In the Matter of:

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

GR-2021-0108, VOL. II

May 17, 2021



www.tigercr.com 573.999.2662

```
1
 2
                     STATE OF MISSOURI
 3
                 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
 4
 5
 6
                TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
 7
 8
                   Discovery Conference
 9
                       May 17, 2021
10
                         Via Webex
11
                         Volume 2
12
    In the Matter of:
13
    Spire Missouri Inc.'s d/b/a )
14
    Spire Request for Authority )
    to Implement a General Rate )
    Increase for Natural Gas ) File No. GR-2021-0108
15
    Service Provided in the
16
    Company's Missouri Service
    Areas
17
18
19
20
                          CHARLES HATCHER, Presiding
                             REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
21
22
    REPORTED BY:
23
    Shelley L. Mayer, CCR (Via Webex)
    TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC
24
25
```

```
APPEARANCES:
 2
        MR. JOHN CLIZER (Via Webex)
        Department of Economic Development
 3
        Office of the Public Counsel
        200 Madison Street
 4
        P.O. Box 2230
        Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
        573.751.5324
 5
    For: Office of the Public Counsel
 6
        MR. MATTHEW APLINGTON (Via Webex)
 7
        MS. GOLDIE BOCKSTRUCK (Via Webex)
        Spire Missouri Inc.
 8
        700 Market Street, 6th Floor
        St. Louis, Missouri 63101
        314.342.0785
 9
        Matt.aplington@spireenergy.com
10
    For: Spire Missouri Inc.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

2.5

JUDGE HATCHER: Let's go on the record.

Today is May 17th at a regularly scheduled discovery conference. This is in the general rate case of Spire Missouri, Inc., File No. GR-2021-0108. Today's discovery issues are brought to us by the Office of the Public Counsel.

Mr. Clizer, would you like to go ahead and -- first, would you like to mark any off? I have counted six discovery requests. Have any of those resolved?

MR. CLIZER: Your Honor, we believe that we have resolved discovery request 3004. And I'll also go ahead and say that Spire has been working very closely with us to try and resolve some of these issues and that I believe we might have additional issues resolved, but that I'm going to ask the Commission to -- or I'll put this: I believe that we have several resolutions potentially in place, but I'm hoping that we can substantially postpone this overall meeting, so to speak.

Let me -- let me explain. We are working with Spire. Several of the issues that we have, we think that we might be able to resolve within the coming week. We'd like to potentially reconvene

sometime next week to see if they're fully resolved, but I'd like to use this opportunity to lay out what my issues are on the record and discuss what our proposed resolution of them are so that we can save time next week, if necessary, and hopefully we won't have a very contentious meeting today.

2.5

JUDGE HATCHER: Perfect. I love it. Please proceed.

MR. CLIZER: Okay. I'm going to just simply run through the list of data requests as they were attached to my initial filing. The first data request was 1001. It was issued by Bob Shallenberg. And without just reading the entire request into the record, it effectively was asking for the information on which Spire Missouri relied for -- that outlined why I chose to file this case.

Oh, and one thing really quick I'd like to state for those of you on the call, I am joined in the conference room at the OPC offices by Bob Shallenberg, Lena Mantle, and Dave Murray who are the individuals who issued these data requests. I asked them to be here in case they needed to provide any additional context or if the Commission had any particular questions that I was unable to answer myself. So --

JUDGE HATCHER: Mr. Clizer, sorry to interrupt. Can you tell me the date that this was filed on? And I'll have the same question for the others.

2.5

MR. CLIZER: I apologize. I would actually have to look up that information.

JUDGE HATCHER: Not important. You go right ahead.

MR. CLIZER: Okay. I can -- I will try -- I will try and send that information via email to the -- to you and copy all of the other parties to this case after this meeting.

As I was saying, this data request was request the document— documentation supporting the decision to file the case and to drive the amount of rate increase requested and the filing dates for the case. The company initially responded with an objection that the information being sought could be construed as attorney/client work product or attorney contact — client privileged information and then followed up with a response that the information being sought could be found in the direct testimony, accounting schedules, and minimum filing requirements filed at the onset of the case.

The OPC's concerns here primarily lies in

