I have no questions.
4	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Coffman.
5	Mr. Woodsmall has been excused.
6	Ms. (connection disruption) has been excused
7	and that leaves us to Mr. Clizer.
8	MR. CLIZER: No questions.
9	THE COURT: Thank you.
10	We now move to questions from the panel.
11	Excuse me. This is a first opportunity for any
12	Commissioners who would like to ask questions. Are
13	there any Commissioner questions for this witness?
14	COMMISSIONER SILVEY: This is Commissioner
15	Silvey. I have none.
16	Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
17	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: No questions.
18	Thank you, Commissioner Holsman.
19	And the bench has no questions.
20	The witness is excused.
21	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
22	THE COURT: Thank you, sir, and I wish you
23	luck on catching your flight.
24	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
25	MR. APLINGTON: Your Honor, this is Mr.

1	Aplington from the Company. We have a physical copy of
2	the two exhibits. Would you like those?
3	THE COURT: No. The Judge will take the
4	responsibility of submitting the prefiled testimony for
5	marking and submission.
6	MR. APLINGTON: Very good. They make an
7	excellent paperweight.
8	THE COURT: Let's move backwards to our
9	opening statements and let's get to our entry of
10	appearances, and I do apologize to the counsel.
11	Let's go ahead and start over just so we have
12	everybody's information here and especially now without
13	the echo and impeding anyone's introduction.
14	For Spire, Ms. Bockstruck.
15	MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Thank you, Judge.
16	Goldie Bockstruck, Matt Aplington and Rachel
17	Niemeier, 700 Market Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63101.
18	We also have Anne Callenbach and Frank Caro with
19	Polsinelli, 900 West 48th Place, Suite 900 Kansas City,
20	Missouri 64112, and we also have Dean Cooper with
21	Brydon, Swearengen and England, 3112 East Capitol
22	Avenue, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.
23	THE COURT: Thank you and for Commission
24	Staff.
25	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. For the Staff of

GR-2021-0108, Vol. X

```
the Commission Kevin A. Thompson, Curtis Stokes, Jamie
 1
 2
     Myers, Karen Bretz, Casey Azland, Ron Irving and
     Madeline McKernan (Ph) P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City,
 3
     Missouri 65102.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Thank you.
               And Office of the Public Counsel.
 6
 7
               MR. CLIZER: Good afternoon. John Clizer,
     C-l-i-z-e-r for the Office of the Public Counsel,
 8
 9
     business address Governor Office Building, Suite 250,
     200 Madison Street, P. O. Box 2230, Jefferson City,
10
11
     Missouri, 65102. Thank you.
12
               THE COURT: And again Midwest Energy Consumers
13
     Group has been excused.
               Consumers Council of Missouri.
14
15
               MR. COFFMAN: Yes, Your Honor. This is John
     Coffman, C-o-f-f-m-a-n. My address is 871 Tuxedo
16
17
     Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63119.
18
               THE COURT: Missouri Industrial Energy
     Consumers have been excused.
19
20
               National Housing Trust.
21
               MR. LINHARES: Thank you, Judge. For National
22
     Housing Trust, Andrew Linhares, and address is 3115
23
     South Grand Boulevard, Suite 600, St. Louis, Missouri
24
     63118.
2.5
               THE COURT: Thank you.
```

And Renew Missouri has been excused. 1 2 Legal Services of Eastern Missouri. 3 MR. BARRS: Thank you, Judge. Paul A. Barrs, B-a-r-r-s. Counsel with Legal Services of Eastern 4 5 Missouri, 4232 Forest Park Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63108. 6 THE COURT: Thank you. 7 8 And Missouri School Board Association. 9 MR. BROWNLEE: Richard Brownlee, B-r-o-w-n-l-e-e, Law Firm RSB3, LLC. on behalf of the 10 11 Missouri School Boards Association also known regularly 12 as MSBA. Thank you. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 And Vicinity Energy Kansas City has been 15 excused. 16 Ouickly we'll run through preliminary matters. 17 One thing I did not mention this morning talking about 18 exhibits is the Judge, and that's me, will take the 19 responsibility on submitting all of the pre-filed 20 testimony in this case. If it's an EFIS the Judge will 21 make sure and submit it on the record. This is because 22 our current hybrid COVID system makes it a little bit 23 As you all notice, our court reporter is 24 participating via WebEx. So with the other exhibits we 2.5 also have an e-mail address to submit those to, and

that's very simply: EXHIBITS@PSC.MO.GOV.

2.5

All right. And we will abide by the order of opening statements and the order of cross-examination that was submitted, and we will now get to the opening statement.

Spire, you can lead us off please.

MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Judge, I was just wondering if the Commission --

(Due to connection issues the testimony was corrupt for this portion of the hearing.)

MR. CLIZER: -- a higher risk utility is going to have less capacity for debt -- a more costly capital structure. And if you need, you know, to stop and think exactly to double check what I'm saying, just picture this for a second. Who's going to have the easier time getting a loan from the bank? The Applebee's that's been in the same spot for 15 years or the new vegan chili food truck that just opened up? Obviously, the well established business with a good track record is going to be able to get easier debt financing and will be able to have more debt on its book. The more risky business is going to have less chance to get debt.

They're going -- the banks are going to want them to put more of their own capital equity up front, and they're going to have a more costly capital structure.

I want to get back to this in just a moment, but the bottom line is that again, less risky businesses should have more debt, less costly capital structure.

More risky businesses should have -- well, shouldn't have. They have less opportunity for debt, and, therefore, have a more costly capital structure.

A normal competitive business has to balance the idea of wanting to have as cheap a capital structure as possible with maintaining a good credit rating; right? Because if a business just went and got all debt, well, the bank's not going to give you that. It wants you to put up a little bit, like when it demands that you put up something for your loan when you go to buy a house.

So a regulated utility wants to balance having lowest cost capital with maintaining a good credit rating. So with these basics out of the way let's take a look at Spire.

The problem here is that Spire Missouri is currently targeting the equity rich capital structure that the Commission approved in its last rate case. And when I mean targeting, I mean they are specifically making sure to exactly reach the capital structure or as near as possible the Commission actually approved.

The result of this is that customers have been

2.5

paying far more for capital than is actually necessary. The Company could have had far more debt on their books and a far cheaper capital structure than they actually have right now, and we estimate that over the last three years this has resulted in almost \$60 million of unnecessary payments by customers.

But, and this is the biggest problem: The relationship between regulated unregulated is now backwards. And to point that out, Spire Missouri is currently carrying more equity on its books and less debt than its parent company, Spire Inc., which is a problem because Spire Inc. with its nonregulated activities is by definition going to be a more risky endeavor.

I mean Spire Missouri is a regulated utility. These are supposed to be the blue chips, you know, the things that the widows and orphans invest in because they're so secure. But for right now it's being treated as if its riskier than its own parent company who's able to maintain more debt and, therefore, have a cheaper capital structure.

You know, and let's pause for a second ago and go, why is this? Why is Spire Missouri targeting its own capital structure? Well, the reason for that is because by having a lot of equity, they're able to

generate a huge amount of cash flow that's flowing up to their parent, and their parent is using all that cash flow to make its own guarantees for its subsidiaries.

2.5

So, again, you have Spire Missouri subsidizing Spire, Inc. by maintaining a higher than necessary equity ratio in its capital structure.

So what are the overall effects of this?
Well, the first one is that Spire is now forcing the
Commission to make business decisions on its behalf.

The Commission often says, "We don't want to be managing the Company." Well, guess what. You're now managing the Company, at least when it comes to capital structure, because the Commission -- sorry -- the Company has already said, it's going to do what the Commission orders. It's going to maintain the capital structure the Commission orders. So, you've been placed in charge. That shouldn't be a position you want to be. You should want the Company to dynamically manage its capital structure in a way that a nonregulated Company would.

Second, your customers are again paying way more than they need to. This company, Spire Missouri can have more debt on its books. It can achieve a lower cost of capital. It doesn't want to because it's providing a subsidy to its parent by maintaining this

higher cost of capital, or, sorry -- higher capital ratio. Let me make sure that's correct.

The third, and this is perhaps the most problematic to me, Staff and the Company have both effectively adopted the position, the capital structure should remain the same because that's what was approved in the last rate case. But again, it's only what was approved in the -- sorry -- the Company is currently targeting its capital structure. So the fact that it's maintained a capital structure that is approved in the last rate case it forms a loop. You see?

The Company -- sorry -- the Commission assigns a capital structure. The Company targets it. The Company achieves it. The Staff remains -- recommends it be maintained and the loop is repeated. What this means is that customers have been put at risk at a perpetual high-cost capital structure, and if the Commission doesn't act, Missouri -- Spire Missouri customers are going to continue paying more than they need to for capital pretty much indefinitely until something else breaks the cycle.

This is again directly because Spire Missouri is targeting its capital structure at what the Commission approved, not actively managing it to balance, maintaining a good capital structure with

achieving the lowest cost of debt, but purposely saying that's the capital structure we want. It's as high as equity we can get.

2.5

What's the solution to all this? Well, as I've said multiple times, Spire, Inc. is actively managing its capital structure. Spire, Inc. is doing what Spire Missouri should be doing as a nonregulated entity. The easy solution, the simple solution is to point to Spire, Inc., and say, use that capital structure as a guide. Spire Inc. is actively managing its capital structure to achieve the lowest cost of capital while maintaining a good capital rating, which is why it's carrying less debt -- sorry -- more debt less equity on its books than its own subsidiary.

So use Spire, Inc. as a guide, and order a capital structure based on the Spire, Inc. consolidated capital structure. This will save rate payers a large amount of money, while simultaneously ensuring that the Company behaves in the same manner that a nonregulated competitive business would, which I again posit is what this Commission wants.

Our expert witness on this is Mr. David
Murray, and let me tell you, he knows his stuff about
capital structures and rate of returns in general. If
you have any further questions, I strongly encourage you

to direct them to Mr. Murray when he takes the stand come Friday.

2.5

Let's move on to the next issue, affiliate transactions. And, again, we're going to start with a very short review of some of the basics. The Commission has an affiliate transaction rule, which is meant to prevent a regulated utility from giving its nonregulated affiliates a financial advantage. It's necessary that we do this to prevent subsidization; right? Because if we gave our nonregulated a financial advantage, for example, by providing them free goods or paying them for more than the goods they give us, then it hurts customers at the benefit of the regulated or nonregulated affiliate.

Finally, just a reminder, the supreme court has recognized the dangers of affiliate transactions and the need for proper controls.

So, in this case there are two problems we need to consider. The first is that Spire, Inc., which I remind you is the parent company of the overall Spire Enterprise, is not currently paying any of the cost for goods and services that Spire Missouri provides to it. This forms the back bone of the central argument and problem the OPC is seeking to address.

The second problem relates to the fact that

GR-2021-0108, Vol. X

1	the allocation mechanisms that are being used are being
2	manipulated in such a manner as to inappropriately
3	assign the majority of costs back to Spire Missouri.
4	This second problem is in my opinion sort of an
5	explanation for how the first is occurring. So I would
6	say that they are intertwined. What are the results
7	though?
8	Well, again the results that Spire Missouri is
9	subsidizing the operation of Spire, Inc., and, once
10	again, Spire's customers, that's Spire Missouri
11	customers, are paying far more than is actually
12	necessary for the cost of goods for service.
13	Finally, this is a clear violation of the
14	affiliate transaction rule, and the regulatory
15	principles of cost causation. You have costs being
16	caused by Spire, Inc. that are being paid for by Spire
17	Missouri when they should be paid for by Spire, Inc.
18	Let's consider a brief example. So I want you
19	to consider Spire, Inc.'s president and CEO, and I pause
20	to you I'm going to go slowly here just in case, by
21	whom is she employed?`
22	If you're like me you would say Spire, Inc.'s
23	CEO is probably employed by Spire, Inc., but she's not.
24	She's actually employed by Spire Missouri.
25	The next question is: Do you think Spire,

Inc. pays any part of the money that goes towards paying its own CEO? Again, if you're like me, you would have to think, yes, Spire, Inc. has to pay for its own CEO. That only makes sense, but the answer is again, no. Spire, Inc. is not paying for any part of the salary of its own CEO. Let that sink in for just a moment.

You have a company, Spire Missouri, who is right now providing a service to Spire, Inc. in the form of a person to manage the Company, and Spire, Inc. is paying nothing for that service. That is the affiliate transaction violation.

Why is this occurring? Well, let me walk you through it. Basically it functions like this: Spire, Inc.'s CEO bills her time to a shared service account. The shared service account allocates her time based on factors that are influenced by payroll.

Spire Missouri says that it has -- Spire
Missouri says that Spire, Inc. has no payroll because it
has no employees. Now it has no employees because its
employees all work for Spire Missouri. They're just,
you know, sort of doing contract work almost for Spire,
Inc., but because it has no employees all of the costs
that would be assigned to Spire, Inc. get flowed back to
Spire Missouri. This creates what I refer to as a Spire
three step shuffle, which, again, you basically have all

your workforce employed by the regular utility. You have the employees in the regulated utility do work for all of the affiliates, and then bill those costs to a shared services pool, and then you allocate all the costs back to the regulated utility using allocation factors that heavily favor the regulated utility and prevent allocation to Spire, Inc.

This is the manipulation of the allocation factors I was describing, and the result is that again, Spire, Inc. doesn't pay for any of the goods and services Spire Missouri produces on its behalf.

So let's talk solutions. The first solution is fairly simple: Direct bill as much as possible. This is literally what's supposed to be done. This is what's required by Spire's Cam, but it's not what's currently happening. That's why you have this problem.

The second is to just make sure that the goods and services produced by Spire, Inc. -- sorry -- produced for Spire, Inc. by Spire Missouri are paid for by Spire Missouri. I have that slide wrong. That should be produced by Spire Missouri. Need to be paid for by Spire, Inc.

Third, you need to treat the Spire, Inc. officers as Spire, Inc. employees for allocation purposes. This idea of saying, well they're Spire

Missouri employees so we're going to assign their costs to Spire Missouri even though they're working on behalf of Spire, Inc. that's where you're getting into this problem.

2.5

So, a couple of pitfalls, arguments I think are going to come up. I'll touch these really briefly. First of all, this is not about whether or not Spire should have a shared services model. I've seen other companies have shared services companies and they don't have this problem. Ameren does it. Evergy does it. They don't do it the same way. This is not about whether you have a shared services company.

The whole, we're following our Cam, it's not true. It's not an excuse. The Cam requires fair and equitable distribution of costs. Assigning everything away from Spire, Inc. is neither fair nor equitable.

Third, even holding companies have to follow the rule. This idea that Spire, Inc. is a holding company and that somehow magically means it's, you know, not required to follow the rule, it's not true, but again, we'll address those in more detail come tomorrow.

Until then let's move on to ultrasonic and diaphragm meters. All right. So here there's two problems again. The first is a problem regarding gold plating. Spire Missouri is attempting to build out its

rate base unnecessarily by switching meter 1 2 infrastructure. The second problem involves a --3 (Asked for clarification.) COURT REPORTER: 4 5 JUDGE HATCHER: Sherry, it was stranded 6 investment. 7 Go ahead, Mr. Clizer. 8 MR. CLIZER: I'm just going to move right on. 9 So let's talk about that gold plating. The first thing 10 I want to say is with regard to these ultrasonic meters, 11 Spire has not done the proper due diligence. 12 Now they're going to come here and tell you the amounts included in this case are relatively small, 13 but what you have to recognize is that they have 14 15 hundreds of thousands of customers. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars of investment 16 going on here. This company has not done any 17 18 cost-benefit analysis to determine whether or not Spire 19 -- al shank meters are better than existing diaphragm 20 They haven't really done any RFPs. 21 haven't done any sourcing allocations. They haven't developed in realistic terms, any actual plans for the 22 23 roll out. They don't -- haven't done what you would 24 expect a nonregulated competitive business to do when 25 deciding whether or not to make this kind of capital

investment.

2.5

Second, its offered justifications are without merit. First off, diaphragm meters are not obsolete no matter what Spire says. Other meter manufacturers are and continue to make -- are going to continue to make diaphragm meters. In fact, they're making diaphragm meters that are on par in terms of the capabilities as ultrasonic meters, which brings me to my second point.

The safety claims are way overstated. The ultrasonic meters that Spire are putting in don't have the existing safety benefits that Spire touts, and you can find diaphragm meters that have those exact same safety benefits. So all the idea that these are so much safer, you can get the same exact safety using diaphragm meters.

Third, Spire's reliability claims are irrelevant, and I don't mean that to say that the reliability is irrelevant. I mean to say that Spire is replacing meters regardless of whether or not they meet their accuracy, and are intending to replace meters after only ten years, long before the diaphragm meters have actually had a chance to wear out and deteriorate.

Finally, I want to point out that the incremental cost argument that you're going to hear from the Company is misleading. You're going to hear the

Company tell you that ultrasonic meters only cost \$25 more than existing diaphragm meters. And you're going to get into your head that that's okay they only cost \$25. Don't.

2.5

This is much like if you had a friend who bought a car that was supposed to last eight years, and then the next year they buy another car, and they tell you the other car, it only cost \$200 more, so it was a good investment, and you point out to them, yeah, but now you're paying for two cars when you only needed the one. The fact that ultrasonic meters are only -- only \$25 more expensive than diaphragm meters, belies the fact that you have to pay for a whole second meter when you wouldn't otherwise have to.

That brings us to the second issue, stranded investments. As I've been saying, Spire's been replacing retiring meters that are about 20 years before they actually need to be retired according to the average service life of those meters based on its interpretation of a Commission rule, and it wants to accelerate that process of replacing meters early. This has created a disconnect between the actual service life and the regulation or depreciation life of these meters, which Spire has known about for years, and through several different rate cases, for which it has done

nothing to attempt to correct.

2.5

The result of this is that nearly two-thirds of Spire's diaphragm meter account is now unrecovered. But, if you let Spire begin the process of replacing those diaphragm meters with ultrasonic meters, it means that customers are going to have to pay for two meters at the same time. They'll be paying for the diaphragm meters, which are already in rates, and for the ultrasonics. Spire wants their customers to pay return and profit on two meters at the same time. This, the OPC argues, is unjustifiable.

One customer one meter. That is the OPC's argument. Customers should get the benefit of what they pay for and not have to pay for multiple meters just because Spire finds a new toy. This is not about safety. This is about Spire building out its rate base and using that as a means of funneling even more money to its parent company, Spire, Inc. It is a gold plating --

COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)

JUDGE HATCHER: Sherry, the word is gold

plating. Thank you.

MR. CLIZER: I grow concerned that apparently

24 I'm very hard to understand.

JUDGE HATCHER: It's a term of art. I can

understand the mishearing.

MR. CLIZER: I'm joking.

The Commission needs to protect Spire's customers from this rampant gold plating. I'm just going to move in.

So let's have a conclusion real brief. I'm going to summarize my three major points. There's going to be a lot of writing on this slide. I wanted to get it all out there so the Commission could see it.

Once again, you need to order capital structure that's consistent with the consolidated capital structure of Spire, Inc. This is necessary, because if you don't, Spire Missouri is going to keep targeting your capital structure that you set in the last rate case, your Staff will keep recommending that same targeted structure, and Spire will end up paying far more than it needs to for capital because it will have far more equity than it needs to. Use the consolidated capital structure to force the Company to act like a competitive business, specifically its own parent, Spire, Inc.

You need to order Spire Missouri to comply with the affiliate transaction rules. That means actually assigning costs to Spire, Inc. for the goods and services Spire Missouri is making and giving to

Spire, Inc.

2.5

Three. We're asking you to either disallow the recovery of ultrasonic meters, or make an adjustment to the existing depreciation reserve balances for diaphragm meters in order to account for and prevent this double recovery, this stranded investment from being borne by customers and forcing them to pay for two meters at the same time.

There are a whole bunch of other issues in the case. I'm going to run through these at a very high level, like one or two sentences each.

Rate of return. The only other issue is cost of equity. Honestly, I'm just going to let David Murray explain this to you when he takes the stand on Friday.

Incentive compensation. A well developed incentive compensation plan should pay for itself through the earnings that it generates. In other words, you should be able to recover the cost of the incentive plan through policy of regulatory lag. You don't need to include it in rates. That's double dipping.

Cash working capital. Staff and Spire want to include in rates a cost -- an amount of money to pay the day to day costs for Spire to make quarterly tax payments. Spire isn't paying taxes; therefore, you don't need to include that amount of money in rates.

You don't have to include money to make payments that the Company doesn't make.

Capitalization of overheads. The USOA says that you have to have a definite relationship to construction in order to capitalize overheads. Use of an arbitrary percentage is strictly not allowed. Spire's testimony basically acknowledges that the Company is using an arbitrary percentage that is not allowed. We are asking for the Commission to order them to stop doing something they're not allowed to do.

Also, I will throw out here that we're only asking for the capitalization of general overheads.

There are overheads that do have an actual relationship to construction. We are not asking for them to disallow that. Just the ones related to general overheads that have no definite relationship to construction, which is what conforms with the rule.

Net operating loss inclusion. Staff and the Company are ignoring the fact that the Company has income tax expense that's built into rates, but is not remitted to taxing authorities. This income tax expense should be used to offset any NOL that would otherwise reduce rate base.

In the alternative, the Commission should issue an asset to track the amount of income tax expense

that is included in rate base but not remitted to the taxing authorities so that that amount can be used in the future to offset rates.

2.5

Gross receipts tax. The Company's tariffs allow for it to include gross receipts tax on a prorated basis of customers' bills; however, the amount that is included has to be based on the amount that's actually charged by the municipalities that impose the tax.

The municipalities that impose the tax almost all state that the tax is the amount charged less refunds. When Spire issued a refund, but did not remove the refund amount from the amount charged to customers, they charged customers more than what the taxing authority charged Spire. Because they charged more to customers than what the taxing authority charged to Spire, they produced a windfall to themselves.

Mechanisms to address weather conservation or both. Spire currently has a weather normalization adjustment mechanism. They have presented no real testimony as to why they should be allowed to maintain it. They are resting on their laurels on the assumption that the Commission will, of course, give them to it because it already has.

The OPC suggests that they shouldn't even have that because they've made no real efforts to show why

they keep needing it. At a minimum, you should just maintain the existing thing instead of moving to something that is decoupling by another name.

In the last case the Commission determined that it couldn't do what Spire is effectively attempting to do in this case because it had lacked the statutory authority because the mechanism accounted for more than weather and conservation, which is again true here. The mechanism accounts for everything. It is just decoupling by another name.

Depreciation we are about to cover, and I'm not going to cover that here because we'll probably give another opening just before that.

Rate design. The OPC is asking for the reduction of about \$2.50 from the Company's current customer charge to a \$20 charge. It's fairly straightforward. I'm going to let Dr. Geoff Marke discuss that at length on Thursday.

And low income issues. The low income advocates have put forward a slate of some very exciting and cool ideas that would help low income advocates, including a program that would help customers -- not customers. Well, yes, customers who are in critical needs situation receive help. So the people go to a hospital, for example. They'll have somebody trained at

the hospital to tell them, this is how you can reduce your bills if you need to.

2.5

The ability to perform these programs depends on getting funding, and right now what we're asking is for the Company to up front something, literally any amount of money to help fund these programs. Well, I take that back. Specifically, the OPC is requesting the Company put forward a million dollars, which it believes is consistent with what other utilities are providing.

And I want to make this clear, Spire's currently the only major investor on utility in this state that isn't providing any funding for these kind of programs. We would ask that they put forward something.

I think that the rest of the programs are already fairly well covered by the other Intervenors so I'm not going to belabor that point.

Oh, wrong button. I'm hitting the comport.

So, as one last thing I'm going to throw out this revenue impact of the OPC's case. This is here so that the Company can -- sorry -- the Commission can think in terms of real dollars.

A couple of things I want to draw your attention to. Right off the bat you'll notice that we actually have a pretty sizable positive adjustment. Oh, and by the way, I'm starting with the table on the left,

which are the OPC's issues and our estimations of their cost.

2.5

That sizable adjustment is what would happen if you take the depreciation rates that John Robinett has recommended, and you'll notice again, it's plus 16.9 million. It's a lot of money. We are asking for that in part A, because it's the right thing to do to correct for depreciation problems that have occurred, and, B, because we believe it's offset by the considerable amount of counter subsidization adjustments that are -- or, sorry -- counter adjustments that are necessary to correct substance subsidization.

In particular I will note to you, that if you correct the problem related to the capital structure that I pointed out, and adopt the rates proposed by Mr. Robinett, it will be effectively a wash to the Company. That negative 20 million for capital structure plus 16.9. Recognizing, you know, the 3 million some odd dollars difference.

Overall, the OPC's adjustments are negative 76.6. Now let's switch over to the other table really quick. As you've already heard, Spire's initial request was for \$112 million, of which 47 was the ISRS money that was already collecting, and another 65 million on top of that.

Now Staff's filed direct I believe was an increase of 54 million over base rates. Their True-up position I think is weighing in at 8182 based on what I was given but I don't have it in front of me.

2.5

The OPC's adjustment to Staff's case is that negative 76.6 million. So based off the filed position as you can see we would actually be going negative, but we're not asking that.

The OPC's just asking that there be no increase to base rates, and you might be wondering why are we not asking for a negative if we think that's what the adjustments will allow.

Well, two things. First, we first -- excuse me. When we first staked our position at the beginning of this case, we weren't sure exactly how things were going to turn out, but we knew based on the adjustments that we were already going to recommend that it was probably highly unlikely that there was going to be a reason to increase companies rates. That's why we went with that initially.

