THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Evidentiary Hearing

June 3, 2015

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 1

In the Matter of the Petition of Missouri - American Water Company For Approval to Change File No. W0-2015-0211 Its Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge (ISRS)

DANI EL JORDAN

SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE.

ROBERT S. KENNEY, DANIEL Y. HALL, Commissioners.

REPORTED BY: ANGLE D. THRELKELD, CCR TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

1	APPEARANCES
2	DEAN L COODED Attornov at Law
3	DEAN L. COOPER, Attorney at Law Brydon, Swearengen & England, P.C. 312 East Capitol Avenue
4	P. O. Box 456
5	Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456 573.635.7166
6	FOR: MAWC
7	CYDNEY D. MAYFIELD, Legal Counsel Public Service Commission
8	200 Madi son Street Jefferson Ci ty, Mi ssouri 65101
9	573.751.4227 FOR: Staff of the Missouri Pubic Service Commission
10	
11	CHRISTINA BAKER 200 Madison Street
12	Suite 650 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 FOR: Office of Public Counsel
13	FOR: OTTICE OF PUBLIC COURSE
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	(Exhibits 1 through 4 marked.)
2	JUDGE JORDAN: Good morning, everyone.
3	I have now unmuted. The Commission is calling the
4	action in File Number WO-2015-0211. And the
5	caption of this case reads as follows: This is in
6	the Matter of the Petition of Missouri-American
7	Water Company For Approval to Change Its
8	Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge, also
9	known as an ISRS. That is the acronym.
10	I'm Daniel Jordan. I'm the regulatory
11	law judge assigned to this action. We're here for
12	an evidentiary hearing on the merits of this
13	appl i cati on.
14	I'm going to start by asking everyone to
15	silence their cell phones. I'm not going to
16	require you to turn them off, because they
17	occasionally prove useful. So I am silencing my
18	cell phone right now.
19	And I will also ask everyone I will
20	remind everyone to use the microphone when
21	speaking. It's a largish room and sound sometimes
22	gets lost.
23	I understand that there are no
24	preliminary matters that we need to take up before
25	we get into entries of appearance. Is that

1	correct?
2	MS. MAYFIELD: That's correct, Your
3	Honor.
4	MR. COOPER: That's correct.
5	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you, Counselors.
6	Then let's begin with entries of
7	appearance, and we'll start with the Applicant.
8	MR. COOPER: Dean Cooper from the law
9	firm Brydon, Swearengen & England, P.C., appearing
10	on behalf of Missouri-American Water Company. The
11	court reporter has the address.
12	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.
13	And for Staff.
14	MS. MAYFIELD: Your Honor, Cydney
15	Mayfield for Staff. And I have previously provided
16	my information to the court reporter.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.
18	And for the Office of Public Counsel.
19	MS. BAKER: Thank you. Christina Baker
20	appearing on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel
21	and the customers. And I have also provided my
22	information to the court reporter.
23	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you very much.
24	I understand the parties plan to waive
25	cross-examination of the witnesses. Do we have

1 all -- do we have all the exhibits marked? 2 MS. MAYFIELD: I believe so, Your Honor. 3 MR. COOPER: Well, I think we may just 4 need to identify which exhibits are which numbers, 5 but... 6 JUDGE JORDAN: That's fine. 0kay. 7 did want to mention something about scheduling 8 before we begin, because I want to make sure I 9 don't forget it at the end. That has to do with 10 the date for briefing, which is the briefs --11 according to the schedule that Staff and the 12 Applicant filed, briefs will be due on the 12th of And that would leave, I count, 17 days 13 14 before the proposed effective date of the tariffs. 15 Given that there are only two agendas 16 scheduled between those two dates, that may 17 reduce -- depending on how the Commission decides 18 this action, that may reduce the time for filing an 19 application for rehearing as to an order approving 20 compliance tariffs. If that's what the Commission 21 orders, that's the way it goes. So just reminding 22 everyone that its the case. There's been no 23 objection to that schedule, so I take it there is 24 no objection. 25 And, with that, I believe we are ready

for opening statements, unless anybody has anything else first.

Not seeing anything, let's have the opening statement of Missouri-American Water

Company.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

Before I get started, I want to hand out a document that contains the statutes that I'll be citing during my opening statement. It's certainly not anything that I will offer into evidence, but merely a recitation of those statutes and a rule that I will be -- will be discussing.

Unlike many hearings that I've appeared in, it's my belief that there's no significant factual dispute in this case. The testimony filed by Missouri-American Water Company and the Staff really provides no controversy to three what I believe are primary facts in this case. One, that 25,892,662 is the amount that equals 10 percent of Missouri-American's base revenue level approved by the Commission in Missouri-American's most recent general rate proceeding; second, that MAWC's current request for 1.9 -- excuse me, \$1,919,991 in additional ISRS revenue is associated with eligible infrastructure system replacements; and, three,

that the development of Missouri-American's current ISRS included \$1,665,202 of reconciliation related to previous under recovery or under collection of ISRS dollars.

That leaves for the Commission, in my -in my opinion, an issue of statute and rule
interpretation; that is, whether the reconciliation
amount should be included in determining how the
revenue requirement relates to the cap.
Missouri-American, of course, believes that it
should not.

If Missouri-American is correct, then its full \$1.9 million request should be included in the new ISRS rate. If Staff is correct, only \$254,789 of that request should be included in the ISRS rate.

The Court of Appeals Western District, in the context of a natural gas ISRS statute, has stated that the obvious legislative intent of the ISRS statute is to allow the utility to timely recover its costs for infrastructure system replacement projects by way of a rate adjustment outside of a general rate case.

Staff's interpretation of the statutes would thwart the legislative intent based on prior

failure of the rate design. In other words, because of the inexactness of the rate design process and Missouri-American believes declining usage of its customers, Staff would deny Missouri-American timely recovery of costs associated with its infrastructure system replacement projects.

It is -- again, it is

Missouri-American's position that the statutes do not intend for the ISRS cap to apply to a combination of the ISRS costs and the revenue reconciliation amounts.

Before you I believe the first statute that's cited in the document I handed out is 393.1003(1), which contains I guess what I would refer to as the cap language. You'll see in that provision that the adjustments to which the limitation applies are the costs for eligible infrastructure system replacements. ISRS costs are defined as depreciation, expenses, and property taxes that will be due within 12 months of the ISRS filing. There's no mention in the statute of amounts necessary to reconcile previous under or over collection of ISRS revenues. The statute does refer to, let's see, petitions to establish or

change ISRS rate schedules. Well, again, a reconciliation is not a change. The statute refers to reconciliation as an adjustment.

Elsewhere in the ISRS statutes a company is limited to two changes within a 12-month period. A reconciliation hasn't been deemed to fit within those changes. Within the Commission's rules there's a description of establish, change, reconcile listed as three separate things. So, again, we believe that the statute does not intend for reconciliation to be a part of that cap question.

Further on down the sheet I provided to you, there's the description of 393.1006.5(1), which states that an ISRS shall be calculated based upon the amount of ISRS costs that are eligible for recovery during the period in which the surcharge will be in effect and so on. Again, there's no mention of the use of revenue reconciliation amounts in the calculation of the ISRS costs.

Reconciliation is treated completely separately in Section 393.1006.5(2), which is before you on the second page, but in relevant fact talks about the fact that at the end of each 12-month calendar period the water corporation

shall reconcile the differences between the revenues resulting from an ISRS and the appropriate pretax revenues as found by the Commission for that period, and then ultimately ends, as I mentioned before, in terms of an adjustment of the ISRS, something different than the establishment or the change of the ISRS.

I'd also mention that there's reference to appropriate pretax revenues. The definition of appropriate pretax revenues does not include anything concerning the reconciliation amounts. It talks about three items, none of which are reconciliation amounts.

The statute and the Commission's rules further recognize differentiation between the recovery of ISRS costs and the revenue reconciliation amounts. Section 393.1006.6(1) states that a water corporation that has implemented an ISRS pursuant to the provisions of the ISRS shall file revised rate schedules to reset the ISRS to zero when new base rates and charges become effective for the water corporation following a Commission order establishing customer rates in a general rate proceeding, and so on.

Now, having said that, revenues

reconciliation amounts do not go to zero in the
rate case. Commission rule again, that's
provided on the sheet I handed out
4 CSR 240-3.650(17) indicates that if an over or
under recovery of ISRS revenues, including
Commission-ordered refunds, exists after the ISRS
has been reset to zero, that over or under recovery
shall be tracked and considered in the next ISRS
filing after the rate case. So, again, the rules
deem the ISRS amounts to be something different
from from the reconciliation amounts and treat
them differently.
Staff's approach would deny

Staff's approach would deny
Missouri-American the opportunity for recovery of
ISRS costs based solely on the fact that prior ISRS
rates were set assuming a customer usage level
greater than that which Missouri-American
experienced, resulting in the nonrecovery of
authorized ISRS costs in prior periods.

Staff uses this previous nonrecovery to really further the nonrecovery by adding both the currently-authorized ISRS costs with the unrecovered prior costs to assess the application of the cap. That approach would result in Missouri-American's nonrecovery of, as I said,

1.6 million and some change in revenues that's really associated with eligible infrastructure system replacements that have been made that are completed, are in service.

6 7

5

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

23 24

25

22

Missouri-American believes that Staff's interpretation of the ISRS statute is contrary to the obvious legislative intent, as stated by the Court of Appeals, and, therefore, erroneous and should not be followed by the Commission.

Because I also have to, essentially, hedge my bets in this matter, we have also requested that should the Commission agree with Staff's interpretation, that the Commission consider an order that allows the company to book that \$1.6 million of unrecovered ISRS in a regulatory asset for consideration in a future rate case or the first ISRS after the next rate case. We believe that that is consistent with the provision that's provided in the Commission's It's a little different timing, I would rul es. acknowledge, than what's talked about in the But I don't think that the Commission's rules. rules necessarily contemplated that we would already know the under recovery amount at this stage, as we do in this case.

1	Thank you. And if you have any
2	questions, I'm available for those.
3	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you, Counselor.
4	Commissioner Hall.
5	COMMISSIONER HALL: Good morning,
6	Mr. Cooper.
7	MR. COOPER: Good morning.
8	COMMISSIONER HALL: Is it safe to say
9	that the reason why we are here is because or at
10	least one of the reasons why we're here is because
11	of declining consumption?
12	MR. COOPER: Certainly the Company
13	believes that to be the case.
14	COMMISSIONER HALL: That if if
15	instead of using the historic test year we had used
16	some kind of future test year in the last rate case
17	to take into account declining consumption, then we
18	wouldn't have a dispute here today; is that
19	correct?
20	MR. COOPER: I don't know that I can say
21	that that's necessarily the case. I think it would
22	help. I think it would it would mitigate the
23	size of the dispute. But we will probably end up
24	with three years between between rate cases.
25	COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, let's say that

1	our future test year was spot on, that we that
2	we nailed the consumption decline.
3	MR. COOPER: If it was spot on, yes, we
4	would not have a dispute then.
5	COMMISSIONER HALL: So let's let's
6	hypothetically speaking, let's say in in the
7	next rate case we do some type of future test year
8	and let's say that our crystal ball is amazingly
9	accurate and we are spot on or, actually,
10	let's let's say that consumption the
11	consumption decline is not what we anticipated; it
12	actually was a reduced there was a consumption
13	decline, but it wasn't what we anticipated.
14	MR. COOPER: We assumed a greater
15	decline
16	COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.
17	MR. COOPER: than what was
18	experi enced. Okay.
19	COMMISSIONER HALL: Would your statutory
20	interpretation inure to the benefit of the company
21	in that scenario or would it inure to the benefit
22	of ratepayers?
23	MR. COOPER: I'm not sure it would be to
24	the necessarily to the benefit of either one. I
25	think that the ratepayers would continue to be

1	whole in that situation, because the reconciliation
2	would still be used to reduce the amount of the
3	ultimate ISRS rate to be paid by the customer.
4	So I think I think in that situation
5	maybe it would be to the benefit of both, because
6	the Company would would view itself as
7	recovering all of its ISRS costs and, to the extent
8	it over recovered those in prior periods, the
9	customer would get the benefit of that. So I think
10	it would
11	COMMISSIONER HALL: When would the
12	customer get the benefit?
13	MR. COOPER: Within the reconciliation.
14	So on a yearly basis the ISRS would be adjusted,
15	according to the statute, to provide for that
16	that prior over recovery, I believe, in your
17	hypotheti cal .
18	COMMISSIONER HALL: So Staff is taking
19	the position that if the Commission agrees with the
20	Company that the Company will over recover on the
21	ISRS, they will they will they will collect
22	more than the 10 percent cap. Is that your
23	understanding as well?
24	MR. COOPER: I know they've taken that
25	position. We would quibble with them a little bit,

1 because the words collect and recovery have been 2 Well, we're -- we're here partially because 3 the Company hasn't collected or recovered what the 4 rate was designed to produce. So --5 COMMISSIONER HALL: So you --6 MR. COOPER: -- I guess I'm breaking a 7 little bit with you because of that situation. 8 don't know that -- and, again, because of the 9 declining usage that's been experienced. 10 the rate is set where the Company would like to see 11 it set, I don't know that the Company will 12 necessarily collect more than the 10 percent 13 amount. 14 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well. 15 hypothetically, let's -- let's say that that did --16 that did result, that collections came in and 17 exceeded the 10 percent, do you think there is 18 statutory authorization for us to put a tracker on 19 that -- on those receipts and -- and account for 20 them at the next rate case or is that the -- is 21 that the Commission rule that you pointed to at the 22 end of your --23 MR. COOPER: Yes. Yes, I believe that 24 the Commission rule provides for that, both 25 directions. I -- I've talked in terms of a

1	regulatory asset because, I mean, we're looking to
2	book things that we think are under recoveries.
3	But I think if they were over recoveries, it would
4	be a regulatory liability and would equally apply.
5	COMMISSIONER HALL: That's all I have.
6	Thank you.
7	MR. COOPER: Thank you.
8	JUDGE JORDAN: I don't have any
9	questions from the other commissioners. So thank
10	you.
11	MR. COOPER: Thank you.
12	JUDGE JORDAN: In the order of opening
13	statements that I have is the Office of Public
14	Counsel going next.
15	MS. BAKER: May it please the
16	Commission. Recovery of costs by a regulated
17	utility in Missouri is normally based on a
18	historical test year basis. However, Missouri
19	statute has provided utilities with certain
20	exceptions to this rule. The Infrastructure System
21	Replacement Surcharge, or ISRS, statutes
22	contemplate such an exception. Instead of
23	requiring utilities to spend money on certain
24	infrastructure replacement first then seek recovery
25	in rates, the statute provides the utility the

3

4

5

6 7

9

10

8

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

ability to have a surcharge whereby customers pay in advance. The benefit to the utility is great. The benefit to the customer is debatable.

Since these costs are future costs, the statute provides for the surcharge to be based on an estimate of future infrastructure costs. order to provide a mechanism to rein in the effects on the customers and to try to seek a balance, the statute provides for an ISRS revenue cap calculation. The statute provides for all of this to be completed between a set cycle of rate cases to try to verify the amount of the actual infrastructure costs.

As an exception to the rule in Missouri, Public Counsel asked that the Commission interpret the ISRS statute in the most narrow way reasonable as a customer protection. Customers have no say in the exact business decisions by Missouri-American and should not be seen as a bottomless pit of cash flow.

Therefore, Public Counsel agrees with Staff's position that the amount of ISRS revenues authorized by the Commission associated with the reconciliation of prior under or over collections should be included in the revenue cap calculation for Missouri-American.

Public Counsel also agrees with Staff's position that Missouri-American should not be allowed to record a regulatory asset for any ISRS costs determined to be above the revenue cap provided by the statute. And Public Counsel believes that to do otherwise would subvert the customer protection of the revenue cap, tipping the balance unreasonably in Missouri-American's favor, which is not the reason for the statute.

Thank you.

JUDGE JORDAN: Questions from the bench? Chairman.

CHAIR KENNEY: Just one, Ms. Baker.

Thank you. What is your understanding of the rational e behind the 10 percent revenue cap that was written into the statute?

MS. BAKER: It's my understanding that because there was -- there are many mechanisms for Missouri-American to be made whole, mainly the original view of that they have the ability to come back in for a rate case at any time and the fact that the revenues of what they're going to spend in the future is -- is an estimate, it keeps the amount low that's put into the surcharge in the --

maybe a reasonable amount so that customers aren't paying more in their surcharge than they are in their regular rates. It connects those two things together.

CHAIR KENNEY: So is it your position and would you agree then that if we adopted Staff position -- Staff's position and left unrecovered about \$1.6 million or whatever it is and didn't put into regulatory asset, that's just money

Missouri-American would never recover?

MS. BAKER: I mean, they could come in for a rate case at any time. And as a matter of fact, they have filed a notice that they are coming in for a rate case. These things will be looked at if they're within the test year.

CHAIR KENNEY: Well, presumably they're not in the test year; that's why they want to record it on a regulatory asset. So if that is the case, you will agree that they just will never recover that money?

MS. BAKER: If it's outside of the rate case, it is possible, yes. But they could have come in -- you know, if they saw this -- and I know that this was even brought up in their last ISRS case. And if they thought that that was something

_	
1	that was a gamble, they could have come back in
2	right then.
3	CHAIR KENNEY: Because they control the
4	timing of the
5	MS. BAKER: Because
6	CHAIR KENNEY: filing?
7	MS. BAKER: they control the timing.
8	CHAIR KENNEY: Okay. Thank you.
9	JUDGE JORDAN: Commissioner Hall.
10	COMMISSIONER HALL: Good morning,
11	Ms. Baker.
12	MS. BAKER: Good morning.
13	COMMISSIONER HALL: Commission Rule
14	4 CSR 240-3.650(17) that Mr. Cooper referred to
15	this morning, what is the purpose of this rule in
16	your
17	MS. BAKER: Let me grab the
18	COMMISSIONER HALL: your information?
19	MS. BAKER: the paper that he gave us
20	so that I have the exact thing.
21	243.650(17).
22	COMMISSIONER HALL: Um-hum. Yes.
23	MS. BAKER: Okay. That does give the
24	ability to track the over recovery after it's been
25	set to zero within the test year of the previous

1	case.
2	COMMISSIONER HALL: It gives the
3	Commission the authority to do it. It doesn't
4	require it. Is that your position?
5	MS. BAKER: Yes.
6	COMMISSIONER HALL: So it gives us the
7	authority to make an over recovery a regulatory
8	liability and an under recovery a regulatory asset
9	in the next in the next rate case?
10	MS. BAKER: It gives the authority to
11	take that into account in the next rate case, yes.
12	It doesn't it doesn't automatically say that
13	it's going to be recovered or not recovered in the
14	next rate case.
15	COMMISSIONER HALL: Right. But it
16	establishes a process by which recovery is possible
17	in the next rate case?
18	MS. BAKER: Yes.
19	COMMISSIONER HALL: That's all I have.
20	Thank you.
21	MS. BAKER: Thank you.
22	JUDGE JORDAN: I have no questions from
23	the other commissioners. Thank you very much.
24	MS. BAKER: Thank you.
25	JUDGE JORDAN: The opening statement of

1 Staff.

MS. MAYFIELD: May it please the Commission and the Honorable Judge. I bet if I were to ask this room who in here enjoys playing board games, I would probably get a lot of takers and a lot of people raising their hands. I was playing my favorite board game the other day, Monopoly, with my six-year-old son, Dalton, and for the first time I was struck by some of the significance of some of the spaces on the board. And in case you've forgotten what Monopoly board.

