BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION STATE OF MISSOURI

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Evidentiary Hearing

March 22, 2016

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 16

In The Matter Of Missouri-American)
Water Company's Request For)
Authority To Implement A General) File No.
Rate Increase For Water And Sewer) WR-2015-0301
Service Provided In Missouri)
Service Areas.)

KENNARD L. JONES, Presiding SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE DANIEL Y. HALL, Chairman, STEPHEN M. STOLL, WILLIAM P. KENNEY, SCOTT T. RUPP, MAIDA J. COLEMAN, COMMISSIONERS

REPORTED BY: Tracy Taylor, CCR No. 939 TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

1	APPEARANCES
2	WILLIAM B. ENGLAND III. A
3	WILLIAM R. ENGLAND, III, Attorney at Law DEAN COOPER, Attorney at Law
4	PAUL A. BOUDREAU, Attorney at Law Brydon, Swearengen & England, PC
5	PO Box 456 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0456
6	573.635.7166 FOR: Missouri-American Water Company
7	LARRY W. DORITY, Attorney at Law
8	Fischer & Dority, PC 101 Madison, Suite 400 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
9	573.636.6758 FOR: Public Water Supply District No. 1
10	of Andrew County Public Water Supply District No. 2
11	of Andrew county
12	EDWARD F. DOWNEY, Attorney at Law Bryan Cave
13	221 Bolivar Street, Suite 101 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
14	573. 556. 6622 FOR: Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers
15	
16	ALEXANDER ANTAL, Associate General Counsel 301 West High Street
17	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 573.522.3304
18	FOR: Missouri Division of Energy
19	LELAND B. CURTIS, Attorney at Law Curtis, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe
20	130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200 St. Louis, Missouri 63105
21	314.725.8788 FOR: City of Warrensburg
22	MARC ELLINGER, Attorney at Law
23	STEPHANIE BELL, Attorney at Law Blitz, Bardgett, Deutsch
24	308 East High Street, Suite 301 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
25	573.634.2500 FOR: City of Joplin

```
1
     JEFFREY R. LAWYER, Attorney at Law
            Tieman, Spencer & Hicks, LLC
 2
            702 Felix Street
            St. Joseph, Missouri 64501
            816. 279. 3000
 3
            City of St. Joseph
      FOR:
 4
     GARY DRAG, Attorney at Law
 5
            Law Office of Gary Drag
            3917-A McDonald Avenue
 6
            St. Louis, Missouri 63116-3816
            314. 496. 3777
 7
      FOR:
            City of Brunswick, Missouri
8
     JOE BEDNAR, Attorney at Law
     KEITH WENZEL, Attorney at Law
 9
            Spencer Fane
            304 East High Street
10
            Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
            573. 634. 8115
11
      FOR:
            City of Riverside
     JOSHUA K.T. HARDEN, Attorney at Law
12
            Dentons
13
            4520 Main Street, Suite 1100
            Kansas City, Missouri 64111
14
            816. 460. 2545
      FOR:
             Kansas City Power & Light Company
15
     MARC D. POSTON, Deputy Public Counsel
     TIMOTHY OPITZ, Senior Counsel
16
            PO Box 2230
17
            Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
            573. 751. 5558
18
      FOR:
            Office of the Public Counsel
19
     KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel
     JAMIE MYERS, Assistant Staff Counsel
20
            200 Madi son Street, Sui te 800
            PO Box 360
            Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360
21
            573. 751. 4140
            Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission
      FOR:
22
23
24
25
```

1 (MAWC Exhibit 47 was marked for 2 identification.) 3 (Riverside Exhibits 1, 2 and 3 were 4 marked for identification.) 5 (MIEC Exhibit 5 was marked for 6 i denti fi cati on.) 7 JUDGE JONES: We are on the record with 8 Case Number WR-2015-0301, Missouri American's request 9 for a rate increase. The first issue -- well. I 10 should say, as I said on the record, there was an 11 agreement filed by the Office of the Public Counsel to 12 which Staff objected. We will have that discussion 13 after we hear testimony and -- on the issue of 14 regulatory policy. So let's go ahead and start with 15 our first witness. 16 CHAIRMAN HALL: Actually, Judge --17 JUDGE JONES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. So this -- or I 19 quess yesterday Staff filed as a highly confidential 20 document its calculation on the ROE, and I appreciate 21 Staff doing that. In that same order to which Staff 22 responded, there was an invitation to the other 23 parties to file a -- may file documents, information relevant to their respective positions on ROE. 24 25 curious first, the Company, whether -- whether the

1 Company intends to take us up on our invitation. 2 MR. COOPER: Our first reaction is -- is 3 probably not to file anything else, Commissioner. 4 recognize that that is Staff's -- Staff's explanation 5 of Staff's position. It's different than ours, but --6 but I don't know that anything is served by -- by 7 filing anything at this point. 8 CHAIRMAN HALL: Let me put it this way: 9 I think it would give at least myself -- and I can't 10 speak for any other Commissioner, but it would give me 11 some more comfort in terms of evaluating the 12 stipulation. So I think that's the value. 13 MR. COOPER: We will take that into 14 account and likely take you up on your -- on the 15 offer. 16 CHAIRMAN HALL: Any other party? I mean 17 we'd be curious with -- to see any other party's 18 calculation as well. 19 MR. POSTON: Judge, we did not intend to 20 file -- I'm sorry, Judge. Chairman, we did not intend 21 to file anything, but we don't have any reason to 22 disagree with what Staff filed. 23 CHAIRMAN HALL: You don't have any reason 24 to disagree. I don't know what that means. You don't 25 disagree with their calculation or your -- your

1	position is consistent with that calculation?
2	MR. POSTON: I think our position is
3	consistent with Staff's position.
4	CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Well, we
5	would extend that that offer to that invitation
6	to any other party wishing to wishing to do so.
7	Thank you.
8	MR. COOPER: Commissioner, one other
9	thing. I think the Company was asked yesterday if it
10	could provide a an equivalent number from the last
11	rate case to the 10.35 total return pre-tax total
12	return number that's in the stip that we talked about
13	yesterday.
14	CHAIRMAN HALL: Concerning the ISRS.
15	MR. COOPER: Concerning the ISRS. And
16	that equivalent number from the last case would have
17	been 11.33 percent.
18	CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.
19	JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
20	CHAIRMAN HALL: Commissioner Rupp, that
21	was you that asked that?
22	COMMISSIONER RUPP: Yes. Thank you.
23	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Let's go ahead and
24	start with our first witness.
25	MR. THOMPSON: Are we going to have an

opportunity for mini openings on this topic, Judge? 1 2 JUDGE JONES: On regulatory policy? 3 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir. 4 JUDGE JONES: Sure. You have an 5 opportunity. Do you want to make opening statements 6 on that? 7 MR. THOMPSON: I would. JUDGE JONES: Let's start with Missouri 8 9 Ameri can. 10 MR. COOPER: Good morning. As you are 11 all familiar, Missouri American's operations extend 12 throughout the state of Missouri. I think it's --13 it's somewhat helpful as a part of this -- this 14 proceeding to provide some background in terms of the 15 statistics surrounding their service. 16 The Company provides service to more than 17 460,000 water customers and more than 12,000 18 wastewater customers. And that's done through 19 approximately 25 public water systems and 56 public 20 wastewater systems that extend themselves into 21 24 counties in Missouri, over 150 communities in 22 Missouri. 23 Those water facilities consist of 24 approximately 11 water treatment plants, 29 well 25 sites, 119 water storage tanks and over 6,700 miles of

water main. On the wastewater side, there are approximately 46 mechanical wastewater treatment plants, 10 wastewater lagoons and 76 miles of wastewater collection system piping. Missouri American has not been before this -- this Commission for a general rate case since 2012.

2012. Since that time, it's taken several steps
that -- that are to the benefit of the state of
Missouri and its customers. First, it's brought
efficiency to its systems. Missouri American's

O and M expenses have decreased as compared to the amounts recognized in the last general rate case.

We've provided statistics on that in the testimony, but at a high level, the total 0 and M expenses in the test year ending December 31, 2014 were about 7.1 million dollars less than they were in the last general rate case test year. The savings in these 0 and M costs off-sets some of the revenue requirement associated with the capital improvements that have been made since that time. And while I -- in actual dollars, it's 7.1 million. If you CPI adjust those dollars, it's probably the equivalent of around 12 million dollars of savings that have been brought by the Company to its operations.

Since that last general rate case,

Missouri American has added six water systems and another six wastewater systems. Most of these are small and some of them are immediate -- were immediately troubled systems. For example, the Tri-State's Utility Inc. system, which came to the company from a federal bankruptcy court; and more recently the Hickory Hills Water and Sewer System, which came to the company after a long pending Commission receivership.

Finally, since the last rate case,
Missouri American has made substantial investment in
the state of Missouri. As of January 31st, 2016, the
company had invested nearly 500 million dollars in
capital improvements. These -- these investments
improved systems, dependability and provided jobs in
the state.

Having said that, challenges exist for the company. First, water and wastewater systems are extremely capital intensive. Compared with other utilities, water and wastewater utilities are the most capital intensive utilities. Studies show the water industry is three times more capital intensive than the gas industry and two times more capital intensive than the electric industry.

The company is also faced with declining

use. Today, with little customer growth, static or declining per customer consumption and revenue, driven largely by conservation efforts, nationwide efficiency standards, the landscape is driving the need for adjustments to the traditional regulation that was developed in a growth environment. People still buy new appliances and fixtures, but due to federal mandates, those new appliances now use less energy and water than those that they replace.

The Company is further challenged by the difference between its fixed costs and its variable rates. Most of the water utility's costs are fixed, recovering investments in pipes, treatment plants and other equipment, while most water revenue is variable collected through volumetric rates on a per gallon basis.

The Company's testimony in this case indicates that 91 percent of Missouri American's costs are fixed, while only 23 percent of its revenues come from fixed charges. Thus, year in and year out, MAWC is relying on its variable or its volumetric revenues for collecting over two-thirds of its fixed costs.

Lastly, as most of are you familiar with, the recent ISRS decision of the Court of Appeals will have an impact for the Company. If this decision

stands, it will certainly change the investment that MAWC is able to make in St. Louis County. only look to the discussions and circumstances surrounding the old St. Louis County Water Company prior to the enactment of ISRS to get an idea of how things may change. It was estimated by this Commission in 2001 that the replacement of the St. Louis County

2001 that the replacement of the St. Louis County aging infrastructure would cost billions, with a B, of dollars. Since the last general rate case, MAWC has invested an additional 221 million dollars in this infrastructure replacement through its ISRS investments; however, the great majority of this investment remains to be made.

In its Rebuttal Testimony, MAWC provided its earned ROE over the last ten years. In looking at those -- those percentages, you'll see that the only year the Company earned a return on equity that was greater than 90 perc-- 9 percent was 2012, which was one of the hottest, driest summers on record. Many of the other earned returns during that time period were much lower, as low as 2.95 percent, 4.76 percent. And keep in mind this was with -- with ISRS in place at that -- during that entire time period.

While historic test year relying on

volumetric sales has been -- has been suggested by some of the parties might have been appropriate when the growth and usage and customers counterbalance the growth and investment, this situation no longer exists. Today we see increasing investment requirements alongside falling customer revenues.

The best way to ensure that appropriate levels of capital investment are consistently and appropriately funded is through predictable and timely recovery of investments, meaningful recognition of revenue trends and return on the capital devoted to serving customers' needs.

As we move forward into the future, there will need to be a willingness to think beyond what has been described as the traditional rate-making techniques if Missouri American is going to continue to provide safe and adequate service at just and reasonable rates.

Now, this morning when we do turn to testimony of witnesses, Missouri American will present three witnesses for -- for questions. The first will be Ms. Cheryl Norton, who is the president of Missouri American Water Company. The second will be Mr. John Watkins, who is the director of rates and regulatory support for the American Water Works Service Company.

And the third will be Mr. Edward Haye who is vice president, chief regulatory counsel of American Water Works Service Company. Thank you.

JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Cooper. And for the Staff of the Commission.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. Good morning. May it please the Commission. As we go to hearing on this case, we are taking up primarily the second half of a rate race. As you well know, there are two halves. The first half is always determining what revenue does the Company need on a going-forward basis. And in this case, the parties have reached an agreement and have submitted to you a Stipulation and Agreement covering the revenue requirement half.

The second half of the rate case is the rate design; how do we collect the money that the Company needs on a going-forward basis? How do we collect it from the customers? And that has to do with such things as the responsibility of each customer class for a percentage of the costs of service, the way the rates are designed, how much of it is going to be this fixed customer charge, how much of it will be collected through the volumetric rates. You heard Mr. Cooper talking about that.

The parties have tried hard, but have not

Regulatory policy, that is the heart and

 been able to reach an agreement on the rate design part of this case. And so here we are in the hearing room.

soul of what you do. The statutes authorize you to make rates and the statutes give some guidance on how that has to be done and the statutes define what the end point must be. The end point must be rates that

are just and reasonable.

And we know that just and reasonable rates are rates that reimburse the Company for the cost of the service it provides and allows the Company a reasonable opportunity to earn a fair return on its investment that's not any more than necessary from the point of view of the customer to pay for the service that the customer receives, that's fair in the sense that each customer is bearing the cost of the service that he or she receives.

So that's the end point. But the statute doesn't tell you how to get to the end point and that's where regulatory policy comes into play.

The Supreme Court has said that as long as the result is just and reasonable, then the courts shouldn't inquire into how you got there. So the processes, the various adjustments and the weighing

1 | 2 | 3 |

and the balancing that you do to get to that end result of just and reasonable rates, you have a lot of discretion, a lot of discretion in doing that.

So what Staff would like to say with respect to regulatory policy today is this: How do people afford water and sewer service? I mean think about it. The water service that's provided by Missouri American, that's the only utility product that you actually consume; you take into your body. It has to be safe enough for you to drink it, to cook with it, to bathe in it.

And we've seen from the recent news about what's going on in Flint, Michigan, we can see what happens when the water that's provided is not safe.

We can see how that can quickly become a crisis of national dimension. So this is a very important thing.

And how do people afford that? The way people afford that is by acting together as a community. Together as a community. I don't have a well in my backyard. I get water from the city treatment plant that's owned by Missouri American. And I trust Missouri American to treat that water to make it safe for me to drink and to bathe in and cook with and they haven't let me down. That water has

1 been safe a

been safe and I've enjoyed it.

Unlike an electric company, which has a huge service area, Missouri American, as Mr. Cooper told you, consists of lots of little service areas. Some are big like St. Louis County, some are middling size like Jefferson City or St. Charles, St. Joseph, Joplin. Others are quite small.

And they're not all interconnected the way an electric service area is. Right? Each of these service areas has its own water sources, its own water treatment, its own sewage collection, its own sewage treatment. That's a lot of capital to provide all that.

So what happens when a small district needs a new water plant or a new sewer plant? What happens if you have, say, 150 people in a service area and they need a new water plant or a new sewer plant? How do you -- how do they afford it? The answer has to be district consolidation. And that's what Staff has been championing in this case.

Now, we're not going for total consolidation. We're not talking single-tariff pricing. We're not saying push everybody together in one district. But we are very much in favor of

1 consolidating the small districts into units so that 2 costs can be shared so that improvements can be 3 affordable. 4 Finally, you also have to think about 5 supporting this company in its -- in its acquisition 6 of troubled systems. That's something that Missouri 7 American has been doing as an ongoing project. 8 Mr. Cooper alluded to that as well. They will not do 9 that if they do not get the rate treatment necessary 10 to make it affordable. I mean this is a private 11 business. They've got shareholders, they have to be 12 responsible for the financials. 13 It is in the public interest for Missouri 14 American to continue to acquire troubled systems and 15 provide them with professional competent management. 16 I ask you to bear that in mind as you make rates 17 today. Thank you. 18 JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. 19 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Judge? 20 JUDGE JONES: Commissioner. 21 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you. 22 Mr. Thompson, excuse me. Excuse me. Several of the 23 witnesses talked about consolidated tariff pricing and 24 Mr. McDermott spent some time on that. 25 My question to you, you said Staff is

1	leaning towards moving towards championing a this
2	new tariff pricing consolidated, but does not does
3	Staff believe that we're leaning going towards a
4	single tariff in the future? Is this a step towards
5	that or
6	MR. THOMPSON: It is a step towards that,
7	I think. How far it will go, I don't know. That's up
8	to the Commission.
9	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Is that a common
10	trend nationally?
11	MR. THOMPSON: I believe that it is.
12	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. Thank you.
13	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
14	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Office of the Public
15	Counsel?
16	MR. POSTON: I have a PowerPoint.
17	May it please the Commission. My name's
18	Marc Poston. I'm here on behalf of the Office of the
19	Public Counsel and the public. On this issue of
20	regulatory policy, Public Counsel urges you to look
21	closely at the policies established by Missouri law,
22	which I'll address in a few minutes, and apply those
23	policies to the remaining issues in this case.
24	We believe the facts of this case will
25	show that Missouri American's proposed customer charge

American Water's the largest water

and district consolidation violate established regulatory policy because they're unreasonable, discriminatory and unduly preferential to the Company at the expense of ratepayers.

company in the country, serving 15 million customers. Here in Missouri, as you heard Mr. Cooper state, the Company has 460,000 water customers served by 25 separate and distinct water systems and another 13,700 wastewater customers in 56 separate and distinct wastewater systems.

This issue of regulatory policy is really an issue of public policy because ultimately the role of the Commission is to apply the public policy written into the Missouri statutes. Here I've quoted from a Supreme Court case that says, The public policy is the principle which declares that no one can be -- can lawfully do that which has a tendency to be injurious to the public welfare.

The public policy established in Missouri by statute states that rates must be just and reasonable. It also states that no water corporation shall provide any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any person or company and they shall provide no undue or unreasonable prejudice or

393, 130,

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

disadvantage to any person or company. That's in

And then when we look at 393.140, another policy established by statute, it's for the Commission to determine after a hearing whether the rates or charges or acts or regulations of any such person or corporation are unjust, unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential.

So if a rate regulation or act violates this policy, the statutes provide the authority for the Commission to fix the problem and set just and reasonable rates in regulations.

When Public Counsel takes positions in cases before the Commission, we do so representing the interests of all customers of a particular company. But there are many issues where what's in the best interest of certain customers is not the same as what's in the best interest of other customers, even customers within the same class.

In those cases and on those issues, it's often difficult to take a position. The Commission also struggles with that same problem when it decides those same issues. In this case, district consolidation is one such issue. Shifting cost responsibility from one part of the state to another

creates differences of opinion on whether socialized rating is good public policy.

′

Fortunately, in this case many of the separate water system customers are independently represented and they're here to tell you what they believe is in their best interest. While we believe our rate-making positions are in the interest of Missouri American customers overall, we defer to those parties being separately represented to tell you what's in their best interest. Joplin and St. Joseph can best tell you why consolidation is not good public policy for their residents and businesses and, likewise, Platte County and Brunswick can tell you why consolidation is good public policy for their residents and businesses.

And you've already heard from the public directly at each local public hearing and the comments filed on EFIS. And I'd like to highlight a few issues and common themes heard at those public hearings as they relate to public policy, because many of these common themes are concerning.

And the most common sentiment shared by customers across all districts is that rates are already too high. They asked the Commission to do what it can to help minimize the rates they're already

1

3

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

1314

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

paying. And another common theme you heard over and over again across the entire state were complaints of poor customer service.

Most of my public hearing experience has been with rate cases involving gas companies and, to a lesser extent, electric companies. And I don't ever recall hearing the same consistent complaints of poor customer service across a company's territory as we've heard from American Water's customers. That's something we ask you to take into consideration as you deliberate on the remaining issues. Ask yourselves if the Company's poor customer service record justifies regulatory policies that shift risk away from the Company through something like high fixed charges and on to customers that have already endured multiple recent rate increases or does such poor performance support a reduced customer charge.

And I'm not going to spend a lot of time on these, but I would like to go through each -- the public hearings and just kind of highlight some of the things you heard as you were at those public hearings. I'll start over on the St. Louis side at UMSL. We hear poor customer service, leaks going unrepaired for long periods, poor service when people call in. We heard opposition to consolidation. We heard people

saying the company's too big, it should be broken up.

And then we heard the fixed incomes -- people on fixed incomes struggle to cover the increases. And we did hear one -- a positive comment was that the water quality is good.

Now, in Ferguson we also heard poor customer service, the response time to leaks is poor, five- to ten-minute hold time when they call in. They also raised the faulty meter issues. One gentleman testifying that the Company didn't offer him the required repayment period for an under-charge. They're required to offer them twice the period of the under-charge to repay it. It wasn't until he told him that he had looked at their tariff before they got serious about giving him what he -- what the law requires.

We also heard the fixed income struggles and this is a common theme we hear. People really do have to forego medicine and meals to pay utility rates when they go up. And we also heard opposition to consolidation.

Arnold, more poor customer service issues, also opposition to consolidation. And we jump over to the other side of the state, Riverside. More poor customer service complaints, slow response time

1	to Leaks. That was the Platte Woods mayor. Poor
2	water quality in Riverside damaging appliances, that's
3	a separate complaint in front of the Commission. We
4	heard testimony for a lower customer charge and there
5	was support for consolidation in Riverside.
6	St. Joseph, oppose consolidation. We
7	heard from the St. Joseph city manager. He made good
8	points about how it masks the true cost-of-service to
9	consol i date.
10	Mexico, again, oppose consolidation.
11	They raised the faulty meter issues. And, again, good
12	water quality in Mexico.
13	Jefferson City, the focus was on sewer.
14	The 65 dollar rate, too high. Customers owning a
15	septic shouldn't pay as much; we heard that.
16	Opposition to the flat sewer rates. We heard
17	opposition to the consolidation. And we also heard
18	complaints about the Company doesn't know who it
19	serves. There's customers that they don't even bill,
20	they don't know that they're serving.
21	The concern in Warrensburg was more about
22	the poverty level in the community and what rates
23	rate increases would do to them.
24	Warsaw, more poor customer service, poor
25	water quality

1 Joplin, oppose consolidation. 2 Branson again, opposition to 3 consolidation. We also heard support for 4 consolidation in Branson and we also heard about 5 faulty meters and poor customer service. 6 I would encourage you to read through the 7 EFIS public comments. There's 205 filed comments in 8 Some of the same themes; poor customer service, 9 poor water quality, safety concerns, and 10 affordability. That's probably the most theme. 11 And you look through and you hear some of 12 the stories that people are telling you about their 13 lives through their comments. Lillian A., an 14 84-year-old woman living on 600 dollars a month. 15 That's 7,200 dollars a year. I cannot imagine trying 16 to pay an increase to your water bill when you have a 17 fixed income like that. 18 There's other public policy 19 considerations we would like you to consider in this 20 I consider this to be a very poorly presented case. 21 and managed case on behalf of the Company. Started 22 out with inconsistent usage data being provided to the 23 different parties. Company ignored the Commission's 24 directive to respond to the Staff's rate design 25 report. Very high-level key witnesses have been

replaced in this case. I think at least four
 witnesses have been replaced.
 The Company failed to disclose the

The Company failed to disclose the thousands of faulty meters until late in the case. And it's my understanding the employee that disclosed that has been terminated. It's not good public policy to reward companies when you can't trust the data that they provide to support their case.

The last public policy consideration I'd ask you to consider is American Water is doing very well. It's a very good investment. They've added S&P -- they've been added to the S&P 500 this month. Record stock price, highest since they went public.

The Company is successfully growing through its nationwide strategy of acquisitions and organic growth. So when they tell you that they're helping Missouri out by acquiring systems in Missouri, they're doing it because it helps their bottom line. So any additional shift in risk to customers is unwarranted.

Even though there's been many concerns that the Company is not performing for its customers, the evidence will show a Company that performs very well financially for its shareholders. We ask that you find the 30.6 million rate increase is sufficient

1	to give the Company all it needs and any additional
2	shift in risk to customers through higher fixed
3	customer charges or district consolidation is not in
4	the public interest. Thank you.
5	JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Poston.
6	And next we'll hear from Missouri
7	Division of Energy.
8	MR. ANTAL: The Division of Energy will
9	waive opening on this issue. Thank you.
10	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Missouri Industrial
11	Energy Consumers?
12	MR. DOWNEY: Judge, we have no witness
13	and no opening on this issue. We're we're
14	restricted to the next issue.
15	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Before I go all the
16	way through the list, is there anyone else who would
17	like to make an opening on this issue. Mr. Bednar?
18	MR. BEDNAR: Yes, Your Honor, for the
19	City of Riverside. May it please the Court may it
20	please the Commission. Good morning, Commissioners.
21	It's a pleasure to be able to be in front of you and
22	talk about this very important issue.
23	And I think Mr. Thompson on behalf of
24	Staff, as well as Mr. Poston, really has isolated the
25	issues that are of utmost importance to this

policy-making body and that's why we're here. We want to reinforce the role of the Commission that -- to set the regulatory policy. And rate design is essential to all of the inequities that have been brought out by both the Office of Public Counsel and Staff.

And what did you hear time and time again? Low fixed-income people have issues, rate case are issues. The amount of rates by each district vary. So when you look at Platte County itself, we are paying -- and you look at Mayor Rose's testimony, the ratepayers in Platte County pay 50 percent higher than St. Louis, 60 percent higher than Jefferson City, 70 percent higher than Mexico and Joplin, over 100 percent higher than St. Joseph and 140 percent higher than Warrensburg.

And our position is there's got to be a band somewhere in the middle and a policy set of when the inequity from district to district for residential usage and even industrial and commercial usage begins to be -- put one resident, one business at a disadvantage over another unfairly.

As Mr. Thompson pointed out, the mission is just and reasonable rates. You have a lot of bandwidth to be able to address this concern in a way that is fair to everybody. We don't have Public

Service Commissions for each district. We have one
Public Service Commission to set a consistent policy.
And that's what we're talking about here is what is
going to be in the best interest of the residential
ratepayer who needs water for their survival, who
needs water to bathe.

Those are all issues that should be simple. And there should be a consistency there no matter where you live and work in Missouri that there should be a minimum to maximum that you pay for your rate.

Now, we are in a weird position -- and I say that not to be unprofessional, but we are -- we are in more agreement with the Company and with Staff on this issue than the Office of Public Counsel. And in spite of what you heard the Office of Public Counsel discuss in regards to the low-income users, the overall residential users that are talking about the rates, fact is their relief that they're asking for is best presented in consolidation.

And so you can do a blend. And we leave it open to the Commission. We believe the three-zone system is fair. We understand the concerns of Joplin and -- and the concerns of St. Joseph. If they want to remain district specific, that's fine. Do

consolidation with the rest of the districts because we will get significant relief in Platte County. And we are not alone. There will be several districts that would get a significant decrease as a result.

And as I pointed out earlier in my opening, this issue of our rates versus the other district rates, we will still be higher than other districts who will get an increase. St. Louis would get somewhat of an increase as would Warrensburg, but their rates are so much lower than ours now and if we talk about socialization and consistency and just and reasonableness, we believe that is justifiable by the record.

In fact, Office of Public Counsel in Mr. Smith's testimony gives you a summary of the arguments for and against single tariff pricing. It's on page 3 of 5, Schedule 16. It's a nice little checklist that gives arguments.

And then to Commissioner Kenney's question about what the other states are doing, of the 25 states that have addressed -- that is -- actually applies to a single tariff consolidated, 14 -- or 22 have -- 22 out of 25 states have adopted single-tariff pricing. The three that have not are California, Maryland and Mississippi. And Maryland and

Mississippi say it wasn't an issue for their states. It is an issue in this state.

And so we believe in Office of Public
Counsel's own testimony and exhibits, there's support
for some type of a consolidated tariff or
single-tariff pricing. Because I think the myth is
that we don't have -- that we have district-specific
pricing now, and we don't. Every rate case since 2000
has included a district being consolidated into
St. Louis for one reason or another in order to lower
rates or the creation in the last rate case of zone
eight.

We have 32 districts. We have eight zones right now under the current tariff. The proposal to go to three makes sense, it's just and reasonable and we believe allows you to fill --fulfill the public policy of reducing volatility among ratepayers and having the rates more consistent and most importantly, affordable.

The -- the residential ratepayer is the only ratepayer that does not get to recover their costs in water. Everybody else, commercial or industrial, can re-- can charge their customers their cost of doing business.

The retired citizen on a fixed income,

the low-income working class, they don't get to come 1 2 here and ask for a raise. They're forced to make it 3 on their own, give up food, give up other medical 4 But when a retiree who uses 600 gallons of 5 water a month has to pay close to 100 dollars for 6 their services, they're begging this Commission to 7 provide relief. And we believe it can be done and can 8 be a significant result for the residential ratepayers 9 that would be very thankful to this Commission for 10 taking the volatility out and returning to an 11 affordable rate case for the residential water user. 12 Thank you very much. 13 JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Bednar. 14 Is there any other party who would like 15

to make an opening statement on this issue of regulatory policy?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CURTIS: Yes, I would. If it would please the Commission, my name is Leland Curtis. represent the City of Warrensburg.

I would like to echo comments made primarily on the regulatory policy made by Mr. Poston and Mr. Bednar, specifically with regard to residential rates. In the class of customers we've got residential, industrial, commercial, sales for resale public and private fire.

1	As Mr. Bednar said, the only ones who
2	have the inability to pass on any costs are the
3	residential customers. The residential customers
4	constitute the single, by far, largest class of
5	customers among the various customer classes. And I
6	would urge the Commission to be sensitive to the
7	plight of many residential customers, those who are on
8	low-income, fixed income, students.
9	You saw the slide that in Warrensburg,
10	25 percent of the population in Warrensburg are below
11	the poverty level. So, you know, while there are
12	customer classes we think of them as classes, think
13	again that the residential are the only ones who are
14	unable to pass on and must absorb the full weight of
15	any rate increase. And so urge the Commissioners to
16	be very sensitive with regard to that. Thank you.
17	JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Curtis.
18	Any other opening statements on
19	regulatory policy? Okay. Let's go ahead and start
20	with our first witness. Missouri American?
21	MR. COOPER: Missouri American would call
22	Ms. Cheryl Norton.
23	JUDGE JONES: Good morning, Ms. Norton.
24	Will you raise your right hand, please.
25	(Witness affirmed.)

1	JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
2	You may proceed, Mr. Cooper.
3	CHERYL NORTON, testified as follows:
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COOPER:
5	Q. Please state your name.
6	A. Cheryl Norton.
7	Q. And by whom are you employed and in what
8	capaci ty?
9	A. Missouri American Water and I'm the
10	presi dent.
11	Q. Have you caused to be prepared for the
12	purposes of this proceeding certain witness
13	qualification testimony in question and answer form?
14	A. I have.
15	Q. And is it your understanding that that
16	testimony has been marked as Exhibit MAWC 46?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Are you also adopting portions of other
19	testimony that has been filed in question and answer
20	form in this case?
21	A. Yes, I am.
22	Q. Does that testimony include what has been
23	marked as Exhibit MAWC 11, which is the Corrected
24	Direct Testimony of Frank Kartmann?
25	A. Yes.

1	Q. Does it also include portions of what has
2	been marked as MAWC 40, the Direct Testimony of Phil
3	Wood?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And would the portions of Mr. Wood's
6	testimony that you're adopting include pages 4,
7	line 13 through page 9, line 14, description of MAWC
8	and its operating facilities and MAWC's staffing
9	l evel s?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Would it also include page 14, line 2 to
12	page 17, line 9, water efficiency?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And would it also include page 22,
15	line 11 to page 25, line 22, data collection and
16	organizational streamlining?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And lastly, in regard to Exhibit MAWC 40,
19	would it also include page 30, line 15 to the end of
20	that testimony, which would be performance measures
21	and water efficiency?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Okay. Are you also adopting a portion of
24	Exhibit MAWC 41, Rebuttal Testimony of Phil Wood?
25	A. Yes.

1	Q. And would that be page 10, line 4 to
2	page 11, line 9, the Local 335 unfilled jobs
3	testimony?
4	A. Yes.
5	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
6	which are contained in Exhibits 46, 11 and the
7	portions of Exhibits MAWC 40 and 41 that have been
8	identified today, would your answers be the same?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And would those answers be true and
11	correct to the best of your information, knowledge and
12	belief?
13	A. Yes.
14	MR. COOPER: At this time, Your Honor, we
15	would offer into evidence Exhibits MAWC 46 and MAWC 11
16	only. There will be other witnesses that provide the
17	remaining support for the other two exhibits that I
18	have mentioned.
19	JUDGE JONES: Is there any objection to
20	Exhibits MAWC 11 and 46? I don't see any.
21	MAWC 11 and MAWC 46 are admitted into the
22	record.
23	(MAWC Exhibits 11 and 46 were received
24	into evidence.)
25	MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor. We

1	would tender Ms. Norton for cross-examination.
2	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Looks Like Missouri
3	
	Department of Energy goes first on cross-examination.
4	MR. ANTAL: No questions, Judge. Thank
5	you.
6	JUDGE JONES: MI EC?
7	MR. DOWNEY: No questions.
8	JUDGE JONES: City of Brunswick?
9	MR. DRAG: No questions, Your Honor.
10	JUDGE JONES: City of Joplin?
11	MS. BELL: No questions.
12	JUDGE JONES: City of Riverside?
13	MR. BEDNAR: Yes, Your Honor.
14	CROSSEXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:
15	Q. Morni ng.
16	A. Morni ng.
17	Q. We originally met at the town hall
18	meeting that Missouri American
19	A. We did, yes.
20	Q. You were present. How long have you been
21	president of the company?
22	A. Just about four and a half months.
23	Q. Well, congratulations
24	A. Thank you.
25	Q on that promotion. Any idea what

1	caused the replacement? Was it just did
2	Mr. Kartmann just retire?
3	A. No. I don't believe he retired, but it
4	was just a management change.
5	Q. Okay. Now, at the you've heard a lot
6	of discussion on our opening statements about rate
7	design. That's important in consolidated pricing
8	of some sort is important to the company, is it not?
9	A. It is.
10	Q. And do you believe that if we went to a
11	more consolidated tariff or even single tariff, that
12	overall there the smaller districts and other
13	districts would have a resulting rate decrease?
14	A. Yes, I do.
15	Q. And can that be done still incorporating
16	reasonable fixed customer charges amongst all the
17	districts?
18	A. Yes, it can.
19	Q. What do you see as the advantages to the
20	Company and to districts like Platte County for single
21	tariff or consolidated tariff?
22	A. I think it allows the appropriate
23	investments to be made in each of those communities
24	and still make water and wastewater service affordable
25	for all customers.

1	Q. And is it not true that the Company plans
2	to install a new water treatment plant in Platte
3	County?
4	A. Yes, we do.
5	Q. And given our current average rate is
6	approximately 66 dollars per resident per month, what
7	might happen if we maintain district-specific pricing
8	for the ratepayers in Platte County?
9	A. They will see another relatively large
10	rate increase to cover the cost of that treatment
11	pl ant.
12	Q. Could it as much as double?
13	A. It's possible. I'm not sure exactly what
14	those numbers are, but it would be significant.
15	Q. Closer to 100 dollars a month then.
16	Correct?
17	A. Yes. Uh-huh.
18	Q. Now, in addition, you were faced with a
19	new challenge that I think you were unaware of that
20	came out at the town hall meeting
21	A. Uh-huh.
22	Q about water quality. And I want to
23	compliment the Company for addressing that
24	A. Uh-huh.
25	Q in a straightforward fashion at that

town hall meeting.

2

A. Uh-huh.

3

5

6

Q. But could you explain to the Commission a little bit about the challenges that the Company's facing that the customers have experienced within Thousand Oaks, Riss Lake and Montebello?

7

8

9

10

11

A. Yes. Yes. We've had a very intermittent issue with water quality, the aesthetic side of water quality. So there are no health issues, no health concerns related to this issue. We soften water in Platte County at that treatment facility that needs to be replaced so badly. And through that softening process, the calcium is -- is allowed to settle out on the surface of pipes to inhibit corrosion so -- and to

12 13

14

15

inhibit thinks like lead leaking into the water

16

system. And so it's a good process to follow.

17 18

intermittently there are certain homes that as the water travels into the homes, that calcium starts to

20

19

settle out in large amounts. Neighbors can have no

However, for some reason, very

21

issue and -- and the person right next to them can

have -- have a pretty significant issue.

2223

I was unaware of how serious the issues were until we had the public hearing and then we had a

24

follow-up town hall meeting where we had a lot of

1	discussions with customers. We've been in touch with
2	customers, we've done a lot of home visits for these
3	customers. We've done some some flushing for these
4	customers. And we are looking at treatment changes
5	right now to try to eliminate it as much as possible.
6	The real issue is that we have not been
7	able to identify what is causing the problem;
8	therefore, we can't make an exact change that we know
9	will solve that issue. We are in the process of
10	installing a carbon dioxide kind of recarbonation
11	system for for Platte County and we're hoping that
12	will help, but we're doing lots of testing actually
13	this week even to try to pinpoint exactly what's
14	causing the issue and why only certain homes are
15	i mpacted.
16	Q. Now, the and the damage to the homes
17	varies from household to household, does it not?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. Some it's limited to faucets, others
20	A. Uh-huh.
21	Q you've had refrigerators, dishwashers,
22	washing machines and water softeners?
23	A. Uh-huh.
24	Q. In addition, the Company has provided to
25	certain customers whole-house filters?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And in that case, those last supposed
3	to last 90 days or so?
4	A. Uh-huh.
5	Q. They're only lasting about 30 in some
6	cases. Correct?
7	A. Uh-huh.
8	Q. And so is it to your knowledge, again,
9	I know you're new
10	A. Uh-huh.
11	Q so it hasn't been under your watch,
12	but it's your understanding, is it not, that the first
13	notice of this occurred in 2008 or 2009?
14	A. That sounds correct, based on the
15	timeline that I've seen.
16	Q. Now, are you aware that these customers
17	that have received whole-house filters have had to
18	sign agreements that limit the ability for them to
19	discuss the fact that the Company provided a
20	whole-house filter?
21	A. I am aware that there was an agreement
22	that they signed when we put those filters in place.
23	Q. And do you understand that some of those
24	ratepayers feel that is a confidentiality agreement
25	and some have characterized it as a gag order?

1	A. I have not heard that from customers.
2	Q. Yeah. Have you seen the agreement
3	yoursel f?
4	A. I have not seen the exact agreement. It
5	was described to me, but I haven't actually seen the
6	agreement.
7	Q. All right. Let me grab it for you. It's
8	marked as an exhibit. I've got copies for everybody
9	else, but it's marked as Exhibit 3. If I could if
10	I could show the witness. If you'd take a look at
11	that.
12	A. Thank you.
13	MR. BEDNAR: If I could distribute this
14	to the Commission. Yes?
15	BY MR. BEDNAR:
16	Q. Does that
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Is that consistent with what you've been
19	descri bed?
20	A. Yes. Uh-huh.
21	Q. But it's my understanding is the Company
22	is taking a proactive approach now to contacting
23	customers and asking them to come forward?
24	A. Absolutely. We're doing we've done a
25	survey, both telephone and e-mail.

1	O Okov And one you otill working on
1	Q. Okay. And are you still working on
2	have you come up with a solution to the problem yet?
3	A. We're still trying to identify exactly
4	what's causing the problem. We believe the
5	recarbonation system will help to solve the issue, but
6	we're also checking phosphate levels and various other
7	parameters.
8	Q. And have you considered compensating
9	folks for the damages to their internal systems at
10	their homes, their appliances and stuff?
11	A. We are looking at the damage claims that
12	are coming in and developing a protocol for assessing
13	each of those damages. There's certain certain
14	things that happen when you have hard water, you know,
15	some faucet replacements and things like that that are
16	normal. So we're trying to balance out what's driven
17	by this issue.
18	Q. Right. But it is your understanding that
19	this is more than for many of the customers who
20	have complained, it is definitely more than just a
21	hard water problem. Correct?
22	A. Yes. Yes.
23	Q. Thank you very much. No further
24	augeti one

JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Bednar.

25

1	MR. BEDNAR: Thank you.
2	JUDGE JONES: Any cross-examination from
3	St. Joseph?
4	MR. LAWYER: One question, Your Honor.
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LAWYER:
6	Q. Good morning.
7	A. Good morning.
8	Q. During the cross-examination by
9	Mr. Bednar, it's been brought up that Platte County is
10	anticipating a new water treatment plant being put in;
11	is that correct?
12	A. That's correct.
13	Q. And I realize this was before your time
14	in your current position, but are you aware of in the
15	last roughly 20 years that St. Joseph had received a
16	water treatment plant?
17	A. I am very aware of that.
18	Q. And other significant improvements for
19	the Joplin district; is that correct?
20	A. Yes. Uh-huh.
21	Q. Does it seem just and reasonable to you
22	that those districts should bear costs for
23	improvements to which they receive no benefit?
24	A. I believe that by by including them in
25	the single tariff or in a tariff group, that they will

1	receive benefits from that. For example, those
2	treatment plants and those upgrades that have been
3	made to those communities have not been fully
4	depreciated or fully paid for. And so by including
5	them into a tariff group, everyone is paying for a
6	portion of those those plants as well. So I think
7	that it's spread out through the entire tariff group.
8	Q. But if we look back, those districts have
9	already borne the cost of improvements for themselves;
10	is that correct?
11	A. A portion of those costs, yes. Uh-huh.
12	Q. I have nothing further. Thank you.
13	A. Thank you.
14	JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
15	City of Warrensburg?
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CURTIS:
17	Q. Good morning, Ms. Norton.
18	A. Morni ng.
19	Q. My name is Lee Curtis. I represent the
20	City of Warrensburg.
21	I believe you heard your counsel,
22	Mr. Cooper, indicate that Missouri American has
23	460,000 water customers?
24	A. Uh-huh.
25	Q. About how many of that 460,000 are

1	residential customers?
2	A. I I don't know the exact number, but
3	it typically runs about 90 percent of the customers
4	will be residential customers.
5	Q. Thank you.
6	A. Uh-huh.
7	JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply
8	Di stri cts?
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DORITY:
10	Q. Good morning, Ms. Norton.
11	A. Good morning.
12	Q. My name is Larry Dority and our firm
13	represents the Public Water Supply Districts in Andrew
14	County, which are sale for resale customers of
15	Missouri American in the St. Joseph district.
16	It's my understanding if I look at your
17	testimony that I believe has been marked as
18	Exhibit 46, that describes what your duties are as
19	president of Missouri American. And among those you
20	list that, I'm responsible for the development,
21	management and operations of Missouri American systems
22	in the state of Missouri and among those
23	responsibilities is directing the preparation of the
24	investment budget.
25	Would that he an accurate reading?

1	A. That's correct, uh-huh.
2	Q. Okay. And you also adopted the corrected
3	testimony of Frank Kartmann and I believe that has
4	been marked as Exhibit 11 and received into the
5	evi dence.
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And that testimony reflects that Missouri
8	American operates 11 water treatment plants. I
9	believe Mr. Cooper mentioned that figure in his
10	opening statement.
11	A. Uh-huh.
12	Q. And that the Platte County water
13	treatment facility will be retired prior to the end of
14	the book life; is that correct?
15	A. That's correct.
16	Q. Okay. So is the replacement of this
17	Platte County water plant one of those major
18	infrastructure investments that is on the Company's
19	planning horizon at this point?
20	A. Yes, it is.
21	Q. Thank you. And are you projecting
22	significant capital expenditures on this new water
23	treatment plant over the next several years?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Can you advise the Commission what the

1	estimated amount of those expenditures might be? And
2	if it needs to be confidential, I guess we can go
3	in-camera.
4	A. Yeah. We're right in the middle of
5	design phase right now and so we don't have the the
6	real numbers as to what that's going to be and I
7	can't I can't recall off the top of my head and I
8	don't have it here what what that anticipated level
9	of spend is.
10	MR. DORITY: Okay. May I approach the
11	wi tness?
12	JUDGE JONES: Yes, you may.
13	BY MR. DORITY:
14	Q. Excuse me just a moment. I want to show
15	your counsel.
16	A. Sure.
17	MR. DORITY: Your Honor, I have a Data
18	Request response that has been provided by the Company
19	and it was designated highly confidential. I would
20	just like to refresh the witness's recollection of the
21	amounts that was provided to our client. And I think
22	the Company would request that we go in-camera to
23	allow me to do that.
24	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Let me figure out
25	how to do that. I can't see without my glasses.

mera sessi	on was hold				
	un was neru	, Volume	16, pages	132	
gh 133.					
	igh 133.	igh 133.	igh 133.	igh 133.	igh 133.

1	JUDGE JONES: StoneBridge? Any cross
2	from StoneBridge? Triumph? I'm assuming the unions
3	are not here since they moved to be excused totally
4	from the hearing, which I grant that motion on the
5	record.
6	Office of Public Counsel.
7	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
8	Q. Morning, Ms. Norton.
9	A. Good morning.
10	Q. What's the relationship between Missouri
11	American and American Water Works?
12	A. Missouri American, their parent company
13	is American Water Works. So we're a subsi
14	subsi di ary.
15	Q. So if an investor wants to buy stock in
16	the Company, they would buy American Water Works
17	stock?
18	A. Correct.
19	Q. American Water Works was included in the
20	S&P 500 this month; is that correct?
21	A. That is correct.
22	Q. Would you agree that the Company's stock
23	was at an all-time record high this month?
24	A. Yes. I believe it was.
25	Q. And would you also agree with me that

1	acquiring water and sewer systems is a growth strategy
2	of American Water Works?
3	A. Yes, that's one reason for growth.
4	Q. Thank you. That's all I have.
5	JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
6	Staff of the Commission?
7	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. I have
8	an exhibit. This is Staff Exhibit 32.
9	(Staff Exhibit 32 was marked for
10	i denti fi cati on.)
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:
12	Q. Good morning, Ms. Norton.
13	A. Good morning.
14	Q. Take a look at what I've designated as
15	Staff Exhibit 32. Do you recognize that?
16	A. Yes, I do.
17	Q. In fact, I gave you a copy earlier this
18	morning, didn't l?
19	A. Yes, you did.
20	Q. Had you seen it before then?
21	A. I had not. It had been described to me,
22	but I had not actually seen the document.
23	Q. Okay. So do you acknowledge that this
24	is, in fact, what it purports to be; a letter written
25	by former president, Frank Kartmann, to the City of

1	Arnold, Missouri?
2	A. Yes, I do.
3	Q. And looking down at paragraph 3 on the
4	front page, do you agree with me that it states,
5	Agreed that absent any extraordinary circumstances,
6	the Arnold sewer bill for a 5,000 gallon monthly
7	residential customer currently at \$24.33 dollars per
8	month based on 73 dollars per quarter will not
9	increase beyond \$33.58 per month during the first four
10	years of Missouri American's ownership.
11	Do you see that sentence?
12	A. I do.
13	Q. Okay. And as far as you know, does that
14	undertaking is that still being honored by Missouri
15	Ameri can?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Okay. And if you know, will that level
18	of rates produce enough revenue to cover the cost of
19	service to Arnold?
20	A. I I can't say for sure over that
21	four-year period whether that level of rates would be
22	enough to cover the cost for for Arnold or not. It
23	depends on the level of capital investment and the
24	amount of 0 and M expense that are related to that.
25	Q. Okay. Would you be surprised to know

1	that Staff considers that it would, in fact, result in
2	about a half million dollar shortfall?
3	A. Not completely surprised, no.
4	Q. Okay. Thank you. And if you know, is
5	Mr. Kartmann still employed by Missouri American?
6	A. He is not.
7	Q. Thank you very much. No further
8	questi ons.
9	MR. THOMPSON: And I move for the
10	admission of Staff Exhibit 32.
11	JUDGE JONES: Any objection to Staff's
12	Exhi bi t 32?
13	Okay. I don't see any. Staff's Exhibit
14	32 is admitted into the record.
15	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.
16	(Staff Exhibit 32 was received into
17	evi dence.)
18	JUDGE JONES: Okay. That's all the
19	cross-examination. I'm not overlooking any party, am
20	1?
21	Okay. We'll go to questions from the
22	Commission. Mr. Chairman?
23	QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:
24	Q. Good morning, Ms. Norton.
25	A. Good morning.

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	

25

- Q. Turning to page 29 of Mr. Kartmann's testimony on lines 14 and 15, he states that, Over the same period, we have been growing our operations to the acquisition of five water and five wastewater systems.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What is that time period, do you know?
 - A. Since the last rate case.
 - Q. Since the last rate case?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. Would you view that as a -- as an aggressive acquisition strategy or not?
- A. I would -- I would not say that it is completely aggressive. A lot of these systems were small, troubled systems that, frankly, we got calls from either DNR in some cases or from the Commission saying these systems are really struggling, would you take a look at them.

We typically will go in and -- and look at a system such as that and determine whether or not it's a good fit for our business. And sometimes we do the acquisition and sometimes we don't. We have been, you know, looking for systems that are willing to sell, but I wouldn't say this was extremely aggressive during that time period.

1	Q. Do you anticipate being more aggressive
2	in the future?
3	A. I anticipate having more people working
4	on this at any given time than what we've had in the
5	past potentially. So having a larger number of staff
6	members that that are building relationships and
7	working towards doing more acquisitions, yes. We
8	definitely would like to do more acquisitions in the
9	future.
10	Q. And why is the country excuse me, why
11	is the Company interested in being more aggressive in
12	its acquisition strategy?
13	A. Because we believe that that growing
14	our business is important to keep the economies of
15	scale growing so that we can serve all of our
16	customers at a higher level and do a better job of
17	serving all of our customers.
18	Q. So I and by economies of scale you
19	mean at a lower cost per customer?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. So it's your it's your view that at
22	least one reason to be aggressive is to lower costs to
23	customers overall?
24	A. On a per customer basis, yes.
25	Q. Okay. Do you have a specific target in

1	mind going forward as to the number of companies that
2	you would like you would like to acquire I'm
3	sorry, the number of systems you'd like to acquire per
4	year or
5	A. The number of systems, no. We would like
6	to add on a customer basis, probably, you know,
7	1 percent or in that that range of customers, 1 to
8	2 percent maybe, both organic and through
9	acqui si ti ons.
10	Q. Over what time period?
11	A. On an annual basis.
12	Q. On an annual basis?
13	A. Uh-huh.
14	Q. Okay. And that's both water and sewer?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Okay. To what extent would that strategy
17	be affected by a movement towards single-tariff
18	pricing or a continuation of the status quo?
19	A. I think that as we as we talk to to
20	systems that are considering selling, having some more
21	assurety around rates and being able to keep rates as
22	stable as possible helps them to make a decision
23	that's appropriate for their community.
24	Some communities are are in situations
25	where they don't have the capital to spend, they don't

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
)	4

have the expertise they need to be able to run their systems, they -- they need money, frankly, for a lot of other things that are going on to -- in their communities. And so there are a lot of reasons why a community may feel that selling is important, but one of the things that they are most concerned about would be the stabilization of rates.

- Q. So to the extent that we move towards consolidation and single --
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- tariff pricing, it becomes easier for Missouri American to acquire more small systems?
- A. I think that it -- that in some ways, yes, it would be easier. But more importantly, it would be easier for those customers to afford to have the kind of investments made in their systems that those systems need. A lot of the smaller systems right now are on the verge of not being able to provide safe, reliable water to their customers because they just can't make the kind of capital improvements that are needed in order to keep the rates reasonable.
- Q. To what extent is -- is an acquisition premium a substitute for single-tariff pricing?
 - A. I don't believe that an acquisition

1 premium is a substitute for single-tariff pricing. 2 0. At all. Is there --3 Α. No. 4 Q. So there's no relationship at all? I 5 mean an acquisition premium, which we don't do 6 frequently in this state, but it has been done to at 7 least some extent, would -- would -- would provide an 8 incentive to a purchasing entity to purchase a small 9 troubled system and -- whereas, if -- if we -- if it 10 was just the rate-base, if we didn't give -- give some 11 premium to the rate-base, there would be a 12 disincentive to the Company to purchase a small, 13 troubled system. 14 So -- so if the issue is how do we 15 incentivize you or other companies interested in 16 purchasing small, troubled systems, it seems to me --17 Α. Uh-huh. 18 Q. -- that one option is single-tariff 19 pri ci ng. Another option is an acquisition premium. 20 Α. My concern is that the Agreed. 21 acquisition premium doesn't necessarily help keep 22 those rates just and reasonable for -- for the people 23 in that community. Because if it's a stand-alone 24 small community, then -- and you don't have 25 single-tariff pricing, then their rates could be

l	
1	negatively impacted by that premium.
2	Q. My understanding is that there were
3	12 local public hearings in this case. And I know
4	that you were at many of them. Were you at all of
5	them?
6	A. I was at 10 of 12.
7	Q. Ten of 12?
8	A. Uh-huh.
9	Q. I appreciate your your presence
10	A. Thank you.
11	Q at the local public hearings.
12	I'd like to ask you a couple of questions
13	about Exhibit 3.
14	MR. BEDNAR: Was that put into evidence?
15	JUDGE JONES: No, it was not.
16	MR. BEDNAR: If I can have a late offer
17	to submit it into evidence, I would, Chair, as a
18	Ri versi de exhi bi t.
19	JUDGE JONES: This agreement? Was it the
20	agreement?
21	CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah.
22	JUDGE JONES: Are there any objections to
23	Exhibit 3 offered by was it Riverside?
24	MR. BEDNAR: Yes, Your Honor.
25	JUDGE JONES: I don't see any objection.

1 With that, Riverside Exhibit 3 is admitted into the 2 record. 3 (Riverside Exhibit 3 was received into 4 evi dence.) 5 BY CHAIRMAN HALL: 6 Q. I don't understand why the company has 7 that third provision in this agreement. I was 8 wondering if you could --9 Α. I'm sorry. Can you share that with me? 10 I don't have the actual copy of that. Thank you. 11 Okay. I'm sorry. What was the question? 12 0. Why, if you know, is that third paragraph 13 in this agreement? 14 I don't know for sure. I'm sure that our 15 attorneys had something to do with that. But my -- my 16 thought is based on what I know and what I have found 17 out since I've been in my role, is that -- that at the 18 point where they started handing out these whole-house 19 filters, we didn't understand at all what was causing 20 the issue and we really didn't think that -- that we 21 were -- that we were the issue at that point based on 22 all the conversations that I've had. 23 And so -- so you don't want -- I guess 24 the reason for confidentiality would be that we 25 wouldn't want to be installing those in every single

home in that community, but I can't -- I can't say for sure.

- Q. Okay. Well, I personally find that provision to be repugnant. But we can move on.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. I also -- I want to ask you a couple of questions about some -- some issues raised by Public Counsel in their -- in their opening.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. I understand that faulty meters were -is an issue that was -- was an important issue in this
 case. My understanding is also that that issue has
 largely been -- if not entirely been -- been resolved
 by the -- the non-unanimous stip.

But I am concerned by -- by the statement that -- that Staff discovered a problem late in the case when a Company employee told Staff of the problem and the employee was terminated the following week. Is that true?

A. On the face, that is the timing of what happened. And the reason that we make personnel changes is, of course, confidential. I have offered to provide Staff with confidential documents that explains the change in personnel in that case. And I can assure you that it had nothing to do with the

1	meter issue or the disclosure of the meter issue.
2	Q. Good. I hoped that was the case. And
3	has Staff taken you up on that offer to
4	MR. THOMPSON: Staff will, but has not
5	yet.
6	CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.
7	BY CHAIRMAN HALL:
8	Q. Concerning your parent company
9	A. Yes.
10	Q American Water, American Water has
11	has regulated and unregulated business; is that
12	correct?
13	A. That's correct.
14	Q. Do you know percentage-wise how that
15	breaks down generally between regulated and
16	unregulated business?
17	A. I think it's 90 regulated 90 percent
18	regulated, 10 percent. But Ed Haye, who will testify
19	later, could probably answer that question in more
20	detail.
21	Q. Okay. Then I'll save the rest of my
22	questions for him. Thank you. I have nothing
23	further.
24	A. Thank you.
25	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Stoll?

1	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER STOLL:
2	Q. Good morning.
3	A. Good morning.
4	Q. How are you, Ms. Norton?
5	A. Good.
6	Q. Just have a couple questions to follow
7	up. First of all, I was curious as to do you know
8	when you acquired the Platte County facility?
9	A. I do not.
10	Q. And is
11	A. It was
12	Q. Mr. Bednar was is Riverside the only
13	community
14	A. No.
15	Q in Platte County that you
16	A. No. Parkville is also included in
17	that that district.
18	Q. Parkville. Okay. Do you happen to know
19	the age of the facility that you're going to replace
20	in Platte County?
21	A. I don't know the exact age. It's very
22	old. I believe it was built in the early 1900's. But
23	I can tell you that it structurally is not completely
24	sound at this point. We've had a structural engineer
25	come in and it's it's so old that structurally it's

3

4

not sound in certain areas.

0.

Α.

Yeah.

Uh-huh.

I won't dwell on this, but having

been a city administrator, I understand that water is

not easy to produce and some people think it should

be --

5

6

7

9

12

14

16

17

20

8

10

11

13

15

and --

18

19

21

22 23

24

25

Q.

-- just take it right out of river. So I guess one of the main purposes of

your testimony regarding the capital expenditures that are needed in the future for that Platte County facility and I'm sure for others is the -- what you described as achieving economies of scale. Is that -is that right? So what you're trying to do, what you're suggesting is that in order to replace these facilities, that is best done through consolidation

In many cases, that is the best way to do We try to look at the whole picture and see if consolidating systems that sit close together makes So a lot of times there will be an acquisition sense. of what we refer to as a tuck-in or a community that sits right next to an existing community. And we use a lot of the same staff to -- to treat the water and to also maintain the distribution system in those cases.

1	Q. Okay. And I think I'll stop with that	
2	questi on.	
3	A. Okay.	
4	Q. Thank you very much.	
5	A. Uh-huh.	
6	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Kenney.	
7	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you, Judge.	
8	Perhaps Mr. Bednar may be able to may	
9	know the answer to your question regarding when	
10	Missouri American started supplying water to	
11	Ri versi de.	
12	MR. BEDNAR: Your Honor, I believe that	
13	was 2005, 2006. Seemed like early 2000s. They	
14	acquired the Missouri City's tariff.	
15	THE WITNESS: Yes.	
16	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Perhaps Mr. Busch	
17	might know.	
18	MR. THOMPSON: Early to mid '90s I'm	
19	tol d.	
20	THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you.	
21	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you very	
22	much.	
23	MR. BEDNAR: I apologize.	
24	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:	
25	Q. Good morning, Ms. Norton.	

1	A. Good morning.
2	Q. How are you today?
3	A. Good.
4	Q. Good. You know, the Chairman and I
5	was it last May, I think? The Chairman and I and some
6	advisors and some Staff members met the president of
7	American Water and your predecessor, Mr. Kartmann.
8	A. Uh-huh.
9	Q. We met in St. Joe. Was that last year?
10	And we took a tour of that facility. That's a
11	beautiful facility.
12	A. It is.
13	Q. And then we we paid our 10 dollars and
14	we were going to have lunch together. And I went out
15	to my car and I made the mistake of bringing in two
16	bottles of my Kirkland water and I got chastised for
17	that.
18	A. That's inappropriate at a water utility.
19	Q. I found that out. But one of the things
20	we got to do is we have you had a chance we
21	toured the St. Joe facility. That's a great facility.
22	Have you had a chance to tour your Parkville facility?
23	A. I have.
24	Q. That's a terrible facility.
25	A. It's it's a scary facility.

1	Q. Leaking water and	
2	A. Uh-huh.	
3	Q. One of the things I I was at that	
4	public hearing and I think the mayor of Riverside was	
5	talking about how it needed to be replaced.	
6	A. Uh-huh.	
7	Q. I mean I think everybody agrees to that.	
8	A. Uh-huh.	
9	Q. So you do you agree?	
10	A. Yes.	
11	Q. Okay. So anyway, I do have a question	
12	just a couple short questions. How many states is	
13	American Water in?	
14	A. American Water as a regulated business is	
15	in 16 states.	
16	Q. 16 states. Your low-income riders, how	
17	many states have a low-income rider that you might	
18	know, or do you know that some of them have it?	
19	A. I would say that there are at least three	
20	to five states	
21	Q. Three to five.	
22	A that have a low-income some type of	
23	a low-income tariff.	
24	Q. How many states have single tariff?	
25	A. I think Ed Haye could answer that better	

s a --

1	than I can, but a significant number of them. I've
2	worked in Illinois and in Kentucky and they both had
3	single-tariff pricing.
4	Q. So Illinois and Kentucky both do have
5	single tariff?
6	A. Yes. Plus other states as well.
7	Q. Okay. And you've found that that's a
8	that balances out these expenses like we've been
9	talking about?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Going to Parkville, you have to replace
12	it, it's going to double their rates. But if you
13	can a single tariff is going to smooth
14	A. Spread that out over a much larger number
15	of customers.
16	Q. And I understand OPC's complaint that,
17	you know, you're picking and choosing the winners,
18	but
19	A. Uh-huh.
20	Q I know American Water stepped in and
21	bought some distressed facilities that with the
22	requirements of DNR and meeting regulations, it's
23	going to be impossible to build the facilities that
24	are needed without extremely extreme rate shock.
25	Would you agree?

1	A. That's correct. Yes.
2	Q. Okay. Thank you.
3	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Rupp?
4	COMMISSIONER RUPP: Thank you.
5	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:
6	Q. Morni ng.
7	A. Morning.
8	Q. In your conversation with Chairman Hall,
9	you said that part of your acquisition strategy is to
10	attain a lower cost per customer target for everyone?
11	A. Yes. We we're always looking for
12	efficiencies to try to keep those costs as low as
13	possi bl e.
14	Q. Okay. So when I look at the letter from
15	the City of Arnold from your predecessor and knowing
16	that you guys are taking a bath of X amount of dollars
17	on that for the for the guaranteed period, how is
18	that consistent with your strategy of a lower cost per
19	customer? Are your shareholders absorbing that
20	unrecouped cost or are you trying to pull it from
21	other areas to make yourself whole?
22	A. At this point, that's part of the rate
23	design kind of conversations that have been going on.
24	And I'm not sure exactly where those dollars will come
25	from But but I think that we have to you know

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

the Arnold acquisition was a large wastewater acquisition for us. And trying to establish a base for us of wastewater service and -- and grow from that base I think will help in the long run. This is a short-term issue, but I think in the long run it's going to be a great benefit to -- to all of our wastewater customers throughout the state.

- Q. So when this agreement was written, did the Company have a projection that they knew they were going to be taking a loss on this guaranteed rate at the time that that letter was signed?
- A. I can't answer that question. I don't have that information because I wasn't here.
- Q. On the third paragraph that the Chairman commented on on the Exhibit Number 3, is a reason for that statement being there that if a community's having problems with their water, they find out that someone gets a free in-home water filtration system, that there would be a -- a repeated request from neighbors all the way down the street, everybody wanting to have one of those?
- A. It's very possible that that was a consideration.
- Q. And what is the cost to the Company of providing that in-home --

1	A. I don't know the cost to that.	
2	Q. The comments from OPC on the individual	
3	who gave Staff the information on the faulty meters,	
4	when when when was that information given to	
5	OPC or to Staff?	
6	A. I would say in the last month or six	
7	weeks.	
8	Q. Okay.	
9	A. I don't know the exact date.	
10	Q. And that individual's no longer with the	
11	organi zati on?	
12	A. That's correct.	
13	Q. Okay. Has that individual filed any type	
14	of whistleblower suit against the Company?	
15	A. Absolutely not.	
16	Q. Okay.	
17	A. And again, I can provide documentation	
18	that shows the Lead-up to that decision.	
19	Q. And why did it take a random or an	
20	in a person in your organization that long to	
21	inform Staff of the faulty meter situation? Why was	
22	that not offered up to Staff and other parties?	
23	A. That's a very good question. So so	
24	when I came to Missouri American in in November of	
25	2015, I evaluated the the data that was being	

1	generated from some meter change-outs that were
2	related to a meter issue. And and we kind of
3	changed course at that time in November and and
4	stopped changing out the volume of meters that we had
5	been before.
6	So there are some very specific issues
7	related to certain serial numbers of those meters,
8	which we'll get a lot more into it during the
9	investigation of this issue. And and those meters
10	are the meters that we should focus on to change out.
11	And there's there's not you know, it's not a
12	huge number. It's it's an issue with the meters
13	speci fi cal I y.
14	Q. And when did you when did you review
15	that data and make the decision to stop changing out
16	the large amount of
17	A. In November. I came on November 11th and
18	I would say within a week I made that change.
19	Q. And when I'm sorry, when was this
20	individual let go?
21	A. In February, I believe.
22	Q. And so
23	A. No. I'm sorry, it was early March.
24	Q. Early March.
25	A. It was early March. Probably March 8th,

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

I'm thinking.

