BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Discovery Conference

August 9, 2017

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 2

NANCY DIPPELL, Presiding SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

REPORTED BY: Beverly Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640 TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC



```
1
                         APPEARANCES
 2
     DAVID WOODSMALL, Attorney at Law
             807 Winston Court
 3
             Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
             573.797.0005
              Midwest Energy Consumers Group
 4
      FOR:
 5
     BRIAN BEAR, General Counsel
             301 West High Street, PO Box 1157
             Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
 6
             573.526.2423
 7
      FOR:
              Missouri Divison of Energy
 8
     WHITNEY PAYNE, Associate Counsel
     MARK JOHNSON, Senior Counsel
200 Madison Street, Suite 800
 9
             PO Box 360
             Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360
10
             573.751.7431
              Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission
11
      FOR:
12
     MR. RICHARD S. BROWNLEE, III, Attorney at Law
             Richard S. Brownlee, III, LLC
             121 Madison Street
13
             Jefferson City, Missouri
                                         65101
14
             573.616.1911
              Missouri School Boards' Association
      FOR:
15
     MR. MARC POSTON
             Office of the Public Counsel
16
             200 Madison Street, Suite 650
             Jefferson City, Missouri
17
             573.751.5558
18
              Office of the Public Counsel
      FOR:
19
     MR. RICK E. ZUCKER, Associate General Counsel
             Laclede Gas Company
             700 Market Street, 6th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
20
             314.342.0533
21
       AND
22
     MR. MICHAEL C. PENDERGAST
             Laclede Gas Company
23
             700 Market Street, 5th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
24
             314.288.8723
25
      FOR:
              Laclede Gas Company, and Its Operating Units,
```

1	APPEARANCES (Continued)
2	
3	MR. ANDREW LINHARES, Attorney at Law 409 Vandiver Drive Building 5, Suite 205
4	Columbia, Missouri 65202 314.471.9973
5	FOR: National Housing Trust
6	MR. TERRY M. JARRETT, Attorney at Law Healy Law Offices, LLC
7	514 East High Street, Suite 22 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
8	573.415.8379 FOR: MoGas Pipeline LLC
9	
10	MS. NATALIE KARAS 1875 Connecticut Avenue NW Washington. DC 20009-2000
11	Washington, DC 20009-2000 202.572.3389 FOR: Environmental Defense Fund
12	FOR: Environmental Defense Fund
13	ALSO PRESENT:
14	Ms. Annika Brink, National Housing Trust Mr. Jeffrey A. Keevil, Senior Staff Counsel
15	Mil Serricy Al Receirly Serror Sear Counser
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

GR-2017-0215 and GR-2017-0216

1	INDEX
2	DISCOVERY CONFERENCE: Page
3	Staff's Motion for Leave to Object Out of Time Granted 34
4	Objection to DR Requests Sustained 49
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

_

J

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. I think we're ready then. We'll go ahead and go on the record. This is Case Nos. GR-2017-0215 and GR-2017-0216, In the Matter of Laclede Gas Company and Laclede Gas Company d/b/a Missouri Gas Energy's Request to Increase Their Revenues for Gas Service.

My name is Nancy Dippell, and I'm the Regulatory Law Judge assigned to this matter, and we've come here today for a discovery conference. The discovery issues mostly between Staff and Laclede were resolved. I'll let Staff say if they still have any dispute.

MS. PAYNE: No, we don't have any dispute. As stated in our motion, there's just been some concerns about the timing and then the quality of the answers along with the timing.

TUDGE DIPPELL: I guess before I get into that I probably should take entries of appearance so we're clear. Sorry. I was ready to jump right in.

Let's go ahead and take entries of appearance before we get started and you can -- I don't think you have to give all of the address information. We'll have that and I'll make sure the court reporter has that. Staff?

MS. PAYNE: Whitney Payne and Mark Johnson

1	for Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission.						
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Office of Public Counsel?						
3	MR. POSTON: Marc Poston with the Office						
4	of Public Counsel.						
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: The City of St. Joe is not						
6	going to be here. Consumers Council of Missouri?						
7	(No response.)						
8	JUDGE DIPPELL: I didn't hear from						
9	Mr. Coffman.						
10	Environmental Defense Fund?						
11	MS. KARAS: Hi, Your Honor, this is						
12	Natalie Karas on behalf of the Environmental Defense						
13	Fund.						
14	JUDGE DIPPELL: Laclede Gas?						
15	MR. ZUCKER: Rick Zucker and Mike						
16	Pendergast here on behalf of Laclede Gas and MGE.						
17	JUDGE DIPPELL: Midwest Energy Consumers						
18	Group?						
19	MR. WOODSMALL: David Woodsmall on behalf						
20	of MECG.						
21	JUDGE DIPPELL: Missouri Division of						
22	Energy?						
23	MR. BEAR: Brian Bear on behalf of the						
24	Division of Energy.						
25	JUDGE DIPPELL: Missouri Industrial Energy						

1	Consumers also said that they would not be here today.
2	Missouri School Boards' Association?
3	MR. BROWNLEE: Richard Brownlee.
4	JUDGE DIPPELL: Missouri Gas Pipeline?
5	MR. JARRETT: Terry Jarrett on behalf of
6	MoGas.
7	JUDGE DIPPELL: National Housing Trust?
8	MR. LINHARES: Andrew Linhares on behalf
9	of National Housing Trust.
10	MS. BRINK: This is Annika Brink with the
11	National Housing Trust.
12	JUDGE DIPPELL: Kansas City Power & Light
13	and GMO?
14	(No response.)
15	JUDGE DIPPELL: And the Union told me that
16	they would not be here.
17	Is there anyone that I missed?
18	Okay. Thank you. Then the other disputes
19	that we had pending was a dispute that is similar to
20	what Staff Counsel just mentioned from OPC and Laclede.
21	Mr. Poston, did you want to elaborate on any of that?
22	MR. POSTON: Yeah. The first one we
23	raised was a similar concern with Staff to the
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: And can you speak up just
25	a little?
- 1	

MR. POSTON: Yeah. -- to the DRs coming in late, and we've got a list we're going to provide Laclede of the ones that are excessively late. And I'd like to have an opportunity to work with them on that.

The other issues we identified in our pleading we've worked out with them. We had a meeting this morning. And I believe that those have been resolved. They've agreed to provide follow-up answers that provide us information that we believe we were asking for.

And as far as the issue about how they sign the DR responses, that they are going to provide us with something that identifies the witnesses that could answer to the truthfulness and correctness of each DR by category. So really on this the only issue that kind of remains is the timing of when they're answering, and that's something, like I said, that I intend to meet with them after this and see if we can work that out.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. I will also caution you on the signatures to the responses to the DRs. When we get to hearing, I don't like it when a witness gets up there and claims that they're not the witness and then we get the next witness up there and they say they're not the witness. So please, all of you, make sure that the other parties know whose testimony it is

that you're giving.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PENDERGAST: Your Honor, it's a very good point. We certainly understand it and, you know, based on our discussions with OPC, you know, we're going to make it very clear what witnesses have what issues or what falls within the scope of their testimony. And you will not hear somebody from Laclede Gas objecting because Glenn Buck happened to sign a DR response but the witness who is covering that particular issue is the one that's answering. I mean if they're the ones on that issue, it's in the scope of their testimony, will be responsible for everything Mr. Buck signed and the contents of that. Plus, you know, we've said we'll be very specific about what the scope of each witness's testimony is on a going-forward basis and we can put both Mr. Buck and the witness that we think will be the one that would answer questions on the stand about it. So we'll do our utmost to avoid that kind of controversy.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. And then with regard to complaints of lateness, would you like to address that, either of you?