JUDGE JORDAN: Counselor, can you move that over a little bit to my right, which I think would be your left. Further. And I think we're in. Very good.

MS. MAYFIELD: Perfect. So just in case you're wondering why I busted out a Monopoly board in the middle of our hearing, I realize that since 1933 Parker Brothers has recognized two utilities as monopoly properties on the board. The one of significance to this particular hearing happens to be the water works.

Now, we are all aware that the game of Monopoly is named after the economic concept of

monopoly, which is the domination of a market by a single entity. In our game setting our players move around the board collecting properties and collecting rents from their opponents, with the ultimate goal of driving the other players into bankruptcy, leaving one monopolist in control of the entire economy.

So why am I talking about Monopoly again? Because that is exactly what Missouri-American Water Company is. It is a regulated monopoly and, as such, this Commission is tasked with the responsibility of ensuring that the behaviors of this monopolist do not lead to the demise of the other players, in this case our ratepayers.

And just like the game of Monopoly has mechanisms to prevent players from passing go and not collecting \$200, our ISRS statute also has mechanisms designed to prevent utilities who utilize the ISRS from exercising their monopoly power to collect more than a statutorily-set cap of 10 percent on revenues derived from an approved ISRS.

Why are these protected mechanisms so important? Because unlike a general rate case

where all aspects of the.

Company's operations, its revenues, expenses, the establishment of rate base, return on equity, are scrutinized to the nth degree, the ISRS is a single-issue ratemaking tool allowed -- allowing very limited review by Staff and other parties of the revenue that is allowed to be charged in the customer rates.

As you will see in the direct and the surrebuttal testimonies of the witnesses, Mark Oligschlaeger for Staff and Jeanne Tinsley for Missouri-American, the parties are in agreement as to what that 10 percent cap on the ISRS revenue should be. And you've already heard that from Mr. Cooper's opening statement, that the parties do agree on what that figure is. To reiterate, that amount is \$25,892,662. Therefore, the most this Commission can authorize MAWC to recover in its revenues under the current ISRS is \$25,892,662.

Now, this is where the parties' agreement starts to divide. The difference between Staff and Missouri-American boils down to what amount of total revenues can be collected under the ISRS. We already know what the cap amount is, and I keep reiterating the figure of \$25,892,662, and

1 there's just no dispute. But if the Commission 2 were to adopt Missouri-American's argument in this 3 case, the amount of revenues authorized by the 4 Commission as part of the ISRS rate would exceed 5 the 10 percent statutory cap. And this is the 6 heart of the matter. It is a legal question, and 7 it is one this Commission is tasked with answering. 8 Within the statute creating the ISRS, 9 there are two protected mechanisms designed to 10 control the amount of ISRS recovery that a utility 11 can have before they are required to file their 12 general rate case to reset those ISRS revenues to

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

zero.

The first protected mechanism is found in 393.1003(1) and is what we've been referring to as that 10 percent cap. It directs the Commission as follows, and I quote: An ISRS on an annualized basis must produce ISRS revenues of at least \$1 million but not in excess of 10 percent of the water corporation's base revenue level approved by the Commission in the water corporation's most recent general rate proceeding. To reiterate, the parties agree on that figure, \$25,892,662.

But the second protected mechanism placed in the statute comes in the form of a

reconciliation mechanism, which is found at 393.1006(5)(2) and reads as follows, and I quote: At the end of each 12-month period that an ISRS is in effect, the water corporation shall reconcile the differences between the revenues resulting from an ISRS and the appropriate pretax revenues as found by the Commission for that period and shall submit the reconciliation and a proposed ISRS adjustment to the Commission for approval to recover or refund the difference, as appropriate, through an adjustment of an ISRS.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This issue of how to treat the ISRS revenues associated with the reconciliation or received revenue is the key point of disagreement between Staff and Missouri-American. Staff takes the position that the entire amount of the ISRS revenues authorized by the Commission at any point in time, including revenues associated with reconciliation of prior ordered ISRS amounts, should be included in the ISRS revenue cap cal cul ati on. This ensures that the ISRS cap calculation takes into account all ISRS revenues authorized for collection from customers in determining the upper limits that should be placed on the form of single-issue rate recovery.

Additionally, this interpretation of the statute follows the rules of statutory construction in construing the statute in a way that does not result in an unreasonable or unnecessary result, meaning why put a cap limitation in there at all if there were ways to just simply and easily get around it.

Ameren fuel adjustment clause matter, a reading of the statute that conforms to the legislative intent to limit contingencies and variables not expressly envisioned within the scope of a legislatively-authorized interim rate adjustment tool like the ISRS may only be remediated, if at all, in a general rate case. In short, as Public Counsel iterated in its opening statement, if Missouri-American wants to recover its lost revenues above this cap limitation, that recovery may be had in the filing of a general rate proceeding.

And I want to be very clear here. Staff is not saying no to the recovery of the items requested in Missouri-American's ISRS filing, and it is not saying that what Missouri-American files in its application for recovery is not and are not

ISRS-eligible items, as defined by the statute. What we are saying is that, according to the statute, the items eligible for ISRS recovery have hit that protected cap mechanism. And while those revenues may be recoverable, the ISRS is not the right place, and this is just simply not the right time.

When a utility hits that 10 percent cap, then the utility has an alternative recourse to come in with its general rate case filing and resetting the ISRS to zero. In such an instance any under collection at that time in the ISRS is woven back to the utility's base rates and recovered in customer rates.

Since the establishment of the ISRS in 2003, which has been 12 years, this is the first time that a utility eligible to receive ISRS recovery has come close to hitting this 10 percent protected cap. The ISRS is keeping utilities investing in infrastructure replacement, while at the same time phasing out the need for general rate case filings. And, remember, without the statutory authorization allowing single-issue ratemaking recovery, these investments and the recovery on and for them would not be permitted.

Therefore, when a statute expressly authorizes an exception to standard ratemaking practice such as our ISRS, close scrutiny should be given to that intent of that statute, and attempts to expand beyond its clear meaning should be carefully evaluated. Close scrutiny should be given to the express limitations in that statute as well.

So what can this Commission authorize in this current ISRS case? To date the Commission has authorized Missouri-American to recover \$25,637,873 under its current ISRS, leaving the Commission the ability to authorize up to an additional \$254,789 in additional ISRS revenues before the 10 percent cap is hit. This \$254,789 is associated with qualified ISRS plant investment. And that is what Staff would request this Commission do, authorize \$254,789 in additional ISRS revenues for this current ISRS filing. That position is consistent with the statutory intent found in 393.1003.

Lastly, I want to touch upon
Missouri-American's request to establish a
regulatory asset for the under recovered components
of its ISRS request, if Staff's ISRS rate increase
recommendation is approved by this Commission.

1 Tying us back to our Monopoly example 2 over here, beautiful Monopoly board, 3 Missouri-American is essentially asking the 4 Commission to draw a chance card in the event you 5 agree with Staff that the cap calculation should 6 include the under collection of revenues component. 7 Missouri-American's hope is that this chance card 8 acts like a get out of jail free card, allowing 9 Missouri-American to avoid having to sit out a turn 10 or two and missing out on collecting Monopoly 11 However, this request to book an ISRS rents. 12 expense as a regulatory asset goes counter to this 13 Commission's treatment of ordinary capital 14 expenditures designed to provide safe and adequate 15 service, and it goes counter to the ISRS statute 16 itself. 17 MAWC points to language found in the 18

ISRS statute at 393.1006(2) as providing the authority for the Commission to grant the booking of an ISRS reconciliation amount as a regulatory asset should a utility hit the 10 percent cap found earlier in the statute. But to read the ISRS statute in this manner is to ignore legal precedent coming out of the Western District of Missouri.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In the case In Re the Matter of the

Application of Laclede Gas Company versus Office of Public Counsel, a case decided in January of 2014, the Western District, in examining the ISRS statute on a matter of first impression, found very clearly that an ISRS -- or that the ISRS statute never refers to more than one ISRS; and no matter how many times the ISRS is changed between rate cases, there is only one ISRS rate for each customer class and the ISRS surcharge is recovered via a single-rate element on the customer's bill.

To permit the booking of expense above the 10 percent cap would violate the clear mandate that only a single ISRS is contemplated by the statute. In this case an ISRS is an ISRS is an ISRS. It doesn't change its stripes. This includes authorized amounts by the Commission, as well as subsequent reconciliation by the utility.

Finally, when utilities seek approval to defer costs rather than charge them to expense, the question is always asked whether the costs in question are extraordinary in nature and would recording these costs have a material impact on the Company's financial results for the period in question. This is a standard question asked when utilities request special treatment of an expense.

And in this case, as you will see, there has been no such claim made, no such evidence advanced by Missouri-American.

So where do the requests for deferral stop and when do they begin? Is it proper to permit the utility to keep coming back in and keep requesting deferral of expenses under the ISRS for three or more years without restriction? Then why put a cap in there at all if that is the intent of the statute? Such an accumulation of deferrals also acts, in effect, to absolve the utility of the responsibility to file for general rate relief to reflect its actual cost levels in rates charged to its customers.

To summarize, there are rules to this version of utility monopoly. Those rules are set forth to act as protective mechanisms to limit the possible abuses of the monopoly power the utility enjoys. Each of you acts as a banker in the game, ensuring that the players play by the rules. The rules state that the ISRS surcharge is subject to limits on the upper ends of the revenues that it will produce in relation to the last base rate amount. The Commission may not approve an ISRS that falls outside of those limits. A 10 percent

1 limit has been stated before, and it is not in 2 dispute by the parties. 3 The Staff is asking this Commission to 4 grant this ISRS application in the amount of 5 \$254,789. It is also Staff's position to deny 6 permitting the booking of any expense not permitted 7 by the ISRS as a regulatory asset. To do so would 8 violate the clear intent of the statute that only a 9 single ISRS exists, permitting the utility to break 10 the rules and to win by chance. 11 Thank you. And I'm open for questions. 12 JUDGE JORDAN: Questions from the bench? 13 Mr. Chairman. 14 CHAIR KENNEY: Yeah, just a couple. 15 Thank you. 16 MS. MAYFIELD: You're welcome. 17 CHAIR KENNEY: What's the cite of that 18 case, the Western District case? 19 MS. MAYFIELD: The citation for the case 20 that I cited is 417 S.W. 3d 815, and it's a 2014 21 case out of the Western District Court of Appeals. 22 CHAIR KENNEY: So if we -- I'll just ask 23 the same question I asked Ms. Baker. If we agree 24 with Staff's position about \$1.6 million that Staff 25 concedes are eligible, that are ISRS-eligible

1	expenses, they're just above the cap, so you can
2	you do concede that they are eligible for the ISRS
3	recovery?
4	MS. MAYFIELD: Yes, based on Staff's
5	review of what Missouri-American submitted, that is
6	a correct assumption.
7	CHAIR KENNEY: And if we don't allow
8	Missouri-American to book that in a regulatory
9	asset, that's just money they'll never recover?
10	MS. MAYFIELD: I mean Mark Oligschlaeger
11	may be better suited to answer that, as he is an
12	accountant. I'm just not in a position to answer
13	that.
14	CHAIR KENNEY: And if it's if it's
15	booked in a regulatory asset for recover because
16	Staff's position is that the ISRS is an ISRS, so we
17	can't establish a second ISRS by allowing recovery
18	of this 1.6. That's ultimately what Staff's
19	characterizing it as; right?
20	MS. MAYFIELD: Yes, in my opening that
21	is the way I've described it. And it's not Staff's
22	characterization. Again, it's our reading of the
23	Western District opinion.
24	CHAIR KENNEY: But if we're just
25	allowing it for recovery in future rates, it's

1	not not going to be delineated on a customer
2	bill as an ISRS item; it's just ISRS-eligible costs
	·
3	being rolled into base rates in the next case.
4	MS. MAYFIELD: I understand what you're
5	saying. I believe that to be a correct statement.
6	CHAIR KENNEY: But you're saying the
7	Laclede Gas case, the Western District case,
8	prohi bi ts that?
9	MS. MAYFIELD: I'm not saying that it
10	directly prohibits exactly the situation that you
11	have just articulated. What I'm saying is that in
12	the reading of the Western District Court of
13	Appeals case, it found that there aren't multiple
14	ISRSs occurring at the same time. And so that
15	anything that you were to put into an ISRS,
16	including reconciliation amount, goes into that
17	single ISRS.
18	CHAIR KENNEY: Okay. Thank you.
19	MS. MAYFIELD: You're welcome.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Commissioner Hall.
21	COMMISSIONER HALL: Good morning.
22	MS. MAYFIELD: Morning.
23	COMMISSIONER HALL: If I could direct
24	your attention to Commission Rule 4 CSR
25	240-3.650(17), that is a I'm going to start out

1 by asking you the same question I asked Ms. Baker. 2 What do you believe the purpose of this rule is? 3 MS. MAYFIELD: I mean, as I read it, because -- and I highlighted it, I do believe that 4 5 it permits this Commission to track those over or 6 under collections. 7 COMMISSIONER HALL: And do what with 8 them? 9 MS. MAYFIELD: To monitor what those 10 amounts are so that in the next general rate 11 proceeding those over or under collections can be 12 accounted for in however fashion that would be 13 accounted for. 14 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. So here's my 15 Over or under recovery, is that over or 16 under recovery comparing ISRS revenues and 17 authorization or is that also comparing over and 18 under recovery with the cap? 19 MS. MAYFIELD: Our interpretation of the 20 statute is the cap is associated with what this 21 Commission authorized and can authorize. So this 22 Commission can authorize up to \$25,892,662. 23 is the amount that this Commission can authorize. 24 Now, what Missouri-American actually collects, I 25 don't necessarily know if the statute speaks to

1	that. That's why I referred to the Missouri or
2	to the Ameren fuel adjustment charge with some
3	variation there, which was directly impacted on
4	usage. Does that answer your question?
5	COMMISSIONER HALL: Kind of. Let me ask
6	you this: The 10 percent cap, you believe it's
7	Staff's position that that is a cap on what we can
8	authorize, that is a cap on what can be recovered,
9	or both?
10	MS. MAYFIELD: I believe Staff's
11	position is that it is what this Commission can
12	authorize. And that's what I've reiterated in my
13	opening, as I described it. This Commission can
14	authorize up to 10 percent of the water
15	corporation's base revenue level approved by the
16	Commission.
17	But we do have a Staff witness here who
18	is an accountant. And if for some reason
19	authorized versus collected is one of those words
20	that may have particular significance in
21	accounting, I'm sure Mark would be able to answer
22	that question for you as well.
23	COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.
24	MS. MAYFIELD: You're very welcome.
25	JUDGE JORDAN: I have no questions from

1	the other commissioners. Thank you.
2	MS. MAYFIELD: Thank you, Judge Jordan.
3	JUDGE JORDAN: We're ready for
4	Applicants to begin their case in chief.
5	MR. COOPER: We would call Ms. Jeanne
6	Ti nsl ey.
7	Your Honor, may we mark Ms. Tinsley's
8	direct and rebuttal testimonies as Exhibits 1 and 2
9	for identification or do you have a different
10	JUDGE JORDAN: No, that's fine. 1 will
11	be the direct, and number 2 will be the rebuttal.
12	Ms. Tinsley, please raise your right
13	hand.
14	JEANNE TINSLEY,
15	after having been first duly sworn, was
16	examined and testified on her oath as follows:
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.
18	DI RECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COOPER:
19	Q Please state your name.
20	A Jeanne Tinsley.
	•
21	Q By whom are you employed and in what
22	capacity?
23	A I'm employed by American Water Service
24	Company as the rates and regulation manager for
25	Missouri-American and Iowa-American.

