1	STATE OF MISSOURI
2	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
3	
4	
5	PREHEARING CONFERENCE
_	August 1, 2001 Jefferson City, Missouri Volume 1
6	
7	
8	
9	In the Matter of the Tariff) Filing of Missouri Public)
10	Service (MPS), a Division of)
11	UtiliCorp United Inc., to) Case No. ER-2001-672 Implement a General Rate) Tariff No. 200101173 Increase for Retail Electric)
12	Service Provided to Customers)
13	in the Missouri Service Area) of MPS.)
14	
15	
16	BEFORE:
17	KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Presiding, DEPUTY CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.
18	DEPUTY CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.
19	
20	
21	REPORTED BY:
22	STEPHANIE L. KURTZ MORGAN Registered Professional Reporter
23	ASSOCIATED COURT REPORTERS, INC. 714 West High Street
24	P. O. Box 1308 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
	(573) 636-7551
25	
	ASSOCIATED COURT REPORTERS, INC. (573) 636-7551 JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101 TOLL FREE 1-800-636-7551

1	APPEARANCES:
2	DEAN L. COOPER, Attorney at Law JAMES C. SWEARENGEN, Attorney at Law
3	Brydon, Swearengen & England, P.C. P. O. Box 456
4	312 East Capitol Avenue Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0456
5	FOR: UtiliCorp United Inc. d/b/a Missouri Public
6	Service.
7	STUART W. CONRAD, Attorney at Law Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson, L.C.
8	1209 Penntower Office Center 3100 Broadway
9	Kansas City, Missouri 64111
10	FOR: Sedalia Industrial Energy Users Association.
11	JEREMIAH D. FINNEGAN, Attorney at Law Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson, L.C.
12	1209 Penntower Officer Center 3100 Broadway
13	Kansas City, Missouri 64111
14	FOR: County of Jackson, Missouri.
15	CATHLEEN A. MARTIN, Attorney at Law Newman, Comley & Ruth, P.C.
16	601 Monroe Street, Suite 301 P. O. Box 537
17	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0537
18	FOR: City of Kansas City, Missouri.
19	DUNCAN E. KINCHELOE, Attorney at Law 2407 West Ash
20	Columbia, Missouri 65203
21	FOR: Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission.
22	JOHN B. COFFMAN, Deputy Public Counsel
23	P. O. Box 7800 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
24	-
25	FOR: Office of Public Counsel and the Public.

1	APPEARANCES Continued:
2	STEVEN DOTTHEIM, Chief Deputy General Counsel NATHAN WILLIAMS, Assistant General Counsel
3	P. O. Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
4	FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service
5	Commission.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(Written Entries of Appearance filed.)
3	JUDGE THOMPSON: Good morning. We're here in
4	the Matter of the Tariff Filing of Missouri Public
5	Service, a Division of UtiliCorp United Inc., to
6	Implement a General Rate Increase for Retail Electric
7	Service Provided to Customers in the Missouri Service
8	Area of Missouri Public Service.
9	This is Case No. ER-2001-672. My name is
10	Kevin Thompson. I'm the Regulatory Law Judge assigned
11	to preside over this matter. We will take oral entries
12	of appearance at this time beginning with the Company.
13	MR. COOPER: Dean L. Cooper and James C.
14	Swearengen from the law firm of Brydon, Swearengen &
15	England, P.C., P. O. Box 456, Jefferson City, Missouri
16	65102 appearing on behalf of UtiliCorp United Inc.
17	doing business as Missouri Public Service.
18	JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Cooper.
19	Staff.
20	MR. WILLIAMS: Nathan Williams and Steven
21	Dottheim appearing on behalf of the Staff of the
22	Missouri Public Service Commission, P. O. Box 360,
23	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
24	JUDGE THOMPSON: Public Counsel.
25	MR. COFFMAN: John B. Coffman on behalf of the