The second thing is I want to make this clear. We're not out to bankrupt the Company, okay? Spire Gas is providing an important service. Natural gas is necessary. We want them to have just and reasonable rates. We just want for customers to get their fair

due, which in this case means counteracting the large 1 2 amount of subsidization that has been going on in order to build up Spire, Inc., the parent company. 3 At the end of the day we believe that a no increase to base rates is fair and reasonable. 5 balances the needs of the Company to collect its capital 6 7 investments with the need of customers to see a 8 reduction to offset the crazy amount of subsidization 9 that has been occurring. 10 And with that I will simply ask if there are 11 any questions? 12 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Clizer. 13 Are there any Commissioner questions for the Office of the Public Counsel? 14 15 All right. Hearing none. Thank you, Mr. Clizer. 16 17 I am going to recorrect our camera situation and then I'm going to call for a break. It is 2:48. It 18 19 is 2:48 by my clock. Let's take an intermission until 20 3:00 p.m. for any necessary breaks. We are in recess 21 until 3:00 p.m. 22 (Off the record.) 23 THE COURT: Let's come back in from recess. 24 Once again just to reorient everyone, we are in a hybrid rate case hearing for Spire Missouri. We have 2.5

participants on a WebEx. We also have live
participants. We are getting ready to start with the
issue of depreciation and follow up with our witnesses.
Witness Spanos was heard earlier today.

I do have one announcement I want to make. Right now talking with our information technologies team, we are experiencing a lot of difficulties with the live stream and keeping that broadcasting for lack of a better word.

We'll be talking again tonight, myself and the IT team, but our current thinking for a solution tomorrow and going forward will be to continue with this format, with the hybrid format, but we are not going to have that camera pointing at the live screen. We will have the web camera, i.e. the Judge's WebEx camera up here to point at the witness stand, and we will likely switch to audio only on the live stream.

The people on WebEx will be the ones viewing the camera, and everyone in here is in person, and so we'll all be able to see the witness testifying. That's just an idea at this point. I'm throwing that out there for everyone to think about and sleep on tonight.

Let's switch gears.

Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will material brought

up on the computer screen show up on WebEx then? And if 1 2 you don't know that's fine. I was just curious. THE COURT: No. Thank you. We will have to 3 figure out a solution for that. Do we have witnesses 4 5 that are going to be having some audiovisual exhibits or 6 accessories? Well, maybe that's a nonissue. We'll get there when we get there. 7 8 Yes, ma'am. 9 MS. BOCKSTRUCK: I do have a question for 10 those that are participating remotely. How are we 11 supposed to get exhibits to them, because we do have 12 copies for people that are here in the room, but for 13 others --THE COURT: You e-mail them to me and I'll 14 15 forward them. 16 MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Okay. 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So, okay. I was -- so 18 e-mail exhibits, openings to you and you're going to be 19 distributing them? 20 THE COURT: Your openings are different than 21 your exhibits. 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Got you. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 I think that has answered all the questions. Let's move on to depreciation. I believe our first 25

witness is Antrainer, and I'm sorry I don't have first 1 2 names handy. MS. BOCKSTRUCK: I think we need to do opening 3 4 statements first. 5 THE COURT: You're right. We want to do small 6 issue opening statements. My apologies. Let us do that and we will start with our same 7 8 list of opening statements, the same order. Spire. 9 Again for everyone on WebEx and in the room, we are starting our testimony on depreciation. That is 10 11 Issue 24, and we will be starting with opening 12 statements. Focus on depreciation. 13 First up is Ms. Bockstruck for Spire. MS. BOCKSTRUCK: 14 Thank you, Judge. 15 May it please the Commission. All parties agree as to one item regarding depreciation in this 16 17 case. That one set of depreciation rates should apply for both Spire East and Spire West. So when it comes to 18 19 depreciation rates in this case, the main issue before 20 the Commission is what depreciation rates should the 21 Company use. 22 The purpose of depreciation rates is to match 23 the full service value of an asset with the utilization of an asset over its useful life. In order to do this a 24

study must be undertaken that looks at the life

1 characteristics of an asset, drivers for replacement and 2 retirements of assets as well as many other factors. The Company through Gannett Fleming Valuation 3 and Rate Consultants, LLC. --4 COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.) 5 6 THE COURT: Maybe that was me. Ms. Bockstruck 7 if you could. 8 MS. BOCKSTRUCK: I was not shuffling papers. 9 THE COURT: If you could try moving the 10 microphone. 11 MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Is this any better? 12 In order to do this study a study must be undertaken that looks at -- I'm sorry. I already read 13 that part. The Company through Gannett Fleming 14 15 Valuation and Rate Consultants conducted a depreciation 16 study which is included as Schedule JJS-R2 to Company 17 witness John Spanos's rebuttal testimony. 18 This depreciation study calculates the annual 19 accrual rates for Spire Missouri's assets by account as 20 of September 30, 2020. The Company's current 21 depreciation rates have not been updated since 2012 and 22 as such are outdated. Despite this fact OPC does not 23 consider Spire's 2020 depreciation study, but instead, 24 takes the position that depreciation rates for the 25 Company be based on Spire East's current depreciation

rates.

They take this position for two reasons. One, because the Company did not file their depreciation study with the direct case. Rendering the 2020 depreciation study void and not to be considered by OPC. The Company maintains that the Commission's rule does not require that the depreciation study be filed. The fact that it was submitted to all parties as part of its direct work papers is enough to meet the requirements of the Commission's rule.

Their second reason is that they don't believe enough data exists for Spire West to appropriately set the depreciation rates for those assets. As supported by Company witness, John Spanos, Spire West has historical transactional data supporting its rates going back to 1994. The initial data also included installation information that goes back to the initial year of service of some of Spire West's assets. This historical data is more than sufficient to establish appropriation -- appropriate depreciation rates for Spire West. To simply apply Spire East's depreciation rates to Spire West assets, would be an inappropriate and inaccurate means of setting combined depreciation rates for the Company.

If Staff proposes an amortization of the

Company's general planned accounts in a manner that 1 2 supports the under recovery of a new assets placed in service. Unlike the Staff's approach, the Company's 3 applied methodology and rates allows for the plant and 4 service to be recovered over the useful life of the 5 6 assets in a manner that ensures there will be -- will 7 not be a reserved deficiency or surplus and ensures 8 future assets of properly recovered at stable rates. 9 Depreciation of cast-iron main is also an issue before the Commission. As shown in the 10 11 depreciation study, the proper recovery of all cast-iron 12 main related assets need to be recovered by end of 2030 13 based on requirements of the cast-iron main replacement 14 program. OPC does not reflect this requirement in its 15 proposal. 16 Spire Missouri requests that the Commission 17 order the depreciation rates be set as proposed by the 18 Company in Schedule JJS-R2. 19 So you see Spire has already provided the 20 testimony today of John Spanos and we also have for you 21 Michelle Antrainer for Spire Missouri. 22 Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Bockstruck. For Staff. 24 Maybe I should ask first. The normal course 25

is to do all of the mini openings and then witnesses? Okay.

Ms. Azland, go ahead.

2.5

MS. AZLAND: Good afternoon. My name is Casey Azland and I am representing Commission Staff. Staff recommends that the Commission order the use of the depreciation rates found in Staff's revenue requirement cost of service report with the exception of accounts related to smart meters and smart meter installation.

Using the depreciation rates proposed by Staff will prevent an over recovery of assets. Since the Company regularly maintains assets in the general plant accounts past their amortization period, and over recovery can occur and has occurred in the past. Staff will review the amortization of these accounts in each future rate case to avoid both over and under recovery. If the Commission were to order the depreciation rates proposed by Spire witness, Mr. Spanos, the Company should also be ordered to regularly retire any assets at the end of their amortization period.

For accounts 381.1 and 382.2 related to smart meters and smart meter installations, Staff recommends the use of the depreciation rates included in the surrebuttal testimony of David Buttig. These rates were ordered by the Commission in Case No. GO20200416. There

```
has been no new evidence supporting the change of these
 1
 2
     depreciation rates since they became effective on
     October 16, 2020.
 3
               Staff witness David Buttig will be testifying
 5
     today and able to answer any questions you may have.
 6
               Thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 8
               And we move to National Housing Trust,
 9
     Mr. Linhares. He is on WebEx.
10
               MR. LINHARES: I have no opening to offer nor
11
     for any other mini opening, Judge.
12
               THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate that.
13
               And next we move to Legal Services, Mr. Barrs.
14
     He is on WebEx.
15
               MR. BARRS: Thank you, Judge. Similar to Mr.
     Linhares, I have no opening on this or any of the other
16
17
     mini -- other issues on mini opening.
18
               THE COURT: Thank you.
               And Office of the Public Counsel.
19
20
               MR. CLIZER: Ready?
21
               THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Clizer.
22
               MR. CLIZER: If it would please the
23
     Commission, once again, John Clizer.
24
               So, I will lift this up. Depreciation.
     should be a relatively -- well, straightforward
25
```

2.5

exercise. You're basically attempting to figure out how long things last. Unfortunately, the process for this case has been rather difficult, torture some might say, and I feel like it's necessary to kind of walk through exactly what happened in this case to figure out why we're at where we're at today.

And it starts with the fact that the Company didn't actually file its depreciation study for any testimony to support its depreciation study in the direct. Instead, what it filed was a schedule buried in one witness's list of schedules that outlined new rates that it wanted. It did supply its deprecation study, I will acknowledge that, but again, nothing was actually put into the record to support what it wanted.

When Staff went to file its cost of service report, it adopted rates that were in large part consistent with the rates that Spire put in its direct, and I have to be very careful here. It was consistent with the rates Spire put in its direct.

The OPC saying, hey, no one's actually filed a rate study in the record, so there's no actual evidence to support anything. We went off the only thing we had, which was the rates that were still in effect, which is what we recommended. We did make a few adjustments which I'll get to at the end of this.

So then we come around to rebuttal, where for the first time, Spire actually files a depreciation study and the testimony supporting it.

2.5

Now, a couple of important points. The study that Spire filed had depreciation rates that were not consistent with what it had requested in its direct. It also criticized Staff for adopting rates that were largely consistent with its direct. It also criticized Staff for not adopting the general plant amortization strategy. I want to point out that up until this point no one had actually filed testimony recommending general plant amortization. And, of course, they criticized us for reusing old rates.

Staff chose not to file rebuttal, which is perfectly reasonable, and the OPC filed to, again, point out that there had not been a depreciation rate, which at that point nothing had been filed yet, and attempted to explain this by citing to Spire's explanation of the rules.

We also chose to use that to address the inconsistencies between Spire's study and its direct requested rates, and point out the Staff error consisting of or relating to the issue on the ultrasonic meters, which all the parties have basically agreed to up to this point.

When surrebuttal comes around, Spire files to basically criticize the OPC for pointing out the timing inconsistency of filing the direct, as well as again, criticizes us for issues related to general plant amortization, which no one had talked about before rebuttal.

Staff points out that its rates are consistent with what Spire had put in direct, although not the actual study, and makes recommendations regarding general plant amortization, in particular the idea that the Company should be ordered to immediately retire all fully accrued assets, which the OPC completely agrees with. They also correct for the mistake that the OPC pointed out.

And then for our part, we pointed out an error that related specifically to the plastic mains' account, and we also made recommendations regarding general plant amortization, and basically explained why that would be a bad idea in the first place.

So, where are we at the end of all of this? You have effectively two studies. You have the Spire study and the sort of a Staff -- well, you have Staff rates at any rate. No pun intended.

You have two different recommendations by the Company. The one in the direct and the one in the

actual study. Now they had been previously maintained they wanted the rates in direct. They've now switched to asking for the rates in their actual study, which are slightly different, and are going to be different than what Staff recommended.

2.5

The OPC, because of all of this confusion, is continuing to maintain that you should just stick with the rates that have already been approved.

Now, as I pointed out in my general opening, we have a few adjustments that when combined with that will actually increase the overall amount of Staff's case by about 16.9 million. The depreciation rates put forward by the Company will actually increase the overall rate of Staff's case by 16.5 million roughly. So we're actually \$400,000 over the Company's rates using the old rates but making Robinett's adjustments. A bit confusing, I know.

If the Commission doesn't stick with the old rates, this is what the Commission should do, and it's going to be very confusing so I'm going to repeat myself.

You should adopt the average service life and net salvage in Staff's class cost of service, and then apply the formula that's in Staff's class cost of service. I don't want to get to down -- and, so, yeah,

I'm going to repeat myself.

2.5

You should take the average service life and net salvage plant values from Staff's class cost of service report and apply the equation in Staff's class cost of service report to get to the ultimate rates.

That is what Staff claims that it did. It's not exactly. They used a weighted average method to get to their rates, which makes their rates slightly less than what it would've been if they had used the method they claim to have used. It's very confusing. I'll try and get all of this out there in cross.

But again, to reiterate. If the Commission does not order to maintain the existing rates with the adjustments recommended by Mr. Robinett, use the average service life and net salvage amounts from class -- from Staff's class cost of service using -- and the equation in Staff's class cost of service to get to the final rates. All right.

I've mentioned this several times. What are the adjustments? I'll roll through them really quick.

The first one involves cast-iron mains, and I frankly -- I almost have to laugh. Spire has insinuated that the OPC is not --

COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)

THE COURT: Sherry, it's cast-iron mains.

MR. CLIZER: Spire insinuated the OPC hasn't made an adjustment for cast-iron mains. The humor in this is that the OPC is recommending adjustment for cast-iron mains, and it's actually substantially more aggressive than Spire's. We actually raise rates by more than what Spire's requesting in order to correct the problem with the cast-iron mains account.

2.5

Let me give you a brief overhead of what that problem is. Spire is retiring all of its cast-iron mains as part of the ISRS Program. The account should be going down; however, Spire's making joint encapsulation projects to prolong the longevity of some of their mains while they do additional work. These joint encapsulation projects are being booked to the account for the mains. That's driving the account up. We don't have a problem with that.

The problem is the fact that joint encapsulations are going to last for about ten years on average, but the mains' account having an 80 year life, which means that you're driving up the mains' account while not depreciating it over the same period that it should be so you have this massive under recovery problem. Coupled with the fact that the whole account should be retired by I believe 2030 with the new ISRS law, you have a problem you need to fix.

Second one, plastic mains. Plastic mains, according to both Staff and the Company should be reduced to an average service life of 65 years. No. Sixty years down from 75. Plastic mains are supposed to last a long time. That's the whole reason were putting them in as part of the ISRS. The Commission is on record as having found that they should last indefinitely, but they are having their average service life reduced. Why? Because the Company has been retiring a large amount of plastic mains prematurely during the ISRS, which is why we had all those appeals.

Again, I'm not trying to litigate that, but when you have a bunch of premature retirements you end up bringing down the overall average life of the plant. You need to correct for that problem by removing the retirements brought about prematurely due to the ISRS, which will bring up the plant's life. The easiest way to do this is to use the average service life that were recommended by the Company itself in the last rate case which is 75 years.

The third adjustment isn't an adjustment to Staff's. It's basically just saying Staff has asked for ten years on the Enterprise software. The Company wishes to shorten it. There's no evidence for shortening it, so use Staff's recommendation there.

Then you have the ultrasonic meters. Again, basically everyone's agreed it should be 20 years. Just use 20 years average service life for the ultrasonic meters.

2.5

The last thing I want to talk about. I know I've been going for a while, general plant amortization. Again, nobody filed direct testimony saying that we should be using general plant amortization. It basically just sort of came out in rebuttal when Spire began criticizing Staff's recommendation. You shouldn't approve general plant amortization. It makes it very difficult to do prudence review of the work because you're lumping all of the assets into one plant.

If you do go with what Staff is proposing or Spire, any kind of general plant amortization you should do the following: One, you should order the Company to immediately retire all fully accrued plant. This is exactly what Staff is already recommending.

Two, I want to pause for just a second because I see you're writing. I want to make sure you have time.

Two, you should order the Company to on a regular basis continue retiring fully accrued plants. This could be monthly, biannually, annually, whatever the basis you set is, just have the Company routinely

retire the fully accrued plants.

2.5

And, three, require the Company to continue booking the individual unit price so that prudence reviews can be conducted in the future. I might have misquoted exactly what their recommendation is. It's in the -- it's in the testimony of John Robinett on surrebuttal.

So, summing up. We say you should maintain the existing rates for Spire East for both Spire East and West. If you don't do that you should take the average service life and net salvage plant values of Staff's cost cass -- Staff's cost of service -- Staff's cost of service report -- I'm tripping over myself -- and apply the equation that's in Staff's cost of service report to get at the rates.

You should make an adjustment to cast-iron mains as recommended by John Robinett. You should make the adjustment to plastic mains as recommended by John Robinett. You should keep the Enterprise software, the ten-year average service life, and you should keep ultrasonic meters at a 20 year average service life. You should not approve general plant amortization, but if you do you should order, A, or one, retire all fully accrued plant.

Two, routinely retire the fully accrued plants

```
moving forward, and, three, keep the individual unit
 1
 2
    pricing so that you can do prudence reviews in the
     future.
 3
               That was a mouthful and I apologize but I had
 4
 5
     to get through a lot.
 6
               Thank you.
 7
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Clizer. I
 8
     appreciate your presentation. Let's get to our witness.
 9
               First up is Spire and, witness Antrainer,
    please come forward. I will swear you in.
10
11
               And, Sherry, the last name is spelled
12
     A-n-t-r-a-i-n-e-r.
13
               Ms. Antrainer, would you please raise your
     right hand?
14
15
               (Witness sworn.)
16
               THE COURT: Thank you.
17
               And for -- please -- I'm sorry. Ms.
18
     Antrainer, state your name and spell your last name for
19
     the court reporter.
20
               THE WITNESS: Michelle Antrainer,
21
     A-n-t-r-a-i-n-e-r.
22
               COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
23
               THE WITNESS: A-n-t-r-a-i-n-e-r.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. And if we could all
25
    project.
```

1	Please, go ahead.		
2	MICHELLE ANTRAINER		
3	called on behalf of the Company, being sworn, testified		
4	as follows:		
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION		
6	BY MS. BOCKSTRUCK:		
7	Q. Ms. Antrainer, can you please state your name		
8	again and your business address?		
9	A. Michelle Antrainer, 700 Market Street		
10	St. Louis, Missouri, 63101.		
11	Q. And by whom are you employed and what is your		
12	title?		
13	A. Spire and my title is lead regulatory analyst.		
14	Q. Are you the same Michelle Antrainer who filed		
15	direct rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony in this		
16	proceeding on December 11, 2020, June 17th, 2021		
17	July 14, 2021 respectively?		
18	A. Yes.		
19	Q. And is it correct that you submitted a		
20	corrected rebuttal testimony on July 20th, 2021?		
21	A. Yes.		
22	Q. Do you have any additions or corrections to		
23	make to your testimony at this time?		
24	A. No.		
25	Q. If I asked you the same questions again today		

1	would your answers remain the same?		
2	A. Yes.		
3	Q. All right. Thank you.		
4	MS. BOCKSTRUCK: At this time I move that the		
5	Commission enter all of Ms. Antrainer's testimony into		
6	the record as Exhibits number 1, 2 and 3.		
7	THE COURT: Thank you. We will mark those as		
8	offered Exhibits 1, 2 and 3.		
9	Are there any objections to the admittance of		
10	Exhibit 1, 2 and 3, that is the direct corrected		
11	rebuttal and surrebuttal respectively of witness		
12	Michelle Antrainer?		
13	Checking on WebEx and I see no objections.		
14	It is received. Thank you.		
15	MS. BOCKSTRUCK: No other questions. I tender		
16	her for cross-examination.		
17	THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Bockstruck.		
18	We go now to cross-examination, and I am not		
19	going to read through the parties that are excused.		
20	National Housing Trust. Mr. Linhares, do you		
21	have any questions for Ms. Antrainer?		
22	MR. LINHARES: No, Judge. Thank you. I have		
23	no questions.		
24	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.		
25	Mr. Barrs for Legal Services, do you have any		

```
questions on cross-examination for Ms. Antrainer?
 1
 2
               MR. BARRS: No questions. Thank you, Judge.
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 3
               And Office of Public Counsel?
 5
               No questions from Office of Public Counsel.
 6
               Ms. Antrainer, hold on just a minute.
 7
               Are there any questions from the
     Commissioners?
 8
 9
               Okay. Hearing none, Ms. Antrainer, you are
10
               Thank you very much.
     excused.
11
               (Witness excused.)
12
               THE COURT: Okay. Let's move on. Our next
13
     witness is Mr. Buttig. Thank you, sir. Please come
     forward. That last name is B-u-t-t-i-q?
14
15
               Please raise your right hand, sir.
16
               (Witness sworn.)
17
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you. Please have a seat.
18
     Please state and spell your name for the court reporter.
               THE WITNESS: My name is David Buttig,
19
20
     B-u-t-t-i-q.
21
               THE COURT: Your witness.
22
                          DAVID BUTTIG,
23
     called on behalf of Staff, being sworn, testified as
24
     follows:
2.5
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
```

1			
1	BY MS. AZLAND:		
2	Q. Mr. Buttig, by whom are you employed and in		
3	what capacity?		
4	A. By the Missouri Public Service Commission as a		
5	professional engineer.		
6	Q. And did you contribute to the Staff cost of		
7	service report marked as Exhibit 101, and did you		
8	provide surrebuttal testimony marked as Exhibit 128?		
9	A. I did.		
10	Q. And do you have any changes or corrections to		
11	either the report or your surrebuttal testimony?		
12	A. I do not.		
13	Q. Is the information contained in both the		
14	report		
15	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)		
16	BY MS. AZLAND:		
17	Q. The question was: Do you have any changes or		
18	corrections to the report or your surrebuttal testimony?		
19	A. I do not.		
20	Q. And is the information contained in the report		
21	and your surrebuttal testimony true and correct to the		
22	best of your knowledge and belief?		
23	A. It is.		
24	MS. AZLAND: At this time I would move for the		

admission for Exhibit 128 and tender the witness for

25

```
1
     cross.
 2
               THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Azland.
               Are there any objections to the admission of
 3
     128 on to the hearing record?
 4
 5
               Hearing none it is so admitted.
               And we have the witness tendered for cross.
 6
 7
     On my list that is Spire goes first.
 8
               MS. BOCKSTRUCK:
                                 Thank you.
 9
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
     BY MS. BOCKSTRUCK:
10
11
               Mr. -- is it Buttig?
          Ο.
12
               Buttig, yes, that's correct.
          Α.
13
               Buttig. Are some general plant accounts
     subject to amortization accounting?
14
15
               In this case or in general?
          Α.
16
               In this case.
          Ο.
17
          Α.
               Not currently there is no Commission order for
     a general plant amortization.
18
19
               Okay. And how about generally?
          Ο.
20
          Α.
               Yes. It has been done in other cases.
21
               Okay. Have you recommended rates for these
          Ο.
22
     general plant accounts consistent with a Company witness
23
     Selinger which is based on amortization accounting?
24
               My recommended rates are similar to Selinger's
          Α.
25
     yes.
```

1	Q. Are the amortization periods by witness		
2	Selinger the same as those presented by witness Spanos?		
3	A. They are.		
4	Q. Is amortization accounting based on a no		
5	interim survivor curve?		
6	A. That's correct.		
7	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)		
8	MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Sure.		
9	BY MS. BOCKSTRUCK:		
10	Q. I asked is amortization accounting based on no		
11	interim survivor curve?		
12	A. And, that's correct.		
13	Q. Would assets excuse me. Would new assets		
14	added to an account with a 20 year period be expected to		
15	have a five percent rate in order to get full recovery		
16	no more no less during the life of the asset?		
17	A. If it was retired at the end of its		
18	amortization period.		
19	Q. Okay. And amortization accounting where there		
20	is no survivor curve, is it expected that all assets be		
21	on the amortization period are fully recovered?		
22	A. Can you repeat that?		
23	Q. Yes. In amortization accounting where there		
24	is no survivor curve		
25	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)		

1	THE WITNESS: I asked her to repeat the		
2	question.		
3	BY MS. BOCKSTRUCK:		
4	Q. Let me ask again. In amortization accounting		
5	where there is no survivor curve, is it expected that		
6	all assets be on the amortization period are fully		
7	recovered?		
8	A. Did you say beyond its amortization period are		
9	fully recovered? Is that what		
10	Q. Yes.		
11	A. They would have been fully recovered but they		
12	are still within the account, and the depreciation rate		
13	is still being applied to it, it could in a sense still		
14	be collecting depreciation.		
15	Q. Okay. I'm going to move on to cast iron		
16	assets. Is it true that the Company has a cast-iron		
17	replacement program in place?		
18	A. It does.		
19	Q. Does the Company have a plan in place to		
20	remove or replace all cast-iron mains by the end of		
21	2030?		
22	A. I believe it does.		
23	Q. Based on the definition of depreciation, would		
24	it be appropriate that all cast-iron main assets get		

recovered through depreciation by the end of 2030?

25

1	A. Y	es.
2	М	S. BOCKSTRUCK: No further questions.
3	т	HE COURT: Thank you.
4	W	e move to National Housing Trust. Mr.
5	Linhares.	
6	М	R. LINHARES: Judge, I have no questions on
7	cross. And	, further, I do not intend to have any cross.
8	I don't know if any other parties are in that same	
9	situation,	but I have no cross for any witnesses.
10	Т	THE COURT: Okay. I will take that into
11	account and	stop calling you. Thank you very much.
12	L	et's move to Legal Services. Mr. Barrs.
13	М	R. BARRS: No questions on this witness,
14	Judge.	
15	T	HE COURT: Okay.
16	A	nd that leaves us to Office of the Public
17	Counsel.	
18	М	R. CLIZER: Thank you.
19		CROSS-EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. CLIZ	ER:
21	Q. G	ood afternoon. All right. So I have to
22	start off b	y immediately correcting myself from my
23	opening. W	ere you listening to my opening?
24	А. У	es, I was.
25	Q. D	id you hear me say that Staff has recommended

a ten year life for the Enterprise software? 1 2 Α. I believe I do remember you saying that. Is that correct? 3 Ο. It is not. Α. What has Staff recommended? 5 Ο. I believe that the original one if I still 6 Α. 7 have it I believe it was a 14 year life and I think that 8 Spire will correct me on the ten year. 9 I have here a copy of your Appendix 3 to Staff cost of --10 11 COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.) 12 MR. CLIZER: Appendix 3 to Staff cost of 13 service report. BY MR. CLIZER: 14 15 Please verify what the average service life of 16 the Enterprise software is filed in your cost of service 17 report Appendix 3. 18 This one has a ten year average life. 19 For account 391.95. Ο. 20 Α. 391.5? 21 .95. All right. Thanks. I'm going to move Ο. 22 on to the next round of questions. You would agree with 23 me that Spire did not file --24 (Due to connection issues the testimony was 2.5 corrupt for this portion of the hearing.)