1	Q Have you caused to be prepared for
2	purposes of this proceeding certain direct and
3	rebuttal testimony in question and answer form?
4	A I have.
5	Q Is it your understanding that that
6	testimony has been marked as Exhibits 1 and 2 for
7	i denti fi cati on?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Do you have any changes that you would
10	like to make to that testimony at this time?
11	A Yes, I do have one change. The rebuttal
12	testimony, pages 1 through 4, the header should
13	read "rebuttal" instead of "direct."
14	Q Is that the only change?
15	A That is.
16	Q If I were to ask you the questions that
17	are contained in Exhibits 1 and 2 today, would your
18	answers be the same?
19	A They would.
20	Q Are those answers true and correct to
21	the best of your information, knowledge, and
22	belief?
23	A They are.
24	MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I would offer
25	Exhibits 1 and 2 into evidence and tender

1	Ms. Tinsley for questions.
2	JUDGE JORDAN: Very good. Objections to
3	those exhi bi ts?
4	MS. MAYFIELD: None, Your Honor.
5	JUDGE JORDAN: Very good. Then those
6	exhibits are admitted into the record.
7	(Exhi bi ts 1 and 2 received.)
8	JUDGE JORDAN: The sequence of
9	cross-examination that I have shows
10	cross-examination first from the Office of Public
11	Counsel.
12	MS. BAKER: No questions.
13	JUDGE JORDAN: Cross-examination from
14	Staff?
15	MS. MAYFIELD: No questions.
16	JUDGE JORDAN: Questions from the bench?
17	Mr. Chairman.
18	CHAIR KENNEY: I have no questions.
19	Thank you.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Commissioner Hall.
21	COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes.
22	EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER HALL:
23	Q Good morning.
24	A Good morning.
25	Q If the Commission were to take Staff's

1	and OPC's position in this in this case and deny
2	recovery through the ISRS of the 1.6 million, would
3	Missouri-American be able to recover those expenses
4	via another avenue?
5	A They would not, not until we file
6	another rate case. But the rates set in rate case
7	are proactive versus so we would lose the
8	revenue.
9	Q Wouldn't you be able to get depreciation
10	on that 1.6 million going forward?
11	A Once we file a rate case.
12	Q Which which is imminent? I mean, you
13	filed notice, so
14	A Correct. But it takes 11 months to have
15	rates set.
16	Q So so in the next rate case when the
17	Commission sets the value of your of rate base,
18	it would take into account that 1.6 million?
19	A It would.
20	Q And the Company would receive
21	depreciation 10, 15, 20 year, whatever time period
22	on that 1.6 million. So you would recover it over
23	10, 15, 20 years; you just wouldn't recover it in
24	the expedited manner envisioned by ISRS?
25	A Just going forward. We wouldn't recover

1	the depreciation expense from the time it went into
2	service until the application of new rates.
3	Q Is there any back-of-the-envelope guess
4	as to how much that would be, how much you would
5	lose? And if you can't do that, that's fine.
6	A Yeah, I don't know at this time.
7	Q All right. It's my understanding that
8	Staff's position is that if the Commission were to
9	adopt Missouri-American's interpretation of the
10	ISRS statute that Missouri-American would recover
11	over the 10 percent cap. Is that your
12	understanding as well?
13	A No, I disagree.
14	Q Well, I don't I'm not saying I'm
15	not asking whether you agree or disagree with that
16	position. But my question is is that your
17	understanding that that's Staff's position?
18	A Yes, I do agree.
19	Q Okay. And that Staff believes that the
20	Company would over recover by 1.6 million?
21	A That's their belief.
22	Q Okay. Why is that wrong?
23	A That is wrong because the rates that we
24	are basing our revenue requirement on are
25	calculated from the usage that was determined in

1	our last rate case, which was back from 2010 data,
2	and our usage since then has declined. So if we
3	had set rates based on current usage levels, we
4	wouldn't have an under collection; and, therefore,
5	we'd be able to recover that 1.6 million.
6	Q So, in essence, you believe that because
7	of prior decline in consumption and future decline
8	in consumption that we can authorize the amount
9	that you request here today and you will hit the
10	\$25.9 million cap?
11	A Correct, because we have not collected
12	that amount.
13	Q But you're you're anticipating future
14	decline in consumption? I mean, that's part and
15	parcel
16	A That has been our trend, yes.
17	Q So looking at page 6 of your of your
18	direct testimony and the hypothetical, you believe
19	that it would be appropriate for the Commission to
20	authorize 3.2 million with the belief,
21	understanding, assumption that the actual receipts
22	would be 3 million?
23	A The Commission would authorize 3 million
24	of recovery of investment. The 210,000 is the
25	reconciliation to allow us to collect what we

1	haven't already collected that was previously
2	authori zed.
3	Q But in your hypothetical what is the
4	authorized amount
5	A Three
6	Q after after June 1, 2015?
7	A 3 million 210.
8	Q Okay. So so you believe that the
9	10 percent cap does not apply to what is
10	authorized; you believe that the 10 percent cap
11	only applies to actual receipts?
12	A What is collected, correct.
13	Q How much has been actually recovered
14	under the ISRS since its inception?
15	A That I'm not I don't have that
16	Q But isn't that that's the thing that
17	confused me from the get-go in this whole case,
18	because it seems to me, I mean, reading all the
19	testimony, reading all the briefs, that the
20	fundamental question is what is the actual
21	recovery.
22	A Well, through the true-up period of two
23	thousand from 2012 to September of 2014,
24	we've we haven't recovered 1.6 million of the
25	authorized amount.

1	Q Right. But why can't if everybody
2	agrees as to what the cap is, \$25.8 million, why is
3	this case not as simple as simply figuring out
4	exactly what has been recovered and subtracting
5	that from the twenty-five eight and and putting
6	that as the additional ISRS?
7	A Well, like I said, we we do know
8	through September of 2014 the difference between
9	what was authorized and what was collected, and
10	that is \$1.6 million. So that is the amount that
11	we believe should we should be able to
12	Q 0kay. So
13	A invest.
14	Q So as of September 2014, actual recovery
15	would be what?
16	A 23, 972, 670.
17	Q Okay. And and you don't have
18	current I mean, it obviously changes every
19	month.
20	A Correct.
21	Q But you don't have the current amount?
22	That's that's the most current number you have?
23	A That's the most current. That's the
24	last reconciliation we've completed.
25	Q If the if the Commission were to

1	adopt Missouri-American's statutory interpretation
2	of the ISRS statute and but Staff turned out to
3	be correct that that resulted in an over recovery,
4	meaning over 10 percent recovery, do you think that
5	the the Commission would be able to put a
6	tracker on those dollars and account for that over
7	recovery in the next rate case?
8	A Yes, as a regulatory liability.
9	Q Okay. A couple of remedial questions,
10	if you'll if you'll bear with me.
11	A Sure.
12	Q The the \$25.8 million cap, that's not
13	an annual cap, that is a three-year cap; is that
14	correct?
15	A Correct.
16	Q Okay. And the ISRS surcharge put in
17	place when when the ISRS was initially
18	established, was that designed to recover the
19	expenses for qualifying expenditures over one year?
20	A It was about a six-month period.
21	Q So it was designed to recover that
22	amount over six months?
23	A Yes.
24	Q And is that is that mandated by
25	the by the statute or the rule that a

1	six-month time period for recovery?
2	A We're allowed to file an ISRS twice in
3	any one-year period.
4	Q Right. So you do you believe that on
5	the basis of that, the rates are to be designed
6	the surcharge is to be designed to recover that
7	expense over six months?
8	A Not over six months.
9	Q Over a year?
10	A Over a year.
11	COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. All right. I
12	have no further questions. Thank you.
13	JUDGE JORDAN: I have no questions from
14	the other commissioners. So does that does this
15	questioning generate any recross from OPC?
16	MS. BAKER: No.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Any recross from Staff?
18	MS. MAYFIELD: No, Your Honor.
19	JUDGE JORDAN: Any redirect by
20	Mi ssouri -Ameri can?
21	MR. COOPER: A little bit, Your Honor.
22	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COOPER:
23	Q In response to some early well, let
24	me ask this. Commissioner Hall was asking you
25	about whether the Company would sort of lose

1	recovery of the 1.6 million if Staff's position
2	were deemed to be the appropriate one. Do you
3	remember that?
4	A Yes.
5	Q And part of that discussion you started
6	talking about depreciation expense and some other
7	things associated with this plan. Let me ask you
8	this: Is the eligible ISRS plan that we're talking
9	about in this case, is it in service today?
10	A Itis.
11	Q And do you start to book depreciation
12	associated with that when do you start to book
13	depreciation associated with that plan?
14	A The month after it goes into service.
15	Q Okay. So as to that plan, you are
16	currently booking depreciation expense; correct?
17	A We are.
18	Q And in your next rate case, presumably
19	depreciation expense for that plant will be taken
20	into account; correct?
21	A Correct.
22	Q But I think you were going this
23	direction: Those rates will be set to pick up past
24	periods or for prospective periods?
25	A Prospective periods.

1	Q So the depreciation expense that you've
2	already experienced is gone; is that correct?
3	A Correct.
4	Q And that's when you talk about you'll
5	not get recovery, is the recovery of those
6	there's also property taxes, there's some other
7	things associated with that plan; correct?
8	A Correct.
9	Q And that won't be provided for unless
10	you have some sort of deferral, that won't be
11	provided for in your future rates?
12	A That's correct.
13	Q Just to kind of clear something up, and
14	I think you may have in one of your later answers.
15	But at first I heard you say that an ISRS was
16	designed to recover moneys over a six-month period,
17	and that threw me a little bit. Did you later
18	what period when you do the rate design, are you
19	contemplating a six-month period or a year period?
20	A An annual. An annual period.
21	Q Okay. And if you know I think there
22	was also a question about the cap. Is there a
23	reference to annual annual periods in statute in
24	regard to the cap or do you know?
25	A Not for an annual period, no.

1	MR. COOPER: Well, let me may l
2	approach the witness, Your Honor?
3	JUDGE JORDAN: To clarify, no one need
4	ask my permission to approach the witness, any
5	witness.
6	MR. COOPER: What I've handed the
7	witness is the statute/rule provisions referenced
8	in my opening statement that I provided earlier.
9	BY MR. COOPER:
10	Q On the first page there's Section
11	393.1003(1). Do you see that?
12	A I do.
13	Q And in that statute, one, two, three,
14	four, five, six, seven, eight lines down, on the
14 15	four, five, six, seven, eight lines down, on the very end of that eighth line, do you see that it
	_
15	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it
15 16	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it talks about on an annualized basis?
15 16 17	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it talks about on an annualized basis? A Yes.
15 16 17 18	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it talks about on an annualized basis? A Yes. MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. That's
15 16 17 18	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it talks about on an annualized basis? A Yes. MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have, Your Honor.
15 16 17 18 19 20	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it talks about on an annualized basis? A Yes. MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have, Your Honor. JUDGE JORDAN: You may stand down.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it talks about on an annualized basis? A Yes. MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have, Your Honor. JUDGE JORDAN: You may stand down. COMMISSIONER HALL: I have one more
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it talks about on an annualized basis? A Yes. MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have, Your Honor. JUDGE JORDAN: You may stand down. COMMISSIONER HALL: I have one more question. I'm sorry.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	very end of that eighth line, do you see that it talks about on an annualized basis? A Yes. MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have, Your Honor. JUDGE JORDAN: You may stand down. COMMISSIONER HALL: I have one more question. I'm sorry. JUDGE JORDAN: It's not too late for

1	Q So on an annualized basis in the
2	statute, what does that mean, or how do you
3	interpret that?
4	A I guess I'm not following your question.
5	Q Well, if it's if it's a three-year
6	cap, I mean and this is actually the provision
7	that causes me some some confusion. If the cap
8	is three years but the limitation is 10 percent on
9	an annualized basis, what does on an annualized
10	basis mean?
11	A I believe it's not 10 percent on an
12	annualized basis; it's 10 percent when you get to
13	the final three years. So in the first year we're
14	only we're not issuing the full amount. It's
15	only, you know, maybe 8 million. So it it
16	continues. We don't reach the cap until maybe
17	three years out.
18	MR. COOPER: Your Honor and
19	Commissioner, would it be possible to take maybe a
20	five-minute break so that I can talk to Staff for a
21	moment? I'd like to think that maybe this wouldn't
22	be as confusing if I could have just a minute to
23	talk to Staff and OPC on the matter.
24	JUDGE JORDAN: Any problem with that?
25	COMMISSIONER HALL: None.

JUDGE JORDAN: 1 Five minutes. We will be 2 in recess. 3 (Off the record.) 4 JUDGE JORDAN: And we are back on the 5 record. Commissioner Hall was questioning the 6 witness. 7 MR. COOPER: If it would -- if it would 8 be possible, the discussion that was had amongst 9 Staff, OPC, and the Company concerned the guestions 10 about the cap and whether it's an annual cap. 11 to the extent it makes any difference to the 12 Commission, the parties, I believe -- and they 13 certainly can jump in and correct me if I'm 14 wrong -- it's the belief of all three parties that 15 the cap is really an annual cap. When we talk 16 about \$25 million, that's an annual amount. 17 So, for example -- the extreme example 18 that was provided in our discussion is is that if a 19 company were able to ramp up its installation of 20 ISRS-eligible plant such that it drove an ISRS rate 21 in year one equal to its cap, \$25 million for 22 example, it potentially could recover that 25 23 million in year one, year two, year three, which 24 would ultimately be a total of 75 million in my 25 example. It couldn't add any more ISRS-eligible

1	plant after the first year, but but it's our
2	belief and I'll turn it over to Staff and OPC
3	from there that that is an annual cap number
4	that we're comparing to.
5	JUDGE JORDAN: Staff? OPC?
6	MS. MAYFIELD: Staff agrees with
7	Mr. Cooper's description of the cap.
8	MS. BAKER: Public Counsel also.
9	COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.
10	JUDGE JORDAN: No more questions,
11	Commissioner Hall?
12	COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, actually, let
13	me get clarification. I don't know if I should
14	direct this to you, Mr. Cooper, or to Ms. Tinsley.
15	So I think what you said is that the 25
16	million is an annual cap. So it would it's
17	conceivable that Missouri-American could recover
18	\$25 million a year for three years, \$75 million?
19	MR. COOPER: If we assume they were able
20	to put in enough plant to drive that.
21	COMMISSIONER HALL: And so would that
22	\$75 million in plant could in January of each
23	of the three years, could they put \$25 million in
24	new plant and equipment in?
25	MR. COOPER: No.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

MR. COOPER: Once -- once they had -- and that's my assumption, I guess in my hypothetical, is that in year one they've installed and have in service enough plant to drive an ISRS rate in a total amount of 25 million. So I think, you know, once they reach that number in year one, they certainty couldn't add any more in years two and three.

COMMISSIONER HALL: They couldn't add any more plant and equipment?

MR. COOPER: Right. Now, we would differ with Staff as to what to do if actual recoveries were greater or lesser than the 25 million. But -- but that's kind of where we lead in this case, I guess.

JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Let me ask the stupid question here, because this sounds -- this is to be a different perspective than how I read the prefiled testimony. So we have a cap that everyone agrees is the \$25 million number, apparently. The parties read the statutes to say that \$25 million is the most that can be collected -- the most -- no, I'll use the language of the statute. An ISRS on an annualized basis

1	must produce ISRS revenues not in excess of
2	\$25 million.
3	Now, when we say that's annualized, that
4	means you can get \$25 million in a year. You can
5	produce not in excess of \$25 million a year. You
6	generate that much revenue. 59 15.
7	You produce that much revenue. What
8	about the three-year life of the ISRS, can the
9	can Missouri-American collect more than
10	\$25 million?
11	MR. COOPER: Over the three-year life?
12	JUDGE JORDAN: Yes.
13	MR. COOPER: Yes, we believe so.
14	JUDGE JORDAN: So \$25 million is
15	actually \$25 million each year of the life of the
16	ISRS, not all years of the life of the ISRS; is
17	that correct?
18	MR. COOPER: Say that again. I'm sorry,
19	Your Honor.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: \$25 million is what we
21	produce by ISRS. That's the ISRS revenue we
22	generate. We generate that in year one, then again
23	in year two, and then again in year three of the
24	ISRS; is that correct?
25	MR. COOPER: In our hypothetical, which

1	assumes that we rate design has hit it spot on
2	and we've actually collected what we thought we
3	were going to collect and all those assumptions.
4	But, yes.
5	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Then does Staff
6	agree?
7	MS. MAYFIELD: Yes, Your Honor.
8	JUDGE JORDAN: And does OPC agree?
9	MS. BAKER: Yes, I believe so.
10	JUDGE JORDAN: I will ask Commissioner
11	Hall's question in another form then. For the
12	for the current year that we're in, what's the best
13	descriptor of that, of this period that we're
14	talking about? I'll ask that of the witness.
15	EXAMINATION BY JUDGE JORDAN:
16	Q How do you describe this period that
17	we're talking about collecting the ISRS that's
18	surcharge that's at issue here?
19	A The surcharge, the 1.9 we're requesting?
20	Q Yes. I understand that your ISRS runs
21	out in September; is that correct?
22	A That's correct.
23	Q Okay. How do we describe the period
24	ending in September?
25	A In September if

1	Q Do we call that a fiscal year? Do we
2	call that an ISRS period?
3	A Yeah, an ISRS reconciliation period.
4	Our first ISRS went into effect in September, on
5	September 25th, 2012. So every September we do a
6	reconciliation.
7	Q So September ends this reconciliation
8	peri od?
9	A That's correct.
10	Q Okay. So my question is and I'll
11	direct it to you also in the year ending, the
12	fiscal say this again. In the ISRS period
13	ending September of 2015, Missouri-American
14	Missouri-American's ISRS surcharge must generate no
15	more than no more than a 25 the \$25 million
16	amount?
17	A That's correct.
18	Q Okay. Not less than a million dollars,
19	but it must generate no more than that?
20	A Correct.
21	Q Okay. Do you have a handle on how much
22	ISRS ISRS revenue the surcharge has generated so
23	far in this period ending September 2015?
24	A I do not have the exact revenue amounts.
25	I do know that our usage has is still lower than

_	
1	what was authorized in our last case.
2	Q Okay. Do you have an amount of revenue
3	generated for any period?
4	A Just for the periods that we've already
5	reconci I ed.
6	Q Okay. And that would mean up to
7	September of 2014?
8	A Correct.
9	Q Ending September of 2014. And what is
10	that amount, please?
11	A 23, 972, 670.
12	Q Okay. That number's familiar to me. I
13	know I've seen it in your testimony.
14	Now, I'll also ask Commissioner Hall's
15	question again in this simplified and simpleminded
16	way. If the issue is how much revenue ISRSs
17	generate, don't we take that number that cap
18	I'll say, and subtract the number that you just
19	gave for me? Is that what you're telling the
20	Commission to do?
21	A The 25 minus the 23?
22	Q Um-hum.
23	A Yes, I believe so.
24	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Thank you.
25	Commissioner Hall, did you have any more

1	questi ons?
2	COMMISSIONER HALL: Yeah, I do.
3	FURTHER EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER HALL:
4	Q So what was what is the total amount
5	of ISRS-eligible expenditures that the Company has
6	had since the inception of the ISRS in this case?
7	A That is the 23 million 972. That's how
8	much we've
9	Q Total over three years?
10	A Yes.
11	Q Okay. Well, then I am still confused as
12	to how we if we have a \$25 million cap a year,
13	how we have a total of \$23 million in expenditures
14	over three. So, I mean
15	A Well, if you look at the chart on page 7
16	of my direct testimony, the if you look at the
17	last column, it says the amount associated with new
18	ISRS plant, that's the revenue that we were
19	authorized that was based on new ISRS investment.
20	So in September it was only 3.7 million, in June it
21	was 5.8, because we have never invested enough in
22	one year to get to the 25 million. That would
23	almost be impossible. So the first year our ISRS
24	was in place, it was about 9 million only. So in
25	that first year we were only authorized to collect

1	9 million.
2	Q Where does that 9 million appear?
3	A I'm just adding the first two numbers,
4	the first two ISRS in our first 12-month period.
5	Q So you that's a result of two two
6	different orders; right?
7	A Correct.
8	Q The first one authorized roughly 4
9	million?
10	A Correct.
11	Q And that was for \$4 million worth of
12	plant and equipment up and running, used and
13	useful?
14	A The 3.7, yes. There was also a \$253,000
15	adjustment for under recovery included in the
16	amount. But the amount associated with plant was
17	only 3.7 million.
18	COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. All right.
19	Thank you.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Mr. Chairman, do you have
21	any further questions?
22	CHAIR KENNEY: I'm confused again,
23	because it looks like I don't have a question.
24	Maybe just a comment.
25	EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN KENNEY:

1	Q You guys are saying \$25 million cap
2	annually. But reading this chart it seems like
3	you're saying it's 25 million over a three-year
4	period. And that's so I'm confused.
5	A Well, the way to explain it is we have
6	the \$25 million cap.
7	Q Total?
8	A Total.
9	Q Over the entire life of the ISRS?
10	A Any year.
11	Q In any given year?
12	A In any given year 25 million. So in the
13	first year we only were authorized 9 million,
14	say
15	Q Okay.
16	A so we were clearly way under the cap.
17	Q And that's for the WO-2012-0401 and
18	W0-2013-0466?
19	A Correct.
20	Q And you add those two together, so
21	\$9 million. You were well under 25 million?
22	A Well under 25 million. So that means we
23	can continue to invest and ask for recovery.
24	Q Okay.
25	A The second two we requested another 2.9

1	and 4.1. We were still clearly under the
2	\$25 million cap.
3	Q And then now?
4	A Now we're getting in this next in
5	this current filing, we're asking for 1.9, which
6	includes 1.6 million of under recovery from all
7	those prior ISRSs that we didn't collect.
8	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. If I may return to
9	my simpleminded questions. Why are we talking
10	about a one-year period and a three-year period?
11	First you started talking about one-year periods
12	with the \$25 million cap. Now you're adding
13	previous periods the previous three years and
14	looking at a \$25 million cap.
15	THE WITNESS: Yeah, we have three years
16	to get to the \$25 million cap. We're never going
17	to get to 25 million in the first year. So the cap
18	is in total of all ISRSs between the two rate
19	case between rate cases.
20	COMMISSIONER HALL: So that would
21	that's a three-year cap.
22	CHAIR KENNEY: So it's a three-year cap,
23	not an annual.
24	JUDGE JORDAN: It's both. And
25	THE WITNESS: Well, it's looked at

1	annual it's looked at at each ISRS filing to
2	make sure we're not over the cap. But
3	JUDGE JORDAN: It's both. You're saying
4	that over the life of three years you cannot
5	collect more than 25 million, but you could collect
6	that in one year?
7	THE WITNESS: We could.
8	JUDGE JORDAN: And then there would be
9	no more?
10	THE WITNESS: And then we'd have to
11	stop, right.
12	CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Mr. Cooper said you
13	could collect 75 million theoretically. He said
14	that he said there was a hypothetical situation
15	under which you could theoretically collect \$75
16	million.
17	THE WITNESS: Correct. And if we did
18	reach that 25 million in the first year, which is
19	very highly unlikely, then we could still continue
20	to collect that 25 million each year. Those rates
21	would stay in effect until we file our next rate
22	case.
23	CHAIR KENNEY: This seems mathematically
24	contradictory. It's either 25 million over the
25	life of the ISRS from rate case to rate case, but

1 then you're also saying it conceivably could be 2 \$25 million annually for a grand total of 75 3 million under Mr. Cooper's hypothetical. 4 THE WITNESS: That's a --5 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: I'm confused. 6 THE WITNESS: Yeah, that hypothetical 7 would never really happen. We'd have to collect 8 all of it in the first year and then wait three 9 years to file a rate case. 10 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Collect all... THE WITNESS: To be able to collect 75 11 12 million. We'd have -- we'd have to have 25 million 13 filing in our first year and then collect -- and 14 then that would stay in rates. So that means 25 15 million each year until we file a rate case. 16 JUDGE JORDAN: Counselor, did you have 17 something? 18 MR. COOPER: Well, yeah, and I think 19 Staff counsel does as well. I'm not sure where 20 we're kind of getting off track, but I think it's 21 this: I think that there is investment in the 22 plant to start with; and when we start talking 23 about what's going to be in the ISRS rate, we're 24 really talking about the costs associated with that 25 investment. So, for example, on page 7 of

1	Ms. Tinsley's testimony there, we were looking at
2	that chart, and in the far-right column she's got
3	the 3.736,587 in the as the amount associated
4	with new ISRS plant for that 0401 case. That
5	that's the costs associated with the plant
6	investment. So there's more more investment
7	than that, right, that drives those costs.
8	Those costs that investment will
9	exist in year two, in year three, and in year four,
10	and that 3.736 is the annual cost associated with
11	that investment. So that 3.7 continues in year
12	two to be recovered in year two, in year three,
13	and so on. That investment doesn't go away. The
14	cost associated doesn't go away.
15	COMMISSIONER HALL: So the surcharge
16	conti nues?
17	MR. COOPER: So the surcharge yeah,
18	it's a part of the surcharge that's being
19	COMMISSIONER HALL: Even though even
20	though the surcharge in that year brought in the
21	amount equal to the investment
22	MR. COOPER: Correct.
23	COMMISSIONER HALL: the surcharge
24	conti nues?
25	MR. COOPER: Because it's designed on a

1	yearly basis. So it's designed to recover the 3.7
2	each year until ultimately we go back to to zero
3	in the next rate.
4	COMMISSIONER HALL: Even though the
5	your out of pocket was \$3.7 million, you're going
6	to get \$3.7 million that first year, that second
7	year, and that third year?
8	MR. COOPER: Because it that 3.7
9	consists of the depreciation expense that has to be
10	recorded on an annual amount, the property taxes
11	that have to be paid every year, the return on the
12	investment for every year. So that those
13	those items are going to be incurred or paid or
14	whatever every year until you get to a rate case
15	and that plant is rolled into the rate base on a
16	going-forward basis.
17	So so when we look at this, this
18	chart, I mean, we start with 3.7. Then there's
19	additional plant investment that drives the 5.8.
20	That's new investment different
21	CHAIR KENNEY: That's incremental.
22	That's not that's a whole that's an
23	incremental amount.
24	MR. COOPER: It is. Correct, Chairman.
25	And I'll turn it over to Staff, because

1	I think they wanted to jump in on that.
2	CHAIR KENNEY: That's an incremental
3	annualized amount for different investment than is
4	reflected in the 3.7 million?
5	MR. COOPER: Yes.
6	MS. MAYFIELD: Correct.
7	CHAIR KENNEY: Okay. Fair enough.
8	MS. MAYFIELD: I don't want
9	CHAIR KENNEY: I'm starting to get it
10	now.
11	MS. MAYFIELD: Yeah, I don't know if
12	Staff has much more to answer than what Mr. Cooper
13	clarified, except I think he hit the issue that
14	Commissioner Hall and that Judge Jordan and
15	yourself, Chairman, were driving at, what is the
16	ISRS comprised of. And he explained that it's
17	depreciation, property tax, as well as the return
18	on the investment. So I think understanding what
19	comprises the ISRS helps to explain how that
20	annualized amount is figured up.
21	CHAIR KENNEY: So if you okay. So to
22	go back to your hypothetical. If you had
23	\$25 million of new investment in year one
24	MR. COOPER: Yeah, I probably
25	CHAIR KENNEY: you would collect that

1	25 million annually, but you wouldn't have any
2	additional incremental plant that you could add on
3	to that? So
4	MR. COOPER: Correct.
5	CHAIR KENNEY: in this 9 2512
6	WO-2012-0472.
7	01 had you set the ISRS amount at 25
8	million that year, the rest of these cases never
9	would have happened, and this would have been an
10	annual collection of 25 million, 729.
11	Arriving at your grand total of 75
12	million.
13	MR. COOPER: Right.
14	CHAIR KENNEY: I got it.
15	MR. COOPER: And there would have been a
16	reconciliation on a yearly
17	CHAIR KENNEY: Okay.
18	MR. COOPER: basis. But, yeah.
19	CHAIR KENNEY: But you so the cap
20	prevents the addition of any new plant, if you were
21	to get to the 25 million in that first year?
22	MR. COOPER: Correct.
23	CHAIR KENNEY: All right. I think I
24	understand. I think I got it now.
25	COMMISSIONER HALL: And so

1	CHAIR KENNEY: Thank you.
2	THE WITNESS: I do have the total
3	investment amount.
4	COMMISSIONER HALL: So for \$25 million
5	of investment in that first year, you're going to
6	recover \$75 million over the three years?
7	MR. COOPER: Yeah. And
8	COMMISSIONER HALL: And that would
9	include \$25 million of out of costs or
10	out-of-pocket expenditure to build, to buy the
11	plant and equipment, and then 50 million for
12	depreciation and property taxes?
13	CHAIR KENNEY: No, the whole investment
14	is 75 million, but you've annualized it over
15	twenty over three years.
16	MR. COOPER: And investment is probably
17	a little
18	CHAIR KENNEY: More than.
19	MR. COOPER: not really what we want
20	to call that. Because the 25 million is really the
21	revenue requirement or the costs associated with
22	the plant investment. The plant investment would
23	have to be much greater than 25 million to drive 25
24	million in ISRS costs.
25	But, yes, in that example, if it were

1	possible to invest all that in the first year, get
2	to the cap in the first year such that your ISRS
3	costs could be recovered with the 25 million, and
4	that's going to happen year after year after year
5	because those costs are annual costs. And over the
6	life of it that's why we say in that example if
7	you hit it perfect and you didn't have any
8	reconciliation, you could potentially recover 75
9	million in ISRS revenue at the end of the third
10	year. Of course, in reality, they're not that nice
11	and neat, because you come in in partial years
12	and
13	CHAIR KENNEY: 25 million doesn't
14	reflect the sum total of the investment. It's an
15	annualized recovery of that investment. So it's
16	necessarily greater than 25 million.
17	MR. COOPER: Absolutely.
18	CHAIR KENNEY: Yes.
19	MR. COOPER: Yes.
20	COMMISSIONER HALL: And so the
21	whatever whatever volumetric rate was put
22	into put into effect in your hypothetical, that
23	would that brought in \$25 million in the in
24	the first year, is would that that rate would
25	continue, absent any action by the Commission the

1	next two years or
2	MR. COOPER: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER HALL: or
4	MR. COOPER: Yes. You would come
5	in annually for your reconciliation; but provided
6	you were hitting it spot on, I assume that that
7	rate would just continue. You wouldn't on the
8	same tariff sheet.
9	COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.
10	JUDGE JORDAN: Any further questions
11	from the bench?
12	Mr. Chairman.
13	CHAIR KENNEY: Maybe. So just sorry.
14	Just going through each of these, so the
15	3.7 million, the ISRS charge is reset in the 0406
16	to collect an incremental additional 5.8 million;
17	and then again in the 0055, it's reset again to
18	collect an incremental 2.9 million, all the way
19	down; right?
20	THE WITNESS: Correct.
21	CHAIR KENNEY: Okay.
22	MR. COOPER: Yes, it would be. We've
23	got some reconciliation amounts in there that would
24	affect it as well. But, generally, yes.
25	CHAIR KENNEY: So the 1.9 million

1	reflects 1.6 million in prior periods under
2	recovery. Why wasn't that 1.6 reflected in the
3	adjustments to the prior ISRSs?
4	MR. COOPER: Yeah, and I wouldn't
5	categorize or characterize it in that fashion. 1.9
6	are costs associated with new
7	CHAIR KENNEY: With new investment.
8	MR. COOPER: eligible ISRS projects.
9	The 1.6 was from the Company's perspective was a
10	reconciliation amount that's already built into the
11	existing the existing rate.
12	CHAIR KENNEY: So this is not a
13	characterization of whether you should be allowed
14	under recovery to collect the under recovery
15	then, it's a characterization of you're saying
16	the 1.9 reflects new investment?
17	MR. COOPER: It does, yes.
18	CHAIR KENNEY: Staff is saying though
19	that that 1.9 that 1.6 million of it is under
20	recovered from prior periods; is that right? Okay.
21	MR. COOPER: I I'll let Staff I'd
22	be happy to answer for Staff.
23	JUDGE JORDAN: And I'll remind everyone
24	to use the microphone. Make sure it's turned on.
25	CHAIR KENNEY: So the 1.9 million is new

1	investment?
2	MR. OLIGSCHLAEGER: Yes.
3	CHAIR KENNEY: All right.
4	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. A little bit of
5	that came from people who are not under oath. Some
6	of it is argument from Counsel, and there was one
7	nod in agreement, and I think a verbalization from
8	Staff's witness; is that correct? And I'm asking
9	Counsel.
10	MS. MAYFIELD: Yes, Your Honor, that's
11	correct. And I'm certain Mr. Oligschlaeger would
12	be able to answer under oath the same question that
13	Chairman Kenney just proposed.
14	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.
15	And for the
16	CHAIR KENNEY: You'll have to remember
17	to ask him.
18	JUDGE JORDAN: And for the witness, if
19	the Commission or anyone else were to ask you
20	what's been asked of Counsel, would you agree with
21	his answers?
22	THE WITNESS: I do.
23	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.
24	Any further questions from the bench?
25	Mr. Chairman.

1	CHAIR KENNEY: No, thank you.				
2	JUDGE JORDAN: Commissioner Hall.				
3	COMMISSIONER HALL: None. Thank you.				
4	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you. You may stand				
5	down.				
6	THE WITNESS: Thank you.				
7	(Witness excused.)				
8	JUDGE JORDAN: Does that conclude				
9	Missouri-American's case in chief?				
10	MR. COOPER: It does, Your Honor.				
11	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.				
12	Then let's continue with the case in				
13	chi ef of Staff.				
14	MS. MAYFIELD: Your Honor, I would call				
15	Mark Oligschlaeger. And, Your Honor, I believe				
16	that Staff's exhibits have been marked Exhibits 3				
17	and 4. Is that a correct understanding?				
18	COURT REPORTER: Yes.				
19	MS. MAYFIELD: Yes. Okay. From the				
20	court reporter I do understand that Staff's				
21	exhibits, his direct has been marked Exhibit				
22	Number 3 and rebuttal of Mr. Oligschlaeger has been				
23	marked as Exhibit Number 4.				
24	COURT REPORTER: Yes.				
25	JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.				

1	Please raise your right hand.			
2	MARK OLI GSCHLAEGER,			
3	after having been first duly sworn, was			
4	examined and testified on his oath as follows:			
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. MAYFIELD:			
6	Q Could you please state your name.			
7	A Mark L. Oligschlaeger.			
8	Q And, Mark, where are you currently			
9	employed and in what capacity?			
10	A I am employed by the Missouri Public			
11	Service Commission as manager of the auditing unit.			
12	Q Did you cause to be prepared in this			
13	matter direct and rebuttal testimony?			
14	A I did.			
15	Q And is it your understanding that that			
16	direct and rebuttal testimony has been marked as			
17	Exhibits 3 and 4?			
18	A Yes.			
19	Q Do you have any changes to either the			
20	direct or rebuttal testimony?			
21	A I do not.			
22	Q If I were to ask you the same questions			
23	as contained in your direct and rebuttal testimony,			
24	would your answers be the same?			
25	A They would.			

1	Q Are those answers true and accurate to
2	the best of your knowledge?
3	A Yes.
4	MS. MAYFIELD: Your Honor, I would move
5	for the admission of Exhibits 3 and 4 into the
6	record.
7	JUDGE JORDAN: I'm not seeing any
8	objections. Those exhibits are received into the
9	record.
10	(Exhi bi ts 3 and 4 recei ved.)
11	JUDGE JORDAN: Anything else for this
12	witness before I ask for cross?
13	MS. MAYFIELD: No, Your Honor.
14	JUDGE JORDAN: Okay. Cross-examination
15	from the Office of Public Counsel?
16	MS. BAKER: No questions. Thank you.
17	JUDGE JORDAN: Cross-examination from
18	Mi ssouri -Ameri can?
19	MR. COOPER: No questions.
20	JUDGE JORDAN: Questions from the bench?
21	Mr. Chairman.
22	CHAIR KENNEY: No, I'll let Mr. Hall go
23	first.
24	JUDGE JORDAN: Commissioner Hall.
25	EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER HALL:

1	Q Good morning.
2	A Good morning.
3	Q So you were obviously in the hearing
4	room during the discussion about whether the 10
5	percent cap applies to an annual amount received or
6	the amount received over a three-year time period?
7	A I was.
8	Q Could you explain to me your your
9	understanding of the 10 percent cap?
10	A As I understand the 10 percent cap, it
11	is intended to be a limit on the amount of annual
12	revenues a qualifying utility is authorized to
13	recover through an ISRS rate. And as an annual
14	amount, obviously the amount of revenues a company
15	can collect over the entire life of an ISRS, which
16	can go beyond one year, can be greater than the
17	amount of the annual cap.
18	Q And is it is it your understanding
19	that when the Commission approves of a surcharge
20	amount in year one that that surcharge amount
21	continues forward until the next rate case, absent
22	some some change in the tariff ordered by the
23	Commi ssi on?
24	A If I understand your question, yes, the
25	surcharge established in the first year of an ISRS

will continue on. It may be added to under certain conditions. But, yes, the amount, for example, reflected in year one may be presumed to continue to be collected in years two and three, until the Company files a general rate case.

Q And so at the -- at the next rate case when the ISRS is set -- reset to zero, the Company will have recovered its out of pocket -- its out-of-pocket expenses for the construction or purchase of a plant or plant equipment, depreciation on that plant and equipment, a rate of return established in the prior rate case on that plant and equipment, and property taxes paid?

A I might quibble with the term out of pocket. What it would recover is its normal revenue requirement associated with those plant additions, which is depreciation expense, property taxes in some instances, and a rate of return factored up for income taxes.

Q So is that a three-year depreciation?