1 the fact that while information claimed as 2 attorney/client privileged or attorney/client work 3 product, attorney work product, the company didn't supply a privilege log to let us know what exactly 4 5 what information was actually being claimed as 6 privileged. Having spoken with Spire, I believe that 7 there was at least one document they were claiming as 8 privileged. 9 Effectively what the OPC would like with 10 regard to this DR is just a privilege log letting us 11 know the existence of the documentation that was --12 that pertained to this DR the company is claiming 13 privileged. 14 JUDGE HATCHER: Okay. 15 MR. CLIZER: I'm pausing here just in 16 case, I want to let Spire or any other party 17 intercede directly to each of these DRs without just 18 going through all of them. 19 JUDGE HATCHER: Mr. Aplington, you're 20 muted, sir. Sorry. You're showing as unmuted. 21 Can't hear you. 22 MR. CLIZER: I see he's called in. 23 JUDGE HATCHER: Okay. We'll wait a second and let him call back in. Welcome back, 24 Mr. Aplington. Still not hearing you if you're --25

oh, now I got your video. I think we have it now. 1 Т 2 just heard you set down your headphones. 3 MR. APLINGTON: Can you hear me now? JUDGE HATCHER: 4 Yes. 5 MR. CLIZER: Yes. 6 MR. APLINGTON: Okay. Great. Sorry 7 about that. 8 Yes. Thanks, John, for running through 9 that and that helps us to understand a little bit As you noted, John, our primary issue with 10 better. 11 this one was that we felt was seeking primarily work 12 product. There is at least one presentation that I 13 put together along with Mr. Whiteall (ph) to our leadership counsel that has to do with the filing of 14 15 the case, some strategy, litigation position type of 16 thing. And so we could get you a log on that, a 17 privilege log, but that's the concern is that it goes 18 to really litigation strategy that would be protected by work product or privilege. 19 20 JUDGE HATCHER: And since it -- we're 21 more or less poised to do a repeat of our initial 22 discovery conference, we will continue this until 23 next week. Let's move on to issue two, which by my 24 count is data request 1027. 25 MR. CLIZER: Yes. Thank you, your Honor.

This was again issued by Bob Shallenberg, and it sought copies of all documentation presented to Spire Inc. and/or the Spire Missouri officers and/or directors regarding formation of Spire Services.

2.5

The response that we received was effectively that the information we were being -requesting could primarily be found attached to or in the direct testimony of the John Flaherty -- no,
Thomas Flaherty, I apologize, Thomas Flaherty, that was filed in the last general Spire rate case. Spire has subsequently updated its response with additional copies of testimony Mr. Flaherty produced, as well as work papers, and I thank them for that.

Having reviewed some of the information, we maintain -- we still believe that it does not pertain to material that was generated prior to the creation of Spire Services, which is what we're primarily concerned with, but we are interested in working with the company to either confirm or identify what material existed prior to the creation of Spire Services or figure out if there is additional information.

And because we're on the record, I want to make this very clear. The information that we are seeking was that which existed prior to the creation

of Spire Services that was relied upon by the Spire 1 2 Incorporated board of directors and Spire Missouri officers in determining to create Spire Services, the 3 4 service company. 5 JUDGE HATCHER: Okay. And, 6 Mr. Aplington, if you are clear on that, I will give 7 you the opportunity to respond if you'd like. 8 MR. APLINGTON: Sure. Yeah, we will 9 look. I mean, that gives us a little bit better understanding, John, just in the last couple days of 10 11 what exactly you're looking for. So, to be honest, I 12 don't know to what extent there is additional 13 materials beyond what -- the update that we provided 14 on Friday, so we will commit to looking and seeing if 15 there's anything else to produce there. 16 JUDGE HATCHER: Okay. Let's move on. 17 Data request 3004 has been resolved. It's off my 18 list. And moving on to, I'm going in numerical 19 order, data request 3011. 20 MR. CLIZER: Yes. 21 JUDGE HATCHER: And to summarize, this is 22 all of the Spire Incorporated board minutes since 23 September 30th, 2017. MR. CLIZER: Yeah. 24 The board of director minutes along with the board of director committee 2.5

minutes and the materials for both of those.

2.5

So we received initially the board of director minutes; however, there was some degree of redaction made to the minutes that we received. We also received some of the initial board of director materials, but we noted, based on pagination, that some of the information, some of the pages had been removed. Spire has since updated their response with the committee minutes and materials as we requested, and I thank them for that. However, once again we noted some amount of redaction within the committee minutes as well as, I believe, some amount of missing materials based on pagination once again.

