Page 199

STATE OF MISSOURI

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Hearing

June 29, 2016

Jefferson City, Missouri Volume 7

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

KIM S. BURTON, Presiding, REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.

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

REPORTED BY:

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

Page 200 **APPEARANCES:** DIANA C. CARTER, Attorney at Law Brydon, Swearengen & 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 3100 Broadway 1209 Penntower Officer Center Kansas City, MO 64111 (816)753-1122 stucon@swclaw.net FOR: Midwest Energy Users Association. DAVID WOODSMALL, Attorney at Law Woodsmall Law Office 807 Winston Court Jefferson City, MO 65101 (573)797 - 0005david.woodsmall@woodsmalllaw.com FOR: MECG. MARC ELLINGER, Attorney at Law Blitz, Bardgett & Deutsch 308 East High Street, Suite 301 Jefferson City, MO 65101-3237 (573)634 - 2500Sbell@bbdlc.com FOR: City of Joplin. ALEXANDER ANTAL, Attorney At Law Missouri Division of Energy P.O. Box 1157 Jefferson City, MO 65102 FOR: Division of Energy

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

Page 201 CYDNEY MAYFIELD, Deputy Public Counsel 1 Office of the Public Counsel P.O. Box 2230 2 200 Madison Street, Suite 650 Jefferson City, MO 65102-2230 3 (573)751 - 48574 FOR: Office of the Public Counsel and the Public. 5 6 KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel JAMIE MYERS, Legal Counsel 7 Missouri Public Service Commission P.O. Box 360 8 200 Madison Street Jefferson City, MO 65102 9 (573)751 - 3234FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public 10 Service Commission. 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

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

Page 203 1 CHAIRMAN HALL: Are there any opening 2 remarks? 3 MR. ELLINGER: No. 4 CHAIRMAN HALL: Good morning. Let me 5 start with a couple of questions, and I guess -- I guess I'll direct these at you, Mr. Thompson, and 6 others can --7 8 (Laughter.) 9 MR. WOODSMALL: We previously agreed that all questions go to Kevin. 10 11 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Page 3 of the 12 stipulation concerning rate case expense, noting 13 that the parties agreed to the same mechanism that was used in 2014-0370, recovery of rate case --14 15 linking the recovery of rate case expense to the 16 percentage of its rate increase request found or 17 agreed to be just and reasonable. So the amount that the parties agreed 18 19 to as a revenue requirement increase was 20,000 -excuse me -- 20.39 million; is that correct? 20 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 21 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. What was the 22 23 initial request? 24 MR. THOMPSON: I don't have that with 25 me, sir.

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

Page 205 not going -- okay. 1 2 MR. THOMPSON: That's different from 3 whatever amount might be available to pay ongoing 4 expenses in that area. 5 MR. WOODSMALL: The vegetation management tracker was discontinued in the last 6 7 case, but there was still a balance that was 8 tracked that needed to be recovered. The 9 unamortized amount of that tracker is now 2.18 million and will be amortized over an 10 additional five years. So the tracker was 11 12 discontinued last case, and this is just kind of a 13 catchup. 14 CHAIRMAN HALL: So is that on top of 15 the revenue requirement? 16 MR. WOODSMALL: There is an amount in 17 the revenue requirement, not a specified amount, for vegetation management as well as all other 18 19 expenses, and this is an amount from previous 20 periods that's over and above that. MS. CARTER: These numbers do not 21 22 increase the revenue requirement, if that was the 23 question. 24 CHAIRMAN HALL: Moving to page 5, the 25 disclaimer language that's related to the solar

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

Page 207 that this language might disincentivize potential 1 ratepayers from attempting to utilize such a 2 3 system? 4 MS. MAYFIELD: To my knowledge, I 5 don't believe that is the case. I think we -- the intention behind the notice is to just put them on 6 7 notice that --8 CHAIRMAN HALL: I know that's the 9 intention, but I'm just wondering if that might serve to dis-- I guess I might look at the Division 10 of Energy for whether they believe that that could 11 12 disincentivize a ratepayer from putting in such a 13 system. 14 MR. ANTAL: I think theoretically it 15 possibly could. I don't have any analytical data 16 to show that such notices have. In the grand 17 scheme of things, this is something that we could live with. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HALL: This is a general 20 question, and it may illustrate some ignorance on my part, but I don't remember as much MEEIA issues 21 in other rate cases, and I'm wondering why in this 22 rate case we're setting forth what the MEEIA 23 24 programs are to be, costs, how to be treated, 25 et cetera, and why this is different than other

Page 208 1 rate cases. 2 MS. CARTER: Empire does not have a 3 MEEIA program in place. 4 CHAIRMAN HALL: So this is in lieu of 5 having a separate MEEIA program? MS. CARTER: Yes. These aren't 6 7 actually MEEIA programs. They're DSM programs. 8 CHAIRMAN HALL: Got you. That makes 9 complete sense. Okay. So turning to page 7, 10 paragraph F of 13, all the parties here agree that all these programs will have a term of not less 11 12 than two years so they can't be discontinued unilaterally by the utility, unlike other utilities 13 within the MEEIA programs, correct? 14 15 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir. 16 MS. CARTER: Correct. 17 CHAIRMAN HALL: That makes sense. Okay. Turning to the FAC on page 8 and 9. I'm 18 19 wondering how -- how this FAC treats transmission 20 compared to Ameren and KCP&L. MR. WOODSMALL: It's the same 21 22 mechanism. It's the same mechanism in that it looks at the percent of transmission used for 23 24 off-system sales versus native load. The 25 percentages are different, but it's the same

Page 209 formula. 1 2 CHAIRMAN HALL: Where does it say 3 that? How is that to be extrapolated from? 4 MR. WOODSMALL: Well, it --5 MS. CARTER: It's the top of page 9. MR. WOODSMALL: Right. The sentence 6 7 going from the bottom of page 8 to the top of 8 page 9 talks about the percentage of the MISO 9 transmission versus the SPP transmission costs. CHAIRMAN HALL: And so those 10 particular percentages, 50 and 34, correlate to the 11 12 same formula that we used in Ameren and KCP&L? 13 MR. WOODSMALL: Correct. CHAIRMAN HALL: So we are going to 14 allow transmission costs to flow through the FAC if 15 16 they are purchased power to serve native load and 17 true off-system sales; is that correct? MS. CARTER: That is the intent. 18 19 MR. WOODSMALL: The percentages are 20 the same as in the last case because the numbers haven't changed much, but it is the same formula. 21 CHAIRMAN HALL: Turning to rate 22 23 design, there's two provisions here that I'm 24 wondering how they are to be reconciled. One says 25 for the LP class, the volumetric energy charges

