

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of Laclede Gas Company's)
Request to Increase Its Revenues for) Case No. GR-2017-0215
Gas Service)

In the Matter of Laclede Gas Company's)
d/b/a Missouri Gas Energy's Request to) Case No. GR-2017-0216
Increase Its Revenues for Gas Service)

MOTION TO LATE FILE TESTIMONY ATTACHMENT

COMES NOW the Missouri Office of the Public Counsel (OPC) and for its Motion to Late File Attachment states:

1. On November 21, 2017, OPC filed the Surrebuttal Testimony of Ara Azad in this rate case.
2. An attachment to the testimony was inadvertently omitted from the filings
3. OPC is attaching the filing as soon as possible after recognizing the inadvertent omission, so no party should be prejudiced by this request.

WHEREFORE, the Office of the Public Counsel respectfully submits this Motion to Late File Testimony Attachment and includes the Attachment.

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL

By: /s/ Lera L. Shemwell
Lera Shemwell, Mo. Bar No. 43792
Senior Counsel
PO Box 2230
Jefferson City, MO 65102
P: (573) 751-4857
F: (573) 751-5562
E-mail: lera.shemwell@ded.mo.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On this 22nd day of November, 2017, I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing motion was submitted to all relevant parties by depositing this motion into the Commission's Electronic Filing Information System ("EFIS").

/s/ Lera L. Shemwell

Laclede Gas Company
GR-2017-0215 and GR-2017-0216

Response to OPC Data Request 8504

Question:

Please describe how the amount was determined to allocate to MGE the costs of the Enterprise Information Management System (New Blue).

Response:

The amounts allocated to MGE were dependent on the software. The attached workpaper, which was provided with the original workpapers delivered to OPC on April 13, 2017 details the allocation amounts and allocation methodologies utilized in the process.

Signed by: Glenn Buck

Enterprise Software Account 391500 at 12-31-16

Adjustments from LGC to MGE

| Utility Acct | Company | Bus Seg | Asset Description | Software | Type | Balance | Allocation % | MGE | LGC |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle Enterprise Business Suite | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 22,641,945.33 | 41.42% | 9,378,293.76 | 13,263,651.57 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | STAT for Oracle EBS | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 153,790.12 | 41.42% | 63,699.87 | 90,090.25 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Hyperion Upgrade 2016 | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 1,137,876.51 | 41.42% | 471,308.45 | 666,568.06 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Hyperion 600 Patch ERPi Adaptor | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 343,507.24 | 41.42% | 142,280.70 | 201,226.54 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle EBS Implementation-MGE Integ | Oracle/Hyperion | MGE Integration | 3,271,531.93 | 100.00% | 3,271,531.93 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 27,548,651.13 | | 13,327,114.71 | 14,221,536.42 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Powerplant Implementation | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 5,632,346.50 | 41.42% | 2,332,917.92 | 3,299,428.58 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Work Order Addition | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 26,751.73 | 41.42% | 11,080.57 | 15,671.16 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | PowerPlan Upgrade w/ Tax Repairs | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 594,020.34 | 41.42% | 246,043.22 | 347,977.12 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Powertax and Provision Configure | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 945.00 | 41.42% | 391.42 | 553.58 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | PowerPlan Implementation-MGE Integ | PowerPlan | MGE Integration | 2,057,187.12 | 100.00% | 2,057,187.12 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 8,311,250.69 | | 4,647,620.25 | 3,663,630.44 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle Customer Care & Billing | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 25,052,923.53 | 42.62% | 10,677,556.01 | 14,375,367.52 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | CC&B Phase 2 Enhancements | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 1,750,278.48 | 42.62% | 745,968.69 | 1,004,309.79 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | CC&B Upgrade | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 1,445,900.62 | 42.62% | 616,242.84 | 829,657.78 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle CC&B - MGE Integration | CC&B | MGE Integration | 12,678,027.68 | 100.00% | 12,678,027.68 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 40,927,130.31 | | 24,717,795.22 | 16,209,335.09 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | G4 Rebuild for Maximo | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 1,217,913.77 | 41.42% | 504,459.88 | 713,453.89 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | IBM Maximo Implementation | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 17,307,105.61 | 41.42% | 7,168,603.14 | 10,138,502.47 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | GIS Upgrade for Maximo | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 2,894,746.30 | 41.42% | 1,199,003.92 | 1,695,742.38 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Enhancements Phase 2 Impl | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 1,664,374.74 | 41.42% | 689,384.02 | 974,990.72 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo License True Up | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 9,000.00 | 41.42% | 3,727.80 | 5,272.20 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Ph 3 Enhancements Imple | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 961,264.48 | 41.42% | 398,155.75 | 563,108.73 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Enhancements Ph 2 | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 1,589,316.16 | 41.42% | 658,294.75 | 931,021.41 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo - MGE Integration | Maximo | MGE Integration | 14,473,563.36 | 100.00% | 14,473,563.36 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 40,117,284.42 | | 25,095,192.62 | 15,022,091.80 |
| Grand Total | | | | | | 116,904,316.55 | | 67,787,722.80 | 49,116,593.75 |
| | | | | | | Total | | MGE | LGC |
| Expense 7% | | | | | | 8,183,303.00 | 7.00% | 4,745,141.00 | 3,438,162.00 |
| | | | | | | Total | | MGE | LGC |
| | | | | | | 100.00% | | 41.42% | 58.58% |
| Plant Balance | | | | | | | | | 1,868,492,831 |
| Account 391.5 | | | | | | | | | 116,904,317 |
| Balance | | | | | | 2,990,113,148 | | 1,238,524,634 | 1,751,588,515 |
| | | | | | | Total | | MGE | LGC |
| | | | | | | 100.00% | | 42.62% | 57.38% |
| # of Customers | | | | | | 1,048,782 | | 447,033 | 601,749 |

| Utility Acct | Company | Bus Seg | Asset Description | Software | Type | Depr Reserve | | | |
|--------------|---------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle Enterprise Business Suite | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 6,596,513.51 | 43.07% | 2,841,118.37 | 3,755,395.14 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | STAT for Oracle EBS | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 34,090.16 | 43.07% | 14,682.63 | 19,407.53 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Hyperion Upgrade 2016 | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 29,088.64 | 43.07% | 12,528.48 | 16,560.16 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Hyperion 600 Patch ERPi Adaptor | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 28,053.08 | 43.07% | 12,082.46 | 15,970.62 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle EBS Implementation-MGE Integ | Oracle/Hyperion | MGE Integration | 618,782.71 | 100.00% | 618,782.71 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 7,306,528.10 | | 3,499,194.65 | 3,807,333.45 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Powerplant Implementation | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 1,642,322.38 | 43.07% | 707,348.25 | 934,974.13 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Work Order Addition | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 6,866.21 | 43.07% | 2,957.28 | 3,908.93 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | PowerPlan Upgrade w/ Tax Repairs | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 76,232.62 | 43.07% | 32,833.39 | 43,399.23 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Powertax and Provision Configure | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 132.27 | 43.07% | 56.97 | 75.30 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | PowerPlan Implementation-MGE Integ | PowerPlan | MGE Integration | 385,456.54 | 100.00% | 385,456.54 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 2,111,010.02 | | 1,128,652.43 | 982,357.59 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle Customer Care & Billing | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 5,992,970.57 | 42.62% | 2,554,204.06 | 3,438,766.51 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | CC&B Phase 2 Enhancements | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 326,731.86 | 42.62% | 139,253.12 | 187,478.74 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | CC&B Upgrade | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 28,684.32 | 42.62% | 12,225.26 | 16,459.06 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle CC&B - MGE Integration | CC&B | MGE Integration | 1,107,634.96 | 100.00% | 1,107,634.96 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 7,456,021.71 | | 3,813,317.40 | 3,642,704.31 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | G4 Rebuild for Maximo | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 291,296.42 | 42.62% | 124,150.53 | 167,145.89 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | IBM Maximo Implementation | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 4,644,598.28 | 42.62% | 1,979,527.79 | 2,665,070.49 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | GIS Upgrade for Maximo | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 692,443.61 | 42.62% | 295,119.47 | 397,324.14 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Enhancements Phase 2 Impl | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 291,551.89 | 42.62% | 124,259.42 | 167,292.47 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo License True Up | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 262.50 | 42.62% | 111.88 | 150.62 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Ph 3 Enhancements Imple | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 78,467.04 | 42.62% | 33,442.65 | 45,024.39 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Enhancements Ph 2 | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 27,533.84 | 42.62% | 11,734.92 | 15,798.92 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo - MGE Integration | Maximo | MGE Integration | 1,265,258.01 | 100.00% | 1,265,258.01 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 7,291,411.59 | | 3,833,604.67 | 3,457,806.92 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Grand Total | 24,164,971.42 | 12,274,769.15 | 11,890,202.27 |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