Spire seems to suggest that one of its primary concerns is regarding the sensitivity of this document or these documents. We have both, Spire and OPC, kind of reached a mutual understanding that we can resolve some of the sensitivity issues by allowing OPC to review the requested material in person at an office here in Jefferson City, which I believe the company is amenable to. We are hoping if we can do that within this coming week with the potential to make copies of that material which we find most relevant and we'll work with the company to ensure that, we're not just going to ask for

everything to be copied, but if that is agreeable, as 1 2 long as we have unrestricted access to the minutes and materials, the unredacted versions and the 3 complete set of materials to review sometime in the 5 course of this coming week at an office here in 6 Jefferson City, that would resolve this issue. 7 JUDGE HATCHER: And, Mr. Aplington, we'll 8 turn to you if you would like to make comments or 9 just acknowledge your understanding. 10 MR. APLINGTON: Sure. So, yeah. We have 11 been working I think pretty diligently to try to get material to you all. You all have the unredacted 12 versions of the governance committee and audit 13 committee materials, so I think those are -- those 14 15 are resolved. The compensation committee material, 16 that -- that's no problem. The board of directors' full board 17 18 minutes, we had pretty lengthy discussions about 19 those redactions already and I think OPC has a pretty 20 good idea of what those are. So I have no problem 21 providing the full board minutes unredacted for

I think the only question is whether there's anything in the strategy components that we would not want to provide in person, and so I would

22

23

24

2.5

review in person.

suggest that we take the next week to fully vet that. 1 2 Because I -- I have not yet seen those materials So I think we should take the next week to 3 either. I think that's the crux of the issue. 4 work on that. 5 JUDGE HATCHER: Okay. Mr. Clizer, that 6 takes us to your last --7 MR. CLIZER: Actually --8 JUDGE HATCHER: Oh, sorry. Go ahead. 9 MR. CLIZER: If you -- the strategy committee meeting, and I'm not saying that there's 10 11 one particular committee that is the most important 12 to us, but I know for a fact that our witness, Dave 13 Murray, is particularly interested in this meeting as 14 we believe that it is very germane to his particular 15 issue. And we have been able to access similar 16 material in the past from other companies. For 17 example, Ameren Missouri's last general rate case 18 provided us a very similar set of materials. I quess 19 I'm a little bit confused as to what exactly is the 20 basis for why Spire would think it can withhold any 21 of the strategic committee materials from us. Again, 22 I'm more than willing to work with the company 23 regarding the securities documents by reviewing them 24 only in person at their offices, but I -- does the 2.5 company have a particular basis upon which it would

think it can withhold the documents? 1 2 MR. APLINGTON: Sure. So, some of -some of the issues -- there's a couple of issues. 3 Some of the issue is relevance. So, for example, if 4 5 there's a potential M&A acquisition that was being 6 looked at by a nonregulated affiliate, then had 7 nothing to do with the company and it didn't go 8 through, we wouldn't think that was relevant. 9 Another issue, and part of -- part of the reason why I said that I haven't even seen them is we 10 11 have to make sure that we're abiding by all the FERC standards of conduct. So if there's a nonregulated 12 13 potential transaction involving, you know, a 14 midstream entity, I -- I need to not see that myself 15 so that it doesn't influence anything going out of Spire Missouri. So there's a lot of layer of review 16 17 to make sure that we're compliant with everything here and that -- that's part of the issue. 18 19 MR. CLIZER: I'd like to, if I may, 20 respond on the relevance issue, just to point out, as 21 David Murray explained in his direct testimony which 22 has now been filed, a large part of his capital 23 structure analysis is governed by the idea that Spire 24 Incorporated is using Spire Missouri -- I want to

make sure I say this correctly -- to -- yes, to allow

2.5

for additional leverage.

2.5

So I guess my point is the existence of other transactions, transactions with affiliates, is actually highly relevant to this case per, you know, the testimony that's already been filed.

As to the FERC issue, honestly, that's a little bit outside my wheelhouse, but I would look into that more.

Again, I would like to think that we can get this resolved in a week, assuming that we can see the unredacted material, and I'm more than willing to postpone for a week. But I want to make sure this is out there now so it's no surprise to anybody, I do not accept the argument regarding relevance at this time, and I think I've laid out my argument for why that is.

JUDGE HATCHER: Thank you, Mr. Clizer.

Let's go on to the last two data requests. And these are both related to the weather normalization rider.

Mr. Clizer.

MR. CLIZER: I'm going to cover both of these together. 8001.1 and 8002.1 were both issued by Ms. Lena Mantle. They both sought a very specific analysis, effectively of the monetary impact, the current, both because of Spire's give-back position