		Page 210
1	shall not be increased as part of this case. And	
2	then a couple of paragraphs later on page 10 it	
3	says, after these adjustments, including setting	
4	the residential customer charge, all remaining	
5	rates within each class shall be increased by the	
6	same percentage. How are those how are those	
7	reconciled?	
8	MR. WOODSMALL: I can see a little	
9	bit of confusion, discrepancy there. I can tell	
10	you the way that it has been handled within the	
11	tariffs, if you look at the tariffs that were filed	
12	yesterday or was that Monday? Anyway, the	
13	tariffs that were filed for the LP class, the	
14	energy charges remain the same, and the entirety of	
15	the rate increase is on the other components.	
16	CHAIRMAN HALL: And I've not reviewed	
17	those tariffs, but I assume that those tariffs	
18	would show and this agreement contemplates	
19	declining block rates in the in the winter	
20	season for residential; is that correct?	
21	MR. WOODSMALL: I don't know what the	
22	numbers are, but it maintains the current rate	
23	design and says that the parties will study it.	
24	CHAIRMAN HALL: Which is?	
25	MS. CARTER: It maintains the same	

Page 211 one step down that we discussed last time we were 1 before you, 2 to 3 cents. 2 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. But the 3 4 parties have agreed for the next rate case to study 5 the issue and develop an analysis regarding 6 responsible energy use as related to residential block rates? I assume that's what the parties are 7 8 focused on there. So there's at least an 9 acknowledgement by the parties to consider some 10 kind of level or possible declining block rates in order to promote conservation. Is that how --11 12 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir. 13 MS. MAYFIELD: Correct. 14 MR. ANTAL: That's our understanding. 15 CHAIRMAN HALL: Good. One more thing 16 I like. Okay. I do have another question about on 17 page 7, paragraph 13H, it says, If the Commission orders a low-income rate pilot program in this 18 19 case, the cost of the program will receive 20 regulatory asset rate case treatment as specified 21 in paragraph 15. To me, that looks like -- well, it's 22 23 an agreement by the parties as to how to fund a 24 program if the Commission so orders one, correct? 25 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

Page 212 CHAIRMAN HALL: Is it realistic --1 and maybe I need to -- I'll start with Mr. Thompson 2 3 and then go to Ms. Carter and go from there. But 4 is it possible that, should the Commission order a 5 low-income rate pilot program, that the parties could put one together in time for us to approve it 6 7 when we approve the stipulation? 8 MR. THOMPSON: I believe the parties 9 probably could. MS. CARTER: I think it would be hard 10 to get it ready in time to approve this stip. We 11 12 were discussing before we went on the record, 13 because if you don't approve this stip, then we have to have a hearing. But I think we could put 14 something together before you need to approve the 15 16 tariffs. 17 If you could approve the stipulation and direct us to create a low-income pilot tariff 18 19 program, we then would have time before compliance 20 tariffs would need to be approved. CHAIRMAN HALL: Judge, does that make 21 22 sense? 23 JUDGE BURTON: Yes. 24 MR. WOODSMALL: The only thing I'd 25 add is, as far as doing a low-income pilot, I think

Page 213 that can be done. As you heard in the last 1 hearing, the problem is, would it be an efficient 2 3 low-income pilot? That's the problem we have is 4 how to structure it so that it's efficient, so that 5 it meets whatever goals it's designed to do. 6 Empire was saying the last hearing 7 that we previously had a low-income pilot and it 8 was terminated because it wasn't efficient. And I don't know how you measure efficiencies. But the 9 problem is structuring one to meet whatever goals, 10 policies you may set forth. 11 12 CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, if the -- if 13 the goal is affordability, which I -- I mean, I think that is the overall goal of a low-income 14 tariff. If that's the goal and we let the parties 15 16 try to work one out, then we see if it works and 17 that's the definition of a pilot. I mean, speaking for myself, I would 18 19 not want to require a low-income pilot if the 20 parties could not agree to one. MR. WOODSMALL: At this point we 21 haven't agreed to one, just because we are 22 23 uncertain -- I can't say just because, but I think 24 in part because we are uncertain as to what the Commission wants policy-wise with a low-income 25

Page 214 program. There was talk, I believe Dr. Marke was 1 2 talking in the last case, and it might have been 3 Empire was talking in the last case that there were 4 problems when people exited the low-income pilot 5 being less able to pay their bills. 6 So, I mean, what are we trying to 7 accomplish here? If we're trying to accomplish 8 just throwing money at it and make rates more 9 affordable for some people, that's easy to do. If 10 we're trying to accomplish more help them through a rough time, make them better able going forward to 11 12 pay these rates, that takes something more. CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. It's the 13 first. It's not the second from my perspective. I 14 don't know -- I don't think it's possible to 15 16 formulate one that accomplishes your second goal 17 there. MR. WOODSMALL: And I don't have any 18 19 thoughts on that either. I don't know. 20 CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, we don't need to resolve the issue here if the -- if the 21 Commission were to decide to ask the parties to put 22 one together, then we could see what comes out of 23 24 that and then make a decision. 25 MR. WOODSMALL: When you say see what

		Page 215
1	comes out of that, that's a problem. What are we	
2	trying to measure? If the goal is solely	
3	affordability, why measure anything? I mean, by	
4	its very nature, you give someone money, you're	
5	making it easier for them to pay their bills. When	
6	you say see what comes out of that, what do you	
7	want us to measure?	
8	CHAIRMAN HALL: Similar to what we	
9	ordered in the Missouri American case, I think we	
10	would be looking to see how many how many	
11	ratepayers participated, what the cost of the	
12	program was, what the impact was on bad debt, and	
13	then also an understanding well, and then also	
14	looking at how many people had their service cut	
15	off, what the costs were related to that. I mean,	
16	think there's a whole host of things that we could	
17	learn from it that would be a value.	
18	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Mr. Chairman,	
19	can I	
20	CHAIRMAN HALL: Absolutely.	
21	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: We discussed	
22	this earlier, the questions that the Chairman just	
23	had. Didn't Empire say that they that their	
24	findings when they did their pilot program, that	
25	when those that were on the program got back off	

