In the Matter of Spire Missouri, Inc. d/b/a Spire (East)		
Hearing before:		
Judge John Clark		
August 16, 2022		
PHIPPS REPORTING Raising the Bar!		

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS Procedural Conference
Tuesday, August 16, 2022 8:30 a.m 8:44 a.m.
Missouri Public Service Commission WebEx
VOLUME 1 Pages 1 - 15
In the Matter of Spire Missouri, ) Inc. d/b/a Spire (East) ) File No. GR-2021-0127 Purchased Gas Adjustment (PGA) ) Tariff Filing )
JOHN CLARK, Presiding SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
Stenographically Reported By: Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640 Job No. 266995
1

```
1
     APPEARANCES:
 2
     On behalf of Spire (East):
 3
          Spire
          700 Market Street
 4
          St. Louis, MO 63101
 5
          BY:
               MATTHEW APLINGTON, ESQ.
               matt.aplington@spireenergy.com
 6
     On behalf of the Staff of the
 7
     Public Service Commission:
          Public Service Commission
 8
          200 Madison Street, Suite 800
 9
          P.O. Box 360
          Jefferson City, MO
                               65102
10
          BY:
               JAMIE MYERS, ESQ.
11
                jamie.myers@psc.mo.gov
     On behalf of the Office of the
12
     Public Counsel:
13
          Office of the Public Counsel
          200 Madison Street, Suite 650
14
          P.O. Box 2230
15
          Jefferson City, MO
                               65102
16
          BY:
               MARC POSTON, ESQ.
               Marc.Poston@opc.mo.gov
17
     On behalf of the Environmental Defense Fund:
18
          Rothfelder Stern, LLC
19
          407 Greenwood Avenue, Unit 301
          Trenton, NJ
                       08609
20
          BY:
               MARTIN ROTHFELDER, ESQ.
21
               mrothfelder@rothfelderstern.com
22
23
24
25
```

Page 2

1	INDEX	Page 3
2		Page
3	Oral Entries of Appearance	4
4	Statement by Mr. Aplington	6
5	Status report due 10/17/22	12
6	Certificate of Reporter	15
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	Page 4 (The following proceedings began at 8:30 a.m.:)
2	JUDGE CLARK: Okay. It's 8:30. Why don't we
3	go on the record. Today's date is August 16th of 2022;
4	and as I said before, the time is 8:30 a.m. The
5	Commission has set aside this time for a procedural
б	conference today in the case captioned as In the Matter
7	of Spire Missouri, Incorporated d/b/a Spire East
8	(Purchased Gas Adjustment) Tariff Filing and this is
9	File No. GR-2021-0127.
10	My name is John Clark. I'm the Regulatory Law
11	Judge overseeing this matter. I'm going to begin by
12	asking the attorneys for the parties to enter their
13	appearance for the record starting with Spire Missouri
14	East.
15	MR. APLINGTON: Good morning, Your Honor.
16	This is Matt Aplington, General Counsel of Spire
17	Missouri, Inc. representing the Company this morning,
18	700 Market Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63101.
19	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Aplington. For
20	the Commission Staff.
21	MS. MYERS: Good morning, Judge. Jamie Myers
22	on behalf of the Commission Staff, 200 Madison Street,
23	Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.
24	JUDGE CLARK: Thank you, Ms. Myers. Do we
25	have anybody from the Office of the Public Counsel?

Page 5 1 Anybody from Consumers Council of Missouri? 2 Environmental Defense Fund. MR. ROTHFELDER: Yes, Your Honor. Martin 3 4 Rothfelder, Rothfelder Stern, LLC, appearing for 5 Environmental Defense Fund. 6 JUDGE CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Rothfelder. And 7 for Midwest Energy Consumers Group. Nobody present. 8 Okay. We'll go on. 9 This I quess to kind of -- and we're having 10 somebody joining us. Let's see who that is. 11 MS. CROW: Hi, this is Ann Crow and Mark 12 Oligschlaeger with Staff. 13 JUDGE CLARK: Thank you very much. Staff had filed their recommendation, the Environmental Defense 14 15 Fund had requested additional time, I believe, to respond to the recommendation. I believe additional 16 17 time was given to all the parties who wanted to take 18 until August 1 to respond to Staff's ACA recommendation, 19 and then Spire Missouri East responded or replied to 20 those comments. Among other things they requested, they 21 requested that I call a procedural conference, which 22 I've done today. 23 I guess the guestion at this point is, and I'll turn it over to Spire in a second since they had 24 25 requested this, to kind of explain why they requested