- Q. So you knew the issue of faulty meters in November, yet Staff was not given that information after you filed this until five months later?
- A. Yeah, at -- at that point I guess there wasn't a lot of clarity around what the Staff knew and what the Staff didn't know. And that was my miss by not asking enough questions and -- and clarifying that. I think the team was very caught up in trying to solve the operational issues that they felt they had and -- and missed making that call, frankly.
- Q. If this individual would not have provided information to the Staff on the faulty meters, how would Staff have gotten that information?
- A. I -- I -- I don't know the answer to that. I can assure you that -- that I'm -- I lead from a very transparent perspective and that any kind of issues in the future would be brought up right away. But these issues were identified and dealt with, you know, prior to that -- prior to me being here.
- Q. So let me rephrase that question. Would have Staff been given that information if it did not come from that individual?
 - A. I don't -- I don't know the answer to

1	that because I was unclear about what the Staff knew,
2	what the Staff didn't know.
3	Q. Okay. OPC had several comments about
4	poor customer service.
5	A. Uh-huh.
6	Q. And one of them you touched on was in an
7	area you're having problems with the water softening
8	and the calcium
9	A. Yes.
10	Q in the water.
11	A. Uh-huh.
12	Q. And that goes back to complaints that you
13	said complaints it started in 2008, 2009?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And when when did you start providing
16	the in-home systems and into that area?
17	A. I'm not sure about the timing of that.
18	Again, the situation was very isolated. And based
19	based on the information that I've been given
20	Q. Can you give me a ball park?
21	A to the process
22	Q. Are we talking 2010? Are we talking
23	2015?
24	A. I don't know without pulling up a
25	timeline to look at the details. I would say probably

1	in the last three years, but I can't swear to that.
2	Q. Okay. So then OPC also made other claims
3	of poor customer service
4	A. Uh-huh.
5	Q long wait times on the phone call
6	A. Uh-huh.
7	Q you know, the leaks not being fixed.
8	A. Uh-huh.
9	Q. And you said there was complaints on this
10	in 2008, 2009, but nothing was really done to address
11	it up until
12	A. That
13	Q several years later?
14	A. No. That that's not true. The team
15	had done a lot of things trying to identify what the
16	issue was, what was causing it and tried to help these
17	customers in the best way that they knew. And and
18	I didn't realize what kind of an issue it was until
19	February when they had the public hearing.
20	And so so yes, we have definitely
21	stepped up the things that we're trying to do, but the
22	team I think did did a good job of trying to
23	identify what the issues were.
24	And and literally based on everything
25	that we've been able to pull together and unless

1	that's changed in the last couple of weeks with
2	information, it's it's 2 percent or less of the
3	customers that are really experiencing this severe
4	problem. So they were trying to work with those
5	individual customers.
6	Q. So you said you held a local public or
7	a town hall meeting
8	A. We did.
9	Q about the issue?
10	A. Uh-huh.
11	Q. When was that?
12	A. That was in early March.
13	Q. Of this year?
14	A. Uh-huh.
15	Q. So my, you know, question is if we had
16	complaints on this issue from 2 going back to 2008,
17	2009, and then it's March of 2016
18	A. Uh-huh.
19	Q what is your process for getting a
20	complaint? If it's unresolved, do you guys just
21	forget about it? Do you just let them pile up?
22	Because it seems like this has been an issue your
23	Company has known about for eight years
24	A. Uh-huh.
25	Q but nothing seemed to be really

happening until there was a rate case filed eight years later. So what is your process for following up on all these complaints?

A. The process would be if a complaint comes in and it's a water quality complaint, typically we would send someone out to their house. They would talk to the customer and they would -- they would try to resolve that complaint as best they could. And -- and if they felt like the customer was -- was satisfied or that they had been able to address the question, they would close out that complaint.

In this case I know that there's one customer that -- that I'm very familiar with that -- that we've actually gone into his home repeatedly and -- and our team has continued to follow up with this customer. Still haven't been able to completely fix the problem, not even fix it at all to this point.

But they put in some -- some test loops of different -- different plumbing materials, they've collected samples, they've done flushing, they've done all kinds of things. So even though the complaint has been going on, it's -- my -- my team did not stop going out or addressing it with this customer. They've continued to go and follow up. They just haven't been able to fix the issue.

1	Q. So you're saying that if a complaint is
2	not if you're continually working on this
3	particular set of complaints in this area
4	A. Uh-huh.
5	Q consistently for the past eight years?
6	A. I'm saying that based on the timeline
7	I've seen, that yes, I believe that we've been
8	consistently working on this for the past more I
9	think more so in the past five to six years.
10	Q. The Office of OPC in their opening
11	statement, you know, used some information from local
12	public hearings on poor customer service, long wait
13	times when you call in. Do you track, you know, in
14	your call centers the amount of wait time, what is the
15	average amount of wait time
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Q is it at industry standards, below
18	industry standards, above? Can you give some
19	information on your call center and its customer
20	servi ce?
21	A. Yes. We've made some changes recently in
22	the call center trying to address any concerns that
23	that might be out there. At times when customers call
24	in, there are longer wait times than what we would
25	like, but for the most part, our our wait times are

1	well within the industry standards. And typically we
2	will answer more than 80 percent of the calls or
3	80 percent of the calls in a minute or less. And
4	so so customers, in general, are not having long
5	wait times, but there will be periods when they call
6	in that they may they may have longer wait times
7	than
8	Q. And what do you
9	A 30 to 60 seconds.
10	Q. And can you attribute that to anything?
11	A. You can we can contribute that to a
12	lot of different things. If there's a situation going
13	on within the business that would generate a lot of
14	extra calls, that could that could cause longer
15	longer wait times. Absenteeism at the call center can
16	cause longer wait times, so
17	Q. Do you outsource your call center or is
18	this in-house?
19	A. It's in-house, uh-huh.
20	Q. And have you provided any filings in this
21	about the information on the call centers in the
22	and the response times and information in any Data
23	Requests?
24	A. I don't know the answer to that. I'm
25	sorry.

1	Q. Can your Company provide any of that
2	information
3	A. Absolutely.
4	Q to back it up?
5	A. Absolutely. And we've worked closely
6	with the Staff here on some things some of the
7	changes that were made at the call center were done in
8	conjunction with with conversations with Staff
9	here. The geographical routing, so Missouri calls go
10	to the same customer service reps all the time.
11	Recording 100 percent of the calls so that if we do
12	have a customer complaint, we can go back and listen
13	to that call and see if the customer service rep acted
14	inappropriately; and if they did, we can deal with
15	that all at one time.
16	We have we have high customer
17	satisfaction ratings. So I think that customer
18	complaints at the public hearings, frankly, that's not
19	uncommon. You go to any public hearing you guys
20	know as well as I do, that you're going to have
21	customers that are going to show up because they have
22	a complaint. And so we try to deal with those at
23	those hearings right away.
24	But last year our customer satisfaction
25	percentage based on phone surveys throughout Missouri

1	were was that 92 percent of our customers were
2	received. So I think that overall we're doing a very
3	good job of serving the customers. And I think that
4	there are some one-off issues that, yes, we can
5	certainly do better with and we're doing we have a
6	whole customer strategy program going on right now
7	where we're looking at many different ways to try to
8	serve our customers the very best that we can.
9	Q. And I and I noticed at some of the
10	local public hearings that the complaints tended to
11	resolve around one area.
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Some multiple complaints were coming from
14	the same issue.
15	A. Uh-huh.
16	Q. You just took over a system, billing
17	issues and things of that nature.
18	A. Uh-huh.
19	Q. Have you tracked every person that had a
20	complaint at the local public hearings and have your
21	people been in contact with them and attempted to
22	resolve them?
23	A. Yes.
24	COMMISSIONER RUPP: I think that's all, I
25	have, Judge. Thank you.

1	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Coleman?
2	COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Thank you, Judge.
3	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN:
4	Q. Good morning.
5	A. Good morning.
6	Q. So my fellow Commissioners brought up
7	several issues that I'm particularly interested in,
8	the customer service issues
9	A. Uh-huh.
10	Q the employee that was terminated. So
11	since some of those have been addressed, I'm going to
12	concentrate on some other issues.
13	Let's go back most immediately to the
14	questions by Commissioner Rupp. Relative to the call
15	centers and the issues there
16	A. Uh-huh.
17	Q I am not as concerned or impressed, I
18	think, about the ratings that your company or to that
19	extent
20	A. Uh-huh.
21	Q most any company receives
22	A. Uh-huh.
23	 as far as customer satisfaction.
24	Because the people who have no problems are usually
25	the ones who respond to those types of surveys.

1	A. Uh-huh.
2	Q. Folks who do have complaints and are not
3	getting their issues addressed
4	A. Uh-huh.
5	Q are less likely to have the time to be
6	taking a survey about how great their service is.
7	A. Uh-huh.
8	Q. So my question would be more about
9	response time to the problems that people call about.
10	A. Uh-huh.
11	Q. How have you addressed those issues that
12	we've heard throughout state
13	A. Uh-huh.
14	Q relative to the poor response time to
15	leaks, to other issues, replacement of filters,
16	appliance issues
17	A. Uh-huh.
18	Q more so than the surveys
19	A. Uh-huh.
20	Q for good customers service on the
21	tel ephone?
22	A. Uh-huh. Right. And just to clarify, we
23	also do another survey that looks at just when a
24	service order is generated. So we do try to get that
25	information and so so if you called in and had a

service person come out to your home, we do a separate survey related to that as well.

Q. What is that showing you?

A. 85 percent of the customers were satisfied or very satisfied with that -- with that interaction.

Q. Uh-huh.

A. So -- so that's pretty high for the industry standard. But I think -- I think more to your question, trying to give customers more opportunities to give feedback in a very timely manner is something that we're looking at.

We've -- we've added some surveys at the call center. So when customers call in, if they're not happy with how that interaction went, they can do a survey right then -- it's a two-question survey -- and tell us that they're not satisfied. Again, that gives us time to get right with that customer service rep and deal with that situation.

And -- and we are trying to balance the customer's concerns and issues with what our tariffs say and what the right thing to do is from a business perspective. So when you talk about replacing appliances and things like that, we have to be careful in that approach, but we also want to be fair. And so

we have had several meetings related to the -- the Platte County situation, trying to figure out what the fair way is to deal with that and those meetings continue.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. Consolidation is a big issue.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. I remember at the St. Joseph hearing, it was number one on the -- of concern by many of those that testified --
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- that day. How do you give people a good feeling about consolidation when they feel that the rates that they pay shouldn't be covering such large zones or districts? How do you address that?
- A. I think helping people understand how it actually works can sometimes help to alleviate those concerns. And actually putting numbers behind that to say that if we make an investment and it's spread over, you know, 1,500 customers, this is going to be the impact to the rates. If it's spread out over 150,000 customers, this is the impact to rates and so it's a much smaller impact. And I think helping people to see that and understand that.

And the interesting thing about

consolidating the tariffs is that it depends on which 1 2 point in time you're talking about that. So -- so we 3 talked about that, I believe, based on what I've been 4 told, when the St. Joe plant was being built. And --5 and at that point St. Joe was supportive of that. 6 I understand that because it made sense for them to be 7 able to spread those costs out. It would have been 8 less of an impact for them. 9

And so -- so it's hard that -- that as the -- that point in time changes -- and right now I believe that the -- the increase that we're looking at is less than 2 percent across the state. So it's a good time to consolidate because there's going to be less impact negatively on customers and -- and going forward, it can just minimize that overall impact.

- Q. Of course you understand that when a family is a family of one or maybe a family of two opposed to --
 - A. Uh-huh.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. -- parents and two or three kids, they're really not feeling like this is equal.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. So consolidation really kind of is -- is hard to comprehend by those customers, I would think.
 - A. Yeah, I guess I'm not understanding how

1	the family size would
2	Q. Well
3	A make a difference.
4	Q people feel that from the testimony
5	that I heard, if I'm not using X number of gallons,
6	why should I be charged the same as other people? Why
7	am I covering the cost of possibly larger families
8	than I? I don't think they understand or really hear
9	that
10	A. Uh-huh.
11	Q explanation about why consolidation
12	makes sense.
13	A. Right. And it and it really doesn't
14	have a lot to do with family size.
15	Q. I know, but that's the
16	A. That's how
17	Q impression of people.
18	A. And, again, it goes back to being ed
19	able to educate people and help them try to understand
20	the basic concepts of how that works.
21	Q. Well, speaking of education, down in Cape
22	Girardeau at the Hillcrest hearing, there were a lot
23	of people who threw around the phrase that their water
24	rates were increasing and their sewer rates
25	800 percent. How do you offset that impression?

1	A. I'm sorry. Where was that at?
2	Q. That was in Hillcrest.
3	MR. COOPER: Judge, I believe or
4	Commissioner, I believe Hillcrest is not part of the
5	Missouri
6	COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Hillcrest is which
7	one?
8	MR. COOPER: It's a utility onto itself.
9	BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN:
10	Q. Okay. Never mind.
11	A. Yeah. I'm not familiar with that one.
12	Q. Okay. Never mind. I'm going to too many
13	hearings obviously.
14	A. I understand.
15	Q. I better separate my papers then so we
16	okay.
17	So then the last question would be about
18	the claim from Staff that several Missouri American
19	Water witnesses were replaced. Did I hear that
20	correctly?
21	A. That's correct.
22	Q. And what is that about?
23	A. That is about management changes and
24	structural changes within the organization that
25	that caused that. There were various different things

1	that caused that. Me being new in my position,
2	testimony had already been filed by my predecessor
3	so so I replaced him.
4	We also had a director of rates for a
5	division and that division was changed and so Missouri
6	American Water is no longer part of what was referred
7	to as the central division. So we're kind of a
8	stand-alone state at this point. And so that director
9	of of rates moved to a different position and so
10	his testimony was replaced as well.
11	And then then the other employee that
12	we've talked about quite a bit today and the reason
13	for him no longer being here, that happened recently
14	and so his testimony was adopted as well.
15	Q. So nothing should be read into those
16	A. No.
17	Q replacements as far as this case?
18	A. No. The fourth employee was actually
19	very ill. He had pneumonia and so was unable to make
20	it to to testify.
21	Q. Thank you.
22	COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Thank you, Judge.
23	JUDGE JONES: Any recross based on
24	questions from the Commissioners? St. Joseph; is that
25	correct?

1	MR. DOWNEY: I'm with the MIEC, Judge.
2	JUDGE JONES: MI EC. Okay.
3	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DOWNEY:
4	Q. Good morning.
5	A. Morni ng.
6	Q. My name's Ed Downey.
7	A. Uh-huh.
8	Q. I represent industrial customers in the
9	St. Louis Metro area.
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And you've had a lot of discussion with
12	the Commissioners about socializing costs. And I got
13	the distinct impression that you believe by buying
14	these troubled water and sewer companies, you're going
15	to lower the cost per unit for your existing
16	customers. Is that really what you were saying?
17	A. I no, I would I wouldn't say that
18	necessarily. But but we would try to by
19	increasing the customer base we don't want all of
20	our growth to be these small, troubled systems. Okay?
21	But we also want to be good stewards and and help
22	out wherever we can when it makes sense. And so so
23	we do sometimes acquire these small, troubled systems/
24	And you're right, they don't they
25	don't necessarily pay for themselves, especially right

1	up front.
2	Q. Okay. And I did hear the term "economies
3	of scale."
4	A. Uh-huh.
5	Q. And maybe that's why I was a little
6	confused here.
7	A. Uh-huh.
8	Q. You understand that there are a large
9	number of parties in this case that oppose
10	consolidation?
11	A. I do.
12	Q. Do you know why they're opposing it?
13	A. I've heard the arguments, yes.
14	Q. And cost?
15	A. Uh-huh.
16	Q. Okay. And we I'm not sure if it's
17	highly confidential or not, but the Parkville water
18	plant figures
19	A. Uh-huh.
20	Q we discussed those. It's going to be
21	very, very expensive to replace that plant
22	A. Uh-huh.
23	Q correct? You're going to have to
24	A. Yes.
25	Q answer audibly.

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Okay. And if we socialize those costs,
3	as as the Company is proposing, a large portion of
4	those costs will be borne by the St. Louis Metro area.
5	Do you agree?
6	A. I think that the the impact on an
7	individual basis will be will be relatively small.
8	Q. So what you're saying is when we
9	socialize costs over a lot of people
10	A. Uh-huh.
11	Q then the impact per person is less?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. But on a district-wide base, St. Louis
14	Metro district is going to absorb an awful lot of
15	these costs of the Parkville plant. Right?
16	A. There are more customers in St. Louis so
17	if each individual customer accepts a portion of that,
18	yes, that that cost will be more for that district
19	then it would be for a smaller district because they
20	have fewer customers that would be absorbing that
21	cost.
22	Q. And what service will the customers in
23	St. Louis Metro area receive from this plant in
24	Parkville?
25	A. They won't receive any service. But

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
	۱

25

similar investments in St. Louis, the costs of those investments would be spread out amongst all the customers as well. So the customers in Parkville would -- would also have a portion of investments made in St. Louis. It just spreads it out through the entire state.

- Q. Now, you understand I represent industrial customers in St. Louis?
 - A. I do, yes.
- Q. Do you have any reason to doubt that their rate increase will be four times what it otherwise would be if we consolidate?
- A. I -- I -- I don't have the exact numbers in front of me and I believe that it would depend greatly on how that consolidation was done. But I -- I did not believe that it was four times.
- Q. Okay. And if I were to tell you without consolidation, keeping the current districts as we have them, their increase would be 4.15 percent, with consolidation would be close to 18 percent, would you dispute that?
- A. Again, it depends on how you look at the consolidation. The numbers that I've seen based on different -- different runs for consolidation, that increase was much less than that.

1	Q. Okay. And and you mentioned to
2	Commissioner Coleman that now is a good time to
3	consolidate
4	A. Yes.
5	Q did you not?
6	A. I did.
7	Q. And that's because right now the impact
8	will not be as great as later?
9	A. At this point in time today, I think that
10	the impact is not not that great.
11	Q. Okay. And that's because today we're not
12	yet paying for the Parkville plant. Correct?
13	A. Yes. And and even though we talked
14	about the numbers for the Parkville plant, in the
15	grand scheme of the amount of capital that's spent
16	across the state to make sure that we are investing in
17	our infrastructure and that we do have sustainable
18	systems, that's a very small amount of the amount of
19	capital that we spend between rate cases.
20	Q. When you were presenting consolidation to
21	the public at these various public hearings
22	A. Uh-huh.
23	Q were you telling the public that they
24	can expect to see socialization of these large
25	expenditures that are coming down the pipe?

1	A. We talked openly about what consolidation
2	meant. And and that that plant was brought up
3	in at least two or three of the of the public
4	heari ngs.
5	Q. Did the residents of St. Louis know about
6	it, do you recall?
7	A. I don't recall.
8	MR. DOWNEY: That's all I have, Judge.
9	JUDGE JONES: Any other recross?
10	MR. BEDNAR: Yes, Your Honor. I'll defer
11	to Staff.
12	JUDGE JONES: Let's go over here, OPC
13	last or near the end. Let's let the cities go first
14	on recross.
15	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:
16	Q. Mr. Downey's request for consolidation, I
17	think you brought up early in your response to one of
18	the Commissioner's questions when we talk about the
19	number of customers, it's evident on Public Counsel's
20	front page of their PowerPoint that we're talking
21	about Platte County has 5,484 accounts by their
22	A. That sounds correct.
23	Q. St. Louis has 343,810 accounts?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Warrensburg, 6,000; Jefferson City,

1	9,000; Mexico, 4,000. So leaving St. Joe and Joplin
2	aside if they want to maintain district specific, that
3	shows real reduced impact
4	A. Yes, sir.
5	Q and rate shock on everyone. And to
6	your point, when St. Louis has increases in their
7	infrastructure, Platte County will be sharing those
8	costs as well. Correct?
9	A. That's correct.
10	Q. And everybody will be sharing in a
11	relatively even manner. Correct?
12	A. That's correct.
13	Q. Because I don't know if you had a
14	chance to see Mayor Rose's testimony
15	A. Yes.
16	Q but it contained a summary of the
17	various rates on it would be the first Exhibit 1-R,
18	the different rates for each district since 2006 and
19	those increases from 2006 to 2005 or 2015, I'm
20	sorry. In fact, this is the second time second
21	rate case in which the Company has recommended a rate
22	decrease in the consolidation. Correct?
23	A. That's what I've been told, yes.
24	Q. And that's been fought by Public Counsel
25	and the industrials of St. Louis. Correct?

1	A. Correct.
2	Q. Now, Mr. Downey did not bring up the
3	price differential for water between St. Louis
4	industrials and Platte County industrials. Correct?
5	A. Correct.
6	Q. Are you aware that the Platte County
7	industrial cost of water may reach 2- to 300 percent
8	compared to the St. Louis industrials?
9	A. No. I was unaware of that.
10	Q. No further questions.
11	A. Thank you.
12	JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
13	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:
14	Q. Good morning.
15	A. Good morning.
16	Q. Are you aware that Joplin's rates have
17	increased by 132 percent over the last three rate
18	cases?
19	A. No. I didn't have that exact number.
20	Q. But you are aware that all of those costs
21	that increased were solely borne by Joplin?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. By their residents?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. And they weren't shared with any other

1	district?
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. And we've talked a little bit today about
4	Platte County and the Parkville water plant. Under
5	your proposed plan of consolidation or Staff's
6	proposed plan of consolidation, those costs would be
7	borne by other ratepayers; is that correct?
8	A. That's a portion of them would be,
9	yes.
10	Q. And specifically under your plan, some of
11	those costs would be borne by the residents of Joplin?
12	A. I believe that's correct.
13	Q. You also said that Illinois is under a
14	single-tariff plan?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Can you I've looked at Missouri
17	American's website and they're showing different
18	districts in Illinois. Are there different districts
19	in Illinois?
20	A. There there there are a few
21	different districts, I believe. And as they make
22	acquisitions, that that impacts that as well. But
23	when I when I worked in Illinois, at that point
24	we we rolled several districts into a more
25	single-tariff pricing.

1	Q. Do you know how many current districts
2	there are in Illinois?
3	A. I do not.
4	Q. Would it surprise you to know that
5	there's more than ten?
6	A. Yes, it would surprise me.
7	Q. And in each of those districts there are
8	different rates currently. Correct?
9	A. I don't know the answer to that. I
10	haven't been there for five years so
11	Q. Okay.
12	A again, acquisitions can change that.
13	Q. No further questions.
14	JUDGE JONES: Other than Staff or OPC,
15	are there any other parties that need to do recross?
16	Okay. Let's go to OPC.
17	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
18	Q. You got a lot of questions from the
19	Bench, so I'm going to start with questions you
20	received from the Chairman. And if I understand your
21	testimony, the single tariff pricing enables the
22	Company to purchase systems that might not otherwise
23	want to sell?
24	A. No. That's that's not the case. I
25	mean it would it would allow us to have additional

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	

conversations, but -- but if a community doesn't want to sell, then we're not going to be talking to them.

- Q. Didn't you testify to the effect that explaining single-tariff pricing convinces them to sell when they might not otherwise want to sell?
- A. It can be a factor to address some of the concerns they may have.
- Q. And not all systems that you purchase are struggling systems; is that correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And single-tariff pricing is a way to enable the growth strategy of American Water; is that correct?
- A. It -- it can be a factor that can help with that growth strategy, yes.
- Q. You also received questions about Arnold and the -- the shortfall --
 - A. Yes.
- Q. -- from -- I guess between the commitment that the Company made and -- and I guess there's a revenue shortfall there. And you were asked about what to do with that and I wasn't sure about your answers. What is your proposal -- what's the Company's proposal to the Commission to do with that shortfall?

1	A. I think that there would be better
2	witnesses to answer that question about that
3	shortfall.
4	Q. So you don't have any proposal for the
5	Commi ssi on?
6	A. I don't personally at this time, no.
7	Q. Do you think the it would be fair for
8	the shareholders to cover that or customers in other
9	systems?
10	A. I think that there are many ways that you
11	can get there and that's more about rate design. And
12	I don't have the answers to that right now.
13	Q. And which witness would be better to
14	answer that?
15	A. That's a good question. Paul Herbert I
16	believe would be the right person to answer that.
17	Q. And there was discussions about the
18	Platte County treatment plant. You discussed that
19	with Commissioner Kenney. And you stated that I
20	believe you testified that state plant will be
21	replaced in the near future
22	A. Yes.
23	Q is that correct?
24	A. Uh-huh.
25	Q. And then earlier you had testified about

1	the cost to that system with Mr. Dority. And those
2	numbers that you had provided to Mr. Dority that are
3	now in the record, those are just estimates. Correct?
4	A. Yes. But they're usually relatively
5	cl ose.
6	Q. But it won't be until after those plants
7	are really built that we'll really know how close
8	those estimates were to the true cost of those
9	plants
10	A. That's true.
11	Q is that correct?
12	So by the next rate case we should have a
13	better understanding of what those costs will be; is
14	that correct?
15	A. Absolutely, yes.
16	Q. And then in response to questions from
17	Commissioner Coleman, talking about helping people
18	understand the impacts of consolidation and did the
19	Company provide customers with any information on
20	impacts with consolidation?
21	A. Yes. At the public hearings that was
22	gi ven out.
23	Q. Was there any information provided to
24	customers that did not attend the public hearings?
25	A. I'm unsure. I would have to verify that.

1	Q. Okay. So you don't know if any
2	customers you don't know if it wasn't until they
3	showed up at the public hearing that they were first
4	told that here's a proposal to consolidate your rates?
5	A. I don't believe that to be the case, but
6	I'm not sure of the mailings that that went out or
7	the timing of those mailings.
8	Q. Well, one I guess one response you
9	gave to Commissioner Coleman was that it helps people
10	understand it's helpful to have them understand the
11	impacts, like the dollar impacts.
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. And would you agree with that?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And do you know if there was any dollar
16	impact information provided on the consolidation for
17	each district, what that dollar impact would be to a
18	particular customer to be consolidated with another
19	district?
20	A. The the consolidation proposal with
21	the rates that were attached to that were included in
22	the papers that we handed out I know at the public
23	heari ngs.
24	Q. Just the handouts. Okay. Thank you.
25	That's all.

1	A. Uh-huh.
2	JUDGE JONES: Recross from Staff.
3	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.
4	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:
5	Q. Ms. Norton, following up on the questions
6	from Chairman Hall
7	A. Uh-huh.
8	Q I'd like to have you provide those
9	confidential documents you indicated you would about
10	the termination of the employee who told staff about
11	the faulty meter issue.
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Do you have any idea how long that would
14	take to provide those?
15	A. I should be able to have them very soon,
16	because the documents are I will share with you
17	what we prepared prior to our conversation.
18	Q. Thank you. And could you have them
19	provided to my attention?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Thank you.
22	MR. THOMPSON: And I would inquire of the
23	Commission how the Commission would like Staff to
24	report its findings after reviewing those documents?
25	THE WITNESS: Yes, please.

1	JUDGE JONES: It can be filed as a highly
2	confidential Commission exhibit.
3	MR. THOMPSON: The report or the
4	documents themselves?
5	JUDGE JONES: The documents. The report
6	is however you want to submit it. It's your report.
7	Right? It would be Staff's report?
8	MR. THOMPSON: That's correct.
9	JUDGE JONES: Tell us however you want to
10	tell us.
11	MR. THOMPSON: Very good, Judge. Thank
12	you. No further questions. Thank you.
13	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
14	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Redi rect?
15	MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
16	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COOPER:
17	Q. You received some questions from
18	Mr. Bednar about water quality issues in the Platte
19	County district and there were several references to a
20	town hall meeting. Was that something that Missouri
21	American arranged?
22	A. Yes. We worked with elected officials to
23	arrange that that meeting.
24	Q. And that was separate and apart from this
25	rate case?

1	A. Yes, it was.
2	Q. Riverside Exhibit 3 is a document that
3	says Field Test Agreement. Do you remember that
4	document?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. If you know, how many of those types of
7	agreements were executed?
8	A. I'm sorry. I don't know the answer to
9	that. I I don't know.
10	Q. While we were in-camera, you provided
11	some some numbers related to the Platte County
12	treatment plant project. And you may have done this a
13	little bit with Mr. Poston, but but again, are
14	those numbers how developed would you say those
15	numbers are?
16	A. I would say that they're reasonably
17	developed. They're in our business plan, our capital
18	expenditure plan and so we typically have a good idea.
19	We have the expertise of building plants throughout
20	the United States and so our engineers know
21	approximately what it's going to cost to build a plant
22	the size of it.
23	Q. But I think at one point you started to
24	answer perhaps that that maybe the design phase is
25	not quite complete; is that correct?

1	A. That's right. We're currently working on
2	the design phase of the treatment facility.
3	Q. And then in answer to one of the
4	cross-examination questions, you alluded to the fact
5	that even as significant as those dollars are, that in
6	relation to the overall spend or investment that the
7	Company has made in the past in capital investment,
8	that it's not that large.
9	I guess going back to my opening
10	statement, I made a comment that since the last rate
11	case, the Company had invested nearly 500 million
12	dollars. Would you agree with that figure?
13	A. That's correct. Our annual spend is
14	typically between 100 and 150 million dollars a year.
15	Q. You received some questions from Chairman
16	Hall in regard to acquisition premium. Do you
17	remember those?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. And I think you were you were trying
20	to explain why recovery of acquisition premium might
21	not serve the same goal as single-tariff pricing; is
22	that right?
23	A. That's correct.
24	Q. Without single-tariff pricing, if there
25	were recovery of an acquisition premium, from who

1	would you assume that that acquisition premium would
2	be recovered?
3	A. The ratepayers.
4	Q. Okay. And that would be potentially in
5	addition to any new necessary investment that might be
6	needed in
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. There were questions for you concerning
9	what's been called the faulty meter issue. As a part
10	of the revenue requirement stipulation that we
11	discussed yesterday, has the Company agreed to a
12	process to further investigate and detail and report
13	on that that situation?
14	A. Yes, we have.
15	Q. And that's an ongoing investigative
16	docket here before this Commission?
17	A. That's correct.
18	Q. And I guess there was discussion of the
19	timing. I think you explained that you had taken over
20	as president in November of 2015. Correct?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. To your understanding, is that faulty
23	meter issue or what's referred to as the faulty meter
24	issue, is that largely a late 19 or a late 2015
25	event?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Counsel for the City of Joplin was asking
3	you about recent increases in Joplin's rates. Do you
4	recall that?
5	A. I do.
6	Q. And I think the implication was that
7	Joplin had experienced a substantial increase over the
8	last few rate cases. To your knowledge, has there
9	been a is there a relatively new treatment plant
10	that has been put in place in Joplin?
11	A. There has been a lot of work done in
12	Joplin recently, a lot of capital investment.
13	Q. Okay. And would it be accurate to say
14	that that investment has already been paid for by the
15	Joplin customers?
16	A. That a portion of that investment has
17	been paid for. The depreciation of that plant that
18	plant's life is much longer than a few years. So only
19	a portion has been paid for so far.
20	Q. So if you know, what would be a normal
21	life to be used for depreciation on a treatment plant
22	like that?
23	A. I believe it's around 60 years.
24	MR. COOPER: Okay. That's all the
25	questions I have, Your Honor.

1	JUDGE JONES: Okay. You may step down.			
2	THE WITNESS: Thank you.			
3	JUDGE JONES: Well, we've been going for			
4	about two hours now, but I want to go ahead and push			
5	through to the next witness. So let's go with your			
6	next witness.			
7	MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I if you			
8	could give us five minutes.			
9	JUDGE JONES: Sure.			
10	MR. COOPER: A walk down the hall would			
11	be wonderful.			
12	JUDGE JONES: Okay. We'll take a			
13	five-minute break.			
14	(A recess was taken.)			
15	MR. COOPER: Missouri American would call			
16	Mr. John Watkins. He needs to be sworn, I believe.			
17	JUDGE JONES: Mr. Watkins, can you raise			
18	your right hand.			
19	(Witness affirmed.)			
20	JUDGE JONES: Thank you.			
21	JOHN WATKINS, testified as follows:			
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COOPER:			
23	Q. Would you state your name, please?			
24	A. John Watkins.			
25	Q. By whom are you employed and in what			

1	capaci ty?		
2	A. I'm employed by American Water Works		
3	Service Company as director of rates and regulatory		
4	support.		
5	Q. Have you prepared for purposes of this		
6	proceeding certain Surrebuttal Testimony in question		
7	and answer form?		
8	A. Yes.		
9	Q. And is it your understanding that that		
10	testimony has been marked as Exhibit MAWC 39 for		
11	i denti fi cati on?		
12	A. Yes.		
13	Q. Are you also adopting testimony today?		
14	A. Yes, I am.		
15	Q. And is that a portion of Exhibit MAWC 41,		
16	the Rebuttal Testimony of Phil Wood?		
17	A. Correct.		
18	Q. And is the portion of that testimony you		
19	are adopting page 3, line 8 through page 7, line 22,		
20	demand side water efficiency?		
21	A. Yes, it is.		
22	Q. If I were to ask you the questions which		
23	are contained in Exhibit 39 and then the portion of		
24	MAWC 41 that you're adopting today, would your answers		
25	be the same?		

1	A. Yes, they would.	
2	Q. Are those answers true and correct to the	
3	best of your information, knowledge and belief?	
4	A. Yes, they are.	
5	MR. COOPER: Your Honor, at this time I	
6	would offer into evidence Exhibit MAWC 39.	
7	JUDGE JONES: Any objection to Exhibit 39	
8	from Missouri American?	
9	I don't see any. MAWC 39 is admitted	
10	into the record.	
11	(MAWC Exhibit 39 was received into	
12	evi dence.)	
13	MR. COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor. I	
14	would tender Mr. Watkins for cross-examination.	
15	JUDGE JONES: Cross-examination from	
16	Missouri Department of Energy?	
17	MR. ANTAL: No questions. Thank you.	
18	JUDGE JONES: MI EC?	
19	MR. DOWNEY: No questions.	
20	JUDGE JONES: City of Brunswick?	
21	MR. DRAG: No questions, Your Honor.	
22	JUDGE JONES: City of Joplin?	
23	MS. BELL: No questions.	
24	JUDGE JONES: City of Riverside?	
25	MR. BEDNAR: No questions, Your Honor.	

1	JUDGE JONES: City of St. Joseph?
2	MR. LAWYER: No questions.
3	JUDGE JONES: City of Warrensburg
4	MR. CURTIS: No questions.
5	JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply
6	Di stri ct?
7	MR. DORITY: No questions. Thank you.
8	StoneBridge? Triumph?
9	MR. HARDEN: No questions.
10	JUDGE JONES: The unions aren't here.
11	Office of Public Counsel?
12	MR. POSTON: No questions.
13	JUDGE JONES: And the Staff of the
14	Commi ssi on?
15	MR. THOMPSON: No questions. Thank you,
16	Judge.
17	JUDGE JONES: Any questions from the
18	Commi ssi on?
19	CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes. Thank you.
20	QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:
21	Q. Good morning.
22	A. Good morning.
23	Q. What is your title again, sir?
24	A. I'm director of rates and regulatory
25	support.

1	Q. And your employer?
2	A. American Water, the service company.
3	Q. So are we heard earlier this
4	morning that the service company has three employees;
5	is that correct?
6	A. No, that's the parent company, American
7	Water Works.
8	Q. The parent. I'm sorry. Okay. Are you
9	familiar with Staff's water utility rate design
10	anal ysi s?
11	A. I've reviewed it, yes.
12	Q. I was reading through your Surrebuttal
13	Testimony and you on page 8, you provided four
14	options to to to address consumption and capital
15	investment issues?
16	A. Yes, I do.
17	Q. You did not address Staff's water utility
18	rate design analysis as one of those options and I was
19	wondering why?
20	A. I think some of those are covered there.
21	I I these are the leading ones that are usually
22	offered in in against the revenue stabilization,
23	I guess. These are the leading four, I would say.
24	Q. Well, look do you do you by chance
25	have a copy of that water utility rate design

1 anal ysi s?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And there's essentially seven components to it. I don't think we need to address the seventh in that that is a -- that's a non-rate design issue. It may be a -- may be related to rate design, but it's not rate design in and of itself and that's the corresponding downward adjustment in return on equity. So issues one through six.

I was wondering if -- if you could spend just a moment with me looking at the extent to which that six-factor rate design approach would address the dual concerns of capital infrastructure -- of capital investment needs and declining consumption. Other witnesses for the Company have looked at specific -- have looked at each of those specific factors, but nobody looked at it from a holistic perspective and that's what I was -- and that's what I'm hoping you may be able to do.

- A. Okay. I'm not positive I have the same one because I don't have anything numbered one to six.
- Q. Well, I'm looking at -- at the order directing filing of Supplemental Testimony issued by the Commission on February 3rd, 2016 and that lists --
 - A. Okay. I do have that one. I'm sorry.

1	Q. Okay. So give you a second to find your		
2	pl ace.		
3	A. Okay.		
4	Q. Let me just start with this: To what		
5	extent does this six-factor rate design approach not		
6	address the dual concerns of infrastructure needs and		
7	declining consumption?		
8	A. I think it depends on which variable you		
9	want to look at. I mean we could walk through each		
10	one individually.		
11	Q. Well, that but that's exactly my		
12	point. I'm I want to look at all six together as a		
13	comprehensive rate design approach.		
14	A. Okay.		
15	Q. So what my I'll rephrase my question.		
16	I'm trying to understand to what extent does this		
17	six-factor approach to rate design address or not		
18	address the dual concern set forth by the company of		
19	significant infrastructure needs with declining		
20	consumption?		
21	And I'll I'll also to be fair to		
22	you, sir, if it's if that is a question that you		
23	believe is appropriate to defer to someone else or if		
24	you believe that it would be appropriate to spend a		
25	little time looking at that yourself and then coming		

6

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

back up to answer that question, I'm fine with either of those two.

- Α. No. I can answer it -- at least I'll try to in part for you.
 - Q. Thank you.
- Α. The declining usage I'm not sure is truly addressed. I mean an increase in customer charge helps us with our fixed cost. So we're 91 percent fixed cost, 77 percent of our revenues are related to that fixed co-- recovery of it is variable produced. So if we have a loss in consumption, it does impact the company because most of our fixed costs are collected through the variable charge. So increase in the customer charge helps the company, but it doesn't help stop declining usage.
- Q. Right. But if you put that in conjunction with some type of modified future test year for consumption, doesn't that address it?
- Α. Depends on what we consider in that modified future test year. So declining usage is a year -- every year phenomenon. So if we set rates today, next year it could be lowered because of declining usage and the year after that and the year after that and it still doesn't address the issue of weather variability.

- Q. So it would depend on how accurate the parties and ultimately the Commission are in setting some kind of future test year?
- A. Correct. And to my knowledge, I don't think any utility's ever accurately forecasted the revenues year to year to year on the usage levels.
 - Q. So -- okay. Continue.
- A. And that's one of the reasons we were proposing the RSM. It works really well for California and New York. I've been involved in many of the New York cases and have seen the benefits of revenue stabilization. It really does take away the issue of the usage level.

So if the company predicts the rate level with their declining usage, it's on us. If we predicted too great of a decline, we're going to refund that money back to the customers if they use more water. So less the cost to reduce that. If declining usage is ignored in that, then typically on a -- a typical year, our revenues will come in below what the levels were set at and we'll surcharge the customer to be made whole again.

Q. So do you have a general understanding as to what has happened to consumption over the last five to ten years for Missouri American per customer?

1	A. Generally, yes.			
2	Q. And is that is that trendline well,			
3	what is the trendline?			
4	A. It is declining.			
5	Q. Do you know a percentage?			
6	A. I believe Mr. Root (phonetic) said it was			
7	approximately 2 percent, somewhere in that range.			
8	Q. And so if we had some type of future test			
9	year that took that into account, you think that would			
10	be insufficient?			
11	A. It might cover us for the first year, but			
12	as soon as you're out of rates, that decline will			
13	continue to impact the company.			
14	Q. Well, what if the and is there is			
15	there really much of a difference between a a			
16	modified future test year and a two-way tracker and			
17	the the mechanism that you actually proposed in			
18	this case, I mean functionally?			
19	A. The mechanism that we propose that's used			
20	in New York and California, they both use future			
21	years. California actually uses a three-year			
22	forecasted year with the RAM, the winter revenue			
23	adjustment mechanism. New York typically, if they			
24	settle a case, ends up settling for a three-year			
25	period so it's also a future look with an RSM.			

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2

24

25

Q. So is it is it safe to say that
essentially what you're saying is is some type of
modified future test year for consumption would be an
improvement over the historic test year that that
we currently employ in in Missouri and it and it
would address some of the concerns that the Company
has? It's not as accurate or as sophisticated a model
as what what the Company originally proposed, which
was the rate stabilization mechanism? A step in the
right direction

- A. Yes, it would be a step in the right direction.
- Q. -- but not all the way?

 So what is your view of inclining block rates for residential customers?
- A. Inclining block rates can put the company at great financial stress, because once we institute those rates, customers will conserve. That's one of the main reasons why California went to the RAM is they went to inclining blocks. They have usage issues out in California obviously. But they want to make sure they don't harm the company by moving these blocks higher and higher to force customers to conserve.
 - Q. But if you -- if you combined that with

some type of future test year with trackers, it might solve that issue?

- A. It could, yes.
- Q. To what extent is it a concern that you're -- actually let me -- let me rephrase that.

What is your concern about the fact that 23 percent of your revenue is from fixed cost, but 91 percent of your costs are fixed?

- A. So without even factoring usage day in and day out, we have to predict that -- in the rate case we'd have to predict the usage perfectly to make sure we're recovering our fixed cost. If that usage falls below the level of the usage allowed in the case, we won't recover our fixed costs. So it is a great concern, because 91 percent of our costs are fixed. So the majority of our costs are fixed, but yet our fixed revenue is very low compared to that.
- Q. But the issue is dollars coming in the door. And it's -- I mean the dollars don't come in with a -- with a -- some symbol that this is a fixed cost, this is a variable cost. I mean it's -- the dollars are coming in the door.

So the concern is that if you've -- if too much of your money is -- is coming in based on variable costs, that you're going to have less coming

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	

24

25

in over time.

- A. Again, it depends on the amount of revenues that are actually being used compared to what was forecasted, yes.
- Q. And does a rate stabilization mechanism 100 percent, from your perspective, address that concern?
- A. It does. Because it sets the level of the rates in -- in the rate case, the Commission authorized that level of rates and then the Company will refund anything it collects over that level or surcharge anything that's collected below that level. So no matter what the rate level is allowed in the rate case itself, it will collect.
- Q. Is it safe to say that the modified future test year for consumption with -- with the one-way tracker just described in the -- in the Staff's report would be preferable to the status quo?
- A. I'd have to review the one-way tracker to be able to answer that again in detail.
- Q. Well, essentially the one-way tracker says that if -- if consumption goes above the future test year forecast, then -- then the Company would refund -- or would credit those amounts to customers; whereas, if it went below, it would not.

1	A. I guess the issue with the one-way
2	tracker, again, is the fixed cost recovery. So if
3	we're coming in below, we're not recovering our full
4	fixed cost if we don't hit that usage level that was
5	determined in the rate case.
6	Q. I have nothing further. Thank you.
7	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Stoll?
8	COMMISSIONER STOLL: Yes.
9	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER STOLL:
10	Q. Very quickly, did you say California uses
11	an inclining
12	A. Yes, they do.
13	Q block rate?
14	How about in New York?
15	A. In New York we have four systems. And
16	one one of the systems has a summer block rate. So
17	they're flat block in the winter and in the summer
18	they go to inclining blocks for the residential
19	customers. One of the districts is a flat rate year
20	round. The other two are they include residential,
21	commercial and industrial customers in the same so
22	their block technically goes up, but it starts to
23	trail off for the higher-use customers.
24	Q. Okay. You know, it kinds of makes us
25	nervous here in the midwest when we see something

1	happening in New York and California, but have you
2	proposed this rate stabilization mechanism in other
3	states?
4	A. Yes. We have it currently in Illinois
5	that it's been proposed.
6	Q. It's been proposed there?
7	A. It's been proposed in Illinois in their
8	current rate case, yes.
9	Q. Okay. I think that's all for right now.
10	Thank you though.
11	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Kenney?
12	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No.
13	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Rupp?
14	COMMISSIONER RUPP: No.
15	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Coleman?
16	COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: No questions.
17	JUDGE JONES: Any recross based on
18	Commissioner questions? I'm just going to go down the
19	list. Missouri Department of Energy? MIEC?
20	Brunswick? Joplin? Riverside? St. Joseph?
21	Warrensburg? Water Districts? StoneBridge? Triumph?
22	OPC?
23	MR. POSTON: Yes.
24	JUDGE JONES: Go ahead.
25	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:

1	Q. Good morning.
2	A. Good morning.
3	Q. I think it's still morning.
4	You were testifying on the revenue
5	stabilization mechanism.
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. The Company's no longer requesting that
8	proposal; is that correct?
9	A. That is correct.
10	Q. And that's as a result of the revenue
11	stipulation; is that correct?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. And if that is it your understanding
14	that if that agreement is not accepted in full, that
15	all of the issues in that agreement, those 40-plus
16	issues are also not resolved?
17	A. I believe that's correct.
18	Q. And you also testified on usage and the
19	claims that usage is declining; is that right?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. Would you agree that other parties to
22	this case have challenged the Company's claims of
23	reduced usage?
24	A. I believe they have, yes.
25	Q. Thank you. That's all.

1	JUDGE JONES: Staff of the Commission?
2	MR. THOMPSON: No questions, Judge.
3	Mr. Poston asked all mine.
4	JUDGE JONES: Any redirect from the
5	Company?
6	MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
7	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COOPER:
8	Q. To your knowledge, Mr. Watkins, would the
9	Staff's rate design report have been addressed in the
10	Company's Supplemental Direct Testimony?
11	A. I'm sorry. What was
12	Q. Well, you were asked some questions about
13	the Staff's rate design report that was filed really
14	before this
15	A. Yes. I believe there were a couple
16	witnesses that did address the six or seven topics
17	individually, yes.
18	Q. Okay. You were asked some questions
19	about what the significance is that the Company has a
20	high percentage of its costs that are fixed versus a
21	high percentage of its revenues that are associated
22	with variable revenues or variable pricing. Do you
23	remember that?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Would it be accurate to say that that

1	that situation puts recovery of the fis fixed cost
2	at risk?
3	A. Yes, it does.
4	Q. Due to what types of factors?
5	A. Due to weather and declining usage
6	mai nl y.
7	Q. Things that the Company has no control
8	over?
9	A. Correct. The Company has no control over
10	those.
11	Q. Then there were some questions about a
12	one-way tracker that was referenced in the Staff
13	report. Do you remember that?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And I believe that in your testimony, you
16	indicated that that one-way tracker would work fine to
17	the benefit of the customer if if usage turned out
18	to be greater than what was expected in the rate case.
19	Correct?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. But does it do anything in the situation
22	where usage is is less than what is expected at the
23	setting of rates?
24	A. No, it does not.
25	Q. So it would not address in any way this

1	sort of fixed variable conundrum?
2	A. No, it wouldn't.
3	Q. Okay. That's all the questions I have.
4	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Mr. Watkins, you may
5	step down.
6	And Missouri American, you have one more
7	wi tness?
8	MR. COOPER: We do. We would call Mr. Ed
9	Haye Edward Haye.
10	JUDGE JONES: Good morning, sir. Can you
11	raise your right hand?
12	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
13	(Wi tness affirmed.)
14	JUDGE JONES: Thank you, sir.
15	You may proceed.
16	EDWARD HAYE, testified as follows:
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COOPER:
18	Q. Please state your name.
19	A. Edward Haye.
20	Q. By whom are you employed and in what
21	capaci ty?
22	A. American Water Works Service Company,
23	vice president, chief regulatory counsel.
24	Q. Have you caused to be prepared for the
25	purposes of this proceeding certain witness

1	qualification testimony in question and answer form?
2	A. Yes, I have.
3	Q. And is it your understanding that that's
4	been marked as Exhibit MAWC 47 for identification?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Are you also adopting testimony here
7	today?
8	A. Yes, I am.
9	Q. And would that testimony include Exhibit
10	MAWC 38, Direct Testimony of Gary VerDouw?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And would it include Exhibit MAWC 22,
13	Rebuttal Testimony of Don Petry?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And would it include Exhibit MAWC 23,
16	Surrebuttal Testimony of Don Petry?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. And then are you also adopting in part a
19	portion of Exhibit MAWC 40, the Direct Testimony of
20	Phil Wood?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And would those portions that you're
23	adopting be pages 9, line 16 through page 13, line 23,
24	MAWC compensation and annual incentive program? Is
25	that one of the portions?

1	A. Yes, it is.
2	Q. And then would the other portion be
3	page 17, line 11 through page 22, line 9, benefits of
4	business transformation project?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Okay. If I were to ask you the questions
7	which are contained in Exhibit 39 well, excuse me,
8	47, 38, 22, 23 and the portions of MAWC 40 that you're
9	adopting today, would your answers be the same?
10	A. Yes, they would.
11	Q. Would those answers be true and correct
12	to the best of your information, knowledge and belief?
13	A. Yes, they would.
14	MR. COOPER: Your Honor, at this time I
15	would offer Exhibits MAWC 47, MAWC 38, MAWC 22, and
16	MAWC 23.
17	JUDGE JONES: Any objection to Exhibit
18	47, 38, 22 or 23?
19	Seeing none, those exhibits are admitted
20	into the record.
21	(MAWC Exhibits 22, 23, 38 and 47 were
22	recei ved into evidence.)
23	MR. COOPER: At this time we would tender
24	Mr. Haye for cross-examination.
25	JUDGE JONES: Cross-examination for

1	Missouri Department of Energy?
2	MR. ANTAL: No questions.
3	JUDGE JONES: MI EC?
4	MR. DOWNEY: No questions.
5	JUDGE JONES: City of Brunswick?
6	MR. DRAG: No questions.
7	JUDGE JONES: City of Joplin?
8	MS. BELL: No questions.
9	JUDGE JONES: City of Riverside?
10	MR. BEDNAR: No questions, Your Honor.
11	JUDGE JONES: City of St. Joseph?
12	MR. LAWYER: No questions.
13	JUDGE JONES: City of Warrensburg?
14	MR. CURTIS: No questions, Your Honor.
15	JUDGE JONES: Water districts?
16	MR. DORITY: No questions.
17	JUDGE JONES: StoneBridge? Triumph?
18	MR. HARDEN: No questions.
19	JUDGE JONES: The Office of Public
20	Counsel?
21	MR. POSTON: No questions.
22	JUDGE JONES: Staff of the Commission?
23	MR. THOMPSON: No questions. Thank you,
24	Judge.
25	JUDGE JONES: Any questions from the

1	Chai r?
2	CHAIRMAN HALL: Very briefly.
3	QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:
4	Q. Good morning.
5	A. Good morning.
6	Q. Ms. Norton indicated that you might be
7	able to answer a couple of questions that I have about
8	regulated business versus unregulated business with
9	the parent company.
10	A. Sure. Yes.
11	Q. And I think she said ball park about
12	10 percent of American Water's business is
13	unregulated, 90 percent of it is regulated. Is that
14	accurate?
15	A. That is accurate.
16	Q. Can you explain to me a little bit about
17	the 10 percent of unregulated business
18	A. Sure.
19	Q unregulated?
20	A. There are a few components of that
21	business. One is called our military services group.
22	They essentially provide water and wastewater services
23	to military bases throughout the United States much
24	like we do, but their customers are all military
25	bases.

1	Another segment is called contract
2	services. They provide water and wastewater services
3	to municipality and large industrial customers on a
4	contract basis. They don't own the assets. They
5	operate the assets for municipalities or large
6	i ndustri al s.
7	Another segment of that business is
8	called American Water Resources. We refer to it
9	internally as Homeowners Services. They provide
10	warranty services for service line protection programs
11	for warranties of customer-owned assets oftentimes
12	related to water and wastewater services.
13	Q. Thank you.
14	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Stoll?
15	COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. Thank
16	you for your testimony.
17	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Kenney?
18	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.
19	Thank you.
20	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Rupp?
21	COMMISSIONER RUPP: No questions.
22	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Coleman?
23	COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: No questions.
24	JUDGE JONES: Any recross based on
25	questions from the Chairman? Any redirect?

```
MR. COOPER:
                               No, Your Honor.
 1
 2
                  JUDGE JONES:
                                       Mr. Haye, you may
                                Okay.
 3
     step down.
 4
                  THE WITNESS:
                                Thank you.
 5
                  JUDGE JONES:
                                Okay. It looks like Office
6
     of Public Counsel has a witness next. Mr. Marke; is
7
     that correct?
8
                  MR. POSTON: Yeah. We'd call Dr. Geoff
9
     Marke.
10
                  JUDGE JONES: Can you raise your right
11
     hand, sir?
12
                  (Witness affirmed.)
13
                  JUDGE JONES: Thank you, sir. You may be
14
     seated.
15
     GEOFF MARKE, testified as follows:
16
     DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
17
            Q.
                  Will you please state your name?
18
            Α.
                  Dr. Geoff Marke.
19
            Q.
                  Can you please spell it for the court
20
     reporter?
                  It's G-e-o-f-f and then Marke, M-a-r-k-e.
21
            Α.
22
                  Are you the same Dr. Marke that caused to
            Q.
23
     be prepared and filed Direct, Rebuttal on Revenue
24
     Requirement, Rebuttal on Rate Design and Surrebuttal
25
     Testimony that's been marked as OPC's Exhibit 9, 10,
```

1	11 and 12?
2	A. I am.
3	Q. And do you have any changes or
4	corrections to that testimony?
5	A. I don't.
6	Q. If I were to ask you the questions that
7	appear in your testimony today, would your answers be
8	the same or substantially the same?
9	A. They would.
10	MR. POSTON: Your Honor, I offer Exhibits
11	OPC 9, 10, 11 and 12 into the record and tender
12	Dr. Marke for cross-examination.
13	JUDGE JONES: Any objections to OPC's
14	Exhi bi ts 9, 10, 11 and 12?
15	Hearing none, those exhibits are admitted
16	into the record.
17	(OPC Exhibits 9, 10, 11 and 12 were
18	received into evidence.)
19	JUDGE JONES: And now we'll take cross
20	from Missouri Department of Energy.
21	MR. ANTAL: No questions, Judge. Thank
22	you
23	JUDGE JONES: MI EC?
24	MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Judge.
25	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DOWNEY:

1	Q. Good morning, Dr. Marke.
2	A. Good morning.
3	Q. At least for seven more minutes anyway.
4	Did you hear the opening statements of
5	counsel this morning?
6	A. I did.
7	Q. Did you hear Mr. Bednar on behalf of
8	Ri versi de?
9	A. I did.
10	Q. Did you hear him say that OPC had
11	sponsored testimony that 22 out of 25 states have
12	adopted single-issue pricing?
13	A. I did.
14	Q. Is that correct, that statement, that OPC
15	has that in its testimony?
16	A. I think it's it's a misleading
17	statement. OPC Witness Smith, Ralph Smith, included
18	testimony from an EP a 1990 EPA document that
19	included 22 it included a list of states that had
20	gone, to some degree, towards single-tariff
21	consolidated pricing.
22	I say it's misleading because the
23	document that Mr. Smith quotes or cites in that
24	document or in that testimony is from 1999. A
25	considerable amount of time has passed since 1999 and

the states there have -- have changed.

American Water in that case.

Q. Okay. As you sit here today, how many of those 25 states have single-issue pricing?

A. It's a difficult question to answer. I would say that -- I can say with confidence from an investor-owned utility standpoint, that Pennsylvania

Missouri -- or the American Water -- Pennsylvania

can be considered a single-tariff state under the

Dr. McDermott included in his testimony a 2015 update where there was some shift. I think the specific shift between the 1999 and the 2015 for his document included Rhode Island and Missouri. So whereas, Missouri was formally put down as a single-tariff priced state, in Dr. McDermott's testimony, it had moved to -- moving towards it would be the way to characterize it.

We went ahead and looked at the states that were listed in that EPA document to get a sense of whether or not single-tariff pricing was a -- a phenomenon that was taking place across the US. I would I caution, first of all, that my testimony spoke to the fact that -- I cited actually American Water on this number, but 84 percent of all water systems right now are municipal owned. Well over 90 percent of all

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
11 12 13 14	
12 13 14	
12 13 14 15	
12 13	
12 13 14 15	
12 13 14 15 16	
12 13 14 15 16 17	
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	

23

24

25

wastewater systems are municipal owned. So when we're talking about single-tariff pricing, it can be very misleading.

lowa, for example, lowa American Water has -- operates in two cities. They have some form of consolidated pricing in there, but overall it's a very small segment of the overall lowa citizen base. And that's the only IOU in lowa.

Illinois, Ms. Norton came up here and spoke to, you know, her knowledge of the state about five years ago. When I looked at Illinois -- the Illinois American web page, you see well over double-digit districts. There's many, many districts.

So when we refer to, you know -- the devil's in the details. And I think I've heard that echoed, you know, several times throughout this this morning. I would concur with that. My cursory look at the states did not suggest single-tariff pricing was a prominent feature for many reasons that were stated above.

- Q. Let me try this question a little differently. For investor-owned utility operations, water operations, do the majority of them have single-issue pricing, single-tariff pricing?
 - A. I limited my search to the states that

1	were listed in the EPA site as states that had
2	generally accepted single-tariff pricing. And my
3	review of it is no, the majority do not.
4	Q. Okay. So certainly less than 22 out of
5	25?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And I'm trying not to to infringe on
8	your time under district consolidation, so I'll
9	I'll stop my questions at that.
10	JUDGE JONES: Any cross from the City of
11	Brunswi ck?
12	MR. DRAG: No, Your Honor.
13	JUDGE JONES: City of Joplin?
14	MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor.
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:
16	Q. I believe Mr. Downey just asked you some
17	questions about other states and you've looked at
18	those other states. American Water currently is
19	operating in 15 states, is that correct including,
20	Mi ssouri?
21	A. I think the exact number is 16.
22	Q. 16?
23	A. It's a little confusing. I would say 15,
24	16.
25	Q. So in the 16 states that American Water

4	
1	is operating, how many are under single-tariff
2	pri ci ng?
3	A. I mean I would say full single tariff
4	and this is different than when we were talking about
5	moving towards consolidation. We might say moving
6	towards consolidation might be more in line with what
7	Staff is proposing in terms of zones, but actual
8	single-tariff pricing, I would limit that to just
9	Pennsyl vani a.
10	Q. One?
11	A. Right.
12	Q. Okay. And you had said you had reviewed
13	Illinois's information?
14	A. I had.
15	Q. I'm going to hand you what's been marked
16	Joplin 2.
17	Q. All right. So is this the information
18	that you reviewed or have you seen this before?
19	A. Yes, this is it.
20	Q. Okay. And this is the information of
21	Illinois Notice of Proposed Change in Scheduled Rates
22	that's currently before the Illinois Commission?
23	A. That's correct.
24	Q. And the second page, what do you see on
25	the second page? Does that show separate districts,

1	14 to be exact?
2	A. It does.
3	Q. And so in your opinion, is this
4	single-tariff pricing?
5	A. This would not appear to be single-tariff
6	pri ci ng.
7	Q. Okay. No further questions.
8	MS. BELL: At this time I'd offer Joplin
9	2.
10	JUDGE JONES: Any objection to Joplin's
11	Exhi bi t 2?
12	I see none. Joplin's Exhibit 2 is
13	admitted into the record.
14	(Joplin Exhibit 2 was received into
15	evi dence.)
16	JUDGE JONES: Any questions for
17	Ri versi de?
18	MR. BEDNAR: Yes, Your Honor.
19	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:
20	Q. Dr. Marke, in reference to your
21	allegation that I was misleading, this is testimony
22	from Office of Public Counsel though? This was their
23	exhi bi t?
24	A. That is correct.
25	Q. Right. And it's actually highlighted

State Commission policies and has the chart. Now, in 1999 -- so what you've highlighted is the fact that it's somewhat misleading to talk about district-specific policies at all because we really don't have district-specific policy in the state of Missouri, do we? Have we not consolidated districts since 2000?

- A. There has been consolidation, yes, sir.
- Q. There has. From St. Charles into St. Louis, Warrenton into St. Louis --
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. -- correct?

So to say that Missouri is a district-specific state would be somewhat misleading too because we've taken it upon -- the parties have taken it upon themselves to consolidate amongst themselves as could be agreed upon over the last 16 years. Correct?

- A. Correct.
- Q. And also, the law of Missouri is that rates or charges, as you pointed out -- or your counsel pointed out in the PowerPoint, if rates or charges or the acts or regulations of any such persons or corporations are unjust, unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential or in any wise

1	in violation of any provision of law, the Commission
2	shall determine and prescribe the just and reasonable
3	rates and charges thereafter be enforced for the
4	service to be furnished. Correct?
5	A. I'm not an attorney, but I'll take your
6	word for it.
7	Q. So you'll agree that there's a point when
8	rates become too unreasonable for a particular
9	district, that you've supported the consolidation of
10	districts in the the Office of Public Counsel has
11	supported consolidation of districts in the past.
12	Correct?
13	A. Correct.
14	Q. Do you have a number or index of what
15	your base number is for a reasonable rate and how high
16	that has to go before you support consolidation?
17	A. I would be speaking for myself,
18	Mr. Bednar.
19	Q. That's fine.
20	A. You know, I think when we say an increase
21	in rates, I think we try to look at the totality of
22	it. And in that sense, what I mean is if we have a
23	district that is vastly under-paying their
24	cost-of-service, when we say like a 50 percent

increase, proportionately that might not have the same

25

sort of impact on, say, a city like Riverside that's paying -- their total bill would be much greater. So to give you a range, I would say that it's -- we look at it on a case-by-case basis.

- Q. Is there any district in particular that you focus on that you'd use as a basis for what the base would be for average residential user per month or average customer per month?
- A. I would say St. Louis Metro on average, because they represent 81 percent of the overall customer base.
- Q. And so what -- if that's the index, how far do you have to go above that St. Louis rate before you would support consolidation?
 - A. When you say to support consolidation --
- Q. Does it have to be 20 percent greater than the St. Louis residential rate, 30 percent, 50 percent, 100 percent? At what point do you believe consolidation becomes just and reasonable?
- A. I mean, again, I think it depends on the situation at hand. A 40 percent increase for a district that's charging say 7 cents for a volumetric charge at face value for us wouldn't be out of the zone of reasonableness.
 - Q. Have you -- has the Public Counsel

1	offered any regulatory scheme, rulemaking scheme that
2	would establish standards for consolidation?
3	A. Have we proposed?
4	Q. Yes.
5	A. No, we have not.
6	Q. No further questions.
7	JUDGE JONES: City of St. Joseph?
8	MR. LAWYER: I have no questions.
9	JUDGE JONES: City of Warrensburg?
10	MR. CURTIS: No questions. Thank you.
11	JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply
12	Districts? StoneBridge?
13	MR. DORITY: I'm going to save my
14	questions on district consolidation until we take up
15	that issue, Judge. Thank you.
16	JUDGE JONES: I appreciate that,
17	Mr. Dority.
18	Triumph? Staff of the Commission?
19	MR. THOMPSON: No questions. Thank you,
20	Judge.
21	JUDGE JONES: Missouri American Water
22	Company?
23	MR. COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
24	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. COOPER:
25	Q. Dr. Marke and I think Mr. Bednar may

1	have gotten to this a little bit, but the term
2	"single-tariff pricing and consolidated pricing" were
3	kind of being thrown around. Would you agree with me
4	that they're not necessarily the same thing?
5	A. I would agree with that.
6	Q. And so less than single-tariff pricing,
7	you could have some consolidation of different systems
8	into a single price. Correct?
9	A. Mr. Cooper, could you please repeat that
10	again? I'm sorry.
11	Q. Yeah. So short of well, tell me what
12	you would how you would define single-tariff
13	pri ci ng.
14	A. A uniform rate across all the districts.
15	Q. Across all the districts in the state?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. Okay. So but short of a uniform rate
18	across all districts within the state, you could
19	have
20	A. Some form of consolidation.
21	Q some form of consolidation. Correct?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Okay. And that consolidation might or
24	might not be apparent on the face of a company's
25	tariff. Correct?

1	A. I would agree with that.
2	Q. So, for example, if you're familiar with
3	it, I think that the Company's current Jefferson City
4	wastewater district actually includes, what, maybe
5	50 individual wastewater systems within that. Right?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. So that would be a form of consolidation
8	that already exists in the Company's tariffs?
9	A. That's correct.
10	Q. And it would be hard to just look at the
11	Company's tariffs and discern that. Correct?
12	A. I mean I believe I would agree with you.
13	It would be tough to go ahead and and by reading
14	the tariffs knowing to know that Jefferson City has
15	50, say, separate systems within that, yes.
16	Q. Yeah, that that rate is a form of
17	consolidated rate?
18	A. Sure.
19	Q. That's all the questions I have.
20	JUDGE JONES: Any questions from the
21	commissioners? Mr. Chairman?
22	CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions. Thank you.
23	COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. Thank
24	you.
25	JUDGE JONES: Redi rect?