| Total | MGE | LGC |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|
| 100.00% | 43.07% | 56.93% |
| Reserve Balance | | 672,614,561 |
| Account 391.5 | | 24,164,971 |
| Balance | 1,139,062,662 | 490,613,073 |

| Total | MGE | LGC |
|----------------|-----------|---------|
| 100.00% | 42.62% | 57.38% |
| # of Customers | 1,048,782 | 447,033 |

| Utility Acct | Company | Bus Seg | Asset Description | Software | Type | Total | MGE Adjustments from CCGC to MGE | |
|--------------|---------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| | | | | | | Net Book Value | Net Book Value | Net Book Value |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle Enterprise Business Suite | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 16,045,431.82 | 6,537,175.39 | 9,508,256.43 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | STAT for Oracle EBS | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 119,699.96 | 49,017.24 | 70,682.72 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Hyperion Upgrade 2016 | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 1,108,787.87 | 458,779.97 | 650,007.90 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Hyperion 600 Patch ERPi Adaptor | Oracle/Hyperion | newBlue/Other | 315,454.16 | 130,198.24 | 185,255.92 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle EBS Implementation-MGE Integ | Oracle/Hyperion | MGE Integration | 2,652,749.22 | 2,652,749.22 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 20,242,123.03 | 9,827,920.06 | 10,414,202.97 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Powerplant Implementation | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 3,990,024.12 | 1,625,569.67 | 2,364,454.45 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Work Order Addition | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 19,885.52 | 8,123.29 | 11,762.23 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | PowerPlan Upgrade w/ Tax Repairs | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 517,787.72 | 213,209.83 | 304,577.89 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Powertax and Provision Configure | PowerPlan | newBlue/Other | 812.73 | 334.45 | 478.28 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | PowerPlan Implementation-MGE Integ | PowerPlan | MGE Integration | 1,671,730.58 | 1,671,730.58 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 6,200,240.67 | 3,518,967.82 | 2,681,272.85 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle Customer Care & Billing | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 19,059,952.96 | 8,123,351.95 | 10,936,601.01 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | CC&B Phase 2 Enhancements | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 1,423,546.62 | 606,715.57 | 816,831.05 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | CC&B Upgrade | CC&B | newBlue/Other | 1,417,216.30 | 604,017.58 | 813,198.72 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle CC&B - MGE Integration | CC&B | MGE Integration | 11,570,392.72 | 11,570,392.72 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 33,471,108.60 | 20,904,477.82 | 12,566,630.78 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | G4 Rebuild for Maximo | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 926,617.35 | 380,309.35 | 546,308.00 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | IBM Maximo Implementation | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 12,662,507.33 | 5,189,075.35 | 7,473,431.98 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | GIS Upgrade for Maximo | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 2,202,302.69 | 903,884.45 | 1,298,418.24 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Enhancements Phase 2 Impl | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 1,372,822.85 | 565,124.60 | 807,698.25 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo License True Up | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 8,737.50 | 3,615.92 | 5,121.58 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Ph 3 Enhancements Imple | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 882,797.44 | 364,713.10 | 518,084.34 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Enhancements Ph 2 | Maximo | newBlue/Other | 1,561,782.32 | 646,559.83 | 915,222.49 |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo - MGE Integration | Maximo | MGE Integration | 13,208,305.35 | 13,208,305.35 | 0.00 |
| | | | | | | 32,825,872.83 | 21,261,587.95 | 11,564,284.88 |
| | | | | | | 92,739,345.13 | 55,512,953.65 | 37,226,391.48 |

Enterprise Software Account 391500 at 12-31-16

| <u>Utility Acct</u> | <u>Company</u> | <u>Bus Seg</u> | <u>Asset Description</u> | <u>Software</u> |
|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle CC&B - MGE Integration | CC&B |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo - MGE Integration | Maximo |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle EBS Implementation-MGE Integ | Oracle/Hyperion |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | PowerPlan Implementation-MGE Integ | PowerPlan |
| | | | | Subtota |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle Customer Care & Billing | CC&B |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | CC&B Phase 2 Enhancements | CC&B |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | CC&B Upgrade | CC&B |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | G4 Rebuild for Maximo | Maximo |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | IBM Maximo Implementation | Maximo |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | GIS Upgrade for Maximo | Maximo |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Enhancements Phase 2 Impl | Maximo |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo License True Up | Maximo |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Ph 3 Enhancements Imple | Maximo |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Maximo Enhancements Ph 2 | Maximo |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Oracle Enterprise Business Suite | Oracle/Hyperion |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | STAT for Oracle EBS | Oracle/Hyperion |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Hyperion Upgrade 2016 | Oracle/Hyperion |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Hyperion 600 Patch ERPi Adaptor | Oracle/Hyperion |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Powerplant Implementation | PowerPlan |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Work Order Addition | PowerPlan |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | PowerPlan Upgrade w/ Tax Repairs | PowerPlan |
| 391500 | Laclede Gas Company | 10010 | Powertax and Provision Configure | PowerPlan |
| | | | | Subtotal newBlue/Othe |

| Type | Balance | Depr Reserve | Net Book Value | gl_posting_mo_yr |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| MGE Integration | \$ 12,678,027.68 | \$ 1,107,634.96 | \$ 11,570,392.72 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| MGE Integration | \$ 14,473,563.36 | \$ 1,265,258.01 | \$ 13,208,305.35 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| MGE Integration | \$ 3,271,531.93 | \$ 618,782.71 | \$ 2,652,749.22 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| MGE Integration | \$ 2,057,187.12 | \$ 385,456.54 | \$ 1,671,730.58 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| MI MGE Integration | \$ 32,480,310.09 | \$ 3,377,132.22 | \$ 29,103,177.87 | |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 25,052,923.53 | \$ 5,992,970.57 | \$ 19,059,952.96 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 1,750,278.48 | \$ 326,731.86 | \$ 1,423,546.62 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 1,445,900.62 | \$ 28,684.32 | \$ 1,417,216.30 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 1,217,913.77 | \$ 291,296.42 | \$ 926,617.35 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 17,307,105.61 | \$ 4,644,598.28 | \$ 12,662,507.33 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 2,894,746.30 | \$ 692,443.61 | \$ 2,202,302.69 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 1,664,374.74 | \$ 291,551.89 | \$ 1,372,822.85 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 9,000.00 | \$ 262.50 | \$ 8,737.50 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 961,264.48 | \$ 78,467.04 | \$ 882,797.44 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 1,589,316.16 | \$ 27,533.84 | \$ 1,561,782.32 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 22,641,945.33 | \$ 6,596,513.51 | \$ 16,045,431.82 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 153,790.12 | \$ 34,090.16 | \$ 119,699.96 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 1,137,876.51 | \$ 29,088.64 | \$ 1,108,787.87 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 343,507.24 | \$ 28,053.08 | \$ 315,454.16 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 5,632,346.50 | \$ 1,642,322.38 | \$ 3,990,024.12 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 26,751.73 | \$ 6,866.21 | \$ 19,885.52 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 594,020.34 | \$ 76,232.62 | \$ 517,787.72 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| newBlue/Other | \$ 945.00 | \$ 132.27 | \$ 812.73 | 12/1/2016 0:00 |
| MI Implementation | \$ 84,424,006.46 | \$ 20,787,839.20 | \$ 63,636,167.26 | |
| GRAND TOTAL | \$ 116,904,316.55 | \$ 24,164,971.42 | \$ 92,739,345.13 | |