1	$_{\rm Page\ 6}$ this. My question for the parties is going to be when
2	are we looking at a resolution of this matter, how far
3	are we looking out at putting a hearing, and when can I
4	expect a procedural schedule. So those are the things
5	that I have in my mind. In that regard, Mr. Aplington,
б	why did Spire want to call a procedural conference?
7	MR. APLINGTON: Thank you, Your Honor, and
8	thank you for accommodating us by calling one.
9	There's been a lot of discussion and comments
10	made about the process and the procedure to be followed
11	in this case, and so we thought it was prudent to get
12	the parties together to get everyone's input on what the
13	process should be.
14	From our perspective, and it's reflected in
15	our reply comments to some extent, we continue to work
16	with Staff on one discrete issue surrounding an asset
17	management agreement with an affiliate Spire Marketing,
18	and we are sharing additional information with Staff on
19	that point and having some further discussions.
20	I see that OPC is not on, but we are engaged
21	in a similar process with Public Counsel to share some
22	documents that they had requested and help them perform
23	their own analysis on the STL Pipeline affiliate
24	transaction transportation arrangement. So we feel at
25	this time that it would be proper for us to, or for you

1	$_{\rm Page~7}$ I should say, to set a date perhaps 60 days out for the
2	parties to continue in these discussions, at which time
3	the parties would report to you that they've either
4	reached a resolution of these discrete issues that are
5	outstanding, or to provide a further status report, or
б	to request a procedural schedule at that time. But we
7	feel that additional 60 days or so would give time for
8	the parties to have some additional fruitful
9	discussions.
10	JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you. And I will
11	note you said that you're continuing to work with Staff,
12	or have discussions with Staff, and with the Office of
13	the Public Counsel. But according to at least Staff's
14	recommendation, it doesn't appear that there's a lot of
15	disagreement between Spire and the Commission Staff at
16	least in that regard. I get the impression that most of
17	the disagreement at this point right now is with
18	intervenors and possibly with Public Counsel in that
19	regard.
20	Now, you had indicated 60 days. I'm not
21	really opposed to an amount of time to try and work with
22	the other parties to see if an agreement can be reached.
23	At the same time, I would like to have at least some

24 sort of procedural schedule in place so that at least 25 we're kind of ticking off some boxes as we go along with

Page 8 1 an idea that this would be going somewhere. Do you 2 think you could incorporate the 60 days into a 3 procedural schedule? I think we can probably work 4 MR. APLINGTON: 5 with the other parties to come up with a procedural 6 schedule that would incorporate a period perhaps 60 days 7 for further discussions before, you know, before deadlines would kick off within the schedule, if that's 8 9 what you mean. 10 Yes. Is there anybody who is JUDGE CLARK: 11 opposed to 60 days for negotiations? 12 This is Martin Rothfelder MR. ROTHFELDER: from Environmental Defense Fund. I'm hardly going to 13 oppose 60 days to talk to people, but at the same time 14 it's our view that the issues are broad and that as we 15 went through in detail in our comments the Company has 16 the burden of proof and the procedural schedule should 17 18 start with the Company filing a full case consistent 19 with it meeting its burden of proof in a docket where prudence issues have been raised. And whether that 20 21 filing happens in 60 days or 120 days, it's our view 2.2 that that's how this case should start procedurally. 23 JUDGE CLARK: When in people's mind do they 24 see this going to hearing --25 MS. MYERS: Judge --

