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J UDGE J ORDAN: Good morning, everyone.
I have now unmuted. The Commission is calling the action in File Number WD-2015-0211. And the caption of this case reads as follows: This is in the Matter of the Petition of Mssouri-American Water Company For Approval to Change Its I nf rastructure System Repl acement Surcharge, al so known as an ISRS. That is the acronym

I'm Dani el Jordan. I'mthe regul at ory I aw judge assigned to this action. We're here for an evi dentiary hearing on the merits of this application.
l'm goi ng to start by asking everyone to silence their cell phones. l'm not going to require you to turn them off, because they occasi onally prove useful. So I amsilencing my cell phone right now.

And I will al so ask everyone -- I will remind everyone to use the microphone when speaking. It's a Iargi sh room and sound sometimes get l lost.

I understand that there are no preliminary matters that we need to take up before we get into entries of appearance. Is that
correct?
MS. MAYFI ELD: That's correct, Your Honor.

MR. COOPER: That's correct.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Thank you, Counsel ors.
Then let's begin with entries of appearance, and we'll start with the Applicant.

MR. COOPER: Dean Cooper fromthe Iaw firmBrydon, Swearengen \& Engl and, P.C., appearing on behalf of Mssouri-American Water Company. The court reporter has the address.

JUDGE J ORDAN: Thank you.
And for Staf.
MS. MAYFIELD: Your Honor, Cydney Mayfield for Staff. And I have previ ously provided my information to the court reporter.

JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.
And for the Office of Public Counsel.
Mb. BAKER: Thank you. Christina Baker appearing on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel and the customers. And I have al so provi ded my information to the court reporter.

J UDGE JORDAN: Thank you very much.
I understand the parties pl an to wai ve cross-exam nation of the witnesses. Do we have
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all -- do we have all the exhi bits marked?
MS. MAYFIELD: I bel ieve so, Your Honor.
MR. COOPER: Well, I thi nk we may just need to identify whi ch exhi bits are whi ch numbers, but...

J UDGE J ORDAN: That's fine. Okay. I di d want to mention something about scheduling bef ore we begin, because I want to make sure I don't forget it at the end. That has to do with the date for briefing, which is the briefs -according to the schedule that Staff and the Applicant filed, briefs will be due on the 12 th of June. And that woul d I eave, I count, 17 days bef ore the proposed effective date of the tariffs.

Given that there are onl y two agendas schedul ed bet ween those two dates, that may reduce -- depending on how the Commission deci des this action, that may reduce the time for filing an application for rehearing as to an order approving compliance tariffs. If that's what the Commission orders, that's the way it goes. So just reminding everyone that that is the case. There's been no obj ection to that schedule, so l take it there is no obj ection.

And, with that, I bel ieve we are ready
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for openi ng statements, unl ess anybody has anything el se first.

Not seei ng anything, let's have the openi ng statement of Mssouri-American Water Company.

MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
Bef ore I get started, I want to hand out a document that contains the stat utes that l'Il be citing during my openi ng statement. It's certai nly not anything that l will offer into evi dence, but merely a recitation of those stat utes and a rule that l will be -- will be di scussing.

Unlike many hearings that l've appeared in, it's my belief that there's no significant factual dispute in this case. The testimmy filed by Mssouri-Ameri can Water Company and the Staff really provi des 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 M ssouri-American's base revenue level approved by the Commi ssi on in M ssouri-American's nost 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 systemrepl acements; and, three,
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that the devel opment of Mssouri-American's current ISRS incl uded \$1, 665, 202 of reconciliation rel at ed to previ ous under recovery or under collection of ISRS dollars.

That leaves for the Cormission, in my-in my opinion, an issue of stat ute and rule interpretation; that is, whether the reconciliation amount should be incl uded in determining how the revenue requi rement rel ates to the cap. Mssouri-American, of course, believes that it shoul d not.

If Mssouri-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 incl uded in the ISRS rate.

The Court of Appeal s Western District, in the context of a natural gas ISRS statute, has stated that the obvious legi slative intent of the ISRS stat ute is to allow the utility to timely recover its costs for infrastructure system repl acement projects by way of a rate adj ustment outside of a general rate case.

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

## IN THE MATTER OF MAVC

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

It is -- again, it is
M ssouri-American's position that the stat utes do not intend for the ISRS cap to apply to a conbi nation of the ISRS costs and the revenue reconciliation amounts.

Before you l believe the first stat ute that's cited in the document l handed out is 393. 1003(1), whi ch contai ns I guess what I would refer to as the cap Ianguage. You'll see in that provi si on that the adj ustments to which the limitation applies are the costs for eligible infrastructure systemrepl acements. 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 previ ous under or over collection of ISRS revenues. The stat ute does refer to, let's see, petitions to establish or
change ISRS rate schedules. Well, agai $n$, a reconciliation is not a change. The statute refers to reconciliation as an adj ustment.

El sewhere in the ISRS stat utes 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 Cormission's rul es there's a description of establish, change, reconcile listed as three separate things. So, agai $n$, we bel $i$ eve that the stat ute 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), whi ch states that an ISRS shall be cal cul at ed based upon the amount of ISRS costs that are eligi ble 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 bef ore you on the second page, but in rel evant fact tal ks about the fact that at the end of each 12- month cal endar period the water corporation
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shall reconcile the differences between the revenues resulting froman ISRS and the appropriate pretax revenues as found by the Cormission for that period, and then ultimately ends, as l mentioned bef ore, in terms of an adj ustment of the ISRS, something different than the establishment or the change of the ISRS.
l'd al so mention that there's reference to appropriate pretax revenues. The definition of appropriate pretax revenues does not incl ude anything concerning the reconciliation amounts. It tal ks about three itens, none of which are reconciliation amounts.

The stat ute and the Commission's rules further recognize differentiation bet ween the recovery of ISRS costs and the revenue reconciliation amounts. Section 393. 1006. 6(1) states that a water corporation that has i mpl emented an ISRS pursuant to the provi si ons of the ISRS shall file revi sed rate schedul es 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, havi ng sai d that, revenues
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reconciliation amounts do not go to zero in the rate case. Commission rule -- again, that's provi ded on the sheet I handed out -4 CSR 240-3.650(17) indi cates that if an over or under recovery of ISRS revenues, incl udi ng Commissi on-ordered ref unds, exi sts 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, agai $n$, the rules deemthe ISRS anهunts to be something different from-- fromthe reconciliation anounts and treat them differently.

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

Staff uses this previ ous nonrecovery to really further the nonrecovery by addi ng both the currently-authorized ISRS costs with the unrecovered prior costs to assess the application of the cap. That approach would result in M ssouri-American's nonrecovery of, as l said,
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1. 6 million and some change in revenues that's really associ ated with eligi ble infrastructure system repl acements that have been made that are compl et ed, are in service.

M ssouri-American believes that Staff's interpretation of the ISRS stat ute is contrary to the obvi ous legi slative intent, as stated by the Court of Appeals, and, ther ef ore, erroneous and should not be followed by the Cormission.

Because I al so have to, essentially, hedge my bets in this matter, we have al so requested that should the Commission agree with Staff's interpretation, that the Commission consider an order that allows the company to book that $\$ 1.6 \mathrm{milli}$ on of unrecovered ${ }^{\text {I SRS }} \mathrm{in}$ a regul atory 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 provi ded in the Commission's rules. It's a little different timing, l would acknow edge, than what's tal ked about in the Cormissi on's rules. But I don't think that the rul es necessarily contempl ated that we would al ready know the under recovery amount at this stage, as we do in this case.
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Thank you. And if you have any questions, l'mavailable for those.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Thank you, Counsel or.
Cormim ssi oner Hall.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Good mor ni ng, Mr. Cooper.

MR. COOPER: Good morni ng.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Is it safe to say that the reason why we are here is because -- or at Ieast one of the reasons why we're here is because of declining consumption?

MR. COOPER: Certai nl y the Company bel ieves that to be the case.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: That if -- if instead of using the hi storic test year we had used some ki nd of future test year in the last rate case to take into account declining consumption, then we woul dn't have a di spute here today; is that correct?

MR. COOPER: I don't know that I can say that that's necessarily the case. I think it would hel p . I thi nk it would -- it would mitigate the size of the dispute. But we will probably end up with three years between -- bet ween rate cases.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Well, let's say that
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our future test year was spot on, that we -- that we nailed the consumption decline.

MR. COOPER: If it was spot on, yes, we would not have a di spute then.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: So let's -- let's -hypothetically speaking, let's say in -- in the next rate case we do some type of future test year and let's say that our crystal ball is amazingly accurate and we are spot on -- or, actually, let's -- let's say that consumption -- the consumption decline is not what we antici pated; it actually was a reduced -- there was a consumption decline, but it wasn't what we anticipated.

MR. COOPER: We assumed a greater decline --

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Ri ght.
MR. COOPER: -- than what was
experi enced. Okay.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Wbul d your stat ut ory interpretation inure to the benefit of the company in that scenario or would it inure to the benefit of ratepayers?

