In the Matter of:

Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri's Tariffs to Increase ...

GR-2019-0077

January 07, 2019



www.tigercr.com 573.999.2662

1	STATE OF MISSOURI
2	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	
4	
5	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
6	Procedural Conference
7	January 7, 2019
8	Jefferson City, Missouri
9	Volume 1
10	
11	
12	
13	In the Matter of Union Electric) Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri's) File No. GR-2019-0077
14	Tariffs to Increase Its) Revenues for Natural Gas Service)
15	Reveildes for Natural das Service,
16	JOHN T. CLARK, Presiding
17	REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	REPORTED BY: Beverly Jean Bentch, CCR No. 640
23	TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES
2	LEWIS MILLS, JR., Attorney at Law (By telephone)
3	Bryan Cave 221 Bolivar Street, Suite 101
4	Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 573.556.6622 FOR: Missouri Industrial Energy Consumors
5	FOR: Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers
6	JERMAINE GRUBBS, Corporate Counsel 1901 Chouteau Avenue
7	PO Box 66149, MC 1310 314.554.2041
8	FOR: Ameren Missouri
9	LERA SHEMWELL, Senior Counsel CALEB HALL, Senior Counsel PO Box 2230
10	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 573.526.1445
11	FOR: Office of the Public Counsel
12	ROBERT S. BERLIN, Deputy Counsel 200 Madison Street, Suite 800
13	PO Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360
14	573.526.7779 FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission
15	RICHARD S. BROWNLEE, Attorney at Law
16	121 Madison Street Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
17	573.616.1911 FOR: Missouri School Boards' Association
18	ANDREW J. LINHARES, Attorney at Law (By telephone)
19	3115 S. Grand Avenue Suite 600
20	St. Louis, Missouri 63118 314.471.9973
21	FOR: National Housing Trust
22	RICK E. ZUCKER, Attorney at Law (By telephone) 14412 White Pine Ridge Lane
23	Chesterfield, Missouri 63017-6301 FOR: Spire Missouri, Inc.
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES (Continued)
2	
3	TIM OPITZ, Staff Attorney (By telephone) 409 Vandiver Drive Building 5, Suite 205
4	Columbia, Missouri 65202 573.825.1796
5	FOR: Renew Missouri
6	Present: Martin Hyman, Missouri Division of Energy Lisa Kremer, Missouri Division of Energy
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEED	ΙN	G	S
---------	----	---	---

2.5

JUDGE CLARK: We'll go on the record now. It is January 7, 2019. The current time is 10:09 a.m. We're getting a little bit of a late start today. The wrong room was opened by mistake, and the court reporter had to move over to this room and get re-set up again in Room 310 of the Governor Office Building.

The Commission has set aside this time today for a Procedural Conference in the case captioned as In the Matter of Union Electric d/b/a Ameren Missouri's Tariffs to Increase Its Revenues for Natural Gas Service, File No. GR-2019-0077.

Anybody who's going to be speaking today, I'm going to ask that you be sure that your mike is on because we've got several people participating by phone and I want to be sure that everybody is adequately able to hear. I'm going to start by asking the parties to enter their appearance. I'm John Clark. I'm the Regulatory Law Judge for this proceeding today. Starting appearances with Ameren Missouri?

MS. GRUBBS: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Jermaine Grubbs appearing on behalf of Union Electric Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri.

JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. From the Commission staff?

1	MR. BERLIN: Yes, Judge. Let the record
2	reflect Robert S. Berlin appearing on behalf of the
3	staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission at the
4	Commission's Jefferson City offices. The court reporter
5	has all the contact information.
6	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. Office of the Public
7	Counsel?
8	MS. SHEMWELL: Good morning. Thank you,
9	Judge. Lera Shemwell and Caleb Hall representing the
10	Office of the Public Counsel and the public, and the
11	court reporter has our information. Thank you.
12	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. The Missouri
13	Division of Energy has no attorney present today but
14	does have staff here. I'm noting that for the record.
15	Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers?
16	MR. MILLS: Yes, Judge. This is Lewis Mills
17	appearing on behalf of Missouri Industrial Energy
18	Consumers. My address is 221 Bolivar Street, Jefferson
19	City, Missouri 65101. Thank you.
20	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. The Missouri School
21	Boards' Association?
22	MR. BROWNLEE: Let the record show the
23	appearance of Richard Brownlee. The court reporter has
24	my location data, and with me today is Mike Parnell,
25	representative of the Missouri School Boards'