		Page 216
1	the program, that their bad debt situations	
2	increased? I mean, you had more so the	
3	determination was there was no cause and effect.	
4	MS. CARTER: It was say you take a	
5	person here, their situation in terms of paying	
6	their bills improves while they're on the program,	
7	but then after the program, they drop to below	
8	their starting point on ability to pay.	
9	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: There was no	
10	MR. WOODSMALL: There's no going-	
11	forward benefit for the other ratepayers.	
12	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Just used the	
13	money somewhere else. So when the money wasn't	
14	there, they'd gotten established in using that	
15	money elsewhere, so they didn't pay their bills?	
16	MS. CARTER: From Empire's	
17	standpoint, I would say what we would be looking	
18	for, since there wasn't consensus, and we spent a	
19	lot of time trying for consensus on this issue so	
20	we could put something forward. All the parties	
21	worked very hard to find that, and we didn't reach	
22	it. What we would be looking for from the	
23	Commission is an order, a directive to do and	
24	possibly a certain amount of money, and then	
25	possibly put it to us to design how it works within	
1		

Page 217 those directives. If you were to give us, you have 1 to do this with this dollar amount, then I think 2 3 the parties could work together on how to design 4 that. 5 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Dr. Marke, was it your testimony that we shouldn't jump into 6 7 something like this? I can't recall what you had 8 talked about. I know in past cases you had some 9 testimony. DR. MARKE: Yes, Commissioner, that 10 was my general sentiment. If I may, we have been 11 12 in discussions based off of the feedback that we received from the last on-the-record from 13 Commissioner Rupp about the low-income on-bill 14 financing program. We're actually set to meet as a 15 16 collaborative on July 5th to discuss that program 17 going forward. And we received interest from the Federal Government as well, the Federal Department 18 19 of Energy, as far as possible assistance in that. 20 So I would offer that there is being -- there is work being done on our side 21 collectively to at least address part of the 22 23 low-income. 24 MS. CARTER: And that's in our DSM section, that's one of the new pro-- possible new 25

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

Page 218

		Page 219
1	looking for you to tell us to do this.	
2	MS. CARTER: Two separate parts. We	
3	responded to your particular questions last time we	
4	were before you with regard to the PAYS program,	
5	and so that is already in the works. And assuming	
6	it works for Empire, and that's why we're having	
7	the meetings, and works for everyone else, then	
8	that would be put in place on January 1st, 2017.	
9	That is not a straight low-income pilot program.	
10	If the Commission is also wanting	
11	more like what happened in Missouri American Water	
12	Company's case where it's more just a straight	
13	discount for people who qualify for that based on	
14	income, that is something we would need you to	
15	order the parties to do.	
16	COMMISSIONER RUPP: So in the absence	
17	of us issuing an order ordering you to do PAYS, are	
18	you going to do something of that nature if it	
19	actually works for everyone?	
20	MS. VUYLSTEKE: Yes.	
21	COMMISSIONER RUPP: So you will be	
22	doing something of that nature?	
23	MS. CARTER: It is already in motion	
24	to see what exactly will work for Empire and	
25	Empire's customers.	

Page 220 1 COMMISSIONER RUPP: And you're confident that you can get an agreement on that 2 3 program to move forward? 4 MS. CARTER: Yes. We already have 5 that agreement. CHAIRMAN HALL: Commissioner Stoll? 6 7 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Not on this 8 issue specifically. 9 CHAIRMAN HALL: If we were to instruct the parties to put together a low-income 10 pilot, what is a dollar amount that the company 11 12 believes is reasonable? MS. CARTER: I do not have that. The 13 company did not give me a number that they thought 14 15 was reasonable in order for me to answer that 16 question right now. That is something certainly we could look into and I could do some sort of 17 pleading to answer that. 18 19 CHAIRMAN HALL: Why do you believe 20 that it's necessary for us, for the Commission to set that dollar amount? Why couldn't that dollar 21 amount also be subject to the negotiation of the 22 23 parties? 24 MS. CARTER: We certainly could do that. Just based on the discussions we had, 25

		Page 221
1	agreement wasn't reached. Different interests from	
2	different parties, and it seemed like this was	
3	something that was going to need to come from the	
4	Commission.	
5	CHAIRMAN HALL: Is there any does	
6	any lawyer in the room believe that if the	
7	Commission were to order the parties to put	
8	together a low-income tariff, that that is in any	
9	way inconsistent with the stipulation, the	
10	agreement amongst all the parties set forth in this	
11	agreement?	
12	MR. WOODSMALL: I wouldn't say it's	
13	inconsistent. If the Commission came out and said	
14	we want a low-income program that costs	
15	\$20 million, we might have some pushback then, but	
16	reasonable numbers, I don't think it would be	
17	inconsistent.	
18	I know your next question's going to	
19	be, well, what is a reasonable number? I don't	
20	know. I'll know it when I see it. But I think if	
21	it's consistent in magnitude with what was done in	
22	previous cases, which we agreed to, I think it	
23	would be consistent with the spirit of this	
24	stipulation.	
25	MR. ELLINGER: Unless there was some	

Page 222 provision in the low-income program would violate 1 some other provision in the stipulation, such as 2 3 maybe it would have an impact upon weatherization, 4 on energy efficiency, things of that type, because 5 those programs can inherently have a negative impact on some of those provisions. 6 7 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: When we ordered that in the Ameren case, I think the testimony was 8 based off of LIHEAP, and I think they said they had 9 10 about 17,000 individuals encompassing their entire service territory. And I know we set it up, for 11 12 instance, to come up with a certain area. 13 Now, does Empire have an idea of, in some of your communities that have a higher 14 percentage of LIHEAP individuals, what that might 15 16 be numbers in certain areas? 17 MS. CARTER: Empire is a little different than Missouri American Water Company 18 because Empire doesn't have so many different 19 20 service areas. It would be a little harder to pick out a particular community, unless you went with, 21 for example, Reed Spring or Joplin. It would 22 probably be more of their customers involved. 23 They 24 do LIHEAP obviously, and I think the last time we 25 were here Division of Energy had those numbers

Page 223 1 perhaps. 2 MR. ANTAL: So the poverty rates for 3 the counties that Empire serves are in the 4 testimony of DE witness Sharlet Kroll, the average 5 for those counties is just over 19 percent, which is higher than the state average, which is 15.4, I 6 believe, maybe 15.5. 7 8 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I just have a 9 couple questions. First of all, on page 7D on the 10 PAYS program, is legislation needed in Missouri for this to go forward or has that legislation already 11 12 been passed? Is there some -- is legislation 13 needed to adopt a PAYS program? If I had thought of this earlier, I would have looked it up. Does 14 anybody know? Maybe not. I mean --15 16 MR. WOODSMALL: I don't think so. 17 COMMISSIONER STOLL: You don't think 18 so? 19 MR. WOODSMALL: Especially if the 20 parties all agree to it in this case. I don't 21 think it's necessary. COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Because I 22 23 recall we had a -- our Mid America Regulatory 24 meeting a couple weeks ago in Bismarck, and there 25 was a presentation made about the PAYS program, and

