

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
STATE OF MISSOURI

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Evidentiary Hearing

November 4, 2010

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 5

In The Matter Of Laclede) File No. GR-2005-0203
Purchased Gas Adjustment)
For 2004-2005)

RONALD D. PRIDGIN, Presiding
SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
ROBERT M. CLAYTON III, Chairman,
JEFF DAVIS,
KEVIN GUNN,
ROBERT S. KENNEY, via telephone
COMMISSIONERS

REPORTED BY:
Tracy Taylor, CCR No. 939
TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

A P P E A R A N C E S

MICHAEL C. PENDERGAST, Attorney at Law
RICK ZUCKER, Attorney at Law
720 Olive Street, Room 1520
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
314.342.0533
FOR: Laclede Gas Company

MARC D. POSTON, Deputy Public Counsel
PO Box 2230
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
573.751.5558
FOR: Office of Public Counsel

KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel
LERA L. SHEMWELL, Deputy Counsel
PO Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
573.751.8700
FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Good afternoon. We are on the record. This is a hearing in Cases No. -- or File Nos. GR-2005-0203 and GR-2006-0288 in the matter of Laclède Gas Company's purchased gas adjustment for 2004-2005 and 2005-2006.

I'm Ron Pridgin. I'm the regulatory law judge assigned to preside over this case. Right now it is about one o'clock in the afternoon November 4th, 2010. We are in the Governor Office Building in Jefferson City, Missouri.

I would like to get entries of appearance from counsel, please, beginning with the Staff of the Commission.

MS. SHEMWELL: Good afternoon. Thank you, Judge Pridgin. Lera Shemwell and Kevin Thompson representing the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, Post Office Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Shemwell, thank you.

On behalf of Laclède Gas Company, please.

MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you, your Honor. Michael C. Pendergast and Rick Zucker appearing on behalf of Laclède Gas Company. Our business address is 720 Olive Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63101.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Pendergast, thank

you.

On behalf of the office of the Public Counsel, please.

MR. POSTON: Thank you. Mark Poston appearing on behalf of Office of the Public Counsel and the public.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Poston, thank you. Any other counsel wishing to enter an appearance?

All right. Hearing none, if I could inquire of the parties and apologize. The -- Judge Jones is assigned over this file but had to leave suddenly and so I am filling in for him. I understand this hearing to be over a discovery dispute between Staff and counsel and -- excuse me, between Staff and Laclède. And if I could get the parties' I guess, plans on how you wish to proceed. In other words, do you plan on calling any witnesses or are you simply presenting -- or going forward with oral argument?

MS. SHEMWELL: Judge, this was noticed as an evidentiary hearing. Staff is planning to call a witness. I would note that we are responding to very specific orders of the Commission and which the Commission notified Staff to produce a list of what Laclède -- what was -- what documents were requested

and what Laclède actually produced and also noticed that the hearing was to test Staff's voracity on that list. So we are prepared to offer the Staff person who prepared the list.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. Thank you. So you have one witness, Ms. Shemwell; is that correct?

MS. SHEMWELL: That's correct.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right.

Mr. Pendergast?

MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you, your Honor. We will have two witnesses to present today. And in terms of what they will testify to and what the proper scope of this evidentiary hearing is, as I recall, the order establishing this evidentiary hearing indicated that it was to assess the voracity of the various representations that Staff has made in its pleadings.

Among those representations that Staff has made in its pleadings is that the information that Staff has requested and that it wants to pursue penalties against Laclède for not providing is necessary because Laclède has been operating under a CAM in pricing its transactions that has not been approved by the Commission and, therefore, each transaction has to be evaluated and audited and this information is necessary to do that.

It is the company's perspective that that is simply not true. That the Cost Allocation Manual that Laclede has been operating under for the last nine years was the direct result of a Stipulation and Agreement that was approved by this Commission that went ahead and looked at the testimony of a Laclede witness, looked at the testimony of a Staff witness, said that we believe this CAM is necessary to go ahead and protect customers from cross-subsidizations and other detrimental effects; Laclede, go forward and submit this to the Staff and continue to go ahead and submit reports to the Staff on an annual basis. It set forth the pricing standards under which you'll be doing your transactions.

Shortly after that Stipulation and Agreement was approved by the Commission, we had a rate case where the Staff determined that Laclede should be allowed to go ahead and sell off-system gas to its customer -- or to its affiliate as well as other third-party purchasers in the wholesale market.

And in that tariff it specifically said that those transactions should be priced in accordance with Laclede's CAM and -- or the affiliate transaction rule, if applicable. We submitted a CAM that had the pricing standards to the Staff in December of 2001

which set forth specifically how these transactions were to be priced. And we did that because Staff had gone ahead and indicated that that was a component that should be included in the Staff, how are you going to go ahead and determine the fair market value or fair market pricing of this.

Not only did Staff recommend that, but they recommended that we have a code of conduct. And under that code of conduct we should train and advise our employees of how important it was to comply with the CAM. Not only should we do that, but if employees failed to comply with the CAM, they should face disciplinary action, including potential termination. Those were Staff's recommendations, not ours.

So we trained our employees. We told them that they needed to do this. We audited the CAM on an annual basis with our internal audit department. And when the Commission's affiliate transaction rule became effective and applicable to Laclede, we filed or submitted to Staff another CAM that made several modest changes in it to make sure that it was consistent with the affiliate transaction rule.

We were advised by the Staff shortly after we did that, that they would look over the CAM, they would go ahead and look at it page by page and

advise us if they had any problems with it. Well, we didn't find that they had any problems with it until about four years later when the Staff indicated that, well, maybe they had a different standard than what was in the CAM.

When Steve Reed stood before this Commission in oral argument and said, Well, you know, we really don't think the CAM's relevant or we're not going to pay any attention to it because we're going to go ahead and look at other standards for pricing these transactions, well, I'll tell you what.

You know, Mr. Thompson said in his pleading in his brief here that he didn't like the pejorative manner that the company has addressed these matters. And if I've been pejorative or we've been pejorative in our pleadings, I want to go ahead and apologize.

But I hope the Commission has some understanding of how frustrating it is when you have a document like this that all parties, including Public Counsel, have agreed to that is supposed to establish the rules of the game for conducting these transactions and then five or six or seven years later after those transactions have taken place you're told, Sorry, we think there might be a different standard

that we want to go ahead and use and we need to go ahead and ferret out a bunch of information applicable to this new standard that's never been authorized, that's not consistent with the CAM and that we believe is wholly inconsistent with the affiliate transactions.

You know, the rules of the game which have been approved by this Commission and which this Commission told us to go ahead and follow, ought to be observed by everybody. And when they are repeatedly not, we tend to get a little frustrated and we tend to go ahead and perhaps speak in very direct and straightforward terms about how egregious we think that is.

So we welcome the opportunity today to go ahead and shed some light on exactly what the CAM was, how it developed, that it was a product of both Staff and Public Counsel's, that we have filed annual reports every year to the Staff which set forth how we've gone ahead and priced various transactions and what those transactions have been. And hopefully that will be helpful to the Commission as it determines this issue. Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Pendergast, thank you.

MS. SHEMWELL: Judge, if I may --

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Can I ask a couple questions --

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Davis.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: -- before we --

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I have a couple of questions.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Pendergast, you said that the CAM is actually referred to in one of your tariffs?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Could you identify that tariff?

MR. PENDERGAST: It is PSC Missouri No. 5, consolidated original sheet No. 42 -- R-42. And if you like, I have a copy of it here that I can provide to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes. Could you -- I mean, I don't know if Ms. Shemwell or anybody wants to look it over before you bring it up, but -- and I'm assuming we can take official notice of it since it's a tariff already on file here at the Commission.

MR. PENDERGAST: That would be my

understanding, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. And is this in the definitions or where -- I mean --

MR. PENDERGAST: It's about two sentences down.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. Here it is. So under one --

MS. SHEMWELL: Commissioner Davis --

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes.

MS. SHEMWELL: -- I am sorry to interrupt.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Go ahead.

MS. SHEMWELL: But I would like to note that the Commission's orders for today are based upon the September 14th, 2010 order directing Staff filing, which directed Staff to list the documents that were requested and what was actually produced. So that's the notice that the Commission gave to the Staff and to the public, frankly.

And then the Commission also issued a later notice that the Commission will set this matter for a hearing to make a determination as to the voracity of Staff's assertions. Staff's understanding was that the Commission would ask questions about Staff's assertion on the documents that were requested

and what was actually produced since that was the order that was the basis.

If the Commission wants to address the CAM, Staff is more than happy to do that. However, Staff does not believe that that is what has been noticed for hearing today. Staff is prepared to fully discuss the list that Staff was ordered to provide and the basis of that list, but if the Commission wants to get into the CAM, Staff is going to need time to adequately prepare for that because Ms. Allee is not our witness on the CAM.

Our understanding of what the Commission ordered was simply that Ms. Alley or the Staff prepare a list and that's what we're here today to discuss. Again, that's what the Commission noticed. If the Commission wants to get off into the CAM, I would suggest that additional notice is required to Staff and -- and any other parties who might be interested.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. Well, I'm just going to say, Ms. Shemwell, that I'm going to -- I'll take notice of that and it's fine, but I am going to go back and reference this document entitled Staff's Prehearing Brief, which copies were hand-delivered to my office on May 3rd, 2010 with the express request from Mr. Thompson that they actually

be read.

And I would refer you to page 5, that -- bottom of the page -- In the present case, it is critically important that the Commission is mindful that, one, Laclede has never submitted a CAM annually as the affiliate transaction rules require; and two, Laclede has never sought nor obtained Commission approval of its CAM as the rules require.

So I mean, you have placed this issue here in front of us today and I'm asking Mr. Pendergast about that. And we can -- you know, we may -- I agree, Ms. Shemwell, we may need another hearing, but, you know, it's -- in my opinion, Staff has taken somewhat schizophrenic positions here and I'm just trying to get to the bottom of one or all of them. And I agree we may have to have another hearing, but I want to go ahead and inquire of Mr. Pendergast, if you **don't** mind.

MR. POSTON: If I could just weigh in real quick before --

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Sure.

MR. POSTON: I concur with everything that Ms. Shemwell stated. If we knew this was going to be about the CAM and -- I might have a witness here today, which I don't. This is --

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: So we need to have another CAM hearing?

MR. POSTON: Well, I think that's what the eventual hearing in this case is going to be about in part. But I just ask the Commission to keep this proceeding focused on what the Commission asked it to -- asked us to do.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: We'll try to do that, Mr. Poston. I wish OPC and Staff would have been so mindful in some of our past proceedings here when we've had other Commissioners who have gone off way on fishing expeditions and, you know, everybody just sat silent. So I would --

MR. POSTON: I'm not aware of which cases you're talking about.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: If you want some examples of those cases, Mr. Poston, I'm sure I can probably go back and find some of them.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: I'm sure Commissioner Davis would also understand the proposition that two wrongs don't make a right. So if that was done in the past, it's certainly not appropriate. And it was offensive then, it certainly is not appropriate to do it again.

And as I understand it, this hearing is

to determine solely whether Laclede Gas has complied with the terms of the Commission order. Not a request by the Staff, but of a Commission order. And if they have -- and if they have, wonderful, great, we can move on to the substantive issues. But we are here today to determine -- and if there are disputes about whether they have -- they have complied with the Commission order, then we can get -- we can resolve those here.

I am in no way trying to cut off your line of inquiry, Commissioner Davis, and I think you're correct that the issue was brought up in the brief and I certainly think the Commissioners are entitled to answer their own questions, but I also think that it is appropriate to keep focus on what this hearing is about, which is much more narrow than the broader -- the broader issue.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right. I agree. I think I've just got two more questions for Mr. Pendergast here.

MR. Pendergast, when was the affiliate transaction rule promulgated, do you recall? It was before I got here.

MR. PENDERGAST: I believe it was either in 2001 or 2002.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. And then Staff -- you said Staff raised those concerns four years later, so that would have been approximately '05 or '06?

MR. PENDERGAST: Staff raised the concerns about the consistency of the CAM with the affiliate transaction rule, to my knowledge, for the first time in 2007 after the transactions at issue in this case had already been completed.

We submitted a revised CAM when the affiliate transaction rule, which had been stayed as to Laclede and several other utilities, was upheld by the Missouri Supreme Court and became applicable to Laclede. In March of 2004, we filed a revised CAM and slightly revised some aspects of the CAM. You know, they were pretty consistent with the rules to begin with, but it revised a few aspects of the CAM. We submitted that to the Staff and to OPC and we also had a requirement to submit it to our labor union, which we did.

And it was after that that the Staff assured us they would take a look at it, they would go ahead and let us know if they had any problems. And as I said, it wasn't until these ACA proceedings that we began to go ahead and get the notion that Staff

thought a standard other than what we had in our CAM and a pricing process other than what we had in the CAM should be applicable to these transactions that had already taken place. So, you know, it's been sitting with Staff and OPC for years.

As I said, we tried to comply with those CAMs, we were directed by Staff to go ahead and make sure our people were trained in accordance with that CAM, that they were subject to penalties and disciplinary action if they didn't comport their transactions with that CAM. And to find out years after the fact that what we were instructed to go ahead and comply with is irrelevant and meaningless and that the Staff is free to pursue something different than that, it's -- it's really frustrating.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. This is my last question, Mr. Pendergast. We have the -- Mr. Thompson seems to -- Mr. Thompson implies that in his brief and then also the affiliate transaction rule -- I'll go with the marketing affiliate transactions 4 CSR 240-40.016, I'm going to say 4 -- I'm going to say 4D, which is -- you know, it references that the gas corporations will use a Commission-approved CAM.

I mean when this dispute arose, you know,

why haven't you or any of your utility brethren ever sought approval of the CAM? I mean, wouldn't that have resolved this issue already?

MR. PENDERGAST: You know, Commissioner, that's an excellent question. And I don't know why nobody other than Laclede has sought that kind of Commission approval.

But to the extent the Commission approval is required, we got the closest thing to approval that I can think of. We have a Stipulation and Agreement that was approved by the Commission in 2001 that had testimony from the company that said, Here's what a Cost Allocation Manual should look like and this is what it should include, that had testimony from the Staff that said, Here's what should be included; in addition to what the company has, I want A, B, C, D, E, F and G in it. And the Commission said, Go forward and implement that kind of CAM and everything will be just fine and then submit it to Staff on a regular basis thereafter. That's exactly what we did.

And so if you're looking for something that's been approved by the Commission, I think Laclede comes a heck of a lot closer to it than any other utility in this state. And why other utilities haven't sought Commission approval, I don't know, but

we thought we had an operating document here that was fully consistent with the Commission order.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. But obviously the affiliate transaction rule superseded your old CAM in some respects and the CAM or the -- the marketing affiliate rule and everything says, you know, Commission approved.

And when they said -- I mean and this is me -- my impression was when you became aware that Staff had issues with the CAM, you know, why -- why not -- I mean why not file -- file something? I mean because I mean obviously you think that, you know, apparently the -- the stip from 2001 supersedes the rule. I mean why didn't you file something and bring that to the Commission's attention in 2007, I mean, as opposed to here we are in 2010? We've got three or four of these cases stacked up and, you know, and it looks like we are months, if not years, away from resolving this issue still.

MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah. And I guess, you know, from a procedural standpoint, that's certainly another alternative that we could have pursued, but in a way, we had pursued that very thing. We have argued to the Commission, Here's what our CAM is and here's what it says. We've talked about how, you know, the

Commission approved the CAM process and that we should move forward with one and what the elements should be. And -- and we've raised that repeatedly before the Commission and said, This is what our CAM says.

Now, you know, that's asking the Commission to go ahead and approve it maybe by a different means than just saying, Okay -- and I think we provided copies of the document too to the Commission. The Commission's seen it.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right.

MR. PENDERGAST: They've gone through it. And if I thought that proceeding in a slightly different way and saying, Okay, we're being very direct now and we're asking you to go ahead and approve this CAM rather than simply put before you the CAM and say, Here's what it says and here's why it ought to go ahead and be dispositive of these issues, we'd be more than happy to go ahead and do that.

In a way, I think we have done that. Not as directly as perhaps we could have, but if that's something that the Commission believes would be helpful to resolve, you know, this rather lengthy morass, we'd be more than happy to go ahead and do it.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Pendergast.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: The 2001 Stipulation and Agreement that you're referring to --

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: -- is that the same one that allowed the LER to exist? Is it the same stipulation?

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, it's one that recognized reorganization. LER at the time was already a separate corporation, a separate legal entity. And what it did was recognize a reorganization where we now had a parent company, Laclède Group. And rather than be a subsidiary of Laclède Gas Company, it became a sister utility.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: A sister. And that's the same Stipulation and Agreement where Laclède agrees not to say lack of possession or possession of documents in LER's possession was not a defense to providing documents to the Commission?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes. We said that in the context of, Commissioner, to the extent that we had agreed to provide information and that information was information that was necessary to ensure compliance with the CAM or other relevant regulatory purposes.

And our view on that is it wasn't an

agreement to go ahead and provide documentation no matter how irrelevant it might be, no matter how far afield it might be from the CAM or far afield it might be from the Commission's affiliate transaction rule. I really resist just taking one aspect of that Stipulation and Agreement and say, Oh, you agreed not to go ahead and object to information on the basis that --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: That's not what I asked.

MR. PENDERGAST: Okay. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: I asked that possession would not be a defense to providing the information.

MR. PENDERGAST: We agreed that we would not raise that objection, but we agreed in the context of only agreeing to provide information that was relevant to the Commission's rate-making authority.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Well, but -- I understand. And I appreciate you trying to get that in again, but I'm focused on the one issue.

MR. PENDERGAST: Sure.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: I appreciate your apology on the pejorative pleadings because I, quite frankly, think that the pleadings they have been

pejorative in this case. They've been some of the harshest that I've seen and to the point where -- where you accuse Commissioners of misconduct and I think it showed a basic lack -- lack of respect. But I will -- I will also say that I -- I will acknowledge the frustration that may be occurring and that that may be an example of that frustration.

I would ask that you would also acknowledge that it gets very frustrating for Commissions when they issue orders and utilities don't comply with them or don't follow them, as a general -- as a general proposition.

I think that your comments about the CAM and Commissioner Davis' questions are perfectly appropriate, but I also think that this is a hearing -- that's substantive. And I think you would agree that ultimately what the Staff recommends or what the Staff decides is not the decision, but the decision is ultimately made by the Commission. Correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: No, I -- I would agree with that. But I'd also like to point out that what the Staff is requesting here is authority to go to circuit court and level penalties on Laclede Gas Company for its alleged failure to go ahead and comply

with the Commission's order.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Right.

MR. PENDERGAST: And we -- we think we have complied and we think we have gone ahead and provided what's available.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But that's what we're deciding today. It is certainly appropriate for us to make inquiries to determine whether utilities which we regulate have complied with our orders. Correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: And if they don't comply with our orders, then the remedy in the statute is to go to circuit court and seek penalties.

MR. PENDERGAST: It is.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: The fact that we're having this hearing today certainly doesn't prejudge either compliance with the Commission order or the ultimate substance as to whether or not the issues that you brought up with the CAM may ultimately be decided in your favor.

MR. PENDERGAST: You know, that's true, but -- but one thing I have to note here is that the affiliate transaction rule itself, as well as the Stipulation and Agreement in the 2001 case, do not establish the principle that the Staff can get

whatever information it wants. Okay? It doesn't establish that. It doesn't say you can go to an affiliate and whatever tickles your fancy, you can go ahead and get it.

What it says is you can get information that's necessary to satisfy compliance with the standards and other requirements that are in the rule. And I've seen a resistance, quite frankly, to deciding what those standards are and what they mean.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But the Commission has decided in the current order that we're talking about what those -- what documents are being -- are required. In what -- in what the Commission's opinion, whether it be wrong or right, but in -- and there are differences of opinion, but what the Commission order deems relevant and available and -- and needed to be produced.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: That decision's been made. And it's been challenged, has it not?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah, it's been challenged.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: And to the higher courts?

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, we -- it's on a

stay. You rarely, if ever, get those. And we, you know, follow the normal pattern there and didn't receive a stay, but the substantive issue hasn't been decided yet.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: So as we stand today -- and you're certainly well within your rights to move that up, but -- but the Commission has made a determination that these documents are relevant. And I -- I don't disagree with your point that Staff has cart blanche to go out and get whatever they want to get, but that determination's already been made.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, the Commission made a couple of determinations. At one point, you know, it said, I'm not going to talk about the affiliate transaction rule. Said it's a red herring. It said, I'm not going to talk about enforcement of the Stipulation and Agreement. It's a red herring. I'm just going to go ahead and pursue under the general rules of discovery.

And under the general rules of discovery, generally speaking, you only have to provide information that's within your control, possession and custody. And we have provided all the information that's within our control, custody and possession. We have worked with LER to provide additional information

that we think is consistent with the affiliate transaction rule and consistent with the CAM. So from our perspective, we've complied with the rule -- or with the Commission's order and we've complied fully with it.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Which we'll decide today. We might agree with that.