1			
1	THE COURT: Any recross for Mr. Robinett?		
2	MR. BARRS: No questions. Thank you.		
3	THE COURT: Thank you, sir.		
4	And the next we come to Staff.		
5	MS. AZLAND: No questions.		
6	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.		
7	And Spire?		
8	MS. MYERS: No questions.		
9	THE COURT: And that leaves us to redirect.		
10	Mr. Clizer.		
11	MR. CLIZER: Thank you, Your Honor.		
12	REDIRECT EXAMINATION		
13	BY MR. CLIZER:		
14	Q. Let's go in reverse order and start with the		
15	bench questions. So you were asked briefly about the		
16	Staff approach and the rates in Appendix 3. Let's break		
17	that down into two different parts. Let's start with		
18	the Staff approach.		
19	What was Staff's approach for coming up with		
20	the actual depreciation rates recommended as you		
21	understand it?		
22	A. Based on testimony and my understanding, Staff		
23	utilized files provided by the Company and arrived at		
24	very similar rates that were recommended by the Company.		
25	The one main difference in my opinion based on the		

statement of positions now, is the general plant accounts where Staff recommended a total account rate that is present in Mr. Spanos's study, but Mr. Spanos is not actually recommending his total account rate.

- Q. What is Mr. Spanos recommending as you understand it?
- A. He is recommending a treatment of zero percent depreciation rates for all fully accrued, and then a solid rate based on the lives that are similar to what Staff has recommended in their study. He applied everything that is unfully amortized.
- Q. Between the Staff method and Mr. Spanos's method, which do you think is more accurate or what flaws do you see?
- A. I wouldn't recommend either because I'm hesitant to recommend a zero percent depreciation rate on continuing assets. I would recommend Mr. Spanos's unamortized balance only for the accounts.
- Q. What about the accounts that have a different service life as proposed by Staff?
- A. Generally I would be supportive of Staff with the exceptions to mains per cast-iron and plastic.
- Q. So you would agree to using the service life and net salvage values in Staff Appendix 3?
 - A. Yes.

But if you apply the service life and net 1 Ο. 2 salvage values to the equation, which is found on page 112 of Staff's cost of service, which I will provide to 3 you if you do not have a copy of in front of you, will 4 5 you get the rates that are in Staff's Appendix 3? And 6 there was a long pause in that question so I can repeat 7 it if necessary. 8 Α. I believe the main issues are going to happen 9 down in general plant where they would not be because of --10 11 So if you used a --Q. 12 COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.) 13 THE WITNESS: The waiting method. BY MR. CLIZER: 14 15 So if you used the Staff's average service 16 life and net salvage from their Appendix 3, and applied 17 the equation on page 112 of their cost of service, you 18 would reach a solid depreciation rate that is similar to 19 what Mr Spanos --20 MS. BOCKSTRUCK: I'm going to object to this 21 line of questioning. It's beyond the scope of redirect. 22 MR. CLIZER: I'm attempting to clarify what 23 exactly Staff's approach is, which admittedly is a bit

confusing there, but I'll move on.

BY MR. CLIZER:

24

So the other half of this was the general 1 Ο. 2 plant amortization which you mentioned. Just briefly explain what general plant amortization is and why you 3 have a problem with it. 4 5 General plant amortization is usually applied 6 to the general plant accounts where it is a bunch of 7 smaller assets that aren't readily tracked by the 8 utilities. And what it ultimately could allow for is 9 that you basically just have to take the total additions 10 for the year, and keep track of that, because that's 11 really what you're tracking is additions for the year,

Can you use Staff's rates or Mr. Spanos's 0. rates for that matter without ordering general plant amortization?

reasonable costs for the assets that they're adding.

and making sure that they recover that value over the

individual assets and tracking to say are these still

amortization period. You lose potentially the value of

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Objection again. This is beyond the scope of redirect.
- THE COURT: Let me refer to my questions. asked if OPC agreed with the approach used by Staff.
- MR. CLIZER: To which Mr. Robinett responded that he did but for the general plant amortization, which I'm attempting to explain what that answer meant.

THE COURT: I think we're fine. Overruled. 1 2 Go ahead, Mr. Clizer. BY MR. CLIZER: 3 Do you need me to repeat the question? Ο. 5 Α. Yes, please. 6 O. Can you use the rates recommended by Staff and 7 not order general plant amortization? 8 Α. Yes. 9 All right. I'm going to move on. Let's talk about cast-iron. 10 Spire appears to 11 be of the position or assumption that you're not 12 recommending a change to cast-iron. Are you 13 recommending conditions for an adjustment to cast-iron 14 mains? 15 With depreciation rate change, yes. Is your adjustment designed to make sure that 16 17 Spire recovers the outstanding balance of cast-iron main plants by the end of the -- I know 2030 is not around 18 19 but I'm going to say the ISRS Sunset Provision? 20 If you look at my testimony on page four of my direct I spell out the math. I'm actually 21 22 recommending the depreciation rate, which is almost 23 three times what the Company did. 24 Is Mr. Spanos's recommendation going to Ο. recover all of the outstanding cast-iron plants by the

1	end of the ISRS Sunset Provision period?
2	A. I don't know. Mine accounts for not only the
3	original cost but the cost of removal with an eight year
4	life.
5	Q. All right. You were asked some questions
6	regarding Spire East versus Spire West. Now you're
7	recommending Spire East
8	THE COURT: Mr. Clizer, I'm going to raise a
9	problem here. I understood that we were doing redirect
10	and that was limited to bench questions and I was the
11	only one.
12	MR. CRIZER: Oh.
13	THE COURT: Is that correct?
14	MR. CLIZER: Wait. Is not redirect also
15	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It covers also cross,
16	Judge.
17	THE COURT: Okay. Sorry about that. Go
18	ahead.
19	MR. CLIZER: Okay. You scared me for a
20	minute.
21	BY MR. CLIZER:
22	Q. Okay. You were asked several questions about
23	the difference between Spire East and Spire West. So,
24	again, just so we know where we're starting, you're

recommending Spire East be applied to both; right?

1	7\	Yes
	Α.	162

- Q. What were your problems with the Spire West data?
- A. Historically there's been an issue with the data dating back to an original transfer that lost part of it. With that I believe there was probably creation of additional data to AJIT that may exist, but basically you have data from '94 forward that could be used.
- Q. But your recommendation is if you want to use the best data just use Spire East?
- A. I was more comfortable with Spire East's historical data, yes.
- Q. So you were asked several questions about conducting a site visit or speaking with Company personnel. Do you feel it's necessary to conduct a site visit to do a depreciation study or recommend depreciation rates?
- A. Generally it's helpful. I don't know that it's entirely necessary all the time depending on your familiarity with the utility.
- Q. Did Spire offer personnel to have conversations with OPC recommending its rates?
- A. It didn't ask for it, but I would assume that they would have allowed that.
 - MR. CLIZER: I don't think I have any other

redirect. 1 2 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Clizer. I believe that does it for our witness. 3 4 Mr. Robinett, you are excused. And it is 4:50. I'm just stating that for 5 6 everyone's information. I had brought up the issue of 7 possibly going late this week and possibly going late 8 this evening. 9 I'm going to start with a question and maybe ease ourselves into this. If we stop now what is the 10 11 schedule for the rest of the week? My concern being capital overheads, which is scheduled for today. Are we 12 13 just going to bump that to tomorrow morning? Also, Mr. Clizer, before we make decisions, I 14 15 recall that you had a scheduling concern that you wanted 16 to bring up. 17 MR. CLIZER: My concern was that I have a 18 person who was previously scheduled to discuss on the 19 WNARRNA issue, which given that's the first thing on 20 Wednesday will most likely fall in the afternoon. 21 has a doctor's appointment in the afternoon. I'd like 22 to push it to the top of the day. 23 MR. THOMPSON: Staff has no objection to that. 24 MS. BOCKSTRUCK: Spire doesn't object, Your 2.5 Honor.

1	THE COURT: Granted.
2	MR. CLIZER: If I assume that there is limited
3	cross from the other Intervenors on the issue of
4	capitalization of overheads, which seems likely given
5	the current state of the hearing, I do not have much
6	cross of capitalization of overheads.
7	MR. THOMPSON: Neither do I.
8	MR. BOCKSTRUCK: The Company wanted to proceed
9	this evening on the issue.
10	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
11	MS. BOCKSTRUCK: I said the Company is willing
12	to proceed this evening on the issue of capitalization
13	of overhead.
14	THE COURT: Okay. Seeing no objections we're
15	going to proceed to our next issues.
16	That is capital overheads. Let me see who I
17	have on my witness list. Krick.
18	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Krick, please come
20	on up to our witness stand and
21	MS. BOCKSTRUCK: I believe we have mini
22	opening statements.
23	THE COURT: Mr. Krick, if you could please
24	hold on. We'll have mini opening statements first. I
25	appreciate that.

Okay. Let's keep with the same order. Spire for opening our mini opening statements, and this is concerning capital overheads.

Mr. Cooper, at your convenience.

2.5

OPENING STATEMENT

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

I guess for the court reporter this is Dean Cooper appearing on behalf of Spire Missouri.

Your Honor, Spire Missouri calculates its overhead capitalization rates in accordance with the uniform system of accounts using a reasonable and acceptable approach that is consistent with its historical practice, and charges overheads to capital that are reasonably applicable to its projects.

The Staff and OPC witnesses focus on those aspects of the USOA Gas Plant Instruction 4B that discusses direct time assignments and special studies. However, what the USOA prohibits in the last sentence of USOA Gas Plant Instruction 4B is the use of arbitrary percentages or amounts.

Spire Missouri capitalizes overheads using a systematic and consistent approach that primarily relies on cost causation factors to estimate the relationship of certain overhead costs to construction activities in lieu of studies. These factors are not fixed, but

rather are updated monthly as level of construction activities vary throughout the year and the seasons.

2.5

Spire Missouri's process is based on reason and judgment and, therefore, is not arbitrary.

Moreover, the general ledger contains transaction level support for these costs. No changes are necessary to the overhead capitalization amounts.

The Commission's report and order in Case No. GO-2019-0356, which was issued by the Commission on October 30 of 2019, similarly found that since Spire Missouri allocated overhead costs consistently with how these costs are allocated in the last general rate cases, it did not add arbitrary percentages for amounts to its overhead costs. The Commission concludes that Spire Missouri's treatment of overheads for purposes of these cases is allowable according to the USOA.

Further, Section 4 of 20CSR4240-40.040 allows the Commission to vary from the USOA where appropriate.

Spire Missouri's process for assigning overheads to capital investments has not fundamentally changed since that time. However, we are here because in reference to the ISRS case, the Commission further indicated that decisions varying from the method in the general rate case are best handled during the course of a rate case when there's more time for a full

examination and all rate factors are being reviewed.

That opportunity has been provided in this case,
however, the answer should be the same.

2.5

Further, while it's acknowledged that consistency for (connection disruption) is not a reason to do something, Spire's approaches provide stability for its customers and the Company in terms of rate impacts over many years.

Any restriction as to Spire's ability to capitalize overheads would necessitate a substantial increase to Spire's revenue requirement. This is because costs that are currently being allocated to capital and recovered over the life of those assets, would instead be shifted to expense and recovered on an annual basis.

As shown in the surrebuttal testimony of Company witness Timothy Krick, that could be an increase of as much as \$115 million in the Company's annual revenue requirement. This type of rate whip lash is neither good for customers nor the Company.

Now having said this, if on a going forward basis the Commission believes a special study or studies are necessary, Spire is very much willing to conduct such studies to share those results with the parties, and modify its procedures when rates are next set if

appropriate.

2.5

As you mentioned earlier, Your Honor, Spire will provide the testimony today of Mr. Timothy Krick, who is the vice president, controller and chief accounting officer of Spire Missouri.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

Next on our order of opening is Staff.

OPENING STATEMENT

MR. THOMPSON: May it please the Commission.

This is a straightforward issue. Staff attempted to audit the capitalized overheads and was unable to do so. Let me quote from the testimony of Mr. Young, Staff's expert.

In response to a data request asking for test year overhead employee costs and the related benefits that are capitalized, Spire stated it does not maintain records of such information.

Furthermore, Spire states that the allocation of costs to capital orders has dozens of steps, and is a complex systematic process. Consequently, Staff cannot accurately discern the origin of overhead costs that Spire is booking to its capital projects and including in its rate base.

Staff is unable to affirm that Spire is in compliance with USOA requirements found in Gas Plant

Instructions 3 and 4.

Consequently -- oh, and let me add, that Staff also is of the opinion that there are costs currently capitalized by Spire that appear to conflict with the quidance set forth in the USOA.

Consequently, Staff recommends that on a going forward basis the Commission should order Staff, or -- excuse me, Spire, to cease capitalizing non-operational overhead costs, or, alternatively, order Spire to cease capitalizing costs received from Spire Services until such time that Spire can demonstrate its compliance with the USOA.

Spire cannot be audited. That is simply a circumstance that cannot be permitted to persist. It's Staff's obligation as the investigatory arm of the Commission to determine whether or not utility companies are complying with Commission regulations. In this instance Staff is unable to do so.

Thank you.

Questions?

THE COURT: Following our list of openings I believe Legal Services. Mr. Barrs, you're next on our list. Did you have an opening for capital overheads?

MR. BARRS: I do not and sorry to try and clarify what I said earlier. I will not have mini

```
1
     opening statements on any other issues barring legal low
 2
     income issues scheduled for Friday.
 3
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Barrs. What about
 4
     cross-examination? Should I keep asking you on cross
 5
     too?
               MR. BARRS: Not for this witness. Thank you
 6
 7
     on this issue or on the witness for this issue.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.
 9
               Then our next opening statements Office of
     Public Counsel.
10
11
               Thank you, sir.
12
                        OPENING STATEMENT
13
               MR. CLIZER: If it would please the
     Commission.
14
15
               (Connection disruption.)
16
               MR. CLIZER: Regardless, I'll just project.
17
               No?
               THE COURT: No, because we have WebEx.
18
19
     have a court reporter.
20
               MR. CLIZER: Should I try and move it over
21
    here? I'm going to stand right here and do it because
22
     this is not going to take very long at all.
23
               Fortunately, I think Mr. -- I think Staff's
24
     attorney has summed up the problems with this issue
25
     admirably. I have very little to add to it.
```

As the excerpts that I handed out shows the 1 2 USOA prohibits assigning capitalizing to overheads -sorry. Capitalizing overheads based on arbitrary 3 percentages. The Company is using arbitrary percentages 4 to allocate its overheads. I mean there is really not a 5 6 whole lot more to it than that, honestly. 7 The Company talks about providing a study. Ι 8 would point out that the second full sentence says: 9 Where the procedure of using, you know, timecards is 10 practical, you shall provide a study basically if they 11 haven't already. They're already supposed to be doing 12 what they're suggesting they might do if the Commission wants them to. That's the whole problem here. They're 13 using arbitrary percentages. They're clearly not 14 15 allowed to. I second everything else that Staff said 16 and I have nothing else really further to add. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Clizer. 18 That will conclude our mini opening statements 19 on the issue of capital overheads. Again that is Issue 20 15. 21 We will go ahead and start with our witnesses. Witness Krick, K-r-i-c-k, could you please come up to 22 23 the witness stand. 24 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 25 (Witness sworn.)

GR-2021-0108, Vol. X

1	THE COURT: Thank you. Please take your seat.
2	And would you state and spell your name for the court
3	reporter.
4	THE WITNESS: Yeah. Timothy Krick, K-r-i-c-k.
5	THE COURT: And Spire's witness.
6	MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
7	TIMOTHY KRICK,
8	called on behalf of the Company, being sworn, testified
9	as follows:
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MR. COOPER:
12	Q. Mr. Krick, by whom are you employed and what
13	capacity?
14	A. I'm employed by Spire as controller and chief
15	accounting officer of Spire Missouri.
16	Q. Have you caused to be prepared for the
17	purposes of this case certain direct, rebuttal and
18	surrebuttal testimony in question and answer form?
19	A. Yes, I have.
20	Q. Is it your understanding that that testimony
21	has been marked as Exhibits 15, 16 and 17 for
22	identification?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Do you have any changes that you would like to
25	make to that testimony at this time?

I do have one minor change to my rebuttal on 1 2 page six. There's a table or image that was entered at 3 the top of the page that belonged at the bottom of the 4 page. 5 If the question comes up on that topic I can 6 point it out for you. 7 Yeah. So it should have been after which Ο. 8 answer? 9 The one at the bottom of page six. Α. 10 All right. So the answer that would start on Ο. 11 line 11 and end on line 15? 12 Correct. Yes. Α. If I ask you the questions which are contained 13 in Exhibits 15, 16 and 17 today, would your answers as 14 15 with the one change you noted be the same? 16 Yes, they would. Α. 17 Are those answers true and correct to the best of your information, knowledge and belief? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I would offer 21 Exhibits 15, 16 and 17 into evidence and tender the 22 witness for cross-examination. 23 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Cooper. 24 Are there any objections to the admission of

Exhibits 15, 16 or 17?

1 Hearing none they are so admitted. 2 The witness has been tendered, and according 3 to my official list of cross-examination we go to Staff. 4 MR. THOMPSON: Kevin Thompson for Staff. Thank you, Your Honor. No questions. 5 6 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. 7 Next we go to Office of the Public Counsel. 8 MR. CLIZER: No questions. Thank you, Your 9 Honor. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. 11 Let me check. I do have questions for you. EXAMINATION BY THE COURT: 12 13 Mr. Krick, what do you mean in your direct testimony on page 11 lines 22 to 23, and it's restated 14 15 again in your rebuttal, page ten lines 23 to 24 when you 16 say quote: The process and systems used to capitalize 17 overhead has changed in recent years. What did you mean 18 by that statement? We've enhanced our system, so we've actually 19 20 put in some newer systems as part of our Oracle system. 21 So we've actually enhanced the systems used to process 22 the allocation as somewhat as a result of the cases last 23 well too. We knew all parties desired more transparency 24 so we actually added additional accounts to provide

2.5

additional transparency.

Q. Thank you. When did those changes occur?

- A. We implemented them at the beginning of fiscal year '20.
- Q. Both Staff witness Matt Young, and OPC witness Bob Schallenberg state that Spire does not maintain the records required under the USOA Gas Plant Section 4 overhead construction costs to support its allocation of costs to capital projects.

A Staff witness, Matt Young states, and I am referring to his surrebuttal page 18 line ten quote: Furthermore, the only time general and administrative expenses can be capitalized when the incremental cost method is not used, the studies are made to determine a relationship to construction. Spire has provided no such studies end quote.

Do you agree with his statement?

- A. Somewhat. We provide -- we use different causal relationships to approximate what a study would provide, or better said, in lieu of what a formal study would provide, and these are the same causal relationships that we've used and updated for my seven years here, and I suspect the case before that.
- Q. Thank you. And has Spire completed the studies that were required by the USOA to determine the relationship between general and administrative costs?

We have not performed formal studies by a 1 Α. 2 third party. We've performed internal studies meant to approximate or provide similar evidence. 3 Okay. Has Spire required its supervisors to 5 maintain -- maintain timecards that identify how their 6 time is spent? 7 Α. They do. 8 Q. Is Spire STL Pipeline regulated by the Federal 9 Energy Regulatory Commission? 10 Α. Yes. 11 Do you know if Spire STL Pipeline is required Ο. 12 to follow the FERC USOA? 13 Α. Yes. Yes, you know, or yes, it is? 14 Ο. 15 I know that Spire STL Pipeline is Α. 16 required to follow the FERC USOA. 17 O. Thank you. Sorry. Lawyers. 18 Α. Yes. 19 Do you know who D. Scott Sabbert is? Ο. 20 Α. Yes, I do. 21 Would you tell me? Ο. 22 Sure. He is a peer of mine at the Company. Α. 23 He is the vice president of financial planning and

analysis and supply chain. He also serves as the chief

financial officer of the pipeline and our marketing

24

1	business.
2	Q. Okay.
3	THE COURT: I am checking. I do not have any
4	further questions. Okay.
5	We now go back to recross. So going to my
6	handy list of cross-examination for a Spire witness we
7	go first to Staff.
8	MR. THOMPSON: Kevin Thompson for Staff. No
9	questions. Thank you, Judge.
10	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.
11	Next we go to Mr. Clizer for the Office of the
12	Public Counsel.
13	MR. CLIZER: No questions. Thank you.
14	THE COURT: Thank you.
15	And we go to redirect.
16	MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	I guess for the court reporter this is Dean
18	Cooper again.
19	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. COOPER:
21	Q. Mr. Krick, you were asked questions by Judge
22	Hatcher starting with how the process has changed over
23	recent years. What is the process that was being
24	referred to?
25	A. The process is how we allocate overheads to

construction projects?

Q. Yes.

2.5

A. Can I just write it? Is that what you're asking? So we have a general ledger that maintains each and every detail of every transaction that could be in the form of an invoice by a third party. That could be a time record of an employee, and that could be a general ledger of entry. So within that general ledger we also have spot ledgers that maintain additional details of each and every one of those transactions.

We provided the general ledger as part of the request to Staff and OPC that included every one of those details. We did receive some questions. I heard also that they couldn't conclude -- they couldn't do an audit, which with all of the details we provided, I'm puzzled to understand why they couldn't accomplish an audit.

- Q. Did you offer to provide additional information?
- A. We did, knowing that there are lots of details associated with this, we went back to Staff and offered to provide exactly what they asked for, and we did mention that it would be a heavy lift, and that maybe some type of sampling method would be more appropriate, and that they would -- we would follow up after their

initial direct was filed. To my knowledge I don't think there was really any further follow-up.

- Q. And when you say, there was no follow-up, you mean by the Company or by the Staff or what are you referring to?
- A. From the Staff there was no additional questions to further perform audit activities.

2.5

- Q. You reference in response to a bench question the causal relationship. Can you tell me how that causal relationship is established by the Company?
- A. One of the primary relationships we used is field direct labor as a percentage of total field labor. That obviously drives a lot of activity to the Company as it relates to construction activity.

We also have various causal factors within the operation where vehicle usage is one, and other types of overheads that get consumed in the construction process. So we use again, with the direct labor for a lot of our A&G costs, which has been the discussion here, but there's lots of other overheads that we apply with other types of costs drivers, cost causation drivers.

- Q. Once that causal relationship is established how often do you update it?
- A. Well, we update that causal relationship at least annually in the budgeting process, but when it

2.5

comes to allocating overheads to capital it's a monthly process because we do have -- if you have a very warm winter, we may get some construction activities done, and the overheads that support that would then be capitalized. But if we had a very cold winter, very little capital would be done in the winter, and all that would go to O&M.

So one of my -- in my testimony I mentioned that if we did a study that is more of a static one time snapshot of what -- how does overhead support construction, and that's why I feel like our method is appropriate because it adjusts monthly.

- Q. You got a bench question that asked about I think required studies if I heard correctly. Do you necessarily agree that studies are required by the USOA?
- A. If you read it black-and-white, and I think there's -- there's -- I feel like this part of the USOA is somewhat vague. There's terms in there, reasonably applicable, equitable proportion as far as practical.

So again, I think a study is one way of doing that, but I also think a reasonable method is to, you know, use a causal relationship such as we did.

MR. COOPER: I don't have any more questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

```
I believe that wraps us up for this witness.
 1
 2
               Mr. Krick, you are excused.
               Mr. Young for Staff is our next witness.
 3
                                                          Ιf
     Mr. Young would make his way to the witness stand.
 4
               (Witness sworn.)
 5
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Please have a
 6
 7
     seat and state and spell your name for the court
 8
     reporter.
 9
               THE WITNESS: Sure. My name is Matthew Young.
     M-a-t-t-h-e-w Y-o-u-n-q.
10
11
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Young.
12
               And, Staff, your witness.
               MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. This is
13
14
     Kevin Thompson for Staff.
15
                          MATTHEW YOUNG,
     called on behalf of the Staff, being sworn, testified as
16
17
     follows:
18
                        DIRECT EXAMINATION
19
     BY MR. THOMPSON
20
          O.
               Good evening, Mr. Young.
21
               Good evening.
          Α.
22
               How are you employed?
          Q.
23
               I am a regulatory officer for the Missouri
     Public Service Commission Staff.
24
2.5
          O.
               Are you the same Matthew Young that prepared
```

1	or caused to be prepared rebuttal testimony marked as
2	Exhibit 125, surrebuttal testimony marked as Exhibit 140
3	and contributed to Staff's revenue requirement cost of
4	service report both public and confidential marked as
5	Exhibit 101?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to any
8	of those pieces of testimony?
9	A. No.
10	Q. If I were to ask you the same questions today
11	would your answers be the same?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And are those answers true and correct to the
14	best of your knowledge and belief?
15	A. Yes.
16	MR. THOMPSON: At this time, Your Honor, I
17	would offer Exhibits 125 and 140.
18	THE COURT: Thank you.
19	Are there any objections to Exhibit 125 or
20	Exhibit 140 being admitted onto the hearing record?
21	Hearing no objections it's so admitted.
22	MR. THOMPSON: I tender the witness for
23	cross-examination.
24	THE COURT: Thank you.
25	And according to my handy list we go to Spire.

