

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
Hearing
June 2, 2016
Jefferson City, Missouri
Volume 5

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

KIM S. BURTON, Presiding,
REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.

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

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES:

PAUL A. BOUDREAU, Attorney at Law
DEAN L. COOPER, Attorney at Law
L. RUSSELL MITTEN, Attorney at Law
DIANA C. CARTER, Attorney at Law
Brydon, Swearngen & England, P.C.
312 East Capitol
P.O. Box 456
Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456
(573)635-7166
paulb@brydonlaw.com
rmitten@brydonlaw.com
FOR: The Empire District Electric
Company.

STUART CONRAD, Attorney at Law
Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson
3100 Broadway
1209 Penntower Officer Center
Kansas City, MO 64111
(816)753-1122
stucon@fcplaw.com

FOR: Midwest Energy Users
Association.

DAVID WOODSMALL, Attorney at Law
Woodsmall Law Office
807 Winston Court
Jefferson City, MO 65101
(573)797-0005
david.woodsmall@woodsmallllaw.com

FOR: MECG.

MARC ELLINGER, Attorney at Law
STEPHANIE BELL, Attorney at Law
Blitz, Bardgett & Deutsch
308 East High Street, Suite 301
Jefferson City, MO 65101-3237
(573)634-2500
Sbell@bbdlc.com

FOR: City of Joplin.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ALEXANDER ANTAL, Attorney At Law
Missouri Division of Energy
P.O. Box 1157
Jefferson City, MO 65102

FOR: Division of Energy

CYDNEY MAYFIELD, Deputy Public Counsel
Office of the Public Counsel
P.O. Box 2230
200 Madison Street, Suite 650
Jefferson City, MO 65102-2230
(573)751-4857

FOR: Office of the Public Counsel
and the Public.

KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel
JAMIE MYERS, Legal Counsel

Missouri Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 360
200 Madison Street
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573)751-3234

FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public
Service Commission.

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (WHEREUPON, the hearing began at
3 8:37 a.m.)

4 (EMPIRE EXHIBIT NOS. 1-34, ECG
5 EXHIBIT NOS. 1-5, CITY OF JOPLIN EXHIBIT NO. 1,
6 DIVISION OF ENERGY EXHIBIT NOS. 1-5, MEUA EXHIBIT
7 NOS. 1-3, STAFF EXHIBIT NOS. 1-24 AND OPC EXHIBIT
8 NOS. 1-18 WERE MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

9 JUDGE BURTON: Let's go ahead and go
10 on the record in the matter of the Empire District
11 Electric Company's request for authority to
12 implement a general rate increase for electric
13 service, File No. ER-2016-0023.

14 Good morning, everyone. It's
15 8:37 a.m. on June 2nd, 2016. The Commission has
16 set this date and time for an evidentiary hearing
17 on Empire's general rate increase request. At this
18 time I will ask the parties and everyone who's here
19 present to please put their phones and electronic
20 devices on silent mode.

21 And we'll go ahead and take the entry
22 of appearance by the parties. On behalf of the
23 Empire District Electric Company?

24 MS. CARTER: Diana Carter and Dean
25 Cooper with Brydon, Swearngen & England for the

1 Empire District Electric Company.

2 JUDGE BURTON: On behalf of the Staff
3 of the Missouri Public Service Commission?

4 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.
5 Kevin Thompson, Jamie Myers and Nicole Mers for the
6 Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,
7 Post Office Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri
8 65102.

9 JUDGE BURTON: Office of the Public
10 Counsel?

11 MS. MAYFIELD: Thank you, your Honor.
12 Cydney Mayfield for Office of the Public Counsel
13 and for the ratepayers, and my information has been
14 previously provided to the court reporter.

15 JUDGE BURTON: Midwest Energy Users
16 Association.

17 MR. CONRAD: Stu Conrad,
18 3100 Broadway, Suite 1209, Kansas City, Missouri,
19 64111. I have also provided that information to
20 the court reporter.

21 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you. City of
22 Joplin?

23 MS. BELL: Stephanie Bell and Marc
24 Ellinger for the City of Joplin. Our information
25 has been provided to the court reporter.

1 JUDGE BURTON: Midwest Energy
2 Consumers Group?

3 MR. WOODSMALL: David Woodsmall on
4 behalf of the Midwest Energy Consumers Group.

5 JUDGE BURTON: Missouri Division of
6 Energy?

7 MR. ANTAL: Yes, your Honor. Alex
8 Antal with the Missouri Department of Economic
9 Development, appearing today on behalf of the
10 Missouri Division of Energy, P.O. Box 1157,
11 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

12 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you. Now, are
13 there any procedural matters that we need to
14 address while we are on the record before we begin
15 today?

16 MS. MAYFIELD: Your Honor, previously
17 I'd indicated that the Office of the Public Counsel
18 may add an additional witness should the Commission
19 ask some questions related to policy on the rate
20 case expense, and that witness would be Chuck
21 Hyneman.

22 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you very much.
23 It's my understanding today that we will be
24 addressing regulatory policy, rate case expense a
25 and potential pilot low-income rate for the issues.

1 The attorneys will be providing an opening
2 statement on those issues and addressing any
3 concerns that the Commission might have.

4 MR. THOMPSON: I think we're not
5 going to be doing opening statements, Judge.

6 JUDGE BURTON: Okay. Will the
7 attorneys be coming up to answer any questions from
8 the Bench?

9 MR. THOMPSON: We'll all be happy to
10 answer questions as best we can.

11 JUDGE BURTON: I believe that this is
12 a little bit different from the procedural schedule
13 we previously had in place, so I would say let me
14 know if we want to adjust the schedule of which
15 parties would go in which order.

16 MS. CARTER: Judge, I think as far as
17 all of us back here are concerned, we do not have
18 anything prepared for you today due to a pending
19 settlement on all of the revenue requirement
20 issues, but we as attorneys are all here ready to
21 answer questions on regulatory policy and then the
22 two issues that the Commission wanted addressed, in
23 addition to what we had put on the issues list.

24 And then we also have -- each party
25 has their witnesses here today on those three

1 issues, if the Commission were to want to take
2 testimony on those issues.

3 JUDGE BURTON: All right. And let's
4 begin with regulatory policy. I believe the
5 witnesses that we have listed are Mr. Beecher, Kim
6 Bolin and Marke from Empire, Staff and OPC.

7 MS. MAYFIELD: That's correct.

8 JUDGE BURTON: Does the Commission --

9 MR. CONRAD: Judge, let the record
10 note that we strongly support regulatory policy.

11 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you, Mr. Conrad.
12 Duly noted.

13 MR. WOODSMALL: It depends on the
14 policy.

15 JUDGE BURTON: We do have the
16 prefiled testimony that has not been entered yet
17 from those three witnesses on those issues, but let
18 me see if the Commission has any questions it would
19 like to ask any of the attorneys or the witnesses
20 that were identified for regulatory policy issues.

21 CHAIRMAN HALL: I have no questions
22 about regulatory policy.

23 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I've been
24 totally thrown off, and I have no questions about
25 regulatory policy either.

1 JUDGE BURTON: It appears that this
2 will be a fast day. And let's move on then to the
3 rate case expense issue, and for this the parties
4 have identified the following available witnesses:
5 Keith from Empire, McMellen from Staff, Sarver from
6 Staff and Conner from the Office of Public Counsel.

7 MS. MAYFIELD: With the addition of
8 Hyneman.

9 JUDGE BURTON: With the addition of
10 Mr. Hyneman. Are there any questions from the
11 Bench for the attorneys?

12 CHAIRMAN HALL: I have a couple. My
13 understanding is that there is a pending settlement
14 on the revenue requirement, which I assume would
15 include rate case expense. Can someone explain
16 what the -- whether the settlement would include or
17 will include specific mention of rate case expense
18 and how it is being calculated?

19 MS. CARTER: We have not drafted the
20 settlement agreement yet. If that's something the
21 Commission would like us to put in there, we
22 certainly can specify.

23 All parties were in agreement early
24 on in this case that we would utilize for rate case
25 expense the sharing mechanism that the Commission

1 ordered in the recent KCP&L rate case. So that is
2 what we were following throughout the case and will
3 be following with the settlement.

4 CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, speaking on my
5 behalf, I would appreciate the stipulation
6 including specific reference to how that was
7 calculated. And I applaud the parties' willingness
8 to agree to that particular mechanism.

9 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I too would like
10 to see that. So I may not have any questions today
11 until we see what the agreement -- language of the
12 agreement is.

13 JUDGE BURTON: Moving on, if there
14 aren't any --

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Hold on. You
16 know, one other topic which we don't have on our
17 agenda but in this settlement agreement, one of the
18 things is you mentioned the KCP&L case that we
19 would like as a Commission is dealing with the ROE.
20 A lot of times we get this black box ROE and we
21 don't necessarily appreciate that. We appreciate
22 that the parties are trying to work together, but
23 we would like a range so we can have an idea and
24 calculate where it is.

25 MS. CARTER: We have been listening,

1 and that has also been contemplated throughout our
2 settlement discussion, and the settlement agreement
3 will have actually a very tight ROE range that the
4 settlement is based on.

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.

6 JUDGE BURTON: All right. Thank you.

7 Moving on to the final issue for the day, which
8 would be the potential pilot low-income rate.

9 MR. ANTAL: Judge, if I may. The
10 Division of Energy wasn't in the room or was on the
11 phone line when parties discussed not having
12 opening statements on issues. So we do have some
13 prepared remarks, and if no other party has an
14 objection, I'm prepared to make those remarks.

15 JUDGE BURTON: That sounds fine.
16 Mr. Antal, if you would just like to step up to the
17 podium.

18 MR. ANTAL: May it please the
19 Commission? My name is Alex Antal. I'm here today
20 representing the Missouri Division of Energy.
21 Thought this impromptu issue was worth an opening
22 statement. I know Staff gave its position in its
23 updated statement of positions, and wanted to give
24 the Commission the Division of Energy's position on
25 potential low-income rates or additional low-income

1 programming.

2 As demonstrated in the rebuttal and
3 surrebuttal testimony Division of Energy witness
4 Sharlet Kroll, there is a significant need in
5 Empire's service territory. The average poverty
6 rates in the state of Missouri by county is
7 roughly -- well, the state average is 15.5 percent.
8 In the 16 counties that Empire serves, the average
9 poverty level is 19 -- just over 19 percent. So
10 there is, you know, a lot of people living in
11 poverty in Empire's service territory, and I think
12 we should be mindful of that.

13 The Division of Energy believes that
14 it is in the Commission's statutory authority to
15 implement low-income rates and similar programs to
16 provide economic relief to these customers. The
17 Comprehensive State Energy Plan discussed the
18 implementation of low-income rates and believes
19 that the -- either the Commission or the General
20 Assembly should take action.

21 If the Commission wishes to give
22 immediate relief to the people living in poverty in
23 Empire's service territory, it has the ability to
24 implement a pilot program in this case. I'll in
25 just a little bit kind of move on to a specific

1 example that the Division has developed. Not
2 saying it's a perfect or that we're necessarily
3 recommending this example, but basically we've made
4 an example based off of the Commission's recent
5 decision in the Missouri American case, what an
6 80 percent discount on the customer charge would
7 look like for this utility.

8 And then the Division of Energy would
9 also inform the Commission that there are existing
10 low-income programs in the state that other
11 utilities are using and that have shown promise.
12 One example would be Ameren Missouri's Keeping
13 Current program, which has a more nuanced approach
14 than say a flat customer charge discount. It
15 provides tiered incentives based off of a
16 customer's percentage of the federal poverty limit
17 that they find themselves in.

18 So as I mentioned, there's a
19 significant need in Empire's service territory.
20 Generally in the state of Missouri households that
21 find themselves in -- with incomes 50 to
22 100 percent of the federal poverty level have an
23 average home energy burden of 17 percent of their
24 annual income. Now, to put that in perspective,
25 many experts in housing analysis, in affordable

1 housing have stated and published that an energy
2 burden of 6 percent of your income is the threshold
3 for unaffordability. So we're literally talking
4 about almost three times what is considered by
5 experts to be unaffordable.

6 As I said earlier, in 2014 over
7 15 percent of individuals in the state of Missouri
8 were found to be in the federal poverty limits, and
9 in Empire's service territory alone, the average is
10 19 -- just over 19 percent.

11 We did an analysis in again DE
12 witness Sharlet Kroll's testimony, rebuttal
13 testimony, which we found that, based on a bill
14 sample provided by Empire, the current average
15 monthly residential bill is approximately \$142 or
16 just over \$1,700 annually, which creates an energy
17 burden of 8.5 percent for a family at 100 percent
18 of the federal poverty level. That's assuming a
19 family size of three persons, which is just over
20 the average family size in Empire's service
21 territory, creating a 42 percent greater than --
22 energy burden than what is considered affordable by
23 national experts.

24 As I said earlier, the establishment
25 of a low-income rate or additional low-income

1 relief pilot programs is -- was also recommended in
2 the Comprehensive State Energy Plan to be --
3 specifically the CSEP stated that -- recommended
4 the clarification of the explicit -- that it be
5 made explicit that the PSC has the statutory
6 authority to consider rates specific to low-income
7 utility customers.

8 Now, Staff mentioned in its statement
9 of position a working docket from a few years ago
10 where this specific topic was discussed. The
11 Division of Energy nor myself were involved in that
12 particular docket, but I did review most of the
13 comments that were in that docket or filed in that
14 docket prior to this case or prior to today's
15 hearing.

16 And from my perspective, the
17 consensus was that the Commission does not have the
18 explicit statutory authority to implement a
19 low-income rate class. However, many stakeholders
20 in their comments said that the Commission may have
21 the implicit authority to establish a low-income
22 rate.

23 And essentially, the way I -- you
24 know, a lot of ink has already been spilled on this
25 issue about whether -- what is the Commission's

1 authority on this issue, and it's unclear. The
2 courts have not made a determination, and to date,
3 what seems to be the course is that, you know,
4 we're going to wait to see if the general assembly
5 takes action to give the Commission explicit
6 authority, which has not happened.

7 And I see two alternatives. We can
8 continue to wait for the General Assembly to make
9 clarification on this issue, or the Commission can
10 take -- can test the bounds of its statutory
11 authority. And, you know, as cases of first
12 impression, there is the risk that such a decision
13 may be overturned. But that is the question before
14 the Commission is continue to wait for
15 clarification from the General Assembly or, you
16 know, take action, see where the bounds of the
17 authority lies.

18 As also mentioned in the CSEP, the
19 Commission has considered affordability in past
20 Commission proceedings. We think that considering
21 affordability for a low-income rate class is
22 consistent with past practices. And the Commission
23 should use -- should consider affordability in this
24 case and when setting rates and in future cases.

25 Now, turning to the example that I

1 mentioned, the Division of Energy took the design
2 that the Commission approved in the recent Missouri
3 American case and tried to apply it to what it
4 would look like for Empire. And this is on page 3,
5 slide 2 of the handout. We modeled both Staff's
6 proposed \$15 customer charge, Empire's 14.47
7 customer charge, and the current customer charge of
8 12.42.

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Excuse me. Can
10 I interrupt you?

11 MR. ANTAL: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: These numbers,
13 this 2,400, 2,399, is that a percentage of LIHEAP
14 or is that total LIHEAP on page 3, number of
15 participants.

16 MR. ANTAL: Number of participants.
17 That is -- those are the actual number of LIHEAP
18 customers that Empire has. They're not
19 percentages.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Where were you
21 on the position with American Water on this?

22 MR. ANTAL: The Division of Energy
23 supported the establishment of the low-income
24 customer charge pilot.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: This Commission

1 just less than a month ago said they would not do a
2 state -- or an all --

3 MR. ANTAL: A service territory wide.

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Yeah, pilot
5 program.

6 MR. ANTAL: I'm aware of that, yes.

7 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So you're
8 recommending we do that, and you think we have
9 statutory authority to do that, correct? Possibly?
10 It's questionable?

11 MR. ANTAL: The Division of Energy
12 believes that the Commission has the authority to
13 establish a low-income rate.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Because I
15 looked at your numbers, and the 24 cents a customer
16 per month it would cost the other customers is
17 almost identical to what a pilot program
18 encompassing the entire service territory of
19 American Water would cost. Actually, this is a
20 little more, that this Commission denied. They
21 didn't want to go there. So you're recommending we
22 do that now?

23 MR. ANTAL: The Division of Energy is
24 not specifically recommending this approach in this
25 case. We're purely providing this for the

1 Commission, this example for the Commission's, you
2 know --

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. Because
4 I didn't see this similar information in the
5 American Water case, which is -- we just concluded.

6 MR. ANTAL: Well, to be clear, the
7 Division of Energy did not take a position on the
8 low-income pilot in the Missouri American case
9 until the briefing occurred. So we did not take a
10 position at hearing --

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. Thank
12 you.

13 MR. ANTAL: -- in that case.

14 So based off essentially qualifying
15 all LIHEAP customers for this type of 80 percent
16 discount on the customer charge, you would see a
17 monthly cost to residential customers, assuming
18 that you applied the cost of such a program
19 specifically to residential customers.

20 And the Division acknowledges that
21 that's not the only option that the Commission has.
22 The Commission could spread costs over all rate
23 classes. But for this example, we looked at just
24 spreading the cost to residential, and you're
25 looking at a cost of, you know, just over 20 cents

1 to just over 24 cents per customer. And that would
2 provide a discount of just over \$10 to just over
3 the \$12, depending on the customer charge that the
4 Commission ultimately would approve or someplace in
5 the middle if parties are able to settle on a
6 customer charge. A purely illustrative example.

7 However, as I said earlier, this type
8 of approach doesn't necessarily have all the
9 nuances you would want to have in a low-income
10 pilot program. As I said, Ameren Missouri's
11 Keeping Current program is a more nuanced approach.
12 It has different tiers of bill rebates or customer
13 rebates based off of a customer's percentage in the
14 federal poverty limits.

15 This also takes into account things
16 such as heating customers versus non-heating
17 customers. Now, heating customers who use
18 electricity obviously are going to have larger
19 bills than customers who use another source of
20 energy for their heating needs.

21 Keeping Current also requires LIWAP
22 or LIWAP rather participation or that they sign up
23 for it to ensure that if we're going to give people
24 rebates, that they're at least in the queue to get
25 weatherization services so that their housing stock

1 is as efficient as possible.

2 There are also educational
3 requirements and tiered cooling programs for
4 customers who just go on such a program during the
5 summer cooling period and need the extra additional
6 support to get through the hot summers.

7 The Division of Energy has two
8 witnesses that are willing to field Commissioner
9 questions. We have Sharlet Kroll, who this will be
10 her first time appearing before this Commission.
11 She can field questions on the need for low-income
12 relief in Empire's service territory as well as
13 low-income program administration.

14 And then we have had Mr. Martin
15 Hyman, who has appeared here before, who can field
16 questions on rate and program design as well as
17 bill and customer impacts.

18 So that is the conclusion of my
19 prepared remarks.

20 CHAIRMAN HALL: Good morning. Will
21 one of your witnesses be able to discuss Empire
22 District's experimental low-income program that was
23 in place, I believe, from 2002 maybe to 2009 or
24 2010?

25 MR. ANTAL: Neither of our witnesses

1 were involved in that program. However, I believe
2 Ms. Kroll has reviewed the evaluation of that
3 program and may be able to field some questions.

4 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Good morning.

6 Have the parties been discussing a low-income rate
7 as part of this settlement or part of this case?

8 MR. ANTAL: The parties, to my
9 knowledge, have not considered this until the
10 Commission brought it to our attention.

11 COMMISSIONER STOLL: So is it even
12 possible that there would be a low-income pilot
13 project established? How would that work? Why are
14 we going to hear witnesses about something that
15 can't happen?

16 MR. ANTAL: I believe it's within the
17 Commission's authority --

18 COMMISSIONER STOLL: To hear it?

19 MR. ANTAL: -- to order a pilot
20 program. But, I mean, in direct testimony, there
21 has not been any specific proposals as we had in --
22 at least in Missouri American case we had
23 surrebuttal testimony that had outlined a pilot
24 program. But here we have nothing in testimony.

25 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Also, so your

1 statement that says the Commission has the
2 authority to establish a low-income rate and doing
3 so is consistent with the recommendations of the
4 Comprehensive State Energy Plan, that is you have
5 nuanced that. That is not exactly correct,
6 correct? You're saying we hear you say we have the
7 authority, and then I think you just said you
8 didn't think we really did, that would have to be
9 legislative action, or was I --

10 MR. ANTAL: No. To be clear, what I
11 meant to convey was that the Division believes that
12 the Commission has the authority to establish a
13 low-income class. However, it's not -- it's not
14 explicit. There's no explicit authority.

15 COMMISSIONER STOLL: So establish a
16 low-income class, but we would have to do that to
17 square our action with state law? Because doesn't
18 it say in state law, and I don't have the
19 reference, that you have to treat all customers in
20 a class the same?

21 MR. ANTAL: The Commission has the
22 authority to -- you have to treat them the same,
23 unless the Commission establishes a new class. The
24 Commission has approved multiple pilot programs
25 that give rebates to low-income customers who today

1 are still considered to be residential customers.

2 COMMISSIONER STOLL: So they could be
3 residential customers, but they would be in a
4 separate class, a low-income residential customer;
5 is that correct?

6 MR. ANTAL: We believe the Commission
7 has the authority to do so. I don't know if this
8 is the case to do it in since those issues have not
9 been discussed in testimony, but we do believe it
10 is within the Commission's authority.

11 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Thank
12 you.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: In our recent
14 case, American Water, could it be considered that
15 we set up a separate class? It might be a small
16 class. It's a pilot program, right? But it's
17 still -- we gave them a special rate.

18 MR. ANTAL: Legally, I don't know
19 that I would be comfortable today saying that you
20 have established a separate class. I know that the
21 Commission established a pilot program based off
22 its experimental rate authority, but I don't
23 believe --

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, are they
25 going to receive a different rate?

1 MR. ANTAL: In practice, yes.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And are the
3 other customers picking up that charge?

4 MR. ANTAL: Yes, they are. For
5 practical purposes --

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: The Commission
7 just decided to make it a smaller amount. Instead
8 of -- this separate group. Instead of giving
9 everybody it, the entire LIHEAP, they said let's
10 take a percentage of LIHEAP?

11 MR. ANTAL: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.

13 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you, Mr. Antal.
14 Ms. Carter, would you like to --

15 MS. CARTER: Judge, this may be a
16 good time. Empire has marked as Exhibits 32, 33
17 and 34 certain documents from Empire's ELIP,
18 experimental low-income program, that went in in
19 2002, and that may help answer some of the
20 questions that Commissioners have regarding how
21 that functioned in the past. They had a very
22 thorough evaluation done and many years of data to
23 go off of with that program.

24 JUDGE BURTON: Would you like to
25 offer?

1 MS. CARTER: Yes, Exhibit 32, 33 and
2 34.

3 JUDGE BURTON: And just for the
4 record to be clear, I have 32 as marked the direct
5 testimony of Sherrill McCormack, Case No.
6 ER-2011-0004, and 33 is the ELIP Evaluation from
7 March 29, 2010?

8 MS. CARTER: Correct.

9 JUDGE BURTON: And Exhibit 34 is the
10 Global Agreement for File No. ER-2011-0004?

11 MS. CARTER: Yes, those are connect.

12 JUDGE BURTON: Are there any
13 objections to the admissions of those three
14 exhibits, Empire's Exhibits 32, 33 or 34?

15 (No response.)

16 JUDGE BURTON: Seeing none, they are
17 admitted into the record.

18 (EMPIRE EXHIBITS 32, 33 AND 34 WERE
19 RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE.)

20 MS. CARTER: Judge, I believe I gave
21 you one copy of each of those. Here are four more
22 copies of each.

23 JUDGE BURTON: Does the Commission
24 have any questions for Ms. Carter or any of the
25 other --

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I'd like them
2 explained. Can we have the summary explained,
3 No. 34?

4 JUDGE BURTON: Ms. Carter, could you
5 please step up to the podium --

6 MS. CARTER: Sure.

7 JUDGE BURTON: -- and explain this
8 exhibit?

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Can you
10 summarize the, I guess it was -- what are these,
11 33, 34, 35?

12 MS. CARTER: 32, 33, 34.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: 33 was the
14 summary of the program through 2010; is that
15 correct?

16 MS. CARTER: It's the program
17 evaluation that --

18 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Could that be
19 explained? Because we're just receiving it. I
20 don't want to sit here and try to read it.

21 MS. CARTER: Yes. And just to
22 briefly summarize, this has not been an issue in
23 the case between the parties. It was not in any
24 testimony, and we had not contemplated discussing
25 it at the hearing. The Commissioners requested

1 that be added as an issue. So we are all here to
2 do our very best, but there was not a substantial
3 amount of preparation time on this issue because
4 the parties were not contemplating a low-income
5 rate coming out of this case, but we will do our
6 very best.

7 Empire started in 2002 with an ELIP,
8 an experimental low-income program, and what you
9 have is Mrs. McCormack's testimony from 2010, which
10 is when Empire and the parties were looking to
11 terminate the low-income program, and they had the
12 evaluation done and then there was a settlement
13 agreement to discontinue it.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Was that
15 established in a rate case?