MR. COOPER: l'm not sure it would be to the -- necessarily to the benefit of either one. I thi nk that the ratepayers would continue to be
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whole in that situation, because the reconciliation would still be used to reduce the amount of the ultimate ISRS rate to be paid by the customer.

So I think -- I think in that situation maybe it would be to the benefit of both, because the Company would -- would view itself as recovering all of its ISRS costs and, to the extent it over recovered those in prior periods, the custoner would get the benefit of that. So I think it would --

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Wen woul d the customer get the benefit?

MR. COOPER: Within the reconciliation. So on a yearly basis the ISRS would be adj usted, according to the statute, to provide for that -that prior over recovery, l believe, in your hypot hetical.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: So St aff is taking the position that if the Commission agrees with the Company that the Company will over recover on the ISRS, they will -- they will -- they will collect more than the 10 percent cap. Is that your under standing as well?

MR. COOPER: I know they' ve taken that position. We would qui bble with thema little bit,
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because the words collect and recovery have been used. Well, we're -- we're here partially because the Company hasn't collected or recovered what the rate was desi gned to produce. So --

COMM SSI ONER HALL: So you --
MR. COOPER: -- I guess I'mbreaking a little bit with you because of that situation. I don't know that -- and, again, because of the declining usage that's been experienced. Even if the rate is set where the Company would like to see it set, I don't know that the Company will necessarily collect more than the 10 percent anount.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Well hypothetically, let's -- let's say that that did -that did result, that collections came in and exceeded the 10 percent, do you think there is statutory authorization for us to put a tracker on that -- on those recei pts and -- and account for them at the next rate case or is that the -- is that the Commission rule that you pointed to at the end of your --

MR. COOPER: Yes. Yes, I beli eve that the Cormission rule provides for that, both directions. I -- I've tal ked internゅ of a
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regul at ory asset because, I mean, we're looking to book things that we thi nk are under recoveries. But l think if they were over recoveries, it would be a regul at ory liability and would equally apply.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. COOPER: Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: I don't have any questions fromthe ot her commissioners. So thank you.

MR. COOPER: Thank you.
JUDGE J ORDAN: In the order of opening statements that I have is the Office of Public Counsel goi ng next.

Mb. BAKER: May it pl ease the Commission. Recovery of costs by a regul ated utility in Mssouri is normally based on a historical test year basis. However, Mssouri statute has provi ded utilities with certain exceptions to this rule. The Infrastructure System Repl acement Surcharge, or ISRS, stat ut es contempl ate such an exception. Instead of requiring utilities to spend money on certain infrastructure repl acement first then seek recovery in rates, the stat ute provi des the utility the
ability to have a surcharge whereby customers pay in advance. The benefit to the utility is great. The benefit to the customer is debatable.

Si nce these costs are future costs, the statute provides for the surcharge to be based on an estimate of future infrastructure costs. In order to provide a mechani smto rein in the effects on the customers and to try to seek a bal ance, the stat ute provides for an ISRS revenue cap cal cul ation. The stat ute provides for all of this to be compl eted between a set cycle of rate cases to try to verify the anount of the actual infrastructure costs.

As an exception to the rule in Mssouri, Public Counsel asked that the Commission inter pret the ISRS stat ute in the nost narrow way reasonable as a customer protection. Customers have no say in the exact business deci sions by Mssouri-American and should not be seen as a bottonless pit of cash flow.

Therefore, Public Counsel agrees with Staff's position that the amount of ISRS revenues authorized by the Commission associ ated with the reconciliation of prior under or over collections should be incl uded in the revenue cap cal cul ation
for Mssouri-American.
Public Counsel al so agrees with Staff's position that Mssouri-American should not be allowed to record a regul at ory asset for any ISRS costs determined to be above the revenue cap provi ded by the stat ute. And Public Counsel bel ieves that to do otherwi se would subvert the customer protection of the revenue cap, tipping the bal ance unreasonably in M ssouri-American's favor, whi ch is not the reason for the stat ute.

Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Questions fromthe bench?
Chai rman.
CHAI R KENNEY: Just one, ME. Baker.
Thank you. What is your understanding of the rationale behind the 10 percent revenue cap that was written into the stat ute?

MB. BAKER: It's my understanding that because there was -- there are many mechani sms for Mssouri-Arerican to be made whole, mainly the original vi ew 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 --
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næybe a reasonable amount so that customers aren't paying more in thei $r$ surcharge than they are in thei $r$ regular rates. It connects those two things t oget her.

CHAI R 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 regul at ory asset, that's just money Mssouri-Anerican would never recover?

MS. BAKER: I mean, they coul d 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.

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

MB. 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 thei r last ISRS case. And if they thought that that was something
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that was a gamble, they could have come back in right then.

CHAI R KENNEY: Because they control the timing of the --

Mb. BAKER: Because --
CHAI R KENNEY: -- filing?
MS. BAKER: -- they control the timing.
CHAI R KENNEY: Okay. Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Commi ssi oner Hal I.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Good morni ng,
Ms. Baker.
MS. BAKER: Good morni ng.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Commi ssi on Rul e 4 CSR 240-3.650(17) that Mr. Cooper referred to this morning, what is the purpose of this rule in your --

MS. BAKER: Let me grab the --
COMM SSI ONER HALL: -- your information?
Mb. BAKER: -- the paper that he gave us so that I have the exact thing.
243. 650(17).

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Um hum Yes.
MS. BAKER: Okay. That does gi ve the ability to track the over recovery after it's been set to zero within the test year of the previous
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case.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: It gi ves the
Commission the authority to do it. It doesn't require it. Is that your position?

MG. BAKER: Yes.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: So it gi ves us the aut hority to make an over recovery a regul at ory liability and an under recovery a regul at ory asset in the next -- in the next rate case?

MS. BAKER: It gi ves the authority to take that into account in the next rate case, yes. It doesn't -- it doesn't aut omatically say that it's going to be recovered or not recovered in the next rate case.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Ri ght. But it establishes a process by which recovery is possible in the next rate case?

MS. BAKER: Yes.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: That's all I have. Thank you.

Mb. BAKER: Thank you.
JUDGE JORDAN: I have no questions from the ot her commissi oners. Thank you very much.

MS. BAKER: Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: The openi ng statement of

St aff.
MS. MAYFIELD: May it please the Commission and the Honorable Judge. I bet if I were to ask this room who in here enj oys playing board ganes, 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, Mbnopoly, with my six-year-old son, Dalton, and for the first time l was struck by some of the si gnificance of some of the spaces on the board. And in case you' ve forgotten what Mbnopoly looks like, l've actually brought a Mbnopoly board.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Counsel or, can you nove 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. MAYFI ELD: Perfect. So just in case you're wondering why I busted out a Mbnopoly board in the middle of our hearing, I realize that since 1933 Parker Brothers has recogni zed two utilities as monopoly properties on the board. The one of si gnificance to this particular hearing happens to be the water works.

Now, we are all aware that the game of Mbnopoly is named after the economic concept of
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monopoly, which is the domination of market by a single entity. In our game setting our players move around the board collecting properties and collecting rents fromtheir opponents, with the ultimate goal of driving the other players into bankruptcy, leaving one monopolist in control of the entire economy.

So why aml tal king about Mbnopoly agai $n$ ? Because that is exactly what Mssouri-Arerican Water Company is. It is a regul at ed monopoly and, as such, this Commission is tasked with the responsi bility of ensuring that the behaviors of this monopolist do not lead to the demise of the other players, in this case our rat epayers.

And just like the gare of Mbnopoly has mechani sns to prevent players frompassing go and not collecting \$200, our ISRS stat ute al so has mechani sns designed to prevent utilities who utilize the ISRS fromexercising their monopoly power to collect more than a stat utorily-set cap of 10 percent on revenues derived froman approved I SRS.

Why are these protected mechani sns 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 testimmies of the witnesses, Mark Oi gschl aeger for Staff and Jeanne Tinsley for M ssouri-American, the parties are in agreement as to what that 10 percent cap on the ISRS revenue should be. And you' ve al ready heard that from Mr. Cooper's opening statement, that the parties do agree on what that figure is. To reiterate, that anount is $\$ 25,892,662$. Ther ef ore, 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 di vi de. The difference bet ween Staff and Mssouri-American boils down to what amount of total revenues can be collected under the ISRS. We al ready know what the cap anount is, and I keep reiterating the figure of $\$ 25,892,662$, and
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there's just no di spute. But if the Commission were to adopt Mssouri-American's argument in this case, the amount of revenues authorized by the Commission as part of the ISRS rate would exceed the 10 percent statutory cap. And this is the heart of the matter. It is a legal question, and it is one this Commission is tasked with answering.

Within the stat ute creating the ISRS, there are two protected mechani snæ desi gned to control the amount of ISRS recovery that a utility can have before they are required to file their general rate case to reset those ISRS revenues to zero.

The first protected mechanismis 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 proceedi ng. To reiterate, the parties agree on that figure, $\$ 25,892,662$.

But the second protected mechanism pl aced in the stat ute comes in the formof a
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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 bet ween 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 adj ustment to the Commi ssi on for approval to recover or refund the difference, as appropriate, through an adj ustment of an ISRS.

