	Page 1
1	
2	
3	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
4	OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI
5	VOL. III
6	
7	HEARING
8	IN THE MATTER OF: GR-2021-0320
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	April 25, 2022
14	
15	
16	PAMELA G. WILLIAMS, RPR
17	MISSOURI CCR #880
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376

	Pag	ge 2
1	INDEX OF EXHIBITS	
2	Exhibit No. Pag	e No.
3	Exhibit No. 1 Earhart Testimony	33
4	Exhibit No. 2 Earhart Surrebuttal	33
5	Exhibit No. 100 Patterson Testimony	77
6	Exhibit No. 100C Schedules 4 and 5	78
7	Exhibit No. 101 Patterson Surrebuttal	77
8	Exhibit No. 102 Corrected Schedules	79
9	Exhibit No. 102C Corrected Schedules	79
10	Exhibit No. 300 Ervin, II Testimony	58
11	Exhibit No. 301 Ervin, II Surrebuttal	58
12	Exhibit No. 302 Ervin, Sr. Testimony	72
13	(The exhibits were retained by the parties.)	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

				Page 3
1			INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS	
2				Page No.
3			OPENING STATEMENT	
4	Ву	Mr.	Fisher	10
5	Ву	Mr.	Brownlee	17
6	Ву	Ms.	Myers	27
7	Ву	Mr.	Williams	30
8			EXAMINATION OF MS. EARHART	
9	Ву	Mr.	Fisher	32
10	Ву	Mr.	Brownlee	35
11	Ву	Jud	ge Pridgin	45
12	Ву	Mr.	Brownlee	52
13	Ву	Mr.	Fisher	53
14			EXAMINATION OF MR. ERVIN, II	
15	Ву	Mr.	Brownlee	57
16	Ву	Mr.	Fisher	60
17	Ву	Mr.	Brownlee	67
18			EXAMINATION OF MR. ERVIN, SR.	
19	Ву	Mr.	Brownlee	72
20	Ву	Jud	ge Pridgin	74
21	Ву	Mr.	Brownlee	77
22			EXAMINATION OF MR. PATTERSON	
23	Ву	Ms.	Myers	78
24	Ву	Mr.	Fisher	81
25	Ву	Mr.	Brownlee	85
	I			

		Page 4
1	By Judge Pridgin	96
2	By Ms. Myers	101
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	I and the second	

	Page 5
1	IN THE MATTER OF:
2	File No. GR-2021-0320
3	
4	
5	The Public Service Commission Hearing
6	regarding the above captioned matter was held on
7	behalf of the parties via Webex on the 25th day of
8	April, 2022, before Pamela G. Williams, RPR, CSR MO.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
Page 6
    APPEARANCES OF THE PARTIES:
1
    ON BEHALF OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMM.:
3
    Ms. Jamie Myers
    200 Madison Street, Suite 800
    Jefferson City, MO 65102
4
    ON BEHALF OF OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL:
5
    Mr. Nathan Williams
6
    200 Madison Street, Suite 650
    Jefferson City, MO 65102
8
    ON BEHALF OF LIBERTY (Empire):
    Mr. James M. Fisher and
    Ms. Diana C. Carter
10
    101 Madison Street, Suite 400
    Jefferson City, MO 65101
11
12
    ON BEHALF OF MIDWEST ENERGY GROUP:
1.3
    Mr. Tim Opitz
    308 E. High Street, Suite B101
14
    Jefferson City, MO 65101
15
    ON BEHALF OF MISSOURI SCHOOL BOARDS' ASS.:
16
    Mr. Richard Brownlee, III
    121 Madison Street
17
    Jefferson City, MO 65101
18
19
    ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE:
2.0
    Honorable Ron Pidgin
21
22
    THE COURT REPORTER:
2.3
    Ms. Pamela G. Williams
    Veritext Legal Solutions
24
    701 Market Street, Suite 310
    St. Louis, Missouri 63101
2.5
```

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, that this Public Service Commission hearing may be taken in shorthand by and before Pamela G. Williams, Registered Professional Reporter, Missouri Certified Court Reporter, CCR #880, and afterwards transcribed into typewriting.

2.

2.2

2.5

* * * * *

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Good morning. We are on the record. This is the evidentiary hearing in File No. GR-2021-0320. It's in the matter of the request of the Empire District Gas Company, d/b/a Liberty for authority to file tariffs increasing rates for gas service provided to customers in its Missouri service area.

Good morning. I am Ron Pridgin. I'm the Regulatory Law Judge assigned to preside over this hearing this being held on April 25th, 2022. We are in the government office building in Jefferson City, Missouri and also using Webex for this hearing. The time is approximately 8:40 a.m.

I would like to get entries of appearance from counsel. Symmetry has already asked to be excused from this hearing and I have granted that request. So let me get entries of appearance from the parties beginning with Empire District Gas,

1 please.

2.

2.2

2.5

MR. FISHER: Thank you, Judge. On behalf of Empire District Gas Company, let the record reflect the appearance of Diana C Carter and James M.

Fisher. Our contact information's on the entry form but since the reporter's not in the room, perhaps I should go ahead and give you addresses.

My address, it's the law firm of
Fisher & Dougherty, PC, 101 Madison Street, Suite
400, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101. Ms. Carter's
address is, she's with Liberty Utilities in-house
counsel, and her address is 428 East Capital Avenue,
Suite 303, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fischer, Thank you. On behalf of the staff of the commission, please.

MS. MYERS: Good morning, Judge. On behalf of the staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, this is Jamie Myers. My address is 200 Madison Street, Suite 800, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Myers, thank you. On behalf of the Office of Public council, please.

MR. WILLIAMS: Nathan Williams, Chief Deputy
Public Counsel, P.O. Box 2230, Jefferson City,
Missouri 65102.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you, Mr. Williams. On behalf of MSBA, please.

2.

2.2

2.4

2.5

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes. Let the record show the appearance of Richard Brownlee. My address is the Gallery Level, 121 Madison Street, Jefferson City, Missouri. I'm appearing on behalf of Missouri School Boards' Association. With me today is Mike Parnell, Executive Director. And I have two witnesses. One is Louis Ervin, Sr. and Louis Ervin, Jr.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Brownlee, thank you. On behalf of MECG, please.

MR. OPITZ: Good morning. Tim Opitz on behalf of Midwest Energy Consumers Group. My address is 308 East Highway, Suite B 101, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Opitz, thank you. Have I overlooked anyone? All right. I believe the first order of business then, will be the order of opening statements. And I show that Empire District Gas will be the first to make an opening statement. I'm sorry, I'm getting some feedback in the room, I'm not sure who's on.

COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Judge, do you want to acknowledge the commissioners in the room?

1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'm sorry, is this
2	Commissioner Holsman?
3	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Yes, sir.
4	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. I see if there
5	are any commissioners that would like to make any
6	opening remarks before we go on to opening
7	statements?
8	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: I just want the
9	record to reflect which commissioners are present.
10	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Very good, Commissioner
11	Holsman, thank you. You are here. Commissioner
12	Holsman, thank you, sir. Any other commissioner
13	wishing to make any opening remarks? All right.
14	Thank you.
15	Anything further before we move on to
16	opening statements? All right. Mr. Fisher, when
17	you're ready, sir.
18	[OPENING STATEMENT]
19	BY MR. FISHER:
20	Good morning, Judge Pridgin and
21	Commissioners. Diana Carter and I will be
22	representing the Empire District Gas Company, d/b/a
23	Liberty in this case. As you know, Empire District
24	Gas filed a rate case requesting a \$1.36 billion

rate increase. This was the first rate increase

25

case for the company since 2010.

2.

2.2

2.5

On April 12th, the parties filed a stipulation and agreement, which resolved all of the revenue requirement issues and all of the rate design issues in the case. And I understand we will be considering in an on the record presentation format, that stipulation at the end of the hearing today.

We were not able to settle the issues raised by the Missouri School Boards' Association and those issues are to be heard today. All of the issues involve the school transportation program, which EDG has been operating for about 20 years.

The school transportation program has been working well from the company's perspective, but EDG is willing to work with the Missouri School Board Association and the staff and any other interested party to improve it as we go forward into the future.

As Staff Witness Patterson points out in his rebuttal testimony on pages eight, nine and ten, the issues raised by the association involve very -- involve very little money on an annual basis for each school that participates in the school transportation program in a typical year.

The association has proposed three changes to Empire's transportation service tier.

Two of these would involve changes to the current commission approved tariff that Empire has not proposed to change in the rate case.

2.

2.2

2.4

2.5

The association has also opposed one of Empire's proposed revisions to clarify that the ultimate customer is responsible to pay the bill if it's marketer or aggregator fails to pay the gas transportation service, as what happened during that winter storm year in February of last year.

But, Judge, the company proposes at this time to withdraw that third issue relating on our list of issues, Issue 1 C, which deals with the customer responsibility clarification language. We would propose to withdraw that and it doesn't need to be heard at that time. And it's my understanding that no other party objects to that request.

Both the company and the staff recommend that the commission deny the association's remaining two requests relating to the transportation tariffs. And I'd like to just briefly go through the company's position on these three issues.

The first issue involves the

association's request to change Empire's existing aggregation, balancing and charging -- and cash out charges. These rates were approved by the commission in Case No. GR2009-0434 and are just and reasonable.

2.

2.2

2.4

2.5

These charges came about as a result of a settlement in that 2009 rate case. There was extensive testimony on the transportation tariffs and fees from six witnesses representing Empire, staff, and a gas marketer company that supplied gas to transportation customers.

The commission approved the stipulation that settled the issue in that case and established the current fees for aggregation, balancing and cash out charges for small and medium transportation customers.

These fees have remained unchanged for the last 12 years. As staff witness Patterson testifies, staff supports the existing charges for Empire. But he suggested that since these types of charges have not changed across the LBC industry for many years, they may not be high enough to cover the current cost of providing these services.

Now going to the cash out and balancing issue. The association proposes to

eliminate cash out balancing and substitute what's called a carry over method. Or in the alternative, eliminate multipliers applied to the pricing of larger imbalances.

2.2

2.4

2.5

When the commission reviews the testimony of staff witness Patterson on pages eight, nine and ten, the commission will quickly note that these issues involve small amounts of money.

However, it will take some time, some effort and expense for the parties and the commission to reevaluate these charges in the future.

The staff has also pointed out that the association's alternative carry over method has some problems for Empire and has only recently been adopted by Missouri's largest LBC, Spire of Missouri.

Unlike Empire, Spire has its own on -- on system storage facilities and is considerably larger than Empire. There are also differences in the billing practices of the companies, which makes the school board association's carry over method less desirable for Empire.

The staff has also recommended that the cash out method should be the norm for other

school transportation programs operated by all the other LBCs in Missouri. I refer you to

Mr. Patterson's rebuttal on page eight, lines three through five.

2.2

2.4

2.5

Second, the association proposes to create a separate tariff that would apply only to school transportation pools separate from the other transportation tariffs.

Empire agrees that it would be helpful and appropriate to develop a separate rate schedule for the school transportation program schools. Eventually, Empire hopes to have a separate rate schedule for the school transportation programs for both the Empire District Gas Company, and its sister company, Liberty Utilities Midstates that includes the best practices for school transportation programs.

However, we do not believe that it would be reasonable to merely adopt the standard alone tariff that currently exists for Liberty Utilities Midstates or to incorporate parts of that tariff into the EDG tariff at this time.

The company believes that there are -- needs to be significant updates and other language improvements to the Liberty Midstates

school transportation tariff.

2.2

2.4

2.5

Empire has had discussions with staff regarding some of these updates and improvements. We believe it will take some time to discuss the staff's perspective on these issues and develop and implement some of these changes.

For example, we believe it would be appropriate to change the cash out structure of the midstates tariff to be more similar to the Empire District Gas structure. Or some other type of cash out structure that's acceptable to the association, the commission staff and other interested parties.

We would -- we would propose to begin discussing the provisions of the stand alone tariff with the association and the staff and other interested parties sometime after the conclusion of this rate case. And have a revised tariff ready for the commission's consideration, concurrent with Liberty Midstates' next general rate case.

As you know, companies have to file about every three years in order to keep their SRIS. And Liberty Midstates has an SRIS, they -- their SRIS was last effective in June of 2021, so they would need to file it by 2024.

Thank you for your attention today.

- Judge, I would take any of your questions and if
 not, I'll be done.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right, Mr. Fischer,
- 4 | thank you. Let me see if I have any bench
- 5 questions. Commissioner Holsman, any questions? I
- 6 don't hear anything. Commissioner Holsman, if you
- 7 have any questions, feel free to let me know.
- 8 Otherwise, Mr. Fisher, thank you.
- 9 MR. FISHER: Thank you.
- 10 COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: Hey, Judge, I got no
- 11 | questions, but it makes me star stick (phonetic)
- 12 every time I want to try to unmute so unless I
- 13 | unmute, I don't have any questions.
- 14 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you.
- 15 | Opening statement then from MSBA.
- 16 OPENING STATEMENT
- 17 BY MR. BROWNLEE:
- Good morning, Judge and Commissioner.
- 19 I'm Richard Brownlee, I'm representing Missouri
- 20 | School Boards' Association.
- I had briefly thought over before
- 22 coming in here that I think my first public service
- 23 commission case was in 1974, which it's me getting
- 24 close to 50 years over here, so it's probably
- 25 | time -- this may -- this may be my last case, as

well as being able to talk about the first case.

2.

2.2

2.5

But, in any event, let me -- let me talk about this a minute. And I -- I first would like to comment, having at least some experience with lots of different cases, water cases and gas, electric, that this case, for as simple as it is, is actually -- it's in a way complex, but we are also sort of trapped in the procedural conundrum of rate cases and when they have to be heard and otherwise.

So, there's a lot of what, I guess, would be technical procedural issues that are here that create problems, where if in a normal case that you might have in a civil type of case where you had, basically, as much time as you wanted to visit and talk about the issues and try to come to some resolution, in this particular case with rate cases and timing, it's become a real issue. And one that's mutual to all of us. I'd not pointing out that anybody's created problems.

With me, and I'd like -- and I'll turn to my opening. With me is Mike Parnell, Executive Director of Missouri School Boards.

Mike's been here for a long, long time. And Louis Ervin, Sr and Louis Ervin, II. I know Louis Ervin, Sr. and I were at -- worked on the legislative when

the statute and unique statute I'm going to address was passed in 2002. I think some of the commissioners may have been in the house during that time it passed. You all would remember if you were.

2.

2.2

2.5

The Missouri School Boards

Associations is a 501 C (6) trade association. We represent about 390 elementary and secondary school districts, with about 2,650 school accounts that utilize natural gas, off of, whether they're Spire, different, almost all the different gas pipelines that are, of course, subject to the statute. They don't get to -- the gas companies don't get to opt out, it's a mandatory statute that rules should rule equally for everyone.

Organized a purchasing cooperative called MOPER which is, really, a school board natural gas consortium. We purchase gas through agents through gas on the -- on the interstate pipelines and from sources out state. It's typically transported in on the interstate pipeline system. It's passed off to the local utilities at a, I guess the word then would be city gate. And then we utilize the distribution system, the local distribution system of the local utility to pass the gas to the schools.

The statute, again, was created in 2002. It was House Bill 1402. And it's been codified and changed once, I think the next year or so, but it's now Section 393.310.

2.

2.2

2.5

If I had to say there's one thing that's significant and unique about this case, it's the fact that statute exists. No large industrials have it, no -- I mean, the pipelines, no interstate pipelines have it. It is unique to the schools and it has some language that's binding. Whether it's always been followed is an issue that the Judge and you all have will to ponder, but the fact of it is, it is Missouri law and a statutory format.

It creates an aggregate supply and transportation program for all the eligible schools. Requires the gas corporations to file tariffs for year one, which I believe was 2003, as well as thereafter. Those tariffs were required and, again, this is statutory language requiring a minimum to allow the purchasing of the natural gas supply and transportation through this consortium.

The resale -- and, now, listen, the resale and transport service of the gas corporation must be at the cost less the transportation fee.

That is a -- that is a critical statement you'll

hear this morning, you'll see it in briefs, and it's important in any later discussions as to exactly the meaning of that.

2.2

2.5

The statute also allows for the inclusion in those tariffs of all applicable distribution costs, plus an aggravation and balancing fee determined by the commission, that's not to exceed four-tenths of one cents per therm, delivered the first year.

There is no telemetry required for the schools and no special metering, unless the school uses, I believe, a hundred thousand therms per year. The tariffs must have no negative impact, financial impact on gas corporation, on other customers, or, which I think the statute uses taxing entities, which I believe is, really, the cities and the counties.

Pipeline capacity is to be treated in the large -- like the large industrials. That is, the physical treatment of the gas and how it's shipped, how it's delivered, how it's charged, is handled that way so there's, really, no unique circumstance for that. But, again, that's the physical handling, not the costs. And that was actually added a year or so afterwards in the

statute.

2.2

2.4

2.5

Interestingly, immediately after the statute was passed in '02, there were seven gas dockets created. One for -- that's applicable to Empire was Aquila (phonetic), which was their previous name. It's Case no. GT2003-0038. I'm going to, at one point, ask the commission under their rules of evidence, that the commission administrative note the report and order in that case, as well as any other matters in that file. And I'll be passing out a copy of the report in order -- at the conclusion of my statement.

There was an order in approving the stipulation agreement on August 15th, 2002. It kind of reviewed the history of the statute. It recognized there would be model tariff sheets that would have no material change. And that's, again, another important where no material change in the revenue requirements of the companies. And the company would report its actual incremental costs each year to the commission so they could compete the over and under recovery of the -- the paired commission, in their order, recognized their might be a few small changes in revenue and financial impact.

Tt.'s

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

But, again, because the schools were at a smaller volumeric numbers, that these -- the commission held that nothing material, unless otherwise shown. No party was allowed to have any unreasonable delays, paragraph eight. And the companies were also required to provide yearly data, including the administrative costs, which are the incremental costs and the gas costs, as well as gas costs including distribution costs, and aggregation and balancing fees.

I think as Jim mentioned, I'd say the Grogman (phonetic) of this case, really, is two things. It's the issue of cash out and carry over, which I know my witnesses have addressed. And, really, of all the years we've been involved in this, this is the best presentation I can recall where it's really historically been explained what has gone on in this case from the inception to where we are now. It's, really, a treatise on -- on the gas transportation program in Missouri. And that includes, I think, ours, our witnesses, the company witnesses, as well as the staff witnesses. really -- really a really, I'm loathe to -reluctant to use the word good job, but it's very

complete and understandable.

Again, the issues in this case area 1 2. carry over and cash out and, again, the separate 3 tariff. I think we used a separate tariff. I deal with that issue in a number of cases. It really 5 does make sense because it's -- this is such a unique circumstance with the unique statute. The 6 separate tariff, to me, is the clearest way to deal with it and -- and it -- deal with even adjustments 8 we might make. If you've got a separate tariff, it 10 just -- it accommodates that.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

We think the current Empire position There's been no cost support for the is flawed. present filing on aggregation and balancing. There's been, really, no cost support on even the the cash out. And the cash out, the earlier case that was talked about, has created a -- has created a cash out that is for imbalances, that really is applicable to large pipe lines and industrials. And it creates the circumstance where if we're -- if the schools are short, we're paying up to a hundred and fifty percent penalty. And if the company is -- is in error, we only get a 50 percent recrement. So we think per se, that current cash out and any other cash out that models after that sliding scale, again, is contrary to the statute in that it is

beyond the actual costs.

2.

2.2

2.4

2.5

The rates that -- for the daily computation are included and they're a public record. They're in documents which are referred to, I think, in the actual company statute. It's either Natural Gas Weekly or Gas Daily. Those are, like, the publications that give the -- the pricing for gas. It's daily evidence and with monthly summaries.

And, I guess, in conclusion, if there is one here, we're talking about a statute in 2002.

And we are here 20 years later, still with an unresolved situation on the actual cost of the gas to these companies.

This matter had been kicked down the road. The last time this was set, these rates that were mentioned, I think in Jim's statement in that case, the school board didn't participate in that case, we didn't even receive notice from the commission that it was going on. And I could say that might be my fault with the notification system then was not like EFIS today. And in any event, we at that case when these were set, we weren't there.

As to waiting for the next general rate case, maybe -- maybe that's not a choice. And

being very candid at that. We would, again, we're believed to hear this company talk about their willing to meet with us. We'd like, if we could -- as I said, if we could order pizza and start the meeting today at 1, we'd like to do that.

2.