16 MS. CARTER: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: A Commission
18 set up that pilot program in 2002?

19 MS. CARTER: Yes. And on page 15 of
20 Ms. McCormack's testimony, which is Exhibit 32,
21 that has the case number where it was established.
22 It was set up with two tiers, depending on poverty
23 level, and they received a bill credit depending on
24 the LIHEAP poverty level. You could either have a
25 bill credit up to \$20 or a bill credit up to \$50,

1 and you could be on the program for a 12-month
2 period and then you could reapply at the end of
3 that 12-month period to continue.

4 Unfortunately, what Empire and the
5 parties involved found is that when customers went
6 off the program, their bill paying habits were
7 worse than when they went on the program. So
8 looking at before the program and after the
9 program, bill-paying habits were less after they
10 graduated from the program.

11 And so it was determined to
12 discontinue the program due to that, that it wasn't
13 helping bill-paying habits in this case, and also
14 there was an evaluation on the cost effectiveness
15 of the program and it was determined not to be cost
16 effective using the agreed-upon rating scale.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So you're
18 saying that as the program went on, when the
19 customers got off the program, they had taken
20 advantage of it and it wasn't a -- they just --
21 their late pays got worse than before the program
22 started?

23 MS. CARTER: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.

25 MS. CARTER: It does not mean we

1 wouldn't be willing to look at it again and give it
2 another try. So that is the experience that we had
3 2002 to 2010.

4 COMMISSIONER RUPP: I have a
5 question. So you say when they got off the
6 program. Is that because the program pilot ended
7 or because they no longer qualified due to an
8 increase of income or parameters or --

9 MS. CARTER: I cannot say
10 specifically on that. And I don't know that it's
11 broken down to that level in the evaluation. It
12 certainly could be that they decided not to reply.
13 It's not because the funding was ending.

14 JUDGE BURTON: Is it possible that
15 Empire's witness Mr. Keith would be available to
16 answer?

17 MS. CARTER: He is certainly
18 available. I don't know if he can answer that
19 question, though.

20 MR. KEITH: I don't know that level
21 of detail. It wasn't because funding was ending.

22 MS. CARTER: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER RUPP: That's all I
24 needed to know.

25 MS. CARTER: It was not a funding

1 issue.

2 COMMISSIONER RUPP: Okay. Very good.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: But that's
4 different than the pilot program we just approved
5 in American Water was just a discount in the
6 customer charge, period, and then I think Division
7 of Energy's approach is just a discount in the
8 customer charge.

9 MS. CARTER: Correct.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Which is
11 completely different than the program that Empire
12 established in 2002, correct?

13 MS. CARTER: It was a bill credit
14 amount not specific to the customer charge,
15 although that is what would come off first.
16 Everyone has the customer charge and then their
17 energy charges and it was a credit. So it was a
18 higher amount that they would have been receiving.

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Much higher.

20 MS. CARTER: Much higher.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN HALL: Do you believe that
23 the Commission would have the authority to
24 implement some type of low-income program, be it a
25 pilot or service-territory-wide, outside of a rate

1 case?

2 MS. CARTER: I am not prepared to
3 answer that question for you because we haven't
4 been anything about it until just a few days ago in
5 this case. Certainly the Commission has
6 experimental authority, and utilities and parties
7 have been able to do many things in settlements
8 that perhaps couldn't be done through an order of
9 the Commission.

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: You indicated and the
11 report also indicates that the program was dis--
12 was discontinued in part because it was deemed to
13 be not cost effective. What does that mean?

14 MS. CARTER: In looking at it, it
15 appears similar to the standards we're now using on
16 MEEIA programs on the cost effectiveness test, and
17 I would not be able to explain the details for that
18 on what all goes into that calculation. But it
19 seems that this program evaluation was similar to
20 what we now use on MEEIA-type programs to determine
21 cost effectiveness.

22 CHAIRMAN HALL: Would your witness be
23 able to provide more information on that? It seems
24 to me that one of the purposes of a low-income
25 program is to promote affordability, and I can't

1 imagine how your company's cost effective analysis
2 would include that particular parameter, but maybe
3 it does.

4 JUDGE BURTON: We'll just plan on
5 having Mr. Keith up here to answer those questions
6 and he can state what he knows, what he's familiar
7 with, if it's outside your scope.

8 MS. CARTER: Yes. He has been warned
9 that he will be put up here.

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: And I'll go ahead and
11 let you know, the company and all the other parties
12 here, this issue was thrown at you a little late in
13 the game. I absolutely understand why counsel and
14 witnesses may not be as prepared as they would
15 otherwise be on other issues. And it may, in fact,
16 be too late in the game for the Commission to take
17 action on this issue.

18 But I think, speaking for myself, I
19 wanted more information on Empire's program from
20 2002 to 2010 and particularly in light of the
21 Commission's order, recent order in Missouri
22 American where we implemented, as Commissioner
23 Kenney indicated, a somewhat different program.
24 Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Do you have an

1 idea of what the total dollar amount was for those
2 programs or range?

3 MS. CARTER: I know it is --

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Again, I
5 appreciate your --

6 MS. CARTER: It was shared funding.
7 There were some shareholder funds and some
8 ratepayer funds, and I imagine Mr. Keith will know
9 those dollar amounts. Otherwise, maybe not. I
10 know it is in one of these documents.

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And I -- again,
12 I echo Chairman Hall's comments. I know this is
13 very late in the game, and if you don't know them,
14 I understand that, but I'm just curious because I
15 know in the Division of Energy's proposal they're
16 looking at about 367,000 to cover the entire
17 district-wide at a reduction of \$12 using Staff's
18 members. I was just curious about how much money
19 was spent in those.

20 MS. CARTER: That's definitely
21 something we can follow up with for you. That will
22 be easy to find. I don't know the dollar amounts
23 offhand.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I just briefly
25 ran through 33, and I didn't see the totals

1 anywhere. That's fine. I was just curious.

2 MS. CARTER: We can definitely follow
3 up with that. Like you said, it would have been
4 higher. It was a substantial bill credit depending
5 on the poverty level, and it was for all who
6 qualified under LIHEAP.

7 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And was that a
8 district-wide program?

9 MS. CARTER: It was Empire's service
10 territory.

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Maybe we
12 shouldn't talk about that. The Commission doesn't
13 like that.

14 MR. ANTAL: Commissioner, if I may.
15 I've been directed to the tariff, the ELIP tariff,
16 and it's our understanding that the annual funding
17 was approximately \$300,000.

18 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: That almost
19 covers what your proposal is, right? I think you
20 were about 367, if I remember right.

21 MR. ANTAL: Again, it's not our
22 recommendation. It's purely an illustrative
23 example, but yes, the budgets are pretty close.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.

25 MS. CARTER: Mr. Keith would be happy

1 to get up there and answer other questions,
2 including on other low-income programs that Empire
3 has available, although not a low-income rate.

4 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you. Are there
5 any other parties that would like to have counsel
6 address the Commission? Are there any attorneys
7 that the Commission would like to have?

8 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. I'll ask
9 Mr. Thompson a question, and perhaps other
10 attorneys might be interested in responding as
11 well. It's the same question I asked Ms. Carter.
12 I'm curious as to whether or not Staff has a
13 position as to whether or not the Commission could
14 put some type of low-income tariff in place, be it
15 pilot or service territory-wide, outside of a rate
16 case.

17 MR. THOMPSON: Without having done
18 any research on the issue, my reaction would be no.
19 I think you would have to do that in a rate case.
20 The Commission does not have authority to treat
21 some residential ratepayers differently than other
22 residential ratepayers. The statute clearly
23 forbids discrimination and preferences.

24 The Commission has the authority to
25 establish classes of service based on differences

1 of service, and there are some early Supreme Court,
2 Missouri Supreme Court cases addressing the
3 Commission's power to classify. It's not
4 arbitrary. You can't classify simply because you
5 want to. You have to classify based on cost.
6 Traditional regulation is all about cost, cost of
7 service.

8 So you certainly have a
9 well-recognized power to do experimental things,
10 such as an experimental low-income program, in
11 order to investigate what the result would be or
12 how it would work or whatever the issues are that
13 you would want to gather information about by doing
14 the program.

15 But as far as permanently
16 establishing a low-income class or a low-income
17 rate mechanism, I don't think the Commission has
18 the statutory authority to do that.

19 CHAIRMAN HALL: I think perhaps
20 you're combining two issues. One issue is whether
21 we have the authority to establish a low-income
22 rate, and then the second issue is whether we have
23 that authority outside of a rate case.

24 MR. THOMPSON: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN HALL: And the first issue I

1 understand the legal issues involved without
2 question.

3 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN HALL: The second issue is
5 whether it can be done outside of a rate case. So
6 for this question, assume we have the authority to
7 put some kind of low-income tariff in place. I'm
8 curious as to whether or not we can do it outside
9 of a rate case.

10 MR. THOMPSON: Again, I think you
11 can't. In the telephone world, they would
12 establish new service offerings outside of rate
13 cases all the time, and that was permissible
14 because it was new. Here, the only thing that's
15 new is the way you're charging for it. It's the
16 same old service but perhaps charged in a different
17 way.

18 So I think it would have to be done
19 in a rate case where all relevant factors would be
20 considered.

21 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Any other
22 counsel wish to comment on that?

23 MS. MAYFIELD: I would just respond
24 that I would agree with Mr. Thompson's analysis.
25 I'm starting to dig into this just a little bit,

1 and I would agree that the Commission would not
2 have authority outside of a rate case to implement
3 a low-income rate absent a review of all inclusive
4 factors. So I would just mirror the eloquent
5 statement Mr. Thompson made.

6 CHAIRMAN HALL: And that would be
7 your position whether it was a new class or if it
8 was simply a low-income pilot similar to the pilot
9 put in place in Missouri American?

10 MS. MAYFIELD: Well, certainly to the
11 class. I'm not so much for sure about the Missouri
12 American example, but certainly to the class
13 itself. I would have to research more on the other
14 part.

15 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Any other
16 attorneys wish to --

17 MR. CONRAD: Judge, let me -- the old
18 gray-haired guy. There is an old case, and I think
19 that it is at least one of those to which
20 Mr. Thompson is referring. I wish I could recall
21 the citation. It is referred to generally as the
22 Londray case. And I see him nodding his head. It
23 essentially tells the Commission -- this was
24 reversed by the Court. Told the Commission at that
25 time that they were free to classify customers

1 based on load and usage characteristics and on no
2 other characteristics.

3 Now, that did not involve residential
4 customers and staying within a class. I have to
5 agree with Mr. Thompson's analysis, and as he warns
6 you, he hasn't researched it, and honestly I
7 haven't either for a long time since the Londray
8 case, but that does limit your ability to classify
9 customers. And perhaps that's one that
10 Mr. Thompson was referring to.

11 CHAIRMAN HALL: I have no further
12 questions.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Mr. Thompson?

14 MR. THOMPSON: Sir?

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: What was your
16 involvement in that 2002 Empire rate case? I know
17 you have a plethora of knowledge.

18 MR. THOMPSON: A plethora of -- I do
19 not recall what involvement, if any, I had in the
20 2002 Empire rate case.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I'm curious
22 because the Commission established a program for
23 low-income -- or low-income program. That's what
24 I've been told today, and it ran till 2010 until it
25 was determined that it was not effective. So it

1 must have gone through several rate cases.

2 MR. THOMPSON: I'm sure it did.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I'm told now
4 that we can't do that.

5 MR. THOMPSON: No. You can do an
6 experimental program.

7 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Was that an
8 experimental program?

9 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, it was.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, did it
11 only encompass so many qualified people or how did
12 it work?

13 MR. THOMPSON: It may have
14 encompassed all eligible ratepayers within the
15 entire service area.

16 CHAIRMAN HALL: So in other words,
17 Commissioner, it was experimental because it was
18 called experimental.

19 MS. CARTER: That is exactly correct.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Mr. Thompson, I
21 notice Staff had recommended that we consider this
22 in a future rate case, the low-income program,
23 correct? That's Staff's position, correct?

24 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: What's Staff's

1 position if this Commission wanted to impose an
2 experimental low-income program?

3 MR. THOMPSON: Staff would do
4 whatever it could to facilitate the Commission
5 achieving its desire.

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So I wish I
7 would have known about that experimental deal about
8 a month ago.

9 JUDGE BURTON: I do have a question
10 to follow up on that. If it is an experimental
11 program, let's say, for instance, would it be
12 available to consider through a tracker program
13 where it's considered a regulatory asset?

14 MR. THOMPSON: Well, I think that's
15 what's -- that was what was done in the Missouri
16 American one, if I recall correctly, was that the
17 revenue that was forgone by the company was
18 deferred.

19 JUDGE BURTON: And would that be an
20 option outside of this rate case?

21 MR. THOMPSON: I think you could
22 probably, and I say probably, because the question
23 is -- as Diana said very eloquently, a lot of
24 things can be accomplished by agreement that cannot
25 be imposed by fiat. In other words, if all the

1 stakeholders are willing to sign on and nobody's
2 running to the Court of Appeals saying make them
3 stop, make them stop, then many things can be done.

4 So I believe that a revenue-neutral
5 program -- and by revenue-neutral I mean the
6 company may not be collecting the money now, but
7 the company gets to collect the money later with a
8 carrying cost. Right?

9 So that kind of program could
10 probably be imposed outside of a rate case because
11 it doesn't impact all moving parts. Right? It's
12 neutral. The only -- the only part it impacts is
13 the company has to accept collecting less money
14 now, but it's satisfied because it will collect
15 more money later. So you could probably do that
16 between rate cases, outside of a rate case.

17 JUDGE BURTON: Would any of the other
18 parties like to respond to that?

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Mr. Thompson,
20 now that we've had this introduced by the Division
21 of Energy, couldn't the parties put this into some
22 type of black box settlement?

23 MR. THOMPSON: There is no question
24 that if the Commission wants an experimental
25 low-income pilot program to come out of this case,

1 then the parties can put one together for you. I
2 do not doubt that for a moment.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, I would
4 recommend that I think the Division of Energy's
5 approach would be a good approach to adopt, but I'm
6 just one commissioner.

7 MR. ANTAL: Judge, if I may. There
8 was a couple of questions from the commissioners
9 that I wanted to address.

10 Based off a review of the former ELIP
11 tariff, it appears that the program was available
12 to the first 1,000 customers who applied and the
13 applications went through.

14 And to Commissioner Rupp's question,
15 it appears based off the tariff that the program --
16 customers were allowed to participate in the
17 program for 12 months and then would have to
18 reapply to participate.

19 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Was the program
20 reauthorized in the next rate case then for it to
21 go that long, I assume, or was there a time limit?

22 MS. CARTER: There were multiple rate
23 cases. There was no automatic end to the program.
24 It ended through a settlement in the 2011 rate
25 case.

1 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Thanks.

2 JUDGE BURTON: The parties have
3 identified witnesses that are available to answer
4 any questions the Commission may have on these
5 issues, and they are Mr. Keith from Empire,
6 Ms. Kliethermes from Staff, Marke from OPC, Kroll
7 and Hyman from Division of Energy. Does the
8 Commission wish to hear any testimony from those
9 entities?

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. I think
11 Mr. Keith from the company to start on my
12 recommendation.

13 JUDGE BURTON: All right. Mr. Keith,
14 would you please step forward.

15 (Witness sworn.)

16 JUDGE BURTON: Would you please state
17 and spell your name for the record.

18 THE WITNESS: My name is Scott Keith,
19 K-e-i-t-h.

20 JUDGE BURTON: Okay. And could you
21 state what your current position is?

22 THE WITNESS: My current position is
23 director of planning and regulatory at Empire
24 District Electric Company.

25 SCOTT KEITH testified as follows:

1 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

2 Q. Good morning.

3 A. Good morning.

4 Q. So my understanding based on the
5 comments this morning and my brief review of the
6 report prepared by -- well, Exhibit 33, is that
7 this was a program, the experimental low-income
8 program was a program that was designed by the
9 company; is that correct?

10 A. I wasn't employed at Empire when it
11 was first put into place. I came along in 2005.
12 So I'm not sure who designed the program. It might
13 have been a collaborative effort between a group of
14 people.

15 Q. So there was a \$20 credit or a \$50
16 credit based on income; is that correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And who determined eligibility? Was
19 that something determined by the company or --

20 A. No, it wasn't. My recollection is we
21 used two CAP agencies, one in Joplin and one in
22 Ozark, and the program wasn't really service area
23 wide. That kind of limited it to several of our
24 larger counties. And I think there's some
25 discussion of that in the evaluation that it could

1 be expanded by using some of the CAP agencies in
2 the Branson area, for example.

3 Q. So the two CAP agencies were --

4 A. I think it was Economic Security in
5 Joplin and OACAC in Ozark.

6 Q. And it was available for the first
7 1,000 eligible applicants?

8 A. I don't recall that. I know we had
9 participation issues. It didn't seem like we got
10 the participation everybody thought we were going
11 to have. So we really never expended the budget.

12 Q. So you never reached the caps?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Ms. Carter indicated that the program
15 was discontinued in part because it was deemed not
16 to be cost effective. Can you explain to me what
17 that means?

18 A. Yes. I'll try. The consultant we
19 hired to review it, everybody agreed it needed to
20 be evaluated again, and we had to hire an
21 independent consultant to do it. In looking -- I
22 briefly looked at the document a couple of days ago
23 when this came up, and it looked like it had a cost
24 effectiveness of .31. It was below 1. Which meant
25 to the consultant that was doing the evaluation

1 that it actually cost more than it saved, so that
2 it turned into an adder to everybody's bill.

3 Q. So the cost side of that equation I
4 think I understand. That's the amount that is
5 being essentially subsidized on customers' bills.
6 But the savings, what is that?

7 A. I'm not sure what they used. I could
8 see maybe bad debt savings as an offset. I'm not
9 sure what benefits they used to offset the cost.
10 It was below one, though. For example, like
11 affordability you mentioned earlier might be this
12 subjective cost that they did not consider, but it
13 would -- it would never show up on our books and
14 records.

15 Q. Yeah. Because for me, that is the
16 goal of a low-income tariff is to promote
17 affordability so that individuals or families with
18 low income are able to afford electricity. And I
19 don't understand how that -- I think you
20 acknowledged this as well. I don't know how that
21 could be part of a formula used to determine cost
22 effectiveness.

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. So it was also indicated earlier this
25 morning that the -- that this program was funded by

1 **shareholders and ratepayers; is that correct?**

2 A. That's correct. That's how it
3 started. As I recall, it was 50/50. It was -- say
4 150,000 was in rates and 150,000 was funded by the
5 shareholders, given a \$300,000 budget.

6 Q. **So the \$300,000 budget was set by**
7 **either commission order or tariff or both, correct?**

8 A. It was probably part of a settlement.
9 So that dollar amount was derived at the settlement
10 and then brought forward to the Commission for
11 approval and got into the tariffs that way.

12 Q. **If the Commission were to indicate**
13 **its desire that the company work with Staff, OPC**
14 **and the other -- and the other parties to put**
15 **together some type of experimental low-income**
16 **program, do you have any thoughts as to what that**
17 **might look like, what might make sense in light of**
18 **the company's prior experience?**

19 A. Well, for sure one of the things we'd
20 certainly like to see is the evaluation of the
21 customer eligibility taken out of our hands, in
22 other words, determined by some independent CAP
23 agency or something. We don't want to get into the
24 business of trying to track income of customers.

25 Q. **Yeah. And I for one would agree with**

1 that completely.

2 A. But certainly we'd be happy to work
3 with them. We did it before with this ELIP
4 program, and we'd be willing to do it again to come
5 up with some design to present.

6 Q. In the Missouri American case, the
7 Commission ordered a pilot program that involved an
8 80 percent reduction of the customer charge. It
9 left the variable rates in place. And I don't know
10 if the order spelled this out, but at least from my
11 perspective that made sense because we didn't want
12 to do anything to encourage additional consumption.
13 We didn't want to encourage inefficient use of
14 water.

15 I think the same principle would
16 apply here, that if we were going to put in place
17 some kind of low-income tariff, doesn't it make
18 more sense to focus on the customer charge as
19 opposed to the variable charge?

20 A. Yes. However, given what happened to
21 our old program at 20 and \$50, with our charge only
22 being around 12.50, \$13 now, it's not -- doesn't
23 appear to be a lot of bill credit or not as much
24 help as we were trying to give before.

25 And then, you know, over the term of

1 our program, it appeared all the payment --
2 participants and their payment methods were --
3 became worse once they were off the program. So it
4 didn't seem to encourage, I don't know, quicker
5 payments or more efficient usage necessarily.

6 Q. Though I must say, I'm -- I don't
7 understand why anyone would be surprised that if
8 somebody -- if a low-income family was receiving a
9 20 or a \$50 credit on their bill and then all of a
10 sudden they weren't, why anyone would be surprised
11 that that didn't cause additional payment problems.

12 A. I agree.

13 Q. Well, I -- I'll just say that I -- I
14 very much appreciate the company's willingness to
15 put this program in place from 2002 to 2010. I
16 think it was a very progressive effort by the -- by
17 the company and the parties.

18 One of the criteria for eligibility I
19 believe included some type of conservation efforts
20 or weatherization.

21 A. I believe they had to sign up for
22 assistance for one thing. They had to be on the
23 list of assistance. At that time I doubt if Empire
24 had a weatherization program, but we do right now,
25 and certainly that could be added, that they get

1 into that queue, too. And they had to sign up for
2 average pay, try and spread out some of their spike
3 bills over 12 months.

4 Q. Is there any information on the
5 results of participants applying for available
6 energy assistance programs, including
7 weatherization?

8 A. In the report?

9 Q. Or otherwise.

10 A. I'm trying to think. If I -- I don't
11 know that we would track that internally. The CAPs
12 may have that. They would be able to, say, match
13 customers up that way.

14 Q. If the Commission were to direct the
15 parties to put together some type of experimental
16 program, if we were to direct the company to work
17 with the parties to find some type of discrete
18 geographic area to do that, do you have any sense
19 now as to what that discrete geographic area might
20 be?

21 A. Well, we have two major areas, the
22 Branson area and then we have the Joplin area. I'd
23 have to think about that a little bit. But I would
24 think it would be between those two, one of those
25 two.

1 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. I have no
2 further questions. Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions.
4 Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I have a
6 question or two and then a comment.

7 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:

8 Q. You stated one of the failures with
9 this program was the lack of participation?

10 A. Yes. We really never came close to
11 spending that budget. So we always had these
12 excess funds that we essentially rolled over into
13 other DSM and energy efficiency programs.

14 Q. You know, we had a recent Kansas City
15 Power & Light rate case, and I recall that their
16 low-income weatherization program, that our Staff
17 had requested not increasing any money. This
18 Commission voted to raise that, not because of this
19 lack of participation. I notice that a lot of
20 these programs in the low-income communities there
21 is a lack of participation, maybe because they
22 don't know the programs exist.

23 What type of methods do you have, if
24 you know, did Empire use to inform the low-income
25 community that this program was available?

1 A. The ELIP, the ELIP that was in place
2 for a number of years?

3 Q. Yes.

4 A. I don't recall exactly what we did.
5 I know that currently we do market the existing
6 programs, and we try and get out the word through
7 advertisement and things like that and the CAPs,
8 make sure the CAPs help market them.

9 Q. A lot of times low-income customers
10 don't have the access to as much media or
11 information as others. They're strapped. I can
12 understand that they don't realize the programs are
13 out there.

14 A. I know that would be an important
15 aspect to put into the new program.

16 Q. I think if it was just based off of a
17 customer charge and they'd have to sign up for it,
18 if somehow we knew we can -- a process that's not
19 cumbersome to the company but that we could use
20 would be much easier to implement than it be just
21 on a customer charge. I think it would be easier
22 to have them sign up for.

23 A. I would agree, except we'd certainly
24 want the CAPs to determine the eligibility because
25 they also manage our weatherization programs. So

1 they can match up that customer and see if they're
2 eligible for weatherization, too.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Great. Thank
4 you very much.

5 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:

6 Q. Good morning, sir.

7 A. Good morning.

8 Q. I'm going to stop and ask -- and step
9 back and question, why are we even considering
10 this? So I want to verify some facts. In the
11 previous program people can apply for 12 months and
12 then they can reapply, but what you found was that
13 people had a bigger difficulty when they got off
14 the program of paying their bills than when they
15 were on the program?

16 A. Yes, that's correct.

17 Q. Okay.

18 MS. CARTER: And just to clarify
19 that, the comparison was before they went on the
20 program with after, not during.

21 BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:

22 Q. Not during. Right. So you could
23 simply basically -- you could make the assumption
24 that, unless their economic situation changed, that
25 once they were on the program, they were going to

1 be dependent on the program moving forward to help
2 meet their -- pay their electric bill.

3 So my question is, gets back to the
4 old saying, you can give a person a fish and
5 they're hungry for -- feed them for a day, but if
6 you teach them how to fish, they can not be hungry
7 for the rest of their life. I butchered that
8 saying, but you know what I'm trying to say.

9 So shouldn't the goal -- if we think
10 about a low-income, is there a way to structure a
11 program that, rather than just giving them the
12 money, a credit on their bill, you take the amount
13 that you would have given them in the credit on the
14 bill and you do energy efficiency upgrades to their
15 apartment, to their house, and you can tie it to
16 the deed? I know that Kentucky has done this and
17 they have some programs. And use that money that
18 would help them lower their bill long-term rather
19 than just give them a credit on their bill.