Thi s issue of how to treat the ISRS revenues associated with the reconciliation or recei ved revenue is the key poi nt of di sagreement bet ween Staff and M ssouri-American. Staff takes the position that the entire amount of the ISRS revenues authorized by the Cormission at any point in time, incl udi ng revenues associ ated with reconciliation of prior ordered ISRS amounts, should be incl uded in the ISRS revenue cap cal cul ation. This ensures that the ISRS cap cal cul ation takes into account all ISRS revenues aut horized for collection from customers in determining the upper limits that should be placed on the form of single-issue rate recovery.
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Additionally, this interpretation of the statute follows the rules of stat ut ory construction in construing the stat ute 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 si mply and easily get around it.

Just as this Commission didin the Ameren fuel adj ustment clause matter, a readi ng of the stat ute that conforms to the legislative intent to limit contingencies and variables not expressly envi sioned within the scope of a I egi slativel $y$-authorized interimrate adj ust ment tool like the ISRS may only be remedi ated, if at all, in a general rate case. In short, as Public Counsel iterated in its opening statement, if Mssouri-American wants to recover its lost revenues above this cap limitation, that recovery may be had in the filing of a general rate proceedi ng.

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

ISRS-el igi ble itens, as defined by the stat ute. What we are saying is that, according to the stat ute, the itens eligi ble for ISRS recovery have hit that protected cap mechanism And while those revenues nay be recoverable, the ISRS is not the right place, and this is just simply not the right time.

Wen 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 custoner rates.

Si nce the establishment of the ISRS in 2003, which has been 12 years, this is the first time that a utility eligible to recei ve ISRS recovery has come close to hitting this 10 percent protected cap. The ISRS is keeping utilities investing in infrastructure repl acement, while at the same time phasing out the need for general rate case filings. And, remember, without the stat utory aut horization al lowing single-i ssue rat emaking recovery, these investments and the recovery on and for them would not be permitted.
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Therefore, when a stat ute expressly aut horizes an exception to standard ratemaking practice such as our ISRS, cl ose scrutiny should be gi ven to that intent of that stat ute, and attempts to expand beyond its clear meaning should be carefully eval uated. Cl ose scrutiny shoul d be gi ven to the express limitations in that stat ute as well.

So what can this Cormission authorize in this current ISRS case? To date the Commission has authorized Mssouri-American to recover \$25,637, 873 under its current ISRS, I eavi ng the Cormi ssi on 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
Mssouri-American's request to establish a regul atory asset for the under recovered components of its ISRS request, if Staff's ISRS rate increase recommendation is approved by this Commission.
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Tying us back to our Mbnopol y example over here, beautiful Mbnopoly board, M ssouri-American is essentially asking the Commission to draw a chance card in the event you agree with Staff that the cap calculation should incl ude the under collection of revenues component. Mssouri-American's hope is that this chance card acts like a get out of jail free card, allowing Mssouri-American to avoid having to sit out a turn or two and missing out on collecting Mbnopoly rents. However, this request to book an ISRS expense as a regul at ory asset goes counter to this Commission's treat ment of ordi nary capital expenditures desi gned to provi de safe and adequate service, and it goes counter to the ISRS statute itself.

MAWC points to language found in the I SRS statute at 393.1006(2) as providing the authority for the Commission to grant the booking of an ISRS reconciliation anهunt as a regul at ory asset should a utility hit the 10 percent cap found earlier in the stat ute. But to read the ISRS statute in this manner is to ignore legal precedent coming out of the Western District of Mssouri.

In the case In Re the Matter of the

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

To permit the booking of expense above the 10 percent cap would vi ol ate the clear mandate that only a single ISRS is contempl at ed by the statute. In this case an ISRS is an ISRS is an ISRS. It doesn't change its stripes. This incl udes 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 al ways 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.
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And in this case, as you will see, there has been no such cl ai mmde, no such evi dence advanced by M ssouri - Ameri can.

So where do the requests for def er ral stop and when do they begin? ls 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 accumul ation of deferrals al so acts, in effect, to absol ve 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 rul es are set forth to act as protective mechanisns tolimit the possible abuses of the nonopoly power the utility enj oys. Each of you acts as a banker in the game, ensuring that the players play by the rules. The rul es state that the ISRS surcharge is subject to limits on the upper ends of the revenues that it will produce in rel ation to the last base rate amount. The Cormissi on may not approve an ISRS that falls outside of those limits. A 10 percent
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limit has been stated before, and it is not in di spute by the parties.

The Staff is asking this Commi ssion to grant this ISRS application in the amount of $\$ 254,789$. It is al so Staff's position to deny permitting the booking of any expense not permitted by the ISRS as a regul at ory asset. To do so would viol ate the clear intent of the stat ute that only a single ISRS exists, permitting the utility to break the rules and to win by chance.

Thank you. And I'mopen for questions.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Questions from the bench?
Mr. Chai rman.
CHAI R KENNEY: Yeah, just a coupl e.
Thank you.
MS. MAYFI ELD: You' re wel come.
CHAI R KENNEY: What's the cite of that case, the Western District case?

Mb. MAYFIELD: The citation for the case that I cited is 417 S. W 3d 815, and it's a 2014 case out of the Western District Court of Appeal s.

CHAI R KENNEY: So if we -- l'll just ask the same question I asked Mb. Baker. If we agree with Staff's position about $\$ 1.6$ million that Staff concedes are eligi ble, that are ISRS-el igible
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expenses, they're just above the cap, so you can -you do concede that they are el igi ble for the ISRS recovery?

MS. MAYFI ELD: Yes, based on Staff's revi ew of what $M$ ssouri-American submitted, that is a correct assumption.

CHAI R KENNEY: And if we don' $t$ allow M ssouri-American to book that in a regul atory asset, that's just money they'll never recover?

MB. MAYFI ELD: I mean Mark Oligschl aeger may be better suited to answer that, as he is an accountant. I'mjust not in a position to answer that.

CHAI R KENNEY: And if it's -- if it's booked in a regul atory asset for recover -- because Staff's position is that the ISRS is an ISRS, so we can't establish a second ISRS by allowing recovery of this 1.6. That's ultimatel y what Staff's characterizing it as; right?

MS. MAYFI ELD: Yes, in my openi ng that is the way l've described it. And it's not Staff's characterization. Agai n, it's our reading of the Western Di strict opi ni on.

CHAI R KENNEY: But if we' re just al lowing it for recovery in future rates, it's
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not -- not going to be del i neated on a customer bill as an ISRS item it's just ISRS-eligi ble costs bei ng rolled into base rates in the next case.

MS. MAYFI ELD: I understand what you're saying. I bel ieve that to be a correct statement.

CHAI R KENNEY: But you're saying the Laclede Gas case, the Western Di strict case, prohi bits that?

MS. MAYFI ELD: I'm not saying that it di rectly prohi bits exactly the situation that you have just articul ated. What l'msaying is that in the reading of the Western District Court of Appeal s case, it found that there aren't multiple I SRSs occurring at the same time. And so that anything that you were to put into an ISRS, i ncl uding reconciliation amount, goes into that si ngl e I SRS.

CHAI R KENNEY: Okay. Thank you.
MS. MAYFI ELD: You're wel come.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Commi ssi oner Hall.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Good morning.
MB. MAYFI ELD: Mbrning.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: If I could di rect your attention to Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-3. 650(17), that is a-- I'mgoing to start out
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by asking you the same question l asked Ms. Baker. What do you believe the purpose of this rule is?

MS. MAYFIELD: I mean, as I read it, because -- and I hi ghlighted it, I do believe that it permits this Commission to track those over or under collections.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: And do what with themp

MS. MAYFI ELD: To monitor what those amounts are so that in the next general rate proceeding those over or under collections can be accounted for in however fashi on that would be accounted for.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Okay. So here's my question: Over or under recovery, is that over or under recovery comparing ISRS revenues and authorization or is that al so comparing over and under recovery with the cap?

MS. MAYFI ELD: Our interpretation of the statute is the cap is associated with what this Commission authorized and can authorize. So this Commission can authorize up to $\$ 25,892,662$. That is the amount that this Commission can authorize. Now, what M ssouri-American actually collects, I don't necessarily know if the stat ute speaks to
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that. That's why l referred to the M ssouri -- or to the Ameren fuel adj ustment charge with some variati on there, whi ch was directly i mpacted on usage. Does that answer your question?

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Ki nd of. Let me ask you this: The 10 percent cap, you believe - it's Staff's position that that is a cap on what we can authorize, that is a cap on what can be recovered, or both?

Mb. MAYFI ELD: I bel i eve Staff's position is that it is what this Commission can authorize. And that's what l've reiterated in my opening, as I described it. This Commi ssi on can authorize up to 10 percent of the water cor por ation's base revenue level approved by the Commi ssi on.