1	MR. COOPER: It seems like we would be after
2	OPC, Your Honor.
3	THE COURT: I am referring to it's page 10.
4	I don't know where it came from. All I took was page
5	10. But the order of opening statements and the order
6	of cross-examination.
7	Staff, this seems like it was one of the
8	schedules produced. Maybe one of the very initial
9	schedules. If Spire wants to pass I'm happy to call in
10	OPC first.
11	MR. COOPER: No. We have some questions.
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MR. COOPER: But the normal sort of practice I
14	think we would follow Mr. Clizer on this.
15	Judge, I'm going to hand to Mr. Young, with
16	your permission, the document that Mr. Clizer passed out
17	during his opening statement.
18	THE COURT: Go ahead.
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. COOPER:
21	Q. Mr. Young, would you agree that when we talk
22	about capitalized overheads, the base costs that are at
23	issue are costs that were incurred by Spire Missouri;
24	correct?
25	A. I'm not quite in addition to the cost

incurred by Spire Missouri, there is a litany of costs 1 2 incurred by --COURT REPORTER: (Asking for assistance.) 3 I said that in addition THE WITNESS: Sure. 4 5 to the costs incurred by Spire Missouri there are also 6 costs that flow through Spire Services. 7 BY MR. COOPER: 8 Q. And when you talk about costs that have flowed 9 through Spire Services, those costs as well as the costs that are incurred by Spire Missouri itself, that's the 10 11 pool of costs that we're talking about when we start to 12 move towards what should or shouldn't be capitalized as a part of the overheads; correct? 13 14 Α. Yes. 15 And ultimately the question we're dealing with in this issue is: What portion of those costs should be 16 17 capitalized along with the construction projects as 18 opposed to expense. Is that an accurate statement? 19 Α. Yes. And what I handed you -- well, let me back up. 20 Ο. 21 Do you recognize what I handed you? 22 It appears to be an Instruction 4 of the USOA. Α.

times in your testimony, but in particular I think in

your rebuttal testimony you quoted from A, Subpart A

Okay. And I think you quoted this several

23

24

2.5

Ο.

where it talks about the types of overhead construction costs such as engineering supervision, general office salaries and expenses, construction engineering and supervision by others and onward. Do you remember doing that?

- A. I believe it was my surrebuttal. It could be both. Yes, I do.
- Q. And again, those types of costs if not capitalized, you would expect them to be expensed; correct?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. Now in this case we're dealing with amounts that have -- overheads that have already been capitalized on Spire Missouri's books; correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And on a going forward basis, no provision is made in Staff's revenue requirement to treat any of the previously capitalized types of expenses as -- or capitalized amounts as expenses going forward; is that correct?
- A. That's correct. In my direct testimony one of my recommendations was for the Commission to order adjustments to reflect their decision on this issue and that's what I was referring to. Unfortunately, I just don't have a number.

1 Q. Say that again.

- A. In my direct testimony one of my recommendations was for an accounting adjustment to reflect the Commission's decision. Unfortunately, I just don't have a number.
- Q. And by that accounting adjustment, would that be additional expenses that would've been added to the Staff's revenue requirement?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now looking back at that excerpt from
 Instruction 4 that you have in front of you and still in
 Subpart A, would you agree with me that after that
 listing of types of overheads, it goes on to state that
 these shall be charged the particular jobs or units on
 the basis of the amount that such overhead reasonably
 applicable thereto?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now neither you nor any other Staff witness have filed testimony suggesting that the underlying costs that have been capitalized were not prudently incurred; have you?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Again, if we look at our Gas Plant Instruction 4 that's in front of you, and Mr. Clizer conveniently highlighted this sentence. The last sentence of Subpart

B states: The addition to direct construction costs of arbitrary percentages or amounts to cover assumed overheard costs is not permitted; correct?

A. Correct.

- Q. So while 4 B identifies direct time reporting and special studies as permitted, what it straight out prohibits is the capitalization of arbitrary percentages or amounts; correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Would you agree with me that a common definition of arbitrary would be not done according to reason or judgment?
 - A. That's not in the applicable definition.
- Q. Now in your surrebuttal in your description of Spire Missouri's process, you state that: Instead of conducting studies of the time charged to clearing accounts by its employees, Spire uses the direct labor charges as the basis of distributing overhead payroll costs; correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And I think you further explain that Spire has assumed there is a relationship between how construction employees use their time and how a supervisor's time is used?
 - A. Yes, and that's what makes it an arbitrary

sentence.

- Q. Well, that's my question for you. Doesn't the method used by Spire use reason or judgment? It's just not the reason or judgment that you think they should use?
- A. It's not the -- it's not reasonable to just assume that the supervisors and their supervisors and all the way up to who knows how far up the hierarchy of the employees, that their time is dictated by how the time is reported by the field employees.
- Q. But let's back up a second. I mean you're making an assumption as to how this plays out down the road. But at the fundamental level, there is reason or judgment in terms of how Spire Missouri approaches these overheads, the capitalization of overheads; correct?
 - A. No. We won't know until we see how their -COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
 THE WITNESS: How Spire's reasoning was laid

20 BY MR. COOPER:

out.

Q. Now just for sort of explanation I guess of impacts here, and you and I talked about this at the beginning of the questions, but that to the extent capitalized amounts or amounts are not capitalized, they would be expensed; correct?

A. Correct.

- Q. And I think in your portion of the Staff report for the cost of service, you kind of explain that to some extent; correct?
 - A. I don't recall doing that.
- Q. Okay. Well, let's get at it this way. Would you agree that at a very rough kind of high level that the revenue requirement impact of capitalized amounts is about ten percent?
 - A. That's a good ballpark estimate, yes.
- Q. So, for example, if \$1 million of overheads are capitalized, all else being equal, you'd expect an increase in revenue requirement of about a hundred thousand?
- A. I don't know about any -- would contribute to the revenue requirement by a hundred thousand.
- Q. Okay. On the other hand -- well, let me say, if we go the other direction, if we say that million dollars of cost is not capitalized and instead expensed, again, all else being equal, that million dollars would increase the revenue requirement by a million dollars; correct?
- A. If you moved the hundred million dollars from rate base to expense, it also affects depreciation expense and then rate of return. So it would probably

be a net increase of 70 to 80 million if you moved it from rate base to expense.

- Q. Well, we not only pause because we kind of ended up starting from a different number I think in our hypotheticals, but your hypothetical was working with a hundred million dollars coming out of rate base and going into expense; correct?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. And so you would expect that you would have some offsets, but you think that would still impact revenue requirement by 70 to 80 million; correct?
- A. Yes. There would be no doubt there's a short-term increase I'm talking about.
- Q. And again, if we go back to my first example, if we said a hundred million in rate base, what would you expect the revenue requirement impact to be, and we talked about ten percent, it would only be a hundred -- now I've got myself confused. Ten million in that example; correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Now in your surrebuttal testimony you cite to a NARUC interpretation of the USOA for electric and gas utilities; don't you?
 - A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. And you attached that, in fact, to the

1	schedule here to your surrebuttal?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Now the USOA applicable to Spire Missouri is
4	or yeah, the USOA applicable to Spire Missouri is
5	created by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or
6	FERC; correct?
7	A. That's right.
8	Q. And not NARUC?
9	A. Correct.
10	Q. And the NARUC interpretation you provided is
11	dated September of 1988; correct?
12	A. That's correct.
13	Q. Is that the most recent interpretation of the
14	FERC electric and gas USOA that NARUC has published?
15	A. As far as I'm aware that's the only
16	interpretation.
17	Q. And, in fact, that 1988 interpretation would
18	predate the version of the FERC USOA that's utilized by
19	this Commission; correct?
20	A. That's probably correct but I think the
21	language is identical.
22	Q. Is there a reason that this 1988 NARUC
23	interpretation has not been relied on by the Staff over
24	the last 32 plus years?

A. I'm not aware of the time that it has been

brought forth as an issue to be considered.

- Q. It's been there since 1988 but can you tell me again what your response is?
- A. My response is I'm not aware of any case since 1988 where the interpretation of Gas Plant Instructions 3 and 4 has been considered in a rate case.
- Q. Now I think as a consequence of the Staff position, and this is in your testimony, Staff recommends that the Commission should order Spire to cease capitalizing nonoperational overhead costs, or as an alternative, order Spire to cease capitalizing costs received from Spire Services until such time that Spire can demonstrate its compliance at the USOA. Is that accurate?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. In Staff's proposal, who's going to decide that Spire has demonstrated its compliance?
- A. Well, I had envisioned that Spire and Staff and Public Counsel would cooperate and provide status reports to Commission, and decide how to implement that in Spire's general rate cases.
- Q. So you would envision then that none of these amounts would be returned to being capitalized as overhead until the next rate case?
 - A. Well, the problem is, what we don't want is a

1	large adjustment to expense to charge rate payers as a
2	result of this case, and then in between rate cases
3	Spire is allowed to put those costs in the rate base and
4	not be expensed out. And so there's a I guess
5	there's got to be some consideration of what repairs are
6	made.
7	Q. So tell me how that would work between cases.
8	Are you proposing that there be a regulatory asset that
9	would hold those costs in between rate cases?
10	A. I don't think so. I think you quantify what
11	we're putting in the rates in the current case, and make
12	a best effort not to double recover from rate
13	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
14	THE WITNESS: Double recover from rate payers.
15	BY MR. COOPER:
16	Q. What are you going to do if at the end of this
17	process it's determined that well, I guess I'm
18	struggling with how this is going to play out in that
19	next rate case. So, are you going to go back and pick
20	up some of these expenses that should have been paid by
21	the rate payers in the next rate case?
22	A. No. I think if we put in for an expense
23	repairs will have paid it solely. There is no
24	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)

25

THE COURT: Put the mic really close to your

mouth. I think that's the issues.

THE WITNESS: So I think my answer was that the costs that are charged to rate payers will be charged to rate payers and there won't be a pool of costs that should've been charged. And in the next rate case we'll have some work done about how Spire has complied with the USOA.

BY MR. COOPER:

- Q. But in the meantime, aren't you holding back some amount of costs that Spire Missouri would have otherwise capitalized?
- A. If there is a mismatch it's just because I can't quantify the overheads, and it will depend on what the Commission orders.
- Q. We talked about this a little earlier, but is a special study, or I guess a series of special studies one of the ways you would envision Spire would demonstrate its compliance with the USOA?
- A. I think what we've been -- what Staff has been looking for is just the rationale and the basis of how overheads are sent to capital, and however that looks, whether it's a special study by a third party or whether it's a formal documentation I don't know.
- MR. COOPER: That's all the questions I have,
 Your Honor.

1	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cooper.
2	Remind me where we're at.
3	Thank you, Mr. Clizer. Go ahead.
4	MR. CLIZER: I'm going to try and keep mine as
5	short as possible.
6	CROSS-EXAMINATION
7	BY MR. CLIZER:
8	Q. Good evening, Mr. Cooper.
9	A. Good evening.
10	Q. Do you have a copy
11	MR. COOPER: Good evening.
12	MR. CLIZER: I do apologize. It is late.
13	BY MR. CLIZER:
14	Q. Do you have a copy of your surrebuttal in
15	front of you?
16	A. I do.
17	Q. Can you go to page 19?
18	A. I'm there.
19	Q. I'm going to attempt to paraphrase lines 14
20	through 18, and feel free to correct me, but would you
21	agree that you're effectively saying that Spire does not
22	keep sufficient records regarding the capitalization of
23	overhead costs due to complete your audit?
24	A. Yes. In multiple data requests in an attempt
25	to evaluate USOA's instructions, I guess Plant

Instruction No. 4 paragraph C where overhead construction costs shall be kept to show each overhead in nature and amount charged to each work order and each plant account and the basis of distribution. And so in the surrebuttal that you asked about, Spire has not been able to provide anything and satisfy that instruction.

- Q. Do you have a copy of Mr. Schallenberg's direct?
 - A. Yes.

2.5

- Q. Would you go to page 25 of the direct?

 MR. CLIZER: Your Honor, I would note that Mr. Schallenberg's direct was filed confidential in its entirety. I'm going to pose this question in a manner that hopefully does not touch on any confidentiality, nor do I think confidentiality would be an issue with what we are discussing with regard to my questions right now. I want to put you on notice of that fact.

 BY MR. CLIZER:
- Q. So can you read lines 22 through line 5 on the next page to yourself? You don't have to read it out loud. Just read it to yourself.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Would you agree that that recommendation would at least help to alleviate the problems you identified on page 19 of your surrebuttal that I asked you about

previously?

- A. I agree that would help.
- Q. That would help. Mr. Young, I really want to call you something different. I apologize. Mr. Young, do you know for certain right now the amounts currently being booked as expense overheads and being collected in base rates are not going to be further capitalized to ISRS projects in the future?
- A. I don't know. I wouldn't have a guess about ISRS projects. I know Mr. Schallenberg's direct -- well, on that page you've directed me to, it quotes \$173 million of overheads that are being capitalized. I believe Mr. Krick's surrebuttal it states \$87 million of overheads are being capitalized before an income tax factor, of which I don't think is applicable. But the answer is, no. The amounts are confusing.
- Q. Okay. Maybe I didn't phrase that question correctly. I'm not asking about the amounts. I'm asking about whether or not you can say for certain right now, that whatever is being capitalized and expensed in overheads will not be further -- sorry. Excuse myself.

Can you say for certain right now that whatever is being expensed to overheads currently and included in base rates will not be further capitalized

1	in a future ISRS project?
2	A. I don't know. I can't say for certain. You
3	know, the level of expense I guess the level of
4	overhead changes every year and there's a
5	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)
6	THE WITNESS: A lot of moving pieces.
7	BY MR. CLIZER:
8	Q. On that same page 25 of Mr. Schallenberg's
9	direct, lines 19 through 21 he proposes a tracker. Now
10	I know that you have voiced opposition to this tracker.
11	My question is: Would that tracker at least
12	make it more likely that it is possible to determine
13	whether amounts currently being booked as an expense as
14	overheads are being capitalized to ISRS projects in the
15	future?
16	A. I just don't know how it would work.
17	Q. Fair enough.
18	MR. CLIZER: I believe that was all my
19	questions.
20	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Clizer.
21	We'll now turn to bench questions. I'll ask
22	the Commissioners first. Do any Commissioners have any
23	questions for Mr. Young?
24	Okay. Hearing none the Judge does have a few
25	questions.

EXAMINATION BY THE COURT:

- Q. First, Mr. Young, do you know if the Missouri PSC has adopted the FERC Form 2, and that's spelled F-E-R-C? Has the Missouri PSC adopted the FERC Form 2 as the annual report required to be submitted by its gas regulated entity?
 - A. I believe it has.
- Q. Mr. Young, do you know if the parties were provided a copy of the 2020 annual report submitted by Spire STL Pipeline with FERC during this case?
 - A. I don't know.
 - O. Okay. Thank you.

In your surrebuttal testimony page 16 lines 13 to 16 you state quote: Spire comes to the conclusion that costs are not unique in nature and are equally eligible for capitalization. For example, Spire applies the same capital transfer rate to injuries and damages insurance, and nearly the entire office supply's account and directors' and officers' insurance, despite the varying relationship of those costs to construction end quote.

What is the capital transfer rate Spire applied to injuries and damages insurance, office supplies, and directors' and officers' insurance?

A. I can't recall the percentage itself. I

believe it would have been the three factor general
allocator.

O. Without Spire completing a study of superal

- Q. Without Spire completing a study of supervisor timecard distributions, would there be any way to determine an appropriate capital transfer rate based on the requirements of the USOA?
- A. I'm sorry. Could you repeat the first part of that question.
- Q. Without Spire completing a study of supervisor timecard distributions, would there be any way without that to determine an appropriate capital transfer rate based on the requirements of the USOA?
- A. I think they would have to look at the time cards of their employees and come to some sort of documented conclusion to apply the transfer rate.
- Q. I'm hearing you answer -- I'm hearing you answer in the negative but I'm not hearing you say no. So I'm going to ask the question. Without Spire completing a study of the supervisor timecard distributions, would there be any way to determine an appropriate capital transfer rate based on the USOA requirements?
- A. Off the top of my head, no, I can't think of any way based on USOA language they could do that.
 - Q. Thank you. Could Staff have performed its own

Spire supervisor time report to determine an overhead capitalization rate that would comply with the USOA?

A. No.

2.5

Q. In your rebuttal testimony page five line seven to ten you state -- let me tell you the question first. I'm going to explain what you -- I'm going to ask for you to explain what you mean by nonoperational overheads.

Here's the quote. For everyone else I'm looking at page -- rebuttal page five line seven to ten. Quote: Staff recommended that, on a going forward basis, the Commission should order Spire to cease capitalizing nonoperational overhead costs, or as an alternative order -- as an alternative order Spire to cease capitalizing costs received from Spire Services, until such a time as Spire can demonstrate its compliance with the USOA.

So I ask you in the middle of that quote, please explain what you meant by, nonoperational overhead costs.

A. When I came up with the term, nonoperational overhead costs, I was referencing and I should have done it in testimony, I was referencing the direct testimony of Mr. Krick in Case Numbers GO20190356 and GO20190357.

On page six of his testimony he breaks down capital

costs into direct charges, operational overheads and nonoperational overheads, and those are described as employee benefits, shared service and administrative and general costs.

- Q. I want to make sure I have that straight. The report and order that we took notice of and only took notice of your report and order, are you stating that you got that phrase and definition non -- where did it go -- nonoperational overhead costs from Mr. Krick of Spire's testimony from a different case?
- A. That's correct. But basically I've had a nonoperational overhead costs are indirect costs in regard to construction that are not related to fieldwork. That's what I had envisioned when I use that term.
- Q. Just for my education, not related to fieldwork, are we then talking about the office workers that somehow participate -- I'm talking about architects, lawyers, planners --
- A. Sorry to interrupt. All of the things that Spire charges to construction such as the engineering, the corporate engineering function, the new growth support and there are several others, but, yes, the corporate type costs.
 - O. Okay. How in general would the amount of

nonoperational overhead differ from costs capitalized from Spire Services?

- A. Spire Services costs are embedded in the nonoperational overhead costs. So Spire Services costs, if I understand it correctly, are a subset of nonoperational costs.
 - Q. Okay. Let me pause here.

THE COURT: Sherry, if you can unmute and let me know how you're doing? If you need a break? I think we might be at least another 30 minutes give or take.

COURT REPORTER: I can go that long without a break.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's proceed.

BY THE COURT:

Q. Mr. Young, I've got two more questions. In the direct testimony of OPC Robert Schallenberg Schedule RES-D-4 it is stated that the test year overheads of Spire Missouri East and West combined to a total of 172 million and a rounded number. The schedule lists different types of overhead and the amounts of each type of overhead for East and West separately if the Commission were to order Spire to cease capitalizing nonoperational overhead costs. Would that eliminate all of the overhead types that appear on Schallenberg's Direct Schedule RES-D-4 or are the nonoperational

overheads only a part of the \$172.8 million total?

2.5

- A. I didn't bring Mr. Schallenberg schedules, so I don't recall exactly what that list looks like. It seems like if the Commission were to order all of those costs not go into capital, if I remember the schedule, it would be almost the entire list.
- Q. Okay. I believe this is the last question for me. What information would Spire need to provide to the Staff for Staff to be able to audit Spire Missouri's capitalized overhead costs and to determine if Spire were in compliance with the USOA?
- A. If Spire were to be able to provide some record of its plant accounts that displays the nature and amount of each overhead, which Spire has not been able to provide, not in the general ledger, then that would be a good start, and then we could move on to -- but if we do the nature and quantity we could move on to the basis of the relationship to construction.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Young.

Before I tender the witness, I'm going to take official notice of the Spire Missouri East and West annual report submitted to the Missouri Public Service Commission for 2020.

Where are we at? This leads to some recross.

Let's check our official list.

```
For Staff witnesses. My apologies, Mr.
 1
 2
              Would you like to go first or should I call
     OPC?
 3
 4
               MR. COOPER: Are my choices first or not at
 5
     all?
 6
               THE COURT: No.
                                No. I'll let you go last.
               MR. COOPER: Really? I'll go last.
 7
 8
               THE COURT: Mr. Clizer.
 9
               MR. CLIZER: No further questions.
10
               THE COURT: Okay.
11
               And, Mr. Cooper.
12
               MR. COOPER:
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
                        CROSS-EXAMINATION
13
     BY MR. COOPER:
14
15
               Mr. Young, the Judge asked you a question as
16
     to what types of things would need to be supplied;
17
     correct?
18
          Α.
               Correct.
19
               And do you remember did you have an e-mail
20
     exchange with Mr. Selinger of Spire Missouri in regard
21
     to information that might be available and different
22
     types of information that the Company might be able to
23
    provide?
24
          Α.
               I remember that, yes.
25
          Q.
               Okay.
```

MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I'd like to mark an 1 2 exhibit if I could. THE COURT: You're going to be introducing 3 that to be offered onto the record? 4 5 MR. COOPER: I am, correct. I believe Exhibit 6 46, Your Honor, if that's consistent with your record. 7 THE COURT: Exhibit 46. MR. COOPER: Thank you. 8 9 BY MR. COOPER: 10 Mr. Young, you let me know when you've had a 11 chance to look at Exhibit 46. 12 Α. Okav. 13 Do you recognize that to be an exchange, an 14 e-mail exchange you had with Mr. Selinger of Spire 15 Missouri? 16 Yes, it is. Α. 17 O. And Mr. Selinger had offered some different 18 ways to get at the underlying information; correct? 19 He offered what he could offer. 20 Ο. And as of May 4th you had suggested that 21 perhaps everyone could come back to that after Staff's 22 filing; correct? 23 Α. I did. Did you ever go back to that after Staff's 24 Ο. 2.5 filing?

1	A. No. At this point it was clear that Spire
2	couldn't provide overheads by cost elements and
3	accounts.
4	Q. And so you never went back to see what
5	Mr. Selinger had offered or could provide in that
6	regard?
7	A. No. He said it would require a lot of waiver.
8	Called it a Big Lift, and I didn't want him to go
9	through all the exercise to provide a bunch of data that
10	wasn't going to help my audit.
11	Q. So you never requested that Big Lift; correct?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. It was mentioned in one of the Judge's
14	well, let me back up.
15	MR. COOPER: Judge, I would offer Exhibit 46.
16	THE COURT: These are the e-mails that were
17	just passed out. Does any party have any objection to
18	admission of Exhibit 46 on to the hearing record?
19	MR. CLIZER: I would well, to what extent
20	is it being offered, because my objection is hearsay
21	unless it's only being offered to the extent it proves a
22	statement by Mr. Young. Mr. Selinger's statements are
23	hearsay. So I think Mr. Young has authenticated this as
24	a conversation he had with a representative of the

Company, and so I think it comes in for whatever ways

the Commission chooses to provide it. 1 2 I would offer that if it's being introduced -- if the Commission is only accepting the portion that 3 4 Mr. Young replies and every statement of the witness. THE COURT: The Commissioners are very aware 5 6 of the hearsay rule, and I will let them take this under 7 their hat to determine its weight. 8 The objection is overruled. The exhibit is 9 admitted onto the record. 10 BY MR. COOPER: 11 Mr. Young, one of the Judge's questions I 12 think referred to a three factor test in terms of the assignment of certain costs to capitalized overheads. 13 14 Is there -- is the three factor test really applicable 15 to the assignment of or the establishment of capitalized overheads, or is that a term that would normally be 16 17 utilized in regard to corporate allocations? That's correct. 18 Α. COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.) 19 20 THE WITNESS: That's correct. It is more applicable to distributing costs to affiliates. 21 22 BY MR. COOPER: 23 Q. Again, there was some questions about what you 24 meant by nonoperational costs that came from the bench, 25 and that was referenced back to your or Staff's

recommendation that the capitalization of those costs be 1 2 ceased. Again, no matter what constitutes those costs 3 4 or what amount they're in, there is no provision made in 5 Staff's case for treating those costs as expenses in the 6 alternatives to capitalizing them as a part of the 7 overheads; correct? 8 Α. That's right. 9 MR. COOPER: That's all the questions I have, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: And we come to redirect. 11 12 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 14 BY MR. THOMPSON: 15 So picking up with the question that Mr. Cooper just asked, you never suggested that any 16 17 costs that have already been booked to overheads --18 I'm sorry. I'm having a hard time hearing the 19 last part of that. 20 COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.) 21 MR. THOMPSON: I don't know what I was saying 22 anyway. Let me try again. This is Kevin Thompson for 23 Staff. BY MR. THOMPSON: 24 2.5 O. Your recommendation was for a change in

1 practice going forward; isn't that correct? 2 Α. That is correct. Okay. And did you envision any fixed amount 3 Ο. that had already been capitalized being instead 4 5 expensed? No, I did not. 6 Α. 7 So this wasn't going to be a financial Ο. disaster? 8 I didn't make it into disallowance for 9 Α. Spire's cost of service. 10 11 Okay. Now with respect to Exhibit 46, do you 12 have that up there? Was that the e-mail, or was that the --13 Α. 14 Ο. That was the e-mail. 15 Α. Okay. Take a look at page two, and in the middle do 16 Ο. 17 you see there's an e-mail from you dated April 29th? 18 Α. Yes. 19 And the second paragraph there or maybe it's 20 the third, anyway there is a mention of a spreadsheet. 21 Do you see that? 22 Α. I do. 23 It says a spreadsheet similar to what we look at in the ISRS case? 24

2.5

Α.

Yes.