1	Association. Thank you.
2	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. The National Housing
3	Trust?
4	MR. LINHARES: Yes, thank you, Judge.
5	Appearing by phone on behalf of the National Housing
6	Trust, Andrew Linhares. My address is 3115 South Grand,
7	Suite 600, St. Louis, Missouri 63118.
8	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. From Renew Missouri?
9	MR. OPITZ: Thank you, Judge. For Renew
10	Missouri, Tim Opitz. My address is 409 Vandiver Drive,
11	Building 5, Suite 205, Columbia, Missouri 65202.
12	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. And Spire Missouri?
13	MR. ZUCKER: Thank you, Judge Clark. Rick
14	Zucker, Z-u-c-k-e-r, appearing on behalf of Spire
15	Missouri, Inc.
16	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. Is there anybody
17	I've missed?
18	MR. BROWNLEE: Judge, Richard Brownlee again.
19	I was remiss also not to mention that Louie Ervin is on
20	the call with us today also.
21	JUDGE CLARK: Mr. Ervin, you're present?
22	MR. ERVIN: Yes, Your Honor. Louie Ervin.
23	I'm with Latham, Ervin & Associates.
24	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you. Are there any
25	preliminary matters or pending motions at this time? I

see no hands. I'm going to go over a few things.

The Commission staff originally had requested that the parties put together a procedural schedule and have it presented on Friday so that we could talk about that today if there are any changes. The Commission staff filed a motion indicating that they wanted an extension of that time and that the usual practice before the Commission was that this is a time when there are numerous and diverse parties that they meet and put together a procedural schedule. That motion was granted and a procedural schedule is due January 14, 2019.

Originally I had been thinking of a late
August the 30th date for an evidentiary hearing. I
believe I had put that in. After considering what a
briefing schedule might be and looking at the number of
parties that were involved, what I'm going to ask is
that any procedural schedule have no hearing that ends
past the end of July. So I don't want to be going into
August for an evidentiary hearing. So when you're
designing your procedural schedule, look at the end of
July as the last possible hearing date.

The second thing I want to discuss, because there were two things submitted in regards to it, were local public hearings. And I received suggestions for discussions of local public hearings, a very well

written motion considering that I extended the time for the procedural schedule and you proposed, I believe, six potential locations; is that correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

MS. SHEMWELL: Actually we're not proposing those locations for public hearings specifically but simply suggested that those were the locations where hearings have been held in the past. It's been since 2010 that there's been an Ameren gas case, and I just wanted to open up the locations for the discussions of the parties to see what everyone would find to be suitable. We're not suggesting seven local public hearings by any means, but we did not feel comfortable making the decision ourselves whether or not to set one for central Missouri if that would be adequate and also to discuss -- we didn't have the attendance numbers at the time we filed this, but I just wanted to mention that those were possibilities in Ameren's territory just for consideration. I was not recommending that many public hearings for this small case but just that that would cover Ameren's territory.

JUDGE CLARK: Okay. And there may have been some misunderstanding there. Staff filed a motion indicating that due to the low number of turnout at several of the locations, I believe they cited Cape Girardeau as having zero attendance, Wentzville as

having zero attendance, Columbia as having four, 1 2 Jefferson City as having three and Mexico as having nine 3 at the last rate case. They were suggesting that some of those places might not be necessarily good locations. 5 Is that correct, Mr. Berlin? 6 MR. BERLIN: That's correct, Judge. And staff 7 has recommended that we have one local public hearing 8 with the possibility if the Commission so directs having 9 a second one as stated in my response to public counsel's filing. 10 11 JUDGE CLARK: Is there any other party that 12 would like to weigh in on that? 13 MS. SHEMWELL: I would like to weigh in further if I might. Public counsel is obviously 14 15 interested in involving the public, and we would like to 16 explore a variety of ways of reaching the public more 17 effectively so that they can participate in some way, 18 and we would like to suggest that the Commission consider taking official notice of written comments that 19 20 are filed in the case and that all of Ameren's customers 21 be notified of the ability to file either with the 22 Commission or submit comments in some way if they can't 23 or are just not able to attend a local public hearing. 24 JUDGE CLARK: Okay. When you say "official 2.5 notice," are you talking about like as evidence at an

evidentiary hearing?

2.5

MS. SHEMWELL: Well, I'm thinking that that's what we were thinking. We just discussed it briefly this morning. Public counsel can submit those attached to testimony so that they would come into the record.