But we do have a Staff witness here who is an account ant. And if for some reason authorized versus collected is one of those words that may have particul ar si gni ficance in accounting, l'm sure Mark would be able to answer that question for you as well.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.
MS. MAYFI ELD: You' re very wel come.
J UDGE J ORDAN: I have no questions from

## IN THE MATTER OF MAVC

the ot her commissi oners. Thank you.
MS. MAYFI ELD: Thank you, Judge Jordan.
J UDGE J ORDAN: We' re ready for
Applicants to begin their case in chi ef.
MR. COOPER: We woul d call ME. Jeanne Ti nsl ey.

Your Honor, may we mark ME. Tinsley's direct and rebuttal testimonies as Exhi bits 1 and 2 for identification or do you have a different...

J UDGE J ORDAN: No, that's fine. 1 will be the direct, and number 2 will be the rebuttal.

Ms. Ti nsl ey, please rai se your right hand.

J EANNE TI NSLEY,
after having been first duly sworn, was
examined and testified on her oath as follows:
JUDGE JORDAN: Thank you.
DI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MR. COOPER:

## Q Pl ease state your name.

A Jeanne Tinsley.
Q By whom are you empl oyed and in what capacity?

A I'mempl oyed by American Water Service Company as the rates and regul ation manager for M ssouri-Ameri can and I owa-Ameri can.

Q Have you caused to be prepared for purposes of this proceeding certain direct and rebuttal testimony in question and answer form

A I have.
Q Is it your understanding that that testimony has been narked as Exhi bits 1 and 2 for i dentification?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any changes that you would like to nake to that testimony at this time?

A Yes, I do have one change. The rebuttal testimony, pages 1 through 4, the header should read "rebuttal " instead of "direct."

Q Is that the only change?
A That is.
Q If I were to ask you the questions that are contai ned in Exhi bits 1 and 2 today, woul d your answers be the same?

A They would.
Q Are those answers true and correct to the best of your infornation, know edge, and bel i ef ?

A They are.
MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I would offer
Exhi bits 1 and 2 into evi dence and tender

Mb. Tinsl ey for questions.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Very good. Obj ections to those exhi bits?

MG. MAYFI ELD: None, Your Honor.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Very good. Then those exhi bits are admitted into the record.
(Exhi bits 1 and 2 recei ved.)
J UDGE J ORDAN: The sequence of cross- exam nati on that I have shows cross-exami nation first fromthe Office of Public Counsel.

MS. BAKER: No questions.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Cross-exami nation from
St af f ?
MS. MAYFI ELD: No quest i ons.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Questions from the bench?
Mr. Chai rman.
CHAI R KENNEY: I have no questi ons.
Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Commi ssi oner Hall.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Yes.
EXAM NATI ON BY COMM SSI ONER HALL:

## Q Good morni ng.

A Good morning.
Q If the Commissi on were to take Staff's
and OPC's position inthis-- inthis case and deny recovery through the ISRS of the 1.6 mili ion, would M ssouri - Anerican be abl e to recover those expenses vi a anot her avenue?

A They would not, not until we file another rate case. But the rates set in rate case are proacti ve versus -- so we would lose the revenue.

Q Wbuldn't you be able to get depreciation on that $1.6 \mathbf{m i l l i}$ on going for ward?

A Once we file a rate case.
Q Which -- which is iminent? I mean, you filed notice, so...

A Correct. But it takes 11 months to have rates set.

Q So -- so in the next rate case when the Commission sets the val ue of your -- of rate base, it would take into account that 1.6 miliion?

A lt would.
Q And the Company woul d recei ve depreci ation 10, 15, 20 year, whatever time period on that 1.6 mili on. So you would recover it over 10, 15, 20 years; you just woul dn' t recover it in the expedi ted manner envi si oned by ISRS?

A Just going forward. We woul dn't recover
the depreciation expense fromthe time it went into service until the application of new rates.

Q Is there any back- of-the- envel ope guess as to how much that nould be, how much you nould lose? And if you can't do that, that's fine.

A Yeah, I don't know at this time.
Q All right. It's my understanding that Staff's position is that if the Comission were to adopt Mssouri-Anerican's interpretation of the ISRS stat ute that Mssouri-American woul d recover over the 10 percent cap. Is that your understandi ng as wel I?

A No, I di sagree.
Q Vell, I don't -- I'mnot saying -- I'm not asking whet her you agree or di sagree with that position. But my question is is that your understanding that that's Staff's position?

A Yes, I do agree.
Q Okay. And that St aff believes that the Company noul d over recover by 1.6 miliion?

A That's thei $r$ bel $i$ ef.
Q Okay. Why is that wrong?
A That is wrong because the rates that we are basing our revenue requirement on are cal cul ated fromthe usage that was determined in
our Iast rate case, whi ch was back from 2010 data, and our usage since then has declined. So if we had set rates based on current usage level s, we woul dn' t have an under collection; and, therefore, we' d be able to recover that 1.6 million .

Q So, in essence, you believe that because of prior decline in consumption and fure decline in consumption that we can authorize the anount that you request here today and you will hit the \$25.9 million cap?

A Correct, because we have not collected that amount.

Q But you' re -- you're anticipating future decline in consumption? I mean, that's part and parcel --

A That has been our trend, yes.
Q So looking at page 6 of your -- of your di rect testimony and the hypothetical, you bel ieve that it would be appropriate for the Commission to authorize 3. 2 million with the belief, underst andi ng, assumption that the actual recei pts would be $\mathbf{3} \mathbf{m i l l i}$ on?

A The Commission would authorize 3 million of recovery of investment. The 210,000 is the reconciliation to allow us to collect what we
haven't al ready collected that was previ ously aut horized.

Q But in your hypothetical what is the aut hori zed anount --

A Three --
Q -- after -- after June 1, 2015?
A 3 million 210.
Q Okay. So -- so you bel i eve that the 10 percent cap does not apply to what is authorized; you believe that the 10 percent cap only applies to actual recei pts?

A What is collected, correct.
Q How much has been actually recovered under the ISRS since its inception?

A That l'm not -- I don't have that --
Q But isn't that -- that's the thing that conf used ne fromthe get-go in this whole case, because it seens to ne, I mean, reading all the testimony, reading all the briefs, that the fundanental question is what is the actual recovery.

A Vell, through the true-up period of two thousand -- from 2012 to September of 2014, we' ve -- we haven't recovered 1.6 million of the aut horized amount.

Q Ri ght. But why can't -- if everybody agrees as to what the cap is, $\$ 25.8 \mathrm{mili}$ on, why this case not as simple as simpliguring out exactly what has been recovered and subtracting that fromthe twenty-five eight and -- and putting that as the additional ISRS?

A Well, like l said, we -- we do know through Septenber of 2014 the difference bet ween what was authorized and what was collected, and that is \$1.6 million. So that is the anount that we believe should -- we should be able to --

Q Okay. So --
A -- invest.
Q So as of Septenber 2014, act ual recovery woul d be what?

A 23, 972, 670.
Q Okay. And -- and you don' $t$ have current -- I mean, it obvi ously changes every nont $h$.

A Correct.
Q But you don't have the current amount? That's -- that's the nost current number you have?

A That's the most current. That's the I ast reconciliation we ve complet ed.

Q If the -- if the Comm ssion were to
adopt Mssouri-American's stat utory interpretation of the ISRS stat ute and -- but Staff turned out to be correct that that resulted in an over recovery, meani ng over 10 percent recovery, do you think that the -- the Comissi on would be able to put a tracker on those dollars and account for that over recovery in the next rate case?

A Yes, as a regulatory liability.
Q Okay. A couple of remedial questions, if you'll -- if you'll bear with me.

A Sure.
Q The -- the $\$ 25.8 \mathrm{mili}$ on cap, that's not an annual cap, that is a three- year cap; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q Okay. And the ISRS surcharge put in pl ace when -- when the ISRS was initially establ $i$ shed, was that desi gned to recover the expenses for qualifying expenditures over one year?

A It was about a six-month period.
Q So it was desi gned to recover that anount over six months?

A Yes.
Q And is that -- is that mandated by the -- by the statute or the rule that -- a
si $x$ - month time period for recovery?
A We're allowed to file an ISRS twi ce in any one-year period.

Q Right. So you -- do you bel ieve that on the basis of that, the rates are to be desi gned -the surcharge is to be desi gned to recover that expense over six months?

A Not over six months.
Q Over a year?
A Over a year.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Okay. All right. I have no further questions. Thank you.

JUDGE JORDAN: I have no questions from the ot her commi ssi oners. So does that -- does this questi oni ng generate any recross from OPC?

MS. BAKER: No.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Any recross from St aff?
ME. MAYFI ELD: No, Your Honor.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Any redi rect by
M ssouri - Arer i can?
MR. COOPER: A little bit, Your Honor.
REDI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MR. COOPER:
Q In response to some early -- well, let me ask this. Comi ssi oner Hall was asking you about whet her the Company woul d sort of I ose
recovery of the $\mathbf{1 . 6} \mathbf{~ m i l i o n i f ~ S t a f f ' s ~ p o s i t i o n ~}$ were deened to be the appropriate one. Do you renember that?

A Yes.
Q And part of that di scussi on you started tal ki ng about depreciation expense and some ot her things associ ated with this pl an. Let me ask you this: Is the el igi ble ISRS pl an that we' re tal king about in this case, is it in service today?