1	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
2	Q. Just one. You got the questions about
3	Public Counsel's positions on consolidation. And we
4	have entered into a stipulation that does move to some
5	consolidation; is that correct?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. And that's to be taken up I believe at
8	the next issue. Is that your understanding?
9	A. That's my understanding.
10	Q. All right. Thank you. That's all.
11	JUDGE JONES: All right, Dr. Marke, you
12	may step down.
13	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
14	JUDGE JONES: Staff has a witness.
15	MR. THOMPSON: Staff calls Natelle
16	Di etri ch.
17	(Wi tness affirmed.)
18	JUDGE JONES: Thank you. You may be
19	seated.
20	NATELLE DIETRICH, testified as follows:
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:
22	Q. Please spell your name for the reporter.
23	A. Natelle, N-a-t-e-l-l-e, Dietrich,
24	D-i-e-t-r-i-c-h.
25	Q. How are you employed?

1	A. I am the Staff director for the Public
2	Service Commission.
3	Q. Now, you did not submit any testimony in
4	this case; isn't that correct?
5	A. That's correct.
6	Q. As Staff director, is it your function to
7	make the final decisions as to what Staff's positions
8	are in any case?
9	A. That's correct.
10	MR. THOMPSON: May I approach, Your
11	Honor?
12	JUDGE JONES: Yes, you may.
13	BY MR. THOMPSON:
14	Q. I show you what's been marked as Staff's
15	Exhibit 33. Do you recognize that?
16	A. Yes. This is my credentials.
17	Q. I'll give you a copy.
18	MR. THOMPSON: I can provide copies to
19	the Commission later. I only had those two. And this
20	document was sent out to all of you a couple days ago.
21	BY MR. THOMPSON:
22	Q. Does that accurately reflect your
23	training your experience and your training?
24	A. Yes, it does.
25	MR. THOMPSON: At this time I would move

1	the to admission of Staff 33.
2	JUDGE JONES: Staff Exhibit 33. And
3	could you describe that for me again, Mr. Thompson?
4	I'm sorry.
5	MR. THOMPSON: That's Ms. Dietrich's
6	credentials that would normally be attached to her
7	testimony if she filed any.
8	JUDGE JONES: Any objections to Staff's
9	Exhi bi t 33?
10	Seeing none, Staff Exhibit 33 is admitted
11	into the record.
12	(Staff Exhibit 33 was received into
13	evi dence.)
14	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. I
15	tender the witness for cross-examination.
16	JUDGE JONES: Any cross-examination from
17	Department of Energy?
18	MR. ANTAL: No cross. Thank you.
19	JUDGE JONES: MI EC?
20	MR. DOWNEY: No cross.
21	JUDGE JONES: City of Brunswick?
22	MR. DRAG: No cross, Your Honor.
23	JUDGE JONES: City of Joplin?
24	MS. BELL: No questions.
25	JUDGE JONES: City of Riverside?

1	MR. BEDNAR: No questions, Your Honor.
2	JUDGE JONES: City of St. Joseph?
3	MR. LAWYER: No questions.
4	JUDGE JONES: City of Warrensburg?
5	MR. CURTIS: No questions, Your Honor.
6	JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply
7	Di stri cts?
8	MR. DORITY: No questions.
9	JUDGE JONES: StoneBridge? Triumph?
10	MR. HARDEN: No questions.
11	JUDGE JONES: OPC?
12	MR. POSTON: No questions.
13	JUDGE JONES: Missouri American Water
14	Company?
15	MR. COOPER: No questions.
16	JUDGE JONES: All right. Any questions
17	from the Commissioners?
18	CHAIRMAN HALL: Just a few.
19	QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:
20	Q. Good afternoon.
21	A. Good afternoon.
22	Q. There is a significant amount of written
23	testimony in this case and then also some some
24	comments during openings of various parties that the
25	two most significant challenges facing Missouri

American are significant capital needs and declining consumption. Would you -- would you agree that those are significant challenges facing -- facing Missouri American?

- A. I would agree that that has been portrayed as that. I think Staff has a different opinion as far as the declining consumption and probably Mr. Busch could get into the details more.
- Q. So Staff does -- does not believe that there is generally a trend going down to consumption?
- A. No. I would say that there's generally a trend, but perhaps not --
 - Q. Okay. Well --
 - A. -- to the extent as Missouri American.
- Q. Okay. So assuming that there is a general trend of declining consumption, is that a significant challenge for Missouri American going forward?
- A. Again, I would say it's a significant challenge. I don't know specifically for Missouri American. For -- for the water industry in general, I would say it's a challenge.
- Q. And so would you -- do you think that there are other challenges more significant for the Company than declining consumption and the significant

1	capital needs?
2	A. I think the aging infrastructure, which
3	would be the capital needs, is a significant
4	probably the most significant issue for the Company.
5	And then along with that, declining consumption to the
6	extent that it's an issue also.
7	Q. So would you are you aware of other
8	significant challenges facing the Company?
9	A. Not that I can think of off the top of my
10	head.
11	Q. So is it Staff's position that that
12	whatever resolution the Commission reaches in this
13	case, it should it should address these two
14	these two challenges?
15	A. That the Commission's resolution should
16	address those challenges?
17	Q. Yes.
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Obviously there's other concerns,
20	affordability for example, there are other
21	concerns, but but we need to take those two into
22	account for sure. Is that is that your testimony?
23	A. That's correct. Along with ensuring just
24	and reasonable rates, safe and adequate service.
25	Q. Okay. Thank you.

1	COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions, thank
2	you.
3	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Coleman?
4	COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: No questions.
5	JUDGE JONES: Any recross based on the
6	Chairman's questions? Any redirect?
7	MR. POSTON: I will have recross. I'm
8	sorry.
9	JUDGE JONES: You have recross?
10	MR. POSTON: Yes.
11	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
12	Q. I can't read my own handwriting.
13	You were asked questions about the usage
14	and infrastructure challenges. Do you believe that
15	the revenue requirement stipulation we entered into
16	adequately addresses those challenges for this case?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Thank you. That's all.
19	MR. JONES: I'm assuming there's no more
20	recross. Okay. Any redirect?
21	MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Poston addressed my
22	point. Thank you, Judge.
23	JUDGE JONES: All right. Ms. Dietrich,
24	you may step down.
25	Okay. Those are all the witnesses for

1	this first issue of regulatory policy. I realize it's
2	a quarter after noon, but we want there's a witness
3	we have to accommodate. So let's go ahead and move
4	right into the next issue of district consolidation,
5	we'll take opening statements, talk about the
6	stipulation, take one witness and then go to lunch.
7	How does that sound? Well, doesn't matter.
8	MR. COOPER: Judge, I need to get
9	Mr. England here for that issue before we move on.
10	JUDGE JONES: All right. Is he upstairs?
11	Down the street?
12	MR. COOPER: He's down the street. Do
13	you want to do it well, I can do that. It will
14	probably take a few minutes to get him here or we
15	could just plan to start at 1:00 p.m. I suppose too.
16	JUDGE JONES: Does he have to be here for
17	the opening and the discussion of the Stipulation and
18	Agreement?
19	MR. COOPER: Yes.
20	JUDGE JONES: Well, let's go ahead and
21	have him walk on down here. Or I'm sure he runs from
22	time to time.
23	MR. COOPER: I have run with him at the
24	Y. He's actually pretty good at it.
25	JUDGE JONES: Let's take a brief break

1 while we gather Mr. England. 2 (A recess was taken.) 3 JUDGE JONES: The issue we're on now is 4 district consolidation, consolidated pricing. Let's 5 take opening statements beginning with Missouri 6 American Water Company. 7 MR. ENGLAND: Your Honor, I'm going to 8 make a reference to a schedule that's contained in 9 Paul Herbert's Rebuttal Testimony and I thought I'd 10 just duplicate that schedule. It doesn't need to be 11 marked as an exhibit since it will be part of his 12 testimony offered later when he takes the witness 13 stand. 14 JUDGE JONES: You may proceed. 15 MR. ENGLAND: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 It's been a while since I've appeared before the 17 Commission, so I feel probably necessary to introduce 18 My name is Trip England and I, along with my myself. 19 younger and more energetic partner, represent Missouri 20 American Water Company. 21 I want to talk to you today about the 22 issue that's been identified as consolidated pricing. 23 I've handed out a schedule from one of our witness's 24 Rebuttal Testimony, Mr. Paul Herbert. And it shows 25 the proposed groupings that first the Company proposed

as part of its direct case and then the groupings of various districts into larger water districts proposed by the Staff. You'll see some handwritten numbers on the schedule. Those are corrections that Mr. Herbert will make when he gets on the witness stand later today.

Consolidated pricing from the Company's perspective is the establishment of the same rates for the same service provided by the water company regardless of the customer's location. As shown in Staff's handout Monday, yesterday, Missouri American Water Company provides water service to 19 different water districts and 13 different sewer or wastewater districts.

The Company's proposal in this case is to consolidate those 19 water districts into three zones and those 13 sewer districts into two zones. The Staff, as I indicated earlier, is also proposing to consolidate the water districts into three rate groups or larger districts and the sewer districts into five groups.

The different groupings or zones proposed by the Company and Staff take different approaches. First, the Company based its grouping on the existing level of rates in the various districts and trying to

1 | Q 2 | Q 3 | i 4 | 1

group those districts with the lowest rates in group one or zone one, those with the highest existing rates in zone three, and then, of course, zone two captures the districts with rates in between those two extremes.

The Staff, on the other hand, has proposed, and not unreasonably, consolidation of the various districts based on their geographic location or proximity as well as the similar operating characteristics of the various districts.

The Company has gone as far as to indicate its acceptance of the Staff's grouping in its Rebuttal Testimony so the Company is agnostic right now whether you accept its proposed grouping of districts or Staff's proposed grouping or consolidation of districts.

What we do propose is a substantial or a significant consolidation of the 19 water districts and the 13 sewer districts. In that regard, and I've only recently seen it, the Company is not in favor of and cannot accept the limited consolidation that's been proposed in the Non-unanimous Stipulation and Agreement that was filed earlier today by a number of parties. And of course, what it wants to avoid at all costs is continuation of the status quo which is

primarily district-specific pricing for most of its districts.

decision. The question you need to ask yourself is are we going to consolidate an average cost over a larger geographic area and over a larger customer base? Doing this will promote better rate stability, it will mitigate rate increases or what's been termed as rate shock when one district has to absorb a large capital investment. It will promote universally available water service at affordable rates and it will promote the acquisition of small, troubled water and wastewater systems.

District-specific pricing, as advocated by some, will not achieve any of these goals. The proponents of district-specific pricing trumpet the virtue of cost-based pricing; that the cost causer should be the cost payer. But setting rates on a district-specific basis may be no more accurate than setting rates on a consolidated basis as proposed by the Company and Staff in this case.

First, consider that district-specific costs already have achieved a level of consolidation. For example, the customer who lives next to the water treatment plant is going to be far less expensive to

serve than the customer who lives miles away from the treatment plant who obviously incurs transmission costs in getting the water there, as well as pumping costs and perhaps storage costs depending on where they're located in the district. District-specific costs do not recognize these cost differentials between customers within the district.

15

16

8

Second, consider that many of the district's costs in this case represent an allocation of common operation and maintenance expenses. Staff witness Busch explains, these cost allocations are made based on informed judgment, but are more of an art than a science. Thus, depending on how you choose to allocate costs -- these common operating and maintenance costs -- among districts, the resulting district costs can vary widely.

21

24

25

When it comes right down to it, water is a homogenous product, whether it's taken from surface water supplies or pumped from wells in the ground. It's treated to meet the same quality standards and provided at the same or similar pressures. There is no good reason why the price of this product should be different depending on where the customer lives within the various serving areas of this company.

By the way, the same rationale for

consolidating water districts would apply equally to consolidating sewer districts.

You don't have to take my word for it though. The Company has retained the services of two expert witnesses in this case to tell you about consolidated pricing and its virtues. The first is Mr. Paul Herbert. He is with Gannett and Fleming rate consultants and has prepared and submitted the only class cost-of-service study for the Company in this case. Mr. Herbert has been working and consulting in the areas of rate design and cost-of-service for nearly 40 years.

Second, Dr. Karl Meyer -- or excuse me, Dr. Karl McDermott, who will appear here tomorrow, has also been retained by the Company to provide a policy perspective on the benefits of consolidated tariff pricing. Dr. McDermott has a Ph.D. in economics and has been working in the field of public utility regulation for over 30 years. Notably, part of his work experience includes work on the Illinois Commerce Commission Staff and then later as a Commissioner with the Illinois Commerce Commission. More recently, he is a professor of public -- or excuse me, of economics, including the regulation of public utilities and has taught graduate and undergraduate

level courses, including regulatory economics at 1 2 Illinois State University. 3 One final comment or note about 4 consolidated pricing. And I'm quoting from the 5 testimony of Staff witness Busch who says, Now is the 6 perfect time to consolidate rates when no one district 7 is likely to experience rate shock. 8 You need look no further than the handout 9 you received yesterday to see that while water rates 10 or base rates are increasing by approximately 11 11 percent in this case, nearly 10 percent of that 12 increase has already been experienced by customers in 13 the St. Louis County district through the ISRS 14 surcharge. So the real net increase in base rate 15 revenues for the water district is about 1 percent. 16 We think that makes, as Staff witness 17 Busch would say, a perfect time for the Commission to 18 realign the rates of the various districts in this 19 state and move to meaningful consolidation of those 20 rates and districts. Thank you. 21 JUDGE JONES: Thank you. Mr. Chairman 22 might have a couple --23 CHAIRMAN HALL: Excuse me, Mr. England. 24 Just a couple of questions. You -- you -- you 25 mentioned that the issue before us on district

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

consolidation is a policy issue, and I agree. I'm wondering though, are there any legal standards or is there any case law out there that would give us any quidance in this policy decision?

MR. ENGLAND: Yes, but you put me on the spot, Chairman Hall. I'm not sure any of the parties are arguing that you can't do some level of consolidation or cost averaging. As I mentioned, we already do it at the district level. I believe there's some in the -- what has been called district eight where the small water systems have been partially consolidated.

From a legal perspective -- and I can't recall the case name, but it had to -- it dealt with I believe pricing of gas service in and around the Cape Girardeau area. And the city was either arguing for or against rates -- rate differential between inside the city limits and outside the city limits. And I'm coming at this at a very high level because the case is 40 years old, I believe. And my memory these days is not that good.

But I do recall that the Court of Appeals in that case, it may have even been the Supreme Court, said that averaging of rates was appropriate, that the Commission was not constrained to set rates within the

1	city limits based on the costs within the city limits
2	and different rates outside the city limits based on
3	those costs.
4	CHAIRMAN HALL: So in other words, do you
5	believe that of the of the proposals on the table,
6	Staff's, the Company's, OPC's OPC, dash, MIEC and
7	the cities, that the Commission pretty much has
8	discretion to choose from any of them from a legal
9	perspecti ve?
10	MR. ENGLAND: From the ones I've seen so
11	far, yes, sir.
12	CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you.
13	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Opening I believe
14	that's all, Mr. England. Thank you.
15	MR. ENGLAND: Thank you.
16	JUDGE JONES: Opening statements from the
17	Staff of the Public Service Commission.
18	MS. MYERS: May it please the Commission.
19	I am Jamie Myers with Staff counsel and I'll be
20	introducing Staff's district consolidation and
21	consolidated pricing proposals.
22	I would first like to start off by noting
23	that Staff consisting abides by cost-of-service
24	rate-making principles, including the concept that
25	cost should be assigned to cost causers. Yet Staff is

cognizant of the reality of rate -- that rate-makingdoes not occur in a vacuum.

Staff is sensitive to the important public policy issues implicated here, among which include the need for all Missouri residents to have access to safe and adequate drinking water; the desire to minimize, to the extent possible, rate shock to Missouri residents; and the unfortunate reality that there are many struggling water and sewer companies in Missouri.

Staff is here to provide the Commission with a district consolidation proposal that strikes the appropriate balance between cost-of-service rate-making and public policy concerns.

Staff's three-district water proposal is a hybrid steam -- or a hybrid scheme. Staff does not at this time support full consolidation of all districts into one, which would result in single-tariff pricing, nor does Staff support a strict application of district-specific pricing.

Staff supports combining Missouri
American Water Company's water districts into three
hybrid districts. Staff consolidated the many service
areas of Missouri American Water Company into three
districts, combining service areas with similar

operating characteristics and geographic locations. 1 2 Staff's proposed water district one is 3 comprised of St. Louis Metro, which is St. Louis 4 County, Warren County and St. Charles, Mexico, 5 Jefferson City, Anna Meadows, Redfield and Lake 6 Carmel. 7 Staff's proposed water district two is 8 comprised of St. Joseph, Platte County and Brunswick. 9 And finally, Staff's proposed water 10 district three is comprised of Joplin, StoneBridge, Warrensburg, Whitebranch, Lake Taneycomo, Lakewood 11 12 Manor, Rankin Acres, Spring Valley, Tri-States, 13 Emerald Pointe, Maple Wood and Riverside Estates. 14 Thankfully, Mr. England passed out a 15 handout of which page 2 you can graphically see what 16 Staff's grouping would be. Staff has allocated costs 17 to each respective district. Staff is proposing that 18 the fixed charge and the commodity charge will be 19 uniform within each district for each class. 20 For sewer districts, Staff proposes a 21 five-district plan based simply on geographic 22 District one would be Arnold. Location. Sewer 23 district two is Platte County. Sewer district three is Cedar Hills, Warren County, Anna Meadows and 24 25 Meramec. Sewer district 4 is Jefferson City, Maple

Wood and Ozark Meadows. Sewer district five is 1 2 StoneBridge, Saddlebrooke and Emerald Pointe. 3 is proposing at this time that sewer rates remain at 4 their current levels. 5 Staff witness James A. Busch is here to 6 provide any answers you may have about Staff's 7 consolidation proposal. Mr. Busch has written Direct, 8 Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testimonies concerning 9 consolidation. Mr. Busch is also sponsoring Staff's 10 report on class cost-of-service and rate design. 11 And I'd also like to bring attention to 12 the Commission in regards to Chairman Hall's question 13 about the legal standards here. Staff had a case, it 14 was SW-2011-0103 that dealt with the legal issues of 15 consol i dati on. So thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN HALL: What was that citation 17 agai n? 18 MS. MYERS: It's SW-2011-0103. 19 JUDGE JONES: Questions? 20 CHAIRMAN HALL: Do you agree with 21 Mr. England though that at the end of the day, the 22 Commission has a policy decision to make? It has 23 discretion concerning the various consolidation 24 proposals that are at issue here? 25 MS. MYERS: We do.

1 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Thank you. 2 JUDGE JONES: Thank you. 3 Office of the Public Counsel? 4 MR. POSTON: May it please the 5 Commission. When we consider the issue of district 6 consolidation, we're really considering another aspect 7 of rate design. There's no physical connection being 8 made when two separate water systems consolidate. 9 It's a fictional consolidation for rate-making 10 purposes. The water source, treatment plants, pump 11 stations, storage tanks and the pipes, they all stay 12 separate. It's really just a change in how -- how 13 cost responsibility is shared and allocated. 14 Consolidation establishes a regulatory 15 policy of subsidizing high-cost water systems by other 16 separate and distinct water systems. It requires 17 those served by average- to low-cost systems to pay 18 costs incurred by high-cost systems. 19 We have two witnesses submit testimony on 20 this issue; our in-house economist, Dr. Geoff Marke 21 and our outside consultant, Mr. Ralph Smith of Larkin 22 Dr. Marke lays out a number of well Associ ates. 23 researched and explained reasons why consolidating as proposed in this case is not in the public interest. 24 25 And the first reason to reject the

consolidation proposed by the Company and the Staff is that it distorts price signals. And by that I mean when you consolidate, you're making it easier for the Company to further invest in high-cost areas that may not even need investment. It masks the investment by spreading it out over more customers, thus, giving the Company an incentive to make needless investments in systems that are already high-cost systems. This --the result is higher costs for everyone.

If you maintain the price signal by using district-specific pricing, however, it focuses -- forces the Company to be more thoughtful when it invests in its systems. District-specific pricing helps reduce over-investment in infrastructure.

Likewise, consolidation also distorts the price signal for the customers. A customer in a high-cost water service that's being subsidized by customers of another water system will have more of an incentive to use more water due to that subsidy.

consolidated pricing violates well established principles of cost causation and does not resolve in cost-based rates. As you heard repeatedly in the public hearings, the majority of the Company's customers want to pay cost-based rates and with a few exceptions, are consistently opposed to paying costs

1 for someone else's water systems.

When deciding this issue, you'll need to ask yourself if it's better for thousands of low-income customers in St. Louis, St. Joe or Joplin to pay costs incurred by separate water systems that cannot and will not ever provide them with a single drop of water.

Another point Dr. Marke makes is that water service is local. It's not -- it's locally extracted, either from surface water or wells. It's locally treated and it's locally delivered. This is very different than electric and gas utilities where the product can be delivered across the state. Consolidation ignores the fact that water systems hundreds of miles apart do not share plant.

Consolidating separate water systems raises the public policy arguments I identified earlier today in my regulatory policy opening statements; namely, those created by Sections 393.130 and 393.140 of the Missouri statutes.

The rates and regulations of Missouri American cannot provide an undue or unreasonable preference or prejudice, advantage or disadvantage. Consolidating districts will create advantages and disadvantages -- disadvantages, depending on the

1 I

locale of the water system.

That alone, however, doesn't mean consolidating isn't lawful -- to go to the Chairman's question -- since the statute qualifies those prohibitions to those that are undue or unreasonable, suggesting that consolidation is legal, so long as the record supports the Commission conclusion that such consolidation is not undue or unreasonable.

To the extent the Commission concludes that it's good public policy to further consolidate Missouri American Water's districts, we ask that you follow the consolidation proposal that we filed with Joplin, St. Joe, Brunswick and MIEC, which was not opposed by the Public Water Districts and the City of Warrensburg.

We believe the agreement addresses the needs of every party in this case. It would allow a number of smaller districts to be consolidated with larger districts, while at the same time maintaining the district-specific pricing being advocated by most of the municipal parties in this case.

Also, if you consolidate districts in this case as proposed by the Staff, we strongly urge you not to also raise the customer charge. And to instead, reduce the customer charges and help mitigate

the rate shock that could occur from the cost shifts and rate increases caused by consolidation alone. Please don't multiply the harmful impacts on customers by hitting them a second time through a higher customer charge.

Instead, please order the rates proposed in the Staff's Direct Testimony, which range between 9 and 11 dollars depending on the district, or the zone as Staff has characterized it. These rates are consistent with other customer charges in Missouri; namely, those provided by the two largest electric companies in Missouri, Ameren and KCPL, which charge an 8 dollar and \$11.88 customer charge respectively.

Missouri American Water seeks a \$17.40 customer charge in this case, which is much higher than the rate American Water charges in almost every other state where it provides service. Throughout this case you've heard the Company's witnesses compare Missouri American to electric industry and if they believe such similarities exist, a similar customer charge is also warranted.

In conclusion, while we continue to support district-specific pricing, we recognize that the Commission may be interested in consolidating.

If that assessment is correct, we urge you to approve

1	our Non-unanimous Stipulation and Agreement and
2	resolve three issues at once; customer charge,
3	district consolidation and sewer revenue requirement.
4	If socialized rate-making is to be the policy of the
5	state to help distressed water and sewer systems, that
6	policy should come from the General Assembly. And
7	hopefully that policy will to share costs statewide,
8	not just by a few distant municipalities. Thank you.
9	JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
10	Mr. Chairman?
11	CHAIRMAN HALL: A couple questions. I
12	understand that OPC does not like either the Company's
13	or Staff's consolidation proposals. Do you have a
14	thought as to which one you dislike more?
15	MR. POSTON: We we would by far prefer
16	the Staff's proposal over the Company's proposal.
17	CHAIRMAN HALL: And why is that?
18	MR. POSTON: Well, I think Mr. Marke
19	would probably be the or Dr. Marke, sorry, would
20	probably be the best to answer that for you.
21	CHAIRMAN HALL: That's fine. Thank you.
22	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Thank you.
23	Missouri Division of Energy.
24	MR. ANTAL: Good afternoon. May it
25	please the Commission. My name is Alex Antal and I'm

here today appearing on behalf of the Missouri
Division of Energy. I will save some of my remarks
regarding the Division of Energy's interest in this
case for my opening in the rate design and customer
charge opening; however, I did want to make some brief
comments that are related to the consolidation issue
in this case.

The Division of Energy's witness,
Mr. Hyman recommended in his Rebuttal Rate Design
Testimony that the Commission requests it consider a
comparison of bill impacts between the various
parties' district consolidation proposals under a
common revenue requirement and billing unit
assumptions. Revenue requirement is a key factor
affecting the level at which rates are set and in
determining the impacts of district consolidation.

Now, the Division of Energy renews that recommendation here today. The Division of Energy has had the opportunity to review both Company's consolidation proposals under their filed revenue requirements. However, those revenue requirements, as you know, are significantly different in dollar amounts.

Now, the Commission has before it a Non-unanimous Stipulation and Agreement as to a

agreed-upon revenue requirement between the parties that has not been approved at this time; however, it does provide a basis for a common revenue requirement to -- for the parties who are proposing consolidation to conduct a bill impact analysis.

Now, why is it important to do a bill impact analysis? The purpose of a bill impact analysis is to determine the changes to customer bills as the result of changes in rates, which such an analysis is often based on the average customer. However, it should also take into account customers who use more or less amounts of a given commodity to determine equity and efficiency impacts.

We believe that it would be prudent and reasonable for the parties that are proposing consolidation in this case to perform a bill impact analysis and provide that to the Commission so we can do an apples-to-apples comparison under a common revenue requirement. So that's the extent of my prepared remarks. If there are any questions --

CHAIRMAN HALL: You're suggesting that the parties submit a bill impact analysis based upon their -- their consolidation position and their rate design position. Correct?

MR. ANTAL: Yes. With a common revenue

1	requi rement.
2	CHAIRMAN HALL: With a common revenue
3	requirement. I agree. I like that idea.
4	MR. ANTAL: Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN HALL: Is that something, Judge,
6	that you can specifically request?
7	JUDGE JONES: Sure. The parties are
8	ordered to file a bill impact statement. Is that what
9	it was?
10	MR. ANTAL: A bill impact analysis.
11	JUDGE JONES: And you want Staff and OPC
12	to do that?
13	MR. ANTAL: As well as the Company. I
14	think those are all the three different consolidation
15	proposals. Those parties may have, you know, comments
16	as to the reasonableness and tim you know, the
17	amount of time they may need for such an analysis.
18	CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, I don't think we
19	need it by, you know, 1:30 or anything. But I
20	JUDGE JONES: We'll talk about the timing
21	of filing that off the record.
22	CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you.
23	MR. ENGLAND: Your Honor, excuse me.
24	This is Mr. England back in the back row here. We can
25	have an analysis for you by 1:30 on the various

1	proposals. I'm tempted to offer that the other
2	parties who want to make their own billing analysis
3	make their own sandwich, but we have various scenarios
4	that we think address what Mr. Antal's requesting.
5	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Thank you,
6	Mr. England. Any more questions? You may sit down,
7	Mr. Antal.
8	MR. ANTAL: Thank you.
9	JUDGE JONES: Missouri Industrial Energy
10	Consumers?
11	MR. DOWNEY: Somebody know how to turn
12	the computer on?
13	JUDGE JONES: I know what I have to do up
14	here. I don't know what you need to do over there.
15	Let's see if this works.
16	MR. DOWNEY: I anticipated this might
17	happen so I brought copies. Hopefully enough for
18	everybody. Should I wait for Commissioner Stoll?
19	JUDGE JONES: He'll be right back. Thank
20	you. I think if you'll come over to the witness stand
21	and move the mouse, it may give you a screen.
22	MR. DOWNEY: I thought the mouse was up
23	there.
24	JUDGE JONES: I don't know.
25	MR. FISCHER: It may just be the switch

is off on the --1 2 JUDGE JONES: Try to turn the power on. 3 MR. DOWNEY: All right. 4 MR. POSTON: He had some problems earlier 5 with that powering down. 6 MR. DOWNEY: You have to turn the power 7 on here. 8 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Sorry. 9 MR. DOWNEY: All right. Good afternoon. 10 May it please the Commission. My name is Ed Downey. I represent industrial consumers in the St. Louis 11 12 Metro district. In representing them, I'm also here 13 tangentially representing residential consumers in 14 that district as well. 15 The MIEC opposes consolidated pricing. 16 Our witness, our sole witness on this issue is Brian 17 He's a technical expert with Brubaker and 18 Unfortunately, he had scheduled a Associ ates. 19 vacation this week before we got the hearing schedule 20 in this case. He's out of town. He is not available 21 today. I've summoned him back to Missouri to testify 22 tomorrow afternoon on this issue. And I certainly 23 hope you will have questions for him since he's going 24 to be traveling and breaking up his vacation. 25 As shown in the Direct Testimony of Brian Collins at page 3, the industrial class of the

St. Louis district would see over four times the

increase under consolidated pricing. That's over and
above what it would see under the current breakdown of
districts. Residential and other customers in the

St. Louis Metro district would also see
disproportionate increases as well.

Consolidated pricing places convenience of the Company over fairness and avoidance of discrimination. Consolidated pricing also ignores the differences in costs of providing service. It's inconsistent with traditional cost-of-service principles. It results in subsidies to customers in high-cost districts at great -- great cost to customers in low-cost districts.

Consolidated pricing is unfair.

Consolidating price -- consolidated pricing can erode the efficiency of the water system by sending the wrong price signals. You've already heard some of those comments from OPC. Consolidated pricing causes decision makers to focus on who gets and who gives the subsidies and that can change over time, causing parties to ever change their positions.

As an example of that, you need look no further than Riverside. Riverside in this case thinks

consolidated pricing is wonderful. Yet in WR-2000-281, it argued that consolidated pricing was both illegal discrimination and unreasonable. And in its brief, which I have a copy of and I'm going to ask the Commission to take official notice of it, the brief it filed in that case, it cited State ex rel. Kansas City versus Public Service Commission, a very old yet still valid Missouri Supreme Court en banc decision.

In that decision, the Court said, Neither convenience, expediency or necessity are proper matters for consideration in the determination of whether or not an act of the Commission is authorized by the statute.

What I've heard a lot of today is it's -it's expedient to consolidate districts for pricing
purposes.

Riverside also cited Section 393.130.1 and .3, which I believe Mr. Poston made reference to in his opening statement. Subsection 1 provides, All charges made or demanded by any water corporation for water service rendered or to be rendered shall be just and reasonable. Every unjust or unreasonable charge made or demanded for water service or connection therewith is prohibited.

Subsection 3 provides, No water corporation shall make or grant any -- and the important word is undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any person, corporation or locality or to any particular description of service in any respect whatsoever or subject any particular person, corporation or locality or any particular description of service to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever.

I also refer you to Bonbright's treatise, Principles of Public Utility Rates at pages 338 and 384. And I'm going to ask the Commission to take official notice of that as well. Static efficiency of the rate classes and rate blocks is discouraging wasteful use of service. That's attributes of proper utility rates. Reflection of all the present and future private and social costs and benefits occasioned by a services provision; in other words, all internalities and externalities.

He also touts fairness of the specific rates in the apportionment of total cost of service among the different ratepayers so as to avoid arbitrariness and capriciousness and to attain equity in three dimensions: Horizontal, equals treated equally; vertical, unequals treated unequally; and

1
 2
 3

anonymous, i.e., no ratepayers' demands can be diverted away uneconomically from an incumbent by a potential entrant.

He also touts avoidance of undue discrimination in rate relationships so as to be, if possible, compensatory, i.e., subsidy free with no inter-customer burdens.

He also notes dynamic efficiency in promoting innovation and responding economically to changing demand and supply patterns is an important consideration.

Here, as Mr. Collins observes on page 4 of his direct, there is no common or economic cost structure across the many company districts throughout this state. Specifically, many of the districts are not interconnected to the same or group of same water treatment plants. A water treatment plant in Joplin or St. Joseph, for example, cannot provide treated water to the St. Louis Metro district.

And on page 5, Collins observes,

Consolidated pricing is inconsistent with traditional cost-of-service principles and ignores the concept of cost causation. In essence, consolidated pricing results in price subsidies to consumers in high-cost districts at great cost to customers in low-cost

districts.

And you see that here. The consumer groups that are represented if they are in the high-cost districts, they want consolidation. If they're in the low-cost districts, they're fighting it.

He also -- Mr. Collins also notes on page 6, there's a transparency element here. If rates were to be consolidated, there would be no reason to maintain separate books and records for each operating district. This could inhibit management from effectively managing each of the districts because district-specific costs will not be maintained or managed. Due to the loss of transparent operating and financial data for each operating district, it would be very difficult to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of each operating unit or each operating district.

Indeed, as the MIEC understands the facts of this case, part of the reason Staff and the Company seek to consolidate districts now is that the cost impact to be subsidizing -- to the subsidizing districts now is not as great as it will likely be in the next few rate cases. And I think you heard during the opening statement of Staff that that is the

testimony of Mr. Busch.

But the subsidizing ratepayer should know what the true impact of consolidated pricing to them will be. Not just for now, but in the future. Transparency requires that. The better forum for considering consolidated pricing is in the next couple of rate cases when the cost of large plant improvements are under consideration. That's when you'll know who's going to be paying what.

The MIEC notes that Dr. Marke expressed the same concerns to consolidated pricing voiced by Collins. In addition, Dr. Marke observes that the consolidated pricing approach is a solution in search of a problem. And that you can find on his Surrebuttal at page 10.

He notes that one of the offered reasons for consolidated pricing is that it will encourage Missouri American to acquire more problem water and sewer systems. However, as he notes, Missouri American is already acquiring those systems while under district-specific pricing.

Dr. Marke also notes that the Missouri
American residential customers did not share a similar
income level. As shown on page 17 of Marke direct,
Platte County has one of the highest median income

1 Leve
2 St.
3 St.
4 Metr
5 Bell
6 of f
7 Lowe
8 thei
9 Plat

I evels and lowest poverty rates while the average of St. Louis Metro is worse in each metric and Joplin and St. Joseph are even worse still. And as for St. Louis Metro, Dr. Marke notes on page 18 of his direct, that Bellefontaine Neighbors and Ferguson, which are part of the St. Louis Metro district, have some of the lowest income levels and highest poverty rates, yet their ratepayers would be subsidizing ratepayers in Platte County.

Dr. Marke notes on his direct, pages 18 and 19, that under a CTP design, Ferguson and Ladue -- he includes Ladue -- and as you know, the income and the poverty rate is -- income is higher, poverty rate is lower there. Those residents would be subsidizing future high-cost districts geographically dispersed across the state and which no direct benefit would be received in St. Louis Metro. This would produce a result for St. Louis Metro customers well beyond the zone of just and reasonable.

In this case, Missouri American Water Company has not provided any compelling evidence that consideration of Missouri American Water Company's districts is warranted. In fact, it appears likely that a movement to further consolidate would place an additional burden on those least able to bear it.

In addition, you have the testimony of 1 2 the Joplin finance director Haase -- I hope I'm 3 pronouncing that correctly. Joplin opposes 4 consolidated pricing for some of the same reasons as 5 Collins and Marke, but she included an additional 6 reason that consolidating price is unfair for Joplin. 7 She notes that Joplin had earlier accepted 8 district-specific pricing, which because of expensive 9 Joplin district expenditures, caused Joplin's rates to 10 greatly increase because those expenditures were not 11 soci al i zed. 12 Now, she notes that under -- how unfair 13

Now, she notes that under -- how unfair it would be to Joplin to have it subsidize expensive plant improvements for other districts that did not subsidize Joplin's improvements.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, there's a partial stipulation, and I'm sure we'll discuss it in more detail later, but the Missouri Industrial Energy Commission did sign that and there is some consolidation in that. It is non-unanimous and I understand at least the Staff has objected to it. But it -- that stipulation is signed by representatives of the three metropolitan areas served by Missouri American; St. Louis, Joplin, St. Joseph, plus the Office of Public Counsel.

That stipulation attempts to address the

newly added, smaller problem systems. And in that 1 2 stipulation, the parties to that stipulation in the 3 spirit of compromise agree to limited consolidation in 4 which Anna Meadows and Hickory Hills would be 5 consolidated into St. Louis Metro. Brunswick would be 6 consolidated into the St. Joseph district, Redfield 7 into the Jefferson district -- Jefferson City district 8 and the remaining districts in district eight would be 9 consolidated with Branson. 10 In addition, St. Louis Metro and the City 11 of Joplin agreed to subsidize a 5 percent rate 12 reduction for Platte County. And of that 5 percent 13 rate reduction, 90 percent of the cost of that would 14 be borne by St. Louis Metro. That's all I had. 15 you have questions, I'd be happy to answer them. 16 JUDGE JONES: Mr. Chairman? 17 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. Are you taking the 18 position that the consolidation proposals of Staff and 19 the Company are illegal? 20 MR. DOWNEY: The -- I knew that was 21 I wish I had the answer. I think we likely coming. 22 will in our briefing. And I believe we'll likely 23 incorporate a lot of the same briefing that Riverside

submitted to this Commission 15 years ago.

CHAIRMAN HALL:

24

25

0kay.

1	MR. DOWNEY: Obviously the standard is
2	whether it's unjust or unreasonable. Discrimination
3	by itself and preference by itself are not the
4	standard. It's got to be unjust or unreasonable.
5	CHAIRMAN HALL: And another question
6	similar to the one I had for Public Counsel is between
7	the Staff proposal and the Company's proposal, is
8	there one that you dislike more?
9	MR. DOWNEY: I the person to ask would
10	be Brian Collins, because I don't profess to know
11	enough about them.
12	CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Thank you.
13	MR. DOWNEY: Thank you.
14	MR. JONES: Commissioner Kenney?
15	Commissioner Stoll?
16	COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. Thank
17	you.
18	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I've got one short
19	one. In your partial stipulation, even though the
20	numbers are smaller but you're you're consolidating
21	the districts just like the other stipulation. isn't
22	yours unjust and unreasonable then?
23	MR. DOWNEY: I I kind of thought I
24	might get something like that. I mean we don't want
25	to be the party of no so

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No, I appreciate --2 I understand you are giving, but I would think under 3 your same statement, it's still --4 MR. DOWNEY: I think I'd be hard pressed 5 to challenge something that I stipulated to. 6 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you. 7 COMMISSIONER RUPP: I'm going to save all 8 my questions for his witness. 9 JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Coleman? 10 COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: No questions. 11 JUDGE JONES: And for the City of 12 Brunswi ck? 13 MR. DRAG: May it please the Commission. 14 Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Gary Drag. I 15 represent the City of Brunswick. 16 I'm going to give you a little background 17 about Brunswick. It is a city of approximately 900 18 residents located in northwest Missouri, about 19 40 minutes west of Jo-- of Moberly. There are 20 approximately 330 residential MAW customers in the 21 city and total about 340 customers total. 22 About 10 to 15 years ago, Brunswick was 23 The storefronts were boarded up. They have dyi ng. 24 fought back, they have -- they're start -- they're 25 revitalizing the town, but it's an uphill struggle.

And they have faced many of the difficulties that small towns face. One of the difficulties is that Brunswick has some of the highest, if not the highest, water rates in the state out of MAW.

So because of that, Brunswick supports

So because of that, Brunswick supports some form of district consolidation. We have signed the non-unanimous stipulation that was put together by the Office of Public Counsel because we -- we are consolidated into a larger district which will address our long-term issues. Granted, it does give us short-term rate relief, but the bigger issue is that -- that it's the longer-term outlook.

In theory, we could also support -- and we made this known -- that we -- we would support MAW's or Staff's proposals for consolidation. We just want to have a viable rate structure for a small town. We do not support keeping Brunswick as a stand alone. Based on the revenue requirements, the rate impact would be -- how can I say -- extremely adverse.

One of the things that has not been talked about is the social cost. If we go with single -- single-district pricing, in essence, the smaller districts -- Brunswick, for an example, Platte County, they will be faced with -- or are facing extremely high water rates. There is an economic

Incentive for people to move out of those to lower-cost areas, especially industry. That causes a hollowing out of these smaller communities. And so there is a social cost.

Can that be quantified? I -- probably not. But I think that is an issue that needs to be considered and is -- you know, not just what is good for individual districts but what is good for all of Missouri. And is it good for Missouri to go and have these small towns and small -- you know, hollowed out because of ex-- because of the high rates.

I'd also like to talk -- There's been comments made about how in the public hearings people were opposed to consolidated pricing, consolidated tariffs. Consumers have a very short outlook. And so what -- while they may support con-- they may support district-specific pricing now, 10 -- 5, 10, 15 years down the road when they are faced with upgrading their -- you know, upgrades to their water system for new EPA regulations, some unforeseen mechanical issue, infrastructure failure, at that point they'll change their view.

I think what needs to be done here is that the Commission needs to take a long-term view, which the consumer doesn't have. And to be honest,

1	many this municipalities do not have. And that is to
2	go and look long term and say, you know, where do we
3	need to go to ensure that there is that the that
4	we have equitable rates and we have good water supply
5	to all the citizens of Missouri. And so I
6	that's I would also caution this very short-term
7	outlook and caution against, you know, putting much
8	weight in that.
9	So in summary, we are requesting that the
10	Commission do s approve some form of district
11	consolidation and with the idea that it will
12	encourage, if not definitely not discourage the
13	viability of the smaller districts, their economic
14	viability. Thank you. And do you have any questions?
15	CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions. Thank you.
16	COMMISSIONER RUPP: You're representing
17	Brunswick or New Brunswick?
18	MR. DRAG: City of Brunswick. That's it?
19	Thank you very much.
20	JUDGE JONES: City of Joplin.
21	MS. BELL: May it please the Commission.
22	My name is Stephanie Bell and I'm here on behalf of
23	the City of Joplin.
24	And Chairman Hall, I believe you've asked
25	several questions today already about legal standards

and case law so we're going to start with that. As
you've heard already today, Section 393.130 prohibits
a water company from granting any undue or
unreasonable preference or advantage to any locality
or subject any locality to any undue or reasonable
[sic] prejudice or disadvantage.

With respect to discriminatory rates and

With respect to discriminatory rates and the City of Joplin specifically, the Western District addressed this issue in 2005 in State ex rel. City of Joplin V. Public Service Commission and explained, The Commission lacks statutory authority to approve discriminatory rates and its approval of the rates, which require Joplin ratepayers to pay significantly more than the actual cost of service in that district for the express purpose of subsidizing the services provided in the Company's other districts that were only paying the actual cost-of-service, arguably exceeded its authority.

And so while that case didn't -- wasn't ultimately decided on that point, it offered some suggestion on the interpretation of Section 393.130.

So Joplin is here today, as it was in 2000 and in the many rate cases in between, in support of district-specific pricing. In -- in the 2000 Missouri American rate case, Staff, OPC and almost all

of the municipal intervenors opposed a single-tariff pricing or what we call STP. And the Commission determined rates would be just and reasonable under district-specific pricing or DSP. The Commission approved stipulations which maintained district-specific pricing in 2003, 2007, 2008 and 2010.

Today you've already heard from several of the other parties why single-tariff pricing creates unreasonable preferences, prejudices and disadvantages. But it's not just that STP would create discriminatory rates on its own, which it would, but the real unfairness comes in the game of Ping-Pong.

As Mr. Fischer, representing the Public Water Districts, stated in the 2000 case, it is important to recognize that some of -- some public policies just don't work if continuity is not maintained. It is patently unfair to go to DSP in 2000 and then flip-flop back now to STP.

As Mr. Fischer stated in 2000, if the Commission does not choose to stay the course over the long term, there will be substantial inequities depending on where each district happens to be in the construction cycle.

As you know, this Commission has previously found consumers in some districts have subsidized consumers in other districts. Consumers in some districts, for example, Joplin and St. Joseph, have already borne the cost of significant infrastructure investment their own. So now to ask those same consumers to bear the cost of infrastructure investments in other districts from which they receive no benefit is discriminatory.

Likewise, some consumers have not contributed to infrastructure investments outside their district and have not faced infrastructure costs in their own district. Now that it could be their turn, they're asking this Commission to shift those costs on to other consumers. To shift those costs now on to the non-benefiting consumers would be discriminatory.

As you will hear from Ms. Haase today, Missouri American's made several major improvements to Joplin -- the Joplin water treatment plant in the last 15 years, which caused rates to increase in Joplin under district-specific pricing. But the reason Joplin has never wavered and has not wavered from its support for district-specific pricing, despite increasing rates, is because what it sees as the real

advantage of district-specific pricing.

,

The real advantage of district-specific pricing is certainty for ratepayers. The promise of DSP for Joplin was that although its residents might pay higher prices for a while for its own infrastructure investment, its residents could know that in the future, they would be shielded from having to pay for infrastructure in other districts.

At the public hearing, and I believe, Commissioner Rupp, you were at the Joplin public hearing, you heard from Mr. Mark Anderson, a Joplin resident who said, The creation of several massive water rate zones would further cloud the issues that surround the cost-of-service to revenues making it more difficult in the future for the public to assess the reasonableness of rate changes.

This was the primary issue in the 2000 case and highlighted by the counsel for Warrensburg when he said, Understandability and acceptability by the people who pay is important. They can't understand why they would have to pay for a plant in another district.

While Mr. Anderson talks in terms of clouding cost-of-service issues, what he is really getting at is the issue that was discussed heavily

yesterday and which I believe is of particular importance to Chairman Hall, and that's transparency. The main benefit of DSP is transparency for ratepayers. They pay for the services and benefits they receive. This transparency holds the Company accountable and promotes only efficient investments by the Company.

In the on-the-record proceeding in the working case that was previously referenced by Ms. Myers, SW-2011-0103, counsel for Staff stated, Staff would note that in situations where DSP currently exists, should the Commission elect to switch to STP, Staff believes that customer education should be an essential component in the rate-making and rate implementation process.

The evidence in this case will show that there has been minimal effort on the part of the Company to educate the residents in the anchor communities that consolidation means they might be footing the bill for upgrades in other districts.

Moving forward. This lack of transparency is unfair to the residents of Joplin and certainly against the public interest. As this Commission has stated previously in its order approving a non-unanimous stipulation in 2011, the

Commission's guiding purpose in setting rates is to protect the consumer against the natural monopoly of the public utility. The principles of cost causation only support district-specific pricing.

As argued by Staff in the 2000 case, DSP achieves one of the principal goals of rate-making; to design rates that recover allocated costs of service from those causing the costs to be incurred. In addition, in 2000, Staff argued that district-specific pricing, unlike STP, satisfied another important goal of rate-making, which is to minimize subsidization.

In its reply -- in its reply brief that Ms. Myers referenced, Staff also said STP can have the consequence of distorting price signals, interfering with public feedback regarding appropriate levels of investment and masking costs of acquisitions, which I think is similar to what you heard from Mr. Poston earlier.

In 1999 -- so Mr. Thompson earlier also posed the question of how people afford water. So I wanted to talk a little bit about how the residents of Joplin afford water. In 1999, the Commission determined that Joplin had been subsidizing St. Charles, Parkville, Mexico and Brunswick.

The residents of Joplin will see an

increase in excess of 60 percent in the 2000 case and an increase of nearly 25 percent in the 2008 case.

Joplin received an increase of almost 16 percent in

So in less than five years, the residents of

5 Joplin saw 132 percent increase.

Currently Joplin's fixed customer charge for a five-eighths meter is at 18.53. In contrast, St. Louis is at 14.42 and Platte is at 15.47. The only districts with higher customer charges are the very small districts, Brunswick and the like. Joplin residents are paying a higher customer charge for a five-eighths meter then about 95 percent of Missouri American's other customers.

Compounding the issue for the residents of Joplin is their median income, which ranges from 40- to 42,000 a year. This contrasts significantly with some of the other stand-alone districts.

Jefferson City is at 53,000 and as -- has been mentioned, Platte is almost 68,000.

The residents of Joplin have been paying for infrastructure investment and has endured substantial increases in recent years. Under DSP, Joplin stands to see a minimal rate increase or even rate decreases over the next 50 years as minimal infrastructure improvements would be required after

they have already made significant investments. A
move towards STP at this point would significantly
disadvantage Joplin's residents.
Missouri American's witness Mr. McDerr

Missouri American's witness Mr. McDermott lists six advantages of STP. If you examine those reasons closely, most of the advantages of STP are really advantages for the Company and they serve to advance the utility's private interest rather than any public interest.

The first and third reasons are essentially identical. The Company identifies them as better incentives for standard water quality and promote state economic development goals. But the Company explains this means enabling the Company's recovery of government-mandated investment.

The Company next argues that STP provides better incentives for large water companies to purchase under-performing water companies. STP would allow the Company to achieve its goal of acquiring more customers.

Two other reasons offered by

Mr. McDermott are efficiency and convenience. STP

would purportedly lower administrative and regulatory

costs and would create a consistent regulatory

approach for all public utilities.

The Staff provides four justifications for STP. Staff also offers the convenience and efficiency argument. The Staff argues that because the Company continues to add districts, it is difficult to develop rates on a district-specific basis. Likewise, Staff suggests that STP may lead to reduced rate case expense as Staff devotes many hours to allocation and assignment of costs.

As you heard from Mr. Downey, the Missouri Supreme Court in State ex rel. Kansas City had previously explained that neither convenience, expediency or necessity are proper matters for consideration in the determination of whether or not an act of Commission is authorized by statute.

Staff argues that STP might encourage
Missouri American to purchase additional small
systems. I don't know how I explain to the Joplin
residents that their rates might increase because
there is an interest in helping the utility expand its
business. Ms. Norton testified earlier these small
districts need money. Maybe my explanation to Joplin
residents is that those individuals in those smaller
districts need their money.

Finally, Staff argues that STP will avoid rate shock to the small systems recently purchased by

Missouri American. Again, what about the thousands of Joplin customers who have been faithfully paying their water bills despite a shocking 132 percent increase in five years?

In addition, the Company's choice to acquire small, under-paying districts is a business judgment that the Company makes and it seems unfair to allow them to use this as a justification to shift costs onto existing ratepayers.

The reason the Company and Staff support -- the reasons that we've just gone through that the Company and the Staff support STP are hypothetical. And if you examine these reasons closely, it is difficult to determine how the rate structure would protect the consumer or would be in the interest of all of Missouri American's customers or in the public interest of the state as a whole.

On behalf of the citizens of Joplin, I ask that you carefully consider the ramifications of a move towards single-tariff pricing. We believe that you will see the prudent, just and reasonable course is to maintain district-specific pricing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you.

JUDGE JONES: Do you have a witness that has to leave by 2:00?

1	MS. BELL: Yes.
2	JUDGE JONES: Why don't we go ahead
3	and
4	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Mr. Chai
5	Mister Judge, I'd like a question. Ms. Bell,
6	that's a compelling argument, as Mr. Downey made the
7	same one and Mr. Poston. I under I appreciate that.
8	We have at the Public Service
9	Commission we have several distressed water districts.
10	And oftentimes because of EPA and Department of
11	Natural Resource regulations, that these small water
12	sewer companies are unable to take care of the
13	problems. It's impossible financially.
14	And I so I would tend to agree with
15	your argument, but if it's not if we don't have a
16	company like Missouri American Water that comes in and
17	buys that distressed community that they're not going
18	to make any money on, there really in some
19	instances it would be very difficult to provide water
20	or sewer services to those families. So how would you
21	suggest what we, as the Commission, take into
22	consi derati on?
23	MS. BELL: Sure. Joplin has actually
24	signed onto the non-unanimous stipulation that's
25	already been I think spoken about today and that OPC

presented and I think MIEC went over some of the 1 2 And it seeks to handle some of those smaller 3 districts. You'll see like Brunswick is consolidated 4 and some of the other small districts are consolidated 5 together to handle some of those issues. 6 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I appreciate that. 7 That's generous of Joplin to do. I'm serious when I 8 say that. But we have several little tiny places out 9 there that are, you know, 50 customers, 75, that it's 10 impossible -- I look forward -- looking forward, I 11 don't see how, unless we have some type of 12 consolidated tariff pricing, that they can get any 13 service in the next several years. That's just my 14 opinion. I think -- I don't know. Some of them are 15 very distressed 16 MS. BELL: Ri ght. And I don't think 17 we're arguing that, you know, there's no 18 consolidation. Obviously in the stipulation there's 19 eight districts and some of those very small districts 20 are consolidated into other districts to handle those 21 very same issues. 22 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you. 23 MS. BELL: Thank you. 24 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Why don't you -- why 25 don't we go ahead and call your witness up so we can

1	get her on the road and then we'll continue with
2	opening and then take lunch.
3	(Witness affirmed.)
4	JUDGE JONES: Thank you. You may
5	proceed.
6	LESLIE HAASE, testified as follows:
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:
8	Q. Could you please state your name and your
9	business record for the record?
10	A. Leslie Haase, 602 South Main, Joplin,
11	Mi ssouri .
12	Q. And where are you currently employed?
13	A. The City of Joplin.
14	Q. And what is your current job title?
15	A. Fi nance di rector.
16	Q. Did you prepare and cause to be filed in
17	this case Rebuttal Testimony, which has been marked as
18	Exhibit JOP 1?
19	A. I did.
20	Q. And do you have any changes or
21	corrections you need to make to that testimony at this
22	time?
23	A. I don't.
24	Q. If I asked you the same questions that
25	are contained in Exhibit JOP 1, would your answers be

1	the same as shown there?
2	A. They would.
3	Q. And is the information in those answers
4	true and correct to the best of your knowledge?
5	A. They are.
6	MS. BELL: I have no further questions at
7	this time. I would offer JOP 1.
8	JUDGE JONES: Any objections to Exhibit
9	JOP 1?
10	I don't hear any. Exhibit JOP 1 is
11	admitted into the record.
12	(Joplin Exhibit 1 was received into
13	evi dence.)
14	JUDGE JONES: Let's proceed right into
15	cross-examination from Staff.
16	MS. MYERS: No questions, Your Honor.
17	JUDGE JONES: Department of Energy?
18	MR. ANTAL: No questions. Thank you.
19	JUDGE JONES: MIEC?
20	MR. DOWNEY: Just I'm sorry I butchered
21	your name earlier.
22	THE WITNESS: That's okay.
23	JUDGE JONES: No questions?
24	MR. DOWNEY: No further questions.
25	JUDGE JONES: City of Brunswick?

No questions, Your Honor. 1 MR. DRAG: 2 JUDGE JONES: City of Riverside? 3 MR. BEDNAR: Just a couple, Your Honor. 4 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR: 5 Q. Ms. Has, I don't know if you're aware or 6 not or if the city has a position -- the city council 7 and the mayor as to whether or not you would -- the 8 city would accept having Joplin in a district by 9 itself if other districts were consolidated. Has the 10 city taken a position on that? 11 Α. I believe that the city -- we're here 12 today to request district-specific pricing for Joplin. 13 As to consolidating anywhere else, we have no opinion. 14 0. Thank you. Appreciate it. No further 15 questions. 16 JUDGE JONES: City of St. Joseph? 17 MR. LAWYER: No questions. 18 JUDGE JONES: Warrensburg? 19 MR. CURTIS: No questions. Thank you. 20 JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply Districts? 21 22 MR. DORITY: No questions. 23 JUDGE JONES: StoneBridge? Triumph? Office of Public Counsel? 24 25 MR. POSTON: No questions.

1	JUDGE JONES: And Missouri American Water
2	Company?
3	MR. ENGLAND: Thank you, Your Honor.
4	Just a few.
5	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGLAND:
6	Q. Ms. Haase, I represent the Company just
7	to let you know where I'll be coming from. And you've
8	signed on or at least Joplin has signed on with
9	this non-unanimous stipulation, as I understand; is
10	that right?
11	A. Yes, sir.
12	Q. And essentially that non-unanimous
13	stipulation holds what I call Joplin harmless, right?
14	You remain on district-specific pricing?
15	A. Yes, sir.
16	Q. No one is consolidated with you and
17	you're not consolidated with anyone else?
18	A. Yes, sir.
19	Q. If there was another rate design proposal
20	that would hold Joplin harmless, continue it on
21	district-specific pricing, is it fair to say you would
22	be you would not object to that type of
23	arrangement?
24	A. I would say that we would review the
25	any proposal like that.

1	Q. Well, what as long as you're held
2	harmless as you are today in your non-unanimous
3	stipulation, what what interest would you have in
4	other districts being consolidated or not?
5	A. I guess from my standpoint, it would be
6	as long as yes, as long as we have
7	district-specific pricing going forward and there
8	would not be any term limit to that.
9	Q. Okay. Thank you.
10	MR. ENGLAND: No other questions, Your
11	Honor.
12	JUDGE JONES: All right. Any questions
13	from the Commission. Mr. Chairman?
14	CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, I think just a few.
15	QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:
16	Q. Good afternoon.
17	A. Good afternoon.
18	Q. Have you done an analysis of the rate
19	impact to Joplin customers that would result from
20	either Staff's or the Company's consolidation
21	proposal?
22	A. I have seen those numbers.
23	Q. So have you done a calculation?
24	A. I have not myself.
25	Q. What is your understanding of the impact

from those -- from Staff's consolidation proposal and the Company's consolidation proposal on Joplin ratepayers?

- A. The Staff's proposal is a small increase, I believe less than 1 percent. The -- the stipulatio-- the non-unanimous stipulation, I believe the impact is about 1.5 percent to the City of Joplin.
- Q. So is it -- is it the actual dollar increase that is motivating the City of Joplin's opposition to Staff and the Company's proposal? Is it philosophical? Is it a concern about what could happen in the future? All of the above?
- A. I believe that it's the long-term implication. The City of Joplin, we believe that where we're located and our water source and our cost drivers are all unique in Joplin. We do not believe that our citizens should subsidize other districts. And so the long-term implications are really what's driving us being here and opposing the consolidated pricing.
- Q. And that would be the case even if -- if there was an argument presented that -- that in the long run, it could actually result in a reduction to -- to rates in Joplin if some type of consolidation occurred? For example, if Joplin were combined with

another water district with a lower cost per residential customer, you would still be opposed to that?

A. I guess my answer would be that we would want to look at that; however, our belief -- we've already made the improvements. Missouri American Water has made the improvements to our -- to our system and our -- our residents have paid that. You heard the information that our residents have seen an increase of 132 percent.

So to move away from that at this point we feel like would be very harmful. The fact that we've had district-specific pricing for -- since 2000, that's 15 years, and now to move to consolidated pricing would unfairly shift cost drivers that the citiz-- the citizens of Joplin should not have to subsidize.

- Q. But it is possible that there could be a consolidation of Joplin with another system that could reduce rates for Joplin customers. You would still be opposed to that?
- A. Again, I would have to go back to what somebody said earlier. Costs in the short-term can decrease, but over the long term as improvements are made in infrastructure in other districts, Joplin

1	believes that in the long run, the costs for Joplin
2	would be would be higher. So while it may be a
3	decrease short term, we believe that long term, it's
4	in Joplin's best interest to keep district-specific
5	pri ci ng.
6	Q. And that's because the capital
7	improvements have already been made in Joplin and you
8	don't foresee any significant investment needed
9	capital investment needed in the near to short in
10	the near to long term?
11	A. Yes, sir. In addition to the other
12	capital needs across at the other districts across
13	the state.
14	Q. Okay. Thank you.
15	COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. Thank
16	you for your testimony.
17	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.
18	JUDGE JONES: Any questions based on
19	questions from the Chair?
20	MR. ENGLAND: Yes, Your Honor.
21	MR. BEDNAR: Yes, Your Honor.
22	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:
23	Q. Ms. Haase, I just wanted to go over with
24	you again on those potential options when we talk
25	about Joplin having already paid for their

improvements. Did you hear the testimony of
Ms. Norton and talk about depreciation schedules?

- A. Yes, sir, I did.
- Q. And so you're -- there is still a continuation of cost that you're going to be paying in the future for that -- those improvements that have been made, not to mention the ongoing annual capital expenses that are imposed upon Joplin that you understand there would be a cost sharing amongst other districts with whom Joplin would be consolidated with, don't you?
- A. I do understand. But again, Joplin feels like we are unique in that our costs -- we're willing to pay for our costs, but we believe that over the long term, we would be subsidizing other districts.

 And -- and we can't support that.
 - Q. Even if it reduced your rates?
- A. We believe that over the long term it would not reduce our rates.
- Q. But you don't know that, do you? Have you seen any models that it might reduce your rates?
- A. I have not. But what I would be looking for would be something that goes out for many years to show the true impact to the citizens.
 - Q. Now, are you aware that in 2007 Joplin's

1	rate was we're talking about increases?
2	A. Uh-huh.
3	Q. There's also an issue of where where
4	your base starts and we'll just use 2007 as an
5	example. The average residential rate in 2007 was
6	\$16.29 in Joplin, while at the same time Parkville,
7	Platte County was \$38.39. Today at the present time,
8	I believe Joplin's rate is the 2007 rate of Parkville,
9	38.39, and Parkville's is 66.20. So and part of
10	that is you've got 20,000 customers in Joplin and
11	5,000?
12	A. Yes, sir.
13	Q. So if we can maintain your
14	district-specific cost and allocations and other
15	districts consolidate to provide their ratepayers
16	relief, you don't offer any objection to that at this
17	time. Correct?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. Thank you.
20	JUDGE JONES: Any other recross based on
21	questions from the Chairman?
22	MR. ENGLAND: Yes, Your Honor.
23	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGLAND:
24	Q. Ms. Haase, you mentioned something about
25	taking the long-term view. Are you aware of the fact

1	that the Company's had discussions with the city, that
2	is Joplin, regarding long-term issue with the source
3	of supply water supply in the Joplin area?
4	A. I am.
5	Q. And that could have a significant impact
6	on the investment needed to correct that problem.
7	Correct?
8	A. Yes, sir.
9	Q. Okay. You also mentioned that you had
10	seen an impact on Joplin and quoted a couple of
11	percentage figures indicating small increase of maybe
12	a half percent to 1.5 percent. Have you also seen
13	figures, at least on the Company's proposal, which
14	would result in a decrease for the Joplin district?
15	A. Yes, sir, I have seen that.
16	Q. Okay. Thank you. No other questions.
17	JUDGE JONES: Office of Public Counsel?
18	MR. POSTON: No questions.
19	JUDGE JONES: Any redirect?
20	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:
21	Q. Just one question. Based upon the
22	information in the previous questions that your rates
23	in the short term might decrease, do you still support
24	district-specific pricing?
25	A. We do because of the long-term

1 implications. 2 Q. Thank you. 3 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Thank you. You may 4 step down. 5 Okay. Let's go ahead and finish up 6 opening statements for this issue. Moving to the City 7 of Riverside. 8 MR. BEDNAR: May it please the 9 Commission. I think once again, I'd like to repeat 10 that we do not have a district-specific policy -- a 11 pure district-specific policy in the state. 12 Commission and the parties, at the times they see fit, 13 have consolidated districts in order to -- as 14 Commissioner Kenney brought up, to avoid unjust and 15 volatility in those cases. 16 I think that the characterization that 17 Missouri American -- and believe me, we have issues 18 with Missouri American. We're not in any way taking 19 the position that they are error free, given our water 20 But to -- I think it is an unfair quality issues. 21 characterization to act like they're just out as a 22 Pacman buying up districts. 23 It's my understanding that this 24 Commission has requested, DNR has requested at least 25 an investigation as to what districts that they can

acquire because it serves the public interest. And I think that's where this Commission is. And that's the uniqueness of the Public Service Commission compared to any other decision-making body. You have those --you're a tri-headed agency in that you have an executive responsibility, you have a judicial responsibility and you have a legislative responsi bility. And many of the issues or concerns that

have been raised by MIC and Joplin and St. Joseph can be taken up in rulemaking as well. If you want to have transparency together with your consolidation, you can do that. You can ask for whatever conditions you want in regards to transparency of cost per district. I don't think anybody's objecting to that.

In regards to -- I was a little shocked that we've gone down to economics and pitting one resident's average income versus another resident's average income. There's never been in this state customer class or ratepayer class based upon your annual income.

I think that we are all sensitive to cost to low-income customers. And there we are equal in that we don't think that a low-income ratepayer in Riverside paying 66 dollars a month is just and

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

6

reasonable compared to any other district where they may be paying 28 or 30 dollars or even 38 dollars. So I think that is the unique circumstance that the Commission has, the unique authority they have is to balance this out and create a bandwidth as to what's fair for the residential payer.

7 8 i 9 d 10 -11 l 12 d 13 l 14 -15 i 16 a 17 -18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, one of the -- again, another option is for the industrial classifications or commercial classifications to take on more responsibility to keep the residential ratepayer harmless. And that's what Mayor Rose in her testimony has suggested as another option of creating a single tariff for residential payers across the state to protect those instances and those who can recover their cost of water through the resale through product or whatever, they have that ability, but the residential customer who does not get to recover their cost is protected. And so we urge the Commission to look at that as a possibility as well.