A Well, no. What you would do is you would apply the approved depreciation rates for whatever accounts the qualifying plant is booked to; and if that's, for example, assuming a 20-year life, they would collect 1/20th of the depreciation

1	on that asset each year through the ISRS rate, and					
2	that treatment would continue as part of the					
3	general rate case.					
4	Q Okay. This is beginning to come					
5	together. So do you know what the total					
6	expenditure was for the ISRS-eligible plant and					
7	equipment during the term of this ISRS?					
8	A I do not. That number can be provided,					
9	I believe, but I do not have that at my fingertips.					
10	Q Okay. Do you know what the current					
11	surcharge is, the ISRS surcharge?					
12	A The rate itself, no. I know what					
13	amounts of money it is designed to collect on an					
14	annualized basis.					
15	Q So on an annualized basis it is					
16	currently designed to recover what amount? That's					
17	the \$23 million number; right?					
18	A No. As Staff would state it, it's the					
19	\$25.6 million amount.					
20	Q Oh, that's that's the authorized ISRS					
21	revenue. Okay.					
22	A Correct.					
23	Q So let me ask you this: If if the					
24	if consumption decline continues consistent let					
25	me rephrase. If the consumption decline going					

1	forward was consistent with the consumption decline				
2	historically, that we continue to see the same type				
3	of decline that we have the last two years, if we				
4	see that same decline in the next year				
5	A Yes.				
6	Q and the Commission were to adopt the				
7	Company's interpretation of the statute that we				
8	should not include the reconciliation amounts in				
9	determining the cap				
10	A Yes.				
11	Q what do you believe that the				
12	annual revenues from the ISRS would exceed the				
13	statutory cap?				
14	A Okay. Let's make sure I understand the				
15	assumptions. If the pattern cited by the Company				
16	of declining usage since the last rate case				
17	continues past this point and is applicable to the				
18	new whatever the new ISRS recovery is, would				
19	they recover the amount authorized from this case,				
20	all other things being equal of their				
21	Q Well, not the amount authorized by the				
22	case yeah well, would they would they				
23	recover beyond the \$25.8 million cap				
24	A If the				
25	Q if we adopted their interpretation of				

the statute?

A If their -- okay. Their interpretation of the statute, which is you should only include the initial revenue-authorized amount based on initial assumptions as to customer usage. Okay. Let me think about that. I don't believe they would be in excess of the cap. In fact, they may be under the cap because they did not fully recover all of the ISRS revenues authorized as a result, hypothetically, of this case because of continuing declining usage.

Q So if we take the position that the cap applies to revenues exclusively and not to authorization, then we could -- we could authorize over the cap and arrive at the amount equal to or below the cap?

A If you're asking could you assume a continuing pattern of declining usage and authorize the Company to recover more than 10 percent of the revenue target with the assumption that would bring them in close to or below the revenue target when all is said and done, I don't know whether legally you could do that; but, I mean, that's an approach.

Q Well, let's -- let's say we did that. Could we put a tracker on it such that it would

capture any over recovery and -- and establish a --1 a regulatory liability in the next rate case? 2 3 Again, I don't mean to get into the 4 legalities of it. I'm not aware certainly that the 5 statute or the rule contemplates such a thing. My6 assumption as a layman would be the Commission 7 would have general powers to do that in that case. 8 Q And, actually, to clarify, I wasn't 9 really asking for a legal analysis. I was really 10 asking more mechanically would that -- would that 11 work in order to assure that the amounts received was -- were below the cap? And I think you said 12 13 yes? 14 I believe so, yes. Α 15 0 Can you -- I read your -- your 16 direct and rebuttal testimony, and you made the 17 argument that the Commission Rule 240-2.650(17) 18 does not allow or require a regulatory asset be 19 established should the -- should the Commission 20 adopt Staff's position in this case? 21 Α Yes, that is correct. 22 0 Can you explain why that is? 23 That particular section, by my Α Sure. 24 reading, applies to cases where the Commission has 25 authorized a certain amount of ISRS revenues and

1	the Company had either over or under collected, and
2	it describes what happens to those under and over
3	collections if a general rate case is filed before
4	a full reconciliation can be done. I think that's
5	separate and distinct from a situation where the
6	Commission has determined an overall cap exists and
7	the Company is not authorized in the first place to
8	include certain ISRS-related costs in its ISRS rate
9	because of the cap.
10	Q So it goes to the to the issue that I
11	raised with your counsel about over/under recovery.
12	That is related to what is authorized; that's not
13	necessarily what is related to the cap?
14	A That certainly would be my reading of
15	that.
16	COMMISSIONER HALL: All right. I have
17	no further questions. Thank you.
18	JUDGE JORDAN: And did that question
19	generate any recross from OPC?
20	MS. BAKER: No. No, Your Honor.
21	JUDGE JORDAN: From Missouri-American?
22	MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor.
23	JUDGE JORDAN: Any redirect from from
24	Staff? Sorry.
25	MS. MAYFIELD: No, Your Honor.

1	JUDGE JORDAN: Then you may stand down.
2	(Wi tness excused.)
3	JUDGE JORDAN: Does that conclude
4	Staff's case in chief?
5	MS. MAYFIELD: Yes, Your Honor.
6	JUDGE JORDAN: Very good.
7	I mentioned earlier the briefing in this
8	case. Briefs are due on the 12th of this month,
9	according to our schedule. So we will need an
10	expedited transcript. We will need this transcript
11	prepared on an expedited basis.
12	Is there anything else before we go off
13	the record? Not hearing anything. Then we will
14	adjourn the evidentiary hearing, and we will go off
15	the record.
16	Thank you, everyone.
17	(Heari ng adj ourned.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2		PAGE
3	THE COMPANY'S	
4		
5	JEANNE TINSLEY	39
6	Direct Examination By Mr. Cooper Examination By Commissioner Hall	39 41
7	Redirect Examination By Mr. Cooper Further Examination By Commissioner Hall	48 51
8	Examination By Commissioner Hall Further Examination By Commissioner Hall	57 60
9	Examination By Chairman Kenney	61
10	STAFF'S EVIDENCE	
11	MARK OLI GSCHLAEGER	76
12		7.
13	Direct Examination By Ms. Mayfield Examination By Commissioner Hall	76 77
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

				1
1		EXHIBIT	INDEX	
2		Marked	Rcv' d	
3	1	Tinsley Direct	3	41
4	2	Tinsley Rebuttal	3	41
5	3	Oligschlaeger Direct	3	77
6	4	Oligschlaeger Rebuttal	3	77
7	·	orr geem deger meddetal	· ·	, ,
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17 18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Angie D. Threlkeld, a Certified Court
Reporter, CCR No. 1382, the officer before whom the
foregoing hearing was taken, do hereby certify that
the foregoing hearing was taken by me to the best of
my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting
under my direction; that I am neither counsel for,
related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the
action in which this hearing was taken, and further,
that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney
or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor
financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of
the action.

Angie D. Threlkeld

	Ī	Ī	l	ı
A	55:10 62:20	46:2 54:6	11:11 27:19	appear 61:2
ability 18:1	69:2	55:21	32:16 37:10	appearance 3:25
19:21 21:24	added 79:1	allow 7:20 35:7	58:24 72:23	4:7
30:13 88:7	adding 11:21	44:25 83:18	80:13 81:8	appeared 6:13
able 38:21 42:3	61:3 63:12	allowed 19:4	83:11	appearing 4:9
42:9 44:5	addition 69:20	25:5,7 48:2	analysis 83:9	4:20
46:11 47:5	additional 6:24	73:13	Angie 1:19 88:3	applicable 81:17
53:19 54:19	30:13,14,18	allowing 25:6	88:20	Applicant 4:7
65:11 74:12	46:6 67:19	29:23 31:8	annual 47:13	5:12
absent 71:25	69:2 72:16	35:17,25	50:20,20,23,23	Applicants 39:4
78:21	Additionally	allows 12:14	50:25 53:10,15	application 3:13
Absolutely	28:1	alternative 29:9	53:16 54:3,16	5:19 11:23
71:17	additions 79:17	amazingly 14:8	63:23 64:1	28:25 32:1
absolve 33:11	address 4:11	Ameren 28:9	66:10 67:10	34:4 43:2
abuses 33:18	adequate 31:14	38:2	69:10 71:5	applies 8:18
account 13:17	adjourn 85:14	American 1:11	78:5,11,13,17	45:11 78:5
16:19 22:11	adjourned 85:17	39:23	81:12	82:13 83:24
27:22 42:18	adjusted 15:14	amount 6:19 7:8	annualized	apply 8:10 17:4
47:6 49:20	adjustment 7:22	9:16 12:24	26:17 51:16	45:9 79:22
accountant	9:3 10:5 27:9	15:2 16:13	52:1,9,9,12	approach 11:13
35:12 38:18	27:11 28:9,13	18:12,22 19:25	55:25 56:3	11:24 51:2,4
accounted 37:12	38:2 61:15	20:1 25:17,23	68:3,20 70:14	82:23
37:13	adjustments	25:24 26:3,10	71:15 80:14,15	appropriate
accounting	8:17 73:3	27:16 31:20	annually 62:2	10:2,9,10 27:6
38:21	admission 77:5	33:24 34:4	65:2 69:1 72:5	27:10 44:19
accounts 79:23	admitted 41:6	36:16 37:23	answer 35:11,12	49:2
accumulation	adopt 26:2 43:9	44:8,12 45:4	38:4,21 40:3	approval 1:12
33:10	47:1 81:6	45:25 46:10,21	68:12 73:22	3:7 27:9 32:18
accurate 14:9	83:20	47:22 52:14	74:12	approve 33:24
77:1	adopted 20:6	53:16 55:6	answering 26:7	approved 6:20
acknowledge	81:25	58:16 59:2,10	answers 40:18	24:22 26:20
12:21	advance 18:2	60:4,17 61:16	40:20 50:14	30:25 38:15
acronym 3:9	advanced 33:2	61:16 66:3,21	74:21 76:24	79:22
act 33:17	affect 72:24	67:10,23 68:3	77:1	approves 78:19
action 3:4,11	agendas 5:15	68:20 69:7	anticipated	approving 5:19
5:18 71:25	agree 12:12 20:6	70:3 73:10	14:11,13	argument 26:2
88:10,14	20:19 25:16	78:5,6,11,14	anticipating	74:6 83:17
acts 31:8 33:11	26:23 31:5	78:14,17,20,20	44:13	arrive 82:15
33:19	34:23 43:15,18	79:2 80:16,19	anybody 6:1	Arriving 69:11
actual 18:12	57:6,8 74:20	81:19,21 82:4	apparently	articulated
33:13 44:21	agreement 25:12	82:15 83:25	55:22	36:11
45:11,20 46:14	25:21 74:7	amounts 8:12,23	Appeals 7:17	asked 18:15
55:13	agrees 15:19	9:20 10:11,13	12:8 34:21	32:20,24 34:23
add 53:25 55:8	18:21 19:2	10:17 11:1,10	36:13	37:1 74:20

	I	I	I	
asking 3:14 31:3	16:18 29:23	34:23 37:1	57:9 59:23	85:7
34:3 37:1	37:17 82:14	41:12 48:16	75:15 80:9	briefs 5:10,12
43:15 48:24	authorize 25:18	54:8 57:9	81:11 82:6	45:19 85:8
63:5 74:8	30:9,13,17	77:16 84:20	83:14	bring 82:20
82:17 83:9,10	37:21,22,23	balance 18:8	believes 7:10 8:3	Brothers 23:20
aspects 25:1	38:8,12,14	19:9	12:5 13:13	brought 20:24
assess 11:23	44:8,20,23	ball 14:8	19:7 43:19	23:12 66:20
asset 12:16 17:1	82:14,18	banker 33:19	bench 19:12	71:23
19:4 20:9,18	authorized	bankruptcy	34:12 41:16	Brydon 2:3 4:9
22:8 30:23	11:19 18:23	24:6	72:11 74:24	build 70:10
31:12,21 34:7	26:3 27:17,23	base 6:20 10:21	77:20	built 73:10
35:9,15 80:1	30:11 32:16	25:3 26:20	benefit 14:20,21	business 18:18
83:18	37:21 38:19	29:13 33:23	14:24 15:5,9	busted 23:18
assigned 3:11	45:2,4,10,25	36:3 38:15	15:12 18:2,3	buy 70:10
associated 6:24	46:9 59:1	42:17 67:15	best 40:21 57:12	
8:6 12:2 18:23	60:19,25 61:8	based 7:25 9:15	77:2 88:6	$\frac{\mathbf{C}}{\mathbf{C} \cdot \mathbf{C}}$
27:13,18 30:15	62:13 78:12	11:15 17:17	bet 23:3	C 2:1
37:20 49:7,12	80:20 81:19,21	18:5 35:4 44:3	bets 12:11	calculated 9:15
49:13 50:7	82:9 83:25	60:19 82:4	better 35:11	43:25
60:17 61:16	84:7,12	basing 43:24	beyond 30:5	calculation 9:20
65:24 66:3,5	authorizes 30:2	basis 15:14	78:16 81:23	18:10,25 27:21
66:10,14 70:21	automatically	17:18 26:18	bill 32:10 36:2	27:22 31:5
73:6 79:16	22:12	48:5 51:16	bit 15:25 16:7	calendar 9:25
assume 54:19	available 13:2	52:1,9,10,12	23:14 48:21	call 39:5 58:1,2
72:6 82:17	avenue 2:3 42:4	55:25 67:1,16	50:17 74:4	70:20 75:14
assumed 14:14	avoid 31:9	69:18 80:14,15	board 23:5,7,10	calling 3:3
assumes 57:1	aware 23:24	85:11	23:12,18,21	cap 7:9 8:10,16
assuming 11:16	83:4	bear 47:10	24:3 31:2	9:11 11:24
79:24	B	beautiful 31:2	boils 25:22	15:22 18:9,25
assumption 35:6		beginning 80:4	book 12:14 17:2	19:5,8,16
44:21 55:3	B 87:1	behalf 4:10,20	31:11 35:8	24:21 25:13,24
82:20 83:6	back 19:22 21:1	behaviors 24:13	49:11,12	26:5,16 27:20
assumptions	29:13 31:1	belief 6:14 40:22	booked 35:15	27:21 28:5,18
57:3 81:15	33:6 44:1 53:4	43:21 44:20	79:23	29:4,8,19
82:5	67:2 68:22	53:14 54:2	booking 31:19	30:15 31:5,21
assure 83:11	back-of-the-e	believe 5:2,25	32:11 34:6	32:12 33:9
attempts 30:4	43:3	6:18 8:13 9:10	49:16	35:1 37:18,20
attention 36:24	Baker 2:10 4:19	12:18 15:16	bottomless	38:6,7,8 43:11
attorney 2:2	4:19 17:15	16:23 36:5	18:19	44:10 45:9,10
88:11	19:14,18 20:11	37:2,4 38:6,10	Box 2:4	46:2 47:12,13
auditing 76:11	20:21 21:5,7	44:6,18 45:8	break 34:9	47:13 50:22,24
authority 22:3,7	21:11,12,17,19	45:10 46:11	52:20	52:6,7,16
22:10 31:19	21:23 22:5,10	48:4 52:11	breaking 16:6	53:10,10,15,15
authorization	22:18,21,24	53:12 56:13	briefing 5:10	53:21 54:3,7
	l	l	I	l

	-	ī	ī	
54:16 55:20	78:21 79:5,6	77:22	clarified 68:13	72:4 80:4
59:17 60:12	79:12 80:3	Chairman 19:13	clarify 51:3 83:8	comes 26:25
62:1,6,16 63:2	81:16,19,22	34:13 41:17	class 32:8	coming 20:13
63:12,14,16,17	82:10 83:2,7	61:20,25 64:12	clause 28:9	31:24 33:6
63:21,22 64:2	83:20 84:3	65:5,10 67:24	clear 28:21 30:5	comment 61:24
69:19 71:2	85:4,8	68:15 72:12	32:12 34:8	Commission 1:1
78:5,9,10,17	cases 13:24	74:13,25 77:21	50:13	2:7,9 3:3 5:17
81:9,13,23	18:11 32:7	86:9	clearly 32:4	5:20 6:21 7:5
82:7,8,12,15	63:19 69:8	chance 31:4,7	62:16 63:1	10:3,23 11:2
82:16 83:12	83:24	34:10	close 29:18 30:3	12:9,12,13
84:6,9,13	cash 18:19	change 1:12 3:7	30:6 82:21	15:19 16:21,24
capacity 39:22	categorize 73:5	9:1,2,8 10:7	collect 15:21	17:16 18:15,23
76:9	cause 76:12	12:1 32:15	16:1,12 24:21	21:13 22:3
capital 31:13	caused 40:1	40:11,14 78:22	44:25 56:9	23:3 24:11
Capitol 2:3	causes 52:7	changed 32:7	57:3 60:25	25:18 26:1,4,7
caption 3:5	CCR 1:19 88:4	changes 9:5,7	63:7 64:5,5,13	26:16,21 27:7
capture 83:1	cell 3:15,18	40:9 46:18	64:15,20 65:7	27:9,17 28:8
card 31:4,7,8	certain 17:19,23	76:19	65:10,11,13	30:9,10,12,17
carefully 30:6	40:2 74:11	characterizati	68:25 72:16,18	30:25 31:4,19
case 3:5 5:22	79:1 83:25	35:22 73:13,15	73:14 78:15	32:16 33:24
6:15,18 7:23	84:8	characterize	79:25 80:13	34:3 36:24
11:2,9 12:17	certainly 6:9	73:5	collected 16:3	37:5,21,22,23
12:17,25 13:13	13:12 53:13	characterizing	25:23 38:19	38:11,13,16
13:16,21 14:7	83:4 84:14	35:19	44:11 45:1,12	41:25 42:17
16:20 19:22	certainty 55:8	charge 32:19	46:9 55:24	43:8 44:19,23
20:12,14,19,22	CERTIFICATE	38:2 72:15	57:2 79:4 84:1	46:25 47:5
20:25 22:1,9	88:1	charged 25:8	collecting 24:3,4	53:12 59:20
22:11,14,17	Certified 88:3	33:13	24:18 31:10	71:25 74:19
23:11,17 24:14	certify 88:5	charges 10:21	57:17	76:11 78:19,23
24:25 26:3,12	CHAIR 19:14	chart 60:15 62:2	collection 7:3	81:6 83:6,17
28:15 29:10,22	20:5,16 21:3,6	66:2 67:18	8:24 27:23	83:19,24 84:6
30:10 31:25	21:8 34:14,17	chief 39:4 75:9	29:12 31:6	Commission's
32:2,14 33:1	34:22 35:7,14	75:13 85:4	44:4 69:10	9:7 10:14
34:18,18,19,21	35:24 36:6,18	Christina 2:10	collections 16:16	12:19,22 31:13
36:3,7,7,13	41:18 61:22	4:19	18:24 37:6,11	Commission-o
39:4 42:1,6,6	63:22 64:23	citation 34:19	84:3	11:6
42:11,16 44:1	67:21 68:2,7,9	cite 34:17	collects 37:24	Commissioner
45:17 46:3	68:21,25 69:5	cited 8:14 34:20	column 60:17	13:4,5,8,14,25
47:7 49:9,18	69:14,17,19,23	81:15	66:2	14:5,16,19
55:16 59:1	70:1,13,18	citing 6:8	combination	15:11,18 16:5
60:6 63:19	71:13,18 72:13	City 1:7 2:4,8,12	8:11	16:14 17:5
64:22,25,25	72:21,25 73:7	claim 33:2	come 19:21	21:9,10,13,18
65:9,15 66:4	73:12,18,25	clarification	20:11,23 21:1	21:22 22:2,6
67:14 75:9,12	74:3,16 75:1	54:13	29:10,18 71:11	22:15,19 36:20
<u>'</u>				