Laclede Gas Company / Missouri Gas Energy
GR-2017-0215 / GR-2017-0216

Response to OPC Data Request 1021

Question:

1021

1. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 9 lines 20-23. Please list and state the business purpose of each and every Spire operating company and/or affiliate.
2. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 9 lines 20-23. Please describe how Spire's new Shared Services Company and model increases the transparency of Laclede and Spire's corporate allocations and affiliate transactions.
3. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 10 lines 4-5. Please provide monthly allocation reports of costs from the Shared Services Company to each operating company and affiliate for the period August 2015 through March 2017. Please ensure the report describes the nature of the cost, allocation factor, and dollar amount of costs allocated or charged to each cost center.
4. Please provide a copy of each and every analysis or report created by the Shared Services Company for the period August 2015 through March 2017.
5. Please state each and every cost center, operating company or affiliate under the Spire umbrella that 1) did not receive Shared Services Company allocations or charges in the rate case test year and 2) are not currently receiving Shared Service Company allocations or charges.
6. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 9 lines 3-6. For each operating company, affiliate and/or other entity that received cost allocations or charges from the Shared Services Company, please provide by month for the period August 2015 through March 2017, the dollar amount of a) average fixed assets, revenue, and payroll by month by entity.
7. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 12 lines 18-21. For each operating company, affiliate and/or other entity that received cost allocations or other charges from The Laclede Group, please provide by month for the period August 2010 through the last month prior to the change to the Shared Services Company, a) a copy of each and every monthly corporate allocation report generated, the dollar amounts of costs allocated from or charged from The Laclede Group to: A) Laclede Gas Company, B) MGE (post acquisition), and C) each and every other operating company, affiliate or entity in which The Laclede Group allocated or assigned or charged costs.
8. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 12 lines 15-17. Please provide a copy of each and every analysis and ongoing report referenced here for the period August 2015 through March 2017.
9. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 13 lines 20-21. Please provide a copy of the training provided to employees referenced here.
10. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 14 lines 5-7. Please provide a copy of the variances and trends that were analyzed and discussed for each month since the inception of the Shared Services Company through March 2017.
11. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 14 lines 9-11 please provide a copy of the variances and future forecasts presented and discussed in each monthly business review meeting for each operating unit for each month since the inception of the

Shared Services Company through March 2017.

12. Reference the direct testimony of Laclede witness Timothy Krick page 14 lines 11-13 please provide a copy of each report that includes explanations for relevant variances that were distributed to executive management and the BOD monthly for each month since the inception of the Shared Services Company through March 2017.

Response:

1. The business purpose of each entity is stated in the articles of incorporation, reference workpaper OPC1021.1.
2. Increased transparency is largely due to the aggregation of the costs of shared service functions in one company versus allocated and charged directly between multiple companies. There are several benefits to this approach, not limited to but including a holistic view of the costs of these functions and services, removes overlap and redundancy of reporting, and easier to track movements of allocations from one company rather than allocations between several companies.
3. Reference supporting documentation provided in monthly excel reports DR1021.3. There are three categories of expenses (Directors Fees & Expenses, Directors Equity Compensation, and Employees Equity Compensation) that were integrated into the automated allocation process in early FY17, separate workpapers are provided for these items as an attempt to limit any confusion that may have resulted showing part of the year in Shared Services. Note that the Shared Services Company had no transactions in August 2015 and September 2015 because the entity was not used until FY 2016.
4. Documentation provided in #3, 10, and 12 encompasses all relevant analysis and reporting related to the Shared Services Company for the periods requested.
5. Affiliates/operating companies are listed below. The original direct charge or expense is accumulated at the cost center level, allocations of those expenses are not pushed down to individual cost centers, rather a shared service cost center is used for the corporate allocations, therefore in response to the question the majority of cost centers did not receive allocations.

5.1

Spire Inc. (Holding Company)
Spire Resources LLC
Spire Midstream LLC
Spire STL Pipeline LLC
Shared Services Company
Laclede Investment LLC
Laclede Gas Family Services, Inc. (dissolved 9/30/2016)
Spire Storage Inc - Storage Services
Energy South Inc.

5.2

Spire Inc. (Holding Company)

Spire Resources LLC
Spire Midstream LLC
Spire STL Pipeline LLC (will receive allocations in FY17 Q3)
Shared Services Company
Laclede Investment LLC
Laclede Gas Family Services, Inc. (dissolved 9/30/2016)
Spire Storage Inc - Storage Services
Energy South Inc.

6. The 3 factor allocation that includes the average of fixed assets, revenue, and payroll for the 12 month periods ending 9/30/2015, 9/30/2016, and the 6 months ending 3/31/2017 are attached as workpapers OPC1021.6. These factors are not calculated on a monthly basis.

7. Copies of annual CAM reports for FY2011 – FY2016 are attached, reference files OPC1021.7.

8. Documentation provided in #3, 10, and 12 encompasses all relevant analysis and reporting related to the Shared Services Company for the periods requested.

9. Please see the response to MPSC DR 0142.

10. Reference files attached OPC1021.10

11. Reference response to #12.

12. Reference files attached OPC1021.12 and OPC1021.14

Signed by: Glenn Buck



SUPREME COURT OF MISSOURI
en banc

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL,)
)
 Appellant,)
)
 vs.) **No. SC92964**
)
 MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE)
 COMMISSION and)
 ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION,)
)
 Respondents.)

Appeal from the
Missouri Public Service Commission

*Opinion issued July 30, 2013, and modified on the Court's own motion
September 10, 2013*

The Office of Public Counsel (OPC) appeals from an order entered by the Missouri Public Service Commission (PSC) rejecting the PSC staff's proposed actual cost adjustment disallowances regarding Atmos Energy Corporation's transactions with its affiliate. This Court reverses.

When a regulated gas corporation such as Atmos Energy engages in a business transaction with an affiliated entity, it is required to abide by the affiliate transaction rules set forth in the Missouri Code of State Regulations. *4 CSR 240-40.015-40.016*. Due to the inherent risk of self-dealing, the presumption of prudence utilized by the PSC when reviewing regulated utility transactions should not be employed if a transaction is between a utility and the utility's affiliate.

Because the PSC reviewed the transaction between Atmos and its affiliate through the lens of the presumption of prudence, its order is unlawful and unreasonable. Accordingly, the order is reversed and the case remanded to the PSC for further review consistent with this opinion.

I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In 2007 and 2008, Atmos Energy Corporation operated as the largest natural-gas-only distributor in the United States. As a local distributing company, Atmos does not produce its own gas and does not purchase gas directly from producers. Instead, Atmos contracts with independent gas marketing companies to purchase natural gas. Atmos then delivers the purchased gas to customers through its local pipelines.

Atmos is subject to regulation as a gas corporation and public utility by the Missouri Public Service Commission (PSC). *See* § 386.020; § 386.250; *chapter 393*.¹ The PSC is a state agency established to regulate public utilities operating within the state. Pursuant to the statutory provisions in chapter 393, the PSC has jurisdiction over the rates and charges that Atmos imposes on its Missouri customers.²

In addition to the basic amount Atmos charges its customers under its published rate, Atmos also is permitted to charge its customers for additional costs it has incurred when the price it pays its suppliers for gas increases. These additional charges are recovered through a two-part mechanism known as a purchased gas adjustment/actual cost adjustment process (PGA/ACA). In the PGA portion of this process, a utility such

¹ All Missouri statutory references are to RSMo 2000 unless otherwise indicated.