		Page 224
1	I I recall that there were certain states that	
2	had authorized, maybe set up this program, but I	
3	it was just general question and I'll look it up	
4	myself and see if it is required. So to your	
5	knowledge, Commissioner Kenney, are you aware of	
6	that?	
7	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I'm aware. I'm	
8	trying to think about what was in my packet of	
9	information that I put together.	
10	MR. WOODSMALL: I'm 99 percent	
11	certain there is no legislation that deals with	
12	PAYS currently in Missouri. The question then	
13	becomes whether we need that legislation. To	
14	implement what we're doing here, I don't think so.	
15	COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Well,	
16	when you do make that presentation, I like the	
17	idea. The presentation that we had at our MARC	
18	meeting was very good, and it seems like the	
19	program will accomplish a number of things in	
20	demand side management. So I'll look forward to	
21	hearing about that when you when a presentation	
22	is made at a Commission agenda.	
23	The other question I have would be,	
24	on page 3, under depreciation, it says Empire in	
25	the last sentence, Empire will no longer engage in	
1		

		Page 225
1	the process of discontinuing depreciation on assets	
2	when reserves are equal to or higher than original	
3	costs. I think I know what that means, but could	
4	somebody explain that to me? Anyone.	
5	MR. WOODSMALL: I'll take a shot at	
6	it. I'm no depreciation expert, that's for sure.	
7	COMMISSIONER STOLL: I'm always glad	
8	to hear that, that people that I think know an	
9	awful lot have difficulty with these.	
10	MR. WOODSMALL: Well, I don't even	
11	know an awful lot.	
12		
13	COMMISSIONER STOLL: Go right ahead.	
14	MR. WOODSMALL: So what happens is,	
15	let's say you have an asset that is \$100 when it's	
16	originally constructed, and you depreciate it over	
17	ten years. The company receives depreciation	
18	expense of \$10 a year. Well, what happens then in	
19	the 11th year if that asset is still around? You	
20	have \$10. Do you stop depreciating it at the	
21	when it gets to zero?	
22	What was happening before, as I	
23	understand it, was Empire would stop depreciation	
24	on that asset when it reached the initial plant in	
25	service amount. What this and if you stop	

Page 226 depreciation, you have a lesser expense, you have 1 2 profits go up. 3 So what this says is that the company 4 will no longer stop depreciation. The reserve will 5 continue to grow so that the reserve is greater than the original plant in service amount. That 6 7 leads to questions. What do you do with that 8 excess reserve in future cases? Do you apply it to other accounts? 9 10 Those questions aren't addressed here. It just says that they will continue 11 12 depreciation on that asset until the Commission 13 does something. 14 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Thanks 15 for that explanation. 16 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: That's an 17 approved accounting method? Looking back there at the --18 19 MR. WOODSMALL: I'm going to need 20 some help on that one. COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Yeah. 21 That's 22 why I'm looking --23 MR. OLIGSCHLAEGER: Yes. The 24 standard depreciation accounting followed by most 25 utilities in the state is they keep on booking

Page 227 amounts to depreciation even if the account it 1 2 question or the category of -- broad category of 3 accounts in question is fully depreciated. And 4 that is necessary to make sure customers get the 5 benefit of all amounts they pay in to the company in the form of depreciation expense. Just because 6 7 an asset may be fully depreciated on its books 8 doesn't mean the customers stop paying depreciation 9 on it at that exact time. Basically it would have to wait until the next rate case to reflect that 10 11 change. 12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you. 13 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I failed to look over to the left and realize that we do have a 14 depreciation expert in the room, Mr. Oligschlaeger. 15 16 MR. OLIGSCHLAEGER: There's 17 Mr. Robinett here, too. COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Thank you 18 19 very much. I have no additional questions. 20 JUDGE BURTON: I just had a few follow-up questions. It looks as if all the 21 parties agree to the admission of prefiled 22 23 testimony. Nothing was excluded, correct? 24 MR. WOODSMALL: And that's contingent 25 on approval of the stipulation. If we have to go

Page 228 to hearing, then that will all happen later. 1 2 And this may be a good time. As I 3 understand it, the Commission set aside next 4 Tuesday for a hearing. So we need to know quickly 5 if the Commission has problems with the 6 stipulation. JUDGE BURTON: Thank you, 7 8 Mr. Woodsmall. As a follow-up for the potential 9 for a pilot program for low-income, could someone 10 identify what the amount was that was set aside in the prior Empire pilot program for low-income? 11 12 DR. MARKE: Your Honor, it's in the 13 report. I want to say it's in the annual budget of roughly half a million. It never got close to that 14 amount in any given year. So that money just 15 16 rolled over each successive year. 17 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you, Dr. Marke. And there was obviously discussion about --18 19 DR. MARKE: And -- I'm sorry. That 20 money there, just to be clear for some of the other programs, that was half ratepayer dollars and half 21 22 shareholder dollars. 23 JUDGE BURTON: Thank you for that clarification. And there was discussion about the 24 25 potential in the settlement agreement for a

Page 229 presentation in the future to the Commission on the 1 2 PAYS program. It's indicated that this would be 3 part of any program that would be implemented to go 4 into effect on January 1st, 2017. 5 If the PAYS or any other comparable 6 program is submitted by the company, when is the 7 company projecting to actually have a presentation 8 on this? 9 MS. CARTER: We have not gotten that 10 far. 11 JUDGE BURTON: So it would probably 12 be in the fall? 13 MS. CARTER: Yes. The idea would be for 30-day tariff filings for the new DSM programs, 14 with the hope that those would just go into effect 15 16 then in 30 days, and we would have a presentation 17 to the Commission around that same time period. JUDGE BURTON: Okay. Thank you. Are 18 19 there any further questions from the Commission? 20 Would the parties like to add any final comments? All right. Seeing none. 21 Then I will just go ahead and say, I 22 know that next Monday is the 4th of July, and as 23 24 you were discussing, Mr. Woodsmall, we actually 25 have July 5th as a potential date. I believe there