20 Is there a way that -- is there a
21 possibility of structuring it in a way that would
22 provide long-term benefits to the end user?

23 A. Such as like educational benefits,
24 too, maybe a -- what do they call them, behavioral
25 change program. I can't remember what they're

1 called now. But there certainly would be some
2 opportunity and probably should be -- it should be
3 coupled with something other than just money so
4 that there's some longer-term benefit for increased
5 energy efficiency or they use energy in the most
6 efficient manner.

7 Q. Because I'm going to make the
8 assumption that if you're a low-income person that
9 is on here, there probably is a statistical strong
10 correlation between how energy efficient your
11 appliances, your air conditioning, your heating and
12 your house, the weatherization of the house,
13 there's probably a strong correlation between those
14 two. I'm sure it probably can be statistically
15 verified.

16 So if we were to look at -- if we
17 were to have a program and structure it in that
18 way, then there would be so much more impact on the
19 dollars that would be spent, and when a person --
20 if they do leave or whatever, then that benefit
21 stays with that meter and that deed for the next
22 person then that comes in.

23 So I would really encourage you guys
24 to explore that. I'm sure you probably can't in
25 this rate case. But I do know that several other

1 states have programs like this where they tie it to
2 the deed. The question comes into financing, but
3 if you can do it in a rate case or a low-income
4 rider, then there will be some monies in there.

5 A. I'm sure the group that gets together
6 to try and collaborate on this, we can think of
7 some things to couple it with that hopefully would
8 meet what you're talking about.

9 Q. That would be great. Thank you.

10 MR. ANTAL: Judge, if I may? Just to
11 address Commissioner Rupp's comments, we do have --
12 you know, the company and the Division of Energy do
13 have, you know, weatherization programs currently,
14 and there have been discussions of whether or not
15 additional low-income programs can be developed.
16 But we'll definitely take your comments into
17 consideration in developing any future programs.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. RUPP: Just to follow up on your
20 comment. My thoughts are to go beyond
21 weatherization. Go into -- I have a furnace that's
22 50 years old that is completely not energy
23 efficient, but I'm low income and I can't afford
24 \$3,000 to go have my furnace replaced, but that
25 would be a huge savings towards energy efficiency,

1 or my air conditioner or what have you. And if you
2 can somehow tie the financing to the deed, get
3 beyond weatherization, beyond weather stripping,
4 because that's only going to get you so far, get
5 into some of the big energy users.

6 But I appreciate your comments. I
7 think that's great.

8 MR. ANTAL: Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: You know,
10 looking at Exhibit 33, the evaluation of the
11 low-income program, certainly low-income programs
12 are -- can be very convoluted, I think, as far as
13 what happens to a person that's getting the
14 subsidy, and it's a lot more involved, a lot more
15 complicated than we have the time to go into.

16 I do have a lot of questions about
17 this evaluation, which I understand it covers a
18 period from 2003 to 2009. And so that makes a big
19 difference, too, in the different things we've been
20 talking about. I certainly look forward to reading
21 this information.

22 But I do think, know from experience
23 and from folks that I have worked with as a
24 legislator that it does appear to be a subsidiary
25 during the time that people are getting the

1 assistance because just because a person is
2 participating in a low-income program, it doesn't
3 mean that their financial situation is getting any
4 better. They may be getting help with a utility
5 but not getting help overall. So there's, you
6 know, so many other things that are part of what's
7 going on in the life of a person that needs these
8 services.

9 And Commissioner Rupp, the question
10 is feed a man for -- feed a -- let me see. Give a
11 man a fish, you feed him for a day. Teach a man to
12 fish, you feed him for a lifetime. Thank you,
13 Judge.

14 JUDGE BURTON: Were there any
15 questions from the parties for this witness? Okay.
16 Seeing none. Thank you, Mr. Keith. You're
17 excused.

18 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

19 JUDGE BURTON: Would the Commission
20 like to hear from any other witness that was
21 offered for this issue?

22 CHAIRMAN HALL: If there are any
23 witnesses that are prepared to discuss the final
24 report of the experimental low-income program by
25 Tech Market, Exhibit 33, I'd be interested in

1 getting different parties' perspectives on that
2 report. If there's nobody here who's prepared to
3 talk about it, then...

4 MS. MERS: I believe Staff's witness
5 Sarah Kliethermes can speak on that.

6 MS. MAYFIELD: And OPC's witness
7 Dr. Marke can also speak on that as well.

8 MR. ANTAL: And Division of Energy's
9 witness Sharlet Kroll can speak to it, too.

10 (Witness sworn.)

11 JUDGE BURTON: Would you please state
12 and spell your name for the record.

13 THE WITNESS: Sarah Kliethermes,
14 S-a-r-a-h, K-l-i-e-t-h-e-r-m-e-s.

15 JUDGE BURTON: And would you please
16 state your position and place of employment.

17 THE WITNESS: Regulatory Economist 3
18 with the Missouri Public Service Commission Staff.

19 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you.

20 SARAH KLIETHERMES testified as follows:

21 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

22 Q. Good morning.

23 A. Good morning.

24 Q. So my understanding is that this
25 particular report indicated that the program was

1 not cost effective and it had an adverse effect on
2 bill-paying habits?

3 A. Yes. And I think there's an
4 important aspect of the experiment that hasn't
5 really come out yet this morning, and that was that
6 part of what the experiment was, to get around some
7 of the issues that have been raised with legal
8 challenges of relief for low-income customers, the
9 experiment was to see if reducing the bill burden
10 for customers who were often in arrearage
11 situations would have an effect on reducing the
12 overall revenue requirement by reducing cash lead
13 lag problems, bad debt problems, that sort of
14 thing.

15 So while low-income relief I think in
16 the minds of many parties was a very laudable
17 latent benefit, the technical design of the program
18 I believe was to the experiment of reducing the
19 company's cash flow issues and bad debt burden.

20 Q. And upon what do you base that
21 understanding?

22 A. I was the attorney for Staff on the
23 rate cases from 2006 through 2010 or something like
24 that.

25 Q. Is there anything in the record that

1 would indicate that that was the purpose of the
2 program?

3 A. It is my recollection -- although
4 given how this came up, I frankly didn't think to
5 look at it. It is my recollection that there's
6 some testimony in that 2002 rate case probably from
7 Staff witness Ann Ross that would address that
8 issue. That's my recollection.

9 Q. Because that -- the effect of the
10 low-income program on a company's bad debt was
11 expressly one of the things that the Commission
12 cited in the Missouri American case.

13 A. Yes. And if I may just a bit
14 further.

15 Q. Please.

16 A. Part of the experiment was that there
17 were defined criteria to be tested and that were
18 tested, you know. So essentially the program ran
19 when it ran with the intent to study those aspects,
20 and I think it was viewed that the benefit to the
21 low-income customers during the time, if that's
22 something the Commission couldn't objectly seek
23 out, that that was certainly a desirable, you know,
24 benefit that came about as part of that study.

25 Q. Do you, sitting here today, have

1 thoughts as to how a program could be better
2 structured either from the perspective of
3 affordability or from the perspective of minimizing
4 bad debt?

5 A. Frankly, off the top of my head --
6 well, not entirely off the top of my head. The
7 Commission's approach in Missouri American at least
8 from a, can Staff and the company work together to
9 design tariffs to implement this and know how to
10 process it approach, that addressed a lot of the
11 problems that have come up in the past when we've
12 looked at this.

13 As far as an implementation approach,
14 you're avoiding having a separate class that we
15 have to have load research data for. You're
16 avoiding having to estimate normalized volumetric
17 usage.

18 So certainly from the part of it that
19 I work with, the Commission's Missouri American
20 approach is a very workable solution. As far as
21 how that has a better impact on customers, frankly,
22 there's probably better people on Staff to answer
23 that question. I apologize for that.

24 Q. So if the Commission were to ask the
25 company to work with Staff, OPC and the other

1 parties to put together some type of either
2 experimental program or pilot program, do you
3 sitting here today have a thought as to whether it
4 would make sense to do it like Missouri American
5 where there was a discount exclusively on the
6 customer charge or would you think there's some
7 other approach that makes sense?

8 A. Speaking only from a, you know, I
9 guess technologically feasible side, if you do it
10 on volumetric, I frankly don't know how we would do
11 that. If you do it as a flat dollar value, whether
12 it's applied to the customer charge or similar to
13 how the ELIP program worked, we can do that math.

14 Q. Well, if you were to do it as a
15 credit --

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. -- separate and apart from either the
18 volumetric or the customer charge, from a -- from a
19 mechanical perspective, that's something new?

20 A. Yes, absolutely. That worked with
21 ELIP and I think it could work for, you know, as
22 far as the ability to bill it and process it and
23 keep track of the money.

24 Q. Yeah. I guess I was asking more from
25 a policy perspective, would it make sense to do it

1 exclusively on the customer charge? There is the
2 issue that on a \$140 bill reducing 13 to \$15 may
3 not have much effect.

4 A. Exactly. You know, not -- while
5 there are better people on Staff to answer probably
6 more detailed questions than that, yeah, I mean,
7 intuitively you don't have a lot of play there with
8 the size customer charge that Empire has relative
9 to total bill.

10 Q. Now, the average bill is \$140 or so;
11 is that correct?

12 A. That sounds roughly right, and --
13 yes.

14 Q. And my understanding, and this may
15 not be the case specifically with Empire, but I
16 think there is data out there that shows that there
17 is a rough correlation between income and
18 consumption. Do you agree with that, that the
19 low-income customers tend to consume less than
20 high-income customers?

21 A. I know there have been different
22 studies on that over time. I don't know what the
23 most current view of that is. I know at one time
24 there was a -- I believe there was a U-shaped
25 graph, but I don't know if that is currently still

1 the belief.

2 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. I have no
3 further questions.

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.

5 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:

6 Q. Good morning.

7 A. Good morning.

8 Q. You're a regulatory economist level
9 three?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. All right. Let's just put on the
12 economist hat. Not considering any social benefit
13 or social positives that could come out, what --
14 after reviewing this study that they did, what are
15 the purely economical benefits to ratepayers, to
16 the company, the shareholders, of having a program
17 like this besides the people that got the
18 reduction?

19 A. Sure. In that bad debt -- and I'm
20 struggling with the term right now. It's one of
21 the accounting terms. But the uncollectibles and
22 the lead lag cash flow issue, those all factor in
23 to the revenue requirement. So all customers end
24 up paying bad debt. So if you reduce the level of
25 bad debt, you reduce what those customers pay. You

1 reduce the carrying cost on bad debt.

2 Q. But with this study specifically
3 showing that they did not have any, what is the --
4 if that study is showed to be true, then what is
5 the economic benefit of having a program like this?

6 A. For these customers during this time
7 period as studied, this showed that you spent more
8 money reducing customers' bills than what bad debt
9 was reduced, is my understanding.

10 Q. So is there an economic benefit to
11 having -- to having had this program?

12 A. This program, no.

13 Q. Thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions.

15 Thank you.

16 JUDGE BURTON: Any questions from the
17 parties? You may be excused.

18 Would the Commission like to hear
19 next from -- I believe we have Marke available or
20 Mr. Hyneman from the Office of Public Counsel or
21 Kroll from the Division of Energy.

22 MS. MAYFIELD: We have Dr. Marke
23 available.

24 (Witness sworn.)

25 JUDGE BURTON: Would you please state

1 and spell your name for the record.

2 THE WITNESS: It's Geoff Marke,
3 G-e-o-f-f, M-a-r-k-e.

4 JUDGE BURTON: And would you please
5 state your current position and place of
6 employment.

7 THE WITNESS: I'm an economist with
8 the Missouri Office of Public Counsel.

9 GEOFF MARKE testified as follows:

10 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

11 Q. Good morning.

12 A. Good morning.

13 Q. Here is a wide-open question. You've
14 been in the hearing room all morning?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. You've listened to the discussion
17 about the experimental low-income program and
18 the -- and the report that was issued about that
19 program that is Exhibit 33?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you have any thoughts?

22 A. I do have some thoughts.

23 Q. Yes.

24 A. Okay. I didn't think it was a very
25 good program or a report. I've got a handout if

1 you're interested.

2 JUDGE BURTON: Would you please hold
3 on one second and let's have your counsel review
4 that and see if it's going to be marked for the
5 record.

6 MS. MAYFIELD: Did you prepare this
7 handout?

8 THE WITNESS: I did.

9 MS. MAYFIELD: Did the information on
10 the handout come from the report that is Exhibit 33
11 offered by the Empire District?

12 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

13 MS. MAYFIELD: And is there also
14 information contained in here, a chart that was
15 prepared based on your rebuttal testimony that will
16 be submitted in this case later on?

17 THE WITNESS: Yes.

18 MS. MAYFIELD: Your Honor, I would
19 like to mark this as OPC Exhibit 19, and I will
20 pass it out to the parties for review.

21 JUDGE BURTON: One moment and we'll
22 see if there are any objections.

23 (OPC EXHIBIT 19 WAS MARKED FOR
24 IDENTIFICATION.)

25 JUDGE BURTON: What's been marked as

1 OPC Exhibit 19, Ms. Mayfield, did you want to move
2 for this to be admitted?

3 MS. MAYFIELD: I would move for the
4 admission of this, OPC Exhibit 19.

5 JUDGE BURTON: Are there any
6 objections?

7 (No response.)

8 JUDGE BURTON: Seeing none,
9 Exhibit OPC 19 is admitted into the record.

10 (OPC EXHIBIT 19 WAS RECEIVED INTO
11 EVIDENCE.)

12 THE WITNESS: Okay. So I had an
13 opportunity to review the evaluation last night and
14 the attached surrebuttal. So on the -- on the page
15 with all the text, No. 1 is highlights of the
16 actual evaluation itself. Some of these points
17 have already been fleshed out. The bullet points
18 under the Tier 1 and Tier 2, the highlights that
19 I'd just like to bring to the Commission's
20 attention.

21 So there are two tiers. That second
22 tier with the larger number, you're talking zero to
23 50 percent of the federal poverty line, that's
24 very, very poor. So all the observations are -- I
25 think are spot on in terms of it's very difficult

1 to get out of this cycle once you're stuck into it.

2 So it's not a surprise that bad debt and arrears
3 went up after.

4 It should be noted within the study
5 that when they were on the program, bad debt and
6 arrears went down. So there's that.

7 We do have programs like this with
8 KCPL. We do have programs like this in Ameren.
9 They're mildly successful. They're getting better.
10 It's a work in progress.

11 BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

12 Q. Excuse me. I'm sorry to interrupt.
13 You said that while customers were in the program,
14 bad debt and arrearages went down?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. Can you direct me to the report where
17 that is set forth?

18 A. As soon as I find my report. So
19 there's two sections within the report. There's
20 several bar graphs that are listed there. The
21 first set of bar graphs talks about bad debt and
22 arrears in conjunction with other payment programs.
23 So it's not just the ELIP program that a family
24 might be receiving. They might also be receiving
25 LIHEAP, some other form of assistance,

1 weatherization, so forth.

2 That can -- in terms of data, that
3 can make it more difficult to go ahead and clean
4 and see what the actual impact of just ELIP is.
5 Again, the vast majority of these customers you're
6 talking a \$20 discount.

7 The second set tries to control for
8 just the ELIP numbers. So I want to say several
9 different breakdowns here.

10 Q. Where are you in the report? I'm
11 sorry.

12 A. I'm on page 17, and I'm trying to
13 take --

14 JUDGE BURTON: And this is of
15 Empire's Exhibit 33?

16 THE WITNESS: It is. And to be
17 honest with you, Chairman, I'm -- caught me off
18 guard. I know that it's in here, but I don't know
19 which bar graph that speaks to that.

20 BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

21 Q. Would you agree that -- I mean, and I
22 think this was your point -- that that indicates at
23 least one significant benefit from the program?

24 A. Right.

25 Q. And so in a sense, that evidence

1 would go directly to affordability?

2 A. It would. It would. The program
3 itself, though, the evaluation kind of -- it opines
4 on some of the faults of it. The program had
5 difficulty advertising.

6 So I think one of my bullet points
7 refers to this, that the information provided on
8 the website is not listed under programs offered by
9 Empire in Missouri. So Missouri ratepayers, if
10 they had access to the Internet, would see that and
11 they wouldn't see anything under Missouri.

12 You couldn't find this information on
13 any of the CAP agency websites. The report itself
14 says that, you know, points out that a lot of
15 low-income customers at this period might not have
16 access to the Internet anyway. I think that was a
17 point raised earlier.

18 There was a lot of speculation, I
19 guess, on the evaluators that said that customers
20 might not be inclined to sign up for this program
21 because, and this is the third point, customers may
22 want to let their utility bill rise to a high level
23 of arrearage and receive notice of disconnection.
24 When this occurs, they can often qualify for
25 temporary emergency relief through the emergency

1 crisis intervention program. Essentially these
2 customers then would have access to a larger
3 credit.

4 If they stayed on the ELIP program,
5 part of that contingent -- part of that requirement
6 of the ELIP program was that they were essentially
7 put into budget billing, a levelized bill. For
8 some customers this can be a bit confusing because
9 your bill in any given month might be larger than
10 your actual usage.

11 In that sense, if you're on a
12 levelized payment, you're also not eligible for any
13 emergency relief funds. So that's one -- one trip
14 to the hospital. That's one, you know, fill in the
15 blank, whatever emergency and all of a sudden it
16 becomes that much more difficult.

17 Weighing those options, those
18 realities on a day-to-day basis, customers might
19 not opt to go into an ELIP program.

20 We've spoken a lot about the benefit
21 cost test. I think there's a reference that the
22 same test is used in MEEIA. I'm fortunate to have
23 spent a lot of time in MEEIA. It's not the same
24 test. The low-income -- I'd never heard of this
25 test before. It's called the low-income -- the

1 low-income public purpose test. I had to go ahead
2 and Google that. I found the Tech Mark report that
3 actually describes that test. So this is from a
4 2001 study.

5 The key thing to note here -- and
6 this is the third black bullet point on that page.
7 So what was referenced is the results of the
8 low-income public purpose test is 0.22.

9 I bolded the statement coming up in
10 the next sentence. This program, like many most
11 low-income programs, is essentially a subsidy to
12 the customers that participate. From an evaluation
13 standpoint, from a social researcher standpoint,
14 this gives me pause, any time you have somebody
15 making a bold statement that low-income programs
16 are all subsidies. The idea behind it is that the
17 evaluator themselves would want to remain neutral.
18 So right off the bat -- again, I'm -- I paused.

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Excuse me. If
20 it's not a subsidy, what is it?

21 THE WITNESS: So I follow you down to
22 the next part, and we've been trying to kind of
23 wrestle with this idea. Are there any benefits
24 that can be had from low-income programs? There's
25 been several different progressive utilities that

1 really tried to make an impact in this area. The
2 graph there refers to Citizens Gas. It's an
3 Indiana utility. Essentially they came to the
4 conclusion that some money's better than no money.
5 So they gave a discount and essentially were able
6 to net a greater amount of revenue than they
7 otherwise would with the control group.

8 Essentially, this no longer makes it
9 a subsidy. You've got customers -- utility's
10 better off. Customers are better off. Reference a
11 couple other programs. Colorado, Excel, and New
12 Jersey, Pennsylvania both have similar programs.

13 This is an important distinction,
14 though, because I would say that I'm fairly
15 confident that most of these states actually had a
16 low-income designation, so they can actually offer
17 a low-income rate. It's been statutorily driven.

18 There's in my mind a difference
19 between a bill credit program and a low-income rate
20 program or a low-income classification. We've got
21 bill credits. We've got lots of -- we have a
22 history of pilots of bill credit programs that have
23 died for various reasons.

24 I've got mixed feelings about all of
25 this. On one hand, I think it's absolutely

1 important, and I hear what the Commission is
2 saying. My hesitation just lies -- I echoed this
3 in the Missouri American case. I think it's just
4 important that we design it right. I'd hate to
5 have another pilot program just go to the graveyard
6 at the end of the day.

7 And that's what I feel like going
8 through the four years' worth of rate case
9 testimony, that's what I saw was that we had good
10 intentions to start off, and for all sorts of
11 reasons things changed.

12 We have been talking about other
13 low-income programs. It's been an active
14 discussion in terms of the DSM and the energy
15 efficiency and weatherization. To Commissioner
16 Rupp's point, we looked into the Eastern Kentucky
17 PACE tariff program, and we spoke with Holz Home
18 (phonetic), is the head of a fraction out of the
19 DOE that's pushing the PACE tariff program.

20 My understanding of program as it
21 stands right now is that it's a -- it's been
22 successful with coops. They don't have any
23 examples -- nobody -- there hasn't been an
24 investor-owned utility that's attempted to do the
25 program yet.

1 Given the parameters of where Empire
2 is, the desire of the Commission to do a low-income
3 program, it's largely rural community as opposed to
4 some of the other utilities. I think the PACE
5 tariff is an excellent idea to move forward, and to
6 the extent that we're looking at low-income
7 programs to bridge into some of the DSM programs,
8 again, Empire doesn't have a MEEIA. It seems like
9 it would be a good fit. So we have had discussions
10 about that.

11 On the back of the page, this is
12 actually from my rebuttal testimony. There were
13 questions about is there any data to substantiate
14 whether or not low-income customers use less energy
15 or not. This is primary data from Empire Electric
16 themselves. This isn't any other party. This is
17 Empire. This was used to support their IRP and
18 their DSM programs.

19 There's a lot of numbers going on
20 there and there's a lot to kind of take in. Empire
21 is a unique company in the sense that there are a
22 lot more electric space heating customers, but --
23 so any time that we're talking about just
24 reducing -- this is somewhat ironic given our
25 position in a lot of testimony. As far as the

1 customer charge goes, I think we just be cognizant
2 that -- well, let me step back.

3 BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

4 Q. Let me -- so I'm looking at the
5 bottom four rows of page 2 of that exhibit, and
6 though the numbers don't line up directly, it would
7 appear that from those numbers there is a
8 correlation between income and consumption. Is
9 that correct?

10 A. That's how I interpret it.

11 Q. And so with that -- and this came
12 directly from what source?

13 A. This is the Empire's triennial IRP.

14 Q. So with that information, if a
15 program were designed that involved exclusively a
16 reduction or a possible elimination of the customer
17 charge for low-income residents, in light of the
18 fact that low-income residents tend to have lower
19 consumption, that could have a significant impact,
20 could it not?

21 A. For those customers, yes.

22 Q. Okay. I'll let you continue.

23 A. I'll finish with the low-income
24 public purpose test. The fact that it's a low
25 number is largely because of the inputs that are in

1 there. You have a copy of the exhibit. It's on
2 page 23. So the benefits in that case are speaking
3 strictly to fewer shutoffs, fewer reconnects and
4 fewer notices.

5 It's what you value, I mean, at the
6 end of the day, what you want to deem as a benefit.
7 We can -- I wouldn't put a lot of stock in these
8 numbers at the end of the day, the low-income
9 public purpose test. Outside of this evaluation
10 and the reference of the 2001, I couldn't find it
11 anywhere else. All right.

12 If this evaluation just looked at was
13 there an increase in revenues, like Excel did, I
14 think you would automatically see benefits right
15 there. That in turn would change. So, you know,
16 that just speaks to the design and the importance
17 of really crafting this in a tight manner.

18 CHAIRMAN HALL: I have no further
19 questions. Thank you.

20 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER STOLL:

21 Q. I appreciate your testimony and the
22 information that you passed out. I mean, to me one
23 of the important things you said is that we need
24 to design this right, whatever -- if there is a
25 low-income program, it needs to be designed

1 correctly. I'm not sure what that looks like.

2 A. Right.

3 Q. But that's my only reason to pause in
4 this case because I don't want to do something just
5 to say or just to do something. I really would
6 like to see it designed right and have all the
7 parties give input and -- and try to come up with a
8 product that we think would be useful or a model or
9 looking at the Excel project, how would that fit in
10 Missouri.

11 I also think there are a lot of
12 things that could be done and hopefully are being
13 done as far as weatherization and -- and other
14 means to give people an opportunity to live in a
15 home or an apartment that is more energy efficient.

16 Frankly, many places don't have
17 building codes, and I heard testimony in previous
18 cases from people who lived in apartments, young
19 people who said, you know, I would love to reduce
20 my bill, but the apartment I'm in is just not up to
21 par. So I think there's always things we can work
22 on there, and I know people are doing that.

23 But I think when we do implement a
24 program for low-income participants in Empire, I'd
25 like to see it done right and to get input from all

1 the parties. So that's more of a statement than a
2 question, but I did appreciate the design right
3 aspect. I think that's -- that's crucial in --
4 it's crucial in anything we do, but in this
5 program, too. Thank you.

6 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:

7 Q. Good morning.

8 A. Good morning.

9 Q. Would you give a brief overview of
10 the PACE program for the benefit of the
11 Commissioners and those in the audience and the
12 thousands listening online?

13 A. Actually, DE might be better able to
14 speak to the PACE program, but it's my
15 understanding the PACE program was selected as one
16 of Time Magazine's 100 best ideas moving into the
17 new millennium. It was this idea that on-bill
18 financing and energy efficiency, that you could go
19 ahead and retrofit your property, to go ahead and
20 reduce your consumption and pay off those debt
21 through your monthly bills.

22 The program basically ran into a lot
23 of problems because of the housing crisis, and
24 Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac essentially said that if
25 you owed a lot of money on your house, you had to

1 pay the bank first as opposed to going through the
2 utility and the on-bill financing.