2.2

2.5

attention, I appreciate Commissioner Holsman being here. I know he was, I think, in the school system at one time. So we know this is dear to his heart. And other than that, again, I'm going to, at the point I think if we introduce the testimony, which we believe I think in my series of 300 through 300, I'm going to mark that one report and order as one of the exhibits. And, again, note that their -- the staff witness and we mentioned our witnesses mentioned several other cases which might be referred to by the parties in briefs or otherwise.

So, with that, I'm going to -- I'll close and stand for any questions. I know this is a little -- the procedure in this is not quite like a civil trial, but if there's anything I could add at this point as a non evidentiary comment, I'd be happy to do that.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Brownlee, thank you. I will call staff counsel, Ms. Myers, up and then just

while you're changing, if I hear anything from commissioner you can come back and answer questions and otherwise we'll just move on to staff.

MR. BROWNLEE: You bet. Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you so much.

Ms. Myers, when you're ready.

[OPENING STATEMENT]

BY MS. MYERS:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

Well, good morning and may it please the Commission. My name is Jamie Myers. I am here representing the staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission.

Staff witness Keenan Patterson has sponsored and prefiled rebuttal and surrebuttal testimonies addressing the issues remaining in this case. Mr. Patterson is here today to answer any questions on this testimony, but just, briefly, I would like to give an overview of staff's position.

First, staff recommends the commission deny MSBA's request to modify Empire's aggregation, balancing and cash out charges in this case.

Staff's own analysis indicates that Empire's aggregation and balancing costs have likely increased since the development of Empire's current

fees from the prior rate case. The staff is not proposing an increase in these fees. Instead, staff recommends the commission approves Empire proposal to allow the current fees to remain unchanged.

2.

2.2

2.5

Empire's current fee for aggregation and balancing services for small transportation customers was developed from many rounds of testimony, as Mr. Fisher mentioned, in Case No. GR2009-0434.

As Staff Witness Patterson states in his rebuttal testimony, the current fees are based on the record developed in that case and can be presumed just and reasonable.

Further, despite MSBA's many claims that these fees are not based on costs, MSBA has not presented reliable evidence on what Empire's actual costs of providing aggregation and balancing services to small and medial transportation customer is, nor has MSBA provided reliable evidence supporting what an appropriate cost base rate should be.

Instated, MSBA advocates that the commission either entirely eliminate these fees or greatly reduce them. Regarding cash outs, cash outs are a common and reasonable practice for resolving

imbalances for both gas corporations and interstate pipelines.

2.

2.2

2.4

2.5

Further, the application of multipliers to cash out prices is another practice of gas corporations and interstate pipelines to provide on economic signal to encourage shippers to closely balance gas delivered and received. The specific multipliers currently used by Empire are consistent with those that are charged by upstream pipelines. Staff recommends the commission approve Empire's proposal to maintain its current cash out practices.

Lastly, staff recommends the commission deny MSBA's request for a separate school aggregation tariff at this time. A separate tariff is not required by law, nor is it practically necessary to implement a school aggregation program. School aggregation pools are fundamentally transportation customers. And Empire's current transportation tariff has been able to adequately address the unique statutory requirements for school aggregation pools.

Now, as Mr. Fisher stated, as Empire is willing to meet with staff and MSBA and other stakeholders to look for a stand alone

transportation tariff in the future, staff is more than happy to be part of that conversation. And, in fact, has been part of that conversation. But, again, at this point in time, the complexity of doing that, it would be premature to try to do that in this case.

Staff Witness Keenan Patterson, again, has sponsored pre filed rebuttal and surrebuttal testimonies on the staff recommendations that I just mentioned. Mr. Patterson is here today to answer questions on this topic and I here as well, if you have any questions for me. Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Myers, thank you so much. And we'll see if we have any opening statement from public counsel, Mr. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: Just briefly, thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: When you're ready, sir.

[OPENING STATEMENT]

19 BY MR. WILLIAMS:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

Good morning. Nathan Williams, appearing on behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel, may it please the Commission. Public Counsel has no witnesses on any of these particular issues in this case.

Public Counsel's primary concern is

potential and almost certainty of cross 1 subsidization due to imbalances. Public Counsel 3 understands that imbalances are measured monthly, whereas spot market gas is done instantaneously, 4 5 which creates the potential for imbalances. that's, really, staff's concerns with these 6 7 transportation tariffs or school aggregation. does not have an issue with schools aggregating to 8 purchase natural gas, but it does have a concern if 10 the right price is going to those schools. 11 that's it.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Williams, thank you. Any opening on behalf of MECG?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

MR. OPITZ: No opening for MECG, thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Opitz, thank you. And Symmetry has been excused from this hearing. All right. Anything else before we proceed to cross examination? I believe the first witness is going to be Empire's witness, Ms. Earhart. Anything else? Okay. And I don't know if Ms. Earhart's in the hearing room or on Webex?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, she is here. I would call Tatiana Earhart to the stand.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. She'll come forward to be sworn, please.

Good morning. If you'll raise your right hand to be sworn please. Do you swear the evidence you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you very much. And if you can try to speak into the microphone more for people who are participating by Webex. And, Mr. Fisher, when you're ready.

MR. FISHER: Thank you, Judge.

[EXAMINATION OF MS. EARHART]

QUESTIONS BY MR. FISHER:

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

- Q Please state your name and address, for the record?
- A My name is Tatiana Earhart. My business address is 602 South Joplin, Joplin, Missouri 64802.
- Q Are you the same Tatiana Earhart that filed rebuttal testimony and surrebuttal testimony in this case?
 - A Yes.
- Q For purposes of the record, I would like to have the rebuttal testimony of Tatiana Earhart marked as Exhibit No. 1 and the surrebuttal as marked as No. 2.

	Page 33
1	(Whereupon, Exhibits Nos. 1 and
2	2 were marked for
3	identification.)
4	Q (By Mr. Fisher) Did you have any changes or
5	corrections that you need to make to either of those
6	pieces of testimony?
7	A I do. I need to make two one correction
8	and then one change. On my rebuttal testimony, on
9	page six, starting on line six, I answered to
10	Mr. Ervin's question regarding EDG's requirement
11	that schools with loads of over 40,000 CCFs
12	telemetry, I answered that incorrectly. I need to
13	change that to say that all transportation customers
14	with the exception of the individual schools
15	participating pursuant to Section 393.210, RSMO are
16	required to install telemetry at customer facility.
17	Individual schools participating pursuant to Section
18	393.310 with annual gas consumption greater than a
19	hundred thousand CCF are required to install
20	telemetry.
21	Q Okay. Would that replace the answer that
22	you have currently on page six, lines six through
23	eight?
2.4	A Correct.

Okay. And do you have another change or

25

- correction you need to make?
 - A Yes. Referring to your opening statement that we're going to withdraw the issue 1 C. So in my surrebuttal, on page three, line five, we'd like to remove that question and answer.
 - Q With those changes, if I ask you the questions contained in exhibits 1 and 2, would your answers be the same?
 - A Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

- 10 Q And are they true and correct to the best of 11 your knowledge and belief?
- 12 A Yes.
- MR. FISHER: Your Honor, I would then move

 for the admission of Exhibits No. 1 and 2 and tender

 the witness for cross-examination.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fisher, thank you.
- 17 Exhibits 1 and 2 have been offered. Any objections?
- 18 | Hearing none, Exhibits 1 and 2 are admitted into
- 19 evidence. We'll move to cross examination. Staff,
- 20 any questions?
- MS. MYERS: No questions, Judge.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you.
- 23 | Public Counsel?
- MR. WILLIAMS: No questions, thank you.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. MECG?

Page	35

1 MR. OPITZ: No, thank you, Judge.

2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: MSBA?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes.

[CROSS EXAMINATION OF MS. EARHART]

QUESTIONS BY MR. BROWNLEE:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

Q Good morning. I'm Richard Brownlee, I represent the Missouri School Boards. I think we've met earlier today and I know your company well and Jim.

When were you first employed with Empire? And I'm going to use -- well, let me ask you another. Are you also employed by Midstates and Liberty and Empire?

A I started with Empire District Company back in December of 2008. I worked for the electric side up until 2013. And then I came over to the Empire District Gas side in 2016. And I'm currently in the position of manager of gas supply for Central. Which includes both Midstates and Empire District Gas.

Q So I take it you were not employed by either one of those at year 2002 when the statute was passed?

A Correct.

Q Were you employed by any gas utility during

that period, that is prior to what I'd say this
hearing or this issue, were you familiar with the
Missouri School Boards' statute, which I'll refer
to?

- A Prior to 2008?
- 6 O Yes.

5

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

- A No.
 - Q Okay. And you -- you testified, I believe, the company generally supports staff's position on aggregation and balancing; is that a fair statement?
 - A Staff's position?
- 12 | Q Uh-huh.
- 13 A Yes.
- Q Okay. And if staff's position on balancing,
 aggregation or cash out proved to not be at cost,
 would you then support the staff position?
 - A Well, the rates that are in the tariff right now, they were analyzed to be at cost.
 - Q Okay. Do you know whether they, in fact, are at cost on this case? I know they were set much, much before this case, correct?
 - A Correct.
- Q Yeah. And I'm talking about this case. Did
 the company do any analysis on the cash out costs
 for this case?

A No, the rates that are in the tariff today were reviewed in the prior rate case.

Q No, I'm -- but, again, I understand that.

I'm asking about this case today. Did the company provide any cost data to support the rates in this case that you're asking the commissioner to approve on cash out?

A We didn't change these rates, the rates were reviewed back in the prior case.

Q So the answer's no, you didn't provide any additional data in this case?

A No.

2.

2.2

Q Okay. And the same for aggregation, did you provide any -- any cost analysis for this case on the aggregation portion of the issues before us?

A No.

Q And the same question for distribution costs. Did you provide -- prepare any cost data for this case at issue?

A No. All analysis was done in the prior case.

Q Okay. And are you aware that the paragraph four of that statute says that the -- that the -- at the natural gas company shall apply gas corporations costs of purchasing of such gas supplies and

transportation, you know that's in the statute, correct?

A The statute says that it requires the commission to establish the charges.

- Q Okay. But if you didn't supply any additional data, then the commission has nothing from you, and I don't know if the staff, I can ask them the same question. Did -- but you didn't supply any additional costs for this case, did you?
 - A Not specifically.

2.2

2.5

- Q Do you know of any -- any other rate case? We've heard that the school boards didn't supply any -- any cost data. Is it the obligation of the school boards to supply cost data for cash out or aggregation or balancing?
- A We supplied the data to them through the data request. They have the bills and all the cash out materials.
- Q Well, why didn't you do it if it was that easy? And by you, I mean the company?
 - A It was not required for this rate case.
- Q Okay. Well, you know that the statute says here that the company's supposed to provide data on the existing case -- I mean, on their costs. Even though that was 20 years ago, the statute still is

1 | exactly the same it was in then.

MR. FISHER: Your Honor, I would object to that question. I think it's a mischaracterization of the statute. It also calls for a legal conclusion.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'll sustain.

- Q (By Mr. Brownlee) On the rebuttal testimony, you said you did not agree with -- and it's on page six. Do you have that in front of you, page six, lines nine through twelve? And there's a -- I think, also you mentioned -- you didn't agree with page 14, lines 22 and 23. I'm not going to approach the witness because she's got her testimony. Let's go to page six, lines nine through twelve. Do you have that?
 - A Regarding the capacity release?
- 17 O Yes.

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

- 18 | A Yes.
 - Q Yeah. And you mentioned -- are there any large volume MSBA schools on your utility system that would be classified as large volume otherwise?
 - A Not to my knowledge. I don't believe -- we do have a couple of colleges. But I don't think those are MSBA.
 - Q Does your company release capacity to small

1 | volume schools?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

- A Yes.
- Q Does the statute state that a company must provide for transportation to service to Missouri schools on the system?
- MR. FISHER: Objection again, legal conclusion that's being called for.
- MR. BROWNLEE: Well, I asked her if the statute states that. That's not her opinion, she can say if the statute states it, Your Honor. It says what it says.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yeah, I'll overrule. She can answer, if she knows. And if she doesn't she can state that.
- Q (By Mr. Brownlee) You want me to read it again?
- A Yes.
- Q Does the statute state that the company must provide for transportation service to the eligible schools?
- A Yes.
- Q Yeah. And you -- do you know what year it was, I think Mr. Fisher may have mentioned. Do you know what the last time that the commission actually changed the aggregation and balancing and cash out

charges; do you know what year that was?

- A The rates became effective 2010.
- Q And it was -- would you accept that I believe it was GR2009-0434?
- A Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

- Q I think -- I think that's correct. I don't mean to mislead you, that wasn't any tricky question. But, without -- without the cost report we've talked about, how does the commission make any finding on that -- in the case --
 - A On the costs that were --
- Q -- for balancing, aggregation or cash out? How do they it if there's no data from the company on this issue?
- A I'm not sure -- I'm not sure what was provided in the previous rate case since I wasn't involved. I'm not sure what witnesses they used for that rate case. However, I do know that our pipeline costs have only increased since 2010.
 - Q Right.
- A Which means those costs have not gone down, they've only gone up.
- Q But those costs that you just talked about, the increasing costs, wouldn't that be, normally, something you'd put in your rate case?

1 A Potentially.

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

Q So if Public Counsel would like to know what those increased costs were, just so we'd wonder about subsidization, but the company hasn't produced that, have they?

A No.

- Q Excuse me a minute here. Do you -- do you know personally, and I know it's from an earlier case. Do you have any knowledge about the aggregation and balancing charges that are currently in your tariff and how they might compare to other utilities? Do you -- In your preparation, did you review that?
 - A No, I'm not familiar.
- Q So you couldn't answer any questions about that in terms of the actual dollar amounts compared to other utilities?

A No.

- Q Okay. Do you know, would you -- would you accept that the aggregation and balancing charges are five times higher than your sister company, Liberty utilities?
- A I'm not familiar with all the other utilities' cost fractures. I just mostly -- I recently took over Midstates. So I'm still learning

- 1 | Midstates' cost structures.
- Q Yeah. Well, I'm not to embarrass you, but I
- 3 | mean, you didn't compare, for preparation today,
- 4 like, what you -- what these fees, what these rates
- 5 are compared to your sister company, that the
- 6 Missouri schools pay? You don't know whether
- 7 | there's a five times disparity between your company,
- 8 | Empire, and Liberty?
- 9 A Which -- which component?
- 10 Q Just the rates in general. For the
- 11 | aggregation and balancing charges. Your -- they're
- 12 five times higher than your sister company. Are you
- 13 familiar with that?
- 14 A The aggregation charge is the same.
- 15 Q Yeah. And balancing, do you say they're the
- 16 same?
- 17 A The aggregation?
- 18 Q Yeah. And they're not five times higher
- 19 | than -- that's your testimony?
- 20 A Not to my knowledge.
- 21 0 Okay.
- 22 A But I'm not as familiar with that.
- Q Well, if you're not familiar, then you just
- 24 | don't know; is that a fair statement?
- 25 A Yes.

	Page 44
1	MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. Could we have just a
2	minute, just take
3	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Certainly.
4	Q (By Mr. Brownlee) All right. Right on just
5	that very last question. To be fair, if you
6	combined the current aggregation and balancing fees
7	of Empire, are you aware that they're five times
8	higher for the Missouri Schools than Liberty's
9	charges; are you familiar with that?
10	A No.
11	MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. All right. I think
12	that's all at this time. Thanks so much.
13	Appreciate it.
14	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you.
15	Let's see if we have any bench questions. I will
16	have a few questions for the witness. Commissioner
17	Holsman, any questions?
18	COMMISSIONER HOLSMAN: No, Judge. No
19	questions at this time.
20	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Commissioner,
21	thank you. Any other commissioners that have any

24

22

23

25

questions? All right. Ms. Earhart, I'm going to

have a few questions for you.

[EXAMINATION OF MS. EARHART]

QUESTIONS BY JUDGE PRIDGIN:

2.

2.2

2.4

2.5

Q If I could direct you to page three of your rebuttal testimony. And more specifically, like the bottom of page three, top of page four when you're discussing balancing approaches.

Can you explain, I guess, in more detail what -- what is Empire's concern with other balancing approaches that create opportunities for participants to the detriment of Empire's firm sales customers?

A The carry over earned netting. There's a couple of areas of concern for the company. The first one is the company has limited resources to use to balance the company's city gates. As Patterson pointed out in his rebuttal testimony, the line packs. Other utilities may be utilizing line pack. To my knowledge, Empire does not utilize the line packs so that doesn't give us the additional flexibility.

Another one is, we do not have any on system storage. So we can't pull from multiple storage scenarios. Also, the storage that we use to serve the firm sales customer is limited. We don't have an abundant amount of storage for the system.

So any capacity that is being held for the firm sales customers, it's crucial that we keep the majority of that capacity for those firm sales customers. The firm sales customers pay for that storage capacity 365 days a year at a higher cost.

2.

2.2

2.5

With netting and carrying over, I think that there could be an opportunity for unintentional scenario that would potentially harm the firm sales customers. For example, if it was November and we're heading into winter and the prices are increasing, there may be some incentive to go long, which leaves more in storage for the colder months when the prices are higher, which means that that short term storage would be taking up the capacity it's meant for those firm customers.

And then, maybe towards the end of winter, like if it was February and it's very cold, then there may be incentive to go short in February. Meaning, you're withdrawing more of the storage out that was meant for the firm sales customers. And being replaced later by the customer, for the transportation customers in the lower priced months.

Q Okay. And I have a few questions and if I -- if you've already answered them, please let me know. You know, I may -- I may miss some of your

answers as it applies to all these questions.

2.

2.2

2.5

But can you explain in more detail how Empire's pipeline storage contracted for firm sales customers would be used by aggregators if netting or carry over of imbalances were used?

A If -- if you use the netting, if they carry over a balance, so, if they're -- if they're long or they're short, they've either used storage -- we have storage withdrawal plan. And we're trying to use a certain amount of storage each month. And if it's unintentionally used during a different month, then we have to make adjustments.

With the netting and carrying over, I think it's just that that's an asset that the firm sales customers are paying for 365 days a year. And this is -- the solution that they're proposing is, like, a short term storage solution, minus the costs. But it's taking away that protection that's meant for the firm sales customers.

Q Okay. If I can direct you to more, page four of your rebuttal testimony. Can you explain more in detail how aggregation and balancing fees reduce gas commodity fees charged to your customers through the purchase gas adjustment clause?

A The aggregation and balancing fees that we

collect from the different transportation pools are directly credited to our PGA mechanism. So, whatever the total gas cost is for the year, we -- we take those revenues and reduce our gas cost, which goes back to the firm sales customers.

1

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

Q Okay. What does Empire do to balance the small volume pools?

A Each day, when gas is sent to the gate, if there is too much gas sent to each gate, which would be a combination of your large volume, small volume and sales customers, whatever the excess is, our MO net of storage will take care of that. Or on days where there's too little gas sent to the gate, the storage will balance all of the city's gates.

- Q How did Empire balance the small volume pools during winter storm Yuri?
 - A When you say how, do you mean how much or?
- Q I guess your method. I mean how much is fine as well, but more your method.

A The method? We have a regression model that predicts how much our system should use and how much we should withdraw and any of the additional shortage from the small volume pools gets balanced from the storage.

Q Were there issues with those imbalances of

- the small volume pool customers that impacted
 Empire's distribution system as a whole?
- 3 A Yes.

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

- 4 O What were those issues?
 - A During the storm, the school pools did not send enough gas during the storm for reasonable expectation of usage.
 - Q Does Empire have the ability to read school gas meters without telemetry?
 - A The equipment that we installed has the capability to produce daily reads, from what I understand. It wouldn't be on a real time basis, but at the end of the month it would be able to give daily data, from what I understand.
- Q Okay. Do you have a copy of Mr. Ervin,
 Sr.'s corrected surrebuttal testimony?
- 17 | A I do.
- Q Okay. If I could direct you to appendix
 four of that testimony. And let me know when you're
 there.
- 21 A Surrebuttal?
- 22 O Correct.
- 23 A And I'm sorry, one more time, appendix four?
- Q Four, yes. And specifically, Empire's
- response to data request 7.2.

- A Seven point two, yes.
- Q Okay. Do you know who James Young is that responded to that data request?
 - A Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q I think the data requests asks if Empire buys pipeline storage for transportation customers. And Mr. Young said, no, but explained that Empire uses upstream storage services; is that correct?
 - A Let me read the response.
- Q Sure.
 - A Would you like my interpretation?
 - Q Well, actually, I just had a question and you can also give your interpretation if you want. Would the daily balancing for service provided to the city gates include all gas including transportation customers?
 - A Will you repeat that?
 - Q Sure. Would the daily balancing for service provided to the system city gates include all gas delivered to Empire, including the transportation customers?