MR. PENDERGAST: Right. And -- and -- and the Commission said before in an order January 20th, I think it was, eight or nine months ago when it was proceeding under the general rules of discovery, as they did in the subsequent order, that Laclède only had to provide information that was in its possession.

So, you know, the Commission never overturned that, they never reversed it, they never said, Laclède, you don't have to go ahead -- or you have to turn over information whether it's in your possession or not. So that's an order that's still outstanding.

And, of course, you know, we do have the Commission's order in 2001 in the holding company docket that I don't think we can completely ignore. And that I'm -- you know, it's been called a red herring, that order and the CAM and everything else in

the August order. I still don't understand how it is a red herring, but the fact of the matter is that's a valid Commission order too.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Okay. But today we're just determining whether the valid Commission order to -- order to turn over documents has been complied with.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, you know, from my perspective --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: I don't want to reargue -- I don't want to reargue the relevancy issues.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, that's what we're doing.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: They've been decided. The issue here is whether you complied. And you may -- we may come out of this and say, You have absolutely complied. You know, thank you very much, you've done everything you're supposed to do, appreciate it, you know, good work. But we don't need to reargue because the Commission has already made a determination.

MR. PENDERGAST: Okay. And -- and Commissioner, I just have to respectfully dissent that the Commission really has decided those issues. I

think they --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: There's an order that says you have to provide these documents. Correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: There is an order that says provide --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: And do you get to pick and choose what documents of those you decide you want to comply with based on the Commission order?

MR. PENDERGAST: I think --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: This -- this is -- remember, this is procedural. I'm not talking substantive. So I just want to make sure that the principle that you're standing for is, is that when there is a valid Commission order that is in effect, that you get to independently, as the -- as the utility, decide what documents you get to turn over and what you don't?

MR. PENDERGAST: I have --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: If you believe that, that's fine. I just want to make that clear.

MR. PENDERGAST: I haven't independently decided that. I have provided the Commission, we have provided the Commission all the documents that are in our possession.

Now, what you're saying is you want

documents from LER. You want documents from somebody that's not in this proceeding today and you want to go ahead and get them through Laclede Gas Company. I have given you all the documents that Laclede Gas Company has. And I have arranged with LER to provide additional documents to go ahead and give to Staff based on what the standards are we were supposed to be operating under for the last eight or nine years. So I have done that.

You know, the Commission's free to narrow this as much it wants to narrow it, but I think I'm free to go ahead and say I don't agree with that narrowing and I don't think it's appropriate. I don't think it was appropriate six or eight months ago and I don't think it's appropriate today.

We followed the rules, Commissioner, and they ought to have to follow the rules too and the rules of the game. And compartmentalizing it and segregating it and saying, We're just doing this little narrow issue while we're ignoring the big picture, to me is not an appropriate way to administer justice.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Okay. So you -- I mean, I just -- I just -- good to know where you stand; that Commission orders, if you think that there

are bigger issues that are involved, you don't have to comply with them.

MR. PENDERGAST: I have complied with them.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But the -- you said you have complied with this particular one.

MR. PENDERGAST: I have.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But you just said -- stated very passionately that you think that in the bigger issues, that -- that you don't have to.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: I mean are you -- that's what I'm trying to make clear. I'm not trying to --

MR. PENDERGAST: I understand.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: -- I'm not trying to pick a fight.

MR. PENDERGAST: I understand.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: I'm just trying to get an idea procedurally what we're talking about.

MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah. And --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: And are we talking about compliance or something bigger? And, look, I -- I think that Commissioner Davis is right. I think we're going to probably have to have another hearing

about the CAM. And at the end of the day, I might agree with you 100 percent on the substantive issues.

There is a procedural issue and a Commission order issue that I think is -- is paramount to what this Commission does. Commission orders, whether you -- whether people agree with them or not, if they are determined to be lawful, need to be complied with.

It is a general broad-based principle that is what makes this Commission work under the statutory scheme. And if that principle isn't adhered to by Staff, by investor-owned utilities or anyone else that we have jurisdiction over, this -- this whole regulatory scheme falls absolutely apart.

So we're not talking about some minor detail in -- in what's going on. We're talking about a bedrock foundation of what -- what the Commission does. And so I just want to make perfectly clear that when Commission orders the law-- lawful Commission orders, when they are in force and effect, need to be complied with.

MR. PENDERGAST: And -- and --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: And -- and you -- we're going to determine whether you complied with this today. And like I said, we may very well agree

with you that you complied.

MR. PENDERGAST: And, Commissioner, I fully agree and fully respect what you've said. And -- and the Commission, if it's going to function, has to have its orders complied with. I don't disagree with that at all. You know, subject to appeal --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Absolutely.

MR. PENDERGAST: -- so forth and so on. And -- and I'm telling you that notwithstanding my concerns about the bigger picture, you know, I believe we have gone ahead and complied with the orders. I think we've turned over all the documents that are within our possession.

I think that people saying that we don't have the right to say that we've turned everything over in our possession because of the Stipulation and Agreement in the 2001 case, if they're going to interject that, they also have to talk about what that agreement said about the CAM and other things, which I don't think have been followed, but notwithstanding that, I think we have turned it over.

You know, the only documents that are still sought are documents that belong to somebody else that's not in the hearing room today, another

party, another legal entity. And, you know, the only other thing I would notice about that is, you know, two years into this, LER has still never received a subpoena for these documents. They've sought them solely through Laclède Gas Company. They've submitted subpoenas to LER before. LER has in some instances complied with them, in some instances not.

Yet here we sit today facing possible penalties, you know, when the Staff hasn't even attempted to go ahead and get that -- it through a subpoena through LER, which, you know, is certainly a mechanism the Commission has available for discovery.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: You probably -- can you speak on -- I mean, you may not be able to answer this question and I'm not asking you to because I know that there are -- that there are lines set up in order to make sure -- does LER recognize Commission -- has LER's compliance with Commission subpoenas been voluntary or do they believe that they are required to comply with Commission subpoenas? I just don't know so I'm just asking the question. And you may not -- I don't want you to answer the question if you don't feel like you can or you --

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, I -- I can't -- I don't even know if they've directly considered the

question. All I can tell you is I'm familiar with the fact that they have complied with them in the past.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: In certain instances?

MR. PENDERGAST: In certain instances. I think they've resisted them in several other instances. And, quite frankly, in this instance when we had the evidentiary hearing come up, obviously we've had discussions with LER about this entire issue. As I said, we arranged to have some information provided.

And we asked them once again, you know, the Commission has said that they're going to have an evidentiary hearing to consider whether we've complied with it. You know, consider anew providing this kind of information. And they responded and said, We don't believe that in this particular circumstance, that we should be providing this information or we have an obligation to. And we'll be happy to make those letters available to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Mr. Pendergast, I appreciate your indulgence and I look forward to hearing from the witnesses.

MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner Gunn, thank you. Commissioner Kenney, you had questions?

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Yes. Can you all hear me?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Everybody?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: There was a document -- this is -- Mr. Pendergast, there was a document that Staff filed that's marked HC that was an attachment.

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: The chart. I think it was filed September 30th. Do we need to go in-camera to discuss that?

MR. PENDERGAST: I don't think so. If we talk about it generally, I think we'll be okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Let me just -- I want to make sure I'm clear because I was sitting over here and listening and it sounds dangerously close to me like we're re-litigating the whole issue of what documents are responsive and which documents are not responsive.

And I just want to be clear that from my understanding, Judge Wilson, in reviewing Laclède's writ of review, directed its writ of mandamus to

Laclede ordering it to comply with the motions -- with our orders granting Staff's Motion to Compel; is that right?

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, he directed that, but I believe he put in his order to the extent the information is within our custody, possession and control.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So it's possession and control?

MR. PENDERGAST: I believe that's what was in his order. I don't have it right now.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: It's not -- I guess what I'm -- I guess what I'm trying to figure out is -- because my understanding of the relevance of this provision in the CAM that -- or the -- in the stipulation rather, there was a provision in the stipulation that -- that provided that Laclede would not use as a defense or an objection to providing documents that it doesn't have possession or control of certain documents. Right?

MR. PENDERGAST: In the context of what information we were agreeing to provide, that is correct. And my point is that they have gone outside the information that we agreed to provide. And having done that, they're trying to use this provision that's

contingent on it being relevant under that particular provision.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And it's relevant for purposes of determining compliance with the CAM. Right?

MR. PENDERGAST: Right.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Or our general regulatory functioning. Correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. And part of our general regulatory function is to engage in the PGA and ACA review. Right?

MR. PENDERGAST: It is.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. So that to me -- and I guess I'm doing what we're not supposed to be doing, I'm re-litigating this issue. But to me, that last portion of -- of the phrase "whether it's relevant to compliance with the CAM or for purposes of our general regulatory functions," that catch-all phrase would seem to encompass what we're discussing here, a PGA or ACA review.

MR. PENDERGAST: You know, if you keep it very general like that, I think perhaps you could go ahead and say that it's in connection with something of that nature. But I think that when you have rules

that say how things are supposed to be priced and you have a CAM that says how things are supposed to be priced and you have those rules saying that the affiliate of a utility is only required to provide access to information necessary to show compliance with those things, that to then say, you know, because Staff has determined that it wants to pursue a different kind of standard that's inconsistent, in our view, with both the CAM and the rule, that it can get whatever information it wants, I -- I don't believe that we agreed to that.

It's as if Staff had said, If you're purchasing gas from an affiliate where the seller has red hair, I'm not going to go ahead and recognize that. Tell me who has red hair over at LER. And if we **objected**, I would hope the Commission would say, Of course you don't have to answer that kind of question. That has no relevance to anything.

And, quite frankly, I think at this point the disjunct between the rule and the approach that Staff is taking and the standard that it is advocating is just as wide as -- as that example.

They've clarified over the last couple of months in the Atmos case and this case that their view is if you do business with an affiliate, no profit.

The affiliate can't profit. You know, in contrast to every other marketer out there. If it's your affiliate, they don't get to earn a profit. And if you sell gas to the affiliate, we got to follow it around, see what it did and take those profits away as well. And I'll tell you --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Let me interrupt you because I don't want to -- we're getting a little more deep into the analysis than I was trying to get. The -- if -- if you're purchasing gas from an affiliate, is it relevant to a prudence analysis to determine the price at which the affiliate purchased it from its upstream supplier?

MR. PENDERGAST: Absolutely not. No. It's not the least bit relevant.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Because you complied with what's in the CAM?

MR. PENDERGAST: Because we complied with what's in the CAM and there is no additional basis in this particular case for saying that that was imprudent. As I've said before --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Wait, wait, wait, wait. Let me make sure I understand what you're saying. You're saying there's no additional basis to argue that it's imprudent because it complied with the

CAM?

MR. PENDERGAST: I -- in this particular circumstance. I'm saying there are circumstances where that wouldn't be the case. If we bought a lot more gas than we needed, I don't care if it's in compliance with the CAM, you bought too much gas, that's imprudent. If we bought from a prohibitively inexpensive source for reasons other than reliability or diversity, even if the price was in compliance with the CAM or the affiliate transaction rule, I think you could raise prudence there.

But none of those factors have been raised in this case. The only thing that's been raised in this case is, you know, it's not the priced the right way and I don't think an affiliate ought to be able to make a profit and, therefore, I'm going to go ahead and propose a disallowance.

And, you know, if -- if you had wanted to go ahead and not have affiliates make any profits in transactions with utilities, then just write a rule to that effect and say they can't do that. But don't have an affiliate transaction rule that assumes you can do these transactions and a discrimination rule that says treat your affiliate and other marketers like that and then do exactly the opposite.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So you are saying the compliance with the CAM does not end the inquiry. Correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: I'm saying it doesn't necessarily end the inquiry in each and every case. In this case, it absolutely, definitively does end the inquiry.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Why? Why -- why in this case?

MR. PENDERGAST: Because Staff has not put anything in its pleadings, in its recommendations or anything else that would say even though they're in compliance with the CAM, they're still imprudent because, for example, they bought too much gas; for example, they bought it at a prohibitively expensive location where they normally wouldn't do it and for reasons other than reliability.

You know, what the Staff is doing here is saying, They bought it, it was from an affiliate and I want to apply a different standard than fair market price even though you've been able to demonstrate six ways from Sunday what that fair market price is.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: But what your -- this is kind of circular, but isn't what Staff trying to -- isn't Staff trying to find out the very things

that you're saying that they haven't alleged?

MR. PENDERGAST: You know, we -- we have demonstrated to Staff that this was a price that was consistent with what unaffiliated suppliers were offering. We have demonstrated to Staff that this is consistent with the market price for gas in the St. Louis market was based on LER's sales to schools that was also done under a competitive bidding process.

We have shown that this is consistent with what our own GSIP, our lawful tariff approved by the Commission, said was a benchmark for determining whether you have procured gas in a superior enough way that you ought to be rewarded for it. This was better pricing than what's in our GSIP -- our approved GSIP.

And we have also shown Staff that based on what LER based for the gas on the MRT West Line, the markup they had was less than the markup we get when we make off-system sales and less than their average markup.

So, you know, I'm not sure how many different ways you can prove that something that was competitive, but -- but it doesn't matter.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: They're not allowed to make their own independent determinations of how

they want to go and analyze these sales?

MR. PENDERGAST: What they are not permitted to do is to come in and tell a utility, We're changing the rules of the game after the fact, whether they're going to say prudence or otherwise, and we're going to subject you to a different standard than what we agreed to seven or eight years ago, that we've had full access to over that period of time and we've just decided that you shouldn't have profits under these transactions. They are not permitted to do that, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: But they are permitted to -- see, I'm -- so you're saying that they're not permitted to go any further than what is allowed by the CAM, but then you're saying yes, they are permitted to go and --

MR. PENDERGAST: I'm saying if there were facts or circumstances that fell outside the CAM -- and I've given several examples, bought too much gas --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: But those are your examples. What -- I mean, that's not --

MR. PENDERGAST: And I haven't heard another example from the Staff. The only thing I've heard from the Staff is we've got a different

standard --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well --

MR. PENDERGAST: -- and -- and we don't want you to make any profit on these transactions. And that's not what your rules provide, that's not what our CAM provides. That's just a fundamentally disconnected unauthorized standard.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And forgive my ignorance, because I don't remember Staff making the argument that they're trying to make a blanket determination that you shouldn't -- that an affiliate can't make profits.

Is that argument the Staff is making Ms. Shemwell or Mr. Thompson?

MS. SHEMWELL: Judge, I'm going to respectfully remind the Commission that this particular hearing --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No, I know. I know. I know. And I'm going to get back to that, but I'm just -- I just -- is that the argument the Staff's making?

MS. SHEMWELL: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: It is not?

MS. SHEMWELL: No, sir.

MR. PENDERGAST: Your Honor, all I can go

by is what Staff puts on paper and put in its words and says to the Commission. And they have said in our case in their answer to the counterclaim that there shouldn't be any profit that inures to an affiliate, all ought to inure to the ratepayer, that there shouldn't be any profit for an affiliate when you purchase gas. They said in the Atmos case there shouldn't be profit earned by an affiliate.

So I don't know how many times Staff gets to say it and then say that's not what they mean, but they've clearly said it over and over again.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. I'm sorry. Let me get away from that and let me return to this Attachment A. And the first page of it, I want to make sure we're talking about the same document. It's -- it's horizontally oriented. It says, Staff's requested documents 9/1808 Motion to Compel on the left-hand column. And then next to that, detailed list of documents requested by Staff. Is that the -- are we talking about -- is that the same chart?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And then there's one, two, three, four, five boxes on that front page and those are the documents Staff has requested?

MR. PENDERGAST: Right.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Are the parties all in agreement that those first five documents are, in fact, the documents that Staff requested and that were covered by the September 18th Motion to Compel?

MS. SHEMWELL: Staff is.

MR. PENDERGAST: I don't disagree with that, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. And then the second column is a detailed list of documents requested by Staff. And is everybody in agreement that that column is accurate and what's -- it's a detailed list of the documents that the Staff requested?

MS. SHEMWELL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Mr. Pendergast?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And then the third column, Status: Complete response, partial response, no response. Does that column accurately reflect Laclede's responses to each of those document requests?

MR. PENDERGAST: No, your Honor, it does not.

MS. SHEMWELL: Staff -- Staff --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: It does not?

MS. SHEMWELL: Staff believes that it does.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. Let's start with number one, partial response. Is that accurate, Mr. Pendergast?

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, if what you mean by response is did you provide certain documents, I would say yeah that is a partial response. But if what you're saying is you didn't respond or explain why you did not provide documents, no.

I mean we provided documents that we had or we arranged with LER to provide documents that they agreed were relevant. And all I want to do is indicate that when it says no response, it wasn't a case of us just giving the high hat to the Staff and saying, Well, go, you know, whatever.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: That's good enough.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Why is it only a partial response, Ms. Shemwell?

MS. SHEMWELL: Commissioner Kenney, Anne Allee is here today to testify about this document. Perhaps --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: All right. Well, maybe I'm taking you guys off of your presentation. I apologize. I'll stop. But it occurs to me that this

document is -- is the focus of this -- the focus of this hearing. And what it sounds to me like though and where we're going to have a problem is there's still some discussion about what is relevant and what isn't relevant. And I thought that that determination had already been made. Because when I heard you say, Mr. Pendergast, that you provided the documents that Laclède thought were relevant and --

MR. PENDERGAST: We provided everything that's in our possession, your Honor.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Possession and control or just possession?

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, possession -- possession or control. The only thing that has not been provided by Laclède is documents that belong to a different company, LER.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So documents that belong to LER are not provided?

MR. PENDERGAST: Some documents that belong to LER haven't been provided. But as the list on the right shows, LER did cooperate in providing a fairly significant amount of data to the Staff that, you know, LER I guess believed was appropriate or relevant or did for whatever reason.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, let me just

ask a question about that. If Laclède coordinated with LER and provided some documents in some circumstances, how is it determined which documents would be provided by LER in which circumstances?

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, we -- we didn't determine it. LER determined what it was willing to go ahead and provide. And as I indicated earlier in advance of this hearing, we asked LER to consider anew the information that had been provided.

They provided a rather lengthy response to Laclède saying that, you know, they provided a significant amount of information, but for various reasons, they did not believe it was appropriate to provide the information that they hadn't provided yet.

And, of course, you know, they've never been served with a subpoena, they've never been directly approached by the Staff to go ahead and provide this information and they didn't believe it was appropriate so they didn't --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Do LER and Laclède share any same officers or directors?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes, they do. And -- and, you know, this issue's come up before. I think it came up in the Ameren case. And there's an appellate decision that basically says when you have

common officers or directors, they have fiduciary responsibilities to both of the companies that they operate under. Of course, the affiliate transaction rule freely contemplates that you'll have common officers and directors that will share corporate services.

And the thing is just because they have common officers or directors doesn't mean that they're free to go ahead and order a different company to provide something that they believe as a fiduciary duty shouldn't be provided.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No, I understand. I mean, I -- I understand. I just -- there is -- it seems to me -- well --

MS. SHEMWELL: Commissioner Kenney --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: -- if LER's not going to provide documents -- or if Laclede's not going to provide LER documents because they're not in the possession and control -- I don't know. It just seems like it's fraught with peril in that you provide some of them, but not all of them and you decide which ones you're going to provide and which ones you're not going to provide.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, you know, and I would hope that wouldn't be held against us. That was

us trying to be cooperative. That was --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No, I understand.

MR. PENDERGAST: -- trying to go above and beyond board and arrange to provide information that could even be conceivably relevant to this. And -- and I think we did that. And -- and I don't think that that is a reason to go ahead and say that you ought to agree to stuff that's not relevant under our CAM or the affiliate transaction rule.

And the only other thing too I'll say on the common officers and directors, there's a case out there -- when we were over in circuit court, we pointed it out. Somebody had come to the state of Missouri and I don't know whether they went to the Department of Revenue or something and said, I want this information.

Well, the Department of Revenue didn't have the information. Another governmental agency had the information. Now, you know, they're all under a common officer, it's called the governor. And maybe they were even under a division director, I don't know. But the fact of the matter is they're separate agencies with separate, you know, legal capabilities and -- and responsibilities.

And the court said, Of course you don't

have to go ahead and turn over information that's in another agency. Well, you know, this is in another company.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. One final question and then I will let you all get back to your -- the order of your presentation.

In the circumstance where it indicates that there was no response and that no documents were produced, were those documents that we had already ordered to be produced?

MR. PENDERGAST: I would think that they were documents that were listed. And those were documents that we had probably responded if they weren't produced, that we don't have them.

MS. SHEMWELL: And my response is yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: But they were -- where it says, No response or none, those are documents that would have been subject of the motions to compel that the Commission granted and that judge Wilson ordered enforced?

MS. SHEMWELL: Correct.

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes. To the extent it's in our custody, control, he said provide it. We have.

MS. SHEMWELL: And the court has offered

to hold a full hearing on that in that respect,
Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I'm sorry. Say
that again.