1	Q. Did you ever get a spreadsheet like that?			
2	A. Mr. Selinger offered it, but that was what he			
3	would call Heavy Lift to us to reference to support the			
4	entire			
5	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)			
6	THE WITNESS: Rate base.			
7	BY MR. THOMPSON: I'm looking, Judge. There's			
8	a lot of questions to go through.			
9	BY MR. THOMPSON:			
10	Q. What about a tracker, Mr. Young? You were			
11	asked about OPC's tracker suggestion. Is that something			
12	that you're in favor of?			
13	A. No. As I was some of the rest of my			
14	rebuttal testimony. Not only with a tracker I don't			
15	know how we can mechanically implement it. I don't know			
16	if overhead costs are if they qualify for the			
17	Commission's usual standards on what is tracking and not			
18	tracking.			
19	Q. And with respect to the excerpt from the			
20	uniform system of accounts, do you have that there?			
21	A. Yes.			
22	Q. And looking at paragraph C, is it your			
23	professional opinion that Spire complied with paragraph			
24	C?			
25	A. My opinion is that it did not comply with			

```
1
     paragraph C.
 2
               I have no further questions.
               MR. THOMPSON:
 3
                              Thank you.
 4
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.
               I believe that will lead us to conclude
 5
 6
     Mr. Young's testimony.
 7
               You are excused, sir. Thank you.
 8
               As Mr. Schallenberg makes his way to the stand
 9
     I would like to pass on a request to the counsel for
             The Commission would like to see a copy of the
10
     Spire.
11
     Spire STL Pipeline 2020 FERC Form 2 annual report as an
12
     exhibit.
13
               Okay. Request is passed on.
14
               Mr. Schallenberg, raise your right hand.
15
               (Witness sworn.)
16
               THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Please have a
17
            Pull the microphone very close to your mouth and
18
     state and spell your last name for our court reporter.
19
               THE WITNESS: Robert E. Schallenberg,
20
     S-c-h-a-l-l-e-n-b-e-r-q.
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Schallenberg.
21
22
               And this will be our final witness for today.
23
     We will be adjourning after this witness.
24
               It is Counsel's witness. Mr. Clizer go ahead.
2.5
               MR. CLIZER: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

1	ROBERT E. SCHALLENBERG,			
2	called on behalf of OPC, being sworn, testified as			
3	follows:			
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
5	BY MR. CLIZER:			
6	Q. Mr. Schallenberg, by whom are you employed and			
7	in what capacity?			
8	A. I am employed by the Office of the Public			
9	Counsel and my job title is			
10	COURT REPORTER: (Asked for clarification.)			
11	Director of Policy?			
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.			
13	BY MR. CLIZER:			
14	Q. Did you prepare or cause to be prepared direct			
15	testimony, rebuttal testimony and surrebuttal testimony			
16	for this hearing?			
17	A. Yes.			
18	Q. Did you also receive an order from the			
19	Commission to correct your rebuttal testimony to add			
20	page numbers?			
21	A. Yes.			
22	Q. Did we file a corrected version of your			
23	testimony with page numbers?			
24	A. Yes.			
25	Q. Regarding the direct testimony, corrected			

1	rebuttal testimony and surrebuttal testimony, do you
2	have any changes you would like to make?
3	A. No.
4	Q. If I asked you the same questions that were
5	proposed in your testimony today, would your answers be
6	the same or substantially similar?
7	A. Yes.
8	MR. CLIZER: I would offer 203C, 204P, 204C
9	and 205C, which are respectively the direct testimony,
10	corrected rebuttal testimony public, corrected rebuttal
11	testimony confidential and surrebuttal testimony of
12	Mr. Schallenberg.
13	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Clizer.
14	I will not repeat the list. You all heard the
15	exhibits. Are there any objections to the admission of
16	Mr. Schallenberg's various testimonies?
17	Seeing no objection it is so admitted.
18	MR. CLIZER: Your Honor, I would note that we
19	initially filed the rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony
20	as confidential in their entirety. This was a
21	precautionary measure because we felt like we were
22	finding a large amount of confidential information.
23	If the Commission would so well, the OPC is
24	not claiming any of the information filed as
25	confidential, being claimed as confidential by Spire.

If the Commission would so like, we can let Spire 1 2 determine if there's any portions. Obviously if they don't consider them confidential, and we may be able to 3 file public, I'd offer that to both Spire and the 4 5 Commission, otherwise we are prepared to stand on them 6 being completely confidential. 7 Obviously, nobody's going to make a decision 8 right now if necessary. I'm just throwing that out 9 there. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. I appreciate that. We'll take that under advisement and I'll let you guys 11 12 and ladies talk about that amongst yourselves. 13 Just for future reference, it's probably the 14 better method just so we don't have to worry about the 15 confidential on testimony, but I appreciate your going the extra mile to protect the Company. 16 17 MR. CLIZER: With that I tender the witness for cross. 18 19 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Clizer. 20 Going to my order of cross-examination for an 21 OPC witness, skipping those that have been excused we 22 come to Staff. 23 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. This is 24 Kevin Thompson for Staff. I have no questions of this

25

witness at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Thompson. 1 THE COURT: 2 And for Spire? 3 MR. COOPER: This is Dean Cooper. We have no 4 questions at this time. 5 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cooper. 6 That brings us to bench questions. Are there 7 any questions from the Commissioners? And again to 8 unmute it is *6 if you're on your phone. Hearing no 9 questions the Judge has a handful of questions. 10 EXAMINATION BY THE COURT: 11 Mr. Schallenberg, OPC raised the 12 capitalization of overheads issue in Spire Missouri's That's GO20190356 AND 0357. Those ISRS 13 ISRS cases. 14 cases included plant place in service between February 15 1, 2019 and May 31, 2019. Your direct testimony 16 schedule RES-D-4 includes capitalized overheads for the test year October 1, 2019 through September 30, 2020 17 18 only; is that correct? 19 I can't say I recall that with enough detail 20 but it sounds correct, but I don't have that kind of 21 memory of the case. 22 I think this is referring to your testimony in Ο. this case, your current schedule RES-D-4. I believe the 23 24 -- what are the dates that your scheduled RES-D-4 2.5 covers? What is the time period?

A. October 1st of 2019 through September 30th of 2020.

- Q. All right. Thank you. Does the test year in this rate case cover the Spire fiscal year reported in its 2020 annual report to the Missouri Public Service Commission? Does the test year in this rate case cover Spire's fiscal year which was reported in its 2020 annual report?
- A. That is the test year and the fiscal year match. I believe their annual report matches on a fiscal year basis as well, but I know some of those reports come out on a calendar year basis, and I'm not 100 percent, but I would say from my recollection annual report is on a fiscal year basis.
- Q. Thank you. And do you plan to update the overhead amounts in your direct testimony, and again this is schedule RES-D-4, do you plan to update that schedule to include plant placed into service through May 31st, 2021?
 - A. I would say I'm not -- I don't know.
- Q. Other than labor and materials directly assigned to a capital project, is there any way, based upon the information provided by Spire to determine if any of the overhead allocations to the capital projects are in compliance with the USOA?

- A. I'd say if you want to play it by the precision and say do they have that kind of detail supporting on their overhead the answer's no. If you go back and look at they use a lot of overheads that are labor based, and it's fairly -- if you can make the assumption that those overheads would be impacted by construction labor. So -- and some of these -- I think it's ten overhead categories, some of those categories clearly are labor oriented, and so I don't -- I'm not challenging those types of overheads aren't being capitalized at the time. There is a risk in that that there is some -- some misallocation, but I don't know what happened in this case.
 - Q. I believe I have just a couple more questions. Do you know the total value of the test year plant additions included in rate base associated with the 172.8 million of total overheads you listed on the same schedule we've been talking about, RES-D-4?
- A. As I recall the number is a calendar number of how much was capitalized over a 12 month period over a year, and so the plant balance is a moving balance during the year as different levels of construction materialized that would vary by month. So there would not be on a year of capitalization of overhead, there wouldn't be one fixed plant balance. It would be

constantly moving during the year.

2.5

- Q. This is for my edification again. So there wouldn't -- we couldn't come up with one single number that would say this is the plant additions undertaken by Spire during the test year?
- A. Yes. For example, January -- January, a certain amount of overheads would be capitalized based on January's activity. And when you get to February, February overheads will be based on February activity, and some of those projects will be completed so they're no longer subject to capitalization.

So the number that you're dealing with in a year where you say this is how much overhead you capitalize, that's a accumulative balance of all the fluctuating construction balances you have throughout the year.

- Q. Okay. Would you agree that any tracking of overheads ordered in this rate case prospectively would not provide for any adjustment to capitalized overheads included in plant in this rate case?
 - A. Could you repeat the question?
- Q. Yeah. I was thinking through that myself. Would you agree that any tracking of overheads ordered in this rate case prospectively would not provide for any adjustment to the capitalized overheads included in

plant in this rate case?

- A. I would have to say it depends on how you design that tracker. It could or it couldn't if you designed it one way or the other.
- Q. Let me think through this out loud maybe for just a second. Mr. Clizer was bringing up the points he was bringing up the point that the recommendation by Staff in non term of art language is, we're going to leave alone the capital overheads that exist, and going forward we're going to have a tracker, or have a new system or have an order.

What I'm -- I think the question is getting at, is at that point in time when we switch, if the Commission switches, a tracker is not going to go back in time to do anything to these other capitalized overheads unless they're unfinished; is that --

- A. If that's the case, of which you're talking about, the tracker can only track what it was -- from the time period it was on.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And it isn't designed -- I mean you'd have to do a special study to get to -- and the tracker isn't going to be designed to tell you how much it was last year or the next couple of years. It's only going to track when you put it in effect.

1	Q. Thank you.
2	THE COURT: That is all the questions I have.
3	Let's go back to recross. Checking my handy
4	list we come to Staff.
5	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. Kevin
6	Thompson for Staff. No questions.
7	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.
8	Next we have Spire for recross.
9	MR. COOPER: Just a moment, Your Honor.
10	No questions, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cooper.
12	And redirect, Mr. Clizer.
13	MR. CLIZER: Hopefully keep this very brief.
14	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. CLIZER
16	Q. Bob, you were asked a question about how to
17	tell whether or not something was in compliance. You
18	had responded in part talking about you weren't
19	challenging all overheads. So just to try and clarify,
20	what overheads what is your recommendation regarding
21	overheads?
22	A. At this time the overheads that the
23	practice that should be discontinued is the one that is
24	called the general overhead, which is based on a
25	construction labor ratio I think it's called.

1	Q. So it's not all overheads, just general
2	overhead?
3	A. Not the overhead for like pensions and payroll
4	taxes and those things, they might not be right, but I
5	haven't studied them enough, and there is a general
6	acceptance that that would be a capitalized cost.
7	General overheads is the area you have the most trouble
8	with in terms of being whether they are complaint or
9	not, and that's where my focus is in this case.
10	Q. The only other question was related to this
11	fiscal year timing issue, and maybe I was confused, but
12	Spire's current test year coincide with their fiscal
13	year?
14	A. With the 2020 fiscal year. We're now in a
15	different fiscal year.
16	Q. Do they match up?
17	A. They match up.
18	Q. Okay. That was it.
19	THE COURT: Thank you.
20	Mr. Schallenberg, you are dismissed from the
21	witness stand.
22	Before we dismiss for the day I want to go
23	over just a couple of things. Tomorrow morning we are
24	going to start at 9 a.m. It will be the same and new
25	WebEx number that was sent out this afternoon if you

1	prefer to join by WebEx.
2	Tomorrow and likely for the remainder of the
3	hearing, the live stream this is not the WebEx, this
4	is the live stream that shows on the PSC website will
5	not have video. It will be just like a local public
6	hearing that we have had with this case and with others
7	in the last year. It will have the full audio including
8	the WebEx audio but will only show a still picture of
9	the courtroom. Nobody on WebEx will be on the broadcast
10	and we won't have it they will be able to see each
11	other though.
12	That is all the announcements I have.
13	Are there any other announcements or closing
14	business before I recess?
15	(No response.)
16	THE COURT: Excellent.
17	(End of record.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sherry Marshall, CCR No. 486, within the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the testimony appearing in the foregoing matter was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witnesses 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 matter 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.

Sherry ann Marshall

17 Sherry Marshall, CCR

	25	204P 175:8	391.5 116:20
\$	16 97:3 133:21	205C 175:9	391.95 116:19
\$1 150:11	134:14,21,25 160:13,	207 59:25	3:00 89:20,21
\$112 87:23	14	20CSR4240-40.040	
\$115 128:18	16.5 101:14	127:17	4
\$172.8 165:1	16.9 87:6,18 101:12	20th 108:20	4 127:17 130:1 136:6
\$173 158:11	17 60:8 133:21 134:14,21,25	21 159:9	145:22 147:11,24
\$2.50 85:15	17011 60:1	22 135:14 157:19	148:5 153:6 157:1
\$20 85:16	172 164:19	2230 64:10	4232 65:5
\$20 65.16 \$200 79:8	172.8 179:17	23 135:14,15	46 167:6,7,11 168:15, 18 171:11
•	17th 108:16	24 92:11 135:15	47 87:23
\$25 79:1,4,12 \$400,000 101:15	18 136:10 156:20	25 157:10 159:8	48th 63:19
\$60 68:5	19 156:17 157:25	250 64:9	4:50 124:5
•	159:9	29th 171:17	4.50 124.5 4B 126:16,19
\$87 158:13	1988 152:11,17,22	2:48 89:18,19	4th 167:20
0	153:2,5	2nd 58:9	401 167.20
	1994 94:16		5
0357 177:13	1st 178:1	3	_
1	2	3 87:18 109:6,8,10	5 157:19
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		116:9,12,17 117:16	54 88:2
1 58:4 109:6,8,10 177:15,17	2 55:4 109:6,8,10 160:3,4 173:11	118:24 119:5,16 130:1 153:6	6
10 144:3,5	20 79:17 87:17 105:2,	30 93:20 127:10	6 56:3 177:8
100 178:13	3 106:21 113:14 136:3	164:10 177:17	600 64:23
101 111:7 143:5	200 64:10	30th 178:1	
11 108:16 134:11	2012 93:21	31 177:15	63101 63:17 108:10
135:14	2019 127:10 177:15,	310 55:9	63108 65:6
112 119:3,17	17 178:1	3112 63:21	63118 64:24
12 179:20	2020 93:20,23 94:4 97:3 108:16 160:9	3115 64:22	63119 64:17
125 143:2,17,19	165:23 173:11 177:17	31st 178:19	64112 63:20
128 111:8,25 112:4	178:2,5,7 183:14	32 152:24	65 87:24 104:3
13 160:13	2021 55:4 60:8 108:16,17,20 178:19	35 60:23,25	65101 63:22
14 60:8 108:17 116:7	2030 95:12 103:24	36 60:23,25	65102 64:4,11
156:19	114:21,25 121:18	360 64:3	7
140 143:2,17,20	203C 175:8	381.1 96:21	
15 66:17 132:20 133:21 134:11,14,21,	204C 175:8	382.2 96:21	70 151:1,11
100.21 104.11,14,21,			

adopting 99:7,9 **700** 63:17 108:9 114:12 115:11 116:19 131:25 132:16 174:19 118:2.4 157:4 160:18 **75** 104:4.20 added 57:10 113:14 advantage 72:8,10 accounted 85:7 135:24 147:7 **76.6** 87:21 88:6 advisement 176:11 accounting 112:14, adding 120:15 advocates 85:20,21 23 113:4,10,19,23 8 addition 144:25 114:4 129:5 133:15 affects 150:24 145:4 148:1 147:3,6 **affiliate** 72:3,6,14,16 **80** 103:19 151:1,11 additional 56:6 accounts 85:9 95:1 73:14 74:10 81:23 103:13 123:7 135:24, **8182** 88:3 96:8,13,15,21 112:13, **affiliates** 72:8 75:3 25 139:9,18 140:6 22 118:2,18,19 120:6 **871** 64:16 147:7 169:21 122:2 126:11 135:24 148:17 165:13 168:3 additions 60:13 affirm 129:24 9 172:20 108:22 120:9.11 afternoon 58:4 62:1 179:16 180:4 **accrual** 93:19 64:7 96:4 115:21 9 183:24 address 59:24 64:9, 124:20,21 183:25 **accrued** 100:12 900 63:19 16,22 65:25 72:24 105:17,23 106:1,24,25 aggressive 103:5 76:21 84:17 99:20 **94** 123:8 118:8 108:8 agree 92:16 116:22 **95** 116:21 accumulative 180:14 118:23 136:16 141:15 adjourning 173:23 144:21 147:12 148:10 accuracy 78:20 adjustment 82:3 150:7 156:21 157:23 Α accurate 118:13 84:19 86:24 87:3 88:5 158:2 180:17,23 145:18 153:14 103:2,3 104:21 agreed 99:24 105:2 A&g 140:19 106:16,18 121:13,16 accurately 129:21 120:22 147:3,6 154:1 180:19, **a-n-o-s** 59:11 achieve 69:23 71:11 25 agrees 100:12 A-N-T-R-A-I-N-E-R achieves 70:14 adjustments 87:10, **ahead** 58:18 59:13 107:12,21,23 11,20 88:12,16 98:24 61:2 63:11 77:7 96:3 achieving 71:1 **a.m.** 183:24 101:10,16 102:14,20 97:21 108:1 121:2 acknowledge 98:13 146:23 122:18 132:21 144:18 **abide** 66:2 156:3 173:24 **adjusts** 141:12 acknowledged abilities 55:14 **AJIT** 123:7 128:4 administrative ability 86:3 128:9 136:11,25 163:3 acknowledges 83:7 alleviate 157:24 accelerate 79:21 admirably 131:25 act 70:18 81:20 allocate 75:4 132:5 acceptable 126:12 138:25 admission 60:25 actively 70:24 71:5, acceptance 183:6 111:25 112:3 134:24 **allocated** 127:11,12 10 168:18 175:15 128:12 accepting 169:3 activities 68:13 admittance 109:9 126:24 127:2 140:7 allocates 74:15 access 56:16 141:3 admitted 61:1 112:5 allocating 141:1 accessories 91:6 135:1 143:20,21 169:9 activity 140:13,14 allocation 73:1 75:5, accomplish 139:16 175:17 180:8,9 7,8,24 129:18 135:22 accordance 126:10 admittedly 119:23 actual 77:22 79:22 136:7 83:13 98:21 100:9 account 74:14,15 adopt 87:15 101:22 allocations 77:21 101:1,3 117:20 80:3 82:5 93:19 169:17 178:24 **adopted** 70:5 98:16 100:16 103:7,10,15, **add** 127:13 130:2

19,20,23 113:14

160:3.4

allocator 161:2

allowable 127:16

allowed 58:14 83:6,9, 10 84:20 123:24 132:15 154:3

alternative 83:24 153:11 162:14

alternatively 130:9

alternatives 170:6

Ameren 76:10

amortization 94:25 96:13,15,20 99:9,12 100:5,10,18 105:6,8, 11,15 106:22 112:14, 18,23 113:1,4,10,18, 19,21,23 114:4,6,8 120:2,3,5,13,18,24 121:7

amortized 118:11

amount 69:1 71:18 82:22,25 83:25 84:2,6, 7,10,12 86:6 87:10 89:2,8 101:11 104:10 147:15 155:10 157:3 163:25 165:14 170:4 171:3 175:22 180:7

amounts 77:13 102:15 126:20 127:7, 13 146:12,19 148:2,8 149:24 150:8 153:23 158:5,16,18 159:13 164:20 178:16

analysis 77:18 137:24

analyst 108:13

Andrew 64:22

Anne 63:18

announcement 90:5

announcements

55:20 56:25 58:11 184:12,13