A ltis.
Q And do you start to book depreciation associ ated with that -- when do you start to book depreci ation associ ated with that plan?

A The month after it goes into service.
Q Okay. So as to that pl an, you are currently booking depreci ation expense; correct?

A Ve are.
Q And in your next rate case, presumably depreci ation expense for that plant will be taken into account; correct?

A Correct.
Q But I thi nk you were going this di rection: Those rates will be set to pick up past periods or for prospective peri ods?

A Prospective periods.

Q So the depreciation expense that you' ve al ready experienced is gone; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q And that's -- when you tal $k$ about you'll not get recovery, is the recovery of those -there's al so property taxes, there' s some other things associ ated with that plan; correct?

A Correct.
Q And that non't be provi ded for -- unl ess you have sone sort of deferral, that non't be provi ded for in your future rates?

A That's correct.
Q Just to kind of clear something up, and I thi nk you nay have in one of your later answers. But at first I heard you say that an ISRS was desi gned to recover noneys over a si $x$ - nonth period, and that threw ne a little bit. Did you later -what period -- when you do the rate design, are you contemplating a six-nonth period or a year period?

A An annual. An annual period.
Q Okay. And if you know -- I thi nk there was al so a question about the cap. Is there a reference to annual -- annual periods in stat ute in regard to the cap or do you know?

A Not for an annual period, no.
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MR. COOPER: Well, let me -- may I approach the witness, Your Honor?

J UDGE J ORDAN: To cl arify, no one need ask my permission to approach the witness, any witness.

MR. COOPER: What I've handed the witness is the stat ute/rule provi si ons referenced in my opening statement that I provided earlier.
BY MR. COOPER:
Q On the first page there's Section 393. 1003(1). Do you see that?

A I do.
Q And in that stat ute, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, ei ght lines down, on the very end of that ei ghth line, do you see that it tal ks about on an annualized basis?

A Yes.
MR. COOPER: Okay. Thank you. That's
all I have, Your Honor.
J UDGE J ORDAN: You may st and down.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: I have one more question. I'msory.

J UDGE J ORDAN: It's not too late for Commi ssi oner Hall.

FURTHER EXAM NATI ON BY COMM SSI ONER HALL:

Q So on an annualized basis in the stat ute, what does that mean, or how do you interpret that?

A I guess l'm not following your question.
Q Uéll, if it's -- if it's a three-year cap, I mean -- and this is actually the provision that causes me some -- sone conf usi on. If the cap is three years but the limitation is 10 percent on an annualized basis, what does on an annualized basi $s$ mean?

A I believe it's not 10 percent on an annualized basis; it's 10 percent when you get to the final three years. So in the first year we're only -- we're not issuing the full amount. It's only, you know, maybe 8 million. So it -- it continues. We don't reach the cap until maybe three years out.

MR. COOPER: Your Honor and Commissioner, woul dit be possible to take maybe a five- minute break so that l can talk to Staff for a moment? I'd like to thi nk that maybe this wouldn't be as confusing if l could have just a minute to tal $k$ to Staff and OPC on the matter.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Any probl em wi th that?
COMM SSI ONER HALL: None.
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J UDGE J ORDAN: Fi ve minutes. We will be in recess.
( Off the record.)
J UDGE J ORDAN: And we are back on the record. Commissioner Hall was questioning the witness.

MR. COOPER: If it would -- if it would be possible, the di scussion that was had anongst Staff, OPC, and the Company concerned the questions about the cap and whether it's an annual cap. And to the extent it makes any difference to the Commission, the parties, l believe -- and they certainly can jump in and correct me if l'm wrong -- it's the belief of all three parties that the cap is really an annual cap. When we talk about $\$ 25$ million, that's an annual amount.

So, for example -- the extreme example that was provided in our di scussion is is that if a company were able to ramp up its installation of ISRS-el igi ble plant such that it drove an ISRS rate in year one equal to its cap, $\$ 25$ million for example, it potentially could recover that 25 million in year one, year two, year three, whi ch would ultimately be a total of 75 million in my example. It coul dn't add any more ISRS- el i gi ble

## IN THE MATTER OF MAVC

pl ant after the first year, but -- but it's our bel i ef -- and l'Il turn it over to Staff and OPC fromthere -- that that is an annual cap number that we' re comparing to.

J UDGE J ORDAN: St aff? OPC?
MS. MAYFI ELD: Staff agrees with
Mr. Cooper's description of the cap.
MG. BAKER: Publ ic Counsel al so.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: No more questions, Commi ssi oner Hall?

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Well, act ually, let me get clarification. I don't knowif l should di rect this to you, Mr. Cooper, or to Mb. Tinsley.

So I thi nk what you said is that the 25 million is an annual cap. So it would -- it's concei vable that M ssouri-Ameri can could recover $\$ 25$ milli on a year for three years, $\$ 75$ million?

MR. COOPER: If we assume they were able to put in enough pl ant to drive that.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: And so woul d that $\$ 75$ milli on in pl ant -- could -- in January of each of the three years, could they put $\$ 25$ million in new pl ant and equi pment in?

MR. COOPER: No.

## IN THE MATTER OF MAVC

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Okay.
MR. COOPER: Once -- once they had -and that's my assumption, l 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 l think, you know, once they reach that number in year one, they certai nty coul dn't add any more in years two and three .

COMM SSI ONER HALL: They coul dn't add any more plant and equi pment?

MR. COOPER: Ri ght. Now, we woul d differ with Staff as to what to do if actual recoveries were greater or lesser than the 25 million. But -- but that's ki nd of where we lead in this case, l guess.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Okay. Let me ask the stupid question here, because this sounds -- this is to be a different perspective than howl 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 rost -- no, l'Il use the language of the statute. An ISRS on an annualized basis
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must produce ISRS revenues not in excess of \$25 million.

Now, when we say that's annual ized, that means you can get $\$ 25$ million in a year. You can produce not in excess of $\$ 25 \mathrm{milli}$ on a year. You generate that much revenue. 5915.

You produce that much revenue. What about the three-year life of the ISRS, can the -can M ssouri-Ameri can collect more than \$25 million?

MR. COOPER: Over the three-year Iife?
J UDGE J ORDAN: Yes.
MR. COOPER: Yes, we bel i eve so.
J UDGE J ORDAN: So $\$ 25 \mathrm{milli}$ on is
act ually $\$ 25$ milli on each year of the life of the ISRS, not all years of the life of the ISRS; is that correct?

MR. COOPER: Say that agai $n$. I'msor r , Your Honor.

J UDGE J ORDAN: $\$ 25 \mathrm{milli}$ on is what we produce by ISRS. That's the ISRS revenue we generate. We gener ate that in year one, then agai $n$ in year two, and then agai $n$ in year $t$ hree of the I SRS; is that correct?

MR. COOPER: I n our hypot hetical, whi ch
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assumes that we -- rate design has hit it spot on and we' ve actually collected what we thought we were going to collect and all those assumptions. But, yes.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Okay. Then does Staff agree?

> MS. MAYFI ELD: Yes, Your Honor.

J UDGE J ORDAN: And does OPC agree?
MG. BAKER: Yes, l bel i eve so.
J UDGE J ORDAN: I will ask Commi ssi oner Hall's question in another formthen. For the -for the current year that we're in, what's the best descriptor of that, of this period that we're tal king about? l'Il ask that of the witness. EXAM NATI ON BY J UDGE J ORDAN:

Q How do you describe this period that we' re tal king about collecting the ISRS that's -surcharge that's at issue here?

A The surcharge, the 1.9 we're requesting?
Q Yes. I understand that your ISRS runs out in Sept enber; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. How do we describe the period ending in Sept enber?

A In September if --

Q Do we call that a fiscal year? Do we call that an ISRS period?

A Yeah, an ISRS reconciliation period. Our first ISRS went into effect in September, on Septenber 25th, 2012. So every Septenber we do a reconciliation.

Q So September ends this reconciliation peri od?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. So my question is -- and l'II di rect it to you al so -- in the year ending, the fiscal -- say this again. In the ISRS period endi ng Sept ember of 2015, M ssouri-Aneri can --Mssouri-Anerican's ISRS surcharge must generate no more than -- no more than a 25 -- the $\$ 25$ miliion anount?

A That's correct.
Q Okay. Not less than a million dollars, but it must generate no more than that?

A Correct.
Q Okay. Do you have a handle on how much ISRS -- ISRS revenue the surcharge has generated so far in this period endi ng Septenber 2015?

A I do not have the exact revenue anounts.
I do know that our usage has -- is still lower than
what was authorized in our last case.
Q Okay. Do you have an anount of revenue generated for any period?

A Just for the periods that we' ve al ready reconciled.

Q Okay. And that woul d mean up to
Sept ember of 2014?
A Correct.
Q Endi ng Septenber of 2014. And what is that anount, please?

A 23, 972, 670.
Q Okay. That number's familiar to me. I know l' ve seen it in your testimony.

Now l'Il al so ask Commissioner Hall's question againinthis simplified and simpleminded way. If the issue is how mach revenue ISRSs generate, don't we take that number -- that cap I'II say, and subtract the number that you just gave for me? Is that what you' re telling the Commi ssi on to do?