MS. SHEMWELL: The court in its judgment
and writ of mandamus, if the Commission moves for
contempt, Commissioner, there will be an evidentiary
hearing in front of the circuit court.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: On that spec-- on
those issues about whether those documents are a
subject of the Motion to Compel or not?

MS. SHEMWELL: I -- that is my
understanding, yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. All right.
I will let you all go back to the order that you
wanted to present your case in.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Can I just ask one
more question? And I apologize.

Mr. Pendergast, you talked about how the
Staff needs to follow the rule. Now -- and I just --
I'm just trying to clarify your argument. So the rule
calls for Commission-approved CAM. Now, your argument
is, is that even though the Commission -- the
Commission clearly has not explicitly approved the
CAM, but it has implicitly?

MR. PENDERGAST: My argument would be that the Commission approved a reorganization back in 2001 that said to protect ratepayers, I want a CAM, I want a Cost Allocation Manual. The company has said it's going -- you know, it's happy to do one. The Staff has proposed that it needs to be done, it needs to include these various elements. They were very specific in listing what those elements were. And they said, Go ahead and include that in a CAM and do your business pursuant to that CAM.

So from my perspective, that's pretty close to being approval of a Commission CAM. And then when the Commission's approved a tariff that says, When you do transactions with your affiliate, do it in accordance with CAM, that's another strong indication that it's been approved by the Commission.

And from my perspective, it's been approved by the Commission in a much more explicit fashion than, from what I understand, any other utility's CAM has been approved.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Based on the other two -- the other two factors?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: All right. So your contention is -- and it may be perfectly reasonable --

that you are in complete compliance with the rule that says that you have to have a Commission-approved CAM?

MR. PENDERGAST: I -- I think we are.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Okay. Great. Thank you. I don't have anything else.

MS. SHEMWELL: And we would be happy to address that issue in a hearing noticed --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Sure. And I think we are probably going to have to talk about some of this substantive stuff later on when we make a final determination.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: I think we have some more bench questions. Commissioner Davis?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I'm sorry to belabor this. Mr. Pendergast, I'm going to ask you a yes or no question. I know this may be very hard for you, but let's see if we can't do this with yes, no, maybe, I don't know.

Do you understand why, in essence, asking this Commission to tell the PSC Staff that they are forbidden from, you know, going after the documents of your affiliate or wherever, wherever their investigation takes them, why anyone would be deeply concerned by that precedent that the Commission would be, you know, stopping an investigation of this

nature? I mean do you understand -- understand that concern?

MR. PENDERGAST: Generally, yes.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. All right.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: There's a right answer to that question, Mr. Pendergast.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I mean now -- and here's my next and -- my next and final question. And this is my impression of Staff's argument and I may be wrong here. But I mean, you've made the analogy about, you know, common officers and directors and where, you know, one department's not necessarily going to know what the other one is doing.

But if I had been appointed deputy director of Economic Development and deputy director of Agriculture so that I was deputy director of both of those departments, then I would have knowledge.

And I guess my ultimate concern is if you have a common officer like Ken Neises apparently was, in my impression, and ultimately on the -- on the LER side they decide on November 4th that today is a good day to buy gas for LER and he's vice president and he knows that, but Laclede is not buying gas and then they wait to a later date to say, you know, apples and oranges, I mean, I'm not concerned about affiliate

transaction rule, I'm not concerned about the CAM.

I mean, it kind of gets into a prudence question where -- and maybe there's a plausible explanation for -- you know, maybe Laclede doesn't have the purchasing power that LER has or the pipeline capacity. I mean, there could be 100 different explanations, but -- and I think it's a legitimate question for Staff to ask is -- you know, here's Mr. Neises, who's, you know, kind of the top dog in LER for -- for gas buying as well as in Laclede. And if he thinks it's a good deal over here on one side, why is it not a good deal for Laclede?

And given the fact that you all are in the same building and all in the same pretty much office and, you know, everything, I mean why shouldn't -- I mean, I -- I mean from a prudence perspective I guess my concern is why wouldn't it have also been prudent for Laclede to buy that gas on the same date at the same price that LER was buying it if he thought it was a good deal for that company?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah. Well, and -- and under that hypothetical, you know, I could understand why a question might be raised, but that's not what happened here.

This was a multi-month deal -- it was a

multi-month -- or one-year deal and then it was done the next year. And that deal was based on the prices that an unaffiliated supplier had offered, it was under an index that our GSIP says is reasonable for that area. So it wasn't a case of, you know, a lot of back and forth and I'm shifting between you and them. It was a deal very consistent with the deals we were already doing on that pipeline.

And I agree with you. I mean, you know, when you have that kind of shared ownership, that shared kind of management, you need to be concerned about it. And, you know, I always thought that's why you passed an affiliate transaction rule, that's why you said these transactions have to be priced in this particular way, that's why the Staff said if we're going to go ahead and allow you to reorganize, you need to have a CAM to go ahead and protect ratepayers and that CAM has to spell out how you're going to go ahead and determine market price so that you have objective criteria for determining and making sure that ratepayers are getting a fair deal and subsidy is not going on.

And our main complaint here is having gone ahead and agreed to those provisions, having agreed to those ratepayer safeguards, to go ahead and

have them, you know, on a vague argument of prudence say we're not going to follow those, we're not going to go ahead and judge you based on that, but we're going to judge you based on something entirely different and that's something that doesn't allow you to make any kind of profit or your affiliate to make any profit, that's just wrong. I mean, you know, that's not a prudence issue. That's -- that's just I want a different standard because you're dealing with an affiliate.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Commissioner Davis, can I ask a quick follow-up question?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Sure. I'll turn it over to you.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Because, Commissioner Davis, I think got to what the gist of this is. Isn't it appropriate when you have that kind of management structure, to ask the question? And what you -- you just went through and said, Well, the reason why it's not appropriate to make that inquiry here is because of all these specific factors. You said that's not exactly what happened here, but those are very specific circumstances under which this particular transaction happened.

But the question is one step before that,

that I think Commissioner Davis asked is. So you're saying that we can't even -- that the Staff can't ask the question about those specific circumstances because the -- the utility said we filed the CAM and we did -- we did everything else?

I mean this is -- this is what this is all about. This is about whether or not -- I mean, I think we've made the determination because we've already decided what we -- you can ask and what isn't, but you said based on Commissioner Davis's hypothetical, absolutely you believe that we could ask the question. But then you said, But not in this case because of all these different specific circumstances.

Aren't those specific circumstances really explanations to the questions that are being asked, but it's still appropriate to ask the questions?

MR. PENDERGAST: I -- I think that the questions that are being asked or the information that's being requested above and beyond what's already been provided is being asked in furtherance of a standard that is completely inconsistent with the standards in your rule and the standards in the CAM.

And I do not believe that just because we look at the prudence of transactions in ACA

proceedings where there is no circumstance that's been developed or -- or raised about buying too much gas or buying it from an inappropriate source, that you get to go ahead and say, I'm not going to pay any attention to all the competitive market base information that shows this was a fair deal, I'm just not going to pay attention to that. I'm going to go ahead and dig underneath all that and I'm going to go ahead and see if there's something else maybe that's going on here.

I mean, at some point, you know, you got to go ahead and say we've established mechanisms for determining what a reasonable price is and what a market price is and that's what we're going to live with. And you can concoct all kinds of reasons to go beyond what -- what that information produces and what it says. I mean, you can always say, Well, somebody may be manipulating something somewhere.

But, you know, I think there comes a point where you got to go ahead and say, We live with the mechanisms we came up with -- particularly you're the one that came up with them to make sure ratepayers are protected.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But correct me if I'm wrong. Didn't you say earlier there would be

circumstances under which the competitive market data, which the CAM would have been followed but that may mean that there are -- there's imprudence?

MR. PENDERGAST: Absolutely. There could be circumstances where we bought more gas than we needed.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: So -- so --

MR. PENDERGAST: That hasn't been raised here.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: I understand. But -- but the argument seems to me, because we're talking about information gathering is -- is premature because what -- what you're saying on the one hand is, is yes, there are circumstances in which the CAM and the market competitive data is irrelevant to the inquiry because you could still have other circumstances under which you do that.

And then on the other hand, you're saying but all you have to do is look at the competitive data that that's been done and you don't need to go any further because that validates the transaction in and of itself.

MR. PENDERGAST: I'm saying in this case that is absolutely true. And the reason I'm saying that is because they haven't suggested any

circumstances, bought too much gas, did --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But how do we know that in this case that's the circumstance if we're not even -- if Staff's not even allowed to ask the question?

MR. PENDERGAST: Ask -- you mean the questions about what the transactions were between LER and third parties in places that, you know, don't even touch upon Laclede Gas Company? I mean what's that got to do with anything? I mean, that's completely irrelevant. That's I just want to go ahead and audit your affiliate because I want to audit your affiliate.

It is not related either directly or indirectly to any legitimate inquiry on relevance. Just like in the Atmos case, you know, we did a competitive bidding process, they were the low bidder. That's not good enough. I mean, you know, there comes a point where you got to go ahead and say, Yes, it is. And those are the processes we came up with to make sure it would be good enough.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But Judge Wilson said it wasn't good enough.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, no. Judge Wilson said go ahead and provide it to the extent it's in your custody, control and possession.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: He said -- he said they can ask the question.

MR. ZUCKER: No, he said -- he said he wasn't getting involved in the question.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: No, he said to Laclède we can ask the question. And you could -- you have -- our order --

MR. ZUCKER: No, he said --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: The Commission determination that these documents was relevant, Judge Wilson said, yes, you have to -- Laclède has to provide the documents.

MR. ZUCKER: He said his job was to go ahead and enforce your order, so he did go ahead.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But he made no other -- that was the only basis under which he did it? We did the order and he said, I'm here to enforce the order --

MR. ZUCKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: -- I have no other inquiry?

MR. ZUCKER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: So you're alleging a serious legal malpractice by the judge?

MR. ZUCKER: No.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: He made no independent inquiry as -- we had an order, he was just going to uphold that order?

MR. ZUCKER: He read the statute and said that was his job.

MS. SHEMWELL: I have a copy here if you'd like it.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: I've read it.

MR. PENDERGAST: And he dismissed LER from the case and he --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: LER's a signatory to the Stipulation and Agreement. Right?

MR. PENDERGAST: They're a signatory to the Stipulation. I think one of the factors he did, he said Staff's never even submitted a subpoena to them. I mean, if this information were so important, why haven't they done that?

MR. ZUCKER: And, Commissioner Gunn, let me make one other point. Staff did get to ask the questions that you're seeking. They spent a year auditing us and they come up with issues that have to do with prudence. For example, Laclede bought 100,000 therms of gas at some point. They may say, Why did you need that much gas? That was imprudent for you to buy that much gas. They can say that kind of thing.

And let's say we bought 100,000 therms at that point from LER. Now, that would be an affiliate transaction, but their point would not be the pricing of the affiliate transaction. It would be the prudence. It would be, You bought too much gas. I don't care who bought it from. If it was from LER, if it was from British Petroleum, I don't care, I'm making a prudence -- making a argument.

In this case, they didn't say anything about the amount of gas we bought, where we bought it. They only made one point and the one point was that Laclede paid too much because LER made a profit. And -- and they used prudence as -- as a code word in order to get around the rules which say that we're supposed to price this at a market price. And so they didn't at first say that we have a different standard. They just said we have prudence and they -- it's kind of cloudy.

Over time, over the last few years, they've slowly kind of disclosed more and more that their standard is different. In the Atmos case, they really had to because they had an RFP. If an RFP isn't good enough, the same RFP process the government uses to buy things, what is? So they were kind of trapped into saying, yeah, we better use fair market

price but RFP is not fair market price, something else is.

And finally, they said in this pleading they filed on October 25th a sale of gas-- let's see. Laclède should buy gas from LER at LER's acquisition price. They finally came out and said this standard that we have differs from what's in the rules. Fair market value doesn't matter to us. We can't stand to see a -- an affiliate -- a marketing affiliate make a profit on a transaction.

And what we're asking you is you're expecting us to follow your orders and your rules and you're exactly right to do that. We're asking you to ask Staff to do the same thing.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Which is a fair point, but one that we're not exactly talking about today. Because we're talking about whether you've complied with the Commission. I think -- I led you astray and I apologize for that. But I think we should let people get on track. I see the four Commissioners' heads --

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I'm going to go back to -- I'm going to go back astray one more moment here. Okay, Mr. Pendergast. Is this an Atmos-like situation where -- and forgive my ignorance -- where

we have a supply contract where you're dealing with nominations at, you know, first of the month and then buying gas later on in the month to meet that contract?

I mean because it sort -- I mean my impression where I got with Mr. Sommerer the other day was there were concerns that under that contract, which, you know, per Mr. Sommerer, it was the lowest best bid, but they were -- he was concerned about the actual nominations in the contract.

You know, for instance, if there was a month, you know, where you might buy an inordinately high amount or buy -- nominate zero up front, then pursuant to that contract, if you're buying zero up front at that fixed price, then you're putting your customers at risk, you know, for whatever's on the spot unless -- I mean and maybe in your judgment it was one of those situations where you think that gas prices are going to go lower so you're not going to buy that much. I mean, things just seem high to you. I mean I don't -- I don't know.

But I mean, once again, is that -- is that the case here? Because if it is, then I owe Commissioner Kenney an apology because it is the analogous situation.

MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah. No, it's -- it's -- it's different. And the reason it's different is just from what you've told me, there was a case of nominations and varying it from one day to the next. And, you know, I really can't comment on whether that even raises an issue.

But in this particular case, we were talking about a base load gas supply where the same amount was nominated and delivered each and every day, 365 days out of the year. There wasn't any difference in that. And in this case, the particular transaction was price based on a similar deal we had done with BP/Amoco several months before.

And Staff brought up the point, well, in this case you allowed LER to transport the gas and it was for deliveries into the St. Louis market. So we said okay, fine, fair point, here is some data from the St. Louis market that LER provided that showed what other unaffiliated purchasers were buying gas from LER for; namely, the schools under the school aggregation program that the legislature approved, said they can go ahead and get a cheaper source of gas supply if they buy from the utility. And we demonstrated that for the base load supplies they were taking, our price was favorable to that that we paid

LER.

So we tried to go ahead and address it both at the MRT west line side, the purchase side and also the delivery side and use real market data from unaffiliated buyers and sellers to demonstrate that it was a competitive price.

And you know, at that point we think that if you demonstrate that, you have gone ahead and met what the purpose of the affiliate transaction rule is and you've met what the purpose of the CAM was and how the CAM said this staff ought to go ahead and be assessed and judged.

MR. ZUCKER: So it was a base load deal 10,000 a day, day in, day out, no room for any monkey business.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: And you're saying that you based the prudence of that transaction on a prior transaction with BP -- between BP and Laclede that was --

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: -- for roughly --

MR. PENDERGAST: The prudence and the fair market price.

MR. ZUCKER: The prudence wasn't questioned, just the pricing.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. But you're saying that the price for the Laclede/LER transaction was comparable to the prior BP transaction --

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: -- as well as what the school alliance is paying?

MR. PENDERGAST: In the St. Louis area. For deliveries into the St. Louis area.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: For the deliveries in the -- and is that on -- is that a similar contract? I mean is it, you know, apples? Are we talking about apples or apples and oranges?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah. The schools contract has a base load provision and this was a base load supply. So we compared base load to base load. And the price at which we were buying from LER was favorable. I don't want to --

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Was there a peak provision in there too for --

MR. PENDERGAST: There probably was for the schools. There wasn't for Laclede and LER because this was base load.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: This was just straight base load?

MR. PENDERGAST: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. I'm sorry. No more questions. Sorry.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Anything further for Mr. Pendergast from the Bench?

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: No questions, Judge.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Mr. Poston, anything before we proceed to evidence?

MR. POSTON: No. Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you. And I was glancing over Judge Jones' procedural order and I'm assuming this is simply live testimony and I didn't see any order of witnesses or any order for which anybody, you know, wanted to go first. I assume Staff would want to proceed first and please correct me if I'm mistaken.

MS. SHEMWELL: That's our expectation, Judge.

MR. PENDERGAST: Your Honor, if I could just get a clarification. You know, we kind of began this process by noting what Staff had interjected as far as the CAM is concerned and, you know, its relationship to the information they're requesting here. That was also something that Staff talked about in its initial response to the Commission's order.

You know, our impression was that since

the order for this proceeding said we're going to go ahead and permit inquiry into the voracity of the various statements that Staff has made, that that would be fair game; however, I have sensed a desire at least on the part of some folks that if we're going to ahead and address CAM issues and that sort of thing, that we ought to do it separately and we shouldn't do it today.

And I guess what I would ask for is if we are going to do that, I would request that we have an opportunity to do that before the Commission rules in this particular instance. You know, we're willing to go ahead and ask not questions along those lines we're willing to go ahead and not put witnesses on to address that particular issue which will make this hearing a lot shorter, I think.

But I do think it's important that it be addressed sometime before the Commission makes a final determination in this case when the Staff and OPC are prepared to go ahead and address it.

So I guess I'm asking for guidance from the Bench. Are we going to limit it strictly to non-CAM, what information was, you know, provided by Laclede, what information wasn't on the theory that we'll have another proceeding or another hearing to

talk about the CAM issues that have been also introduced in this case by the Staff?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Pendergast, thank you. Let me let the parties comment. Ms. Shemwell or Mr. Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Judge, I think Mr. Pendergast ought to get a chance to talk about the CAM sometime, but I don't think it's relevant today to the purely factual determination of whether or not they have complied with the Commission's discovery order.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Pendergast -- Ms. Shemwell, I'm sorry.

MS. SHEMWELL: The Commission has already in this case determined issues of possession and relevancy. There's no need to re-litigate those. The Commission has already instructed its general counsel to go over to circuit court.

Judge Jones specifically instructed Staff to provide a list of the documents LaCledé has and has not provided. Staff has done exactly that and Staff is prepared today to answer questions about the list because Judge Jones specifically said, Test Staff's voracity and what he had ordered for today was the list so we can do that.

We are certainly prepared to address the CAM after we have had time, again, to reasonably prepare. And perhaps that is a case where pre-filed testimony might be reasonable.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Poston?

MR. POSTON: Thank you. We have no objections to looking at the CAM issue in a separate case. We do object to I guess suspending the Commission's decision in this case until that proceeding has happened. We agree that it's not relevant to the decision the Commission needs to make here.

And if Laclede does attempt to put up witnesses regarding the CAM today, we will -- or I will object to that. We haven't -- as I said earlier, we didn't bring any CAM witnesses here today. That's not the scope of this proceeding and so we would object to that attempt. Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Well, please correct me if I'm wrong, counsel, but I don't think I hear a disagreement. I think -- I think the parties are saying we just want to stick to what Judge Jones's order said and, you know, testing the voracity of Staff's allegations and we'll save CAM for another day.

MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah. I guess the only disagreement is -- and these issues have been introduced directly by the Staff itself. You know, if Staff didn't believe they were relevant, then you shouldn't have put so much in your initial brief or your prehearing brief about it. You shouldn't have put stuff in -- in your initial response to the Commission order. I mean, I think the Staff is in a difficult place to go ahead and say it's completely irrelevant.

All I'm suggesting today is I'm happy not asking questions about it today, I'm happy not putting a witness up, I'm happy going ahead and giving both sides time to go ahead and prepare for it. But I think given the fact that Staff has, you know, certainly claimed that it's relevant by addressing it in detail in its brief, that before the Commission reaches a decision on this particular issue, we ought to go ahead and have that separate proceeding completed so that we have a full record to -- to make a determination on based on, you know, everything that's relevant, you know, according to Staff's own brief.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Well, I guess to try to make certain that I'm clear, I -- again, I'm not

hearing or I'm not understanding a disagreement on today's proceedings being limited to simply what Judge Jones ordered.

MS. SHEMWELL: I think that's correct.

MR. PENDERGAST: And I'm fine with that, your Honor, as long as it's agreeable that we'll have our day in court on the CAM before a final determination, based on what happens in this proceeding, is made.

MR. THOMPSON: Do you mean, Mike, the determination as to whether or not you've complied with the discovery order?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes. I'm talking about whether or not --

MR. THOMPSON: Well, Staff is opposed to that because that determination in no way involves the CAM.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, you know, I --

MR. THOMPSON: I think he should get a chance to talk about the CAM before the Commission makes its final determination on these two PGA cases and the disallowance that Staff has recommended. Absolutely he gets his day in court there. But on the narrow question of this discovery order and Laclede's compliance with it, the CAM is irrelevant.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, I disagree that it's irrelevant. And I quote no less augustine authority than Kevin Thompson who talks about its relevance in several pages in a prehearing brief.

Now, Kevin, you're the one that --

MR. THOMPSON: It was intended to provide background to the Commission.

MR. PENDERGAST: And I think it's fair background and I want to go ahead and get a chance to provide my version of the background.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Can I ask a question? Are you -- are you -- when you talk about the CAM, are you going to say -- is the essential argument going to be on a certain number of these documents that because the CAM was -- was in place, X document wasn't -- isn't relevant and, therefore, X document doesn't need to be produced? I mean, is that going to be your argument in -- in -- in the proceeding as a general matter?