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

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

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

100.16 202.25	202.11.20	210.15	Court 200.14	224.24 225.1 6
199:16 202:25	202:11,20	210:15	Court 200:14	224:24 225:1,6
203:1,4,11,22	211:17,24	concern 206:25	cover 204:12	225:17,23
204:3,6 205:14	212:4 213:25	concerning	craft 218:16	226:1,4,12,24
205:24 206:2,4	214:22 216:23	203:12 204:9	create 212:18	227:1,6,8,15
206:17,21,23	218:9,24	concluded	CSR 199:22	Deputy 201:1
206:25 207:8	219:10 220:20	230:13	231:17	design 209:23
207:19 208:4,8	221:4,7,13	concludes 230:9	current 210:22	210:23 216:25
208:17 209:2	224:22 226:12	confident 220:2	currently	217:3
209:10,14,22	228:3,5 229:1	confusion 210:9	202:12 206:14	designated
210:16,24	229:17,19	CONRAD 200:8	224:12	204:18
211:3,15 212:1	Commissioner	consensus	customer 210:4	designed 213:5
212:21 213:12	204:19,25	216:18,19	customers	determination
214:13,20	215:18,21	conservation	199:12 219:25	216:3
215:8,18,20,22	216:9,12 217:5	211:11	222:23 227:4,8	Deutsch 200:18
220:6,9,19	217:10,14	consider 211:9	cut 215:14	develop 211:5
221:5	218:2,18,22	consistent	CYDNEY 201:1	DIANA 200:2
change 227:11	219:16,21	221:21,23	D	different 205:2
changed 209:21	220:1,6,7	constructed		207:25 208:25
changes 206:15	222:7 223:8,17	225:16	D 202:1	221:1,2 222:18
charge 210:4	223:22 224:5,7	contemplates	DANIEL 199:16	222:19
charges 209:25	224:15 225:7	210:18	data 207:15	difficulty 225:9
210:14	225:13 226:14	contingent	date 202:11	direct 203:6
Chief 201:6	226:16,21	227:24	229:25 230:4	212:18
City 199:8 200:4	227:12,13,18	continue 226:5	DAVID 200:13	directive 216:23
200:9,14,19,21	Commissioners	226:11	david.woodsm	directives 217:1
200:23 201:3,8	199:18 202:21	correct 202:17	200:15	dis 207:10
231:15	230:1	203:20,21	days 229:16	disclaimer
clarification	communities	208:14,16	DE 223:4	205:25 206:1,5
228:24	222:14	209:13,17	deals 224:11	206:10,18,19
class 209:25	community	210:20 211:13	debt 215:12	discontinued
210:5,13	222:21	211:24 227:23	216:1	204:9,24 205:6
clear 228:20	company 199:11	231:12	decide 214:22	205:12 208:12
close 228:14	200:7 220:11	correlate 209:11	decision 214:24	discontinuing
Cole 231:4,16	220:14 222:18	cost 206:15	declining 210:19	225:1
collaborative	225:17 226:3	211:19 215:11	211:10	discount 219:13
217:16	227:5 229:6,7	costs 207:24	definition	discrepancy
collectively	Company's	209:9,15	213:17	210:9
217:22	199:13 202:6	215:15 221:14	demand 224:20	discuss 217:16
come 218:3,6,17	219:12	225:3	Department	discussed 211:1
218:20,25	comparable	Counsel 201:1,1	217:18	215:21
221:3 222:12	229:5	201:4,6,6	depreciate	discussing
comes 214:23	compared	206:3	225:16	212:12 229:24
215:1,6	208:20	counsels 202:19	depreciated	discussion
comments	complete 208:9	counties 223:3,5	227:3,7	228:18,24
218:24 229:20	compliance	County 231:4,16	depreciating	230:1
Commission	212:19	couple 203:5	225:20	discussions
199:2 201:7,10	components	210:2 223:9,24	depreciation	217:12 220:25
	l		l	

disincentivize	214:3 215:23	explaining	formulate	221:3,18
207:1,12	219:6,24	218:11	214:16	226:19
District 199:10	222:13,17,19	explanation	forth 207:23	going- 216:10
200:6 202:5	223:3 224:24	226:15	213:11 221:10	good 203:4
Division 200:22	224:25 225:23	extrapolated	231:10	211:15 224:18
200:24 207:10	228:11	209:3	forward 204:11	228:2
222:25	Empire's 216:16		214:11 216:11	gotten 216:14
doing 212:25	219:25	F	216:20 217:17	229:9
219:22 224:14	encompassing	F 208:10 231:2	220:3 223:11	Government
dollar 217:2	222:10	FAC 208:18,19	224:20	217:18
220:11,21,21	energy 200:11	209:15	found 203:16	grand 207:16
dollars 228:21	200:22,24	failed 227:13	front 206:13	greater 226:5
228:22	207:11 209:25	fall 229:12	full 231:12	grow 226:5
Dr 206:7,21,24	210:14 211:6	far 212:25	fully 227:3,7	guess 203:5,6
214:1 217:5,10	217:19 222:4	217:19 229:10	fund 211:23	207:10
218:11 228:12	222:25	Feddersen	further 229:19	
228:17,19	engage 224:25	199:22 231:5	future 206:14	$\frac{\mathbf{H}}{\mathbf{H}}$
drop 216:7	England 200:2	231:17	226:8 229:1	half 228:14,21
DSM 208:7	entire 222:10	Federal 217:18		228:21
217:24 218:15	entirety 210:14	217:18	$\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\mathbf{G}}$	Hall 199:16
229:14	equal 225:2	feedback 217:12	G 202:1	203:1,4,11,22
E	ER-2016-0023	File 199:11	general 202:7	204:3,6 205:14
	199:11 202:8	202:8	207:19 217:11	205:24 206:2,4
E 202:1,1 231:2	Especially	filed 210:11,13	224:3	206:17,21,23
231:2	223:19	filings 229:14 final 229:20	Geoff 206:7	206:25 207:8
earlier 215:22 218:24 223:14	established		give 215:4 217:1	207:19 208:4,8
easier 215:5	216:14	financing 217:15	218:15,19 220:14	208:17 209:2 209:10,14,22
East 200:3,18	et 207:25	find 204:6	given 228:15	210:16,24
easy 214:9	evidentiary	216:21	231:15	210.10,24 211:3,15 212:1
effect 216:3	230:6	findings 215:24	glad 225:7	212:21 213:12
229:4,15	exact 227:9	firm 231:6	go 202:4 203:10	212.21 213.12 214:13,20
efficiencies	exactly 219:24	first 214:14	212:3,3 218:4	214.13,20 215:8,20 220:6
213:9	example 222:22	223:9	212:3,3 218:4	220:9,19 221:5
efficiency 222:4	excess 226:8	five 204:21	225:13 226:2	handled 210:10
efficient 213:2,4	excluded 227:23	205:11	227:25 229:3	happen 228:1
213:8	excuse 203:20	fixed 206:12	229:15,22	happened
either 214:19	exited 214:4	flow 209:15	230:2	219:11
electric 199:10	expense 203:12 203:15 204:13	focused 211:8	goal 213:13,14	happening
199:12 200:6	205:13 204:13 225:18 226:1	follow-up	213:15 214:16	225:22
202:5,7	227:6	227:21 228:8	215:2218:21	happens 225:14
ELLINGER	expenses 205:4	followed 226:24	213.2 210.21	225:18
200:17 203:3	205:19	foregoing	goals 213:5,10	happy 202:23
221:25	expert 225:6	231:12	going 204:11,22	hard 212:10
	227:15	form 227:6	205:1 209:7,14	216:21
Empire 199:10			,1	
Empire 199:10 200:6 202:5		formula 209:1	214:11 217:17	harder 222:20
Empire 199:10 200:6 202:5 208:2 213:6	explain 204:11 225:4	formula 209:1 209:12,21	214:11 217:17 218:19 219:18	harder 222:20 hear 225:8