² In 2012, Atmos sold its Missouri assets to Liberty Utilities.

as Atmos files annual tariffs in which it estimates its costs of obtaining gas over the coming year. The PGA amounts are then included in the customers' bills over the ensuing 12 months. Because it is difficult to estimate the projected changes in cost precisely, the utility then files for an adjustment, or ACA, if its actual cost is different than projected in its PGA filing. This ACA allows the PSC to correct any discrepancies between the costs billed and the costs actually incurred. When an ACA is received, the PSC staff audits the utility's gas purchases made during the ACA period in question. As part of the review, the staff evaluates whether the rates paid by consumers for natural gas sold during the period were "just and reasonable." § 393.130.1. The PSC then takes the staff's audit into consideration and ultimately determines the proper ACA amount.³

Atmos submitted its 2007-2008 ACA filings to the PSC on October 16, 2008. PSC staff audited the ACA filing by reviewing and analyzing the billed revenues and

³ The PSC adopted the PGA/ACA rate mechanism pursuant to its broad power to regulate gas utilities, rather than pursuant to a specific statutory directive. *See chapter 393; 4 CSR 240-13.010(1)(S)* (defining "purchased gas adjustment clause"); *4 CSR 240-40.018(1)(B)* (explaining use of purchased gas adjustment clauses to control financial gains or losses associated with gas price volatility). This Court has not addressed the authority of the PSC to utilize the PGA/ACA mechanism as part of its regulation of gas utilities, although one court of appeals decision has done so. *See State ex rel. Midwest Gas Users' Ass'n v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n or State*, 976 S.W.2d 470 (Mo. App. 1998) (discussing implied authorization for use of PGA/ACA mechanism when certain procedural protections are in place). Here, as neither party challenges the use of the PGA/ACA mechanism, this Court still does not reach that issue. *Cf. State ex rel. Util. Consumers' Council of Missouri, Inc. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 585 S.W.2d 41, 46 (Mo. banc 1979) (disapproving *electric* utility's use of a fuel adjustment clause, which is similar to a PGA mechanism, because automatic adjustment clauses were unlawful under statutory scheme then in place); *State ex rel. AG Processing v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 340 S.W.3d 146, 151 (Mo. App. 2011) (approving *electric* utility's use of fuel adjustment clause, which permitted automatic adjustment for actual fuel costs without a full rate hearing, pursuant to legislature's 2005 enactment of section 386.266).

actual gas costs for the period of September 1, 2007, to August 31, 2008, for each of Atmos' eight Missouri service areas. The staff's review raised concerns regarding Atmos' transactions with Atmos Energy Marketing LLC ("AEM").

AEM is a separate, unregulated but affiliated gas marketing company that is wholly owned by Atmos. Between April 2004 and November 2009, Atmos issued 48 requests for proposals (RFPs) in six other service areas. Of these 48 RFPs, AEM submitted bids in response to 24 and was the winning bidder in six.

Two of these six winning bids were for supplying gas to the Hannibal area operating system during the 2007-2008 ACA period. As required when taking bids, Atmos issued a RFP and interested suppliers submitted confidential bids proposing pricing for supplying gas services to Atmos for the Hannibal area. For the 2007-2008 ACA period at issue here, Atmos had two overlapping RFP processes; the first covered the period April 1, 2007, to March 31, 2008, and the second covered the period April 1, 2008, to March 31, 2009. For each period, Atmos sent RFP letters to 56 gas marketing companies.

During the first period, Atmos received only five bids that Atmos said conformed to the RFP requirements. Its affiliate, AEM, submitted the lowest bid at \$14,723,472. The lowest conforming bid submitted by a non-affiliated gas marketer was for \$15,069,726, approximately \$346,000 higher than AEM's bid. During the second period, only three suppliers submitted bids that Atmos said conformed to its RFP. Its affiliate, AEM, submitted a bid of \$13,947,511. This bid was approximately \$100,000 lower than the next lowest bid of \$14,049,424. Atmos awarded AEM both contracts.

Staff raised an issue about how the RFP set out certain supply requirements and whether AEM's bid actually conformed to the RFP requirements. It is uncontested that the RFP mandated that all gas supply be "firm and warranted." But the RFP process also allowed bidders to use either a primary natural gas receipt point or a secondary receipt point. Primary firm delivery is the highest priority gas supply and costs more because timely delivery is assured. Secondary in-path delivery is just below primary firm delivery. The secondary delivery method, though, is still "firm" though less convenient. Both forms of delivery are preferred over "interruptible" supply, because the timing of supplying interruptible gas may be interrupted if the supplier has an inadequate quantity of gas to meet all commitments at a specific time. Staff contended it was not clear that AEM's bid was for firm rather than interruptible gas because the transaction confirmation document that normally specifies "firm" delivery was left blank. Staff also contended the distinction between primary and secondary receipt points was not made clear in the RFP bidding, which could have allowed AEM an advantage if it had insider knowledge that Atmos was willing to accept a secondary receipt point bid. Staff contends this gave AEM a benefit in the transactions because of its affiliation with Atmos.

The transactions between a utility such as Atmos and its affiliate are governed by the PSC's affiliate transaction rules. The rules establish standards for a regulated gas utility's dealings with its affiliated companies. When acquiring natural gas from an affiliate, a regulated local distribution company can compensate its affiliate only at the lesser of the gas' fair market price or the fully distributed cost to the regulated gas

company were it to acquire the gas for itself. 4 CSR 240-40.016(3)(A).⁴ This provision is known as the asymmetrical pricing standard. *State ex rel. Atmos Energy Corp. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n of State*, 103 S.W.3d 753, 762 (Mo. banc 2003).

Following its audit of the 2007-2008 ACA period, the PSC staff report indicated that Atmos had failed to comply with the affiliate transaction rules because it failed to properly document the fair market value and fully distributed cost of its transactions with AEM. Staff proposed a disallowance of \$308,733 for the Hannibal area, an amount equal to the profit AEM earned on that transaction.

In its filed response to the staff's recommendation, Atmos disagreed with the proposed disallowance and requested a hearing. The PSC conducted an evidentiary hearing on March 23 and 24, 2011, and issued a report and order on November 9, 2011.

In considering whether Atmos complied with the affiliate transaction rules, the PSC applied a presumption that Atmos' gas purchases were prudent and put the burden on staff to prove that the purchases from AEM were not prudent. The PSC determined that staff had failed to rebut this presumption, that the fair market price was established by Atmos' bidding process, and that this fair market price was less than the fully

⁴ 4 CSR 240-40.015 is the general affiliate transaction rule, while 4 CSR 240-40.016 specifically regulates transactions between regulated gas corporations and affiliated gas marketing companies. Both 240-40.015 and 240-40.016 provide:

(A) A regulated gas corporation shall not provide a financial advantage to an affiliated entity. For the purposes of this rule, a regulated gas corporation shall be deemed to provide a financial advantage to an affiliated entity if –

1. It compensates an affiliated entity for goods or services above the lesser of –
 - A. The fair market price; or
 - B. The fully distributed cost to the regulated gas corporation to provide the goods or services for itself ...

distributed cost for Atmos to acquire the gas itself. Based on this presumption, the PSC found compliance with the affiliate transaction rules and rejected staff's proposed disallowances regarding Atmos' transactions with AEM.

OPC filed an application for rehearing, which the PSC denied.⁵ OPC appealed and the court of appeals affirmed. This Court granted transfer pursuant to art. V, sec. 10 of the Missouri Constitution after opinion by the court of appeals.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

“Pursuant to section 386.510, the appellate standard of review of a [PSC] order is two-pronged: ‘first, the reviewing court must determine whether the [PSC]'s order is lawful; and second, the court must determine whether the order is reasonable.’” *State ex rel. AG Processing, Inc. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n of State*, 120 S.W.3d 732, 734 (Mo. banc 2003). The PSC’s order has a presumption of validity, and the burden of proof is on the appellant to prove that the order is unlawful or unreasonable. *State ex rel. Sprint Missouri, Inc. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n of State*, 165 S.W.3d 160, 164 (Mo. banc 2005). The lawfulness of an order is determined “by whether statutory authority for its issuance exists, and all legal issues are reviewed de novo.” *AG Processing*, 120 S.W.3d at 734. “The decision of the [PSC] is reasonable where the order is supported by substantial, competent evidence on the whole record; the decision is not arbitrary or capricious or where the [PSC] has not abused its discretion.” *State ex rel. Praxair, Inc. v. Missouri Pub. Serv. Comm’n*, 344 S.W.3d 178, 184 (Mo. banc 2011).

⁵ OPC acts as consumers’ advocate and represents the public in utility cases before the PSC. The powers of the OPC are set forth in section 386.710.