```
in the weather normalization rider case and the
 1
 2
     anomalies that have been identified in direct
     testimony. Having discussed with Spire, I believe
 3
     we've come to the conclusion that Spire did not
 4
 5
     perform these very specific analysis that Ms. Lena
 6
     was -- I'm sorry, Ms. Mantle was requesting and that
 7
     they suggested they would be able to provide a
 8
     written update to their response indicating as much.
 9
     Assuming that that response comes through, this issue
    will be resolved.
10
11
                JUDGE HATCHER: Okay.
12
                MR. APLINGTON: I think that's right,
13
     John.
14
                JUDGE HATCHER: Excellent. Let's turn to
15
     when we want to pick up again. We've all referenced
16
     a week, and I have looked at my calendar. Thursday
17
     afternoon and Friday are probably my only difficult
18
     times, but I wanted to offer all of you to kind of
19
    pick your day. I'm not married to exactly one week
20
     or doing it next Monday as we did last time.
21
     Mr. Clizer, Mr. Aplington, I'll take bids. Anybody
22
     like Tuesday?
23
                MR. APLINGTON: Tuesday afternoon would
    be fine.
24
2.5
                MR. CLIZER: I believe I can work with
```

Tuesday afternoon as well. 1 2 JUDGE HATCHER: Success. We'll take care 3 of the Webex arrangements Tuesday the 25th. Anybody 4 want to nail down a time? We said afternoon. 5 o'clock? 6 MR. CLIZER: I would believe that two 7 o'clock works for us. 8 MR. APLINGTON: Sounds good do me. 9 JUDGE HATCHER: Perfect. I hear no 10 objections. We will set it for two o'clock, a 11 reconvention. And if anybody, I'm looking at 12 Mr. Clizer and Mr. Aplington, prefers to cancel our 13 follow up, just let me know by email, so, by, you 14 know, Monday close of business and I'll email 15 everybody else. Okey dokey. Are there any other 16 issues to discuss while we're all here? Would you 17 like me to leave the Webex open, and I'll take the 18 court reporter with me and let you all converse, 19 question mark? 20 MR. CLIZER: I'd defer to Spire. 21 MR. APLINGTON: I think, you know, based 22 on the conversation that we all had this morning, I 23 think -- and this conference too -- I think I've got 24 a pretty good handle on the issues. So let us go get to work on that and I will follow up offline if 2.5

GR-2021-0108, Vol. II