A The 25 minus the 23 ?
Q Um hum
A Yes, l beli eve so.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Okay. Thank you.
Commissi oner Hall, di d you have any more
questions?
COMM SSI ONER HALL: Yeah, I do.
FURTHER EXAM NATI ON BY COMM SSI ONER HALL:
Q So what was -- what is the total amount of ISRS-eligi ble expenditures that the Company has had since the inception of the ISRS in this case?

A That is the 23 million 972 . That's how much we' ve --

Q Total over three years?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Well, then I am still conf used as to how we -- if we have a $\mathbf{\$ 2 5}$ million cap a year, how we have a total of $\$ \mathbf{2 3} \mathbf{~ m i l i o n}$ in expenditures over three. So, I mean...

A Well, if you look at the chart on page 7 of my direct testimony, the -- if you look at the last col um, it says the amount associated with new ISRS plant, that's the revenue that we were aut horized that was based on new ISRS invest ment. So in Septenber it was only 3.7 million, in June it was 5.8, because we have never invested enough in one year to get to the 25 million . That would al most be impossible. So the first year our ISRS was in place, it was about 9 million only. So in that first year we were onl $y$ authorized to collect
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9 million.
Q Where does that $9 \mathbf{m i l i}$ on appear?
A I'mjust adding the first two numbers, the first two ISRS in our first 12-month period.

Q So you -- that's a result of two -- two different orders; right?

A Correct.
Q The first one authorized roughly 4 million?

A Correct.
Q And that was for $\mathbf{\$ 4} \mathbf{~ m i l l i o n ~ w o r t h ~ o f ~}$ pl ant and equi prent up and running, used and usef ul ?

A The 3.7, yes. There was al so a $\$ 253,000$ adj ustment for under recovery incl uded in the amount. But the amount associated with plant was only 3.7 million.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Okay. Al I right. Thank you.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Mr. Chai rman, do you have any further questions?

CHAI R KENNEY: I'm conf used agai n, because it looks like -- I don't have a question. Maybe just a comment.

EXAM NATI ON BY CHAI RMAN KENNEY:
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Q You guys are saying $\mathbf{\$ 2 5} \mathbf{m i l l i}$ on cap annually. But readi ng this chart it seens like you're saying it's $\mathbf{2 5}$ milion over a three-year period. And that's -- so l'm conf used.

A Vell, the way to explain it is we have the $\$ 25$ million cap.

Q Total ?
A Total.
Q Over the entirelife of the ISRS?
A Any year.
Q In any gi ven year?
A In any given year 25 million. So in the first year we only were authorized 9 million, say --

Q Okay.
A -- so we were clearly way under the cap.
Q And that's for the VO- 2012-0401 and VD- 2013- 0466?

A Correct.
Q And you add those two together, so $\$ 9$ million. You were well under $\mathbf{2 5}$ million?

A Well under 25 million. So that means we can continue to invest and ask for recovery.

Q Okay.
A The second two we requested another 2.9
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and 4.1. We were still clearly under the \$25 million cap.

## Q And then now?

A Now we're getting in this next -- in this current filing, we're asking for 1.9, which includes 1.6 million of under recovery fromall those prior ISRSs that we di $\mathrm{dn}^{\prime} \mathrm{t}$ collect.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Okay. If I may return to my si mpl eminded questions. Why are we tal king about a one-year period and a three-year period? First you started tal king about one-year periods with the $\$ 25$ million cap. Now you're adding previous periods -- the previ ous three years and looking at a $\$ 25$ million cap.

THE WTNESS: Yeah, we have three years to get to the $\$ 25 \mathrm{milli}$ on cap. We're never goi ng to get to 25 million in the first year. So the cap is in total of all ISRSs between the two rate case -- between rate cases.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: So that woul d --
that's a three-year cap.
CHAI R KENNEY: So it's a three-year cap, not an annual.

J UDGE J ORDAN: It's both. And --
THE WTNESS: Well, it's looked at
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annual -- it's looked at at each ISRS filing to make sure we're not over the cap. But...

J UDGE J ORDAN: It's both. You're saying that over the life of three years you cannot collect more than 25 million, but you could collect that in one year?

THE WTNESS: We coul d.
J UDGE J ORDAN: And then there woul d be no more?

THE WTNESS: And then we' d have to stop, right.

CHAI RMAN KENNEY: Mr. Cooper sai d you could collect 75 million theoretically. He said that -- he said there was a hypothetical situation under whi ch you could theoretically collect \$75 million.

THE WTNESS: Correct. And if we did reach that 25 million in the first year, which is very hi ghly unlikely, then we could still continue to collect that 25 million each year. Those rates would stay in effect until we file our next rate case.

CHAI R KENNEY: Thi s seens mathematically contradictory. It's either 25 million over the life of the ISRS fromrate case to rate case, but
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then you're al so saying it concei vably could be \$25 million annually for a grand total of 75 million under Mr. Cooper's hypothetical.

THE WTNESS: That's a --
CHAI RMAN KENNEY: I'm conf used.
THE WTNESS: Yeah, that hypothetical would never really happen. We'd have to collect all of it in the first year and then wait three years to file a rate case.

CHAI RMAN KENNEY: Collect all...
THE WTNESS: To be able to collect 75 million. We'd have -- we'd have to have 25 million filing in our first year and then collect -- and then that would stay in rates. So that means 25 million each year until we file a rate case.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Counsel or, di d you have somet hi ng?

MR. COOPER: Well, yeah, and I think Staff counsel does as well. I'mnot sure where we're kind of getting off track, but l think it's this: I think that there is investment in the plant to start with; and when we start tal king about what's going to be in the ISRS rate, we're really tal king about the costs associ ated with that i nvestment. So, for example, on page 7 of

## IN THE MATTER OF MAVC

Ms. Ti nsl ey's testimony there, we were looking at that chart, and in the far-right col umm she's got the 3. 736, 587 in the -- as the amount associated with new ISRS plant for that 0401 case. That -that's the costs associated with the plant i nvest ment. So there's more -- more investment than that, right, that drives those costs.

Those costs -- that investment will exi st in year two, in year three, and in year four, and that 3.736 is the annual cost associ ated with that investment. So that 3.7 continues in year two -- to be recovered in year two, in year three, and so on. That investment doesn't go away. The cost associ ated doesn't go away.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: So the sur char ge cont i nues?

MR. COOPER: So the surcharge -- yeah, it's a part of the surcharge that's bei ng --

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Even though -- even though the surcharge in that year brought in the amount equal to the investment --

MR. COOPER: Correct.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: -- the surchar ge cont i nues?

MR. COOPER: Because it's desi gned on a
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yearly basis. So it's desi gned to recover the 3.7 each year until ultimately we go back to -- to zero in the next rate.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Even though the -your out of pocket was \$3.7 million, you're going to get $\$ 3.7$ million that first year, that second year, and that third year?

MR. COOPER: Because it -- that 3.7 consists of the depreciation expense that has to be recorded on an annual amount, the property taxes that have to be paid every year, the ret urn on the i nvestment for every year. So that -- those -those itens are goi ng to be incurred or paid or whatever every year until you get to a rate case and that plant is rolled into the rate base on a goi $n g-f$ or ward basi s.

So -- so when we look at this, this chart, I mean, we start with 3.7. Then there's additional plant investment that drives the 5.8. That's new investment different --

CHAI R KENNEY: That's incremental . That's not -- that's a whole -- that's an incremental amount.

MR. COOPER: It is. Correct, Chai rman.
And I'Il turn it over to Staff, because

## IN THE MATTER OF MAUC

I think they wanted to jump in on that.
CHAI R KENNEY: That's an i ncrement al annual ized amount for different i nvestment than is reflected in the 3.7 million?

MR. COOPER: Yes.
MS. MAYFI ELD: Correct.
CHAI R KENNEY: Okay. Fai r enough.
MG. MAYFI ELD: I don't want --
CHAI R KENNEY: I'mstarting to get it now.

MS. MAYFI ELD: Yeah, I don't know if Staff has much more to answer than what Mr. Cooper cl arified, except I thi nk he hit the issue that Commi ssi oner Hall and that Judge J ordan and yourself, Chai rman, were driving at, what is the I SRS comprised of. And he expl ai ned that it's depreci ation, property tax, as well as the return on the i nvest ment. So I thi nk understanding what comprises the I SRS hel ps to expl ai $n$ how that annual ized anount is figured up.

CHAI R KENNEY: So if you -- okay. So to go back to your hypothetical. If you had $\$ 25$ milli on of new invest ment in year one --

MR. COOPER: Yeah, I probabl y --
CHAI R KENNEY: -- you woul d collect that
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25 million annually, but you woul dn't have any additional incremental plant that you could add on to that? So --

MR. COOPER: Correct.
CHAI R KENNEY: -- in this 9 -- 2512 --
no 2012- 0472.
01 had you set the I SRS amount at 25 million that year, the rest of these cases never would have happened, and this would have been an annual collection of 25 milli on, 729.