- 1 Office of the Public Counsel and the rate payers,
- 2 P. O. Box 7800, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you.
- 4 Mr. Conrad, I believe you represent
- 5 intervenors who have been admitted to the case already.
- 6 MR. CONRAD: That is correct, Your Honor. And
- 7 I'm here on behalf of a group that is called Sedalia
- 8 Industrial Energy Users Association. If you would like
- 9 to, for the benefit of the record here this morning, I
- 10 can give you the names of those companies.
- 11 JUDGE THOMPSON: No, I believe those are
- 12 already in the record.
- 13 MR. CONRAD: Okay. And my law office is in
- 14 Kansas City at 1209 Penntower, 3100 Broadway, Kansas
- 15 City, Missouri 64111. And I'm associated with the law
- 16 firm of Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson.
- 17 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, sir.
- 18 Is Mr. Finnegan entering his appearance as
- 19 well?
- 20 MR. FINNEGAN: Yes, I would. I have made an
- 21 application to intervene, which has not been granted
- 22 yet. But I understand that -- from the Company that
- 23 there is no objection to this.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: You're representing who?
- 25 MR. FINNEGAN: And I'm representing the County

- 1 of Jackson, Missouri.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay.
- 3 MR. FINNEGAN: And I'm Jeremiah Finnegan,
- 4 3100 Broadway, Suite 1209, Kansas City, Missouri 64111.
- 5 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you very much.
- 6 Yes, ma'am.
- 7 MS. MARTIN: I'll also enter my appearance.
- 8 I'm Cathleen Martin of the law firm of Newman, Comley &
- 9 Ruth, Post Office Box 537, Jefferson City, Missouri
- 10 65102. I represent the City of Kansas City, Missouri,
- 11 which has filed an application to intervene in this
- 12 case.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Very good. Thank you.
- 14 Mr. Kincheloe.
- MR. KINCHELOE: Duncan E. Kincheloe,
- 16 representing the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric
- 17 Utility Commission, 2407 West Ash, Columbia, Missouri
- 18 65203.
- 19 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, sir.
- 20 Any other counsel present?
- 21 (No response.)
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. I understand there's
- 23 quite a few things that are pending, and we shall see a
- 24 flurry of orders issued by the Commission late this
- 25 week or early next week. And that should resolve

- 1 questions like who's in the case, what's the test
- 2 you're gonna be, when will the true-up be and will
- 3 there be one, things like that.
- 4 Do the parties have anything to bring to my
- 5 attention at this time?
- 6 Mr. Williams.
- 7 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Judge.
- 8 In the Suspension Order and Notice the
- 9 Commission set out specific hearing dates. Staff is
- 10 wanting to know if those are -- if there's any
- 11 flexibility in those dates or if those will be the
- 12 dates that the hearings will be held.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: No, there's -- there's --
- 14 there's -- flexibility exists. If you want to change a
- 15 date, make a motion. Everybody gets a chance to say
- 16 yes or no.
- 17 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Judge.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: What -- what sort of change
- 19 do you have in mind?
- 20 MR. WILLIAMS: We haven't discussed it with
- 21 the other parties, but one would be perhaps moving it
- 22 back a week or so, and another might be to shorten the
- 23 period for that evidentiary hearing.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. Let me just say that
- 25 after my experience with the recent water rate case,

- 1 that any effort to shorten the period of time that I
- 2 will have to write the order will be looked at with
- 3 some degree of alarm.
- 4 Mr. Conrad.
- 5 MR. CONRAD: Sure. Judge, you mentioned the
- 6 issue of test here, we did not take a specific position
- 7 on that and I'd just like for the record to indicate
- 8 that we are not proposing a different test year and
- 9 that has been apparently agreed upon by the parties, so
- 10 we would support that.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Very good.
- 12 Mr. Coffman.
- 13 MR. COFFMAN: Thank you. First, I just
- 14 want -- think that the record should reflect that a
- 15 continuing objection from the Office of Public Counsel
- 16 to this case be characterized as a Missouri Public
- 17 Service case. I don't think there's any point in
- 18 objecting to the style of the case, but I think that
- 19 belies a fundamental problem with this case, and -- and
- 20 it refers to a $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ a $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ merely a division within a
- 21 company.
- 22 In the past the Missouri Public Service was
- 23 synonymous with UtiliCorp in its Missouri
- 24 jurisdictional operations and -- and no longer is. And
- 25 we believe that UtiliCorp United Inc. is the proper