```
needed.
 1
                JUDGE HATCHER: Excellent. Sounds like
 2
     we all have our assignment. Nothing else coming up,
 3
 4
     we are off the record to adjourn.
 5
                 (Off the record.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	
_	

CERTIFICATE

I, Shelley L. Mayer, a Certified Court Reporter, CCR No. 679, the officer before whom the foregoing transcript of proceedings was taken, do hereby certify that the testimony 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 transcript of proceedings 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.

Shelley L. Mayer, CCR

	ahead 28:8,14 30:8	business 41:14	complete 36:4
1	37:8		compliant 38:17
1001 29:12	allowing 35:19	С	components 36:24
1027 32:24	amenable 35:21	calendar 40:16	concern 32:17
17th 28:3	Ameren 37:17	call 29:18 31:24	concerned 33:18
	amount 30:15 35:11,	called 31:22	concerns 30:25
2	analysis 38:23 39:24	cancel 41:12	35:15
2017 34:23	40:5	capital 38:22	conclusion 40:4
25th 41:3	and/or 33:3	care 41:2	conduct 38:12
	anomalies 40:2	case 28:4 29:16,22	conference 28:4 29:19 32:22 41:23
3	Aplington 31:19,25	30:12,15,17,24 31:16 32:15 33:10 37:17	confirm 33:19
3004 28:13 34:17	32:3,6 34:6,8 36:7,10 38:2 40:12,21,23 41:8,	39:4 40:1	confused 37:19
3011 34:19	12,21	chose 29:16	construed 30:19
30th 34:23	apologize 30:5 33:9	City 35:20 36:6	contact 30:20
	argument 39:14,15	claimed 31:1,5	contentious 29:6
8	arrangements 41:3	claiming 31:7,12	context 29:23
8001.1 39:22	assignment 42:3	clear 33:24 34:6	continue 32:22
8001.1 39:22	assuming 39:10 40:9	client 30:20	conversation 41:22
8002. 1 39.22	attached 29:11 33:7	Clizer 28:8,12 29:9	converse 41:18
Α	attorney 30:19 31:3	30:1,5,9 31:15,22 32:5,25 34:20,24 37:5,	copied 36:1
	attorney/client 30:19	7,9 38:19 39:17,20,21	copies 33:2,12 35:23
abiding 38:11	31:2	40:21,25 41:6,12,20	copy 30:11
accept 39:14	audit 36:13	close 41:14	correctly 38:25
access 36:2 37:15	В	closely 28:15	counsel 28:7 32:14
accounting 30:23 acknowledge 36:9		comments 36:8	count 32:24
acquisition 38:5	back 31:24	Commission 28:18 29:23	counted 28:10
additional 28:16	based 35:6,13 41:21	commit 34:14	couple 34:10 38:3
29:23 33:11,22 34:12	basis 37:20,25	committee 34:25	court 41:18
39:1	bids 40:21	35:9,11 36:13,14,15	cover 39:21
adjourn 42:4	bit 32:9 34:9 37:19 39:7	37:10,11,21 companies 37:16	create 34:3
affiliate 38:6	board 34:2,22,24,25	companies 37:16	creation 33:17,20,25
affiliates 39:3	35:2,5 36:17,21	12 33:19 34:4 35:21,	crux 37:4
afternoon 40:17,23 41:1,4	Bob 29:12,19 33:1	24 37:22,25 38:7	current 39:25
agreeable 36:1	brought 28:6	compensation 36:15	
agicoubic 50.1			
	1	I	I