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, I mean it depends on -- on I guess what the other parties argue. I don't know if other parties are going to go ahead and say there's a Stipulation and Agreement from 2001 in which you agreed to not object based on whether it's in your possession or not. If parties are going to

agree not to go ahead --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Again, we have a Commission order that says, Give us these documents.

MR. PENDERGAST: Right.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: And so are you going to say that based on the CAM, we're -- we don't have to give you a document or are you not making that argument?

MR. PENDERGAST: I -- the argument I'm going to make is based on the civil rules of discovery, which is the basis that the Commission relied upon.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Okay. But we -- this is where I went back to my line of inquiry before. We are not re-litigating relevancy here. We have a lawful order that is in place. And so those might be excuses for why you didn't produce something and that may mean that we say, you know, okay, that's fine.

But about whether or not you produce something according to the order is an entirely different argument and has -- doesn't have anything to do with CAM. You either provided a piece of paper to the Staff or you didn't provide a piece of paper to that Staff. And that piece of paper was either required by the Commission's order or it was not

required by the Commission's order.

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: So I don't -- I guess I'm just not clear as to -- as to why -- how the CAM and -- and whether you believe that -- that Staff has either done something wrong or not. This isn't about Staff here. This is about what the Commission has ordered.

MR. PENDERGAST: No, I understand that, your Honor. And -- and I guess what I'm saying is I think we have complied.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Okay. So we'll -- we'll make those determinations.

MR. PENDERGAST: But -- but -- but more than that, you know, I also believe that you're going to be seeking penalties. We're entitled to have a hearing before you go over to circuit court and ask for penalties to be produced. And I don't believe I should be excessively limited in what I'm raising.

The fact of the matter is you've never decided what the CAM means; you've never decided what the affiliate transaction rule means; you've put that off; you've deferred it. You've said, I'm not going to go ahead and get into that.

From our perspective, that is crucial and

central to this particular issue.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Sure.

MR. PENDERGAST: And if you're going to pursue penalties and only give us a hearing that doesn't allow us to go ahead and address that particular issue, those seminal issues -- those seminal affirmative defenses, then that's the Commission's decision. But I don't --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But the penalties are about whether or not you've complied with the order.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, and -- and -- and -- and whether or not you comply with the order, which I believe we have, can also be affected by whether or not the information that was being sought was relevant. And -- and --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: We've made that determination.

MR. PENDERGAST: You --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: We made that determination in the order.

MR. PENDERGAST: You made the determination in the order that in the general rules of civil discovery, it is -- in the Commission's rule it was relevant. In your January 20th order, you --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: This goes back to my

question. So I say, Give me your 10K. I want all of it. Because I, as -- as a judge or as a commissioner, determine that it's relevant to this proceeding. Give it to me.

And then you come back and say, Well, I've given you pages 1 through 7 and I've given you pages 10 through 15 because that's really all that you need in order to make a determination. And then you hand it to me and -- and I'm supposed to say, Thank you very much? I mean that's not how it works.

MR. PENDERGAST: That's not --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: It works -- the way it works is --

MR. PENDERGAST: And that's not what we've done in this case.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But that's what you're saying you're asking us to do.

MR. PENDERGAST: No, I'm not asking you to do that at all. What I'm asking you to do is take note of the fact that we've complied fully with your order. Okay? We have provided you all Laclede documents that are in our possession.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: But you're asking to make an argument about relevancy on certain documents again.

MR. PENDERGAST: And -- and all I'm saying is when we went over to circuit court the first time, you weren't pursuing penalties. Okay? I think the reason you didn't pursue penalties is you never gave us a hearing. Okay? You never gave us a hearing. And if you're going to go ahead and seek penalties in circuit court and try to financially penalize us, then you ought to go ahead and give us a hearing.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: We're giving you a hearing --

MR. PENDERGAST: You're -- you're -- you're --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: -- as to whether you complied with the order or not.

MR. PENDERGAST: You're limiting the hearing and you are limiting my ability to go ahead and raise crucial issues on the theory that you've already decided it when, in fact, you didn't decide it. You said they were red herrings and you weren't going to pay any attention --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: We've decided relevancy of these particular documents, haven't we?

MR. PENDERGAST: You've -- you've said that Laclede ought to be required to go ahead and

produce these. In one order you said to the extent they're in our possession. They aren't. We've provided everything that is in our possession. And the Commission in that order --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Okay. Well, that doesn't have anything to do with the CAM.

MR. PENDERGAST: It has everything to do with the CAM.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Whether documents are in your possession? Explain --

MR. PENDERGAST: No, no, no.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: -- to me how that has to do with the CAM.

MR. PENDERGAST: Whether they're -- you're absolutely right. Whether they're in our possession has nothing to do with the CAM.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Okay. So then we are in -- in the -- if you don't have the documents and they're not in your possession, when they say, Why didn't you turn this over, you say, We don't have it in our possession. We move on.

I don't understand why you have to argue the CAM. Because there's nothing -- this is about whether the documents we requested in our order have been given over to the Staff. And if there is a

possession argument that says they're not in our possession, that's -- that's -- then you may not be required to do it under our order. I just don't understand how arguing -- rearguing the relevancy under the CAM decides whether or not the documents needed to be produced under the lawful order that's in effect right now.

MR. PENDERGAST: You know, I guess, Commissioner, all I'm saying is that we believe we've complied with it. We also believe, as Staff does, that the CAM and what it provided or didn't provide and whether it was approved by the Commission and wasn't approved is indeed relevant to this issue.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: To whether -- to the ultimate determination of the case, I agree with you 100 percent.

MR. PENDERGAST: And -- and -- and -- and -- and the information. And, you know, I don't want to belabor it, but your own rules indicate, our own CAM indicates, the Stipulation and Agreement you approved in 2009 indicated that the information that Staff is entitled to get is based on the standards and the requirements in the rule in the CAM. And I --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: We have an order which requires you to comply with docum-- to comply

with document requests. We are here today to determine whether you have complied with those document requests. This is merely a determination as to whether the physical transfer of documents, the physical transfer of information has gone from -- that we required you to give has gone from Laclede to Staff. That's what we're here to determine today.

And if the answer is no, then we either make a determination because it's either out of your possession and control or you're refusing to do it. And you can have all kinds of explanations as to why you're refusing to do it, but I don't know why -- why that impacts the CAM at all.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, and -- and -- and, you know, if the Commission wants to narrow it down to that degree and if it wants to try and seek penalties depending on what it decides based on that limited thing and it doesn't want to give any opportunity to address what Staff has said in its -- I hope that this isn't going to stand unrebutted. I hope these claims about the CAM and that sort of thing --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Of course it wouldn't. We would -- it would be -- I think you're absolutely right.

MR. PENDERGAST: I hope nothing is going

to be decided based on what Staff put in its pleadings and -- and -- and requesting relief from the Commission here because, you know, it's not true. And we'd like an opportunity to go ahead and rebut it.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: And of course you would have that opportunity.

MR. PENDERGAST: Well, you know, after we go to circuit court, you know, if the Commission decides we --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: This is a discovery dispute, Mr. Pendergast. It's not a substantive issue.

MR. PENDERGAST: It's a discovery dispute. Discovery is governed by the provisions of the affiliate transaction rule.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: We've already made the determination that these documents are relevant. You went to circuit court. The circuit Court came back and ordered you to produce them as Laclede Gas. Correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: It ordered us to produce it to the extent it's in our possession.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Absolutely. But the -- the court order stands on its own. If you don't have the document, you can't produce it. But

that's what we're talking about here. We're not talking about the substance of what's going on.

MR. PENDERGAST: Okay. Well, you know, like I said, Staff interjected the issue. I --

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Staff's not the one that makes the determination. I don't know how many times I have to say it to people that if the Staff says something, it doesn't make it true. The five commissioners make the determination. And we will demonstrate again and again that we don't always listen to Staff because sometimes their argument isn't persuasive and many times the utilities' arguments and -- or OPC's arguments or industrial intervenors' arguments are much more persuasive.

So just because the Staff says something, it doesn't mean anything. It only means something when we determine that it means something. And in this case, we've made that determination.

MR. PENDERGAST: And, Commissioner, I certainly understand what you're saying. If the Commission believes it's appropriate to limit it to that, that's fine. I'm just saying that -- getting back to our earlier conversation, I understand you want to go ahead and have us obey the rules, you want us to go ahead and follow them, want us to comply with

them. We think we've done it in both your discovery order and we think we've done it on a substantive basis.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Well, we'll find out. So you can -- I'm done. We can proceed.

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: Can I ask one question, Judge? Aside from the issues that we have presented in existing cases, we're going back and looking at orders that have age on them, we're looking at the LER structural order back in, what 2001?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: We've got discussion about affiliate transaction rules. How old are those, Mr. Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: Almost as old as the structural orders.

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: Okay. So we're talking at least ten years. We've got another stipulation in the Cost Allocation Manual.

If I ask the question on a going-forward basis, okay, just let's -- let's ignore the litigation that we have right now, would it be helpful from Staff's perspective, Public Counsel, Laclede or any utilities -- should we be reevaluating and the Commission looking at rules to clarify what the

Commission's priorities are rather than rely on a pleading in an ACA case to tee this up for discussion?

Would it be more helpful to have a docket, a case, a rulemaking, a reevaluation, some sort of contested matter that would have substantive value and -- and provide some forward-looking guidance? I mean, is that what needs to happen here? Or are we going to continue having, you know, ongoing disputes step by step? Obviously this is coming up in another case.

MS. SHEMWELL: Staff has filed I believe something similar to what you are suggesting in the --

MR. THOMPSON: Complaint.

MS. SHEMWELL: -- 0006 case. GC2011 --

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: And what is that? Is it a rulemaking? Is it a --

MS. SHEMWELL: No. We are suggesting that the Commission look at how it interprets the affiliate transaction rules, consider how it interprets those and how they would apply to Laclede and I suppose, by extension, perhaps other companies.

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: Does that suggest a need to revise the affiliate transaction rule?

MS. SHEMWELL: Absolutely not.

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: But if we're talking

about challenges and interpretation, wouldn't it be helpful doing a rulemaking that would provide greater clarity?

MS. SHEMWELL: I think --

MR. THOMPSON: We were thinking of a workshop docket. Looking at the rule as it exists, the problems that have arisen, the issues that have arisen among the various parties and -- and what can be done on a going-forward basis to improve compliance and enforcement of the rule. That's what we were thinking.

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: We do a lot of workshops around here. Mr. Pendergast?

MR. PENDERGAST: Mr. Chairman, I think that's an outstanding suggestion. You know, I --

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: Flattery will get you everywhere.

MR. PENDERGAST: Seriously, I mean, this has been a process where, you know, we've been kind of on a dual path over the last three, four years. On the one hand, we've been litigating the dickens out of, you know, what does the rule as it exists today mean. And -- and you know, have we or have we not complied with it or is Staff violating it or so forth and so on.

And on the other hand, we've had, you know, periodic efforts to sit down and talk about it. And it's almost as if it's very difficult to sit down and talk about it while you're litigating it at the same time.

On the other hand, you know, it's important, as I'm sure you recognize, to know what the rules of the game are, to know how you ought to be comporting and conducting yourself. And I think the sooner we can go ahead and make that kind of determination, I think the better off we'll -- we'll all be.

So we're certainly willing to cooperate in any process like that. I think Commissioner Davis had maybe suggested something like that before and --

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: Great minds think alike, right, Commissioner Davis?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: That's exactly right, Mr. Chairman. Kumbaya.

MR. PENDERGAST: And -- and so, you know, if -- if there's a desire to go ahead and -- and do that and walk into those negotiation in good faith, let's -- let's -- let's do it.

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: How many hearings or on-the-records -- how many -- how many times have we

been in a hearing room arguing over these issues?

MR. PENDERGAST: You know, we've had three oral arguments, I'm including the two in our case, the one in the Atmos case. We're now having this evidentiary hearing and we've had a circuit court proceeding that's been back here and maybe we'll be back there again. So we've had a lot of proceedings.

And -- and that's before we even get to the merits of the issue. And I think once you have that kind of churn, once you have that kind of repeated inability to sit there and -- and -- and get things progressing, it means that -- that something needs to change. And I think what needs to change is to go ahead and -- and sit down and come up with a recommendation, hopefully -- either, you know, we can agree to it or --

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: I think I have an idea of your idea of change and I think they have -- I have an idea of what their idea of change is so I -- I get that. I -- I just think -- I think it's frustrating for all of us. It's -- it's absorbing a lot of time by a number of different commissions. So I appreciate that.

Mr. Poston, do you have anything you want to add to that?

MR. POSTON: Yeah. I think that would be very helpful. I think going forward we'll really need that kind of resolution to know how to address these cases in the future. And I think waiting until this case is concluded may be helpful as well because then you'll have all of the real evidence as to, you know, how these transactions occur and that kind of thing to help guide that rulemaking docket.

CHAIRMAN CLAYTON: Judge, I think we need to get this -- this thing going. We've got witnesses and we're -- we need to -- we need to get going, so --

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. What I'm hearing from the parties is -- I don't think I'm hearing a disagreement as to what the scope of today's hearing should be. What I think I'm hearing is -- is perhaps disagreement on when the Commission should rule on the evidence here.

And could I get the parties I guess to confirm that? And if that's the case, could I get the parties to simply agree to file motions on that later? No ruling is going to be made today. To -- to say we want the Commission to rule sooner rather than later and this is why. Because again, I'm flying blind coming into this case, it's not my case. And I don't know that I could do anybody any good by doing

anything other than trying to get you through the witnesses today and then having the Commission decide when to rule on that later. Would the parties be agreeable to do that?

MR. POSTON: Yes, sir.

MS. SHEMWELL: Yes.

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes, your Honor. We're fine.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you. Is there anything further -- and I'm assuming Staff would call witnesses first?

MS. SHEMWELL: Yes.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. If you're ready to proceed with evidence.

MR. THOMPSON: Could we have a moment, Judge?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Certainly. Absolutely.

MR. THOMPSON: If we could have perhaps a five-minute break, I'm thinking that we might be able to reach an evidentiary agreement that would shorten this.

COMMISSIONER GUNN: Oh, please do.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: How about -- we've got 2:45 on this clock. How about until about three o'clock? Will that give you enough time? All

right. We'll --

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Well, wait. Before we go, maybe they can pontificate or prognosticate on the ability of a schedule for -- it looks like we need a proceeding to approve Laclede's CAM. You know, I'm tired of hearing that -- I'm tired of hearing that the -- you said the CAM has not been approved and I think it needs to -- we need to pass on that once and for all.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Will 15 minutes -- will that work for the parties?

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: So about three o'clock. I'll make every effort to make sure we're muted here. We'll go off the record.

(A recess was taken.)

JUDGE PRIDGIN: We're back on the record. We took a break at about 2:45. It is now about 3:05. And do the parties have anything else for the Bench before we proceed to evidence?

MR. THOMPSON: I believe we do, Judge, if I may.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: I think we've reached an agreement that, first of all, the list prepared by

Staff witness Anne Allee and noted as Attachment A -- has been called Attachment A today, Laclede will agree that it's true in the sense that where it says, Partial response, that means some paper was provided; where it says, No response, it means no paper was provided; where it says, Complete response, all documents that could have been provided were provided or that were expected were provided, that it's accurate in that sense.

Staff understands and agrees that Laclede's defense is that it provided everything in its custody and control. Now, we don't stipulate that that's true. We just stipulate that that's the defense that they're going to make. Our intention is to bring us to where we would be if we spent three hours putting on evidence here.

Additionally, Laclede has some letters that they would introduce into the record if we go ahead and put on witnesses. And we will stipulate that they can put them in the record now for what they're worth.

And -- and Laclede further agrees that at all times here in pertinent, there have been shared executives between Laclede Gas Company and LER, one of whom is Ken Neises, although he is no longer with

either company, as I understand. Is that right, Mike?

MR. PENDERGAST: That's correct.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. Have I stated our agreement reasonably coherently?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yeah. I think so. And as Mr. Thompson indicated, we do have some letters that we would like to also put into the record. And more specifically, there is a February 4th letter, 2009 to Steve Reed from me that basically responds to the Commission's January 21st, 2009 and subsequent order on this discovery matter; there is a November 9th, 2009 order from me to Mr. Thompson and Ms. Shemwell; then we have a letter that's dated October 18th, 2010 from myself to William J. Niehoff, counsel for LER, in which I requested LER consider anew providing certain information; and then the October 26th, 2010 letter from Mr. Niehoff to me with their response declining to provide additional information. I think those are all in the packet that Mr. Zucker has provided.

The only other comment I would make, as Kevin noted, there are certain officers that are shared between the two companies. And our view would be that that's entirely consistent with what's permitted by the affiliate transaction rule.

And the only other matter I would discuss is we had a little talk beforehand about what this hearing was going to be limited to and there being an opportunity to file motions relating to the CAM issue or perhaps approval of the CAM and, you know, we'd certainly reserve the right to do that given what we think is the relevance of those things.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. Mr. Pendergast, thank you. That sounds like Staff and Laclede have at least some sort of agreement on how they want to proceed. And Mr. Poston, let me give you the opportunity to comment if you have any objections or comments.

MR. POSTON: I have no objection. We can do those things, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Poston, thank you.

So is what I'm hearing then that the only evidence the parties would put on today would be the documents that Mr. Zucker just handed to me and then Mr. Thompson already has referenced Attachment A I believe to -- which is already a pleading. I don't know if you wanted to introduce that into evidence or if it matters to the parties.

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. I'll go ahead and

put that in.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: So you'll be doing that instead of presenting witnesses?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes. That and the letters.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: That and the letters, right. I just want to make sure -- try to keep the record as clean as I can.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Judge, can I ask a question?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: With respect then to the Attachment A, the -- the spreadsheet document, is it -- just so I'm clear, it's only the first page that has the partial response and -- and no response indicated on it. Correct?

MR. THOMPSON: I think it's on both sides, sir.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: From what I'm seeing, Commissioner, page 1 would have -- you know, under the heading Status, some of those say partial, some say no response. Page 2, either the answers are either complete response or there's -- there's nothing in that box.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: They're just

blanks. Right?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So then it's the first page then that's still -- it's the documents requested on that first page that are in dispute. Correct?

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. That's correct.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And it's Laclede's position that to the extent that it was partial or no response, it's because they are not in Laclede's control or possession. Correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So then the narrow issue for us to determine is -- well, whether that is, in fact, the case or whether there's some other rational basis or some other reason why Laclede would, in fact, have possession and control of those documents. Right?

MR. THOMPSON: I believe so.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And does that depend upon a determination of either the CAM or the -- or rather an interpretation of the CAM or an interpretation of that stipulation that created LER?

MR. PENDERGAST: I think we've probably agreed to disagree on that. And, Commissioner, we

think there is some relevance. And as I understand it, there will be an opportunity to file a motion sometime in the not too distant future that addresses that issue and perhaps even goes further and talks about what we should do with the CAM prospectively.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, okay.

MS. SHEMWELL: I would like to --

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, I'm mean -- I'm sorry. Let me -- I'm not clear. You said something about relevancy. Are you arguing that there's still -- there's still an assertion that they weren't provided because they're not relevant or because Laclede doesn't have possession and control of them?

MR. PENDERGAST: Commissioner, if that's directed to me, I think we would go ahead and say our defense is we've complied and we've given everything we have and what we don't have is not in our possession. We have requested it from LER, they have declined to go ahead and provide it.

And that alone from our perspective, ought to be enough to resolve it. But we also believe that the CAM does have some relevance. And I know nobody's ruled upon it yet, but I think the Judge suggested if we want to file a motion afterwards to

suggest what, if anything, should be done on that rather than taking up a lot of time today -- and the Staff's not prepared to address it, I don't think OPC is.

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No. I understand. I didn't -- that would be beyond what I think we were going to argue today. But we've -- so -- so we've narrowed that issue though. Okay. Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Commissioner, thank you.

Let me, if I could, label these exhibits and verify with the parties exactly what's being offered. And then we'll see if we have any -- any objections on these exhibits. And, Mr. Thompson, I understand Staff's only exhibit today would be Attachment A to -- correct me if I'm wrong, was it your pre-hearing brief?

MR. THOMPSON: No. This was attached to Staff's response that was filed I think September 30th.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay.

MR. THOMPSON: After -- after the writ and Laclede's return to the writ in circuit court were both filed with this Commission on August 31st, Staff was directed to file something in the nature of a

recommendation, I guess advising the Commission as to whether Staff believed Laclède had complied or not. And in response, we filed that list attached to a pleading on September 30th.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: So this would be exhibit -- excuse me, Attachment A to your September 30th, 2010 pleading in --

MR. THOMPSON: In this case.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: -- in this case?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, Judge.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: And it's a two-page document and I've labeled that as Exhibit No. 1 for identification purposes. And you wanted to offer that, Mr. Thompson?

MR. THOMPSON: I would like to offer that.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any objections? Hearing none, Exhibit 1 is admitted.

(Exhibit No. 1 was received into evidence.)