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, you know, the only thing I'd point out is that, you know, this has been a pretty extraordinary case. I think officially we've

1 gotten over a thousand data requests right now, many of 2 which have five, seven, ten discrete questions on them. 3 I'd say if you added them all up, it would probably be 4 somewhere between 3,000 and 5,000 questions that we need 5 to go ahead and answer. 6 Quite frankly, we're doing the best we 7 can. We do have one of our famous Mr. Buck we just 8 talked about has been out of circulation for about a 9 week and a half, two weeks due to some knee surgery, and he's been trying to do the best he can in between the 10 11 pain killers to go ahead and continue working. JUDGE DIPPELL: We'll look forward to his 12 13 testimony. 14 MR. PENDERGAST: It's going to be 15 interesting rebuttal. And, you know, with all that 16 said, though, we understand we've got an obligation to 17 try and be as responsive as we can be. I think that OPC 18 had alerted us to some that were past due that extend 19 the date and I think within two or three days we turned 20 that around, got those answered and just continue to 21 redouble our efforts to answer as quickly as we can. 22 Rick? 23 MR. ZUCKER: I don't think I have anything to add to this. 24 25 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. And I will state to

1 OPC and Staff that, you know, we didn't have any 2 complaints coming to me before this conference. So if 3 you have complaints that you need to get addressed, you can, you know, file a motion, whatever. 4 5 MR. POSTON: May I ask --6 JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes. 7 MR. POSTON: -- does this discovery 8 conference satisfy motions to compel based on lateness 9 or would we need to call another one if another issue arises? 10 11 JUDGE DIPPELL: Well, we have the 12 discovery conferences preset; but if there's something like your testimony is coming up before the next 13 14 conference, I believe, so obviously if there's a 15 discovery issue between now and then that needs to be 16 addressed, it's okay to bring a motion outside of the 17 discovery conference for me or the Commission to 18 address. 19 MR. POSTON: Would we have another 20 discovery conference that was not scheduled before we file that motion? 21 22 JUDGE DIPPELL: Not before. The 23 requirement to contact me with regard to a telephone 24 conference has already been waived in the order and 25 unless there was a need to call everybody in, you know.

1	MR. POSTON: Well, I just didn't want to
2	have to wait until the next discovery conference if we
3	had a discovery issue.
4	JUDGE DIPPELL: No, that's what I'm
5	saying. I'm saying if you need something addressed
6	before a discovery conference, you may file a motion to
7	do so and I will address it in whatever is the
8	appropriate manner. If that's to get everybody on the
9	phone for a conference call, discovery conference or
10	another one or just to rule on it based on the motions
11	=-
12	MR. POSTON: Thank you.
13	JUDGE DIPPELL: and responses, then I
14	would do that.
15	THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Could you
16	give me your name again?
17	MR. POSTON: Marc Poston.
18	THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
19	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. So are Staff and
20	OPC then satisfied with the discussions and what you're
21	going to discuss later with regard to the filings that
22	you've made?
23	MS. PAYNE: Yes.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. All right. Then
25	MR. ZUCKER: Your Honor, let me just add

1	that obviously there isn't anything specific that we're
2	talking about today with Laclede Gas; but when the time
3	comes to talk about specific questions, or if the time
4	comes, hopefully it won't, we'll be responding to the
5	quality of the question also. We've gotten a lot of
6	good questions. And where they're targeted and we
7	understand what they're looking for and can get to the
8	answer, we have no problem with that. But a lot of
9	questions are very broad, they're very deep. They are
10	not targeted at all to a Laclede Gas and MGE rate case
11	and it uses a lot of our resources. And so I would ask
12	that the questioners think a little more about the
13	question they're asking and what it might require from
14	us. We only have so many resources and so much time.
15	We understand people need their evidence and their
16	answers and we want to provide them in a timely manner.
17	JUDGE DIPPELL: And I would expect as well
18	for you all to raise those issues if it comes to that.
19	You've said your peace here. So hopefully that will
20	take care of it.
21	MR. ZUCKER: We have raised these issues
22	with the parties. We haven't come to you to complain
23	about it.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: Well, I appreciate you
25	all, you know, staying out of my office; but at the same

1 time, if that's what it takes to get the case to move 2 along and get everyone the information that they need 3 within the constraints of the resources available, then 4 the whole case will move smoothly and we'll get -- the 5 Commission will get the information that it needs in the 6 end to make an appropriate decision. 7 MR. ZUCKER: Understood. Thank you, 8 Judge. 9 Judge, in response I will say MS. PAYNE: that one of the things that Staff has made a commitment 10 11 to is that the company is welcome to reach out to us at 12 any time to discuss informally, you know, any problems 13 and that that they're having with DRs. You know, we've said communication is key several times in the course of 14 15 this. 16 MR. JOHNSON: And in the same vein, just 17 as OPC has done, we will be sending a list of the DRs 18 that we would prefer to be answered quicker than maybe 19 some others. 20 MR. ZUCKER: We appreciate that. 21 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Good. So 22 then I believe we're just down to Division of Energy's 23 objection or complaint, motion, whatever, with regard to 24 Staff. And would you like to go -- would Division of 25 Energy like to go ahead and kind of tee that up a little

bit?

MR. BEAR: Sure. Your Honor, the Division of Energy served two DRs that are basically identical to each other. One is just directed to Laclede. The other is directed to MGE. What we had specifically sought were copies of complaints received by Staff from customers regarding the current effective rate design from two dates. And those dates were not just picked out of the air. Those were the dates of the last effective rate case when they went into effect.

Why we need them and why we think they're relevant to this case is pretty simple. Rate stabilization is a factor that was put into that rate design case way back when. The reasoning behind that rate stabilization, as we understand as a division, is to encourage in part energy efficiency, and so customer reaction to the rate design that has that component of rate stabilization I think hits right within the strike zone of what DED can offer its expertise on.

As far as the objections, I think that we do have a pure question of law as to the confidentiality concerns raised by Staff. You know, I understand that the personally identifiable information is protected. I think that we have met that as a governmental entity in two ways. First, you know, as counsel to Division of

Energy, it's my responsibility to monitor the use of information that's highly confidential to ensure that those protections are in place. And like I have responsibility for my paralegals and my staff, I have responsibility for everyone in the Division of Energy as well. So there's an oversight that's going to be expected of counsel in every case to maintain confidentiality of protected information.

Specific to the division, however, the individual staff people are compelled under 620 -- 640.155.1 to maintain the confidentiality of confidential information. It's punishable as a crime as a Class A misdemeanor. So we do have protections in place legally and oversight.

You know, in full disclosure, Your Honor, if it comes down to it, you know, we can have our folks sign confidentiality agreements on this, but it really is unnecessary especially when it's a governmental entity with these types of statutory protections in place. But you know, we will leave that up to your discretion.

I think if we resolve that question of law in the affirmative, I think the issues that the Staff is articulating as to burden, which isn't exactly quantified in terms of dollars or staff hours, which I

1 think is a problem if you're trying to stand on an undue 2 burden argument, but I do think if we resolve the 3 confidentiality issue the division can offer some accommodations to relieve burden that may be there. 4 5 We're willing if they just want to put the MGE and 6 Laclede complaints on a DVD from those dates, we'll go 7 through them and look for responsiveness. We're willing 8 to take on that burden. We said that in the motion. 9 We're willing to meet there, but I think probably the 10 roadblock is that pure question of law about confidentiality. 11 12 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Let me state first that 13 I will grant Staff's motion for leave to object out of 14 time, first of all. 15 MS. PAYNE: Thank you. 16 JUDGE DIPPELL: And then would you all like to 17 respond? 18 MS. PAYNE: We filed our response yesterday. 19 I can see you have that there. I think the concern is 20 is that we are bound by statute to protect the 21 confidentiality of the information that we receive; and 22 while I respect that the Division of Energy is a 23 governmental entity, as Mr. Bear points out, there is 24 still a certain concern. If we allowed every

governmental entity access to our information, I'm

25

As far as burden, I did not realize that I

 pretty sure that that would not necessarily meet the statutory obligation that we are under.

needed to quantify hours and dollars to satisfy that.

However, I think it's pretty obvious that we receive a

lot of complaints, and I would say it would be common knowledge that the average customer of any utility is not happy with their rates.