Page 9 1 JUDGE CLARK: -- if it goes to hearing? 2 MS. MYERS: -- from Staff's perspective, I 3 think Staff is certainly in agreement with giving at 4 least 60 days for parties to have additional 5 discussions, get information, because I'm not sure that we could even craft an agreed upon procedural schedule. 6 7 I agree with Mr. Rothfelder, you know, it's going to 8 start with the Company making a direct filing any 9 procedural schedule. Beyond that, how many rounds of testimony, the length of time between testimony, hearing 10 date, you know. I think we need that additional time to 11 12 even talk through some of that. From Staff's perspective, we were not 13 envisioning a hearing anytime this year. It would be 14 next year by the time you would get through an entire 15 procedural schedule. 16 17 MR. APLINGTON: I would agree with that, Jamie. 18 19 JUDGE CLARK: I had actually kind of had in 20 the back of my head that this would go to hearing in 21 February, but that's not decided at this point. Ιt sounds like from Staff's perspective it would be better 2.2 23 rather than incorporating 60 days into the front end of the procedural schedule with a direct filing after that 24 -- or with Spire to file direct testimony after that. 25

Page 10 It would be -- and if I'm paraphrasing this incorrectly, 1 2 let me know -- it would be Staff's preference to have 60 3 days of up-front negotiation before the filing of a proposed procedural schedule? 4 MS. MYERS: Correct. 5 Okay. And Mr. Rothfelder, I JUDGE CLARK: 6 7 heard you indicate that you believe that it should begin with -- that any procedural schedule should begin with 8 9 Spire filing its direct case in chief; is that correct? 10 MR. ROTHFELDER: Yes, and I think I heard 11 Staff in agreement on that. 12 JUDGE CLARK: But you said you were not 13 opposing the 60 days? 14 MR. ROTHFELDER: No, Your Honor. I mean, we 15 could come out of this procedural -- this conference today, in addition to the 60 days, certainly you could 16 17 set a deadline for them to file that testimony 90 days 18 out, 100 days out, 120 days out so that if we're in 19 agreement that that's the step if it's not settled, I 20 don't see any reason to not develop that date today. 21 JUDGE CLARK: The only reason that I might 2.2 have against that is if the parties are having fruitful 23 negotiations and at that point wish to continue negotiating for an additional 30 days or so. So my 24 25 tendency is to want to give the 30 days -- give the 60

Page 11 days, flag myself on that, and kind of -- well, actually 1 2 why don't I just --Let's see. 60 days. Today is the 16th. 3 So that puts us roughly September 16. How about I give the 4 5 parties until October 17 to engage in these discussions 6 that Spire is wanting the parties to engage in and on 7 the 17th the parties file a status report and at that time I'll know whether or not I need to order the filing 8 9 of a procedural schedule. 10 Does that work for everybody? 11 MR. APLINGTON: Spire is in agreement with 12 that approach. 13 MR. ROTHFELDER: We're happy to file something on October 17 as well, Your Honor. 14 JUDGE CLARK: Does that work for Staff? 15 MS. MYERS: Yes, that works for Staff. 16 17 MR. POSTON: Judge, this is Marc Poston. Ι 18 just want to let you know I joined a few minutes ago. 19 I'm sorry I was late. I had written the time down 20 wrong. Your approach is good with me as well. 21 JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Thank you for letting me Thank you for letting me know 2.2 know then, Mr. Poston. 23 that Public Counsel is here. If you missed anything, 24 I'll be happy to recap it. It doesn't sound like you did. But I will go over basically Spire has requested 25

Page 12 1 60 days to continue to negotiate to see if an agreed 2 upon outcome can be reached between the various parties. 3 I'm ordering a status report due October 17 so that I know at that time whether there's going to be 4 5 further negotiations or whether I need to order a 6 procedural schedule at that time. 7 MR. POSTON: That's fine with OPC. 8 JUDGE CLARK: I'm sorry. Go ahead. I didn't know if you were wanting 9 MR. POSTON: 10 confirmation from me that that was good with OPC. What you just explained sounds good. 11 12 JUDGE CLARK: Is OPC opposed to that? 13 MR. POSTON: No, no, that works for us. 14 JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Great. All right. Is 15 there anybody who would like me to issue a written order 16 or is me just saying a status report is due October 17 17 and putting that in my calendar fine? 18 MR. ROTHFELDER: It's certainly fine by EDF. 19 We'll plan on sending you a letter on October 17. 20 JUDGE CLARK: Okav. I will look for the 21 parties to file a status report on October 17 as to the 22 status of the negotiations between the parties and 23 whether or not a procedural schedule needs to be 24 ordered. 25 Are there any other matters that the