annual 93:18 128:15, 18 160:5,9 165:22 173:11 178:5,8,10,13

annually 105:24 140:25

answer's 179:3

answers 60:18 109:1 134:14,17 143:11,13 175:5

Antrainer 92:1 95:21 107:9,13,18,20 108:2, 7,9,14 109:12,21 110:1,6,9

Antrainer's 109:5

anyone's 63:13

Aplington 57:5 62:25 63:1,6,16

apologies 61:15 92:6 166:1

apologize 63:10 107:4 156:12 158:4

apparently 57:18 80:23

appeals 104:11

appearance 58:20

appearances 57:1 63:10

appearing 126:8

appears 121:10 145:22

Appendix 116:9,12, 17 117:16 118:24 119:5,16

Applebee's 66:16

applicable 126:14 141:19 147:16 148:13 152:3,4 158:15 169:14,21

application 55:11

applied 95:4 114:13 118:10 119:16 120:5 122:25 160:23

applies 160:16

apply 92:17 94:21

101:24 102:4 106:14 119:1 140:20 161:15

appointment 124:21

approach 95:3 117:16,18,19 119:23 120:22 126:12,22

approaches 128:6 149:14

appropriately 94:12

appropriation 94:20

approve 105:11 106:22

approved 67:21,24 70:6,8,10,24 101:8

approximate 136:18 137:3

April 171:17

arbitrary 83:6,8 126:19 127:4,13 132:3,4,14 148:2,7,11, 25

architects 163:19

area 56:20 183:7

argues 80:11

argument 72:23 78:24 80:13

arguments 76:5

arm 130:15

arrived 117:23

art 80:25 181:8

aspects 126:16

asset 83:25 92:23,24 93:1 113:16 154:8

assets 93:2,19 94:13, 18,22 95:2,6,8,12 96:11,12,19 100:12 105:13 113:13,20 114:6,16,24 118:17 120:7,14,15 128:13

assign 73:3 76:1

assigned 74:23 178:22

assigning 76:15 81:24 127:19 132:2

assignment 169:13, 15

assignments 126:17

assigns 70:12

assistance 145:3

Association 61:11 65:8,11

assume 123:23 125:2 149:7

assumed 148:2,22

assumption 84:21 121:11 149:12 179:6

attached 151:25

attempt 80:1 156:19,

attempted 99:17 129:10

attempting 76:25 85:5 98:1 119:22 120:25

attention 86:23

attorney 131:24 attorneys 56:22

audio 55:18 58:2 90:17 184:7,8

audiovisual 91:5

audit 129:11 139:15, 17 140:7 156:23 165:9 168:10

audited 130:13

August 55:4 58:9

authenticated 168:23

authorities 83:21 84:2

authority 84:14,15 85:7

Avenue 59:25 63:22 65:5

average 79:19 101:22 102:2,7,14 103:19 104:3,8,14,18 105:3 106:11,20,21 116:15, 18 119:15

avoid 96:16

aware 152:15,25 153:4 169:5

Azland 64:2 96:3,4,5 111:1,16,24 112:2 117:5

В

B-A-R-R-S 61:22 65:4

B-O-C-K-S-T-R- 57:14

B-R-O-W-N-L-E-E 61:13 65:10

B-U-T-T-I-G 110:14, 20

back 67:1 72:23 73:3 74:23 75:5 86:7 89:23 94:16,17 123:5 138:5 139:21 145:20 147:10 149:11 151:14 154:19 155:9 167:21,24 168:4,14 169:25 179:4 181:14 182:3

backwards 63:8 68:9

bad 100:19

balance 67:7,15 70:25 118:18 121:17 179:21,25 180:14

balances 82:4 89:6 180:15

ballpark 150:10

bank 66:16

bank's 67:11

bankrupt 88:22

banks 66:23

barring 131:1

Barrs 61:22,24 65:3 97:13,15 109:25 110:2 115:12,13 117:2 130:22,24 131:3,6

base 77:1 80:16 83:23 84:1 88:2,10 89:5 129:23 144:22 150:24 151:2,6,15 154:3 158:7,25 172:6 179:16

based 71:16 74:15 79:19 84:7 88:3,6,16 93:25 95:13 112:23 113:4,10 114:23 117:22,25 118:9 127:3 132:3 161:5,12,21,24 178:22 179:5 180:7,9 182:24

basically 74:13,25 83:7 98:1 99:24 100:2, 18 104:22 105:2,9 120:9 123:7 132:10 163:11

basics 67:17 72:5

basis 84:6 105:23,25 128:15,22 130:7 146:16 147:15 148:18 155:20 157:4 162:12 165:18 178:11,12,14

bat 86:23

began 105:10

begin 55:5 80:4

beginning 88:14 136:2 149:23

behalf 59:16 62:2 65:10 69:9 75:11 76:2 108:3 110:23 126:8 133:8 142:16 174:2

behaves 71:19

belabor 86:16

belief 111:22 134:18 143:14

belies 79:12

believes 86:8 128:22

belonged 134:3

bench 62:19 117:15 122:10 140:8 141:13 159:21 169:24 177:6

benefit 72:13 80:13

benefits 78:11,13 129:15 163:3

biannually 105:24

Big 168:8,11

biggest 68:7

bill 75:3,13

bills 74:14 84:6 86:2

bit 57:24 65:22 67:12 101:17 119:23

black-and-white 141:16

blue 68:16

Board 61:10 65:8

Boards 65:11

Bob 136:5 182:16

Bockstruck 57:3,4,7, 13 59:14,19,23 60:21 61:5 63:14,15,16 66:7 91:9,16 92:3,13,14 93:6,8,11 95:23 108:6 109:4,15,17 112:8,10 113:8,9 114:3 115:2 119:20 120:19 124:24 125:8,11,21

bone 72:23

book 66:21

booked 103:14 158:6 159:13 170:17

booking 106:3 129:22

books 68:2,10 69:23

71:14 146:14

borne 82:7

bottom 67:2 134:3,9

bought 79:6

Boulevard 64:17,23

Box 64:3,10

break 89:18 117:16 164:9,12

breaks 70:21 89:20 162:25

Bretz 64:2

briefly 76:6 117:15 120:2

bring 104:17 124:16 165:2

bringing 104:14 181:6.7

brings 78:8 79:15 177:6

broadcast 55:18 184:9

broadcasting 90:8

brought 90:25 104:16 124:6 153:1

Brownlee 61:12 65:9

Brydon 63:21

budgeting 140:25

build 76:25 89:3

building 56:7 64:9 80:16

built 83:20

bump 124:13

bunch 82:9 104:13 120:6 168:9

buried 98:10

business 59:24 64:9 66:19,22 67:7,10 69:9 71:20 77:24 81:20 108:8 138:1 184:14

businesses 67:2,4

Buttig 96:24 97:4 110:13,19,22 111:2 112:11,12,13

button 86:17

buy 67:14 79:7

C

C-L-I-Z-E-R 64:8

C-O-F-F-M-A-N 62:2 64:16

calculates 93:18 126:9

calendar 178:12 179:19

call 56:24 89:18 144:9 158:4 166:2 172:3

called 59:16 108:3 110:23 133:8 142:16 168:8 174:2 182:24,25

Callenbach 63:18

callers 57:9

calling 115:11

Cam 75:15 76:13,14

camera 89:17 90:14, 15,19

Camp 59:25

capabilities 78:7

capacity 66:12 111:3 133:13 174:7

capital 66:12,24,25 67:3,6,8,16,20,23 68:1,3,21,24 69:6,12, 15,19,24 70:1,5,9,10, 13,17,20,23,25 71:2,6, 9,11,12,16,17,24 77:25 81:10,12,14,17, 19 82:21 87:14,17 89:6 124:12 125:16 126:3,13 127:20 128:13 129:19,22 130:23 132:19 136:8 141:1,6 155:21 160:17,22 161:5,11,21 162:25 165:5 178:22, 24 181:9

capitalization 83:3, 12 125:4,6,12 126:10 127:7 148:7 149:15 156:22 160:16 162:2 170:1 177:12 179:24 180:11

capitalize 83:5 128:10 135:16 180:14

capitalized 129:11, 16 130:4 136:12 141:5 144:22 145:12,17 146:9,14,18,19 147:20 149:24 150:8,12,19 153:23 155:11 158:7, 12,14,20,25 159:14 164:1 165:10 169:13, 15 171:4 177:16 179:11,20 180:7,19,25 181:15 183:6

capitalizes 126:21

capitalizing 130:8,10 132:2,3 153:10,11 162:13,15 164:22 170:6

Capitol 63:21

car 79:6.7.8

cards 161:14

careful 98:18

Caro 63:18

carrying 68:10 71:13

cars 79:10

case 65:20 67:21 70:7,11 72:18 73:20 77:13 81:15 82:10 85:4,6 86:19 88:5,15 89:1,25 92:17,19 94:4 96:16,25 98:3,5 101:12,14 104:19 112:15,16 127:8,22, 24,25 128:2 133:17 136:22 146:12 153:4, 6,24 154:2,11,19,21 155:6 160:10 162:24 163:10 170:5 171:24 177:21,23 178:4,6 179:13 180:18,20,24 181:1,17 183:9 184:6

cases 79:25 112:20 127:13,16 135:22 153:21 154:2,7,9 177:13,14

Casev 64:2 96:4

cash 69:1,2 82:21

cass 106:12

cast 114:15

cast-iron 95:9,11,13 102:21,25 103:2,4,7,9 106:16 114:16,20,24 118:22 121:10,12,13, 17,25

catch 58:13

catching 62:23

categories 179:8

causal 136:18,20 140:9,10,15,22,24 141:22

causation 73:15 126:23 140:21

caused 73:16 133:16 143:1

cease 130:8,9 153:10, 11 162:12,15 164:22

ceased 170:2

central 72:23

CEO 73:19,23 74:2,3, 6,14

chain 137:24

Chairman 62:16

challenging 179:10 182:19

chance 66:22 78:22 167:11

change 58:16 97:1

121:12,15 134:1,15 170:25

changed 127:21 135:17 138:22

characteristics 93:1

charge 69:17 85:16 154:1

charged 84:8,10,12, 13,14,15 147:14 148:16 155:3,4,5 157:3

charges 126:13 148:18 163:1,21

Charles 55:2 58:7

chat 55:24

cheap 67:8

cheaper 68:3,20

check 66:14 135:11 165:25

checking 109:13 138:3 182:3

chief 129:4 133:14 137:24

chili 66:18

chips 68:16

choices 166:4

chooses 169:1

chose 99:14,20

circumstance 130:14

cite 151:22

citing 99:18

City 63:19,22 64:3,10 65:14

claim 102:10

claimed 175:25

claiming 175:24

claims 78:9,16 102:6

clarification 57:6,12, 15 59:22 77:4 80:20 93:5 102:24 107:22 111:15 113:7,25 116:11 119:12 125:10 149:17 154:13,24 159:5 169:19 170:20 172:5 174:10

clarify 119:22 130:25 182:19

class 101:23,24 102:3,4,15,16,17

clear 73:13 86:10 88:21 168:1

clearing 148:16

clients 56:18,23

Clizer 62:7,8 64:7 66:11 77:7,8 80:23 81:2 89:12,16 97:20, 21.22.23 103:1 107:7 115:18,20 116:12,14 117:10,11,13 119:14, 22,25 120:23 121:2,3 122:8,14,19,21 123:25 124:2,14,17 125:2 131:13,16,20 132:17 135:8 138:11,13 144:14,16 147:24 156:3,4,7,12,13 157:11,18 159:7,18,20 166:8,9 168:19 173:24,25 174:5,13 175:8,13,18 176:17,19 181:6 182:12,13,15

clock 89:19

close 154:25 173:17

closing 184:13

Coffman 62:1,2,4 64:15,16

coincide 183:12

cold 141:5

collect 89:6

collected 158:6

collecting 87:24 114:14

combined 94:23 101:10 164:18

comfortable 123:11

Commission 55:5,22 58:9 60:21 63:23 64:1 66:8 67:21,24 69:9,10, 13,15,16 70:12,18,24 71:21 72:5 79:20 81:3, 9 83:9,24 84:22 85:4 86:20 92:15,20 95:10, 16 96:5,6,17,25 97:23 101:18.19 102:12 104:6 109:5 111:4 112:17 127:9,14,18,22 128:22 129:9 130:7, 16,17 131:14 132:12 137:9 142:24 146:22 152:5,19 153:9,20 155:14 162:12 164:22 165:4,23 169:1,3 173:10 174:19 175:23 176:1,5 178:6 181:14

Commission's 94:6, 10 127:8 147:4 172:17

Commissioner

57:16,22 62:13,14,17, 18 89:13

Commissioners

62:12 110:8 159:22 169:5 177:7

common 148:10

companies 76:9,17 88:19 130:16

company 59:16 63:1 68:2,11,19 69:11,12, 14,18,19,22 70:4,8,12, 13,14 71:19 72:20 74:7,9 76:12,19 77:17 78:25 79:1 80:18 81:19 83:2,8,19 86:5, 8,20 87:17 88:22 89:3, 6 92:21 93:3,14,16,25 94:3,6,14,24 95:18 96:12,18 98:7 100:11, 25 101:13 104:2,9,19, 23 105:16,22,25 106:2 108:3 112:22 114:16, 19 117:23,24 121:23

123:14 125:8,11 128:7,17,20 132:4,7 133:8 137:22 140:4, 10,13 166:22 168:25 176:16

Company's 84:4 85:15 93:20 95:1,3 101:15 128:18

compensation 82:15,16

competitive 67:7 71:20 77:24 81:20

complaint 183:8

complete 58:20 156:23

completed 136:23 180:10

completely 100:12 176:6

completing 161:3,9,

complex 129:20

compliance 129:25 130:11 153:13,17 155:18 162:17 165:11 178:25 182:17

complied 155:7 172:23

comply 81:22 162:2 172:25

complying 130:17

comport 86:17

computer 56:20 91:1

concern 124:11,15,

concerned 80:23

conclude 132:18 139:14 173:5

concludes 127:14

conclusion 81:6 160:14 161:15

conditions 121:13

conduct 123:15 128:23

conducted 93:15 106:4

conducting 123:14 148:16

conferences 56:14

confidential 143:4 157:12 175:11,20,22, 25 176:3,6,15

confidentiality 157:14,15

conflict 130:4

conforms 83:17

confused 151:18 183:11

confusing 101:17,20 102:10 119:24 158:16

confusion 101:6

connection 57:21 58:1 60:10 62:6 66:9 116:24 128:5 131:15

consequence 153:7

conservation 84:17 85:8

considerable 87:10

consideration 154:5

considered 94:5 153:1,6

consistency 128:5

consistent 81:11 86:9 98:17,18 99:6,8 100:7 112:22 126:12, 22 167:6

consistently 127:11

consisting 99:23

consolidated 71:16 81:11,19

constantly 180:1

constitutes 170:3

construction 83:5, 14,16 126:24 127:1 136:7,14 139:1 140:14,17 141:3,11 145:17 146:1,3 148:1, 22 157:2 160:20 163:13,21 165:18 179:7,22 180:15 182:25

Consultants 60:5 93:4,15

consumed 140:17

Consumers 61:25 62:2 64:12,14,19

contained 111:13,20 134:13

continue 70:19 78:5 90:12 105:23 106:2

continuing 101:7 118:17

contract 74:21

contribute 111:6 150:15

contributed 143:3

controller 129:4 133:14

controls 72:17

convenience 126:4

conveniently 147:24

conversation 168:24

conversations 56:22

cool 85:21

Cooper 63:20 126:4, 6,8 129:6 133:6,11 134:20,23 138:16,18, 20 141:23,25 144:1, 11,13,20 145:7 149:20 154:15 155:8,24 156:1,8,11 166:2,4,7, 11,12,14 167:1,5,8,9 168:15 169:10,22

170:9,16 177:3,5 182:9,11

cooperate 153:19

copies 91:12

copy 63:1 116:9 119:4 156:10,14 157:7 160:9 173:10

corporate 163:22,24 169:17

correct 70:2 80:1 87:8,12,14 100:13 103:6 104:15 108:19 111:21 112:12 113:6, 12 116:3,8 122:13 134:12,17 143:13 144:24 145:13 146:10, 11,14,15,20,21 147:22 148:3,4,8,9,19,20 149:15,25 150:1,4,22 151:7,8,11,19,20 152:6,9,11,12,19,20 156:20 163:11 166:17, 18 167:5,18,22 168:11,12 169:18,20 170:7 171:1,2 174:19 177:18,20

corrected 108:20 109:10 174:22,25 175:10

correcting 115:22

corrections 60:13 108:22 111:10,18 143:7

correctly 141:14 158:18 164:5

corrupt 66:10 116:25

cost 67:16 69:24 70:1 71:1,11 72:21 73:12, 15 78:24 79:1,3,8 82:12,18,22 87:2 96:8 98:15 101:23,24 102:3,5,16,17 106:12, 13,14 111:6 116:10, 12,16 119:3,17 122:3 126:23 136:12 140:21 143:3 144:25 150:3,19 168:2 171:10 183:6

costly 66:12,25 67:3,

costs 73:3,15 74:22 75:3,5 76:1,15 81:24 82:23 120:15 126:24 127:6,11,12,14 128:12 129:15,19,21 130:3,9, 10 136:7,8,25 140:19, 21 144:22,23 145:1,5, 6,8,9,11,16 146:2,8 147:20 148:1,3,19 153:10,11 154:3,9 155:3,5,10 156:23 157:2 160:15,20 162:13,15,20,22 163:1,4,9,12,24 164:1, 3,4,6,23 165:5,10 169:13,21,24 170:1,3, 5,17 172:16

Council 61:25 62:3 64:14

counsel 57:4 63:10 64:6,8 65:4 89:14 97:19 110:4,5 115:17 131:10 135:7 138:12 153:19 173:9 174:9

Counsel's 173:24

Counselors 56:18

counter 87:10,11

counteracting 89:1

couple 76:5 86:22 99:4 179:14 181:24 183:23

Coupled 103:23

court 55:2,19 57:6,8, 12,13,15,16 58:5,22 59:1,8,12,22 60:24 61:6,10,14,17,24 62:4, 9,22 63:3,8,23 64:5, 12,18,25 65:7,13,23 72:15 77:4 80:20 89:12,23 91:3,14,20, 23 92:5 93:5,6,9 95:23 97:7,12,18,21 102:24, 25 107:7,16,19,22,24 109:7,17,24 110:3,12,

17.18.21 111:15 112:2 113:7,25 115:3,10,15 116:11 117:1,3,6,9 119:12 120:21 121:1 122:8,13,17 124:2 125:1,10,14,19,23 126:7 129:6 130:21 131:3,8,18,19 132:17, 24 133:1,2,5 134:23 135:6,10,12 138:3,10, 14,17 141:25 142:6,7, 11 143:18,24 144:3, 12.18 145:3 149:17 154:13,24,25 156:1 159:5,20 160:1 164:8, 11,13,14 165:19 166:6,8,10 167:3,7 168:16 169:5,19 170:11,20 172:5 173:4,16,18,21 174:10 175:13 176:10,19 177:1,5,10 182:2,7,11 183:19 184:16

courtroom 55:9 56:11 184:9

cover 85:11,12 148:2 178:4.6

covered 86:15

covers 122:15 177:25

COVID 65:22

crazy 89:8

created 79:22 152:5

creates 74:24

creation 123:6

credit 67:9,16

critical 85:23

criticize 100:2

criticized 99:7.8.12

criticizes 100:4

criticizing 105:10

CRIZER 122:12

cross 102:11 112:1,6 115:7,9 122:15 125:3, 6 131:4 176:18

cross-examination

61:7 66:3 109:16,18 110:1 112:9 115:19 131:4 134:22 135:3 138:6 143:23 144:6,19 156:6 166:13 176:20

crunch 58:24

curious 91:2

current 65:22 85:15 90:11 93:20,25 125:5 154:11 177:23 183:12

Curtis 64:1

curve 113:5,11,20,24 114:5

customer 80:12 85:16

customers 67:25 68:6 69:21 70:16,19 72:13 73:10,11 77:15 80:6,9,13 81:4 82:7 84:12,13,15 85:22,23 88:25 89:7 128:7,20

customers' 84:6 cycle 70:21

D

damages 160:17,23 dangers 72:16

data 94:12,15,16,19 123:3,5,7,8,10,12

date 55:4

dated 152:11 171:17

129:14 156:24 168:9

dates 177:24

dating 123:5

David 71:22 82:13 96:24 97:4 110:19,22

day 55:5 58:9 82:23 89:4 124:22 183:22

days 56:21

dealing 145:15 146:12 180:12

Dean 63:20 126:7 138:17 177:3

debt 66:12,20,21,22 67:3,5,11 68:2,11,20 69:23 71:1,13

December 108:16

decide 153:16.20

deciding 77:25

decision 146:23 147:4 176:7

decisions 69:9 124:14 127:23

decoupling 85:3,10

deficiency 95:7

definite 83:4.16

definition 68:13 114:23 148:11,13 163:8

demands 67:12

demonstrate 130:11 153:13 155:18 162:16

demonstrated 153:17

depend 155:13

depending 123:19

depends 86:3 181:2

deprecation 98:12

depreciating 103:21

depreciation 79:23 82:4 85:11 87:4,8 90:3 91:25 92:10,12,16,17, 19,20,22 93:15,18,21, 23,24,25 94:3,5,7,13, 20,21,23 95:9,11,17 96:7,10,17,23 97:2,24 98:8,9 99:2,5,16 101:12 114:12,14,23, 25 117:20 118:8,16 119:18 121:15,22

123:16,17 150:24

describing 75:9

description 148:14

design 85:14 181:3

designed 121:16 181:4,21,23

desired 135:23

detail 76:21 139:5 177:19 179:2

details 139:10,13,15, 20

deteriorate 78:22

determine 77:18 130:16 136:13,24 159:12 161:5,11,20 162:1 165:10 169:7 176:2 178:23

determined 85:4 154:17

developed 77:22 82:15

diaphragm 76:23 77:19 78:3,6,12,14,21 79:2,12 80:3,5,7 82:5

dictated 149:9

differ 164:1

difference 87:19 117:25 122:23

difficult 98:3 105:12

difficulties 90:7

diligence 77:11

dipping 82:20

direct 59:18 72:1
75:13 88:1 94:4,9
98:10,17,19 99:6,8,21
100:3,8,25 101:2
105:7 108:5,15 109:10
110:25 121:21 126:17
133:10,17 135:13
140:1,12,18 142:18
146:21 147:2 148:1,5,
17 157:8,10,12 158:10
159:9 162:23 163:1
164:16,25 174:4,14,25

175:9 177:15 178:16

directed 158:11

direction 150:18

directly 70:22 178:21

Director 174:11

directors' 160:19,24

disallow 82:2 83:14

disallowance 171:9

disaster 171:8

discern 129:21

disconnect 79:22

discontinued 182:23

discuss 85:18 124:18

discusses 126:17 discussing 157:16

discussion 140:19

dismiss 183:22

dismissed 183:20

displays 165:13

disruption 57:21 60:10 62:6 128:5 131:15

distancing 56:6

distributing 91:19 148:18 169:21

distribution 76:15 157:4

distributions 161:4, 10,20

doctor's 124:21

document 144:16

documentation 155:23

documented 161:15

dollars 77:16 86:8,21 87:19 150:19,20,21,23 151:6

double 66:14 82:6,20 154:12,14

doubt 151:12

dozens 129:19

draw 86:22

drivers 93:1 140:21

drives 140:13

driving 103:15,20

dropped 57:17

due 66:9 77:11 89:1 104:16 116:24 156:23

dynamically 69:18

Ε

e-mail 65:25 91:14,18 166:19 167:14 171:13, 14,17

e-mails 168:16

earlier 90:4 129:2 130:25 155:15

early 79:21

earnings 82:17

ease 124:10

easier 66:15.20

easiest 104:17

East 63:21 92:18 106:9 122:6,7,23,25 123:10 164:18,21 165:21

East's 93:25 94:21 123:11

Eastern 61:21 65:2,4

easy 71:8

echo 63:13

edification 180:2

education 163:16

effect 98:23 181:25

effective 97:2

effectively 60:8 70:5 85:5 87:16 100:21 156:21

effects 69:7

effort 154:12

efforts 84:25

EFIS 65:20

electric 151:22 152:14

elements 168:2

eligible 160:16

eliminate 56:16 164:23

embedded 164:3

employed 60:2,4 73:21,23,24 75:1 108:11 111:2 133:12, 14 142:22 174:6,8

employee 129:15 139:7 163:3

employees 74:19,20, 22 75:2,24 76:1 148:17,23 149:9,10 161:14

encapsulation 103:12,14

encapsulations 103:18

encourage 71:25

end 56:25 81:16 89:4 95:12 96:20 98:25 100:20 104:13 113:17 114:20,25 121:18 122:1 134:11 136:15 154:16 160:20 184:17

endeavor 68:14

ended 151:4

Energy 64:12,18 65:14 137:9 152:5

engineer 111:5

engineering 146:2,3 163:21,22

England 63:21

enhanced 135:19,21

ensures 95:6.7

ensuring 71:18

enter 60:22 109:5

entered 134:2

Enterprise 72:21 104:23 106:19 116:1, 16

entire 160:18 165:6 172:4

entirety 157:13 175:20

entity 71:8 160:6

entries 58:20

entry 57:1 63:9 139:8

envision 153:22 155:17 171:3

envisioned 56:13 153:18 163:14

equal 150:12,20

equally 160:15

equation 102:4,16 106:14 119:2,17

equitable 76:15,16 141:19

equity 66:24 67:20 68:10,25 69:6 71:3,14 81:18 82:13

error 99:22 100:15

establish 94:19

established 66:19 140:10,22

establishment

estimate 68:4 126:23 150:10

estimations 87:1

evaluate 156:25

evening 58:13 124:8 125:9,12 142:20,21 156:8,9,11

Evergy 76:10

everybody's 63:12

everyone's 105:2

evidence 97:1 98:21 104:24 134:21 137:3

evidentiary 55:5 58:10

exact 78:12,14

examination 59:18 108:5 110:25 117:12 128:1 133:10 135:12 138:19 142:18 160:1 170:13 174:4 177:10 182:14

excellent 63:7 184:16

exception 96:8

exceptions 118:22

excerpt 147:10 172:19

excerpts 132:1

exchange 166:20 167:13,14

exciting 85:20

excusal 58:22

excuse 62:11 76:14 88:13 113:13 130:8 158:22

excused 58:21 61:20 62:5,6,20 64:13,19 65:1,15 109:19 110:10,11 124:4 142:2 173:7 176:21

exercise 98:1 168:9

exhibit 60:25 109:10 111:7,8,25 143:2,5,19,

20 167:2,5,7,11 168:15,18 169:8 171:11 173:12

exhibits 60:23 63:2 65:18,24 91:5,11,18, 21 109:6,8 133:21 134:14,21,25 143:17 175:15

EXHIBITS@PSC. MO.GOV. 66:1

exist 123:7 181:9

existing 77:19 78:11 79:2 82:4 85:2 102:13 106:9

exists 94:12

expect 77:24 146:9 150:12 151:9,16

expected 113:14,20 114:5

expense 83:20,21,25 128:14 145:18 150:24, 25 151:2,7 154:1,22 158:6 159:3,13

expensed 146:9 149:25 150:19 154:4 158:21,24 171:5

expenses 136:12 146:3,18,19 147:7 154:20 170:5

expensive 79:12

experiencing 90:7

expert 71:22 129:13

explain 82:14 99:18 120:3,25 148:21 150:3 162:6,7,19

explained 100:18

explanation 73:5 99:18 149:21

extent 149:23 150:4 168:19,21

extra 56:13 176:16

F

F-E-R-C 160:4

fact 70:9 72:25 78:6 79:11,13 83:19 93:22 94:8 98:7 103:17,23 151:25 152:17 157:17

factor 158:15 161:1 169:12,14

factors 74:16 75:6,9 93:2 126:23,25 128:1 140:15

fair 76:14,16 88:25 89:5 159:17

fairly 75:13 85:16 86:15 179:5

fall 124:20

false 58:5

familiarity 123:20

favor 75:6 172:12

February 177:14 180:8,9

Federal 137:8 152:5

feel 98:4 123:15 141:11,17 156:20

felt 175:21

FERC 137:12,16 152:6,14,18 160:3,4, 10 173:11

field 140:12 149:10

fieldwork 163:14,17

figure 57:24 91:4 98:1,5

file 55:6 58:10 94:3 98:8,15 99:14 116:23 174:22 176:4