So when the Division of Energy requests

So when the Division of Energy requests complaints relating to rate design, the average customer does not say I'm unhappy with the design of my rates. They generally say I'm unhappy with the quantity of my rates. So this specific category of complaints would amount to a large number of complaints overall and it would ultimately come down to our staff having to go through each complaint individually to determine which

ones specifically refer to rate design.

So beyond the confidentiality concerns of the fact that these complaints generally come from individual customers who have no intention of making their personal information public, we also amount to the fact that they would have to be gone through individually. So when the Division of Energy says that they will make accommodations and come and look at these complaints, we've now escalated this to not just looking

1
 2
 3

at the specific complaints that are in their category but all of the complaints and all of those customers' personal information.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Let me start with so when you're asking for current effective residential rate design, what are you asking for?

MR. BEAR: Specifically we're looking at consumer complaints about my rate is too high, that there are issues with how I'm being charged. It is a comprehensive request, but it's one that doesn't require — I think Staff's concern that they would have to review each individual case for responsiveness, that's not what we're asking for.

I think if there are tagged categories that we can come to an agreement with we're fine with receiving those. The division is not going to raise any complaint about a volume that's received that is nonresponsive or is less than useful, it doesn't hit the exact strike zone. We're just trying to think of a way in order to gather those complaints in a manner that's going to hit what we're looking for and to allow us to go through those and effectively present that testimony to the Commission which we think is very valuable.

MR. PENDERGAST: Your Honor, you know, I don't mean to interject here but I guess I will, you

know, just on the release of the information, you know, we've become increasingly cautious about making individual customer information available. We have stripped out the names of customers when it comes to providing various kinds of account information and that sort of thing and that's because, you know, notwithstanding what I'm sure would be the earnest efforts of the Division of Energy and others to protect that information, in this day and age we've seen too many computers hacked.

We've seen too many unintentional releases of information and, you know, from our perspective great caution has to be taken in distributing information that individual customers have provided to the staff and provided to anybody else because nobody today can say I can guarantee that nobody is going to hack that information and take it.

And I guess the second concern we would have is let's say they have the information and now we're going to have testimony talking about we had this many customers that maybe made some general complaint about, you know, the rate design, what's the probative value of that, you know, why are we going to have to respond to that not having the opportunity to cross-examine those customers and what does that say

about the process we have including public hearings, ability to comment to the Commission and that sort of thing they're supposed to get at those very issues. So you know, from our perspective given the desire to protect that information and customer confidentiality and the probative value, you know, the question is why is this information really appropriate.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Well, the problem is that it's a discovery issue and while, yes, we all need to be careful with security, and so forth, of confidential information, if it is the type of information that should be disclosed because it is genuinely calculated to possibly lead to admissible evidence, then it needs to be discovered. So those are good reasons for not doing it but they're not really the legal brunt of it. So what we need to get at is if this is the appropriate information to be discovered and if it is able to be discovered.

MR. POSTON: Can I weigh in here real quick?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Certainly, Mr. Poston.

MR. POSTON: One thing I'll point out is that the way the Staff organizes their complaints is by categories and there is a rate category. I don't think it would be very difficult and will require any real

1	detailed analysis of each complaint to just provide all				
2	of the ones that are about rates. You can even inquire				
3	a date range. So it would take a few minutes really to				
4	be able to pull all those up.				
5	And I think the reason the customers are				
6	calling is they want something to be done about their				
7	complaint and DE's offering to do something. I don't				
8	know if their position is going to be contrary to our				
9	position on rates. It could be. But as far as them				
10	seeing information, we have no concerns that they will				
11	release this information and make it public. Giving it				
12	to DE does not make it public. It would be public if				
13	it's released to the public. I don't see them asserting				
L4	that that's what they're going to do. I don't recall				
15	any instances where HC information				
16	THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I don't				
17	recall?				
18	MR. POSTON: where highly confidential				
19	information has been released. I don't think that's a				
20	real concern with any of these agencies.				
21	MR. KEEVIL: Judge, I wasn't planning to				
22	say anything. That's why I'm sitting in the back of the				
23	room.				
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Keevil. You better				
25	enter your appearance.				

MR. KEEVIL: I have to jump in on this because I want to correct something Mr. Poston said. Staff does not, and this is based on my communication with the consumer services department directly, Staff's identifiers do not include rate design. That was what the question was about. Mr. Poston's comment something about rates, that's an entirely different broader, like I say, different category identifier than what the data request itself is about. I think that may have been somewhat misleading to the Judge and to the Commission. There is no identifier in there for rate design.

Secondly, what we're talking about here is not these typical highly confidential information that is addressed in a rate case. What we're talking about here is something falling clearly within the purview of Section 386.480, RSMo, which in my estimation changes the evaluation because as I recall 386.480 requires an order or decision of the Commission, which I assume you would be standing in the Commission's stead, but requires an order to disclose such information. So this is not your typical HC information. So just those two points of correction here so we don't get off track.

There is no identifier in the consumer complaint database for rate design, and we're talking about 386.480 information rather than your typical HC

1 rate case type stuff. 2 MR. POSTON: I would concur. If I said 3 differently, then I was in error, but it does just categorize rates and what I understand what DE was 4 5 saying today is that they want all of the complaints 6 about rates, not specifically just rate design. 7 MS. PAYNE: Okay. To follow up with that, 8 my understanding is is that there are several 9 identifying categories that refer to rates either 10 generally or indirectly. So it would, in fact, be a lot and it would require attention to it. And as I cited 11 12 the one Commission rule that, in fact, we are bound to contact and ask the disclosers of confidential 13 14 information to us if they are okay with that information 15 being disclosed which would mean contacting every 16 individual consumer complainant who has filed a complaint in the course of the test year. 17 18 MR. BEAR: Your Honor, if I could have 19 just a chance to respond since it is my motion. 20 JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. That's fine. 21 MR. BEAR: I'll take this in reverse order 22 here. First, the Division of Energy is part of DED, which the PSC is also part of DED as well. As part of 23 24 the concerns raised by MGE and Laclede about

confidential information, beyond the fact that it's a

25

1 crime, you know, we routinely handle sensitive data, including Social Security numbers, employment data, trade secrets, things that are handled in very elaborate manners and things that are incredibly confidential, and the procedures that we have in place ITSD works for all entities here and so the data security programs that we have, you know, for DED generally play to both DE and throughout state government. So if the government is trusted to protect this information from one subdivision of DED, I think another subdivision is just as equally able to protect it using those same protocols.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As to the issue about the different tags or the different identifiers, I think that that's a conversation that we can have with Staff if it's just selecting certain identifiers to have. The question about responsiveness and, you know, and also whether or not this is going to be valuable, why do we get these complaints in the first place and categorize them if they're not going to be used during a rate case in order to prove a point or to potentially lead to discoverable information or have an expert testify.

If it's not going to be used when the Commission is making a decision in this regard, then why do we have it in the first place? And I think that the reason we have it is that so OPC's staff, the Division

of Energy and others can do analysis and provide the Commission with the most probative information possible, and I think that it's very difficult for us to sit here and say that consumer input on a rate design that has been in effect for these years is irrelevant to the Commission's determination of what the proper rate design should be going forward. So I think that it's relevant. I think that we can -- I think that the burden is perhaps overstated because we're just asking for raw complaints with tagged categories. Those should be easily able to be produced.