heard 213:1	222:15	jurisdictions	left 227:14	210:13
hearing 199:6	information	206:9	Legal 201:6	
212:14 213:2,6	224:9		legislation	M
218:3 224:21	infrastructure	K	223:10,11,12	M 199:17
228:1,4 230:4	204:18	K 199:22 231:5	224:11,13	Madison 201:2
230:6,9	inherently 222:5	231:17	lesser 226:1	201:8
help 214:10	initial 203:23	Kansas 200:9	let's 202:4	magnitude
226:20	204:5 225:24	KCP&L 208:20	225:15	221:21
High 200:18	instance 222:12	209:12	level 211:10	maintains
higher 222:14	instruct 220:10	keep 226:25	lieu 208:4	210:22,25
223:6 225:2	intent 209:18	Kellene 199:22	LIHEAP 222:9	making 215:5
holiday 230:11	intention 207:6	231:5,17	222:15,24	management
Honor 228:12	207:9	Kenney 199:17	line 204:13	205:6,18
hope 229:15	interest 217:17	204:19,25	linking 203:15	224:20
230:10	interests 221:1	215:18,21	Litigation	MARC 200:17
host 215:16	investment	216:9,12 217:5	199:22 231:7	224:17
	206:12,13	222:7 224:5,7	little 210:8	Marke 206:7,21
I	involved 222:23	226:16,21	222:17,20	206:24 214:1
idea 222:13	issue 202:23	227:12	live 207:18	217:5,10
224:17 229:13	211:5 214:21	Kevin 201:6	load 208:24	218:11 228:12
identify 228:10	216:19 220:8	203:10	209:16	228:17,19
ignorance	230:3	KIM 199:15	longer 224:25	matter 199:10
207:20	issues 207:21	kind 205:12	226:4	202:5
illustrate 207:20	issuing 219:17	211:10	look 207:10	matters 230:7
impact 206:15	item 204:13	know 206:17	210:11 218:5,7	MAYFIELD
215:12 222:3,6		207:8 210:21	220:17 224:3	201:1 206:2,6
implement	J	213:9 214:15	224:20 227:13	207:4 211:13
202:6 224:14	JAMIE 201:6	214:19 217:8	looked 223:14	mean 213:13,18
implemented	January 218:1	221:18,20,20	looking 215:10	214:6 215:3,15
229:3	218:16 219:8	222:11 223:15	215:14 216:17	216:2 223:15
improves 216:6	229:4	225:3,8,11	216:22 219:1	227:8
included 206:19	Jefferson 199:8	228:4 229:23	226:17,22	means 225:3
including 210:3	200:4,14,19,23	knowledge	looks 208:23	meant 206:23
income 219:14	201:3,8 231:16	207:4 224:5	211:22 227:21	measure 213:9
inconsistent	joinder 202:15	Kroll 223:4	lot 216:19 225:9	215:2,3,7
221:9,13,17	Joplin 200:21		225:11	MECG 200:16
increase 202:7	222:22	L	lovely 230:11	mechanism
203:16,19	Judge 199:15	language 205:25	low-income	203:13 208:22
205:22 210:15	202:4 212:21	206:18,22	211:18 212:5	208:22
increased 210:1	212:23 227:20	207:1	212:18,25	MEEIA 207:21
210:5 216:2	228:7,17,23	Laughter 203:8	212:10,25	207:23 208:3,5
Increasing	229:11,18	Law 199:15	213:25 214:4	208:7,14
199:11	July 217:16	200:2,8,13,13	217:14,23	meet 213:10
indicated	229:23,25	200:17,22	219:9 220:10	217:15
202:19 229:2	jump 217:6	lawyer 221:6	221:8,14 222:1	meeting 223:24
individuals	June 199:7	leads 226:7	228:9,11	224:18
206:11 222:10	202:12	learn 215:17	LP 209:25	meetings 219:7