 - A Correct. It would balance everything at the end of the day.
- Q Okay. Great. Why is an analysis on the impact to firm customers important before making any

tariff change to aggregation and balancing fees?

2.2

2.4

A An analysis of the storage and aggregation fees. For -- for the benefit of the firm sales customers, you would want to make sure that their costs are being recovered, that they're not paying for storage or transportation costs that other customer are using.

Q Okay. Could you tell me why it takes time to develop and implement changes to the STP tariff?

A Currently, Empire does not have a school tariff, a stand alone school tariff. We have transportation tariffs that have flexibility that will allow the schools to still participate in a transportation program. Our sister company does have a stand alone tariff, which we had talked about trying to model something along those lines.

However, that tariff needs to have major, just some updates and language improvements. That going to take some time.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. I think those are all the questions I have, thank you. Let me see if we have any recross, based on bench questions and I'll begin with staff. Any questions?

MS. MYERS: No questions, Judge, thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. OPC?

	Page 52
1	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, no.
2	JUDGE PRIDGIN: MECG?
3	MR. OPITZ: No, thank you.
4	JUDGE PRIDGIN: MSBA?
5	[FURTHER EXAMINATION OF MS. EARHART]
6	QUESTIONS BY MR. BROWNLEE:
7	Q Regarding sort of the overall issue here,
8	the carry over, the tariffs, the special tariffs,
9	and your company, along with the school board and
10	with staff, were you were you around or were you
11	present during 2018 when the company proposed a
12	tariff change on these issues and with some meetings
13	that occurred?
14	A I was in the gas supply department in 2018.
15	Q Did you attend those meetings, any of them
16	at all or not?
17	A Are these the meetings with Jill Schwartz?
18	Q Yeah, I think. Yes.
19	A I did attend the meetings.
20	Q What were the purpose of those of those
21	meetings; do you recall?
22	A I was not the main lead on that, that
23	meeting.
24	Q Do you know if the commission or if the

company had filed some -- some actual tariffs to --

25

- 1 | to address a number of these issues at that time?
- A For Empire, not to my knowledge.
 - O You don't know that?
- 4 A No.

3

8

10

- Q Could they have? I mean, if -- if -- you just don't know yourself whether proposed tariffs were filed in 2018 to address these issues?
 - A Not to my knowledge.
 - Q And do you know whatever happened to that filing?
- 11 A No.
- MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. All right. Thanks so much.
- 14 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Brownlee, thank you.
- 15 | Any redirect, Mr. Fisher?
- MR. FISHER: Just briefly, Your Honor.
- 17 [FURTHER EXAMINATION OF MS. EARHART]
- 18 QUESTIONS BY MR. FISHER:
- 19 Q Judge Pridgin asked you, I think, how 20 aggregation fees were treated related to the PGA.
- 21 Do you recall those questions?
- 22 A Yes.
- Q Is it correct to conclude that aggregation
- fees don't help the company's bottom lime, they get
- 25 | flowed back to help customers?

A Correct. None of those dollars are flowing into the revenue for the company. They all go directly back to the direct -- the firm sales customers to reduce their costs.

Q So by raising those aggregation fees, it wouldn't help the company's rate of return on equity or rate of return on investment, right?

A No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

Q Did Empire District Gas Company request the approval of any increases in aggregation balancing or cash out fees in this case?

A No.

Q Are you aware that some rates are going up as a result of the stipulation and agreement among the parties on -- on other firm customers?

A Yes.

Q You were asked a question by Mr. Brownlee about paragraph four of a statute. And that statute happens to be attached to Louis Ervin, II's direct testimony. Do you have a copy of Mr. Ervin's direct testimony? And I'd like to refer you to that statute that he includes at Appendix 1. Do you have that now?

A Yes.

Q I'd like to refer for you to Section

- 1 | 393.310. And he asked you about paragraph four.
- 2 | That paragraph states: "The tariffs required
- 3 | pursuant to subsection 3 of this section shall, at a
- 4 | minimum, " and then I'd like to drop down to
- 5 | subsection 2 there. Where it says: "Provide for
- 6 the resale of such natural gas supplies, including
- 7 related transportation costs to the eligible school
- 8 | entities at the gas corporation's cost of purchasing
- 9 of gas supplies and transportation, plus all
- 10 applicable distribution costs." Is that what that
- 11 says?
- 12 A Yes.
- Q So that says that that portion has to be at
- 14 | cost; is that how you would read that?
- 15 A Correct.
- 16 Q Let's go on, though. It says: "Plus, an
- 17 | aggregation and balancing fee to be determined by
- 18 | the commission." Is that right? Is that what the
- 19 statute says?
- 20 | A Correct.
- Q Does that say to be determined at cost by
- 22 | the commission?
- 23 A No.
- Q Has the commission determined the
- appropriate aggregation, balancing and cash out fees

for Empire District Gas in the past rate case?

A Yes.

2.2

2.5

MR. FISHER: That's all the questions I have, Judge. Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Mr. Fisher, thank you. Ms. Earhart, thank you very much. You may step down. And I believe the next witness is going to be MSBA's witness, Mr. Ervin, Sr; is that correct?

MR. BROWNLEE: We would prefer to have Mr. Ervin, Jr., be first if it would. I think then it would allow if there's any follow-ups or historical questions, Senior would be more in a position to answer those.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. Sounds like MSBA wants to call Mr. Ervin, II. Any objections or anything further before he takes the stand? Okay. Anything further before Mr. Ervin, II takes the stands? All right. If you'll come forward to be sworn, please, sir.

If you'll raise your right hand to be sworn please. Do you swear the evidence you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

	Page 57
1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you very much. You
2	may have a seat. And, Mr. Brownlee, when you're
3	ready, sir.
4	MR. BROWNLEE: Thank you.
5	[EXAMINATION OF MR. ERVIN, II]
6	QUESTIONS BY MR. BROWNLEE:
7	Q Would you please state your name for the
8	record?
9	A Louis Ervin, II.
10	Q By whom are you employed?
11	A I'm with LAV Energy Advisors, appearing on
12	behalf Missouri School Boards' Association.
13	Q And has your company represented the
14	Missouri School Boards' Association for a number of
15	years?
16	A Yes. Prior to me joining the company, Louis
17	Senior represented them since the beginning of 2002,
18	I believe.
19	Q You have uniquely the same name. Is he your
20	father?
21	A Yes, he is.
22	Q Okay. You have filed testimony in this
23	proceeding; is that not correct?
24	A That's correct.

Q And I think under the previous procedural

25

And, again, if I ask you -- if we ask you

2.5

0

the same questions, would your answers be the same?

A Yes, they would.

2.2

2.5

- Q Are there any additions or corrections?
- A No, there are not.

MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. And, Your Honor, at this time, I'd also like to have the commission take administrative notice and I think mark it probably as Exhibit 303. And that's the order approving the stipulation and agreement in the Case No.

GT-2003-30038, which was the original Equila (phonetic) case that I believe was a predecessor of Empire. And that was the case, one of the seven, that was issued by the commission at the immediate conclusion of the statute in the year. And at this time, pass out copies of that.

At this time, Your Honor, I'm going to go ahead and offer Exhibits 300, 301 and 303.

And also make note that there are a number of other PSC decisions mentioned in various testimonies. And I believe under the evidentiary rules contained at 4 CSR, whatever the evidentiary rule is for the commission, there is a specific paragraph that deals with prior administrative -- prior commission records, public records and this would be one, along with the others one. And I'd ask that the

- commission would be able to take administrative
 notice of those records and any subsequent documents
 or briefs that might be filed.
- And I will tender Mr. Ervin, II for cross.
 - JUDGE PRIDGIN: Very good. Thank you.

 Exhibits 300, 301 and 303 have all been offered.

 Any objections? Hearing none, Exhibits 300, 301 and 303 are admitted. See if we have any cross examination? MECG, any cross? Public Counsel?

 Questions from staff?
- MS. MYERS: No questions, Judge.
- 13 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Empire District Gas?
- 14 [EXAMINATION OF MR. ERVIN, II]

15 OUESTIONS BY MR. FISHER:

6

7

8

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.5

- Q Good morning, Mr. Ervin. I have just a few questions for you. I'd like to direct you to your direct testimony on page four, at lines 15 and 16. There you indicate that MSBA is the authorized purchasing agent for approximately 2,390 STP accounts. What does the STP account mean?
 - A School Transportation Program.
- Q Out of which, 140 are in the Empire service area; is that correct?
 - A That's correct what I stated and that's, to

- the best of my knowledge, that's correct.
- Q Does that mean that the association serves 3 140 schools in the Empire service area?
 - A That's the way I read that, yes.
 - Q Okay. So would it be correct to conclude that the Empire service area represents roughly six percent, if my calculator was right, of your total number of schools that you serve in Missouri?
 - A If you checked your calculator, yes, sir.
 - Q Okay. On page five of your direct, on line 20, you state that STP was created in July of 2002 with the enactment of Section 393.310 RSMO; is that right?
 - A Yes, sir.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

- Q So, has the School Transportation Program been operating in the Empire service area for about 20 years?
 - A To the best of my knowledge, yes.
- Q And then on page five of your direct, at line 15, you state: "Schools, students, teachers and taxpayers benefit from group purchasing of natural gas. Absent these STP saving on gas supply costs, schools would have fewer dollars for teachers, computers and other classroom learning tools;" is that right?

- A That's what I stated, yes.
- Q Would it be correct to conclude that the Missouri schools have benefited as a result of the school transportation program provided by Empire District Gas and other LDCs?
 - A Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q Would you characterize the school transportation program in the Empire service area as a success during those years?
 - A Yes.
- Q Then on page nine of your direct testimony, at lines 17, you state: "MSBA would like to have the commission order STP tariffs to comply with Section 393.310 RSMO so that MSBA can avoid intervention in rate cases"; is that right?
 - A Yes.
- Q Is it correct that it's expensive for the association to intervene in natural rate cases?
- A Yes, it is.
 - Q Do you have an estimate of what you -- the kind of costs you would avoid if you didn't have to intervene in rate cases?
 - A I don't know that answer.
- Q Okay. Mr. Ervin, would you agree with me that Empire's aggregation and balancing fees have

been determined by, and established by the commission in Empire's 2009 rate case?

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

2.5

- A That's what I have understood.
- Q Okay. The statute does not mandate how the commission must establish the aggregation and balancing fee; isn't that correct?
 - A I don't believe that's correct.
- Q Okay. Has the school board association ever filed a formal complaint against the Empire District Gas Company in the 20 years that the transportation program's been operating?
- A I haven't been around that whole time. We have definitely tried to work with every utility, including Empire, as stated in 2018 and 2019. And we're largely in agreement and otherwise would have filed something that we had an agreement other than staff said that they would prefer to be in a rate case. So, you know, I don't -- I think that's the extent of, that I'm aware of.
- Q To your knowledge, there's never been a whole formal complaint filed against Empire
 District?
- A I didn't testify to that one way or the other, I don't know the answer. Senior would be available to answer that question most likely.

Q All righty. No, that's fair. Thank you.

On page six of your direct testimony at line 16, you begin explaining the nomination process and how it affects cash outs and balancing; is that right?

A Yes.

2.

2.2

2.5

Q Would you agree that if the aggregator or the transportation customer agent does a good job of nominating its expected customer rates, and with that assumption, then the cash outs and balancing penalties are really not a measured factor for the customer or the pool administrator if he's doing a good job nominating them, right?

A I don't know how you would define a god job because this -- most of them are not daily telemetry so, you know, the weather changes more than they can predict. So I don't -- I don't know how to answer that.

Q Okay. Well, isn't it true that it's when the aggregator or the transportation customer agent misses the mark, for whatever reason, weather or anything else on his nominations, that's when cash outs and balancing penalties become a concern?

A Yes. I would say that every utility is that way and every customer's that way, yes.

Q Has MSBA estimated what would be the

expected impact, in dollars, if the commissioner adopts your proposed aggregation and balancing fees in this case?

- A No, we have not.
- Q You don't recall of giving us an estimate of \$1800?
 - A I don't recall the estimate. I do know we were not looking at total costs because we were trying to make sure that we're looking at the principal of -- of the statute and because it -- it sets precedent.
- Q Sitting here today, what would be an estimate, in your opinion?
 - A I would have to check and look at volumes.
- Q Okay. Do you think it would be less than \$5,000?
- 17 A I'm really not sure.
- 18 | Q Okay.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

- 19 A It's not -- we didn't bring the issue up as 20 a -- as a dollar issue.
 - Q Let's turn to page 13 of your direct testimony. On line four, where you state: "Making schools ultimately liable for actions or inactions of suppliers could effectively be used as a means to eliminate the MSBA program and force schools to be

under Empire system supply which, typically, results in the MSBA schools paying more for natural gas as compared to the current managed program." Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.

2.

2.2

Q At the time you filed your testimony, did you believe that Empire was attempting to eliminate MSBA -- the MSBA program from in this case?

A I didn't know their intent. What I saw was their -- their red line tariff to remove aggregators and marketers from responsibility. So that -- I'm not -- I'm not saying that was their intent.

Q Okay. Do you believe that's their intent today?

A I don't know their intent.

Q Do you believe that Empire is trying to force schools to be under the Empire system supply in this case?

A I don't -- I don't have any reason to think one way or the other, so I don't know.

Q Thank you for your patience, that's all I have.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fischer, thank you. Let me see if we have any bench questions. Commissioner Holsman, any question, sir? I'm not hearing any and

I don't have any questions. We don't have any bench questions, so no recross. And I believe this witness can step down.

MR. BROWNLEE: I had a question.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay, go ahead.

[FURTHER EXAMINATION OF MR. ERVIN, II]
OUESTIONS BY MR. BROWNLEE:

Q Mr. Ervin, Mr. Fisher asked you about the size of the schools and the number of schools and their system compared to the overall. If -- when you have penalty provisions like in the current tariff on the cash out, do schools have a way, to your knowledge, of -- of adjusting any sort of income to schools to pay those kind of penalties, to pay those kind of charges?

A I mean, they have, as far as I know, they don't adjust it based on those charges.

Q I mean, they don't -- they don't get to raise their prices for the service schools provide?

A I guess not. I'm not the expert on the schools.

Q Do you know whether schools get a huge percent of their revenue off taxes? I mean, if they get an unusual charge like a gas penalty, that can have a significant derelictious effect on schools;

would it not?

2.2

2.5

A Yeah, my comment was that -- that these schools are not in control of that and the weather is more in control, even in the suppliers. And to penalize them 50 percent either direction, either over delivered or under delivered, which benefits the PGA, or -- or take some away from a PGA, that's out of their control.

And so, just the penalty is -- is the issue. Not -- not the fact that there will be imbalances.

Q And regarding the questions you were asked about the costs to cash out and the costs of aggregation, is it the position of -- of MSBA that you want to eliminate cash out in this case?

A No. We -- we, really, specifically said carry over would be the ideal way, but we also said that there's nothing wrong with cash out in principal and the methodology. It's just the fact that they're paying a 50 percent premium or a penalty if they have to buy more or they're getting charged -- or they're getting deducted 50 percent of the cost of gas. So that shows up -- up to 50 percent of the cost of gas. So that shows up directly on their bills as a -- as a big hit.

So for example, if the cost of gas is \$10, you know, then they're going to have to pay 15.

Now that's a high price, obviously, but we saw that at polar vortex during Storm Yuri. And if they have to give money back from their company, they'd be getting it back at \$5 for what they already paid \$10 for. So that's -- that's the tiered cash out, the highest level it would be 50 percent.

- Q And, really, isn't that the Grogman of the issue on cash out? It's just, philosophically it's not wrong if it charges applicable costs?
 - A Correct.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q And do you see -- and we've used that word the add on. We've used the word penalty, haven't we, and that show up in the testimony?
 - A Yes.
- Q Is there -- is there any place in the -- in the underlying statute where you see any reference to a penalty in terms of the gast costs?
 - A No, there's not.
- Q And that gas cost is not from the transporter, the penalty's imposed by the utility; is it not?
- 24 A That's correct.
- 25 MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Mr. Brownlee, thank you. And, Mr. Ervin, you can step down. And I'm showing the time is just right around 10:00 so this seems to be an appropriate time to take a mid morning break. We'll take 15 minutes and resume at 10:15 with Mr. Ervin, Sr.'s testimony.

2.

2.2

2.5

And I'll just remind everyone in the hearing room that Webex is still streaming so please, somebody outside can still hear you if you're in the hearing room. Anything further before we go off the record? I'm sorry, go ahead, Mr. Brownlee. Okay, we'll go off the record. We'll resume at 10:15. Thank you, we're off the record.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was held off the record.)

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Let's go back on the record. Good morning, we are on the record again in file No. GR-2021-0320. Just as a bit of a road map where we've been, where we're going.

We've had -- we finished off with Mr. Ervin, II, I believe with this cross examination. I understand Mr. Ervin, Sr. is the next scheduled witness and I think I heard on the -- off the record, rather, that no parties have any cross examination for that witness; is that correct? I'm

- 1 hearing no response. I'm taking that as true.
- $2\mid$ Okay. I'll have him take the stand. I will have a
- 3 | few questions for him and then we'll go on to
- 4 Mr. Patterson.
- As far as the presentation on the
- 6 parties' stipulation and agreement, I'm unsure
- 7 | exactly how we'll proceed with that, but my gut
- 8 | reaction right now with commissioner response is
- 9 that we'll just simply continue forward after
- 10 Mr. Patterson's cross is done and take cross
- 11 examination -- or excuse me, take the on record
- 12 comments on the stipulation and see if we have any
- 13 bench questions on the stipulation.
- 14 So I just wanted to give you a heads
- 15 | up we'll probably just keep going after
- 16 Mr. Patterson's cross is finished with the on the
- 17 record presentation on the stip.
- 18 So anything further before Mr. Ervin
- 19 is sworn in? All right. If you'll raise your right
- 20 | hand to be sworn, please, sir. Do you swear the
- 21 evidence you're about to give will be the truth, the
- 22 whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you
- 23 God?
- 24 THE WITNESS: I do.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you, sir. You may

	Page 72
1	have a seat. Mr. Brownlee, when you're ready, sir.
2	MR. BROWNLEE: Thank you, sir.
3	[EXAMINATION OF MR. ERVIN, SR.]
4	QUESTIONS BY MR. BROWNLEE:
5	Q Please state your name for the record.
6	A Louis R. Ervin.
7	Q Sir, by whom are you employed?
8	A LEV Energy Advisors.
9	Q And have you caused testimony to be filed in
L 0	this current proceeding?
L1	A Yes.
L 2	Q And have we previously asked and agreed the
L 3	court reporter would mark your testimony as Exhibit
L 4	302?
L 5	A Yes.
L 6	(Whereupon, Exhibit No. 302 was
L 7	marked for identification by the
L 8	reporter.)
L 9	Q Thank you. Very briefly, we you've
20	heard, and I know you're familiar with it, you
21	were you not the Louis Ervin that were representing
22	the school board in the year 2002 when the statute
23	that we've talked about was passed?
24	A Yes, and before that, I think starting about
5	1998

Q Okay. And and during the the
proceeding of various cases dealing with
transportation of the school issue, have you
represented the school board's in front of not just
this company, but I think most all of the other gas
utility cases that have occurred?

2.2

2.5

A Yes, I was witness in all seven utilities back at that point in time. In 2002, there were seven, now they're five, but I testified in each one of those.

Q And there's one case that we did not participate in; is that not correct?

A Well, there was a case in 2009 that we didn't know about.

Q That we didn't, therefore, participate on?

MS. MYERS: Judge, I object. What's -- what

procedure is going on here? Are we providing

additional testimony?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'm going to sustain. I mean, the point of this is already prefiled testimony is here to stand cross. I'm going to sustain.

Q (By Mr. Brownlee) Right. Well, I think you covered that in your testimony. If I ask you the same questions as indicated in Exhibit 3012, would

- your answers be the same?
- A Yes.

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

- Q And are there any corrections or additions you'd like to make at this time?
- 5 A No.

MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. At this time, Your Honor, I'm going to offer Exhibit 302 and tender Mr. Ervin for cross, which I believe you have questions but I think other attorneys have waived.

thank you. Exhibit 302 has been offered. Any objections? Hearing none, Exhibit 302 is admitted. And we'll just verify, does any -- any counsel have cross examination for this witness? Going once, going twice, very good. Mr. Holsman, any questions? All right. Hearing none, I have just a few questions for you, Mr. Ervin.

[CROSS EXAMINATION OF MR. ERVIN]
QUESTIONS BY JUDGE PRIDGIN:

Q If I could direct you to your surrebuttal testimony, page ten. And, specifically, lines 11 through 13, please. And let me know when you're there, please.