1	Page 13 Commission needs to take up at this time before we go
2	off the record?
3	MR. ROTHFELDER: I just want to mention it
4	would be a letter from EDF, Your Honor. We haven't had
5	much communication with the parties. Assuming it
6	continues on the course it's been on, I'm not sure we
7	would have a lot of knowledge of where other parties are
8	at. So our letter on October 17 would indicate how much
9	we have or haven't talked with parties and where we're
10	at.
11	JUDGE CLARK: That would be fine. If you wish
12	to file a letter instead of a pleading, that would be
13	fine.
14	MR. ROTHFELDER: A pleading is fine too. I
15	don't know if I'll have a lot of knowledge to where the
16	other parties are at.
17	JUDGE CLARK: Okay. Mr. Aplington, was it
18	your intention to engage EDF in discussions?
19	MR. APLINGTON: Yes. We're certainly
20	interested in doing that. To a point that Your Honor
21	made early on in the conference, and I think it is worth
22	repeating, this case touches on a broad range of
23	transactions, you know, for gas supply for an entire
24	period. Your Honor is correct that the issues that
25	remain between the parties are relatively narrow and

Page 14 1 discrete when compared to the total scope of this 2 docket. The discussions that we're going to be having 3 are on discrete single issues. JUDGE CLARK: All right. Thank you, Mr. 4 5 Aplington. Is there anything else that needs to be taken 6 7 up by the Commission at this time? Okay. Thank you all 8 for meeting me on this rainy morning. I'll let you get 9 back to getting about your days. 10 MR. ROTHFELDER: If you could send some of the 11 rain out east, we'd appreciate it. 12 JUDGE CLARK: I'll see what I can do. The wind should be blowing it that way, but I don't know if 13 it will still get to you. Why don't we go off the 14 15 record at this time and I'll adjourn this procedural conference. Again, thank you all for your time in 16 17 meeting me this morning. 18 (The proceedings adjourned at 8:44 a.m.) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	Page 15 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF MISSOURI )
3	COUNTY OF COLE )
4	I, Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640, do
5	hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
б	stenographically report the foregoing Public Service
7	Commission procedural conference and that the
8	transcript, pages 1 through 14, is a true record of my
9	stenographic notes.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
11	employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties,
12	nor am I a relative or counsel connected with the
13	action, nor am I financially interested in the action.
14	Dated this 25th day of August, 2022.
15 16	Beverly Jean Bertch
17	Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

> 1 1 5:18 100 10:18 120 8:21 10:18 16 11:4 16th 4:3 11:3 17 11:5,14 12:3, 16,19,21 13:8 17th 11:7 2 200 4:22 2022 4:3 3 30 10:24,25 6 60 7:1,7,20 8:2, 6,11,14,21 9:4,23 10:2, 13,16,25 11:3 12:1 63101 4:18

65101 4:23 7 700 4:18 8 8:30 4:1,2,4 8:44 14:18 9 90 10:17 Α a.m 4:1 a.m. 4:4 14:18 ACA 5:18 accommodating 6:8 addition 10:16 additional 5:15,16 6:18 7:7,8 9:4,11 10:24 adjourn 14:15 adjourned 14:18

Adjustment Assuming 4:8 affiliate 6:17,23 agree 9:7,17 agreed 9:6 12:1 agreement back 6:17 7:22 9:3 10:11,19 11:11 ahead began 12:8 amount begin 7:21 analysis 6:23 Ann 5:11 anytime 9:14 Aplington 4:15,16,19 6:5,7 8:4 9:17 11:11 13:17,19 14:5 appearance 4:13 appearing 5:4 approach call 11:12,20 arrangement 6:24 asset 6:16

13:5 attorneys 4:12 August 4:3 5:18 в 9:20 14:9 basically 11:25 4:1 4:11 10:7,8

behalf 4:22 blowing 14:13 boxes 7:25 broad 8:15 13:22 burden

### 8:17,19

#### C

calendar 12:17 5:21 6:6 calling 6:8 captioned 4:6

> case 4:6 6:11 8:18,22 10:9 13:22 chief 10:9 City 4:23 Clark 4:2,10,19,24 5:6,13 7:10 8:10,23 9:1, 19 10:6,12,21 11:15,21 12:8,12,14,20 13:11,17 14:4,12 comments 5:20 6:9,15 8:16 Commission 4:5,20,22 7:15 13:1 14:7 communication 13:5 Company 4:17 8:16,18 9:8 compared 14:1 conference 4:6 5:21 6:6 10:15 13:21 14:16 confirmation 12:10 consistent 8:18