meets 213:5	228:4 230:6,8	217:13 230:12	204:13,15,17	norgonally
	· · · ·		204:13,13,17 206:10 209:11	personally 231:8
method 226:17	needed 205:8	ongoing 205:3		
MEUA 202:15	223:10,13	OPC 206:4	219:3 222:21	perspective
Mid 223:23	negative 222:5	opening 203:1	parties 202:13	214:14
Midwest 199:22	negotiation	order 211:11	202:17,18	pick 222:20
200:11 231:6	220:22	212:4 216:23	203:13,18	pilot 211:18
million 203:20	never 228:14	218:4 219:15	208:10 210:23	212:5,18,25
205:10 221:15	new 217:25,25	219:17 220:15	211:4,7,9,23	213:3,7,17,19
228:14	218:15,16	221:7	212:5,8 213:15	214:4 215:24
MISO 209:8	229:14	ordered 215:9	213:20 214:22	219:9 220:11
Missouri 199:1	nice 218:22	222:7	216:20 217:3	228:9,11
199:8,13	notes 231:13	ordering 219:17	219:15 220:10	place 208:3
200:22 201:7	notice 206:11	orders 211:18	220:23 221:2,7	218:12 219:8
201:10 206:23	207:6,7 230:3	211:24	221:10 223:20	231:9,14
215:9 219:11	notices 207:16	original 225:2	227:22 229:20	plant 225:24
222:18 223:10	notified 230:5	226:6	230:5	226:6
224:12 231:3	noting 203:12	originally	parties' 202:9	pleading 220:18
231:16	number 220:14	225:16	parts 219:2	point 213:21
MO 200:4,9,14	221:19 224:19	overall 206:15	passed 223:12	216:8
200:19,23	numbers 205:21	213:14	paulb@brydo	policies 213:11
201:3,8	209:20 210:22		200:5	policy-wise
Monday 210:12	221:16 222:16	$\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\mathbf{P}}$	pay 205:3 214:5	213:25
229:23	222:25	P 199:17 202:1	214:12 215:5	possible 211:10
money 214:8		P.C 200:2	216:8,15 227:5	212:4 214:15
215:4 216:13	0	P.O 200:3,23	paying 216:5	217:19,25
216:13,15,24	O 202:1	201:2,7	227:8	possibly 207:15
228:15,20	obviously	packet 224:8	PAYS 219:4,17	216:24,25
morning 203:4	222:24 228:18	page 203:11	223:10,13,25	potential 207:1
motion 219:23	off-system	204:8,9,20	224:12 229:2,5	228:8,25
move 220:3	208:24 209:17	205:24 208:9	Penntower	229:25 230:4
moving 204:8,9	offer 217:20	208:18 209:5,7	200:9	poverty 223:2
205:24	office 200:13	209:8 210:2	people 214:4,9	power 209:16
MYERS 201:6	201:1,4 206:3	211:17 223:9	215:14 219:13	prefiled 227:22
	231:15	224:24	225:8	present 202:22
<u> </u>	Officer 200:9	paragraph	percent 204:5	231:8
N 202:1	okay 203:11,22	208:10 211:17	208:23 223:5	presentation
native 208:24	204:6,8 205:1	211:21	224:10	202:3,13
209:16	208:9,18 211:3	paragraphs	percentage	223:25 224:16
nature 215:4	211:16 223:22	210:2	203:16 209:8	224:17,21
219:18,22	224:15 226:14	parameters	210:6 222:15	229:1,7,16
necessary	227:18 229:18	218:5	percentages	230:13
220:20 223:21	Oligschlaeger	part 207:21	208:25 209:11	Presiding
227:4	226:23 227:15	210:1 213:24	209:19	199:15
need 212:2,15	227:16	217:22 229:3	period 204:21	previous 205:19
212:20 214:20	on-bill 217:14	participated	229:17	221:22
219:14 221:3	on-the-record	215:11	periods 205:20	previously
224:13 226:19	202:2,13	particular	person 216:5	203:9 213:7
			=	

nuton 229.11	221.15	210.10 211.7	magnage 202.6 21	agring 212.6
prior 228:11	221:15	210:19 211:7	request 202:6,21	saying 213:6
pro 217:25	put 207:6 212:6	211:10 214:8	203:16,23	says 204:20
probably 212:9	212:14 214:22	214:12 223:2	204:5	209:24 210:3
222:23 229:11	216:20,25	reach 216:21	require 213:19	210:23 211:17
problem 213:2,3	218:12 219:8	reached 221:1	required 224:4	218:4,23
213:10 215:1	220:10 221:7	225:24	requirement	224:24 226:3
problems 214:4	224:9	read 218:23	203:19 204:16	226:11
228:5	puts 206:10	ready 212:11	204:17 205:15	Sbell@bbdlc.c
proceedings	putting 207:12	realistic 212:1	205:17,22	200:20
199:5 231:8,11	PV 206:11,15	realize 227:14	reserve 226:4,5	scheme 207:17
process 225:1	0	reasonable	226:8	SCOTT 199:18
profits 226:2		203:17 204:7	reserves 225:2	season 210:20
program 208:3	qualify 219:13	220:12,15	residential	second 214:14
208:5 211:18	question 205:23	221:16,19	210:4,20 211:6	214:16
211:19,24	206:8 207:20	rebates 206:1	resolve 214:21	section 217:25
212:5,19 214:1	211:16 220:16	recall 217:7	responded	see 202:25 210:8
215:12,24,25	224:3,12,23	223:23 224:1	219:3	213:16 214:23
216:1,6,7	227:2,3	receive 211:19	response 218:12	214:25 215:6
217:15,16	question's	received 217:13	responsible	215:10 219:24
218:20 219:4,9	221:18	217:17	211:6	221:20 224:4
220:3 221:14	questions	receives 225:17	revenue 203:19	Seeing 229:21
222:1 223:10	202:20,22,25	reconciled	204:15,16	sense 208:9,17
223:13,25	203:5,10	209:24 210:7	205:15,17,22	212:22
224:2,19 228:9	215:22 219:3	record 202:4,9	reviewed 210:16	sentence 209:6
228:11 229:2,3	223:9 226:7,10	212:12 230:8	right 209:6	224:25
229:6	227:19,21	230:11	220:16 225:13	sentiment
programs	229:19	recovered 205:8	229:21 230:9	217:11
207:24 208:7,7	quickly 228:4	recovery 203:14	rmitten@bry	separate 208:5
208:11,14	quite 204:7	203:15	200:5	219:2
218:1,15,16	R	Reed 222:22	Robinett 227:17	serve 207:10
222:5 228:21		reflect 227:10	rolled 228:16	209:16
229:14	R 202:1 231:2	regard 219:4	room 206:7	serves 223:3
projecting 229:7	rate 202:7	regarding 211:5	221:6 227:15	service 199:2,12
promote 211:11	203:12,14,15	regulatory	rough 214:11	199:13 201:7
proposed	203:16 206:14	199:15 211:20	roughly 228:14	201:10 202:7
202:14 206:6	207:22,23	223:23	RPR 199:22	215:14 222:11
Provided 199:12	208:1 209:22	related 205:25	231:17	222:20 225:25
provision 222:1	210:15,22	211:6 215:15	Rupp 199:18	226:6
222:2	211:4,18,20	remain 210:14	217:14 218:2	Services 199:22
provisions	212:5 227:10	remaining 210:4	218:18,22	231:7
209:23 222:6	ratepayer	remarks 203:2	219:16,21	set 202:11
Public 199:2	207:12 228:21	remember	220:1	213:11 217:15
201:1,1,4,5,7	ratepayers	207:21	~	220:21 221:10
201:10 206:3	207:2 215:11	report 228:13	S	222:11 224:2
purchased	216:11	REPORTED	S 199:15 202:1	228:3,10 231:9
209:16	rates 199:12	199:21	sales 208:24	setting 207:23
pushback	204:12 210:5	Reporter 231:6	209:17	210:3
		-		