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: You're welcome. And that is Staff's only exhibit today?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, it is, Judge.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. And Laclède,

Mr. Zucker brought me it looks four different what look to be letters from Laclede Gas Company -- excuse me, three letters from Laclede Gas Company and a letter from a law firm to Mr. Pendergast. Would that be correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes. From a law firm that represents LER.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. Thank you. And just so we can be clear, let me label Exhibit No. 2 for identification purposes the February 4th, 2009 letter to Mr. Reed from Laclede Gas Company. It appears to be a three-page letter plus an attachment on the back, so four total pages and it's from Mr. Pendergast. I will label that as Exhibit 2 for identification purposes.

And, Mr. Pendergast, you would like this offered?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes. So offered.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any objections?

MR. THOMPSON: No objection.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Hearing none, Exhibit 2 is admitted.

(Exhibit No. 2 was received into evidence.)

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Exhibit 3 I would have as

a November 9th, 2009 letter from Laclede Gas Company to Mr. Thompson from Mr. Pendergast. It appears to be two pages.

And you would like that offered, Mr. Pendergast?

MR. PENDERGAST: Yes, your Honor.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: That is Exhibit No. 3 for identification purposes. Any objections?

MR. THOMPSON: No objection.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Hearing none, Exhibit 3 is admitted.

(Exhibit No. 3 was received into evidence.)

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Exhibit 4 I have as an October 18th, 2010 letter from Laclede Gas Company to Mr. Niehoff from Mr. Pendergast. It is a two-page letter. And then also is Attachment A, which appears to be similar to, if not identical to, Staff Exhibit No. 1, Attachment A to the September 30th, 2010 pleading. That's Exhibit No. 4 for identification purposes. And that's being offered?

MR. PENDERGAST: So offered.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any objection?

MR. THOMPSON: No objection.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Exhibit 4 is admitted.

(Exhibit No. 4 was received into evidence.)

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Exhibit 5, for identification purposes, an October 26th, 2010 letter that appears to be to Mr. Pendergast and appears to be four pages from William Niehoff, apparently counsel for LER if I'm describing that correctly. And I've got that labeled as Exhibit 5 for identification purposes.

And that's being offered. Is that correct?

MR. PENDERGAST: So offered.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any objections?

MR. THOMPSON: No objection.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Hearing none, Exhibit 5 is admitted.

(Exhibit No. 5 was received into evidence.)

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any further exhibits from Laclède?

MR. PENDERGAST: No, your Honor.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Mr. Poston, any exhibits, any evidence?

MR. POSTON: No, your Honor.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Thank you.

Any other evidence or argument from counsel?

MR. PENDERGAST: None today, your Honor. The only thing I would do is point out that there had been a suggestion made about filing whatever motions or pleadings parties believed were appropriate to address the CAM issue and any potential relevance it has or how it should be treated in the future. And we would certainly reserve the right to do that given the representations that were made today that other parties were not in a position to address it or had questions about its relevance.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Certainly. All right. Thank you. Anything further from counsel?

MR. THOMPSON: Are you going to be expecting a brief arguing the evidence? I mean, we put our evidence in. Obviously we have one view of what that evidence shows and they have a different view of what the evidence shows. Wouldn't you like written argument on that?

JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'm going to take the easy way out and defer that to Judge Jones since this is his case and I'm just kind of filling in at the last minute. I -- I'm trying to get out of the way as fast as I can so I -- so I don't mess things up.

MR. THOMPSON: We could send copies to

you too, Judge, if you continue to retain an interest in this matter.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: That's very kind of you.

MR. PENDERGAST: Just so the record's clear on that score though, I believe we would request the opportunity to do that. So when you bring it to Judge Jones's attention, at least from our perspective, we'd like to.

MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. We'd like that opportunity as well.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: I see no problem with it. I'm just trying to get out of the way.

MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you, Judge.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: You're welcome. Anything further from counsel?

MR. THOMPSON: No, Judge.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Commissioner Kenney, anything further?

COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No. Thank you very much. Thank you all for indulging me participating by phone.

MR. PENDERGAST: Thank you.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you, Commissioner.

If there's nothing further -- all right, thank you very much, we will go off the record.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you.

(Exhibit Nos. 1 through 5 were marked for
identification.)

(Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned.)

EXHIBITS INDEX

	MARKED	REC' D
Exhibit No. 1 Recommendation	358	352
Exhibit No. 2 Letter to Mr. Reed from Mr. Pendergast dated 2/4/09	358	353
Exhibit No. 3 Letter to Mr. Thompson and Ms. Shemwell from Mr. Pendergast dated 11/9/09	358	354
Exhibit No. 4 Letter to Mr. Niehoff from Mr. Pendergast dated 10/18/10	358	355
Exhibit No. 5 Letter to Mr. Pendergast from Mr. Niehoff from 10/26/10	358	355

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Tracy Thorpe Taylor, CCR No. 939, within the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the testimony appearing in the foregoing matter was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witnesses 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 matter 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.

Tracy T Taylor, CCR

Tracy Thorpe Taylor, CCR

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

EXHIBITS INDEX

	MARKED	REC'D
Exhibit No. 1 Recommendation	358	352
Exhibit No. 2 Letter to Mr. Reed from Mr. Pendergast dated 2/4/09	358	353
Exhibit No. 3 Letter to Mr. Thompson and Ms. Shemwell from Mr. Pendergast dated 11/9/09	358	354
Exhibit No. 4 Letter to Mr. Niehoff from Mr. Pendergast dated 10/18/10	358	355
Exhibit No. 5 Letter to Mr. Pendergast from Mr. Niehoff from 10/26/10	358	355

<p><u>0</u> 0006 338:14 05 263:3 06 263:4</p> <hr/> <p><u>1</u> 1 330:6 348:20 352:12,18,19 354:19 358:3 360:3,25 10 330:7 10,000 318:14 10/18/10 360:9 10/26/10 360:11 100 279:2 305:6 333:16 100,000 313:22 314:1 10K 330:1 11/9/09 360:7 14th 258:15 15 330:7 344:10 1520 249:3 18th 294:4 346:14 354:15</p> <hr/> <p><u>2</u> 2 348:22 353:9,14,21, 23 360:4 2/4/09 360:5 2:45 343:24 344:18 2001 253:25 262:25 265:11 266:13 268:1 271:24 274:22 280:18 302:3 326:23 337:10 2002 262:25 2004 263:14 2004-2005</p>	<p>248:15 250:5 2005-2006 250:5 2007 263:8 266:15 2009 333:21 346:9,10,12 353:10 354:1 2010 248:7 250:9 258:15 259:24 266:16 346:14,17 352:7 354:15,19 355:4 20th 274:10 329:24 21st 346:10 2230 249:6 240-40.016 264:21 25th 315:4 26th 346:17 355:4</p> <hr/> <p><u>3</u> 3 353:25 354:7,10,12 360:6 3:05 344:18 30th 283:13 351:20 352:4,7 354:19 314.342.0533 249:4 31st 351:24 352 360:3 353 360:5 354 360:7 355 360:9,11 358 360:3,5,7,9, 11 360 249:10 250:17 365 317:10 3rd 259:24</p>	<p><u>4</u> 4 248:7 264:21 354:14,20,25 355:1 360:8 42 257:17 4D 264:22 4th 250:8 304:21 346:8 353:10</p> <hr/> <p><u>5</u> 5 248:9 257:17 260:2 355:3,8,15,1 7 358:3 360:10 573.751.5558 249:7 573.751.8700 249:11</p> <hr/> <p><u>6</u> 63101 249:3 250:24 65101 249:11 65102 249:7 250:18</p> <hr/> <p><u>7</u> 7 330:6 720 249:3 250:24</p> <hr/> <p><u>9</u> 9/1808 293:17 939 248:24 359:4 9th 346:12 354:1</p> <hr/> <p><u>A</u> ability 331:17 344:4 359:8 able 281:14 288:16 289:21 343:19 absolutely</p>	<p>275:18 279:14 280:8 287:14 289:6 308:11 310:4,24 325:23 332:15 334:24 335:23 338:24 343:17 absorbing 341:21 ACA 263:24 285:12,21 308:25 338:2 access 286:5 291:8 accordance 253:22 264:8 302:15 according 324:22 327:20 accurate 294:11 295:4 345:9 accurately 294:19 accuse 270:3 acknowledge 270:5,9 acquisition 315:5 action 254:13 264:10 359:11,15 actual 316:10 actually 252:1 257:11 258:17 259:1,25 add 341:25 addition 265:16 additional 259:17 273:25 277:6 287:19,24 346:18 Additionally 345:17</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>address 250:23 259:3 303:7 318:2 321:6,15,20 323:1 329:5 334:19 342:3 351:3 356:6,10</p> <p>addressed 255:14 321:18</p> <p>addresses 350:3</p> <p>addressing 324:16</p> <p>adequately 259:10</p> <p>adhered 279:11</p> <p>adjourned 358:5</p> <p>adjustment 248:15 250:4</p> <p>administer 277:21</p> <p>admitted 352:18 353:22 354:11,25 355:16</p> <p>advance 297:8</p> <p>advise 254:9 255:1</p> <p>advised 254:23</p> <p>advising 352:1</p> <p>advocating 286:21</p> <p>affected 329:13</p> <p>affiliate 253:19,23 254:18,22 256:5 260:6 262:21 263:7,11 264:19,20 266:4,6 269:4 271:23 272:3 273:15 274:1 286:4,13,25</p>	<p>287:1,3,4,11 ,12 288:10,15,22 ,24 289:19 292:11 293:4,6,8 298:3 299:9 302:14 303:22 304:25 306:13 307:6,10 311:12 314:2,4 315:9 318:9 328:22 335:15 337:13 338:19,23 346:25</p> <p>affiliates 288:19</p> <p>affirmative 329:7</p> <p>afield 269:3</p> <p>afternoon 250:1,8,14</p> <p>afterwards 350:25</p> <p>against 252:20 298:25</p> <p>age 337:9</p> <p>agencies 299:23</p> <p>agency 299:18 300:2</p> <p>aggregation 317:21</p> <p>ago 274:10 277:14 291:7</p> <p>agreeable 325:6 343:4</p> <p>agreed 255:21 268:21 269:6,15,16 284:24 286:11 291:7 295:13 306:24,25 326:24 349:25</p> <p>agreeing 269:17</p>	<p>284:22</p> <p>agreement 253:5,16 265:10 268:2,15 269:1,6 271:24 273:17 280:18,20 294:2,10 313:12 326:23 333:20 343:20 344:25 346:4 347:10</p> <p>Agriculture 304:16</p> <p>ahead 253:6,8,11,1 8 254:3,5,25 255:10,16 256:1,2,9,12 ,16,20 258:12 260:17 263:23,25 264:7,13 267:6,14,17, 18,23 269:1,7 270:25 271:4 272:4 273:18 274:17 277:3,6,12 280:12 281:10 285:24 286:14 288:17,19 297:7,17 298:9 299:7 300:1 302:9 306:16,17,19 ,24,25 307:3 309:4,8,9,12 ,20 311:11,18,24 312:14 317:22 318:2,8,11 321:2,6,13,1 4,20 324:9,13,14, 19 326:9,22 327:1 328:24 329:5 331:6,8,17,2</p>	<p>5 335:4 336:24,25 340:10,21 341:14 345:19 347:25 350:16,20</p> <p>alike 340:17</p> <p>Allee 259:10 295:21 345:1</p> <p>allegations 323:24</p> <p>alleged 270:25 290:1</p> <p>alleging 312:23</p> <p>Alley 259:13</p> <p>alliance 319:6</p> <p>Allocation 253:2 265:13 302:4 337:19</p> <p>allow 306:16 307:5 329:5</p> <p>allowed 253:18 268:5 290:24 291:15 311:4 317:15</p> <p>alone 350:21</p> <p>already 257:24 263:9 264:4 265:3 268:9 273:11 275:21 296:6 300:9 306:8 308:9,20 322:14,17 331:19 335:16 347:21,22</p> <p>alternative 266:22</p> <p>am 251:13 258:10 259:21 262:10 359:9,12</p> <p>Ameren 297:24</p> <p>among 252:17 339:8</p> <p>amount 296:22 297:12</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>314:10 316:13 317:9 analogous 316:25 analogy 304:10 analysis 287:9,11 analyze 291:1 anew 282:14 297:8 346:16 Anne 295:20 345:1 annual 253:12 254:17 256:18 annually 260:5 answer 262:14 281:14,22 286:17 293:3 304:6 322:22 334:8 answers 348:22 anybody 257:21 320:13 342:25 anyone 279:12 303:23 anything 286:18 289:11,12 303:5 311:10 314:9 320:3,7 327:21 332:6 336:16 341:24 343:1,10 344:19 351:1 356:13 357:14,18 apart 279:14 apologize 251:11 255:17 295:25 301:18 315:19 apology 269:24</p>	<p>316:24 apparently 266:13 304:19 355:6 appeal 280:7 appearance 250:11 251:9 appearing 250:22 251:5 359:6 appears 353:12 354:2,17 355:5 appellate 297:25 apples 304:24 319:11,12 applicable 253:24 254:19 256:2 263:13 264:3 apply 289:20 338:20 appointed 304:14 appreciate 269:20,23 275:20 282:21 341:22 approach 286:20 approached 297:17 appropriate 261:22,23 262:15 270:15 271:7 277:13,14,15 ,21 296:23 297:13,19 307:17,20 308:16 336:21 356:5 approval 260:8 265:2,7,8,9, 25 302:12 347:5 approve 267:6,15 344:5</p>	<p>approved 252:23 253:5,16 256:8 265:11,22 266:7 267:1 290:11,15 301:24 302:2,13,16, 18,20 317:21 333:12,13,21 344:7 approximately 263:3 area 306:5 319:7,8 aren't 308:14 332:2 argue 287:25 326:21 332:22 351:7 argued 266:23 arguing 333:4 341:1 350:10 356:15 argument 251:19 255:7 292:10,13,20 301:21,22 302:1 304:9 307:1 310:11 314:8 326:13,18 327:8,9,21 330:24 333:1 336:11 356:1,19 arguments 336:12,13,14 341:3 arisen 339:7,8 arose 264:25 arrange 299:4 arranged 277:5 282:9 295:12 Aside 337:7 aspect 269:5 aspects 263:15,17 assertion 258:25</p>	<p>350:11 assertions 258:23 assess 252:15 assessed 318:12 assigned 250:7 251:12 assume 320:13 assumes 288:22 assuming 257:23 320:11 343:10 assured 263:22 astray 315:19,23 Atmos 286:24 293:7 311:15 314:21 341:4 Atmos-like 315:24 attached 351:18 352:3 attachment 283:10 293:14 345:1,2 347:21 348:13 351:16 352:6 353:12 354:17,19 attempt 323:13,18 attempted 281:10 attention 255:9 266:15 309:5,7 331:21 357:7 attorney 249:2 359:13 audit 254:17 311:11,12 audited 252:24 254:16 auditing</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>313:21 August 275:1 351:24 augustine 326:2 authority 269:18 270:23 326:3 authorized 256:3 available 271:5 272:16 281:12 282:19 average 290:20 aware 261:14 266:9 away 266:18 287:5 293:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <hr/> <p>background 326:7,9,10 base 309:5 317:8,24 318:13 319:14,15,22 ,24 based 258:14 276:8 277:7 290:7,16,17 302:21 306:2 307:3,4 308:10 317:12 318:17 324:21 325:8 326:24 327:6,10 333:22 334:17 335:1 basic 270:4 basically 297:25 346:9 basis 253:12 254:17 259:2,8 265:20 269:7 287:19,24 312:16 327:11 337:3,21</p>	<p>339:9 349:16 became 254:19 263:13 266:9 268:13 bedrock 279:17 beforehand 347:2 begin 263:16 beginning 250:12 behalf 250:20,23 251:2,5 belabor 303:14 333:19 believe 253:8 256:4 259:5 262:24 276:19 280:11 281:19 282:16 284:5,10 286:10 297:13,18 298:10 308:11,24 324:4 328:5,15,18 329:13 333:9,10 338:11 344:21 347:22 349:19 350:22 357:5 believed 296:23 352:2 356:5 believes 267:21 295:1 336:21 belong 280:24 296:15,18,20 bench 303:13 320:4 321:22 344:19 benchmark 290:12 best 316:9 359:8</p>	<p>better 290:14 314:25 340:11 beyond 299:4 308:20 309:16 351:6 bid 316:9 bidder 311:16 bidding 290:8 311:16 bigger 278:1,10,23 280:11 bit 287:15 blanche 273:10 blanket 292:10 blanks 349:1 blind 342:23 board 299:4 bottom 260:3,15 bought 288:4,6,7 289:14,15,19 291:19 310:5 311:1 313:22 314:1,5,6,10 box 249:6,10 250:17 348:24 boxes 293:23 BP 318:18 319:3 BP/Amoco 317:13 break 343:19 344:18 brethren 265:1 brief 255:13 259:23 262:13 264:19 324:5,6,17,2 3 326:4 351:17 356:15 bring 257:22 266:14</p>	<p>323:16 345:15 357:6 British 314:7 broad-based 279:9 broader 262:17 brought 262:12 271:19 317:14 353:1 building 250:9 305:14 bunch 256:2 business 250:23 286:25 302:10 318:15 buy 304:22 305:18 313:25 314:24 315:5 316:12,13,20 317:23 buyers 318:5 buying 304:23 305:10,19 309:2,3 316:3,14 317:19 319:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>CAM 252:22 253:8,23,24 254:11,12,16 ,20,24 255:5 256:4,16 257:11 259:4,9,11,1 6 260:5,8,24 261:2 263:6,10,14, 15,17 264:1,3,9,11 ,24 265:2,18 266:4,5,10,2 4 267:1,4,15,1 6 268:23 269:3 270:13 271:19 274:2,25 279:1 280:20</p>
---	--	--	---

284:15	310:23	340:16,19,24	clarification
285:4,18	311:3,15	341:17 342:9	320:19
286:2,9	313:10	challenged	clarified
287:17,19	314:9,21	272:20,22	286:23
288:1,6,10	316:23	challenges	clarify
289:2,13	317:3,7,11,1	339:1	301:21
291:15,18	5 321:19	chance 322:7	337:25
292:6 299:9	322:2,15	325:20 326:9	clarity 339:3
301:22,25	323:3,8,9	change	CLAYTON
302:3,9,10,1	330:15	341:13,18,19	248:20 320:5
2,15,20	333:15	changes	337:6,12,17
303:2 305:1	336:18	254:21	338:15,22,25
306:17,18	338:2,4,10,1	changing	339:12,16
308:4,23	4 341:4	291:4	340:16,24
310:2,14	342:5,19,24	chart 283:12	341:17 342:9
318:10,11	349:15	293:20	clean 348:8
320:21 321:6	352:8,9	cheaper	clear 276:20
322:1,8	356:22	317:22	278:13
323:2,7,14,1	cases 250:2	Chief 249:9	279:18
6,24	261:14,17	choose 276:7	283:18,23
325:7,17,20,	266:17	churn 341:10	324:25 328:4
25 326:12,15	325:21 337:8	circuit	348:14 350:9
327:6,22	342:4	270:24	353:9 357:5
328:4,21	catch-all	271:13	clearly
332:6,8,13,1	285:19	299:12 301:8	293:11
6,23	CCR 248:24	322:18	301:24
333:5,11,20,	359:4,18	328:17	clock 343:24
23 334:13,21	central 329:1	331:2,7	close 283:19
344:5,7	certain	335:8,18	302:12
347:4,5	282:3,4	341:5 351:23	closer 265:23
349:21,22	284:20 295:7	circular	closest 265:9
350:5,23	324:25	289:24	cloudy 314:18
356:6	326:14	circumstance	code 254:8,9
CAMS 264:7	330:24	282:16 288:3	314:13
CAM's 255:8	346:16,22	300:7 309:1	coherently
capabilities	certainly	311:3	346:4
299:23	257:6,9	circumstances	column 293:18
capacity	261:22,23	288:3 291:18	294:9,11,18,
305:6	262:13	297:3,4	19
care 288:5	266:21	307:23	comes 265:23
314:6,7	271:7,16	308:3,13,14	309:19
cart 273:10	273:6 281:11	310:1,5,14,1	311:17
case 250:7	323:1 324:16	6 311:1	coming 338:9
253:17 260:3	336:20	City 248:8	342:24
261:4 263:9	340:13	249:7,11	comment 317:5
270:1 271:24	343:17 347:6	250:10,17	322:4 346:21
280:18	348:11	civil 327:10	347:12
286:24	356:8,12	329:23	comments
287:20	CERTIFICATE	claimed	270:13
288:4,13,14	359:2	324:16	347:13
289:5,6,9	certify 359:5	claims 334:20	Commission
293:3,7	Chairman		
295:15	248:20 320:5		
297:24	337:6,12,17		
299:11	338:15,22,25		
301:16 306:5	339:12,14,16		
308:12			