3 Subsequently the program has been
4 really focused on commercial customers. It's my
5 understanding that there might be a rural component
6 that's being introduced right now. It's -- it's
7 something that a lot of people feel very passionate
8 about and move forward, and we're trying our best
9 to promote that in both Ameren and KCPL's service
10 territory with their commercial and industrial
11 programs.

12 Q. So I know one of the issues that they
13 were running into was with a mortgage you can
14 bundle these and you can securitize these and you
15 can sell them in the other market. There hasn't
16 been a market for this. But I believe that some
17 financial products have emerged that have allowed
18 this, which has brought some of the financing costs
19 down.

20 So when you look at a district like
21 Empire that has 77 percent of the people that own
22 their own home and you have almost 70 percent of
23 the people's homes were built in the last century,
24 would you think that the PACE program would be a
25 good match for what is trying to be accomplished

1 through the comments you've heard here in that
2 district?

3 A. I mean, if you can get around the, I
4 guess the earlier stated hurdles of PACE, I think
5 it's a phenomenal match for Empire. Yeah. I mean,
6 just building things better to code, better to
7 standards is going to go a long way. And I think
8 it's something that people and families can
9 understand. It goes through your bill and it's not
10 a piecemeal process. So you can go ahead and get
11 that HVAC but also get that insulation, get the
12 whole retrofit process.

13 Too often we just do things
14 singularly, and when you're trying to conserve
15 energy through air conditioning or heating, it's
16 really a systematic approach. It's the whole
17 house. So PACE enables that process.

18 Q. And so in your testimony, you had
19 seen multiple pilots that have been tried over the
20 period of years that have been done and then just
21 went to the wayside and failed. And to your point
22 of designing and to Commission Stoll's question of
23 designing it, would it be prudent to look at a
24 program that has been -- received a lot of
25 attention, has been vetted, has gone through some

1 ups and downs and some tweaks and try to model that
2 versus recreating the wheel?

3 A. I mean, that's the key. We just -- I
4 don't think most people would probably accuse
5 Missouri of being a first mover. So we can --
6 there's plenty of examples to go ahead and the best
7 practices that we do lean on.

8 Q. Thanks.

9 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN:

10 Q. Good morning. I'd like a
11 clarification on the statement about the -- some of
12 these low-income programs were not a subsidy,
13 because I think that people in general who are
14 receiving the assistance would certainly believe
15 that it's a subsidy because now they're getting
16 credited and getting a grant for something they
17 didn't have to pay. So give me your reasoning
18 behind your comments, please.

19 A. I mean, I would agree with you,
20 Commissioner. And to clarify my comment in terms
21 of the subsidy comment, I think subsidy within the
22 context of rate design sometimes has a negative
23 connotation that we can't justify doing X because
24 it's a subsidy because you're favoring one
25 intraclass or one group over another, and we're

1 supposed to be nondiscriminatory.

2 I guess the only point I was trying
3 to make is that there are a number of utilities
4 that have gone on record and said that by helping
5 and enabling this group, it's actually a benefit
6 for all. And we make that comment all the time as
7 a societal benefit, but now we have empirical
8 evidence where at the bottom line there's actually
9 revenues that are being created, being captured
10 that otherwise would not. In that sense, I look at
11 that as just good business practice.

12 Q. Okay. I think I had another. Under
13 your item No. 1, your bullet point No. 3, that
14 customers let their utility bills rise in order to
15 receive a notice of disconnection. They can then
16 go to some agency to receive assistance. That
17 doesn't always happen, though, does it?

18 A. No, and I would caution with that,
19 that as I read those, I mean, it seemed it was
20 speculative, that these are reasons maybe that it
21 was taking place. There's a lot of uncertainty
22 with that evaluation, whether the numbers -- at the
23 end of the day, if we were -- you know, if we had
24 to go back in time and do this over, I think it
25 would be imperative that we actually look at what

1 that data says. There's a lot of ways to interpret
2 that.

3 COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Thank you.
4 Thank you, Judge.

5 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you. Any
6 questions from the parties?

7 MR. ANTAL: Judge, I would have a
8 couple questions for Dr. Marke, if I may.

9 QUESTIONS BY MR. ANTAL:

10 Q. Dr. Marke, you were discussing the
11 findings of the evaluation and some of the
12 challenges with marketing the ELIP program with the
13 Commissioners, and I wanted to ask you if you
14 recalled the finding that the CAP agencies
15 indicated that they lacked program brochures to
16 explain the program to their clients?

17 A. I mean, that seemed to be -- there
18 was definitely a disconnect between the agencies,
19 utility, I think stakeholders, as far as really
20 promoting the program. Again, I think \$300,000 was
21 the annual budget. I think expenditures didn't
22 exceed maybe 50,000 at any given year. I think we
23 know that the level of poverty, I think you cited
24 to this earlier, is obviously very great in that
25 area. To suggest that that money couldn't get

1 spent raises some doubt.

2 Q. And would you think that, in your
3 opinion, that having a brochure that explains the
4 program would be essential to promoting a program
5 such as this?

6 A. I think it would help. I think the
7 best thing we could do is probably bring the CAP
8 agencies themselves to the table and ask them
9 directly, what can we do to empower you?

10 MR. ANTAL: Okay. Thank you. No
11 further questions.

12 JUDGE BURTON: Commissioner Rupp has
13 an additional question.

14 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:

15 Q. I'm sorry. I forgot a question. On
16 your handout, Exhibit 19, on the page with the
17 text, you mentioned that some individuals could
18 qualify for emergency relief through the emergency
19 crisis intervention program. Who funds that and
20 where's that program housed?

21 A. I couldn't speak to that directly.
22 My understanding from reading the evaluation is
23 that that's a component of Empire itself, but that
24 was a quote lifted directly from the evaluation
25 itself.

1 Q. So you believe it's like another
2 program offered from the utility, it's not through
3 some other social benefactor, government agency
4 or --

5 A. I guess I would put it that way. The
6 sheer fact that I don't know that, the fact that
7 we've got multiple different streams, and then if
8 you cross one of these streams all of a sudden
9 you're out of the program suggests to me that
10 there's a flaw there. Again, the design is really
11 important, but I don't know.

12 MR. ANTAL: Judge, if I may, I
13 believe DE's witness Ms. Kroll could answer that
14 question when she takes the stand.

15 JUDGE BURTON: Were there any further
16 questions for this witness based off of the
17 questions from the Commission or from Division of
18 Energy?

19 (No response.)

20 JUDGE BURTON: All right. Seeing
21 none, you're excused. Why don't we take a brief
22 ten-minute recess and we will return at about
23 10:45.

24 (A BREAK WAS TAKEN.)

25 JUDGE BURTON: At this time why don't

1 we go ahead and call up Division of Energy's
2 witness Kroll.

3 MR. ANTAL: Yes. Division of Energy
4 calls Ms. Sharlet Kroll to the stand.

5 (Witness sworn.)

6 JUDGE BURTON: Would you please state
7 and spell your name for the record after you're
8 seated.

9 THE WITNESS: Sharlet Kroll,
10 S-h-a-r-l-e-t, K-r-o-l-l.

11 JUDGE BURTON: And would you please
12 identify your job title and place of employment?

13 THE WITNESS: I am a Planner 2 within
14 the Missouri Division of Energy.

15 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you. Are there
16 any questions for Ms. Kroll?

17 SHARLET KROLL testified as follows:

18 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

19 Q. Good morning.

20 A. Good morning.

21 Q. What would your view be of
22 implementation of a program that included an either
23 elimination or reduction in the customer charge for
24 LIHEAP eligible customers in Empire's service
25 territory limited to some specific geographic

1 region yet to be determined? Is that a program
2 from a policy perspective that you believe would
3 make sense?

4 A. So I want to make sure I understand
5 correctly. So you're asking about limiting the
6 program just to LIHEAP customers within the
7 geographic area and my viewpoint on whether that
8 would be a good design?

9 Q. Well, and the benefit would be a
10 reduction or elimination of the customer charge.

11 A. Okay. So in my surrebuttal
12 testimony, I looked at the average bill currently
13 of an Empire customer based on Mr. Hyman's analysis
14 of the usage data that we received, and I compared
15 that looking to a family of three for Empire
16 customers because the average household size,
17 according to U.S. Census data, is 2.46 for that
18 area.

19 And based on that, those customers
20 currently have an energy burden of 8.5 percent. So
21 if there was, say, a \$12 reduction on the customer
22 charge, on the fixed charge, that would reduce the
23 energy burden not quite a full percent. So they
24 would drop it from 8.5 down closer to 7 point --
25 and I can't remember the exact number.

1 Q. Is that analysis based on average
2 consumption and average bills or is that analysis
3 based upon --

4 A. It is based on average consumption.

5 Q. Well, that's a pretty significant
6 distinction, isn't it?

7 A. I will let Mr. Hyman -- I will defer
8 that question to Mr. Hyman. As far as other
9 benefits, any time the bill goes down, customers do
10 have more income to spend in other areas, it helps
11 reduce their energy burden.

12 One of the challenges to the program
13 from looking at Empire's Exhibit 33 was that the
14 incentive amount wasn't significant enough for
15 consumers to take advantage of, and I believe
16 Dr. Marke alluded to this, that some customers --
17 some customers didn't want to be part of the
18 program because if they did go into a situation
19 where they received a notice of termination, then
20 they could apply to the Energy Crisis Intervention
21 Program through the LIHEAP program and receive a
22 more significant payment onto their bill.

23 So that would be a program
24 implementation challenge that would have to be
25 addressed.

1 Q. Any other comments from a policy
2 Or -- policy perspective or from a mechanical
3 implementation perspective on such a program?

4 A. So any time you implement a new
5 program there is a lot of energy that a program
6 manager needs to put into that program to get it up
7 and off the ground. So Empire would need to be
8 committed to having a designated person assigned to
9 be able to get this program moving.

10 It's more than just cutting a check,
11 handing it off to your contracted partners and
12 hoping at the end of 12 months that it ran right.
13 Based on my experience, having managed statewide
14 programs and done contract management, you have to
15 be following up at least on a quarterly basis with
16 your contractors, making sure that they are hitting
17 the measures that you have in place, making sure
18 that they have the support, the technical support,
19 being available to answer calls to them, having the
20 education that they need, the guidelines that they
21 need to know the parameters, the scope of work is
22 for this contract expectation, making sure that,
23 you know, they're a quarter way through their
24 annual budget -- excuse me -- they're a quarter of
25 the way through their contract period, are they a

1 quarter of a way through their budget. So you want
2 to make sure they're on track with their budget.

3 So there's a lot of program
4 management that the company will be taking on. And
5 I feel that, you know, that probably needs to be a
6 designated person within the company, not just
7 handing it off to Mr. Hackney as other duties
8 assigned, because he covers all of their energy
9 efficiency programs and weatherization programs for
10 both Missouri and for Arkansas. So he has a huge
11 responsibility of overseeing programs, multiple
12 programs.

13 So that would be one concern that I
14 would have is the time commitment and the personnel
15 designated to the program. The other issue would
16 be the contract agencies, because the CAP agencies
17 do multiple programs in their communities. So this
18 is another aspect that we would be asking them to
19 take on, which they've done in the past, but there
20 is an administrative cost for them.

21 And just having done a quick review
22 of Ameren's Keeping Up evaluation that was done in
23 2012, one of the comments that that evaluation
24 found was that the payment -- I hesitate to use the
25 word payment -- the administrative costs that the

1 agencies were asked to take on in order to identify
2 and process and follow up with customers that were
3 enrolling in Keeping Current was not significant
4 enough for those CAP agencies to incur that burden
5 of managing the program.

6 The other point I'd like to make is
7 you want to keep the program simple and easily
8 understood. You're dealing with a population that
9 has multiple challenges that they deal with in
10 their everyday lives, and this will be another
11 application that they will need to apply for. So
12 the application process needs to be very
13 streamlined and very simple so that it doesn't
14 become a burdensome process for them that they
15 don't then not follow forward with.

16 CHAIRMAN HALL: I have no further
17 questions. Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions.

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.
20 Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER RUPP: No questions.

22 MR. ANTAL: Ms. Kroll can answer the
23 questions about the funding for that emergency
24 program.

25 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:

1 Q. Ma'am, would you please answer that
2 question.

3 A. Yes. So LIHEAP has two components to
4 it: Their energy assistance, which assists with
5 heating, and then they also have their crisis
6 program, which is their Energy Crisis Intervention
7 Program, their ECIP, and that requires verification
8 of a verifiable crisis, so a shutoff, in order for
9 a client to apply for and receive that.

10 Q. And LIHEAP is funded by?

11 A. It is a federal program, and Missouri
12 through the Department of Social Services applies
13 for that federal grant and manages it.

14 Q. So once again, to your point, if
15 you're going to design a program, look at the other
16 programs that are out there and make sure there's
17 not a cross-cutting disincentive to participate.
18 Thank you.

19 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN:

20 Q. I think I do need a clarification.
21 It was the doctor's testimony that I think said
22 that -- I may be wrong here. Been listening to a
23 little bit of testimony this morning -- that if a
24 person could possibly be in the LIHEAP program but
25 not receive funding from other places, there can't

1 be like a -- you can't dip out of two pots. Have
2 you ever heard of that in that type of a situation?
3 Because I know, as you just mentioned, that Social
4 Services administers the program. They send those
5 funds out to different nonprofits throughout the
6 state, like community action organizations and
7 other nonprofits.

8 Are people able to receive funds from
9 other entities if they receive LIHEAP funds?

10 A. So I believe what Dr. Marke was
11 referring to is the possibility, and I've not
12 reviewed the policy manual for LIHEAP, but if I
13 understand correctly, there may be language in the
14 LIHEAP stipula-- policies and procedures that if
15 they're participating in this type of budget
16 billing program, then they wouldn't be eligible.
17 And again, I am speculating because I have not
18 reviewed those.

19 MR. MARKE: Commissioner, if I may?
20 It's just the reverse. My understanding was that
21 part of the condition on the ELIP program was that
22 customers could not apply for the emergency
23 program.

24 COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Okay. Thank
25 you. Thank you, Judge.

1 THE WITNESS: Well, they would need a
2 verifiable shutoff notice in order to be eligible
3 for ECIP.

4 BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN:

5 Q. And LIHEAP also, wouldn't they, or is
6 LIHEAP just funding provided based on your income?

7 A. It is --

8 Q. That's subsidy.

9 A. It is income based at 145 percent of
10 poverty.

11 Q. Okay. Thank you.

12 QUESTIONS BY JUDGE BURTON:

13 Q. I just have a quick question. This
14 is sort of a follow-up on Commissioner Rupp's
15 question. Concerning the Emergency Crisis
16 Intervention Program, are you familiar with the
17 percentage of the individuals in Empire's area who
18 would use that?

19 A. I did not request that data from the
20 company. I only requested the number of LIHEAP
21 recipients, so those who were receiving energy
22 assistance. So I don't have that information.

23 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you. Are there
24 any questions from the parties?

25 (No response.)

1 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you very much.

2 You're excused.

3 I believe the Commission will hear
4 next from Mr. Hyman.

5 MR. ANTAL: DE calls Mr. Martin Hyman
6 to the stand.

7 (Witness sworn.)

8 JUDGE BURTON: You may be seated.
9 Would you please state and spell your name for the
10 record.

11 THE WITNESS: Martin Hyman,
12 H-y-m-a-n.

13 JUDGE BURTON: And what is your
14 current job title and place of employment?

15 THE WITNESS: I am a Planner 3 in the
16 Missouri Division of Energy.

17 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you. Any
18 questions from the Commission?

19 MARTIN HYMAN testified as follows:

20 QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

21 Q. I think I'm going to ask you the same
22 question I asked Ms. Kroll. That is, what would
23 your view be of the establishment of a low-income
24 program that involved the elimination or reduction
25 of the customer charge for LIHEAP-eligible

1 customers of Empire that resided in some specific
2 geographic region of the service territory?

3 A. So as a division, I don't think we've
4 discussed this, the issue of limiting it to a
5 specific geographic area. For example, when I was
6 running my calculations I did it as all LIHEAP
7 participants that Ms. Kroll got in her -- from her
8 data request. I think that the 80 percent customer
9 charge reduction option is certainly one option,
10 and that's as Mr. Antal stated. But I think that's
11 sort of the simple, quick and easy if you want to
12 provide immediate relief option.

13 If you want to do something more
14 detailed, I think you need to have a working docket
15 to examine what the proper rate design would be.
16 So, for example, if you wanted to move towards
17 Ameren's Keeping Current program, which is a pretty
18 good model from what we've seen, that that would be
19 something certainly you could discuss in a docket.

20 Q. Well, what about the specific program
21 that was contemplated by the Commission with regard
22 to Missouri American?

23 A. As I said, I think that's certainly
24 one option. That's sort of your simple quick fix
25 option. That's relatively easy to implement

1 compared to if you wanted to add in some other
2 things that you see, for example, in Keeping
3 Current, such as arrearage reductions, maybe even
4 throw in some sort of education component.

5 So like I say, I think we -- there's
6 definitely a need for some type of program in the
7 Empire territory. I think the questions are how
8 soon do you want to do this, and what design do you
9 want?

10 CHAIRMAN HALL: I have no further
11 questions. Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.
14 Thank you.

15 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you very much.
16 Are there any questions from the parties? You're
17 excused.

18 I believe that is all the witnesses
19 that the Commission is looking to hear from today
20 on that issue. So unless there are any final
21 statements from the parties on that, we can go and
22 address procedural issues for the remainder of the
23 hearing.

24 Now, it's my understanding the
25 parties have tentatively reached a settlement as

1 far as revenue requirement and still are working to
2 address some issues as far as rate design and some
3 fuel issues. We do have the hearing scheduled to
4 resume next week, and I believe there was
5 discussion about perhaps canceling Monday's hearing
6 to give parties an opportunity to work on
7 settlement, then resuming on Tuesday because of
8 some issues of potential conflict with witnesses.

9 MR. THOMPSON: That's correct, Judge.

10 MS. MAYFIELD: That's correct.

11 JUDGE BURTON: So looking at next
12 Tuesday, and that would be June 7th, unless I hear
13 otherwise from parties, are we fine beginning at
14 8:30 in the morning?

15 Now, as it is right now, the parties
16 have obviously heard the testimony and the issues
17 that have been brought up and the questions that
18 the Commission had on the issue low-income pilot
19 program, both one in the past and the current one.
20 Since the parties haven't formalized any final
21 agreement to submit to the Commission as far as the
22 revenue requirement for the agreement, if this is
23 something that is to be added by the parties in any
24 final settlement of potential low-income program,
25 that's obviously something the Commission will

1 review. If not, we can review this as part of
2 something that might be addressed in the briefing
3 at the conclusion of the hearing, and that would be
4 an issue of what potential options the parties
5 would recommend or suggest for the low-income
6 program or other options and the legality of any
7 potential conflicts or issues that the parties
8 might see or challenges to the Commission looking
9 into an experimental program perhaps in either this
10 case or in a separate filing.

11 Now, just for some housekeeping, the
12 only exhibits that we have admitted into the record
13 today are Empire's Exhibits 32, 33 and 34, which
14 Ms. Carter have clarified they have been provided
15 to the court reporter, and Office of the Public
16 Counsel's Exhibit 19.

17 MS. MAYFIELD: Yes.

18 JUDGE BURTON: Is there anything else
19 that needs to be addressed while we're on the
20 record?

21 MS. BELL: Just one thing, your
22 Honor. If we do move forward with this list of
23 issues, the City of Joplin only takes a position on
24 certain issues and so requests for next week to be
25 excused from time to time.

1 JUDGE BURTON: That would be fine. I
2 just state, provide notice of what days you will be
3 unavailable.

4 MS. BELL: Thank you.

5 MS. CARTER: Judge, we'll try to get
6 a new schedule to you by the end of tomorrow,
7 depending on how things go this afternoon and
8 tomorrow.

9 JUDGE BURTON: I was hoping for one
10 today, but I will definitely take tomorrow. Thank
11 you, everyone, and we're off the record.

12 (WHEREUPON, the hearing concluded at
13 11:12 a.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

| | EMPIRE'S EXHIBITS | MARKED | REC'D |
|----|---|--------|-------|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | EXHIBIT NO. 1 | | |
| 4 | Direct Testimony of Brad P. Beecher | 20 | |
| 5 | EXHIBIT NO. 2 | | |
| 6 | Rebuttal Testimony of Brad P. Beecher | 20 | |
| 7 | EXHIBIT NO. 3 | | |
| 8 | Direct Testimony of Aaron J. Doll | 20 | |
| 9 | EXHIBIT NO. 4 | | |
| 10 | Direct Testimony of Nathaniel W. Hackney | 20 | |
| 11 | EXHIBIT NO. 5 | | |
| 12 | Rebuttal Testimony of Nathaniel W. Hackney | 20 | |
| 13 | EXHIBIT NO. 6 | | |
| 14 | Surrebuttal Testimony of Nathaniel W. Hackney | 20 | |
| 15 | EXHIBIT NO. 7 | | |
| 16 | Direct Testimony of W. Scott Keith | 20 | |
| 17 | EXHIBIT NO. 8NP/8HC | | |
| 18 | Rebuttal Testimony of W. Scott Keith | 20 | |
| 19 | EXHIBIT NO. 9 | | |
| 20 | Surrebuttal Testimony of W. Scott Keith | 20 | |
| 21 | EXHIBIT NO. 10 | | |
| 22 | Direct Testimony of Joan E. Land | 20 | |
| 23 | EXHIBIT NO. 11 | | |
| 24 | Direct Testimony of Jeffery P. Lee | 20 | |
| 25 | EXHIBIT NO. 12 | | |
| 26 | Surrebuttal Testimony of Blake A. Mertens | 20 | |
| 27 | EXHIBIT NO. 13 | | |
| 28 | Direct Testimony of Bryan S. Owens | 20 | |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | EXHIBIT NO. 14NP/HC | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Bryan S. | |
| 2 | Owens | 20 |
| 3 | EXHIBIT NO. 15NP/HC | |
| | Direct Testimony of Robert W. Sager | 20 |
| 4 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 16 | |
| 5 | Rebuttal Testimony of Robert W. | |
| | Sager | 20 |
| 6 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 17 | |
| 7 | Direct Testimony of Thomas J. | |
| | Sullivan | 20 |
| 8 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 18 | |
| 9 | Rebuttal Testimony of Thomas J. | |
| | Sullivan | 20 |
| 10 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 19 | |
| 11 | Surrebuttal Testimony of Thomas J. | |
| | Sullivan | 20 |
| 12 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 20NP/HC | |
| 13 | Direct Testimony of Todd W. Tarter | 20 |
| 14 | EXHIBIT NO. 21 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Todd W. | |
| 15 | Tarter | 20 |
| 16 | EXHIBIT NO. 22 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Todd W. | |
| 17 | Tarter | 20 |
| 18 | EXHIBIT NO. 23 | |
| | Direct Testimony of James H. | |
| 19 | Vander Weide | 20 |
| 20 | EXHIBIT NO. 24 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of James H. | |
| 21 | Vander Weide | 20 |
| 22 | EXHIBIT NO. 25 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of James H. | |
| 23 | Vander Weide | 20 |
| 24 | EXHIBIT NO. 26 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of L. Jay | |
| 25 | Williams | 20 |

| | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|----|
| 1 | EXHIBIT NO. 27 | | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of L. Jay | | |
| 2 | Williams | 20 | |
| 3 | EXHIBIT NO. 28NP/HC | | |
| | Direct Testimony of Tim N. Wilson | | |
| 4 | Supplement Schedules | 20 | |
| 5 | EXHIBIT NO 29NP/HC | | |
| | True-Up Direct Testimony of Tim N. | | |
| 6 | Wilson | 20 | |
| 7 | EXHIBIT NO. 30NP/HC | | |
| | Direct Testimony of John M. Woods | 20 | |
| 8 | | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 31 | | |
| 9 | Rebuttal Testimony of John M. Woods | 20 | |
| 10 | EXHIBIT NO. 32 | | |
| | Direct Testimony of Sherrill | | |
| 11 | McCormack | 20 | 42 |
| 12 | EXHIBIT NO. 33 | | |
| | ELIP Evaluation - March 29, 2010 | 20 | 42 |
| 13 | | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 34 | | |
| 14 | Global Agreement, Case No. | | |
| | ER-2011-0004 | 20 | 42 |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| | MECG'S EXHIBITS | | |
| 17 | EXHIBIT NO. 1 | | |
| | Direct Testimony of Kavita Maini | 20 | |
| 18 | | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 2NP/HC | | |
| 19 | Rebuttal Testimony of Kavita Maini | 20 | |
| 20 | EXHIBIT NO. 3 | | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Kavita | | |
| 21 | Maini | 20 | |
| 22 | EXHIBIT NO. 4NP/HC | | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Steve | | |
| 23 | Chriss | 20 | |
| 24 | EXHIBIT NO. 5NP/HC | | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Richard | | |
| 25 | Nelson | 20 | |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | CITY OF JOPLIN'S EXHIBITS | |
| 2 | EXHIBIT NO. 1 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Leslie | |
| 3 | Haase | 20 |
| 4 | DIVISION OF ENERGY'S EXHIBITS | |
| 5 | EXHIBIT NO. 1 | |
| | Direct Testimony of Martin R. | |
| 6 | Hyman | 20 |
| 7 | EXHIBIT NO. 2 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Martin R. | |
| 8 | Hyman | 20 |
| 9 | EXHIBIT NO. 3 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Martin R. | |
| 10 | Hyman | 20 |
| 11 | EXHIBIT NO. 4 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Sharlet E. | |
| 12 | Kroll | 20 |
| 13 | EXHIBIT NO. 5 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Sharlet E. | |
| 14 | Kroll | 20 |
| 15 | MEUA'S EXHIBITS | |
| 16 | EXHIBIT NO. 1 | |
| | Direct Testimony of Donald | |
| 17 | Johnstone | 20 |
| 18 | EXHIBIT NO. 2 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Donald | |
| 19 | Johnstone | 20 |
| 20 | EXHIBIT NO. 3 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Donald | |
| 21 | Johnstone | 20 |
| 22 | STAFF'S EXHIBITS | |
| 23 | EXHIBIT NO. 1 | |
| | Accounting Schedules | 20 |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | EXHIBIT NO. 2NP/HC | |
| | Revenue Requirement Report with | |
| 2 | Appendices 1-3 | 20 |
| 3 | EXHIBIT NO. 3NP/HC | |
| | Rate Design & Class Cost of | |
| 4 | Service Report | 20 |
| 5 | EXHIBIT NO. 4 | |
| | Direct Testimony of Kim K. Bolin | |
| 6 | (Filed 3/25/16) | 20 |
| 7 | EXHIBIT NO. 5 | |
| | Direct Testimony of Kim K. Bolin | |
| 8 | (Filed 4/8/16) | 20 |
| 9 | EXHIBIT NO. 6 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Kory Boustead | 20 |
| 10 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 7 | |
| 11 | Rebuttal Testimony of Brad J. | |
| | Fortson | 20 |
| 12 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 8 | |
| 13 | Surrebuttal Testimony of Brad J. | |
| | Fortson | 20 |
| 14 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 9 | |
| 15 | Surrebuttal Testimony of Jermaine | |
| | Green | 20 |
| 16 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 10NP/HC | |
| 17 | Rebuttal Testimony of Shana Griffin | 20 |
| 18 | EXHIBIT NO. 11NP/HC | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Shana | |
| 19 | Griffin | 20 |
| 20 | EXHIBIT NO. 12 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Paul R. | |
| 21 | Harrison | 20 |
| 22 | EXHIBIT NO. 13 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Robin | |
| 23 | Kliethermes | 20 |
| 24 | EXHIBIT NO. 14 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Robin | |
| 25 | Kliethermes | 20 |

| | | |
|----|------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1 | EXHIBIT NO. 15 | |
| | Direct Testimony of Sarah L. | |
| 2 | Kliethermes | 20 |
| 3 | EXHIBIT NO. 16 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Sarah L. | |
| 4 | Kliethermes | 20 |
| 5 | EXHIBIT NO. 17 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Sarah L. | |
| 6 | Kliethermes | 20 |
| 7 | EXHIBIT NO. 18 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Shawn E. | |
| 8 | Lange | 20 |
| 9 | EXHIBIT NO. 19 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Amanda C. | |
| 10 | McMellen | 20 |
| 11 | EXHIBIT NO. 20 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Amanda C. | |
| 12 | McMellen | 20 |
| 13 | EXHIBIT NO. 21 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of John A. | |
| 14 | Robinett | 20 |
| 15 | EXHIBIT NO. 22 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of John A. | |
| 16 | Robinett | 20 |
| 17 | EXHIBIT NO. 23NP/HC | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of David C. | |
| 18 | Roos | 20 |
| 19 | EXHIBIT NO. 24 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Ashley R. | |
| 20 | Sarver | 20 |
| 21 | | OPC'S EXHIBITS |
| 22 | EXHIBIT NO. 1HC | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Geoff Marke | 20 |
| 23 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 2 | |
| 24 | Rebuttal Testimony of Geoff Marke | 20 |
| 25 | | |

| | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | EXHIBIT NO. 3HC | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Geoff | |
| 2 | Marke | 20 |
| 3 | EXHIBIT NO. 4 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Geoff | |
| 4 | Marke | 20 |
| 5 | EXHIBIT NO. 5 | |
| | Direct Testimony of Amanda C. | |
| 6 | Conner | 20 |
| 7 | EXHIBIT NO. 6 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Amanda C. | |
| 8 | Conner | 20 |
| 9 | EXHIBIT NO. 7HC | |
| | Direct Testimony of Charles R. | |
| 10 | Hyneman | 20 |
| 11 | EXHIBIT NO. 8 | |
| | Direct Testimony of Charles R. | |
| 12 | Hyneman | 20 |
| 13 | EXHIBIT NO. 9 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Charles R. | |
| 14 | Hyneman | 20 |
| 15 | EXHIBIT NO. 10 | |
| | Direct Testimony of Keri Roth | 20 |
| 16 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 11 | |
| 17 | Rebuttal Testimony of Keri Roth | 20 |
| 18 | EXHIBIT NO. 12 | |
| | Surrebuttal Testimony of Keri Roth | 20 |
| 19 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 13HC | |
| 20 | Rebuttal Testimony of John S. Riley | 20 |
| 21 | EXHIBIT NO. 14 | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of John S. Riley | 20 |
| 22 | | |
| | EXHIBIT NO. 15 | |
| 23 | Direct Testimony of Lena M. Mantle | 20 |
| 24 | EXHIBIT NO. 16HC | |
| | Rebuttal Testimony of Lena M. | |
| 25 | Mantle | 20 |

1 EXHIBIT NO. 17

Rebuttal Testimony of Lena M.

2 Mantle 20

3 EXHIBIT NO. 18

Surrebuttal Testimony of Lena M.

4 Mantle 20

5 EXHIBIT NO. 19

Handout Prepared by Geoff Marke 86 87

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF MISSOURI)

) ss.

COUNTY OF COLE)

I, Kellene K. Feddersen, Certified
Shorthand Reporter with the firm of Midwest
Litigation Services, do hereby certify that I was
personally present at the proceedings had in the
above-entitled cause at the time and place set
forth in the caption sheet thereof; that I then and
there took down in Stenotype the proceedings had;
and that the foregoing is a full, true and correct
transcript of such Stenotype notes so made at such
time and place.

Given at my office in the City of
Jefferson, County of Cole, State of Missouri.