If Staff feels that they need to review each individual complaint in order to do that, I just don't see that as a real need when we can achieve some type of agreement, you know, whether that's a bulk dump to DE with us having to go through it for responsiveness or perhaps doing a word search of certain terms or only doing certain types of tagged categories we can get there, but I think that direction is absolutely proper if we allow it to happen.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Here's my first thing. I think your request is a little either too broad or not broad enough as the case may be because I think you're asking for something different in your request --

1 MR. BEAR: Okay. 2 JUDGE DIPPELL: -- than what you really 3 want. It sounds to me like you basically want consumer complaints about rates, and I'm not sure that given the 4 5 term rate design as it is usually used in this context that what you're asking for is what you really want. 6 7 MR. BEAR: Okay. 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: So I think you need to revise your request. But getting to the meat of the 9 10 issue, which would be is there anything Staff could give 11 you in response to what you want, we keep saying there's 12 a lot of comments or complaints, but what's a lot? I 13 mean --14 MS. PAYNE: I don't have the specific number. I mean this is strictly from talking to our 15 director of consumer --16 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: Because when I did -- when 18 I went into EFIS, which is also something Division of 19 Energy might try, and searched for consumer comments for 20 Laclede in that time period, I got eight. Now --21 MR. KEEVIL: Judge, I don't think you were 22 searching in the consumer services informal complaint 23 database. 24 JUDGE DIPPELL: Well, that is true. 25 MR. KEEVIL: That's where most of these

1	things are going to show up. I can tell you I don't
2	know how it breaks down company specific. I just
3	overall we're talking thousands of complaints per year
4	received by the consumer services. I don't know how
5	many of those would be, like I say, specific to MGE and
6	Laclede. I know overall with all of the regulated
7	utilities consumer services handles thousands of calls
8	per year.
9	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. But they do, in
10	fact, categorize them according to company and general
11	subject matter; is that your understanding? Is that
12	your understanding?
13	MS. PAYNE: They do categorize them.
14	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
15	MR. BEAR: Judge, is this something that
16	maybe we just meet and confer what are the categories
17	and maybe we reissue the DR for specific categories?
18	Would that be acceptable to Staff?
19	JUDGE DIPPELL: I think Staff is still
20	going to have the same objection with regard to the
21	confidentiality.
22	MR. BEAR: Absolutely.
23	JUDGE DIPPELL: So I'd like to work
24	through this and figure that out and then you can go
25	forward with what you think you can get. And you might

consider, I don't know how burdensome this would be, but you cited Ms. Fred's testimony in some other rate cases and those appeared to be very general statements and so I don't know if a general summary of, you know, we received a thousand complaints about I don't like my rates or whatever. I don't know if that's the kind of thing that would be adequate for your purposes. That's something you might discuss.

With regard to the actual confidentiality, it's my reading of 386.480 that again the Commission can order that information to be released. It's also my reading of the discovery rule Section 8 with regard to that's where it comes in that Staff is supposed to notify the person that provided the information before releasing it. However, there's also a provision in this rule for a waiver of specific provisions. So it might be that information cannot be immediately released but if someone were to request for a waiver of this provision where you had to notify everyone that might be an option.

And then I get back to the part about I take it then that there's something different available with regard to what's available in EFIS. So just as an aside, those comments are public when consumers put those comments in EFIS. The attachments to those are

1 not. And that has more to do with virus prohibiting or 2 nefarious use of our system than it does with the confidentiality of the information. 3 4 So I guess my ruling is that your data 5 request is not specific enough to be answered at this 6 time. However, I think any objections to future 7 requests will need to be with a little more specificity 8 with regard to like, you know, what's a lot of comments, 9 what burden is going to -- is this going to cause Staff 10 in responding to. 11 MS. PAYNE: Absolutely. 12 JUDGE DIPPELL: And again I think there's 13 a way around the releasing of public information. 14 MR. KEEVIL: Judge, I think -- I don't 15 disagree with that last statement, but I think that 16 would have to come from you or the Commission. 17 JUDGE DIPPELL: I agree, I agree. 18 MR. KEEVIL: I don't think we can simply 19 agree oh, yeah, we'll waive that. 20 JUDGE DIPPELL: I agree. 21 MR. KEEVIL: I don't think we can do that. 22 I think it will have to come from you. 23 JUDGE DIPPELL: And you can certainly 24 include that in your objections as to an extra burden 25 provided, but I do think that there is a way around the

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

confidentiality, and part of that is because what we were just talking about I think when consumers make complaints to the PSC, they're making the complaint to be heard. Certainly we want to protect, you know, personal information, phone numbers, account numbers --

MS. PAYNE: Addresses.

JUDGE DIPPELL: -- all of those things, but I think that consumers are not expecting that their complaints are going to be held by the PSC never to be talked about by anybody.

MS. PAYNE: It's not the complaints that we're concerned about. It is the personal information. JUDGE DIPPELL:

MS. PAYNE: It's things like phone numbers and addresses, and occasionally parties provide those things when they are unlisted in any other place at least to their knowledge.

Right.

JUDGE DIPPELL: I agree. I would like to see provisions for the protection of that kind of information; but as far as the meat of the issue why they're complaining, that seems like information that could be useful and could provide evidence. I'm curious as to whether it's available in any other context but perhaps not. If consumer services has its own database, then perhaps that's the only place, but again maybe some

1 summary of that information is appropriate. 2 throwing out options for you. My ruling is that the 3 request is not specific enough, and so I will sustain 4 your objection to those DR requests and allow you to 5 make a new one. 6 MR. BEAR: Thank you, Your Honor. 7 JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any other issues? 8 MR. JOHNSON: I would just say going 9 forward with the related request from DE we'd appreciate 10 it if you would include both attorneys on all requests 11 for either case. MR. BEAR: Okay. Did I miss one? Who did 12 13 I miss? 14 MS. PAYNE: Well, you sent specifically 15 the MGE data request to me and you sent the Laclede one 16 specifically to him. Even though we are technically 17 leads on these cases separately, we also have been 18 handling everything in duality and we've actually --19 Staff and OPC have been filing their DRs in both cases 20 identically to keep the numbers the same. It's just a 21 practice we've been doing because as the company pointed 22 out this is a big case. This has included a lot of 23 discovery. 24 MR. BEAR: No problem. 25 JUDGE DIPPELL: It's a little confusing

because we haven't consolidated the cases because everything is being kept separate. Right now we've only consolidated it for hearing and procedural purposes. So keep that in mind when you're filing back and forth.

Is there anything else discovery related or? Okay. I will say the order says to get your discovery disputes in not less than two business days before each discovery conference. I guess you could consider Monday one of those business days before Wednesday conference, but I'd sure like to see it by 10:00, at least have 48 hours, especially if it's something that's been ongoing. If it's something that just came up, obviously go ahead and get it in so we can get it taken care of. And I won't set up a conference line myself unless I'm asked; but if somebody needs one or wants one, feel free to ask. And I think that's all I have. Is there anything else?

All right. Then hopefully you all can continue to your discussions. As I said before we went on the record, settlement is my favorite word. So I will see you all next time. We can go off the record.

(Off the record.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

that the foregoing is a full, true and correct

transcript of such Stenotype notes so made at such time

Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640

I, Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640, Certified Court Reporter with the firm of Tiger Court Reporting, LLC, within the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that I was personally present at the proceedings had in the above-entitled cause at the time and place set forth in the caption sheet thereof; that I then and there took down in Stenotype the proceedings had; and

and place.