III. ANALYSIS

The OPC argues that the PSC's order is unlawful and unreasonable in that it violates 4 CSR 240-40.016 and is not based on competent and substantial evidence. The order is unlawful, the OPC contends, because the PSC did not adhere to the asymmetrical pricing standard rules, which require documentation showing that Atmos charged customers the lesser of the fair market price or the fully distributed cost for the gas supply acquired from Atmos' affiliate, AEM. The OPC claims the order is unreasonable because it believes the PSC's conclusion that Atmos acquired gas supply from AEM at the lesser of the fully distributed cost or fair market price is not supported by competent and substantial evidence. This error was contributed to by the PSC's misreliance on the presumption of prudence in reviewing the bid of an affiliate, which OPC says is improper.

A. Presumption of Prudence

The burden is on the gas corporation to prove that the gas costs it proposes to pass along to customers are just and reasonable. § 393.150.2; *see also Matter of Kansas Power and Light Co., 30 Mo. P.S.C. (N.S.) 76 (1989)* (The gas corporation "has the burden of showing its proposed rates are just and reasonable ... [and] of showing the reasonableness of costs associated with its rates for gas.)

While the burden of proof rests on the gas corporation, the PSC's practice has been to apply a "presumption of prudence" in determining whether a utility properly incurred its expenditures. The presumption of prudence is not a creature of statute or regulation. It first was recognized by the PSC in *Matter of Union Electric, 27 Mo. P.S.C.*

(*N.S.*) 183 (1985) and has been applied by it since that point.

Under the presumption of prudence, a utility's costs "are presumed to be prudently incurred. ... However, the presumption does not survive a showing of inefficiency or improvidence" that creates "serious doubt as to the prudence of an expenditure." *Id. at 193*, quoting *Anaheim, Riverside, Etc. v. Fed. Energy Reg. Com'n*, 669 F.2d 799, 809 (D.C. Cir. 1981). If such a showing is made, the presumption drops out and the applicant has the burden of dispelling these doubts and proving the questioned expenditure to have been prudent. *Id.*

The Missouri court of appeals has applied the presumption of prudence in cases involving affiliated companies without discussing whether its rationale is applicable to affiliates. *See, e.g., State ex rel. Pub. Counsel v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 274 S.W.3d 569, 582 (Mo. App. 2009) (stating without analysis that "[a]lthough UE purchased the CTGs from its affiliates, the commission properly presumed that UE was prudent in its purchase of the CTGs"); *State ex rel. Assoc. Natural Gas Co. v. Public Serv. Comm'n*, 954 S.W.2d 520 (Mo. App. 1997) (without discussing rationale court assumes presumption applies and finds Commission erred in finding it was overcome and disallowing increase where no harm to customers was shown).

This Court has not addressed directly whether the presumption of prudence is valid in either affiliate or non-affiliate cases, although it did note its existence, without addressing its legitimacy, in *dicta* in a non-affiliate case, *State ex rel. Riverside Pipeline Co., L.P. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n of State*, 215 S.W.3d 76, 85 (Mo. banc 2007). *Riverside* upheld a stipulation between the PSC and certain energy companies that precluded

prudence review by the PSC.

The OPC agrees that a presumption of prudence is appropriately applied in arms-length transactions, and this Court concurs. When dealing at arms-length, there is a diminished probability of collusion and the pressures of a competitive market create an assumption of legitimacy.

OPC argues, however, that a presumption that a transaction was agreed to prudently should not apply to *affiliate* transactions because of the greater risk of self-dealing when contracting with an affiliate. This Court again agrees. As noted in the report of a Congressional staff investigation of the particularly egregious affiliate dealings between Enron and its pipeline subsidiaries in the wake of Enron's collapse:

[W]henever a company conducts transactions among its own affiliates there are inherent issues about the fairness and motivations of such transactions. ... One concern is that where one affiliate in a transaction has captive customers, a one-sided deal between affiliates can saddle those customers with additional financial burdens. Another concern is that one affiliate will treat another with favoritism at the expense of other companies or in ways detrimental to the market as a whole.

Staff of Senate Comm. on Gov't Affairs, 107th Cong., *Committee Staff Investigation of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Oversight of Enron* 26, n.75 (Nov. 12, 2002); see also Judy Sheldrew, *Shutting the Barn Door Before the Horse Is Stolen: How and Why State Public Utility Commissions Should Regulate Transactions Between A Public Utility and Its Affiliates*, 4 NEV. L.J. 164, 195 (2003).

This greater risk inherent in affiliate transactions arises because agreements between a public utility and its affiliates are not "made at arm's length or on an open market. They are between corporations, one of which is controlled by the other. As such

they are subject to suspicion and therefore present dangerous potentialities.” *Pac. Tel. & Tel. Co. v. Pub. Utils. Comm’n*, 215 P.2d 441, 449 (Cal. 1950) (Carter, J., dissenting).

Indeed, as the PSC acknowledged in *State ex rel. Atmos Energy Corp. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n of State*, 103 S.W.3d 753, 763-64 (Mo. banc 2003), the affiliate transaction rules were adopted in response to the very kinds of concerns now raised by OPC. In that case, the concern was with a profit-producing scheme among certain public utilities termed “cross-subsidization,” through which some utilities would abandon their traditional monopoly structure and expand into non-regulated areas. “This expansion [gave] utilities the opportunity and incentive to shift their non-regulated costs to their regulated operations with the effect of unnecessarily increasing the rates charged to the utilities’ customers.” *Id.* at 764. See also *United States v. Western Elec. Co.*, 592 F. Supp. 846, 853 (D.D.C.1984) (“As long as a [utility] is engaged in both monopoly and competitive activities, it will have the incentive as well as the ability to ‘milk’ the rate-of-return regulated monopoly affiliate to subsidize its competitive ventures”).

Here, the concern is with an ability to offer a lower bid than one’s competitors because of access to inside information about costs and terms and because of an ability to shift fixed costs to the regulated utility, thereby allowing the affiliate to bid lower due to lower overhead costs. While this Court does not suggest that there was such conduct here, the risk of this conduct and the incentive to undertake it inherently exists in affiliate transactions.

For these reasons, the rationale for permitting a presumption of prudence in arms-length transactions simply has no application to affiliate transactions. The PSC enacted

the affiliate transaction rules in 2000 with the precise purpose of thwarting unnecessary rate hikes due to cross-subsidization. *State ex rel. Atmos*, 103 S.W.3d at 764. Those rules require that a utility must show that it paid the lesser of the fair market rate or the fully distributed cost to the regulated gas corporation and require that records be kept supporting these calculations. 4 CSR 240-40.016(4)(B) (“[T]he regulated gas corporation shall document both the fair market price of such ... goods and services and the fully distributed cost to the regulated gas corporation to produce the ... goods or services for itself.”)

The affiliate rules’ stated purpose is to “prevent regulated utilities from subsidizing their non-regulated operations ... and provide the public the assurance that their rates are not adversely impacted by the utilities’ nonregulated activities.” 240-40.015. A presumption that costs of transactions between affiliates were prudent is inconsistent with these rules.

For these reasons, the majority of other courts to address the issue have concluded that a presumption of prudence should not be applied to affiliate transactions. In *US W. Commc’ns, Inc. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n of Utah*, 901 P.2d 270 (Utah 1995), the Supreme Court of Utah held that the Utah Public Service Commission correctly placed the burden on a telephone provider of proving that the services rendered by its affiliate were not duplicative. In support of its decision, the court remarked; “While the pressures of a competitive market might allow us to assume, in the absence of a showing to the contrary, that nonaffiliate expenses are reasonable, the same cannot be said of affiliate expenses not incurred in an arm's length transaction.” *Id. at 274.*

The Supreme Court of Idaho reached a similar conclusion in *Boise Water Corp. v. Idaho Pub. Utilities Comm'n*, 555 P.2d 163 (1976). The court refused to make an exception to the rule placing upon the utility the burden of proving reasonableness of its operating expenses paid to an affiliate, stating; “The reason for this distinction between affiliate and non-affiliate expenditures appears to be that the probability of unwarranted expenditures corresponds to the probability of collusion.” *Id. at 169*. See also, *Turpen v. Oklahoma Corp. Comm'n*, 769 P.2d 1309, 1320-21 (Okla. 1988) (“It is generally held that, while the regulatory agency bears the burden of proving that expenses incurred in transactions with nonaffiliates are unreasonable, the utility bears the burden of proving that expenses incurred in transactions with affiliates are reasonable); *Michigan Gas Utilities v. Michigan Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 206234, 1999 WL 33454925 (Mich. App. Feb. 9, 1999) (“the utility has the burden of demonstrating that its transactions with its affiliate are reasonable”). This Court concurs. A presumption of prudence is inconsistent with the rationale for the affiliate transaction rules and with the PSC’s obligation to prevent regulated utilities from subsidizing their non-regulated operations.