filed 88:1,6 94:7 98:10,20 99:5,11,15, 17 105:7 108:14 116:16 140:1 147:19 157:12 175:19,24 **files** 99:2 100:1 117:23

filing 100:3 167:22,25

final 102:17 173:22

Finally 72:15 73:13 78:23

financial 72:8,10 137:23,25 171:7

financing 66:20

find 78:12

finding 175:22

finds 80:15

fine 91:2 121:1

Firm 65:10

fiscal 136:2 178:4,7,9, 11,14 183:11,12,14,15

fix 103:25

fixed 126:25 171:3 179:25

flaws 118:14

Fleming 60:4 93:3,14

flight 58:13 62:23

flow 69:1,3 145:6

flowed 74:23 145:8

flowing 69:1

fluctuating 180:15

focus 92:12 126:15 183:9

follow 76:17,20 90:3 137:12,16 139:25 144:14

follow-up 140:2,3

food 66:18

force 81:19

forcing 69:8 82:7

Forest 65:5

form 74:8 133:18 139:6 160:3,4 173:11

formal 136:19 137:1 155:23

format 90:13

forms 70:11 72:23

formula 101:24

Fortunately 131:23

forward 58:18 85:20 86:8,13 90:12 91:15 101:13 107:1,10 110:14 123:8 128:21 130:7 146:16,19 162:11 171:1 181:10

found 96:7 104:7 119:2 127:10 129:25

Frank 63:18

frankly 102:22

free 72:11 156:20

Friday 72:2 82:14 131:2

friend 79:5

front 66:24 86:5 88:4 119:4 147:11,24 156:15

full 92:23 113:15 127:25 132:8 184:7

fully 100:12 105:17,23 106:1,23,25 113:21 114:6,9,11 118:8

function 55:24 163:22

functions 74:13

fund 86:6

fundamental 149:13

fundamentally 127:20

funding 86:4,12

funneling 80:17

future 84:3 95:8 96:16 106:4 107:3 158:8 159:1,15 176:13

G

Gannett 60:4 93:3,14

gas 88:22,23 126:16, 19 129:25 136:6 147:23 151:23 152:14 153:5 160:5

gave 72:10

gears 90:23

general 71:24 83:12, 15 95:1 96:12 99:9,11 100:4,10,17 101:9 105:6,8,11,15 106:22 112:13,15,18,22 118:1 119:9 120:1,3,5,6,17, 24 121:7 127:5,12,24 136:11,25 139:4,8,11 146:2 153:21 161:1 163:4,25 165:15 182:24 183:1,5,7

generally 112:19 118:21 123:18

generate 69:1

generates 82:17

Geoff 85:17

get all 102:11

give 56:10 67:11 72:12 84:22 85:12 103:8 164:10

giving 72:7 81:25

GO-2019-0356 127:9

GO20190356 162:24 177:13

GO20190357 162:24

GO20200416 96:25

gold 76:24 77:9 80:18,21 81:4

Goldie 57:4,13 63:16

good 56:21 57:3 62:1 63:6 64:7 66:19 67:9, 16 70:25 71:12 79:9 96:4 115:21 128:20

142:20,21 150:10 156:8,9,11 165:16

goods 72:11,12,22 73:12 75:10,17 81:24

Governor 56:7 64:9

GR-2021-0108 55:6 58:10

Grand 64:23

Granted 58:22 125:1

gross 84:4,5

Group 64:13

grow 80:23

growth 163:22

guarantees 69:3

guess 69:11 126:7 138:17 149:21 154:4, 17 155:16 156:25 158:9 159:3

guidance 130:5

guide 71:10,15

guys 176:11

Н

half 120:1

hand 59:6 107:14 110:15 144:15 150:17 173:14

handed 132:1 145:20,

handful 177:9

handle 58:1

handled 127:24

handy 92:2 138:6 143:25 182:3

happen 87:3 119:8

happened 98:5 179:13

happening 75:16

happy 144:9

hard 65:23 80:24 170:18

hat 169:7

Hatcher 55:2 57:19 58:7 77:5 80:21,25 138:22

head 79:3 161:23

Heads 56:24

hear 56:21 57:7,17, 19,20 78:24,25 115:25

heard 87:22 90:4 139:13 141:14 175:14

hearing 55:4,6,8 57:9 58:6,8,10,17 61:1 66:10 89:15,25 110:9 112:4,5 116:25 125:5 135:1 143:20,21 159:24 161:16,17 168:18 170:18 174:16 177:8 184:3,6

hearsay 168:20,23 169:6

heavily 75:6

heavy 139:23 172:3

helpful 123:18

hesitant 118:16

hey 98:20

hierarchy 149:8

high 71:2 82:10 150:7

high-cost 70:17

higher 66:11 69:5 70:1

highlighted 147:25

highly 55:25 88:18

Hill 59:25

historical 94:15,19 123:12 126:13

Historically 123:4

hitting 86:17

hold 110:6 125:24 154:9

holding 76:17,18 155:9

Holsman 62:17,18

honestly 82:13 132:6

Honor 58:19 62:25 64:15 117:11 124:25 126:6,9 129:2 133:6 134:20 135:5,9 138:16 141:24 143:16 144:2 155:25 157:11 166:12 167:1,6 170:10 173:25 175:18 182:9,10

hospital 85:25 86:1

house 57:4 67:14

Housing 61:14 64:20, 22 97:8 109:20 115:4

huge 69:1

humor 103:2

hundred 150:13,16, 23 151:6,15,17

hundreds 77:15,16

hurts 72:12

hybrid 55:7 65:22 89:24 90:13

hypothetical 151:5 hypotheticals 151:5

ı

i.e. 90:15

idea 67:8 75:25 76:18 78:13 90:21 100:10,19

ideas 85:21

identical 152:21

identification 133:22

identified 157:24

identifies 148:5

identify 137:5 ignoring 83:19 image 134:2 immediately 100:11 105:17 115:22 **impact** 86:19 150:8 151:10,16 impacted 179:6 **impacts** 128:8 149:22 impeding 63:13 implement 153:20 172:15 implemented 136:2 important 88:23 99:4 **impose** 84:8,9 inaccurate 94:23 inappropriate 94:22 inappropriately 73:2 **Inc.'s** 73:19,22 74:14 incentive 82:15,16,18 include 82:20,22,25 83:1 84:5 178:18 included 77:13 84:1, 7 93:16 94:16 96:23 139:12 158:25 177:14 179:16 180:20,25 includes 56:22 177:16 including 85:22 129:22 184:7 inclusion 83:18 income 83:20,21,25 85:19,21 131:2 158:14 inconsistencies 99:21 inconsistency 100:3 increase 88:2.10.19

89:5 101:11,13

interim 113:5,11 128:11,17 150:13,21

151:1.13 intermission 89:19 incremental 78:24 136:12 incurred 144:23 145:1,2,5,10 147:21 indefinitely 70:20 104:8 indirect 163:12 individual 106:3 107:1 120:14 **Industrial** 64:18 influenced 74:16 information 63:12 90:6 94:17 111:13,20 124:6 129:17 134:18 139:19 165:8 166:21. 22 167:18 175:22,24 178:23 infrastructure 77:2 initial 87:22 94:16,17 140:1 144:8 initially 88:20 175:19 **injuries** 160:17,23 insinuated 102:22 103:1 installation 94:17 96:9 installations 96:22 instance 130:18 instruction 126:16, 19 145:22 147:11,23 157:1.6 instructions 130:1 153:5 156:25 insurance 160:18,19, 23,24 **intend** 115:7 intended 100:23 intending 78:20

internal 137:2 Internet 55:10 interpretation 79:20 151:22 152:10,13,16, 17,23 153:5 interrupt 163:20 intertwined 73:6 Intervenors 86:15 125:3 introduced 169:2 introducing 167:3 introduction 63:13 **invest** 68:17 investigatory 130:15 investment 77:6.16 78:1 79:9 82:6 investments 79:16 89:7 127:20 investor 86:11 invoice 139:6 involves 77:3 102:21 iron 114:15 **irrelevant** 78:17,18 Irving 64:2 **ISRS** 87:23 103:10,24 104:6,11,16 121:19 122:1 127:22 158:8,10 159:1,14 171:24 177:13 **issue** 72:3 79:15 82:12 83:25 90:3 92:6, 11,19 95:10 99:23 123:4 124:6,19 125:3, 9,12 129:10 131:7,24 132:19 144:23 145:16 146:23 153:1 157:15 177:12 183:11 **issued** 84:11 127:9 **issues** 58:2 66:9 82:9

85:19 87:1 97:17 100:4 116:24 119:8 125:15 131:1,2 155:1 item 92:16 J **J-O-H-N** 59:10 **Jamie** 64:1 January 180:6 January's 180:8 Jefferson 63:22 64:3, 10 JJS-R1 60:11 **JJS-R2** 60:11 93:16 95:18 **job** 174:9 jobs 147:14 **John** 59:10,15 60:6 62:2 64:7,15 87:4 93:17 94:14 95:20 97:23 106:6,17,18 join 184:1 joint 103:11,14,17 joking 81:2 judge 55:3,22 57:3, 18,19 58:8 59:14 61:15 63:3,15 64:21 65:3,18,20 66:7 77:5 80:21,25 92:14 97:11, 15 109:22 110:2 115:6,14 122:16 138:9,21 142:13 144:15 159:24 166:15 168:15 170:12 172:7 176:23 177:9 182:5 **Judge's** 90:15 168:13 169:11 judgment 127:4 148:12 149:3,4,14 **July** 60:8 108:17,20

June 60:8 108:16

justifications 78:2

Κ

K-R-I-C-K 132:22 133:4

Kansas 63:19 65:14

Karen 64:2

keeping 90:8

Kevin 61:8 64:1 135:4 138:8 142:14 170:22 176:24 182:5

kind 77:25 86:12 98:4 105:15 150:3,7 151:3 177:20 179:2

knew 88:16 135:23

knowing 139:20

knowledge 111:22 134:18 140:1 143:14

KOLKMEYER 57:16

Krick 125:17,19,23 128:17 129:3 132:22 133:4,7,12 135:13 138:21 142:2 162:24 163:9

Krick's 158:13

L

labor 140:12,18 148:17 178:21 179:5, 7,9 182:25

lack 90:8

lacked 85:6

ladies 176:12

lag 82:19

laid 149:18

language 152:21 161:24 181:8

large 71:17 89:1 98:16 104:10 154:1 175:22 largely 99:8

lash 128:19

late 124:7 156:12

laugh 102:22

laurels 84:21

law 55:3,22 58:8 65:10 103:25

lawyers 137:17 163:19

lead 66:6 108:13 173:5

leads 165:24

leave 181:9

leaves 62:7 115:16 117:9

ledger 127:5 139:4,8, 11 165:15

ledgers 139:9

left 86:25

legal 61:21,22 65:2,4 97:13 109:25 115:12 130:22 131:1

length 85:18

level 82:11 127:1,5 149:13 150:7 159:3

levels 179:22

lieu 126:25 136:19

life 79:19,22,23 92:24, 25 95:5 101:22 102:2, 15 103:19 104:3,9,14, 17,18 105:3 106:11, 20,21 113:16 116:1,7, 15,18 118:20,23 119:1,16 122:4 128:13

lift 97:24 139:23 168:8,11 172:3

limited 122:10 125:2

lines 135:14,15 156:19 157:19 159:9 160:13 **Linhares** 61:15 64:21,22 97:9,10,16 109:20,22 115:5,6

list 92:8 98:11 112:7 125:17 130:21,23 135:3 138:6 143:25 165:3,6,25 175:14 182:4

listed 179:17

listening 115:23

listing 147:13

lists 164:19

litany 145:1

literally 75:14 86:5

litigate 104:12

live 55:12,16 90:1,8, 14,17 184:3,4

lives 118:9

LLC 60:5 65:10 93:4

loan 66:16 67:13

local 184:5

long 78:21 98:2 104:5 119:6 131:22 164:11

longer 180:11

longevity 103:12

loop 70:11,15

lose 120:13

loss 83:18

lost 123:5

lot 68:25 81:8 87:6 90:7 107:5 132:6 140:13,18 159:6 168:7 172:8 179:4

lots 139:20 140:20

loud 157:21 181:5

Louis 63:17 64:17,23 65:5 108:10

low 85:19,21 131:1

lower 69:23

lowest 67:16 71:1,11

luck 62:23

lumping 105:13

М

M-A-T-T-H-E-W 142:10

Madam 57:16

made 84:25 100:17 103:2 136:13 146:17 154:6 170:4

Madeline 64:3

Madison 64:10

magically 76:19

main 92:19 95:9,12,13 114:24 117:25 119:8 121:17

mains 102:21,25 103:2,4,7,10,13,15 104:1,4,10 106:17,18 114:20 118:22 121:14

mains' 100:16 103:19,20

maintain 68:20 69:15 84:20 85:2 101:7 102:13 106:8 129:16 136:5 137:5 139:9

maintained 70:10,15

maintaining 67:9,16 69:5,25 70:25 71:12

maintains 94:6 96:12 139:4

major 81:7 86:11

majority 73:3

make 56:10,15 58:23 60:14 63:6 65:21 69:3, 9 70:2 75:17 77:25 78:5 82:3,23 83:1,2 86:10 88:21 90:5

98:24 105:20 106:16, 17 108:23 121:16 124:14 133:25 142:4 154:11 159:12 163:5 171:9 175:2 176:7 179:5

makes 65:22 74:4 100:9 102:8 105:11 148:25 173:8

making 67:23 78:6 81:25 101:16 103:11 120:12 149:12

manage 69:18 74:9

managing 69:11,12 70:24 71:6,10

manipulated 73:2

manipulation 75:8

manner 71:19 73:2 95:1,6 157:13

manufacturers 78:4

mark 109:7 167:1

Marke 85:17

marked 111:7,8 133:21 143:1,2,4

Market 63:17 108:9

marketing 137:25

marking 63:5

massive 103:22

match 92:22 178:10 183:16,17

matches 178:10

material 90:25

materialized 179:23

materials 178:21

math 121:21

Matt 63:16 136:4,9

matter 78:4 120:17 170:3

matters 65:16

Matthew 57:4 142:9, 15.25

Mckernan 64:3

meaning 55:8

means 70:16 76:19 80:5,17 81:23 89:1 94:23 103:20

meant 72:6 120:25 137:2 162:19 169:24

meantime 155:9

measure 175:21

mechanically 172:15

mechanism 84:19 85:7.9

mechanisms 73:1 84:17

meet 78:19 94:9

memory 177:21

mention 65:17 139:23 171:20

mentioned 102:19 120:2 129:2 141:8 168:13

merit 78:3

meter 77:1 78:4 79:13 80:3,12 96:9,22

meters 76:23 77:10, 19,20 78:3,6,7,8,10, 12,15,19,20,21 79:1,2, 11,12,17,19,21,23 80:5,6,8,10,14 82:3,5, 8 96:9,22 99:24 105:1, 4 106:21

method 102:7,9 118:12,13 119:13 127:23 136:13 139:24 141:11,21 149:3 176:14

methodology 95:4

mic 154:25

Michelle 95:21 107:20 108:2,9,14

109:12

microphone 93:10 173:17

microphones 56:21

middle 162:18 171:16

Midwest 64:12

mile 176:16

million 68:5 86:8 87:6,17,18,23,24 88:2, 6 101:12,14 128:18 150:11,18,20,21,23 151:1,6,11,15,18 158:12,13 164:19 165:1 179:17

millions 77:16

mine 122:2 137:22 156:4

mini 96:1 97:11,17 125:21,24 126:2 130:25 132:18

minimum 85:1

minor 134:1

minute 110:6 122:20

minutes 164:10

misallocation 179:12

mishearing 81:1

misleading 78:25

mismatch 155:12

misquoted 106:5

Missouri 61:19,21
62:3 63:17,20,22 64:4,
11,14,17,18,23 65:1,2,
5,8,11 67:19 68:9,15,
23 69:4,22 70:18,22
71:7 72:22 73:3,8,10,
17,24 74:7,17,18,20,
24 75:11,19,20,21
76:1,2,25 81:13,22,25
89:25 95:16,21 108:10
111:4 126:8,9,21
127:11 129:5 133:15
142:23 144:23 145:1,

5,10 149:14 152:3,4 155:10 160:2,4 164:18 165:21,22 166:20 167:15 178:5

Missouri's 93:19 127:3,15,19 146:14 148:15 165:9 177:12

mistake 100:13

model 76:8

modify 128:25

moment 57:11 67:1 74:6 182:9

money 71:18 74:1 80:17 82:22,25 83:1 86:6 87:6,23

monitor 55:12

month 179:20,23

monthly 105:24 127:1 141:1,12

morning 57:3 58:6 65:17 124:13 183:23

mouth 155:1 173:17

mouthful 107:4

move 60:21 62:10 63:8 72:3 76:22 77:8 81:5 91:25 97:8,13 109:4 110:12 111:24 114:15 115:4,12 116:21 119:24 121:9 131:20 145:12 165:16,

moved 150:23 151:1

moving 85:2 93:9 107:1 159:6 179:21 180:1

MSBA 65:12

multiple 71:5 80:14 156:24

municipalities 84:8,

Murray 71:23 72:1 82:13

mute 55:21

Myers 64:2 117:8

Ν

names 92:2

NARUC 151:22 152:8,10,14,22

National 61:14 64:20, 21 97:8 109:20 115:4

Natural 88:23

nature 157:3 160:15 165:13,17

necessarily 141:15

necessitate 128:10

needed 79:10

needing 85:1

negative 87:17,20 88:6,7,11 161:17

negotiation 56:14

net 83:18 101:23 102:3,15 106:11 118:24 119:1,16 151:1

newer 135:20

Niemeier 57:5 63:17

nobody's 176:7

NOL 83:22

non-operational

nonissue 91:6

nonoperational

153:10 162:7,13,19,21 163:2,9,12 164:1,4,6, 23,25 169:24

nonregulated 68:12 69:19 71:7,19 72:7,10, 14 77:24

normal 56:8 67:7 95:25 144:13

normalization 84:18

note 56:20 58:23 87:13 157:11 175:18

noted 134:15

notice 56:17 65:23 86:23 87:5 157:17 163:6,7 165:21

number 55:6 58:10 109:6 146:25 147:5 151:4 164:19 179:19 180:3,12 183:25

numbers 162:24 174:20,23

0

O&m 141:7

object 119:20 124:24

objection 120:19 124:23 168:17,20 169:8 175:17

objections 58:15,17 60:24 61:1 109:9,13 112:3 125:14 134:24 143:19,21 175:15

obligation 130:15

obsolete 78:3

occur 96:14 136:1

occurred 87:8 96:14

occurring 73:5 74:12 89:9

October 97:3 127:10 177:17 178:1

odd 87:19

offer 97:10 123:21 134:20 139:18 143:17 167:19 168:15 169:2 175:8 176:4

offered 60:6 78:2 109:8 139:21 167:4, 17,19 168:5,20,21 172:2

office 56:7 57:23 64:6,8,9 89:14 97:19

110:4,5 115:16 131:9 135:7 138:11 146:2 160:18,23 163:17 174:8

officer 129:5 133:15 137:25 142:23

officers 75:24

officers' 160:19,24

official 135:3 165:21, 25

offset 83:22 84:3 87:9 89:8

offsets 151:10

one's 98:20

onward 146:4

OPC 72:24 80:11 84:24 85:14 86:7 93:22 94:5 95:14 98:20 99:15 100:2,12, 13 101:6 102:23 103:1,3 120:22 123:22 126:15 136:4 139:12 144:2,10 164:16 166:3 174:2 175:23 176:21 177:11

OPC's 80:12 86:19 87:1,20 88:5,9 172:11

opened 66:18

opening 58:14 63:9 66:3,4 85:13 92:3,6,8, 11 97:10,11,16,17 101:9 115:23 125:22, 24 126:2,5 129:7,8 130:23 131:1,9,12 132:18 144:5,17

openings 91:18,20 96:1 130:21

operating 83:18

operation 73:9 140:16

operational 163:1

opinion 73:4 117:25 130:3 172:23,25

opportunity 62:11 67:5 128:2

opposed 145:18

opposition 159:10

Oracle 135:20

order 61:6 66:2,3
71:15 81:10,22 82:5
83:5,9 89:2 92:8,24
93:12 95:17 96:6,17
102:13 103:6 105:16,
22 106:23 112:17
113:15 117:14 121:7
126:1 127:8 129:7
130:7,9 144:5 146:22
153:9,11 157:3
162:12,14 163:6,7
164:22 165:4 174:18
176:20 181:11

ordered 96:19,25 100:11 180:18,23

ordering 120:17

orders 69:15,16 129:19 155:14

oriented 179:9

origin 129:21

original 116:6 122:3 123:5

orphans 68:17

outdated 93:22

outlined 98:11

outstanding 121:17, 25

overhead 103:8 125:13 126:10,24 127:7,11,14 129:15,21 130:9 135:17 136:7 141:10 146:1 147:15 148:18 153:10,24 156:23 157:1,2 159:4 162:1,13,20,22 163:9, 12 164:1,4,20,21,23, 24 165:10,14 172:16 178:16,24 179:3,8,24 180:13 182:24 183:2,3 overheads 83:3.5.12. 13,15 124:12 125:4,6, 16 126:3,13,21 127:15,20 128:10 129:11 130:23 132:2, 3,5,19 138:25 140:17, 20 141:1,4 144:22 145:13 146:13 147:13 149:15 150:11 155:13, 21 158:6,12,14,21,24 159:14 162:8 163:1,2 164:17 165:1 168:2 169:13.16 170:7.17 177:12,16 179:4,6,10, 17 180:7,9,18,19,23, 25 181:9,16 182:19, 20,21,22 183:1,7

overheard 148:3

overruled 121:1 169:8

overstated 78:9

Ρ

p.m. 58:4 89:20,21

P.O. 64:3

paid 73:16,17 75:19, 21 154:20,23

panel 62:10

papers 93:8 94:9

paperweight 63:7

par 78:7

paragraph 157:1 171:19 172:22,23 173:1

paraphrase 156:19

parcel 56:14

parent 68:11,19 69:2, 25 72:20 80:18 81:21 89:3

Park 65:5

part 55:15,19,25 74:1, 5 87:7 93:14 94:8 98:16 100:15 103:10

104:6 123:5 135:20 139:11 141:17 145:13 161:7 165:1 170:6,19 182:18

participants 55:8,11, 13 90:1,2

participate 163:18

participating 55:10 56:20 65:24 91:10

parties 56:15,17 58:12 92:15 94:8 99:24 109:19 115:8 128:24 135:23 160:8

parts 117:17

party 137:2 139:6 155:22 168:17

pass 144:9 173:9

passed 144:16 168:17 173:13

past 96:13,14

Paul 59:11 61:22 65:3

pause 56:10 68:22 73:19 105:19 119:6 151:3 164:7

pay 74:3 75:10 79:13 80:6,9,14 82:7,16,22

payers 71:17 154:1, 14,21 155:3,4

paying 68:1 69:21 70:19 72:11,21 73:11 74:1,5,10 79:10 80:7 81:16 82:24

payments 68:6 82:24 83:1

payroll 74:16,18 148:18 183:3

pays 74:1

peer 137:22

Pennsylvania 59:25

pensions 183:3

people 56:1 85:24

90:18 91:12

percent 113:15 118:7,16 150:9 151:17 178:13

percentage 83:6,8 140:12 160:25

percentages 126:20 127:13 132:4,14 148:2,7

perfectly 99:15

perform 86:3 140:7

performed 137:1,2 161:25

period 96:13,20 103:21 113:14,18,21 114:6,8 120:13 122:1 177:25 179:20 181:19

periods 113:1

permission 144:16

permitted 130:14 148:3,6

perpetual 70:17

persist 130:14

person 55:9,15 56:19 74:9 90:19 124:18

personnel 123:15,21

Ph 64:3

phone 56:2 177:8

phrase 158:17 163:8

physical 63:1

physically 55:8

pick 154:19

picking 170:15

picture 66:14 184:8

pieces 143:8 159:6

pipeline 137:8,11,15, 25 160:10 173:11

pitfalls 76:5

place 63:19 100:19 114:17,19 177:14

plan 82:16,19 114:19 178:15,17

planned 95:1

planners 163:19

planning 137:23

plans 77:22

plant 95:4 96:12 99:9, 12 100:4,10,17 102:3 104:14 105:6,8,11,13, 15,17 106:11,22,24 112:13,18,22 118:1 119:9 120:2,3,5,6,17, 24 121:7 126:16,19 129:25 136:6 147:23 153:5 156:25 157:4 165:13 177:14 178:18 179:15,21,25 180:4,20 181:1

plant's 104:17

plants 105:23 106:1, 25 121:18,25

plastic 100:16 104:1, 4,10 106:18 118:22

plating 76:25 77:9 80:19,22 81:4

play 154:18 179:1

Playing 56:7

plays 149:12

point 55:23 68:9 71:9 78:8,23 79:9 86:16 90:16,21 99:10,15,17, 22,25 132:8 134:6 168:1 181:7,13

pointed 87:15 100:14,15 101:9

pointing 90:14 100:2

points 81:7 99:4 100:7 181:6

policy 82:19 174:11

Polsinelli 63:19

pool 75:4 145:11 155:4 **portion** 66:10 116:25 145:16 150:2 169:3 portions 176:2 pose 157:13 posit 71:20 **position** 69:17 70:5 88:3.6.14 93:24 94:2 121:11 153:8 positions 118:1 positive 86:24 possibly 124:7 potentially 120:13 practical 132:10 141:19 practice 126:13 144:13 171:1 182:23 pre-filed 65:19 precautionary 175:21 precision 179:2 predate 152:18 **prefer** 184:1 prefiled 63:4 preliminary 65:16 premature 104:13 prematurely 104:10, **prepare** 174:14 prepared 133:16 142:25 143:1 174:14 176:5 present 118:3 presentation 107:8 presented 84:19 113.2 president 60:5 73:19

129:4 137:23

presiding 55:3 58:8 **press** 56:3 pretty 70:20 86:24 prevent 72:7,9 75:7 82:5 96:11 previously 61:19 101:1 124:18 146:18 158:1 **price** 106:3 pricing 107:2 primarily 126:22 **primary** 140:11 principles 73:15 **prior** 58:14 private 55:24 problem 67:19 68:7, 12 72:24,25 73:4 75:16 76:4,10,24 77:3 87:14 103:7,9,16,17, 23,25 104:15 120:4 122:9 132:13 153:25

problematic 70:4 problems 72:18 76:24 87:8 123:2 131:24 157:24 procedural 58:15 procedure 132:9 procedures 128:25 proceed 125:8,12,15 164:13 proceeding 55:23 60:7 108:16 process 79:21 80:4 98:2 127:3,19 129:20 135:16,21 138:22,23, 25 140:17,25 141:2 148:15 154:17 produced 75:18,19, 21 84:16 144:8 produces 75:11

professional 111:5 117:23 128:2 136:14 172:23 139:11.15 152:10 160:9 178:23 **profit** 80:10 **providing** 56:5 69:25 program 85:22 95:14 72:11 74:8 86:9,12 103:10 114:17 88:23 132:7 programs 86:3,6,13, provision 121:19 14 122:1 146:16 170:4 prohibits 126:18 prudence 105:12 132:2 148:7 106:3 107:2 project 107:25 131:16 prudently 147:20 159:1 178:22 **PSC** 55:16 160:3.4 projects 103:12,14 184:4 126:14 129:22 136:8 139:1 145:17 158:8,10 **public** 64:6,8 89:14 159:14 178:24 180:10 97:19 110:4,5 111:4 115:16 131:10 135:7 **prolong** 103:12 138:12 142:24 143:4 **proper** 72:17 77:11 153:19 165:22 174:8 175:10 176:4 178:5 95:11 184:5 properly 95:8 published 152:14 proportion 141:19 **Pull** 173:17 proposal 95:15 153:16 proposed 87:15 95:17 96:10.18 118:20 175:5 proposes 94:25 159:9 proposing 105:14 154:8 prorated 84:5 prospectively 180:18,24 protect 81:3 176:16

pun 100:23 purpose 92:22 purposely 71:1 purposes 75:25 127:15 133:17 **push** 124:22 **put** 66:23 67:12,13 70:16 85:20 86:8,13 98:14,17,19 100:8 101:12 135:20 154:3, 22,25 157:17 181:25 **putting** 78:10 104:5 154:11 **puzzled** 139:16 Q **qualify** 172:16 quantify 154:10

155:13

proves 168:21

provide 111:8 119:3

128:6 129:3 132:10

135:24 136:17,19,20

153:19 157:6 165:8,

9 169:1 180:19,24

provided 95:19

12,15 166:23 168:2,5,

137:3 139:18,22