A	alerted 27:18	Associate 19:8	51:3,15	30:10 31:1,4
ability 38:2	allow 36:21	19:19	beyond 35:18	32:10,12,14
able 38:17 39:4	43:20 49:4	Association	41:25	33:7 36:12
42:11 43:11	allowed 34:24	19:14 24:2	big 49:22	40:14 41:1
** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***	amount 35:14	assume 40:18	bit 32:1	42:19 43:23
above-entitled	35:21	attachments	Boards' 19:14	49:11,22
51:7	analysis 39:1	46:25	24:2	cases 46:2 49:17
absolutely 43:19	43:1	attention 41:11	bound 34:20	49:19 50:1
45:22 47:11	Andrew 20:2	Attorney 19:2	41:12	categories 36:14
acceptable	24:8	19:12 20:2,6	Box 19:5,9	38:24 41:9
45:18	Annika 20:14	attorneys 49:10	breaks 45:2	43:10,18 45:16
access 34:25	24:10	August 18:7	Brian 19:5	45:17
accommodati	answer 25:14	available 31:3	23:23	categorize 41:4
34:4 35:24	26:17 27:5,21	37:3 46:22,23		42:18 45:10,13
account 37:5	30:8	48:23	bring 28:16 Brink 20:14	category 25:15
48:5	answered 27:20	48:23 Avenue 20:10	24:10,10	35:13 36:1
achieve 43:14	31:18 47:5	Service In National Infection and Aride Broad Se-	broad 30:9	The control of the co
actual 46:9	answering 25:16	average 35:7,10 avoid 26:18	43:23,23	38:24 40:8 cause 47:9 51:7
add 27:24 29:25	26:10	avoiu 20.16	broader 40:7	cause 47.9 31.7
added 27:3	answers 22:16	B	Brownlee 19:12	37:13
address 22:23	25:8 30:16	back 32:14	19:12 24:3,3	cautious 37:2
26:22 28:18	anybody 37:15	39:22 46:21	brunt 38:15	CCR 18:24 51:3
29:7	48:10	50:4	Buck 26:8,12,16	51:15
addressed 28:3	appearance	based 26:4 28:8	27:7	certain 34:24
28:16 29:5	22:19,21 39:25	29:10 40:3	Building 20:3	42:15 43:17,18
40:14	appeared 46:3	basically 32:3	bulk 43:15	certainly 26:3
addresses 48:6	appreciate	44:3	burden 33:24	38:21 47:23
48:15	30:24 31:20	basis 26:15	34:2,4,8 35:3	48:4
adequate 46:7 admissible 38:13	49:9	Bear 19:5 23:23	43:9 47:9,24	CERTIFICATE
affirmative	appropriate	23:23 32:2	burdensome	51:1
33:23	29:8 31:6 38:7	34:23 36:7	46:1	Certified 51:4
age 37:9	38:16 49:1	41:18,21 44:1	business 50:7,9	certify 51:6
	argument 34:2	44:7 45:15,22		chance 41:19
agencies 39:20	arises 28:10	49:6,12,24	C	changes 40:16
agree 47:17,17	articulating	behalf 23:12,16	C 19:1,22 20:1	charged 36:9
47:19,20 48:18	33:24	23:19,23 24:5	22:1	circulation 27:8
agreed 25:8	aside 46:24	24:8	calculated 38:12	cited 41:11 46:2
agreement 36:15 43:15	asked 50:15	believe 25:7,9	call 28:9,25 29:9	City 18:8 19:3,6
	asking 25:10	28:14 31:22	calling 39:6	19:10,13,17
agreements 33:17	30:13 36:5,6	Bentch 18:24	calls 45:7	20:7 23:5
ahead 22:3,21	36:13 43:9,24	51:3,15	caption 51:8	24:12
27:5,11 31:25	44:6	best 27:6,10	care 30:20 50:14	claims 25:22
50:13	asserting 39:13	better 39:24	careful 38:10	Class 33:13
air 32:9	assigned 22:9	Beverly 18:24	case 22:4 26:25	clear 22:20 26:5
WII J2.7	J			
Living a series of the series				

	1	1	1	
clearly 40:15	48:21	32:21 33:8,11	20:14 23:2,4	decision 31:6
Coffman 23:9	complaint 31:23	33:17 34:3,11	24:20 32:25	40:18 42:23
Columbia 20:4	35:16 36:16	34:21 35:18	33:7	DED 32:19
come 22:10	37:21 39:1,7	38:5 45:21	course 31:14	41:22,23 42:7
30:22 35:15,19	40:24 41:17	46:9 47:3 48:1	41:17	42:10
35:24 36:15	43:13 44:22	confusing 49:25	court 18:25 19:2	deep 30:9
47:16,22	48:3	Connecticut	22:24 29:15,18	Defense 20:11
comes 30:3,4,18	complaints	20:10	39:16 51:4,4	23:10,12
33:16 37:4	26:21 28:2,3	consider 46:1	covering 26:9	department
46:13	32:6 34:6 35:6	50:9	crime 33:12 42:1	40:4
coming 25:1	35:10,13,14,19	consolidated	cross-examine	design 32:7,14
28:2,13	35:25 36:1,2,8	50:1,3	37:25	32:17 35:10,11
comment 38:2	36:20 38:23	constraints 31:3	curious 48:22	35:17 36:6
40:6	41:5 42:18	consumer 36:8	current 32:7	37:22 40:5,11
comments 44:12	43:10 44:4,12	40:4,23 41:16	36:5	40:24 41:6
44:19 46:24,25	45:3 46:5 48:3	43:4 44:3,16	customer 32:16	43:4,7 44:5
47:8	48:9,11	44:19,22 45:4	35:7,10 37:3	desire 38:4
Commission	component	45:7 48:24	38:5	detailed 39:1
18:1 19:11	32:17	consumers 19:4	customers 32:7	determination
23:1 28:17	comprehensive	23:6,17 24:1	35:20 37:4,14	43:6
31:5 36:23	36:10	46:24 48:2,8	37:21,25 39:5	determine 35:16
38:2 40:10,18	computers 37:10	contact 28:23	customers' 36:2	different 40:7,8
41:12 42:23	concern 24:23	41:13		42:12,13 43:24
43:2 46:10	34:19,24 36:11	contacting 41:15	D	46:22
47:16	37:18 39:20	contents 26:13	D 21:1 22:1	differently 41:3
Commission's	concerned 48:12	context 44:5	d/b/a 18:17 22:5	difficult 38:25
40:19 43:6	concerns 22:15	48:23	data 27:1 40:8	43:3
commitment	32:22 35:18	continue 27:11	42:1,2,6 47:4	Dippell 18:21
31:10	39:10 41:24	27:20 50:19	49:15	22:2,8,18 23:2
common 35:6	concur 41:2	Continued 20:1	database 40:24	23:5,8,14,17
communication	confer 45:16	contrary 39:8	44:23 48:24	23:21,25 24:4
31:14 40:3	conference 18:6	controversy	date 27:19 39:3	24:7,12,15,24
company 18:17	21:2 22:10	26:19	dates 32:8,8,9	25:19 26:20
19:19,23,25	28:2,8,14,17	conversation	34:6	27:12,25 28:6
22:5,5 31:11	28:20,24 29:2	42:14	David 19:2	28:11,22 29:4
45:2,10 49:21	29:6,9,9 50:8	copies 32:6	23:19	29:13,19,24
Company's	50:10,14	correct 40:2	day 37:9	30:17,24 31:21
18:14	conferences	51:10	days 27:19 50:7	34:12,16 36:4
compel 28:8	28:12	correction 40:22	50:9	38:8,21 39:24
compelled 33:10	confidential	correctness	DC 20:10	41:20 43:21
complain 30:22	33:2,12 38:10	25:14	DE 39:12 41:4	44:2,8,17,24
complainant	39:18 40:13	Council 23:6	42:7 43:16	45:9,14,19,23
41:16	41:13,25 42:4	counsel 19:5,8,8	49:9 DEL 20:7	47:12,17,20,23
complaining	confidentiality	19:16,18,19	DE's 39:7	48:7,13,18