- A I'm there.
- Q Okay. Thank you. I believe in that

testimony you state that Section 393.310 RSMO requires gas corporations to provide services to small schools at incremental cost and that surrebuttal also includes Appendix One, which is a copy of that statute; is that correct?

A Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

Q Can you show me where in Section 393.310 there's any reference to cash out and pipeline capacity releases?

A Yes. Now just to find it. Okay. Let's see, we take it one at a time, I think. Okay. The reference to incremental cost is under paragraph five.

Q Well, that's note quite my question. My question is, where does it state any reference to cash out or pipeline capacity releases?

A The -- the reference to the cash out is under paragraph two where it says the gas corporations' costs of purchasing gas supply and transportation. So I think I answered that.

- Q Okay. Okay. And if I could --
- A And then capacity.
- Q All right.
- A And then capacity, actually the capacity part of the statute was not part of the 2002

statute, it came about a year later. And that is in paragraph six.

- Q Okay, thank you. If I could refer you to page 11 of your surrebuttal and specifically lines 12 and 13. And let me know when you're there, please.
 - A I'm there.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

- Q Okay, thank you. I think in those lines you state under Section 393.10: "There will be neither negative impacts on others nor penalties to eligible small school entities." Can you show me where that language is in the statute?
- A It goes back to paragraph two where it says:

 "At the gas corporations' cost of purchasing such
 gas supplies."
- Q Okay. And then, and lastly, if I could refer you to page 13 of your testimony, lines five and six. And if you can let me know when you're there, please.
 - A I'm there.
- Q Okay. I believe in that testimony you state: "Staff did not represent schools' interests in that case or comply with Section 3393.10." With that statement, are you referring to File No.

A I believe that's correct, yes.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay, thank you. Those are all the questions that I have. Since we've had some bench questions, I'll ask if anybody has any cross based on my questions? No cross, very good. Any redirect?

[FURTHER EXAMINATION OF MR. ERVIN]
OUESTIONS BY MR. BROWNLEE:

- Q Mr. Ervin, regarding the last question from the judge about that case, that was the case we -- the school boards were not appropriate in; is that correct?
 - A Correct.
- Q Okay. We did not receive notice at that time from the commission it was even filed?
 - A No.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

- MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. That was what I was trying to get at earlier. Sorry, I didn't --
- 19 JUDGE PRIDGIN: No problem, thank you.
 - MR. BROWNLEE: That's all I have. And, again, I'm going to reoffer those exhibits and that would conclude our position. Did -- If I can ask a question while I'm up here. Did you rule on the admissibility of exhibit -- the exact -- the copy of the report and order from that case?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yes, that's 303 and was
offered without objection and admitted. And thank
you, and 302's admitted. And, Mr. Ervin, thank you
very much, you may step down. And I believe that
leaves us to Mr. Patterson. Anything further from
counsel before Mr. Patterson is sworn? If you'll
come forward, sir, and be sworn.

If you'll raise your right hand to be sworn, please. Do you swear the evidence you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

THE WITNESS: I do.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you, sir, you may have a set. Ms. Myers, when you're ready.

[EXAMINATION OF MR. PATTERSON]

OUESTIONS BY MS. MYERS:

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

2.2

- Q Thank you. Mr. Patterson, please state your full name for the record.
- 19 A My name is Keenan, K-E-E-N-A-N, Patterson, 20 P-A-T-T-E-R-S-O-N.
 - Q Thank you. And, Mr. Patterson, where are you employed and what is your job title?
- 23 A I'm employed with the staff of the Missouri
 24 Public Service Commission. My title is Senior
 25 Professional Engineer.

Q And are you the same Keenan Patterson who prepared or caused to be prepared the rebuttal testimony that we are marking as Exhibit 100 and the surrebuttal testimony that we are marking as Exhibit 101?

A I am.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

(Whereupon, Exhibits Nos. 100 and 101 were marked for identification by the reporter.)

Q (By Ms. Myers) Do you have anything you wish to correct in either of those testimonies?

A Yes, I have corrections to Schedules 4 and 5 of my rebuttal testimony.

Q Okay. And those schedules are confidential, Mr. Patterson?

A Yes.

MS. MYERS: Okay. Judge, we have provided the parties present here with copies of those corrections. Staff is going to offer those corrected schedules Exhibit 102.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: And will that need to be 102 and then 102 HC?

MS. MYERS: 102 C. And same with
Mr. Keenan's -- or Mr. Keenan Patterson's rebuttal
testimony. It will be 100 Public and 100 C.

1

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

(Whereupon, Exhibits Nos. 102,

102 C and 100 C were marked for

identification by the reporter.)

(By Ms. Myers) All right. Mr. Patterson --4 0 5

or aside from those corrections to Schedules 4 and 5, if I asked you the same questions today, would your answers be the same?

Α Yes.

So the information in these documents is true and correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?

Α Yes.

MS. MYERS: All right. Thank you. Your Honor, staff tenders Mr. Patterson for cross examination. And we'll go ahead and offer Exhibits 100, 101 and 102.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. And if you could again, so I could get down in my notes, let me know exactly what those exhibits are, please?

MS. MYERS: Sure. Exhibit 100 is the rebuttal testimony of Mr. Keenan Patterson, Public and confidential versions. Exhibit 101 is the surrebuttal testimony of Keenan Patterson. Exhibit 102 is the corrected confidential schedules of Mr. Keenan Patterson. And then Schedules 4 and 5

of Mr. Keenan Patterson's rebuttal testimony. And these are confidential in their entirety.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Myers, thank you.

4 Exhibits 100, 101, and 102 have been offered. Any

objections? And those are admitted. That will be

Exhibit 100, public and confidential, Exhibit 101,

and Exhibit 102, confidential, those are all

8 | admitted. Any cross-examination from Public

O | Counsel? Thank you. MECG? Empire District Gas?

10 When you're ready, Mr. Fisher.

[EXAMINATION OF MR. PATTERSON]

QUESTIONS BY MR. FISHER:

- Q Good morning, Mr. Patterson. I just have a couple of questions or areas, anyway. I think I'd like to begin by visiting with you about the staff's position on the proposal to eliminate cash out, balancing, and substitute the carry over method.
- 18 | Are you familiar with those terms?
 - A Yes.

3

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

2.2

2.5

- Q Is the cash out method used by other local distribution companies in Missouri?
 - A Yes.
- Q Would you characterize that as the predominant method used?
 - A Yes.

Q To your knowledge, has it been used for a number of years since the school transportation program began?

A Yes.

2.

2.2

2.5

Q On page fif -- or excuse me, on page four, beginning at line 15, I believe you explained to the commission why balancing is important; is that right?

A Let me look.

Q Yeah, page four, beginning at line 15.

A Yes.

Q Would you explain how transportation imbalances could cause the sales customers gas costs to be higher than they would otherwise have been if the costs had not been recovered from the transportation customer?

A Well, any imbalance between the gas company, in or out of the utility system, has to be managed somehow. And so, the utility would be applying its resources to those imbalances. Primarily, I would think in a smaller utility either making withdrawals or injections to storage on a interstate pipeline or, potentially, depending on the severity of the imbalance, purchasing gas to make up for a shortage. And all those costs, at least initially, would tend

to flow through the purchase gas adjustment because they are gas costs.

- Q Would that mean since it flows through the PGA, that it does not help or hurt the -- the gas company's bottom line?
 - A Correct.
- Q But it could affect the impact on firm customers?
- A Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

- Q Okay. I'd like to ask you to turn to page nine, line two. There you calculate the average amount per school for some certain annual credits; is that right?
 - A Let me review this briefly here.
- 15 O Yes.
- 16 A Yes.
- Q You have included in the numbers as confidential numbers; is that right?
- 19 A Yes.
 - MR. FISHER: Judge, just for purposes of the record, Empire doesn't believe these average numbers need to be kept confidential, if the commission would prefer to make them public. The table that he has in his testimony probably could be kept public -- or kept confidential, but the average

numbers, we would not object if they were made public.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay, thank you.

- Q (By Mr. Fisher) On page nine at line two, you calculate the average amount per school for the annual credits; is that right?
 - A Yes.
- Q And that number, I'm going to go ahead and say it publicly, is \$47 per school, right?
- A Yes.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.2

- Q And then on page ten of your rebuttal, you discuss how much Empire charges the school aggregation pools on aggregation and balancing fees; is that right?
 - A Yes.
- Q You testified that the average annual charge is \$154 per school per year for aggregation and balancing fees; is that correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q So that's about \$13 a month if my calculator works right?
 - A Approximately.
- Q Is it your understanding that Empire's been charging these fees since this last job rate case?
- 25 A Yes.

MR. FISHER: I think that's all the questions I have. Thank you, Judge.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fisher, thank you. Any cross from MSBA?

[CROSS EXAMINATION OF MR. PATTERSON]
QUESTIONS BY MR. BROWNLEE:

Q Good morning, sir. I'm Richard Brownlee, I think we've met previously and probably over the period of time in many years. I represent Missouri School Boards' Association and I'd like to ask you some questions about your testimony and the issues in the case, I know you're very familiar.

Just on a couple of things that Mr.

Fisher was -- had just asked, while they're fresh in my mind. The -- you said that the cash out was, I think, the predominant whatever, called gas pricing methodology, that the cash out was predominant in -- by the utilities in the State of Missouri; is that correct?

A Yes.

2.

2.2

2.5

Q Now, does that include how many companies? Are you talking about seven -- or well, there are fewer gas utilities now. What about -- what about Spire?

A Spire cashes out everyone except the

schools.

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

Q Right. Okay. So, and you all, basically, it's fair to say the staff is -- you prefer the carry -- or the cash out method compared to the carry over mouthed?

A Yes.

Q And I think on several places in your testimony you mention that the schools want to get rid of cash out; is that your -- do you know that you've testified to that on several occasions?

A I do believe I've mentioned that in my testimony, yes.

Q Do you know whether they want to get rid of it or just make sure that that -- Mr. Ervin, Jr. testified that they want to -- cash out's okay as long as it involves just the cost; isn't that a fair statement is what he testified to?

A My understanding is his testimony is that they proposed moving to carry out balancing and as an alternative, adjusting the multipliers related to cash out, yes.

Q So cash out could exist, it's their objection is the multipliers; isn't that fair? That's a fair statement, isn't it?

A I would say that is a reasonable statement.

- Q Okay. Well, I want to make sure that the commission understands that. Because the school board, the way I read the testimony, is not against cash out, they're against the multipliers that are in effect. That's a fair statement; isn't it?
 - A They are against the multipliers.
- Q Yeah, okay. And regarding the -- the issue -- Well, let me -- let me go back here a second here.

Were you working at the commission -- I know you were -- in 2018 and '19?

A Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

- Q Were you familiar with that the company that Spire -- I mean that Empire and the school boards came forward with a tariff at that time in dealing with these, I think all of these issues?
- A They discussed tariff changes with staff and, I believe, EDG.
 - Q Do you know if they filed a tariff?
 - A To my knowledge, they did not file a tariff.
- Q Okay. And did you work and have meetings with them on that tariff -- or on that the proposed tariff draft?
 - A Yes, I attended meetings related to that.
 - Q And what was the result of all of that; do

1 | you know?

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- A To my knowledge, nothing happened after those meetings. There was no tariff filed.
- Q And is it fair to state that the staff opposed those tariff proposals from the company and school board at that time?
- A I would say that the staff had issues with them.
 - Q Okay. Well, by issues there wasn't supporting issues, was it?
- 11 A That is correct.
 - Q Okay. And do you know whether if it was withdrawn at that time, whether since the three years as elapsed, whether the company or staff has worked on subsequent tariff proposal dealing with cash out and balancing and aggregation?
 - MS. MYERS: Judge, I object. Mr. Patterson just testified he was not aware of a tariff filing.
- 19 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yeah --
- MR. BROWNLEE: It's not a tariff filing.
- 21 And I said that work on tariff issues.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yeah, I'll overrule and let him answer if he knows the answer.
- 24 THE WITNESS: I'm not, really, that familiar 25 with how much has gone on since then. I don't think

staff has been very involved in discussions on that issue between then and this rate case.

- Q (By Mr. Brownlee) Since the last rate case when these rates were set, have you seen any further filings from the company on any issues dealing with school transportation?
 - A I'm not aware of any.
- Q Okay. And you've worked on those cases, have you not? On the Empire cases that have been filed since then?
- A Since 2009?
- 12 Q Yeah.

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- A I'm not even sure if there has been a rate case since 2009.
- Q Okay. And let me ask you, did -- have you seen, in this case, any cost figures or supporting documentation filed by the company to continue the current charges for cash out, anything the company has filed?
 - A New since the last case, no.
- Q Okay. Same question for aggregation and balancing. Any charges, any cost figures that the company has filed since the last rate case?
- 24 A No.
- 25 Q Okay. And there are none in this case, are

there, from the company?

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

A Oh, I thought your last question meant since the last case. There were filings in the last case, but no new costs in this case.

Q Right. And so the only real figures have come from the staff that you testified to; isn't that correct, where you showed the chart I think you've got on that one page?

A Yeah.

Q Okay. Is that a normal procedure for the staff to file and do the accounting work for the company in a rate case?

MS. MYERS: Judge, I object. This is an unfair characterization of Mr. Patterson's testimony.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yeah, I'll overrule.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I wasn't trying to say what the rate should be. I was simply trying to support the motion that there was cost basis for that rate in a previous case and that it was a reasonable allocation of known costs.

Q (By Mr. Brownlee) Okay. But the charts you've put in your testimony is current and recent cases, it's not clear back to the last rate case; is it?

- A No, it represents current pipeline storage rates.
 - Q Right. Okay. Have you ever worked for a gas utility?
 - A No.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

- Q Have you ever contracted for natural gas through in any way from a gas utility?
 - A No.
- Q Okay. Do you follow the daily market price and the fluctuations in gas?
 - A Not in detail.
- Q Okay. If it were proved that the cash out or carry over was contrary to the statute, would you be supportive of this -- your position as staff?
- A I suppose if it were proved that it were contrary to law, it wouldn't matter what staff thought about it. That would rule.
- Q Well, you're aware, are you not, that a statute could have been on the books for a long time and not followed by the people who are suppose to follow the statute; is that a fair statement?
 - A That's fair.
- Q Yeah. And do you know whether, in fact, since '02, this company has filed and always supported in actual cost figure for -- to support

- 1 their -- their natural -- or their school tariff?
 2 You don't understand?
 - A My presumption is that since the commission approved those rates, they were adequately supported in those cases.
 - Q And since that time, what'd you say, in '08?
- A Or -- Or since 2002.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

2.5

- Q Yeah. Do you know -- you don't know whether -- when's the last time the company filed any cost justification for cash out, balancing, or any of other factors that we've discussed today, when was the last time?
- A Well, there was evidence presented in the 2009 case related to the balancing fee.
- O Correct.
 - A The aggregation fee has been the same since the beginning and has never had cost support from anyone.
 - Q Well, there's been no support cost from the -- this company for sure, right?
- A Right. And then, the -- the cash out multipliers are the same as those used by upstream pipelines. So, those are the type of multipliers that the company pays for its imbalances.
 - Q With your knowledge -- You are familiar with

- the statute, are you not?
- A Somewhat.

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

- Q Yep. Well, you reviewed it, I'm sure you have. You've filed extensive testimony surrounding the statute and the schools, correct?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. Do you know whether Spire has, since the time of 2002, filed any kind of annual updated documentation on any of the transportation cost issues?
 - A Do you mean --
- Q Have schools -- I mean, has Empire, I'm sorry. Have they filed any annual updated cost reports on any of their costs since 2002?
 - A I don't know.
- Q None to your knowledge?
- A No, in terms of, are you referring to what the 2002 tariff stated about those filings?
- O Uh-huh.
- A Yes. But those ended with at least the 2009 tariff, so that would have been the latest. And between then, 2002 and 2009, I don't know if any were filed.
- Q And you don't know from 2009 to present whether any have been filed?

A Not to my knowledge, no.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

Q Okay. Do you believe the statute would require that filing?

MR. FISHER: Judge, I'll object. I think that's a legal conclusion.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'll sustain.

- Q (By Mr. Brownlee) When you have a gas company -- this is a general question -- when you have a gas company, do you know whether that statute would require that the school transportation issue be a part of every rate case that any gas company files?
 - A I don't think it specifically says that.
- Q And it, clearly, has not been a part of every case as far as you know from the gas companies you worked on; is that correct?
- A Correct. As far as I know, it's not been an issue in every case.
- Q And you understand that the statute does require the gas corporation services will be at cost?
 - A Yes, cost of service rate making applies, really, everywhere.
- Q And that says specifically, gas and transportation; is that correct?

- A Yes, it does specifically say gas purchase and transportation costs.
- Q Yeah. Do you see anywhere in the statutory language the approval or the mention of penalties for any of the services or any of the charges a utility can make to the schools.
- A Well, my understanding of the statute is that it allows the gas corporation to collect all the cost it has related to providing the service. And there are gas costs associated with paying penalties to upstream pipelines for imbalances.
- Q But that's what the -- the penalties are done -- provided by interstate pipelines that are used there, correct?
 - A Yes.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

- Q And large industrials, correct?
- A And all transportation customers at Empire District.
- Q But none of those other -- the other two groups I just mentioned have -- none of them have a specific statute dealing with how they should be charged, correct?
 - A Not to my knowledge.
- Q Okay. Could I just have a minute, excuse me for a second. I'm fading here for a moment.

Do you know whether the company buys gas every day in order to supply to its customers, including the schools?

A Well, I know they buy gas for every day. Okay.

O Yeah.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

A I suspect they do end up buying gas every day because there are other types of purchases probably don't typically cover the full amount.

MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. All right. Thank you,

11 sir.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Mr. Brownlee, thank you. I have just a few questions for Mr. Patterson and we'll see if we have any recross or redirect.

[EXAMINATION OF MR. PATTERSON]
QUESTIONS BY JUDGE PRIDGIN:

Q Mr. Patterson, if I could direct you to your rebuttal. And, specifically, on page three, lines two through four. And if you could let me know when you're there, please.

A I'm there.

Q I believe that testimony states: "Empire releases firm interstate pipeline capacity to its transportation customers or their aggregators. And

those customers or the aggregators control the use of that capacity." Is that correct?

A Yes.

2.2

2.5

Q Is this capacity release identified on an interstate pipeline's electronic bulletin board that any pipeline customer can acquire or is this something different?

A My understanding is that it's something different. That it's specifically set aside for them in the tariff.

Q Okay. Can I direct you to page five, line 18, also your rebuttal and if you'll let me know when you're there, please.

A Yes.

Q On line 18 at page five you describe:

"Spire Missouri requirements that school aggregation

pools be balanced by adjusting nominations." Can

you describe how nominations of gas per delivery are

made?

A Well, it's a little different for the transportation customer because they, generally also, have to give some kind of notice to the utility about their nominations. Though, I think in the case of Empire, Empire actually monitors that through the -- the pipelines' bulletin boards.

But there are -- there is a schedule of processes for nominating gas. Generally speaking, most gas is nominated the day before the gas day on which it's to flow. There are later periods when they are able to make nominations or adjust nominations even during the gas day.

But they would post their nomination with the pipeline. There would be a process of confirmation, communication back and forth between the pipeline and the shipper confirming the information. Then, kind of a reconciliation pipe process where the pipeline would decide how much gas is actually going to flow and how much of that will be allocated to each of the shippers.

Q Okay, thank you. And can I direct you to page eight of your rebuttal. I'm sorry, I don't have a line number, but I'm looking for, I guess, the area where you quote from Spire Missouri's rate case GR2021-0108. Testimony that cash out balancing of school aggregation pools is desirable. Do you see that?

A Yes.

2.2

2.5

Q Can you give me an example of how a pool operator can ship gas purchases to their financial advantage if a cash out balancing provision isn't

used?

2.2

2.5

A Well, certainly. You could, in one month, if you're anticipating a low or a high price, then you could send less gas than you anticipate needing or more gas than you anticipate needing. And then, in the following month when you would anticipate prices to normalize or -- or shift, you would make up the difference then with more or less expensive gas, depending on which way it might be an advantage.

And, actually, under the current system, that could even happen within a month since Empire balances their transportation customers, all of them including the schools, on a monthly basis. Within a month, if you're saying I'm going to have high prices tomorrow or the next couple of days, but by the end of month, they're from going to drop again, well, I can short now and then make up the difference later in the month, not have an imbalance or have all smaller imbalance, but still take advantage of that price difference between today and a month later.