JUDGE CLARK: I don't see any need to address that today.

MS. SHEMWELL: Thank you.

JUDGE CLARK: In regard to locations, however, I do have some concerns about potential leaving out any area of Ameren's service area. When I looked at the map this morning, I saw four essentially distinct service areas relevant to this. What I was currently thinking, and since I don't want to leave any of those out and it has been a substantial period of time since the last rate increase, I was thinking Rolla, Wentzville, Cape Girardeau and either a hearing in Jefferson City or Columbia.

Now, that contemplates four hearings and I'll leave it to the parties to discuss among themselves whether they want to do Jefferson City or Columbia. I'm not opposed to reducing it to three if the parties can substantially agree, but right now I'm thinking four is a good number and that does hit all the service areas.

Now, with that I'd asked -- Several parties

last week, and they're on the phone, several parties asked to have a call-in number established so that they could call in and participate in today's hearing and a call-in number was established. I believe I have that call-in number open until noon. That will give the parties an opportunity to discuss at least in a general way the laying down of a procedural schedule for this case.

2.5

That being said, are there any other issues that need to be taken up by the Commission at this time?

MR. BERLIN: Judge, I'd like to make a comment on a procedural schedule. You may not be aware of it but last week Ameren and staff had worked to put together a procedural schedule based upon previous Commission orders, and all parties should have a copy of the draft that Ameren and staff had agreed upon and done for the purpose of facilitating discussion today.

Although you had just changed, I want to make sure I'm correct, that no evidentiary hearings to be held in August but the end of July.

JUDGE CLARK: That's correct. That's because I'm contemplating a briefing schedule. I guess I hadn't initially factored that into account.

MR. BERLIN: Because in the proposal that I had circulated to the parties I had put in we had

drafted and come to some dates for a briefing schedule, for example, and I'll just give this to you for your information. Initial post-hearing briefs would be due September 13, reply and true-up briefs September 20, Commission order by September 30, operation of law date November 2.

JUDGE CLARK: The problem I have with that is, as you said, the operation of law is November. To allow the potentiality for a 30-day notice on that, I really have to have an order done by the beginning of September. So I'm going to stick by no evidentiary hearing past the end of July. So I know that means you're going to have to rework what you and Ameren agreed on, but as was put in staff's motion that's part of today's hearing is an opportunity for everybody to get some input and discuss the procedural schedule and submit something that will work for all the parties and will work for me.

MR. HALL: Your Honor, just for clarification, public counsel noticed that July 31 falls on a Wednesday. Is July 31 a hard deadline that you do not want an evidentiary past that time or is the understanding that we could have if it need be hearing dates opened on the Thursday and Friday following that date on August 1 and 2?

JUDGE CLARK: I think that's a good question.

I think that's a reasonable question. I think that when I'm looking at the potentiality of two weeks for hearings is what I'm thinking. So if I'm looking at a two-week hearing schedule and Thursday and Friday fall past that date, I think that would be fine.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Your Honor.

JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Is there anybody else with any comments or questions or anything that needs to come before the Commission at this time?

MR. BROWNLEE: Richard Brownlee.

JUDGE CLARK: Yes.

2.5

MR. BROWNLEE: I had one comment. It's probably a keen sense of the obvious but right now the Commission there's about four or five cases going on, whether the tax cases and other rate cases, and I would only ask that the parties working on this scheduling try to take a peek at that or keep that in mind too because what's going to happen I'm fearful is we're going to end up putting four or five of these cases together and we're all going to be here for about three months at a time or something. I know that's hard to do. I don't think anybody else has got schedules yet but at least I think it's something we should be mindful, because I know that has occasionally happened in the past when

we've just been inundated with too many things to barely keep them straight. That's all I have to say.

JUDGE CLARK: That's true. There's a lot going on right now. There's also as we're looking out towards this there are things in August like the MARC conference that could mean that the commissioners are going to be out of town, things like that. Office of Public Counsel, is there a time period on these local public hearings?

MS. SHEMWELL: We typically do them I think after rebuttal, and that's something we were going to look at today. At least after direct so that the parties' positions are better known. We don't want to do them before direct because we want to be able to tell the public what the file positions are. We could certainly agree to do them after direct and even before rebuttal if the schedule requires that.

JUDGE CLARK: I don't think -- I think that answered my question but my question was more do we have any deadlines by law.

MS. SHEMWELL: I don't think so. Thank you.