	1	1	î	
49:7,25	dollars 33:25	41:22 43:1	falls 26:6	23:16 24:4
directed 32:4,5	35:4	44:19	famous 27:7	26:7 30:2,10
direction 43:19	DR 21:4 25:12	Energy's 18:18	far 25:11 32:20	gather 36:20
directly 40:4	25:14 26:8	22:6 31:22	35:3 39:9	general 19:5,19
director 44:16	45:17 49:4	ensure 33:2	48:20	37:21 45:10
disagree 47:15	Drive 20:3	enter 39:25	favorite 50:20	46:3,4
disclose 40:20	DRs 25:1,20	entirely 40:7	feel 50:16	generally 35:12
disclosed 38:12	31:13,17 32:3	entities 42:6	feels 43:12	35:19 41:10
41:15	49:19	entity 32:24	figure 45:24	42:7
disclosers 41:13	duality 49:18	33:19 34:23,25	file 18:14,17	genuinely 38:12
disclosure 33:15	due 27:9,18	entries 22:19,21	28:4,21 29:6	getting 44:9
discoverable	dump 43:15	Environmental	filed 34:18 41:16	give 22:23 29:16
42:20	DVD 34:6	20:11 23:10,12	filing 49:19 50:4	44:10
discovered		equally 42:10	filings 29:21	given 38:4 44:4
38:14,17,18	E	error 41:3	fine 36:15 41:20	giving 26:1
discovery 18:6	E 19:1,1,19 20:1	escalated 35:25	firm 51:4	39:11
21:2 22:10,11	20:1 21:1 22:1	especially 33:18	first 24:22 32:25	Glenn 26:8
28:7,12,15,17	22:1	50:11	34:12,14 41:22	GMO 24:13
28:20 29:2,3,6	earnest 37:7	estimation 40:16	42:18,24 43:21	go 22:3,3,21
29:9 38:9	easily 43:11	evaluation 40:17	five 27:2	27:5,11 31:24
46:12 49:23	East 20:7	everybody 28:25	Floor 19:20,23	31:25 34:6
50:5,7,8	effect 32:10 43:5	29:8	folks 33:16	35:15 36:21
discrete 27:2	effective 32:7,10	evidence 30:15	follow 41:7	43:16 45:24
discretion 33:21	36:5	38:13 48:22	follow-up 25:8	50:13,21
discuss 29:21	effectively 36:22	exact 36:18	foregoing 51:10	going 23:6 25:2
31:12 46:8	efficiency 32:16	exactly 33:24	forth 38:10 50:4	25:12 26:4
discussions 26:4	efforts 27:21	excessively 25:3	51:8	27:14 29:21
29:20 50:19	37:8	Excuse 29:15	forward 27:12	33:6 36:16,20
dispute 22:13,14	EFIS 44:18	expect 30:17	43:7 45:25	37:16,20,23
24:19	46:23,25	expected 33:7	49:9	39:8,14 42:17
disputes 24:18	eight 44:20	expecting 48:8	frankly 27:6	42:19,22 43:7
50:7	either 26:22	expert 42:21	Fred's 46:2	45:1,20 47:9,9
distributing	41:9 43:22	expertise 32:19	free 50:16	48:9 49:8
37:13	49:11	extend 27:18	full 33:15 51:10	going-forward
division 23:21	elaborate 24:21	extra 47:24	Fund 20:11	26:15
23:24 31:22,24	42:3	extraordinary	23:10,13	good 26:3 30:6
32:2,15,25	employment	26:25	future 47:6	31:21 38:14
33:5,9 34:3,22	42:2			gotten 27:1 30:5
35:9,23 36:16	encourage 32:16	F	G	government
37:8 41:22	energy 19:4,7	fact 35:19,22	G 22:1	42:8,8
42:25 44:18	23:17,22,24,25	41:10,12,25	Gas 18:13,15,16	governmental
Divison 19:7	31:25 32:3,16	45:10	18:17,19 19:19	32:24 33:18
doing 27:6 38:15	33:1,5 34:22	factor 32:13	19:23,25 22:5	34:23,25
43:17,18 49:21	35:9,23 37:8	falling 40:15	22:5,6,7 23:14	GR-2017-0215
,				

	•	ai .		
18:14 22:4	49:6	22:23 25:9	Jeffrey 20:14	kinds 37:5
GR-2017-0216	hopefully 30:4	31:2,5 32:23	Joe 23:5	knee 27:9
18:17 22:4	30:19 50:18	33:2,8,12	Johnson 19:8	know 25:25 26:3
grant 34:13	hours 33:25 35:4	34:21,25 35:21	22:25 31:16	26:4,13,23,24
Granted 21:3	50:11	36:3 37:1,3,5,9	49:8	27:15 28:1,4
great 37:12	Housing 20:5,14	37:12,13,17,19	Judge 18:22	28:25 30:25
Group 19:4	24:7,9,11	38:5,7,11,11	22:2,9,18 23:2	31:12,13 32:22
23:18		38:17 39:10,11	23:5,8,14,17	32:25 33:15,16
guarantee 37:16	I	39:15,19 40:13	23:21,25 24:4	33:20 36:24
guess 22:18	identical 32:3	40:20,21,25	24:7,12,15,24	37:1,1,6,12,22
36:25 37:18	identically 49:20	41:14,14,25	25:19 26:20	37:23 38:4,6
47:4 50:8	identifiable	42:9,21 43:2	27:12,25 28:6	39:8 42:1,7,16
	32:23	46:11,14,17	28:11,22 29:4	43:15 45:2,4,6
H	identified 25:5	47:3,13 48:5	29:13,19,24	46:1,4,4,6 47:8
hack 37:16	identifier 40:8	48:12,20,21	30:17,24 31:8	48:4
hacked 37:10	40:11,23	49:1	31:9,21 34:12	knowledge 35:7
half 27:9	identifiers 40:5	input 43:4	34:16 36:4	48:17
handle 42:1	42:13,15	inquire 39:2	38:8,21 39:21	
handled 42:3	identifies 25:13	instances 39:15	39:24 40:10	L
handles 45:7	identifying 41:9	intend 25:17	41:20 43:21	Laclede 18:13
handling 49:18	III 19:12,12	intention 35:20	44:2,8,17,21	18:16 19:19,23
happen 43:20	immediately	interesting	44:24 45:9,14	19:25 22:5,5
happened 26:8	46:17	27:15	45:15,19,23	22:11 23:14,16
happy 35:8	include 40:5	interject 36:25	47:12,14,17,20	24:20 25:3
HC 39:15 40:21	47:24 49:10	irrelevant 43:5	47:23 48:7,13	26:7 30:2,10
40:25	included 49:22	issue 25:11,15	48:18 49:7,25	32:4 34:6
Healy 20:6	including 38:1	26:9,11 28:9	jump 22:20 40:1	41:24 44:20
hear 23:8 26:7	42:2	28:15 29:3		45:6 49:15
heard 48:4	Increase 18:14	34:3 38:9	K CALLS	large 35:14
hearing 25:21	18:18 22:6	42:12 44:10	Kansas 24:12	late 25:2,3
50:3	increasingly	48:20	Karas 20:9	lateness 26:21
hearings 38:1 held 48:9	37:2	issues 22:11 25:5	23:11,12	28:8
Hi 23:11	incredibly 42:4	26:5 30:18,21	keep 44:11	law 18:22 19:2
	indirectly 41:10 individual 33:10	33:23 36:9	49:20 50:4	19:12 20:2,6,6
high 19:5 20:7 36:8	35:20 36:12	38:3 49:7	Keevil 20:14	22:9 32:21
190 - 200 - 2	35:20 36:12 37:3,14 41:16	ITSD 42:5	39:21,24 40:1	33:22 34:10
highly 33:2 39:18 40:13	43:13	J	44:21,25 47:14	lead 38:13 42:20
	individually	Jarrett 20:6	47:18,21	leads 49:17
hit 36:18,20 hits 32:18	35:16,23	24:5,5	kept 50:2	leave 21:3 33:20
Honor 23:11	33:10,23 Industrial 23:25	Jean 51:3,15	key 31:14 killers 27:11	34:13
26:2 29:25	informal 44:22	Jefferson 18:8	kiners 27:11 kind 25:15	legal 38:15
32:2 33:15	informally 31:12	19:3,6,10,13	26:18 31:25	legally 33:14 let's 22:21 37:19
36:24 41:18	information	19:3,0,10,13	46:6 48:19	
JU.27 71.10	midi mativii	17.17 40.7	70.0 40.17	Light 24:12