Q Okay, thank you. And then finally, do you have a copy of Section 393.310 in front of you?

A I can get it.

Q I believe it's in Mr. Ervin, Sr.'s corrected surrebuttal as Appendix One, if that helps.

A Yes, I have it.

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

Q Okay. Thank you. At paragraph five for that statute, it states that the aggregation program will not have any negative financial impact on the gas corporation, it's other customers or local taxing authorities, and that the aggregation charge is sufficient to generate revenue at least equal to all incremental costs caused by the aggregation program.

What is your understanding of the phrase, at least equal to all incremental costs?

A My understanding of that is that that should recover at least -- at least enough revenue to cover the cost of administering this program.

Q What's your understanding of the -- of the phrase "incremental costs" in that statute?

A It would be additional costs above and beyond the service they're already providing for transportation customers.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you. I think those are all the questions that I have. Let me see if we have any recross based on my questions. Any questions from Public Counsel?

- 1 MR. WILLIAMS: No, thank you.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: MECG? Empire District Gas?
- MR. FISHER: No, thank you, Judge.
- 4 JUDGE PRIDGIN: MSBA? All right. Thank
- 5 you. I believe that then concludes Mr. Patterson's
- 6 examination. Thank you, sir, you may step down.
- 7 MS. MYERS: Oh, Judge, I just had probably
- 8 one or two redirect.
- JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'm sorry, Ms. Myers, my
- 10 | mistake.
- MS. MYERS: Not a problem.
- 12 [FURTHER EXAMINATION OF MR. PATTERSON]
- 13 QUESTIONS BY MS. MYERS:
- 14 O Thank you, mr. Patterson. Just quickly,
- 15 Mr. Brownlee had asked you if you were familiar with
- 16 what he called the statute and I think the Judge
- 17 referred to that as Section 393.310. Is that your
- 18 understanding of what the statute is that
- 19 Mr. Brownlee was referring to?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q Okay. And I think Mr. Brownlee asked you
- 22 several questions about, you know, if cash outs were
- 23 proven to be inconsistent with the statute would
- 24 staff still support them. Are cash outs mentioned
- 25 | anywhere in the statute?

1 A No.

2.2

2.5

Q No. And Mr. Brownlee referred to it being at cost. Are you familiar with the language, and I believe it is in paragraph two: "Provide for the sale of such natural gas supplies, including rate of transportation service cost to the eligible school entities at the gas corporation's cost of purchasing of such gas supplies and transportation plus, all applicable distribution costs. Plus, an aggregation and balancing fee to be determined by the commission."

Is that an accurate reading of the statute?

A Yes.

MS. MYERS: All right, thank you. That's all the questions I had for you. Thank you, Mr. Patterson.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Myers, thank you. I apologize for the oversight. Now, I believe we're done with the examination of Mr. Patterson. And you may step down, sir. Thank you very much.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: And I believe that then, concludes the evidentiary hearing and we will now provide to the on the record presentation on the

	Page 103
1	stipulations. And unless the parties wish to go
2	otherwise, I would plan to simply go in the same
3	order as the order of opening statements and let
4	parties just tell me what they want to tell me about
5	the stipulation. Mr. Brownlee?
6	MR. BROWNLEE: If we could take one minute
7	to be excused?
8	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Oh, sure. We'll take a
9	brief recess for about ten minutes and we'll go back
10	on the record at ten after 11. All right. We are
11	off the record.
12	(Whereupon, the evidentiary
13	hearing proceeding was adjourned
14	at 11:00 a.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Pamela G. Williams, Certified Shorthand Reporter, within and for the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing hearing was duly sworn; the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

Certified Shorthand Reporter

within the State of Missouri

Panda G. Williams

[**& - 880**] Page 1

&	16 60:18 64:2	2230 8:24	428 8:12
	17 3:5 62:12	23 39:12	45 3:11
& 8:9	18 97:12,15	25 1:13	47 84:9
0	1800 65:6	25th 5:7 7:17	5
02 22:3 91:24	18113 104:18	27 3:6	5 2:6 69:6 79:12
08 92:6	19 87:11	3	80:6,25
1	1974 17:23	3 55:3	5,000 65:16
1 2:3 12:14 26:5	1998 72:25	30 3:7	50 17:24 24:22
32:24 33:1 34:3,7	2	300 2:10 26:12,12	68:5,20,22,23 69:8
34:14,17,18 54:22	2 2:4 32:25 33:2	58:2,6,12,15 59:17	501 19:6
1.36 10:24	34:7,14,17,18 55:5	60:7,8	52 3:12
10 3:4 69:2,6	2,390 60:20	301 2:11 58:4,7,20	53 3:13
100 2:5 79:3,7,25	2,650 19:8	59:17 60:7,8	57 3:15
79:25 80:2,16,20	20 11:13 25:12	3012 73:25	58 2:10,11
81:4,6	38:25 61:11,17	302 2:12 72:14,16	6
100c 2:6	63:10	74:7,11,12	
101 2:7 4:2 6:10	200 6:3,6 8:18	302's 78:3	6 19:6
8:9 9:15 79:5,8	2002 19:2 20:2	303 8:13 59:8,17	60 3:16
80:16,22 81:4,6	22:14 25:11 35:22	60:7,9 78:1	602 32:17
102 2:8 79:20,21	57:17 61:11 72:22	308 6:13 9:15	63101 6:24
79:22,23 80:1,2,16	73:8 75:25 92:7	310 6:24	64802 32:17
80:24 81:4,7	93:8,14,18,22	32 3:9	650 6:6
102c 2:9	2003 20:17	33 2:3,4	65101 6:10,14,17
10:00 70:3	2003-30038 59:10	3393.10. 76:23	8:10,13,20 9:16 65102 6:4,7 8:25
10:15 70:6,13	2008 35:15 36:5	35 3:10	67 3:17
11 74:21 76:4	2009 13:7 63:2	365 46:5 47:15	
103:10	73:13 89:11,14	390 19:7	7
11:00 103:14	92:14 93:20,22,24	393.10 76:9	7.2. 49:25
12 13:18 76:5	2010 11:1 41:2,19	393.210 33:15	701 6:24
121 6:16 9:5	2013 35:16	393.310 33:18	72 2:12 3:19
12th 11:2	2016 35:17	61:12 62:14 75:1	74 3:20
13 65:21 74:22	2018 52:11,14 53:7	75:7 99:24	77 2:5,7 3:21
76:5,17 84:20	63:14 87:11	393.310. 20:4 55:1	78 2:6 3:23
14 39:12	2019 63:14	101:17	79 2:8,9
140 60:23 61:3	2021 16:23	4	8
1402 20:2	2021-0320 1:8 5:2	4 2:6 59:20 79:12	800 6:3 8:19
15 60:18 61:20	7:10 70:18	80:5,25	81 3:24
69:2 70:5 82:6,10	2022 1:13 5:8 7:17	40,000 33:11	85 3:25
154 84:17	2024 16:24	400 6:10 8:10	880 1:17 7:5
15th 22:14	22 39:12	100 0.10 0.10	

8:40 7:20	addressed 23:14	aggregating 31:8	amount 45:25
9	addresses 8:7	aggregation 13:2	47:10 83:12 84:5
96 4:1	addressing 27:15	13:14 23:9 24:13	96:9
7 0 112	adequately 29:20	27:21,24 28:5,17	amounts 14:8
a	92:4	29:15,17,18,22	42:16
a.m. 7:20 103:14	adjourned 103:13	31:7 36:10,15	analysis 27:23
ability 49:8 104:7	adjust 67:17 98:6	37:13,15 38:15	36:24 37:14,20
able 11:9 18:1	adjusting 67:13	40:25 41:12 42:10	50:24 51:2
29:20 49:13 60:1	86:20 97:17	42:20 43:11,14,17	analyzed 36:18
98:5	adjustment 47:24	44:6 47:22,25	annual 11:23
absent 61:22	83:1	51:1,2 53:20,23	33:18 83:12 84:6
abundant 45:25	adjustments 24:8	54:5,10 55:17,25	84:16 93:8,13
accept 41:3 42:20	47:12	62:25 63:5 65:2	answer 27:2,16
acceptable 16:11	administering	68:14 84:13,13,17	30:11 33:21 34:5
accommodates	100:16	88:16 89:21 92:16	40:13 42:15 56:14
24:10	administrative	97:16 98:20 100:5	62:23 63:24,25
account 60:21	6:19 22:9 23:7	100:8,10 102:9	64:16 88:23,23
accounting 90:11	59:7,23 60:1	aggregator 12:9	answer's 37:10
accounts 19:8	administrator	64:6,19	answered 33:9,12
60:21	64:11	aggregators 47:4	46:24 75:20
accurate 102:12	admissibility	66:10 96:25 97:1	answers 34:8 47:1
acknowledge 9:25	77:24	ago 38:25	58:17,18 59:1
acquire 97:6	admission 34:14	agree 39:8,11	74:1 80:7
action 104:11,16	admitted 34:18	62:24 64:6	anticipate 99:4,5,6
actions 65:23 actual 22:20 25:1	60:9 74:12 78:2,3	agreed 7:1 72:12	anticipating 99:3
	81:5,8	agreement 11:3	anybody 77:4
25:5,13 28:16 42:16 52:25 91:25	adopt 15:19	22:14 54:14 59:9	anybody's 18:19
add 26:21 69:14	adopted 14:15	63:15,16 71:6	anyway 81:14
add 20:21 69:14 added 21:25	adopts 65:2	agrees 15:9	apologize 102:19
additional 37:11	advantage 98:25	ahead 8:7 59:17	appearance 7:22
38:6,9 45:19	99:10,21 advisors 57:11	67:5 70:11 80:15	7:24 8:4 9:4
48:22 73:18	72:8	84:8 allocated 98:14	appearances 6:1
100:19	advocates 28:22	allocated 98:14 allocation 90:21	appearing 9:6 30:21 57:11
additions 58:13	affect 83:7	allow 20:20 28:4	
59:3 74:3	agent 60:20 64:7	51:13 56:12	appears 104:5 appendix 49:18,23
address 8:8,11,12	64:19	allowed 23:4	54:22 75:4 100:2
8:18 9:4,15 19:1	agents 19:18	allows 21:4 95:8	applicable 21:5
29:21 32:14,17	aggravation 21:6	alternative 14:2	22:4 24:18 55:10
53:1,7	aggregate 20:14	14:13 86:20	69:11 102:9
,	<u>uggregute</u> 20.17	11.13 00.20	07.11 102.7

			9
application 29:3	assigned 7:16	balance 29:7	21:12,16 26:12
applied 14:3	associated 95:10	45:15 47:7 48:6	31:18 36:8 39:22
applies 47:1 94:22	association 9:7	48:14,15 50:22	41:4 56:7 57:18
apply 15:6 37:24	11:10,17,22 12:1,6	balanced 48:23	58:1,3 59:11,20
applying 82:19	13:25 15:5 16:11	97:17	63:7 66:7,13,16
appreciate 26:6,7	16:15 17:20 19:6	balances 99:13	67:2 70:21 74:8
44:13	57:12,14 61:2	balancing 13:2,15	74:25 76:21 77:1
approach 39:12	62:18 63:8 85:10	13:25 14:1 21:7	78:4 82:6 83:21
approaches 45:6,9	association's	23:10 24:13 27:21	86:11 87:18 94:2
appropriate 15:10	12:20 13:1 14:13	27:24 28:6,17	96:23 100:1 101:5
16:8 28:20 55:25	14:22	36:10,14 38:15	102:4,19,23
70:4 77:11	associations 19:6	40:25 41:12 42:10	believed 26:2
approval 54:10	assumption 64:9	42:20 43:11,15	believes 15:23
95:4	attached 54:19	44:6 45:6,9 47:22	bench 17:4 44:15
approve 29:10	attempting 66:7	47:25 50:14,18	51:22 66:24 67:1
37:6	attend 52:15,19	51:1 54:10 55:17	71:13 77:4
approved 12:4	attended 87:24	55:25 62:25 63:6	benefit 51:3 61:21
13:3,12 92:4	attention 16:25	64:4,9,22 65:2	benefited 62:3
approves 28:3	26:7	81:17 82:7 84:13	benefits 68:6
approving 22:13	attorney 104:13	84:18 86:19 88:16	best 15:16 23:16
59:8	attorneys 74:9	89:22 92:10,14	34:10 61:1,18
approximately	august 22:14	98:19,25 102:10	80:10 104:7
7:20 60:20 84:22	authorities 100:8	base 28:20	bet 27:4
april 1:13 5:8 7:17	authority 7:12	based 28:11,15	beyond 25:1
11:2	authorized 60:19	51:22 67:17 77:5	100:20
aquila 22:5	available 63:25	100:24	big 68:25
area 7:14 24:1	avenue 8:12	basically 18:14	bill 12:8 20:2
60:24 61:3,6,16	average 83:11,21	86:2	billing 14:20
62:8 98:18	83:25 84:5,16	basis 11:23 49:12	billion 10:24
areas 45:13 81:14	avoid 62:14,21	90:19 99:14	bills 38:17 68:25
aside 80:5 97:9	aware 37:22 44:7	began 82:3	binding 20:10
asked 7:22 40:8	54:13 63:19 88:18	beginning 7:25	bit 70:18
53:19 54:17 55:1	89:7 91:18	57:17 82:6,10	board 11:17 14:21
58:17 67:8 68:12	b	92:17	19:17 25:18 52:9
72:12 80:6 85:14	b 7:11 9:15 10:22	behalf 5:7 6:2,5,8	63:8 72:22 87:3
101:15,21	b101 6:13	6:12,15 8:2,15,16	88:6 97:5
asking 37:4,6	back 27:2 35:14	8:22 9:2,6,12,14	board's 73:4
asks 50:5	37:9 48:5 53:25	30:21 31:13 57:12	boards 6:15 9:7
ass 6:15	54:3 69:5,6 70:16	belief 34:11 80:11	11:10 17:20 18:22
asset 47:14	73:8 76:13 87:8	believe 9:18 15:18	19:5 35:7 36:3
	90:24 98:9 103:9	16:4,7 20:17	38:12,14 57:12,14
	100.0		

[boards - charges] Page 4

77:11 85:10 87:14	c	28:1,8,12 30:6,24	caused 72:9 79:2
97:25	c 6:9 8:4 12:14	32:20 36:20,21,23	100:10
books 91:19	19:6 34:3 79:23	36:25 37:2,4,6,9	ccf 33:19
bottom 45:5 53:24	79:25 80:2,2	37:11,14,19,21	ccfs 33:11
83:5	calculate 83:11	38:9,11,21,24	cer 1:17 7:5
box 8:24	84:5	41:10,16,18,25	central 35:18
break 70:5	calculator 61:7,9	42:9 54:11 56:1	cents 21:8
brief 70:14 103:9	84:20	59:9,11,12 63:2,18	certain 47:10
briefly 12:23	call 26:25 31:23	65:3 66:8,18	83:12
17:21 27:17 30:16	56:16	68:15 73:11,13	certainly 44:3
53:16 72:19 83:14	called 14:2 19:16	76:23 77:10,10,25	99:2
briefs 21:1 26:17	40:7 85:16 101:16	84:24 85:12 89:2	certainty 31:1
60:3	calls 39:4	89:3,14,16,20,23	certificate 104:1
bring 65:19	candid 26:1	89:25 90:3,3,4,12	certified 7:4 104:2
brownlee 3:5,10		90:20,24 92:14	104:19
3:12,15,17,19,21	capability 49:11	94:11,15,18 97:24	certify 104:4
3:25 6:16 9:3,4,11	capacity 21:18	98:19	change 12:5 13:1
17:17,19 26:24	39:16,25 46:1,3,5	cases 18:5,5,9,16	16:8 22:17,18
27:4 31:22 35:3,5	46:15 75:9,16,22	24:4 26:16 62:15	33:8,13,25 37:8
35:6 39:7 40:8,15	75:24,24 96:24	62:18,22 73:2,6	51:1 52:12
44:1,4,11 52:6	97:2,4	89:8,9 90:24 92:5	changed 13:21
53:12,14 54:17	capital 8:12	cash 13:2,15,24	20:3 40:25
56:10 57:2,4,6	captioned 5:6	14:1,25 16:8,10	changes 12:2,3
58:9 59:5 67:4,7	care 48:12	23:13 24:2,15,15	16:6 22:24 33:4
69:25 70:1,12	carry 14:2,13,22	24:17,23,24 27:21	34:6 51:9 64:15
72:1,2,4 73:23	23:13 24:2 45:12	28:24,24 29:4,11	87:17
74:6,10 77:8,17,20	47:5,6 52:8 68:17	36:15,24 37:7	changing 27:1
85:6,7 88:20 89:3	81:17 86:4,5,19	38:14,17 40:25	changing 27.1 characterization
90:22 94:7 96:10	91:13	41:12 54:11 55:25	90:14
96:12 101:15,19	carrying 46:6	64:4,9,21 67:12	characterize 62:7
101:21 102:2	47:13	68:13,15,18 69:7	81:23
103:5,6	carter 6:9 8:4	69:10 75:8,16,17	charge 43:14
building 7:18	10:21	81:16,20 85:15,17	67:24 84:16 100:8
bulletin 97:5,25	carter's 8:10	86:4,9,15,21,22	charged 21:21
business 9:19	case 10:23,24 11:1	87:4 88:16 89:18	29:9 47:23 68:22
32:16	11:5 12:5 13:4,7	91:12 92:10,21	95:22
buy 68:21 96:4	13:13 16:17,19	98:19,25 101:22	charges 13:3,6,15
buy 08.21 90.4 buying 96:7	17:23,25 18:1,6,12	101:24	13:19,21 14:11
buying 90.7 buys 50:6 96:1	18:13,16 20:6	cashes 85:25	27:21 38:4 41:1
buys 30.0 90.1	22:6,10 23:12,18	cause 82:13	42:10,20 43:11
	24:1,15 25:18,19	cause 02:13	· ·
	25:23,25 27:16,22		44:9 67:15,17

888-391-3376

	I	I	I
69:11 84:12 89:18	coming 17:22	company 7:11 8:3	concerns 31:6
89:22 95:5	comm 6:2	10:22 11:1 12:12	conclude 53:23
charging 13:2	comment 18:4	12:19 13:10 15:14	61:5 62:2 77:22
84:24	26:22 68:2	15:15,23 22:20	concludes 101:5
chart 90:7	comments 71:12	23:21 24:21 25:5	102:24
charts 90:22	commission 1:3	26:2 35:8,14 36:9	conclusion 16:16
check 65:14	5:5 7:2 8:15,18	36:24 37:4,24	22:12 25:10 39:5
checked 61:9	12:4,20 13:4,12	38:20 39:25 40:3	40:7 59:14 94:5
chief 8:23	14:5,7,10 16:12	40:18 41:13 42:4	concurrent 16:18