248:1 249:12	264:24	309:24	298:1,4,8
250:13,17	301:22 303:2	310:7,10	299:11,20
251:23,24	commissioner	311:2,21	304:11,19
252:23	257:2,5,7,10	312:1,5,9,15	companies
253:5,16	,14,20	,20,23	298:2 338:21
255:7,18	258:1,2,6,8,	313:1,8,11,1	346:23
256:8,9,22	9,12 259:19	8 315:15,22	company 249:4
257:19,24	260:21	316:24	250:20,23
258:18,20,21	261:1,8,16,1	318:16,21	255:14
,24	9 262:11,18	319:1,5,9,18	265:12,16
259:3,8,12,1	263:1 264:16	,23 320:1	268:11,13
5,16 260:4,7	265:4 266:3	326:11	270:25
261:5,6	267:10,24	327:2,5,13	274:22
262:2,3,8	268:1,4,14,2	328:3,12	277:3,5
265:7,8,11,1	0	329:2,9,16,1	281:5 296:16
7,22,25	269:9,12,19,	9,25	298:9 300:3
266:2,7,24	23 270:14	330:2,12,16,	302:4 305:20
267:1,4,6,9,	271:2,6,11,1	23	311:9 345:24
21 268:18	5	331:10,14,22	346:1
270:19	272:10,19,23	332:5,9,12,1	353:2,3,11
271:17	273:5 274:6	7	354:1,15
272:10,16	275:4,10,13,	333:9,14,24	company's
273:7,12	15,24	334:22	250:4 253:1
274:9,15	276:2,6,10,1	335:5,10,16,	comparable
275:3,5,21,2	9 277:16,23	23 336:5,19	319:3
5	278:5,8,12,1	337:4	compared
276:8,14,22,	6,19,22,24	340:14,17,18	319:15
23 277:25	279:23	343:22 344:2	compartmental
279:4,5,10,1	280:2,8	348:9,12,20,	izing 277:18
7,19 280:4	281:13	25	compel 284:2
281:12,17,18	282:3,20,24,	349:3,8,13,2	293:17 294:4
,20	25	0,25	300:20
282:12,19	283:1,4,5,7,	350:6,8,15	301:11
286:16	12,17	351:5,9	competitive
290:12	284:8,12	357:17,19,23	290:8,23
292:16 293:2	285:3,7,10,1	commissioners	309:5
300:20	4	248:22	310:1,15,19
301:6,23,24	287:7,16,22	261:11	311:16 318:6
302:2,12,16,	289:1,8,23	262:13 270:3	complaint
18 303:20,24	290:24	315:21 336:9	306:23
312:9 315:18	291:11,12,21	commissions	338:13
321:11,18	292:2,8,18,2	270:10	complete
322:14,17	3 293:12,22	341:22	294:18 303:1
323:11	294:1,7,8,15	Commission's	345:6 348:23
324:8,17	,17,25	254:18	completed
325:20 326:7	295:3,17,18,	258:14	263:9 324:20
327:3,11	20,23	266:15 267:9	completely
328:7 332:4	296:11,17,25	269:4,18	274:23
333:12	297:20	271:1 272:13	308:22
334:15	298:12,15,16	274:4,22	311:10 324:9
335:3,8	299:2	277:10	compliance
336:21	300:4,16,17	302:13	268:23
337:25	301:2,3,7,9,	320:24	271:17 272:6
338:18	14,17	322:10 323:9	278:23
342:16,22	302:21,24	327:25 328:1	
343:2 351:24	303:4,8,13,1	329:8,23	
352:1	4 304:4,5,7	338:1 346:10	
Commission-	307:11,13,15	common	
approved	308:1,10		

281:18 285:4,18 286:5 288:6,9 289:2,13 303:1 325:25 339:9 complied 262:1,7 271:4,9 274:3,4 275:7,16,18 278:3,6 279:8,21,24 280:1,5,12 281:7 282:2,13 287:17,18,25 315:18 322:10 325:11 328:11 329:10 330:20 331:15 333:10 334:2 339:24 350:17 352:2 comply 254:10,12 264:6,13 270:11,25 271:12 276:8 278:2 281:20 284:1 329:12 333:25 336:25 component 254:3 comport 264:10 comporting 340:9 conceivably 299:5 concern 304:2,18 305:17 concerned 303:24 304:25 305:1 306:11 316:9 320:21 concerns 263:2,6	280:11 316:7 concluded 342:5 concoct 309:15 concur 260:22 conduct 254:8,9 conducting 255:22 340:9 confirm 342:19 connection 285:24 consider 282:13,14 297:8 338:19 346:15 considered 281:25 consistency 263:6 consistent 254:22 256:4 263:16 266:2 274:1,2 290:4,6,10 306:7 346:24 consolidated 257:17 contemplates 298:4 contempt 301:7 contention 302:25 contested 338:5 context 268:20 269:16 284:21 contingent 285:1 continue 253:11 338:8 357:1 contract 316:1,4,7,10 ,14 319:11,14	contrast 287:1 control 273:22,24 284:7,9,19 296:12,14 298:19 300:24 311:25 334:10 345:12 349:11,17 350:13 conversation 336:23 cooperate 296:21 340:13 cooperative 299:1 coordinated 297:1 copies 259:23 267:8 356:25 copy 257:18 313:6 corporate 298:5 corporation 268:9 corporations 264:23 correct 252:6,7 262:12 270:20 271:9 276:3 284:23 285:8 289:3 300:22 309:24 320:14 323:19 325:4 335:20 346:2 348:16 349:2,6,7,11 ,12 351:16 353:5 355:11 correctly 355:7 Cost 253:2 265:13 302:4 337:19 counsel 249:6,8,9,10	250:12 251:3,5,8,15 255:21 322:17 323:20 337:23 346:15 355:6 356:1,13 357:15 359:10,13 Counsel's 256:18 counterclaim 293:3 couple 257:2,7 273:13 286:23 course 274:21 286:17 297:15 298:3 299:25 334:22 335:5 court 248:24 263:13 270:24 271:13 299:12,25 300:25 301:5,8 322:18 325:7,23 328:17 331:2,7 335:8,18,24 341:5 347:16 351:23 courts 272:24 covered 294:4 created 349:23 criteria 306:20 critically 260:4 cross- subsidizati ons 253:9 crucial 328:25 331:18 CSR 264:21 current
--	--	--	---

272:11 custody 273:23,24 284:6 300:24 311:25 345:12 customer 253:19 customers 253:9 316:16 cut 262:10	305:11,12,20 ,25 306:1,2,7,21 309:6 317:12 318:13 dealing 307:9 316:1 deals 306:7 December 253:25 decide 274:6 276:7,16 298:21 304:21 331:19 343:2 decided 271:20 272:11 273:4 275:15,25 276:22 291:9 308:9 328:21 331:19,22 335:1 decides 270:18 333:5 334:17 335:9 deciding 271:7 272:8 decision 270:18,19 297:25 323:9,11 324:18 329:8 decision's 272:19 declined 350:20 declining 346:18 deems 272:16 deep 287:9 deeply 303:23 defense 268:17 269:13 284:18 345:11,14 350:17 defenses 329:7 defer 356:21 deferred	328:23 definitions 258:3 definitively 289:6 degree 334:16 delivered 317:9 deliveries 317:16 319:8,9 delivery 318:4 demonstrate 289:21 318:5,8 336:10 demonstrated 290:3,5 317:24 department 254:17 299:15,17 departments 304:17 department's 304:12 depend 349:21 depending 334:17 depends 326:20 deputy 249:6,10 304:14,15,16 describing 355:7 desire 321:4 340:21 detail 279:16 324:17 detailed 293:18 294:9,12 determination 258:22 273:8 275:22 292:11 296:5 303:11 308:8 312:10 321:19 322:9	324:21 325:8,11,16, 21 329:17,20,22 330:8 333:15 334:3,9 335:17 336:6,9,18 340:11 349:21 determination s 273:13 290:25 328:13 determination 's 273:11 determine 254:5 262:1,6 271:8 279:24 287:12 297:6 306:19 330:3 334:2,7 336:17 349:14 determined 253:17 279:7 286:7 297:3,6 322:15 determines 256:22 determining 275:5 285:4 290:12 306:20 309:13 detrimental 253:10 developed 256:17 309:2 Development 304:15 dickens 339:21 difference 317:10 differences 272:15 different 255:4,25 264:15 267:7,13 286:8 289:20
---	--	---	--

290:22 291:6,25 296:16 298:9 305:6 307:5,9 308:13 314:16,21 317:2 327:21 341:22 353:1 356:17 differs 315:7 difficult 324:9 340:3 dig 309:8 direct 253:4 256:12 267:14 directed 258:16 264:7 283:25 284:4 350:16 351:25 directing 258:15 direction 359:9 directly 267:20 281:25 297:17 311:13 324:3 director 299:21 304:15,16 directors 297:21 298:1,5,8 299:11 304:11 disagree 273:9 280:6 294:6 326:1 349:25 disagreement 323:21 324:2 325:1 342:14,16 disallowance 288:17 325:22 disciplinary 254:13 264:10	disclosed 314:20 disconnected 292:7 discovery 251:14 273:19,20 274:12 281:12 322:10 325:12,24 327:11 329:23 335:10,13,14 337:1 346:11 discrimination 288:23 discuss 259:7,14 283:14 347:1 discussing 285:20 discussion 296:4 337:12 338:2 discussions 282:8 disjunct 286:20 dismissed 313:9 dispositive 267:17 dispute 251:14 264:25 335:11,14 349:5 disputes 262:6 338:9 dissent 275:24 distant 350:3 diversity 288:9 division 299:21 docket 274:23 338:4 339:6 342:8 docum 333:25 document	255:20 259:22 266:1 267:8 283:8,9 293:15 294:20 295:21 296:1 326:15,16 327:7 334:1,3 335:25 348:13 352:12 documentation 269:1 documents 251:25 258:16,25 268:17,18 272:12 273:8 275:6 276:3,7,16,2 3 277:1,4,6 280:13,23,24 281:4 283:21 284:19,20 293:17,19,24 294:2,3,9,12 295:7,10,11, 12 296:7,15,17, 19 297:2,3 298:17,18 300:8,9,12,1 3,19 301:10 303:21 312:10,12 322:20 326:14 327:3 330:22,24 331:23 332:9,18,24 333:5 334:4 335:17 345:7 347:20 349:4,18 dog 305:9 done 261:21 267:19 275:19 277:9 284:25 290:8 302:6 306:1 310:20 313:17 317:12 322:21 328:6 330:15 337:1,2,5	339:9 351:1 dual 339:20 duly 359:6 duty 298:11 <hr/> E earlier 297:7 309:25 323:15 336:23 earn 287:3 earned 293:8 easy 356:21 Economic 304:15 effect 276:14 279:20 288:21 333:7 effective 254:19 effects 253:10 effort 344:14 efforts 340:2 egregious 256:13 eight 274:10 277:8,14 291:7 either 262:24 271:17 311:13 327:22,24 328:6 334:8,9 341:15 346:1 348:22 349:21 elements 267:2 302:7,8 else 274:25 279:13 280:25 289:12 303:5 308:5 309:9 315:1 344:19 employed 359:10,13 employee 359:13
---	--	---	---

employees 254:10,11,15	280:16 296:9 305:15 308:5 324:21	351:15 352:6,12,18, 19,23	<hr/> F <hr/>
encompass 285:20	332:3,7 345:11	353:9,14,21, 23,25	face 254:12
enforce 312:14,17	350:17	354:7,10,12, 14,18,20,25	facing 281:8
enforced 300:21	everywhere 339:17	355:1,3,8,15 ,17 358:3	fact 264:12 271:15 275:2
enforcement 273:16 339:10	evidence 320:7 342:6,17 343:14	360:3,4,6,8, 10	282:2 291:4 294:3 299:22 305:13 324:15 328:20 330:20 331:19 349:15,17
engage 285:11	344:20 345:16 347:19,23	exhibits 351:11,14 355:19,23 360:1	factors 288:12 302:22 307:21 313:14
ensure 268:22	352:20 353:24 354:13	exist 268:5	failed 254:12
enter 251:8	355:2,18,23 356:1,15,16, 17,18	existing 337:8	failure 270:25
entire 282:8	evidentiary 248:6 251:21 252:13,14 282:7,13 301:7 341:5 343:20	exists 339:6,22	facts 291:18
entirely 307:4 327:20 346:24	exactly 256:16 265:20 285:9 288:25 307:22 315:13,16 322:21 340:18 351:12	expectation 320:16	factual 322:9
entitled 259:22 262:14 328:16 333:22	example 270:7 286:22 289:14,15 291:24 313:22	expected 345:8	fair 254:5,6 289:20,22 306:21 309:6 314:25 315:1,7,15 317:17 318:23 321:4 326:8
entity 268:10 281:1	examples 261:17 291:19,22	expecting 315:12 356:15	fairly 296:22
entries 250:11	excellent 265:5	expeditions 261:12	faith 340:22
essence 303:19	excessively 328:19	expensive 289:15	falls 279:14
essential 326:13	excuse 251:15 352:6 353:2	explain 295:9 332:10	familiar 282:1
establish 255:21 271:25 272:2	excuses 327:17	explanation 305:4	fancy 272:3
established 309:12	executives 345:24	explanations 305:7 308:15 334:11	favor 271:20
establishing 252:14	exhibit	explicit 302:18	favorable 317:25 319:17
evaluated 252:24		explicitly 301:24	February 346:8 353:10
eventual 261:4		express 259:25	feel 281:23
everybody 256:10 261:12 283:5 294:10		extension 338:21	fell 291:18
everything 260:22 265:18 266:6 274:25 275:19		extent 265:8 268:20 284:5 300:23 311:24 332:1 335:22 349:9	ferret 256:2

<p>fiduciary 298:1,10</p> <p>fight 278:17</p> <p>figure 284:13</p> <p>file 248:14 250:3 251:12 257:24 266:11,14 342:20 347:4 350:2,25 351:25</p> <p>filed 254:19 256:18 263:14 283:9,13 308:4 315:4 338:11 351:19,24 352:3</p> <p>filing 258:15 356:4</p> <p>filling 251:13 356:22</p> <p>final 300:4 303:10 304:8 321:18 325:7,21</p> <p>finally 315:3,6</p> <p>financially 331:7 359:14</p> <p>fine 259:21 265:19 276:20 317:17 325:5 327:18 336:22 343:8</p> <p>firm 353:4,6</p> <p>first 263:8 293:14 294:2 314:16 316:2 320:13,14 331:2 343:11 344:25 348:14 349:4,5</p> <p>fishing 261:12</p> <p>five 255:23 293:23 294:2 336:8</p> <p>five-minute</p>	<p>343:19</p> <p>fixed 316:15</p> <p>Flattery 339:16</p> <p>flying 342:23</p> <p>focus 262:15 296:1</p> <p>focused 261:6 269:21</p> <p>folks 321:5</p> <p>follow-up 307:12</p> <p>forbidden 303:21</p> <p>force 279:20</p> <p>foregoing 359:6</p> <p>forgive 292:8 315:25</p> <p>forth 253:13 254:1 256:19 280:9 306:6 339:24</p> <p>forward 251:19 253:10 265:17 267:2 282:21 342:2</p> <p>forward- looking 338:6</p> <p>foundation 279:17</p> <p>frankly 258:19 269:25 272:8 282:6 286:19</p> <p>fraught 298:20</p> <p>free 264:14 277:10,12 298:9</p> <p>freely 298:4</p> <p>front 260:10 293:23 301:8 316:13,15</p> <p>frustrated 256:11</p> <p>frustrating 255:19 264:15 270:9</p>	<p>341:20</p> <p>frustration 270:6,7</p> <p>full 291:8 301:1 324:20</p> <p>fully 259:6 266:2 274:4 280:3 330:20</p> <p>function 280:4 285:11</p> <p>functioning 285:8</p> <p>functions 285:19</p> <p>fundamentally 292:6</p> <p>furtherance 308:21</p> <p>future 342:4 350:3 356:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>ga 315:4</p> <p>game 255:22 256:7 277:18 291:4 321:4 340:8</p> <p>gas 248:15 249:4 250:4,20,23 253:18 262:1 264:23 268:13 270:24 277:3,4 281:5 286:13 287:4,10 288:5,6 289:14 290:6,13,17 291:20 293:7 304:22,23 305:10,18 309:2 310:5 311:1,9 313:23,24,25 314:5,10 315:5 316:3,18 317:8,15,19, 22 335:19 345:24 353:2,3,11 354:1,15</p>	<p>gathering 310:12</p> <p>GC2011 338:14</p> <p>general 270:11,12 273:19,20 274:11 279:9 285:7,11,19, 23 322:17 326:18 329:22</p> <p>generally 273:21 283:16 304:3</p> <p>gets 270:9 293:9 305:2 325:23</p> <p>getting 287:8 306:21 312:4 336:22</p> <p>gist 307:16</p> <p>given 277:4 291:19 305:13 324:15 330:6 332:25 347:6 350:17 356:8</p> <p>giving 295:15 324:13 331:10</p> <p>glancing 320:10</p> <p>going-forward 337:20 339:9</p> <p>gone 254:3 256:20 261:11 267:11 271:4 280:12 284:23 306:24 318:8 334:5,6</p> <p>governed 335:14</p> <p>government 314:23</p> <p>governmental 299:18</p> <p>governor 250:9 299:20</p> <p>GR-2005-0203 248:14 250:3</p> <p>GR-2006-0288</p>
--	---	---	--

250:3 granted 300:20 granting 284:2 great 262:4 303:4 340:16 greater 339:2 Group 268:12 GSIP 290:11,15 306:4 guess 251:16 266:20 284:12,13 285:15 296:23 304:18 305:17 321:9,21 323:8 324:1,24 326:21 328:3,10 333:8 342:18 352:1 guidance 321:21 338:7 guide 342:8 Gunn 248:21 261:19 268:1,4,14 269:9,12,19, 23 271:2,6,11,1 5 272:10,19,23 273:5 274:6 275:4,10,15 276:2,6,10,1 9 277:23 278:5,8,12,1 6,19,22 279:23 280:8 281:13 282:3,20,24 283:4 295:17 301:17 302:21,24 303:4,8 304:5 307:11,15 309:24 310:7,10 311:2,21	312:1,5,9,15 ,20,23 313:1,8,11,1 8 315:15 326:11 327:2,5,13 328:3,12 329:2,9,16,1 9,25 330:12,16,23 331:10,14,22 332:5,9,12,1 7 333:14,24 334:22 335:5,10,16, 23 336:5 337:4 343:22 guys 295:24 <hr/> H <hr/> hair 286:14,15 hand 310:13,18 330:9 339:21 340:1,6 hand- delivered 259:24 handed 347:20 happen 338:7 happened 305:24 307:22,24 323:10 happens 325:8 happy 259:4 267:18,23 282:18 302:5 303:6 324:11,12,13 hard 303:16 harshesht 270:2 hat 295:15 haven't 265:1,25 276:21 290:1 291:23 296:20 310:25 313:17 323:15 331:23	having 271:16 284:24 306:23,24 338:8 341:4 343:2 HC 283:9 heading 348:21 heads 315:21 hear 283:2 323:20 heard 291:23,25 296:6 hearing 248:6 250:2 251:10,14,21 252:2,13,14 258:22 259:6 260:13,17 261:2,4,25 262:16 270:16 271:16 278:25 280:25 282:7,13,22 292:17 296:2 297:8 301:1,8 303:7 321:16,25 325:1 328:17 329:4 331:5,6,9,11 ,17 341:1,5 342:13,14,15 344:6 347:3,18 352:17 353:21 354:10 355:15 358:5 hearings 340:24 heck 265:23 held 298:25 help 342:8 helpful 256:22 267:22 337:22 338:3 339:2 342:2,5	hereby 359:5 here's 265:12,15 266:24 267:16 304:8 305:8 herring 273:15,17 274:25 275:2 herrings 331:20 he's 304:22 high 295:15 316:13,20 higher 272:23 hold 301:1 holding 274:22 Honor 250:21 252:10 292:25 294:22 296:10 320:18 325:6 328:10 343:7 347:15 354:6 355:21,24 356:2 hope 255:18 286:16 298:25 334:19,20,25 hopefully 256:21 341:15 horizontally 293:16 hours 345:16 hypothetical 305:22 308:11 <hr/> I <hr/> I'd 270:22 idea 278:20 341:17,18,19 identical 354:18 identificatio n 352:13 353:10,15 354:8,20
---	---	---	---