Arriving at your grand total of 75 million.

MR. COOPER: Ri ght.
CHAI R KENNEY: I got it.
MR. COOPER: And there woul d have been a reconciliation on a yearly --

CHAI R KENNEY: Okay.
MR. COOPER: -- basis. But, yeah.
CHAI R KENNEY: But you -- so the cap prevents the addition of any new plant, if you were to get to the 25 million in that first year?

MR. COOPER: Correct.
CHAI R KENNEY: All right. I think I
understand. I think I got it now.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: And so --
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CHAI R KENNEY: Thank you.
THE WTNESS: I do have the tot al i nvest ment amount.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: So for $\$ 25$ milli on of investment in that first year, you're going to recover $\$ 75 \mathrm{milli}$ on over the three years?

MR. COOPER: Yeah. And --
COMM SSI ONER HALL: And that woul d incl ude $\$ 25$ million of out of costs -- or out-of-pocket expenditure to build, to buy the pl ant and equi prent, and then 50 milli on for depreciation and property taxes?

CHAI R KENNEY: No, the whol e i nvest ment is 75 million, but you' ve annualized it over twenty -- over three years.

MR. COOPER: And investment is probably a little --

CHAI R KENNEY: Mbre than.
MR. COOPER: -- not really what we want to call that. Because the 25 milion is really the revenue requirement or the costs associated with the plant investment. The plant invest ment woul d have to be much greater than 25 million to drive 25 million in ISRS costs.

But, yes, in that example, if it were
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possible to invest all that in the first year, get to the cap in the first year such that your ISRS costs could be recovered with the 25 million, and that's going to happen year after year after year because those costs are annual costs. And over the life of it -- that's why we say in that example if you hit it perfect and you di dn't have any reconciliation, you could potentially recover 75 million in ISRS revenue at the end of the third year. Of course, in reality, they're not that ni ce and neat, because you come in in partial years and. . .

CHAI R KENNEY: 25 milli on doesn't
reflect the sumtotal of the investment. It's an annualized recovery of that investment. So it's necessarily greater than 25 million.

MR. COOPER: Absol ut el y.
CHAI R KENNEY: Yes.
MR. COOPER: Yes.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: And so the --
what ever -- what ever vol umetric rate was put into-- put into effect in your hypot hetical, that would - that brought in $\$ 25$ million in the - in the first year, is -- would that - that rate would conti nue, absent any action by the Commi ssi on the
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next two years or --
MR. COOPER: Yes.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: -- or --
MR. COOPER: Yes. Yes. You woul d come in annually for your reconciliation; but provided you were hitting it spot on, I assume that that rate would just conti nue. You woul dn't -- on the same tariff sheet.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Any further questions from the bench?

Mr. Chai rman.
CHAI R KENNEY: Maybe. So just -- sorry. Just going through each of these, so the 3. 7 million, the ISRS charge is reset in the 0406 to collect an increment al additional 5.8 million; and then agai $n$ in the 0055, it's reset again to collect an incremental 2.9 million, all the way down; right?

THE W TNESS: Correct.
CHAI R KENNEY: Okay.
MR. COOPER: Yes, it would be. $W e^{\prime}$ ve got some reconciliation amounts in there that would affect it as well. But, generally, yes.

CHAI R KENNEY: So the 1.9 milli on
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reflects 1.6 million in prior periods under recovery. Why wasn't that 1.6 reflected in the adj ust ments to the prior ISRSs?

MR. COOPER: Yeah, and I woul dn't categorize or characterize it in that fashion. 1.9 are costs associ ated with new --

CHAI R KENNEY: With new investment.
MR. COOPER: -- el igible ISRS projects.
The 1.6 was -- fromthe Company's perspective was a reconciliation amount that's al ready built into the exi sting -- the existing rate.

CHAI R KENNEY: So this is not a
characterization of whether you should be allowed under recovery -- to collect the under recovery then, it's a characterization of -- you're saying the 1.9 reflects new investment?

MR. COOPER: It does, yes.
CHAI R KENNEY: St aff is saying though that that 1.9-- that 1.6 million of it is under recovered fromprior periods; is that right? Okay.

MR. COOPER: I -- l'Il let Staff -- l'd be happy to answer for Staff.

J UDGE J ORDAN: And l'Il remind ever yone to use the microphone. Make sure it's turned on.

CHAI R KENNEY: So the 1.9 million is new
i nvest ment?
MR. OLI GSCHLAEGER: Yes.
CHAI R KENNEY: Al I right.
J UDGE JORDAN: Okay. Alittle bit of that came from people who are not under oath. Some of it is argument from Counsel, and there was one nod in agreement, and I think a verbalization from Staff's witness; is that correct? And I'masking Counsel.

MS. MAYFIELD: Yes, Your Honor, that's correct. And I'mcertain Mr. Oi igschl aeger would be able to answer under oath the same question that Chai rman Kenney just proposed.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Thank you.
And for the --
CHAI R KENNEY: You' II have to remenber to ask him

J UDGE J ORDAN: And for the witness, if the Commission or anyone el se were to ask you what's been asked of Counsel, would you agree with hi $s$ answers?

THE WTNESS: I do.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Thank you.
Any further questions fromthe bench?
Mr. Chai rman.

CHAI R KENNEY: No, thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Commi ssi oner Hal I.
COMM SSI ONER HALL: None. Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Thank you. You may stand down.

THE WTNESS: Thank you.
(W'tness excused.)
J UDGE J ORDAN: Does that concl ude
M ssouri-American's case in chi ef ?
MR. COOPER: It does, Your Honor.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Thank you.
Then let's continue with the case in chi ef of Staff.

MS. MAYFI ELD: Your Honor, I woul d call Mark Oigschl aeger. And, Your Honor, I believe that Staff's exhi bits have been marked Exhi bits 3 and 4. Is that a correct understanding?

COURT REPORTER: Yes.
MS. MAYFI ELD: Yes. Okay. Fromthe court reporter I do understand that Staff's exhi bits, his di rect has been marked Exhi bit Number 3 and rebuttal of Mr . Oigschl aeger has been marked as Exhi bit Number 4.

COURT REPORTER: Yes.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Thank you.

Pl ease rai se your ri ght hand.
MARK OLI GSCHLAEGER,
after having been first duly sworn, was
examined and testified on his oath as follows:
DI RECT EXAM NATI ON BY MG. MAYFI ELD:
Q Could you please state your name.
A Mark L. Oifigschl aeger.
Q And, Mark, where are you currently empl oyed and in what capacity?

A I amempl oyed by the M ssouri Public Service Commission as manager of the auditing unit.

Q Did you cause to be prepared inthis matter di rect and rebuttal testimony?

A I did.
Q Andis it your understanding that that di rect and rebuttal testimony has been marked as Exhi bits 3 and 4?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any changes to either the di rect or rebuttal testimony?

A I do not.
Q If I were to ask you the same questions as contai ned in your di rect and rebuttal testimony, yould your answers be the same?

A They would.

## Q Are those answers true and accurate to

 the best of your know edge?A Yes.
MB. MAYFI ELD: Your Honor, I woul d move for the admission of Exhi bits 3 and 4 into the record.

J UDGE J ORDAN: I'm not seei ng any obj ections. Those exhi bits are recei ved into the record.
(Exhi bits 3 and 4 recei ved.)
J UDGE J ORDAN: Anything el se for this witness bef ore l ask for cross?

MS. MAYFI ELD: No, Your Honor.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Okay. Cross- examination
fromthe Office of Public Counsel ?
ME. BAKER: No questions. Thank you.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Cross-examinat ion from
M ssouri - Ameri can?
MR. COOPER: No questions.
JUDGE J ORDAN: Questions fromthe bench?
Mr. Chai rman.
CHAI R KENNEY: No, l'Il let Mr. Hall go first.

J UDGE J ORDAN: Commi ssi oner Hal I.
EXAM NATI ON BY COMM SSI ONER HALL:

Q Good morning.
A Good morning.
Q So you were obvi ously in the hearing room during the di scussi on about whet her the 10 percent cap applies to an annual amount recei ved or the anount recei ved over a three- year time period?

A I was.
Q Could you explainto me your -- your understanding of the 10 percent cap?

A As I understand the 10 percent cap, it is intended to be a limit on the amount of annual revenues a qualifying utility is authorized to recover through an ISRS rate. And as an annual amount, obvi ously the amount of revenues a company can collect over the entire life of an ISRS, which can go beyond one year, can be greater than the amount of the annual cap.

Q Andis it -- is it your understanding that when the Comi ssi on approves of a surcharge anount in year one that that surcharge anount continues forward until the next rate case, absent sone -- some change in the tariff ordered by the Commi ssi on?

A If l understand your question, yes, the surcharge established in the first year of an ISRS
will continue on. It may be added to under certain conditions. But, yes, the amøunt, 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 equi pnent, depreciation on that plant and equi prent, a rate of return established $\mathbf{i n}$ the prior rate case on that pl ant and equi prent, and property taxes paid?