Consumers 5:1,7 continue 6:15 7:2 10:23 12:1 continues 13:6 continuing 7:11 correct 10:5,9 13:24 Council 5:1 Counsel 4:16,25 6:21 7:13,18 11:23 craft 9:6 Crow 5:11 D d/b/a 4:7 date 4:3 7:1 9:11 10:20 days 7:1,7,20 8:2, 6,11,14,21 9:4,23 10:3, 13,16,17,18, 24,25 11:1,3 12:1 14:9 deadline 10:17 deadlines 8:8

**decided** 9:21

**Defense** 5:2,5,14 8:13

**detail** 8:16

**develop** 10:20

direct 9:8,24,25 10:9

disagreement 7:15,17

discrete 6:16 7:4 14:1,3

discussion 6:9

discussions 6:19 7:2,9,12 8:7 9:5 11:5 13:18 14:2

**docket** 8:19 14:2

documents 6:22

**due** 12:3,16

E

**early** 13:21

east
 4:7,14 5:19
 14:11
EDF

12:18 13:4,18

Energy
5:7
engage
11:5,6 13:18
engaged
6:20

**enter** 4:12

end

9:23

entire 9:15 13:23

**Environmental** 5:2,5,14 8:13

envisioning 9:14

everyone's 6:12

expect 6:4

explain 5:25

explained 12:11

extent 6:15

#### F

February 9:21 feel

6:24 7:7

filed

file
 4:9 9:25
 10:17 11:7,13
 12:21 13:12

www.phippsreporting.com (888) 811-3408

## 5:14 filing 4:8 8:18,21 9:8,24 10:3,9 11:8 fine 12:7,17,18 13:11,13,14 flag 11:1 front 9:23 fruitful 7:8 10:22 full 8:18 Fund 5:2,5,15 8:13 G gas 4:8 13:23 General 4:16 give 7:7 10:25 11:4 giving 9:3 good 4:15,21 11:20 12:10,11 GR-2021-0127 4:9 Great 12:14 Group 5:7

guess 5:9,23 н happy 11:13,24 head 9:20 heard 10:7,10 hearing 6:3 8:24 9:1, 10,14,20 Honor 4:15 5:3 6:7 10:14 11:14 13:4,20,24 Ι idea 8:1 impression 7:16 incorporate 8:2,6 Incorporated 4:7 incorporating 9:23 incorrectly 10:1 information 6:18 9:5 input 6:12 intention 13:18

interested 13:20 intervenors 7:18 issue 6:16 12:15 issues 7:4 8:15,20 13:24 14:3 J Jamie 4:21 9:18 Jefferson 4:23 John 4:10 joined 11:18 joining 5:10 Judge 4:2,11,19,21, 24 5:6,13 7:10 8:10,23, 25 9:1,19 10:6,12,21 11:15,17,21 12:8,12,14,20 13:11,17 14:4,12 к kick 8:8 kind 5:9,25 7:25 9:19 11:1

knowledge 13:7,15 L late 11:19 Law 4:10 length 9:10 letter 12:19 13:4,8, 12 letting 11:21,22 LLC 5:4 lot 6:9 7:14 13:7,15 Louis 4:18 м made 6:10 13:21

Madison 4:22 making 9:8 management 6:17

Marc 11:17 Mark

5:11

Market 4:18 Marketing 6:17 Martin 5:3 8:12 Matt 4:16 matter 4:6,11 6:2 matters 12:25 meeting 8:19 14:8,17 mention 13:3 Midwest 5:7 mind 6:5 8:23 minutes 11:18 missed 11:23 Missouri 4:7,13,17,18, 23 5:1,19 morning 4:15,17,21 14:8,17 Myers 4:21,24 8:25 9:2 10:5 11:16 Ν narrow 13:25