355:4,8 358:4 identify 257:14 ignorance 292:9 315:25 ignore 274:23 337:21 ignoring 277:20 III 248:20 I'll 255:11 259:21 264:20 287:6 295:25 299:10 307:13 344:14 347:25 I'm 250:6 257:22 259:19,20 260:10,15 261:14,17,19 264:21,22 269:11,21 273:14,16,18 274:24 276:11 277:11 278:13,16,19 280:10 281:15,21 282:1 283:18 284:13 285:15,16 286:14 288:3,16 289:4 290:21 291:13,17 292:15,19,20 293:12 295:24 301:3,21 303:14,15 304:25 305:1 306:6 309:4,6,7,8, 24 310:23,24 312:17 314:7 315:22,23 320:1,11,15 321:21 322:13 323:20 324:11,12,13 ,25	325:1,5,13 327:9 328:4,10,19, 23 330:9,18,19 331:1 333:9 336:22 337:5 340:7 341:3 342:12,13,15 ,23 343:10,19 344:5,6 347:18 348:14,19 350:8,9 351:16 355:7 356:20,22,23 357:12 impacts 334:13 implement 265:18 implicitly 301:25 implies 264:18 important 254:10 260:4 313:16 321:17 340:7 impression 266:9 304:9,20 316:6 320:25 improve 339:9 imprudence 310:3 imprudent 287:21,25 288:7 289:13 313:24 inability 341:11 inappropriate 309:3 in-camera 283:14 include 265:14 302:7,9 included 254:4 265:15 including	254:13 255:20 341:3 inconsistent 256:5 286:8 308:22 indeed 333:13 independent 290:25 313:2 independently 276:15,21 index 306:4 360:1 indicate 295:14 333:19 indicated 252:14 254:3 255:3 297:7 333:21 346:6 348:16 indicates 300:7 333:20 indication 302:15 indirectly 311:14 indulgence 282:21 indulging 357:20 industrial 336:13 inexpensive 288:8 information 252:18,25 256:2 268:21,22 269:7,14,17 272:1,5 273:22,23,25 274:13,18 282:10,15,17 284:6,22,24 286:5,10 297:9,12,14, 18 299:4,16,18, 19 300:1 308:19 309:6,16 310:12 313:16	320:22 321:23,24 329:14 333:18,21 334:5 346:16,19 initial 320:24 324:5,7 inordinately 316:12 inquire 251:11 260:17 inquiries 271:8 inquiry 262:11 289:2,5,7 307:20 310:15 311:14 312:21 313:2 321:2 327:14 instance 282:6 316:11 321:12 instances 281:6,7 282:3,4,6 instead 348:3 instructed 264:12 322:17,19 intended 326:6 intention 345:14 interest 357:1 interested 259:18 359:15 interject 280:19 interjected 320:20 336:4 internal 254:17 interpretatio n 339:1 349:22,23
---	--	--	---

interprets 338:18,20	351:8 356:6	352:11 353:13	350:24 351:9,21
interrupt 258:11 287:7	issued 258:20	I've 255:15	352:5,9,10,11,17,21,22,24,25
intervenor 336:13	issues 262:5	262:19 270:2	353:8,19,21,25
introduce 345:18 347:23	266:10	272:8 287:21	354:7,10,14,23,25
introduced 322:2 324:3	267:17	291:19,24	355:3,13,15,19,22,25
inure 293:5	271:18	313:8 330:6	356:12,20,21
inures 293:4	275:12,25	352:12 355:7	357:1,3,7,11,13,14,16,17,23 358:1,2
investigation 303:23,25	278:1,10	<hr/> J <hr/>	judged 318:12
investor- owned 279:12	279:2 301:10	January	judgment 301:5 316:17
involved 278:1 312:4	313:21 321:6	274:10	jurisdiction 279:13
involves 325:16	322:1,15	329:24	justice 277:22
irrelevant 264:13 269:2	324:2 329:6	346:10	<hr/> K <hr/>
310:15	331:18 337:7	JEFF 248:21	Ken 304:19
311:11	339:7 341:1	Jefferson	345:25
324:10	issue's	248:8	Kenney 248:22
325:25 326:2	297:23	249:7,11	275:13
isn't 279:11	it's 257:23	250:10,17	282:25
289:24,25	258:4 259:21	job 312:13	283:1,5,7,12,17 284:8,12
296:5 307:16	260:13	313:5	285:3,7,10,14
308:9 314:23	261:22	Jones 251:12	287:7,16,22
326:16 328:6	264:4,15	320:10	289:1,8,23
334:20	268:7	322:19,23	290:24
336:11	272:20,21,25	325:3 356:21	291:12,21
issue 256:23	273:15,17	Jones's	292:2,8,18,23
260:9	274:18,24	323:22 357:7	3 293:12,22
262:12,17	277:13,15	judge 248:20	294:1,8,15,17,25
263:8 265:3	280:4	250:1,7,15,19,25	295:3,18,20,23
266:19	284:8,12	9,25	296:11,17,25
269:21	285:3,17,24	251:7,11,20	297:20
270:10 273:3	286:12	252:5,8	298:12,15,16
275:16	287:2,15,25	256:24	299:2
277:20	288:5,14	257:1,4,6,9	300:4,17
279:3,4	293:16	282:24	301:3,9,14
282:9 283:20	294:11	283:3,6,24	316:24
285:16 303:7	298:20	292:15	348:9,12,25
307:8 317:6	299:20	300:20	349:3,8,13,20
321:15 323:7	300:23	303:12	0 350:6,8
324:18	302:5,16,17	307:3,4	351:5
329:1,6	305:7,11	311:21,23	357:18,19
333:13	307:19	312:10,24	Kevin 248:21
335:12 336:4	308:16	320:3,5,6,9,10,17	
341:9 347:4	311:24	322:3,6,12,19,23	
349:14 350:4	314:17	323:5,19,22	
	317:1,2	324:24 325:2	
	321:17 322:8	330:2 337:7	
	323:10	342:9,12	
	324:9,16	343:9,13,16,17,23	
	325:6	344:10,13,17,21,23 347:8	
	326:2,8,24	348:2,6,9,11,19 349:2	
	330:3 334:9		
	335:3,11,13,22 336:21		
	340:3,6		
	341:20,21		
	342:24		
	345:3,8		
	348:14,17		
	349:3,4,8,10		

249:9 250:15 326:3,5 346:22 kinds 309:15 334:11 knew 260:23 knowledge 263:7 304:17 Kumbaya 340:19 <hr/> L Tabet 351:11 353:9,14 Tabeled 352:12 355:8 labor 263:19 lack 268:16 270:4 Laclede 248:14 249:4 250:4,20,23 251:16,25 252:1,20,21 253:3,6,10,1 7 254:19 260:5,7 262:1 263:12,14 265:6,23 268:12,13,15 270:24 274:13,17 277:3,4 281:5 284:1,17 296:8,15 297:1,11,20 304:23 305:4,10,12, 18 311:9 312:6,11 313:22 314:12 315:5 318:18 319:21 321:24 322:20 323:13 330:21 331:25 334:6 335:19 337:23 338:20 345:2,17,22, 24 347:9	349:16 350:13 352:2,25 353:2,3,11 354:1,15 355:20 Laclede/LER 319:2 Laclede's 253:23 283:24 294:20 298:17 325:24 344:5 345:11 349:8,10 351:23 last 253:3 264:17 277:8 285:17 286:23 314:19 339:20 356:23 later 255:3,23 258:21 263:3 303:10 304:24 316:3 342:20,22 343:3 law 248:20 249:2 250:6 279:19 353:4,6 lawful 279:7,19 290:11 327:16 333:6 least 287:15 321:5 337:18 347:10 357:7 leave 251:12 led 315:18 left-hand 293:18 legal 268:9 281:1 299:23 312:24 legislature 317:21 legitimate 305:7 311:14 lengthy	267:22 297:10 LER 268:5,8 273:25 277:1,5 281:3,6,11,1 7 282:8 286:15 290:17 295:12 296:16,18,20 ,21,23 297:2,4,6,8, 20 298:18 304:20,22 305:5,10,19 311:7 313:9 314:2,6,12 315:5 317:15,18,20 318:1 319:16,21 337:10 345:24 346:15 349:23 350:19 353:7 355:7 Lera 249:10 250:15 LER's 268:17 281:18 290:7 298:16 313:11 315:5 less 290:18,19 326:2 let's 295:3 303:17 314:1 315:4 337:21 340:23 letter 346:8,13,17 353:4,11,12 354:1,15,17 355:4 360:5,7,9,11 letters 282:19 345:17 346:6 348:5,6 353:2,3 level 270:24 light 256:16 limit 321:22	336:21 limited 325:2 328:19 334:17 347:3 limiting 331:16,17 line 262:11 290:17 318:3 327:14 lines 281:16 321:13 list 251:24 252:3,4 258:16 259:7,8,14 293:19 294:9,12 296:20 322:20,22,25 344:25 352:3 listed 300:12 listen 336:11 listening 283:19 listing 302:8 litigating 339:21 340:4 litigation 337:21 little 256:11 277:20 287:8 347:2 live 309:14,20 320:11 LLC 248:24 load 317:8,24 318:13 319:14,15,22 ,24 location 289:16 long 325:6 longer 345:25 lot 265:23 288:4 306:5 321:16 339:12 341:7,21 351:2 Louis 249:3
---	--	--	--

250:24 290:7 317:16,18 319:7,8 low 311:16 lower 316:19 lowest 316:8	299:22 315:8 326:19 328:20 338:5 346:11 347:1 357:2 359:6,11	330:10 336:16 338:7 339:18,23 350:8 356:15	316:2,3,12 months 266:18 274:10 277:14 286:24 317:13
<hr/> M <hr/>	matters 255:15 347:24	meaningless 264:13	morass 267:23
main 306:23	may 257:1	means 267:7	motion 284:2
malpractice 312:24	259:24 260:12,16 270:6,7 271:19 275:17 279:25 281:14,21 302:25 303:16 304:9 309:18 310:2 313:23 327:18 333:2 342:5 344:22	328:21,22 336:16,17 341:12 345:4,5	293:17 294:4 301:11 350:2,25
management 306:11 307:17	mechanism 281:12	mechanisms 309:12,21	motions 284:1 300:19 342:20 347:4 356:4
mandamus 283:25 301:6	meet 316:3	mere 334:3	move 262:5 267:2 273:7 332:21
manipulating 309:18	merely 334:3	merits 341:9	moves 301:6
manner 255:14	mess 356:24	met 318:8,10	MRT 290:17 318:3
Manual 253:2 265:13 302:4 337:19	maybe 255:4 267:6 295:24 299:20 303:17 305:3,4 309:9 316:17 340:15 341:6 344:3	Michael 249:2 250:22	multi-month 305:25 306:1
MARC 249:6	mean 257:21	Mike 325:10 346:1	muted 344:14
March 263:14	258:3 260:9 264:25 265:2 266:8,11,12, 14,15 272:9 277:24 278:12 281:14 291:22 293:10 295:6,11 298:8,13 304:1,7,10,2 5 305:2,6,15,1 6 306:9 307:7 308:6,7 309:11,17 310:3 311:6,9,10,1 7 313:16 316:5,17,20, 21,22 319:11 324:8 325:10 326:17,20 327:18	mind 260:18	myself 346:14
Mark 251:4	meanings 260:4 261:10	mindful 260:4 261:10	<hr/> N <hr/>
marked 283:9 358:3 360:2	minds 340:16	mindful 260:4 261:10	namely 317:20
market 253:20 254:5,6 289:20,22 290:6,7 306:19 309:5,14 310:1,15 314:15,25 315:1,8 317:16,18 318:4,23	minor 279:15	minute 356:23	narrow 262:16 277:10,11,20 325:24 334:15 349:13
marketer 287:2	minutes 344:10	misconduct 270:3	narrowed 351:8
marketers 288:24	Missouri 248:2,8 249:3,7,11,1 2 250:10,16,18 ,24 257:16 263:13 299:14 359:5	misconduct 270:3	narrowing 277:13
marketing 264:20 266:5 315:9	mistaken 320:15	Missouri 248:2,8 249:3,7,11,1 2 250:10,16,18 ,24 257:16 263:13 299:14 359:5	nature 285:25 304:1 351:25
markup 290:18,20	modest 254:21	moment 315:23 343:15	necessarily 289:5 304:12
matter 248:14 250:3 258:21 269:2 275:2 290:23	month 318:14	month	necessary 252:21,25 253:8 268:22 272:6 286:5
			negotiation 340:22
			Neises 304:19 305:9 345:25
			neither 359:10

Niehoff 346:14,17 354:16 355:6 360:9,11	251:24 noting 320:20 notion 263:25 notwithstandi ng 280:10,21 November 248:7 250:8 304:21 346:12 354:1	261:23 offer 252:3 352:13,15 offered 300:25 306:3 351:13 353:17,18 354:4,21,22 355:10,12 offering 290:5 office 249:8 250:9,17 251:2,5 259:24 305:15 officer 299:20 304:19 officers 297:21 298:1,5,8 299:11 304:11 346:22 official 257:23 off-system 253:18 290:19 oh 269:6 343:22 okay 252:5 258:2,6 259:19 263:1 264:16 266:3 267:7,13 269:11 272:1 275:4,23 277:23 283:16 285:10,14 293:12 294:8 295:3 300:4 301:14 303:4 304:4 315:24 317:17 319:1 320:1 327:13,18 328:12 330:21 331:3,5 332:5,17 336:3 337:17,21	343:13 346:3 347:8 350:6 351:8,21 353:8 old 266:4 337:13,15 Olive 249:3 250:24 ones 298:22 one-year 306:1 ongoing 338:8 on-the- records 340:25 OPC 261:9 263:18 264:5 321:19 351:3 OPC's 336:13 operate 298:3 operating 252:21 253:3 266:1 277:8 opinion 260:13 272:14,15 opportunity 256:15 321:11 334:18 335:4,6 347:4,12 350:2 357:6,10 opposed 266:16 325:15 opposite 288:25 oral 251:19 255:7 341:3 oranges 304:25 319:12 order 252:14 258:15 259:2 262:2,3,8 266:2 271:1,17 272:11,16 274:4,9,12,1 9,22,25 275:1,3,6
	0 obey 336:24 object 269:7 323:8,15,18 326:24 objected 286:16 objection 269:16 284:18 347:14 353:20 354:9,23,24 355:14 objections 323:7 347:12 351:14 352:17 353:19 354:8 355:13 objective 306:20 obligation 282:18 obtained 260:7 obviously 266:3,12 282:7 338:9 356:16 occur 342:7 occurring 270:6 occurs 295:25 o'clock 250:8 343:25 344:13 October 315:4 346:14,17 354:15 355:4 offensive		

276:2,4,8,14 279:4 281:16 284:5,11 298:9 300:6 301:15 312:7,14,17, 18 313:2,3 314:14 320:10,12,24 321:1 322:11 323:23 324:8 325:12,24 327:3,16,20, 25 328:1 329:10,12,20 ,22,24 330:8,21 331:15 332:1,4,24 333:3,6,24 335:24 337:2,10 346:11,12	ours 254:14 outcome 359:15 outside 284:23 291:18 outstanding 274:20 339:15 overturned 274:16 owe 316:23 ownership 306:10	331:23 particularly 309:21 parties 251:11,16 255:20 259:18 294:1 311:8 322:4 323:21 326:21,22,25 339:8 342:13,18,20 343:3 344:11,19 347:19,24 351:12 356:5,10 359:11,14	260:11,18 262:20,21,24 263:5 264:17 265:4 266:20 267:11,25 268:3,7,19 269:11,15,22 270:21 271:3,10,14, 21 272:18,21,25 273:12 274:8 275:8,23 276:4,9,18,2 1 278:3,7,11,1 5,18,21 279:22 280:2,9 281:24 282:4,20,23 283:8,11,15 284:4,10,21 285:6,9,13,2 2 287:14,18 288:2 289:4,10 290:2 291:2,17,23 292:3,25 293:21,25 294:6,15,16, 22 295:5,6 296:7,9,13,1 9 297:5,22 298:24 299:3 300:11,23 301:19 302:1,23 303:3,15 304:3,6 305:21 308:18 310:4,8,23 311:6,23 313:9,13 315:24 317:1 318:20,22 319:4,7,13,2 0,25 320:4,18 322:3,7,12 324:1 325:5,13,18 326:1,8,20 327:4,9 328:2,9,14 329:3,11,18, 21
ordered 259:7,13 300:10,21 322:24 325:3 328:8 335:19,21	ordered 284:1	party 281:1 pass 344:8 passed 306:13 passionately 278:9 past 261:10,22 282:2 path 339:20 pattern 273:2 pay 255:9 309:4,7 331:21 paying 319:6 peak 319:18 pejorative 255:14,15,16 269:24 270:1	ordering 284:1
orders 251:23 258:14 270:10 271:9,12 277:25 279:5,19,20 280:5,12 284:2 315:12 337:9,16	paid 314:12 317:25 paper 293:1 327:22,23,24 345:4,5 paramount 279:4 parent 268:11 partial 294:18 295:4,8,19 345:4 348:15,21 349:9	penalize 331:8 penalties 252:20 264:9 270:24 271:13 281:9 328:16,18 329:4,9 331:3,4,7 334:16 Pendergast 249:2 250:21,22,25 252:9,10 256:24 257:10,13,16 ,25 258:4	orders 251:23 258:14 270:10 271:9,12 277:25 279:5,19,20 280:5,12 284:2 315:12 337:9,16
oriented 293:16	participating 357:20 particular 278:6 282:16 285:1 287:20 288:2 292:17 306:15 307:23 317:7,11 321:12,15 324:18 329:1,6		oriented 293:16
original 257:17			original 257:17
otherwise 291:5 359:14			otherwise 291:5 359:14
ought 256:9 267:17 277:17 288:15 290:14 293:5 299:8 318:11 321:7 322:7 324:18 331:8,25 340:8 350:22			ought 256:9 267:17 277:17 288:15 290:14 293:5 299:8 318:11 321:7 322:7 324:18 331:8,25 340:8 350:22

330:11,14,18 331:1,12,16, 24 332:7,11,14 333:8,17 334:14,25 335:7,11,13, 21 336:3,19 337:11 339:13,14,18 340:20 341:2 343:7 346:2,5 347:8 348:4 349:12,24 350:15 353:4,6,14,1 6,18 354:2,5,6,16 ,22 355:5,12,21 356:2 357:4,13,22 360:5,7,9,11 people 264:8 279:6 280:15 315:20 336:7 per 316:8 percent 279:2 333:16 perfectly 270:14 279:18 302:25 perhaps 256:12 267:20 285:23 295:22 323:3 338:21 342:16 343:18 347:5 350:4 peril 298:20 period 291:8 periodic 340:2 permit 321:2 permitted 291:3,10,13, 14,16 346:25 person 252:3 perspective 253:1 274:3 275:9	302:11,17 305:17 328:25 337:23 350:21 357:8 persuasive 336:12,14 pertinent 345:23 Petroleum 314:7 PGA 285:12,21 325:21 phone 357:21 phrase 285:17,20 physical 334:4,5 pick 276:7 278:17 picture 277:21 280:11 piece 327:22,23,24 pipeline 305:5 306:8 placed 260:9 places 311:8 plan 251:18 planning 251:21 plans 251:17 plausible 305:3 pleading 255:13 315:3 338:2 347:22 352:4,7 354:20 pleadings 252:16,18 255:16 269:24,25 289:11 335:1 356:5 please 250:12,20 251:3 320:14 323:19 343:22	plus 353:12 Po 249:6,10 point 270:2,22 273:9,13 284:23 286:19 309:11,20 311:18 313:19,23 314:2,3,11 315:16 317:14,17 318:7 356:3 pointed 299:13 pontificate 344:3 portion 285:17 position 349:9 356:10 positions 260:14 possession 268:16,17 269:13 273:22,24 274:14,19 276:24 280:14,17 284:6,8,19 296:10,11,12 ,13,14 298:19 311:25 322:15 326:25 330:22 332:2,3,10,1 6,19,21 333:1,2 334:10 335:22 349:11,17 350:13,19 possible 281:8 Post 250:17 Poston 249:6 251:4,7 260:19,22 261:3,9,14,1 7 320:6,8 323:5,6	341:24 342:1 343:5 347:11,14,16 355:22,24 potential 254:13 356:6 power 305:5 precedent 303:24 pre-filed 323:3 prehearing 324:6 326:4 pre-hearing 351:17 Prehearing 259:23 prejudge 271:16 premature 310:12 prepare 259:10,13 323:3 324:14 prepared 252:3,4 259:6 321:20 322:22 323:1 344:25 351:3 present 252:11 260:3 301:16 presentation 295:24 300:6 presented 337:8 presenting 251:19 348:3 preside 250:7 president 304:22 Presiding 248:19 pretty 263:16 302:11 305:14 price 287:12 288:9 289:21,22 290:3,6 305:19
---	--	--	---