We are open to any approach or policy or new idea that this Commission would throw out or Staff or Public Counsel, any of the parties. We've looked at them all. We believe that there should be more consistency. We believe you have the authority to do that as guaranteed by statute and that this General

1 Assembly has delegated to you, the rulemaking 2 authority, judicial authority and executive authority 3 to make sure that we have just and reasonable rates 4 here in the state. Thank you. 5 JUDGE JONES: Any questions? 6 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes. 7 JUDGE JONES: Mr. Bednar. 8 MR. BEDNAR: I'm sorry. 9 CHAIRMAN HALL: That's okay. I have not 10 read any of the briefs filed by your client in the -in the prior rate case, but there was some discussion 11 12 earlier that the City of Riverside took a contrary 13 position on this issue in the last rate case; is that 14 correct? 15 MR. BEDNAR: I would -- did not represent 16 the city at that time. I was representing the State 17 at that time. So just to --18 CHAIRMAN HALL: But being the kind of 19 lawyer you are, I'm sure you read those briefs. 20 MR. BEDNAR: Yes. I believe that the --21 that Riverside at one time was opposed to that, but I 22 think as all decision makers and government officials 23 in the legislature and executive branch, we do reserve 24 the right to change our minds. And we have new 25 officials, we have new facts, we have new evidence.

1 And I think that's what's important, so --2 CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, let me -- let me --3 let discuss with you those new facts. 4 MR. BEDNAR: Yes. 5 CHAIRMAN HALL: What facts are different 6 in this case from the last case that could justify a 7 change in position? 8 MR. BEDNAR: I -- I don't know that I 9 agree with that position, as attorney to attorney, 10 Chairman. As long as I've been involved in these 11 cases, I've always believed that you have the ability 12 to do consolidated pricing, because the broad 13 authority to do just and reasonable rates. I just 14 disagree with the previous counsel in that position. 15 So I think you do have the authority to 16 ensure that there's just and reasonable rates to all 17 ratepayers of the state and you have the flexibility 18 by statute and by history to do your investigation and 19 hold your horns to develop the right policy. You are 20 the policymakers. 21 CHAIRMAN HALL: So you disagree with the 22 legal conclusion set forth in -- in the brief filed by 23 your client in the last case. What about any kind of 24 factual difference that might justify a change in 25 position?

1	MR. BEDNAR: Well, I think the facts are
2	the ever-evolving knowledge we have of the water
3	challenges of the state that everybody's acknowledged.
4	You have a growing population moving, you have a
5	movement of population. We have new businesses in
6	Riverside now, for example, that that weren't
7	there. You have new suburbs, you have new
8	subdivisions, you have new challenges to water systems
9	that people both in the private and public sector did
10	not anticipate in regards to the sustainability of
11	those individual water systems.
12	They might have seemed like a good idea
13	at that time, but the life experiences that we have
14	have shown that there's a tail on all these issues
15	that people did not anticipate 20 years ago, 15 years
16	ago.
17	CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Thank you.
18	MR. BEDNAR: Thank you.
19	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Stoll?
20	COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. Thank
21	you.
22	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Kenney?
23	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.
24	Thank you.
25	

JUDGE JONES: 1 Commissioner Rupp? 2 COMMISSIONER RUPP: No questions. 3 JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Coleman? COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: No questions. 4 5 JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Bednar. 6 MR. BEDNAR: Thank you. 7 JUDGE JONES: City of St. Joseph? 8 MR. LAWYER: May it please the 9 Commission. I am Jeff Lawyer, representing the City 10 of St. Joseph. 11 The City of St. Joseph has intervened in 12 this case as they did in 2011 because district 13 consolidation is important to us as a government, but 14 more so because it's important to the residents of 15 St. Joseph. For us, this is not simply a 16 philosophical question. It is one that has been 17 concrete and has been quite painful to the people of 18 St. Joseph. 19 In 2000, the Commission moved away from 20 single-tariff pricing and no one but the people of 21 St. Joseph contributed to the construction of a 22 75 million dollar water treatment facility. 23 St. Joseph customers saw their rates increase by as much as 230 percent. At that time the Commission 24 25 reasoned in part that, quote, one factor for

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25 consideration in determining just and reasonable rates is public perception, end quote.

Testimony in the local public hearings in that previous case was considered to be strongly in favor of district-specific pricing. And the Commission then reasoned that, quote, Missouri American Water, therefore, must set its rates separately for each service area in order to recover the appropriate revenue requirement for each service area.

It is inherently inequitable and discriminatory that the good people of St. Joseph would now or in the near future be required to subsidize capital improvements for St. Louis, Platte County or any other district in the state from which it receives no benefit.

The median income in St. Joseph is approximately \$44,000. Under Staff's proposal, St. Joseph customers would subsidize Platte County where the median income is more than 20,000 above that of St. Joseph at approximately 67,000. More would be asked of those least able to give.

This Commission should base its decision, at least in part, upon -- in this case upon the reasonable and just principle of cost causation. To

1 do otherwise would lead to the obvious public 2 perception that the people of St. Joseph or the people 3 of Joplin somehow matter less than the people in other 4 districts in the state. Please remember this as you 5 make your decisions. And now if you have any 6 questions for me. 7 JUDGE JONES: Thank you, sir. 8 Warrensburg? 9 MR. CURTIS: May it please the 10 Commission. My name's Lee Curtis. I represent 11 Warrensburg and I've represented Warrensburg in these

rate cases since the '80s. It was Missouri Cities Water and the various iterations thereafter.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm proud to say I'm -- it was music to my ears to hear OPC, MIEC, Joplin and St. Joseph singing the praises of district-specific pricing, because that is what Warrensburg has advocated all along very consistently in the face. Warrensburg -these are clear cost causation issues. We've heard that. These are the proper economic signals to send to districts.

These are all non-interconnected water districts. For them to be consolidated and treated as a -- it was originally uniform pricing they called it as a opposed to now single-tariff pricing, is not

good.

And -- and Mr. England has heard this before, but I'm going to repeat this analogy again because I did it back in 2000 in speaking against St. Joseph. And the analogy is this: You have 12 individuals going out to dinner and it's a very nice restaurant. The waiter comes out and he says, How -- how should -- how would we do this? Should we have individual checks or put it all together and divide it by 12? And everyone takes a vote. And 11 vote for single check, we'll divide it by 12. And the one guy who votes against it is a vegetarian.

They start ordering and the first one orders champagne, caviar -- the Clicquot champagne, the next Kobe beef and on up the line. They get the signal. It's divided equally. And the poor vegetarian gets stuck.

Well, if you look at Mr. England's exhibit that he handed out, the groupings, these have the average residential cost-of-service by district. You will see Warrensburg's annual residential cost-of-service is 409 dollars. The top is Platte County at 1,031 dollars. All the others are well above Warrensburg. Warrensburg is the vegetarian at this dinner table.

And we resent -- because we have maintained consistently district-specific pricing. We think that should be continued and we join many of the others, as we have in the past.

After the non-unanimous revenue requirement settlement was reached, calculations were made on a district-specific basis. And for Warrensburg even with the 31.1 million dollar increase, Warrensburg's average rates went up by 1.31 percent. If you look at all the other models that are coming out, and we haven't seen them all yet, Warrensburg residential rates are going to be going in excess of 20 percent.

So you've got a 1 point -- a little over 1 percent cost-of-service on the new revenues that have been, you know, non-unanimously agreed to. Only a 1 percent increase. And all of a sudden Warrensburg gets 20 percent.

I would remind you -- and we haven't really tested I guess the meaning of 393.130, an undue or an unreasonable preference. Is that -- do the math on that. What is that? That's almost 18 times what the cost-of-service would be. That's getting pretty close to maybe being undue or unreasonable.

Again, district-specific is the best way

1	to go. I do applaud Staff for their attempt to create
2	the hybrid districts, the three districts, and in
3	recognition that there are troubled, smaller systems
4	that could be brought on board in a fashion. And I
5	think there's a way to achieve a reasonable compromise
6	without, you know, adhering strictly to a
7	district-specific pricing because I think there is
8	flexibility clearly this Commission has.
9	But I think the underlying, the bedrock
10	principle from which you deviate should be
11	district-specific pricing and not much deviation from
12	that. Thank you.
13	JUDGE JONES: Questions?
14	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.
15	JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Curtis.
16	Public Water Supply District?
17	Just a moment, Mr. Dority.
18	COMMISSIONER COLEMAN: Mr. Dority, before
19	you start, I would suggest that you make no references
20	to Kobe beef or champagne as it is about 2:10, because
21	I may have to take the Judge outside and have a word
22	with him. Thank you very much.
23	Thank you, Judge.
24	MR. DORITY: Excellent point,
25	Commissioner. I'll keep that in mind.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

Well, good afternoon. May it please the Commission. For the record, my name is Larry Dority. And Jim Fischer and I again represent the Public Water Supply Districts Numbers 1 and 2 of Andrew County in that matter.

These not-for-profit public districts serve rural customers in areas outside of St. Joseph but within the St. Joseph water district of Missouri American. Al though they are among the Company's larger customers, they are, in reality, only representing their rural customers since any increase in the cost of water must eventually be passed on to their customers.

Their entire water supply comes from Missouri American. They are not standby users. need for water and usage is 24-7 throughout the year. As our statement of position reflects, we are most interested in this rate design portion of the proceeding and I will elaborate on our positions in just a moment.

In the Staff's water utility rate design analysis filed in this docket last June, Staff candidly acknowledged that rate design, be it water, electric, gas or any other industry, is more art than sci ence. Depending upon the goals of the designer,

1 r

rate design can take many paths.

Č

Well, as you've already heard today, many of us in this room have been down this particular path regarding district consolidation and pricing, a torturous path for some of us. And it seems we may have come full circle.

Yes, back in 2000 we were among the voices crying in the wilderness trying to persuade the Commission to hold the course of single-tariff pricing. At that time the new St. Joseph water plant was being placed into rate-base. Along with the City of St. Joseph, we sponsored the testimony of Dr. Janice Beecher, who had recently completed a major public policy study of the single-tariff issue which was sponsored by NARUC and the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

We suggested that her study provided an objective discussion of both the advantages and the disadvantages of single-tariff pricing from a former regulator's perspective. Indeed, I would note that excerpts from that study are attached as Schedule RCS-16 to the Direct Testimony of OPC witness Ralph Smith and you've heard discussions about that testimony throughout the morning.

What was the Commission hearing from us

back in 2000? We acknowledged that there is an understandable desire among regulatory agencies to keep your public policy options open. But it's also important to recognize that some public policies just don't work if continuity is not maintained over the years. I think Ms. Bell referenced that earlier.

We stress that this issue was among those public policies where consistency must be maintained if the benefits are to be achieved if it's going to be fair to all concerned.

At that time we reminded the Commission that in the Company's previous rate case prior to 2000 Wess Henderson, on behalf of the Staff, had observed that this issue by its nature is not a here-today, gone-tomorrow kind of rate design. Asked whether a decision in that previous case would bind the Commission in the future, Mr. Henderson explained, I don't think it would be fair or proper to have single-tariff pricing in this case and then in the next case go back to district-specific and then in the next case go back to single-tariff pricing.

We pointed out that if the Commission did not choose to stay the course over the long term, there would be substantial inequities, depending on where each district happens to be in the construction

cycle. You've heard that time and time again today. We talked about fairness, we talked about equity and we talked about transparency in the process.

The City of Riverside, as Mr. Downey covered in detail and others have discussed, was advising the Commission that single-tariff pricing was unlawful and discriminatory, as well as unreasonable. Their bottom line, the Commission should terminate the single-tariff pricing experiment and return to district-specific pricing.

The City of Warrensburg, my friend and colleague, Mr. Curtis, strenuously advocating for district-specific pricing, noted that it had been before this Commission numerous times in the past, it's a battle that's been going on for some time although maybe at a skirmish level. But quoting his opening statement in that proceeding, We are now down to the major showdown. This is a major battle. This is a major issue. And it is vital, we believe, that the Commission address it and resolve between single-tariff pricing and district-specific pricing once and for all.

Continuing to quote, So it is time for the Commission to exercise wisdom in adopting a rate design philosophy that will stand the test of time.

Sure, it's going to be painful somewhat in that interim in moving to district-specific cost-of-service level for each district, end quote.

Boy, was Mr. Curtis right. Prophetic, I might say. Painful, indeed.

On a three-to-two vote, the Commission decision going to district-specific pricing and embarking -- also embarking upon inter-class shifts within the St. Joseph district increased our water district's rates by over 200 percent above the previously approved rates.

Needless to say, that rate increase was unprecedented in sheer magnitude and the resulting rate shock was extremely difficult for our customers to understand. The district-specific pricing was ultimately upheld. We have continued to participate in these proceedings to protect our and our customers' interests and it doesn't seem possible, quite frankly, that 15 years have passed.

I would note that the non-unanimous stipulation filed this morning indicates that while not signatories, we do not oppose the limited consolidation afforded Brunswick becoming a part of the St. Joseph district. And I understand we're going to get into that stipulation momentarily.

21

22

23

24

25

As I stated earlier, we have consistently maintained that fairness and equity demand that transparency be an integral part of the Commission's consideration of this important topic. However, ironically in this proceeding, it has been suggested, and I believe Mr. England quoted it in his opening and I'll quote it now: Now is the perfect time to consolidate rates when no one district is likely to experience rate shock. Staff is very cognizant of how some customers view the idea of consolidating rate districts. If the Commission were to wait until one district was on the verge of experience rate shock, then the outcry from the other districts would be very focal and the moment toward consolidation would be harder to justify. Thus, consolidating now is an opportune time.

Excuse me? Staff's proposed consolidated new district 2 will consist of St. Joseph, the anchor district with the most customers; Platte County, which includes Riverside; and Brunswick.

Company witness Dunn in his Direct
Testimony and Ms. Norton this morning testified
concerning the Platte County water treatment
retirement and the fact that they're building a new
water treatment plant in Platte County, which is in

the Company's current capital investment plan, has construction starting in 2017 with completion by the end of May of 2018. A new water treatment plant. Now that has a familiar ring to it. A loud and expensive ring.

I don't see transparency to the customers of St. Joseph in this situation. Consolidate now and they will find out the implications later. I wonder what the turnout would have been in St. Joe if they had seen Mr. England's handout, particularly page 2.

Let's look at district -- at page 2 at district two. St. Joseph, costs per residential customer, 418 dollars; Platte County, 1,000 dollars; Brunswick, 937 dollars. And this is before the water plant comes on line.

Commissioner Coleman, Commissioner Kenney
I think you were at the St. Joseph public hearing. I
don't recall, having read the transcript, any
discussion, any mention of this new water treatment
plant coming online for Platte County. And I would
suggest that if they had been made aware of it prior
to the local hearing, you might still be there hearing
testimony in the City of St. Joseph.

So turning to the positive, our statement reflects that the water districts support and

1	appreciate the class cost-of-service main adjustment
2	for the sale for resale customers in the St. Joseph
3	service area. This is an appropriate recognition that
4	the sale for resale customer class is connected
5	directly to the transmission system and does not
6	receive any benefit from the smaller distribution
7	mains.
8	We maintain all of our trunk lines from
9	the points of connection throughout the districts as
10	well as the distribution lines, 400 miles for Andrew 1
11	and 300 miles for Andrew 2.
12	We also support the Staff's position that
13	the existing declining block rate structure for the
14	sale for resale class be maintained in the St. Joseph
15	service territory, which allows larger customers who
16	generally experience better load factors to pay a
17	lower tail block rate to reflect the lower costs to
18	serve them.
19	Thank you very much for your attention
20	and I'd be happy to answer any questions.
21	JUDGE JONES: Questions? Commissioner
22	Stol I.
23	COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. Thank
24	you for your history lesson.
25	MR DORLTY: You're very welcome

1	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I was going to say
2	the same thing. Regarding that history lesson, just
3	two questions. Is it your opinion and belief that
4	this Commission should be consistent with past
5	Commissions in order that the utilities can have a
6	direction on which way we're going?
7	MR. DORITY: I think generally speaking,
8	there is value in continuity and being consistent. I
9	recognize that conditions change, facts may change and
10	the public policy decisions that you, as the
11	Commission have to render, can change as
12	accordingly. But as a general proposition, I think
13	there is great value in consistency.
14	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Would you also
15	agree that a past Commission's decision has no impact
16	on a future Commission decision?
17	MR. DORITY: I think that is the law,
18	that you are not bound by past Commission decision.
19	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.
20	MR. DORITY: Yes, sir, Commissioner.
21	JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Dority.
22	MR. DORITY: Thank you very much.
23	JUDGE JONES: StoneBridge Village?
24	Triumph Foods?
25	Okay. Well, I don't think we'll talk

Let's

1 about the Stipulation and Agreement just yet. 2 Let's be back here at 3:30. go ahead and take lunch. 3 (A recess was taken.) 4 JUDGE JONES: Let's go ahead and go on 5 the record. We've heard opening statements on the 6 district consolidation -- consolidated pricing issue. 7 Let's go ahead and go with the -- a discussion of the 8 agreement that was just filed. 9 OPC, can you -- can you just walk us 10 through that and see if we have any questions? 11 MR. POSTON: Sure. And I'll start with 12 saying we -- one of our goals here, as I think I said 13 before, is we were trying to come up with something 14 that gave a little of something to every party in this 15 And that's what we think we've achieved. 16 Starting out with rate design the 17 five-eighths and three -- it says three-fifths, that 18 should be three-fourths meter. These are the current 19 St. Louis rates. And we're proposing just a uniform 20 customer charge across all the districts. And this is 21 something that we thought the Company would -- would 22 help the Company, because I know they're proposing 23 uniform rates across districts at their 17.40. 24 this isn't up to their level, but it does provide a 25 uniform rate as they have requested for those sizes of 1 meters.

So then we just propose that -- that there just be an equal percentage increase based on the overall increase in the case to the other par-- the other classes.

And if any other parties want to jump in and stop me if they think I'm saying something wrong, please do.

And on district consolidation, what we tried to do is we tried to identify the smaller districts that had been recently acquired and -- and identified as possibly having more of a need to be consolidated. And so we addressed those.

Anna Meadows and Hickory Hills are close to St. Louis so we consolidated those with St. Louis. Brunswick, which is kind of on its own, it's -- you know, it's not next to any other district, but it's -- it is -- I don't know how many miles from St. Joseph, but we did get St. Joseph to agree that they would be willing to take Brunswick. I think there was tes-- we heard it's about 340 accounts. Redfield, be consolidated with Jefferson City. Again, Redfield is just south of here.

And then we propose a new Branson district that would take in all of those other small

systems that were in the district eight.

_

And then recognizing the concerns that Platte has raised about their current high rates and water quality and all those issues, we've proposed a 5 percent reduction which, of course, wouldn't be possible if the representatives from Joplin and St. Louis didn't agree that they would take on that 5 percent.

On the sewer systems, it's our understanding this 565,000 is the revenue requirement that's -- it's uncertain who's going to pick that up. And so in this, we've come up with a solution that, once again, Joplin and St. Louis have agreed to take that on in order to avoid the consolidation -- the other consolidation proposals.

Arnold, we're proposing that be capped at the 33 dollar flat charge consistent with the commitments to Arnold ratepayers that you heard about this morning.

Capital expenditure plans this -- you know, there's been a lot of talk in this case about capital -- capital expenditure plans going forward between now and the next rate case. And we just thought that having the Company file this annually would give us an opportunity to have that information

1 available going into the next rate case and to know 2 exactly what -- what plans they do have. 3 And then there's just the general 4 provisions that you saw in the other stipulation. 5 JUDGE JONES: Do you have questions? 6 CHAIRMAN HALL: I do have one question. 7 The fourth bullet under rate design where it says, All 8 other remaining increases and decreases. Is that --9 is that the volumetric increases or decreases or are 10 you speaking specifically about customer charges? And 11 if so, I'm confused. 12 I asked a question and I'm waiting for 13 the answer. 14 MR. DOWNEY: We're working on it. 15 CHAIRMAN HALL: 0kay. 16 MR. DOWNEY: Chairman Hall, Ed Downey on 17 MIEC's behalf. The way I interpreted this language 18 when I signed this stipulation, and I'm not hearing 19 disagreement, is whatever aspects go into rates would 20 be given an across-the-board increase commensurate 21 with -- with the percentage determined, which I guess 22 was the 1.15 percent. 23 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Well, but -- so 24 the three bullets above that concern the customer 25 charge. And then does that bull-- does this bullet

1	encompass the volumetric? And, you know, I'm
2	MR. DOWNEY: I understand it would
3	encompass volumetric and every other element that goes
4	into rates. And if
5	CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. And then I guess
6	another question for for OPC and any other
7	signatory to the agreement is and I think I know
8	the answer to this, but if the agreement is only to
9	these specific customer charges, there wouldn't be an
10	agreement to have a statewide customer charge that was
11	higher than that, for example?
12	I mean it's there's two components to
13	it. One, you got a statewide charge, but it's that
14	specific charge that you that I mean it's
15	you're not voicing support for a statewide charge.
16	It's this specific charge. Does that make sense, what
17	I'm asking?
18	MR. POSTON: Yeah. We're not yeah,
19	we're not voicing support for generally a statewide
20	charge. We're
21	CHAIRMAN HALL: You could live with this
22	one?
23	MR. POSTON: Or less, yes.
24	CHAIRMAN HALL: Or less. And I should
25	know this, but what never mind. I see it here.

Thank you.

MR. POSTON: And I will point out that that charge, as it says, is the St. Louis Metro rate. So that means 80 percent of the Company's customers would not get an increase to their customer charge.

JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Stoll?

that I have a specific question about this stipulation I'll call it, but those that are opposed to this plan, if anybody would like to make any comments, be happy to hear from you as to -- I don't want you to divulge any plans necessarily, but if there is something you could tell us about your accepting of this or opposition to it, that would be great.

MR. BEDNAR: Yeah, I -- our objection to this is it really doesn't address the fundamental policy issues that we need to establish going forward, at least for the Platte County water district is -- and it's not even fine print. This is a one-time one rate case settlement at a 5 percent decrease. We're not consolidated with anyone. So it just kind of pushes it down the road, kick the can down the road.

And I believe, and I think other parties believe, that there are other consolidation models that will offer not only the Platte County water

district but other water districts a decrease in their 1 2 rates if we establish the appropriate consolidation 3 model. 4 And that's what we would -- that's what 5 we would propose. And that's why I'm opposed to --6 I'm never opposed to a rate decrease, but this really 7 doesn't -- you know, given all the issues at hand, we 8 really want the consolidation issue to be resolved in 9 this case. 10 COMMISSIONER STOLL: And you were 11 obviously involved in this discussion, but --12 MR. BEDNAR: No. 13 COMMISSIONER STOLL: You weren't? 14 MR. BEDNAR: It was e-mailed to me this 15 morni ng. 16 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. You weren't 17 obviously involved then. 18 MR. BEDNAR: No. 19 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. 20 JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Bednar. 21 MS. MYERS: Staff can speak to this as 22 well. Staff did not sign onto this agreement. 23 we consider this a step in the right direction, there 24 is some consolidation, it's minimal and it really 25 doesn't address the large issues that we see, public

policy concerns that we have. And we really feel that Staff's three-district hybrid scheme is superior in that regard.

COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay.

MR. ENGLAND: Commissioner Stoll, I would agree with Jamie's comments or the Staff's comments, excuse me. And we intend to file, if need be, a formal objection.

Now, having said that, I do appreciate the parties' efforts to try to reach an agreement and there are some -- as Jamie pointed out, some -- some movement here that's positive. For example, we are very supportive of statewide customer charges. We'd actually like to see them higher and we address that later in our testimony and there's an issue on that in the rate design. But statewide customer charges is certainly a positive. The fact that the parties are willing to consider some consolidation, obviously not as much as we would like, is also a positive.

And one thing that I need to mention and -- as it has not been mentioned or at least not since I've been here in the hearing room, is the sewer system revenue contribution. We believe that the contribution needs to be something more in the neighborhood of a million two to million three rather

than the 565,000 dollars. We've got a real issue and 1 2 we'll address it in testimony -- real issue with the 3 Arnold system not recovering or not being able to 4 recover its true cost-of-service at least as -- as 5 proposed by Staff. So that's a big issue as well. 6 COMMISSIONER STOLL: And you said a 7 million two to a million three? 8 MR. ENGLAND: Roughly in that 9 neighborhood, yes, sir. And I think it's roughly an 10 additional 700-- million three is what I'm told. It's 11 roughly an additional 700,000 dollars almost attr--12 solely attributable to the Arnold situation. 13 COMMISSIONER STOLL: How do you see that 14 being resolved? 15 Well, I think -- my MR. ENGLAND: 16 suspicion is you're going to have to resolve it, 17 because I don't think we're going to reach agreement 18 on it. If you think it's appropriate, then I think we 19 would propose that it be recovered from perhaps all of 20 the districts -- all of the water districts and 21 perhaps residential because the sewer system primarily 22 serves residential customers. 23 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. I won't ask 24 anything further about Arnold right now then. 25 Is there very -- is there any chance that the entire

1	group could work out a plan on this, a consolidation
2	plan that that they could support or well, I'm
3	getting all kinds of different looks so
4	MR. ENGLAND: Well, in fairness to
5	everyone, I think everyone has really tried. I mean
6	I'm not I'm not criticizing anybody's lack of
7	effort. But you understand and you've heard some of
8	the testimony so far. There are some parochial
9	entrenched interests that that feel like they've
10	gone as far as they can as far as compromise and I
11	think they're willing to let you all, as the
12	policymakers, you know, make that decision
13	COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay.
14	MR. ENGLAND: I'll let them speak for
15	themselves.
16	COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. That's
17	that sounds like where we are and I certainly
18	understand that. Okay. I do appreciate the efforts
19	everybody has made and will carry on from here and see
20	where our discussion leads.
21	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Kenney?
22	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I'm good.
23	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Rupp?
24	COMMISSIONER RUPP: I'm good.
25	JUDGE JONES: Let's go ahead and start

1	with our first witness on or second witness now on
2	district consolidation. I take it that's Herbert or
3	MA somebody for Missouri American?
4	MR. BEDNAR: Your Honor, I think they
5	made some accommodations for the mayor of Riverside to
6	speak since Mr. Herbert may run over into tomorrow
7	morning. So I'd call Mayor Kathleen Rose to the
8	stand.
9	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Now, this is on rate
10	design. Correct?
11	MR. BEDNAR: We agreed to it's really
12	consolidated tariffs as well as rate design.
13	JUDGE JONES: Can you raise your right
14	hand.
15	(Wi tness affirmed.)
16	JUDGE JONES: Thank you.
17	MR. BEDNAR: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	KATHLEEN ROSE, testified as follows:
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:
20	Q. Would you state your full name for the
21	record, please?
22	A. Kathleen Rose, R-o-s-e.
23	Q. And and what is your occupation? What
24	is your role today?
25	A. I am the mayor for the City of Riverside.

1	Q. And as mayor for the City of Riverside,
2	did you cause certain testimony to be filed previously
3	in this case?
4	A. I did.
5	Q. Under your name?
6	A. (Witness nodded head.)
7	Q. And since you filed that testimony, are
8	there any changes you'd like to make or new
9	information that you have found out that you'd like to
10	add to that testimony?
11	A. Yes. In March the first part of
12	March, we the City of Riverside, provided a our
13	City Hall for Missouri American to hold a town hall
14	meeting. We had close to 100 people in attendance for
15	that town hall meeting. And that meeting I was
16	shocked and surprised at all of the water quality
17	issues that I heard throughout all of the district in
18	Platte County.
19	Q. What, in particular, did you hear that
20	you were surprised about?
21	A. Well, we have our own subdivision in
22	Riverside. It's only a subdivision that is six years
23	old and there were several residents that were present
24	to talk about their damaged water pipes and faucets.
25	Q. Now, this was in addition at the

1	public hearing there was some testimony, was there
2	not, on and that was from the Thousand Oaks
3	subdivision and some from Montebello. Correct?
4	A. Yes. But we heard about more of them at
5	the town hall meeting. You know, low water pressure,
6	calcified pipes, damaged appliances. It was pretty
7	extensive as far as all over the district.
8	Q. And do you recall the comments from the
9	Company as to what actions they were taking or what
10	actions they'd taken since it began back in 2008 or
11	' 9?
12	A. Well, they basically had just told
13	everybody in the group that they were working with two
14	or three people in the room. And most people had not
15	had their issues resolved.
16	Q. Anything else between the time of the
17	filing of the testimony and today?
18	A. No.
19	MR. BEDNAR: I would tender Mayor Rose to
20	others for cross-examination. I'd offer Exhibit 1
21	as into evidence.
22	JUDGE JONES: Does anyone have any
23	objection to Riverside Exhibit 1?
24	Riverside Exhibit 1 is admitted into the
25	record.

1	(Diverside Exhibit 1 was received into
	(Riverside Exhibit 1 was received into
2	evi dence.)
3	JUDGE JONES: Cross-examination from
4	Staff?
5	MS. MYERS: No questions, Your Honor.
6	JUDGE JONES: Missouri Division of
7	Energy?
8	MR. ANTAL: No questions, thank you.
9	JUDGE JONES: MI EC?
10	MR. DOWNEY: No cross, Judge.
11	JUDGE JONES: City of Brunswick?
12	MR. DRAG: No questions, Your Honor.
13	JUDGE JONES: City of Joplin?
14	MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor.
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:
16	Q. Good afternoon. My name is Stephanie
17	Bell and I'm with the City of Joplin today. I have a
18	few questions.
19	In your Direct Testimony you argue that
20	it is unjust and unreasonable in this day and age for
21	a resident to pay a different amount for his water
22	just because he lives in a particular area; is that
23	correct?
24	A. That's correct.
25	Q. You would agree that residents in
-	

1	different areas pay different different costs for
2	things like housing?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And for taxes?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And things like food?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And would you agree that residents in
9	different areas have different median incomes?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Okay. You state in your testimony that
12	you would eliminate district-specific rate-making.
13	Specifically, do you support single-tariff pricing?
14	A. I do. Or some kind of consolidation
15	to for that the residential ratepayer gets a
16	better rate.
17	Q. Were you involved in the 2000 rate case?
18	A. No.
19	Q. Are you aware that Riverside was involved
20	in that case?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And have you reviewed the brief that
23	Riverside filed in that case?
24	A. No. I was not the mayor.
25	Q. When did you become the mayor of

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	

25

Ri versi de?

- A. 2006.
- Q. In 2006. Okay. In that brief Riverside said it consistently continues to oppose the continuation of STP because it is both unlawful and unreasonable, in violation of the common law and Section 393.130.

Does Riverside today believe that STP is unlawful and unreasonable?

- A. That sounds like something legal that I really can't speak to.
- Q. Okay. Do you know has there -- have there been any new facts or changes in circumstances since 2000 that would have caused Riverside to change its opinion?
- A. I can only speak since I have been the mayor since 2006 and I've been involved in five rate increases in ten years that I have been the mayor.

 And never in my wildest days would I have thought that we had seen the water increase double in those ten years' time. So that -- that's a big factor.
- Q. And one new fact that we do know is that the upcoming plant improvements or plant replacement in Parkville within the Platte County district, which Riverside is a part. Correct?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. The Riverside brief in 2000 says, The
3	touchtone of public utility rate regulation is the
4	rule that one group or class of consumers shall not be
5	burdened with the cost created by another group or
6	class.
7	Do you disagree with that statement now?
8	A. I do.
9	Q. In that in that brief Riverside argued
10	that cost-based rates send proper price signals to
11	utility customers, provide appropriate public input
12	and cost-based rates provide earnings stability for
13	the utility.
14	Do you have any reason to believe that
15	statement is untrue?
16	A. No. Again, I cannot speak to what was in
17	that that brief.
18	Q. Okay. So you became the mayor in 2006,
19	you said; is that correct?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. And Riverside participated in the 2007
22	Missouri American case?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Do you know if Riverside argued for
25	single-tariff pricing in that case?
ı	

1	A. I don't think so.
2	Q. And you participated Riverside
3	participated in the 2008 and 2010 cases?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And do you know if they argue if
6	Riverside argued for single-tariff pricing in either
7	of those cases?
8	A. I know I had very I had a lot of
9	conversations with Mr. Kartmann about single tariff.
10	Q. Okay. No further questions.
11	JUDGE JONES: City of St. Joseph?
12	MR. LAWYER: No questions.
13	JUDGE JONES: Warrensburg?
14	MR. CURTIS: No questions. Thank you.
15	JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply
16	Di stri cts?
17	MR. DORITY: No questions. Thanks.
18	JUDGE JONES: StoneBridge? Triumph?
19	OPC?
20	MR. POSTON: No questions.
21	JUDGE JONES: Missouri American Water
22	Company?
23	MR. ENGLAND: No questions, Your Honor.
24	JUDGE JONES: Questions from the
25	Commi ssi on?

1	CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions. Thank you.
2	COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. Thank
3	you.
4	THE WITNESS: Okay.
5	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: You're always
6	skipping me, boss.
7	JUDGE JONES: I can't see you sitting
8	down there.
9	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:
10	Q. Mayor, thank you for your service to your
11	constituents. I remember I saw you at the public
12	heari ng.
13	On the town hall, who called the town
14	hall?
15	A. Missouri American. They contacted me
16	about wanting to hold a town hall meeting and they
17	needed a place to provide for that town hall and we
18	offered our our City Hall for that to happen.
19	Q. So would you agree that they were very
20	proactive in trying to get that going at that point?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Now, I and would you agree that a lot
23	of the problems on the water side are I don't want
24	to use the word "sporadic," but as I listened to some
25	of the members of the that subdivision what was

the name of the subdivision? 1 2 Α. Thousand Oaks. 3 0. Thousand Oaks. That -- and I had heard some testimony that not everybody has the problems. 4 5 lot of people do have problems, but then somehow some 6 people don't? 7 Α. That's correct. 8 Q. Okay. Have they -- I'm just curious, 9 have they -- and I'm sure there were a lot of angry 10 residents at that town hall that were speaking. I 11 read some of the -- the testimony. Is -- do you agree 12 that you need a new system? 13 I agree they need to fix the system that Α. 14 they have. 15 Do you think that system can be fixed, Q. 16 the one they have there? 17 Α. I don't know. 18 Q. Okay. Because I've been through it. I 19 think it's -- I don't know -- I forgot how old it was, 20 but it's terrible shape and obviously you're having problems so and I know -- I've heard testimony about 21 22 leaks happening in the roads and I know they don't 23 have a large staff at that facility. But your 24 argument is that the people who use the water from 25 that facility should not have to pay all the expenses

1	of that facility; is that right?
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. And why is that?
4	A. Because water is a necessity of life.
5	And my perspective is a little bit different than
6	other electeds possibly, because I believe that there
7	are there are many things that as individuals,
8	that we are involved in that we pay for that other
9	people benefit by, number one. But number two, the
10	the residential ratepayer, that is a basic service
11	that they need and it needs to be a fair and
12	reasonable rate for them to be able to have that.
13	Q. And that is our commission. We have to
14	give fair and reasonable rates. So I would agree with
15	that. Your argument is because the expense is so
16	high, it's unfair for your constituents?
17	A. That's correct. And I have an aging
18	popul ati on.
19	Q. Do do you believe we should have a
20	low-income tariff also or do you support that?
21	A. I I would need to see that, but it
22	sounds reasonable.
23	Q. All right. Thank you.
24	A. Anything else?
25	JUDGE JONES: Just a moment.

1	Any recross based on questions from
2	Commissioner Kenney? OPC?
3	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
4	Q. Good afternoon. I just wanted to ask how
5	many town hall meetings has Missouri American
6	contacted you about and asked you to hold?
7	A. One.
8	Q. Okay. And it wasn't until this case was
9	opened before the Commission that they asked you that;
10	is that correct?
11	A. That's correct.
12	Q. Thank you. That's all.
13	JUDGE JONES: Any redirect?
14	MR. BEDNAR: Yes, Your Honor.
15	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:
16	Q. Just to clarify the transcript, the
17	exhibit that you have attached to your testimony is
18	the testimony that was elicited at the public hearing.
19	Correct?
20	A. That's correct.
21	Q. And then the city sponsored their own
22	town hall community meeting based because as a
23	result of what you heard at that public hearing.
24	Correct?
25	A. That's correct.

- Q. And it was after that second hearing is when the Company contacted you about having their town hall meeting. Correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And that's where over 100 people showed up for that at 6:00, 7:00 in the evening. Correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, there's a little spot on the cross-examination from Joplin about the socialization of rate-making and you talk about your perspective as mayor. In your administration, have you taken the parochial approach of everybody's responsible for their own city and you don't share your services or any values or assistance that you can provide other communities?
- A. Not at all. We -- we -- we have a wonderful relationship and partnership with just about every city in our region that we are -- that we share a lot of different things with. And it's been -- it's been very valued to be able to not just think about your own and think about others.
- Q. And you actually have shared with Joplin as well, have you not, after the tornado?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. And you lost a public safety officer.

1	Correct?
2	A. That's correct. We sent one of our
3	public safety officers down for their tornado
4	assistance and he lost his life.
5	Q. No further questions.
6	JUDGE JONES: You may step down.
7	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
8	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Missouri American.
9	MR. ENGLAND: Thank you, Your Honor. I
10	think it's time for our witness Paul Herbert
11	JUDGE JONES: Yes.
12	MR. ENGLAND: if I'm reading the
13	schedule correct. Would it be a good idea to go off
14	the record and mark these additional exhibits we've
15	been talking about?
16	JUDGE JONES: Sure.
17	MR. ENGLAND: And distribute them as
18	well. Thank you.
19	(MAWC Exhibits 48, 49, 50 and 51 were
20	marked for identification.)
21	(Witness affirmed.)
22	JUDGE JONES: Thank you, sir. You may be
23	seated.
24	PAUL R. HERBERT, testified as follows:
25	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGLAND:

1	Q. Would you please state your full name for
2	the record, please?
3	A. Paul R. Herbert.
4	Q. And by whom are you employed and in what
5	capaci ty?
6	A. I am president of Gannett Fleming
7	Evaluation and Rate Consultants, LLC.
8	Q. And are you appearing here on behalf of
9	Missouri American Water Company?
10	A. I am.
11	Q. Mr. Herbert, did you cause to be prepared
12	and filed in this proceeding a document entitled
13	Direct Testimony of Paul R. Herbert and marked for
14	purposes of identification as MAWC Exhibit 7?
15	A. I have.
16	Q. Let me identify your other testimony
17	before we get into corrections. Did you also cause to
18	be prepared and filed a document entitled Supplemental
19	Testimony of Paul R. Herbert, previously marked for
20	purposes of identification as MAWC Exhibit 8?
21	A. I did.
22	Q. Next, did you cause to be prepared and
23	filed a document entitled Rebuttal Testimony of Paul
24	R. Herbert, previously marked for purposes of
25	identification as MAWC Exhibit 9?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Finally, did you cause to be prepared and
3	filed in the case a document entitled Surrebuttal
4	Testimony of Paul R. Herbert, marked for purposes of
5	identification as MAWC Number 10?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. With respect to those exhibits, sir, do
8	you have any corrections you need to make at this
9	time?
10	A. I do.
11	Q. Would you please take them slowly for the
12	folks here as well as the record?
13	A. On MAWC Number 8, my Direct Testimony
14	Q. Excuse me. I believe that's 7.
15	A. Oh, I'm sorry. MAWC Number 7, yes. My
16	direct. The table of contents, the page numbers
17	beginning with the third line, customer rate design,
18	should be page 12 instead of 11; the next one should
19	be page 15 instead of 14; the next should be page 19
20	instead of 18; and the customer rate design should be
21	page 21 as opposed to 19.
22	Q. Do you have any other changes or
23	corrections?
24	A. I do. On on page 3 of the same
25	exhibit or same testimony, lines 17 and lines 20, the

1	Schedule Number PRH-2 should become PRH-1A in both
2	in both lines, 17 and 20.
3	Q. And should the exhibit attached to your
4	testimony previously marked PRH-2 also become PRH-1A?
5	A. It should.
6	Q. Thank you, sir. Any other changes or
7	corrections?
8	A. In my in the Direct Testimony, again,
9	for some reason the page numbers from page after
10	page 11 did not get registered. So those pages
11	subsequent to page 10 should be numbered page 11
12	through 25.
13	Moving to my Rebuttal Testimony, MAWC
14	Number 9
15	Q. Excuse me, sir. I think you that's
16	Number 8. You're one ahead of yourself.
17	A. Rebuttal.
18	Q. I'm sorry. My mistake.
19	A. I don't think there's any changes to
20	Number 8.
21	Q. Your correct. My mistake.
22	A. On Number 9 on page 9 of Number 9,
23	lines 21 and 22, I indicate Mr. Martin suggests. It
24	should have been Mr. Hyman, the same in line 22. It
25	should be Mr. Hyman's position. And on page 13 of the
25	Shourd be Wit. Hyman S position. And on page 13 of the

same document, lines 5 and 6, the line 5 the word 1 2 "Brunswick" should be scratched. And at the end of 3 that sentence it should read, Platte County and 4 Brunswick are. Continuing, The only significant 5 outliers at 1,031 instead of 35 and 937 dollars 6 annual I y. And then I believe the -- the last 7 8 changes are to Schedule Number PRH-6 that was attached 9 to my Rebuttal Testimony. On page 1, the cost per 10 residential customer in the last column for Mexico 11

under zone two should be \$578.35 instead of the
433.76. And under zone 3, the \$702.92 should be
\$937.23.

On page 2 of the schedule, the same
corrections need to be made for Mexico and Brunswick.

corrections need to be made for Mexico and Brunswick For Mexico, 578.35 instead of the 433.76. And for Brunswick, 937.23 instead of the 702.92.

Q. Thank you, sir.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. With that, I believe that's all my corrections.
- Q. Thank you, sir. Now, let me turn your attention to the exhibits that were just marked a little while ago. The first being I believe MAWC Exhibit Number 49.

JUDGE JONES: I think you started at 48.

Looks like I'm the one with 1 MR. FNGLAND: 2 the numbering problem, Your Honor. Thank you. You're 3 right, 48. 4 THE WITNESS: I have it. 5 BY MR. ENGLAND: 6 Q. Mr. Herbert, would you please explain 7 what this analysis is purporting to show? 8 Α. This is the -- the Company's original 9 proposal for consolidated tariff pricing for zones 10 one, two and three based on the settlement level of 11 revenue requirement of a 30.6 million overall 12 increase. Uses the agreed -- what I'll call the 13 agreed-to billing determinants and customer charges at 14 17.40 across -- across the statewide for all -- all 15 three zones. 16 Q. Are the customer charges those that were 17 proposed by the Company in its original filing? 18 Α. It -- they are. 19 Q. And then focusing on the first page of 20 that exhibit, can you explain what you're showing in 21 the first column, which I believe is column B? 22 That shows for -- it shows the bill Α. Yes. 23 impacts for the different rate and meter size 24 customers by various usages. That shows their present 25 rate, their proposed rate and the percentage increase

1	or decrease.
2	Q. For example, with respect to the first
3	I guess on line 9, it says rate A, five-eighths inch
4	meters. Is that a typical residential customer
5	A. It is.
6	Q size?
7	A. It is.
8	Q. And then I think you indicated that you
9	are showing it at three levels of consumption?
10	A. Yes. At 3,000 gallons per month, which
11	would be probably lower than average; 5,000 gallons a
12	month, which would probably be around average; and
13	then a higher level at 8,000 gallons a month, which
14	would
15	Q. Moving down to lines 23 and 37, you have
16	the rate A, but one is a one-inch meter and the other
17	is a two-inch meter. What customers are typically
18	served by those size meters, sir?
19	A. Well, one-inch meters would be maybe some
20	larger residential or some smaller commercial
21	customers.
22	Q. Okay.
23	A. Two-inch also could be commercial,
24	that that kind of customer.
25	Q. And before we leave this first page,

1	going across the top in the various columns, have you
2	listed all of the water districts there?
3	A. They are listed through columns D
4	through
5	Q. And what's the
6	A F.
7	Q. And what's the significance of zone one
8	or two or three that you have there?
9	A. Those are the zones that the Company
10	originally proposed in their original filing. Zones
11	one, two and three are indicated for each of the of
12	the districts that those districts fall into.
13	Q. Okay. Turn the page, if you would,
14	please. And what size meters are depicted on this
15	page, please?
16	A. Over on the left on line 51 you can see
17	rate A, six-inch meters. That would be some larger
18	customers, probably industrial or larger public
19	authority potentially.
20	Q. And then the last group?
21	A. Rate J are the large customers.
22	That's
23	Q. I'm sorry.
24	A that's the separate category that are
25	indicated for larger users. And they could they

could not only be industrial, but large commercials also.

- Q. And then it's the same columns for the various districts as on the first page; is that right?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. Page 3, can you tell us what's shown on that page?
- A. The third page simply shows the amount of fixed charge revenue from each district based on the rate design in this scenario and whether -- under present rates and under the proposed rates and the total fixed charge revenue in the far right column S.
- Q. Turning the page, I believe it will be page 4 -- not marked, but the fourth page in that exhibit.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you explain what that purports to show?
- A. This shows the proposed rates for each district based on the zone that they are assigned to in the Company's original filing. The customer charges are at the top. The volumetric charges for rate A and commercial going onto the next page, industrial, OPA, rate J and sales for resale are then shown in the -- on the second page.

1	Q. OPA stands for what, sir?
2	A. Other Public Authority. It's mainly
3	municipal type of operations.
4	Q. Thank you. Turning to the next page,
5	let's say the last
6	A. The last two pages are the present rates
7	for each district.
8	Q. Thank you. Oh, with respect to the
9	parameters, if you will, that are spelled out at the
10	top of the exhibit on the first page, the last one you
11	have a statement that says, Percent change in bills
12	includes rolling into base rates the current ISRS for
13	St. Louis County. Can you explain that, please?
14	A. That would mean that the present rate
15	bill includes the ISRS charge.
16	Q. I think do you mean the proposed rate?
17	A. I'm sorry. The proposed rate has that,
18	yes, I'm sorry.
19	Q. The present rate does not have that in
20	there?
21	A. That's correct. I'm sorry.
22	Q. Thank you. Now, turning to Exhibit 49,
23	is that a similar type of analysis as to what we just
24	di scussed?
25	A. Itis.

		I
	1	
	2	
	_	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	

24

25

Q. Except it models a different scenario; is that right?

A. That -- that's right. This is the -this is the Staff's consolidated tariff pricing under
the same revenue requirement of 30.6 million overall
increase. It -- it places what we understand that -of Staff's customer charges for the -- each of the
zones. At the top there in column V it shows zone one
at 16.50, zone two at 14.80 and zone three at 14.50.

And then the rest of the -- these al -- this also reflects the agreed-to billing determinants, same as the previous exhibit. And then the rest of the -- the rest of the pages are -- are -- the format is the same. It shows the present rate and bill at various usages for the different rate categories and the proposed -- proposed rates and the percent increase.

And these zones -- however, these zones at the top are -- are Staff's zones one, two and three as opposed to the Company's zones, I believe. Yes

MR. ENGLAND: Just a second, Your Honor.

BY MR. ENGLAND:

Q. Turning your attention to page 2, I believe you've got a class customer listed there that we didn't have in the first exhibit down at the

1	bottom. Do you see that?
2	A. Rate B?
3	Q. Yes.
4	A. That's for the sales for resale.
5	Q. Yes. Can you explain who those customers
6	might be?
7	A. Those those are the customers that the
8	Company sells water in bulk to utilities water
9	other water utilities that resell the water to their
10	own customers.
11	Q. Like Public Water Supply Districts?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Okay. Thank you. Turning your attention
14	now to Exhibit 50, please describe what that analysis
15	purports to show.
16	A. This is the this shows the
17	non-unanimous proposal that was just discussed earlier
18	this afternoon by the parties, including OPC and
19	and MIEC and the rest. This this shows what the
20	rates would be under their their global proposal,
21	which includes a 5 percent decrease to Platte County
22	residential customers with them that being shared
23	10 percent and 90 percent to Joplin and St. Louis.
24	It includes also a 565,000 dollar
25	contribution from Joplin and St. Louis for sewer

1	cus
2	cha
3	and
4	1. 1
5	fro
6	cus
7	
8	def
9	to
10	
11	i ni
12	exl
13	
14	
15	Exl
16	of
17	
18	sar
19	dol

21

22

23

24

25

customers, excluding Arnold. It reflects a customer charges statewide at 14.42 for five-eighth inch meter and 16.09 for a three-quarter inch meter and a 1.15 percent increase to all other larger meter sizes from St. Louis Metro area. At-- but having those customer charges applied statewide.

Also, it's based on the agreed-to billing determinants and the rest of the schedule is similar to the previous two.

- Q. And does this purport to have the same information in the same format as the prior two exhibits you discussed?
 - A. They do.
- Q. Let me turn your attention now to Exhibit 51. I believe this was a proposal by the City of Riverside. Can you please explain this?
- A. Yes. Again, this -- this reflects the same revenue requirement level of a 30.6 million dollar increase. It is a consolidated tariff pricing scenario for all districts, excluding Joplin and St. Joe's. That he would -- Joplin and St. Joe's would retain their own district-specific pricing and all the other districts would be consolidated.
- Q. What other parameters are included in that model or analysis?

1	
2	8
3	1
4	8
5	ķ
6	S
7	r
8	t
9	i
10	
11	k
12	i
13	t
14	
15	c
16	
17	
18	ķ
19	1
20	ķ

22

23

24

25

A. This includes a customer charge of 16.50 across the consolidated districts and main-- maintains the customer charges under present rates for Joplin and St. Joe's. The rate -- I'm looking at the rates page now. It looks like this -- the rate J for St. Louis Metro is slightly -- slightly less than the rest of the consolidated districts. I don't know if that was -- that's an error or that's -- was intentional.

I think it was intentional, but I don't know at this point. I'm sorry. I just noticed that it's different. It's 1 point -- it's .1645 instead of the .17 for the other consolidated districts.

- Q. Okay. Well, I can't help you with that one, Mr. Herbert.
 - A. I don't know.
- Q. Turning now -- or turning back to your prepared Direct Supplemental Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testimony and keeping in mind the corrections that you previously -- previously indicated, if I were to ask you those questions here today on the stand, would your answers be the same?
 - A. They would.
- Q. Are those answers true and correct to the best of your knowledge, information and belief?

A. They are.
Q. With respect to the schedules that are
attached to your testimonies and to the four exhibits
that you've just identified, 48 through 51, were those
prepared by you or under your direct supervision?
A. They were.
Q. And do they contain information that's
true and correct to the best of your knowledge,
information and belief?
A. They are.
Q. Thank you, sir.
MR. ENGLAND: I have no other questions
of the witness at this time and subject to
cross-examination would ask that Company Exhibits 7,
8, 9, 10, 48 and 49, 50 and 51 be admitted into the
record.
JUDGE JONES: Any objections to those
exhi bi ts?
MR. POSTON: Judge, can we hold off on
entering this until tomorrow until we've had an
opportunity to look at these numbers that we're
just getting this now.
JUDGE JONES: You mean with regard to 48
through 51?
MR. POSTON: Yes. I'm sorry. Just 48

1	through 51.
2	JUDGE JONES: Sure. Any objection to
3	MAWC 7, 8, 9 or 10?
4	I don't see any. MAWC 7, 8, 9, 10 are
5	admitted into the record.
6	(MAWC Exhibits 7, 8, 9 and 10 were
7	recei ved into evidence.)
8	JUDGE JONES: And now we'll have
9	cross-examination from Missouri Department of Energy.
10	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ANTAL:
11	Q. Hello, Mr. Herbert.
12	A. Hello.
13	Q. My name is Alex Antal. I'm an attorney
14	representing the Missouri Division of Energy. And
15	it's my understanding that you'll be unavailable
16	tomorrow during our rate design and customer charge
17	discussion; is that correct?
18	A. I'll be here in the morning. I won't be
19	here in the afternoon.
20	Q. Okay. Well, you have a noon flight?
21	A. I have to leave here around noon to catch
22	my flight.
23	MR. ANTAL: Okay. Well, if I'll leave
24	it up to the judge. I know there was some discussion
25	before the break of taking up his customer charge

1	issues at this time. If we want to do that now, I'm
2	happy to answer the ask questions on customer
3	charge now, but if if we want to take those issues
4	up tomorrow morning, I'll wait until then.
5	JUDGE JONES: Do you have questions
6	concerning district consolidation?
7	MR. ANTAL: Not at this time.
8	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Let's let's go
9	ahead and talk about district consolidation at this
10	point in the transcript. And for your convenience
11	after that, if everyone's prepared, then we'll go
12	ahead and talk to you about customer charge so that
13	you don't have to risk missing a flight tomorrow.
14	MIEC, do you have cross-examination?
15	MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Judge.
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DOWNEY:
17	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Herbert.
18	A. Good afternoon.
19	Q. My name's Ed Downey. I represent
20	industrial customers. And I want to ask you some
21	questions about these exhibits that you just prepared.
22	First of all, did you just prepare these?
23	A. Yes. Over the last couple days.
24	Q. Okay. And did you prepare them or did
25	somebody that works for you prepare them?

1	A. Actually my assistant did the number
2	crunchi ng, yes.
3	Q. Okay. I want to talk to you about
4	Exhibit 50 first. Now, it's my understanding what
5	you're doing is modeling rate impacts using the
6	non-unanimous stipulation that my client signed
7	A. That's right.
8	Q as well as others?
9	A. That's right.
10	Q. And the first column shows St. Louis
11	Metro
12	A. Yes.
13	Q is that right?
14	Actually that's not the first column.
15	That's column D.
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Okay. And if I'm reading this correctly,
18	every single class of customer for St. Louis Metro is
19	seeing a rate increase; is that right?
20	A. I believe so, yes.
21	Q. Some some more significant than others
22	though. Ri ght?
23	A. That's right.
24	Q. And just slide over and look at column N,
25	as in Nancy. That's Platte County?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Am I correct that it is showing a
3	decrease in every single single customer class?
4	A. That's right.
5	Q. And that's under the non-unanimous
6	stipulation. And in some cases those decreases are
7	above 50 percent. Right? I'm sorry, in one case.
8	I'm going to help you. That's column N, line
9	A. 68.
10	Q 68.
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Okay.
13	A. I notice the last line shows an increase
14	for Platte County.
15	Q. Okay. I'm sorry. I guess
16	A. I'm not sure why.
17	Q. I stand corrected. That's 4 million
18	gallons per month?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. That's a 10 percent increase. Column N,
21	line 82, that's almost a 50 percent decrease?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And that's for 45,000 gallons per month?
24	A. Yeah. It has a lot to do with this lower
25	customer charge.

1	Q. Okay. And you said something to
2	Mr. England about this includes the 565,000 dollar
3	contribution from Joplin or St. Louis for sewer
4	customers. Explain how you factored that cost into
5	this. If you explained it already, I missed it, so
6	try me again.
7	A. No. I didn't explain any details about
8	it.
9	Q. Okay.
10	A. Other than it reduces the it takes
11	it takes 565,000 dollars of revenue requirement from
12	the sewer and applies that requirement that revenue
13	requirement 10 percent to Joplin, 90 percent to
14	St. Louis County as a revenue target from which the
15	rates can then be adjusted in order to make that up.
16	Q. Okay. So part of this increase that
17	we're seeing in the St. Louis Metro rates in column D
18	is attributable to the stipulation's provision that
19	St. Louis Metro will absorb 90 percent of that sewer
20	cost, that 565,000 dollar sewer cost. Right?
21	A. That's right.
22	Q. Okay. That's not something that's on top
23	of these percentage increases?
24	A. No. That's that's this is
25	all-inclusive of those items.

1	Q. Okay. I've got some more questions.
2	Give me just a second.
3	And I'd like you to look at Exhibit 48.
4	And it's my understanding that's the Company's
5	consolidated tariff pricing model?
6	A. Yeah. Based on their original proposal,
7	yes.
8	Q. All right. And then if we look at
9	column D, that's St. Louis Metro, every single class
10	is seeing a rate increase. Correct?
11	A. That's correct.
12	Q. And then for Platte County, just I'm
13	using Platte County as an example because I know their
14	rates are high. In every single instance under the
15	Company proposal, every single class, this is
16	column column N, Platte County receives a
17	significant rate decrease?
18	A. That's right.
19	Q. But really the only class that it
20	receives a rate decrease under the Company proposal
21	that it wouldn't receive a rate decrease under the
22	non-unanimous stip is the 4 million gallon per month
23	class; is that correct?
24	A. For Platte County?
25	Q. For Platte County, column N.

1	A. I believe that's correct.
2	Q. All right. No further questions. Thank
3	you.
4	JUDGE JONES: Any questions from
5	Brunswi ck?
6	MR. DRAG: No questions, Your Honor.
7	JUDGE JONES: Joplin?
8	MS. BELL: Yes, sir.
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:
10	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Herbert.
11	A. Good afternoon.
12	Q. I'm Stephanie Bell on behalf of Joplin.
13	Earlier Mr. England had made a comment
14	about a sewer shortfall of approximately 1.3 million.
15	Is that what you heard?
16	A. That's what I heard.
17	Q. Okay. If we look at Exhibits 48, 49 and
18	51, is that sewer shortfall reflected in the rates in
19	those charts anywhere?
20	A. I don't know.
21	Q. You don't know?
22	A. I don't I'm sorry. I don't know.
23	Q. Do you know who might know? You
24	calculated these numbers?
25	A. My assistant did.

1	Q. Okay. And you said with the calculation
2	for fif let's see, for the non-unanimous stip
3	proposal, which would be 50
4	A. Fifty.
5	Q you said you had to go in and add that
6	565. You didn't add in 1.3 million on these other
7	three three exhibits, did you?
8	A. I don't know.
9	Q. Okay.
10	A. I wish I could tell you, but I I'm
11	sorry. I don't want to say if I'm not sure.
12	Q. Okay. Do you you have stated that you
13	don't object to Staff's consolidation plan; is that
14	correct?
15	A. That's right.
16	Q. Okay. And you understand that Staff's
17	consolidation plan would put Joplin in with
18	Warrensburg?
19	A. Yes, it would.
20	Q. Warrensburg and Joplin's systems are not
21	interconnected in any way, are they?
22	A. They are not, to my knowledge.
23	Q. And are you aware that Warrensburg is
24	more than 160 miles from Joplin?
25	A. Yes.

1	Q. And are you aware that Joplin's current
2	source of supply is both surface water and
3	groundwater?
4	A. I'll take that, subject to check.
5	Q. And Warrensburg's source of supply is
6	solely groundwater?
7	A. I don't know, but that could be.
8	Q. Okay. Are you aware of any effort on the
9	part of the Company to educate people in Joplin that
10	they had to pay for upgrades that they might have
11	to pay for upgrades in Warrensburg or in another
12	district in the future?
13	A. I'm not aware.
14	Q. Okay. In your Direct Testimony, you
15	argue that the Company's ability to absorb the cost of
16	capital projects is a compelling argument in favor of
17	consolidation. You made that argument. Correct?
18	A. I make the argument that the that by
19	having consolidated pricing, it it spreads those
20	large construction projects over a wider base of
21	customers, yes.
22	Q. How
23	A. Which which leads to rate stability.
24	Q. Can you explain how that benefits the
25	customers in Joplin?

- A. It benefits all customers, because at some time down the road everyone's going to need significant improvements to their system. And so I -- that leads to the rate stability that I'm talking about. It may not be next year, it may not be five years down the road, it may not be ten. It might -- it could be longer. But eventually every district is going to need some kind of significant capital improvement project.
- Q. In your Direct Testimony, you state,
 There is no question that the service rendered to a
 residence in one area is the same as the service
 rendered to a residence in other area.
 - A. The service is the same.
- Q. Is surface water and groundwater treated and processed the same or differently? It's different, isn't it?
- A. It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. It's the end of product. It's what comes out of the tap that's important. Okay? When you draw a glass of water in Joplin or you draw one in St. Louis, does -- do you sit there and say, Oh, wow, this is groundwater or oh, my, this must be surface water. You don't know. It's -- it's -- it's the same product. It's the end product that's important.

1	Q. And I understand that was part of your
2	testimony. My question is, do you treat surface water
3	and groundwater differently? You do, don't you?
4	A. The treatment process?
5	Q. Correct.
6	A. Of course.
7	Q. Of course. And so that would be factored
8	into the costs? There are different costs in treating
9	groundwater versus surface water. Correct?
10	A. There are.
11	Q. Are you aware of any capital improvement
12	plans in the future for the district of Warrensburg?
13	A. I I'm not the one to ask that.
14	Q. Okay. No further questions.
15	JUDGE JONES: Thank you. Questions from
16	Ri versi de?
17	MR. BEDNAR: Just a couple, Your Honor.
18	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:
19	Q. Mr. Herbert, MIEC asked you about the
20	Staff proposals in regards to and Company proposals
21	in regards to the increases that St. Louis customers
22	would see versus those in Platte County. Correct?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. And he was talking in percentages.
25	Correct?

1	A. He was.
2	Q. Now, if you turn to Exhibit 48, which was
3	the Company's original proposal
4	A. Yes.
5	Q while Platte County gets decreases in
6	almost every category, their dollar amount is still
7	higher at a higher level than St. Louis in every
8	category. Correct?
9	A. It is.
10	Q. And some more significant than others.
11	Correct?
12	A. That's correct.
13	Q. Especially when you get into the
14	industrial aspect. If I could turn your attention on
15	the Company's proposal original proposal, column N
16	and D on the second page, the 2 million and 4 million
17	dollars where in St. Louis an industrial user's
18	present rate is 6,380.04 and the current rate in
19	Platte County is 17,623. Even with the decrease of
20	19.3 percent, the Platte County rate will still be
21	double that of St. Louis. Correct?
22	A. That's correct.
23	Q. And that is true on the Staff proposal.
24	The only lines that in which Platte County would
25	have a higher rate than Saint or lower rate than

1	St. Louis is on page 1, line 40 under rate A, two
2	meters. It would be higher by 22 cents or I mean
3	23 cents I mean lower by 23 cents. Sorry.
4	A. That's correct. I'm checking the others.
5	Q. And then on page 2, line 54, it looks
6	like Platte County would have be lower by 16 cents?
7	A. That's right.
8	Q. And still for your major industrials,
9	even after the price adjustments of Staff, the
10	industrial rate on line 90 of that column N is
11	12,128 dollars while in St. Louis it's \$8,225.09,
12	column D, 90?
13	A. That's correct.
14	Q. So even though we can play with the
15	percentages, St. Louis still has a tremendous
16	advantage over Platte County in overall rates. Right?
17	A. Their rates would still be lower.
18	Q. Thank you. Appreciate it.
19	JUDGE JONES: Any questions from
20	St. Joseph?
21	MR. LAWYER: Yes, Your Honor.
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LAWYER:
23	Q. Good afternoon. Excuse me. Good
24	afternoon, Mr. Herbert.
25	A. Good afternoon.

1	Q. I have some questions as they relate to
2	the Company's original proposal just kind of in a
3	generality. Joplin has already asked this question
4	about connections between districts. Are you aware of
5	any connections between the water systems in these
6	di stri cts?
7	A. I'm not aware.
8	Q. Not aware of any. And then I believe
9	I don't want to waste the Commission's time on this,
10	as I believe it's already been covered previously, but
11	you were speaking briefly about what matters is the
12	end product. But if I understood that correctly,
13	that's not taking into the cost that goes into
14	creating that end product. Am I correct in
15	understanding that?
16	A. The costs are different.
17	Q. The costs are different?
18	A. They I would be amazed if they were
19	the same, to be honest with you. It would be
20	remarkable.
21	Q. Remarkable?
22	A. Okay? But I don't think it's it's a
23	compelling reason to have a different price for the
24	same end product.
25	Q. For the same end product. Even so

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	გ	
	9	
	-	
1		
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	1	ĺ

if -- if the Company has different costs in providing that, that's irrelevant?

A. It's irrelevant to sound rate design, in my view. It -- because as others have said earlier today, there are cost differences within districts that nobody seems to care about. There -- there's --

Q. Certainly.

A. -- significant difference between a customer that's served at the -- the high service -- or directly from the treatment plant pumping as opposed to somebody's who's miles away that require maybe one or two different booster stations and storage tanks.