JUDGE CLARK: All right. If there's nothing further, I will adjourn this hearing. We'll go off the record and that will give the parties an opportunity to talk today and work out a procedural schedule. You can

1	move the speaker phone up here to wherever it best suits
2	all of you. Thank you for your appearances today. And
3	I will look forward to seeing a procedural schedule on
4	the 14th.
5	MS. SHEMWELL: Thank you.
6	(Off the record.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	GR-2019-0077
1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	I, Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640,
4	Certified Court Reporter with the firm of Tiger Court
5	Reporting, LLC, within the State of Missouri, do hereby
6	certify that I was personally present at the proceedings
7	had in the above-entitled cause at the time and place
8	set forth in the caption sheet thereof; that I then and
9	there took down in Stenotype the proceedings had; and
10	that the foregoing is a full, true and correct
11	transcript of such Stenotype notes so made at such time
12	and place.
13	Beverly Fean Bentch

Beverly Jean Bentch, CCR No. 640

Index: 1..copy

	65101 5:19	attorney 5:13	CCR 16:3,15
	65202 6:11	August 7:13,19 11:20	central 8:14
1 12:25		12:25 14:5	CERTIFICATE 16:1
10:09 4:3	7	aware 11:12	Certified 16:4
13 12:4	7 4:3	В	certify 16:6
14 7:11			changed 11:18
14th 15:4	A	barely 14:1	circulated 11:25
	a.m. 4:3	based 11:14	cited 8:24
2	ability 9:21	beginning 12:10	City 5:4,19 9:2 10:17,
2 12:6,25	above-entitled 16:7	behalf 4:22 5:2,17 6:5,14	21
20 12:4	account 11:23	Bentch 16:3,15	clarification 12:19
2010 8:8	address 5:18 6:6,10	Berlin 5:1,2 9:5,6	Clark 4:2,18,24 5:6, 12,20 6:2,8,12,13,16,
2019 4:3 7:11	10:6	11:11,24	21,24 8:21 9:11,24
205 6:11	adequate 8:14	Beverly 16:3,15	10:6,9 11:21 12:7 13:1,8,12 14:3,18,22
221 5:18	adequately 4:16	bit 4:4	Columbia 6:11 9:1
-	adjourn 14:23	Boards' 5:21,25	10:18,21
3	agree 10:23 14:16	Bolivar 5:18	comfortable 8:12
30 12:5	agreed 11:16 12:14	briefing 7:15 11:22	comment 11:11 13:13
30-day 12:9	Ameren 4:10,20,23 8:8 11:13,16 12:13	12:1	comments 9:19,22
30th 7:13	Ameren's 8:17,20	briefly 10:3	13:9
31 12:20,21	9:20 10:11	briefs 12:3,4	Commission 4:8,24
310 4:7	Andrew 6:6	Brownlee 5:22,23 6:18 13:11,13	5:3 7:2,5,8 9:8,18,22 11:10,15 12:5 13:10,
3115 6:6	appearance 4:18	Building 4:7 6:11	15
	5:23		Commission's 5:4
4	appearances 4:20	C	commissioners 14:6
409 6:10	appearing 4:22 5:2,	Caleb 5:9	Company 4:23
	17 6:5,14	call 6:20 11:3	concerns 10:10
5	area 10:11	call-in 11:2,4,5	conference 4:9 14:6
5 6:11	areas 10:13,24	Cape 8:24 10:16	consideration 8:18
	Associates 6:23	caption 16:8	Consumers 5:15,18
6	Association 5:21 6:1	captioned 4:9	contact 5:5
600 6:7	attached 10:4	case 4:9 8:8,19 9:3,20	contemplates 10:19
63118 6:7	attend 9:23	11:8	contemplating 11:22
640 16:3,15	attendance 8:15,25	cases 13:15,16,20	copy 11:15
10.5,15	9:1		
	1	I	