Linhares 20:2	meeting 25:6	name 22:8 29:16	47:6,24	overall 35:14
24:8,8	mentioned	names 37:4	obligation 27:16	45:3,6
list 25:2 31:17	24:20	Nancy 18:21	35:2	oversight 33:6
little 24:25 30:12	met 32:24	22:8	obvious 35:5	33:14
31:25 43:22	MGE 23:16	Natalie 20:9	obviously 28:14	overstated 43:9
47:7 49:25	30:10 32:5	23:12	30:1 50:13	
LLC 18:25	34:5 41:24	National 20:5,14	occasionally	P
19:12 20:6,8	45:5 49:15	24:7,9,11	48:15	P 19:1,1 20:1,1
51:5	MICHAEL	necessarily 35:1	offer 32:19 34:3	22:1
look 27:12 34:7	19:22	need 27:4 28:3,9	offering 39:7	Page 21:2
35:24	Midwest 19:4	28:25 29:5	office 19:16,18	pain 27:11
looking 30:7	23:17	30:15 31:2	23:2,3 30:25	paralegals 33:4
35:25 36:7,21	Mike 23:15	32:11 38:9,16	Offices 20:6	part 32:16 41:22
lot 30:5,8,11	mind 50:4	43:12,14 44:8	officially 26:25	41:23,23 46:21
35:6 41:10	minutes 39:3	47:7	oh 47:19	48:1
44:12,12 47:8	misdemeanor	needed 35:4	okay 22:2 24:18	particular 26:9
49:22	33:13	needs 28:15 31:5	25:19 26:20	parties 25:25
Louis 19:20,24	misleading	38:13 50:15	27:25 28:16	30:22 48:15
	40:10	nefarious 47:2	29:19,24 31:21	Payne 19:8
<u>M</u>	missed 24:17	never 48:9	31:21 34:12	22:14,25,25
M 20:6	Missouri 18:2,8	new 49:5	36:4 41:7,14	29:23 31:9
Madison 19:9	18:17 19:3,6,7	nonresponsive	41:20 43:21	34:15,18 41:7
19:13,16	19:10,11,13,14	36:17	44:1,7 45:9,14	44:14 45:13
maintain 33:7	19:17,20,24	Nos 22:4	49:12 50:6	47:11 48:6,11
33:11	20:4,7 22:6	notes 51:11	ones 25:3 26:10	48:14 49:14
making 35:20	23:1,6,21,25	notify 46:14,19	35:17 39:2	peace 30:19
37:2 42:23	24:2,4 51:5	notwithstandi	ongoing 50:12	Pendergast
48:3	MoGas 20:8	37:7	OPC 24:20 26:4	19:22 23:16
manner 29:8	24:6	number 35:14	27:17 28:1	26:2,23 27:14
30:16 36:20	Monday 50:9	44:15	29:20 31:17	36:24
manners 42:4	monitor 33:1	numbers 42:2	49:19	pending 24:19
Marc 19:15 23:3	morning 25:7	48:5,5,14	OPC's 42:25	people 30:15
29:17	motion 21:3	49:20	Operating 19:25	33:10
Mark 19:8 22:25	22:15 28:4,16	NW 20:10	opportunity	period 44:20
Market 19:20,23	28:21 29:6		25:4 37:24	person 46:14
matter 18:13,16	31:23 34:8,13	0	option 46:20	personal 35:21
22:4,9 45:11	41:19	O 22:1	options 49:2	36:3 48:5,12
mean 26:10	motions 28:8	object 21:3	order 28:24	personally 32:23
36:25 41:15	29:10	34:13	36:19 40:18,20	51:6
44:13,15	move 31:1,4	objecting 26:7	41:21 42:19	perspective
meat 44:9 48:20		objection 21:4	43:13 46:11	37:12 38:4
MECG 23:20	N N 10-1-20-1-21-1	31:23 45:20	50:6	phone 29:9 48:5
meet 25:17 34:9 35:1 45:16	N 19:1 20:1 21:1 22:1	49:4 objections 32:20	organizes 38:23	48:14 picked 32:8
			outside 28:16	

Pipeline 20:8	problem 30:8	punishable	43:4,6 44:5	reissue 45:17
24:4	34:1 38:8	33:12	46:2	related 49:9
place 33:3,14,20	49:24	pure 32:21	rates 35:8,11,13	50:5
42:5,18,24	problems 31:12	34:10	39:2,9 40:7	relating 35:10
48:16,25 51:7	procedural 50:3	purposes 46:7	41:4,6,9 44:4	release 37:1
51:12	procedures 42:5	50:3	46:6	39:11
planning 39:21	proceedings	purview 40:15	raw 43:10	released 39:13
play 42:7	18:5 51:6,9	put 26:15 32:13	reach 31:11	39:19 46:11,17
pleading 25:6	process 38:1	34:5 46:24	reaction 32:17	releases 37:11
please 25:24	produced 43:11		reading 46:10	releasing 46:15
Plus 26:13	programs 42:6	Q	46:12	47:13
PO 19:5,9	prohibiting 47:1	quality 22:16	ready 22:2,20	relevant 32:12
point 26:3,24	proper 43:6,19	30:5	real 38:19,25	43:8
38:22 42:20	protect 34:20	quantified 33:25	39:20 43:14	relieve 34:4
pointed 49:21	37:8 38:5 42:9	quantify 35:4	realize 35:3	remains 25:16
points 34:23	42:11 48:4	quantity 35:12	really 25:15	REPORTED
40:22	protected 32:23	question 30:5,13	33:17 38:7,15	18:24
position 39:8,9	33:8	32:21 33:22	39:3 44:2,6	reporter 22:24
possible 43:2	protection 48:19	34:10 38:6	reason 39:5	29:15,18 39:16
possibly 38:13	protections 33:3	40:6 42:15	42:25	51:1,4
Poston 19:15	33:13,19	questioners	reasoning 32:14	Reporting 18:25
23:3,3 24:21	protocols 42:11	30:12	reasons 38:14	51:5
24:22 25:1	prove 42:20	questions 26:17	rebuttal 27:15	request 18:14,18
28:5,7,19 29:1	provide 25:2,8,9	27:2,4 30:3,6,9	recall 39:14,17	22:6 36:10
29:12,17,17	25:12 30:16	quick 38:20	40:17	40:9 43:22,25
38:19,21,22	39:1 43:1	quicker 31:18	receive 34:21	44:9 46:18
39:18 40:2	48:15,22	quickly 27:21	35:5	47:5 49:3,9,15
41:2	provided 37:14	Quite 27:6	received 32:6	requests 21:4
Poston's 40:6	37:15 46:14	R	36:17 45:4	27:1 35:9 47:7
potentially	47:25	R 19:1 20:1 22:1	46:5	49:4,10
42:20	providing 37:5	raise 30:18	receiving 36:15	require 30:13
Power 24:12	provision 46:15	36:16	record 22:3	36:10 38:25
practice 49:21	46:19	raised 24:23	50:20,21,22	41:11
prefer 31:18	provisions 46:16	30:21 32:22	redouble 27:21	requirement
present 20:13	48:19	41:24	refer 35:17 41:9	28:23
36:22 51:6	PSC 41:23 48:3	range 39:3	regard 26:21	requires 40:17
preset 28:12	48:9	rate 30:10 32:7	28:23 29:21	40:20
Presiding 18:21	public 18:1	32:10,12,13,15	31:23 42:23	residential 36:5
pretty 26:25	19:11,16,18	32:17,18 35:10	45:20 46:9,12	resolve 33:22
32:12 35:1,5	23:1,2,4 35:21	35:17 36:6,8	46:23 47:8	34:2
probably 22:19	38:1 39:11,12	37:22 38:24	regarding 32:7	resolved 22:12
27:3 34:9	39:12,13 46:24	40:5,11,14,24	regulated 45:6	25:8
probative 37:22	47:13	41:1,6 42:19	Regulatory	resources 30:11
38:6 43:2	pull 39:4	,	18:22 22:9	30:14 31:3
				<u> </u>