The PSC counters that it always has recognized a presumption of prudence and that this Court cannot read the affiliate transaction rules to negate that presumption in the case of affiliated transactions because the affiliate transaction rules themselves state that they did not “modify existing legal standards regarding which party has the burden of proof in commission proceedings.” 4 CSR 240-40.015(6)(C) & 240-40.016(7)(C). This argument is based on a misunderstanding of the concept of burden of proof.

Missouri law sets out the burden of proof in PSC proceedings. As noted earlier,

those statutes provide that a gas corporation has the burden to prove that the gas costs it proposes to pass along to customers are just and reasonable. § 393.150.2. The PSC has no authority to adopt rules changing the burden of proof set out in the relevant statutes, and it was proper for the affiliate transaction rules to note that they did not attempt to do so. See *Kanakuk-Kanakomo Kamps, Inc. v. Dir. of Revenue*, 8 S.W.3d 94, 98 (Mo. banc 1999) (A regulation that is beyond the scope of the statute is a nullity).

A change in the presumption of prudence does not change the burden of proof set out in the PSC governing statutes. The presumption of prudence does not address the burden of proof at all. It sets out *an evidentiary presumption* created by the PSC. That standard provides that the utility's expenditures are presumed to be prudent until adequate contrary evidence is produced, at which point the presumption disappears from the case. See *Deck v. Teasley*, 322 S.W.3d 536, 539 (Mo. banc 2010) (discussing general law of presumptions). This presumption affects who has the burden of proceeding, but it does not change the burden of proof, which by statute must remain on the utility.⁶ § 393.150.2.

Further, the presumption of prudence is not even a creature of statute or of PSC regulations or rules. It was created by PSC case law. It cannot be applied inconsistently with the PSC's governing statutes and rules. As discussed above, the application of a presumption of prudence to a transaction with an affiliated company is inconsistent with

⁶ Although the above analysis is dispositive, it bears noting that the PSC has not identified any rule, regulation or decision in which it affirmatively determined prior to the adoption of the affiliate transaction rules that the presumption of prudence was applicable to affiliate transactions. For this reason also, AEM's argument is not well taken.

the PSC's statutory and regulatory obligations to review affiliate transactions. Accordingly, the presumption of prudence is inapplicable to affiliate transactions.

B. PSC Order Inappropriately Relied on Presumption of Prudence

The PSC used the presumption of prudence to shift the burden from Atmos, which should have been required to show that it complied with the affiliate transaction rules, and instead placed the burden on staff to show that Atmos did not do so.

The effect of the PSC's reliance on the presumption of prudence is particularly obvious in regard to the PSC's discussion of what would have been the fully distributed cost had Atmos obtained the gas itself rather than going through third parties. As noted earlier, the affiliate transaction rules mandate that a utility shall not provide a financial advantage to an affiliated entity. The utility provides a financial advantage if it "compensates an affiliated entity for ... goods or services above the lesser of ... [t]he fair market price ... or [t]he fully distributed cost to the [utility] to provide the ... goods or services for itself." *4 CSR 240-40.016(3)(A)*.

In all transactions that involve the purchase or receipt of goods or services from an affiliated entity, the utility must document the fair market value and the fully distributed cost, *4 CSR 240-40.016(4)(B)*,⁷ and this documentation must be kept in books and

⁷ The regulation states in relevant part:

In transactions that involve either the purchase or receipt of information, assets, goods or services by a regulated gas corporation from an affiliated entity, the regulated gas corporation shall document both the fair market price of such information, assets, goods and services and the fully distributed cost to the regulated gas corporation to produce the information, assets, goods or services for itself.

4 CSR 240-40.016(4)(B).

records with “sufficient detail to permit verification with this rule.” 4 CSR 240-40.016(5)(C)1.⁸ The rules specifically define what figures must be included in the calculation of the fully distributed cost:

Fully distributed cost (FDC) means a methodology that examines all costs of an enterprise in relation to all the goods and services that are produced. FDC requires recognition of all costs incurred directly or indirectly used to produce a good or service. Costs are assigned either through a direct or allocated approach. Costs that cannot be directly assigned or indirectly allocated (e.g., general or administrative) must also be included in the FDC calculation through a general allocation.

4 CSR 240-40.016(1)(F).

Due to its reliance on the presumption of prudence, the PSC did not consider whether Atmos kept the required books and records and whether Atmos showed that its fully distributed costs were higher than the fair market value of the services received from its’ affiliate. Neither did it require Atmos or AEM to produce most of these records to staff or OPC.⁹ Staff did not have evidence as to how AEM prepared its bid or as to

⁸ The evidentiary requirement requires a regulated gas company maintain the following records:

1. Records identifying the basis used (e.g., fair market price, fully distributed cost, etc.) to record affiliate transactions; and
2. Books of accounts and supporting records in sufficient detail to permit verification of compliance with this rule.

4 CSR 240-40.016(5)(C).

⁹ This also led the PSC to not resolve the issue whether Atmos adequately complied with the PSC’s order compelling production of certain information in its books and records and whether the order went beyond what was required by the affiliate transaction rules. In light of the presumption of prudence, the PSC found that this discovery was not necessary. Because it is appropriate for the PSC to determine the parties’ disagreement on the meaning, effect and compliance with the motion to compel in the first instance in light of this Court’s ruling on the inappropriateness of using the presumption of prudence in affiliate transactions, this Court does not resolve this issue here but leaves it for the PSC to resolve on remand.

the sharing of costs between Atmos and AEM because it had not been able to obtain this information. This led the PSC to reject staff's proposed disallowance of \$308,733 in profits because, it found, staff did not offer "any serious argument to suggest that Atmos could provide gas-marketing services for itself cheaper if it did not use the services of gas marketing companies."

Of course, it was not up to staff to prove a negative. Whether staff thought the cost would have been cheaper if Atmos had not used the affiliate was the not the relevant question; the affiliate transaction rules put the burden on Atmos to keep records that would allow it to show it would not have been cheaper.

The PSC notes that staff did not specifically contest what Atmos' costs of providing its own gas marketing services would have been. OPC, however, did contest this issue. In its initial brief before the PSC, OPC specifically challenged the prudence of purchasing gas at a marked-up price from an affiliate rather than by Atmos acquiring the gas itself at a similar or lesser cost, stating, "Atmos' decision to purchase gas through its marketing affiliate AEM, rather than by making the gas purchases itself (and avoiding the AEM profit mark-up) is reason alone to render Atmos' purchasing decisions imprudent."

OPC argues that the PSC erred in simply presuming that, because there was a bid process, the lowest price bid must have been the lowest fair market value of the gas. It argues that the number of bidders was so low that the bid process was inadequate to identify the fair market value of the gas. OPC also specifically questions whether Atmos required AEM to bid for the same service as the other companies to whom Atmos sent an RFP in light of staff's evidence that the agreement between Atmos and AEM left blank

whether the gas was to be “firm” or “interruptible gas,” whereas other gas-supply agreements between Atmos and non-affiliates specifically identified that firm gas was required. This was an important distinction because, as noted earlier, firm gas transportation, for which delivery is guaranteed, is generally more expensive than interruptible transportation, for which delivery can be delayed if the pipeline’s capacity is completely in use.

OPC suggests that if Atmos requested proposals for firm gas transportation with the understanding that it would be sufficient if AEM bid the cost of interruptible gas transportation, it would have allowed AEM to undercut the other gas marketers’ bids. If this were what happened, the bid by AEM most certainly would not have reflected the “fair market price” of firm gas.