quantity 165:17

quarterly 82:23

question 73:25 91:9 111:17 114:2 119:6 121:4 124:9 133:18 134:5 140:8 141:13 145:15 149:2 157:13 158:17 159:11 161:8, 18 162:5 165:7 166:15 170:15 180:21 181:12 182:16 183:10

questioning 119:21

auestions 60:16 61:3,9,13,16,23 62:3, 8,10,12,13,17,19 71:25 89:11,13 91:24 97:5 108:25 109:15, 21,23 110:1,2,5,7 115:2,6,13 116:22 117:2,5,8,15 120:21 122:5,10,22 123:13 130:20 134:13 135:5, 8,11 138:4,9,13,21 139:13 140:7 141:23 143:10 144:11 149:23 155:24 157:16 159:19, 21,23,25 164:15 166:9 169:11,23 170:9 172:8 173:2 175:4 176:24 177:4,6,7,9 179:14 182:2,6,10

quick 56:13 87:22 102:20

Quickly 65:16

quote 129:12 135:16 136:10,15 160:14,21 162:9,11,18

quoted 145:23,25

quotes 158:11

R

Rachel 57:5 63:16

raise 59:5 103:5 107:13 110:15 122:8 173:14 raised 177:11

rampant 81:4

rate 60:4 67:21 70:7, 11 71:17,24 77:1 79:25 80:16 81:15 82:12 83:23 84:1 85:14 89:25 93:4,15 96:16 98:21 99:16 100:23 101:14 104:19 113:15 114:12 118:2, 4,9,16 119:18 121:15, 22 127:12,24,25 128:1,7,19 129:23 150:24,25 151:2,6,15 153:6,21,24 154:1,2,3, 9,12,14,19,21 155:3,4, 5 160:17,22 161:5,11, 15,21 162:2 172:6 178:4,6 179:16 180:18,20,24 181:1

rates 80:8 82:20,22, 25 83:20 84:3 87:4,15 88:2,10,19,25 89:5 92:17,19,20,22 93:19, 21,24 94:1,13,15,20, 22,24 95:4,8,17 96:7, 10,17,23,24 97:2 98:11,16,17,19,23 99:5,7,13,22 100:7,23 101:2,3,8,12,15,16,19 102:5,8,13,18 103:5 106:9,15 112:21,24 117:16,20,24 118:8 119:5 120:16.17 121:6 123:17,22 126:10 128:25 154:11 158:7,

ratio 69:6 70:2 182:25

rationale 155:20

reach 67:23 119:18

read 93:13 109:19 141:16 157:19,20,21

readily 120:7

ready 90:2 97:20

real 81:6 84:19,25 86:21

realistic 77:22

reason 68:24 88:19 94:11 104:5 127:3 128:5 148:12 149:3,4, 13 152:22

reasonable 88:24 89:5 99:15 120:15 126:11 141:21 149:6

reasoning 149:18

reasons 94:2

rebuttal 60:7,17,22 93:17 99:1,14 100:6 105:9 108:15,20 109:11 133:17 134:1 135:15 143:1 145:25 162:4,10 172:14 174:15,19 175:1,10,19

recall 124:15 150:5 160:25 165:3 177:19 179:19

receipts 84:4,5

receive 85:24 139:13 174:18

received 109:14 130:10 153:12 162:15

recent 135:17 138:23 152:13

recess 89:20,23 184:14

recognize 77:14 145:21 167:13

recognized 72:16

Recognizing 87:18

recollection 178:13

recommend 55:25 88:17 118:15,16,17 123:16

recommendation

104:25 105:10 106:5 121:24 123:9 157:23 170:1,25 181:7 182:20

recommendations 100:9,17,24 146:22 147:3

recommended 87:5 98:24 101:5 102:14 104:19 106:17,18 112:21,24 115:25 116:5 117:20,24 118:2,10 121:6 162:11

recommending

81:15 99:11 103:3 105:18 118:4,5,7 121:12,13,22 122:7,25 123:22

recommends 70:14 96:6,22 130:6 153:9

record 55:7,16,19,25 56:4,12 58:1,21 59:9, 20 60:23,25 65:21 66:19 89:22 98:14,21 104:7 109:6 112:4 139:7 143:20 165:13 167:4,6 168:18 169:9 184:17

records 129:17 136:6 156:22

recorrect 89:17

recover 82:18 120:12 121:25 154:12,14

recovered 95:5,8,12 113:21 114:7,9,11,25 128:13.14

recovers 121:17

recovery 82:3,6 95:2, 11 96:11,14,16 103:22 113:15

recross 117:1 138:5 165:24 182:3,8

redirect 117:9,12 119:21 120:20 122:9, 14 124:1 138:15,19 170:11,13 182:12,14

reduce 83:23 86:1

reduced 104:3,9

reduction 85:15 89:8

refer 61:6 74:24

120:21

reference 127:22
140:8 172:3 176:13

referenced 169:25

referencing 162:22,
23

referred 138:24
169:12

referring 136:10 140:5 144:3 146:24 177:22

reflect 95:14 146:23 147:4

refund 84:11,12

refunds 84:11

regard 77:10 157:16 163:13 166:20 168:6 169:17

regular 75:1 105:23

regularly 65:11 96:12,19

regulated 67:15 68:8, 15 72:7,13 75:2,5,6 137:8 160:6

regulation 79:23

regulations 130:17

regulatory 55:3,22 58:8 73:14 82:19 108:13 137:9 142:23 152:5 154:8

reiterate 102:12

related 83:15 87:14 95:12 96:9,21 100:4, 16 129:15 163:13,16 183:10

relates 72:25 140:14

relating 99:23

relationship 68:8 83:4,13,16 126:23 136:14,25 140:9,10, 22,24 141:22 148:22 160:20 165:18 relationships 136:18.21 140:11

reliability 78:16,18

relied 152:23

relies 126:22

remain 70:6 109:1

remainder 184:2

remains 70:14

remember 116:2 146:4 165:5 166:19,24

remind 72:20 156:2

reminder 72:15

remitted 83:21 84:1

remotely 91:10

removal 122:3

remove 84:11 114:20

removing 104:15

Rendering 94:4

Renew 61:19 65:1

reorient 89:24

repairs 154:5,23

repeat 58:11 101:20 102:1 113:22 114:1 119:6 121:4 161:7 175:14 180:21

repeated 70:15

replace 78:20 114:20

replacement 93:1 95:13 114:17

replacing 78:19 79:17,21 80:4

replies 169:4

report 96:8 98:16 102:4,5 106:13,15 111:7,11,14,18,20 116:13,17 127:8 143:4 150:3 160:5,9 162:1 163:6,7 165:22 173:11 178:5,8,10,14 reported 149:10 178:4,7

reporter 55:19 57:6, 12,15,16 59:22 65:23 77:4 80:20 93:5 102:24 107:19,22 110:18 111:15 113:7, 25 116:11 119:12 125:10 126:7 131:19 133:3 138:17 142:8 145:3 149:17 154:13, 24 159:5 164:11 169:19 170:20 172:5 173:18 174:10

reporting 148:5

reports 153:20 178:12

representative 168:24

representing 96:5

request 58:12 87:22 129:14 139:12 173:9, 13

requested 99:6,22 168:11

requesting 86:7 103:6

requests 56:15 95:16 156:24

require 94:7 106:2 168:7

required 75:15 76:20 136:6,24 137:4,11,16 141:14,15 160:5

requirement 95:14 96:7 128:11,19 143:3 146:17 147:8 150:8, 13,16,21 151:11,16

requirements 94:9 95:13 129:25 161:6, 12,22

requires 76:14

RES-D-4 164:17,25 177:16,23,24 178:17 179:18

reserve 82:4

reserved 95:7

respect 171:11 172:19

responded 120:23 182:18

response 129:14 140:8 153:3,4 184:15

responsibilities 55:14

responsibility 63:4 65:19

rest 86:14 124:11 172:13

restarting 58:7

restated 135:14

resting 84:21

restriction 128:9

result 67:25 75:9 80:2 135:22 154:2

resulted 68:5

results 73:6,8 128:24

retire 96:19 100:11 105:17 106:1,23,25

retired 79:18 103:24 113:17

retirements 93:2 104:13,16

retiring 79:17 103:9 104:10 105:23

return 80:9 82:12 150:25

returned 153:23

returns 71:24

reusing 99:13

revenue 86:19 96:7 128:11,19 143:3 146:17 147:8 150:8, 13,16,21 151:11,16 reverse 117:14 review 72:5 96:15 105:12 reviewed 128:1

reviews 106:4 107:2 **RFPS** 77:20

rich 67:20

Richard 61:12 65:9

risk 66:11 70:16 179:11

riskier 68:19

risky 66:21 67:2,4 68:13

road 149:13

Robert 164:16 173:19 174:1

Robinett 87:4,16 102:14 106:6,17,19 117:1 120:23 124:4

Robinett's 101:16

roll 77:23 102:20

Ron 64:2

room 56:9,13,15,17, 18,23 57:17 91:12 92:9

rooms 56:5

rough 150:7

roughly 101:14

round 116:22

rounded 164:19

routinely 105:25 106:25

RSB3 65:10

rule 72:6 73:14 76:18, 20 79:20 83:17 94:6, 10 169:6

rules 81:23 99:19

run 65:16 82:10

S

S-C-H-A-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G 173:20

S-P 59:11

Sabbert 137:19

safer 78:14

safety 78:9,11,13,14 80:16

salaries 146:3

salary 74:5

salvage 101:23 102:3,15 106:11 118:24 119:2,16

sampling 139:24

satisfy 157:6

save 71:17

scared 122:19

Schallenberg 136:5 164:16 165:2 173:8, 14,19,21 174:1,6 175:12 177:11 183:20

Schallenberg's

157:7,12 158:10 159:8 164:24 175:16

schedule 58:16 60:14 93:16 95:18 98:10 124:11 152:1 164:16, 19,25 165:5 177:16,23 178:17,18 179:18

scheduled 124:12,18 131:2 177:24

schedules 60:10 98:11 144:8,9 165:2

scheduling 124:15

School 61:10 65:8,11

scope 119:21 120:20

Scott 137:19

screen 90:14 91:1

seasons 127:2

seat 110:17 133:1 142:7 173:17

Section 127:17 136:6

secure 68:18

seeking 72:24

Selinger 112:23 113:2 166:20 167:14, 17 168:5 172:2

Selinger's 112:24 168:22

Senate 59:25

sense 74:4 114:13

sensitive 58:13

sentence 126:18 132:8 147:25 149:1

sentences 82:11

separately 164:21

September 93:20 152:11 177:17 178:1

series 155:16

serves 137:24

service 73:12 74:8, 10,14,15 79:19,22 88:23 92:23 94:18 95:3,5 96:8 98:15 101:22,23,25 102:2,4, 5,15,16,17 104:3,8,18 105:3 106:11,12,13, 14,20,21 111:4,7 116:13,15,16 118:20, 23 119:1,3,15,17 142:24 143:4 150:3 163:3 165:22 171:10 177:14 178:5,18

services 61:21,23 65:2,4 72:22 75:4,11, 18 76:8,9,12 81:25 97:13 109:25 115:12 130:10,22 145:6,9 153:12 162:15 164:2, 3,4

session 58:4

set 55:5 58:9 81:14 92:17 94:12 95:17 105:25 128:25 130:5

setting 94:23

shank 77:19

share 128:24

shared 74:14,15 75:4 76:8,9,12 163:3

Sherry 77:5 80:21 102:25 107:11 164:8

shifted 128:14

short 72:5 156:5

short-term 151:13

shorten 104:24

shortening 104:25

should've 155:5

show 84:25 91:1 157:2 184:8

showing 55:12

shown 95:10 128:16

shows 132:1 184:4

shuffle 74:25

shuffling 93:8

Silvey 57:22,23 62:14,15

similar 97:15 112:24 117:24 118:9 119:18 137:3 171:23 175:6

similarly 127:10

simple 71:8 75:13

simply 66:1 89:10 94:21 130:13

simultaneously 71:18

single 180:3

sink 74:6

sir 62:22 109:24 110:13,15 117:3 125:18 131:8,11 132:24 142:6 173:7,16

sit 57:24

site 123:14,15

situation 85:24 89:17 115:9

Sixty 104:4

sizable 86:24 87:3

skipping 176:21

slate 85:20

sleep 90:22

slide 75:20 81:8

slightly 101:4 102:8

slowly 55:23 73:20

small 77:13 92:5

smaller 120:7

smart 96:9,21,22

snapshot 141:10

social 56:6

software 104:23 106:19 116:1,16

solely 154:23

solid 118:9 119:18

solution 71:4,8 75:12 90:11 91:4

solutions 75:12

sort 73:4 74:21 100:22 105:9 144:13 149:21 161:14

sounds 57:9 177:20

sourcing 77:21

South 64:23

Spanos 58:18 59:5, 10,15 60:6 90:4 94:14 95:20 96:18 113:2 118:3,5 119:19

Spanos's 60:22 93:17 118:3,12,17 120:16 121:24 speak 56:3

SPEAKER 90:25 91:17,22 122:15

speaking 57:14 123:14

special 126:17 128:22 148:6 155:16, 22 181:22

specifically 67:22 81:20 86:7 100:16

spell 59:8 107:18 110:18 121:21 133:2 142:7 173:18

spelled 107:11 160:3

spent 137:6

Spire 57:2,4 59:3 63:14 66:6 67:18,19 68:9,11,12,15,23 69:4, 5,8,22 70:18,22 71:5, 6,7,9,10,15,16 72:19, 20,22 73:3,8,9,10,16, 17,19,22,23,24,25 74:3,5,7,8,9,13,17,18, 20,21,23,24 75:7,10, 11,18,19,20,21,22,23, 24,25 76:2,3,7,16,18, 25 77:11,18 78:4,10, 11,18 79:24 80:4,9,15, 16,18 81:12,13,16,21, 22,24,25 82:1,21,23, 24 84:11,14,16,18 85:5 88:22 89:3,25 92:8,13,18 93:19,25 94:12,14,18,21,22 95:16,19,21 96:18 98:17,19 99:2,5 100:1, 8,21 102:22 103:1,9 105:9,15 106:9 107:9 108:13 112:7 116:8,23 117:7 121:10,17 122:6,7,23,25 123:2, 10,11,21 124:24 126:1,8,9,21 127:3,10, 15,19 128:23 129:2,5, 16,18,22,24 130:4,8,9, 10,11,13 133:14,15 136:5,14,23 137:4,8, 11,15 138:6 143:25

144:9,23 145:1,5,6,9, 10 146:14 148:15,17, 21 149:3,14 152:3,4 153:9,11,12,17,18 154:3 155:6,10,17 156:21 157:5 160:10, 14,16,22 161:3,9,18 162:1,12,14,15,16 163:21 164:2,3,4,18, 22 165:8,9,10,12,14, 21 166:20 167:14 168:1 172:23 173:10, 11 175:25 176:1,4 177:2,12 178:4,23 180:5 182:8

Spire's 73:10 75:15 78:16 79:16 80:3 81:3 83:7 86:10 87:22 93:23 99:18,21 103:5, 6,11 128:6,9,11 133:5 149:18 153:21 163:10 171:10 178:7 183:12

spoke 57:23

spot 66:17 139:9

spreadsheet 171:20, 23 172:1

St 63:17 64:17,23 65:5 108:10

stability 128:6

stable 95:8

Staff 61:7,8 63:24,25 70:4,14 81:15 82:21 83:18 94:25 95:24 96:5,10,14,22 97:4 98:15 99:7,9,14,22 100:7,22 101:5 102:6 104:2,22 105:14,18 110:23 111:6 115:25 116:5,9,12 117:4,16, 18,22 118:2,10,12,20, 21,24 120:22 121:6 124:23 126:15 129:7, 10,20,24 130:2,6,7,18 132:15 135:3,4 136:4, 9 138:7,8 139:12,21 140:4,6 142:3,12,14, 16,24 144:7 147:18 150:2 152:23 153:7,8, 18 155:19 161:25 162:11 165:9 166:1 170:23 176:22,24 181:8 182:4,6

Staff's 88:1,5 95:3 96:7 101:11,14,23,24 102:3,4,16,17 104:22, 25 105:10 106:12,14 117:19 119:3,5,15,23 120:16 129:12 130:15 131:23 143:3 146:17 147:8 153:16 167:21, 24 169:25 170:5

staked 88:14

stand 72:1 82:14 90:16 125:20 131:21 132:23 142:4 173:8 176:5 183:21

standards 172:17

start 58:5 63:11 72:4 90:2 92:7 115:22 117:14,17 124:9 132:21 134:10 145:11 165:16 183:24

starting 58:4 86:25 92:10,11 122:24 138:22 151:4

starts 98:7

state 56:4,12 59:8,21, 24 84:10 86:12 107:18 108:7 110:18 125:5 133:2 136:5 142:7 147:13 148:15 160:14 162:5 173:18

stated 59:20 129:16 164:17

statement 66:5 118:1 126:5 129:8 131:12 135:18 136:16 144:17 145:18 168:22 169:4

statements 58:14 63:9 66:3 92:4,6,8,12 125:22,24 126:2 131:1,9 132:18 144:5 168:22

states 129:18 136:9

static 141:9 stating 124:5 163:7 **status** 153:19 statutory 85:6 step 74:25 steps 129:19 **stick** 101:7,18 **STL** 137:8,11,15 160:10 173:11 Stokes 64:1 **stop** 66:13 83:10 115:11 124:10 straight 148:6 163:5 straightforward 85:17 97:25 129:10 **stranded** 77:5 79:15 82:6 strategy 99:10 **stream** 55:12,16 56:8 90:8,17 184:3,4 **Street** 63:17 64:10 108:9 strictly 83:6 strongly 71:25 **structure** 66:13,25 67:3,6,8,20,23 68:3, 21,24 69:6,13,16,19 70:5,9,10,13,17,23,25 71:2.6.10.11.16.17 81:11,12,14,16,19 87:14,17 structures 71:24 struggling 154:18 studied 183:5 **studies** 100:21 126:17,25 128:22,24 136:13,15,24 137:1,2 141:14,15 148:6,16 155:16

148:1 158:13

study 92:25 93:12,16, 18,23 94:4,5,7 95:11 98:8,9,12,21 99:3,4,21 100:9,22 101:1,3 118:3,10 123:16 128:22 132:7,10 136:18,19 141:9,20 155:16,22 161:3,9,19 181:22 stuff 71:23 **subject** 112:14 180:11 submission 63:5 **submit** 65:21,25 submitted 66:4 94:8 108:19 160:5,9 165:22

submitting 63:4 65:19 Subpart 145:25 147:12,25 subset 164:5 subside 57:10

subsidiaries 69:3 subsidiary 71:14

subsidization 72:9 87:10,12 89:2,8

subsidizing 69:4 73:9

subsidy 69:25 substance 87:12

substantial 128:10

Substantial 120.10

substantially 103:4 175:6

sufficient 94:19 156:22

suggested 167:20 170:16

suggesting 132:12 147:19

suggestion 172:11

suggests 84:24

Suite 63:19 64:9,23

summarize 81:7

summed 131:24

summing 106:8

Sunset 121:19 122:1

supervision 146:2,4

supervisor 161:3,9, 19 162:1

supervisor's 148:23

supervisors 137:4 149:7

supplied 166:16

supplies 160:24

supply 98:12 137:24

supply's 160:18

support 98:9,14,22 127:6 136:7 141:4,10 163:23 172:3

supported 94:13

supporting 94:15 97:1 99:3 179:3

supportive 118:21

supports 95:2

supposed 68:16 75:14 79:6 91:11 104:4 132:11

supreme 72:15

surplus 95:7

surrebuttal 60:7,17, 22 96:24 100:1 106:7 108:15 109:11 111:8, 11,18,21 128:16 133:18 136:10 143:2 146:6 148:14 151:21 152:1 156:14 157:5,25 158:13 160:13 174:15 175:1,11,19

survivor 113:5,11,20, 24 114:5

suspect 136:22

swear 59:4 107:10

Swearengen 63:21

switch 87:21 90:17, 23 181:13

switched 101:2

switches 181:14

switching 77:1

sworn 59:7,16 107:15 108:3 110:16,23 132:25 133:8 142:5,16 173:15 174:2

system 65:22 126:11 135:19,20 172:20 181:11

systematic 126:22 129:20

systems 135:16,20, 21

T

table 86:25 87:21 134:2

takes 72:1 82:14 93:24

talk 75:12 77:9 105:5 121:10 144:21 145:8 176:12

talked 100:5 149:22 151:17 155:15

talking 65:17 77:15 90:6,10 145:11 151:13 163:17,18 179:18 181:17 182:18

talks 132:7 146:1

targeted 81:16

targeting 67:20,22 68:23 70:9,23 81:14

targets 70:13

tariffs 84:4

tax 82:23 83:20,21,25 84:4,5,8,9,10 158:14

taxes 82:24 183:4

taxing 83:21 84:2,13,

team 90:7,11

technical 58:2

technologies 90:6

ten 78:21 103:18 104:23 116:1,8,18 135:15 136:10 150:9 151:17,18 162:5,10 179:8

ten-year 106:20

tender 109:15 111:25 134:21 143:22 165:20 176:17

tendered 112:6 135:2

term 80:25 162:21 163:15 169:16 181:8

terms 77:22 78:7 86:21 128:7 141:18 149:14 169:12 183:8

test 129:14 164:17 169:12,14 177:17 178:3,6,9 179:15 180:5 183:12

testified 59:16 108:3 110:23 133:8 142:16 174:2

testifying 90:20 97:4

testimonies 175:16

testimony 60:7,14, 17,22 63:4 65:20 66:9 83:7 84:20 92:10 93:17 95:20 96:24 98:9 99:3,11 105:7 106:6 108:15,20,23 109:5 111:8,11,18,21 116:24 117:22 121:20 128:16 129:3,12 133:18,20,25 135:14 141:8 143:1,2,8 145:24,25 146:21 147:2,19 151:21 153:8 160:13 162:4,23,25 163:10 164:16 172:14 173:6 174:15,19,23,25 175:1,5,9,10,11,19 176:15 177:15,22 178:16

thereto 147:16

thing 65:17 77:9 85:2 86:18 87:7 88:21 98:22 105:5 124:19

things 68:17 86:22 88:13,15 98:2 163:20 166:16 183:4,23

thinking 90:11 180:22

Thompson 61:8 63:25 64:1 124:23 125:7 129:9 135:4,6 138:8,10 142:13,14,19 143:16,22 170:12,14, 21,22,24 172:7,9 173:3,4 176:23,24 177:1 182:5,6,7

thousand 150:14,16

thousands 77:15

throw 83:11 86:18

throwing 90:21 176:8

Thursday 85:18

tight 57:24

time 56:10 58:13,24
60:14 66:15 74:14,15
80:7,10 82:8 99:2
104:5 105:21 108:23
109:4 111:24 123:19
126:17 127:21,25
130:11 133:25 136:11
137:6 139:7 141:9
143:16 148:5,16,23
149:9,10 152:25
153:12 161:13 162:1,
16 170:18 176:25
177:4,25 179:11
181:13,15,19 182:22

timecard 161:4,10,19

timecards 132:9 137:5

times 71:5 102:19 121:23 145:24

timing 100:2 183:11

Timothy 128:17 129:3 133:4,7

title 60:3 108:12,13 174:9

today 58:8 60:16 90:4 95:20 97:5 98:6 108:25 124:12 129:3 134:14 143:10 173:22 175:5

Today's 55:4

tomorrow 76:21 90:12 124:13 183:23 184:2

tonight 90:10,22

top 87:25 124:22 134:3 161:23

topic 134:5

torture 98:3

total 118:2,4 120:9 140:12 164:18 165:1 179:15,17

touch 76:6 157:14

touts 78:11

toy 80:15

track 66:19 83:25 120:10 181:18,25

tracked 120:7

tracker 159:9,10,11 172:10,11,14 181:3, 10,14,18,22

tracking 120:11,14 172:17,18 180:17,23

trained 85:25

transaction 72:6 73:14 74:11 81:23 127:5 139:5

transactional 94:15

transactions 72:4,16 139:10

transfer 123:5 160:17,22 161:5,11, 15,21

transparency 135:23,25

treat 75:23 146:17

treated 68:18

treating 170:5

treatment 118:7 127:15

tripping 106:13

trouble 183:7

truck 66:18

true 76:14,20 85:8 111:21 114:16 134:17 143:13

True-up 88:2

Trust 61:14 64:20,22 97:8 109:20 115:4

turn 88:16 159:21

Tuxedo 64:16

two-thirds 80:2

type 128:19 139:24 163:24 164:20

types 140:16,21 146:1,8,18 147:13 164:20,24 166:16,22 179:10

U

ultimate 102:5

ultimately 120:8 145:15

ultrasonic 76:22 77:10 78:8,10 79:1,11 80:5 82:3 99:23 105:1, 3 106:21 ultrasonics 80:9 unable 129:11.24

130:18

unamortized 118:18

underlying 147:19 167:18

understand 58:25 80:24 81:1 117:21 118:6 139:16 164:5

understanding

117:22 133:20

understood 122:9

undertaken 92:25 93:13 180:4

underway 58:6

unfinished 181:16

unfully 118:11

UNIDENTIFIED

90:25 91:17,22 122:15

uniform 126:11 172:20

unique 160:15

unit 106:3 107:1

units 147:14

unjustifiable 80:11

Unlike 95:3

unmute 56:2 164:8

177:8

unmuting 55:23

unnecessarily 77:1

unnecessary 68:6

unrecovered 80:3

unregulated 68:8

update 140:23,24

178:15,17

updated 93:21 127:1

136:21

usage 140:16

users 56:2

USOA 83:3 126:16, 18,19 127:16,18 129:25 130:5,12 132:2 136:6,24 137:12,16 141:15,17 145:22 151:22 152:3,4,14,18 153:13 155:7,18 161:6,12,21,24 162:2, 17 165:11 178:25

USOA's 156:25

usual 172:17

utilities 86:9 120:8 151:23

utility 66:11 67:15 68:15 72:7 75:1,2,5,6 86:11 123:20 130:16

utilization 92:23

utilized 117:23 152:18 169:17

٧

vague 141:18

Valuation 60:4 93:3,

values 102:3 106:11 118:24 119:2

vary 127:2,18 179:23

varying 127:23 160:20

vegan 66:17

vehicle 140:16

verify 116:15

version 152:18

174:22

versus 122:6

vice 129:4 137:23

Vicinity 65:14

video 55:15 184:5

videoconferencing

55:10

viewable 55:16,17

viewing 55:14 90:18

violation 73:13 74:11

visit 123:14,16

voiced 159:10

void 94:5

W

Wait 122:14

waiting 119:13

waiver 168:7

walk 74:12 98:4

wanted 81:8 98:12,14 101:2 124:15 125:8

wanting 67:8

warm 141:2

wash 87:16

watch 56:5

ways 155:17 167:18 168:25

wear 78:22

weather 84:17,18 85:8

web 56:8,17 90:15

Webex 55:10,11,13, 15,17,20,21,24 56:2, 19,23 57:8,10 65:24 90:1,15,18 91:1 92:9 97:9,14 109:13 131:18 183:25 184:1,3,8,9

website 184:4

Wednesday 124:20

week 124:7,11

weighing 88:3

weight 169:7

weighted 102:7

West 63:19 92:18 94:12,14,21,22 106:10 122:6,23 123:2 164:18,21 165:21

West's 94:18

whip 128:19

whispered 56:21

widows 68:17

windfall 84:16

winter 141:3,5,6

wishes 104:24

witness's 98:11

witnesses 56:6,9 90:3 91:4 96:1 115:9 126:15 132:21 166:1

WNARRNA 124:19

wondering 66:7

88:10

Woodsmall 58:19,25 59:2 62:5

word 80:21 90:9

words 82:17

work 74:20,21 75:2 94:9 103:13 105:12 154:7 155:6 157:3 159:16

workers 163:17

workforce 75:1

working 76:2 82:21 151:5

worry 176:14

would've 102:9 147:7

wraps 142:1

write 139:3

writing 81:8 105:20

wrong 75:20 86:17

Υ

Y-O-U-N-G 142:10

year 79:7 94:18 103:19 106:21 113:14 116:1,7,8,18 120:10, 11 122:3 127:2 129:15 136:3 159:4 164:17 177:17 178:3,4,6,7,9, 11,12,14 179:15,21, 22,24 180:1,5,13,16 181:24 183:11,12,13, 14,15 184:7

years 66:17 68:5 78:21 79:6,17,24 103:18 104:3,4,20,23 105:2,3 128:8 135:17 136:22 138:23 152:24 181:24

Young 129:12 136:4, 9 142:3,4,9,11,15,20, 25 144:15,21 158:3,4 159:23 160:2,8 164:15 165:19 166:15 167:10 168:22,23 169:4,11 172:10

Young's 173:6