respect 34:22	20:1 22:1	show 45:1	45:18,19 46:13	Sustained 21:4
respond 34:17	satisfied 29:20	sign 25:12 26:8	47:9 49:19	system 47:2
37:24 41:19	satisfy 28:8 35:4	33:17	Staff's 21:3	System 47.2
responding 30:4	saving 29:5,5	signatures 25:20	34:13 36:11	T
47:10	41:5 44:11	signed 26:12	40:4	tagged 36:14
response 23:7	says 35:23 50:6	similar 24:19,23	stand 26:17 34:1	43:10,18
24:14 26:8	scheduled 28:20	simple 32:12	stand 20:17 54:1	tags 42:12
31:9 34:18	School 19:14	simple 32.12 simply 47:18	start 36:4	take 22:19,21
44:11	24:2	sit 43:3	started 22:22	30:20 34:8
responses 25:12	scope 26:6,11,14	sitting 39:22	state 18:2 27:25	37:17 39:3
25:20 29:13	search 43:17	smoothly 31:4	34:12 42:8	41:21 46:22
responsibility	searched 44:19	Social 42:2	51:5	taken 37:13
33:1,4,5	searching 44:22	somebody 26:7	stated 22:15	50:14
responsible	second 37:18	50:15	statement 47:15	takes 31:1
26:12	Secondly 40:12	somewhat 40:10	statements 46:3	talk 30:3
responsive 27:17	secrets 42:3	sorry 22:20	statute 34:20	talked 27:8
responsiveness	Section 40:16	39:16	statutory 33:19	48:10
34:7 36:12	46:12	sort 37:6 38:2	35:2	talking 30:2
42:16 43:16	security 38:10	sought 32:5	staying 30:25	37:20 40:12,14
Revenues 18:15	42:2,6	sounds 44:3	stead 40:19	40:24 44:15
18:19 22:6	see 25:18 34:19	speak 24:24	Stenotype 51:9	45:3 48:2
reverse 41:21	39:13 43:14	specific 26:14	51:11	targeted 30:6,10
review 36:12	48:19 50:10,21	30:1,3 33:9	Street 19:5,9,13	technically
43:12	seeing 39:10	35:13 36:1	19:16,20,23	49:16
revise 44:9	seen 37:9,11	44:14 45:2,5	20:7	tee 31:25
Richard 19:12	selecting 42:15	45:17 46:16	strictly 44:15	telephone 28:23
19:12 24:3	sending 31:17	47:5 49:3	strike 32:18	tell 45:1
Rick 19:19	Senior 18:22	specifically 32:5	36:18	ten 27:2
23:15 27:22	19:8 20:14	35:17 36:7	stripped 37:4	term 44:5
right 22:20 27:1	sensitive 42:1	41:6 49:14,16	stuff 41:1	terms 33:25
29:24 32:18	sent 49:14,15	specificity 47:7	subdivision 42:9	43:17
48:13 50:2,18	separate 50:2	St 19:20,24 23:5	42:10	Terry 20:6 24:5
roadblock 34:10	separately 49:17	stabilization	subject 45:11	test 41:17
room 39:23	served 32:3	32:13,15,18	Suite 19:9,16	testify 42:21
routinely 42:1	Service 18:1,15	staff 19:11 20:14	20:3,7	testimony 25:25
RPR 18:24 51:3	18:19 19:11	22:11,12,24	summary 46:4	26:6,11,15
51:15	22:7 23:1	23:1 24:20,23	49:1	27:13 28:13
RSMo 40:16	services 40:4	28:1 29:19	supposed 38:3	36:22 37:20
rule 29:10 41:12	44:22 45:4,7	31:10,24 32:6	46:13	46:2
46:12,16	48:24	32:22 33:4,10	sure 22:24 25:25	Thank 24:18
ruling 47:4 49:2	set 50:14 51:8	33:23,25 35:15	32:2 35:1 37:7	29:12,18 31:7
	settlement 50:20	37:14 38:23	44:4 50:10	34:15 49:6
<u>S</u>	seven 27:2	40:3 42:14,25	surgery 27:9	thereof 51:8
S 19:1,12,12	sheet 51:8	43:12 44:10	sustain 49:3	thing 26:24 37:6

38:3,22 43:22	51:11	usually 44:5	45:3 48:12	years 43:5
46:7	true 44:24 51:10	utilities 45:7	we've 22:9 25:2	yesterday 34:18
things 31:10	Trust 20:5,14	utility 35:7	25:6 26:13,25	
42:3,4 45:1	24:7,9,11	utmost 26:18	27:16 30:5	Z
48:7,14,16	trusted 42:9		31:13 35:25	zone 32:19 36:19
think 22:2,22	truthfulness	V	37:2,9,11	Zucker 19:19
26:16,25 27:17	25:14	valuable 36:23	49:18,21 50:2	23:15,15 27:23
27:19,23 30:12	try 27:17 44:19	42:17	Wednesday	29:25 30:21
32:11,18,20,24	trying 27:10	value 37:23 38:6	50:10	31:7,20
33:22,23 34:1	34:1 36:19	Vandiver 20:3	week 27:9	
34:2,9,19 35:5	turned 27:19	various 37:5	weeks 27:9	0
36:11,14,19,23	two 27:9,19 32:3	vein 31:16	weigh 38:19	1
38:24 39:5,19	32:8,25 40:21	virus 47:1	welcome 31:11	I
40:9 42:10,13	50:7	volume 18:9	went 32:10	10:00 50:11
42:24 43:3,7,8	type 38:11 41:1	36:17	44:18 50:19	1157 19:5
43:8,19,22,24	43:15		West 19:5	121 19:13
44:8,21 45:19	types 33:19	W	Whitney 19:8	1875 20:10
45:25 47:6,12	43:18	wait 29:2	22:25	2
47:14,15,18,21	typical 40:13,21	waive 47:19	willing 34:5,7,9	2 18:9
47:22,25 48:2	40:25	waived 28:24	Winston 19:2	200 19:9,16
48:8 50:16		waiver 46:16,18	witness 25:21,22	20009-2000
thousand 27:1	U	want 24:21 29:1	25:23,24 26:9	20:10
46:5	ultimately 35:15	30:16 34:5	26:16	20. 10 2017 18:7
thousands 45:3	understand 26:3	39:6 40:2 41:5	witness's 26:14	202.572.3389
45:7	27:16 30:7,15	44:3,3,6,11	witnesses 25:13	20:11
three 27:19	32:15,22 41:4	48:4	26:5	20. 11 205 20:3
throwing 49:2	understanding	wants 50:16	Woodsmall 19:2	20 3 20.3 22 20:7
Tiger 18:25 51:4	41:8 45:11,12	Washington	23:19,19	22 20.7
time 21:3 30:2,3	Understood	20:10	word 43:17	3
30:14 31:1,12	31:7	wasn't 39:21	50:20	3,000 27:4
34:14 44:20	undue 34:1	way 32:14 36:19	work 25:4,18	301 19:5
47:6 50:21	unhappy 35:11	38:23 47:13,25	45:23	314.288.8723
51:7,11	35:12	ways 32:25	worked 25:6	19:24
timely 30:16	unintentional	we'll 22:3,23	working 27:11	314.342.0533
times 31:14	37:11	26:13,18 27:12	works 42:5	19:21
timing 22:16,17	Union 24:15	30:4 31:4 34:6	-	314.471.9973
25:16	Units 19:25	47:19	X	20:4
today 22:10 24:1	unlisted 48:16	we're 22:2,20	X 21:1	34 21:3
30:2 37:15	unnecessary	25:2 26:4 27:6	T 7	360 19:9
41:5	33:18	30:1 31:22	<u>Y</u>	386.480 40:16
told 24:15	use 33:1 47:2	34:5,7,9 36:7	yeah 24:22 25:1	40:17,25 46:10
track 40:22	useful 36:18	36:13,15,19,21	47:19	
	10.00	37:20 40:12,14	year 41:17 45:3	4
trade 42:3	48:22		•	
	48:22 uses 30:11	40:24 43:9	45:8	409 20:3

GR-2017-0215 and GR-2017-0216

48 50:11	9 18:7	1	I	
49 21:4	7 10.7			
5				
5 20:3				
5,000 27:4				
514 20:7				
573.415.8379				
20:8				
573.526.2423				
19:6				
573.616.1911				
19:14				
573.751.5558				
19:17				
573.751.7431				
19:10				-
573.797.0005				
19:3				
5th 19:23				
6				
620 33:10				
63101 19:20,24				
640 18:24 51:3				
51:15		-		
640.155.1 33:11				
650 19:16				
65101 19:3,13				
20:7				
65102 19:6,17				
65102-0360				
19:10				
65202 20:4				
6th 19:20		ia .		
7				
			6	
700 19:20,23				
8				
8 46:12				
800 19:9				
807 19:2				
9				