settlement	231:3,16	Suite 200:18	216:14	209:9,9,15
204:14 228:25	states 206:9	201:2	thing 211:15	treated 206:14
shareholder	224:1	sure 225:6 227:4	212:24	207:24
228:22	Stenotype	230:5	things 207:17	treatment
Sharlet 223:4	231:11,13	Swearengen	215:16 222:4	211:20
sheet 231:10	step 211:1	200:2	224:19	treats 208:19
shorter 218:19	STEPHEN	system 206:16	think 207:5,14	true 209:17
Shorthand	199:17	207:3,13	212:10,14,25	231:12
231:6	stip 204:20	systems 206:11	212:10,14,23	try 213:16
shot 225:5	212:11,13	5ystems 200.11	213:11,25	218:13
show 207:16	218:23	Т	215:16 217:2	trying 214:6,7
210:18	stipulates	T 199:18 231:2	218:6 221:16	214:10 215:2
side 217:21	204:15	231:2	221:20,22	216:19 224:8
224:20	stipulation	take 216:4 225:5	222:8,9,24	Tuesday 228:4
similar 206:18	202:14,16	takes 214:12	223:16,17,21	turn 202:24
215:8	203:12 212:7	talk 214:1	224:8,14 225:3	turning 208:9
sir 203:25	212:17 221:9	talked 217:8	225:8 230:10	208:18 209:22
208:15 211:12	221:24 222:2	talking 214:2,3	Thompson	two 208:12
211:25	227:25 228:6	talks 209:8	201:6 203:6,21	209:23 219:2
situation 216:5	Stoll 199:17	tariff 212:18	203:24 204:14	two-thirds
situations 216:1	220:6,7 223:8	213:15 221:8	204:22 205:2	204:5
solar 205:25	223:17,22	229:14	208:15 211:12	type 222:4
solely 215:2	224:15 225:7	tariffs 199:11	211:25 212:2,8	
somebody 225:4	225:13 226:14	206:19 210:11	thought 220:14	U
sorry 228:19	227:13,18	210:11,13,17	223:13	unamortized
sort 220:17	stop 225:20,23	210:17 212:16	thoughts 214:19	205:9
speaking 213:18	225:25 226:4	212:20	throwing 214:8	Unanimous
specific 202:21	227:8	tell 210:9 218:7	time 202:10,24	202:15
202:23 206:8	straight 219:9	219:1	211:1 212:6,11	uncertain
specifically	219:12	ten 225:17	212:19 214:11	213:23,24
220:8	Street 200:18	term 208:11	216:19 218:13	understand
specified 205:17	201:2,8	terminated	218:14 219:3	225:23 228:3
211:20	structure 213:4	213:8	222:24 227:9	understanding
spent 216:18	structured	terms 216:5	228:2 229:17	211:14 215:13
spirit 221:23	218:15	territory 222:11	231:9,14	unilaterally
SPP 209:9	structuring	testimony 217:6	today's 230:9	208:13
Spring 222:22	213:10	217:9 222:8	top 205:14 209:5	United 206:9
ss 231:3	STUART 200:8	223:4 227:23	209:7	use 211:6
Staff 201:6,10	stucon@swcla	Thank 227:12	tracked 205:8	Users 200:11
standard 226:24	200:10	227:18 228:7	tracker 204:10	utilities 208:13
standpoint	study 210:23	228:17,23	204:23 205:6,9	226:25
216:17	211:4	229:18	205:11	utility 206:20
start 203:5	subject 220:22	Thanks 226:14	trackers 204:10	208:13
212:2	submitted	theoretically	transcript 199:5	utilize 207:2
starting 216:8	202:16 229:6	207:14	231:13	
state 199:1	successive	thereof 231:10	transmission	
223:6 226:25	228:16	they'd 202:23	208:19,23	value 215:17

vegetation	207:9,22	100 225:15	4th 229:23	9:57 230:13
0	207:9,22 208:19 209:24		4111 229:23	9:5 7 230:13 99 224:10
204:18 205:5 205:18	208:19 209:24 Woodsmall	1157 200:23 11th 225:19	5	99 224:10
			5 205:24	
vegetation/inf	200:13,13	1209 200:9	50 209:11	
204:10	203:9 204:1,4	13 208:10	573)634-2500	
versus 208:24	205:5,16	13H 211:17	200:19	
209:9	208:21 209:4,6	15 211:21	573)635-7166	
violate 222:1	209:13,19	15.4 223:6	200:4	
Volume 199:8	210:8,21	15.5 223:7	573)751-3234	
volumetric	212:24 213:21	17,000 222:10	201:9	
209:25	214:18,25	19 223:5	573)751-4857	
VUYLSTEKE	216:10 221:12	1st 218:1,16	201:3	
219:20	223:16,19	219:8 229:4	573)797-0005	
W	224:10 225:5	2	200:15	
wait 227:10	225:10,14			
want 227:10 want 213:19	226:19 227:24	2 211:2 2.18 205:10	5th 217:16 229:25 230:4	
215:7 218:3	228:8 229:24	20 221:15	229:23 230:4	
213.7 218.5 221:14 228:13	work 213:16	20,000 203:19	6	
	217:3,21	20,000 203.19 20.39 203:20	64111 200:9	
wanting 219:10 wants 213:25	218:14 219:24	20.39 203:20 200 201:2,8	650 201:2	
218:9	worked 216:21	200 201:2,8 2014-0370	65101 200:14	
	works 213:16	2014-0370 203:14	65101-3237	
wasn't 213:8	216:25 219:5,6		200:19	
216:13,18 221:1	219:7,19	2016 199:7	65102 200:23	
	wouldn't 221:12	202:12	201:8	
Water 219:11	<u> </u>	2017 218:16	65102-0456	
222:18		219:8 229:4	200:4	
way 206:13	<u> </u>	2230 201:2	65102-2230	
210:10 218:23	Y 199:16	29 199:7 29th 202:12	201:3	
221:9	Yeah 214:13	29th 202:12	67 204:5	
we'll 230:2,4	226:21	3	67 204.5 6th 230:2	
we're 207:23	year 225:18,19	$\frac{3}{3203:11204:8,9}$	UII 230.2	
214:7,10	228:15,16	204:20 211:2	7	
217:15 218:25	years 204:21	204.20 211.2 224:24	7 199:8 208:9	
219:6 224:14	205:11 208:12	30 229:16	211:17	
we've 218:10	205.11 208.12	30-day 229:14	7D 223:9	
weatherization	yesterday	301 200:18		
222:3	210:12	308 200:18	8	
weeks 223:24	210.12	3100 200:8	8 208:18 209:7	
went 212:12	Z	310 200:3	807 200:14	
222:21	zero 225:21	32.3 204:2,3	816)753-1122	
WILLIAM		34 209:11	200:10	
199:17	0	360 201:7	838 199:22	
Winston 200:14		500 201.7		
winter 210:19	1	4	9	
witness 223:4	10 210:2 225:18	436,481 204:20	9 208:18 209:5,8	
wondering	225:20	456 200:3	9:18 202:3,12	
	l		l	l