Kellene K. Feddersen, RPR, CSR, CCR

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| A | 52:6 60:9 74:11 79:7 118:22 119:2 | 55:1 56:5 65:25 67:12 70:23 82:18 89:21 102:19 | 109:14 | 67:1 |
| Aaron 122:7 | addressed 23:22 | agreed 63:19 | amounts 50:9,22 | appearing 22:9 37:10 |
| ability 28:23 56:8 81:22 | 80:10 109:25 120:2,19 | agreed-upon 45:16 | analysis 29:25 30:11 49:1 54:24 56:5 108:13 109:1,2 | appears 25:1 48:15 60:11,15 |
| able 36:5 37:21 38:3 48:7,17,23 64:18 68:12 93:5 99:13 110:9 114:8 | addressing 22:24 23:2 53:2 | agreement 25:20 25:23 26:11,12 26:17 27:2 42:10 44:13 58:24 119:21 119:22 124:14 | Ann 79:7 | Appendices 126:2 |
| above-entitled 130:9 | adjust 23:14 | ahead 20:9,21 49:10 89:3 92:1 99:19,19 101:10 102:6 107:1 | annual 29:24 51:16 104:21 110:24 | applaud 26:7 |
| absent 55:3 | administers 114:4 | air 73:11 75:1 101:15 | annually 30:16 | appliances 73:11 |
| absolutely 49:13 81:20 93:25 | administration 37:13 | Alex 22:7 27:19 | answer 23:7,10 23:21 41:19 46:16,18 48:3 49:5 52:1 61:3 80:22 82:5 106:13 110:19 112:22 113:1 | applicants 63:7 |
| accept 59:13 | administrative 111:20,25 | ALEXANDER 19:1 | Antal 19:1 22:7,8 27:9,16,18,19 33:11,16,22 34:3,6,11,23 35:6,13 37:25 38:8,16,19 39:10,21 40:6 40:18 41:1,4,11 41:13 51:14,21 60:7 74:10 75:8 77:8 104:7,9 105:10 106:12 107:3 112:22 116:5 117:10 | application 112:11,12 |
| access 70:10 90:10,16 91:2 | admission 87:4 | allowed 60:16 100:17 | anyway 90:16 | applications 60:13 |
| accomplished 58:24 100:25 | admissions 42:13 | alluded 109:16 | apart 81:17 | applied 35:18 60:12 81:12 |
| account 36:15 | admitted 42:17 87:2,9 120:12 | alternatives 32:7 | apartment 72:15 98:15,20 | applies 113:12 |
| accounting 83:21 125:23 | admission 87:4 | Amanda 127:9 127:11 128:5,7 | apartments 98:18 | apply 33:3 66:16 71:11 109:20 112:11 113:9 114:22 |
| accuse 102:4 | admissions 42:13 | Ameren 29:12 36:10 88:8 100:9 | apologize 80:23 | applying 68:5 |
| achieving 58:5 | admitted 42:17 87:2,9 120:12 | Ameren's 111:22 117:17 | Appeals 59:2 | appreciate 26:5 26:21,21 50:5 67:14 75:6 97:21 99:2 |
| acknowledged 64:20 | admission 87:4 | American 29:5 33:3,21 34:19 35:5,8 38:22 40:14 47:5 49:22 55:9,12 58:16 66:6 79:12 80:7,19 81:4 94:3 117:22 | appear 66:23 75:24 96:7 | approach 29:13 34:24 36:8,11 47:7 60:5,5 80:7,10,13,20 81:7 101:16 |
| acknowledges 35:20 | admission 87:4 | amount 41:7 44:3 47:14,18 50:1 64:4 65:9 72:12 93:6 | appearance 20:22 | approval 65:11 |
| action 28:20 32:5 32:16 39:9,17 49:17 114:6 | admission 87:4 | | APPEARANC... 18:1 | approve 36:4 |
| active 94:13 | admission 87:4 | | appeared 37:15 | approved 33:2 39:24 47:4 |
| actual 33:17 87:16 89:4 91:10 | admission 87:4 | | | approximately 30:15 51:17 |
| add 22:18 118:1 | admission 87:4 | | | arbitrary 53:4 |
| added 44:1 67:25 119:23 | admission 87:4 | | | area 17:13 57:15 62:22 63:2 68:18,19,22,22 93:1 104:25 108:7,18 115:17 117:5 |
| adder 64:2 | admission 87:4 | | | areas 68:21 109:10 |
| addition 23:23 25:7,9 | admission 87:4 | | | Arkansas 111:10 |
| additional 22:18 27:25 30:25 37:5 66:12 67:11 74:15 105:13 | admission 87:4 | | | |
| address 22:14 | admission 87:4 | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>arrearage 78:10 90:23 118:3 arrearages 88:14 arrears 88:2,6,22 Ashley 127:19 asked 52:11 112:1 116:22 asking 81:24 108:5 111:18 aspect 70:15 78:4 99:3 111:18 aspects 79:19 assembly 28:20 32:4,8,15 asset 58:13 assigned 110:8 111:8 assistance 67:22 67:23 68:6 76:1 88:25 102:14 103:16 113:4 115:22 assists 113:4 Association 18:14 21:16 assume 25:14 54:6 60:21 assuming 30:18 35:17 assumption 71:23 73:8 attached 87:14 attempted 94:24 attention 38:10 87:20 101:25 attorney 18:2,2,3 18:3,9,15,19,20 19:1 78:22 attorneys 23:1,7 23:20 24:19 25:11 52:6,10 55:16 audience 99:11 authority 17:11 20:11 28:14 31:6,18,21 32:1 32:6,11,17 34:9</p> | <p>34:12 38:17 39:2,7,12,14,22 40:7,10,22 47:23 48:6 52:20,24 53:18 53:21,23 54:6 55:2 automatic 60:23 automatically 97:14 available 25:4 46:15,18 52:3 58:12 60:11 61:3 63:6 68:5 69:25 84:19,23 110:19 average 28:5,7,8 29:23 30:9,14 30:20 68:2 82:10 108:12 108:16 109:1,2 109:4 avoiding 80:14 80:16 aware 34:6 a.m 20:3,15 121:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <hr/> <p>back 23:17 71:9 72:3 95:11 96:2 103:24 bad 64:8 78:13 78:19 79:10 80:4 83:19,24 83:25 84:1,8 88:2,5,14,21 bank 100:1 bar 88:20,21 89:19 Bardgett 18:20 base 78:20 based 27:4 29:4 29:15 30:13 35:14 36:13 40:21 52:25 53:5 56:1 60:10 60:15 62:4,16</p> | <p>70:16 86:15 106:16 108:13 108:19 109:1,3 109:4 110:13 115:6,9 basically 29:3 71:23 99:22 basis 91:18 110:15 bat 92:18 Beecher 24:5 122:3,5 began 20:2 beginning 119:13 behalf 20:22 21:2 22:4,9 26:5 behavioral 72:24 belief 83:1 believe 23:11 24:4 37:23 38:1 38:16 40:6,9,23 42:20 47:22 59:4 67:19,21 77:4 78:18 82:24 84:19 100:16 102:14 106:1,13 108:2 109:15 114:10 116:3 118:18 119:4 believes 28:13,18 34:12 39:11 Bell 18:20 21:23 21:23 120:21 121:4 Bench 23:8 25:11 benefactor 106:3 benefit 73:4,20 78:17 79:20,24 83:12 84:5,10 89:23 91:20 97:6 99:10 103:5,7 108:9 benefits 64:9 72:22,23 83:15 92:23 97:2,14 109:9</p> | <p>best 23:10 44:2,6 99:16 100:8 102:6 105:7 better 76:4 80:1 80:21,22 82:5 88:9 93:4,10,10 99:13 101:6,6 beyond 74:20 75:3,3 big 75:5,18 bigger 71:13 bill 30:13,15 36:12 37:17 44:23,25,25 45:6 47:13 51:4 64:2 66:23 67:9 72:2,12,14,18 72:19 78:9 81:22 82:2,9,10 90:22 91:7,9 93:19,21,22 98:20 101:9 108:12 109:9 109:22 billing 91:7 114:16 bills 36:19 64:5 68:3 71:14 84:8 99:21 103:14 109:2 bill-paying 45:9 45:13 78:2 bit 23:12 28:25 54:25 68:23 79:13 91:8 113:23 black 26:20 59:22 92:6 Blake 122:23 blank 91:15 Blitz 18:20 bold 92:15 bolded 92:9 Bolin 24:6 126:5 126:7 books 64:13 bottom 96:5</p> | <p>103:8 BOUDREAU 18:2 bounds 32:10,16 Boustead 126:9 box 18:5 19:2,6 19:11 21:7 22:10 26:20 59:22 Brad 122:3,5 126:11,13 Branson 63:2 68:22 BREAK 106:24 breakdowns 89:9 bridge 95:7 brief 62:5 99:9 106:21 briefing 35:9 120:2 briefly 43:22 50:24 63:22 bring 87:19 105:7 Broadway 18:10 21:18 brochure 105:3 brochures 104:15 broken 46:11 brought 38:10 65:10 100:18 119:17 Bryan 122:25 123:1 Brydon 18:4 20:25 budget 63:11 65:5,6 69:11 91:7 104:21 110:24 111:1,2 114:15 budgets 51:23 building 98:17 101:6 built 100:23 bullet 87:17 90:6</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <p>92:6 103:13 bundle 100:14 burden 29:23 30:2,17,22 78:9 78:19 108:20 108:23 109:11 112:4 burdensome 112:14 BURTON 17:15 20:9 21:2,9,15 21:21 22:1,5,12 22:22 23:6,11 24:3,8,11,15 25:1,9 26:13 27:6,15 41:13 41:24 42:3,9,12 42:16,23 43:4,7 46:14 49:4 52:4 58:9,19 59:17 61:2,13,16,20 76:14,19 77:11 77:15,19 84:16 84:25 85:4 86:2 86:21,25 87:5,8 89:14 104:5 105:12 106:15 106:20,25 107:6,11,15 115:12,23 116:1,8,13,17 118:15 119:11 120:18 121:1,9 business 65:24 103:11 butchered 72:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>C 18:3 20:1 127:9,11,17 128:5,7 130:2,2 calculate 26:24 calculated 25:18 26:7 calculation 48:18 calculations 117:6 call 72:24 107:1</p> | <p>called 57:18 73:1 91:25 calls 107:4 110:19 116:5 canceling 119:5 CAP 62:21 63:1 63:3 65:22 90:13 104:14 105:7 111:16 112:4 Capitol 18:4 caps 63:12 68:11 70:7,8,24 caption 130:10 captured 103:9 carrying 59:8 84:1 Carter 18:3 20:24,24 23:16 25:19 26:25 41:14,15 42:1,8 42:11,20,24 43:4,6,12,16,21 44:16,19 45:23 45:25 46:9,17 46:22,25 47:9 47:13,20 48:2 48:14 49:8 50:3 50:6,20 51:2,9 51:25 52:11 57:19 60:22 63:14 71:18 120:14 121:5 case 17:11 22:20 22:24 25:3,15 25:17,24,24 26:1,2,18 28:24 29:5 31:14 32:24 33:3 34:25 35:5,8,13 38:7,22 40:8,14 42:5 43:23 44:5 44:15,21 45:13 48:1,5 52:16,19 53:23 54:5,9,19 55:2,18,22 56:8 56:16,20 57:22</p> | <p>58:20 59:10,16 59:25 60:20,25 66:6 69:15 73:25 74:3 79:6 79:12 82:15 86:16 94:3,8 97:2 98:4 120:10 124:14 cases 32:11,24 53:2 54:13 57:1 59:16 60:23 78:23 98:18 cash 78:12,19 83:22 caught 89:17 cause 67:11 130:9 caution 103:18 CCR 17:22 130:17 Census 108:17 Center 18:11 cents 34:15 35:25 36:1 century 100:23 certain 41:17 120:24 certainly 25:22 46:12,17 48:5 53:8 55:10,12 65:20 66:2 67:25 70:23 73:1 75:11,20 79:23 80:18 102:14 117:9 117:19,23 Certified 130:5 certify 130:7 Chairman 17:16 24:21 25:12 26:4 37:20 38:4 47:22 48:10,22 49:10 50:12 52:8 53:19,25 54:4,21 55:6,15 56:11 57:16 61:10 62:1 69:1</p> | <p>76:22 77:21 83:2 85:10 88:11 89:17,20 96:3 97:18 107:18 112:16 116:20 118:10 challenge 109:24 challenges 78:8 104:12 109:12 112:9 120:8 change 72:25 97:15 changed 71:24 94:11 characteristics 56:1,2 charge 29:6,14 33:6,7,7,24 35:16 36:3,6 41:3 47:6,8,14 47:16 66:8,18 66:19,21 70:17 70:21 81:6,12 81:18 82:1,8 96:1,17 107:23 108:10,22,22 116:25 117:9 charged 54:16 charges 47:17 charging 54:15 Charles 128:9,11 128:13 chart 86:14 check 110:10 Chief 19:10 Chriss 124:23 Chuck 22:20 citation 55:21 cited 79:12 104:23 Citizens 93:2 City 17:8 18:5,11 18:16,21,23 19:3,7,12 20:5 21:7,18,21,24 22:11 69:14 120:23 125:1</p> | <p>130:15 clarification 31:4 32:9,15 102:11 113:20 clarified 120:14 clarify 71:18 102:20 class 31:19 32:21 39:13,16,20,23 40:4,15,16,20 53:16 55:7,11 55:12 56:4 80:14 126:3 classes 35:23 52:25 classification 93:20 classify 53:3,4,5 55:25 56:8 clean 89:3 clear 35:6 39:10 42:4 clearly 52:22 client 113:9 clients 104:16 close 51:23 69:10 closer 108:24 code 101:6 codes 98:17 cognizant 96:1 Cole 130:4,16 COLEMAN 17:18 75:9 102:9 104:3 113:19 114:24 115:4 collaborate 74:6 collaborative 62:13 collect 59:7,14 collecting 59:6 59:13 Colorado 93:11 combining 53:20 come 47:15 59:25 66:4 78:5 80:11 83:13</p> |
|---|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>86:10 98:7 comes 73:22 74:2 comfortable 40:19 coming 23:7 44:5 92:9 comment 54:22 69:6 74:20 102:20,21 103:6 comments 31:13 31:20 50:12 62:5 74:11,16 75:6 101:1 102:18 110:1 111:23 commercial 100:4,10 commission 17:2 19:11,14 20:15 21:3,6 22:18 23:3,22 24:1,8 24:18 25:21,25 26:19 27:19,24 28:19,21 29:9 31:17,20 32:5,9 32:14,19,20,22 33:2,25 34:12 34:20 35:1,21 35:22 36:4 37:10 38:10 39:1,12,21,23 39:24 40:6,21 41:6 42:23 44:17 47:23 48:5,9 49:16 51:12 52:6,7,13 52:20,24 53:17 55:1,23,24 56:22 58:1,4 59:24 61:4,8 65:7,10,12 66:7 68:14 69:18 76:19 77:18 79:11,22 80:24 84:18 94:1 95:2 101:22 106:17</p> | <p>116:3,18 117:21 118:19 119:18,21,25 120:8 commissioner 24:23 26:9,15 27:5 33:9,12,20 33:25 34:4,7,14 35:3,11 37:8 38:5,11,18,25 39:15 40:2,11 40:13,24 41:2,6 41:12 43:1,9,13 43:18 44:14,17 45:17,24 46:4 46:23 47:2,3,10 47:19,21 49:22 49:25 50:4,11 50:24 51:7,11 51:14,18,24 56:13,15,21 57:3,7,10,17,20 57:25 58:6 59:19 60:3,6,14 60:19 61:1 69:3 69:5,7 71:3,5 71:21 74:11 75:9 76:9 83:4 83:5 84:14 92:19 94:15 97:20 99:6 102:9,20 104:3 105:12,14 112:18,19,21 112:25 113:19 114:19,24 115:4,14 118:12,13 commissioners 17:19 41:20 43:25 60:8 99:11 104:13 Commission's 28:14 29:4 31:25 35:1 38:17 40:10 49:21 53:3 80:7</p> | <p>80:19 87:19 commitment 111:14 committed 110:8 communities 69:20 111:17 community 69:25 95:3 114:6 company 17:11 18:8 20:23 21:1 49:11 58:17 59:6,7,13 61:11 61:24 62:9,19 65:13 67:17 68:16 70:19 74:12 80:8,25 83:16 95:21 111:4,6 115:20 company's 17:13 20:11 49:1 65:18 67:14 78:19 79:10 compared 108:14 118:1 comparison 71:19 completely 47:11 66:1 74:22 complicated 75:15 component 100:5 105:23 118:4 components 113:3 Comprehensive 28:17 31:2 39:4 concern 111:13 concerned 23:17 Concerning 115:15 concerns 23:3 concluded 35:5 121:12 conclusion 37:18 93:4 120:3 condition 114:21</p> | <p>conditioner 75:1 conditioning 73:11 101:15 confident 93:15 conflict 119:8 conflicts 120:7 confusing 91:8 conjunction 88:22 connect 42:11 Conner 25:6 128:6,8 connotation 102:23 Conrad 18:9,10 21:17,17 24:9 24:11 55:17 consensus 31:17 conservation 67:19 conserve 101:14 consider 31:6 32:23 57:21 58:12 64:12 consideration 74:17 considered 30:4 30:22 32:19 38:9 40:1,14 54:20 58:13 considering 32:20 71:9 83:12 consistent 32:22 39:3 consultant 63:18 63:21,25 consume 82:19 consumers 22:2 22:4 109:15 consumption 66:12 82:18 96:8,19 99:20 109:2,4 contained 86:14 contemplated 27:1 43:24</p> | <p>117:21 contemplating 44:4 context 102:22 contingent 91:5 continue 32:8,14 45:3 96:22 contract 110:14 110:22,25 111:16 contracted 110:11 contractors 110:16 control 89:7 93:7 convey 39:11 convoluted 75:12 cooling 37:3,5 Cooper 18:2 20:25 coops 94:22 copies 42:22 copy 42:21 97:1 correct 24:7 34:9 39:5,6 40:5 42:8 43:15 47:9 47:12 57:19,23 57:23 62:9,16 63:13 64:23 65:1,2,7 71:16 82:11 85:15 88:15 96:9 119:9,10 130:12 correctly 58:16 98:1 108:5 114:13 correlation 73:10 73:13 82:17 96:8 cost 34:16,19 35:17,18,24,25 45:14,15 48:13 48:16,21 49:1 53:5,6,6 59:8 63:16,23 64:1,3 64:9,12,21 78:1</p> |
|--|---|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| <p>84:1 91:21 111:20 126:3 costs 35:22 100:18 111:25 counsel 19:5,5,8 19:10,10 21:10 21:12 22:17 25:6 49:13 52:5 54:22 84:20 85:8 86:3 Counsel's 120:16 counties 28:8 62:24 county 28:6 130:4,16 couple 25:12 60:8 63:22 74:7 93:11 104:8 coupled 73:3 course 32:3 court 18:16 21:14,20,25 53:1,2 55:24 59:2 120:15 courts 32:2 cover 50:16 covers 51:19 75:17 111:8 crafting 97:17 created 103:9 creates 30:16 creating 30:21 credit 44:23,25 44:25 47:13,17 51:4 62:15,16 66:23 67:9 72:12,13,19 81:15 91:3 93:19,22 credited 102:16 credits 93:21 crisis 91:1 99:23 105:19 109:20 113:5,6,8 115:15 criteria 67:18 79:17</p> | <p>cross 106:8 cross-cutting 113:17 crucial 99:3,4 CSEP 31:3 32:18 CSR 17:22 130:17 cumbersome 70:19 curious 50:14,18 51:1 52:12 54:8 56:21 current 29:13 30:14 33:7 36:11,21 61:21 61:22 82:23 85:5 112:3 116:14 117:17 118:3 119:19 currently 70:5 74:13 82:25 108:12,20 customer 29:6,14 33:6,7,7,24 34:15 35:16 36:1,3,6,12 37:17 40:4 47:6 47:8,14,16 65:21 66:8,18 70:17,21 71:1 81:6,12,18 82:1 82:8 96:1,16 107:23 108:10 108:13,21 116:25 117:8 customers 17:12 28:16 31:7 33:18 34:16 35:15,17,19 36:16,17,17,19 37:4 39:19,25 40:1,3 41:3 45:5,19 55:25 56:4,9 60:12,16 64:5 65:24 68:13 70:9 78:8 78:10 79:21</p> | <p>80:21 82:19,20 83:23,25 84:6,8 88:13 89:5 90:15,19,21 91:2,8,18 92:12 93:9,10 95:14 95:22 96:21 100:4 103:14 107:24 108:6 108:16,19 109:9,16,17 112:2 114:22 117:1 customer's 29:16 36:13 cutting 110:10 cycle 88:1 Cydney 19:5 21:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <hr/> <p>D 20:1 DANIEL 17:16 data 41:22 80:15 82:16 89:2 95:13,15 104:1 108:14,17 115:19 117:8 date 20:16 32:2 David 18:15 22:3 127:17 david.woodsm... 18:17 day 25:2 27:7 72:5 76:11 94:6 97:6,8 103:23 days 48:4 63:22 121:2 day-to-day 91:18 DE 30:11 99:13 116:5 deal 58:7 112:9 dealing 26:19 112:8 Dean 18:2 20:24 debt 64:8 78:13 78:19 79:10 80:4 83:19,24</p> | <p>83:25 84:1,8 88:2,5,14,21 99:20 decided 41:7 46:12 decision 29:5 32:12 deed 72:16 73:21 74:2 75:2 deem 97:6 deemed 48:12 63:15 defer 109:7 deferred 58:18 defined 79:17 definitely 50:20 51:2 74:16 104:18 118:6 121:10 demonstrated 28:2 denied 34:20 Department 22:8 113:12 dependent 72:1 depending 36:3 44:22,23 51:4 121:7 depends 24:13 Deputy 19:5 derived 65:9 describes 92:3 design 33:1 37:16 66:5 78:17 80:9 94:4 97:16,24 99:2 102:22 106:10 108:8 113:15 117:15 118:8 119:2 126:3 designated 110:8 111:6,15 designation 93:16 designed 62:8,12 96:15 97:25 98:6</p> | <p>designing 101:22 101:23 desirable 79:23 desire 58:5 65:13 95:2 detail 46:21 detailed 82:6 117:14 details 48:17 determination 32:2 determine 48:20 64:21 70:24 determined 45:11,15 56:25 62:18,19 65:22 108:1 Deutsch 18:20 developed 29:1 74:15 developing 74:17 Development 22:9 devices 20:20 DE's 106:13 Diana 18:3 20:24 58:23 died 93:23 difference 75:19 93:18 differences 52:25 different 23:12 36:12 40:25 47:4,11 49:23 54:16 75:19 77:1 82:21 89:9 92:25 106:7 114:5 differently 52:21 difficult 87:25 89:3 91:16 difficulty 71:13 90:5 dig 54:25 dip 114:1 direct 38:20 42:4 68:14,16 88:16</p> |
|---|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| 122:3,7,8,14,20 122:21,25 123:3,7,13,18 124:3,5,7,10,17 125:5,16 126:5 126:7 127:1 128:5,9,11,15 128:23 directed 51:15 directly 90:1 96:6,12 105:9 105:21,24 director 61:23 dis 48:11 disconnect 104:18 disconnection 90:23 103:15 discontinue 44:13 45:12 discontinued 48:12 63:15 discount 29:6,14 35:16 36:2 47:5 47:7 81:5 89:6 93:5 discrete 68:17,19 discrimination 52:23 discuss 37:21 76:23 117:19 discussed 27:11 28:17 31:10 40:9 117:4 discussing 38:6 43:24 104:10 discussion 27:2 62:25 85:16 94:14 119:5 discussions 74:14 95:9 disincentive 113:17 distinction 93:13 109:6 district 17:10 18:8 20:10,23 | 21:1 61:24 86:11 100:20 101:2 District's 37:22 district-wide 50:17 51:8 division 19:2,4 20:6 22:5,10 27:10,20,24 28:3,13 29:1,8 31:11 33:1,22 34:11,23 35:7 35:20 37:7 39:11 47:6 50:15 59:20 60:4 61:7 74:12 77:8 84:21 106:17 107:1,3 107:14 116:16 117:3 125:4 docket 31:9,12 31:13,14 117:14,19 doctor's 113:21 document 63:22 documents 41:17 50:10 DOE 94:19 doing 23:5 39:2 53:13 63:25 98:22 102:23 Doll 122:7 dollar 50:1,9,22 65:9 81:11 dollars 73:19 Donald 125:16 125:18,20 doubt 60:2 67:23 105:1 downs 102:1 Dr 77:7 84:22 104:8,10 109:16 114:10 drafted 25:19 driven 93:17 drop 108:24 DSM 69:13 | 94:14 95:7,18 due 23:18 45:12 46:7 Duly 24:12 duties 111:7 <hr/> E <hr/> E 20:1,1 122:20 125:11,13 127:7 130:2,2 earlier 30:6,24 36:7 64:11,24 90:17 101:4 104:24 early 25:23 53:1 easier 70:20,21 easily 112:7 East 18:4,21 Eastern 94:16 easy 50:22 117:11,25 ECG 20:4 echo 50:12 echoed 94:2 ECIP 113:7 115:3 economic 22:8 28:16 63:4 71:24 84:5,10 economical 83:15 economist 77:17 83:8,12 85:7 education 110:20 118:4 educational 37:2 72:23 effect 78:1,11 79:9 82:3 effective 45:16 48:13 49:1 56:25 63:16 78:1 effectiveness 45:14 48:16,21 63:24 64:22 efficiency 69:13 72:14 73:5 | 74:25 94:15 99:18 111:9 efficient 37:1 67:5 73:6,10 74:23 98:15 effort 62:13 67:16 efforts 67:19 either 24:25 28:19 44:24 56:7 65:7 80:2 81:1,17 107:22 120:9 electric 17:10,12 18:8 20:11,12 20:23 21:1 61:24 72:2 95:15,22 electricity 36:18 64:18 electronic 20:19 eligibility 62:18 65:21 67:18 70:24 eligible 57:14 63:7 71:2 91:12 107:24 114:16 115:2 elimination 96:16 107:23 108:10 116:24 ELIP 41:17 42:6 44:7 51:15 60:10 66:3 70:1 70:1 81:13,21 88:23 89:4,8 91:4,6,19 104:12 114:21 124:12 Ellinger 18:19 21:24 eloquent 55:4 eloquently 58:23 emerged 100:17 emergency 90:25 90:25 91:13,15 105:18,18 | 112:23 114:22 115:15 Empire 17:10 18:8 20:4,10,23 21:1 24:6 25:5 28:8 30:14 33:4 33:18 37:21 41:16 42:18 44:7,10 45:4 47:11 52:2 56:16,20 61:5 61:23 62:10 67:23 69:24 82:8,15 86:11 90:9 95:1,8,15 95:17,20 98:24 100:21 101:5 105:23 108:13 108:15 110:7 117:1 118:7 Empire's 20:17 28:5,11,23 29:19 30:9,20 33:6 37:12 41:17 42:14 46:15 49:19 51:9 89:15 96:13 107:24 109:13 115:17 120:13 122:1 empirical 103:7 employed 62:10 employment 77:16 85:6 107:12 116:14 empower 105:9 enables 101:17 enabling 103:5 encompass 57:11 encompassed 57:14 encompassing 34:18 encourage 66:12 66:13 67:4 73:23 ended 46:6 60:24 |
|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p>energy 18:13 19:2,4 20:6 21:15 22:1,4,6 22:10 27:10,20 28:3,13,17 29:8 29:23 30:1,16 30:22 31:2,11 33:1,22 34:11 34:23 35:7 36:20 37:7 39:4 47:17 59:21 61:7 68:6 69:13 72:14 73:5,5,10 74:12,22,25 75:5 84:21 94:14 95:14 98:15 99:18 101:15 106:18 107:3,14 108:20,23 109:11,20 110:5 111:8 113:4,6 115:21 116:16 Energy's 27:24 47:7 50:15 60:4 77:8 107:1 125:4 England 18:4 20:25 enrolling 112:3 ensure 36:23 entered 24:16 entire 34:18 41:9 50:16 57:15 entirely 80:6 entities 61:9 114:9 entry 20:21 equation 64:3 ER-2011-0004 42:6,10 124:14 ER-2016-0023 17:11 20:13 essential 105:4 essentially 31:23 35:14 55:23</p> | <p>64:5 69:12 79:18 91:1,6 92:11 93:3,5,8 99:24 establish 31:21 34:13 39:2,12 39:15 52:25 53:21 54:12 established 38:13 40:20,21 44:15 44:21 47:12 56:22 establishes 39:23 establishing 53:16 establishment 30:24 33:23 116:23 estimate 80:16 evaluated 63:20 evaluation 38:2 41:22 42:6 43:17 44:12 45:14 46:11 48:19 62:25 63:25 65:20 75:10,17 87:13 87:16 90:3 92:12 97:9,12 103:22 104:11 105:22,24 111:22,23 124:12 evaluator 92:17 evaluators 90:19 everybody 41:9 63:10,19 everybody's 64:2 everyday 112:10 evidence 42:19 87:11 89:25 103:8 evidentiary 20:16 exact 108:25 exactly 39:5 57:19 70:4 82:4</p> | <p>examine 117:15 example 29:1,3,4 29:12 32:25 35:1,23 36:6 51:23 55:12 63:2 64:10 117:5,16 118:2 examples 94:23 102:6 exceed 104:22 Excel 93:11 97:13 98:9 excellent 95:5 excess 69:12 exclusively 81:5 82:1 96:15 excuse 33:9 88:12 92:19 110:24 excused 76:17 84:17 106:21 116:2 118:17 120:25 exhibit 20:4,5,5,6 20:6,7,7 42:1,9 43:8 44:20 62:6 75:10 76:25 85:19 86:10,19 86:23 87:1,4,9 87:10 89:15 96:5 97:1 105:16 109:13 120:16 122:2,4 122:6,8,10,12 122:14,15,17 122:19,21,22 122:24 123:1,3 123:4,6,8,10,12 123:14,16,18 123:20,22,24 124:1,3,5,7,8 124:10,12,13 124:17,18,20 124:22,24 125:2,5,7,9,11 125:13,16,18 125:20,23</p> | <p>126:1,3,5,7,9 126:10,12,14 126:16,18,20 126:22,24 127:1,3,5,7,9 127:11,13,15 127:17,19,22 127:23 128:1,3 128:5,7,9,11,13 128:15,16,18 128:19,21,22 128:24 129:1,3 129:5 exhibits 41:16 42:14,14,18 120:12,13 122:1 124:16 125:1,4,15,22 127:21 exist 69:22 existing 29:9 70:5 expanded 63:1 expectation 110:22 expended 63:11 expenditures 104:21 expense 22:20,24 25:3,15,17,25 experience 46:2 65:18 75:22 110:13 experiment 78:4 78:6,9,18 79:16 experimental 37:22 40:22 41:18 44:8 48:6 53:9,10 57:6,8 57:17,18 58:2,7 58:10 59:24 62:7 65:15 68:15 76:24 81:2 85:17 120:9 experts 29:25 30:5,23</p> | <p>explain 25:15 43:7 48:17 63:16 104:16 explained 43:2,2 43:19 explains 105:3 explicit 31:4,5,18 32:5 39:14,14 explore 73:24 expressly 79:11 extent 95:6 extra 37:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <hr/> <p>F 130:2 facilitate 58:4 fact 49:15 96:18 96:24 106:6,6 factor 83:22 factors 54:19 55:4 facts 71:10 failed 101:21 failures 69:8 fairly 93:14 familiar 49:6 115:16 families 64:17 101:8 family 30:17,19 30:20 67:8 88:23 108:15 Fannie 99:24 far 23:16 53:15 75:4,12 80:13 80:20 81:22 95:25 98:13 104:19 109:8 119:1,2,21 fast 25:2 faults 90:4 favoring 102:24 feasible 81:9 Feddersen 17:22 130:5,17 federal 29:16,22 30:8,18 36:14 87:23 113:11</p> |