	1	1	1	1
36:21,23 37:7	components	contemplate	67:8,24 68:5	65:24 66:5,7,8
37:14 38:5,23	30:23	17:22	68:12,24 69:4	70:9,21,24
41:20,21,22	comprised 68:16	contemplated	69:13,15,18,22	71:3,5,5 73:6
48:11,24 51:21	comprises 68:19	12:23 32:13	70:7,16,19	84:8
51:24,25 52:19	concede 35:2	contemplates	71:17,19 72:2	counsel 2:7,12
52:25 53:5	concedes 34:25	83:5	72:4,22 73:4,8	4:18,20 17:14
54:9,11,12,21	conceivable	contemplating	73:17,21 75:10	18:15,21 19:2
55:1,10 57:10	54:17	50:19	77:19 84:22	19:6 28:16
59:14,25 60:2	conceivably	context 7:18	86:6,7	32:2 41:11
60:3 61:18	65:1	contingencies	Cooper's 25:15	54:8 65:19
63:20 66:15,19	concept 23:25	28:11	54:7 65:3	74:6,9,20
66:23 67:4	concerned 53:9	continue 14:25	corporation	77:15 84:11
68:14 69:25	concerning	62:23 64:19	9:25 10:18,22	88:8,12
70:4,8 71:20	10:11	71:25 72:7	27:4	Counselor 13:3
72:3,9 75:2,3	conclude 75:8	75:12 79:1,3	corporation's	23:13 65:16
77:24,25 84:16	85:3	80:2 81:2	26:20,21 38:15	Counselors 4:5
86:6,7,8,13	conditions 79:2	continues 52:16	correct 4:1,2,4	count 5:13
commissioners	conforms 28:10	66:11,16,24	7:12,14 13:19	counter 31:12
1:17 17:9	confused 45:17	78:21 80:24	35:6 36:5	31:15
22:23 39:1	60:11 61:22	81:17	40:20 42:14	couple 34:14
48:14	62:4 65:5	continuing	44:11 45:12	47:9
company 1:11	confusing 52:22	82:10,18	46:20 47:3,14	course 7:10
3:7 4:10 6:5,16	confusion 52:7	contradictory	47:15 49:16,20	71:10
9:4 12:14	connects 20:3	64:24	49:21 50:2,3,7	court 1:20 4:11
13:12 14:20	consider 12:14	contrary 12:6	50:8,12 53:13	4:16,22 7:17
15:6,20,20	consideration	control 21:3,7	56:17,24 57:21	12:8 34:21
16:3,10,11	12:16	24:6 26:10	57:22 58:9,17	36:12 75:18,20
24:10 32:1	considered 11:8	controversy	58:20 59:8	75:24 88:3
39:24 42:20	consistent 12:18	6:17	61:7,10 62:19	creating 26:8
43:20 48:25	30:19 80:24	Cooper 2:2 4:4,8	64:17 66:22	cross 77:12
53:9,19 60:5	81:1	4:8 5:3 6:6	67:24 68:6	cross-examina
78:14 79:5,7	consists 67:9	13:6,7,12,20	69:4,22 72:20	4:25 41:9,10
81:15 82:19	construction	14:3,14,17,23	74:8,11 75:17	41:13 77:14,17
84:1,7	28:2 79:9	15:13,24 16:6	80:22 83:21	crystal 14:8
Company's 25:2	construing 28:3	16:23 17:7,11	cost 33:13 66:10	CSR 11:4 21:14
32:23 73:9	consumption	21:14 39:5,18	66:14	36:24
81:7 86:3	13:11,17 14:2	40:24 48:21,22	costs 7:21 8:5,11	current 6:23 7:1
comparing	14:10,11,12	51:1,6,9,18	8:18,19 9:16	25:19 30:10,12
37:16,17 54:4	44:7,8,14	52:18 53:7	9:20 10:16	30:19 44:3
completed 12:4	80:24,25 81:1	54:14,19,25	11:15,19,22,23	46:18,21,22,23
18:11 46:24	contained 40:17	55:2,12 56:11	15:7 17:16	57:12 63:5
completely 9:21	76:23	56:13,18,25	18:4,4,6,13	80:10
compliance 5:20	contains 6:8	64:12 65:18	19:5 32:19,20	currently 49:16
component 31:6	8:15	66:17,22,25	32:22 36:2	76:8 80:16

	I	I		ı
currently-aut	defer 32:19	difference 25:21	document 6:7	39:23 76:9,10
11:22	deferral 33:4,7	27:10 46:8	8:14	88:9,12
customer 10:23	50:10	53:11	dollars 7:4 47:6	employee 88:11
11:16 15:3,9	deferrals 33:10	differences 10:1	58:18	ends 10:4 33:22
15:12 18:3,17	defined 8:20	27:5	domination 24:1	58:7
19:8 25:8	29:1	different 10:6	draw 31:4	England 2:3 4:9
29:14 32:8	definition 10:9	11:10 12:20	drive 54:20 55:5	enjoys 23:4
36:1 82:5	degree 25:4	39:9 55:19	70:23	33:19
customer's	delineated 36:1	61:6 67:20	drives 66:7	ensures 27:21
32:10	demise 24:14	68:3	67:19	ensuring 24:12
customers 4:21	deny 8:4 11:13	differentiation	driving 24:5	33:20
8:4 18:1,8,17	34:5 42:1	10:15	68:15	entire 24:7
20:1 27:23	depending 5:17	differently 11:12	drove 53:20	27:16 62:9
33:14	depreciation	direct 25:9	due 5:12 8:21	78:15
cycle 18:11	8:20 42:9,21	36:23 39:8,11	85:8	entity 24:2
Cydney 2:7 4:14	43:1 49:6,11	39:18 40:2,13	duly 39:15 76:3	entries 3:25 4:6
	49:13,16,19	44:18 54:14		envisioned
<u>D</u>	50:1 67:9	58:11 60:16	<u>E</u>	28:12 42:24
D 1:19 2:7 86:1	68:17 70:12	75:21 76:5,13	E 2:1,1 86:1	equal 53:21
87:1 88:3,20	79:11,17,20,22	76:16,20,23	87:1,1	66:21 81:20
Dalton 23:8	79:25	83:16 86:6,12	earlier 31:22	82:15
Daniel 1:15,17	derived 24:22	87:3,5	51:8 85:7	equally 17:4
3:10	describe 57:16	direction 49:23	early 48:23	equals 6:19
data 44:1	57:23	88:8	easily 28:6	equipment
date 5:10,14	described 35:21	directions 16:25	East 2:3	54:24 55:11
30:10	38:13	directly 36:10	economic 23:25	61:12 70:11
dates 5:16	describes 84:2	38:3	economy 24:7	79:10,11,13
day 23:7	description 9:8	directs 26:16	effect 9:18 27:4	80:7
days 5:13	9:14 54:7	disagree 43:13	33:11 58:4	equity 25:4
Dean 2:2 4:8	descriptor 57:13	43:15	64:21 71:22	erroneous 12:8
debatable 18:3	design 8:1,2	disagreement	effective 5:14	essence 44:6
decided 32:2	50:18 57:1	27:14	10:22	essentially 12:10
decides 5:17	designed 16:4	discussing 6:12	effects 18:7	31:3
decisions 18:18	24:19 26:9	discussion 49:5	eight 46:5 51:14	establish 8:25
decline 14:2,11	31:14 47:18,21	53:8,18 78:4	eighth 51:15	9:8 30:22
14:13,15 44:7	48:5,6 50:16	dispute 6:15	either 14:24	35:17 83:1
44:7,14 80:24	66:25 67:1	13:18,23 14:4	64:24 76:19	established
80:25 81:1,3,4	80:13,16	26:1 34:2	84:1	47:18 78:25
declined 44:2	determined 19:5	distinct 84:5	element 32:10	79:12 83:19
declining 8:3	43:25 84:6	District 7:17	eligible 6:24	establishes
13:11,17 16:9	determining 7:8	31:24 32:3	8:18 9:16 12:2	22:16
81:16 82:11,18	27:24 81:9	34:18,21 35:23	29:3,17 34:25	establishing
deem 11:10	development 7:1	36:7,12	35:2 49:8 73:8	10:23
deemed 9:6 49:2	differ 55:13	divide 25:21	employed 39:21	establishment

	1	1	l	1
10:6 25:3	exercising 24:20	32:21	43:5	32:4 36:13
29:15	Exhibit 75:21,23	extreme 53:17	fingertips 80:9	four 51:14 66:9
estimate 18:6	exhibits 3:1 5:1	F	firm 4:9	free 31:8
19:24	5:4 39:8 40:6		first 6:2 8:13	fuel 28:9 38:2
evaluated 30:6	40:17,25 41:3	fact 9:23,24	12:17 17:24	full 7:13 52:14
event 31:4	41:6,7 75:16	11:15 19:22	23:9 26:14	84:4
everybody 46:1	75:16,21 76:17	20:13 82:7	29:16 32:4	fully 82:8
evidence 6:10	77:5,8,10	factored 79:19	39:15 41:10	fundamental
33:2 40:25	exist 66:9	facts 6:18	50:15 51:10	45:20
86:10	existing 73:11	factual 6:15	52:13 54:1	further 9:13
evidentiary 1:5	73:11	failure 8:1	58:4 60:23,25	10:15 11:21
3:12 85:14	exists 11:6 34:9	Fair 68:7	61:3,4,4,8	23:15 48:12
exact 18:18	84:6	falls 33:25	62:13 63:11,17	51:25 60:3
21:20 58:24	expand 30:5	familiar 59:12	64:18 65:8,13	61:21 72:10
exactly 24:9	expedited 42:24	far 58:23	67:6 69:21	74:24 84:17
36:10 46:4	85:10,11	far-right 66:2	70:5 71:1,2,24	86:7,8 88:10
Examination	expenditure	fashion 37:12	76:3 77:23	future 12:16
39:18 41:22	70:10 80:6	73:5	78:25 84:7	13:16 14:1,7
48:22 51:25	expenditures	favor 19:9	fiscal 58:1,12	18:4,6 19:24
57:15 60:3	31:14 47:19	favorite 23:7	fit 9:6	35:25 44:7,13
61:25 76:5	60:5,13	figure 25:16,25	five 51:14 53:1	50:11
77:25 86:6,6,7	expense 31:12	26:23	five-minute	G
86:7,8,8,9,12	32:11,19,25	figured 68:20	52:20	-
86:13	34:6 43:1 48:7	figuring 46:3	flow 18:20	gamble 21:1
examined 39:16	49:6,16,19	file 1:12 3:4	followed 12:9	game 23:7,24
76:4	50:1 67:9	10:20 26:11	following 10:23	24:2,16 33:19
examining 32:3	79:17	33:12 42:5,11 48:2 64:21	52:4	games 23:5
example 31:1	expenses 8:20	65:9,15	follows 3:5	gas 7:18 32:1 36:7
53:17,17,22,25	25:3 33:7 35:1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	26:17 27:2	
65:25 70:25	42:3 47:19	filed 5:12 6:15 20:13 42:13	28:2 39:16	general 6:22 7:23 10:24
71:6 79:2,24	79:9	84:3	76:4	24:25 26:12,22
exceed 26:4	experienced	files 28:24 79:5	foregoing 88:5,6	28:15,19 29:10
81:12	11:18 14:18	filing 5:18 8:22	forget 5:9	29:21 33:12
exceeded 16:17	16:9 50:2	11:9 21:6	forgotten 23:11	37:10 79:5
exception 17:22	explain 62:5	28:19,23 29:10	form 26:25	80:3 83:7 84:3
18:14 30:2	68:19 78:8	30:19 63:5	27:25 40:3	generally 72:24
exceptions 17:20	83:22	64:1 65:13	57:11	generate 48:15
excess 26:19	explained 68:16	64:1 63:13 filings 29:22	forth 33:17	56:6,22,22
56:1,5 82:7	express 30:7	final 52:13	forward 42:10	58:14,19 59:17
exclusively	expressly 28:11		42:25 78:21	84:19
82:13	30:1	Finally 32:18 financial 32:23	81:1	84:19 generated 58:22
excuse 6:23	extent 15:7	financially 88:13	found 10:3	59:3
excused 75:7	53:11	fine 5:6 39:10	26:14 27:1,7	get-go 45:17
85:2	extraordinary	1111 C J.U J7.1U	30:20 31:17,21	ger-gu 43.17
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

	I	I	l .	I
65:20	Hall 1:17 13:4,5	85:13,14,17	identify 5:4	instances 79:18
give 21:23	13:8,14,25	88:5,6,10	ignore 31:23	intend 8:10 9:10
given 5:15 30:4	14:5,16,19	hearings 6:13	imminent 42:12	intended 78:11
30:7 62:11,12	15:11,18 16:5	heart 26:6	impact 32:22	intent 7:19,25
gives 22:2,6,10	16:14 17:5	hedge 12:11	impacted 38:3	12:7 28:10
go 11:1 24:17	21:9,10,13,18	help 13:22	implemented	30:4,20 33:9
66:13,14 67:2	21:22 22:2,6	helps 68:19	10:19	34:8
68:22 77:22	22:15,19 36:20	highlighted 37:4	important 24:25	interested 88:13
78:16 85:12,14	36:21,23 37:7	highly 64:19	impossible 60:23	interim 28:13
goal 24:5	37:14 38:5,23	historic 13:15	impression 32:4	interpret 18:15
goes 5:21 31:12	41:20,21,22	historical 17:18	inception 45:14	52:3
31:15 36:16	48:11,24 51:21	historically 81:2	60:6	interpretation
49:14 84:10	51:24,25 52:25	hit 29:4 30:15	include 10:10	7:7,24 12:6,13
going 3:14,15	53:5 54:9,11	31:21 44:9	31:6 70:9 81:8	14:20 28:1
17:14 19:23	54:12,21 55:1	57:1 68:13	82:3 84:8	37:19 43:9
22:13 36:1,25	55:10 59:25	71:7	included 7:2,8	47:1 81:7,25
42:10,25 49:22	60:2,3 61:18	hits 29:8	7:13,15 18:25	82:2
57:3 63:16	63:20 66:15,19	hitting 29:18	27:20 61:15	inure 14:20,21
65:23 67:5,13	66:23 67:4	72:6	includes 32:16	invest 46:13
70:5 71:4	68:14 69:25	Honor 4:3,14	63:6	62:23 71:1
72:14 80:25	70:4,8 71:20	5:2 6:6 39:7	including 11:5	invested 60:21
going-forward	72:3,9 75:2,3	40:24 41:4	27:18 36:16	investing 29:20
67:16	77:22,24,25	48:18,21 51:2	income 79:19	investment
good 3:2 13:5,7	84:16 86:6,7,8	51:19 52:18	increase 30:24	30:16 44:24
21:10,12 23:16	86:13	56:19 57:7	incremental	60:19 65:21,25
36:21 41:2,5	Hall's 57:11	74:10 75:10,14	67:21,23 68:2	66:6,6,8,11,13
41:23,24 78:1	59:14	75:15 77:4,13	69:2 72:16,18	66:21 67:12,19
78:2 85:6	hand 6:7 39:13	84:20,22,25	incurred 67:13	67:20 68:3,18
grab 21:17	76:1	85:5	indicates 11:4	68:23 70:3,5
grand 65:2	handed 8:14	Honorable 23:3	inexactness 8:2	70:13,16,22,22
69:11	11:3 51:6	hope 31:7	information	71:14,15 73:7
grant 31:19 34:4		hypothetical	4:16,22 21:18	73:16 74:1
great 18:2	hands 23:6	15:17 44:18	40:21	investments
greater 11:17	happen 65:7	45:3 55:4	infrastructure	29:24
14:14 55:14	71:4	56:25 64:14	1:12 3:8 6:25	Iowa-American
70:23 71:16	happened 69:9	65:3,6 68:22	7:21 8:6,19	39:25
78:16	happens 23:22	71:22	12:2 17:20,24	ISRS 1:13 3:9
guess 8:15 16:6 43:3 52:4 55:3	84:2	hypothetically 14:6 16:15	18:6,13 29:20	6:24 7:2,4,14
43:3 52:4 55:3 55:16	happy 73:22 header 40:12	82:10	initial 82:4,5 initially 47:17	7:16,18,20 8:10,11,19,21
guys 62:1	heard 25:14	02.10	installation	8:24 9:1,4,15
guys 02.1	50:15	I	53:19	9:16,20 10:2,5
H	hearing 1:5 3:12	identification	installed 55:4	10:7,16,19,20
H 87:1	23:19,22 78:3	39:9 40:7	instance 29:11	10:21 11:5,6,8
	23.17,22 10.3		1115tance 27.11	10.21 11.3,0,0
L	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	1