choice 25:25	17:23 21:7 22:7,8	42:21 43:5,7,12	confidential 79:14
circumstance	22:21,23 23:3	45:13,14 51:14	80:22,24 81:2,6,7
21:23 24:6,19	25:20 27:10,12,20	52:9,11,25 54:2,9	83:18,22,25
cities 21:16	28:3,23 29:10,14	57:13,16 63:10	confirmation 98:9
city 6:4,7,10,14,17	30:22 38:4,6	69:5 73:5 82:17	confirming 98:10
7:19 8:10,13,19,24	40:24 41:9 52:24	87:13 88:5,14	considerably
9:5,16 19:23	55:18,22,24 59:6	89:5,17,18,23 90:1	14:19
45:15 50:15,19	59:13,22,23 60:1	90:12 91:24 92:9	consideration
city's 48:14	62:13 63:2,5	92:20,24 94:8,9,11	16:18
civil 18:13 26:21	77:15 78:24 82:7	96:1	considering 11:6
claims 28:14	83:22 87:2,10	company's 11:15	consistent 29:9
clarification 12:15	92:3 102:11	12:23 38:23 45:15	consortium 19:18
clarify 12:7	commission's	53:24 54:6 83:5	20:21
classified 39:21	16:18	compare 42:11	consumers 9:14
classroom 61:24	commissioner	43:3	consumption
clause 47:24	9:24 10:2,3,8,10	compared 42:16	33:18
clear 90:24	10:11,12 17:5,6,10	43:5 66:3 67:10	contact 8:5
clearest 24:7	17:18 26:7 27:2	86:4	contained 34:7
clearly 94:14	37:6 44:16,18,20	compete 22:21	59:20
close 17:24 26:19	65:1 66:24 71:8	complaint 63:9,21	continue 71:9
closely 29:7	commissioners	complete 23:25	89:17
codified 20:3	9:25 10:5,9,21	complex 18:7	contracted 47:3
cold 46:17	19:3 44:21	complexity 30:4	91:6
colder 46:13	commodity 47:23	comply 62:13	contrary 24:25
collect 48:1 95:8	common 28:25	76:23	91:13,16
colleges 39:23	communication	component 43:9	control 68:3,4,8
combination	98:9	computation 25:3	97:1
48:10	companies 14:21	computers 61:24	conundrum 18:8
combined 44:6	16:20 19:12 22:19	concern 30:25	conversation 30:2
come 18:15 27:2	23:6 25:14 81:21	31:9 45:8,13	30:3
31:24 56:19 78:7 90:6	85:21 94:15	64:22	cooperative 19:16

Veritext Legal Solutions

		10.00.00	
copies 59:15 79:18	37:5,14,18 38:13	cover 13:22 96:9	46:15,20,22 47:4
copy 22:11 49:15	38:14 41:8 42:24	100:15	47:15,19,23 48:5
54:20 75:5 77:24	43:1 46:5 48:3,4	covered 73:24	48:11 49:1 50:6
99:24	55:8,14,21 68:23	create 15:6 18:12	50:16,21,25 51:4
corporation 20:23	68:24 69:1,21	45:9	53:25 54:4,15
21:14 94:20 95:8	75:3,12 76:14	created 18:19 20:1	82:13 83:8 95:17
100:7	86:16 89:16,22	22:4 24:16,16	96:2,25 97:1
corporation's 55:8	90:19 91:25 92:10	61:11	99:13 100:7,21
102:7	92:17,19 93:9,13	creates 20:14	d
corporations	94:21,22 95:9	24:19 31:5	d 7:11 10:22
20:16 29:1,5	100:16 102:3,6,7	credited 48:2	daily 25:2,6,8
37:24 75:2,19	costs 21:6,24	credits 83:12 84:6	49:11,14 50:14,18
76:14	22:20 23:7,8,8,9,9	critical 20:25	64:14 91:9
correct 33:24	25:1 27:24 28:15	cross 31:1,17	data 23:6 37:5,11
34:10 35:24 36:21	28:17 36:24 37:18	34:15,19 35:4	37:18 38:6,13,14
36:22 38:2 41:6	37:25 38:9,24	60:5,9,10 70:21,24	38:16,17,23 41:13
49:22 50:8,22	41:11,19,21,23,24	71:10,10,16 73:21	49:14,25 50:3,5
53:23 54:1 55:15	42:3 47:18 51:5,6	74:8,14,18 77:4,5	day 5:7 48:8 50:23
55:20 56:9 57:23	54:4 55:7,10	80:14 81:8 85:4,5	96:2,4,8 98:3,4,6
57:24 58:4,11	61:23 62:21 65:8	crucial 46:2	days 46:5 47:15
60:24,25 61:1,5	68:13,13 69:11,19	csr 5:8 59:21	48:12 99:16
62:2,17 63:6,7	75:19 82:13,15,25	current 12:3 13:14	deal 24:3,7,8
69:12,24 70:25	83:2 90:4,21	13:23 24:11,23	dealing 73:2 87:15
73:12 75:5 77:1	93:14 95:2,10	27:25 28:4,5,11	88:15 89:5 95:21
77:12,13 79:11	100:10,13,18,19	29:11,19 44:6	deals 12:14 59:22
80:10 83:6 84:18	102:9	66:3 67:11 72:10	dear 26:9
85:19 88:11 90:7	council 8:22	89:18 90:23 91:1	december 35:15
92:15 93:5 94:16	counsel 6:5 7:22	99:11	decide 98:12
94:17,25 95:14,16	8:12,24 26:25	currently 15:20	decisions 59:19
95:22 97:2	30:15,22,23 31:2	29:8 33:22 35:17	deducted 68:22
corrected 2:8,9	34:23 42:2 60:10	42:10 51:10	define 64:13
49:16 79:20 80:24	74:13 78:6 81:9	customer 12:8,15	definitely 63:13
100:1	100:25 104:9,13	28:18 33:16 45:24	delays 23:5
correction 33:7	counsel's 30:25	46:21 51:7 64:7,8	delivered 21:9,21
34:1	counties 21:17	64:11,19 82:16	29:7 50:20 68:6,6
corrections 33:5	couple 39:23	97:6,21	delivery 97:18
58:13 59:3 74:3	45:13 81:14 85:13	customer's 64:24	deny 12:20 27:20
79:12,19 80:5	99:16	customers 7:13	29:14
cost 13:23 20:24	course 19:11	13:11,16 21:15	
24:12,14 25:13	court 6:22 7:5	28:7 29:19 33:13	department 52:14 depending 82:23
28:20 36:15,18,20	72:13	45:11 46:2,4,4,9	99:9

[deputy - ervin] Page 7

J4 0.22	J:	45.10	50.20 51.10 52.2
deputy 8:23	discussing 16:14	earned 45:12	50:20 51:10 53:2
derelictious 67:25	45:6	east 8:12 9:15	54:9 56:1 59:12
describe 97:15,18	discussions 16:2	easy 38:20	60:13,23 61:3,6,16
design 11:5	21:2 89:1	economic 29:6	62:4,8 63:9,14,21
desirable 14:22	disparity 43:7	edg 11:13,16 15:22	66:1,7,16,17 81:9
98:20	distribution 19:24	87:18	83:21 84:12 87:14
despite 28:14	19:24 21:6 23:9	edg's 33:10	89:9 93:12 95:17
detail 45:8 47:2,22	37:17 49:2 55:10	effect 67:25 87:5	96:23 97:24,24
91:11	81:21 102:9	effective 16:23	99:13 101:2
determined 21:7	district 7:11,25	41:2	empire's 12:2,7
55:17,21,24 63:1	8:3 9:20 10:22,23	effectively 65:24	13:1 27:20,24,25
102:10	15:14 16:10 35:14	effort 14:9	28:5,16 29:11,19
detriment 45:10	35:17,19 54:9	efis 25:22	31:19 45:8,10
develop 15:10	56:1 60:13 62:5	eight 11:21 14:6	47:3 49:2,24
16:5 51:9	63:9,22 81:9	15:3 23:5 33:23	62:25 63:2 84:23
developed 28:7,12	95:18 101:2	98:16	employed 35:10
development	districts 19:8	either 25:5 28:23	35:12,21,25 57:10
27:25	dockets 22:4	33:5 35:21 47:8	72:7 78:22,23
diana 6:9 8:4	documentation	68:5,5 79:11	104:10,13
10:21	89:17 93:9	82:21	employee 104:13
difference 99:8,19	documents 25:4	elapsed 88:14	enactment 61:12
99:21	60:2 80:9	electric 18:6 35:15	encourage 29:6
differences 14:20	doing 30:5 64:11	electronic 97:5	ended 93:20
different 18:5	dollar 42:16 65:20	elementary 19:7	energy 6:12 9:14
19:10,10 47:11	dollars 54:1 61:23	eligible 20:15	57:11 72:8
48:1 97:7,9,20	65:1	40:19 55:7 76:10	engineer 78:25
direct 45:3 47:20	dougherty 8:9	102:6	entirely 28:23
49:18 54:3,19,20	draft 87:23	eliminate 14:1,3	entirety 81:2
58:2 60:17,18	drop 55:4 99:17	28:23 65:25 66:7	entities 21:16 55:8
61:10,19 62:11	due 31:2	68:15 81:16	76:11 102:7
64:2 65:21 74:20	duly 104:6	embarrass 43:2	entries 7:21,24
96:18 97:11 98:15	e	empire 6:8 7:11,25	entry 8:5
direction 68:5	e 6:13 78:19,19,20	8:3 9:20 10:22,23	equal 100:9,13
104:9	earhart 2:3,4 3:8	12:4 13:9,20	equally 19:14
directly 48:2 54:3	31:19,23 32:12,16	14:14,17,19,23	equila 59:10
68:25	32:18,23 35:4	15:9,12,14 16:2,9	equipment 49:10
director 9:8 18:22	44:22 45:1 52:5	22:5 24:11 28:3	equity 54:6
discuss 16:4 84:12	53:17 56:6	29:8,23 35:11,13	error 24:22
discussed 87:17	earhart's 31:20	35:14,16,19 43:8	ervin 2:10,11,12
92:11	earlier 24:15 35:8	44:7 45:18 48:6	3:14,18 9:9,9
	42:8 77:18	48:15 49:8 50:5,7	18:24,24,24 49:15

Veritext Legal Solutions

[ervin - firm] Page 8

54:19 56:8,11,16	example 16:7 46:9	explaining 64:3	62:25 65:2 84:13
56:18 57:5,9 60:4	69:1 98:23	extensive 13:8	84:18,24
60:14,16 62:24	exceed 21:8	93:4	fewer 61:23 85:23
67:6,8 70:2,6,21	exception 33:14	extent 63:19	fif 82:5
70:22 71:18 72:3	excess 48:11	\mathbf{f}	fifty 24:21
72:6,21 74:8,17,18	excuse 42:7 71:11	facilities 14:18	figure 91:25
77:7,9 78:3 86:14	82:5 95:24	facility 33:16	figures 89:16,22
100:1	excused 7:23	fact 20:7,12 30:3	90:5
ervin's 33:10	31:16 103:7	36:19 68:10,19	file 5:2 7:9,12
54:20	executive 9:8	91:23	16:20,24 20:16
establish 38:4 63:5	18:22	factor 64:10	22:10 70:17 76:24
established 13:14	exhibit 2:2,3,4,5,6	factors 92:11	87:20 90:11
63:1	2:7,8,9,10,11,12	fading 95:25	filed 10:24 11:2
estimate 62:20	32:24 58:2,15,20	fails 12:9	30:8 32:18 52:25
65:5,7,13	59:8 72:13,16	fair 36:10 43:24	53:7 57:22 58:10
estimated 64:25	73:25 74:7,11,12	44:5 64:1 86:3,16	58:20 60:3 63:9
event 18:2 25:22	77:24 79:3,4,20	86:23,24 87:5	63:16,21 66:6
26:6	80:20,22,24 81:6,6	88:4 91:21,22	72:9 77:15 87:19
eventually 15:12	81:7	familiar 36:2	88:3 89:10,17,19
evidence 22:8 25:8	exhibits 2:1,13	42:14,23 43:13,22	89:23 91:24 92:9
28:16,19 32:3	26:14 33:1 34:7	43:23 44:9 72:20	93:4,8,13,23,25
34:19 56:22 71:21	34:14,17,18 58:6	81:18 85:12 87:13	files 94:12
78:9 92:13	59:17 60:7,8	88:24 92:25	filing 24:13 53:10
evidentiary 7:9	77:21 79:7 80:1	101:15 102:3	88:18,20 94:3
26:22 59:20,21	80:15,19 81:4	far 67:16 71:5	filings 89:5 90:3
102:24 103:12	exist 86:22	94:15,17	93:18
exact 77:24	existing 13:1,19	father 57:20	finally 99:23
exactly 21:2 39:1	38:24	fault 25:21	financial 21:14
71:7 80:19	exists 15:20 20:7	february 12:11	22:24 98:24 100:6
examination 3:8	expectation 49:7	46:17,18	financially 104:14
3:14,18,22 31:18	expected 64:8 65:1	fee 20:24 21:7 28:5	find 75:10
32:12 34:15,19	expense 14:10	55:17 63:6 92:14	finding 41:10
35:4 45:1 52:5	expensive 62:17	92:16 102:10	fine 48:19
53:17 57:5 60:10	99:8	feedback 9:22	finished 70:20
60:14 67:6 70:21	experience 18:4	feel 17:7	71:16
70:25 71:11 72:3	expert 67:20	fees 13:9,14,17	firm 8:8 45:10,24
74:14,18 77:7	explain 45:7 47:2	23:10 28:1,2,4,11	46:1,3,4,9,15,20
78:15 80:15 81:8	47:21 82:12	28:15,23 43:4	47:3,14,19 48:5
81:11 85:5 96:16	explained 23:17	44:6 47:22,23,25	50:25 51:3 54:3
101:6,12 102:20	50:7 82:6	51:1,3 53:20,24	54:15 83:7 96:24
		54:5,11 55:25	
		J 1 .J,11 JJ.2J	

[first - groups] Page 9

8 4 0 10 21 10 27	0 1 62 6 21	25 15 10 20 25	50 17 57 5 70 11
first 9:19,21 10:25	formal 63:9,21	35:17,18,20,25	59:17 67:5 70:11
12:25 17:22 18:1	format 11:7 20:13	37:24,24,25 47:23	70:11,12,16 71:3
18:3 21:9 27:19	forth 98:9	47:24 48:3,4,8,9	80:15 84:8 87:8
31:18 35:10 45:14	forward 11:18	48:13 49:6,9	103:1,2,9
56:11	31:25 56:19 71:9	50:15,19 52:14	god 32:5 56:24
fischer 8:14 17:3	78:7 87:15	54:9 55:6,8,9 56:1	64:13 71:23 78:11
66:23	four 21:8 37:23	60:13 61:22,22	goes 48:5 76:13
fisher 3:4,9,13,16	45:5 47:21 49:19	62:5 63:10 66:2	going 13:24 19:1
3:24 6:9 8:2,5,9	49:23,24 54:18	67:24 68:23,24	22:7 25:20 26:10
10:16,19 17:8,9	55:1 60:18 65:22	69:1,21 73:5 75:2	26:13,18 31:10,18
28:8 29:23 32:10	82:5,10 96:20	75:18,19 76:14,15	34:3 35:11 39:12
32:11,13 33:4	fractures 42:24	81:9 82:13,17,24	44:22 51:18 54:13
34:13,16 39:2	free 17:7	83:1,2,4 85:16,23	56:8 59:16 69:2
40:6,23 53:15,16	fresh 85:14	91:4,6,7,10 94:7,9	70:19 71:15 73:17
53:18 56:3,5	front 39:9 73:4	94:11,15,20,24	73:19,21 74:7,14
60:15 67:8 81:10	99:24	95:1,8,10 96:2,4,7	74:15 77:21 79:19
81:12 83:20 84:4	full 78:18 96:9	97:18 98:2,3,4,6	84:8 98:13 99:15
85:1,3,14 94:4	fundamentally	98:12,24 99:4,5,9	99:17
101:3	29:18	100:7 101:2 102:5	good 7:8,15 8:16
five 15:4 34:4	further 10:15	102:7,8	9:13 10:10,20
42:21 43:7,12,18	28:14 29:3 52:5	gast 69:19	17:18 23:24 27:9
44:7 61:10,19	53:17 56:17,18	gate 19:23 48:8,9	30:20 32:1 35:6
73:9 75:13 76:17	67:6 70:10 71:18	48:13	60:6,16 64:7,12
97:11,15 100:4	77:7 78:5 89:4	gates 45:15 48:14	70:17 74:15 77:5
flawed 24:12	101:12 104:12	50:15,19	81:13 85:7
flexibility 45:20	future 11:19 14:11	general 16:19	government 7:18
51:12	30:1	25:24 43:10 94:8	gr 1:8 5:2 7:10
flow 83:1 98:4,13	g	generally 36:9	70:18
flowed 53:25	g 1:16 5:8 6:23 7:3	97:21 98:2	gr2009-0434 13:4
flowing 54:1	104:2	generate 100:9	28:9 41:4 76:25
flows 83:3	gallery 9:5	getting 9:22 17:23	gr2021-0108 98:19
fluctuations 91:10	ganery 5.5 gas 7:11,12,25 8:3	68:21,22 69:6	granted 7:23
follow 56:12 91:9	9:21 10:22,24	give 8:7 25:7 27:18	great 50:24
91:21	12:9 13:10,10	32:3 45:19 49:13	greater 33:18
followed 20:11	15:14 16:10 18:5	50:13 56:23 69:5	greatly 28:24
91:20	19:9,10,12,17,18	71:14,21 78:10	grogman 23:12
following 99:6	19:19,25 20:16,20	97:22 98:23	69:9
force 65:25 66:17	20:23 21:14,20	giving 65:5	group 6:12 9:14
foregoing 104:5	20.23 21.14,20 22:3 23:8,8,20	go 8:7 10:6 11:18	61:21
form 8:5	25:6,6,8,13 29:1,5	12:23 39:14 46:12	groups 95:20
		46:18 54:2 55:16	
	29:7 31:4,9 33:18		

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376

gt 59:10	helps 100:2	ii's 54:19	inconsistent
gt2003-0038 22:6	hey 17:10	iii 1:5 6:16	101:23
guess 18:10 19:22	high 6:13 13:22	imbalance 82:17	incorporate 15:21
25:10 45:7 48:18	69:3 99:3,16	82:24 99:19,20	incorrectly 33:12
67:20 98:17	higher 42:21	imbalances 14:4	increase 10:25,25
gut 71:7	43:12,18 44:8	24:17 29:1 31:2,3	28:2
h	46:5,13 82:14	31:5 47:5 48:25	increased 27:25
hand 32:2 56:21	highest 69:8	68:11 82:13,20	41:19 42:3
71:20 78:8	highway 9:15	92:24 95:11	increases 54:10
handled 21:22	historical 56:12	immediate 59:13	increasing 7:12
handling 21:24	historically 23:17	immediately 22:2	41:24 46:11
happen 99:12	history 22:15	impact 21:13,14	incremental 22:20
happened 12:10	hit 68:25	22:25 50:25 65:1	23:8 75:3,12
53:9 88:2	holsman 9:24 10:2	83:7 100:6	100:10,13,18
happens 54:19	10:3,8,11,12 17:5	impacted 49:1	index 2:1 3:1
happy 26:23 30:2	17:6,10 26:7	impacts 76:10	indicate 60:19
harm 46:8	44:17,18 66:25	implement 16:6	indicated 73:25
hc 79:22	74:15	29:17 51:9	indicates 27:23
heading 46:10	honor 34:13 39:2	important 21:2	individual 33:14
heads 71:14	40:10 53:16 56:25	22:18 50:25 82:7	33:17
hear 17:6 21:1	59:5,16 74:7	imposed 69:22	industrials 20:7
26:2 27:1 70:9	80:14	improve 11:18	21:19 24:18 95:16
heard 11:11 12:17	honorable 6:20	improvements	industry 13:21
18:9 38:12 70:23	hopes 15:12	15:25 16:3 51:18	information 80:9
72:20	house 8:11 19:3	inactions 65:23	98:11
hearing 1:7 5:5	20:2	incentive 46:11,18	information's 8:5
7:2,9,17,20,23	huge 67:22	inception 23:18	initially 82:25
11:7 31:16,21	huh 36:12 93:19	include 50:15,19	injections 82:22
34:18 36:2 60:8	hundred 21:12	85:21	install 33:16,19
66:25 70:8,10	24:20 33:19	included 25:3	installed 49:10
71:1 74:12,16	hurt 83:4	83:17	instantaneously
102:24 103:13	i	includes 15:16	31:4
104:5,11	ideal 68:17	23:21 35:19 54:22	instated 28:22
heart 26:9	identification 33:3	75:4	intent 66:9,12,13 66:15
held 5:6 7:17 23:3	58:8 72:17 79:9	including 23:7,9	interested 11:18
46:1 70:15	80:3	50:15,20 55:6 63:14 96:3 99:14	16:12,16 104:15
help 32:4 53:24,25	identified 97:4	102:5	interestingly 22:2
54:6 56:24 71:22	ii 2:10,11 3:14	inclusion 21:5	interestingly 22:2
78:11 83:4	18:24 56:16,18	income 67:14	interpretation
helpful 15:10	57:5,9 60:4,14	medite 07.14	50:11,13
	67:6 70:21		50.11,15

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