negotiate 12:1 negotiating 10:24 negotiation 10:3 negotiations 8:11 10:23 12:5,22 note 7:11 0 October 11:5,14 12:3, 16,19,21 13:8 Office 4:25 7:12 Oligschlaeger 5:12 OPC 6:20 12:7,10, 12 oppose 8:14 opposed 7:21 8:11 12:12 opposing 10:13 order 11:8 12:5,15 ordered 12:24 ordering 12:3 outcome 12:2

outstanding 7:5 overseeing 4:11 Ρ paraphrasing 10:1 parties 4:12 5:17 6:1,12 7:2,3, 8,22 8:5 9:4 10:22 11:5,6, 7 12:2,21,22 13:5,7,9,16, 25 people 8:14 people's 8:23

perform 6:22 period

8:6 13:24

perspective
 6:14 9:2,13,
 22

Pipeline 6:23

**place** 7:24

**plan** 12:19

**pleading** 13:12,14

point
5:23 6:19
7:17 9:21

10:23 13:20

possibly 7:18

**Poston** 11:17,22 12:7,9,13

preference
10:2

present 5:7

procedural
4:5 5:21 6:4,
6 7:6,24 8:3,
5,17 9:6,9,
16,24 10:4,8,
15 11:9 12:6,
23 14:15

procedurally 8:22

procedure 6:10

proceedings 4:1 14:18

process 6:10,13,21

proof 8:17,19

proper 6:25

proposed 10:4

provide 7:5

prudence 8:20

prudent 6:11

# Public 4:25 6:21 7:13,18 11:23 purchased 4:8 puts 11:4 putting 6:3 12:17 Q question 5:23 6:1 R rain 14:11 rainy 14:8 raised 8:20 range 13:22 reached 7:4,22 12:2 reason 10:20,21 recap 11:24 recommendation 5:14,16,18 7:14 record 4:3,13 13:2 14:15 reflected 6:14

regard 6:5 7:16,19 Regulatory 4:10 remain 13:25 repeating 13:22 replied 5:19 reply 6:15 report 7:3,5 11:7 12:3,16,21 representing 4:17 request 7:6 requested 5:15,20,21,25 6:22 11:25 resolution 6:2 7:4 respond 5:16,18 responded 5:19 Rothfelder 5:3,4,6 8:12 9:7 10:6,10, 14 11:13 12:18 13:3,14 14:10 roughly 11:4 rounds 9:9

S schedule 6:4 7:6,24 8:3,6,8,17 9:6,9,16,24 10:4,8 11:9 12:6,23 scope 14:1 send 14:10 sending 12:19 September 11:4 set 4:5 7:1 10:17 settled 10:19 share 6:21 sharing 6:18 similar 6:21 single 14:3 sort 7:24 sound 11:24 sounds 9:22 12:11 Spire 4:7,13,16 5:19,24 6:6, 17 7:15 9:25

10:9 11:6,11, 25 St 4:18 Staff 4:20,22 5:12, 13 6:16,18 7:11,12,15 9:3 10:11 11:15,16 Staff's 5:18 7:13 9:2,13,22 10:2 start 8:18,22 9:8 starting 4:13 status 7:5 11:7 12:3,16,21,22 step 10:19 Stern 5:4 STL 6:23 Street 4:18,22 supply 13:23 surrounding 6:16 т talk

8:14 9:12

www.phippsreporting.com (888) 811-3408

talked 13:9	5:24
Tariff 4:8	υ
tendency 10:25	up-front 10:3
testimony 9:10,25 10:17	v
<b>things</b> 5:20 6:4	<b>view</b> 8:15,21
thought 6:11	W
ticking 7:25	wanted 5:17
<pre>time    4:4,5 5:15,17    6:25 7:2,6,7,    21,23 8:14    9:10,11,15    11:8,19 12:4,    6 13:1 14:7,    15,16  today    4:6 5:22    10:16,20 11:3</pre>	<pre>wanting     11:6 12 wind     14:13 work     6:15 7:     8:4 11: works     11:16 1 worth</pre>
<b>Today's</b> 4:3 <b>total</b> 14:1	13:21 written 11:19 1 wrong
touches 13:22	11:20
transaction 6:24 transactions 13:23	<b>year</b> 9:14,15
transportation 6:24	
turn	



(888) 811-3408