		ı	ı	ı
11:10,15,15,19	80:1,7,11,20	55:17 56:12,14	keep 25:25 33:6	36:7
11:22 12:6,15	81:12,18 82:9	56:20 57:5,8	33:6	language 8:16
12:17 15:3,7	83:25 84:8	57:10,15 59:24	keeping 29:19	31:17 55:24
15:14,21 17:21	ISRS-eligible	61:20 63:8,24	keeps 19:24	largish 3:21
18:9,16,22	29:1 34:25	64:3,8 65:16	Kenney 1:16	Lastly 30:21
19:4 20:24	36:2 53:20,25	68:14 72:10	19:14 20:5,16	late 51:23
24:18,20,23	60:5 80:6	73:23 74:4,14	21:3,6,8 34:14	law 1:15 2:2
25:4,13,19,24	ISRS-related	74:18,23 75:2	34:17,22 35:7	3:11 4:8
26:4,8,10,12	84:8	75:4,8,11,25	35:14,24 36:6	layman 83:6
26:17,18 27:3	ISRSs 36:14	77:7,11,14,17	36:18 41:18	lead 24:13 55:15
27:6,8,11,12	59:16 63:7,18	77:20,24 84:18	61:22,25 63:22	leave 5:13
27:16,19,20,21	73:3	84:21,23 85:1	64:12,23 65:5	leaves 7:5
27:22 28:14,23	issue 7:6 27:12	85:3,6 86:8	65:10 67:21	leaving 24:6
29:3,5,11,12	57:18 59:16	judge 1:15 3:2	68:2,7,9,21,25	30:12
29:15,17,19	68:13 84:10	3:11 4:5,12,17	69:5,14,17,19	left 20:7 23:15
30:3,10,12,14	issuing 52:14	4:23 5:6 13:3	69:23 70:1,13	legal 2:7 26:6
30:16,18,19,24	item 36:2	17:8,12 19:12	70:18 71:13,18	31:23 83:9
30:24 31:11,15	items 10:12	21:9 22:22,25	72:13,21,25	legalities 83:4
31:18,20,22	28:22 29:1,3	23:3,13 34:12	73:7,12,18,25	legally 82:22
32:3,5,5,6,7,8	67:13	36:20 38:25	74:3,13,16	legislative 7:19
32:9,13,14,14	iterated 28:16	39:2,3,10,17	75:1 77:22	7:25 12:7
32:15 33:7,21	т	41:2,5,8,13,16	86:9	28:10
33:24 34:4,7,9	<u>J</u>	41:20 48:13,17	key 27:14	legislatively-a
35:2,16,16,17	jail 31:8	48:19 51:3,20	kind 13:16 38:5	28:13
36:2,15,17	January 32:2	51:23 52:24	50:13 55:15	lesser 55:14
37:16 42:2,24	54:22	53:1,4 54:5,10	65:20	let's 4:6 6:3 8:25
43:10 45:14	Jeanne 25:11	55:17 56:12,14	know 12:24	13:25 14:5,5,6
46:6 47:2,16	39:5,14,20	56:20 57:5,8	13:20 15:24	14:8,10,10
47:17 48:2	86:5	57:10,15 59:24	16:8,11 20:23	16:15,15 75:12
49:8 50:15	Jefferson 1:7 2:4	61:20 63:8,24	20:23 25:24	81:14 82:24,24
53:20 55:5,25	2:8,12	64:3,8 65:16	37:25 43:6	level 6:20 11:16
56:1,8,16,16	Jordan 1:15 3:2	68:14 72:10	46:7 50:21,24	26:20 38:15
56:21,21,24	3:10 4:5,12,17	73:23 74:4,14	52:15 54:13	levels 33:13 44:3
57:17,20 58:2	4:23 5:6 13:3	74:18,23 75:2	55:7 58:25	liability 17:4
58:3,4,12,14	17:8,12 19:12 21:9 22:22,25	75:4,8,11,25	59:13 68:11	22:8 47:8 83:2
58:22,22 60:6	,	77:7,11,14,17	80:5,10,12	life 56:8,11,15
60:18,19,23	23:13 34:12	77:20,24 84:18	82:22	56:16 62:9
61:4 62:9 64:1	36:20 38:25	84:21,23 85:1	knowledge	64:4,25 71:6
64:25 65:23	39:2,3,10,17 41:2,5,8,13,16	85:3,6 86:8	40:21 77:2	78:15 79:25
66:4 68:16,19	41:20 48:13,17	jump 53:13 68:1	known 3:9	limit 28:11
69:7 70:24	48:19 51:3,20	June 1:6 5:13		33:17 34:1
71:2,9 72:15	51:23 52:24	45:6 60:20	L 2:2 76:7	78:11
73:8 78:13,15	53:1,4 54:5,10	K	Laclede 32:1	limitation 8:18
78:25 79:7	JJ.1, 4 J4.J,10		Lacicut 32.1	28:5,18 52:8
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	ı

	I	I	I	ı
limitations 30:7	market 24:1	19:19 24:17,19	73:1,19,25	monopoly 23:8
limited 9:5 25:6	material 32:22	24:24 26:9	80:17,19 81:23	23:11,12,18,21
limits 27:24	mathematically	33:17	minus 59:21	23:25 24:1,8
33:22,25	64:23	mention 5:7	minute 52:22	24:11,16,20
line 51:15	matter 1:10 3:6	8:22 9:19 10:8	minutes 53:1	31:1,2,10
lines 51:14	12:11 20:12	mentioned 10:4	missing 31:10	33:16,18
listed 9:9	26:6 28:9	85:7	Missouri 1:2,7	month 46:19
little 12:20 15:25	31:25 32:4,6	merely 6:11	2:8,9,12 17:17	49:14 85:8
16:7 23:14	52:23 76:13	merits 3:12	17:18 18:14	months 8:21
48:21 50:17	matters 3:24	microphone	31:24 38:1	42:14 47:22
70:17 74:4	MAWC 2:5	3:20 73:24	76:10	48:7,8
LLC 1:20	25:18 31:17	middle 23:19	Missouri- 1:11	morning 3:2
look 60:15,16	MAWC's 6:22	million 7:13	Missouri-Ame	13:5,7 21:10
67:17	Mayfield 2:7 4:2	12:1,15 20:8	3:6 4:10 6:4,16	21:12,15 36:21
looked 20:14	4:14,15 5:2	26:19 34:24	7:10,12 8:3,5	36:22 41:23,24
63:25 64:1	23:2,17 34:16	42:2,10,18,22	11:14,17 12:5	78:1,2
looking 17:1	34:19 35:4,10	43:20 44:5,10	18:18 19:1,3	move 23:13 24:3
44:17 63:14	35:20 36:4,9	44:20,22,23	19:20 20:10	77:4
66:1	36:19,22 37:3	45:7,24 46:2	24:10 25:12,22	multiple 36:13
looks 23:11	37:9,19 38:10	46:10 47:12	27:15 28:17,24	
61:23	38:24 39:2	49:1 52:15	30:11 31:3,9	N
lose 42:7 43:5	41:4,15 48:18	53:16,21,23,24	33:3 35:5,8	N 2:1 86:1 87:1
48:25	54:6 57:7 68:6	54:16,18,18,22	37:24 39:25	nailed 14:2
lost 3:22 28:17	68:8,11 74:10	54:23 55:6,15	42:3 43:10	name 39:19 76:6
lot 23:5,6	75:14,19 76:5	55:21,23 56:2	48:20 54:17	named 23:25
low 19:25	77:4,13 84:25	56:4,5,10,14	56:9 58:13	narrow 18:16
lower 58:25	85:5 86:12	56:15,20 58:15	77:18 84:21	natural 7:18
	mean 17:1 20:11	58:18 60:7,12	Missouri-Ame	nature 32:21
M	35:10 37:3	60:13,20,22,24	6:20,21 7:1 8:9	neat 71:11
Madison 2:8,11	42:12 44:14	61:1,2,9,11,17	11:25 19:9	necessarily
manager 39:24	45:18 46:18	62:1,3,6,12,13	26:2 28:23	12:23 13:21
76:11	52:2,6,10 59:6	62:21,21,22	30:22 31:7	14:24 16:12
mandate 32:12	60:14 67:18	63:2,6,12,14	43:9 47:1	37:25 71:16
mandated 47:24	82:23 83:3	63:16,17 64:5	58:14 75:9	84:13
manner 31:23	meaning 28:5	64:13,16,18,20	mitigate 13:22	necessary 8:23
42:24	30:5 47:4	64:24 65:2,3	MO 2:4	need 3:24 5:4
mark 25:10	means 56:4	65:12,12,15	moment 52:21	29:21 51:3
35:10 38:21	62:22 65:14	67:5,6 68:4,23	money 17:23	85:9,10
39:7 75:15	mechanically	69:1,8,10,12	20:9,20 35:9	neither 88:8
76:2,7,8 86:11	83:10	69:21 70:4,6,9	80:13	never 20:10,19
marked 3:1 5:1	mechanism 18:7	70:11,14,20,23	moneys 50:16	32:5 35:9
40:6 75:16,21	26:14,24 27:1	70:24 71:3,9	monitor 37:9	60:21 63:16
75:23 76:16	29:4	71:13,16,23	monopolist 24:6	65:7 69:8
87:2	mechanisms	72:15,16,18,25	24:13	new 7:14 10:21
		,10,10,20		
	•	•	•	·

43:2 54:24	Oh 80:20	opportunity	passing 24:17	perspective
60:17,19 66:4	okay 5:6 14:18	11:14	pattern 81:15	55:19 73:9
67:20 68:23	21:8,23 36:18	order 5:19 10:23	82:18	Petition 1:11 3:6
69:20 73:6,7	37:14 38:23	12:14 17:12	pay 18:1	petitions 8:25
73:16,25 81:18	43:19,22 45:8	18:7 83:11	paying 20:2	phasing 29:21
81:18	46:12,17 47:9	ordered 27:19	people 23:6 74:5	phone 3:18
nice 71:10	47:16 48:11	78:22	percent 6:19	phone 3.16 phones 3:15
nod 74:7	49:15 50:21	orders 5:21 61:6	15:22 16:12,17	pick 49:23
nonrecovery	51:18 55:1,17	ordinary 31:13	19:16 24:22	pit 18:19
11:18,20,21,25	57:5,23 58:10	original 19:21	25:13 26:5,16	place 29:6 47:17
normal 79:15	58:18,21 59:2	out-of-pocket	26:19 29:8,18	60:24 84:7
normally 17:17	59:6,12,24	70:10 79:9	30:14 31:21	placed 26:25
notice 20:13	60:11 61:18	outcome 88:13	32:12 33:25	27:24
42:13	62:15,24 63:8	outside 7:23	38:6,14 43:11	plan 4:24 49:7,8
nth 25:4	68:7,21 69:17	20:21 33:25	45:9,10 47:4	49:13,15 50:7
number 3:4	72:9,21 73:20	over/under	52:8,11,12	plant 30:16
39:11 46:22	74:4 75:19	84:11	78:5,9,10	49:19 53:20
54:3 55:7,21	77:14 80:4,10	overall 84:6	82:19	54:1,20,22,24
59:17,18 75:22	80:21 81:14		perfect 23:17	55:5,11 60:18
75:23 80:8,17	82:2,5 83:15	P	71:7	61:12,16 65:22
number's 59:12	Oligschlaeger	P 2:1,1	period 9:5,17,25	66:4,5 67:15
numbers 5:4	25:11 35:10	P.C 2:3 4:9	10:4 27:3,7	67:19 69:2,20
61:3	74:2,11 75:15	P.O 2:4	32:23 42:21	70:11,22,22
	75:22 76:2,7	page 9:23 44:17	45:22 47:20	79:10,10,11,13
0	86:11 87:5,6	51:10 60:15	48:1,3 50:16	79:16,23 80:6
oath 39:16 74:5	once 42:11 55:2	65:25 86:2	50:18,19,19,20	play 33:20
74:12 76:4	55:2,7	pages 40:12	50:25 57:13,16	players 24:2,5
objection 5:23	one-year 48:3	paid 15:3 67:11	57:23 58:2,3,8	24:14,17 33:20
5:24	63:10,11	67:13 79:13	58:12,23 59:3	playing 23:4,7
objections 41:2	OPC 48:15	paper 21:19	61:4 62:4	please 17:15
77:8	52:23 53:9	parcel 44:15	63:10,10 78:6	23:2 39:12,19
obvious 7:19	54:2,5 57:8	Parker 23:20	periods 11:19	59:10 76:1,6
12:7	84:19	part 9:11 26:4	15:8 49:24,24	pocket 67:5 79:8
obviously 46:18	OPC's 42:1	44:14 49:5	49:25 50:23	79:15
78:3,14	open 34:11	66:18 80:2	59:4 63:11,13	point 27:14,17
occasionally	opening 6:1,4,9	partial 71:11	73:1,20	81:17
3:17	17:12 22:25	partially 16:2	permission 51:4	pointed 16:21
occurring 36:14	25:15 28:16	particular 23:22	permit 32:11	points 31:17
offer 6:10 40:24	35:20 38:13	38:20 83:23	33:6	position 8:9
Office 2:12 4:18	51:8	parties 4:24 25:7	permits 37:5	15:19,25 18:22
4:20 17:13	operations 25:2	25:12,15 26:23	permitted 29:25	19:3 20:5,7,7
32:1 41:10	opinion 7:6	34:2 53:12,14	34:6	22:4 27:16
77:15	35:23	55:22 88:9,12	permitting 34:6	30:19 34:5,24
officer 88:4	opponents 24:4	parties' 25:20	34:9	35:12,16 38:7

	1	1	1	1
38:11 42:1	problem 52:24	18:5,9,10	questions 13:2	63:18,19 64:21
43:8,16,17	proceeding 6:22	providing 31:18	17:9 19:12	64:25,25 65:9
49:1 82:12	10:24 26:22	provision 8:17	22:22 34:11,12	65:15,23 67:3
83:20	28:20 37:11	12:19 52:6	38:25 40:16	67:14,15 71:21
possible 20:22	40:2	provisions 10:19	41:1,12,15,16	71:24 72:7
22:16 33:18	PROCEEDIN	51:7	41:18 47:9	73:11 78:13,21
52:19 53:8	1:4	Pubic 2:9	48:12,13 53:9	79:5,6,11,12
71:1	process 8:3	Public 1:1 2:7	54:10 60:1	79:18 80:1,3
potentially	22:16	2:12 4:18,20	61:21 63:9	80:12 81:16
53:22 71:8	produce 16:4	17:13 18:15,21	72:10 74:24	83:2 84:3,8
power 24:21	26:18 33:23	19:2,6 28:15	76:22 77:16,19	ratemaking 25:5
33:18	56:1,5,7,21	32:2 41:10	77:20 84:17	29:23 30:2
powers 83:7	prohibits 36:8	54:8 76:10	quibble 15:25	ratepayers
practice 30:3	36:10	77:15	79:14	14:22,25 24:15
precedent 31:23	projects 7:22 8:7	purchase 79:10	quote 26:17 27:2	rates 10:21,24
prefiled 55:20	73:8	purpose 21:15		11:16 17:25
preliminary	proper 33:5	37:2	R	20:3 25:8
3:24	properties 23:21	purposes 40:2	R 2:1	29:13,14 33:13
prepared 40:1	24:3	pursuant 10:19	raise 39:12 76:1	35:25 36:3
76:12 85:11	property 8:20	put 16:18 19:25	raised 84:11	39:24 42:6,15
presumably	50:6 67:10	20:8 28:5 33:9	raising 23:6	43:2,23 44:3
20:16 49:18	68:17 70:12	36:15 47:5,16	ramp 53:19	48:5 49:23
presumed 79:3	79:13,17	54:20,23 71:21	rate 6:22 7:14	50:11 64:20
pretax 10:3,9,10	proposed 5:14	71:22 82:25	7:16,22,23 8:1	65:14 79:22
27:6	27:8 74:13	putting 46:5	8:2 9:1 10:20	rationale 19:16
prevent 24:17	prospective		10:24 11:2,9	Rcv'd 87:2
24:19	49:24,25	Q	12:16,17 13:16	reach 52:16 55:7
prevents 69:20	protected 24:24	qualified 30:16	13:24 14:7	64:18
previous 7:3	26:9,14,24	qualifying 47:19	15:3 16:4,10	read 31:22 37:3
8:23 11:20	29:4,19	78:12 79:23	16:20 18:11	40:13 55:19,22
21:25 63:13,13	protection 18:17	question 9:12	19:22 20:12,14	83:15
previously 4:15	19:8	26:6 32:20,21	20:21 22:9,11	reading 28:9
45:1	protective 33:17	32:24,24 34:23	22:14,17 24:25	35:22 36:12
primary 6:18	prove 3:17	37:1,15 38:4	25:3 26:4,12	45:18,19 62:2
prior 7:25 11:15	provide 15:15	38:22 40:3	26:22 27:25	83:24 84:14
11:19,23 15:8	18:7 31:14	43:16 45:20	28:13,15,19	reads 3:5 27:2
15:16 18:24	provided 4:15	50:22 51:22	29:10,21 30:24	ready 5:25 39:3
27:19 44:7	4:21 9:13 11:3	52:4 55:18	32:7,8 33:12	reality 71:10
63:7 73:1,3,20	12:19 17:19	57:11 58:10	33:23 37:10	realize 23:19
79:12	19:6 50:9,11	59:15 61:23	42:6,6,11,16	really 6:17 11:21
proactive 42:7	51:8 53:18	74:12 78:24	42:17 44:1	12:2 53:15
probably 13:23	72:5 80:8	84:18	47:7 49:18	65:7,24 70:19
23:5 68:24	provides 6:17	questioning	50:18 53:20	70:20 83:9,9
70:16	16:24 17:25	48:15 53:5	55:6 57:1	reason 13:9

	 I	I	I	I
19:10 38:18	recording 32:22	71:15 73:2,14	reiterating	requirement 7:9
reasonable	recourse 29:9	73:14 81:18	25:25	43:24 70:21
18:16 20:1	recover 7:21	83:1 84:11	related 7:2	79:16
reasons 13:10	15:20 20:10,20	recross 48:15,17	84:12,13 88:9	requiring 17:23
rebuttal 39:8,11	25:18 27:10	84:19	relates 7:9	reset 10:20 11:7
40:3,11,13	28:17 30:11	redirect 48:19	relation 33:23	26:12 72:15,17
75:22 76:13,16	35:9,15 42:3	48:22 84:23	relative 88:11	79:7
76:20,23 83:16	42:22,23,25	86:7	relevant 9:23	resetting 29:11
87:4,6	43:10,20 44:5	reduce 5:17,18	relief 33:12	response 48:23
receipts 16:19	47:18,21 48:6	15:2	remedial 47:9	responsibility
44:21 45:11	50:16 53:22	reduced 14:12	remediated	24:12 33:12
receive 29:17	54:17 67:1	88:7	28:14	rest 69:8
42:20	70:6 71:8	refer 8:16,25	remember 29:22	restriction 33:8
received 27:14	78:13 79:15	reference 10:8	49:3 74:16	result 11:24
41:7 77:8,10	80:16 81:19,23	50:23	remind 3:20	16:16 28:4,4
78:5,6 83:11	82:8,19	referenced 51:7	73:23	61:5 82:9
recess 53:2	recoverable 29:5	referred 21:14	reminding 5:21	resulted 47:3
recitation 6:11	recovered 15:8	38:1	rents 24:4 31:11	resulting 10:2
recognize 10:15	16:3 22:13,13	referring 26:15	rephrase 80:25	11:18 27:5
recognized	29:14 30:23	refers 9:2 32:6	replacement	results 32:23
23:20	32:9 38:8	reflect 33:13	1:13 3:8 7:22	return 25:3 63:8
recommendati	45:13,24 46:4	71:14	8:7 17:21,24	67:11 68:17
30:25	66:12 71:3	reflected 68:4	29:20	79:12,18
reconcile 8:23	73:20 79:8	73:2 79:3	replacements	revenue 6:20,24
9:9 10:1 27:4	recoveries 17:2	reflects 73:1,16	6:25 8:19 12:3	7:9 8:11 9:19
reconciled 59:5	17:3 55:14	refund 27:10	REPORTED	10:16 18:9,25
reconciliation	recovering 15:7	refunds 11:6	1:19	19:5,8,16 25:7
7:2,7 8:12 9:2	recovery 7:3 8:5	regard 50:24	reporter 4:11,16	25:13 26:20
9:3,6,11,19,21	9:17 10:16	regular 20:3	4:22 75:18,20	27:14,20 38:15
10:11,13,17	11:5,7,14	regulated 17:16	75:24 88:1,4	42:8 43:24
11:1,11 15:1	12:24 15:16	24:11	REPORTING	56:7,21 58:22
15:13 18:24	16:1 17:16,24	regulation 39:24	1:20	58:24 59:2,16
27:1,8,13,19	21:24 22:7,8	regulatory 1:15	request 6:23	60:18 70:21
31:20 32:17	22:16 26:10	3:10 12:16	7:13,15 30:17	71:9 79:16
36:16 44:25	27:25 28:18,22	17:1,4 19:4	30:22,24 31:11	80:21 82:20,21
46:24 58:3,6,7	28:25 29:3,18	20:9,18 22:7,8	32:25 44:9	revenue-auth
69:16 71:8	29:24,24 35:3	30:23 31:12,20	requested 12:12	82:4
72:5,23 73:10	35:17,25 37:15	34:7 35:8,15	28:23 62:25	revenue. 59 56:6
81:8 84:4	37:16,18 42:2	47:8 83:2,18	requesting 33:7	revenues 8:24
record 19:4	44:24 45:21	rehearing 5:19	57:19	10:2,3,9,10,25
20:18 41:6	46:14 47:3,4,7	rein 18:7	requests 33:4	11:5 12:1
53:3,5 77:6,9	48:1 49:1 50:5	reiterate 25:16	require 3:16	18:22 19:23
85:13,15	50:5 61:15	26:22	22:4 83:18	24:22 25:2,19
recorded 67:10	62:23 63:6	reiterated 38:12	required 26:11	25:23 26:3,12