[interstate - line] Page 11

interstate 19:19	jim 23:11 35:9	80:21,23,25 81:1	1
19:21 20:8 29:1,5	jim's 25:17	keenan's 79:24	language 12:15
82:22 95:13 96:24	job 23:24 64:7,12	keep 16:21 46:2	15:25 20:10,19
97:5	64:13 78:22 84:24	71:15	51:18 76:12 95:4
intervene 62:18,22	joining 57:16	kept 83:22,24,25	102:3
intervention 62:15	joplin 32:17,17	kicked 25:15	large 20:7 21:19
introduce 26:11	jr 9:10 56:11	kind 22:14 62:21	21:19 24:18 39:20
investment 54:7	86:14	67:14,15 93:8	39:21 48:10 95:16
involve 11:12,22	judge 3:11,20 4:1	97:22 98:11	largely 63:15
11:23 12:3 14:8	6:19 7:8,16 8:2,14	know 10:23 16:20	larger 14:4,19
involved 23:15	8:16,21 9:1,11,17	17:7 18:24 23:14	largest 14:15
41:17 89:1	9:24 10:1,4,10,20	26:8,9,19 31:20	lastly 29:13 76:16
involves 12:25	12:12 17:1,3,10,14	35:8 36:19,20	latest 93:21
86:16	17:18 20:11 26:24	38:1,7,11,22 40:22	lav 57:11
issue 12:13,14,25	27:5 30:13,17	40:24 41:1,18	law 7:16 8:8 20:13
13:13,25 18:17	31:12,15,24 32:7	42:2,8,8,19 43:6	29:16 91:16
20:11 23:13 24:4	32:11 34:16,21,22	43:24 46:25,25	lbc 13:21 14:15
31:8 34:3 36:2	34:25 35:1,2 39:6	49:19 50:2 52:24	lbcs 15:2
37:19 41:14 52:7	40:12 44:3,14,18	53:3,6,9 62:23	ldcs 62:5
65:19,20 68:10	44:20 45:2 51:20	63:18,24 64:13,15	lead 52:22
69:10 73:3 87:8	51:24,25 52:2,4	64:16 65:7 66:9	learning 42:25
89:2 94:10,18	53:14,19 56:4,5,15	66:15,20 67:16,22	61:24
issued 59:13	57:1 58:1 60:6,12	69:2 72:20 73:14	leaves 46:12 78:5
issues 11:4,5,9,11	60:13 66:23 67:5	74:22 76:5,18	legal 6:23 39:4
11:12,22 12:14,24	70:1,16 71:25	80:18 85:12 86:9	40:6 94:5
14:8 16:5 18:11	73:16,19 74:10,19	86:13 87:11,19	legislative 18:25
18:15 24:1 27:15	77:2,10,19 78:1,13	88:1,12 91:23	lev 72:8
30:24 37:15 48:25	79:17,21 80:17	92:8,8 93:7,15,22	level 9:5 69:8
49:4 52:12 53:1,7	81:3 83:20 84:3	93:24 94:9,15,17	liable 65:23
85:11 87:16 88:7	85:2,3 88:17,19,22	96:1,4,20 97:12	liberty 6:8 7:11
88:9,10,21 89:5	90:13,16 94:4,6	101:22	8:11 10:23 15:15
93:10	96:12,17 100:22	knowledge 34:11	15:20,25 16:19,22
\mathbf{j}	101:2,3,4,7,9,16	39:22 42:9 43:20	35:13 42:22 43:8
james 6:9 8:4 50:2	102:18,23 103:8	45:18 53:2,8 61:1	liberty's 44:8
jamie 6:3 8:18	july 61:11	61:18 63:20 67:13	lime 53:24
27:10	june 16:23	80:10 82:1 87:20	limited 45:14,24
jefferson 6:4,7,10	justification 92:10	88:2 92:25 93:16	line 33:9 34:4
6:14,17 7:19 8:10	k	94:1 95:23	45:17,17,19 61:10
8:13,19,24 9:5,15	k 78:19	known 90:21	61:20 64:2 65:22
jill 52:17	keenan 27:13 30:7	knows 40:13 88:23	66:10 82:6,10
	78:19 79:1,24		83:5,11 84:4

[line - morning] Page 12

97:11,15 98:17	manager 35:18	medial 28:18	mischaracterizat
lines 15:3 24:18	mandate 63:4	medium 13:15	39:3
33:22 39:10,12,14	mandatory 19:13	meet 26:3 29:24	mislead 41:7
51:16 60:18 62:12	map 70:18	meeting 26:5	misses 64:20
74:21 76:4,8,17	mark 26:13 59:7	52:23	missouri 1:4,17
96:19	64:20 72:13	meetings 52:12,15	6:2,15,24 7:4,13
list 12:14	marked 32:24,25	52:17,19,21 87:21	7:19 8:10,13,17,19
listen 20:22	33:2 58:2,3,7	87:24 88:3	8:25 9:6,6,16
little 11:23 26:20	72:17 79:8 80:2	mention 86:8 95:4	11:10,16 14:16
48:13 97:20	market 6:24 31:4	mentioned 23:11	15:2 17:19 18:22
loads 33:11	91:9	25:17 26:15,16	19:5 20:13 23:20
loathe 23:23	marketer 12:9	28:8 30:10 39:11	27:11 32:17 35:7
local 19:22,24,25	13:10	39:19 40:23 59:19	36:3 40:4 43:6
81:20 100:7	marketers 66:11	86:11 95:20	44:8 57:12,14
long 18:23,23	marking 79:3,4	101:24	61:8 62:3 78:23
46:12 47:7 86:16	material 22:17,18	merely 15:19	81:21 85:9,18
91:19	23:3	met 35:8 85:8	97:16 104:3,20
look 29:25 65:14	materials 38:18	metering 21:11	missouri's 14:15
82:9	matter 1:8 5:1,6	meters 49:9	98:18
looking 65:8,9	7:10 25:15 91:16	method 14:2,13,22	mistake 101:10
98:17	matters 22:10	14:25 48:18,19,20	mo 5:8 6:4,7,10,14
lot 18:10	mean 20:8 38:20	81:17,20,24 86:4	6:17 48:11
lots 18:5	38:24 41:7 43:3	methodology	model 22:16 48:20
louis 6:24 9:9,9	48:17,18 53:5	68:19 85:17	51:16
18:23,24,24 54:19	60:21 61:2 67:16	microphone 32:9	models 24:24
57:9,16 72:6,21	67:18,23 73:20	mid 70:4	modify 27:20
low 99:3	83:3 87:14 93:11	midstates 15:15	moment 95:25
lower 46:22	93:12	15:21,25 16:9,19	money 11:23 14:8
m	meaning 21:3	16:22 35:12,19	69:5
m 6:9 8:4	46:19	42:25 43:1	monitors 97:24
madison 6:3,6,10	means 41:21 46:14	midwest 6:12 9:14	month 47:10,11
6:16 8:9,19 9:5	65:24	mike 9:7 18:21	49:13 84:20 99:2
main 52:22	meant 46:15,20	mike's 18:23	99:6,12,15,17,19
maintain 29:11	47:19 90:2	mind 85:15	99:22
major 51:17	measured 31:3	minimum 20:19	monthly 25:8 31:3
majority 46:3	64:10	55:4	99:14
making 50:25	mecg 9:12 31:13	minus 47:17	months 46:13,22
65:22 82:21 94:22	31:14 34:25 52:2	minute 18:3 42:7	moper 19:16
managed 66:3	60:10 81:9 101:2	44:2 95:24 103:6	morning 7:8,15
82:18	mechanism 48:2	minutes 70:5	8:16 9:13 10:20
		103:9	17:18 21:1 27:9

Veritext Legal Solutions

www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

[morning - order] Page 13

30:20 32:1 35:6	37:24 55:6 61:22	notification 25:21	61:10 62:24 63:4
60:16 70:5,17	62:18 66:2 91:6	november 46:10	63:8 64:18 65:15
81:13 85:7	92:1 102:5	number 24:4 53:1	65:18 66:13 67:5
motion 90:19	necessary 29:17	57:14 59:18 61:8	69:25 70:12 71:2
mouthed 86:5	need 12:16 16:24	67:9 82:2 84:8	73:1 74:6,25
move 10:15 27:3	33:5,7,12 34:1	98:17	75:10,11,21,21
34:13,19	79:21 83:22	numbers 23:2	76:3,8,16,21 77:2
moving 86:19	needing 99:4,5	83:17,18,21 84:1	77:14,17 79:14,17
msba 9:2 17:15	needs 15:24 51:17	0	80:17 83:10 84:3
28:15,19,22 29:24	negative 21:13	o 78:20	86:2,15 87:1,7,21
35:2 39:20,24	76:10 100:6	object 39:2 73:16	88:9,12 89:8,15,21
52:4 56:15 60:19	neither 76:9 104:9	84:1 88:17 90:13	89:25 90:10,22
62:12,14 64:25	net 48:12	94:4	91:3,9,12 93:7
65:25 66:2,8,8	netting 45:12 46:6	- '	94:2 95:24 96:5
68:14 85:4 101:4	47:5,6,13	objection 40:6 78:2 86:23	96:10 97:11 98:15
msba's 27:20	never 63:20 92:17		99:23 100:4
28:14 29:14 56:8	new 89:20 90:4	objections 34:17 56:16 60:8 74:12	101:21
multiple 45:22	nine 11:21 14:7	81:5	once 20:3 74:14
multipliers 14:3	39:10,14 62:11	- '-	opc 51:25
29:4,8 86:20,23	83:11 84:4	objects 12:18	opening 3:3 9:20
87:4,6 92:22,23	nominated 98:3	obligation 38:13 obviously 69:3	9:21 10:6,6,13,16
mutual 18:18	nominating 64:8	occasions 86:10	10:18 17:15,16
myers 3:6,23 4:2	64:12 98:2	occurred 52:13	18:21 27:7 30:14
6:3 8:16,18,21	nomination 64:3	73:6	30:18 31:13,14
26:25 27:6,8,10	98:7	offer 59:17 74:7	34:2 103:3
30:13 34:21 51:24	nominations 64:21	79:19 80:15	operated 15:1
60:12 73:16 78:14	97:17,18,23 98:5,6	offered 34:17 60:7	operating 11:13
78:16 79:10,17,23	non 26:22		61:16 63:11
80:4,13,20 81:3	norm 14:25	74:11 78:2 81:4	operator 98:24
88:17 90:13 101:7	normal 18:12	office 6:5 7:18	opinion 40:9 65:13
101:9,11,13	90:10	8:22 30:21	opitz 6:13 9:13,13
102:15,18	normalize 99:7	oh 90:2 101:7	9:17 31:14,15
n	normally 41:24	103:8	35:1 52:3
	nos 33:1 58:6 79:7	okay 31:20 33:21	opportunities 45:9
n 78:19,19,20 name 22:6 27:10	80:1	33:25 36:8,14,19 37:13,22 38:5,22	opportunity 46:7
32:14,16 57:7,19	note 14:7 22:9	42:19 43:21 44:1	opposed 12:6 88:5
72:5 78:18,19	26:14 59:18 75:14	44:11 46:23 47:20	opt 19:12
nathan 6:6 8:23	notes 80:18	48:6 49:15,18	order 9:19,19
30:20	notice 25:19 59:7	50:2,24 51:8,20	16:21 22:9,12,13
natural 19:9,17	60:2 77:14 97:22	50:2,24 51:8,20 53:12 56:15,17	22:23 26:4,13
,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	59:8 62:13 77:25
20:20 25:6 31:9		57:22 59:5 61:5	

[order - potential] Page 14

0.5.0.100.0.0			00.00.07.44.40
96:2 103:3,3	part 30:2,3 75:25	paying 24:20	92:23 95:11,13
organized 19:16	75:25 94:11,14	47:15 51:5 66:2	97:25
original 59:10	participants 45:10	68:20 95:10	pizza 26:4
out's 86:15	participate 25:18	pays 92:24	place 69:17
outcome 104:15	51:13 73:12,15	pc 8:9	places 86:7
outs 28:24,24 64:4	participates 11:24	penalize 68:5	plan 47:9 103:2
64:9,22 101:22,24	participating 32:9	penalties 64:10,22	please 8:1,15,22
outside 70:9	33:15,17	67:14 76:10 95:4	9:2,12 27:9 30:22
overall 52:7 67:10	particular 18:16	95:11,12	31:25 32:2,14
overlooked 9:18	30:23	penalty 24:21	46:24 56:20,22
overrule 40:12	parties 2:13 5:7	67:11,24 68:9,21	57:7 70:9 71:20
88:22 90:16	6:1 7:25 11:2	69:14,19	72:5 74:22,23
oversight 102:19	14:10 16:12,16	penalty's 69:22	76:6,19 78:9,17
overview 27:18	26:17 54:15 70:24	people 32:9 91:20	80:19 96:21 97:13
p	71:6 79:18 103:1	percent 24:21,22	plus 21:6 55:9,16
p 78:20	103:4 104:10,14	61:7 67:23 68:5	102:8,9
p.o. 8:24	parts 15:21	68:20,22,24 69:8	point 22:7 26:11
pack 45:18	party 11:18 12:18	period 36:1 85:9	26:22 30:4 50:1
packs 45:17,19	23:4	periods 98:5	73:8,20
page 2:2 3:2 15:3	pass 19:25 59:15	personally 42:8	pointed 14:12
33:9,22 34:4 39:8	passed 19:2,4,21	perspective 11:15	45:16
39:9,12,14 45:3,5	22:3 35:23 72:23	16:5	pointing 18:18
45:5 47:20 60:18	passing 22:11	pga 48:2 53:20	points 11:20
61:10,19 62:11	patience 66:21	68:7,7 83:4	polar 69:4
64:2 65:21 74:21	patterson 2:5,7	philosophically	ponder 20:12
76:4,17 82:5,5,10	3:22 11:20 13:18	69:10	pool 49:1 64:11
83:10 84:4,11	14:6 27:13,16	phonetic 17:11	98:23
90:8 96:19 97:11	28:10 30:7,10	22:5 23:12 59:11	pools 15:7 29:18
97:15 98:16	45:16 71:4 78:5,6	phrase 100:13,18	29:22 48:1,7,16,23
	78:15,17,19,21	physical 21:20,24	49:5 84:13 97:17
pages 11:21 14:6	79:1,15 80:4,14,21	pidgin 6:20	98:20
paid 69:6 paired 22:22	80:23,25 81:11,13	pieces 33:6	portion 37:15
pamela 1:16 5:8	85:5 88:17 96:14	pipe 24:18 98:11	55:13
6:23 7:3 104:2	96:16,18 101:12	pipeline 19:21	position 12:23
	101:14 102:17,20	21:18 41:19 47:3	24:11 27:18 35:18
paragraph 23:5 37:22 54:18 55:1	patterson's 15:3	50:6 75:8,16	36:9,11,14,16
	71:10,16 79:24	82:22 91:1 96:24	56:13 68:14 77:22
55:2 59:22 75:12	81:1 90:14 101:5	97:6 98:8,10,12	81:16 91:14
75:18 76:2,13	pay 12:8,9 43:6	pipeline's 97:5	post 98:7
100:4 102:4	46:4 67:14,15	pipelines 19:10,19	potential 31:1,5
parnell 9:8 18:21	69:2	20:8,9 29:2,5,10	<u> </u>

notontially 42.1	nwiced 16.22	nuchlama 14.14	nuovod 26,15
potentially 42:1 46:8 82:23	priced 46:22	problems 14:14	proved 36:15
	prices 29:4 46:11	18:12,19	91:12,15
practically 29:16	46:13 67:19 99:7	procedural 18:8	proven 101:23
practice 28:25	99:16	18:11 57:25	provide 23:6 29:6
29:4	pricing 14:3 25:7	procedure 26:20	37:5,10,14,18
practices 14:20	85:16	73:17 90:10	38:23 40:4,19
15:16 29:12	pridgin 3:11,20	proceed 31:17	55:5 67:19 75:2
pre 30:8	4:1 7:8,15 8:14,21	71:7	102:4,25
precedent 65:11	9:1,11,17 10:1,4	proceeding 57:23	provided 7:13
predecessor 59:11	10:10,20 17:3,14	72:10 73:2 103:13	28:19 41:16 50:14
predict 64:16	26:24 27:5 30:13	proceedings 3:1	50:19 62:4 79:17
predicts 48:21	30:17 31:12,15,24	process 64:3 98:8	95:13
predominant	32:7 34:16,22,25	98:12	providing 13:23
81:24 85:16,17	35:2 39:6 40:12	processes 98:2	28:17 73:17 95:9
prefer 56:10 63:17	44:3,14,20 45:2	produce 49:11	100:20
83:23 86:3	51:20,25 52:2,4	produced 42:4	provision 98:25
prefiled 27:14	53:14,19 56:5,15	professional 7:4	provisions 16:14
73:20	57:1 60:6,13	78:25	67:11
premature 30:5	66:23 67:5 70:1	program 11:12,14	psc 59:19
premium 68:20	70:16 71:25 73:19	11:25 15:11 20:15	public 1:3 5:5 6:2
preparation 42:12	74:10,19 77:2,19	23:20 29:17 51:14	6:5 7:2 8:17,22,24
43:3	78:1,13 79:21	60:22 61:15 62:4	17:22 25:3 27:11
prepare 37:18	80:17 81:3 84:3	62:8 65:25 66:3,8	30:15,21,22,25
prepared 79:2,2	85:3 88:19,22	82:3 100:5,11,16	31:2 34:23 42:2
present 10:9 24:13	90:16 94:6 96:12	program's 63:11	59:24 60:10 78:24
52:11 79:18 93:24	96:17 100:22	programs 15:1,14	79:25 80:21 81:6
presentation 11:6	101:2,4,9 102:18	15:17	81:8 83:23,25
23:16 71:5,17	102:23 103:8	proposal 28:3	84:2 100:25
102:25	primarily 82:20	29:11 81:16 88:15	publications 25:7
presented 28:16	primary 30:25	proposals 88:5	publicly 84:9
92:13	principal 65:10	propose 12:16	pull 45:22
preside 7:16	68:19	16:13	purchase 19:18
presumed 28:13	prior 28:1 36:1,5	proposed 12:1,5,7	31:9 47:24 83:1
presumption 92:3	37:2,9,20 57:16	52:11 53:6 65:2	95:1
previous 22:6	59:23,23	86:19 87:22	purchases 96:8
41:16 57:25 90:20	probably 17:24	proposes 12:12	98:24
previously 72:12	59:7 71:15 83:24	13:25 15:5	purchasing 19:16
85:8	85:8 96:9 101:7	proposing 28:2	20:20 37:25 55:8
price 31:10 69:3	problem 77:19	47:16	60:20 61:21 75:19
91:9 99:3,21	101:11	protection 47:18	76:14 82:24 102:7

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com
888-391-3376

purpose 52:20	r	69:9 88:24 94:23	recover 100:15
purposes 32:22	r 72:6 78:20	reason 64:20	recovered 51:5
83:20	raise 32:1 56:21	66:19	82:15
pursuant 33:15,17	67:19 71:19 78:8	reasonable 13:5	recovery 22:22
55:3	raised 11:10,22	15:19 28:13,25	recrement 24:22
put 41:25 90:23	raising 54:5	49:6 86:25 90:21	recross 51:22 67:2
q	rate 10:24,25,25	rebuttal 11:21	96:14 100:24
question 33:10	11:4 12:5 13:7	15:3 27:14 28:11	red 66:10
34:5 37:17 38:8	15:10,13 16:17,19	30:8 32:19,23	redirect 53:15
39:3 41:8 44:5	18:8,16 25:25	33:8 39:7 45:4,16	77:6 96:15 101:8
50:12 54:17 63:25	28:1,20 37:2	47:21 79:2,13,24	reduce 28:24
66:25 67:4 75:14	38:11,21 41:16,18	80:21 81:1 84:11	47:23 48:4 54:4
75:15 77:9,23	41:25 54:6,7 56:1	96:19 97:12 98:16	reduced 104:8
89:21 90:2 94:8	62:15,18,22 63:2	recall 23:16 52:21	reevaluate 14:11
questions 17:1,5,5	63:17 84:24 89:2	53:21 65:5,7	refer 15:2 36:3
17:7,11,13 26:19	89:3,13,23 90:12	receive 25:19	54:21,25 76:3,17
27:2,17 30:11,12	90:18,20,24 94:11	77:14	reference 69:18
32:13 34:7,20,21	94:22 98:18 102:5	received 29:7	75:8,12,15,17
34:24 35:5 42:15	rates 7:12 13:3	recess 70:14 103:9	referred 25:4
44:15,16,17,19,22	25:2,16 36:17	recognized 22:16	26:17 101:17
44:23 45:2 46:23	37:1,5,8,8 41:2	22:23	102:2
47:1 51:21,22,23	43:4,10 54:13	recommend 12:20	referring 34:2
51:24 52:6 53:18	64:8 89:4 91:2	recommendations	76:24 93:17
53:21 56:3,13	92:4	30:9	101:19
57:6 58:18 59:1	reaction 71:8	recommended	reflect 8:3 10:9
60:11,12,15,17	read 40:15 49:8	14:24	regarding 5:6 16:3
66:24 67:1,2,7	50:9 55:14 61:4	recommends	28:24 33:10 39:16
68:12 71:3,13	87:3	27:19 28:3 29:10	52:7 58:12 68:12
72:4 73:25 74:9	reading 102:12	29:13	77:9 87:7
74:15,17,19 77:3,4	reads 49:11	reconciliation	registered 7:4
77:5,8 78:16 80:6	ready 10:17 16:17	98:11	regression 48:20