Q. Certainly.

A. A significant difference in cost. But nobody seems to care about that. They're paying the same rate.

- Q. If -- well, I don't want to get into hypotheticals. We've heard that many times as being used as an example. But would the administrative costs of breaking things down to that level be absurd, would you say? I mean would it become the -- the minutia of that, would that become a ridiculous --
 - A. Absurd -- absurd is a good --
 - Q. But using logical geographic districts is

1	a is a step that everyone's willing to take in
2	groupi ng?
3	A. Everyone seems to ignore cost differences
4	when it serves them, yes.
5	Q. Thank you.
6	A. Uh-huh.
7	JUDGE JONES: Warrensburg?
8	MR. CURTIS: No questions. Thank you.
9	JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply
10	Di stri cts?
11	MR. DORITY: Thank you, Judge. Just a
12	coupl e.
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DORITY:
14	Q. Mr. Herbert, thank you for running these
15	various schedules. They're very helpful. And I know
16	Mr. Busch has done a tremendous amount of work trying
17	to model. And for those of us that don't have experts
18	available, we appreciate your sharing work products
19	with us.
20	A. I'll pass your thanks off to my
21	assi stant.
22	Q. Whoever's doing it, we appreciate it.
23	I was looking at your these Schedules
24	48 through 51. And my parochial interest, of course,
25	are the sale for resale and I'm looking at St. Joe.
ı	

And in all of these various scenarios, it appears that there is a single rate on the sale for resale. And I guess I just wanted to ask you, do you understand that in Staff's proposal, that Mr. Busch is recommending to continue a declining block structure for all non-residential customer rate classifications for his water district number two and district number three? Because I don't see that --

- A. No. I thought he had --
- Q. -- when I look at these.
- A. My understanding was he had single rates for classes for the -- all those districts.
- Q. I -- I think if you will look at page 6 of the Staff cost-of-service report where they discuss design of block rates, he testifies Staff proposes to continue the existing SLM rate structure for water district one and to continue a declining block structure for all non-residential customer rate classifications for water district two and water district three. Staff's method in designing the block rates was to keep the existing ratio between the currently approved blocks constant.

And I will cover that with Mr. Busch when he's on the stand, but that's -- that's what Staff has testified to. And I don't see that in any of these

1	schedules when I look under St. Joe.
2	A. Well, I would I would not I would
3	rather have a single block for sales or
4	resal e because
5	Q. I know you would, but that's not what's
6	in existence today. And I think the Staff's report
7	had indicated that they would not undertake moving in
8	any way in that direction without a full
9	cost-of-service analysis, which they have not prepared
10	for this case.
11	A. Well, I think the existing existing
12	sales for resale rate in St. Joe's
13	Q. I can show you that, if you'd like.
14	A. I'm looking at it now. St. Joe's sales
15	for resale, rate B.
16	Q. There is no rate B.
17	A. Well, it's we call it rate B, but
18	it's
19	Q. But there is no rate B.
20	A declining block rates.
21	Q. When I look in the Company's tariffs
22	under rate B, sale for resale, it's reserved for
23	future use. I go back and look at rate A, under your
24	proposed tariff you have a single rate under second
25	revised sheet RT 1 1 And the commodity charge lists

1	residential, commercial, industrial, public authority
2	sale for resale. There is no longer any rate B, per
3	se for your St. Louis Metro, Joplin, Warrensburg, St.
4	Joe, et al.
5	A. Well, I don't have the tariff in front of
6	me. I'm looking at the Exhibit 48 that you referred
7	me to. Frankly, I think I think the single
8	single rate for rate for sales for resale in
9	St. Joe's is appropriate.
10	Q. That's not Staff's that's not Staff's
11	recommendation. That's not Staff's proposal. And so
12	what you purport to represent as the Staff proposal
13	and the Office of Public Counsel's stipulation and
14	some of these others, it's really not reflective of
15	those proposals. It might be what you're proposing.
16	A. Okay. We can make that correction.
17	Q. If you could, I would really appreciate
18	it. Thank you. That's all I have.
19	A. That would be on Number 49 though.
20	Ri ght?
21	Q. Well, that would be on 49, 50 and
22	let's see, 51. Yeah, all of those.
23	A. I'm not sure it would be 51, but since
24	that's the Company's proposal, but
25	O Well

1	A 49 and 50.
2	Q if we keep Joplin and St. Joe as they
3	are today
4	A. Oh, I see.
5	Q they'll need to be revised.
6	A. I understand.
7	Q. Thank you. I appreciate it.
8	A. I stand corrected.
9	Q. Thank you very much.
10	MR. DORITY: That's all I have, Your
11	Honor.
12	JUDGE JONES: Now you got me wondering if
13	these documents should even be coming in if they're
14	not accurate.
15	But StoneBridge? Triumph? OPC?
16	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
17	Q. Yes. Just a few over the same schedules
18	that we just saw. And just for my question's sake,
19	we'll assume that there's accuracy to these schedules.
20	I'd like to start with Exhibit 48 MAWC 48 and this
21	is the Company's filed position. And if you could
22	turn to the third page on that. And this purports to
23	show the change in the customer charge
24	A. The revenue.
25	Q. Revenue change. And so under the

1	Company's filed proposal, St. Louis Metro,
2	13.3 million dollars would be shifted in fixed
3	guaranteed cost recovery to St. Louis Metro; is that
4	correct?
5	A. The increase in the fixed charge revenue
6	for St. Louis Metro would be increased by 13.388,
7	yeah.
8	Q. And that okay. So the answer to my
9	question was yes?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Out of a total of 14 million dollar
12	increase in the guaranteed fixed recovery; is that
13	correct?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And then turning to MAWC 49, Staff's
16	proposal, looking at that same sheet three, that would
17	shift 5 million from present rates fixed guaranteed
18	recovery to St. Louis Metro. Right?
19	MR. ENGLAND: Objection, Your Honor.
20	THE WITNESS: It would increase the
21	fi xed
22	MR. ENGLAND: Excuse me. Objection
23	THE WITNESS: charge revenue
24	MR. ENGLAND: Mr. Herbert
25	THE WITNESS: Yes.

```
1
                  MR. ENGLAND:
                               -- I've got an objection.
                                Oh, I'm sorry.
 2
                  THE WITNESS:
 3
                  MR. ENGLAND: I've let it go on long
 4
     enough, but I'm going to object to the form of the
 5
     question, argumentative in calling it a fixed
 6
     guaranteed revenue.
7
                  JUDGE JONES: Objection overruled.
8
                  MR. DOWNEY:
                               Marc, which exhibit are you
9
     on?
10
                  JUDGE JONES: Go ahead and answer that.
11
                  MR. DOWNEY:
                               Which exhibit are you on?
12
                  MR. POSTON:
                               We're looking at Number 49.
13
                  JUDGE JONES:
                                Do you need him to re-- do
14
     you need to re-ask -- do you need him to re-ask the
15
     questi on?
16
                  THE WITNESS: I do.
17
                  MR. POSTON: I -- he answered it. I
18
     don't know if she had gotten down his answer. I
19
     believe he was answering it while the objection was --
20
                  JUDGE JONES: I didn't hear what his
21
     answer was.
22
                  THE WITNESS: Could you answer -- ask the
23
     question again?
     BY MR. POSTON:
24
25
            Q.
                  Okay. I will ask it again. And I will
```

1	change the format of the question as well. So there
2	is if you look at the St. Louis Metro, there is,
3	under Staff's proposal, 5.3 million would be in fixed
4	recovery. Between present and proposed, there would
5	be an increase of 5.3 million in St. Louis Metro.
6	Ri ght?
7	A. The revenue from the customer charges
8	would increase 5.3 million.
9	Q. And these are charges that the Company
10	would recover whether the customers used any water or
11	not; is that correct?
12	A. As long as the number of customers stay
13	the same.
14	Q. Okay. And then if we look at MAWC
15	Exhibit 50, same sheet three, you see there's not an
16	impact really to St. Louis Metro. Correct?
17	A. No. And the overall impact is a
18	decrease
19	Q. I didn't ask you that question, sir.
20	A of 1.7.
21	Q. Well, actually I will go to you talk
22	about the overall increase. If you look at between
23	the four different scenarios that you've run here, the
24	MAWC Exhibit 50 is actually closer to what the
25	Company's recovering now than any of the other

1	proposals that you've run; is that correct?
2	A. Closer in which way?
3	Q. Well, sir, in fixed cost recovery between
4	what they're getting presently and what they would be
5	getting under the proposed.
6	A. It's closer, but it's less.
7	Q. I recognize that, but it's closer.
8	Right? In all the other three proposals there would
9	be greater fixed recovery for the company. Correct?
10	A. Yes. Because those costs are going up.
11	Q. I didn't ask you why, sir.
12	A. I'm telling you why.
13	JUDGE JONES: You all keep arguing, I'm
14	going to make you kiss and make up.
15	MR. POSTON: Do we have to kiss? That
16	JUDGE JONES: Yeah, you do.
17	BY MR. POSTON:
18	Q. And on this the Exhibit 51, was this
19	proposal did this proposal appear anywhere in your
20	testimony or anybody else's testimony, to your
21	knowl edge?
22	A. It does not as I to my knowledge.
23	Q. That's all the questions I have.
24	JUDGE JONES: Any questions from Staff?
25	MS. MYERS: No questions, Your Honor.

1	JUDGE JONES: Mr. Chairman?
2	CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, I have a couple.
3	QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:
4	Q. Good afternoon.
5	A. Good afternoon.
6	Q. Looking at Exhibit 48, are you
7	assuming or was your assistant assuming the same
8	customer charge for all rate classes?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And is that the Company's objection?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Okay.
13	A. I mean by by meter size, but across
14	the same across the state.
15	Q. Well, is
16	A. If you turn to page 4 of the packet, you
17	can see at the top section of between lines 12
18	through 22, it begins with this you might have
19	heard 17.40. That's the five-eighth inch charge
20	that's applicable to most residential customers. And
21	then the the charge is higher for subsequent larger
22	meter sizes. But as you can see from column C through
23	A, E, there the rates are the same.
24	Q. I guess I'm I'm looking at columns
25	R wait. Yeah R, S, T where it says five-eighths

1	seven-forty and then it's the same thing on the next
2	page. So you've got the the different fixed the
3	different customer charge factored in to each meter
4	si ze?
5	A. Yes. Depending on the size of the meter.
6	That's why down where it says one-inch meters, the
7	bills are higher and the two-inch meters, they're
8	higher still.
9	MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Judge, are we going
10	to have this witness come back on rate design
11	tomorrow? Is that the plan?
12	JUDGE JONES: Yeah, I think we will.
13	CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. I have no
14	further questions. Thank you.
15	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Stoll?
16	COMMISSIONER STOLL: Thank you.
17	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER STOLL:
18	Q. Good afternoon.
19	A. Good afternoon.
20	Q. I think I just have one question. On
21	let's take Exhibit 48. On line 4, J, it says, Percent
22	change in bill includes rolling into base rates the
23	current ISRS for St. Louis County.
24	So we had a couple questions about the
25	reason for the increase in St. Louis and St. Louis

1	Metro. Is that because of the ISRS being rolled into
2	the rates?
3	A. Yes. That as I understand it, the
4	ISRS rate would then be set to zero so that those
5	costs that were being recovered through the ISRS are
6	now in the in the regular rates.
7	Q. Okay.
8	A. That's how I understand it.
9	Q. Okay. So the figure we see here are the
10	present let's take line 11, present rate, 24.75,
11	the change in the consolidated tariff pricing, 29.02,
12	and the difference the percentage change 17.3.
13	That 17.3 does include that what was previously the
14	ISRS amount also?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Okay. Thank you.
17	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Kenny?
18	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you. I just
19	have one quest thank you. I just have one question.
20	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:
21	Q. On your Rebuttal Testimony at the top of
22	page 5, line 3 you had said, The cost use of
23	customer cost analysis are based on the Company
24	revenue requirement that would be result in a
25	five-eighths inch customer charge of 17.40 per month.

1	The level of the customer charge would be amended
2	based on the final revenue requirement on this case.
3	That's what you said there, but that's
4	not what you're doing, are you?
5	A. We did not reflect any reduction in
6	revenue requirement to the 17.40 at this time.
7	Q. So you don't think it needs to be
8	adj usted?
9	A. It it probably should be adjusted
10	slightly. I did a quick calculation that it would
11	instead of 17.40, it would be like 17.20.
12	Q. All right. I was just curious. Thank
13	you.
14	A. So it was a rather minor change.
15	Q. Okay. Got it.
16	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Rupp?
17	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:
18	Q. Thank you very much. So you're going to
19	go back and adjust of some of these numbers?
20	A. It looks like I need to, yes.
21	Q. Okay. While you're doing that, would you
22	be able to provide the same spreadsheet for a
23	single-rate tariff for the entire state and what it
24	would do to all the current
25	A. Yes.

1	Q. I would appreciate that. Thank you.
2	A. We can do that.
3	CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. Actually, I'm
4	sorry. I do have a couple other questions a couple
5	of additional questions.
6	FURTHER QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL:
7	Q. If we could you explain the rationale
8	behind the Company's grouping on consolidation? It
9	apparently is on the basis of cost. At least that's
10	what your counsel indicated in opening. Is that your
11	position or your understanding?
12	A. That was the intent, yes. We were trying
13	to group those and we may have been looking at
14	existing rates. This really shows cost-of-service on
15	this Schedule 6 as opposed to existing rates, but we
16	were looking at, you know, the lower the lower co
17	or the lower rate districts in one group, the higher
18	districts in the last group and and the ones in
19	between in in the second group. That's what our
20	intent was.
21	Q. But you didn't really do that. I mean,
22	there's it's you've got
23	A. This is showing cost, not what the
24	existing rate would be.
25	Q. Okay. So tell me again what your

1	approach was
2	Α. (
3	rate customers
4	together and t
5	our intent. N
6	all the increa
7	this this i
8	customer.
9	Q.
10	Schedule 6?
11	Α. Υ
12	were we wer
13	same you kr
14	industrial rat
15	Q. :
16	ignoring geog
17	at the rates?
18	A. Y
19	Q.
20	A. V
21	of rates, ther
22	districts woul
23	Q.
24	impact to some

approach was	i n	groupi ng.
--------------	-----	------------

- Our approach was trying to get the lower s together, the higher rate customers the middle ones in the middle. That was Now, this -- this schedule is then after ases to revenue requirements that -- so s showing a cost per -- per residential
- And by "this" you're talking about
- Yes. And this is just residential. We re looking at other classes also at the now, at the same -- we were looking at tes and large users.
- So you were -- you were -- you were raphically completely and simply looking
 - es.
 - And grouping it on the basis of rates?
- We thought if you grouped it on the basis n the impact to certain -- certain dn't be as great.
- So you would -- you would minimize rate e extent?
 - Α. Yes.

-- well,

terms of

1	Q. But how do you but that would do some
2	damage to your to your other objectives of well
3	the other objectives that you set forth in your in
4	your testimony.
5	A. Yeah. And that's why we didn't oppose
6	Staff's groupings, because we felt that those were
7	reasonable also.
8	Q. I know this will be kind of arguing
9	against yourself, but can you explain to me how
10	grouping on the basis of cost doesn't necessarily
11	support your overall principles for consolidation?
12	A. I don't I don't know if I understand
13	your question.
14	Q. Well, what are what are what are
15	your what are the overall objectives for
16	consolidation?
17	A. Well, to have have fewer districts
18	and
19	Q. Okay. Well, that's I mean in terms o
20	the the impact on ratepayers, what are the overall
21	objectives for consolidation?
22	A. To have more rate stability among the
23	districts so that large construction projects doesn't
24	affect a single district the way it now can without
25	with district-specific pricing. To reflect the

overall equivalent of service across the state. The fact that it's one company providing the same service in different locations doesn't -- just because where you live shouldn't have an impact on the -- on the price that you pay.

- Q. And -- and does grouping systems on the basis of rates, does that promote long-term rate stability to the same extent as other ways of grouping systems?
- A. It -- it -- it depends on what happens in the future to -- to how you will want to consolidate rates further down the road. So it -- our -- our -- one of our main concerns here in this case was to have less impacts on certain -- on certain districts, though if you group them with their rates more closely aligned, then there wouldn't be as much movement, either increases or decreases, in order to get there.
- Q. And is there -- what is the logic behind grouping it -- grouping these zones on the basis of geography? None of these systems are connected.
- A. I personally don't -- don't see any real benefit about the geography part of it, but others do. So you can ask them. But geography doesn't mean -- I mean I come from Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania American serves all over the state, probably 30 systems. They

1	have one rate. All kinds of different costs and
2	different terrain and different literally all
3	across the state and they have one rate.
4	Q. Have you testified before Public Service
5	Commissions in other states on on this issue of
6	consol i dati on?
7	A. I have.
8	Q. How many states roughly?
9	A. At least at least three.
10	Q. At least three?
11	A. Yeah. Pennsylvania, New Jersey,
12	III i noi s.
13	Q. And and are
14	A. West Virginia.
15	Q. I assume that you're generally aware
16	of of scholarship and the academic studies and
17	analyses of consolidation?
18	A. I'm aware of some of them, yes.
19	Q. Is there is there is there a trend
20	from your perspective?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And what is that trend?
23	A. Consolidation.
24	Q. And is it is it a and is it
25	straight line trend or is it is it a little jagged?

1	A. It's certainly been a movement towards it
2	since the '90s. When it was in the '90s when we
3	first began consolidating that Pennsylvania had at
4	least I want to say five major rate zones at the time.
5	And it took about three rate cases, but we got it
6	in about three rate cases we got it down to one rate.
7	In New Jersey they did major
8	consolidations within New Jersey American prior to
9	their acquisition of Elizabethtown and Mount Holly.
10	Elizabethtown and Mount Holly are now combined, but
11	they're still at this point slightly lower than the
12	rest of New Jersey American. But there's been major
13	consolidation going on since since the '90s.
14	Q. Okay. Thank you.
15	A. Uh-huh.
16	JUDGE JONES: Any cross recross rather
17	based on questions from Commissioners? I don't see
18	any. Any redirect?
19	MR. ENGLAND: Yes, Your Honor.
20	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGLAND:
21	Q. Mr. Herbert, I'm not sure which scenario
22	you were asked, but it had to do with the
23	JUDGE JONES: Mr. England, is your
24	mi crophone on?
25	MR. ENGLAND: I'm sorry. Thank you, Your

1	Honor.
2	BY MR. ENGLAND:
3	Q. Mr. Herbert, I believe you were asked
4	some questions by Mr. Downey regarding some of the
5	specific rate reductions in percentages for the Platte
6	County district. Are those individual rate reductions
7	at the various levels that you have depicted as well
8	as the various size meters indicative of the overall
9	decrease to the to the district?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. For example, looking at Exhibit 48 and
12	the what I call residential customer, the
13	five-eighths inch meter customer, at the three levels
14	of consumption, you show a decrease of 8.7 percent,
15	12.8 percent and 15.8 percent?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And similar not similar numbers, but
18	similar decreases in in all of the other rates.
19	But what is the overall decrease in the district?
20	A. The overall revenue
21	Q. Yes.
22	A difference?
23	Q. I believe it's shown on page 4 of your
24	exhi bi t.
25	A. Oh, in percent?

1	Q. Yes. I'm sorry.
2	A. I thought you were talking revenue.
3	Q. My mistake.
4	A. 14.45 it indicates there in line 7.
5	Q. Okay. Thank you. And you've tried to
6	show those similar district percentages, if you will,
7	for the other scenarios as well. Right?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Roughly on page 4 of each of those
10	A. Yes.
11	Q exhibits?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. I think Commissioner Stoll was getting to
14	a question I wanted to ask you and that had to do with
15	the roll-in of the ISRS surcharge for the St. Louis
16	County customers. For purposes of my question and
17	again I'll focus on Exhibit 48 again, the
18	residential customer, let's say, that's using 5,000
19	gallons a month. There is a proposed percentage
20	increase of 16.2 percent. Do you see that?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. If the ISRS charges are roughly
23	10 percent of that increase, how much is the net
24	increase to that St. Louis County customer?
25	A. That would be like 6.2 percent.

1	Q. Thank you, sir. Mr. Poston with the
2	Office of Public Counsel, had some questions regarding
3	the revenues associated with the fixed charges or the
4	customer charges. I believe that's on page 3 of
5	these each of these analyses?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Approximately how many or what
8	percentage of the Company's costs are fixed?
9	A. Oh, I think in somewhere in my
10	testimony I indicate that it's like somewhere around
11	93 percent of the costs are strictly are fixed
12	costs.
13	Q. And even with the increases that you've
14	proposed and the customer charge, what percentage of
15	the total revenues will be recovered through your
16	proposed customer charges?
17	A. About 25 percent.
18	Q. Do you happen to know what the percentage
19	today is of fixed charged recovery as a percent of
20	total revenues?
21	A. Of total existing revenues?
22	Q. Yes.
23	A. 21.5 percent.
24	Q. So your proposed customer charge increase
25	is only increase the fixed charge fixed charge

1	revenue recovery by approximately 4 percent?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other
4	questions.
5	JUDGE JONES: You may step down,
6	Mr. Herbert.
7	I don't know about you all, but I'd like
8	to keep going since we're behind by about nine
9	witnesses already. So unless anyone feels
10	MS. MYERS: If we could just request a
11	short break.
12	JUDGE JONES: A short break? Okay. Take
13	a five-minute break.
14	(A recess was taken.)
15	JUDGE JONES: We are back on the record
16	in Case Number WR-2015-0301.
17	(Wi tness affirmed.)
18	JUDGE JONES: Thank you, sir. You may be
19	seated.
20	Mr. Poston, did you want to say
21	something?
22	MR. POSTON: Well, just before we move on
23	to Mr. Busch, I want to just go ahead and object to
24	these Exhibits 48 through 51.
25	JUDGE JONES: Oh, you want to object to

them now instead of tomorrow?

MR. POSTON: I don't need to wait. Based on the testimony we heard, I don't think these numbers can be verified. He wasn't even sure how things were calculated. I think there's errors identified. And so I'd like to object to the admission of 48 through 51 and to even strike those numbers from testimony where they were stated in testimony.

JUDGE JONES: Well, Mr. England, did you want to say something?

MR. ENGLAND: Sure. I believe the proper foundation was laid for the exhibits. To the extent there might be some errors or omissions, one of two things, it either goes to the credibility or the weight you want to give it. And too, as I understand, we can make some of those changes and submit revised exhibits, so I don't think that's a basis for objecting to them.

The fact of the matter is that we're the only party that's been able to model any of these scenarios. Neither Public Counsel nor Staff nor any other party to this case can propose or put forward the impact of what they're proposing in the way of the various rate designs they have.

These exhibits are very similar to

1 exhibits that have been shared with these parties 2 throughout the week as we discuss the issue. 3 should be no surprise there. We've tried our best to 4 factor in what we understand to be their parameters 5 when we've tired to factor their proposal. 6 We certainly know what we're proposing. 7 I think have a pretty good idea of what Staff's 8 proposi ng. Mr. Busch can identify whether or not 9 we've accurately depicted Staff's proposal or not. 10 Again, to the extent they may be erroneous, 11 incomplete, that doesn't go to their admissibility. 12 It just goes to --13 JUDGE JONES: I tend to agree with you. 14 It does go to their credibility and, you know, that's 15 been made clear in the record. 16 MR. DOWNEY: Judge, before you rule, I'd 17 also like to lodge an objection to 51. That's a model 18 of nothing that's been proposed by any party. It's 19 not in testimony and it's not in any kind of 20 stipulation. 21 MR. ENGLAND: If Mr. Downey would like, 22 Riverside and the Company will enter into a 23 non-unanimous stipulation that supports Exhibit 24 Number 51. 25 MR. BEDNAR: That's correct, Your Honor.

1 And, in fact, I got into that cross-examination of the 2 Joplin witness in regards to setting aside a 3 district-specific plan that would separate St. Joseph 4 and Joplin and consolidate all the other districts. 5 That's in evidence. And for that illustration, that 6 was the purpose, to show that same bill impact as you 7 would anybody else. 8 I agree with Mr. England. This is a real 9 challenge to find out the billing impact analysis. 10 And the fact that the Company was able to do this does 11 all of us a service. We're free to argue the nits and 12 picks of what we think is -- may be inaccurate to go 13 to the credibility, but I think this is a tremendous 14 aid to all of the other parties in order to argue in 15 the briefs and people can argue against it. 16 JUDGE JONES: Well, if there are 17 corrections to be made to those exhibits, I would 18 rather those corrections be made and then re-offer. 19 If they're not wholly correct, that's fine, but at 20 least closer to being correct than what they are now. 21 He's planning on making corrections; is that correct? 22 MR. ENGLAND: And as I understand it, 23 we're also running a fifth scenario for Commissioner 24 Rupp that would be consolidated pricing across all

25

di stri cts.

1	JUDGE JONES: So all of those can be
2	the corrected versions will be admitted with with
3	the the statewide consolidated version. And if the
4	parties think that there's something erroneous about
5	them, then that can just be highlighted and go to the
6	credi bi l i ty.
7	MS. BELL: And Joplin would like to also
8	have the correction about whether or not sewer
9	increase is on those three exhibits, an answer to that
10	provided in the assumption section.
11	MR. ENGLAND: I believe we have the
12	answer, but we're going to double check overnight and
13	put Mr. Herbert back on the witness stand. He'll have
14	that information for you tomorrow.
15	MS. BELL: And we'll have the opportunity
16	to cross on the corrected copies of the exhibits?
17	MR. ENGLAND: Sure.
18	JUDGE JONES: We'll see about whether you
19	have an opportunity to cross. You had an opportunity
20	to cross on these. And I don't see how your questions
21	would change because some of the exhibits were
22	corrected. It seems like your motivation to cross
23	would go to the policy behind consolidation itself
24	rather than the specific numbers that are on those
25	papers. But tomorrow when they're offered and

1	accepted, then we'll see about cross-examination.
2	Staff, you can go ahead.
3	MS. MYERS: Thank you, Judge. Before we
4	get started here, Staff, in addition to Mr. Busch's
5	pre-filed testimony will be offering another exhibit,
6	Staff Exhibit 34. We've given it to all the parties
7	and now we'll be giving it to the Commission.
8	(Staff Exhibit 34 was marked for
9	i denti fi cati on.)
10	JAMES A. BUSCH, testified as follows:
11	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. MYERS:
12	Q. Mr. Busch, would you please state your
13	full name for the record?
14	A. My name is James A. Busch.
15	Q. Mr. Busch, where are you employed and in
16	what capacity?
17	A. I am the manager of the Water and Sewer
18	Department at the Missouri Public Service Commission.
19	Q. Are you the same James Busch who prepared
20	or caused to be prepared the Direct, the Rebuttal on
21	usage, Rebuttal Testimony on rate design and the
22	Surrebuttal Testimony that have been marked as
23	Exhibits 9, 10, 11 and 12 respectively?
24	A. That, as well as the my direct for
25	class cost-of-service rate design.

1	Q. Correct. And you're also the same James
2	A. Busch who's sponsoring the Staff's report on class
3	cost-of-service and rate design
4	A. That is
5	Q marked as Exhibit 3?
6	A. That is correct.
7	Q. Are you also the same James Busch who is
8	sponsoring the exhibit that was just sent out as Staff
9	Exhibit 34?
10	A. I am.
11	Q. Could you explain Staff Exhibit 34?
12	A. Yes. As as has been mentioned many
13	times today, there are a lot of moving parts to all of
14	this discussion that we're having with consolidation
15	versus district-specific and rate design and class
16	responsibilities. So there is a lot of confusion
17	that's out there and hopefully we can clear it up.
18	But it's very difficult. And I know the Company's
19	worked very hard and the other parties have worked
20	hard. And we try to get information out and it's just
21	very difficult to get people the appropriate numbers
22	and it's tough.
23	What this shows is based upon the
24	non-unanimous stipulation for revenue requirement of
25	30 6 million dollar increase the first sheet is

1 St 2 di 3 wo 4 cu 5 wi 6 re

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Staff's districts, district one, district two and district three or zone one, two and three. If you would then go through how Staff came up with the current revenues, the proposed changes to the classes within each of those districts and then the proposed revenues.

And then the far right column is the percent change to each individual class within that district. It doesn't necessarily mean that any individual -- like a residential consumer for all residentials in district one get a 13.22 percent increase, because it's residential -- it's -- it's combining the St. Louis Metro, Mexico and Jefferson City all into one and then the overall increase as if those were together currently. So it's difficult sometimes to understand.

Then if you turn the page, the second sheet is the same calculations with the revenue requirement. However, what I calculated there is if we did a percentage increase -- an equal percentage increase to each of the customer classes within the districts.

Because if you notice on the first page, there are some wide swings within each district. For instance, district one has a -- the Other Public

1 A 2 1 3 i 4 s 5 d 6 v

Authority as we calculated it down at a negative 15 percent and sale for resale would be 120 percent increase. And I think Mr. Dority mentioned that in some of his remarks earlier when we moved towards district-specific in the 2000 case, there were some very major shifts within the districts as well.

And so the second sheet shows if we would just -- if we do -- if the Commission does decide on Staff's consolidated districts, if we just went ahead and then made the increases equal to each customer class within those districts, what that percent would be.

And then the last sheet is the same calculation, but it deals with the sewer shift. And as has been pointed out, if you take out Arnold, the Arnold district, the proposed increase to all the other sewer systems is about 565,000 dollars. Staff originally in its Direct Testimony, when it was only an increase of about 39,000 and district two was getting a decrease, we proposed shifting all that revenue responsibility to district two.

Now, with a increase that is substantially higher than what Staff's originally proposed testimony was, the amount of revenue responsibility to share has gone up from 39,000 to

1 565,000 and no one major district is getting a 2 decrease. 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 increase from sheet two to sheet three. 13 Thank you, Mr. Busch. Q. 14 15 16 do not. 17 18 19 Α. I believe they would be. 20 Q. 21 22 belief?

So Staff has decided that the best way to shift that 565,000 would be done on a per revenue basis to each district. So district one, since it's the largest district, it has about 80 percent of current revenues, so they would get 80 percent of the 565,000, district two would get 10 percent, and district three would get 10 percent. And so that would be the revenue impacts on each of the classes based on shifting that revenue. So that's the slight Do you have

- anything to correct in any of your testimonies?
- To the best of my knowledge and belief, I
- So with that in mind, if I asked you the same questions today, your answers would be the same?
- And so the information in these documents is true and correct, to the best of your knowledge and
 - Α. They are.

23

24

25

MS. MYERS: All right. Your Honor, Staff offers Staff Exhibits 3, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 34 and

1	tenders Mr. Busch.
2	JUDGE JONES: Are there any objections to
3	those exhi bi t?
4	I don't see any so Exhibits Staff
5	Exhibit 9, 10, 11, 12, 3 and 34 are admitted into the
6	record.
7	(Staff Exhibits 3, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 34
8	were received into evidence.)
9	JUDGE JONES: We'll move on into
10	cross-examination. As we as we cross or ask
11	questions of Mr. Busch, keep in mind that we are on
12	the issue of consolidation and not rate design and
13	customer charge. That's tomorrow. So if anyone asks
14	questions in that area
15	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Judge, is he on
16	stand for tomorrow for rate design?
17	JUDGE JONES: Yes. So if anyone asks
18	questions about rate design and customer charge, I
19	encourage everyone to object.
20	First for cross-examination is Missouri
21	Department of Energy.
22	MR. ANTAL: No questions.
23	JUDGE JONES: MI EC?
24	MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Judge.
25	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DOWNEY:

1	Q. Mr. Busch, would you explain this third
2	page of Exhibit 34?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. It looks to me like the dollars for
5	district one, for instance, the dollars are the same,
6	but the percentages in the right column change?
7	A. I think if you look at the the third
8	column that says Proposed and like, for instance, the
9	residential proposed on the second page is
10	160, 616, 580.
11	Q. Okay.
12	A. It's 160,805,000. So that corresponds
13	to the original or page 2 without the sewer shift
14	is a 13.72 percent increase and with the sewer shift
15	is 13.85 percent.
16	Q. Thank you. I didn't notice that.
17	A. Okay.
18	Q. When describe what you mean by the
19	sewer shift.
20	A. With the 30.6 million dollar increase
21	and again, I'm excluding the Arnold situation because
22	that's a different argument. There was a all the
23	sewer districts right now combined have a 565,000
24	dollar overall increase through all those districts.
25	Currently three or four at least three or four of

the districts -- of the sewer districts are paying \$65.22, which is the highest sewer rate of any regulated sewer company in the state of Missouri.

So to try to keep that rate from going higher and trying not to put all that increase on the other sewer districts that have lower rates, I think that it was important that we take that revenue responsibility and shift it to the water side. And to be fair -- to do that fairly and not to pick on one district or another district, it goes to all the water districts.

And so, again, I calculated the overall revenues. And district one has about 80 percent of the revenues, district two has about 10 percent, district three has about 10 percent. So I took that district 565,000 and spread it to the water districts 80/10/10.

- Q. So are there some customers in the water districts that do not take sewer service from Missouri American?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And are they seeing the increases for this sewer adjustment?
- A. They would take some of the revenue responsibility and that would be shifted to those

1	customers, yes.
2	Q. Do you recall having a conversation
3	during any of the settlement discussions where you
4	indicated that no sewer customer cost would be
5	included in water rates for non-sewer customers?
6	A. I do
7	MS. MYERS: I'm going to object to this.
8	These might be privileged communications said during
9	settlement negotiations.
10	JUDGE JONES: I don't I wasn't there.
11	I don't know.
12	MR. DOWNEY: And unfortunately, Judge, I
13	wasn't either so I don't know if it's it's
14	THE WITNESS: I don't recall that.
15	BY MR. DOWNEY:
16	Q. Okay. If you don't recall, then
17	JUDGE JONES: Is that your answer or are
18	you saying that you don't recall whether this was
19	discussed during settlement?
20	THE WITNESS: I we discussed the
21	sewer issue has been discussed. The non-unanimous
22	stipulation that was filed by Public Counsel and
23	signed by MIEC acknowledges sewer responsibility
24	shifts to two districts. So yes, it has been
25	discussed. But as far as making sure that a

1	particular the water customers would not pay any of
2	the sewer costs, I do not recall that.
3	JUDGE JONES: Okay. Well, no privileged
4	information is now out.
5	BY MR. DOWNEY:
6	Q. Okay. But this Exhibit 34 does show
7	sewer costs being borne by water customers that are
8	not also sewer customers?
9	A. Very similar to the Non-unanimous
10	Stipulation and Agreement, yes.
11	Q. And 80 percent of those costs that are
12	shifted are shifted in district one?
13	A. Right. As opposed to the 90 percent in
14	the stipulation. So we actually are shifting less to
15	district one well, actually to St. Louis Metro
16	SO
17	Q. There were other differences in that
18	stipulation. Are you
19	A. Yes.
20	Q adopting that stipulation?
21	A. I am not. I'm just pointing out
22	similarities.
23	Q. Now, you've testified in many rate cases
24	before the Commission. Correct?
25	A. I have.

1	Q. And don't you regularly testify to this	
2	Commission that cost causation should be the primary	
3	determinant in rate design?	
4	A. Cost ca	
5	MR. BEDNAR: I object. I think the	
6	question was rate design. I think we're saving that	
7	for tomorrow.	
8	JUDGE JONES: Objection sustained.	
9	BY MR. DOWNEY:	
10	Q. Okay. Cost causation let me restate	
11	it. Don't you regularly testify that in determining	
12	what portion of increases are allocated to classes of	
13	customers, the primary consideration is cost	
14	causati on?	
15	A. I believe that cost causation is a factor	
16	that needs to be considered when determining the	
17	proper cost-of-service.	
18	Q. Okay. That's all I have.	
19	JUDGE JONES: City of Brunswick?	
20	MR. DRAG: No questions, Your Honor.	
21	JUDGE JONES: City of Joplin?	
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:	
23	Q. I think we're at good evening now, right,	
24	Mr. Busch?	
25	A. Good evening.	

1	Q. Your plan consolidates Warrensburg with	
2	Joplin; is that correct?	
3	A. Yes.	
4	Q. And you would agree that Warrensburg and	
5	Joplin system are not interconnected?	
6	A. Yes.	
7	Q. And Warrensburg's more than 160 miles	
8	from Joplin?	
9	A. I do not know the distance between	
10	Warrensburg and Joplin.	
11	Q. And Joplin's current source of supply is	
12	both surface water and groundwater?	
13	A. That is correct.	
14	Q. And Warrensburg's source of supply is	
15	solely groundwater?	
16	A. I believe so, yes.	
17	Q. And are you aware that there are	
18	different treatment and processing requirements for	
19	surface water and groundwater?	
20	A. Yes.	
21	Q. Are you aware of any plans for	
22	improvements in the future for Warrensburg?	
23	A. I don't believe I am. There might have	
24	been some discussion at the Warrensburg Local public	
25	hearing, but any big plans, I'm not familiar with	

1	those.	
2	Q. Under your plan let's let's do a	
3	hypothetical. Under your plan, if Warrensburg was to	
4	receive significant improvements in the future, it	
5	would benefit Warrensburg customers to have such costs	
6	spread on Joplin customers?	
7	MR. CURTIS: Objection, hypothetical.	
8	JUDGE JONES: Objection sustained.	
9	BY MS. BELL:	
10	Q. Let's turn to Exhibit PR or the	
11	Schedul e PRH-6.	
12	A. What is PRH-6?	
13	Q. I believe it's Herbert's the one	
14	that's marked Staff grouping that was passed out this	
15	morning and it lists the cost per residential	
16	customer.	
17	A. I don't remember if I brought that up	
18	with me. I know I had it at the desk.	
19	Q. I only have one copy of it.	
20	A. I got it. I got it.	
21	Q. Okay.	
22	A. I'm sorry. I have a lot of paper with	
23	me, so	
24	Q. Me too. As far as page if we turn to	
25	page 2, that shows Staff's consolidation plan?	

1	A. For the most part. It leaves off a		
2	couple of small districts. If you would like, I could		
3	tell you		
4	Q. That's all right. The right column		
5	explains costs per residential customer. Is that your		
6	understandi ng?		
7	A. That's what it states.		
8	Q. Okay. So any city if we're looking		
9	just within those districts in those amounts in the		
10	right column, any city with a lower number compared to		
11	the other cities and their grouping would be paying		
12	rates higher than their cost-of-service under your		
13	pl an?		
14	A. I do not know exactly how Mr. Herbert		
15	came up with these numbers and I'm not going to I		
16	cannot verify if that's a true statement or not.		
17	Q. Assuming these are correct.		
18	A. Could you repeat that then with assuming		
19	they' re correct?		
20	Q. Sure. Any city with a lower number on		
21	this document would be paying rates higher than their		
22	cost-of-service under your plan?		
23	A. If if you assume that the actual		
24	cost-of-service as calculated by Mr. Herbert here,		
25	that's an assumption I think you can make, but it's		

1	only on a residential basis. It doesn't necessarily	
2	get into the other classes, so other classes may be	
3	getting a decrease as well.	
4	Q. But the residential customers would be	
5	paying higher than their actual cost-of-service?	
6	A. Again, I don't know if that's their	
7	actual cost-of-service, if that's an assumption we can	
8	make.	
9	Q. And under that scenario, assuming these	
10	are correct, those residents would be subsidizing the	
11	residents in other districts?	
12	A. I don't necessarily agree that they would	
13	be subsidize them.	
14	Q. Some of the costs from that district	
15	would be shifted to the other districts?	
16	A. That's you're assuming a level of	
17	specificity on the actual cost of providing service	
18	that I cannot assume is correct.	
19	Q. Were you involved in the 2000 Missouri	
20	American rate case?	
21	A. I very much was involved with that case.	
22	Q. And in that case you were a witness on	
23	behalf of Office of Public Counsel?	
24	A. That is correct.	
25	Q. But you were present and listened to	

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3

25

Staff's testimony in that case?

- A. I'm sure I was in the hearing room when Mr. Hubs testified for Staff.
- Q. And -- and your understanding is that Staff in that case supported district-specific pricing?
- A. I believe that eventually they -- that was their position.
- Q. Okay. In that case, Mr. Krueger on behalf of Staff, said, In the present case, the differences of the cost to serve the various districts are substantial. The implementation of STP pricing in this case would result in very significant subsidies between districts and would shift the burden of paying costs from the cost causer to ratepayers and other districts. The Staff, therefore, supports the use of district-specific pricing in this case.

In the beginning there, he talks about the differences of cost to serve the various districts are substantial. Would you agree that in this case the differences to serve the various districts are substantial?

A. In this case, the calculated numbers are vastly different and the revenue responsibilities that we've assigned are vastly different amongst the

1	different classes.	
2	Q. And you testified in 2000 on behalf of	
3	OPC?	
4	A. I did.	
5	Q. And in that case OPC supported	
6	district-specific pricing?	
7	A. Under those conditions in that case, that	
8	was the position of Office of Public Counsel.	
9	Q. And in your Direct Testimony, you said,	
10	The main benefit of the district-specific pricing is	
11	that consumers in a given district pay simply for the	
12	costs to serve that district.	
13	Do you agree with that statement?	
14	A. That is could you repeat exactly what	
15	I said in that case?	
16	Q. You said, The main benefit of	
17	district-specific pricing is that consumers in a given	
18	district pay simply for the costs to serve that	
19	district.	
20	A. At the time that I wrote that, I agree	
21	with that statement.	
22	Q. Okay. But your position has changed	
23	since then?	
24	A. My position as my position in this	
25	regulatory environment has changed, has been refined.	

1	Q. Refined. Okay.	
2	A. Absolutely.	
3	Q. Have there been any policy changes	
4	enacted by the legislature regarding single-tariff	
5	pricing or district-specific pricing that you're aware	
6	of since 2000?	
7	A. I'm not aware of any changes in the	
8	legislature regarding this issue.	
9	Q. Have there been any changes in case law	
10	regarding the Commission's authority or lack thereof	
11	to implement district-specific pricing or	
12	single-tariff pricing?	
13	A. Considering district s or single-tariff	
14	pricing and consolidated pricing exist through many of	
15	the regulated industries, I don't believe there's been	
16	any changes.	
17	Q. Have there been any changes in the water	
18	utility rules that bear on this issue that you're	
19	aware of?	
20	A. Not that I'm aware of.	
21	Q. But you've made a personal shift in your	
22	own views?	
23	A. As I've grown in this field and as I've	
24	been the manager of the Water and Sewer Department	
25	since 2008, my views have changed.	

1	Q. But you agree there are still differences	
2	among the districts in sources of supply?	
3	A. Yes, there are.	
4	Q. And there are still differences among the	
5	districts in the treatment processes?	
6	A. Some, yes.	
7	Q. In the 2011 working case you	
8	participated in that case. Correct?	
9	A. I'm sorry. Which working case?	
10	Q. I believe I have SW-2011-0103.	
11	A. Yes.	
12	Q. Okay. And in that case, it was a working	
13	case set up to discuss the legal implications and the	
14	lawfulness of this type of pricing	
15	A. I think it was a legal and economic con	
16	concepts of single-tariff versus district-specific	
17	pri ci ng.	
18	Q. And you participated in that case on	
19	behalf of Staff, not OPC. Right?	
20	A. I was with Staff at the time, yes.	
21	Q. Okay. And in that in its initial	
22	brief in that case, Staff stated, In Staff's opinion,	
23	the recovery of costs in correlation with their cause	
24	is the most equitable manner to determine the	
25	appropriate rates for any regulated service.	

Do you still agree with that statement?

- A. I do agree with that statement.
- Q. And Staff raised two main concerns in their on-the-record presentation; that single-tariff pricing could result in system over-investment and an inequitable distribution of costs between causers and payers.

Do you have the same opinion today?

- A. I do agree that when you start to consolidate rates, that there is some opportunity for the Company to invest more than is necessary. And I have addressed that in my testimony, how to try to combat that.
- Q. In the same on-the-record proceeding which I talked about in my opening, Staff made comments about educating consumers. Specifically Staff stated, Staff would note that in situations where DSP pricing currently exists, should the Commission elect to switch to a single-tariff rate, Staff believes customer education should be an essential component in the rate-making and rate implementation process.

Do you know if Staff engaged in any customer education regarding the consolidation with the -- specifically with the residents of Joplin?

- A. The first part we were talking about a single-tariffed rate and this is a consolidated rate, so there's a difference between those two concepts. But I do not believe that we went out and talked to any consumers.
- Q. Okay. Are you aware of any customer education by the company related to the consolidation issues?
- A. I believe -- and I'd have to double check, but I thought that during the information that the Company submitted to the press releases, I think they mentioned consolidation of rates at that time, but it -- it was -- in a one-page document it might have just been a sentence or two so --
- Q. And so now today in this case in your Direct Testimony you argue for district consolidation; is that correct?
- A. Yes. Similar to what we did in the 2011 case.
- Q. And in your testimony under your first argument for single-tariff pricing, you say that it becomes difficult to continue to develop rates on a district-specific basis when the Company is acquiring additional districts.

When you say "difficult," when --

7 8

9 10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25 difficult for who? Difficult for the Staff. Correct?

We don't -- we're not proposing single-tariff pricing. We're proposing consolidated tariff pricing. We're not proposing one rate for the entire state. The difficulty is as -- as has been acknowledged today is the designing of the rates when there are so many rate elements to the -- to work with.

And when you have that difficulty, it's very -- it's a lot of cost and it's more cost that the Company has to, you know, employ, which then gets passed along to all consumers to -- to look at all those different rates.

- 0. And do the residents of Joplin have a say in whether or not Missouri American acquires struggling or under-paying districts?
- I wouldn't say that the citizens of Joplin, but they are represented by the Office of Public Counsel which is a party of every case where Missouri American attempts to acquire a system. And the Commission then has to have final authority whether or not any purchase is in the public interest.
- Q. But ultimately as has been discussed today, Missouri American's decision to acquire additional districts is a business judgment by the

1	С
2	
3	О
4	а
5	С
6	О
7	
8	u
9	d
10	
11	S
12	а
13	
14	С
15	t
16	а
17	f
18	
19	

21

22

23

24

25

compan	у?
--------	----

- A. They make a business judgment to acquire or not acquire. Then they -- if they propose to acquire a company, they have to come in front of the Commission to get approval from the Commission in order to do so.
- Q. And it was their testimony and your understanding today that they have considered some districts and not acquired those districts?
- A. Unfortunately, they have not acquired some systems that Staff would love for them to acquire.
- Q. Your second reason for supporting consolidation is that it could benefit customers through reduced rate case expense. And I think you've already spoken to that just now. Do you have a dollar figure for that?
 - A. I do not.
- Q. Do you have any evidence for that specifically?
 - A. I -- no, I do not.
- Q. Okay. The third reason you use to support consolidation is to minimize rate shock. You specifically say that spreading costs helps smaller system customers, these customers in the newly

acquired districts.

How does this help Joplin residents?

A. I think the consolidation of rates on -on the district-specific -- or on the consolidated
method that the Staff came up will help all the
customers in that area. Because even though Joplin is
the largest district in that area, there are still
other large districts down in that area, like
Tri-States and Emerald Pointe. So when all those
districts get combined together, you're going to
spread out the Joplin costs.

Joplin I think had some flood costs that might get -- that the City of Joplin may have to recover in the future rate case because of the flooding that was -- occurred over the Christmas break. If there was consolidated rates with the City of Warrensburg and the other smaller districts in that area, those costs would be spread out over all those systems.

- Q. What's the term? What's the length of time when -- when it would be Joplin's turn to be benefited by that spreading of costs?
- A. I think they're benefited now. I think Ms. Norton very early this morning made a very apt point that -- and this is something that we hear all

1	the time out in the local public hearings and at
2	customer comments is when when a company invests,
3	the customers think that all that investment is being
4	recovered right now. And the investment on a large
5	upgrade takes years for the recovery of that.
6	So if Joplin had improvements in their
7	system three or four, five years ago, those recoveries
8	are still occurring today. So they're taking those
9	recoveries and the rest that's still out there and
10	spreading it out over a larger customer base.
11	So I think the citizens of Joplin,
12	citizens of Warrensburg and St. Joseph, anywhere, are
13	going to be benefited by spreading out of all these
14	costs to a larger customer base.
15	Q. You mentioned specifically earlier
16	Tri-States. You would agree that Tri-States' customer
17	base is about 3,000?
18	A. I think that's correct.
19	Q. And Joplin is about 20,000?
20	A. I think that's correct.
21	Q. Okay. Your last reason for supporting
22	consolidation is that it would provide an incentive to
23	the Company to take over additional districts?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. And ultimately how does providing that

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

24

25

company incentive benefit Joplin ratepayers?

A. Again, I think when you start to consolidate the rates and if another system is purchased by Missouri American, whether or not it's a troubled, smaller system or a slightly larger system, if it's in the Joplin area, therefore, we would put it with the Joplin rate, it would again help spread out the existing Joplin cost to other consumers.

MS. BELL: No further questions.

JUDGE JONES: Any questions from

Ri versi de?

MR. BEDNAR: Just a couple.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:

- Q. Mr. Busch, given your extensive experience and history both with Public Counsel and Staff positions, how would you explain what has changed, in your mind, to move you from a district-specific position in 2000 to today seeing consolidation and further consolidation as the good policy move to make?
- A. In the 2000 case when I was with Public Counsel, I worked on gas -- natural gas, I worked on electric cases. You know, Missouri American was the next big case. There was substantial investment to the City of St. Joseph. The public outcry amongst all

the other districts was tremendous.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

Like in this case, I went to almost all of the local public hearings. 300 people were in St. Charles County was a part of that. was before St. Louis County. It was standing room only in the room.

So as -- as part of Public Counsel, it was our position that, you know, the large outcry from all of our people who we represented wanted district specific and that was what we argued for.

We also at the time -- not only did we argue for district-specific costs, but we also argued there was a prudence disallowance for some of the St. Joseph plant. I believe Staff also made that argument and AG Processing was a intervenor in that case and they also argued for a disallowance and ultimately the Commission did disallow that. So not only were we arguing for district specific, but we were also arguing against the -- some of the plant that was provi ded.

Since the 2000 case, I continued to work for Public Counsel for about four or five more years. You know, only working on large water cases. I didn't get involved with the small water cases at all. came back to the Staff in 2005 and I got appointed to

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24 25 my position in 2008 as the manager of the Water and Sewer Department.

You know, the difference between what happens in a small water case and small water systems compared to what happens in Ameren or Laclede or Missouri American is night and day. It is unbel i evabl e. Nobody worries about Ameren customers getting electricity unless there's a major ice storm or wind storm or something. Nobody worries about the natural gas unless, you know, there's a safety -something.

We have so many small systems that there's -- we have systems that run out of water. And there are real families there. They don't have Water runs dry. Sewer backing up violating state law, violating federal law. Raw sewage flowing into people's backyards.

We have owners who don't want to be regulated, didn't know they were supposed to be regulated, but they're supposed to take care of those They've got zero money. They can't go to systems. They can't go to DNR and get funds because the bank. they're a privately-owned entity.

And so we don't -- you know, that changes your view on world when you all of a sudden have to --

you get calls at night, We don't have water in this area. What can we do? And we're Staff. We don't have authority to really do -- we don't have money to give them, we don't have people -- we actually send people out to help at times. You know, there's only so much that we can do.

So to have a company like Missouri

American and other companies -- and we don't just talk
to Missouri American. We talk to anybody who's
willing to purchase a system, we're calling them up
and sending them out. Because we don't care. We just
got to find somebody who has the ability to go out and
make the appropriate investments to get these systems
running properly.

Maybe they're not failing today, but they're got going to fail five to ten years from now where all of a sudden that system that is using the wastewater is fine today, but we know that environmental regulations are going to change and it's not going to be able to fix it.

So when that happened, that's what's changed. And American has grown from a system with seven relatively similarly sized systems -- other than Brunswick, it was St. Charles, it was Joplin, it was St. Joseph, Mexico, Warrensburg, very similar size.

So it was -- you know, everybody was going -- was in the same boat at that stage.

Now as you look, they got St. Louis

Metro, St. Louis County, 300,000 customers. They've
got -- Redfield has 17 customers. They have
wastewater. They didn't have wastewater in 2000. So
it's a completely different company hitting a
completely different set of facts.

So that's what my change in my philosophy has happened from 2000, simply focusing on larger companies, to 2016, focusing on all water and sewer systems that we regulate here in the state of Missouri.

Q. So it's all to forward the goal of getting just and reasonable rates with reliable service to the community as a whole and that's the obligation of the Commission and overseeing that and making sure that in your case, you have to have an environment available to the companies in order for them to take over your -- as I think you mentioned, the incentive to look at these districts. They're not taking all of them, but every one they do take is an advantage for all of Missouri, is it not?

A. I think it is a public policy, a public interest for larger systems to be able to take over

small, struggling systems to provide the necessary investment to allow all citizens of the state of Missouri, regardless of where they live, to have safe and adequate service.

- Q. And do you think that in 2000, compared to today, there was a public understanding of the need for infrastructure improvements?
- A. I think there's been a lot of discussion of the failing infrastructures throughout the country and the state of Missouri for water and wastewater. I would imagine most people understand that.
- Q. And would you say though it -- just recently that the understanding is beginning as to the true cost of improving that infrastructure across the board?
- A. I don't know if everybody really fully understands the true cost.
- Q. Until it hits you like it did St. Joseph or Joplin and you see those costs?
- A. I -- that is correct. Until you got to pay for it, you don't really realize how much it's going to cost. How much inflation and just the price of doing business has gone up over the last 20 years.
- Q. And we know there's going to be more infrastructure in the future and so it does make sense

1	as a just and reasonable policy that those costs are
2	shared because we're already starting to share those
3	costs. It's really not a change in policy. It's the
4	evolution of a policy that's currently in existence,
5	is it not?
6	A. I think it's an evolution of a policy,
7	yeah.
8	Q. Thank you.
9	JUDGE JONES: City of St. Joseph?
10	MR. LAWYER: Thank you.
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. LAWYER:
12	Q. In your I believe it was in your
13	Rebuttal Testimony, you were asked if anyone from
14	Missouri American Water has ever indicated that they
15	would cease acquiring small troubled systems?
16	A. I remember that, yes.
17	Q. And I believe in that Rebuttal Testimony
18	that you indicated that you have not been told that
19	Missouri American would cease?
20	A. That is correct.
21	Q. That is correct. So you have no reason
22	to think that should we stay with the status quo or
23	with slight changes to the status quo, that Missouri
24	American Water would cease bidding on and evaluating
25	troubled systems that are brought to their attention?

1	A. I do not have firsthand knowledge that
2	they would. They have not made a threat like that,
3	that they are suggesting that they have to have it
4	otherwise they will not continue. What their actual
5	plans are and how aggressive they want to be in the
6	future, regardless of whether or not they get district
7	specific or not, I don't know.
8	Q. Certainly. And I realize that you are
9	not employed by Missouri American Water.
10	A. Ri ght.
11	Q. But you've just spoken of the that
12	that has influenced your your change in view on
13	this issue. And so I just wanted to ask if you had
14	had any reason to believe that Missouri American Water
15	would cease acquiring those troubled districts?
16	A. Right. And I wanted to point out, I
17	think it's important and I think it's an important
18	policy for them to do that, but they're not holding
19	that over Staff's head, at least to say if we don't
20	get our way, we are not going to continue with that,
21	SO
22	Q. Correct. Okay. I just wanted to clarify
23	that
24	A. Sure.
25	Q because I thought that was my

1	understanding of your Rebuttal Testimony
2	A. Ri ght.
3	Q is like I said, I believe it was in
4	your Rebuttal Testimony.
5	Now, under Staff's proposal, St. Joseph
6	would be combined with Platte County; is that correct?
7	A. Platte County and Brunswick.
8	Q. And Brunswick, yes.
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And St. Joseph would be combined with
11	Brunswick under the non-unanimous stipulation that was
12	filed this morning.
13	Are you aware of whether or not
14	St. Joseph's and Platte County's water systems are
15	interconnected in any way?
16	A. To the best of my knowledge and belief,
17	they are not interconnected.
18	Q. And are you aware of any upcoming major
19	capital improvements in for the Platte County
20	system?
21	A. I through the course of this rate
22	case, I was made aware that they are going to be doing
23	a new water treatment facility
24	Q. So
25	A in the Platte County area.

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3

25

- Q. So in the not-too-distant future you would expect to see those costs spread across Staff's district two if that -- if that proposal were adopted by the Commission?
- A. Right. The current costs would be spread amongst all district two and then any future costs would be spread amongst all district two, yes.
 - Q. Excuse me. Sorry. I forgot something.
 - A. That's okay.
- Q. So the numbers in -- that you provided in Staff's Exhibit 34, those are only based on right now. The -- the consolidation would take place now and then there would be -- obviously we're speaking in numbers that you haven't seen, but would you -- would you expect to see much different numbers next time around?
- A. I really don't know. I think the Company testified that throughout the course of -- between the last rate case and this rate case, they did 450 million dollars worth of improvements. I know a majority of that was through the ISRS in the St. Louis County area.

But there was investment I think in just about all districts from the last rate case to this rate case that would be a part of this proposed increase. So I haven't done the exact determination

to determine what was done in each district, but --

- Q. And like I -- I did preface it and I apologize. I'm asking you a question based on numbers that you haven't --
 - A. Right.
- Q. -- had a chance to look at that are entirely speculative. Hypothetically speaking, if -- if that was making a major impact though, St. Joseph would already be combined in district two and -- and would not be in the same position to -- to seek district-specific or I guess neutral status in those --
 - A. Right.
 - Q. -- with those costs; is that correct?
- A. I hate to say this, but, you know, I think truthfully, as was pointed out through the 1990's, they -- we -- the Commission, through the Missouri Cities wa-- and with the acquisition of Joplin and St. Joe, were moving towards single-tariff pricing. And in the 2000 case, the Commission moved away from single-tariff pricing to district-specific.

So whereas it is my -- my position today that if the Commission does consolidate as the Staff is proposing here, that this would be -- hopefully put this issue to bed for a long -- at least until I

1 retire in a few years, that it would stay at that 2 But I don't believe that the -- as was pointed 3 out, that future Commissions are held to what any past 4 Commission has done. So if the City of St. Joseph 5 wanted to argue to go back to some sort of 6 district-specific in a future rate case, I am not 7 aware of any prohibition from that. 8 Q. Thank you. 9 JUDGE JONES: City of Warrensburg? 10 MR. CURTIS: No questions, thank you. 11 JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply District? 12 13 MR. DORITY: I guess just a point of 14 clarification, Judge Jones. I don't want to tread 15 into rate design and the Schedules 48 through -- or 16 sorry, exhibits 48 through 51 that I had the 17 discussion with Mr. Herbert. My concerns went to rate 18 design that is embedded in these schedules. 19 can clarify that with Mr. Busch right now or I can 20 certainly wait until in the morning. 21 JUDGE JONES: Okay. Go ahead and do it 22 right now. 23 MR. DORITY: I'll be very brief. 24 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I had a question 25 too. Let's do it in the morning. Do you want to go

1	to rate design? That's my question. Because if he's
2	going to ask rate design questions
3	MR. DORITY: The only reason I was
4	asking, Judge is if the Company if the Company
5	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: You just said to
6	object you said everybody to object, so I object.
7	JUDGE JONES: This is the reason the
8	whole thing about rate design came up, because of your
9	questions earlier so let's
10	THE WITNESS: Could I at least just say
11	one statement about what happened with the schedules?
12	Mr. Herbert used a flat uniform rate, which is what
13	Staff has put in all of its schedules. But you are
14	correct, in our rate design we did say maintain the
15	current rate structures
16	MR. DORITY: Declining block.
17	THE WITNESS: rate structures. So
18	that's that was the confusion. The Company used
19	the information that we had been providing, but
20	Mr. Dority is correct that in our testimony we have
21	suggested maintaining the current rate structures. We
22	can discuss that more tomorrow, but I
23	MR. DORITY: Well, we'll discuss that
24	tomorrow.
25	THE WITNESS: hope that clarifies the

```
problem as -- as with these schedules.
 1
 2
                               Thank you. That's all I
                  MR. DORITY:
 3
     need.
 4
                  JUDGE JONES:
                                Did you have questions
     though for consolidation?
 5
 6
                  MR. DORITY:
                               No.
                  JUDGE JONES:
 7
                                StoneBridge? Staff of the
8
     Commission?
                   Staff?
                               You mean Public Counsel?
9
                  MR. POSTON:
10
                  CHAIRMAN HALL: It's a Staff witness.
11
                  JUDGE JONES: Oh, I'm sorry.
12
                  THE WITNESS: Have I been traded?
13
                  JUDGE JONES: OPC? Sorry about that.
14
                  MR. POSTON: I have questions.
15
     CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
16
            Q.
                  You attended the Jefferson City public
17
     heari ng.
               Correct?
18
            Α.
                  I did.
19
            Q.
                  And you were a participant in the Q and A
20
     session before the hearing; is that right?
21
            Α.
                  I was.
22
                  Do you recall being asked why you, a
            Q.
23
     member of Staff, were repeatedly answering questions
     directed at the Company?
24
25
            Α.
                  I remember a customer asked the question
```

1	why was I answering questions for that answering
2	Company questions.
3	Q. Did you also attend a local public
4	hearing in Arnold?
5	A. I was in Arnold, yes.
6	Q. I'd like to read portion of the
7	transcript. It's on the second-to-last page of the
8	transcript, page 71. A gentleman, Terry Buchanan
9	it's the very last statement made in that public
10	hearing states, Well, one other thing real quick. It
11	seemed like when the public representatives of the
12	Public Service Commission are talking, it seemed like
13	they have a real what do you say cordial ear fo
14	the other side.
15	He's goes on to say, But when you hear
16	them talk, it's like you're almost taking up for
17	American Water. Thank you.
18	Does it concern you when members of the
19	public question the neutrality of Staff in regards to
20	Missouri American Water?
21	A. I I remember, like I said, the Jeff
22	City question. And I do remember being in the back of
23	the room at Arnold when that customer made that
24	statement. And I was really taken aback by that
25	statement.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

I was standing at the front of the room with another Staff member and Dustin Allison, who was the Public Counsel at the time. And there were various times when questions were asked that -- that are -- to me, were more public policy issues or issues that are impacting the entirety of the water and sewer industries in the state of Missouri.

And -- and I feel that it's Staff's obligation to give the public at that situation the information that's available and what is actually going on and what Staff has done and the Commission has done. So --

- Q. My question to you was, does it concern you when members of the public question the neutrality of Staff in regards to Missouri American? Does that give you any concern?
- A. Well, it does give me concern, but I think it's a lack of the customer's understanding about what the Public Service Commission Staff and the Public Service Commission's role is.
- Q. Were you in the room when Ms. Norton testified about how the Staff will contact the Company to see if the Company's interested in acquiring troubled or distressed systems?
 - A. I was in the room.

1	Q. And how does Staff determine who they
2	contact? Like what companies they contact when
3	they've identified a system has trouble?
4	A. Currently? Currently Staff has a list of
5	about four or five companies: Missouri American;
6	Liberty; a newer company that's involved with some
7	rate cases currently is Central States Water; at the
8	time there was a gentleman down in the Jop Branson
9	area who was acquiring systems. So any entity that
10	has indicated that they're willing to purchase
11	systems, we send out or contact all of them. We do
12	not contact one entity and not contact another entity.
13	We contact all of them at the same time.
14	Q. So currently how many are there that you
15	are able to reach out to and and identify or at
16	least inquire about a troubled system?
17	A. Right now we know of we know of three
18	entities that have indicated they are willing to look
19	at small sy or any system.
20	Q. Can you identify the other entities other
21	than Missouri American?
22	A. As I said, Liberty.
23	Q. Okay.
24	A. And Central States. Those are the other
25	two that I mentioned.

- Q. In regards to Missouri American -- and I think this question may have been asked already -- do they seek to acquire every system that you notify them about?
- A. I believe that when we -- excuse me -- reach out to Missouri American and I know when we reach out to at least one other entity, they -- I believe they look into the systems. They don't always acquire them -- for reasons they don't necessarily share with us, they don't always acquire them. But I'm assuming that they are going out and looking at the systems.
- Q. Can you identify systems that Missouri
 American Water did not acquire after you've contacted
 them?
- A. I don't know since that's dealing with, you know, what the Company is looking into. I mean, I could tell you -- I don't know if it should be confidential or not and whether -- I look at different -- I turn to my attorney and the Staff to deter-- or the Company if I can make that information public.
- Q. You think it's confidential for you to contact a company and ask them if they're interested in a troubled system?

1	A. I don't think that's confidential. I
2	don't know whether or not if they look into it and
3	determine not to purchase it. I don't know you
4	know, that gets into that. But I mean, if my att
5	I'm just trying to be overly cautious. If if I'm
6	being wrong, I'll be happy to I just trying to
7	draw draw
8	Q. I understand. I understand. Would you
9	agree that when Missouri American acquires a troubled
10	system, it's an investment opportunity for the
11	company?
12	A. Yes. They have the opportunity to make
13	investment into that system.
14	Q. And they earn a return on that
15	investment. Correct?
16	A. When they come in for another rate case,
17	they will have an opportunity to earn a return on the
18	investment they make.
19	Q. And you oppose Missouri American's
20	proposed consolidation in this case. Correct?
21	A. That's correct.
22	Q. And why do you oppose that?
23	A. I oppose it because the way that they
24	combined their districts, they took districts that
25	are currently have low rates and lump them together

into a district. They took districts with the next highest rates and put them together. And then they put districts with the highest rates and put those together.

And I think as -- if you looked at the Schedule PRH-6 that was presented earlier, 95 percent of all customers are in zone one and hardly any, a blip, is in zone three, which includes Brunswick, Spring Valley, Ozark Mountain, et cetera.