	DRS 31:17		identify 33:20
D		G	impact 39:24
data 29:10,11,21	E	general 28:4 33:10	important 30:7 37:11
30:13 32:24 34:17,19 39:18	effectively 29:14 31:9 33:6 39:24	37:17 generated 33:16	Incorporated 34:2, 22 38:24
date 30:2	email 30:10 41:13,14	germane 37:14	increase 30:16
dates 30:16	ensure 35:25	give 34:6	indicating 40:8
Dave 29:20 37:12	entire 29:13	give-back 39:25	individuals 29:21
David 38:21	entity 38:14	good 36:20 41:8,24	influence 38:15
day 40:19	Excellent 40:14 42:2	governance 36:13	information 29:14
days 34:10	existed 33:20,25	governed 38:23	30:6,10,18,20,21 31:1, 5 33:6,14,22,24 35:7
decision 30:15	existence 31:11 39:2	GR-2021-0108 28:5	initial 29:11 32:21
defer 41:20	explain 28:22	Great 32:6	35:5
degree 35:3	explained 38:21	guess 37:18 39:2	initially 30:17 35:2
determining 34:3	extent 34:12		intercede 31:17
difficult 40:17		Н	interested 33:18
diligently 36:11	F	handle 41:24	37:13
direct 30:22 33:8 38:21 40:2	fact 31:1 37:12	HATCHER 28:2 29:7	interrupt 30:2 involving 38:13
directly 31:17	felt 32:11	30:1,7 31:14,19,23 32:4,20 34:5,16,21	issue 32:10,23 36:6
director 34:24,25	FERC 38:11 39:6	36:7 37:5,8 39:17	37:4,15 38:4,9,18,20
35:3,5	figure 33:21	40:11,14 41:2,9 42:2	39:6 40:9
directors 33:4 34:2	file 28:5 29:16 30:15	headphones 32:2	issued 29:12,21 33:1 39:22
directors' 36:17	filed 30:3,24 33:10	hear 31:21 32:3 41:9	issues 28:6,16,17,23
discovery 28:3,6,10,	38:22 39:5	heard 32:2	29:3 35:18 38:3 41:16,
13 32:22	filing 29:11 30:16,23 32:14	hearing 31:25	24
discuss 29:3 41:16	find 35:24	helps 32:9	
discussed 40:3	fine 40:24	highly 39:4	
discussions 36:18	Flaherty 33:8,9,12	honest 34:11	Jefferson 35:20 36:6
document 31:7 35:16	follow 41:13,25	honestly 39:6	John 32:8,10 33:8
document 30:14	formation 33:4	Honor 28:12 32:25	34:10 40:13
documentation 30:14 31:11 33:2	found 30:22 33:7	hoping 28:20 35:21	joined 29:18
documents 35:16	Friday 34:14 40:17	1	JUDGE 28:2 29:7 30:1,7 31:14,19,23
37:23 38:1	full 36:17,21	idos perso perso	32:4,20 34:5,16,21 36:7 37:5,8 39:17
dokey 41:15	fully 29:1 37:1	idea 36:20 38:23	40:11,14 41:2,9 42:2
drive 30:15		identified 40:2	
	1		I

К	material 33:16,20	0	ph 32:13
	35:19,23 36:12,15 37:16 39:11		pick 40:15,19
kind 35:17 40:18	materials 34:13 35:1,	objection 30:18	place 28:19
	6,9,13 36:3,4,14 37:2, 18,21	objections 41:10	point 38:20 39:2
L	meeting 28:21 29:6	offer 40:18	poised 32:21
laid 39:15	30:12 37:10,13	office 28:6 35:20 36:5	position 32:15 39:25
large 38:22	midstream 38:14	officers 33:3 34:3	postpone 28:20 39:12
lay 29:2	minimum 30:23	offices 29:19 37:24	potential 35:23 38:5,
layer 38:16	minutes 34:22,25	offline 41:25	13
leadership 32:14	35:1,3,4,9,12 36:2,18, 21	Okey 41:15	potentially 28:19,25
leave 41:17	missing 35:12	onset 30:24	prefers 41:12
Lena 29:20 39:23 40:5	Missouri 28:5 29:15	OPC 29:19 31:9 35:17,19 36:19	presentation 32:12
lengthy 36:18	33:3 34:2 38:16,24	OPC's 30:25	presented 33:2
letting 31:10	Missouri's 37:17	open 41:17	pretty 36:11,18,19
leverage 39:1	Monday 40:20 41:14	opportunity 29:2	41:24
lies 30:25	monetary 39:24	34:7	primarily 30:25 32:11 33:7,18
list 29:10 34:18	morning 41:22	order 34:19	primary 32:10 35:15
litigation 32:15,18	move 32:23 34:16	outlined 29:15	prior 33:16,20,25
log 31:4,10 32:16,17	moving 34:18		privilege 31:4,10
long 36:2	Murray 29:20 37:13 38:21	P	32:17,19
looked 38:6 40:16	muted 31:20	pages 35:7	privileged 30:20 31:2,6,8,13
lot 38:16	mutual 35:17	pagination 35:6,13	problem 36:16,20
love 29:7		papers 33:13	proceed 29:8
	N	part 38:9,18,22	PROCEEDINGS
	nail 41:4	parties 30:11	28:1
M&a 38:5	needed 29:22 42:1	party 31:16	produce 34:15
made 35:4		past 37:16	produced 33:12
maintain 33:15	nonregulated 38:6,	pausing 31:15	product 30:19 31:3
make 33:24 35:23 36:8 38:11,17,25	normalization 39:19	Perfect 29:7 41:9	32:12,19
39:12	40:1	perform 40:5	proposed 29:4
Mantle 29:20 39:23	noted 32:10 35:6,11	person 35:20 36:22,	protected 32:18
40:6	numerical 34:18	25 37:24 pertain 33:16	provide 29:22 36:25 40:7
mark 28:9 41:19		pertain 33:16 pertained 31:12	provided 34:13 37:18
married 40:19		pertaineu 31:12	