306:19 309:13,14 314:15 315:1,6 316:15 317:12,25 318:6,23 319:2,16 priced 253:22 254:2 256:20 286:1,3 288:14 306:14 prices 306:2 316:19 pricing 252:22 253:13,25 254:6 255:10 264:2 290:15 314:3 318:25 Pridgin 248:19 250:1,6,15,1 9,25 251:7 252:5,8 256:24 257:4,6,9 282:24 283:3,6 303:12 320:3,6,9 322:3,12 323:5,19 324:24 342:12 343:9,13,17, 23 344:10,13,17 ,23 347:8 348:2,6,11,1 9 349:2 351:9,21 352:5,9,11,1 7,22,25 353:8,19,21, 25 354:7,10,14, 23,25 355:3,13,15, 19,22,25 356:12,20 357:3,11,14, 17,23 358:2 principle 271:25 276:13	279:9,11 prior 318:18 319:3 priorities 338:1 probably 261:18 278:25 281:13 300:13 303:9 319:20 349:24 problem 296:3 357:11 problems 255:1,2 263:23 339:7 procedural 266:21 276:11 279:3 320:10 procedurally 278:20 proceed 251:17 320:7,14 337:5 343:14 344:20 347:11 proceeding 261:6 267:12 274:11 277:2 321:1,25 323:10,17 324:19 325:9 326:18 330:3 341:6 344:5 proceedings 248:5 261:10 263:24 309:1 325:2 341:7 process 264:2 267:1 290:9 311:16 314:23 320:20 339:19 340:14 processes 311:19 procured 290:13 produce 251:24	327:17,19 332:1 335:19,21,25 produced 252:1 258:17 259:1 272:17 300:9,10,14 326:17 328:18 333:6 produces 309:16 product 256:17 profit 286:25 287:1,3 288:16 292:4 293:4,6,8 307:6,7 314:12 315:10 profits 287:5 288:19 291:9 292:12 prognosticate 344:3 program 317:21 progressing 341:12 prohibitively 288:7 289:15 promulgated 262:22 proper 252:12 propose 288:17 proposed 302:6 proposition 261:20 270:12 prospectively 350:5 protect 253:9 302:3 306:17 protected 309:23 prove 290:22 provide 257:19 259:7 268:21 269:1,17	273:21,25 274:13 276:3,5 277:5 284:22,24 286:4 292:5 295:7,10,12 297:7,14,18 298:10,17,18 ,20,22,23 299:4 300:24 311:24 312:12 322:20 326:6,10 327:23 333:11 338:6 339:2 346:18 350:20 provided 267:8 271:5 273:23 276:22,23 282:10 284:17 295:11 296:7,9,15,1 8,20 297:2,4,9,10 ,11,14 298:11 308:21 317:18 321:23 322:21 327:22 330:21 332:3 333:11 345:4,6,7,8, 11 346:20 350:12 provides 292:6 providing 252:20 268:18 269:13 282:14,17 284:18 296:21 346:16 provision 284:15,16,25 285:2 319:14,19 provisions 306:24
---	---	--	---

<p>335:14 prudence 287:11 288:11 291:5 305:2,16 307:1,8 308:25 313:22 314:5,8,13,1 7 318:17,22,24 prudent 305:18 PSC 257:16 303:20 public 248:1 249:6,8,12 250:16 251:2,5,6 255:20 256:18 258:19 337:23 purchase 293:7 318:3 purchased 248:15 250:4 287:12 purchasers 253:20 317:19 purchasing 286:13 287:10 305:5 purely 322:9 purpose 318:9,10 purposes 268:24 285:4,18 352:13 353:10,15 354:8,21 355:4,9 pursuant 302:10 316:14 pursue 252:19 264:14 273:18 286:7 329:4 331:4 pursued 266:22,23</p>	<p>pursuing 331:3 puts 293:1 putting 316:15 324:12 345:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <p>question 264:17 265:5 281:15,21,22 282:1 286:17 297:1 300:5 301:18 303:16 304:6,8 305:3,8,23 307:12,18,25 308:3,12 311:5 312:2,4,6 325:24 326:11 330:1 337:7,20 348:10 questioned 318:25 questions 257:3,8 258:24 262:14,19 270:14 282:25 303:13 308:15,17,19 311:7 313:20 320:2,5 321:13 322:22 324:12 356:11 quick 260:20 307:12 quite 269:24 272:8 282:6 286:19 quote 326:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>R-42 257:17 raise 269:16 288:11 331:18 raised</p>	<p>263:2,5 267:3 288:13,14 305:23 309:2 310:8 raises 317:6 raising 328:19 rarely 273:1 rate 253:17 rate-making 269:18 ratepayer 293:5 306:25 ratepayers 302:3 306:17,21 309:22 rather 267:15,22 268:12 284:16 297:10 338:1 342:22 349:22 351:2 rational 349:16 reach 343:20 reached 344:24 reaches 324:18 ready 343:13 real 260:20 318:4 342:6 really 255:8 264:15 269:5 275:25 308:15 314:22 317:5 330:7 342:2 reargue 275:11,21 rearguing 333:4 reason 296:24 299:7 307:19 310:24 317:2 331:4 349:16 reasonable 302:25 306:4</p>	<p>309:13 323:4 reasonably 323:2 346:4 reasons 288:8 289:17 297:13 309:15 rebut 335:4 recall 252:13 262:22 REC'D 360:2 receive 273:3 received 281:3 352:19 353:23 354:12 355:1,17 recess 344:16 recognize 268:10 281:17 286:14 340:7 recognized 268:8 recommend 254:7 recommendatio n 341:15 352:1 360:3 recommendatio ns 254:14 289:11 recommended 254:8 325:22 recommends 270:17 record 250:2 324:20 344:15,17 345:18,20 346:7 348:8 357:25 record's 357:4 red 273:15,17 274:24 275:2 286:14,15 331:20 reduced 359:9 Reed 255:6 346:9 353:11</p>
--	--	---	--

360:5 reevaluating 337:24 reevaluation 338:4 refer 260:2 reference 259:22 referenced 347:21 references 264:23 referred 257:11 referring 268:2 reflect 294:19 refusing 334:10,12 regarding 323:14 regular 265:19 regulate 271:9 regulatory 248:20 250:6 268:23 279:14 285:8,11,19 related 311:13 359:10 relating 347:4 relationship 320:22 relative 359:12 relevance 284:14 286:18 311:14 326:4 347:7 350:1,23 356:6,11 relevancy 275:11 322:16 327:15	330:24 331:23 333:4 350:10 relevant 255:8 268:23 269:18 272:16 273:8 285:1,3,18 287:11,15 295:13 296:4,5,8,24 299:5,8 312:10 322:8 323:11 324:4,16,22 326:16 329:15,24 330:3 333:13 335:17 350:12 reliability 288:8 289:17 relied 327:12 relief 335:2 re-litigate 322:16 re-litigating 283:20 285:16 327:15 rely 338:1 remedy 271:12 remember 276:11 292:9 remind 292:16 reorganizatio n 268:8,11 302:2 reorganize 306:16 repeated 341:11 repeatedly 256:10 267:3 REPORTED 248:23 REPORTER 359:2 REPORTING 248:24 reports 253:12	256:19 representatio ns 252:16,17 356:9 representing 250:16 represents 353:7 request 259:25 262:2 321:10 357:5 requested 251:25 252:19 258:17,25 293:17,19,24 294:3,10,13 308:20 332:24 346:15 349:5 350:19 requesting 270:23 320:22 335:2 requests 294:21 334:1,3 require 260:6,8 required 259:17 265:9 272:13 281:19 286:4 327:25 328:1 331:25 333:3 334:6 requirement 263:19 requirements 272:7 333:23 requires 333:25 reserve 347:6 356:8 resist 269:5 resistance 272:8 resisted 282:5 resolution 342:3 resolve 262:8	267:22 350:22 resolved 265:3 resolving 266:19 respect 270:4 280:3 301:1 348:12 respectfully 275:24 292:16 respects 266:5 respond 295:9 responded 282:15 300:13 responding 251:22 responds 346:9 response 294:18,19 295:4,7,8,14 ,19 297:10 300:8,15,18 320:24 324:7 345:4,5,6 346:18 348:15,22,23 349:10 351:19 352:3 responses 294:20 responsibilit ies 298:2 299:24 responsive 283:21,22 result 253:4 retain 357:1 return 293:13 351:23 Revenue 299:15,17 reversed 274:16 review 283:25 285:12,21 reviewing
---	---	--	---

283:24 revise 338:23 revised 263:10,14,15 ,17 rewarded 290:14 RFP 314:22,23 315:1 Rick 249:2 250:22 rights 273:6 risk 316:16 ROBERT 248:20,22 Ron 250:6 RONALD 248:19 room 249:3 280:25 318:14 341:1 roughly 318:21 rule 253:24 254:18,22 262:22 263:7,11 264:20 266:4,6,14 269:4 271:23 272:7 273:15 274:2,3 286:9,20 288:10,20,22 ,23 298:4 299:9 301:20,21 303:1 305:1 306:13 308:23 318:9 328:22 329:23 333:23 335:15 338:23 339:6,10,22 342:17,22 343:3 346:25 ruled 350:24 rulemaking 338:4,16 339:2 342:8 rules 255:22 256:7	260:6,8 263:16 273:19,20 274:11 277:16,17,18 285:25 286:3 291:4 292:5 314:14 315:7,12 321:11 327:10 329:22 333:19 336:24 337:13,25 338:19 340:8 ruling 342:21 <hr/> S <hr/> safeguards 306:25 sale 315:4 sales 290:7,19 291:1 sat 261:13 satisfy 272:6 save 323:24 schedule 344:4 scheme 279:11,14 schizophrenic 260:14 school 317:20 319:6 schools 290:7 317:20 319:13,21 scope 252:13 323:17 342:14 score 357:5 second 294:9 seeing 348:19 seek 271:13 331:6 334:16 seeking 313:20 328:16 seem 285:20	316:20 seems 264:18 298:14,20 310:11 seen 267:9 270:2 272:8 segregating 277:19 sell 253:18 287:4 seller 286:13 sellers 318:5 seminal 329:6,7 send 356:25 SENIOR 248:20 sense 345:3,9 sensed 321:4 sentences 258:4 separate 268:9 299:22,23 323:7 324:19 separately 321:7 September 258:15 283:13 294:4 351:19 352:4,7 354:19 serious 312:24 Seriously 339:18 served 297:16 Service 248:1 249:12 250:16 services 298:6 seven 255:23 291:7 several 254:20 263:12 282:5 291:19 317:13 326:4 share 297:21	298:5 shared 306:10,11 345:23 346:23 shed 256:16 sheet 257:17 Shemwell 249:10 250:14,15,19 251:20 252:6,7 257:1,21 258:8,10,13 259:20 260:12,23 292:14,15,22 ,24 294:5,14,24 295:1,19,20 298:15 300:15,22,25 301:5,12 303:6 313:6 320:16 322:4,13,14 325:4 338:11,14,17 ,24 339:4 343:6,12 346:13 350:7 360:7 shifting 306:6 shorten 343:20 shorter 321:16 shortly 253:15 254:23 showed 270:4 317:18 shown 290:10,16 shows 296:21 309:6 356:17,18 sides 324:14 348:18 signatory 313:11,13 significant 296:22
---	--	--	---

297:12	342:22	,23 255:3	293:16 304:9
silent 261:13	sorry 255:25	256:17,19	311:4 313:15
similar	258:10	258:15,16,18	322:23
317:12	269:11	259:4,5,6,7,	323:24
319:10	293:12 301:3	9,13,17	324:22 336:5
338:12	303:14	260:13 261:9	337:23
354:18	320:1,2	262:3	351:3,15,19
simply 251:18	322:13 350:9	263:2,5,18,2	352:23
253:2 259:13	sort 316:5	1,25	stand 273:5
267:15	321:6 334:21	264:5,7,14	277:25 315:8
320:11 325:2	338:5 347:10	265:15,19	334:20
342:20	sought 260:7	266:10	standard
sir 283:3	265:2,6,25	270:17,18,23	255:4,25
292:22,24	280:24 281:4	271:25 273:9	256:3 264:1
294:14 343:5	329:14	277:6 279:12	286:8,21
348:18	sounds 283:19	281:9 283:9	289:20 291:6
sister	296:2 347:9	286:7,12,21	292:1,7
268:13,14	source 288:8	289:10,18,24	307:9 308:22
sit 281:8	309:3 317:22	,25	314:16,21
340:2,3	speak 256:12	290:3,5,16	315:6
341:11,14	281:14	291:24,25	standards
sitting 264:5	speaking	292:9,13	253:13,25
283:18	273:21	293:1,9,19,2	255:10
situation	spec 301:9	4	272:7,9
315:25	specific	294:3,5,10,1	277:7 308:23
316:25	251:23 302:8	2,24	333:22
situations	307:21,23	295:1,15	standing
316:18	308:3,13,14	296:22	276:13
six 255:23	specifically	297:17	standpoint
277:14	253:21 254:1	301:20 302:6	266:21
289:21	322:19,23	303:20 305:8	stands 335:24
slightly	346:8	306:15 308:2	start 295:3
263:15	spell 306:18	313:19	state 248:2
267:12	spent 313:20	315:14	265:24
slowly 314:20	345:15	317:14	299:13 359:5
solely 262:1	spot 316:17	318:11	stated 260:23
281:5	spreadsheet	320:14,20,23	278:9 346:3
somebody	348:13	321:3,19	statements
277:1 280:24	St 249:3	322:2,19,21	321:3
299:13	250:24 290:7	324:3,4,8,15	Status 294:18
309:17	317:16,18	325:15,22	348:21
sometime	319:7,8	327:23,24	statute
321:18 322:8	stacked	328:5,7	271:12 313:4
350:3	266:17	332:25	statutory
somewhat	staff	333:10,22	279:11
260:14	249:9,12	334:7,19	stay 273:1,3
somewhere	250:12,16	335:1	stayed 263:11
309:18	251:15,21,24	336:4,7,11,1	step 307:25
Sommerer	252:3,16,17,	5 338:11	338:9
316:6,8	19	339:24	Steve 255:6
sooner 340:10	253:7,11,12,	343:10	346:9
	17,25	345:1,10	stick 323:22
	254:2,4,7,20	347:9 351:24	
		352:2 354:18	
		Staff's 252:2	
		254:14	
		258:23,25	
		259:23 284:2	
		292:20	

,22,23,25 358:1,2	thereafter 265:20 359:8	259:25 264:18 292:14 322:5,6 325:10,15,19 326:3,6 337:14,15 338:13 339:5 343:15,18 344:12,21,23 ,24 346:3,6,12 347:21,25 348:17 349:7,19 351:14,18,22 352:8,10,14, 15,21,24 353:20 354:2,9,24 355:14 356:14,25 357:9,16 358:1 360:7	342:14 top 305:9 total 353:13 touch 311:9 track 315:20 Tracy 248:24 359:4,18 train 254:9 trained 254:15 264:8
that's 252:7 256:3,4 258:17 259:14,15 261:3 265:5,20,22 266:21 267:5,20 268:14 269:9 270:16 271:6,21 272:6 273:22,24 274:19 275:2,13 276:20 277:2 278:13 280:25 283:9 284:10,25 286:8 288:7,13 291:22 292:5,6 293:10 295:17 296:10 299:8 300:1 302:11,15 305:23 306:12,13,15 307:5,7,8,21 308:20 309:1,9,14 310:20 311:3,10,11, 17 320:16 323:16 324:22 325:4 327:18 329:7 330:7,10,11, 14,16 333:2,6 334:7 336:1,22 339:10,15 340:18 341:6,8 342:19 345:13 346:2,13,24 349:4,7,12 350:15 354:20,21 355:10 357:3	therefore 252:23 288:16 326:16 there's 276:2 287:24 293:22 296:3 297:24 299:11 304:5 305:3 309:9 310:3 322:16 326:23 332:23 340:21 348:23 349:15 350:11 357:24 thereto 359:14 therms 313:23 314:1 they're 280:18 282:12 284:25 289:12,13 290:24 291:5,14 292:10 298:8,18 299:19,22 313:13 320:22 332:2,14,15, 19 333:1 345:14,21 348:25 350:12 they've 267:11 270:1 275:15 281:4,5,25 282:5 286:23 293:11 297:15,16 314:20 third 294:17 311:8 third-party 253:20 Thompson 249:9 250:15 255:12	Thorpe 359:4,18 three-page 353:12 tickles 272:3 TIGER 248:24 tired 344:6 today 252:11 256:15 258:14 259:6,14 260:10,25 262:6 271:7,16 273:6 274:7 275:4 277:2,15 279:25 280:25 281:8 295:21 304:21 315:17 321:8 322:8,22,24 323:14,16 324:11,12 334:1,7 339:22 342:21 343:2 345:2 347:19 351:2,7,15 352:23 356:2,9 today's 325:2	transaction 252:24 253:23 254:18,22 260:6 262:22 263:7,11 264:19 266:4 269:4 271:23 273:15 274:2 288:10,22 298:3 299:9 305:1 306:13 307:24 310:21 314:3,4 315:10 317:11 318:9,17,18 319:2,3 328:22 335:15 337:13 338:19,23 346:25 transactions 252:22 253:14,22 254:1 255:11,23,24 256:6,20,21 263:8 264:3,11,21 288:20,23 291:10 292:4 302:14 306:14 308:25 311:7 342:7 TRANSCRIPT 248:5 transfer 334:4,5 transport 317:15

trapped 314:25	309:8		ways 289:22 290:22
treat 288:24	understand 251:13	<u>v</u>	we'd 267:18,23 335:4 347:5 357:8,9
treated 356:7	261:20,25	vague 307:1	weigh 260:19
tried 264:6 318:2	269:20 275:1	valid 275:3,5 276:14	welcome 256:15 352:22 357:14
true 253:2	278:15,18	validates 310:21	we'll 261:8 274:6 282:18 283:16 321:25 323:24 325:6 328:12,13 337:4 340:11 341:6 342:2 344:1,15 351:13
271:21	287:23	value 254:5 315:8 338:6	we're 255:8,9 259:14 267:13,14 271:6,15 272:11 275:5,14 277:19,20 278:20,25 279:15,16,24 283:20 285:15,20 287:8 291:4,6 293:15 296:3 306:15 307:2,3 309:14 310:11 311:3 314:14 315:11,13,16 ,17 321:1,5,12,1 3 327:6 328:16 331:10 334:7 336:1 337:8,9,17 338:25 340:13 341:4 342:11 343:7 344:14,17
310:24 335:3	298:12,13	various 252:15 256:20 297:12 302:7 321:3 339:8	
336:8	299:2 302:19	varying 317:4	
345:3,13	303:19 304:1	verify 351:12	
try 261:8	305:22	version 326:10	
324:24 331:7	310:10 328:9	via 248:22	
334:16 348:7	332:22 333:4	vice 304:22	
trying 260:15	336:20,23	view 268:25 286:9,24 346:23 356:16,18	
262:10	346:1 350:1	violating 339:24	
269:20	351:5,15	volume 248:9	
278:13,16,19	understanding 255:19	voluntary 281:19	
284:13,25	258:1,23	voracity 252:2,15 258:23 321:2 322:24 323:23	
287:9	259:12		
289:24,25	283:24	<u>w</u>	
292:10	284:14	wait 287:22,23 304:24 344:2	
299:1,3	301:13 325:1	waiting 342:4	
301:21 343:1	understands 345:10	walk 340:22	
356:23	union 263:19	wasn't 263:24 268:25 295:14 306:5 311:22 312:4 317:10 318:24 319:21 321:24 326:15 333:13	
357:12	unless 316:17		
turn 274:18	unrebutted 334:20		
275:6 276:16	upheld 263:12		
300:1 307:13	uphold 313:3		
332:20	upon 258:14 311:9 327:12		
turned 280:13,16,22	349:21		
two-page 352:11 354:16	350:24		
typewriting 359:9	upstream 287:13		
<u>U</u>	utilities 263:12 265:24 270:10 271:8 279:12 288:20 336:12 337:24		
ultimate 271:18 304:18 333:15	utility 265:1,24 268:13 276:16 286:4 291:3 308:4 317:23		
ultimately 270:17,19 271:19 304:20	utility's 302:20		
unaffiliated 290:4 306:3 317:19 318:5			
unauthorized 292:7			
underneath			

266:16,25 267:3 274:3,4 280:13,16 282:8,13 291:8,9,25 308:8 309:12 329:16 330:15,20 331:22 332:2 333:9 335:16 336:18 337:1,2,12,1 8 339:19,21 340:1 341:2,5,7 342:10 343:23 344:24 349:24 350:17 351:7	352:2 whole 279:14 283:20 wholesale 253:20 wholly 256:5 whom 345:25 who's 305:9 wide 286:22 william 346:14 355:6 willing 297:6 321:12,14 340:13 wilson 283:24 300:21 311:21,23 312:11 wish 251:17 261:9 wishing 251:8 witness 251:22 252:6 253:7 259:11 260:24 324:13 345:1 witnesses 251:18 252:11 282:22 320:12 321:14 323:14,16 342:10 343:2,11 345:19 348:3 359:7 wonderful 262:4 work 275:20 279:10 344:11 worked 273:25 works 330:10,12,13 workshop 339:6 workshops 339:13 worth 345:21 writ 283:25	301:6 351:22,23 write 288:20 written 356:19 wrong 272:14 304:10 307:7 309:25 323:20 328:6 351:16 wrongs 261:21 <hr/> Y <hr/> yet 273:4 281:8 297:14 350:24 you'll 253:13 298:4 342:6 348:2 yourself 340:9 you've 275:19 280:3 289:21 304:10 315:17 317:3 318:10 325:11 328:20,21,22 ,23 329:10 331:18,24 <hr/> Z <hr/> zero 316:13,14 Zucker 249:2 250:22 312:3,8,13,1 9,22,25 313:4,18 318:13,24 346:20 347:20 353:1
--	---	--