I don't think that really accomplishes the goal of helping out the -- the entirety of the systems and does what is -- what we would like to see out of the public policy through consolidation.

- Q. Is the consolidation proposed in the non-unanimous stipulation in your opinion a better alternative than the Company's proposal?
- A. You know, I'll have to think about that. I think that the Non-unanimous Stipulation and Agreement is a -- is a fair approach for moving off of where we are today. It's not nearly as good or, you know -- as Staff's, but comparing it to the -- what the Company has proposed, I haven't made that comparison in my head.
- Q. Can you point to me where in your testimony you've analyzed the impact that your

proposed consolidation will have on the low-income customers in St. Louis, Joplin or St. Joe?

- A. I have not made any analysis of the impact on any low-income customers.
- Q. And what's Staff's proposal for Arnold -the Arnold sewer rate and the 500 -- I think it's like
 700,000 or something like that? Could you explain
 that?
- A. Yes. As was brought out earlier when Ms. Norton was on the stand, there was a letter that was sent out to the City of Arnold that capped the price increase, the rate that would go forward at I think \$33.58. St-- excuse me. I'm sorry. I've been battling a cold for three weeks now.

When another company is purchasing another entity, whether or not it's a municipal system like Arnold or if it would be a small, already regulated system, I don't think Staff agrees with limiting the increase to one particular district that has just been acquired and then spreading all those additional costs to the other districts. You know, in some of the other districts that have been purchased and acquired, we spread them out over everybody. So they get an increase potentially and so will everybody else.

But in this case with Arnold, they're limiting what that increase may be and then there's extra costs that potentially need to be recovered. And I don't think it's Staff's position that that should be then shared with the rest of the customer class. I'm sorry. The rest of the customers within, you know, Missouri American Water or sewer.

Q. Because in your opinion, that type of sharing is not fair?

A. Right. Because that would -- if that was the deal that was made between the Company and the City of Arnold, I don't believe it was put forth in testimony or put forth in the agreement that was filed in front of the Commission. Staff and Public Counsel and anybody else did not have an opportunity to say yeah, we think this is a fair deal so we will agree to cap the price at a certain amount and the rest of the consumers will eat that price.

So I -- I believe that with Arnold, if they want to cap that price, then anything above that price should be, I guess, eaten by the shareholders.

Now, if they want to go above that cap, then we'll discuss that as well.

- Q. That's all I have. Thank you Mr. Busch.
- A. Thank you.

1	JUDGE JONES: Missouri American Water.
2	MR. ENGLAND: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	Your Honor, do you know if the handout that Staff gave
4	the Commission yesterday on the stipulation
5	presentation showing the various systems and the
6	current revenue and revenue increase was made an
7	exhi bi t?
8	JUDGE JONES: I don't think it was.
9	MR. ENGLAND: Can we do that? Because
10	I'm going to have some questions of Mr. Busch
11	regarding that and perhaps other witnesses.
12	JUDGE JONES: It's not an exhibit.
13	MR. ENGLAND: May we make it an exhibit?
14	I guess since I'm offering it, it will be MAWC Exhibit
15	52.
16	(MAWC Exhibit 52 was marked for
17	i denti fi cati on.)
18	JUDGE JONES: You are correct, it is 52.
19	MR. ENGLAND: All right. Thank you.
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGLAND:
21	Q. Mr. Busch, let's start with Exhibit 52.
22	Was this prepared by you or other members of Staff?
23	A. It was not prepared by me. I'm assuming
24	it was prepared by other members of Staff.
25	Q. As far as you know, it's true and

1	accurate?
2	A. I believe that it is. It's yes, it
3	is.
4	Q. All right.
5	MR. ENGLAND: I'd offer that exhibit.
6	JUDGE JONES: Any objection to MAWC
7	Exhi bi t 52?
8	I don't see any. MAWC Exhibit 52 is
9	admitted into the record.
10	(MAWC Exhibit 52 was received into
11	evi dence.)
12	BY MR. ENGLAND:
13	Q. While we're talking about
14	MR. ENGLAND: Thank you, Your Honor.
15	BY MR. ENGLAND:
16	Q. While we're talking about exhibits, I
17	believe you've had an opportunity to see Company
18	Exhibit 49, which is an attempt to model Staff's
19	proposed consolidated tariff pricing scheme for
20	purposes of this case?
21	A. I don't know if I'd refer to it as a
22	scheme, but our proposal.
23	Q. Fair enough. And I think we've noted
24	that the proposed rates, if you will, for the sale for
25	resale was a uniform rate where there should have been

1	a declining block rate; is that right?
2	A. Yeah. I think so.
3	Q. First of all, does that make, in your
4	opinion, much difference in the percentage impacts
5	that this is attempting to show?
6	A. I'd have to go run the numbers on that,
7	to be honest.
8	Q. What does this exhibit, in your
9	opinion, fairly represent Staff's position in this
10	case?
11	A. Are you referring to Exhibit 49?
12	Q. Yes, I'm sorry.
13	A. I don't know. I honestly would need to
14	go back and run the numbers myself to make sure that
15	it is I know that it looks it's very similar to
16	the customer charge as we have calculated based upon
17	the the 30.6 million dollar Non-unanimous
18	Stipulation and Agreement. So that is accurate. I
19	just got to go back and double check to make sure of
20	that before I can say that for sure.
21	Q. Fair enough. Is that something you could
22	do by the next time you appear on the witness stand
23	tomorrow?
24	A. Depends on how quickly I get back on the
25	witness stand tomorrow.

- Q. I understand. Now, again with turning your attention to Exhibit 52, if I understand Staff's proposal in this case, they are going to take the 19 water districts that are shown on the lower half of this exhibit and consolidate them into three zones or super districts; is that right?
- A. We are, yes, combining those districts that are underneath the water section and combining them into three districts, that is correct.
- Q. And the basis for that consolidation is geographic location or proximity and similar operating characteristics. Right?
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And then you're also proposing to consolidate the 13 sewer districts into five zones or groups; is that right?
 - A. That was what we put forth in testimony.
- Q. And that leads me to my next question.

 Has that changed since you filed your Direct

 Testimony?
- A. Well, if you look at what we actually said in our Direct Testimony, we -- we put the five districts -- we combined the sewer districts into five, but then when we looked at the overall increase was so minimal, we said leave the rates as they are at

that stage.

So even though we talk about the consolidation of the five districts, I think we would still take the -- the non-Arnold sewer revenue responsibility and shift that to the water side, which would then leave the current rates as they are on the sewer districts, even with the combinations.

- Q. So help me then. Would you continue to have 13 different sewer rates?
- A. I don't think it's quite 13 different rates. For example, the Jeff City sewer is 65.22, which is the same as the Platte County sewer. So we -- and I think Cedar Hill is at 65.22. So we've already got some consolidation of the sewer rates already.
- Q. So is it my understanding then that although you talk about consolidation in your Direct Testimony, when we come here to the hearing, you're not proposing to consolidate any of the districts?
- A. Well, like I said, in my direct, I talked about consolidation but then I left the rates as they were. So I didn't propose any changes to the sewer rates and we are maintaining that position.
- Q. And, of course, that was because the study that you had in your direct was based upon a

1	revenue requirement a total revenue requirement of
	·
2	somewhere in the neighborhood of, what, 6 or 7 million
3	dollars?
4	A. I think it was more than that, but I
5	can't I don't remember exactly where we were at
6	Direct Testimony. I do know that the sewer increase
7	was about \$39,000.
8	Q. The increase or the revenue the
9	A. The revenue increase
10	Q contribution?
11	A for the sewer the revenue increase
12	for the sewer was like 39,000 dollars, which we would
13	have spread to district two in our direct case.
14	Q. Okay. And then what's your increase?
15	A. Today?
16	Q. At hearing?
17	A. At hearing, as I mentioned, the
18	non-Arnold is an increase of 565,000 and we would
19	spread that to district one, district two and district
20	three in an 80, 10 and 10 manner.
21	Q. Okay. All customers or just residential?
22	A. I just said all all customers.
23	Q. And I apologize because I'm somewhat
24	confused. So if I'm back to Exhibit 52, if I'm
25	reading the Staff exhibit correctly, and I'm just

going to start at the top, Anna Meadows, in order to recover its cost-of-service, needs an increase of approximately 32 percent; is that right?

- A. The revenue responsibility assigned to Anna Meadows is ab-- is a 32 percent increase.
- Q. Okay. And what is the -- are you proposing a rate increase to recover that or not?
- A. As of now, I would suggest that we just maintain the current rates.
- Q. So is it safe to say for all 13 -- excuse me, 12 districts not including Arnold, to the extent they show a rate increase, they're not getting it because of the 565,000 dollar revenue transfer?
- A. Right. Because if you look at Platte County, for example, which according to the revenue responsibilities is a 47 percent increase, if we do you a 47 percent increase on an already \$65.22 rate, you're looking at a sewer rate to the citizens in Platte County of 96 dollars. And so Staff would just take and leave the status quo.
- Q. So essentially what you're saying is for those sewer districts other than Arnold that would otherwise get an increase, and some of them are fairly significant, over 40 percent, you're proposing to negate that with the revenue transfer from the water

1	di stri cts?
2	A. Right. Because I think that that caps
3	the sewer rate at 65.22.
4	Q. Are all of them at 65?
5	A. Some of them are lower.
6	Q. So they'll stay the same?
7	A. They would stay the same.
8	Q. So it's fair to say at least where you've
9	got these significant increases, your sewer tra
10	excuse me, your water contribution to sewer is an
11	effort to mitigate rate shock that would otherwise
12	occur?
13	A. That is correct.
14	Q. Would you agree that the Company
15	attempted to mitigate the rate shock for the various
16	sewer companies excuse me, sewer districts by
17	capping the allocation of its common cost to those
18	districts at roughly 20 dollars a customer?
19	A. I think that was I think I remember
20	the Company making that recommendation.
21	Q. Would you also agree with me that by
22	limiting the amount of common costs that are allocated
23	to the sewer districts, the Company achieves the same
24	or similar result you do by proposing a revenue
25	contribution or transfer?

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	ĺ

25

- A. I know -- if I remember correctly, the Company in their -- their sewer was a uniform sewer rate for all districts other than Arnold, which was at a slight increase of up to like 69 dollars based upon their filing. I don't know what the rates are under the new revenue requirement through the Non-unanimous Stipulation and Agreement, but I think -- I think what -- I think I agree with what you're saying. Could you repeat that just for --
- Q. Sure. I'm saying that essentially the Company sort of achieves the same result that you do through a revenue contribution by them limiting the amount of common costs that are allocated to sewer districts?
 - A. I think that's a fair statement.
- Q. And I think you would also agree -- in fact, you testify to this -- that the cost allocation process is not precise and more of an art than a science?
- A. I agree that the cost allocation process is def-- a lot of al-- any allocation is an art.
- Q. Would you also agree with me that the common costs for Missouri American are close to 70 percent of the operating and maintenance costs?
 - A. I had -- I've not looked at those

1	numbers.
2	Q. Pretty significant though, aren't they?
3	A. I I I've talked to some of our
4	auditors and I believe that it's significant number,
5	but I don't know the exact number.
6	Q. And I believe in response to some
7	questions from Mr. Poston, you articulated why you
8	were not proposing any revenue contribution to the
9	Arnold sewer system. Right?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. But you're proposing at least to increase
12	those rates by 44 percent in order for them to recover
13	their cost of service?
14	A. The revenue responsibility shows a
15	44 percent increase to the Arnold rate. That does not
16	take into account the cap that was built in. So if
17	like I said, if Arnold if Missouri American is
18	willing to design a rate that the Arnold system may go
19	above the \$33.58, then I think Staff would be willing
20	to look at some other shifts.
21	Q. You understand that that cap of roughly
22	33 dollars the Company set as a cap, if you will,
23	wasn't to be achieved until 2020. Right?
24	A. I'm not exactly sure what the cap was. I
25	do know that Ms. Norton's predecessor, Mr. Kartmann,

made a phone call to me and talked about a cap. And I indicated that if the Company was going to do a cap, that any revenue responsibilities above that would not be the responsibility of the other customers and would be shareholders, and he agreed to that.

- Q. I beg your pardon?
- A. He agreed to that in a phone conversation.
- Q. So it's your testimony for the first time I'm hearing today that Mr. Kartmann made a commitment to you that if the cost-of-service was above the 33 dollar cap, that the Company would absorb that?
- A. The reason that you're first now hearing it is because up until this point, until the 30.1 million dollars, Arnold wasn't going to be anywhere near the cap and it wasn't necessary. Arnold wasn't going to have an increase to that level; therefore, it was -- we would have just gone forward with the cost-of-service.
- Q. We've been at that cap for a week or more. And this is the first time I've heard of some commitment that Mr. Kartmann made to you. We've had plenty of discussions.
- A. We have. No, we had plenty of settlement discussions.

1	Q. You didn't think it was significant for
2	you to tell the Company that Mr. Kartmann made that
3	commitment, that the Company would absorb
4	MS. MYERS: I'm going to object here to
5	this being called a commitment. It seems to me
6	Mr. Busch said he explained this to Mr. Kartmann and
7	that he agreed.
8	MR. ENGLAND: Sounds like a commitment to
9	me.
10	MS. MYERS: There's no contract from
11	there.
12	JUDGE JONES: Objection sustained. I
13	don't even think it matters whether he committed or
14	not or broke his commitment or they had sundaes
15	together.
16	BY MR. ENGLAND:
17	Q. Well, let me ask you this: If the
18	Company had not made a commitment to the Arnold
19	customers to limit their rate increase to the
20	33 dollars and the cost-of-service shows that they
21	need a 44 percent increase and you're concerned about
22	rate shock for all the other sewer districts, would
23	you then have agreed to a revenue subsidy for Arnold?
24	A. Again, I don't know if I would have
25	called it a subsidy but

1	Q. A contribution?
2	A I would I would need to rethink
3	that, yes, potentially.
4	Q. So in other words, the only reason you're
5	not supporting a revenue contribution to Arnold is
6	because you didn't like the fact that the Company made
7	a commitment to those customers that you didn't like;
8	is that right?
9	A. Well, I don't it's not that I don't
10	like it. I don't think it's fair for the Company to
11	make a commitment to certain customers and expect
12	other customers to pay for that.
13	Q. If we hadn't made that commitment, you're
14	telling me here today you wouldn't support a 33 or
15	a 40 percent increase to those customers.
16	A. I don't know I don't know that I would
17	support a 4
18	Q. Well, you're not supporting 40 percent
19	increases to the other customers.
20	A. I understand that.
21	Q. Seems to me that your position is more
22	punitive than rate-making, sir.
23	A. I'm not trying to be punitive at all.
24	MS. MYERS: Objection, this is
25	argumentati ve.

1	MR. ENGLAND: I'm done with that line of
2	questi oni ng.
3	JUDGE JONES: Well, objection sustained.
4	BY MR. ENGLAND:
5	Q. You were asked some questions by Ms. Bell
6	from Joplin or on behalf of Joplin about the position
7	you took in 2000 when you were with the Office of
8	Public Counsel?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And I believe attached to Public Counsel
11	witness Marke's testimony is a history of
12	district-specific pricing, single-tariff pricing,
13	consolidated-tariff pricing, whatever you want to call
14	it, dating back to the '80s. Did you read that?
15	A. I read it, but it was months ago so I
16	don't re I don't recall much of it.
17	Q. Would you agree with me that up until
18	about 1998, the Office of Public Counsel was
19	supporting some sort of consolidated tariff pricing
20	for Missouri American?
21	A. If that was in his testimony, I don't
22	recall that and I don't recall up until that point in
23	time.
24	Q. It was an attachment to his testimony.
25	A. Yeah, I don't recall that.

1	Q. Would it surprise you to know that?
2	A. If it was in his attachment, no, it would
3	not.
4	Q. Would it surprise you to know that Public
5	Counsel supported a form of single-tariff pricing
6	prior to 1998?
7	A. I wasn't at Public Counsel prior to that.
8	I know what we did in the 2000 case. I'm not neither
9	surprised nor unsurprised.
10	Q. Okay. I guess what where I'm getting
11	at it, it's not you're not the only person that has
12	changed his position, if you will, regarding
13	single-tariff pricing or district-specific pricing?
14	A. I think we've heard plenty of testimony
15	today from different parties that have changed their
16	positions on that.
17	Q. You were also asked a question by
18	Ms. Bell regarding any changes in the law regarding
19	acquisitions or no, excuse me. Any change in the
20	law regarding the setting of rates for water and sewer
21	companies, I believe?
22	A. Yeah.
23	Q. There has been a change in the law
24	regarding the acquisition of smaller systems, hasn't
25	there, sir?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And and I'm speaking totally from
3	memory so correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe it
4	favors some sort of consolidation or at least
5	temporary consolidation at the time those districts
6	are acquired by a larger utility?
7	A. Yeah. You're referring to the change
8	that would allow the assignment of a current of a
9	district that is being purchased to be assigned to a
10	currently existing district. I think that's what
11	you're referring to.
12	Q. Yes.
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. I mean you're familiar with that change
15	in the law. Correct?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Okay. I'm going to switch gears with
18	you, but sticking with Joplin. Are you aware of the
19	fact that there may be a source of supply issue there
20	that's going to have to be addressed in the
21	not-too-distant future?
22	A. I'm tangentially aware that there is some
23	issues with source supply in the southwest portion of
24	the state.
25	Q. You were asked a question by Mr. Poston

correct, but something about an investment opportunity to purchase small systems. Do you recall that? A. We talked about the purchasing of small systems. O. Do you consider that to be an investment opportunity for anybody? A. If you have the money and you can invest in a smaller system or any troubled system and get the a potential to get a return on that, it is an investment opportunity. Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other questions.	1	about the and I'm going to probably not get this
A. We talked about the purchasing of small systems. O. Do you consider that to be an investment opportunity for anybody? A. If you have the money and you can invest in a smaller system or any troubled system and get the a potential to get a return on that, it is an investment opportunity. O. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. O. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. O. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. O. Thank you, sir. I have no other	2	correct, but something about an investment opportunity
systems. O. Do you consider that to be an investment opportunity for anybody? A. If you have the money and you can invest in a smaller system or any troubled system and get the a potential to get a return on that, it is an investment opportunity. O. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. O. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. O. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. O. Thank you, sir. I have no other	3	to purchase small systems. Do you recall that?
Q. Do you consider that to be an investment opportunity for anybody? A. If you have the money and you can invest in a smaller system or any troubled system and get the a potential to get a return on that, it is an investment opportunity. Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	4	A. We talked about the purchasing of small
opportunity for anybody? A. If you have the money and you can invest in a smaller system or any troubled system and get the a potential to get a return on that, it is an investment opportunity. Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	5	systems.
A. If you have the money and you can invest in a smaller system or any troubled system and get the a potential to get a return on that, it is an investment opportunity. Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	6	Q. Do you consider that to be an investment
in a smaller system or any troubled system and get the a potential to get a return on that, it is an investment opportunity. Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	7	opportunity for anybody?
the a potential to get a return on that, it is an investment opportunity. Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	8	A. If you have the money and you can invest
11 investment opportunity. 12 Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to 13 get that return. In most circumstances, those small 14 require investment that far exceeds the customer's 15 ability to pay. Correct? 16 A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. 17 Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you 18 agree? 19 A. Majority of them, sure. 20 Q. And if this was such a great business 21 opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your 22 door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	9	in a smaller system or any troubled system and get
Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	10	the a potential to get a return on that, it is an
get that return. In most circumstances, those small require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	11	investment opportunity.
require investment that far exceeds the customer's ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	12	Q. Well, let's stick with the potential to
ability to pay. Correct? A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	13	get that return. In most circumstances, those small
A. In some of them, that is correct, yes. Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you agree? A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	14	require investment that far exceeds the customer's
17 Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you 18 agree? 19 A. Majority of them, sure. 20 Q. And if this was such a great business 21 opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your 22 door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	15	ability to pay. Correct?
18 agree? 19 A. Majority of them, sure. 20 Q. And if this was such a great business 21 opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your 22 door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	16	A. In some of them, that is correct, yes.
A. Majority of them, sure. Q. And if this was such a great business opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	17	Q. In the majority of them, wouldn't you
20 Q. And if this was such a great business 21 opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your 22 door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	18	agree?
opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. Characteristics of the control of the contr	19	A. Majority of them, sure.
door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you? A. Yes. C. Thank you, sir. I have no other	20	Q. And if this was such a great business
 A. Yes. Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other 	21	opportunity, you'd have more people knocking down your
Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other	22	door trying to buy these systems, wouldn't you?
	23	A. Yes.
25 questions.	24	Q. Thank you, sir. I have no other
	25	questi ons.

JUDGE JONES: Questions from the 1 2 Commission. Mr. Chairman? 3 CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes. QUESTIONS BY CHAIRMAN HALL: 4 5 Q. Good evening, Mr. Busch. 6 Α. Good evening, Chairman. 7 Q. Is it safe to say that the main 8 justification in your view for some type of 9 consolidated tariff pricing is to facilitate 10 acquisition of distressed systems? 11 Α. I think it's fair to -- to assume that my 12 position is that with the problems we're having with 13 troubled systems, that moving to some sort of 14 consolidation is ultimately in the best interest. 15 And so your -- you -- you agree that cost 16 causation and potential for over-investment are 17 significant factors in opposing further consolidation 18 of rate districts. You just believe that the 19 countervailing policy of trying to facilitate 20 acquisition trumps those other principles? 21 Α. Yeah. I -- and I think the way that 22 Staff consolidated the districts does maintain some 23 level of cost causation. Maybe not to the level that 24 other parties see, but I believe it does maintain some 25 sort of cost causation and I think it's important to

1	maintain that keep that in sight and I'm sorry,
2	I forgot what the other piece of
3	Q. You've answered. You've answered.
4	Looking at Missouri American Exhibit 52
5	A. Uh-huh.
6	Q which you prepared, there are this
7	document includes the recently acquired systems.
8	Ri ght?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Could you point those out to me, which
11	are the my understanding, there were five sewer
12	systems, five water systems acquired since the last
13	rate case?
14	A. Since the last rate case, Anna Meadows
15	I'm starting at the sewer at the top. Arnold, Emerald
16	Pointe, Hickory Hills, Meramec and Saddlebrooke. And
17	then going down to water, you have Anna Meadows again,
18	Emerald Pointe, Hickory Hills, Redfield, Saddlebrooke,
19	Tri-States. And Saddlebrooke was right around the
20	last rate case, but I believe it was after the last
21	rates were put into effect.
22	Q. Okay. And Mr. England asked you some
23	questions about a statute. He didn't give you the
24	statute citation. I believe it's 393.320, which
25	includes a provision that when a when a small water

utility is purchased by a large water public utility, it is to be consolidated with another district and that consolidation is supposed to occur in the order approving the acquisition.

- A. I believe that is the statute, yes.
- Q. And this is actually a fixed rate provision that you worked on over in the General Assembly, isn't it?
 - A. I do not believe so.
- Q. No? Okay. Do you know which of these systems that were purchased after the last rate case were purchased after the effective date of this statute such that we could go back and look at the orders approving the acquisition to see what consolidation was included in that acquisition?
- A. I think Anna Meadows. And when we talk about assigning it to a district, we did not change the rates. If they had a currently existing rate, we did not change the rate to whatever the rate was for that district that it was assigned to. So Anna Meadows, the rate that was being charged, we maintained that same rate. Same with Emerald Pointe.
- Q. And isn't it standard to keep the same rate until the next rate case on --
 - A. That -- that is Staff's position, yes.

So we had Anna Meadows, Emerald Pointe, Hickory Hills, Meramec and Tri-States and Redfield.

- Q. Okay. Were you in the hearing room when Mr. Herbert was discussing, I believe with me, the rationale that the Company used for its grouping of systems for consolidation and -- versus Staff's grouping?
 - A. I was in the room, yes.
- Q. He argued that grouping them on the basis of geography and I'm -- this may not be his exact words, but that it didn't make a lot of sense. Do you agree -- based on geography and that it made sense to group it on the basis of cost.

So first, looking at the Company position on -- which is grouping on the basis of cost, do you agree with him that that approach reduces rate shock?

- A. No. And I think they -- in my opinion, they grouped them based upon the current rates, not necessarily upon cost.
 - Q. I -- that's true.
- A. And so -- and -- and no, I don't.

 Especially when you look at their district three,
 which has barely 1,500 customers out of their

 400-some-odd-thousand. It's -- I don't see how if
 there was investment in one of those districts, you're

1	going to avoid rate shock.
2	Q. Well, I think what he was saying is that
3	there there would and, again, it's just my
4	understanding, that that grouping on the basis of
5	cost or or rates would would reduce the rate
6	shock from the consolidation.
7	A. Oh, I okay. Yeah. If if you
8	consolidate it based upon that, the the shifts
9	between the different districts would be less than the
10	shifts potentially than what Staff has proposed with
11	its hybrid.
12	Q. And there's some value in that, would you
13	agree?
14	A. With
15	Q. Come on. Staff's not going to take the
16	position that rate shock is good.
17	A. No, rate shock is not good.
18	Q. Okay. Then you answered that question.
19	So but you do raise a legitimate issue
20	from from from my perspective that when looking
21	at the Company's grouping, you do have a zone with
22	very, very few customers thereby impeding the goal of
23	spreading out costs.
24	A. That that's my opinion, yes.
25	Q. Would it be possible to structure these

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

24

25

zones on the basis of rates and satisfy that concern?

A. I -- I believe that you can consolidate the rates in just about any way imaginable.

- Q. Well, I mean it doesn't -- I mean, I think I agree with -- with -- with Mr. Herbert, that geography doesn't necessarily make sense as a basis for -- for -- for groupings. So -- but I'll -- I'll go there. What is the -- what's the logic behind geography as a basis for grouping?
- A. And I think this was getting a little bit to what Ms. Bell was going down. My district one has Jefferson City and St. Louis Metro. It also has Mexico, so that's kind of an outlier. But those two major groups, first of all, have -- their source of supply is the Missouri River or the Meramec River so very similar operating characteristics.

District two is more of wells and alluvial wells between Riverside and St. Joseph. So think at some level there's some similar, not always, not exact, but there's some similar operating characteristics.

And the next part about the cost based on geography is that the way that the Company do -- you know, does their operations is based upon geography.

The best example I have is because I know this

gentleman the best with Missouri American. Matt Barnhart is their -- and I don't know his exact title, but he's an operations supervisor in the southwest So he was responsible for Joplin, all the small Bransons and the Warrensburg area. So him and his team focus on those areas. When we were at the Riverside town hall

meeting, the gentleman -- and he's new and I forgot his name. I think it's Mr. Carlson is his name. He's -- he's in charge of St. Joe and Riverside. He's over all -- both of those. So -- and in the St. Louis area, it's -- they do St. Louis and they do Jefferson City, they do Mexico. It's a similar type of consolidation with their operations people.

So I think by doing it by geography, we're keeping those types of costs together, which falls into our hybrid consolidation districts. So that's why I think in -- in Staff's position we do -- we maintain those cost causation that is important to a lot of parties by doing our district consolidation based upon geography, which is similar to what the Company has done.

Q. Okay. So it's not really geography as much as operation characteristics? I'm trying to help you out here.

A. Sure. But, you know -- and part of it is it's geography because -- you know, I went to 10 of the 12 local public hearings for Missouri American. And I go to a lot of the other public hearings for our smaller systems. And one of the things that we hear in the Q and A and sometimes it's on the record in the local public hearing is the consumers down in an area, they talk about paying for their own costs -- you do hear that a lot. But you also hear them talk about why is my rate 40 dollars when the person down the street is paying 20 dollars.

So they -- they're comparing their rates to people who live in the area. They -- they have friends and family and relatives who live near them in the same geographic area. And people look at that and they wonder why is my rate different than somebody else who lives 20 miles down the road.

And there are various reasons for that.

We try to explain that to them. And maybe this is when I get accused of answering for the Company, but, you know, there's a difference in cost between a -- if it's a municipal system versus a privately-owned system. But people are cognizant in their geography of what the rates are being paid. So I think geography does play a part of that.

		ľ
	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
	1	
1	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
	0	
2	•	
2		
_	2	
_	J	١

25

Q. Okay. Let's -- let's return for a moment to the -- to the fundamental reason why you, on behalf of Staff, are proposing consolidation as to facilitate acquisition of distressed systems. There's been ten acquisitions since the last rate case and we don't have a consolidated system. Why -- what's the problem that you're trying to fix?

A. Well, we -- the Company has purchased systems and I -- I think I even mentioned this in my testimony. They have been purchasing systems even under their current structure. By as, you know, we struggle through this today even -- the Public Counsel in the Non-unanimous Stipulation and Agreement with MIEC and others, you know, they bas-- you know, they took Tri-States and Emerald Pointe and they combined a bunch of other small systems with them.

Eventually we're going to run into a situation where even that, you're going to run into a new investment by the Company that's going to impact when you have smaller districts like that. It will still be a small district. And your -- Warrensburg is a small district, Mexico's a small district.

And so I think the consolidation and how we've come up with that and the three districts is just going to allow for better policy on a

going-forward basis.

' /

Q. Let me see if I can figure out what you just said. I think what you're saying is that yes, the Company is acquiring some systems under the current structure, but they are more likely to acquire more under a consolidated structure?

A. I think it's a possibility that, yes, they would be -- they might become more aggressive.

Q. If it's just a possibility, I'm not sure that's really going to move us. So I mean, I -- I -- I -- I think we -- we as a -- as a -- I'm speaking on my own behalf. If -- if -- I mean Staff's mak-- is taking the position that this is the fundamental reason why we need to change the -- the -- the district structure. But -- so I think we need to have some amount of comfort with the -- with the conclusion that doing so is going to facilitate acquisition of -- of troubled and distressed systems.

A. I understand that, Chairman, and that is Staff's hope. But again, I think Ms. Norton was asked the question earlier about how aggressive they are and how aggressive they may be. And I don't know if they -- they haven't indicated one way or the other if they will be more aggressive or not. So I can't -- I can't sit here today and tell you that that is going

to happen. It's our hope that it will.

- Q. In your Rebuttal Testimony, line 5 on page 15, you indicate that Staff does not anticipate seeking further consolidation in the future.
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Why is that?
- A. Because I -- as I mentioned earlier -- when I say further consolidation, we would maintain the three districts. I think as -- for the reasons that we pointed out. And that as new systems would be acquired, they would eventually, you know -- depending upon where they fall in, would be assigned to those districts on a going-forward basis.

So we would consolidate if they purchased more, but we weren't -- I don't -- I don't see a further consolidation to two or a single-tariff rate at this time.

- Q. Why is that? If -- if moving to three is good, why isn't moving to two better and moving to one the best?
- A. Because, you know, I still believe that there are some cost causation factors with the three that are separate and distinct. And as has been pointed out, and I -- I addressed this in my testimony, there is some concern that you could see

1	mouho invoctment a little hit more so than is
1	maybe investment a little bit more so than is
2	necessary, as pointed out like we talked about with
3	St. Joseph and their plant and the different parties
4	recommending some disallowance, which the Commission
5	agreed to.
6	So I think if you go to a full single
7	tariff, you lose those last two two items. And
8	I'm as I sit here today, I don't foresee going
9	forward any further. I think this is a good result
10	and I think this is good for the state of Missouri on
11	a going-forward basis.
12	Q. So in other words, your balancing
13	interests and moving to three reaches that that
14	correct balance from your perspective?
15	A. From my perspective, yes.
16	Q. Okay. I have no further questions.
17	Thank you, Mr. Busch.
18	A. Thank you, Chairman.
19	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Stoll?
20	COMMISSIONER STOLL: I have no questions.
21	But again, thank you for your testimony.
22	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Kenney?
23	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I have no
24	questions. Thank you.
25	JUDGE JONES: Commissioner Rupp?

_	
1	C
2	
3	C
4	€
5	P
6	t
7	t
8	t
9	S
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	t

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER RUPP:

- Q. Yeah, so let me follow up a little bit on Chairman Hall's line of questioning. Is -- you know, earlier in your testimony when we were discussing the Arnold sewer rates and how you were moving them from this zone and then you recalculated it and moving it that zone, was primarily the reason that you did that to just affect the different rates so that -- so to smooth them out?
 - A. Are you talking about the --
 - Q. The Arnold --
 - A. Sorry, Commissioner.
 - Q. Wasn't it the Arnold sewer, 500,000 --
- A. I think it's everybody but Arnold. No, that's everybody but Arnold is the 560,000. So yeah, it was -- it was -- that revenue contribution is shifted to the other water districts to try -- in what we think is an equal basis.
 - Q. And it's shifted to try to --
- A. Try to avoid seeing a rate over 65 dollars for some of the sewer customers.
- Q. Okay. So walk me through how -- how -- how -- how -- how -- how is this statement incorrect: That we have deviated from rate design and we're now picking winners and losers in -- in -- in districts

based off of current rates.

 A. As was briefly touched upon, a lot of the costs are corporately allocated. When you look at a small system -- when a small system comes in for a rate case and they don't have a customer -- a customer call center to handle their complaints. They have the owner.

There are a lot of big costs that are a part of Missouri American system, because of the large size of them, that get allocated on a method, on a formula that is reasonable and is a good a method as any way. But it doesn't, in my opinion, tell me what the true cost of providing service is to some of these smaller systems because those smaller systems don't have a lot of the costs that are now being allocated to them.

And so because of that, I don't really see how we're picking and choosing winners and losers because a lot of times a small -- you know, when Missouri American purchases a small system, they don't go and add to their customer call center. They don't add more people to handle those calls. They just -- you know, they get, you know, put in there. But all of a sudden now that district is picking up a part of those costs.

So in some ways, some of those costs -those smaller systems are actually, you know,
providi -- taking some of those costs away from the
larger districts, you know.

St. Louis County, you know, was a huge company prior to the purchase of Missouri American purchasing them. There -- a lot of these costs were for Missouri American -- or for St. Louis County. So those costs are going to be there regardless of whether or not they pick up a smaller system or not.

those big corporate costs -- and Mr. England mentioned the -- a pretty significant amount of those costs are corporately allocated -- I don't think those are really being caused by a small system. Because when we do a small company rate case, those costs, they're nowhere to be found in a small company rate. They're only found when we -- they get a part of Missouri American's system. So I think they're already being assigned through the process, a portion of those costs.

So when you look at those rates -- so when I start looking at -- you know, I call it a revenue contribution because we determine what a revenue requirement is, but it may not be the exact

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 precise costs of providing service to that area. So when it gets --

Q. All right. Let's -- let's -- let's take a step away from small water and sewer being absorbed. Let's just talk about figuring out are we going to have five zones, four zones, three zones on the current -- the current number of -- of customers that are here, not anyone new. That is kind of where my question was.

How -- how is -- or have -- have we deviated from rate design into picking winners and losers by trying to spread across the cost to those zones, i.e., the 500,000 dollars in the -- in the Arnold service?

- Commissioner, I -- I -- I think I understand what you're suggesting. I just have a hard time saying that we're picking winners and losers. But definitely, based upon current rates and based upon what was calculated as a revenue requirement that was based upon Exhibit 52, some people are going to have an increase and some are going to have a When do you that consolidation, that is -decrease. that is what happens.
- And I guess that's kind of where I'm Q. struggling is, to me, it's either these are your

costs, this is where you live, this is where you chose to live, this is what you need to pay. Or if we're going to have consolidation, then why don't we just have complete consolidation and have one -- one rate for the entire state that says, okay, new system came on board, then next rate case, all this stuff gets added in.

To me, it's -- it's -- we start picking winners and losers when we deviate from full cost of service and we start going down this path of consolidation, but we really don't want to go all the way because we're afraid of what's it's going to do to some of the zones and there's sticker shock and whether or not you'd have the votes for it on the Commission.

That's where I struggle with the picking of the winners and losers because there's a -- there's a decision being made based off of, well, that -- that rate's getting kind of high on this one, we better re-jigger it and spread it around. And so that's where I'm struggling on.

If we're walking down this path, why do we stop at four, why do we stop at five? If we're going to go there, why don't we just go to one?

A. I understand your point, Commissioner.

And I -- because I do still believe in some of the 1 2 cost causation factors and -- and some of the other 3 points that I -- that I've mentioned earlier that I 4 think doing it -- excuse me -- with the three 5 districts is appropriate. Because, you know, the 6 other parties do, you know, make some points and 7 there's things that I've argued in the past. 8 So I think, you know, you need to -- you 9 need to look at the changing world of Missouri 10

American, the changing water and sewer world and acknowledge that some consolidation is a good -- good thi ng.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, you know, I made this exact same proposal in the last rate case well before I had any of this -- you know, like the Riverside plant treatment facility. So I didn't make it and go, oh, my gosh, Riverside's going to go up in the future. did it because I thought it was right thing to do based upon, you know, those reasons. And -- and, you know, I -- I think that when we -- I just can't go all the way to single-tariff pricing at this time.

Q. So some of those costs things -- like you said, some of the water comes from Meramec River in one area and some of it comes from underground. How -- help me understand how that is different than

on an electric rate, you know, there's a coal plant over here and there's a natural gas plant over here and all those costs in differentiation in figures are allocated. Help me -- help me with that.

A. You know, a lot of people talk about how the electric side is an interconnected industry. And when -- you know, they have different generation facilities, they have -- you know, Ameren they have the nuclear facility, Bagnell Dam, they have coal-fired plants, they have gas generation. And when you -- when the lights go on, we don't know where those -- necessarily where they come from. So I think that's slightly different.

Then you do -- you know, as people pointed out, you know, nobody -- when I go home tonight, even though I'm not on the Jeff City system, but when I turn my tap to get water, it's not coming from St. Louis. There's no doubt about that.

But again, it's my opinion that the -some of the operation characteristics of the Company
are such that a geog-- you know, those costs are
there. You know, someone who is over all, you know,
the Mexico and St. Louis area is over all that stuff
for the Company. And so that person doesn't go -- as
I mentioned Mr. Barnhart, Joplin, he doesn't work in

1	the St. Louis area.
2	So it's still trying to maintain some
3	level of cost causation to a localized area. And
4	so and maintain that, which I think is important,
5	without going all the way. And I don't know if I'm
6	I don't know if I'm going to be able to articulate
7	exactly what what you're looking for.
8	Q. And I'm not looking for anything. I'm
9	really struggling with this whole issue and I'm trying
10	to I'm trying to trying to be convinced of
11	A. Sure.
12	Q of other people's inputs.
13	So on the three districts okay. Let
14	me ask this question: Smaller water and sewer
15	rural like small water and sewer districts, if l
16	looked at a map of the state, where are most of them
17	at?
18	A. Most of the small water and sewer
19	systems?
20	Q. Yeah. The ones that are struggling.
21	A. The ones that are regulated by the PSC or
22	the ones that are overall?
23	Q. I guess they would regulated by the
24	PSC that you would be looking for someone to help take
25	them over.

- A. The most regulated water systems by the Public Service Commission are in the southwest portion of the state, below the Missouri River and basically west of the Jeff City -- put Jeff City in the middle.
- Q. So most of them would be in water district three under Staff's grouping?
- A. Yeah. There's a handful that are around the St. Louis area. There's I think only one system that we regulate -- water system that's up in the -- would be considered in the second --
 - Q. Well, then --
 - A. -- district two.
- Q. -- that's my question. If we go to the three -- and it was your statement that we won't have to hopefully touch this until you retire and a long time. But the high-cost sewer -- water and sewer districts that are -- that could be failing that -- that tend to probably have a lot of needs that come in and they're -- majority of them are located in one area, will that not adverse-- more adversely affect the rates in that area compared to the other two and then force us to have to revisit this sooner than --
- A. I -- I don't know. Because with a smaller system an increase -- or, you know, if they have to upgrade it, the investment's going to be

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

smaller. So even though it might have a huge impact on a smaller system or a smaller grouping, you know, when you start getting upwards of 25-, 30,000 customers overall, the impacts may not be nearly as substantial. So it may not really impact it as -- as much as one would think as we're sitting here.

Q. All right. And then you -- Commissioner Hall -- Chairman Hall asked you a question about why the three, why not one. If everyone's rates barely changed and everyone -- and you could go to a one -one district with oversight of disallowance of any type of imprudent investment, would you be for that?

I would be for the districts as we've --Α. the three districts.

- Q. Still stay with the three?
- Α. I would stay with the three, yes, sir.
- Stay with the three. As I look back, it seems like we're having a similar conversation and help -- and hel-- and challenge me on this because I want to see -- I want to get on the same train of thought with this. Whether or not we're talking about tax -- tax credits for businesses in the state, whether or not we're talking about the Foundation Formula for how we fund our schools and what school's going to get more based off of the geographic area and

1 everything.

Is there a way -- let's look at the school formula. We -- this whole entire state how -- what school district is going to get more money from the State, they throw all these factors in, what area of the state are you in, what's your free and reduced lunch, things of that nature.

Is there a way to take a look at the rates for the entire state and look at the investment that maybe Joplin has recently done and provide a dollar amount formula to that to where they could get credit for that? Look at the investments made in the last five, ten years and make adjustments for what they might need to spend in the next five, ten years and look at some type of formulaic rate for the entire state for water and sewer based off of recent investments?

- A. Well, I'm first going to preface anything I say, I'm not familiar at all with the school formula and all that other stuff.
 - Q. It's a mess.
- A. Luckily, my youngest graduated from high school. We're -- I'm -- so just -- if I understand, Commissioner, what you're asking, let me try to repackage it. You're talking about a -- do a single

tariffed rate throughout the state, all districts and then look at each individual district or zone or whatever, however you want to -- and then say, well, they spent so much now over the past, therefore, we lower that rate for -- for a period of time. Is that --

Q. No. I'm kind of looking to say, okay, so we have one single-zone tariff rate and this is what -- this is what the dollar amount is going to be. And let's say in Joplin it's going to be, you know, 539 dollars, you know, per residential customer. But then we can say, but they just made a huge investment in the last several years on new stuff. They're not going to need to build anything new for 20 years.

So can we provide in the initial -- once you do it the first time, say, okay, the likelihood that they're going to -- to need some type of investment is small so, therefore, when we're starting out, we'll give them a 20 percent reduction and reallocate their costs to -- to other places and come up with a -- just a boom, here's your rate moving forward?

A. I think that's very similar to what we have today. We kind of do that today except we don't develop a single rate and then reduce. We just

develop what the rates are.

The other comment I would make upon that is even though the -- a certain district may not necessarily -- maybe they just have some big improvement to their area through, you know, their treatment plant. The Company would -- you know, may need to be replacing mains and there may be other factors that haven't been addressed that need to be addressed in the future. And that those costs are going to be, you know, be there going forward.

So I think the Company, you know, invests in many of its service territories constantly. Sometimes it gets bumped up a little bit higher than at other times, but I think there's a constant level of investment. And even though a treatment facility may last for a long period of time, there's a lot of moving components to that that may, you know, wear out in a shorter period of time that may need to be replaced.

So there's always an upgrade of the system and -- and the facilities that is always going to need to be updated and those customers are going to have to pay for that on a going-forward basis.

So I just -- you know, going to that single-tariff rate and trying to figure out those

1	changes, I don't know that we get necessarily where we
2	want to go. And I think that the maintaining how
3	we develop rates and looking at investment done in
4	certain areas is still the best way to go forward.
5	Q. See, this conversation once again reminds
6	me of the formula school formula, as they created a
7	hold-harmless rate simply just to not make people mad
8	that they weren't going to get as much money. And the
9	difficulty is if you try to provide credit to Joplin
10	or you try to apply credit, is it you're deviating
11	away from just what the math says it is. And so
12	again, I'm back to, okay, if we're going to do it, rip
13	the Band-aid off, this is it and you've put it to bed.
14	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I've got a
15	suggestion for you. Why don't you ask Mr. Bednar to
16	talk about Senate Bill 380. And he could give you a
17	whole discussion on the formula.
18	COMMISSIONER STOLL: That's the whole kit
19	and caboodle. That's where it all started.
20	MR. BEDNAR: That you very much.
21	COMMISSIONER STOLL: That's where it all
22	started.
23	BY COMMISSIONER STOLL:
24	Q. And it was an ability to cobble together
25	votes and try to please people and not make everybody

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

mad. But -- and that's why I'm -- that -- that is the feeling that I'm getting when I look at these. Well, we're moving the \$500,000 here because theirs is already high and over here -- it seems like we're -- once you deviate from either this is your cost and you start going down that road, there's always an argument to be made for -- like you told the Commission, well, you could consolidate these 500 million different ways. And -- so that's where I'm struggling is if we're going to do, let's do it; if we're not, let's just go to cost-of-service.

A. Well, and to -- Commissioner, just -- you know, the 500,000, that's on, you know, the sewer to water issue and then the -- you also then got the consolidation piece. And, you know, it's been a lot of -- we've had a lot of agreements through the years with trying to cobble together something that all the parties could live with to put in front of the Commission.

And, you know, there has always been some recognition of, you know, when the costs get high and, you know, some sort of revenue responsibility shifts, you know, that -- that people have agreed to for various reasons and, you know, that gets put forth.

So, you know, it's really difficult when

1	you look at the revenue responsibilities today and
2	what they should be, to know exactly what the actual
3	cost of providing service is because, you know, there
4	are a lot of ways that this has been sliced and diced
5	over the last, you know, 16 years.
6	So it's very difficult and that's where
7	I'm having to struggle to say this is the exact cost
8	to providing service to any one district. You know,
9	we're making a good faith effort to determine what
10	that is, but to hold our hat to say well, the numbers
11	that are on this sheet are the exact cost of providing
12	service, I just think that's a level of specificity
13	that is not there.
14	Q. Thank you very much
15	A. Thank you, Commissioner.
16	Q for Assisting me in my thought
17	process.
18	JUDGE JONES: Any recross based on
19	questions from the Commission? Missouri Department of
20	Energy?
21	MR. ANTAL: No questions, Your Honor.
22	JUDGE JONES: MI EC?
23	MR. DOWNEY: No recross.
24	JUDGE JONES: Brunswick?
25	MR. DRAG: No questions, Your Honor.

1	JUDGE JONES: Joplin?
2	MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor.
3	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BELL:
4	Q. Commissioner Rupp talked about the
5	Foundation Formula and I want to kind of get to that
6	legislative policy making. So isn't the decision on
7	whether to offer and provide incentives to businesses
8	to facilitate acquisition of troubled water systems a
9	public policy decision for the legislature?
10	A. I I I don't know if that's true or
11	not. I'm not an attorney so I I don't know that I
12	have an opinion on that.
13	Q. Okay. The legislature in the past has
14	made decisions concerning small water districts and
15	has passed legislation concerning small water
16	districts as you heard from Mr. England today.
17	Correct?
18	A. I believe that the yes, the
19	legislature has made some and I think the Commission
20	has as well.
21	Q. Okay. You talked a little bit about who
22	you contact when you have a troubled water system and
23	you mentioned I think fi three to five companies.
24	Do you ever contact municipalities about acquiring
25	those small systems?

1 Α. Since we have no authority over any 2 municipality --3 MS. MYERS: Objection, this is not based 4 This was a question asked in cross. on recross. 5 JUDGE JONES: Objection sustained. 6 MS. BELL: Well, I would argue that the 7 Commissioners did ask questions about the acquiring 8 new districts and how they go about acquiring the new 9 districts and what the incentive for acquiring those 10 new districts is. 11 JUDGE JONES: Objection sustained. BY MS. BELL: 12 13 Q. Okay. You did talk in response to 14 Commission questions about the fact that you don't 15 think cost allocations are necessarily correct. You 16 said you don't think the cost allocations are being 17 properly assigned; is that correct? 18 Α. It's not that I don't think they're being 19 properly assigned. I just -- when you start to 20 allocate the large amount of costs that are -- spacing 21 on the right word -- that are for all the customers, 22 the large amount of costs that are corporate costs and 23 need to be spread out, when you start spreading those 24 out to more and more districts, I think you start 25 losing what it actually means to the actual cost of

providing service to that area.

Э

So we're trying to allocate costs and there has to be a method to do that. But when you're -- but, you know, a lot of what we're hearing is, you know, well, what's the cost of providing service to Joplin. I don't know that anybody has figured out what the exact cost of providing service to Joplin is as a stand-alone entity. And in my opinion, that's the actual cost of providing service there.

When you put them a part of a bigger system and you have to start allocating costs for making a determination -- and I think our auditing staff does a fine job of trying to find a fair way to allocate those costs, but just because it's a fair way and a reasonable way doesn't mean it's the exact cost of providing service to any given area.

- Q. There is nothing in the evidence, in the record or in anyone's testimony of a different way to allocate costs in this case?
- A. That is correct. That's why I talk about revenue responsibilities.
 - Q. No further questions. Thank you.

JUDGE JONES: Riverside?

MR. BEDNAR: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. BEDNAR: I will say the school Foundation Formula is revisited often, but I believe it was the right decision when it was made at that time.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BEDNAR:

Q. That aside, Mr. Busch, would you agree with me though that Commissioner Rupp's idea that it's possible to begin to build some transparency in the process that, I think by your testimony, you admit goes on in every rate case; and that is, you get a --you get a district -- small district, costs are exceeding what anybody would think would be a reasonable cost for a monthly water bill.

And so whether it's Staff or another party says, you know, we got to do something here, we've got to bring some relief. And every district, at least for the last decade, without a lot of transparency, adjustments have been made. And so now we're down -- would you agree with me in that -- just given by district eight from the last case?

- A. I guess I don't quite know what you mean by lack of transparency.
- Q. And I don't mean that in a bad way. I think everybody's intent is to do well. But I think what -- if I'm understanding Commissioner Rupp's

point, is you can -- you have a thought process in your head as to when it's time to make an adjustment. There's a thought process when too high is too high. It's a little bit what I got into earlier with Dr. Marke on the issue of what's too high for Office of Public Counsel.

I think the rulemaking process alone could be a possibility to start establishing that -- some specific objective elements of when there should be consolidation of a district into a larger district. Would you agree?

A. I don't think so. And the reasoning why is that to try to get the rule -- there might be small systems that are not owned by a Missouri American or another relatively large system that may have -- may be in line for large increases and high rates that would -- by definition of anybody, might result in rate shock. And I don't know -- I don't know what we can do about that.

And so -- so I don't know how -- you know, if we get into rulemaking like you're referring to Mr. Bednar, I think there's a lot of other situations that may be difficult. And I think ultimately Staff's district-specif-- or consolidated pricing with the three districts alleviates a lot of

1	that, okay, there's a problem, we got to stop it.
2	We we I think once you consolidate like Staff
3	did, a lot of those concerns I think should not be a
4	concern going forward so
5	Q. And I think I'm talking very similar to
6	what you're saying, Mr. Busch. I'm just saying is
7	there a way to document and adopt by rule that thought
8	process that led Staff to believe that three districts
9	were the right way to go? What are the elements that
10	were examined?
11	A. I mean, I'm assuming that you could do a
12	rul emaki ng on anythi ng.
13	Q. Okay.
14	A. So
15	Q. Now, and I turn back to Section 393.320.
16	Doesn't that give us all some guidance when well,
17	though it was adopted in 2010 by the General Assembly,
18	it speaks of a small utility being 8,000 or less.
19	Correct? I mean you don't have the document
20	A. And I don't know exactly 320, which
21	one that is.
22	Q. It's the statute that deals with the
23	acquiring of a small utility.
24	A. Okay. Okay.
25	Q. Okay. And I think there, again, the

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5

legislature gave great deference to the consolidation process for a smaller utility when acquired by a larger.

- A. I -- yeah. I think that's one way of looking at it.
- Q. So when you look at your -- the -- the Staff's grouping and your zones, I mean let's take a look at all the districts. You have St. Louis at 355,000, you got St. Joseph at 28,000, you've got Joplin at 20,000 and all the rest are under 8,000 significantly, except for Jeff City at 9-.

And so really if you go to Exhibit 51 that the Company prepared today, that's kind of a model. It's still three zones, but it just reconfigures it so that your districts of 20,000 or more keep their district specific and you consolidate everybody else into a large district.

And would you agree with me that there's some basis for that in -- in the statute?

- A. The statute I believe -- I'm not an attorney so I'm just -- from what I've seen of it --
 - Q. Right.
- A. -- is about the acquiring of new systems.

 And I think the 51, leaving Joplin and St. Joseph by
 themselves and mixing everybody else together, goes

	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	O
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5

2

beyond what -- what Staff wants to view as, you know, the cost causation principle. Because you're putting systems that have no -- you know, that have no characteristics together. And -- and that's why Staff would prefer not to do that type of scenario.

- Q. Except for the common characteristics are they're a small system with a higher customer base of residential users without the industrial/commercial users to absorb some of the cost allocation of that district. Correct?
- A. Well, Jeff City has some industrial, Platte County has some industrial, Mexico has some industrial. So there's some -- there's some larger customers in those smaller districts.
- Q. Right. But the Platte County rate that is almost double those of those other districts would reflect a smaller district coupled with a higher residential?
- A. It's more sim-- yeah, it's probably a little bit more similar. But they -- I mean, they've got customer class that are -- you know, the allocations like most of the other larger ones so --
 - Q. No further questions.

JUDGE JONES: St. Joseph?
MR. LAWYER: No questions.

1	JUDGE JONES: Warrensburg?
2	MR. CURTIS: Just one.
3	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CURTIS:
4	Q. Good evening, Mr. Busch.
5	A. Good evening, Mr. Curtis.
6	Q. Commissioner Rupp asked you about where
7	the smaller systems are that are out there and maybe
8	troubled, maybe not. And he indicated those are
9	southwest Missouri pretty much?
10	A. Most of the systems that are being
11	that are regulated by the State by the Public
12	Service Commission are a majority of them are in
13	the southwest.
14	Q. And I know the PSC Staff would not
15	necessarily be involved in assisting or facilitating
16	any acquisition by Missouri American of municipal
17	systems, but are you aware that Missouri American is
18	currently looking at the possibility of submitting an
19	RFP for the system for the City of Hermann?
20	A. I am not.
21	Q. So you would not and there may be
22	others obviously they may be discussing with
23	municipalities in addition to the City of Hermann
24	A. They're
25	Q that would not necessarily involve the

1	Staff?
2	A. Yeah. I they do not come to the Staff
3	and let us know what other acquisitions that they're
4	thinking about. Yeah, I have no idea.
5	Q. Thank you.
6	JUDGE JONES: Public Water Supply
7	Di stri cts?
8	MR. DORITY: No questions.
9	JUDGE JONES: StoneBridge? Triumph?
10	Public Counsel?
11	MR. POSTON: Yes, a few.
12	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. POSTON:
13	Q. You were talking with the Chairman about
14	your rationale for your three districts. And one of
15	them was the ability to acquire these struggling
16	systems. And the Chairman mentioned 393.320 and I was
17	able to pull it up here and I just want to read a
18	paragraph real quick.
19	And it says, Upon the date of the this
20	was in subsection 6. Upon the date of the acquisition
21	of a small water utility by a large water public
22	utility, whether or not the procedures for
23	establishing rate-making rate-base provided by this
24	section have been utilized, the small water utility
25	shall, for rate-making purposes, become part of an

existing service area as defined by the Public Service Commission of the acquiring large water public utility that is either contiguous to the small water utility, the closest geographically to the small water utility or best suited due to operational -- operational or other factors. This consolidation shall be approved by the Public Service Commission in its order approving the acquisition.

So I guess my question is, the law seems to already provide relief for Missouri American when it acquires a struggling system to be able to put it into another system; is that correct? Into another -- into an already existing district?

- A. They have the ability to assign that to a -- to an already existing district.
- Q. And the Commission has fairly wide discretion into what system they put it in?
- A. Right. But, you know, when we do that, we have not yet, you know, to agree to the rates on a going-forward basis. So -- so Staff is believing that if we can consolidate into three districts, then that would be -- the assignment would be better.
- Q. But I mean, coming up with the rates, that's not an insurmountable task to develop the rates and have the Commission approve those rates; is that

1	correct?
2	A. Yeah. That's correct.
3	Q. And then the other reason you talked
4	about was people looking over the fence at their
5	neighbors' rates.
6	A. Uh-huh.
7	Q. So are you staying that somebody in
8	Jefferson City will walk down the street to their
9	neighbor in Ferguson and look at their rate?
10	A. Well, that's a pretty long walk to get
11	from Jeff City to Ferguson. But I do know that there
12	are I've heard consumers compare their rates to
13	friends and family who live in very disparate parts of
14	the state.
15	Q. All right. That's all I have. Thank
16	you.
17	JUDGE JONES: Missouri American Water?
18	MR. ENGLAND: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ENGLAND:
20	Q. Mr. Busch, I want to follow-up on a
21	question I believe Commissioner Rupp was asking you
22	regarding sort of one extreme or the other; full or
23	single tariff pricing for everybody
24	A. I remember that.
25	Q or full district-specific pricing.

A. And I remember that.
Q. And I want to explore the full
district-specific pricing because that results in
rates that not only would be characterized as rate
shock, but perhaps unaffordable, wouldn't it?
A. Without calculating the rates as they
are, based upon the revenue requirement, yes, I think
you could see some very high rates. I'm thinking of
Brunswick, already pays a 22 dollar customer charge
and a \$10.85 per thousand gallon usage. And according
to the revenue requirements by Staff, their rates
would go up 80 percent. So yes, you would in the
Brunswick area for sure you would see massive rate
shock.
Q. So as a practical matter, one end of the
spectrum really isn't possible. Right? Full
district-specific pricing.
A. It's possible, but I would not recommend
it. That would be I mean the rates would be a
hundred dollars or more for water service.
Q. Okay. Well, certainly on full
single-tariff pricing that is possible?
A. You could also go to single-tariff
pricing as well.
Q. But we won't have the problem of people

1	being priced out of the ability to purchase water,
2	will we?
3	A. I believe with the more consolidation you
4	do, the less likely you are to have rates that are
5	unaffordabl e.
6	Q. Thank you, sir.
7	JUDGE JONES: And redirect?
8	MS. MYERS: Yes. Before I begin my
9	redirect, I wanted to answer a question that Chairman
10	Hall had posed. He had asked where he could find
11	look up the cases of systems that had been recently
12	acquired by Missouri American Water.
13	So in Staff's cost-of-service reports on
14	page 3, there is a chart that lists the system name,
15	the utility type, the location of those systems, case
16	numbers and then the date they were approved by the
17	Commission. And, again, that's page 3 of Staff's
18	revenue requirement cost-of-service report.
19	REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. MYERS:
20	Q. And with that said, Mr. Busch, you were
21	asked multiple questions about cost causation. And
22	when formulating this proposal, this district
23	consolidation proposal, did Staff consider cost
24	causati on?
25	A. I believe so.

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24 25

- Did Staff you think, in your opinion, 0. deviate from the basic principles of cost causation in formulating this principle?
- Α. I don't think we deviated from the basic principles of cost causation.
- Q. And also you were asked several questions I noted from Joplin as well as from St. Joseph, questions about interconnection and just how in light of these districts, they're not interconnected and so it doesn't make sense to lump them together or to group them together.
 - Α. That is correct.
- 0. When looking at other service utilities and when they come up with service areas and even rates, you know, is interconnection really that important or is that a characteristic for all of these utilities?
- Α. It -- it's not a characteristic of all utilities. You know, listening to the witness from Joplin today got me thinking about other areas. And so I went up and I looked in the natural gas industry. And I was thinking of MGE because back when I was at -- when I was first with Staff back in the late '90s, I worked in the gas department -- in the Procurement and Analysis Department. Then when I went

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 to Public Counsel, I spent a lot of time in the gas world.

And MGE, you know, which is now purchased by Laclede, provides service to Joplin, Kansas City and St. Joseph. Those are not interconnected systems at all, but they all have one rate. And then for their -- the customer charge and the volumetric charge. And then you have the PGA/ACA, which is the cost of the gas, which is different pipelines provide that gas to Joplin and then different -- you know, up to Kansas City and then up to St. Joe. They have one PGA rate that's blended together for all of their customers.

So it's a very similar concept of what Staff is proposing here as to what has already been approved for years by -- in the natural gas industry. Ameren has a similar concept with its gas prices as well.

- Q. And you were also asked multiple questions about your time with the Office of Public Counsel, particularly your involvement in a 2000 Missouri American Water rate case. Who does the Office of Public Counsel represent?
- The Office of Public Counsel represents Α. the consumers.

Q. And who does the Public Service
Commission the Missouri Public Service Commission
represent?
A. I don't believe the Commission represents
anybody. The Commission is supposed to balance the
public interest between the consumer and the
investor-owned utilities.
Q. So does it make sense that OPC may have a
different position than, say, the Missouri Public
Service Commission?
A. Oh, Public Counsel and Staff have many
different positions.
Q. Do they often disagree?
A. We often disagree. We agree a lot too.
We it's it's a very enjoyable
rel ati onshi p.
Q. And so at that time when you were with
the Office of Public Counsel, which represents the
public at large, you were proposing a different rate
design or rate scheme consolidation scheme, l
should say?
A. Again, I don't want to agree with it was
a scheme.
Q. I'll avoid using scheme. I apologize.
A. We proposed a district-specific

philosophy at the -- in the 2000 case.

2 3

phi I osophy?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25 0. And now you're proposing a consolidation

- Α. And now with the Staff, we are proposing a consolidated rate structure.
 - Q. What conditions have changed since then?
- Α. As I pointed out, you know, the Company is -- you know, was at seven distinct districts of relatively similar size except for the City of Brunswick and now it has expanded, purchased the St. Louis County, purchased the Jeff City utilities, purchased many smaller systems and even some larger systems.

So that's a big -- the Company's It provides wastewater service. It never provided wastewater service, at least in Missouri, back in -- in the year 2000. And I believe that the overall discussion of the, you know, infrastructure needs in the water and wastewater industries have -has real his been discussed nationwide over the last 15 years. It wasn't -- it may have been out there, but again, as Public Counsel, I wasn't that involved with it, so --

Q. Ms. Bell had asked if you had educated Joplin specifically on consolidation. There was a

1	local public hearing in Joplin. Correct?
2	A. There was.
3	Q. And that's part of the rate case
4	procedure, is it not?
5	A. It is.
6	Q. And what what happens in a local
7	public hearing?
8	A. Local public hearings before a local
9	public hearing starts, there is a question and answer
10	session to for the consumers to ask questions to
11	get answers because during the actual local public
12	hearing when the Judge and the Commissioners are
13	there, they are not you know, they can't answer the
14	questions that the consumers have.
15	And so it allows for the Company, Public
16	Counsel and Staff to get up and try to answer
17	questions that the customers may have and to we
18	hear complaints. The we discussed earlier about
19	the Riverside issue, we learned all about the
20	Riverside issue. So it's an opportunity for the
21	Company, OPC and Staff to present its position to the
22	customers and then to answer questions and try to be
23	informative to the customers.
24	Q. And so that would present an opportunity
25	for consolidation to be discussed if there were

questions about it?

2 3

consolidation process, yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

If there were questions about the Α.

Q. 0kay. There are a lot of concerns about when you move towards consolidation. There's risks of over-investment. Do you agree with the more you consolidate, the greater the risk of over-investment?

Α. I think that is a -- excuse me. think that's a very real concern. And as I put forth in my testimony, I believe my Rebuttal Testimony, that I would recommend that the Commission order the Company, if we do consolidate rates, to submit like a five-year plan.

I think the -- if I'm not mistaken, the parties talked about a ten-year plan in their -- in their non-unanimous, but that they would submit their plan for investment five years, especially focusing on what's going to happen in the upcoming year to give Public Counsel, Staff and any other interested party an opportunity to understand what the Company's proposals are going to be.

It wouldn't be a pre-approval process because, you know, I don't think anybody here is agreeing to pre-approve. But it gives the parties an opportunity to understand what the -- what the Company

is proposing to do and to maybe make suggestions in a manner to find maybe a better or at least a lower cost alternative than what the Company's thinking about.

Q. All right. Thank you. And Commissioner Rupp had asked you a question, you know, why aren't you comfortable just moving to single-tariff pricing. When you move towards single-tariff pricing, is the risk greater then of over-investment even with -- if you have some sort of oversight versus our three-district plan?

A. I -- you know, I agree that as -- you get further away. Because, you know, an issue that is brought up -- and I don't disagree -- is that when you -- when you start to spread out those investments over a larger group, the overall impact on the consumers is less. And it makes it easier to -- for the Company, because they're going to get a return on that investment.

So if they can get a little bit higher return from a higher investment and it's -- the rates aren't going up as much, that's a real concern, in my opinion. And I think it's a concern of some of the others in the room as well.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Busch.