81:12,14 85:2,6,11	27:6 30:17 32:10	record 7:9 8:3 9:3	regulatory 7:16
96:13,17 100:23	57:3 72:1 78:14	10:9 11:6 25:4	related 53:20 55:7
100:24,25 101:13	81:10	28:12 32:15,22	86:20 87:24 92:14
101:22 102:16	real 18:17 49:12	57:8 70:11,12,13	95:9 104:10
quickly 14:7	90:5	70:15,16,17,24	relating 12:13,21
101:14	really 19:17 21:16	71:11,17 72:5	relative 104:12
quite 26:20 75:14	21:22 23:12,15,17	78:18 83:21	release 39:16,25
quote 98:18	23:19,23,23,23	102:25 103:10,11	97:4
	24:4,14,17 31:6	records 59:24,24	releases 75:9,16
	64:10 65:17 68:16	60:2	96:24

www.veritext.com

[reliable - schools] Page 17

reliable 28:16,19	55:2	rid 86:9,13	saving 61:22
reluctant 23:24	requirement 11:4	right 9:18 10:4,13	saw 66:9 69:3
remain 28:4	33:10	10:16 17:3,14	saying 66:12 99:15
remained 13:17	requirements	31:10,17,24 32:2,7	says 37:23 38:3,22
remaining 12:21	22:19 29:21 58:1	34:22 36:17 41:20	40:11,11 55:5,11
27:15	97:16	44:4,4,11,14,20,22	55:13,16,19 75:18
remarks 10:6,13	requires 20:16	53:12 54:7 55:18	76:13 94:13,24
remember 19:4	38:3 75:2	56:5,19,21 61:7,13	scale 24:24
remind 70:7	requiring 20:19	61:25 62:15 64:4	scenario 46:8
remove 34:5 66:10	resale 20:22,23	64:12 70:1,3 71:8	scenarios 45:23
reoffer 77:21	55:6	71:19,19 73:23	schedule 15:11,13
repeat 50:17	resolution 18:16	74:10,16 75:23	98:1
replace 33:21	resolved 11:3	78:8 80:4,13 82:8	scheduled 70:22
replaced 46:21	resolving 28:25	83:13,18 84:6,9,14	schedules 2:6,8,9
report 22:9,11,20	resources 45:14	84:21 86:2 90:5	79:12,14,20 80:5
26:13 41:8 77:25	82:20	91:3 92:20,21	80:24,25
reporter 6:22 7:4	responded 50:3	96:10,12 100:22	school 6:15 9:7
7:5 72:13,18 79:9	response 49:25	101:4 102:15	11:10,12,14,16,24
80:3 104:1,3,19	50:9 71:1,8	103:10	11:24 14:21 15:1
reporter's 8:6	responsibility	righty 64:1	15:7,11,13,16 16:1
reports 93:14	12:15 66:11	road 25:16 70:18	17:20 18:22 19:5
represent 19:7	responsible 12:8	ron 6:20 7:15	19:7,8,17 21:12
35:7 76:22 85:9	result 13:6 54:14	room 8:6 9:22,25	25:18 26:8 29:14
represented 57:13	62:3 87:25	31:21 70:8,10	29:17,18,21 31:7
57:17 73:4	results 66:1	roughly 61:6	35:7 36:3 38:12
representing	resume 70:5,13	rounds 28:7	38:14 49:5,8
10:22 13:9 17:19	retained 2:13	rpr 1:16 5:8	51:10,11 52:9
27:11 72:21	return 54:6,7	rsmo 33:15 61:12	55:7 57:12,14
represents 61:6	revenue 11:4	62:14 75:1	60:22 61:15 62:4
91:1	22:19,24 54:2	rule 19:13 59:21	62:7 63:8 72:22
request 7:10,24	67:23 100:9,15	77:23 91:17	73:3,4 76:11
12:18 13:1 27:20	revenues 48:4	rules 19:13 22:8	77:11 82:2 83:12
29:14 38:17 49:25	review 42:13	59:20	84:5,9,12,17 85:10
50:3 54:9	83:14	S	87:2,14 88:6 89:6
requesting 10:24	reviewed 22:15	s 78:20	92:1 94:10 97:16
requests 12:21	37:2,9 93:3	sale 102:5	98:20 102:6
50:5	reviews 14:5	sales 45:10,24 46:2	schools 15:12
require 94:3,10,20	revised 16:17	46:3,4,9,20 47:4	19:15,25 20:9,15
required 20:18	revisions 12:7	47:15,19 48:5,11	21:11 23:1 24:20
21:10 23:6 29:16	richard 6:16 9:4	51:3 54:3 82:13	31:8,10 33:11,14
33:16,19 38:21	17:19 35:6 85:7	51.5 5 1.5 02.15	33:17 39:20 40:1

[schools - staff] Page 18

	I	I	
40:5,20 43:6 44:8	40:19 50:14,18	side 35:15,17	sounds 56:15
51:13 61:3,8,20,23	60:23 61:3,6,16	signal 29:6	sources 19:20
62:3 65:23,25	62:8 67:19 78:24	signature 104:18	south 32:17
66:2,17 67:9,9,12	94:22 95:9 100:20	significant 15:24	speak 32:8
67:14,19,21,22,25	102:6	20:6 67:25	speaking 98:3
68:3 75:3 76:22	services 13:23	similar 16:9	special 21:11 52:8
86:1,8 93:5,12	28:6,18 50:8 75:2	simple 18:6	specific 29:8 59:22
95:6 96:3 99:14	94:20 95:5	simply 71:9 90:18	95:21
schwartz 52:17	set 25:16,23 36:20	103:2	specifically 38:10
se 24:23	58:14 78:14 89:4	sir 10:3,12,17	45:4 49:24 68:16
seat 57:2 72:1	97:9	30:17 56:20 57:3	74:21 76:4 94:13
second 15:5 87:9	sets 58:10 65:11	61:9,14 66:5,25	94:24 95:1 96:19
95:25	settle 11:9	71:20,25 72:1,2,7	97:9
secondary 19:7	settled 13:13	78:7,13 85:7	spire 14:15,17
section 20:4 33:15	settlement 13:7	96:11 101:6	19:9 85:24,25
33:17 54:25 55:3	seven 22:3 50:1	102:21	87:14 93:7 97:16
61:12 62:14 75:1	59:12 73:7,9	sister 15:15 42:21	98:18
75:7 76:9,23	85:22	43:5,12 51:14	sponsored 27:14
99:24 101:17	severity 82:23	sitting 65:12	30:8
see 10:4 17:4 21:1	she'll 31:24	situation 25:13	spot 31:4
30:14 44:15 51:21	sheets 22:16	six 13:9 33:9,9,22	sr 2:12 3:18 9:9
60:9 66:4,24	shift 99:7	33:22 39:9,9,14	18:24,25 56:8
69:13,18 71:12	ship 98:24	61:6 64:2 76:2,18	70:22 72:3
75:11 95:3 96:14	shipped 21:21	size 67:9	sr.'s 49:16 70:6
98:21 100:24	shipper 98:10	sliding 24:24	100:1
seen 89:4,16	shippers 29:6	small 13:15 14:8	sris 16:21,22,23
send 49:6 99:4	98:14	22:24 28:6,18	st 6:24
senior 56:13 57:17	short 24:20 46:14	39:25 48:7,10,15	staff 8:15,17 11:17
63:24 78:24	46:18 47:8,17	48:23 49:1 75:3	11:20 12:19 13:10
sense 24:5	99:18	76:11	13:18,19 14:6,12
sent 48:8,9,13	shortage 48:23	smaller 23:2 82:21	14:24 16:2,12,15
separate 15:6,7,10	82:24	99:20	23:22 26:15,25
15:13 24:2,3,7,9	shorthand 7:3	solution 47:16,17	27:3,11,13,19 28:1
29:14,15	104:2,19	solutions 6:23	28:2,10 29:10,13
series 26:12	show 9:3,20 69:15	somebody 70:9	29:24 30:1,7,9
serve 45:24 61:8	75:7 76:11	somewhat 93:2	34:19 36:16 38:7
serves 61:2	showed 90:7	sorry 9:22 10:1	51:23 52:10 60:11
service 1:3 5:5 6:2	showing 70:3	49:23 70:11 77:18	63:17 76:22 78:23
7:2,13,14 8:17	shown 23:4	93:13 98:16 101:9	79:19 80:14 86:3
12:2,10 17:22	shows 68:23,24	sort 18:8 52:7	87:17 88:4,7,14
20:23 27:12 40:4		67:13	89:1 90:6,11

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376

[staff - take] Page 19

91:14,16 101:24	24:6,25 25:5,11	structures 43:1	supposed 38:23
staff's 16:5 27:18	35:22 36:3 37:23	students 61:20	sure 9:23 41:15,15
27:23 31:6 36:9	38:1,3,22,25 39:4	subject 19:11	41:17 50:10,18
36:11,14 81:15	40:3,9,10,18 54:18	subsection 55:3,5	51:4 65:9,17
stakeholders	54:18,22 55:19	subsequent 60:2	80:20 86:14 87:1
29:25	59:14 63:4 65:10	88:15	89:13 92:20 93:3
stand 16:14 26:19	69:18 72:22 75:5	subsidization 31:2	103:8
29:25 31:23 51:11	75:25 76:1,12	42:4	surrebuttal 2:4,7
51:15 56:17 71:2	91:13,19,21 93:1,5	substitute 14:1	2:11 27:14 30:9
73:21	94:2,9,19 95:7,21	81:17	32:19,24 34:4
standard 15:19	100:5,18 101:16	success 62:9	49:16,21 58:3,23
stands 56:19	101:18,23,25	sufficient 100:9	74:20 75:4 76:4
star 17:11	102:13	suggested 13:20	79:4 80:23 100:2
start 26:4	statutory 20:13,19	suite 6:3,6,10,13	surrounding 93:4
started 35:14	29:21 95:3	6:24 8:9,13,19	suspect 96:7
starting 33:9	step 56:7 67:3 70:2	9:15	sustain 39:6 73:19
72:24	78:4 101:6 102:21	summaries 25:9	73:22 94:6
state 1:4 19:20	stick 17:11	supplied 13:10	swear 32:2 56:22
32:14 40:3,14,18	stip 71:17	38:16	71:20 78:9
57:7 61:11,20	stipulated 7:1	suppliers 65:24	sworn 31:25 32:2
62:12 65:22 72:5	stipulation 11:3,7	68:4	56:20,22 71:19,20
75:1,15 76:9,22	13:13 22:14 54:14	supplies 37:25	78:6,7,9 104:6
78:17 85:18 88:4	59:9 71:6,12,13	55:6,9 76:15	symmetry 7:22
104:3,20	103:5	102:5,8	31:16
stated 29:23 60:25	stipulations 103:1	supply 20:14,20	system 14:18
62:1 63:14 93:18	storage 14:18	35:18 38:5,9,12,14	19:21,24,24 25:21
statement 3:3 9:21	45:22,23,23,25	52:14 61:22 66:1	26:8 39:20 40:5
10:18 17:15,16	46:5,12,14,19 47:3	66:17 75:19 96:2	45:22,25 48:21
20:25 22:12 25:17	47:8,9,10,17 48:12	support 24:12,14	49:2 50:19 66:1
27:7 30:15,18	48:14,24 50:6,8	36:16 37:5 90:19	66:17 67:10 82:18
34:2 36:10 43:24	51:2,6 82:22 91:1	91:25 92:17,19	99:12
76:24 86:17,24,25	storm 12:11 48:16	101:24	t
87:5 91:21	49:5,6 69:4	supported 91:25	_
statements 9:20	stp 51:9 60:20,21	92:4	t 78:20,20
10:7,16 103:3	61:11,22 62:13	supporting 28:20	table 83:23
states 28:10 40:9	streaming 70:8	88:10 89:16	take 14:9 16:4 17:1 35:21 44:2
40:10 55:2 96:23	street 6:3,6,10,13	supportive 91:14	
100:5	6:16,24 8:9,19 9:5	supports 13:19	48:4,12 51:19 59:6 60:1 68:7
statute 19:1,1,11	structure 16:8,10	36:9	
19:13,15 20:1,7	16:11	suppose 91:15,20	70:4,5 71:2,10,11 75:11 99:20 103:6
21:4,15 22:1,3,15			
			103:8

[taken - topic] Page 20

			I
taken 7:2 104:7,11	tend 82:25	31:12,14,15 32:7	94:4,13 97:23
takes 51:8 56:17	tender 34:14 60:4	32:11 34:16,22,24	100:23 101:16,21
56:18	74:7	34:25 35:1 44:14	third 12:13
talk 18:1,3,15 26:2	tenders 80:14	44:21 51:21,24,25	thought 17:21
talked 24:16 41:9	tenths 21:8	52:1,3 53:14 56:4	90:2 91:17
41:23 51:15 72:23	term 46:14 47:17	56:6,6 57:1,4 60:6	thousand 21:12
talking 25:11	terms 42:16 69:19	64:1 66:21,23	33:19
36:23 85:22	81:18 93:17	69:25 70:2,13	three 12:1,24 15:3
tariff 12:4 15:6,20	testified 36:8 73:9	71:25 72:2,19	16:21 34:4 45:3,5
15:22,22 16:1,9,14	84:16 86:10,15,17	74:11,25 76:3,8	88:13 96:19
16:17 22:16 24:3	88:18 90:6	77:2,19 78:2,3,13	tier 12:2
24:3,7,9 29:15,15	testifies 13:19	78:17,21 80:13	tiered 69:7
29:20 30:1 36:17	testify 63:23	81:3,9 84:3 85:2,3	tim 6:13 9:13
37:1 42:11 51:1,9	testimonies 27:15	96:10,13 98:15	time 7:20 12:13,17
51:11,11,15,17	30:9 59:19 79:11	99:23 100:4,22	14:9 15:22 16:4
52:12 66:10 67:12	testimony 2:3,5,10	101:1,3,4,6,14	17:12,25 18:14,23
87:15,17,19,20,22	2:12 11:21 13:8	102:15,16,18,21	19:4 25:16 26:9
87:23 88:3,5,15,18	14:6 26:11 27:17	102:22	29:15 30:4 40:24
88:20,21 92:1	28:8,11 32:19,19	thanks 44:12	44:12,19 49:12,23
93:18,21 97:10	32:23 33:6,8 39:7	53:12	51:8,19 53:1 59:6
tariffs 7:12 12:22	39:13 43:19 45:4	thereto 104:14	59:15,16 63:12
13:8 15:8 20:16	45:16 47:21 49:16	therm 21:8	66:6 70:3,4 73:8
20:18 21:5,13	49:19 54:20,21	therms 21:12	74:4,6 75:11
31:7 51:12 52:8,8	57:22 58:2,3,10,14	thing 20:5	77:15 85:9 87:15
52:25 53:6 55:2	58:21,23 60:18	things 23:13 85:13	88:6,13 91:19
62:13	62:11 64:2 65:22	think 17:22 19:2	92:6,9,12 93:8
tatiana 31:23	66:6 69:15 70:6	20:3 21:15 23:11	times 42:21 43:7
32:16,18,23	72:9,13 73:18,21	23:21 24:3,11,23	43:12,18 44:7
taxes 67:23	73:24 74:21 75:1	25:5,17 26:8,11,12	timing 18:17
taxing 21:15 100:8	76:17,21 79:3,4,13	35:7 39:3,11,23	title 78:22,24
taxpayers 61:21	79:25 80:21,23	40:23 41:6,6	today 9:7 11:8,11
teachers 61:20,24	81:1 83:24 85:11	44:11 46:7 47:14	16:25 25:22 26:5
technical 18:11	86:8,12,18 87:3	50:5 51:20 52:18	27:16 30:10 35:8
telemetry 21:10	90:15,23 93:4	53:19 56:11 57:25	37:1,4 43:3 65:12
33:12,16,20 49:9	96:23 98:19 104:5	59:7 63:18 65:15	66:14 80:6 92:11
64:14	104:6	66:19 70:23 72:24	99:21
tell 51:8 103:4,4	thank 8:2,14,21	73:5,23 74:9	tomorrow 99:16
ten 11:22 14:7	9:1,11,17 10:11,12	75:11,20 76:8	tools 61:25
74:21 84:11 103:9	10:14 16:25 17:4	81:14 82:21 85:1	top 45:5
103:10	17:8,9,14 26:24	85:8,16 86:7	topic 30:11
	27:4,5 30:12,13,16	87:16 88:25 90:7	
	, ,		

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376

[total - when's] Page 21

4.4.1.40.2.61.7	4. 17.10.10.15	. 1	
total 48:3 61:7	try 17:12 18:15	understood 63:3	veritext 6:23
65:8	30:5 32:8	unfair 90:14	versions 80:22
trade 19:6	trying 47:9 51:16	unintentional 46:8	visit 18:14
transcribed 7:5	65:9 66:16 77:18	unintentionally	visiting 81:15
transport 20:23	90:17,18	47:11	vol 1:5
transportation	turn 18:21 65:21	unique 19:1 20:6,9	volume 39:20,21
11:12,14,25 12:2	83:10	21:22 24:6,6	40:1 48:7,10,10,15
12:10,22 13:8,11	twelve 39:10,14	29:21	48:23 49:1
13:16 15:1,7,8,11	twice 74:15	uniquely 57:19	volumeric 23:2
15:13,17 16:1	two 9:8 12:3,21	unmute 17:12,13	volumes 65:14
20:15,21,24 23:20	23:12 33:7 50:1	unreasonable 23:5	vortex 69:4
28:6,18 29:19,20	58:9 75:18 76:13	unresolved 25:13	w
30:1 31:7 33:13	83:11 84:4 95:19	unsure 71:6	waiting 25:24
38:1 40:4,19	96:20 101:8 102:4	unusual 67:24	waived 74:9
46:22 48:1 50:6	type 16:10 18:13	updated 93:8,13	want 9:24 10:8
50:16,20 51:6,12	92:23	updates 15:24	17:12 40:15 50:13
51:14 55:7,9	types 13:20 96:8	16:3 51:18	51:4 68:15 86:8
60:22 61:15 62:4	typewriting 7:6	ups 56:12	86:13,15 87:1
62:8 63:10 64:7	104:8	upstream 29:9	103:4
64:19 73:3 75:20	typical 11:25	50:8 92:22 95:11	wanted 18:14
82:2,12,16 89:6	typically 19:20	usage 49:7	71:14
93:9 94:10,25	66:1 96:9	use 23:24 35:11	wants 56:16
95:2,17 96:25	u	45:15,23 47:6,10	water 18:5
97:21 99:13	uh 36:12 93:19	48:21 97:1	way 18:7 21:22
100:21 102:6,8	ultimate 12:8	uses 21:12,15 50:8	24:7 61:4 63:23
transported 19:20	ultimately 65:23	utilities 8:11 15:15	64:24,24 66:20
transporter 69:22	unchanged 13:17	15:21 19:22 42:12	67:12 68:17 87:3
trapped 18:8	28:4	42:17,22,24 45:17	91:7 99:9
treated 21:18	underlying 69:18	73:7 85:18,23	we've 23:15 35:7
53:20	understand 11:5	utility 19:25 35:25	38:12 41:9 58:1
treatise 23:19	37:3 49:12,14	39:20 63:13 64:23	69:13,14 70:19,20
treatment 21:20	70:22 92:2 94:19	69:22 73:6 82:18	72:23 77:3 85:8
trial 26:21	understandable	82:19,21 91:4,7	92:11
tricky 41:7	23:25	95:6 97:23	weather 64:15,20
tried 63:13	understanding	utilize 19:9,23	68:3
true 34:10 64:18	12:17 84:23 86:18	45:18	webex 5:7 7:19
71:1 80:10	95:7 97:8 100:12	utilizing 45:17	31:21 32:10 70:8
truth 32:3,4,4	100:14,17 101:18	V	weekly 25:6
56:23,23,24 71:21	understands 31:3	various 59:19 73:2	what'd 92:6
71:22,22 78:10,10	87:2	various 33.13 73.2 verify 74:13	what u 92.0 when's 92:9
78:11	07.2	10111y 17.13	WIICH 5 /2./

[williams - yuri] Page 22

	T
williams 1:16 3:7	working 11:15
5:8 6:6,23 7:3	87:10
8:23,23 9:1 30:15	works 84:21
30:16,19,20 31:12	wrong 68:18 69:11
34:24 52:1 101:1	y
104:2	veah 36:23 39:19
willing 11:16 26:3	40:12,22 43:2,15
29:24	43:18 52:18 68:2
winter 12:11	82:10 87:7 88:19
46:10,17 48:16	88:22 89:12 90:9
wish 79:10 103:1	90:16,17 91:23
wishing 10:13	92:8 95:3 96:6
withdraw 12:13	year 11:25 12:11
12:16 34:3 48:22	12:11 20:3,17
withdrawal 47:9	21:9,13,25 22:21
withdrawals	35:22 40:22 41:1
82:21	46:5 47:15 48:3
withdrawing	59:14 72:22 76:1
46:19	84:17
withdrawn 88:13	yearly 23:6
witness 11:20	yeary 23.0 years 11:13 13:18
13:18 14:6 26:15	13:22 16:21 17:24
27:13 28:10 30:7	23:15 25:12 38:25
31:18,19 32:6	57:15 61:17 62:9
34:15 39:13 44:16	63:10 82:2 85:9
56:7,8,25 67:3	88:14
70:23,25 71:24	yep 93:3
73:7 74:14 78:12	~ -
88:24 90:17	young 50:2,7 yuri 48:16 69:4
102:22 104:4,6	yuii 40.10 09.4
witnesses 9:9 13:9	
23:14,21,22,22	
26:15 30:23 41:17	
wonder 42:3	
word 19:22 23:24	
69:13,14	
work 11:16 63:13	
87:21 88:21 90:11	
worked 18:25	
35:15 88:15 89:8	
91:3 94:16	

888-391-3376