correct 8:3 9:5,6 11:19,21 16:10	E	full 16:10	
counsel 5:7,10 9:14 10:4 12:20 14:8	effectively 9:17	G	increase 4:11 10:16
counsel's 9:10	Electric 4:10,22	gas 4:11 8:8	indicating 7:6 8:23
court 4:5 5:4,11,23	end 7:18,20 11:20	general 11:6	Industrial 5:15,17
16:4	12:12 13:19	Girardeau 8:25 10:17	information 5:5,11
cover 8:20	ends 7:17	give 11:5 12:2 14:24	12:3
current 4:3	Energy 5:13,15,17	good 4:21 5:8 9:4	Initial 12:3
customers 9:20	enter 4:18	10:24 13:1	initially 11:23
	Ervin 6:19,21,22,23	Governor 4:7	input 12:16
D	essentially 10:12	GR-2019-0077 4:12	interested 9:15
d/b/a 4:10,23	established 11:2,4	Grand 6:6	inundated 14:1
data 5:24	evidence 9:25	granted 7:10	involved 7:16
date 7:13,21 12:5,25	evidentiary 7:13,19	Grubbs 4:21,22	involving 9:15
13:6	10:1 11:19 12:11,22	guess 11:22	issues 11:9
dates 12:1,24	explore 9:16		
deadline 12:21	extended 8:1	Н	J
deadlines 14:20	extension 7:7	Hall 5:9 12:19 13:7	January 4:3 7:11
decision 8:13	F	hands 7:1	Jean 16:3,15
designing 7:20		happen 13:19	Jefferson 5:4,18 9:2
direct 14:12,14,16	facilitating 11:17	happened 13:25	10:17,21
directs 9:8	factored 11:23	hard 12:21 13:22	Jermaine 4:22
discuss 7:22 8:15	fall 13:5	hear 4:17	John 4:18
10:20 11:6 12:16	falls 12:20	hearing 7:13,17,19,	Judge 4:2,19,24 5:1,
discussed 10:3	fearful 13:19	21 9:7,23 10:1,17 11:3	6,9,12,16,20 6:2,4,8,9, 12,13,16,18,21,24
discussion 11:17	feel 8:12	12:12,15,23 13:5 14:23	8:21 9:6,11,24 10:6,9
discussions 7:25 8:9	file 4:12 9:21 14:15	hearings 7:24,25 8:5,	11:11,21 12:7 13:1,8, 12 14:3,18,22
distinct 10:12	filed 7:6 8:16,22 9:20	7,12,19 10:19 11:19	July 7:18,21 11:20
diverse 7:9	filing 9:10	13:4 14:9	12:12,20,21
Division 5:13	find 8:10	held 8:7 11:19	
draft 11:16	fine 13:6	hit 10:24	K
drafted 12:1	firm 16:4	Honor 4:21 6:22 12:19 13:7	keen 13:14
Drive 6:10	foregoing 16:10	Housing 6:2,5	
due 7:11 8:23 12:3	forward 15:3		L
	Friday 7:4 12:24 13:5		late 4:4 7:12
	I	1	I

Latham 6:23	mindful 13:24	occasionally 13:25	places 9:4
law 4:19 12:5,8 14:20	missed 6:17	Office 4:7 5:6,10 14:7	positions 14:13,15
laying 11:7	Missouri 4:20,23 5:3,	offices 5:4	possibilities 8:17
leave 10:14,20	12,15,17,19,20,25 6:7, 8,10,11,12,15 8:14	official 9:19,24	possibility 9:8
leaving 10:10	16:5	open 8:9 11:5	post-hearing 12:3
Lera 5:9	Missouri's 4:10	opened 4:5 12:24	potential 8:3 10:10
Lewis 5:16	mistake 4:5	operation 12:5,8	potentiality 12:9 13:3
Linhares 6:4,6	misunderstanding	Opitz 6:9,10	practice 7:7
LLC 16:5	8:22	opportunity 11:6	preliminary 6:25
local 7:24,25 8:11 9:7,	months 13:21	12:15 14:24	present 5:13 6:21
23 14:8	morning 4:21 5:8 10:4,12	opposed 10:22	16:6
location 5:24	motion 7:6,10 8:1,22	order 12:5,10	presented 7:4
locations 8:3,5,6,9, 24 9:4 10:9	12:14	orders 11:15	previous 11:14
looked 10:11	motions 6:25	originally 7:2,12	problem 12:7
lot 14:3	move 4:6 15:1	Р	procedural 4:9 7:3, 10,11,17,20 8:2 11:7,
Louie 6:19,22			12,14 12:16 14:25
Louis 6:7	N	Parnell 5:24	15:3
low 8:23	National 6:2,5	part 12:14	proceeding 4:19
	Natural 4:11	participate 9:17 11:3	proceedings 16:6,9
М	necessarily 9:4	participating 4:15	proposal 11:24
made 16:11	noon 11:5	parties 4:17 7:3,9,16 8:10 10:20,22,25 11:1,	proposed 8:2
make 11:11,18	notes 16:11	6,15,25 12:17 13:17	proposing 8:4
making 8:13	notice 9:19,25 12:9	14:24	public 5:3,6,10 7:24, 25 8:5,11,19 9:7,9,14,
	noticed 12:20	parties' 14:13	15,16,23 10:4 12:20
map 10:11 MARC 14:5	notified 9:21	party 9:11	14:8,9,15
Matter 4:10	noting 5:14	past 7:18 8:7 12:12,22 13:6,25	purpose 11:17
matters 6:25	November 12:6,8	peek 13:18	put 7:3,9,14 11:13,25 12:14
means 8:12 12:12	number 7:15 8:23	pending 6:25	putting 13:20
meet 7:9	10:24 11:2,4,5	people 4:15	
mention 6:19 8:16	numbers 8:15	period 10:15 14:8	Q
Mexico 9:2	numerous 7:9	personally 16:6	question 13:1,2
mike 4:14 5:24	0	phone 4:15 6:5 11:1	14:19
Mills 5:16		15:1	questions 13:9
mind 13:18	obvious 13:14	place 16:7,12	
13.10			