JUDGE JONES: Thank you, Mr. Busch. You

1	may step down.
2	Okay. I think we should probably call it
3	a night. Am I to understand am I to understand
4	that OPC's witness Smith is next?
5	MR. POSTON: It was my understanding
6	nobody was going to have questions for him, so you had
7	agreed to let him be dismissed.
8	JUDGE JONES: And the only witnesses
9	witness that we have then for tomorrow on this issue
10	is Marke. Right?
11	MR. POSTON: Yes.
12	JUDGE JONES: Because McDermott and
13	Collins aren't available until the afternoon on
14	Wednesday?
15	MR. ENGLAND: That's correct, Your Honor.
16	JUDGE JONES: Okay. All right.
17	MR. ENGLAND: Your Honor, because of
18	Mr. Herbert's travel schedule, could we put him
19	then the need for him to be cross-examined on rate
20	design issues to the extent parties have those
21	questions and the extent that he's going to support
22	modifications to Exhibits 48, 49, 50 and 51 and
23	parties may want to ask additional questions, would it
24	be wise to put him on first to try to get him done by
25	noon?

1	JUDGE JONES: Well, the only witness we
2	would have otherwise is Marke on consolidation.
3	MR. ENGLAND: Right.
4	JUDGE JONES: Do you think we can do both
5	of them by noon? At the rate we've been going, maybe
6	we can't. I don't know.
7	MR. ENGLAND: And that may be possible,
8	but at least if we start with Herbert, hopefully we'll
9	be certain to get him done by noon.
10	JUDGE JONES: Does anyone have any strong
11	feelings about that? Okay. We can do that.
12	MR. ENGLAND: Thank you.
13	JUDGE JONES: Do you all think we can get
14	through all the witnesses tomorrow? Is there anyone
15	that doesn't think we can?
16	MR. ENGLAND: Just a second.
17	JUDGE JONES: Without my glasses on, I
18	can't see.
19	MR. ENGLAND: Through all of the issues
20	or the witnesses on
21	JUDGE JONES: All the issues. I mean the
22	only real the only issue left is rate design and
23	then low-income tariff. Right?
24	MR. ENGLAND: I'm as interested as
25	anybody in getting it done by the end of the day. I'm

1	just reluctant to make that guarantee today
2	toni ght.
3	JUDGE JONES: Well, you know, you can't
4	make a guarantee. Here, I'll suggest this: For yes
5	and no questions, I will insist on yes or no answers.
6	You don't need to embellish or talk about things that,
7	you know, explain away why you say yes or no. So if
8	you get witnesses get a yes or no question, give a
9	yes or no answer and let your attorney rehabilitate
10	you, if that's necessary. We'll try that for
11	tomorrow.
12	All right. Let's go off the record.
13	(Staff Exhibit 33 was marked for
14	i denti fi cati on.)
15	(Joplin Exhibit 2 was marked for
16	i denti fi cati on.)
17	(Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned
18	until 9:00 a.m., March 23, 2016.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	LNDEV
1	I NDEX
2	REGULATORY POLICY ISSUE
3	Opening Statement by Mr. Cooper 88 Opening Statement by Mr. Thompson 94
4	Opening Statement by Mr. Poston 99 Opening Statement by Mr. Bednar 108
5	Opening Statement by Mr. Curtis 113
6	MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY EVIDENCE
7	CHERYL NORTON Direct Examination by Mr. Cooper 115
8	Cross-Exami nation by Mr. Bednar 118 Cross-Exami nation by Mr. Lawyer 126
9	Cross-Examination by Mr. Curtis 127 Cross-Examination by Mr. Dority 128
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Poston 134 Cross-Examination by Mr. Thompson 135
11	Questions by Chairman Hall 137 Questions by Commissioner Stoll 147
12	Questions by Commissioner Kenney 149
13	Questions by Commissioner Rupp 153 Questions by Commissioner Coleman 166
	Recross-Examination by Mr. Downey 174
14	Recross-Examination by Mr. Bednar 179
15	Recross-Examination by Ms. Bell 181 Recross-Examination by Mr. Poston 183 Recross-Examination by Mr. Thompson 188
16	Redirect Examination by Mr. Cooper 189
17	JOHN WATKINS
18	Direct Examination by Mr. Cooper 194 Questions by Chairman Hall 197
19	Questions by Commissioner Stoll 207 Recross-Examination by Mr. Poston 208
20	Redirect Examination by Mr. Cooper 210
21	EDWARD HAYE Direct Examination by Mr. Cooper 212
22	Questions by Chairman Hall 216
23	
23	
25	

ĺ		
1	OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION	EVI DENCE
2	GEOFF MARKE	LVIDENCE
3	Direct Examination by Mr. Poston Cross-Examination by Mr. Downey 219	218
4	Cross-Examination by Ms. Bell Cross-Examination by Mr. Bednar 225	223
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Cooper 229 Redirect Examination by Mr. Poston	232
6	STAFF OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC	232
7	SERVICE COMMISSION EVIDENCE	
8	NATELLE DIETRICH Direct Examination by Mr. Thompson	232
9	Questions by Chairman Hall 235 Recross-Examination by Mr. Poston	238
10	CONSOLIDATED PRICING ISSUE	
11		240
12	Opening Statement by Mr. England Opening Statement by Ms. Myers	248
13	Opening Statement by Mr. Poston 252 Opening Statement by Mr. Antal	257
14	Opening Statement by Mr. Downey 262 Opening Statement by Mr. Drag	273
15	Opening Statement by Ms. Bell Opening Statement by Mr. Lawyer 306 Opening Statement by Mr. Curtis 308	276
16	Opening Statement by Mr. Dority 311	
17	CITY OF JOPLIN EVIDENCE	
18	LESLIE HAASE Direct Examination by Ms. Bell	289
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Bednar 291 Cross-Examination by Mr. England	292
20	Questions by Chairman Hall 293 Recross-Examination by Mr. Bednar	296
21	Recross-Examination by Mr. England Redirect Examination by Ms. Bell	298 299
22	J	
23		
24		
25		

1		1
,	OLTV OF DIVERGINE EVIDENCE	
1 2	CITY OF RIVERSIDE EVIDENCE KATHLEEN ROSE	
2	Direct Examination by Mr. Bednar	331
3	Cross-Examination by Ms. Bell	334
4	Questions by Commissioner Kenney Recross-Examination by Mr. Poston	339 342
_	Redirect Examination by Mr. Bednar	342
5	MISSOURI AMERICAN WATER COMPANY EVIDENCE	
6	PAUL HERBERT	
7	Direct Examination by Mr. England	344
8	Cross-Examination by Mr. Antal Cross-Examination by Mr. Downey 360	359
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Bell	365
9	Cross-Examination by Mr. Bednar 369 Cross-Examination by Mr. Lawyer 371	
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Dority 374	
11	Cross-Examination by Mr. Poston 378 Questions by Chairman Hall 383	
	Questions by Commissioner Stoll 384	
12	Questions by Commissioner Kenney Questions by Commissioner Rupp	385 386
13	Further Questions by Chairman Hall	387
14	Redirect Examination by Mr. England 393	
	STAFF OF THE MISSOURI	
15	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION EVIDENCE	
16	JAMES A. BUSCH Direct Examination by Ms. Myers 401	
17	Cross-Examination by Mr. Downey 406	411
18	Cross-Examination by Ms. Bell Cross-Examination by Mr. Bednar 426	411
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Lawyer 432	
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Poston 439 Cross-Examination by Mr. England	448
20	Questions by Chairman Hall 465	
21	Questions by Commissioner Stoll 477 Recross-Examination by Ms. Bell 493	
22	Recross-Examination by Mr. Bednar Recross-Examination by Mr. Curtis	496 501
	Recross-Examination by Mr. Poston	502
23	Recross-Examination by Mr. England Redirect Examination by Ms. Myers	504 506
24		
25		

j			
1	EXHIBIT INDEX	MADVED	DECLD
2	MAWC: MAWC Exhibit 7	MARKED	
3	Herbert Direct Testimony	72	359
4 5	MAWC Exhibit 8 Herbert Supplemental Testimony	72	359
6	MAWC Exhibit 9 Herbert Rebuttal Testimony 72 359		
7	MAWC Exhibit 10 Herbert Surrebuttal Testimony	72	359
8 9	MAWC Exhibit 11 Kartmann Corrected Direct Testimony	72 117	
10 11	MAWC Exhibit 22 Petry Rebuttal Testimony	72	214
12	MAWC Exhibit 23 Petry Surrebuttal Testimony	72	214
13	MAWC Exhibit 38 VerDouw Direct Testimony	72	214
1415	MAWC Exhibit 39 Watkins Surrebuttal Testimony	72	196
16	MAWC Exhibit 46 Norton Witness Qualifications	72	117
1718	MAWC Exhibit 47 Haye Witness Qualifications	85	214
19	MAWC Exhibit 48 MAWC Analysis344		
2021	MAWC Exhibit 49 MAWC Analysis344		
22	MAWC Exhibit 50		
23	MAWC Analysis344		
24	MAWC Exhibit 51 City of Riverside proposal 344		
25	MAWC Exhibit 52		