|--|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>113:13 feed 72:5 76:10 76:10,11,12 feel 94:7 100:7 111:5 feelings 93:24 fewer 97:3,3,4 fiat 58:25 field 37:8,11,15 38:3 File 17:11 20:13 42:10 filed 31:13 126:6 126:8 filing 120:10 fill 91:14 final 27:7 76:23 118:20 119:20 119:24 financial 76:3 100:17 financing 74:2 75:2 99:18 100:2,18 find 29:17,21 50:22 68:17 88:18 90:12 97:10 finding 104:14 findings 104:11 fine 27:15 51:1 119:13 121:1 finish 96:23 Finnegan 18:10 firm 130:6 first 32:11 37:10 47:15 53:25 60:12 62:11 63:6 88:21 100:1 102:5 fish 72:4,6 76:11 76:12 fit 95:9 98:9 fix 117:24 fixed 108:22 flat 29:14 81:11 flaw 106:10</p> | <p>fleshed 87:17 flow 78:19 83:22 focus 66:18 focused 100:4 folks 75:23 follow 50:21 51:2 58:10 74:19 92:21 112:2,15 following 25:4 26:2,3 110:15 follows 61:25 77:20 85:9 107:17 116:19 follow-up 115:14 forbids 52:23 foregoing 130:12 forgone 58:17 forgot 105:15 form 88:25 formalized 119:20 former 60:10 formula 64:21 forth 88:17 89:1 130:10 Fortson 126:11 126:13 fortunate 91:22 forward 61:14 65:10 72:1 75:20 95:5 100:8 112:15 120:22 found 30:8,13 45:5 71:12 92:2 111:24 four 42:21 94:8 96:5 fraction 94:18 frankly 79:4 80:5 80:21 81:10 98:16 Freddie 99:24 free 55:25 fuel 119:3 full 108:23 130:12</p> | <p>functioned 41:21 funded 64:25 65:4 113:10 funding 46:13,21 46:25 50:6 51:16 112:23 113:25 115:6 funds 50:7,8 69:12 91:13 105:19 114:5,8 114:9 furnace 74:21,24 further 56:11 69:2 79:14 83:3 97:18 105:11 106:15 112:16 118:10 future 32:24 57:22 74:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>G 20:1 game 49:13,16 50:13 Gas 93:2 gather 53:13 general 20:12,17 28:19 32:4,8,15 102:13 generally 29:20 55:21 Geoff 85:2,9 127:22,24 128:1,3 129:5 geographic 68:18 68:19 107:25 108:7 117:2,5 getting 75:13,25 76:3,4,5 77:1 88:9 102:15,16 give 27:23 28:21 32:5 36:23 39:25 46:1 66:24 72:4,19 76:10 98:7,14 99:9 102:17 119:6 given 65:5 66:20</p> | <p>72:13 79:4 91:9 95:1,24 104:22 130:15 gives 92:14 giving 41:8 72:11 Global 42:10 124:14 go 20:9,9,21 23:15 34:21 37:4 41:23 49:10 60:21 74:20,21,24 75:15 89:3 90:1 91:19 92:1 94:5 99:18,19 101:7 101:10 102:6 103:16,24 107:1 109:18 118:21 121:7 goal 64:16 72:9 goes 48:18 96:1 101:9 109:9 going 23:5 32:4 36:18,23 38:14 40:25 63:10 66:16 71:8,25 73:7 75:4 76:7 86:4 94:7 95:19 100:1 101:7 113:15 116:21 good 20:14 37:20 38:5 41:16 47:2 60:5 62:2,3 71:6,7 77:22,23 83:6,7 85:11,12 85:25 94:9 95:9 99:7,8 100:25 102:10 103:11 107:19,20 108:8 117:18 Google 92:2 government 106:3 graduated 45:10 grant 102:16 113:13 graph 82:25</p> | <p>89:19 93:2 graphs 88:20,21 graveyard 94:5 gray-haired 55:18 great 71:3 74:9 75:7 104:24 greater 30:21 93:6 Green 126:15 Griffin 126:17 126:19 ground 110:7 group 22:2,4 41:8 62:13 74:5 93:7 102:25 103:5 guard 89:18 guess 43:10 81:9 81:24 90:19 101:4 103:2 106:5 guidelines 110:20 guy 55:18 guys 73:23 G-e-o-f-f 85:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>H 123:18,20,22 Haase 125:3 habits 45:6,9,13 78:2 Hackney 111:7 122:9,11,13 HALL 17:16 24:21 25:12 26:4 37:20 38:4 47:22 48:10,22 49:10 52:8 53:19,25 54:4 54:21 55:6,15 56:11 57:16 61:10 62:1 69:1 76:22 77:21 83:2 85:10 88:11 89:20 96:3 97:18</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| <p>107:18 112:16 116:20 118:10 Hall's 50:12 hand 93:25 handing 110:11 111:7 handout 33:5 85:25 86:7,10 105:16 129:5 hands 65:21 happen 38:15 103:17 happened 32:6 66:20 happens 75:13 happy 23:9 51:25 66:2 Harrison 126:21 hat 83:12 hate 94:4 head 55:22 80:5 80:6 94:18 hear 38:14,18 39:6 61:8 76:20 84:18 94:1 116:3 118:19 119:12 heard 91:24 98:17 101:1 114:2 119:16 hearing 17:6 20:2,16 31:15 35:10 43:25 85:14 118:23 119:3,5 120:3 121:12 heating 36:16,17 36:20 73:11 95:22 101:15 113:5 help 41:19 66:24 70:8 72:1,18 76:4,5 105:6 helping 45:13 103:4 helps 109:10 hesitate 111:24</p> | <p>hesitation 94:2 high 18:21 90:22 higher 47:18,19 47:20 51:4 highlights 87:15 87:18 high-income 82:20 hire 63:20 hired 63:19 history 93:22 hitting 110:16 hold 26:15 86:2 Holz 94:17 home 29:23 94:17 98:15 100:22 homes 100:23 honest 89:17 honestly 56:6 Honor 21:11 22:7,16 86:18 120:22 hopefully 74:7 98:12 hoping 110:12 121:9 hospital 91:14 hot 37:6 house 72:15 73:12,12 99:25 101:17 housed 105:20 household 108:16 households 29:20 housekeeping 120:11 housing 29:25 30:1 36:25 99:23 huge 74:25 111:10 hungry 72:5,6 hurdles 101:4 HVAC 101:11 Hyman 37:15</p> | <p>61:7 109:7,8 116:4,5,11,19 125:6,8,10 Hyman's 108:13 Hyneman 22:21 25:8,10 84:20 128:10,12,14 H-y-m-a-n 116:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>idea 26:23 50:1 92:16,23 95:5 99:17 ideas 99:16 identical 34:17 IDENTIFICA... 20:8 86:24 identified 24:20 25:4 61:3 identify 107:12 112:1 illustrative 36:6 51:22 imagine 49:1 50:8 immediate 28:22 117:12 impact 59:11 73:18 80:21 89:4 93:1 96:19 impacts 37:17 59:12 imperative 103:25 implement 20:12 28:15,24 31:18 47:24 55:2 70:20 80:9 98:23 110:4 117:25 implementation 28:18 80:13 107:22 109:24 110:3 implemented 49:22 implicit 31:21</p> | <p>importance 97:16 important 70:14 78:4 93:13 94:1 94:4 97:23 106:11 impose 58:1 imposed 58:25 59:10 impression 32:12 impromptu 27:21 incentive 109:14 incentives 29:15 inclined 90:20 include 25:15,16 25:17 49:2 included 67:19 107:22 including 26:6 52:2 68:6 inclusive 55:3 income 29:24 30:2 46:8 62:16 64:18 65:24 74:23 82:17 96:8 109:10 115:6,9 incomes 29:21 increase 20:12 20:17 46:8 97:13 increased 73:4 increasing 17:11 69:17 incur 112:4 independent 63:21 65:22 Indiana 93:3 indicate 65:12 79:1 indicated 22:17 48:10 49:23 63:14 64:24 77:25 104:15 indicates 48:11 89:22</p> | <p>individuals 30:7 64:17 105:17 115:17 industrial 100:10 inefficient 66:13 inform 29:9 69:24 information 21:13,19,24 35:4 48:23 49:19 53:13 68:4 70:11 75:21 86:9,14 90:7,12 96:14 97:22 115:22 ink 31:24 input 98:7,25 inputs 96:25 instance 58:11 insulation 101:11 intent 79:19 intentions 94:10 interested 52:10 76:25 86:1 internally 68:11 Internet 90:10 90:16 interpret 96:10 104:1 interrupt 33:10 88:12 intervention 91:1 105:19 109:20 113:6 115:16 intraclass 102:25 introduced 59:20 100:6 intuitively 82:7 investigate 53:11 investor-owned 94:24 involve 56:3 involved 31:11 38:1 45:5 54:1 66:7 75:14 96:15 116:24 involvement</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| 56:16,19 ironic 95:24 IRP 95:17 96:13 issue 25:3 27:7 27:21 31:25 32:1,9 43:22 44:1,3 47:1 49:12,17 52:18 53:20,22,25 54:4 76:21 79:8 82:2 83:22 111:15 117:4 118:20 119:18 120:4 issued 85:18 issues 22:25 23:2 23:20,22,23 24:1,2,17,20 27:12 40:8 49:15 53:12,20 54:1 61:5 63:9 78:7,19 100:12 118:22 119:2,3 119:8,16 120:7 120:23,24 item 103:13 | Johnstone 125:17,19,21 Joplin 18:23 20:5 21:22,24 62:21 63:5 68:22 120:23 JOPLIN'S 125:1 Judge 17:15 20:9 21:2,4,9,15,21 22:1,5,12,22 23:5,6,11,16 24:3,8,9,11,15 25:1,9 26:13 27:6,9,15 41:13 41:15,24 42:3,9 42:12,16,20,23 43:4,7 46:14 49:4 52:4 55:17 58:9,19 59:17 60:7 61:2,13,16 61:20 74:10 76:13,14,19 77:11,15,19 84:16,25 85:4 86:2,21,25 87:5 87:8 89:14 104:4,5,7 105:12 106:12 106:15,20,25 107:6,11,15 114:25 115:12 115:23 116:1,8 116:13,17 118:15 119:9 119:11 120:18 121:1,5,9 June 17:7 20:15 119:12 justify 102:23 | KCPL's 100:9 KCP&L 26:1,18 keep 81:23 112:7 Keeping 29:12 36:11,21 111:22 112:3 117:17 118:2 Keith 25:5 46:15 46:20 49:5 50:8 51:25 61:5,11 61:13,18,25 76:16 122:14 122:16,18 Kellene 17:22 130:5,17 Kenney 17:17 26:15 27:5 33:9 33:12,20,25 34:4,7,14 35:3 35:11 40:13,24 41:2,6,12 43:1 43:9,13,18 44:14,17 45:17 45:24 47:3,10 47:19,21 49:23 49:25 50:4,11 50:24 51:7,11 51:18,24 56:13 56:15,21 57:3,7 57:10,20,25 58:6 59:19 60:3 69:5,7 71:3 83:4 92:19 112:19 118:13 Kentucky 72:16 94:16 Keri 128:15,17 128:18 Kevin 19:10 21:5 key 92:5 102:3 Kim 17:15 24:5 126:5,7 kind 28:25 54:7 59:9 62:23 66:17 90:3 92:22 95:20 Kliethermes 61:6 | 77:5,13,20 126:23,25 127:2,4,6 knew 70:18 know 23:14 26:16 27:22 28:10 31:24 32:3,11,16 35:2 35:25 40:7,18 40:20 46:10,18 46:20,24 49:11 50:3,8,10,12,13 50:15,22 56:16 63:8 64:20 66:9 66:25 67:4 68:11 69:14,22 69:24 70:5,14 72:8,16 73:25 74:12,13 75:9 75:22 76:6 79:18,23 80:9 81:8,10,21 82:4 82:21,22,23,25 89:18,18 90:14 91:14 97:15 98:19,22 100:12 103:23 104:23 106:6 106:11 110:21 110:23 111:5 114:3 knowledge 38:9 56:17 known 58:7 knows 49:6 Kory 126:9 Kroll 28:4 37:9 38:2 61:6 77:9 84:21 106:13 107:2,4,9,16,17 112:22 116:22 117:7 125:12 125:14 Kroll's 30:12 K-e-i-t-h 61:19 K-l-i-e-t-h-e-r-... 77:14 | K-r-o-l-l 107:10 <hr/> L L 18:2,3 123:24 124:1 127:1,3,5 lack 69:9,19,21 lacked 104:15 lag 78:13 83:22 Land 122:20 Lange 127:8 language 26:11 114:13 largely 95:3 96:25 larger 36:18 62:24 87:22 91:2,9 late 45:21 49:12 49:16 50:13 latent 78:17 laudable 78:16 law 17:15 18:2,2 18:3,3,9,15,15 18:19,20 19:1 39:17,18 lead 78:12 83:22 lean 102:7 leave 73:20 Lee 122:21 left 66:9 legal 19:10 54:1 78:7 legality 120:6 Legally 40:18 legislative 39:9 legislator 75:24 Lena 128:23,24 129:1,3 Leslie 125:2 let's 20:9 24:3 25:2 41:9 58:11 83:11 86:3 level 28:9 29:22 30:18 44:23,24 46:11,20 51:5 83:8,24 90:22 104:23 levelized 91:7,12 |
| <hr/> J J 17:18 122:7 123:7,9,11 126:11,13 James 123:18,20 123:22 Jamie 19:10 21:5 Jay 123:24 124:1 Jefferson 17:8 18:5,16,21 19:3 19:7,12 21:7 22:11 130:16 Jeffery 122:21 Jermaine 126:15 Jersey 93:12 Joan 122:20 job 107:12 116:14 John 124:7,9 127:13,15 128:20,21 | <hr/> K K 17:22 126:5,7 130:5,17 Kansas 18:11 21:18 69:14 Kavita 124:17,19 124:20 KCPL 88:8 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>lies 32:17 94:2 life 72:7 76:7 lifetime 76:12 lifted 105:24 light 49:20 65:17 69:15 96:17 LIHEAP 33:13 33:14,17 35:15 41:9,10 44:24 51:6 88:25 107:24 108:6 109:21 113:3 113:10,24 114:9,12,14 115:5,6,20 117:6 LIHEAP-eli... 116:25 limit 29:16 56:8 60:21 limited 62:23 107:25 limiting 108:5 117:4 limits 30:8 36:14 line 27:11 87:23 96:6 103:8 list 23:23 67:23 120:22 listed 24:5 88:20 90:8 listened 85:16 listening 26:25 99:12 113:22 literally 30:3 Litigation 17:22 130:7 little 23:12 28:25 34:20 49:12 54:25 68:23 113:23 live 98:14 lived 98:18 lives 112:10 living 28:10,22 LIWAP 36:21,22 load 56:1 80:15</p> | <p>Londray 55:22 56:7 long 56:7 60:21 101:7 longer 46:7 93:8 longer-term 73:4 long-term 72:18 72:22 look 29:7 33:4 46:1 65:17 73:16 75:20 79:5 100:20 101:23 103:10 103:25 113:15 looked 34:15 35:23 63:22,23 80:12 94:16 97:12 108:12 looking 35:25 44:10 45:8 48:14 50:16 63:21 75:10 95:6 96:4 98:9 108:15 109:13 118:19 119:11 120:8 looks 98:1 lot 26:20 28:10 31:24 58:23 66:23 69:19 70:9 75:14,14 75:16 80:10 82:7 90:14,18 91:20,23 95:19 95:20,22,25 97:7 98:11 99:22,25 100:7 101:24 103:21 104:1 110:5 111:3 lots 93:21 love 98:19 low 64:18 74:23 96:24 lower 72:18 96:18 low-income</p> | <p>22:25 27:8,25 27:25 28:15,18 29:10 30:25,25 31:6,19,21 32:21 33:23 34:13 35:8 36:9 37:11,13,22 38:6,12 39:2,13 39:16,25 40:4 41:18 44:4,8,11 47:24 48:24 52:2,3,14 53:10 53:16,16,21 54:7 55:3,8 56:23,23 57:22 58:2 59:25 62:7 64:16 65:15 66:17 67:8 69:16,20,24 70:9 72:10 73:8 74:3,15 75:11 75:11 76:2,24 78:8,15 79:10 79:21 82:19 85:17 90:15 91:24,25 92:1,8 92:11,15,24 93:16,17,19,20 94:13 95:2,6,14 96:17,18,23 97:8,25 98:24 102:12 116:23 119:18,24 120:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p>M 17:17 124:7,9 128:23,24 129:1,3 Mac 99:24 Madison 19:6,12 Mae 99:24 Magazine's 99:16 MAIDA 17:18 Maini 124:17,19 124:21 major 68:21</p> | <p>majority 89:5 making 92:15 110:16,17,22 man 76:10,11,11 manage 70:25 managed 110:13 management 110:14 111:4 manager 110:6 manages 113:13 managing 112:5 manner 73:6 97:17 Mantle 128:23 128:25 129:2,4 manual 114:12 Marc 18:19 21:23 March 42:7 124:12 mark 86:19 92:2 Marke 24:6 61:6 77:7 84:19,22 85:2,9 104:8,10 109:16 114:10 114:19 127:22 127:24 128:2,4 129:5 marked 20:8 41:16 42:4 86:4 86:23,25 122:1 market 70:5,8 76:25 100:15 100:16 marketing 104:12 Martin 37:14 116:5,11,19 125:5,7,9 match 68:12 71:1 100:25 101:5 math 81:13 matter 17:10 20:10 matters 22:13 Mayfield 19:5 21:11,12 22:16</p> | <p>24:7 25:7 54:23 55:10 77:6 84:22 86:6,9,13 86:18 87:1,3 119:10 120:17 Ma'am 113:1 McCormack 42:5 124:11 McCormack's 44:9,20 McMellen 25:5 127:10,12 mean 38:20 45:25 48:13 59:5 76:3 82:6 89:21 97:5,22 101:3,5 102:3 102:19 103:19 104:17 means 63:17 98:14 meant 39:11 63:24 measures 110:17 MECG 18:18 MECG'S 124:16 mechanical 81:19 110:2 mechanism 25:25 26:8 53:17 media 70:10 MEEIA 48:16 91:22,23 95:8 MEEIA-type 48:20 meet 72:2 74:8 members 50:18 mention 25:17 mentioned 26:18 29:18 31:8 32:18 33:1 64:11 105:17 114:3 Mers 21:5 77:4 Mertens 122:23 meter 73:21</p> |
|---|--|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>methods 67:2 69:23 MEUA 20:6 MEUA'S 125:15 middle 36:5 Midwest 17:22 18:13 21:15 22:1,4 130:6 mildly 88:9 millennium 99:17 mind 93:18 mindful 28:12 minds 78:16 minimizing 80:3 mirror 55:4 Missouri 17:1,8 17:13 19:2,11 19:14 21:3,6,7 21:18 22:5,8,10 22:11 27:20 28:6 29:5,20 30:7 33:2 35:8 38:22 49:21 53:2 55:9,11 58:15 66:6 77:18 79:12 80:7,19 81:4 85:8 90:9,9,11 94:3 98:10 102:5 107:14 111:10 113:11 116:16 117:22 130:3,16 Missouri's 29:12 36:10 MITTEN 18:3 mixed 93:24 MO 18:5,11,16 18:21 19:3,7,12 mode 20:20 model 98:8 102:1 117:18 modeled 33:5 moment 60:2 86:21 Monday's 119:5</p> | <p>money 50:18 59:6,7,13,15 69:17 72:12,17 73:3 81:23 84:8 93:4 99:25 104:25 money's 93:4 monies 74:4 month 34:1,16 58:8 91:9 monthly 30:15 35:17 99:21 months 60:17 68:3 71:11 110:12 morning 20:14 37:20 38:5 62:2 62:3,5 64:25 71:6,7 77:22,23 78:5 83:6,7 85:11,12,14 99:7,8 102:10 107:19,20 113:23 119:14 mortgage 100:13 move 25:2 28:25 87:1,3 95:5 100:8 117:16 120:22 mover 102:5 moving 26:13 27:7 59:11 72:1 99:16 110:9 multiple 39:24 60:22 101:19 106:7 111:11 111:17 112:9 Myers 19:10 21:5 M-a-r-k-e 85:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <p>N 20:1 124:3,5 name 27:19 61:17,18 77:12 85:1 107:7 116:9 Nathaniel 122:8</p> | <p>122:10,12 national 30:23 necessarily 26:21 29:2 36:8 67:5 need 22:13 28:4 29:19 37:5,11 97:23 110:7,20 110:21 112:11 113:20 115:1 117:14 118:6 needed 46:24 63:19 needs 36:20 76:7 97:25 110:6 111:5 112:12 120:19 negative 102:22 Neither 37:25 Nelson 124:25 net 93:6 neutral 59:12 92:17 never 63:11,12 64:13 69:10 91:24 new 39:23 54:12 54:14,15 55:7 70:15 81:19 93:11 99:17 110:4 121:6 Nicole 21:5 night 87:13 nobody's 59:1 nodding 55:22 nondiscrimina... 103:1 nonprofits 114:5 114:7 non-heating 36:16 normalized 80:16 NOS 20:4,5,6,7,7 20:8 note 24:10 92:5 noted 24:12 88:4 notes 130:13</p> | <p>notice 57:21 69:19 90:23 103:15 109:19 115:2 121:2 notices 97:4 nuanced 29:13 36:11 39:5 nuances 36:9 number 33:14,16 33:17 44:21 70:2 87:22 96:25 103:3 108:25 115:20 numbers 33:12 34:15 89:8 95:19 96:6,7 97:8 103:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <p>O 20:1 OACAC 63:5 objection 27:14 objections 42:13 86:22 87:6 objectly 79:22 observations 87:24 obviously 36:18 104:24 119:16 119:25 occurred 35:9 occurs 90:24 offer 41:25 93:16 offered 76:21 86:11 90:8 106:2 offerings 54:12 offhand 50:23 office 18:15 19:5 19:8 21:7,9,12 22:17 25:6 84:20 85:8 120:15 130:15 Officer 18:11 offset 64:8,9 Okay 23:6 35:3 35:11 38:4 40:11 47:2 54:3</p> | <p>54:21 55:15 61:1,20 69:1 71:17 76:15 83:2 85:24 87:12 96:22 103:12 105:10 108:11 114:24 115:11 old 54:16 55:17 55:18 66:21 72:4 74:22 once 67:3 71:25 88:1 113:14 online 99:12 on-bill 99:17 100:2 OPC 20:7 24:6 61:6 65:13 80:25 86:19,23 87:1,4,9,10 OPC's 77:6 127:21 opening 23:1,5 27:12,21 opines 90:3 opinion 105:3 opportunity 73:2 87:13 98:14 119:6 opposed 66:19 95:3 100:1 opt 91:19 option 35:21 58:20 117:9,9 117:12,24,25 options 91:17 120:4,6 order 23:15 38:19 48:8 49:21,21 53:11 65:7 66:10 103:14 112:1 113:8 115:2 ordered 26:1 66:7 organizations 114:6</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| <p>outlined 38:23 outside 47:25 49:7 52:15 53:23 54:5,8,12 55:2 58:20 59:10,16 97:9 overall 76:5 78:12 overseeing 111:11 overturned 32:13 overview 99:9 owed 99:25 Owens 122:25 123:2 Ozark 62:22 63:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>P 17:17 20:1 122:3,5,21 PACE 94:17,19 95:4 99:10,14 99:15 100:24 101:4,17 page 33:4,14 44:19 87:14 89:12 92:6 95:11 96:5 97:2 105:16 par 98:21 parameter 49:2 parameters 46:8 95:1 110:21 part 38:7,7 48:12 55:14 59:12 63:15 64:21 65:8 76:6 78:6 79:16,24 80:18 91:5,5 92:22 109:17 114:21 120:1 participants 33:15,16 67:2 68:5 98:24 117:7 participate 60:16</p> | <p>60:18 92:12 113:17 participating 76:2 114:15 participation 36:22 63:9,10 69:9,19,21 particular 26:8 31:12 49:2 77:25 particularly 49:20 parties 20:18,22 23:15 25:3,23 26:7,22 27:11 36:5 38:6,8 43:23 44:4,10 45:5 48:6 49:11 52:5 59:18,21 60:1 61:2 65:14 67:17 68:15,17 76:15 77:1 78:16 81:1 84:17 86:20 98:7 99:1 104:6 115:24 118:16 118:21,25 119:6,13,15,20 119:23 120:4,7 partners 110:11 parts 59:11 party 23:24 27:13 95:16 pass 86:20 passed 97:22 passionate 100:7 Paul 18:2 126:20 paulb@brydo... 18:6 pause 92:14 98:3 paused 92:18 pay 68:2 72:2 83:25 99:20 100:1 102:17 paying 45:6 71:14 83:24 payment 67:1,2</p> | <p>67:11 88:22 91:12 109:22 111:24,25 payments 67:5 pays 45:21 pending 23:18 25:13 Pennsylvania 93:12 Penntower 18:11 people 28:10,22 36:23 57:11 62:14 71:11,13 75:25 80:22 82:5 83:17 98:14,18,19,22 100:7,21 101:8 102:4,13 114:8 people's 100:23 percent 28:7,9 29:6,22,23 30:2 30:7,10,17,17 30:21 35:15 66:8 87:23 100:21,22 108:20,23 115:9 117:8 percentage 29:16 33:13 36:13 41:10 115:17 percentages 33:19 perfect 29:2 period 37:5 45:2 45:3 47:6 75:18 84:7 90:15 101:20 110:25 permanently 53:15 permissible 54:13 person 72:4 73:8 73:19,22 75:13 76:1,7 110:8 111:6 113:24 personally 130:8 personnel 111:14</p> | <p>persons 30:19 perspective 29:24 31:16 66:11 80:2,3 81:19,25 108:2 110:2,3 perspectives 77:1 Peterson 18:10 phenomenal 101:5 phone 27:11 phones 20:19 phonetic 94:18 picking 41:3 piecemeal 101:10 pilot 22:25 27:8 28:24 31:1 33:24 34:4,17 35:8 36:10 38:12,19,23 39:24 40:16,21 44:18 46:6 47:4 47:25 52:15 55:8,8 59:25 66:7 81:2 94:5 119:18 pilots 93:22 101:19 place 23:13 37:23 52:14 54:7 55:9 62:11 66:9,16 67:15 70:1 77:16 85:5 103:21 107:12 110:17 116:14 130:9,14 places 98:16 113:25 plan 28:17 31:2 39:4 49:4 Planner 107:13 116:15 planning 61:23 play 82:7 please 20:19 27:18 43:5 61:14,16 77:11</p> | <p>77:15 79:15 84:25 85:4 86:2 102:18 107:6 107:11 113:1 116:9 plenty 102:6 plethora 56:17 56:18 podium 27:17 43:5 point 89:22 90:17,21 92:6 94:16 101:21 103:2,13 108:24 112:6 113:14 points 87:16,17 90:6,14 policies 114:14 policy 22:19,24 23:21 24:4,10 24:14,20,22,25 81:25 108:2 110:1,2 114:12 poor 87:24 population 112:8 position 27:22,24 31:9 33:21 35:7 35:10 52:13 55:7 57:23 58:1 61:21,22 77:16 85:5 95:25 120:23 positions 27:23 positives 83:13 possibility 72:21 114:11 possible 37:1 38:12 46:14 96:16 possibly 34:9 113:24 Post 21:7 potential 22:25 27:8,25 119:8 119:24 120:4,7 pots 114:1</p> |
|--|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>poverty 28:5,9 28:11,22 29:16 29:22 30:8,18 36:14 44:22,24 51:5 87:23 104:23 115:10</p> <p>power 53:3,9 69:15</p> <p>practical 41:5</p> <p>practice 41:1 103:11</p> <p>practices 32:22 102:7</p> <p>preferences 52:23</p> <p>prefiled 24:16</p> <p>preparation 44:3</p> <p>prepare 86:6</p> <p>prepared 23:18 27:13,14 37:19 48:2 49:14 62:6 76:23 77:2 86:15 129:5</p> <p>present 20:19 66:5 130:8</p> <p>Presiding 17:15</p> <p>pretty 51:23 109:5 117:17</p> <p>previous 71:11 98:17</p> <p>previously 21:14 22:16 23:13</p> <p>primary 95:15</p> <p>principle 66:15</p> <p>prior 31:14,14 65:18</p> <p>probably 58:22 58:22 59:10,15 65:8 73:2,9,13 73:14,24 79:6 80:22 82:5 102:4 105:7 111:5</p> <p>problems 67:11 78:13,13 80:11 99:23</p> <p>procedural 22:13</p> | <p>23:12 118:22</p> <p>procedures 114:14</p> <p>proceedings 17:5 32:20 130:8,11</p> <p>process 70:18 80:10 81:22 101:10,12,17 112:2,12,14</p> <p>product 98:8</p> <p>products 100:17</p> <p>program 28:24 29:13 34:5,17 35:18 36:10,11 37:4,13,16,22 38:1,3,20,24 40:16,21 41:18 41:23 43:14,16 44:8,11,18 45:1 45:6,7,8,9,10 45:12,15,18,19 45:21 46:6,6 47:4,11,24 48:11,19,25 49:19,23 51:8 53:10,14 56:22 56:23 57:6,8,22 58:2,11,12 59:5 59:9,25 60:11 60:15,17,19,23 62:7,8,8,12,22 63:14 64:25 65:16 66:4,7,21 67:1,3,15,24 68:16 69:9,16 69:25 70:15 71:11,14,15,20 71:25 72:1,11 72:25 73:17 75:11 76:2,24 77:25 78:17 79:2,10,18 80:1 81:2,2,13 83:16 84:5,11,12 85:17,19,25 88:5,13,23 89:23 90:2,4,20</p> | <p>91:1,4,6,19 92:10 93:19,20 94:5,17,19,20 94:25 95:3 96:15 97:25 98:24 99:5,10 99:14,15,22 100:3,24 101:24 104:12 104:15,16,20 105:4,4,19,20 106:2,9 107:22 108:1,6 109:12 109:18,21,21 109:23 110:3,5 110:5,6,9 111:3 111:15 112:5,7 112:24 113:6,7 113:11,15,24 114:4,16,21,23 115:16 116:24 117:17,20 118:6 119:19 119:24 120:6,9</p> <p>programming 28:1</p> <p>programs 28:15 29:10 31:1 37:3 39:24 48:16,20 50:2 52:2 68:6 69:13,20,22 70:6,12,25 72:17 74:1,13 74:15,17 75:11 88:7,8,22 90:8 92:11,15,24 93:11,12,22 94:13 95:7,7,18 100:11 102:12 110:14 111:9,9 111:11,12,17 113:16</p> <p>progress 88:10</p> <p>progressive 67:16 92:25</p> <p>project 38:13 98:9</p> | <p>promise 29:11</p> <p>promote 48:25 64:16 100:9</p> <p>promoting 104:20 105:4</p> <p>proper 117:15</p> <p>property 99:19</p> <p>proposal 50:15 51:19</p> <p>proposals 38:21</p> <p>proposed 33:6</p> <p>provide 28:16 36:2 48:23 72:22 117:12 121:2</p> <p>provided 17:12 21:14,19,25 30:14 90:7 115:6 120:14</p> <p>provides 29:15</p> <p>providing 23:1 34:25</p> <p>prudent 101:23</p> <p>PSC 31:5</p> <p>public 17:2 19:5 19:5,8,9,11,14 21:3,6,9,12 22:17 25:6 77:18 84:20 85:8 92:1,8 96:24 97:9 120:15</p> <p>published 30:1</p> <p>purely 34:25 36:6 51:22 83:15</p> <p>purpose 79:1 92:1,8 96:24 97:9</p> <p>purposes 41:5 48:24</p> <p>pushing 94:19</p> <p>put 20:19 23:23 25:21 29:24 49:9 52:14 54:7 55:9 59:21 60:1 62:11 65:14</p> | <p>66:16 67:15 68:15 70:15 81:1 83:11 91:7 97:7 106:5 110:6</p> <p>P.C 18:4</p> <p>P.O 18:5 19:2,6 19:11 22:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <p>qualified 46:7 51:6 57:11</p> <p>qualify 90:24 105:18</p> <p>qualifying 35:14</p> <p>quarter 110:23 110:24 111:1</p> <p>quarterly 110:15</p> <p>question 32:13 46:5,19 48:3 52:9,11 54:2,6 58:9,22 59:23 60:14 69:6 71:9 72:3 74:2 76:9 80:23 85:13 99:2 101:22 105:13,15 106:14 109:8 113:2 115:13 115:15 116:22</p> <p>questionable 34:10</p> <p>questions 22:19 23:7,10,21 24:18,21,24 25:10 26:10 37:9,11,16 38:3 41:20 42:24 49:5 52:1 56:12 60:8 61:4 62:1 69:2,3,7 71:5 75:16 76:15 77:21 82:6 83:3 83:4,5 84:14,16 85:10 95:13 97:19,20 99:6 102:9 104:6,8,9 105:11,14</p> |