26:18 27:5,6	safe 13:8 31:14	12:4 31:15	solely 11:15	86:10
27:13,17,18,22	saw 20:23	39:23 43:2	son 23:8	stage 12:25
28:18 29:5	saying 28:22,24	49:9,14 55:5	sorry 51:22	stand 51:20 75:4
30:14,18 31:6	29:2 36:5,6,9	76:11	56:18 72:13	85:1
33:22 37:16	36:11 43:14	set 11:16 16:10	84:24	standard 30:2
56:1 78:12,14	62:1,3 64:3	16:11 18:11	sort 48:25 50:10	32:24
81:12 82:9,13	65:1 73:15,18	21:25 33:16	sound 3:21	start 3:14 4:7
83:25	says 60:17	42:6,15 44:3	sounds 55:18	36:25 49:11,12
review 25:6 35:5	scenario 14:21	49:23 69:7	spaces 23:10	65:22,22 67:18
revised 10:20	schedule 5:11,23	79:7	speaking 3:21	started 6:7 49:5
right 3:18 14:16	85:9	sets 42:17	14:6	63:11
21:2 22:15	scheduled 5:16	setting 24:2	speaks 37:25	starting 68:9
23:14 29:6,6	schedules 9:1	seven 51:14	special 32:25	starts 25:21
35:19 39:12	10:20	sheet 9:13 11:3	spend 17:23	state 1:2 33:21
43:7 46:1 48:4	scheduling 5:7	72:8	19:23	39:19 76:6
48:11 55:12	scope 28:12	short 28:15	spot 14:1,3,9	80:18
61:6,18 64:11	scrutinized 25:4	shows 41:9	57:1 72:6	stated 7:19 12:7
66:7 69:13,23	scrutiny 30:3,6	significance	Staff 2:9 4:13,15	34:1
72:19 73:20	second 6:22 9:23	23:10,22 38:20	5:11 6:16 7:14	statement 6:4,9
74:3 76:1	26:24 35:17	significant 6:14	8:4 11:20	22:25 25:15
80:17 84:16	62:25 67:6	silence 3:15	15:18 20:6	28:16 36:5
ROBERT 1:16	section 9:22	silencing 3:17	23:1 25:6,11	51:8
rolled 36:3	10:17 51:10	simple 46:3	25:22 27:15,15	statements 6:1
67:15	83:23	simpleminded	28:21 30:17	17:13
room 3:21 23:4	see 8:16,25	59:15 63:9	31:5 34:3,24	states 9:15 10:18
78:4	16:10 25:9	simplified 59:15	38:17 41:14	statute 7:6,18,20
roughly 61:8	33:1 51:11,15	simply 28:6 29:6	43:19 47:2	8:13,22,24 9:2
rule 6:11 7:6	81:2,4	46:3	48:17 52:20,23	9:10 10:14
11:2 16:21,24	seeing 6:3 77:7	single 24:2 32:13	53:9 54:2,5,6	12:6 15:15
17:20 18:14	seek 17:24 18:8	34:9 36:17	55:13 57:5	17:19,25 18:5
21:13,15 36:24	32:18	single-issue 25:5	65:19 67:25	18:9,10,16
37:2 47:25	seen 18:19 59:13	27:25 29:23	68:12 73:18,21	19:6,10,17
83:5,17	SENIOR 1:15	single-rate 32:10	73:22 75:13	24:18 26:8,25
rules 9:7 10:14	separate 9:9	sit 31:9	80:18 84:24	28:2,3,10 29:1
11:9 12:20,22	84:5	situation 15:1,4	Staff's 7:24	29:3 30:1,4,7
12:23 28:2	separately 9:22	16:7 36:10	11:13 12:5,13	31:15,18,22,23
33:15,16,20,21	September	64:14 84:5	18:22 19:2	32:3,5,14
34:10	45:23 46:8,14	six 47:22 48:7,8	20:7 30:24	33:10 34:8
running 61:12	57:21,24,25	51:14	34:5,24 35:4	37:20,25 43:10
runs 57:20	58:4,5,5,7,13	six-month 47:20	35:16,18,21	47:2,25 50:23
S	58:23 59:7,9	48:1 50:16,19	38:7,10 41:25	51:13 52:2
	60:20	six-year-old	43:8,17 49:1	55:25 81:7
S 1:16 2:1 S.W 34:20	sequence 41:8	23:8	74:8 75:16,20	82:1,3 83:5
3. W 34.20	service 1:1 2:7,9	size 13:23	83:20 85:4	statute/rule 51:7
	l	l		l

	1	1	1	
statutes 6:8,11	surrebuttal	tender 40:25	17:2,3 23:14	21:4,7
7:24 8:9 9:4	25:10	term 79:14 80:7	23:15 47:4	Tinsley 25:11
17:21 55:22	Swearengen 2:3	terms 10:5 16:25	49:22 50:14,21	39:6,12,14,20
statutorily-set	4:9	test 13:15,16	52:21 54:15	41:1 54:14
24:21	sworn 39:15	14:1,7 17:18	55:6 65:18,20	86:5 87:3,4
statutory 14:19	76:3	20:15,17 21:25	65:21 68:1,13	Tinsley's 39:7
16:18 26:5	system 1:13 3:8	testified 39:16	68:18 69:23,24	66:1
28:2 29:22	6:25 7:21 8:6	76:4	74:7 82:6	tipping 19:8
30:20 47:1	8:19 12:3	testimonies	83:12 84:4	today 13:18
81:13	17:20	25:10 39:8	third 67:7 71:9	40:17 44:9
stay 64:21 65:14		testimony 6:15	thought 20:25	49:9
stop 33:5 64:11	T	40:3,6,10,12	57:2	tool 25:5 28:14
Street 2:8,11	T 87:1	44:18 45:19	thousand 45:23	total 25:23
stripes 32:15	take 3:24 5:23	55:20 59:13	three 6:17,25	53:24 55:6
struck 23:9	13:17 22:11	60:16 66:1	9:9 10:12	60:4,9,13 62:7
stupid 55:18	41:25 42:18	76:13,16,20,23	13:24 33:8	62:8 63:18
subject 33:21	52:19 59:17	83:16	45:5 51:13	65:2 69:11
submit 27:8	82:12	thank 4:5,12,17	52:8,13,17	70:2 71:14
submitted 35:5	taken 15:24	4:19,23 6:6	53:14,23 54:18	80:5
subsequent	49:19 88:5,6	13:1,3 17:6,7,9	54:23 55:9	touch 30:21
32:17	88:10	17:11 19:11,15	56:23 60:9,14	track 21:24 37:5
subtract 59:18	takers 23:5	21:8 22:20,21	63:13,15 64:4	65:20
subtracting 46:4	takes 27:15,22	22:23,24 34:11	65:8 66:9,12	tracked 11:8
subvert 19:7	42:14	34:15 36:18	70:6,15 79:4	tracker 16:18
Suite 2:11	talk 50:4 52:20	38:23 39:1,2	three-year 47:13	47:6 82:25
suited 35:11	52:23 53:15	39:17 41:19	52:5 56:8,11	transcript 1:4
sum 71:14	talked 12:21	48:12 51:18	62:3 63:10,21	85:10,10
summarize	16:25	54:9 59:24	63:22 78:6	treat 11:11
33:15	talking 24:8	61:19 70:1	79:20	27:12
surcharge 1:13	49:6,8 57:14	72:9 74:14,23	Threlkeld 1:19	treated 9:21
3:8 9:17 17:21	57:17 63:9,11	75:1,3,4,6,11	88:3,20	treatment 31:13
18:1,5 19:25	65:22,24	75:25 77:16	threw 50:17	32:25 80:2
20:2 32:9	talks 9:24 10:12	84:17 85:16	thwart 7:25	trend 44:16
33:21 47:16	51:16	theoretically	TIGER 1:20	true 40:20 77:1
48:6 57:18,19	target 82:20,21	64:13,15	time 5:18 19:22	true-up 45:22
58:14,22 66:15	tariff 72:8 78:22	thereto 88:12	20:12 23:9	try 18:8,12
66:17,18,20,23	tariffs 5:14,20	thing 21:20	27:18 29:7,12	turn 3:16 31:9
78:19,20,25	tasked 24:12	45:16 83:5	29:17,21 36:14	54:2 67:25
80:11,11	26:7	things 9:9 17:2	40:10 42:21	turned 47:2
sure 5:8 14:23	tax 68:17	20:3,14 49:7	43:1,6 48:1	73:24
38:21 47:11	taxes 8:21 50:6	50:7 81:20	78:6	twenty 70:15
64:2 65:19	67:10 70:12	think 5:3 12:22	timely 7:20 8:5	twenty-five 46:5
73:24 81:14	79:13,18,19	13:21,22 14:25	times 32:7	twice 48:2
83:23	telling 59:19	15:4,4,9 16:17	timing 12:20	two 5:15,16 9:5
		, ,	8 3	- ,

20:3 23:20	33:22	want 5:7,8 6:7	65:4,6,11 70:2	42:21 47:19
26:9 31:10	usage 8:4 11:16	20:17 28:21	72:20 74:8,18	48:9,10 50:19
45:22 51:13	16:9 38:4	30:21 68:8	74:22 75:6,7	52:13 53:21,23
53:23 55:8	43:25 44:2,3	70:19	77:12 85:2	53:23,23 54:1
56:23 61:3,4,5	58:25 81:16	wanted 68:1	witnesses 4:25	54:18 55:4,7
61:5 62:20,25	82:5,11,18	wants 28:17	25:10	56:4,5,15,22
63:18 66:9,12	use 3:20 9:19	wasn't 14:13	WO-2012-0401	56:23,23 57:12
66:12 72:1	55:24 73:24	73:2 83:8	62:17	58:1,11 60:12
79:4 81:3	useful 3:17	water 1:11 3:7	WO-2012-0472	60:22,23,25
Tying 31:1	61:13	4:10 6:4,16	69:6	62:10,11,12,13
type 14:7 81:2	uses 11:20	9:25 10:18,22	WO-2013-0466	63:17 64:6,18
typewriting 88:7	utilities 17:19,23	23:23 24:10	62:18	64:20 65:8,13
	23:20 24:19	26:20,21 27:4	WO-2015-0211	65:15 66:9,9,9
U	29:19 32:18,25	38:14 39:23	1:12 3:4	66:11,12,12,20
ultimate 15:3	utility 7:20	way 5:21 7:22	wondering	67:2,6,7,7,11
24:5	17:17,25 18:2	18:16 28:3	23:18	67:12,14 68:23
ultimately 10:4	26:10 29:8,9	35:21 59:16	words 8:1 16:1	69:8,21 70:5
35:18 53:24	29:17 31:21	62:5,16 72:18	38:19	71:1,2,4,4,4,10
67:2	32:17 33:6,11	ways 28:6	work 83:11	71:24 78:16,20
Um-hum 21:22	33:16,18 34:9	we'll 4:7	works 23:23	78:25 79:3
59:22	78:12	we're 3:11 13:10	worth 61:11	80:1 81:4
understand 3:23	utility's 29:13	16:2,2 17:1	wouldn't 13:18	yearly 15:14
4:24 36:4	utilize 24:20	23:15 35:24	42:9,23,25	67:1 69:16
57:20 69:24		39:3 48:2 49:8	44:4 52:21	years 13:24
75:20 78:10,24	V	52:13,14 54:4	69:1 72:7 73:4	29:16 33:8
81:14	value 42:17	57:12,13,17,19	woven 29:13	42:23 52:8,13
understanding	variables 28:11	63:4,5,16 64:2	written 19:17	52:17 54:18,23
15:23 19:15,18	variation 38:3	65:20,23	wrong 43:22,23	55:8 56:16
40:5 43:7,12	verbalization	we've 26:15	53:14	60:9 63:13,15
43:17 44:21	74:7	45:24 46:24		64:4 65:9 70:6
68:18 75:17	verify 18:12	57:2 59:4 60:8	X	70:15 71:11
76:15 78:9,18	version 33:16	72:22	X 86:1 87:1,1	72:1 79:4 81:3
unit 76:11	versus 32:1	welcome 34:16	Y	
unmuted 3:3	38:19 42:7	36:19 38:24	$\frac{1}{\mathbf{Y} 1:17}$	
unnecessary	view 15:6 19:21	went 43:1 58:4	yeah 34:14 43:6	zero 10:21 11:1
28:4 unreasonable	violate 32:12	Western 7:17	58:3 60:2	11:7 21:25
28:4	34:8 Volume 1:8	31:24 32:3	63:15 65:6,18	26:13 29:11 67:2 79:7
	volume 1:8 volumetric	34:18,21 35:23	66:17 68:11,24	07.2 /9:7
unreasonably 19:9	71:21	36:7,12	69:18 70:7	0
unrecovered	/1.41	win 34:10	73:4 81:22	0055 72:17
11:23 12:15	$\overline{\mathbf{W}}$	witness 38:17	year 13:15,16	01 69:7
20:7	wait 65:8	51:2,4,5,7 53:6	14:1,7 17:18	0401 66:4
upper 27:24	waive 4:24	57:14 63:15,25	20:15,17 21:25	0406 72:15
аррег 27.27		64:7,10,17	,	
			<u> </u>	ı

		l .	Ī	I
1	87:4	25,892,662 6:19	4 3:1 11:4 21:14	9
1 1:8 3:1 26:19	2.9 62:25 72:18	25:17,19,25	36:24 40:12	9 60:24 61:1,2
39:8,10 40:6	20 42:21,23	26:23 37:22	61:8,11 75:17	62:13,21 69:5
40:12,17,25	20-year 79:24	25.6 80:19	75:23 76:17	972 60:7
41:7 45:6 87:3	200 2:8,11 24:18	25.8 46:2 47:12	77:5,10 87:6	
1,665,202 7:2	2003 29:16	81:23	4.1 63:1	
1,919,991 6:23	2010 44:1	25.9 44:10	41 86:6 87:3,4	
1.6 12:1,15 20:8	2012 45:23 58:5	2512 69:5	417 34:20	
34:24 35:18	2014 32:2 34:20	253,000 61:14	456 2:4	
42:2,10,18,22	45:23 46:8,14	254,789 7:15	48 86:7	
43:20 44:5	59:7,9	30:13,15,18		
45:24 46:10	2015 1:6 45:6	34:5	5	
49:1 63:6 73:1	58:13,23	25th 58:5	5.8 60:21 67:19	
73:2,9,19	210 45:7		72:16	
1.9 6:23 7:13	210,000 44:24	3	50 70:11	
57:19 63:5	23 59:21 60:7,13	3 1:6 44:22,23	51 86:7	
72:25 73:5,16	80:17	45:7 75:16,22	57 86:8	
73:19,25	23,972,670	76:17 77:5,10	573.635.7166	
1/20th 79:25	46:16 59:11	87:3,4,5,5,6	2:5	
10 6:19 15:22	240-2.650(17)	3.2 44:20	573.751.4227	
16:12,17 19:16	83:17	3.7 60:20 61:14	2:9	
24:22 25:13	240-3.650(17)	61:17 66:11	6	
26:5,16,19	11:4 21:14	67:1,5,6,8,18		
29:8,18 30:14	36:25	68:4 72:15	644:17	
31:21 32:12	243.650(17)	3.736 66:10	60 86:8	
33:25 38:6,14	21:21	3.736,587 66:3	61 86:9	
42:21,23 43:11	25 53:16,21,22	312 2:3	650 2:11	
45:9,10 47:4	54:15,18,23	39 86:5,6	65101 2:8	
52:8,11,12	55:6,14,21,23	393.1003 30:20	65102 2:12	
78:4,9,10	56:2,4,5,10,14	393.1003(1) 8:15	65102-0456 2:4	
82:19	56:15,20 58:15	26:15 51:11	7	
11 42:14	58:15 59:21	393.1006(2)	7 60:15 65:25	
12 8:21 29:16	60:12,22 62:1	31:18	729 69:10	
12-month 9:5,25	62:3,6,12,21	393.1006(5)(2)	75 53:24 54:18	
27:3 61:4	62:22 63:2,12	27:2	54:22 64:13,15	
12th 5:12 85:8	63:14,16,17	393.1006.5(1)	65:2,11 69:11	
1382 88:4	64:5,18,20,24	9:14	70:6,14 71:8	
15 42:21,23 56:6	65:2,12,14	393.1006.5(2)	76 86:11,12	
17 5:13	68:23 69:1,7	9:22	77 86:13 87:5,6	
1933 23:20	69:10,21 70:4	393.1006.6(1)	11 00.13 07.3,0	
	70:9,20,23,23	10:17	8	
2	71:3,13,16,23	3d 34:20	8 52:15	
2 39:8,11 40:6	25,637,873		815 34:20	
40:17,25 41:7	30:11	4		
,				