Similarly, OPC questioned whether the bidding process adequately established the fair market price due to the low number of conforming bids submitted by non-affiliated gas marketers. In the first RFP, only four non-affiliated gas marketers submitted conforming bids; in the second RFP, only two did so (and only if one presumes that they all bid on firm rather than interruptible gas). The record does not show whether the PSC would have considered this a sufficient response to enable it to determine the fair market value of the gas had it not relied on the presumption of prudence.

As with the question of fully distributed costs, due to its reliance on the presumption of prudence, the PSC did not develop a sufficient record on these or related issues to permit this Court to determine whether Atmos complied with the affiliate transaction rules and whether the PSC order is reasonable and lawful. This Court

remands so that the PSC can resolve these issues in the first instance based on the proper standard.

IV. CONCLUSION

The PSC erred in relying upon the presumption of prudence in rejecting staff and OPC's proposed disallowance for Atmos' Hannibal service area gas costs. The affiliate transaction rules were enacted in an effort to prevent regulated utilities from subsidizing their non-regulated activities. To presume that a regulated utility's costs in a transaction with an affiliate were incurred prudently is inconsistent with these rules.

The PSC relied heavily on the presumption of prudence in rejecting staff's proposed disallowance. This error resulted in an order that is unlawful and unreasonable. On remand, the PSC again must consider whether Atmos compensated AEM above the lesser of the fair market price or the fully distributed cost to Atmos to provide the gas for itself. To satisfy the affiliate transaction rules' requirements, Atmos must provide sufficient asymmetrical pricing documentation as to fair market value, including the bidding process, and the calculation of the fully distributed cost. The PSC's order is reversed, and the case remanded.

LAURA DENVER STITH, JUDGE

All concur

Checklist for Compliance with 4 CSR-240-40.015
[Recommended Audit Compliance Worksheet
for Affiliate Transactions Audit]

| | Company Demonstrated Compliance? (Y/N) | Findings | Recommendations |
|---|--|----------|-----------------|
| 1 Definitions | | | |
| A Affiliate entity | | | |
| B Affiliate transaction | | | |
| C Control | | | |
| D Corporate support | | | |
| E Derivatives | | | |
| F Fully distributed costs (FDC) | | | |
| G Information | | | |
| H Preferential service | | | |
| I Regulated gas corporation | | | |
| J Unfair advantage | | | |
| K Variance | | | |
| 2 Standards | | | |
| A No financial advantage to be provided by Laclede Gas/MGE to an affiliate | | | |
| 1 Laclede Gas/MGE is not to compensate an affiliate for goods or services above the lesser of: | | | |
| A Fair market price (FMP), or | | | |
| B FDC to the utility to provide the goods or services for itself | | | |
| 2 Laclede Gas/MGE is not to transfer information, assets, goods, or services to affiliates below the greater of: | | | |
| A FMP or | | | |
| B FDC to the regulated gas corporation | | | |
| B No preferential treatment to be provided by Laclede Gas/MGE to an affiliate | | | |
| C Customer information to be protected | | | |
| D Laclede Gas/MGE not to deviate from rule except per sections (10) | | | |
| E Laclede Gas/MGE to explain to interested customers, that they may seek services from other/non-affiliated companies and to included protocol for compliance with this rule in its annual CAM. | | | |
| F Marketing materials of affiliates with same or similar logos as Laclede Gas/MGE are to clearly display or announce that the affiliate is not regulated by PSC | | | |
| 3 Evidentiary Standards | | | |
| A Laclede Gas/MGE is to obtain competitive bids when making purchases from affiliates or demonstrate why not necessary | | | |
| B When making purchases or receipts from affiliates, Laclede Gas/MGE is to document both the FMP and FDC | | | |
| C When providing information, assets, goods, or services to affiliates, Laclede Gas/MGE must demonstrate that: | | | |
| 1 Laclede Gas/MGE considered all costs incurred to complete the transaction | | | |
| 2 Calculated costs at times relevant to the transaction | | | |
| 3 Allocated joint and common costs appropriately | | | |
| 4 Adequately determined the FMP of the information, assets, goods, or services | | | |
| D In transactions involving purchase of goods or services by Laclede Gas/MGE, Laclede Gas/MGE are to use a Commission-approved CAM which sets forth cost allocation, market valuation, and internal cost methods. CAM may use benchmarking as a market valuation method if approved by the Commission. | | | |
| 4 Record Keeping | | | |

Checklist for Compliance with 4 CSR-240-40.015
[Recommended Audit Compliance Worksheet
for Affiliate Transactions Audit]

| | Company Demonstrated Compliance? (Y/N) | Findings | Recommendations |
|--------------------------------|---|----------|-----------------|
| A | Laclede Gas/MGE is to maintain books, accounts, and records separate from those of affiliates. | | |
| B | Laclede Gas/MGE is to maintain the following in electronic format and make available annually: | | |
| 1 | Full and complete list of all affiliates | | |
| 2 | Full and complete list of all goods and services provided to or received from affiliated entities | | |
| 3 | Full and complete list of all contracts with affiliates | | |
| 4 | Full and complete list of all affiliate transactions undertaken without a written contract, along with explanation of why there was no written contract | | |
| 5 | Amount of all affiliate transactions by entity and account charged | | |
| 6 | Basis used (e.g., FMV, FDC, etc.) to record each type of affiliate transaction | | |
| C | Laclede Gas/MGE is to maintain the following affiliate transactions information on a calendar year basis : | | |
| 1 | Records identifying basis used (e.g., FMP, FDC, etc.) to record all affiliate transactions, and | | |
| 2 | Books of accounts and supporting records in sufficient detail to permit verification of compliance with this rule. | | |
| 5 Records of Affiliates | | | |
| A | Laclede Gas/MGE is to ensure its parent and other affiliates maintain books and records that at a minimum include: | | |
| 1 | Documentation of costs associated with affiliate transactions incurred by parent or affiliate and charged to Laclede Gas/MGE | | |
| 2 | Documentation of methods used to allocate and/or share costs between affiliates, including other jurisdictions and/or corporate divisions | | |
| 3 | Description of costs not subject to allocation to affiliate transactions and documentation supporting nonassignment of costs to affiliate transactions | | |
| 4 | Description of types of services centralized functions (including corporate) provided to any affiliate or division accessing Laclede Gas/MGE's contracted services or facilities | | |
| 5 | Names and job descriptions of Laclede Gas/MGE employees who transferred to a nonregulated affiliated entity | | |
| 6 | Evaluations of the effect on reliability of services provided by Laclede Gas/MGE resulting from access to regulated contracts and/or facilities by affiliates | | |
| 7 | Policies regarding availability of customer information and access to services available to nonregulated affiliated entities desiring use of Laclede Gas/MGE's contracts and facilities | | |
| 8 | Description of and supporting documentation related to use of derivatives that may be related to Laclede Gas/MGE operations, even though obtained by parent or other affiliate | | |
| 6 Access to Records | | | |
| A | Laclede Gas/MGE shall make available books and records of its parent and any other affiliate when required in application of this rule | | |
| B | Commission has authority to: | | |

Checklist for Compliance with 4 CSR-240-40.015
[Recommended Audit Compliance Worksheet
for Affiliate Transactions Audit]

| | Company Demonstrated Compliance? (Y/N) | Findings | Recommendations |
|---------------------------|---|----------|-----------------|
| 1 | Review, inspect, and audit books, accounts and other records kept by Laclede Gas/MGE or affiliate for the purpose of ensuring compliance with this rule and make findings available to the Commission | | |
| 2 | Investigate operations of Laclede Gas/MGE or affiliates and their relationship to one another to ensure compliance with this rule | | |
| C | This rule does not modify existing legal standards regarding which party has the burden of proof in commission proceedings | | |
| 7 Record Retention | | | |
| A | Records required under this rule are to be maintained by Laclede Gas/MGE for a minimum of 6 years | | |
| 8 Enforcement | | | |
| A | The Commission may apply any remedy available to it to enforce these standards or any order of the Commission regarding these standards. | | |
| 9 Training | | | |
| | Laclede Gas/MGE is to train and advise its personnel as to the requirements and provisions of this rule to ensure compliance | | |
| 10 Variances | | | |
| A | Variance to this rule may be obtained by compliance with the following: | | |
| 1 | Laclede Gas/MGE may request a variance by | | |
| 2 | Laclede Gas/MGE may engage in affiliate transactions not in compliance with subsection 2(A) of this rule only if to the best of its knowledge and belief, compliance would not be in the best interests of its regulated customers and it complies with the procedures required by (10)(A)2.A. and (10)(A)2.B | | |
| A | Laclede Gas/MGE is to comply with all reports and record retention requirements for each affiliate | | |
| B | Laclede Gas/MGE is to file notice of noncomplying affiliate transaction with the secretary of the Commission and the OPC within ten days of noncomplying affiliate transaction. The notice is to include a detailed explanation of why Laclede Gas/MGE believes the affiliate transaction was in the best interests of the regulated customers. When filing its annual CAM, Laclede Gas/MGE is to provide the Commission a list of all noncomplying affiliate transactions which occurred between the last filing and current filing. Affiliate transactions submitted under this section are interim until ruled on by the Commission. | | |
| 11 Disclaimer | | | |
| | This rule and actions of the Commission under this rule are not to be construed as approvals or exemptions violating antitrust laws. | | |