|---|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| 106:16,17 107:16,18 112:17,18,19 112:21,23,25 113:19 115:12 115:24 116:18 116:20 118:7 118:11,12,13 118:16 119:17 queue 36:24 68:1 quick 111:21 115:13 117:11 117:24 quicker 67:4 quite 108:23 quote 105:24 | 93:17,19 94:8 102:22 117:15 119:2 126:3 ratepayer 50:8 ratepayers 21:13 52:21,22 57:14 65:1 83:15 90:9 rates 17:12 27:25 28:6,15,18 31:6 32:24 65:4 66:9 rating 45:16 reached 63:12 118:25 reaction 52:18 read 43:20 103:19 reading 75:20 105:22 ready 23:20 realities 91:18 realize 70:12 really 39:8 62:22 63:11 69:10 73:23 78:5 93:1 97:17 98:5 100:4 101:16 104:19 106:10 reapply 45:2 60:18 71:12 reason 98:3 reasoning 102:17 reasons 93:23 94:11 103:20 reauthorized 60:20 rebates 36:12,13 36:24 39:25 rebuttal 28:2 30:12 86:15 95:12 122:5,10 122:16 123:1,5 123:9,14,20,24 124:9,19 125:7 125:11,18 126:9,11,17,22 127:3,9,13,22 127:24 128:17 | 128:20,21,24 129:1 recall 55:20 56:19 58:16 63:8 65:3 69:15 70:4 recalled 104:14 receive 40:25 90:23 103:15 103:16 109:21 113:9,25 114:8 114:9 received 42:19 44:23 87:10 101:24 108:14 109:19 receiving 43:19 47:18 67:8 88:24,24 102:14 115:21 recess 106:22 recipients 115:21 recollection 62:20 79:3,5,8 recommend 60:4 120:5 recommendati... 51:22 61:12 recommendati... 39:3 recommended 31:1,3 57:21 recommending 29:3 34:8,21,24 reconnects 97:3 record 20:10 22:14 24:9 42:4 42:17 61:17 77:12 78:25 85:1 86:5 87:9 103:4 107:7 116:10 120:12 120:20 121:11 records 64:14 recreating 102:2 REC'D 122:1 reduce 83:24,25 | 84:1 98:19 99:20 108:22 109:11 reduced 84:9 reducing 78:9,11 78:12,18 82:2 84:8 95:24 reduction 50:17 66:8 83:18 96:16 107:23 108:10,21 116:24 117:9 reductions 118:3 reference 26:6 39:19 91:21 93:10 97:10 referenced 92:7 referred 55:21 referring 55:20 56:10 114:11 refers 90:7 93:2 regard 117:21 regarding 41:20 region 108:1 117:2 regulation 53:6 regulatory 17:15 22:24 23:21 24:4,10,20,22 24:25 58:13 61:23 77:17 83:8 related 22:19 relative 82:8 relatively 117:25 relevant 54:19 relief 28:16,22 31:1 37:12 78:8 78:15 90:25 91:13 105:18 117:12 remain 92:17 remainder 118:22 remarks 27:13 27:14 37:19 remember 51:20 | 72:25 108:25 replaced 74:24 reply 46:12 report 48:11 62:6 68:8 76:24 77:2,25 85:18 85:25 86:10 88:16,18,19 89:10 90:13 92:2 126:1,4 REPORTED 17:21 reporter 21:14 21:20,25 120:15 130:6 representing 27:20 request 20:11,17 115:19 117:8 requested 43:25 69:17 115:20 requests 120:24 requirement 23:19 25:14 78:12 83:23 91:5 119:1,22 126:1 requirements 37:3 requires 36:21 113:7 research 52:18 55:13 80:15 researched 56:6 researcher 92:13 resided 117:1 residential 30:15 35:17,19,24 40:1,3,4 52:21 52:22 56:3 residents 96:17 96:18 respond 54:23 59:18 responding 52:10 response 42:15 |
| R | | | | |
| R 20:1 125:5,7,9 126:20 127:19 128:9,11,13 130:2 raise 69:18 raised 78:7 90:17 raises 105:1 ran 50:25 56:24 79:18,19 99:22 110:12 range 26:23 27:3 50:2 rate 20:12,17 22:19,24,25 25:3,15,17,24 26:1 27:8 30:25 31:19,22 32:21 34:13 35:22 37:16 38:6 39:2 40:17,22,25 44:5,15 47:25 52:3,15,19 53:17,22,23 54:5,9,12,19 55:2,3 56:16,20 57:1,22 58:20 59:10,16,16 60:20,22,24 69:15 73:25 74:3 78:23 79:6 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 87:7 106:19 115:25 responsibility 111:11 rest 72:7 result 53:11 results 68:5 92:7 resume 119:4 resuming 119:7 retrofit 99:19 101:12 return 106:22 revenue 23:19 25:14 58:17 78:12 83:23 93:6 119:1,22 126:1 revenues 97:13 103:9 revenue-neutral 59:4,5 reverse 114:20 reversed 55:24 review 31:12 55:3 60:10 62:5 63:19 86:3,20 87:13 111:21 120:1,1 reviewed 38:2 114:12,18 reviewing 83:14 Richard 124:24 rider 74:4 right 24:3 27:6 40:16 51:19,20 53:24 59:8,11 61:13 67:24 71:22 82:12 83:11,20 89:24 92:18 94:4,21 97:11,14,24 98:2,6,25 99:2 100:6 106:20 110:12 119:15 Riley 128:20,21 rise 90:22 103:14 risk 32:12 | rmitten@bryd... 18:7 Robert 123:3,5 Robin 126:22,24 Robinett 127:14 127:16 ROE 26:19,20 27:3 rolled 69:12 room 27:10 85:14 Roos 127:18 Ross 79:7 Roth 128:15,17 128:18 rough 82:17 roughly 28:7 82:12 rows 96:5 RPR 17:22 130:17 running 59:2 100:13 117:6 Rupp 17:18 46:4 46:23 47:2 71:5 71:21 74:19 76:9 83:5 99:6 105:12,14 112:21,25 Rupp's 60:14 74:11 94:16 115:14 rural 95:3 100:5 RUSSELL 18:3 | 74:25 saw 94:9 saying 29:2 39:6 40:19 45:18 59:2 72:4,8 94:2 says 39:1 90:14 104:1 Sbell@bbdlc.c... 18:22 scale 45:16 schedule 23:12 23:14 121:6 scheduled 119:3 Schedules 124:4 125:23 scope 49:7 110:21 Scott 17:18 61:18 61:25 122:14 122:16,18 seated 107:8 116:8 second 53:22 54:4 86:3 87:21 89:7 sections 88:19 securitize 100:14 Security 63:4 see 24:18 26:10 26:11 32:4,7,16 35:4,16 50:25 55:22 64:8 65:20 71:1 76:10 78:9 86:4 86:22 89:4 90:10,11 97:14 98:6,25 118:2 120:8 Seeing 42:16 76:16 87:8 106:20 seek 79:22 seen 101:19 117:18 selected 99:15 sell 100:15 | send 114:4 sense 65:17 66:11,18 68:18 81:4,7,25 89:25 91:11 95:21 103:10 108:3 sentence 92:10 separate 40:4,15 40:20 41:8 80:14 81:17 120:10 serves 28:8 service 17:2,12 17:13 19:11,14 20:13 21:3,6 28:5,11,23 29:19 30:9,20 34:3,18 37:12 51:9 52:15,25 53:1,7 54:12,16 57:15 62:22 77:18 100:9 107:24 117:2 126:4 services 17:22 36:25 76:8 113:12 114:4 130:7 service-territo... 47:25 set 20:16 40:15 44:18,22 65:6 88:17,21 89:7 130:9 setting 32:24 settle 36:5 settlement 23:19 25:13,16,20 26:3,17 27:2,2 27:4 38:7 44:12 59:22 60:24 65:8,9 118:25 119:7,24 settlements 48:7 Shana 126:17,18 shared 50:6 shareholder 50:7 | shareholders 65:1,5 83:16 sharing 25:25 Sharlet 28:4 30:12 37:9 77:9 107:4,9,17 125:11,13 Shawn 127:7 sheer 106:6 sheet 130:10 Sherrill 42:5 124:10 Shorthand 130:6 show 64:13 showed 84:4,7 showing 84:3 shown 29:11 shows 82:16 shutoff 113:8 115:2 shutoffs 97:3 side 64:3 81:9 sign 36:22 59:1 67:21 68:1 70:17,22 90:20 significant 28:4 29:19 89:23 96:19 109:5,14 109:22 112:3 silent 20:20 similar 28:15 35:4 48:15,19 55:8 81:12 93:12 simple 112:7,13 117:11,24 simply 53:4 55:8 71:23 singularly 101:14 sir 56:14 57:24 71:6 sit 43:20 sitting 79:25 81:3 situation 71:24 76:3 109:18 114:2 |
|--|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>situations 78:11 size 30:19,20 82:8 108:16 slide 33:5 small 40:15 smaller 41:7 social 83:12,13 92:13 106:3 113:12 114:3 societal 103:7 solution 80:20 somebody 67:8 92:14 someplace 36:4 somewhat 49:23 95:24 soon 88:18 118:8 sorry 88:12 89:11 105:15 sort 78:13 115:14 117:11,24 118:4 sorts 94:10 sounds 27:15 82:12 source 36:19 96:12 space 95:22 speak 77:5,7,9 99:14 105:21 speaking 26:4 49:18 81:8 97:2 speaks 89:19 97:16 special 40:17 specific 25:17 26:6 28:25 31:6 31:10 38:21 47:14 107:25 117:1,5,20 specifically 31:3 34:24 35:19 46:10 82:15 84:2 specify 25:22 speculating 114:17</p> | <p>speculation 90:18 speculative 103:20 spell 61:17 77:12 85:1 107:7 116:9 spelled 66:10 spend 109:10 spending 69:11 spent 50:19 73:19 84:7 91:23 105:1 spike 68:2 spilled 31:24 spoke 94:17 spoken 91:20 spot 87:25 spread 35:22 68:2 spreading 35:24 square 39:17 ss 130:3 Staff 19:10,14 20:7 21:2,6 24:6 25:5,6 27:22 31:8 52:12 57:21 58:3 61:6 65:13 69:16 77:18 78:22 79:7 80:8 80:22,25 82:5 Staff's 33:5 50:17 57:23,25 77:4 125:22 stakeholders 31:19 59:1 104:19 stand 106:14 107:4 116:6 standards 48:15 101:7 standpoint 92:13 92:13 stands 94:21 start 61:11 94:10 started 44:7</p> | <p>45:22 65:3 starting 54:25 state 17:1 28:6,7 28:17 29:10,20 30:7 31:2 34:2 39:4,17,18 49:6 61:16,21 77:11 77:16 84:25 85:5 107:6 114:6 116:9 121:2 130:3,16 stated 30:1 31:3 69:8 101:4 117:10 statement 23:2 27:22,23 31:8 39:1 55:5 92:9 92:15 99:1 102:11 statements 23:5 27:12 118:21 states 74:1 93:15 statewide 110:13 statistical 73:9 statistically 73:14 statute 52:22 statutorily 93:17 statutory 28:14 31:5,18 32:10 34:9 53:18 stayed 91:4 staying 56:4 stays 73:21 Stenotype 130:11 130:13 step 27:16 43:5 61:14 71:8 96:2 Stephanie 18:20 21:23 STEPHEN 17:17 Steve 124:22 stipula 114:14 stipulation 26:5 stock 36:25 97:7 STOLL 17:17 24:23 26:9 38:5</p> | <p>38:11,18,25 39:15 40:2,11 60:19 61:1 69:3 84:14 97:20 112:18 118:12 Stoll's 101:22 stop 59:3,3 71:8 strapped 70:11 streamlined 112:13 streams 106:7,8 Street 18:21 19:6 19:12 strictly 97:3 stripping 75:3 strong 73:9,13 strongly 24:10 structure 72:10 73:17 structured 80:2 structuring 72:21 struggling 83:20 Stu 21:17 STUART 18:9 stuck 88:1 stucon@fcpla... 18:12 studied 84:7 studies 82:22 study 79:19,24 83:14 84:2,4 88:4 92:4 subjective 64:12 submit 119:21 submitted 86:16 Subsequently 100:3 subsidiary 75:24 subsidiaries 92:16 subsidized 64:5 subsidy 75:14 92:11,20 93:9 102:12,15,21 102:21,24 115:8 substantial 44:2</p> | <p>51:4 substantiate 95:13 successful 88:9 94:22 sudden 67:10 91:15 106:8 suggest 104:25 120:5 suggests 106:9 Suite 18:21 19:6 21:18 Sullivan 123:7,9 123:11 summarize 43:10 43:22 summary 43:2 43:14 summer 37:5 summers 37:6 Supplement 124:4 support 24:10 37:6 95:17 110:18,18 supported 33:23 supposed 103:1 Supreme 53:1,2 sure 43:6 55:11 57:2 62:12 64:7 64:9 65:19 70:8 73:14,24 74:5 83:19 98:1 108:4 110:16 110:17,22 111:2 113:16 surprise 88:2 surprised 67:7 67:10 surrebuttal 28:3 38:23 87:14 108:11 122:12 122:18,23 123:11,16,22 124:1,20,22,24 125:2,9,13,20 126:13,15,18</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| 126:20,24 127:5,7,11,15 127:17,19 128:1,3,7,13,18 129:3 Swarengen 18:4 20:25 sworn 61:15 77:10 84:24 107:5 116:7 systematic 101:16 S-a-r-a-h 77:14 S-h-a-r-l-e-t 107:10 | technical 78:17 110:18 technologically 81:9 telephone 54:11 tells 55:23 temporary 90:25 tend 82:19 96:18 tentatively 118:25 ten-minute 106:22 term 66:25 83:20 terminate 44:11 termination 109:19 terms 83:21 87:25 89:2 94:14 102:20 territory 28:5,11 28:23 29:19 30:9,21 34:3,18 37:12 51:10 100:10 107:25 117:2 118:7 territory-wide 52:15 test 32:10 48:16 91:21,22,24,25 92:1,3,8 96:24 97:9 tested 79:17,18 testified 61:25 77:20 85:9 107:17 116:19 testimony 24:2 24:16 28:3 30:12,13 38:20 38:23,24 40:9 42:5 43:24 44:9 44:20 61:8 79:6 86:15 94:9 95:12,25 97:21 98:17 101:18 108:12 113:21 113:23 119:16 122:3,5,7,8,10 | 122:12,14,16 122:18,20,21 122:23,25 123:1,3,5,7,9 123:11,13,14 123:16,18,20 123:22,24 124:1,3,5,7,9 124:10,17,19 124:20,22,24 125:2,5,7,9,11 125:13,16,18 125:20 126:5,7 126:9,11,13,15 126:17,18,20 126:22,24 127:1,3,5,7,9 127:11,13,15 127:17,19,22 127:24 128:1,3 128:5,7,9,11,13 128:15,17,18 128:20,21,23 128:24 129:1,3 text 87:15 105:17 Thank 21:4,11 21:21 22:12,22 24:11 27:5,6 35:11 38:4 40:11 41:12,13 45:24 47:21 49:24 51:24 52:4 69:2,4 71:3 74:9,18 75:8 76:12,16 76:18 77:19 84:13,15 97:19 99:5 104:3,4,5 105:10 107:15 112:17,20 113:18 114:24 114:25 115:11 115:23 116:1 116:17 118:11 118:14,15 121:4,10 Thanks 61:1 | 102:8 thereof 130:10 they'd 70:17 thing 54:14 67:22 78:14 92:5 105:7 120:21 things 26:18 36:15 48:7 53:9 58:24 59:3 65:19 70:7 74:7 75:19 76:6 79:11 94:11 97:23 98:12,21 101:6,13 118:2 121:7 think 23:4,16 28:11 32:20 34:8 39:7,8 47:6 49:18 51:19 52:19 53:17,19 54:10 54:18 55:18 58:14,21 60:4 61:10 62:24 63:4 64:4,19 66:15 67:16 68:10,23,24 70:16,21 72:9 74:6 75:7,12,22 78:3,15 79:4,20 81:6,21 82:16 85:24 87:25 89:22 90:6,16 91:21 93:25 94:3 95:4 96:1 97:14 98:8,11 98:21,23 99:3 100:24 101:4,7 102:4,13,21 103:12,24 104:19,20,21 104:22,23 105:2,6,6 113:20,21 116:21 117:3,8 117:10,14,23 | 118:5,7 third 90:21 92:6 Thomas 123:7,9 123:11 Thompson 19:10 21:4,5 23:4,9 52:9,17 53:24 54:3,10 55:5,20 56:10,13,14,18 57:2,5,9,13,20 57:24 58:3,14 58:21 59:19,23 119:9 Thompson's 54:24 56:5 thorough 41:22 thought 27:21 63:10 81:3 thoughts 65:16 74:20 80:1 85:21,22 thousands 99:12 three 23:25 24:17 30:4,19 42:13 83:9 108:15 threshold 30:2 throw 118:4 thrown 24:24 49:12 tie 72:15 74:1 75:2 tier 87:18,18,22 tiered 29:15 37:3 tiers 36:12 44:22 87:21 tight 27:3 97:17 till 56:24 Tim 124:3,5 time 20:16,18 37:10 41:16 44:3 54:13 55:25 56:7 60:21 67:23 75:15,25 79:21 82:22,23 84:6 91:23 92:14 |
| T | | | | |
| T 17:18 130:2,2 table 105:8 take 20:21 24:1 28:20 32:10,16 35:7,9 41:10 49:16 72:12 74:16 89:13 95:20 106:21 109:15 111:19 112:1 121:10 taken 45:19 65:21 106:24 takes 32:5 36:15 106:14 120:23 talk 51:12 77:3 talking 30:3 74:8 75:20 87:22 89:6 94:12 95:23 talks 88:21 tariff 51:15,15 52:14 54:7 60:11,15 64:16 65:7 66:17 94:17,19 95:5 tariffs 17:11 65:11 80:9 Tarter 123:13,15 123:17 teach 72:6 76:11 Tech 76:25 92:2 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p>95:23 99:16 103:6,24 106:25 109:9 110:4 111:14 120:25,25 130:9,14 times 26:20 30:4 70:9 title 107:12 116:14 today 22:9,15,23 23:18,25 26:10 27:19 39:25 40:19 56:24 79:25 81:3 118:19 120:13 121:10 today's 31:14 Todd 123:13,14 123:16 told 55:24 56:24 57:3 tomorrow 121:6 121:8,10 top 80:5,6 topic 26:16 31:10 total 33:14 50:1 82:9 totally 24:24 totals 50:25 track 65:24 68:11 81:23 111:2 tracker 58:12 Traditional 53:6 transcript 17:5 130:13 treat 39:19,22 52:20 tried 33:3 93:1 101:19 triennial 96:13 tries 89:7 trip 91:13 true 84:4 130:12 True-Up 124:5 try 43:20 46:2</p> | <p>63:18 68:2 70:6 74:6 98:7 102:1 121:5 trying 26:22 65:24 66:24 68:10 72:8 89:12 92:22 100:8,25 101:14 103:2 Tuesday 119:7 119:12 turn 97:15 turned 64:2 turning 32:25 tweaks 102:1 two 23:22 32:7 37:7 44:22 53:20 62:21 63:3 68:21,24 68:25 69:6 73:14 87:21 88:19 113:3 114:1 type 35:15 36:7 47:24 52:14 59:22 65:15 67:19 68:15,17 69:23 81:1 114:2,15 118:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p>ultimately 36:4 unaffordability 30:3 unaffordable 30:5 unavailable 121:3 uncertainty 103:21 unclear 32:1 uncollectibles 83:21 understand 49:13 50:14 54:1 64:4,19 67:7 70:12 75:17 101:9</p> | <p>108:4 114:13 understanding 22:23 25:13 51:16 62:4 77:24 78:21 82:14 84:9 94:20 99:15 100:5 105:22 114:20 118:24 understood 112:8 Unfortunately 45:4 unique 95:21 updated 27:23 upgrades 72:14 ups 102:1 usage 56:1 67:5 80:17 91:10 108:14 use 32:23 36:17 36:19 48:20 66:13 69:24 70:19 72:17 73:5 95:14 111:24 115:18 useful 98:8 user 72:22 users 18:13 21:15 75:5 utilities 29:11 48:6 92:25 95:4 103:3 utility 29:7 31:7 76:4 90:22 93:3 94:24 100:2 103:14 104:19 106:2 utility's 93:9 utilize 25:24 U-shaped 82:24 U.S 108:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>value 81:11 97:5 Vander 123:19 123:21,23 variable 66:9,19</p> | <p>various 93:23 vast 89:5 verifiable 113:8 115:2 verification 113:7 verified 73:15 verify 71:10 versus 36:16 102:2 vetted 101:25 view 82:23 107:21 116:23 viewed 79:20 viewpoint 108:7 Volume 17:8 volumetric 80:16 81:10,18 voted 69:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>W 122:8,10,13 122:14,16,18 123:3,5,13,14 123:16 wait 32:4,8,14 want 23:14 24:1 34:21 36:9 43:20 53:5,13 65:23 66:11,13 70:24 71:10 87:1 89:8 90:22 92:17 97:6 98:4 108:4 109:17 111:1 112:7 117:11,13 118:8,9 wanted 23:22 27:23 49:19 58:1 60:9 104:13 117:16 118:1 wants 59:24 warned 49:8 warns 56:5 wasn't 27:10 45:12,20 46:21 62:10,20,22</p> | <p>109:14 water 33:21 34:19 35:5 40:14 47:5 66:14 way 31:23 54:15 54:17 65:11 68:13 72:10,20 72:21 73:18 101:7 106:5 110:23,25 111:1 ways 104:1 wayside 101:21 weather 75:3 weatherization 36:25 67:20,24 68:7 69:16 70:25 71:2 73:12 74:13,21 75:3 89:1 94:15 98:13 111:9 website 90:8 websites 90:13 week 119:4 120:24 Weide 123:19,21 123:23 Weighing 91:17 well-recognized 53:9 went 41:18 45:5 45:7,18 60:13 71:19 88:3,6,14 101:21 weren't 67:10 we'll 20:21 23:9 49:4 74:16 86:21 121:5 we're 23:4 29:2 30:3 32:4 34:25 36:23 43:19 48:15 95:6,23 100:8 102:25 120:19 121:11 we've 29:3 59:20 75:19 80:11</p> |
|--|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>91:20 92:22 93:20,21 106:7 117:3,18 wheel 102:2 wide 34:3 62:23 wide-open 85:13 WILLIAM 17:17 Williams 123:25 124:2 willing 37:8 46:1 59:1 66:4 willingness 26:7 67:14 Wilson 124:3,6 Winston 18:16 wish 54:22 55:16 55:20 58:6 61:8 wishes 28:21 witness 22:18,20 28:3 30:12 46:15 48:22 61:15,18,22 76:15,18,20 77:4,6,9,10,13 77:17 79:7 84:24 85:2,7 86:8,12,17 87:12 89:16 92:21 106:13 106:16 107:2,5 107:9,13 115:1 116:7,11,15 witnesses 23:25 24:5,17,19 25:4 37:8,21,25 38:14 49:14 61:3 76:23 118:18 119:8 Woods 124:7,9 Woodsmall 18:15,15 22:3,3 24:13 word 70:6 111:25 words 57:16 58:25 65:22</p> | <p>work 26:22 38:13 53:12 57:12 65:13 66:2 68:16 80:8 80:19,25 81:21 88:10 98:21 110:21 119:6 workable 80:20 worked 75:23 81:13,20 working 31:9 117:14 119:1 world 54:11 worse 45:7,21 67:3 worth 27:21 94:8 wouldn't 46:1 90:11 97:7 114:16 115:5 wrestle 92:23 wrong 113:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p> <p>X 102:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>Y 17:16 yeah 34:4 46:22 52:8 61:10 64:15 65:25 81:24 82:6 101:5 year 104:22 years 31:9 41:22 70:2 74:22 94:8 101:20 young 98:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <p>zero 87:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">\$</p> <p>\$1,700 30:16 \$10 36:2 \$12 36:3 50:17 108:21 \$13 66:22 \$140 82:2,10</p> | <p>\$142 30:15 \$15 33:6 82:2 \$20 44:25 62:15 89:6 \$3,000 74:24 \$300,000 51:17 65:5,6 104:20 \$50 44:25 62:15 66:21 67:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>0.22 92:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>1 20:5 63:24 87:15,18 103:13 122:2 124:17 125:2,5 125:16,23 1HC 127:22 1,000 60:12 63:7 1-18 20:8 1-24 20:7 1-3 20:7 126:2 1-34 20:4 1-5 20:5,6 10 122:19 128:15 10NP/HC 126:16 10:45 106:23 100 29:22 30:17 99:16 11 122:21 128:16 11NP/HC 126:18 11:12 121:13 1157 19:2 22:10 12 60:17 68:3 71:11 110:12 122:22 126:20 128:18 12-month 45:1,3 12.42 33:8 12.50 66:22 1209 18:11 21:18 13 82:2 122:24 126:22 13HC 128:19 14 126:24 128:21 14NP/HC 123:1</p> | <p>14.47 33:6 145 115:9 15 30:7 44:19 127:1 128:22 15NP/HC 123:3 15.5 28:7 150,000 65:4,4 16 28:8 123:4 127:3 16HC 128:24 17 29:23 89:12 123:6 127:5 129:1 18 123:8 127:7 129:3 19 28:9,9 30:10 30:10 86:19,23 87:1,4,9,10 105:16 120:16 123:10 127:9 129:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>2 17:7 33:5 87:18 96:5 107:13 122:4 125:7,18 127:23 2nd 20:15 2NP/HC 124:18 126:1 2,399 33:13 2,400 33:13 2.46 108:17 20 35:25 66:21 67:9 122:3,5,7 122:9,11,13,14 122:16,18,20 122:21,23,25 123:2,3,5,7,9 123:11,13,15 123:17,19,21 123:23,25 124:2,4,6,7,9 124:11,12,14 124:17,19,21 124:23,25 125:3,6,8,10,12 125:14,17,19</p> | <p>125:21,23 126:2,4,6,8,9 126:11,13,15 126:17,19,21 126:23,25 127:2,4,6,8,10 127:11,12,14 127:16,18,20 127:22,24 128:2,4,6,8,10 128:12,14,15 128:17,18,20 128:21,23,25 129:2,4 20NP/HC 123:12 200 19:6,12 2001 92:4 97:10 2002 37:23 41:19 44:7,18 46:3 47:12 49:20 56:16,20 67:15 79:6 2003 75:18 2005 62:11 2006 78:23 2009 37:23 75:18 2010 37:24 42:7 43:14 44:9 46:3 49:20 56:24 67:15 78:23 124:12 2011 60:24 2012 111:23 2014 30:6 2016 17:7 20:15 21 123:14 127:13 22 123:16 127:15 2230 19:6 23 97:2 123:18 23NP/HC 127:17 24 34:15 36:1 123:20 127:19 25 123:22 26 123:24 27 124:1 28NP/HC 124:3 29 42:7 124:12</p> |
|--|---|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <p>29NP/HC 124:5</p> <hr/> <p>3</p> <p>3 33:4,14 77:17 103:13 116:15 122:6 124:20 125:9,20</p> <p>3HC 128:1</p> <p>3NP/HC 126:3</p> <p>3/25/16 126:6</p> <p>30NP/HC 124:7</p> <p>301 18:21</p> <p>308 18:21</p> <p>31 63:24 124:8</p> <p>3100 18:10 21:18</p> <p>312 18:4</p> <p>32 41:16 42:1,4 42:14,18 43:12 44:20 120:13 124:10</p> <p>33 41:16 42:1,6 42:14,18 43:11 43:12,13 50:25 62:6 75:10 76:25 85:19 86:10 89:15 109:13 120:13 124:12</p> <p>34 41:17 42:2,9 42:14,18 43:3 43:11,12 120:13 124:13</p> <p>35 43:11</p> <p>360 19:11 21:7</p> <p>367 51:20</p> <p>367,000 50:16</p> <hr/> <p>4</p> <p>4 122:8 125:11 126:5 128:3</p> <p>4NP/HC 124:22</p> <p>4/8/16 126:8</p> <p>42 30:21 124:11 124:12,14</p> <p>456 18:5</p> <hr/> <p>5</p> <p>5 17:8 122:10</p> | <p>125:13 126:7 128:5</p> <p>5NP/HC 124:24</p> <p>50 29:21 74:22 87:23</p> <p>50,000 104:22</p> <p>50/50 65:3</p> <p>573)634-2500 18:22</p> <p>573)635-7166 18:6</p> <p>573)751-3234 19:13</p> <p>573)751-4857 19:7</p> <p>573)797-0005 18:17</p> <hr/> <p>6</p> <p>6 30:2 122:12 126:9 128:7</p> <p>64111 18:11 21:19</p> <p>650 19:6</p> <p>65101 18:16</p> <p>65101-3237 18:21</p> <p>65102 19:3,12 21:8 22:11</p> <p>65102-0456 18:5</p> <p>65102-2230 19:7</p> <hr/> <p>7</p> <p>7 108:24 122:14 126:10</p> <p>7HC 128:9</p> <p>7th 119:12</p> <p>70 100:22</p> <p>77 100:21</p> <hr/> <p>8</p> <p>8 126:12 128:11</p> <p>8NP/8HC 122:15</p> <p>8.5 30:17 108:20 108:24</p> <p>8:30 119:14</p> <p>8:37 20:3,15</p> <p>80 29:6 35:15</p> | <p>66:8 117:8</p> <p>807 18:16</p> <p>816)753-1122 18:12</p> <p>838 17:22</p> <p>86 129:5</p> <p>87 129:5</p> <hr/> <p>9</p> <p>9 122:17 126:14 128:13</p> | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|