providing 36:21	request 28:13 29:12,	September 34:23	supporting 30:14
Public 28:7	13 30:13,14 32:24 34:17,19	service 34:4	surprise 39:13
put 28:18 32:13	requested 30:16 35:9,19	Services 33:4,17,21 34:1,3	Т
Q	requesting 33:7 40:6	set 32:2 36:4 37:18 41:10	takes 37:6
question 30:3 36:23 41:19	requests 28:10 29:10,21 39:18	Shallenberg 29:12, 20 33:1	testimony 30:22 33:8,12 38:21 39:5
questions 29:24	requirements 30:23	showing 31:20	40:3
quick 29:17	resolution 29:4	similar 37:15,18	thing 29:17 32:16
	resolutions 28:19	simply 29:10	Thomas 33:9
R	resolve 28:15,24	sir 31:20	Thursday 40:16
rate 28:4 30:16 33:10 37:17	35:18 36:6 resolved 28:11,13,17	sought 30:18,22 33:2 39:23	time 29:5 39:15 40:20 41:4
reached 35:17	29:1 34:17 36:15 39:10 40:10	Sounds 41:8 42:2	times 40:18
reading 29:13	respond 34:7 38:20	speak 28:21	today 28:3 29:6
reason 38:10	responded 30:17	specific 39:23 40:5	Today's 28:5
received 33:5 35:2,4,	response 30:21 33:5,	Spire 28:5,14,23	transaction 38:13
5	11 35:8 40:8,9	29:15 31:6,16 33:2,3,	transactions 39:3
reconvene 28:25	review 35:19 36:4,22	4,10,17,21 34:1,2,3,22 35:8,14,16 37:20	Tuesday 40:22,23
reconvention 41:11	38:16	38:16,23,24 40:3,4	41:1,3
record 28:2 29:3,14	reviewed 33:14	41:20	turn 36:8 40:14
33:23 42:4,5	reviewing 37:23	Spire's 39:25	type 32:15
redaction 35:4,11	rider 39:19 40:1	spoken 31:6	U
redactions 36:19	room 29:19	standards 38:12	
referenced 40:15	run 29:10	state 29:18	unable 29:24
regard 31:10	running 32:8	strategic 37:21	understand 32:9
regularly 28:3	s	strategy 32:15,18 36:24 37:9	understanding 34:10 35:17 36:9
related 39:19		structure 38:23	unmuted 31:20
relevance 38:4,20 39:14	save 29:4		unredacted 36:3,12,
relevant 35:24 38:8	scheduled 28:3	subsequently 33:11 substantially 28:20	21 39:11
39:4	schedules 30:23		unrestricted 36:2
relied 29:15 34:1	securities 37:23	Success 41:2	update 34:13 40:8
removed 35:8	seeking 32:11 33:25	suggest 35:14 37:1	updated 33:11 35:8
repeat 32:21	send 30:10	suggested 40:7	
reporter 41:18	sensitivity 35:15,18	summarize 34:21	
		supply 31:4	

V
versions 36:3,13
vet 37:1
video 32:1
W
wait 31:23
wanted 40:18
weather 39:19 40:1
Webex 41:3,17
week 28:25 29:1,5 32:23 35:22 36:5 37:1, 3 39:10,12 40:16,19
wheelhouse 39:7
Whiteall 32:13
withhold 37:20 38:1
work 30:19 31:2,3 32:11,19 33:13 35:24 37:4,22 40:25 41:25
working 28:14,22 33:19 36:11
works 41:7
written 40:8