A I might qui bble with the termout of pocket. What it would recover is its normal revenue requi rement associ ated 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 depreci ation?
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 Iife, they would collect $1 / 20$ th of the depreciation
on that asset each year through the ISRS rate, and that treat ment would continue as part of the general rate case.

Q Okay. This is begi nni ng to come together. So do you know what the total expenditure was for the ISRS-el igibleplant and equi prent during the term of this ISRS?

A I do not. That number can be provided, I bel ieve, but I do not have that at my fingertips.

Q Okay. Do you know what the current surcharge is, the ISRS surchar ge?

A The rate itself, no. I know what amounts of money it is desi gned to collect on an annual ized basis.

Q So on an annualized basis it is currently desi gned to recover what amount? That's the $\$ 23 \mathrm{milli}$ on number; right?

A No. As Staff would state it, it's the $\$ 25.6 \mathrm{milli}$ on amount.

Q Oh, that's - that's the authorized ISRS revenue. Okay.

A Correct.
Q So let me ask you this: If --if the if consumption decline continues consi stent - I et ne rephrase. If the consumption decline going
forward was consi stent with the consumption decline hi storically, that we continue to see the same type of decline that we have the last two years, if we see that same decline in the next year --

A Yes.
Q -- and the Commission were to adopt the Company's interpretation of the stat ute that we should not include the reconciliation anounts in determining the cap--

A Yes.
Q -- what -- do you believe that the annual revenues fromthe ISRS nould exceed the stat utory cap?

A Okay. Let's make sure I understand the assumptions. If the pattern cited by the Company of declining usage since the last rate case continues past this point and is applicable to the new -- whatever the new ISRS recovery is, would they recover the amount authorized fromthis case, all other things being equal of their --

Q Vell, not the anount authorized by the case -- yeah -- well, would they -- would they recover beyond the $\$ 25.8 \mathbf{m i l i}$ on cap --

A If the --
Q -- if we adopted their interpretation of

## the stat ute?

A If their -- okay. Thei $r$ inter pretation of the stat ute, which is you should onl y incl ude the initial revenue-authorized amount based on initial assumptions as to customer usage. Okay. Let me thi nk 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.


#### Abstract

Q So if we take the position that the cap applies to revenues excl usi vel $y$ and not to authorization, then we could -- we could authorize over the cap and arrive at the anount equal to or bel ow 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 themin close to or bel ow the revenue target when al i is said and done, I don't know whether legally you could do that; but, I mean, that's an approach.

Q Vell, let's -- let's say we did that. Could we put a tracker on it such that it nould
capt ure any over recovery and -- and establish a -a regul atory liability in the next rate case?

A Again, I don't mean to get into the legalities of it. I'mnot aware certainly that the stat ute or the rule contempl ates such a thing. My assumption as a Iayman would be the Commission would have general powers to do that in that case.

Q And, actually, to clarify, I wasn't really asking for a legal anal ysis. I was really asking more mechani cally nould that -- would that uork in order to assure that the anounts recei ved was -- were bel ow the cap? And I thi nk you said yes?

A I believe so, yes.
Q Okay. Can you -- I read your -- your di rect and rebuttal testinony, and you made the argument that the Commission Rule 240-2.650(17) does not allow or requi re a regul at ory asset be established shoul d the -- should the Comi ssion adopt Staff's position inthis case?

A Yes, that is correct.
Q Can you expl ain why that is?
A Sure. That particular section, by my reading, applies to cases where the Commission has authorized a certain amount of ISRS revenues and
the Company had either over or under collected, and it describes what happens to those under and over collections if a general rate case is filed before a full reconciliation can be done. I think that's separate and distinct froma situation where the Commission has determined an overall cap exists and the Company is not authorized in the first place to incl ude certain ISRS-rel ated costs in its ISRS rate because of the cap.

Q So it goes to the -- to the issue that I raised with your counsel about over/under recovery. That is rel ated to what is authorized; that's not necessarily what is rel ated to the cap?

A That certai $\mathrm{nl} y$ would be my readi ng of that.

COMM SSI ONER HALL: Al I right. I have no further questions. Thank you.

J UDGE J ORDAN: And di d that question generate any recross from OPC?

Mb. BAKER: No. No, Your Honor.
J UDGE J ORDAN: From M ssouri - Amer i can?
MR. COOPER: No, Your Honor.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Any redi rect from-- from Staff? Sorry.

ME. MAYFI ELD: No, Your Honor .

J UDGE J ORDAN: Then you may stand down.
(Witness excused.)
J UDGE J ORDAN: Does that concl ude Staff's case in chi ef

MS. MAYFI ELD: Yes, Your Honor.
J UDGE J ORDAN: Very good.
I mentioned earlier the briefing in this case. Briefs are due on the 12th of this month, according to our schedule. So we will need an expedited transcript. We will need this transcript prepared on an expedited basis.

Is there anything el se before we go off the record? Not hearing anything. Then we will adj ourn the evi dentiary hearing, and we will go off the record.

Thank you, everyone.
( Heari ing adj our ned.)
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| unreasonably | volumetric | 36:7,12 | 66:17 68:11,24 69:18 70:7 |  |
| 19:9 | 71:21 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { w i n }} 34: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:18 70:7 } \\ & 73: 481: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ |
| $11: 23 \quad 12: 15$ | W |  | year 13:15,16 | $0169: 7$ |
| 20:7 | wait 65:8 | 57:14 63:15,25 | 14:1,7 17:18 | 0401 66:4 |
| upper 27:24 | waive 4:24 | 64:7,10,17 | 20:15,17 21:25 | 0406 72:15 |
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| 1 | 87:4 | 25,892,662 6:19 | 43:1 11:4 21:14 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:8 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 | 25.944 :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 2015 1:6 45:6 | $30: 13,15,18$ $34 \cdot 5$ | 5 |  |
| 45:24 46:10 | 2015 1:6 45:6 | 34:5 25th 58.5 | 5.8 60:21 67: |  |
| 49:1 63:6 73:1 | 58:13,23 | 25th 58:5 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{\|l\|} \mathbf{5 . 8} 60: 21 \\ 72: 16 \end{array}\right.$ |  |
| $73: 2,9,19$ 196 | $\mathbf{2 1 0} 45: 7$ $\mathbf{2 1 0 , 0 0 0} 44: 24$ | 3 | 50 70:11 |  |
| $1.96: 237: 13$ 57.1963 .5 | $\mathbf{2 1 0 , 0 0 0} 44: 24$ $\mathbf{2 3} 59: 21$ 60:7,13 | 3 1:6 44:22,23 | 51 86:7 |  |
| 57:19 63:5 $72 \cdot 25$ 73.5,16 | 23 59:21 60:7,13 80:17 |  | $57 \text { 86:8 }$ |  |
| $72: 25$ 73:5,16 $73: 19,25$ | $80: 17$ $\mathbf{2 3 , 9 7 2 , 6 7 0}$ | 45:7 75:16,22 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \mathbf{5 7} 86: 8 \\ \mathbf{5 7 3 . 6 3 5 . 7 1 6 6} \end{array}$ |  |
| 73:19,25 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 68:4 72:15 | 644:17 |  |
| 29:8,18 30:14 | 36:25 | $3.736 \text { 66:10 }$ | 60 86:8 |  |
| 31:21 32:12 | 243.650(17) | 3.736,587 66:3 | 61 86:9 |  |
| $33: 25$ 38:6,14 $42: 21,2343: 11$ | 21:21 $2553: 16,21,22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{3 . 7 3 6 , 5 8 7} 66: 3 \\ & \mathbf{3 1 2} 2: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 650 2:11 |  |
| 42:21,23 43:11 $45: 9,1047: 4$ | $2553: 16,21,22$ $54: 15,18,23$ | $31286: 5,6$ | 651012 :8 |  |
| 45:9,10 47:4 $52 \cdot 8,11,12$ | $54: 15,18,23$ $55: 6,14,21,23$ | 393.1003 30:20 | 65102 2:12 |  |
| 52:8,11,12 $78: 4,9,10$ | $55: 6,14,21,23$ $56: 2,4,5,10,14$ | 393.1003(1) 8:15 | 65102-0456 2:4 |  |
| $78: 4,9,10$ $82: 19$ | 56:2,4,5,15,14 $568: 15$ | 26:15 51:11 | 7 |  |
| 11 42:14 | 58:15 59:21 | 393.1006(2) | $7 \text { 60:15 65:25 }$ |  |
| 12 8:21 29:16 | 60:12,22 62:1 | 31:18 | $729 \text { 69:10 }$ |  |
| 12-month 9:5,25 | 62:3,6,12,21 | 393.1006(5)(2) | $75 \text { 53:24 54:18 }$ |  |
| 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 |  | 70:6,14 71:8 |  |
| 15 42:21,23 56:6 | 65:2,12,14 $68 \cdot 23$ 69.1.7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 393.1006.5(2) } \\ & 9: 22 \end{aligned}$ | 76 86:11,12 |  |
| $175: 13$ 193323.20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:23 69:1,7 } \\ & 69: 10,2170: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 393.1006.6(1) | 77 86:13 87:5,6 |  |
| 1933 23:20 | 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 | 81534.20 |  |
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