Ryan Pfaff

From: Shemwell, Lera <Lera.Shemwell@ded.mo.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2017 4:20 PM
To: Spangler, Marcia A.; Zucker, Rick E.; Poston, Marc; Williams, Hampton; Ara Azad; Ryan Pfaff
Cc: Buck, Glenn W.; Keathley, Lew E.; Noack, Michael; Michael Pendergast; Lobser, Eric E.
Subject: RE: DR 7000 Set

All,
Below are listed almost 20 DRs that are substantially overdue.
Your proposed date to respond on some of these was yesterday.
As you are aware testimony filing is imminent.
Please immediately and fully respond to all DRs.
Thank you .

Lera Shemwell

Senior Counsel
Office of the Public Counsel
200 Madison, Suite650
Jefferson City MO 65109
573-751-5565

lera.shemwell@ded.mo.gov

NOTE: The Missouri Bar Disciplinary Counsel requires all Missouri lawyers to notify all recipients of e-mail that (1) e-mail communications is not a secure method of communication, (2) any e-mail that is sent to you or by you could be copied by other computers as it moves from sender to recipient.

CONFIDENTIAL: This message contains legally privileged and/or confidential information and is intended only for the addressee(s). No addressee should forward, print, copy, or otherwise reproduce this message in any manner that would allow it to be viewed by any individual other than the addressee(s). If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized disclosure, dissemination, distribution, copying or the taking of any action in reliance on the information herein is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this message.

| <i>DR No</i> | <i>Sent Date</i> | <i>Days Outstanding</i> | <i>Response Due Date</i> | <i>Co Objection - Proposed Due Date</i> |
|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 7087 | Friday, June 30, 2017 | 53 | Thursday, July 20, 2017 | |
| 7088 | Friday, June 30, 2017 | 53 | Thursday, July 20, 2017 | |
| 7089 | Friday, June 30, 2017 | 53 | Thursday, July 20, 2017 | |
| 7091 | Friday, June 30, 2017 | 53 | Thursday, July 20, 2017 | |
| 7092 | Friday, June 30, 2017 | 53 | Thursday, July 20, 2017 | |
| 7099 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7100 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7101 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7113 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7116 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7117 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7118 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7119 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7122 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7125 | Friday, July 21, 2017 | 32 | Thursday, August 10, 2017 | Monday, August 21, 2017 |
| 7135 | Thursday, July 27, 2017 | 26 | Tuesday, August 15, 2017 | |
| 7136 | Thursday, July 27, 2017 | 26 | Tuesday, August 15, 2017 | |

Ryan Pfaff

From: Hyneman, Charles <Charles.Hyneman@ded.mo.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 12:00 PM
To: 'Buck, Glenn W.'; Lobser, Eric E.; Noack, Michael
Cc: Marke, Geoff; Ara Azad; Ryan Pfaff
Subject: RE: Meeting on Corporate Allocations, affilaite costs and Flaherty direct

Glenn, I understand the discovery concerns with AZP have been addressed for the time being. Therefore, I am withdrawing my request for this specific discovery meeting for now. I do like your suggestion of a possible conference call between you and me in the future. Maybe we can touch base next week or the following week on this issue to see if progress is being made with AZP DRs.

For example, most of Spire's DR responses to AZP DRs are just references to other DR responses with no narrative clarification regarding why or how the company believes the requested information was actually provided in the referenced DR response and the referenced DR was directly responsive to the current DR.

I personally consider these "responses" to be non-responsive. I believe it is reasonable that the only time it is appropriate to reference another response without a narrative explanation is when the referenced DR asked for identical information—i.e., that the requests are duplicative. We may have some questions on the DRs received to date that just referenced other DRs.

I hope you understand this concern and we are able to resolve this issue informally. Can Laclede provide a narrative description of specifically where (i.e. exact location(s) in the referenced DR such as the document, page number, spreadsheet line number, etc.) the information requested is provided in the responses it referenced? That would be helpful and may avoid future discovery issues.

Chuck

From: Buck, Glenn W. [mailto:Glenn.Buck@spireenergy.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 10:29 AM
To: Hyneman, Charles; Lobser, Eric E.; Zucker, Rick E.; Poston, Marc; Noack, Michael
Cc: Marke, Geoff; 'Ara Azad'; 'Ryan Pfaff'
Subject: RE: Meeting on Corporate Allocations, affilaite costs and Flaherty direct

Chuck,

There seems to be some miscommunication occurring. It is my understanding that Eric and Geoff spoke and that your meeting request was deemed perhaps a bit premature. It was represented to me that Geoff was going to talk to you about providing specific examples where you thought the responses were not fully responsive and give them to us so we might be able to bridge a gap. Regardless, a meeting next week would have been out of the question as we have third quarter BOD meetings on those days which makes meetings (especially long ones) much more difficult, if not possible, to schedule.

I am not sure if a conference call to discuss this may be in order. This may be something that Rick and Marc can help facilitate.

Hope that clears up some of the confusion.

From: Hyneman, Charles [<mailto:Charles.Hyneman@ded.mo.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 10:12 AM
To: Buck, Glenn W. <Glenn.Buck@spireenergy.com>
Cc: Marke, Geoff <geoff.marke@ded.mo.gov>; 'Ara Azad' <aazad@AZPConsulting.com>; 'Ryan Pfaff' <rpfaff@AZPConsulting.com>
Subject: RE: Meeting on Corporate Allocations, affilaite costs and Flaherty direct

Glenn. I sent this email last Thursday and did not see a response. I will send you an agenda no later than Thursday this week. Have you selected a meeting date and time yet? I request that the time be 10 am or later as I will be driving in from Jefferson City. Thanks

Chuck

From: Hyneman, Charles
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2017 11:40 AM
To: 'Buck, Glenn W.'
Cc: Marke, Geoff; Ara Azad; 'Ryan Pfaff'
Subject: Meeting on Corporate Allocations, affilaite costs and Flaherty direct

Glenn, Geoff and I are in continuing discussions with Ara and Ryan concerning Laclede's responses to AZP's data requests. I understand you are working on the particular issue with DR 7000. Geoff spoke with Rick Zucker, Mike Pendergast and Eric Lobser yesterday and the indicated you will have the responses no later than today.

OPC and AZP have concerns about many of Laclede's responses to AZP DRs. Given this concern, I will be compiling a list of AZP DRs that we have specific concerns and including that list in an agenda for a meeting we would like to have with Laclede.

I will send this agenda to you next week and request that we have a meeting at Laclede's HQ in St. Louis on July 26th or July 27th, whichever dates works best for you. We request that Mr. Flaherty and all other people who provided significant work on Mr. Flaherty's testimony and the allocations issue in this case be present. It is my goal to take as much time as we need at this meeting to answer all the questions we have.

I will be attending this meeting in St. Louis as well as Geoff Marke. Ara and Ryan of AZP will be participating through phone conference.

Could you please arrange for this meeting and let me know as soon as possible the date you select? I would like to emphasize that it is very important for Mr. Flaherty to be present.

Thanks,

Chuck