	room 4:5,6,7	stick 12:11	today 4:4,8,13,19
R	RPR 16:3	straight 14:2	5:13,24 6:20 7:5 10:7 11:17 14:12,25 15:2
rate 9:3 10:16 13:16		Street 5:18	today's 11:3 12:15
re-set 4:6	S	submit 9:22 10:4	town 14:7
reaching 9:16	schedule 7:3,10,11,	12:17	transcript 16:11
reasonable 13:2	15,17,20 8:2 11:7,12, 14,22 12:1,16 13:5	submitted 7:23 substantial 10:15	true 14:3 16:10
rebuttal 14:11,17	14:17,25 15:3		true-up 12:4
received 7:24	schedules 13:23	substantially 10:23	Trust 6:3,6
recommended 9:7	scheduling 13:17	suggest 9:18	turnout 8:23
recommending 8:18	School 5:20,25	suggested 8:6	two-week 13:5
record 4:2 5:1,14,22	sense 13:14	suggesting 8:11 9:3	typically 14:10
10:5 14:24 15:6	September 12:4,5,11	suggestions 7:24	
reducing 10:22	service 4:12 5:3	suitable 8:11	U
reflect 5:2	10:11,12,24	Suite 6:7,11	understanding
regard 10:9	set 4:8 8:13 16:8	suits 15:1	12:23
Regulatory 4:19	sheet 16:8	Т	Union 4:10,22
relevant 10:13	Shemwell 5:8,9 8:4 9:13 10:2,8 14:10,21		usual 7:7
remiss 6:19	15:5	taking 9:19	
Renew 6:8,9	show 5:22	talk 7:4 14:25	V
reply 12:4	simply 8:6	talking 9:25	Vandiver 6:10
reporter 4:5 5:4,11,23 16:1,4	small 8:19	Tariffs 4:11	variety 9:16
Reporting 16:5	South 6:6	tax 13:16	
representative 5:25	speaker 15:1	territory 8:17,20	W
representing 5:9	speaking 4:13	testimony 10:5	wanted 7:6 8:9,16
requested 7:2	specifically 8:5	thereof 16:8	ways 9:16
requires 14:17	Spire 6:12,14	thing 7:22	Wednesday 12:21
response 9:9	St 6:7	things 7:1,23 14:1,5,7	week 11:1,13
Revenues 4:11	staff 4:25 5:3,14 7:2,6 8:22 9:6 11:13,16	thinking 7:12 10:2,3, 13,16,23 13:4	weeks 13:3
rework 12:13	staff's 12:14	Thursday 12:24 13:5	weigh 9:12,13
Richard 5:23 6:18 13:11	start 4:4,17	Tiger 16:4	Wentzville 8:25 10:16
Rick 6:13	Starting 4:20	Tim 6:10	work 12:17,18 14:25
Robert 5:2	State 16:5	time 4:3,8 6:25 7:7,8 8:1,16 10:15 11:10	worked 11:13
Rolla 10:16	stated 9:9	12:22 13:10,22 14:8	working 13:17
INOIIA 10.10	Stenotype 16:9,11	16:7,11	

GR-2019-0077 Index: written..Zucker

written 8:1 9:19
wrong 4:5
Z
Z-U-C-K-E-R 6:14
Zucker 6:13,14