OBJECTIONS TO TESTIMONY

TESTIMONY	LOCATION	WORDS
Direct Testimony of James A. Busch	p. 2, lines 11-12	Offers a Legal Conclusion - ". . . in violation of its Commission approved tariff."
	p. 5, lines 13 - 15	Offers a Legal Conclusion - ". . . currently effective tariff . . . approved by the Commission . . . ."
	p. 6, lines 3-4	Offers a Legal Conclusion - "This amount was not approved by the Commission and is not a lawful tariffed rate."
	p. 9, line 16	Offers a Legal Conclusion - ". . . unapproved . . ."
Surrebuttal Testimony of James A. Busch	p. 6, line 2-3	Offers a Legal Conclusion - "This is the tariff sheet that the Commission approved."
Rebuttal Testimony of Keri Roth	p. 4, lines 8-9	Offers a Legal Conclusion - ". . . which has not been approved in the Company's tariff."
	p. 4, lines 12-13	Offers a Legal Conclusion - The Company's current tariff was approved by the Commission in Case No. SR-2000-595 and became effective on May 10, 2000."
Surrebuttal Testimony of Keri Roth	p. 4, lines 15-16	Q – assumes facts not in evidence - "Is there a sewer commodity rate stated in the current Missouri Public Service Commission (MPSC or Commission) approved tariff?"
	p. 5, line 3	Offers a Legal Conclusion - ". . . in violation of its tariff . . ."
	p. 6, lines 20-21	Q – assumes facts not in evidence – "Does the aforementioned settlement agreement represent the current tariff on file?"
	p. 8, lines 14-15	Offers a Legal Conclusion - ". . . which were collected in violation of the Company's current tariff . . .
	p. 9, lines 4-5	Offers a Legal Conclusion - " . . . had it not been inappropriately confiscated by the utility."

Company Exhibit No. 3
Date 5-9-13 Reporter SB
File No. SR-2013-0016