- 1 company would have the right to -- to file a rate case
- 2 with the company -- or with the Commission.
- 3 And I don't need to belabor arguments. I've
- 4 made it in writing, but would -- would orally request
- 5 that this be finally rejected by the Commission as
- 6 it -- we did with the UtiliCorp filing earlier this
- 7 year involving various charges in the -- the St. Joseph
- 8 area. That would be Case No. ET-2001-482. And just
- 9 believe that the -- strongly that the Commission may
- 10 not lawfully grant an order that does not determine the
- 11 cost of service -- the revenue requirement for the
- 12 total Missouri jurisdictional operations of an
- 13 electrical corporation.
- 14 And we may respond to some arguments that were
- 15 made either today or tomorrow in response to my motion,
- 16 and -- and if I would just make this orally also the
- 17 request that the Commission hear oral arguments on this
- 18 issue. It's -- I believe it's such a fundamental
- 19 matter and -- and so -- so fundamental to the way the
- 20 Commission does rate making that it -- that this case
- 21 is a lack of proceeding set a -- set a precedent that
- 22 would be pretty bad for the public interest.
- 23 And we'd ask that -- have the opportunity to
- 24 present oral arguments to the full Commission on that
- 25 matter.

- 1 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Coffman.
- Does anyone else have anything at this time?
- 3 (No response.)
- 4 JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. With respect to
- 5 Mr. Coffman's motion for oral argument, as I'm sure the
- 6 parties are all aware, that one of the matters that is
- 7 pending is Public Counsel's motion to reject a tariff.
- 8 And the Commission has recently asked the Staff to $\{*/\}$
- 9 weigh in on that topic, and the Staff filed its
- 10 argument, I believe, last Friday.
- 11 And I was planning to ask this morning whether
- 12 any other party is going to jump in on that discussion.
- 13 We wouldn't want to deal with it before we have
- 14 received your pros -- you're working on something.
- 15 Okay.
- 16 Any response to Public Counsel's motion then
- 17 to set oral argument on that issue?
- MR. CONRAD: Your Honor, before anyone speaks
- 19 in opposition to it, I think we would go on record as
- 20 supporting Mr. Coffman's request that that be presented
- 21 to the Commission at an appropriate time when, you
- 22 know, the -- the record is complete before -- as you
- 23 mentioned.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you, sir.
- 25 Anyone else?

- 1 MS. MARTIN: Judge.
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Yes, ma'am.
- 3 MS. MARTIN: Certainly Mark Comley from our
- 4 office is more familiar with the City of Kansas City's
- 5 position, but the City of Kansas City's position may
- 6 very well align with that of the Office of Public
- 7 Counsel, and there may be additional support that --
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay.
- 9 MS. MARTIN: -- the City would like to file.
- 10 JUDGE THOMPSON: Thank you. And -- and when
- 11 you-all decide what the position is, let us know.
- 12 Anyone else?
- 13 (No response.)
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. I'll take that to the
- 15 Commissioners and see. I'm -- I -- I can't speak for
- 16 them, but I would suspect that they would want to hear
- 17 this oral argument. And we'll be taking this matter up
- 18 directly, because if it's granted, of course, that
- 19 stops the case. So there's no sense anyone spending
- 20 any more money on it.
- 21 Anything else at that point?
- 22 (No response.)
- JUDGE THOMPSON: Okay. That will conclude the
- 24 recorded portion of the prehearing conference.
- 25 Thank you-all for coming down. Have a nice

1	day. We will be adjourned.
2	WHEREUPON, the on-the-record portion of the
3	prehearing conference was concluded.
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	