1	MIEC: MIEC Exhibit 5		
2	Direct Testimony of Brian C. Collins	85	
3	CITY OF JOPLIN:		
4	Joplin Exhibit 1 Rebuttal Testimony of Leslie Haase	71	290
5	Joplin Exhibit 2		
6	Illinois Notice of Proposed Change in Scheduled Rates	516	225
7	CITY OF RIVERSIDE:		
8	Riverside Exhibit 1 Direct Testimony of Kathleen L. Rose	85	334
9	Riverside Exhibit 2	OE	
10	Listing of Kathleen L. Rose	85	
11	Riverside Exhibit 3 Field Test Agreement	85	144
12	OPC:		
13	OPC Exhibit 9 Direct Testimony of Geoff Marke 72 219	9	
14	OPC Exhibit 10	70	040
15	Rebuttal Testimony of Geoff Marke	72	219
16	OPC Exhibit 11 Rebuttal Testimony of Geoff Marke	72	219
17	OPC Exhibit 12		
18	Surrebuttal Testimony of Geoff Marke	72	219
19	STAFF: Staff Exhibit 3		
	Class Cost of Service and Rate Design	7.0	10/
20	Report	72	406
21	Staff Exhibit 9 Direct Testimony of James A. Busch	72	406
22	Staff Exhibit 10	- —	
23	Rebuttal Testimony of James A. Busch	72	406
24	Staff Exhibit 11 Rebuttal Testimony of James. A. Busch	72	406
25	Reputtal restribility of James. A. Buscil	12	400

```
1
     Staff Exhibit 12
     Surrebuttal Testimony of James A. Busch 72 406
 2
     Staff Exhibit 32
Letter from Mr. Kartmann to City
 3
     of Arnold
                                              135
                                                        137
 4
     Staff Exhibit 33
Natelle Dietrich's Credentials 516
                                                          234
 5
     Staff Exhibit 34
6
     Staff's proposed districts401 406
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Ι,.	455.00.456.11	100 1 040 10	222 25 401 4
A	academic	455:23 456:11	192:1 243:12	332:25 401:4
a.m 516:18	391:16	achieving	392:9 436:18	501:23
ab 454:5	accept 242:14	148:12	462:24 465:10	additional 92:11
aback 440:24	242:21 291:8	acknowledge	465:20 467:4	107:19 108:1
abides 248:23	acceptability	135:23 482:11	467:14,15	183:25 269:25
ability 123:18	280:19	acknowledged	473:4 474:17	270:5 285:16
302:16 304:11	acceptance	305:3 312:23	493:8 501:16	329:10,11
367:15 429:12	242:12	314:1 422:6	502:20 503:8	344:14 387:5
464:15 490:24	accepted 209:14	acknowledges	acquisitions	421:24 422:25
502:15 503:14	223:2 270:7	409:23	107:15 139:7,8	425:23 446:21
506:1	401:1	acquire 98:14	140:9 182:22	514:23
able 92:2 95:1	accepting	140:2,3 141:12	183:12 282:16	address 99:22
108:21 109:24	326:13	174:23 268:18	462:19 473:5	109:24 159:10
122:7 140:21	accepts 176:17	286:6 301:1	502:3	161:10 162:22
141:1,18 149:8	access 249:6	422:20,24	Acres 250:12	169:15 184:6
159:25 161:10	accommodate	423:2,3,4,12	across-the-bo	198:14,17
161:16,25	239:3	443:3,9,10,14	324:20	199:4,12 200:6
170:7 171:19	accommodati	474:5 502:15	act 101:9 264:13	200:17,18
188:15 199:19	331:5	acquired 147:8	285:14 300:21	201:18,24
206:20 216:7	accomplishes	149:14 322:11	acted 164:13	204:6 206:6
269:25 307:22	445:10	423:9,10 424:1	acting 96:19	210:16 211:25
329:3 341:12	account 86:14	446:20,23	actions 333:9,10	237:13,16
343:20 386:22	203:9 237:22	463:6 466:7,12	acts 101:6	261:4 270:25
397:20 399:10	259:11 457:16	475:11 499:2	226:23	274:9 315:20
429:20 430:25	accountable	506:12	actual 89:21	326:16 327:25
442:15 484:6	281:6	acquires 422:15	144:10 224:7	328:14 329:2
502:17 503:11	accounts 179:21	444:9 503:11	277:14,17	addressed
absent 136:5	179:23 322:21	acquiring	294:8 414:23	111:21 166:11
Absenteeism	accuracy 378:19	107:17 135:1	415:5,7,17	167:3,11 201:7
163:15	accurate 128:25	268:20 284:19	433:4 492:2	210:9 238:21
Absolutely	193:13 202:1	421:23 432:15	494:25 495:9	277:9 322:13
124:24 155:15	204:7 210:25	433:15 441:23	511:11	420:12 463:20
164:3,5 186:15	216:14,15	442:9 474:4	add 140:6 285:4	475:24 489:8,9
418:2	243:19 378:14	493:24 494:7,8	332:10 366:5,6	addresses
absorb 114:14	449:1 450:18	494:9 498:23	478:21,22	238:16 255:16
176:14 243:9	accurately 202:5	499:23 503:2	added 90:1	addressing
363:19 367:15	233:22 398:9	acquisition 98:5	107:11,12	120:23 161:23
458:12 459:3	accused 472:20	138:4,12,22	168:13 271:1	adequate 93:17
500:9	achieve 243:15	139:12 141:23	481:7	237:24 249:6
absorbed 480:4	284:19 311:5	141:25 142:5	addition 120:18	431:4
absorbing	achieved 243:23	142:19,21	122:24 192:5	adequately
153:19 176:20	314:9 321:15	148:20 153:9	268:12 270:1	238:16
absurd 373:21	457:23	154:1,2 191:16	271:10 282:9	adhering 311:6
373:24,24	achieves 282:6	191:20,25	286:5 296:11	adjourned
373.21,21				
L				

	-	-	-	
516:17	advance 284:8	257:24 262:9	341:14 398:13	327:22 328:10
adjust 89:22	advantage	262:22 293:16	399:8 412:4	329:17 410:10
386:19	100:24 254:23	293:17 312:1	415:12 416:20	445:19 447:13
adjusted 363:15	265:4 277:4	334:16 342:4	417:13,20	450:18 456:7
386:8,9	280:1,2 371:16	355:18 359:19	419:1 420:1,2	473:13 521:11
adjustment	430:23	360:17,18	420:9 425:16	agreements
199:8 203:23	advantages	365:10,11	444:9 447:16	123:18 190:7
319:1 408:23	119:19 254:24	371:23,24,25	455:14,21	491:16
497:2	284:5,6,7	383:4,5 384:18	456:8,16,20,22	agrees 151:7
adjustments	313:18	384:19 514:13	461:17 464:18	446:18
91:5 95:25	adverse 274:19	AG 427:15	465:15 468:12	ahead 85:14
371:9 487:13	adverse 485:20	age 147:19,21	468:16 469:13	87:23 114:19
496:18	adversely	334:20	470:5 496:6,19	194:4 208:24
administration	485:20	agencies 314:2	497:11 499:18	221:18 231:13
343:11	advise 129:25	agency 301:5	503:19 509:14	239:3,20 287:2
administrative	advising 315:6	313:16	509:22 512:6	288:25 300:5
284:23 373:20	advisors 150:6	aggressive	513:11	321:2,4,7
administrator	advocated	138:12,14,24	agreed 136:5	330:25 347:16
148:3	243:14 255:20	139:1,11,22	142:20 192:11	360:9,12
admissibility	308:17	433:5 474:8,21	226:17 271:11	380:10 396:23
398:11	advocating	474:22,24	310:16 323:13	401:2 404:9
admission	315:12	aging 92:9 237:2	331:11 349:12	437:21
137:10 234:1	aesthetic 121:8	341:17	458:5,7 459:7	aid 399:14
397:6	affect 389:24	agnostic 242:13	459:23 476:5	al 377:4
admit 496:9	477:8 485:20	ago 222:11	491:23 514:7	al 354:10
admitted 117:21	affirmed 114:25	233:20 271:24	agreed-to	456:21
137:14 144:1	194:19 212:13	273:22 305:15	349:13 354:11	Alex 257:25
196:9 214:19	218:12 232:17	305:16 348:23	356:7	359:13
219:15 225:13	289:3 331:15	425:7 461:15	agreed-upon	ALEXANDER
234:10 290:11	344:21 396:17	agree 134:22,25	259:1	83:15
333:24 358:15	afford 96:6,18	136:4 151:9	agreeing 512:24	aligned 390:16
359:5 400:2	96:19 97:19	152:25 176:5	agreement 85:11	all-inclusive
406:5 449:9	141:15 282:20	187:13 191:12	94:13,14 95:1	363:25
adopt 498:7	282:22	209:21 227:7	110:14 123:21	all-time 134:23
adopted 111:23	affordability	230:3,5 231:1	123:24 124:2,4	allegation
129:2 173:14	106:10 237:20	231:12 236:2,5	124:6 143:19	225:21
220:12 435:3	affordable 98:3	247:1 251:20	143:20 144:7	alleviate 169:17
498:17	98:10 112:19	260:3 271:3	144:13 154:8	alleviates 497:25
adopting 115:18	113:11 119:24	287:14 304:9	190:3 209:14	Allison 441:2
116:6,23	243:11	320:15 322:19	209:15 239:18	allocate 244:14
195:13,19,24	afforded 316:23	323:7 328:6	242:23 255:16	494:20 495:2
213:6,18,23	afraid 481:12	334:25 335:8	257:1 258:25	495:15,20
214:9 315:24	afternoon	339:19,22	321:1,8 325:7	allocated 250:16
410:20	235:20,21	340:11,13	325:8,10	252:13 282:7

		_		
456:13 478:3	128:15,19,21	432:14,19,24	analogy 309:3,5	163:2,24
478:10,15	129:8 134:11	433:9,14	analyses 391:17	175:25 183:9
479:14 483:4	134:11,12,13	440:17,20	395:5	185:2,14,16
allocating	134:16,19	441:15 442:5	analysis 198:10	190:8,24 191:3
479:11 495:12	135:2 136:15	442:21 443:1,6	198:18 199:1	195:7 201:1,3
allocation 244:9	137:5 141:12	443:14 444:9	259:5,7,8,10	206:20 213:1
285:8 455:17	146:10,10	447:7 448:1	259:17,22	216:7 221:4
456:17,20,21	149:10 150:7	456:23 457:17	260:10,17,25	257:20 271:15
500:9	151:13,14	461:20 466:4	261:2 293:18	271:21 295:4
allocations	152:20 155:24	471:1 472:3	312:22 349:7	319:20 324:13
244:11 298:14	172:18 173:6	478:9,20 479:6	353:23 355:14	325:8 360:2
494:15,16	184:12 189:21	479:8 482:10	356:25 376:9	379:8 380:10
500:22	194:15 195:2	497:14 501:16	385:23 399:9	380:18,21,22
allow 130:23	196:8 198:2,6	501:17 503:10	446:3 507:25	400:9,12
183:25 255:17	202:25 212:6	504:17 506:12	Analysis344	409:17 506:9
284:19 286:8	212:22 216:12	508:22 517:6	520:19,21,22	511:9,13,16,22
431:2 463:8	217:8 221:8,9	519:5	analyzed 445:25	516:9
473:25	221:23 222:4	American's 85:8	anchor 281:18	answered
allowed 121:13	222:12 223:18	88:11 89:10	317:18	380:17 466:3,3
205:13 206:13	223:25 229:21	91:18 99:25	Anderson	469:18
allows 95:12	235:13 236:1,4	136:10 182:17	280:11,23	answering
112:16 119:22	236:14,17,21	279:19 283:13	Andrew 83:10	380:19 439:23
319:15 511:15	240:6,20	284:4 286:16	83:11 128:13	440:1,1 472:20
alluded 98:8	241:11 249:22	422:24 444:19	312:4 319:10	answers 117:8
191:4	249:24 254:22	479:19	319:11	117:10 184:23
alluvial 470:18	255:11 256:14	amount 109:8	angry 340:9	185:12 195:24
alongside 93:6	256:16,19	130:1 136:24	Anna 250:5,24	196:2 214:9,11
alternative	268:18,20,23	153:16 156:16	271:4 322:14	219:7 251:6
445:16 513:3	269:20,22	162:14,15	454:1,5 466:14	289:25 290:3
amazed 372:18	270:23 277:25	178:15,18,18	466:17 467:16	357:22,24
amended 386:1	285:16 286:1	206:2 220:25	467:20 468:1	405:18 511:11
Ameren 256:12	287:16 292:1	235:22 260:17	annual 140:11	516:5
428:5,7 483:8	295:6 300:17	334:21 352:8	140:12 191:13	Antal 83:15
508:17	300:18 307:7	370:6 374:16	213:24 297:7	108:8 118:4
American 88:9	312:9,15 331:3	385:14 404:24	301:21 309:21	196:17 215:2
89:5 90:1,11	332:13 337:22	447:17 455:22	annually 323:24	219:21 234:18
93:16,20,23,25	338:21 339:15	456:13 474:16	348:6	257:24,25
94:2 96:8,22	342:5 344:8	479:13 487:11	anonymous	259:25 260:4
96:23 97:3	345:9 390:24	488:9 494:20	266:1	260:10,13
98:7,14 100:5	392:8,12	494:22	answer 97:19	261:7,8 290:18
102:8 103:9	408:20 415:20	amounts 89:12	115:13,19	334:8 359:10
107:10 114:20	422:15,20	121:20 130:21	146:19 149:9	359:13,23
114:21 115:9	426:4,23 428:6	206:24 258:23	151:25 154:12	360:7 406:22
118:18 127:22	429:8,9,22	259:12 414:9	157:15,25	492:21 518:13
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	1	1	1	1
519:7	167:16	327:2 329:18	483:23 484:1,3	136:1,6,19,22
Antal's 261:4	appliances 91:7	337:11 377:9	485:8,20,21	153:15 154:1
anticipate 139:1	91:8 105:2	402:21 419:25	486:25 487:5	184:16 250:22
139:3 305:10	125:10 168:24	429:13 482:5	489:5 495:1,17	323:16,18
305:15 475:3	333:6	appropriately	503:1 505:13	329:3,12,24
anticipated	applicable	93:9	areas 82:15 97:4	356:1 404:15
130:8 261:16	383:20	approval 277:12	97:11 148:1	404:16 407:21
anticipating	application	423:5	153:21 244:24	440:4,5,23
126:10	249:20	approve 256:25	245:11 249:24	446:5,6,11,17
anybody 326:10	applied 356:6	276:10 277:11	249:25 253:4	447:1,12,19
382:20 399:7	applies 111:22	503:25	270:22 275:2	454:11,22
429:9 447:15	363:12	approved 259:2	312:7 335:1,9	456:3 457:9,15
464:7 495:6	apply 99:22	278:5 316:11	471:6 490:4	457:17,18
496:12 497:17	100:14 245:1	375:22 503:6	507:14,20	458:15,16
509:5 512:23	490:10	506:16 508:16	arguably 277:17	459:18,23
515:25	appointed	approving	argue 334:19	460:5 466:15
anybody's	427:25	281:25 467:4	338:5 367:15	477:5,11,13,14
301:15 330:6	apportionment	467:14 503:7	399:11,14,15	477:15 480:14
anyone's 495:19	265:21	approximately	421:16 427:12	522:3
anyway 151:11	appreciate	88:19,24 89:2	437:5 494:6	arrange 189:23
220:3	85:20 143:9	120:6 190:21	argued 264:2	arranged 189:21
apart 189:24	229:16 273:1	203:7 246:10	282:5,9 337:9	arrangement
254:15	287:7 288:6	273:17,20	337:24 338:6	292:23
apologize 149:23	291:14 319:1	307:18,21	427:10,12,16	art 244:13
436:3 453:23	328:9 330:18	365:14 395:7	468:9 482:7	312:24 456:18
509:24	371:18 374:18	396:1 454:3	argues 284:16	456:21
apparent 230:24	374:22 377:17	apt 424:24	285:3,15,24	articulate 484:6
apparently	378:7 387:1	arbitrariness	arguing 247:7	articulated
387:9	approach	265:23	247:16 288:17	457:7
Appeals 91:24	124:22 130:10	area 97:3,10,17	382:13 389:8	aside 180:2
247:22	168:25 199:12	158:7,16 162:3	427:18,19	399:2 496:6
appear 219:7	200:5,13,17	165:11 174:9	argument 285:3	asked 87:9,21
225:5 245:14	233:10 268:13	176:4,23 243:6	287:6,15	102:24 184:21
382:19 450:22	284:25 302:20	247:16 299:3	294:22 340:24	210:3,12,18
appeared	343:12 388:1,2	307:8,10 319:3	341:15 367:16	223:16 238:13
240:16	445:19 468:16	334:22 356:5	367:17,18	276:24 289:24
appearing 258:1	approaches	368:12,13	407:22 421:21	307:22 314:15
345:8	241:23	406:14 424:6,7	427:14 491:6	324:12 342:6,9
appears 269:23	appropriate	424:8,18 426:6	argumentative	369:19 372:3
375:1	93:2,7 119:22	429:2 434:25	380:5 460:25	392:22 393:3
applaud 311:1	140:23 200:23	435:21 442:9	arguments	405:17 432:13
apples-to-apples	200:24 247:24	471:5,12 472:7	111:16,18	439:22,25
259:18	249:13 282:15	472:13,15	175:13 254:17	441:4 443:2
appliance	307:9 319:3	480:1 482:24	Arnold 104:22	461:5 462:17
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	1	1	·	
463:25 466:22	210:21 395:3	attended 439:16	Avenue 84:5	158:12 160:16
474:20 486:8	Associates	attention 188:19	average 120:5	164:4,12
494:4 501:6	252:22 262:18	251:11 319:19	162:15 228:7,8	166:13 171:18
506:10,21	assume 192:1	348:22 354:23	228:9 243:5	191:9 201:1
507:6 508:19	378:19 391:15	355:13 356:14	259:10 269:1	202:17 260:24
510:24 513:5	414:23 415:18	370:14 432:25	298:5 301:18	260:24 261:19
asking 110:19	465:11	451:2	301:19 309:20	262:21 273:24
124:23 157:8	assuming 134:2	attorney 83:2,3	310:9 350:11	278:20 295:22
193:2 279:14	236:15 238:19	83:3,7,12,18	350:12	309:4 313:7
325:17 436:3	383:7,7 414:17	83:22,22 84:1	average- 252:17	314:1,20,21
438:4 487:24	414:18 415:9	84:4,8,8,12	averaging 247:8	321:2 333:10
504:21	415:16 443:11	227:5 304:9,9	247:24	357:17 376:23
asks 406:13,17	448:23 498:11	359:13 443:20	avoid 242:24	384:10 386:19
aspect 252:6	assumption	493:11 499:21	265:22 285:24	396:15 400:13
370:14	400:10 414:25	516:9	300:14 323:14	427:25 437:5
aspects 324:19	415:7	attorneys	469:1 477:20	440:22 450:14
Assembly 257:6	assumptions	144:15	509:24	450:19,24
303:1 467:8	258:14	attr 329:11	avoidance 263:9	453:24 461:14
498:17	assure 145:25	attributable	266:4	467:13 486:17
assess 280:15	157:16	329:12 363:18	aware 123:16,21	490:12 498:15
assessing 125:12	assurety 140:21	attribute 163:10	126:14,17	507:22,23
assessment	At 356:5	attributes	181:6,16,20	510:17
256:25	att 444:4	265:15	237:7 291:5	background
assets 217:4,5,11	attached 187:21	audibly 175:25	297:25 298:25	88:14 273:16
assign 503:14	234:6 313:21	auditing 495:13	318:21 335:19	backing 428:15
assigned 248:25	342:17 347:3	auditors 457:4	366:23 367:1,8	backyard 96:21
352:20 416:25	348:8 358:3	authority 82:14	367:13 369:11	backyards
454:4 463:9	461:10	101:10 277:11	372:4,7,8	428:17
467:20 475:12	attachment	277:18 302:4	391:15,18	bad 496:23
479:20 494:17	461:24 462:2	302:24 303:2,2	412:17,21	badly 121:12
494:19	attain 153:10	303:2 304:13	418:5,7,19,20	Bagnell 483:9
assigning 467:17	265:23	304:15 351:19	421:6 434:13	balance 125:16
assignment	attempt 311:1	353:2 377:1	434:18,22	168:20 249:13
285:8 463:8	449:18	404:1 418:10	437:7 463:18	302:5 476:14
503:22	attempted	422:21 429:3	463:22 501:17	509:5
assistance	165:21 455:15	494:1	awful 176:14	balances 152:8
343:14 344:4	attempting	authorize 95:5	B	balancing 96:1
assistant 84:19	450:5	authorized		476:12
361:1 365:25	attempts 270:25	206:10 264:13	B 83:18 92:9	ball 158:20
374:21 383:7	422:20	285:14	349:21 355:2	216:11
assisting 492:16	attend 186:24	available 243:11	376:15,16,17	banc 264:8
501:15	440:3	262:20 324:1	376:19,22	band 109:17
Associate 83:15	attendance	374:18 430:19	377:2	Band-aid
associated 89:19	332:14	441:10 514:13	back 127:8	490:13
			<u> </u>	

	I	I	1	
bandwidth	452:25 456:4	beautiful 150:11	beg 458:6	210:15 211:15
109:24 302:5	468:12,18	becoming	began 333:10	223:16 228:18
bank 428:22	469:8 470:22	316:23	392:3	231:12 232:7
bankruptcy	470:24 471:21	bed 436:25	begging 113:6	236:9 238:14
90:6	478:1 480:18	490:13	beginning 240:5	247:9,15,20
Bardgett 83:23	480:18,20	Bednar 84:8	346:17 416:18	248:5,13
barely 468:23	481:18 482:19	108:17,18	431:13	255:16 256:20
486:9	486:25 487:16	113:13,22	begins 109:19	259:14 264:19
Barnhart 471:2	492:18 494:3	114:1 118:13	383:18	271:22 276:24
483:25	505:7	118:14 124:13	behalf 99:18	280:9 281:1
bas 473:14	bases 216:23,25	124:15 125:25	106:21 108:23	286:20 291:11
base 154:2,4	basic 171:20	126:1,9 143:14	220:7 258:1	294:5,6,13,14
174:19 176:13	341:10 507:2,4	143:16,24	276:22 286:18	294:16 296:3
222:7 227:15	basically 333:12	147:12 149:8	314:13 324:17	297:14,18
228:7,11 243:7	485:3	149:12,23	345:8 365:12	298:8 300:17
246:10,14	basis 91:16	179:10,15	415:23 416:10	302:23,24
298:4 307:23	94:12,17	189:18 196:25	417:2 419:19	303:20 315:19
353:12 367:20	139:24 140:6	215:10 220:7	461:6 473:2	317:6 326:23
384:22 425:10	140:11,12	225:18,19	474:12	326:24 328:23
425:14,17	176:7 217:4	227:18 229:25	belief 117:12	336:8 337:14
500:7	228:4,6 243:19	235:1 291:3,4	196:3 214:12	341:6,19
based 123:14	243:20 259:3	296:21,22	295:5 320:3	346:14 348:7
136:8 144:16	285:6 310:7	300:8 303:7,8	357:25 358:9	348:19,23
144:21 158:18	387:9 388:19	303:15,20	405:15,22	349:21 352:13
158:19 159:24	388:20 389:10	304:4,8 305:1	434:16	354:20,24
162:6 164:25	390:7,19	305:18 306:5,6	believe 99:3,11	356:15 361:20
170:3 173:23	397:17 405:5	326:15 327:12	99:24 102:6,6	365:1 372:8,10
177:23 205:24	415:1 421:23	327:14,18,20	110:22 111:12	380:19 393:3
208:17 217:24	451:10 468:9	331:4,11,17,19	112:3,16 113:7	393:23 395:4
238:5 241:24	468:13,15	333:19 342:14	119:3,10 125:4	397:11 400:11
242:8 244:12	469:4 470:1,6	342:15 369:17	126:24 127:21	405:19 411:15
248:1,2 250:21	470:9 474:1	369:18 398:25	128:17 129:3,9	412:16,23
259:10,22	475:13 476:11	411:5 426:12	134:24 139:13	413:13 416:7
274:18 296:18	477:18 489:23	426:13 490:15	141:25 147:22	418:15 419:10
298:20 299:21	499:19 503:20	490:20 495:25	149:12 156:21	421:4,9 427:14
301:20 322:3	bath 153:16	496:1,5 497:22	162:7 170:3,11	432:12,17
342:1,22	bathe 96:11,24	517:4,8,14	172:3,4 174:13	433:14 434:3
349:10 352:9	110:6	518:4,19,20	177:14,16	437:2 443:5,8
352:20 356:7	battle 315:15,18	519:2,4,9,18	182:12,21	447:12,19
364:6 385:23	battling 446:14	519:21	185:16,20	449:2,17 457:4
386:2 392:17	bear 98:16	bedrock 311:9	187:5 193:23	457:6 461:10
397:2 402:23	126:22 269:25	Beecher 313:13	194:16 200:23	462:21 463:3
405:11 435:11	279:7 418:18	beef 309:15	200:24 203:6	465:18,24
436:3 450:16	bearing 95:17	311:20	209:17,24	466:20,24
	l	l	<u> </u>	

	<u> </u>	I	I	
467:5,9 468:4	426:1	510:14	431:15 481:6	brief 239:25
470:2 475:21	benefited 424:22	bigger 274:11	boarded 273:23	258:5 264:4,6
482:1 493:18	424:23 425:13	495:11	boat 430:2	282:12 304:22
496:2 498:8	benefits 127:1	bill 105:19	body 96:9 109:1	335:22 336:3
499:20 504:21	202:11 214:3	106:16 136:6	301:4	337:2,9,17
506:3,25 509:4	245:16 265:17	228:2 258:11	Bolivar 83:13	419:22 437:23
510:17 512:10	281:4 314:9	259:5,6,7,16	Bonbright's	briefing 271:22
believed 304:11	367:24 368:1	259:22 260:8	265:10	271:23
believes 281:13	best 93:7 101:16	260:10 281:20	book 129:14	briefly 216:2
296:1 420:20	101:18 102:6	349:22 353:15	books 267:10	372:11 478:2
believing 503:20	102:10,11	354:14 384:22	boom 488:21	briefs 303:10,19
Bell 83:22	110:4,20	399:6 490:16	booster 373:12	399:15
118:11 181:13	117:11 148:15	496:13	borne 127:9	bring 181:2
196:23 215:8	148:17 159:17	billing 165:16	176:4 181:21	251:11 496:16
223:14,15	161:8 165:8	258:13 261:2	182:7,11	bringing 150:15
225:8 234:24	196:3 214:12	349:13 354:11	271:14 279:5	broad 304:12
276:21,22	257:20 290:4	356:7 399:9	410:7	broke 459:14
287:1,5,23	296:4 310:25	billions 92:9	boss 339:6	broken 104:1
288:16,23	357:25 358:8	bills 259:8 286:3	bottles 150:16	brought 89:9,24
289:7 290:6	398:3 405:3,15	353:11 384:7	bottom 107:18	109:4 126:9
299:20 314:6	405:21 434:16	bind 314:16	315:8 355:1	157:18 166:6
334:14,15,17	465:14 470:25	bit 121:4 173:12	BOUDREAU	179:2,17
365:8,9,12	471:1 475:20	182:3 190:13	83:3	261:17 300:14
400:7,15	490:4 503:5	216:16 230:1	bought 152:21	311:4 413:17
411:22 413:9	better 139:16	282:21 341:5	bound 320:18	432:25 446:9
426:9 461:5	151:25 165:5	470:10 476:1	Box 83:4 84:16	513:13
462:18 470:11	172:15 185:1	477:2 489:13	84:20	Brubaker
493:2,3 494:6	185:13 186:13	493:21 497:4	Boy 316:4	262:17
494:12 510:24	243:7 254:3	500:20 513:19	branch 303:23	Brunswick 84:7
517:14 518:3	268:5 284:12	blend 110:21	Branson 106:2,4	102:13 118:8
518:14,18,21	284:17 319:16	blended 508:12	271:9 322:24	196:20 208:20
519:3,8,17,21	335:16 445:15	blip 445:8	442:8	215:5 223:11
Bellefontaine	473:25 475:19	Blitz 83:23	Bransons 471:5	234:21 250:8
269:5	481:19 503:22	block 204:14,16	break 194:13	255:13 271:5
Bemiston 83:19	513:2	207:13,16,17	239:25 359:25	273:12,15,17
Bench 183:19	beyond 93:14	207:22 319:13	396:11,12,13	273:22 274:3,5
benefit 89:8	136:9 269:18	319:17 375:5	424:16	274:17,23
126:23 154:6	500:1	375:15,17,20	breakdown	276:17,17,18
211:17 269:16	bidding 432:24	376:3,20	263:4	282:24 283:10
279:9 281:3	big 97:5 104:1	438:16 450:1	breaking 262:24	288:3 290:25
307:16 319:6	169:5 329:5	blocks 204:20,23	373:21	316:23 317:20
341:9 390:22	336:21 412:25	207:18 265:14	breaks 146:15	318:14 322:16
413:5 417:10	426:24 478:8	375:22	Brian 262:16,25	322:20 334:11
417:16 423:14	479:12 489:4	board 311:4	272:10 521:2	348:2,4,15,17

	•	i	i	
365:5 411:19	504:20 506:20	calculating	candidly 312:23	carry 330:19
429:24 434:7,8	513:24,25	505:6	cap 447:17,20	case 85:8 87:11
434:11 445:8	519:16 521:21	calculation	447:22 457:16	87:16 89:6,12
492:24 505:9	521:23,24	85:20 86:18,25	457:21,22,24	89:17,25 90:10
505:13 510:10	522:1	87:1 293:23	458:1,2,12,16	91:17 92:10
Bryan 83:12	Busch's 401:4	366:1 386:10	458:20	94:8,12,15
Brydon 83:4	business 98:11	404:14	capacity 115:8	95:2 97:21
Buchanan 440:8	109:20 112:24	calculations	195:1 212:21	99:23,24
budget 128:24	138:21 139:14	310:6 403:18	345:5 401:16	100:16 101:23
build 152:23	146:11,16	California	Cape 171:21	102:3 106:20
190:21 488:14	151:14 163:13	111:24 202:10	247:15	106:21 107:1,4
496:8	168:22 190:17	203:20,21	capital 89:19	107:8 109:7
building 139:6	214:4 216:8,8	204:19,21	90:14,19,21,22	112:8,11
190:19 317:24	216:12,17,21	207:10 208:1	90:23 93:8,11	113:11 115:20
built 147:22	217:7 285:20	call 103:24	97:13 129:22	123:2 138:8,9
170:4 186:7	286:6 289:9	104:8 114:21	136:23 140:25	143:3 145:12
457:16	422:25 423:2	157:11 159:5	141:20 148:9	145:17,24
bulk 355:8	431:23 464:20	162:13,14,19	178:15,19	146:2 161:1,12
bull 324:25	businesses	162:22,23	190:17 191:7	173:17 175:9
bullet 324:7,25	102:12,15	163:5,15,17,21	193:12 198:14	180:21 183:24
bullets 324:24	305:5 486:22	164:7,13	199:13,13	186:12 187:5
bumped 489:13	493:7	166:14 167:9	236:1 237:1,3	189:25 191:11
bunch 473:16	butchered	168:14,14	243:10 296:6,9	203:18,24
burden 269:25	290:20	194:15 212:8	296:12 297:7	205:11,14
416:14	buy 91:6 134:15	218:8 278:2	307:14 318:1	206:9,14 207:5
burdened 337:5	134:16 464:22	288:25 292:13	323:20,22,22	208:8 209:22
burdens 266:7	buying 174:13	326:9 331:7	367:16 368:8	211:18 221:9
Busch 149:16	300:22	349:12 376:17	369:11 434:19	233:4,8 235:23
236:8 244:11	buys 287:17	393:12 458:1	capped 323:16	237:13 238:16
246:5,17 251:5		461:13 478:6	446:11	241:1,15
251:7,9 268:1	<u> </u>	478:21 479:23	capping 455:17	243:21 244:9
374:16 375:4	C 83:1 383:22	514:2	capriciousness	245:5,10
375:23 396:23	521:2	called 167:25	265:23	246:11 247:3
398:8 401:10	ca 411:4	192:9 216:21	caps 455:2	247:14,19,23
401:12,14,15	caboodle 490:19	217:1,8 247:10	captures 242:3	251:13 252:24
401:19 402:2,7	calcified 333:6	308:24 339:13	car 150:15	255:17,21,23
405:13 406:1	calcium 121:13	459:5,25	carbon 122:10	256:15,18
406:11 407:1	121:19 158:8	calling 380:5	care 287:12	258:4,7 259:16
411:24 426:14	calculated	429:10	373:6,16	262:20 263:25
437:19 447:24	365:24 397:5	calls 138:15	428:20 429:11	264:6 267:20
448:10,21	403:19 404:1	163:2,3,14	careful 168:24	269:20 277:1
459:6 465:5	408:12 414:24	164:9,11	carefully 286:19	277:19,25
476:17 496:6	416:23 450:16	232:15 429:1	Carlson 471:9	278:16 280:18
498:6 501:4	480:19	478:22	Carmel 250:6	281:9,16 282:5

283:1,2 285:7	496:10,20	479:15	262:22 281:23	387:3,6 439:10
289:17 294:21	506:15 508:22	causer 243:17	328:17 330:17	465:2,3,4,6
303:11,13	510:1 511:3	416:15	373:7,14 392:1	474:19 476:18
304:6,6,23	case-by-case	causers 248:25	398:6 433:8	477:3 486:8
306:12 307:4	228:4	420:6	437:20 505:21	502:13,16
307:24 314:12	cases 101:14,20	causes 263:20	certainty 280:3	506:9 517:11
314:16,19,20	103:5 123:6	275:2	cetera 445:9	517:18,21
314:21 321:15	138:16 148:17	causing 122:7	Chai 287:4	518:8,20
322:4 323:21	148:25 178:19	122:14 125:4	Chair 143:17	519:11,13,20
323:23 324:1	181:18 193:8	144:19 159:16	216:1 296:19	Chairman's
326:20 327:9	202:11 267:24	263:22 282:8	Chairman 82:18	238:6 255:3
332:3 335:17	268:7 277:23	caution 221:22	85:16,17,18	challenge 120:19
335:20,23	300:15 304:11	276:6,7	86:8,16,20,23	236:17,20,22
337:22,25	308:12 338:3,7	cautious 444:5	87:4,14,18,20	273:5 399:9
342:8 346:3	362:6 392:5,6	Cave 83:12	137:22,23	486:19
362:7 376:10	410:23 426:23	caviar 309:14	143:21 144:5	challenged
386:2 390:13	427:23,24	CCR 82:22	146:6,7 150:4	91:10 209:22
396:16 397:22	442:7 506:11	cease 432:15,19	150:5 153:8	challenges 90:17
404:5 415:20	catch 359:21	432:24 433:15	154:14 183:20	121:4 235:25
415:21,22	categories	Cedar 250:24	188:6 191:15	236:3,24 237:8
416:1,5,9,10	354:15	452:13	197:19,20	237:14,16
416:13,17,20	category 351:24	center 162:19,22	216:2,3 217:25	238:14,16
416:23 417:5,7	370:6,8	163:15,17	231:21,22	305:3,8
417:15 418:9	caught 157:9	164:7 168:14	235:18,19	champagne
419:7,8,9,12	causation	478:6,21	246:21,23	309:14,14
419:13,18,22	253:21 266:23	centers 162:14	247:6 248:4,12	311:20
421:15,19	282:3 307:25	163:21 166:15	251:12,16,20	championing
422:19 423:15	308:19 411:2	central 173:7	252:1 257:10	97:21 99:1
424:14 426:21	411:10,14,15	442:7,24	257:11,17,21	chance 150:20
426:24 427:2	465:16,23,25	cents 228:22	259:21 260:2,5	150:22 180:14
427:15,21	471:19 475:22	371:2,3,3,6	260:18,22	198:24 329:25
428:4 430:18	482:2 484:3	certain 101:17	271:16,17,25	436:6
434:22 435:18	500:2 506:21	115:12 121:18	272:5,12	change 92:1,6
435:18,23,24	506:24 507:2,5	122:14,25	276:15,24	119:4 122:8
436:20 437:6	cause 163:14,16	125:13,13	281:2 286:23	145:24 156:10
444:16,20	289:16 332:2	148:1 156:7	293:13,14,15	156:18 183:12
447:1 449:20	345:11,17,22	195:6 212:25	298:21 303:6,9	224:21 252:12
450:10 451:3	346:2 419:23	332:2 388:21	303:18 304:2,5	263:22,23
453:13 462:8	caused 115:11	388:21 390:14	304:10,21	275:21 303:24
466:13,14,20	119:1 172:25	390:14 447:17	305:17 324:6	304:7,24 320:9
467:11,24	173:1 212:24	460:11 489:3	324:15,16,23	320:9,11
473:5 478:5	218:22 256:2	490:4 515:9	325:5,21,24	336:14 353:11
479:16 481:6	270:9 279:21	certainly 92:1	339:1 383:1,2	378:23,25
482:14 495:20	336:14 401:20	165:5 223:4	383:3 384:9,13	381:1 384:22
			, -	

385:11,12	300:16,21	328:13,16	466:24	273:21 276:18
386:14 400:21	characterize	349:13,16	cited 221:23	276:20,23
403:8 407:6	221:17	352:22,22	264:6,18	277:8,9 283:18
429:19 430:9	characterized	354:7 356:2,6	cites 220:23	285:10 289:13
432:3 433:12	123:25 256:9	357:3 381:7,9	cities 179:13	290:25 291:2,6
462:19,23	505:4	394:22 395:3,4	222:5 248:7	291:6,8,10,11
463:7,14	charge 94:22	395:16	308:12 414:11	291:16 294:7,9
467:17,19	99:25 103:17	charging 228:22	436:18	294:14 299:1
474:14 521:5	105:4 112:23	Charles 97:6	citiz 295:16	300:6 303:12
change-outs	201:7,13,14	226:9 250:4	citizen 112:25	303:16 306:7,9
156:1	228:23 250:18	282:24 427:4	222:7	306:11 313:11
changed 156:3	250:18 255:24	429:24	citizens 276:5	315:4,11
160:1 173:5	256:5,12,13,15	chart 226:1	286:18 294:17	318:23 322:22
221:1 417:22	256:21 257:2	506:14	295:16 297:24	331:25 332:1
417:25 418:25	258:5 264:23	charts 365:19	422:17 425:11	332:12,13
426:17 429:22	283:6,11	chastised 150:16	425:12 431:2	334:11,13,17
451:19 462:12	321:20 323:17	check 309:11	454:18	338:11 339:18
462:15 486:10	324:25 325:10	367:4 400:12	city 82:8 83:5,8	342:21 343:13
510:6	325:13,14,15	421:10 450:19	83:13,16,21,24	343:18 356:15
changes 122:4	325:16,20	checking 125:6	83:25 84:3,7	403:14 411:19
145:22 162:21	326:3,5 352:9	371:4	84:10,11,13,14	411:21 414:8
164:7 170:10	352:12 353:15	checklist 111:18	84:17,21 96:21	414:10,20
172:23,24	357:1 359:16	checks 309:9	97:6 105:7,13	424:13,16
219:3 259:8,9	359:25 360:3	Cheryl 93:22	108:19 109:12	426:25 432:9
280:16 289:20	360:12 362:25	114:22 115:3,6	113:19 118:8	437:4,9 439:16
332:8 336:13	376:25 378:23	517:7	118:10,12	440:22 446:11
346:22 347:6	379:5,23 383:8	chief 84:19 94:2	127:15,20	447:12 452:11
347:19 348:8	383:19,21	212:23	135:25 148:3	470:12 471:13
397:16 403:4	384:3 385:25	choice 286:5	153:15 179:25	483:16 485:4,4
418:3,7,9,16	386:1 395:14	choose 244:14	193:2 196:20	499:11 500:11
418:17 428:24	395:24,25,25	248:8 278:22	196:22,24	501:19,23
432:23 452:22	406:13,18	314:23	197:1,3 215:5	504:8,11 508:4
462:18 490:1	450:16 471:10	choosing 152:17	215:7,9,11,13	508:11 510:9
changing 156:4	505:9 508:7,8	478:18	223:10,13	510:11 518:17
156:15 266:10	charged 171:6	chose 481:1	228:1 229:7,9	519:1 520:24
482:9,10	395:19 467:21	Christmas	231:3,14	521:3,7 522:3
characteristic	charges 91:20	424:15	234:21,23,25	City's 149:14
507:16,18	101:6 103:14	circle 313:6	235:2,4 247:16	claim 172:18
characteristics	108:3 119:16	circumstance	247:18,18	claims 125:11
242:10 250:1	226:21,23	302:3	248:1,1,2	159:2 209:19
451:12 470:16	227:3 255:25	circumstances	250:5,25	209:22
470:21 471:24	256:10,16	92:3 136:5	255:14 264:7	clarification
483:20 500:4,6	264:21 283:9	336:13 464:13	271:7,10	437:14
characterizati	324:10 325:9	citation 251:16	273:11,15,17	clarifies 438:25

	1	1	1	
clarify 167:22	closer 120:15	352:12 354:8	482:24	100:14 101:4
342:16 433:22	381:24 382:2,6	361:10,14,15	comfort 86:11	101:11,14,21
437:19	382:7 399:20	361:24 362:8	474:16	102:24 105:3
clarifying 157:8	closest 503:4	362:20 363:17	comfortable	108:20 109:2
clarity 157:6	cloud 280:13	364:9,16,16,25	513:6	110:2,22 113:6
class 94:20	clouding 280:24	370:15 371:10	coming 125:12	113:9,18 114:6
101:19 113:1	co 201:10	371:12 383:22	165:13 178:25	121:3 124:14
113:23 114:4	387:16	403:7 407:6,8	200:25 205:18	129:25 135:6
245:9 250:19	coal 483:1	414:4,10	205:22,24,25	137:22 138:16
251:10 263:1	coal-fired	columns 351:1,3	207:3 247:19	184:24 185:5
301:20,20	483:10	352:3 383:24	271:21 292:7	188:23,23
319:1,4,14	cobble 490:24	combat 420:13	310:11 318:20	189:2 192:16
337:4,6 354:24	491:17	combinations	378:13 483:17	197:14,18
361:18 362:3	cognizant 249:1	452:7	503:23	199:24 202:2
364:9,15,19,23	317:9 472:23	combined	commensurate	206:9 210:1
401:25 402:2	cold 446:14	204:25 294:25	324:20	215:22 224:22
402:15 403:8	Coleman 82:20	392:10 407:23	comment 104:4	226:1 227:1
404:11 447:6	166:1,2,3	424:10 434:6	191:10 246:3	229:18 233:2
500:21 521:19	172:6,9 173:22	434:10 436:9	365:13 489:2	233:19 237:12
classes 114:5,12	178:2 186:17	444:24 451:23	commented	240:17 245:21
114:12 265:14	187:9 208:15	473:15	154:15	245:22 246:17
322:5 375:12	208:16 217:22	combining	comments	247:25 248:7
383:8 388:12	217:23 238:3,4	249:21,25	102:17 106:7,7	248:17,18
403:4,21	273:9,10 306:3	403:13 451:7,8	106:13 113:20	249:11 251:12
405:10 411:12	306:4 311:18	come 91:19	155:2 158:3	251:22 252:5
415:2,2 417:1	318:16 517:13	113:1 124:23	235:24 258:6	255:7,9 256:24
classifications	colleague 315:12	125:2 147:25	260:15 263:20	257:25 258:10
302:8,9 375:6	collect 94:16,18	153:24 157:24	275:13 326:10	258:24 259:17
375:19	206:14	168:1 202:20	328:6,6 333:8	262:10 264:5,7
clear 308:19	collected 91:15	205:19 257:6	420:16 425:2	264:13 265:12
398:15 402:17	94:23 161:20	261:20 313:6	Commerce	270:18 271:24
clearly 311:8	201:13 206:12	321:13 323:12	245:20,22	273:13 275:24
Clicquot 309:14	collecting 91:22	384:10 390:24	commercial	276:10,21
client 130:21	collection 89:4	423:4 444:16	109:19 112:22	277:10,11
303:10 304:23	97:12 116:15	452:18 469:15	113:24 207:21	278:2,4,22
361:6	collects 206:11	473:24 483:12	302:8 350:20	279:1,14
close 113:5	Collins 262:17	485:18 488:20	350:23 352:23	281:12,24
148:19 161:11	263:1 266:12	502:2 507:14	377:1	282:22 285:14
177:20 186:5,7	266:20 267:7	comes 95:21	commercials	287:9,21
310:24 322:14	268:12 270:5	161:4 244:17	352:1	293:13 300:9
332:14 456:23	272:10 514:13	278:13 287:16	commission 82:1	300:12,24
closely 99:21	521:2	309:7 312:14	84:22 89:6	301:2,3 302:4
164:5 284:6	column 348:10	318:15 368:19	90:9 92:7 94:5	302:18,21
286:14 390:15	349:21,21	478:4 482:23	94:7 99:8,17	306:9,19,24

307:6,23	172:4,6,9	487:24 490:14	communicatio	108:1 110:14
308:10 311:8	173:22 178:2	490:18,21,23	409:8	118:21 119:8
312:2 313:9,25	185:19 186:17	491:12 492:15	communities	119:20 120:1
314:11,17,22	187:9 207:7,8	493:4 496:7,25	88:21 119:23	120:23 122:24
315:6,8,14,20	207:9 208:11	501:6 504:21	127:3 140:24	123:19 124:21
315:24 316:6	208:12,13,14	513:4 517:11	141:4 275:3	130:18,22
317:11 320:4	208:15,16,18	517:12,12,13	281:19 343:15	134:12,16
320:11,16,18	217:14,15,17	517:18 519:3	community	139:11 142:12
338:25 341:13	217:18,20,21	519:11,12,12	96:20,20	144:6 145:17
342:9 401:7,18	217:22,23	519:20	105:22 140:23	146:8 154:9,24
404:8 410:24	231:23 238:1,3	Commissioner's	141:5 142:23	155:14 160:23
411:2 420:19	238:4 245:21	179:18	142:24 145:1	164:1 166:18
422:21 423:5,5	261:18 262:8	commissioners	147:13 148:21	166:21 176:3
427:17 430:17	272:14,15,16	82:20 108:20	148:22 184:1	180:21 183:22
435:4 436:17	272:18 273:1,6	114:15 166:6	287:17 342:22	184:20 186:19
436:20,23	273:7,9,10	173:24 174:12	430:16	191:7,11
437:4 439:8	276:16 280:10	231:21 235:17	community's	192:11 195:3
440:12 441:11	287:4 288:6,22	273:14 392:17	154:16	198:2,4,6
441:19 447:14	296:15,17	494:7 511:12	companies	199:15 200:18
448:4 465:2	300:14 305:19	Commissions	103:5,6 107:7	201:12,14
476:4 481:15	305:20,22,23	110:1 320:5	140:1 142:15	202:14 203:13
485:2 491:7,19	306:1,2,3,4	391:5 437:3	174:14 249:9	204:6,8,16,22
492:19 493:19	311:14,18,25	commitment	256:12 284:17	206:10,23
494:14 501:12	318:16,16	184:19 458:10	284:18 287:12	210:5,19 211:7
503:2,7,16,25	319:21,23	458:22 459:3,5	429:8 430:11	211:9 212:22
506:17 509:2,2	320:1,14,19,20	459:8,14,18	430:19 442:2,5	216:9 229:22
509:4,5,10	326:6,7 327:10	460:7,11,13	455:16 462:21	235:14 236:25
512:11 518:1,6	327:13,16,19	commitments	493:23	237:4,8 240:6
519:15	328:4,5 329:6	323:18	company 83:6	240:20,25
Commission's	329:13,23	committed	84:14 85:25	241:9,12,23,24
106:23 237:15	330:13,16,21	459:13	86:1 87:9	242:11,13,20
282:1 317:3	330:22,23,24	commodity	88:16 89:24	243:21 244:24
320:15 372:9	339:2,5,9	250:18 259:12	90:6,8,13,18	245:4,9,15
418:10 441:20	342:2 384:15	376:25	90:25 91:10,25	249:24 253:1,4
Commissioner	384:16,17	common 99:9	92:4,18 93:23	253:7,12
86:3,10 87:8	385:17,18,20	102:19,21,22	93:25 94:3,11	260:13 263:9
87:20,22 98:19	386:16,17	103:1 104:18	94:17 95:11,12	266:14 267:20
98:20,21 99:9	394:13 399:23	244:10,14	97:2 98:5	269:21 271:19
99:12 111:19	406:15 437:24	258:13 259:3	100:3,6,8,24	277:3 281:5,7
146:25 147:1	438:5 476:19	259:18,25	101:1,15	281:18 284:7
149:6,7,16,21	476:20,22,23	260:2 266:13	103:14 104:10	284:11,14,16
149:24 153:3,4	476:25 477:1	336:6 455:17	105:18 106:21	284:19 285:4
153:5 165:24	477:12 480:15	455:22 456:13	106:23 107:3	286:7,10,12
166:1,2,3,14	481:25 486:7	456:23 500:6	107:14,22,23	287:16 292:2,6
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	-			
317:21 321:21	103:8,12 104:1	compensating	170:24	204:6 237:19
321:22 323:24	121:4 129:18	125:8	comprehensive	237:21 249:14
333:9 338:22	134:22 184:24	compensation	200:13	268:11 301:9
343:2 345:9	209:7,22	213:24	comprised 250:3	323:2 328:1
349:17 351:9	210:10 230:24	compensatory	250:8,10	390:13 420:3
355:8 358:14	231:3,8,11	266:6	compromise	437:17 498:3
364:15,20	241:7,15 248:6	competent 98:15	271:3 311:5	512:4
367:9 369:20	249:22 253:23	complained	330:10	concludes 255:9
373:1 381:9	256:18 257:12	125:20	computer	conclusion
382:9 385:23	257:16 258:19	complaint 105:3	261:12	255:7 256:22
390:2 398:22	269:22 272:7	152:16 160:20	con 275:16	304:22 474:16
399:10 408:3	277:16 284:14	161:4,5,8,11	419:15	concrete 306:17
420:11 421:7	286:5 293:20	161:21 162:1	concentrate	concur 222:17
421:11,23	294:2,10 299:1	164:12,22	166:12	conditions
422:11 423:1,4	299:13 312:9	165:20	concept 248:24	301:13 320:9
425:2,23 426:1	314:12 318:1	complaints	266:22 508:14	417:7 510:6
429:7 430:7	326:4 349:8	103:2,7 104:25	508:17	conduct 259:5
435:16 438:4,4	352:21 354:20	105:18 158:12	concepts 171:20	confidence
438:18 439:24	364:4 367:15	158:13 159:9	419:16 421:3	221:5
440:2 441:22	370:3,15 372:2	160:16 161:3	concern 105:21	confidential
442:6 443:17	376:21 377:24	162:3 164:18	109:24 142:20	85:19 130:2,19
443:21,24	378:21 379:1	165:10,13	169:9 200:18	145:22,23
444:11 445:22	381:25 383:10	167:2 478:6	205:4,6,15,23	175:17 188:9
446:15 447:11	387:8 395:8	511:18	206:7 294:11	189:2 443:19
449:17 455:14	402:18 441:23	complete 190:25	324:24 440:18	443:23 444:1
455:20,23	445:16 469:21	481:4	441:13,16,17	confidentiality
456:2,11	510:14 512:20	completed	470:1 475:25	123:24 144:24
457:22 458:2	513:3	313:13	498:4 512:9	confused 175:6
458:12 459:2,3	compare 256:18	completely	513:21,22	324:11 453:24
459:18 460:6	504:12	137:3 138:14	concerned 141:6	confusing
460:10 468:5	compared 89:11	147:23 161:16	145:15 166:17	223:23
468:14 470:23	90:19 181:8	388:16 430:7,8	314:10 459:21	confusion
471:22 472:20	205:17 206:3	completion	concerning	402:16 438:18
473:8,19 474:4	301:3 302:1	318:2	87:14,15	congratulations
479:6,16,17	414:10 428:5	compliment	102:21 146:8	118:23
483:20,24	431:5 485:21	120:23	192:8 251:8,23	conjunction
489:6,11	comparing	component	317:23 360:6	164:8 201:17
499:13 510:7	445:21 472:12	281:14 420:21	493:14,15	connected 319:4
511:15,21	comparison	components	concerns 106:9	390:20
512:12,25	258:11 259:18	199:3 216:20	107:21 110:23	connection
513:17 517:6	445:23	325:12 489:17	110:24 121:10	252:7 264:24
519:5	compelling	Compounding	162:22 168:21	319:9
company's	269:21 287:6	283:14	169:18 184:7	connections
82:13 91:17	367:16 372:23	comprehend	199:13 200:6	372:4,5
	_			

	I]		ı
consequence	320:4,8 323:17	264:1,2 266:21	101:24 102:11	313:4 316:23
282:14	consistently	266:23 267:9	102:14 103:25	317:14 321:6
conservation	93:8 162:5,8	268:3,6,11,13	104:21,23	322:9 323:14
91:3	253:25 308:18	268:17 270:4	105:5,6,10,17	323:15 326:24
conserve 204:18	310:2 317:1	271:5,6,9	106:1,3,4	327:2,8,24
204:24	336:4	274:9 275:14	108:3 110:20	328:18 330:1
consider 106:19	consisting	275:14 288:3,4	111:1 141:9	331:2 335:14
106:20 107:10	248:23	288:12,20	148:15 169:5	360:6,9 366:13
201:19 243:22	consists 97:4	291:9 292:16	169:13 170:23	366:17 367:17
244:8 252:5	consolidate	292:17 293:4	171:11 175:10	387:8 389:11
258:10 286:19	105:9 170:13	294:19 295:14	177:15,18,20	389:16,21
327:23 328:18	177:12 178:3	297:10 300:13	177:23,24	391:6,17,23
464:6 506:23	187:4 226:16	304:12 308:23	178:20 179:1	392:13 400:23
considerable	241:16,19	317:17 321:6	179:16 180:22	402:14 406:12
220:25	243:5 246:6	322:13,15,22	182:5,6 186:18	413:25 420:24
consideration	252:8 253:3	326:21 331:12	186:20 187:16	421:7,12,16
103:10 107:9	255:10,22	349:9 354:4	187:20 223:8	423:14,23
154:23 264:12	264:16 267:21	356:19,23	224:5,6 226:8	424:3 425:22
266:11 268:8	269:24 298:15	357:2,7,13	227:9,11,16	426:19,19
269:22 285:13	317:8 318:7	364:5 367:19	228:14,15,19	435:12 439:5
287:22 307:1	390:11 399:4	385:11 399:24	229:2,14 230:7	444:20 445:13
317:4 411:13	420:10 426:3	400:3 404:9	230:20,21,23	445:14 446:1
considerations	436:23 451:5	418:14 421:2	231:7 232:3,5	451:10 452:3
106:19	451:15 452:19	422:3 424:4,16	239:4 240:4	452:14,17,21
considered	469:8 470:2	449:19 461:19	242:7,16,18,21	463:4,5 465:14
125:8 221:7	475:14 491:8	465:9,22 467:2	243:23 246:19	465:17 467:3
275:7 307:4	498:2 499:16	473:6 474:6	247:1,8 248:20	467:15 468:6
411:16 423:8	503:21 512:7	497:24 510:5	249:12,17	469:6 471:14
485:10	512:12	518:10	251:7,9,15,23	471:17,20
considering	consolidated	consolidated-t	252:6,9,14	473:3,23 475:4
140:20 252:6	98:23 99:2	461:13	253:1,15	475:8,16
268:6 418:13	111:22 112:5,9	consolidates	254:14 255:6,8	480:22 481:3,4
considers 137:1	119:7,11,21	412:1	255:12 256:2	481:11 482:11
consist 88:23	187:18 220:21	consolidating	257:3,13 258:6	491:15 497:10
317:18	222:6 226:6	98:1 148:19	258:12,16,20	499:1 503:6
consistency	230:2 231:17	170:1 245:1,2	259:4,16,23	506:3,23
110:8 111:11	240:4,22 241:7	252:23 254:16	260:14 267:4	509:20 510:2
302:24 314:8	243:3,20 245:6	254:24 255:3	270:19 271:3	510:25 511:25
320:13	245:16 246:4	256:24 263:17	271:18 274:6	512:3,5 515:2
consistent 87:1	247:12 248:21	270:6 272:20	274:15 276:11	consolidations
87:3 103:7	249:23 253:20	291:13 317:10	281:19 288:18	392:8
110:2 112:18	255:18 262:15	317:15 392:3	293:20 294:1,2	constant 375:22
124:18 153:18	263:3,8,10,16	consolidation	294:24 295:19	489:14
256:10 284:24	263:17,20	97:20,23 100:1	301:12 306:13	constantly
	l			l

	1	1		
489:12	393:14	459:10	194:7,10,15,22	181:5 182:2,7
constituents	contact 165:21	contrary 303:12	196:5,13 210:6	182:12 183:8
339:11 341:16	441:22 442:2,2	contrast 283:7	210:7 212:8,17	184:9,10,13
constitute 114:4	442:11,12,12	contrasts 283:16	214:14,23	185:23 186:3
constrained	442:13 443:24	contribute	218:1 229:23	186:11,14
247:25	493:22,24	163:11	229:24 230:9	189:8 190:25
construction	contacted	contributed	235:15 239:8	191:13,23
278:25 306:21	339:15 342:6	279:11 306:21	239:12,19,23	192:7,17,20
314:25 318:2	343:2 443:14	contribution	517:3,7,16,17	195:17 196:2
367:20 389:23	contacting	328:23,24	517:19,21	198:5 202:4
consultant	124:22	355:25 363:3	518:4	209:8,9,11,12
252:21	contain 358:7	453:10 455:10	copies 124:8	209:17,20
consultants	contained 117:6	455:25 456:12	233:18 261:17	211:9,19,20
245:8 345:7	180:16 195:23	457:8 460:1,5	400:16	214:11 218:7
consulting	214:7 240:8	477:16 479:24	copy 135:17	220:14 223:19
245:10	289:25	control 211:7,9	144:10 198:25	224:23 225:24
consume 96:9	contents 346:16	conundrum	233:17 264:4	226:12,18,19
consumer 267:2	contiguous	212:1	413:19	227:4,12,13
275:25 282:2	503:3	convenience	cordial 440:13	230:8,16,21,25
286:15 403:10	continually	263:8 264:11	corporate	231:9,11 232:5
509:6	162:2	284:22 285:2	479:12 494:22	232:6 233:4,5
consumers	continuation	285:11 360:10	corporately	233:9 237:23
83:14 108:11	140:18 242:25	conversation	478:3 479:14	256:25 259:24
261:10 262:11	297:5 336:5	153:8 188:17	corporation	290:4 298:17
262:13 266:24	continue 93:16	409:2 458:8	100:22 101:7	298:18 299:6,7
275:15 279:2,3	98:14 169:4	486:18 490:5	264:21 265:2,4	303:14 331:10
279:3,7,10,15	202:7 203:13	conversations	265:7	333:3 334:23
279:16 337:4	256:22 289:1	144:22 153:23	corporations	334:24 336:25
417:11,17	292:20 375:5	164:8 184:1	226:24	337:19,20
420:16 421:5	375:16,17	338:9	correct 117:11	340:7 341:2,17
422:12 426:8	421:22 433:4	convinced	120:16 122:18	342:10,11,19
447:18 472:7	433:20 452:8	484:10	123:6,14	342:20,24,25
504:12 508:25	continued	convinces 184:4	125:21 126:11	343:3,4,6,7,24
511:10,14	161:15,24	cook 96:10,24	126:12,19	344:1,2,13
513:16	310:3 316:16	Cooper 83:3	127:10 129:1	347:21 353:21
consumption	427:21	86:2,13 87:8	129:14,15	357:24 358:8
91:2 198:14	continues 285:4	87:15 88:10	134:18,20,21	359:17 362:2
199:14 200:7	336:4	94:4,24 97:3	146:12,13	364:10,11,23
200:20 201:11	Continuing	98:8 100:7	153:1 155:12	365:1 366:14
201:18 202:24	315:23 348:4	114:21 115:2,4	172:21 173:25	367:17 369:5,9
204:3 206:16	continuity	117:14,25	175:23 178:12	369:22,25
206:22 236:2,7	278:18 314:5	127:22 129:9	179:22 180:8,9	370:8,11,12,21
236:10,16,25	320:8	172:3,8 189:15	180:11,12,22	370:22 371:4
237:5 350:9	contract 217:1,4	189:16 193:24	180:25 181:1,4	371:13 372:14
	,		 	

381:11,16	372:12 453:25	373:5,15 374:3	376:9 387:14	415:14 416:15
382:1,9 398:25	456:1	379:3 382:3	401:25 402:3	417:12,18
399:19,20,21	correlation	385:22,23	411:17 414:12	419:23 420:6
402:1,6 405:14	419:23	387:9,23 388:7	414:22,24	423:24 424:11
405:21 408:21	corresponding	389:10 409:4	415:5,7 454:2	424:12,18,22
410:24 412:2	199:8	411:2,4,10,13	458:11,19	425:14 427:12
412:13 414:17	corresponds	411:15 413:15	459:20 491:11	431:19 432:1,3
414:19 415:10	407:12	415:17 416:11	506:13,18	435:2,5,6
415:18,24	corrosion	416:15,19	costs 89:18	436:14 446:21
419:8 421:17	121:14	422:10,10	91:11,12,18,22	447:3 455:22
422:1 425:18	cost 92:9 95:12	426:8 431:14	94:20 98:2	456:13,23,24
425:20 431:20	95:17 101:24	431:17,22	112:22 114:2	469:23 471:16
432:20,21	112:24 120:10	455:17 456:17	126:22 127:11	472:8 478:3,8
433:22 434:6	127:9 136:18	456:20 457:13	139:22 153:12	478:15,25
436:14 438:14	136:22 139:19	465:15,23,25	170:7 174:12	479:1,3,7,9,12
438:20 439:17	153:10,18,20	468:13,15,19	176:2,4,9,15	479:13,16,21
444:15,20,21	154:24 155:1	469:5 470:22	177:1 180:8	480:1 481:1
448:18 451:9	171:7 174:15	471:19 472:21	181:20 182:6	482:22 483:3
451:13 455:13	175:14 176:18	475:22 478:13	182:11 186:13	483:21 488:20
463:3,15 464:2	176:21 181:7	480:12 481:9	201:12 205:8	489:9 491:21
464:15,16	186:1,8 190:21	482:2 484:3	205:14,15,16	494:20,22,22
475:5 476:14	201:8,9 202:18	491:5 492:3,7	205:25 210:20	495:2,12,15,20
493:17 494:15	205:7,12,21,21	492:11 494:15	242:25 243:23	496:11
494:17 495:21	207:2,4 211:1	494:16,25	244:3,4,4,6,9	council 291:6
498:19 500:10	243:5,17,18	495:5,7,9,16	244:14,15,16	counsel 83:15
503:12 504:1,2	244:6,11 247:8	496:13 500:2,9	248:1,3 250:16	84:15,16,18,19
507:12 511:1	248:25,25	506:21,23	252:18 253:9	84:19 85:11
514:15	252:13 253:21	507:2,5 508:9	253:25 254:5	94:2 99:15,19
corrected	256:1 263:14	513:2 521:19	257:7 263:11	99:20 101:13
115:23 129:2	265:21 266:13	cost-based	265:17 267:13	109:5 110:15
362:17 378:8	266:23,25	243:17 253:22	279:12,15,15	110:17 111:14
400:2,16,22	267:21 268:7	253:24 337:10	282:7,8,16	127:21 130:15
520:9	271:13 274:21	337:12	284:24 285:8	134:6 145:8
correction	275:4 277:14	cost-of-service	286:9 295:23	180:24 193:2
377:16 400:8	279:5,7 282:3	105:8 227:24	296:1 297:13	197:11 212:23
corrections	294:15 295:1	245:9,11	297:14 318:12	215:20 218:6
219:4 241:4	295:15 297:5,9	248:23 249:13	319:17 335:1	220:5 225:22
289:21 345:17	298:14 301:14	251:10 263:12	369:8,8 372:16	226:22 227:10
346:8,23 347:7	301:22 302:14	266:22 277:17	372:17 373:1	228:25 248:19
348:15,20	302:17 307:25	280:14,24	373:21 382:10	252:3 270:24
357:19 399:17	308:19 312:12	309:20,22	385:5 391:1	272:6 274:8
399:18,21	337:5 348:9	310:15,23	395:8,11,12	280:18 281:10
correctly 172:20	363:4,20,20	316:2 319:1	410:2,7,11	291:24 299:17
270:3 361:17	367:15 372:13	329:4 375:14	413:5 414:5	302:22 304:14
	<u> </u>	l		

387:10 395:2	317:19,23,25	91:24 95:22	494:4	177:18 183:1
397:21 409:22	318:13,20	100:16 108:19	cross-examina	208:8 231:3
415:23 417:8	326:18,25	218:19 247:22	118:1,3 126:2	251:4 263:4
422:19 426:15	332:18 336:24	247:23 264:8	126:5,8 127:16	289:14 318:1
426:22 427:7	348:3 353:13	264:10 285:10	128:9 134:7	321:18 323:3
427:22 439:9	355:21 361:25	courts 95:23	135:11 137:19	353:12 367:1
441:3 447:14	362:14 363:14	cover 104:3	191:4 196:14	370:18 384:23
461:8,10,18	364:12,13,16	120:10 136:18	196:15 214:24	386:24 403:4
462:5,7 473:12	364:24,25	136:22 185:8	214:25 219:12	405:7 412:11
497:6 502:10	369:22 370:5	203:11 375:23	219:25 223:15	435:5 438:15
508:1,21,23,24	370:19,20,24	covered 198:20	225:19 229:24	438:21 448:6
509:11,18	371:6,16	315:5 372:10	234:15,16	452:6 454:9
510:22 511:16	384:23 393:6	covering 94:14	290:15 291:4	463:8 468:18
512:19	394:16,24	169:14 171:7	292:5 333:20	473:11 474:5
Counsel's 112:4	427:4,5 430:4	CPI 89:21	334:3,15 343:9	478:1 480:7,7
179:19 232:3	434:6,7,19,25	create 254:24	358:14 359:9	480:18
377:13	435:21 452:12	278:12 284:24	359:10 360:14	currently 136:7
counterbalance	454:15,19	302:5 311:1	360:16 365:9	183:8 191:1
93:3	479:5,8 500:12	created 254:19	369:18 371:22	204:5 208:4
countervailing	500:15 510:11	337:5 490:6	374:13 378:16	223:18 224:22
465:19	County's 434:14	creates 102:1	399:1 401:1	281:12 283:6
counties 88:21	couple 143:12	278:9	406:10,20,25	289:12 375:22
country 100:6	145:6 147:6	creating 302:12	411:22 426:13	403:15 407:25
139:10 431:9	151:12 160:1	372:14	432:11 439:15	420:18 432:4
county 83:10,11	210:15 216:7	creation 112:11	448:20 517:8,8	442:4,4,7,14
92:2,4,8 97:5	233:20 246:22	280:12	517:9,9,10,10	444:25 463:10
102:13 109:9	246:24 257:11	credentials	518:3,3,4,4,19	467:18 501:18
109:11 111:2	268:6 291:3	233:16 234:6	518:19 519:3,7	cursory 222:17
119:20 120:3,8	299:10 360:23	522:5	519:8,8,9,9,10	Curtis 83:18,19
121:11 122:11	369:17 374:12	credibility	519:10,17,17	113:17,18
126:9 128:14	383:2 384:24	397:14 398:14	519:18,18,19	114:17 127:16
129:12,17	387:4,4 414:2	399:13 400:6	519:19	127:19 197:4
147:8,15,20	426:12	credit 206:24	cross-examined	215:14 229:10
148:10 169:2	coupled 500:17	487:12 490:9	514:19	235:5 291:19
179:21 180:7	course 145:22	490:10	CROSSEXA	308:9,10
181:4,6 182:4	156:3 170:16	credits 486:22	118:14	311:15 315:12
185:18 189:19	242:3,24	crisis 96:15	crunching 361:2	316:4 338:14
190:11 246:13	278:22 286:21	criticizing 330:6	crying 313:8	374:8 413:7
250:4,4,8,23	313:9 314:23	cross 134:1	CTP 269:11	437:10 501:2,3
250:24 268:25	323:5 369:6,7	219:19 223:10	curious 85:25	501:5 517:5,9
269:9 271:12	374:24 434:21	234:18,20,22	86:17 147:7	518:15 519:22
274:24 298:7	435:17 452:24	334:10 392:16	340:8 386:12	customer 91:1,2
307:15,19	courses 246:1	400:16,19,20	current 112:14	93:6 94:20,22
309:23 312:4	court 82:23 90:6	400:22 406:10	120:5 126:14	95:15,16,17
	l	l	l	I

			i	·
99:25 103:3,8	361:18 362:3	128:4,14	355:10,22	damaging 105:2
103:12,17,23	362:25 373:9	139:16,17,23	356:1 360:20	DANIEL 82:18
104:7,22,25	375:6,18	140:7 141:15	363:4 367:21	dash 248:6
105:4,24 106:5	378:23 381:7	141:19 152:15	367:25 368:1	data 106:22
106:8 108:3	383:8 384:3	154:7 159:17	369:21 381:10	107:7 116:15
114:5,12	385:23,25	160:3,5 162:23	381:12 383:20	130:17 155:25
119:16 136:7	386:1 388:8	163:4 164:21	388:3,3 394:16	156:15 163:22
139:19,24	393:12,13	165:1,3,8	408:18 409:1,5	267:15
140:6 153:10	394:18,24	167:20 168:4	410:1,7,8	date 155:9
153:19 158:4	395:4,14,16,24	168:10,14	411:13 413:5,6	467:12 502:19
159:3 161:7,9	403:21 404:10	169:20,22	415:4 423:14	502:20 506:16
161:13,16,23	406:13,18	170:14,24	423:25,25	dating 461:14
162:12,19	409:4 413:16	174:8,16	424:6 425:3	day 169:12
164:10,12,13	414:5 420:20	176:16,20,22	428:7 430:4,5	205:9,10
164:16,17,24	420:24 421:6	177:3,3,8	445:7 446:2,4	251:21 334:20
165:6 166:8,23	425:2,10,14,16	179:19 185:8	447:6 453:21	428:6 515:25
168:18 174:19	439:25 440:23	186:19,24	453:22 458:4	days 123:3
176:17 187:18	447:5 450:16	187:2 193:15	459:19 460:7	233:20 247:20
201:7,14	455:18 478:5,5	202:17 204:15	460:11,12,15	336:19 360:23
202:22,25	478:21 488:11	204:18,23	460:19 468:23	deal 164:14,22
211:17 228:8	500:7,21 505:9	206:24 207:19	469:22 477:21	168:19 169:3
228:11 243:6	508:7	207:21,23	480:7 486:4	447:11,16
243:24 244:1	customer's	216:24 217:3	489:22 494:21	dealing 443:16
244:23 253:16	168:21 241:10	244:7 246:12	500:14 508:13	deals 404:14
255:24,25	441:18 464:14	253:6,16,18,24	511:17,22,23	498:22
256:5,10,13,15	customer-own	254:4 256:3	customers'	dealt 157:19
256:20 257:2	217:11	259:11 263:5	93:12 316:17	247:14 251:14
258:4 259:8,10	customers 88:17	263:13,15	cycle 278:25	DEAN 83:3
281:13 283:6,9	88:18 89:9	266:25 268:23	315:1	decade 496:17
283:11 295:2	93:3 94:18	269:18 273:20		December 89:15
301:20 302:16	100:6,8,10	273:21 283:13	<u>D</u>	decide 404:8
318:13 319:4	101:15,17,18	284:20 286:2	D 84:15 351:3	decided 277:20
321:20 324:10	101:19 102:4,8	286:16 288:9	361:15 363:17	405:3
324:24 325:9	102:23 103:9	293:19 295:20	364:9 370:16	decides 101:22
325:10 326:5	103:15 105:14	298:10 301:23	371:12	deciding 254:2
328:13,16	105:19 107:19	306:23 307:19	D-i-e-t-r-i-c-h	decision 91:24
346:17,20	107:22 108:2	312:7,10,11,13	232:24	91:25 140:22
348:10 349:13	112:23 113:23	316:14 317:10	Dam 483:9	155:18 156:15
349:16 350:4	114:3,3,5,7	317:19 318:6	damage 122:16	243:4 247:4
350:24 352:21	119:25 121:5	319:2,15 326:4	125:11 389:2	251:22 263:21
354:7,24 356:1	122:1,2,3,4,25	329:22 337:11	damaged 332:24	264:9,10
356:6 357:1,3	123:16 124:1	349:24 350:17	333:6	303:22 307:23
359:16,25	124:23 125:19	350:21 351:18	damages 125:9	314:16 316:7
360:2,12	127:23 128:1,3	351:21 355:5,7	125:13	320:15,16,18
			l	

	1	1	1	1
330:12 422:24	define 95:7	390:10 450:24	406:16,18	282:23 324:21
481:18 493:6,9	230:12	depicted 351:14	411:3,6 437:15	determining
496:3	defined 503:1	393:7 398:9	437:18 438:1,2	94:10 258:16
decision-maki	definitely	depreciated	438:8,14	307:1 411:11
301:4	125:20 139:8	127:4	457:18 477:24	411:16
decisions 233:7	159:20 276:12	depreciation	480:11 509:20	Deutsch 83:23
308:5 320:10	480:18	193:17,21	514:20 515:22	develop 285:5
493:14	definition	297:2	521:19	304:19 421:22
declares 100:17	497:17	Deputy 84:15	designated	488:25 489:1
decline 202:16	degree 220:20	describe 234:3	130:19 135:14	490:3 503:24
203:12	delegated 303:1	355:14 407:18	designed 94:21	developed 91:6
declining 90:25	deliberate	described 93:15	designer 312:25	190:14,17
91:2 199:14	103:11	124:5,19	designing	developing
200:7,19 201:6	delivered 254:11	135:21 148:12	375:20 422:6	125:12
201:15,20,23	254:13	206:17	designs 397:24	development
202:15,19	demand 195:20	describes 128:18	desire 249:6	128:20 284:13
203:4 209:19	266:10 317:2	description	314:2	deviate 311:10
211:5 236:1,7	demanded	116:7 265:5,7	desk 413:18	481:9 491:5
236:16,25	264:21,24	design 94:16	despite 279:24	507:2
237:5 319:13	demands 266:1	95:1 106:24	286:3	deviated 477:24
375:5,17	Dentons 84:12	109:3 119:7	detail 146:20	480:11 507:4
376:20 438:16	department	130:5 153:23	192:12 206:20	deviating 490:10
450:1	118:3 196:16	185:11 190:24	270:17 315:5	deviation 311:11
decrease 111:4	208:19 215:1	191:2 198:9,18	details 158:25	devil's 222:15
119:13 180:22	219:20 234:17	198:25 199:5,6	222:15 236:8	devoted 93:11
295:24 296:3	287:10 290:17	199:7,12 200:5	288:2 363:7	devotes 285:7
299:14,23	359:9 401:18	200:13,17	deter 443:21	diced 492:4
326:20 327:1,6	406:21 418:24	210:9,13	determinant	Dietrich 232:16
350:1 355:21	428:2 492:19	218:24 245:11	411:3	232:20,23
362:3,21	507:24,25	251:10 252:7	determinants	238:23 518:7
364:17,20,21	depend 177:14	258:4,9 259:24	349:13 354:11	Dietrich's 234:5
370:19 381:18	202:1	269:11 282:7	356:8	522:5
393:9,14,19	dependability	292:19 312:18	determination	difference 91:11
404:20 405:2	90:15	312:21,23	264:12 285:13	171:3 203:15
415:3 480:22	depending 244:4	313:1 314:15	435:25 495:13	304:24 373:8
decreased 89:11	244:13,23	315:25 321:16	determine 101:5	373:15 385:12
decreases	254:25 256:8	324:7 328:16	138:20 227:2	393:22 421:3
283:24 324:8,9	278:24 312:25	331:10,12	259:8,13	428:3 450:4
362:6 370:5	314:24 384:5	346:17,20	286:14 419:24	472:21
390:17 393:18	475:11	352:10 359:16	436:1 442:1	differences
def 456:21	depends 136:23	373:3 375:15	444:3 479:24	102:1 263:11
defer 102:8	170:1 177:22	384:10 401:21	492:9	373:5 374:3
179:10 200:23	200:8 201:19	401:25 402:3	determined	410:17 416:11
deference 499:1	206:2 228:20	402:15 406:12	207:5 278:3	416:19,21

	<u> </u>	ı	1	
419:1,4	483:3	453:6,13 517:7	265:14	299:1 313:23
different 86:5	differently	517:17,21	discovered	409:3 458:23
106:23 161:19	222:22 368:16	518:2,8,18	145:16	458:25
161:19 163:12	369:3	519:2,7,16	discretion 96:3,3	dishwashers
165:7 172:25	difficult 101:21	520:3,9,13	248:8 251:23	122:21
173:9 177:24	221:4 267:16	521:2,8,13,21	503:17	disincentive
177:24 180:18	280:15 285:5	directed 439:24	discrimination	142:12
182:17,18,21	286:14 287:19	directing 128:23	263:10 264:3	dislike 257:14
183:8 224:4	316:14 402:18	199:23	266:5 272:2	272:8
230:7 236:6	402:21 403:15	direction 204:10	discriminatory	dismissed 514:7
241:12,13,22	421:22,25	204:12 320:6	100:3 101:8	disparate
241:23 244:23	422:1,1 491:25	327:23 376:8	226:25 277:7	504:13
248:2 254:12	492:6 497:23	directive 106:24	277:12 278:12	dispersed
258:22 260:14	difficulties 274:1	directly 102:17	279:9,17	269:15
265:22 304:5	274:2	319:5 373:10	307:12 315:7	disproportion
330:3 334:21	difficulty 422:5	director 93:24	discuss 110:17	263:7
335:1,1,1,9,9	422:9 490:9	173:4,8 195:3	123:19 270:17	dispute 177:21
341:5 343:19	dimension 96:16	197:24 233:1,6	304:3 375:14	distance 412:9
349:23 354:1	dimensions	270:2 289:15	398:2 419:13	distant 257:8
354:15 357:12	265:24	disadvantage	438:22,23	distinct 100:9,11
368:17 369:8	dinner 309:6,25	101:1 109:21	447:23	174:13 252:16
372:16,17,23	dioxide 122:10	254:23 265:9	discussed	475:23 510:8
373:1,12	direct 115:4,24	277:6 284:3	175:20 185:18	distorting
381:23 384:2,3	116:2 194:22	disadvantages	192:11 280:25	282:14
390:3 391:1,2	210:10 212:17	254:25,25	315:5 353:24	distorts 253:2,15
391:2 407:22	213:10,19	278:11 313:19	355:17 356:12	distressed
412:18 416:24	218:16,23	disagree 86:22	409:19,20,21	152:21 257:5
416:25 417:1	232:21 241:1	86:24,25	409:25 422:23	287:9,17
422:13 430:7,8	251:7 256:7	304:14,21	510:20 511:18	288:15 441:24
435:15 443:20	262:25 266:13	337:7 509:13	511:25	465:10 473:4
452:9,10	268:24 269:4	509:14 513:13	discussing 468:4	474:18
462:15 469:9	269:10,16	disagreement	477:4 501:22	distribute
472:16 476:3	289:7 313:22	324:19	discussion 85:12	124:13 344:17
477:8 482:25	317:21 331:19	disallow 427:17	119:6 174:11	distribution
483:7,13 491:8	334:19 344:25	disallowance	192:18 239:17	148:24 319:6
495:19 508:9	345:13 346:13	427:13,16	303:11 313:18	319:10 420:6
508:10 509:9	346:16 347:8	476:4 486:11	318:19 321:7	district 83:9,10
509:12,19	357:18 358:5	discern 231:11	327:11 330:20	97:15,20,25
510:15	367:14 368:10	disclose 107:3	359:17,24	100:1 101:23
differential	401:11,20,24	disclosed 107:5	402:14 412:24	108:3 109:8,18
181:3 247:17	404:18 417:9	disclosure 146:1	431:8 437:17	109:18 110:1
differentials	421:16 451:19	discourage	490:17 510:18	110:25 111:7
244:6	451:22 452:17	276:12	discussions 92:3	112:9 126:19
differentiation	452:20,25	discouraging	122:1 185:17	128:15 147:17

176:14,18,19	368:7 369:12	226:4,5,14	182:18,18,21	308:4,21,23
180:2,18 182:1	375:7,7,17,19	243:1,14,16,19	182:24 183:1,7	311:2,2 312:4
187:17,19	375:20 389:24	243:22 244:5	207:19 208:21	312:6 317:11
189:19 197:6	393:6,9,19	249:20 253:11	215:15 222:13	317:13 318:25
223:8 227:9,23	394:6 403:1,1	253:13 255:20	222:13 224:25	319:9 321:20
228:5,22	403:2,9,11,24	256:23 267:13	226:6 227:10	321:23 322:11
229:14 231:4	403:25 404:16	268:21 270:8	227:11 229:12	327:1 329:20
239:4 240:4	404:19,21	275:17 277:24	230:14,15,18	329:20 338:16
243:9 244:5,7	405:1,5,5,6,8,9	278:4,6 279:22	235:7 241:2,2	351:2,12,12
244:16 246:6	407:5 408:10	279:24 280:1,2	241:13,14,16	352:4 355:11
246:13,15,25	408:10,13,14	282:4,9 285:5	241:17,19,20	356:20,23
247:9,10	408:15,16	286:22 291:12	241:20,25	357:2,7,13
248:20 249:12	410:12,15	292:14,21	242:1,4,8,10	372:4,6 373:5
250:2,7,10,17	415:14 417:11	293:7 295:13	242:15,16,18	373:25 374:10
250:19,22,23	417:12,18,19	296:4 298:14	242:19 243:2	375:12 387:17
250:23,25	418:13 421:16	299:24 300:10	244:15 245:1,2	387:18 388:22
251:1 252:5	424:7 427:9,18	300:11 307:5	246:18,20	389:17,23
256:8 257:3	433:6 435:3,6	308:16 310:2,7	249:18,22,23	390:14 399:4
258:12,16	435:7 436:1,9	310:25 311:7	249:25 250:20	399:25 403:1,5
262:12,14	437:12 445:1	311:11 314:20	254:24 255:11	403:22 404:6,9
263:2,6 266:19	446:19 453:13	315:10,13,21	255:14,18,19	404:11 407:23
267:11,15,18	453:19,19,19	316:2,7,15	255:22 263:5	407:24 408:1,1
269:6 270:9	463:9,10 467:2	335:12 356:22	263:14,15	408:6,11,16,19
271:6,7,7,8	467:17,20	389:25 399:3	264:16 266:14	409:24 414:2,9
274:6,9 276:10	468:22 470:11	402:15 404:5	266:15,25	415:11,15
277:8,14	470:17 471:20	416:5,17 417:6	267:1,4,5,12	416:11,14,16
278:24 279:12	473:21,22,22	417:10,17	267:21,23	416:19,21
279:13 280:22	474:15 478:24	418:5,11	269:15,23	419:2,5 421:24
291:8 295:1	485:6,12	419:16 421:23	270:14 271:8	422:16,25
299:14 301:15	486:11 487:4	424:4 426:18	272:21 274:23	423:9,9 424:1
302:1 306:12	488:2 489:3	427:12 436:11	275:8 276:13	424:8,10,17
307:15 309:20	492:8 496:11	436:21 437:6	277:16 278:16	425:23 427:1
311:16 312:8	496:11,16,20	461:12 462:13	279:2,3,4,8	430:21 433:15
313:4 314:25	497:10,10	504:25 505:3	280:8 281:20	435:23 444:24
316:3,9,24	499:16,17	505:17 509:25	283:9,10,17	444:24 445:1,3
317:8,12,18,19	500:10,17	district-wide	285:4,21,23	446:21,22
318:11,12	503:13,15	176:13	286:6 287:9	451:4,6,7,9,15
321:6 322:9,17	506:22	districts 98:1	288:3,4,19,19	451:23,23
322:25 323:1	district's 244:9	102:23 111:1,3	288:20 291:9	452:3,7,19
326:18 327:1	316:10	111:8 112:13	291:21 293:4	454:11,22
331:2 332:17	district-specif	119:12,13,17	294:17 295:25	455:1,16,18,23
333:7 336:24	497:24	119:20 126:22	296:12 297:10	456:3,14
352:9,20 353:7	district-specific	127:8 128:8,13	297:15 298:15	459:22 463:5
360:6,9 367:12	112:7 120:7	169:15 177:18	300:13,22,25	465:18,22
-				

468:25 469:9	155:17	329:1,11 348:5	174:1,3,6	365:6 411:20
471:17 473:20	documents	363:11 370:17	179:8 181:2	492:25 518:14
473:24 475:9	85:23 145:23	371:11 379:2	196:19 215:4	draw 368:20,21
475:13 477:17	188:9,16,24	404:17 407:4,5	219:24,25	444:7,7
477:25 479:4	189:4,5 378:13	435:19 453:3	223:16 234:20	driest 92:20
482:5 484:13	405:20	453:12 454:19	261:11,16,22	drink 96:10,24
484:15 485:17	doing 85:21 96:3	455:18 456:4	262:3,6,9,10	drinking 249:6
486:13,14	98:7 107:10,18	457:22 458:15	271:20 272:1,9	driven 91:2
488:1 493:14	111:20 112:24	459:20 472:10	272:13,23	125:16
493:16 494:8,9	122:12 124:24	472:11 477:21	273:4 285:9	drivers 294:16
494:10,24	139:7 165:2,5	480:13 488:11	287:6 290:20	295:15
497:25 498:8	243:7 361:5	505:20	290:24 315:4	driving 91:4
499:8,15	374:22 386:4	Don 213:13,16	324:14,16,16	294:19
500:14,16	386:21 431:23	door 205:19,22	325:2 334:10	drop 254:7
502:7,14	434:22 471:15	464:22	360:15,16,19	dry 428:15
503:21 507:9	471:20 474:17	Dority 83:7,7	380:8,11 393:4	DSP 278:4,19
510:8	482:4	128:9,12	398:16,21	280:4 281:3,11
districts401	dollar 105:14	130:10,13,17	406:24,25	282:5 283:22
522:6	137:2 187:11	186:1,2 197:7	409:12,15	420:18
diverted 266:2	187:15,17	215:16 229:13	410:5 411:9	dual 199:13
divide 309:10,11	256:13 258:22	229:17 235:8	492:23 517:13	200:6,18
divided 309:16	294:8 306:22	291:22 311:17	518:3,13 519:8	due 91:7 211:4,5
division 83:17	310:8 323:17	311:18,24	519:17	253:19 267:14
108:7,8 173:5	355:24 356:19	312:2 319:25	Downey's	503:5
173:5,7 257:23	363:2,20 370:6	320:7,17,20,21	179:16	Dunn 317:21
258:2,3,8,17	379:11 402:25	320:22 338:17	downward	duplicate 240:10
258:18 334:6	407:20,24	374:11,13	199:8	Dustin 441:2
359:14	423:16 450:17	378:10 404:3	Dr 218:8,18,22	duties 128:18
divulge 326:11	454:13 458:12	437:13,23	219:12 220:1	dwell 148:2
DNR 138:16	487:11 488:9	438:3,16,20,23	221:10,15	dying 273:23
152:22 300:24	505:9	439:2,6 502:8	225:20 229:25	dynamic 266:8
428:22	dollars 89:16,21	517:9 518:16	232:11 245:13	
docket 192:16	89:22,23 90:13	519:10	245:14,17	<u>E</u>
312:22	92:10,11	double 120:12	252:20,22	E 83:1,1 383:23
document 85:20	106:14,15	152:12 336:20	254:8 257:19	e-mail 124:25
135:22 190:2,4	113:5 120:6,15	370:21 400:12	268:10,12,22	e-mailed 327:14
220:18,23,24	136:7,8 150:13	421:9 450:19	269:4,10	ear 440:13
221:13,19	153:16,24	500:16	313:13 497:4	earlier 111:5
233:20 345:12	191:5,12,14	double-digit	Drag 84:4,5	135:17 185:25
345:18,23	205:18,19,22	222:13	118:9 196:21	198:3 241:18
346:3 348:1	256:8 301:25	doubt 177:10	215:6 223:12	242:23 254:18
414:21 421:13	302:2,2 309:22	483:18	234:22 273:13	262:4 270:7
466:7 498:7,19	309:23 318:13	Downey 83:12	273:14 276:18	282:18,19
documentation	318:13,14	108:12 118:7	291:1 334:12	285:20 290:21

	1	1		
295:23 303:12	151:25 174:6	either 138:16	137:5 194:25	England 83:2,4
314:6 317:1	212:8 262:10	201:1 247:16	195:2 212:20	239:9 240:1,7
355:17 365:13	324:16 360:19	254:10 257:12	232:25 289:12	240:15,18
373:4 404:4	ed 171:18	293:20 338:6	345:4 401:15	246:23 247:5
425:15 438:9	educate 171:19	390:17 397:14	433:9	248:10,14,15
445:6 446:9	281:18 367:9	409:13 480:25	employee 107:5	250:14 251:21
474:21 475:7	educated 510:24	491:5 503:3	145:17,18	260:23,24
477:4 482:3	educating	elaborate 312:19	166:10 173:11	261:6 292:3,5
497:4 511:18	420:16	elect 281:12	173:18 188:10	293:10 296:20
early 147:22	education	420:19	employees 198:4	298:22,23
149:13,18	171:21 281:13	elected 189:22	employer 198:1	309:2 317:6
156:23,24,25	420:20,24	electeds 341:6	en 264:8	328:5 329:8,15
160:12 179:17	421:7	electric 90:24	enable 184:12	330:4,14
424:24	Edward 83:12	97:2,10 103:6	enables 183:21	338:23 344:9
earn 95:13	94:1 212:9,16	254:12 256:11	enabling 284:14	344:12,17,25
444:14,17	212:19 517:20	256:19 312:24	enacted 418:4	349:1,5 354:21
earned 92:16,18	effect 184:3	426:23 483:1,6	enactment 92:5	354:22 358:12
92:21	466:21	electricity 428:8	encompass	363:2 365:13
earnings 337:12	effective 467:12	element 267:8	325:1,3	379:19,22,24
ears 308:15	effectively	325:3	encourage 106:6	380:1,3 392:19
easier 141:11,14	267:12	elements 422:7	268:17 276:12	392:20,23,25
141:15 253:3	effectiveness	497:9 498:9	285:15 406:19	393:2 397:9,11
513:16	267:17	elicited 342:18	ends 203:24	398:21 399:8
East 83:23 84:9	efficiencies	eliminate 122:5	endured 103:15	399:22 400:11
easy 148:4	153:12	335:12	283:21	400:17 448:2,9
eat 447:18	efficiency 89:10	Elizabethtown	energetic 240:19	448:13,19,20
eaten 447:21	91:3 116:12,21	392:9,10	energy 83:14,17	449:5,12,14,15
echo 113:20	195:20 259:13	ELLINGER	91:8 108:7,8	459:8,16 461:1
echoed 222:16	263:18 265:13	83:22	108:11 118:3	461:4 466:22
economic	266:8 267:16	else's 254:1	196:16 208:19	479:12 493:16
266:13 274:25	284:22 285:3	382:20	215:1 219:20	504:18,19
276:13 284:13	efficient 281:6	embarking	234:17 257:23	514:15,17
308:20 419:15	effort 281:17	316:8,8	258:2,17,18	515:3,7,12,16
economically	330:7 367:8	embedded	261:9 270:18	515:19,24
266:9	455:11 492:9	437:18	290:17 334:7	518:11,19,21
economics	efforts 91:3	embellish 516:6	359:9,14	519:7,13,19,23
245:17,24	328:10 330:18	Emerald 250:13	406:21 492:20	England's
246:1 301:17	EFIS 102:18	251:2 424:9	Energy's 258:3	309:18 318:10
economies	106:7,8	466:15,18	258:8	enjoyable
139:14,18	eight 112:12,13	467:22 468:1	enforced 227:3	509:15
148:12 175:2	160:23 161:1	473:15	engaged 420:23	enjoyed 97:1
economist	162:5 247:11	employ 204:5	engineer 147:24	ensure 93:7
252:20 F1146.10	271:8 288:19	422:11	engineers	276:3 304:16
Ed 146:18	323:1 496:20	employed 115:7	190:20	ensuring 237:23
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	I

				ı
enter 398:22	91:14	estimates 186:3	214:22 219:18	392:20 401:11
entered 232:4	equitable 276:4	186:8	225:15 234:13	506:19 517:7
238:15	419:24	et 377:4 445:9	269:21 281:16	517:16,17,19
entering 358:20	equity 92:18	evaluate 267:16	290:13 303:25	517:21 518:2,5
entire 92:24	199:8 259:13	evaluated	333:21 334:2	518:8,18,21
103:2 127:7	265:23 315:2	155:25	359:7 399:5	519:2,4,7,13
177:6 312:14	317:2	evaluating 86:11	406:8 423:19	519:16,23
329:25 386:23	equivalent 87:10	432:24	449:11 495:18	examine 284:5
422:5 481:5	87:16 89:22	Evaluation	517:6 518:1,6	286:13
487:3,9,15	390:1	345:7	518:17 519:1,5	examined
entirely 145:13	erode 263:17	evening 343:6	519:15	498:10
436:7	erroneous	411:23,25	evident 179:19	example 90:4
entirety 441:6	398:10 400:4	465:5,6 501:4	Evidentiary	127:1 222:4
445:11	error 300:19	501:5	82:6	231:2 237:20
entities 442:18	357:8	event 192:25	evolution 432:4	243:24 263:24
442:20	errors 397:5,13	eventually	432:6	266:18 274:23
entitled 345:12	especially	312:12 368:7	ex 264:6 277:9	279:4 294:25
345:18,23	174:25 275:2	416:7 473:17	285:10	298:5 305:6
346:3	370:13 468:22	475:11	ex 275:11	325:11 328:12
entity 142:8	512:17	ever-evolving	exact 122:8	350:2 364:13
428:23 442:9	essence 266:23	305:2	124:4 128:2	373:20 393:11
442:12,12	274:22	everybody 97:24	147:21 155:9	452:11 454:15
443:7 446:16	essential 109:3	109:25 112:22	177:13 181:19	470:25
495:8	281:14 420:21	124:8 151:7	223:21 225:1	exceeded 277:18
entrant 266:3	essentially 199:3	154:20 180:10	435:25 457:5	exceeding
entrenched	204:2 206:21	261:18 330:19	468:10 470:20	496:12
330:9	216:22 284:11	333:13 340:4	471:2 479:25	exceeds 464:14
environment	292:12 454:21	430:1 431:16	482:13 492:7	Excellent 311:24
91:6 417:25	456:10	438:6 446:23	492:11 495:7	exceptions
430:19	establish 154:2	446:24 477:14	495:16	253:25
environmental	229:2 326:17	477:15 490:25	exactly 120:13	excerpts 313:21
313:16 429:19	327:2	499:17,25	122:13 125:3	excess 283:1
EP 220:18	established	504:23	153:24 200:11	310:13
EPA 220:18	99:21 100:1,20	everybody's	324:2 414:14	excluding 356:1
221:19 223:1	101:4 253:21	305:3 343:12	417:14 453:5	356:20 407:21
275:20 287:10	establishes	496:24	457:24 484:7	excuse 98:22,22
equal 170:21	252:14	everyone's	492:2 498:20	130:14 139:10
301:23 322:3	establishing	360:11 368:2	Examination	214:7 245:13
403:20 404:10	497:8 502:23	374:1 486:9	115:4 189:16	245:23 246:23
477:18	establishment	evidence 107:23	194:22 210:7	260:23 317:17
equally 245:1	241:8	117:15,24	212:17 218:16	328:7 346:14
265:25 309:16	Estates 250:13	129:5 137:17	232:1,21 289:7	347:15 371:23
equals 265:24	estimated 92:7	143:14,17	299:20 331:19	379:22 435:8
equipment	130:1	144:4 196:6,12	342:15 344:25	443:5 446:13

454:10 455:10	381:15,24	400:9,16,21	244:10 297:8	explanation
455:16 462:19	382:18 383:6	401:23 405:25	340:25	86:4 171:11
482:4 512:8	384:21 393:11	406:4,7 437:16	expensive	285:21
excused 134:3	393:24 394:17	449:16 514:22	175:21 243:25	explore 505:2
executed 190:7	398:23 401:5,6	exist 90:17	270:8,13 318:4	express 277:15
executive 301:6	401:8 402:5,8	256:20 418:14	experience	expressed
303:2,23	402:9,11 406:3	existence 376:6	103:4 233:23	268:10
exercise 315:24	406:5 407:2	432:4	245:20 246:7	extend 87:5
exhibit 85:1,5	410:6 413:10	existing 148:22	317:9,12	88:11,20
115:16,23	435:11 448:7	174:15 241:24	319:16 426:15	extensive 333:7
116:18,24	448:12,13,14	242:2 286:9	experienced	426:14
124:8,9 128:18	448:16,21	319:13 375:16	121:5 193:7	extent 103:6
129:4 135:8,8	449:5,7,8,10	375:21 376:11	246:12	140:16 141:8
135:9,15	449:18 450:8	376:11 387:14	experiences	141:23 142:7
137:10,12,13	450:11 451:2,5	387:15,24	305:13	166:19 199:11
137:16 143:13	453:24,25	395:21 426:8	experiencing	200:5,16 205:4
143:18,23	466:4 480:20	463:10 467:18	160:3	236:14 237:6
144:1,3 154:15	499:12 516:13	503:1,13,15	experiment	249:7 255:9
180:17 189:2	516:15 520:1,2	exists 93:5 231:8	315:9	259:19 388:24
190:2 195:10	520:4,5,7,8,10	281:12 420:18	expert 245:5	390:8 397:12
195:15,23	520:11,13,14	expand 285:19	262:17	398:10 454:11
196:6,7,11	520:16,17,19	expanded	expertise 141:1	514:20,21
213:4,9,12,15	520:20,22,23	510:10	190:19	externalities
213:19 214:7	520:25 521:1,3	expect 178:24	experts 374:17	265:19
214:17 218:25	521:5,7,9,10	435:2,15	explain 121:3	extra 163:14
225:11,12,14	521:12,14,15	460:11	191:20 216:16	447:3
225:23 233:15	521:17,19,21	expected 211:18	285:17 349:6	extracted 254:10
234:2,9,10,12	521:22,24	211:22	349:20 352:17	extraordinary
240:11 289:18	522:1,2,4,6	expediency	353:13 355:5	136:5
289:25 290:8	exhibits 85:3	264:11 285:12	356:16 363:4,7	extreme 152:24
290:10,12	112:4 117:6,7	expedient	367:24 387:7	504:22
309:19 333:20	117:15,17,20	264:16	389:9 402:11	extremely 90:19
333:23,24	117:23 214:15	expenditure	407:1 426:16	138:24 152:24
334:1 342:17	214:19,21	190:18 323:20	446:7 472:19	274:19,25
345:14,20,25	219:10,14,15	323:22	516:7	316:14
346:25 347:3	219:17 344:14	expenditures	explained	extremes 242:5
348:24 349:20	344:19 346:7	129:22 130:1	192:19 252:23	
352:15 353:10	348:22 356:12	148:9 178:25	277:10 285:11	<u>F</u>
353:22 354:12	358:3,14,18	270:9,10	314:17 363:5	F 83:12 351:6
354:25 355:14	359:6 360:21	expense 100:4	459:6	face 145:20
356:15 361:4	365:17 366:7	136:24 285:7	explaining 184:4	228:23 230:24
364:3 370:2	394:11 396:24	341:15 423:15	explains 145:24	274:2 308:18
377:6 378:20	397:12,17,25	expenses 89:11	244:11 284:14	faced 90:25
380:8,11	398:1 399:17	89:15 152:8	414:5	120:18 274:1
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_	_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

	I	I	I	ı
274:24 275:18	factoring 205:9	91:23 161:13	feedback 168:11	323:24 328:7
279:12	factors 199:16	172:11 198:9	282:15	filed 85:11,19
facilitate 465:9	211:4 319:16	231:2 318:4	feel 123:24	86:22 102:18
465:19 473:3	465:17 475:22	412:25 463:14	141:5 169:13	106:7 115:19
474:17 493:8	482:2 487:5	487:19	171:4 240:17	155:13 157:4
facilitating	489:8 503:6	families 171:7	295:12 328:1	161:1 173:2
501:15	facts 99:24	287:20 428:14	330:9 441:8	189:1 210:13
facilities 88:23	267:19 303:25	family 170:17,17	feeling 169:13	218:23 234:7
116:8 148:15	304:3,5 305:1	170:17 171:1	170:21 491:2	242:23 255:12
152:21,23	320:9 336:13	171:14 472:14	feelings 515:11	258:20 264:6
483:8 489:21	430:8	504:13	feels 297:12	289:16 303:10
facility 121:11	factual 304:24	Fane 84:9	396:9	304:22 312:22
129:13 147:8	fail 429:16	far 99:7 114:4	Felix 84:2	316:21 321:8
147:19 148:11	failed 107:3	136:13 166:23	fellow 166:6	332:2,7 335:23
150:10,11,21	failing 429:15	173:17 193:19	felt 157:10 161:9	345:12,18,23
150:21,22,24	431:9 485:17	228:13 236:7	389:6	346:3 378:21
150:25 191:2	failure 275:21	242:11 243:25	fence 504:4	379:1 409:22
306:22 340:23	fair 95:13,16	248:11 257:15	Ferguson 104:6	434:12 447:13
340:25 341:1	109:25 110:23	330:8,10,10	269:5,11 504:9	451:19
434:23 482:16	168:25 169:3	333:7 352:12	504:11	filing 86:7
483:9 489:15	185:7 200:21	403:7 409:25	fewer 176:20	199:23 260:21
facing 121:5	292:21 302:6	413:24 448:25	389:17	333:17 349:17
235:25 236:3,3	314:10,18	464:14	fi 493:23	351:10 352:21
237:8 274:24	341:11,14	fashion 120:25	fictional 252:9	456:5
fact 110:19	408:9 445:19	311:4	field 190:3	filings 163:20
111:14 123:19	447:9,16	faucet 125:15	245:18 418:23	fill 112:16
135:17,24	449:23 450:21	faucets 122:19	521:11	filter 123:20
137:1 180:20	455:8 456:15	332:24	fif 366:2	filters 122:25
191:4 205:6	460:10 465:11	faulty 104:9	fifth 399:23	123:17,22
221:23 226:2	495:14,15	105:11 106:5	Fifty 366:4	144:19 167:15
254:14 269:23	fairly 408:9	107:4 145:10	fighting 267:5	filtration 154:18
295:12 298:25	450:9 454:23	155:3,21 157:2	figure 129:9	final 233:7 246:3
317:24 328:17	503:16	157:13 188:11	130:24 169:2	386:2 422:21
336:22 390:2	fairness 263:9	192:9,22,23	191:12 385:9	finally 90:10
397:19 399:1	265:20 315:2	favor 97:25	423:17 474:2	98:4 250:9
399:10 456:17	317:2 330:4	242:20 307:5	489:25	285:24 346:2
460:6 463:19	faith 492:9	367:16	figured 495:7	finance 270:2
494:14	faithfully 286:2	favors 463:4	figures 175:18	289:15
factor 184:6,14	fall 351:12	feature 222:19	299:11,13	financial 204:17
258:14 306:25	475:12	February	483:3	267:15
336:21 398:4,5	falling 93:6	156:21 159:19	figuring 480:5	financially
411:15	falls 205:13	199:24	file 82:14 85:23	107:24 287:13
factored 363:4	471:17	federal 90:6	85:23 86:3,20	financials 98:12
369:7 384:3	familiar 88:11	91:7 428:16	86:21 260:8	find 107:25

	ī			
145:3 154:17	261:25 278:15	119:16 159:7	167:2 346:12	formula 478:11
200:1 268:14	278:21 312:3	201:8,9,10,12	follow 121:16	486:24 487:3
318:8 399:9	fit 138:21	205:7,8,12,14	147:6 161:15	487:11,19
429:12 495:14	300:12	205:16,16,17	161:24 255:12	490:6,6,17
506:10 513:2	five 138:4,4	205:20 207:2,4	477:2	493:5 496:2
findings 188:24	151:20,21	210:20 211:1	follow-up	formulaic
fine 110:25	157:4 162:9	212:1 250:18	121:25 504:20	487:15
201:1 211:16	183:10 194:8	283:6 340:15	following 145:18	formulating
227:19 257:21	202:24 222:11	352:9,12 379:2	161:2 188:5	506:22 507:3
326:19 399:19	241:20 251:1	379:5,12,17,21	follows 115:3	forth 200:18
429:18 495:14	283:4 286:4	380:5 381:3	194:21 212:16	304:22 389:3
finish 300:5	336:17 368:5	382:3,9 384:2	218:15 232:20	447:12,13
fire 113:25	392:4 425:7	395:3,8,11,19	289:6 331:18	451:17 491:24
firm 128:12	427:22 429:16	395:25,25	344:24 401:10	512:9
first 85:9,15,25	442:5 451:15	467:6	food 113:3 335:6	Fortunately
86:2 87:24	451:22,24	fixed-income	Foods 320:24	102:3
89:9 90:18	452:3 466:11	109:7	footing 281:20	forum 268:5
93:21 94:10	466:12 480:6	fixtures 91:7	force 204:23	forward 93:13
114:20 118:3	481:23 487:13	flat 105:16	485:22	124:23 140:1
123:12 136:9	487:14 493:23	207:17,19	forced 113:2	170:15 236:18
147:7 179:13	512:17	323:17 438:12	forces 253:12	281:21 288:10
180:17 187:3	five- 104:8	Fleming 245:7	forecast 206:23	288:10 293:7
203:11 221:22	five-district	345:6	forecasted 202:5	323:22 326:17
239:1 240:25	250:21	flexibility	203:22 206:4	397:22 430:14
241:24 243:22	five-eighth	304:17 311:8	forego 104:19	446:12 458:18
245:6 248:22	356:2 383:19	flight 359:20,22	foresee 296:8	476:9 488:22
252:25 284:10	five-eighths	360:13	476:8	489:10 490:4
309:13 331:1	283:7,12	Flint 96:13	forget 160:21	498:4
332:11 348:23	321:17 350:3	flip-flop 278:20	forgot 340:19	fought 180:24
349:19,21	383:25 385:25	flood 424:12	435:8 466:2	273:24
350:2,25 352:4	393:13	flooding 424:15	471:8	found 144:16
353:10 354:25	five-minute	flowing 428:16	form 115:13,20	150:19 152:7
360:22 361:4	194:13 396:13	flushing 122:3	195:7 213:1	279:2 332:9
361:10,14	five-year 512:13	161:20	222:5 230:20	479:17,18
392:3 402:25	fix 101:11	focal 317:14	230:21 231:7	foundation
403:23 406:20	161:17,17,25	focus 105:13	231:16 274:6	397:12 486:23
421:1,20 450:3	340:13 429:20	156:10 228:6	276:10 380:4	493:5 496:2
458:9,13,21	473:7	263:21 394:17	462:5	four 107:1
468:14 470:14	fixed 91:11,12	471:6	formal 328:8	118:22 136:9
487:18 488:16	91:19,20,22	focuses 253:11	formally 221:14	177:11,16
507:23 514:24	94:22 103:14	focusing 349:19	format 354:13	198:13,23
firsthand 433:1	104:2,2,17	430:10,11	356:11 381:1	207:15 263:2
fis 211:1	106:17 108:2	512:17	former 135:25	285:1 358:3
Fischer 83:7	112:25 114:8	folks 125:9	313:19	381:23 407:25

	1	1	1	Ī
407:25 425:7	funded 93:9	489:9	generated 156:1	113:3,3 142:10
427:22 442:5	funds 428:22		167:24	142:10 158:20
480:6 481:23	furnished 227:4	<u> </u>	generation	162:18 168:10
four-year	further 91:10	G-e-o-f-f 218:21	483:7,10	168:11 169:12
136:21	125:23 127:12	gag 123:25	generous 288:7	194:8 200:1
fourth 173:18	137:7 146:23	gallon 91:15	gentleman 104:9	228:3 233:17
324:7 352:14	181:10 183:13	136:6 364:22	440:8 442:8	247:3 261:21
Frank 115:24	189:12 192:12	505:10	471:1,8	273:16 274:10
129:3 135:25	207:6 225:7	gallons 113:4	Geoff 218:8,15	307:22 323:25
frankly 138:15	229:6 246:8	171:5 350:10	218:18 252:20	341:14 364:2
141:2 157:11	253:4 255:10	350:11,13	518:2 521:13	397:15 429:4
164:18 316:18	263:25 269:24	362:18,23	521:14,16,17	441:9,16,17
377:7	280:13 290:6	394:19	geog 483:21	466:23 488:19
free 154:18	290:24 291:14	game 278:13	geographic	490:16 498:16
266:6 300:19	329:24 338:10	Gannett 245:7	242:8 243:6	512:18 516:8
399:11 487:6	344:5 365:2	345:6	250:1,21	given 120:5
frequently 142:6	369:14 384:14	Garrett 83:19	373:25 451:11	139:4 155:4
friend 315:11	387:6 390:12	Gary 84:4,5	472:15 486:25	157:3,23
friends 472:14	426:9,19	213:10 273:14	geographical	158:19 186:22
504:13	465:17 475:4,8	gas 90:23 103:5	164:9	259:12 300:19
front 105:3	475:16 476:9	247:15 254:12	geographically	324:20 327:7
108:21 136:4	476:16 495:23	312:24 426:22	269:15 388:16	401:6 417:11
175:1 177:14	500:23 513:12	426:22 428:10	503:4	417:17 426:14
179:20 377:5	519:13	483:2,10	geography	495:17 496:20
423:4 441:1	future 93:13	507:21,24	390:20,22,23	gives 111:15,18
447:14 491:18	99:4 139:2,9	508:1,9,10,16	468:10,12	168:18 263:21
fulfill 112:17	148:10 157:18	508:17	470:6,9,23,24	512:24
full 114:14 207:3	185:21 201:17	gather 240:1	471:15,21,23	giving 104:15
209:14 224:3	201:20 202:3	gears 463:17	472:2,23,25	253:6 273:2
249:17 313:6	203:8,16,20,25	general 82:14	getting 160:19	401:7
331:20 345:1	204:3 205:1	83:15 89:6,12	167:3 244:3	glass 368:20
376:8 401:13	206:16,22	89:17,25 92:10	280:25 310:23	glasses 130:25
476:6 481:9	265:17 268:4	163:4 202:23	330:3 358:22	515:17
504:22,25	269:15 280:7	236:16,21	382:4,5 394:13	global 355:20
505:2,16,21	280:15 294:12	257:6 302:25	404:20 405:1	go 85:14 87:23
fully 127:3,4	297:6 307:13	320:12 324:3	415:3 428:8	94:7 99:7
431:16	314:17 320:16	467:7 498:17	430:15 454:12	103:19 104:20
function 233:6	367:12 369:12	generality 372:3	462:10 470:10	108:15 112:15
functionally	376:23 390:11	generally 146:15	481:19 486:3	114:19 130:2
203:18	412:22 413:4	203:1 223:2	491:2 515:25	130:22 137:21
fund 486:24	424:14 431:25	236:10,11	Girardeau	138:19 156:20
fundamental	433:6 435:1,6	319:16 320:7	171:22 247:16	161:24 164:9
326:16 473:2	437:3,6 463:21	325:19 391:15	give 86:9,10	164:12,19
474:13	475:4 482:17	generate 163:13	95:6 108:1	166:13 179:12

	-	-		
179:13 183:16	312:25 321:12	326:17 329:16	314:15	445:20 465:5,6
194:4,5 207:18	goes 118:3	329:17 339:20	good 88:10 94:6	469:16,17
208:18,24	158:12 171:18	351:1 352:23	102:2,11,14	475:19 476:9
227:16 228:13	206:22 207:22	362:8 368:2,8	104:5 105:7,11	476:10 478:11
231:13 239:3,6	297:23 325:3	380:4 382:10	107:6,11	482:11,11
239:20 255:3	372:13 397:14	382:14 384:9	108:20 114:23	492:9 501:4,5
274:21 275:9	398:12 408:10	386:18 392:13	121:16 126:6,7	gosh 482:17
276:2,3 278:19	440:15 496:10	396:8 400:12	127:17 128:10	gotten 157:14
287:2 288:25	499:25	408:4 409:7	128:11 134:9	230:1 380:18
295:22 296:23	going 87:25	414:15 424:10	135:12,13	government
300:5 311:1	93:16 94:22	425:13 429:16	137:24,25	303:22 306:13
314:20,21	96:13 97:22	429:19,20	138:21 146:2	government
321:2,4,4,7,7	99:3 103:18,23	430:1 431:22	147:2,3,5	284:15
324:19 330:25	110:4 130:6	431:24 433:20	149:25 150:1,3	grab 124:7
344:13 360:8	140:1 141:3	434:22 438:2	150:4 155:23	graduate 245:25
360:11 366:5	147:19 150:14	441:11 443:11	159:22 165:3	graduated
376:23 380:3	152:11,12,13	448:10 451:3	166:4,5 167:20	487:22
380:10 381:21	152:23 153:23	454:1 458:2,15	169:13 170:13	grand 178:15
386:19 396:23	154:6,10	458:17 459:4	174:4,21 178:2	grant 134:4
398:11,14	160:16 161:22	463:17,20	181:14,15	265:2
399:12 400:5	161:23 163:12	464:1 466:17	185:15 189:11	Granted 274:10
400:23 401:2	164:20,21	469:1,15	190:18 197:21	granting 277:3
403:3 428:21	165:6 166:11	470:11 473:17	197:22 209:1,2	graphically
428:22 429:12	169:20 170:13	473:18,19,25	212:10,12	250:15
437:5,21,25	170:14 172:12	474:10,17,25	216:4,5 220:1	great 92:13
446:12 447:22	174:14 175:20	476:8 479:9	220:2 235:20	150:21 154:6
450:6,14,19	175:23 176:14	480:5,20,21	235:21 239:24	167:6 178:8,10
457:18 467:13	183:19 184:2	481:3,10,12,24	244:22 247:21	202:16 204:17
470:8 472:4	190:21 191:9	482:17 484:5,6	255:10 257:24	205:15 263:14
476:6 478:21	194:3 202:16	485:25 486:25	262:9 273:14	263:14 266:25
481:11,24,24	205:25 208:18	487:4,18 488:9	275:7,8,9	267:23 320:13
482:16,17,20	224:15 229:13	488:10,14,17	276:4 293:16	326:14 388:22
483:11,15,24	236:10,17	489:10,10,21	293:17 305:12	464:20 499:1
485:13 486:10	240:7 243:5,25	489:22,24	307:12 309:1	greater 92:19
490:2,4 491:11	262:23 264:4	490:8,12 491:6	312:1 330:22	211:18 228:2
494:8 498:9	265:12 268:9	491:10 498:4	330:24 334:16	228:16 382:9
499:12 505:12	273:7,16 277:1	512:18,21	342:4 344:13	512:7 513:8
505:23 516:12	287:17 293:7	513:17,21	360:17,18	greatly 177:15
goal 191:21	297:5 309:3,6	514:6,21 515:5	365:10,11	270:10
282:10 284:19	310:12,12	going-forward	371:23,23,25	ground 244:19
430:14 445:11	314:9 315:15	94:11,17 474:1	373:24 383:4,5	groundwater
469:22	316:1,7,24	475:13 476:11	384:18,19	367:3,6 368:15
goals 243:15	320:1,6 323:11	489:23 503:20	398:7 411:23	368:22 369:3,9
282:6 284:13	323:22 324:1	gone-tomorrow	411:25 426:19	412:12,15,19
-				

	I	I	I	I
group 126:25	379:12,17	188:6 189:20	handful 485:7	harm 204:22
127:5,7 216:21	380:6	191:16 194:10	handing 144:18	harmful 256:3
242:1,1 266:16	guess 85:19	197:19,20	handle 288:2,5	295:12
330:1 333:13	130:2 144:23	216:2,3 231:22	288:20 478:6	harmless 292:13
337:4,5 351:20	148:8 157:5	235:18,19	478:22	292:20 293:2
387:13,17,18	170:25 184:19	246:23 247:6	handout 241:11	302:10
387:19 390:15	184:20 187:8	248:4,12	246:8 250:15	hat 492:10
468:13 507:11	191:9 192:18	251:16,20	318:10 448:3	hate 436:15
513:15	198:23 207:1	252:1 257:11	handouts 187:24	Haye 94:1
grouped 388:20	293:5 295:4	257:17,21	handwriting	146:18 151:25
468:18	310:20 324:21	259:21 260:2,5	238:12	212:9,9,16,19
grouping 241:24	325:5 350:3	260:18,22	handwritten	214:24 218:2
242:12,14,15	362:15 375:3	271:17,25	241:3	517:20 520:18
250:16 374:2	383:24 436:11	272:5,12	happen 120:7	He'll 261:19
387:8 388:1,19	437:13 447:21	276:15,24	125:14 147:18	400:13
389:10 390:6,8	448:14 462:10	281:2 286:23	261:17 294:12	head 130:7
390:19,19	480:24 484:23	293:14,15	339:18 395:18	237:10 332:6
413:14 414:11	496:21 503:9	303:6,9,18	475:1 512:18	433:19 445:23
468:5,7,9,15	guidance 95:6	304:2,5,21	happened	497:2
469:4,21 470:9	247:4 498:16	305:17 324:6	145:21 173:13	health 121:9,9
485:6 486:2	guiding 282:1	324:15,16,23	202:24 429:21	hear 85:13
499:7	guy 309:12	325:5,21,24	430:10 438:11	103:23 104:4
groupings	guys 153:16	332:13,13,15	happening	104:18 106:11
240:25 241:1	160:20 164:19	333:5 339:1,13	161:1 208:1	108:6 109:6
241:22 309:19		339:14,16,17	340:22	171:8 172:19
389:6 470:7	H	339:18 340:10	happens 96:14	175:2 220:4,7
groups 241:19	Haase 270:2	342:5,22 343:3	97:15,17	220:10 279:18
241:21 267:3	279:18 289:6	383:2,3 384:13	278:24 314:25	290:10 297:1
451:16 470:14	289:10 292:6	387:3,6 439:10	390:10 428:4,5	308:15 326:11
grow 154:3	296:23 298:24	465:3,4 471:7	480:23 511:6	332:19 380:20
growing 107:14	518:18 521:4	486:8,8 506:10	happy 168:15	424:25 440:15
138:3 139:13	half 94:9,10,14	517:11,18,21	271:15 319:20	472:5,9,9
139:15 305:4	94:15 118:22	518:8,20	326:10 360:2	511:18
grown 418:23	137:2 299:12	519:11,13,20	444:6	heard 94:24
429:22	451:4	Hall's 251:12	hard 94:25	100:7 102:16
growth 91:1,6	hall 82:18 85:16	477:3	125:14,21	102:19 103:1,9
93:3,4 107:16	85:18 86:8,16	halves 94:10	170:9,24	103:21,25,25
135:1,3 174:20	86:23 87:4,14	hand 114:24	231:10 273:4	104:2,6,17,20
184:12,15	87:18,20	194:18 212:11	402:19,20	105:4,7,15,16
guarantee 516:1	118:17 120:20	218:11 224:15	480:16	105:17 106:3,4
516:4	121:1,25	228:21 242:6	HARDEN 84:12	110:16 119:5
guaranteed	137:23 143:21	327:7 331:14	197:9 215:18	124:1 127:21
153:17 154:10	144:5 146:6,7	handed 187:22	235:10	167:12 171:5
302:25 379:3	153:8 160:7	240:23 309:19	harder 317:15	175:13 198:3

	_	_		_
222:15 253:22	162:12 164:18	331:6 344:10	266:24 267:4	204:4
256:18 263:19	164:23 165:10	344:24 345:3	269:15 485:16	history 304:18
264:15 267:24	165:20 172:13	345:11,13,19	high-level	319:24 320:2
277:2 278:8	178:21 179:4	345:24 346:4	106:25	426:15 461:11
280:11 282:17	186:21,24	349:6 357:15	higher 108:2	hit 207:4
285:9 295:9	187:23 253:23	359:11 360:17	109:11,12,13	hits 431:18
308:19 309:2	275:13 307:3	365:10 369:19	109:14,15	hitting 256:4
313:2,23 315:1	425:1 427:3	371:24 374:14	111:7 139:16	430:7
321:5 322:21	472:3,4 511:8	379:24 392:21	204:23,23	hold 104:8
323:18 330:7	heart 95:4	393:3 396:6	253:9 256:4,15	292:20 304:19
332:17 333:4	heavily 280:25	400:13 414:14	269:13 280:5	313:9 332:13
340:3,21	Heinz 83:19	414:24 437:17	283:9,11 296:2	339:16 342:6
342:23 365:15	hel 486:19	438:12 468:4	325:11 328:14	358:19 492:10
365:16 373:19	held 131:2 160:6	470:5 515:8	350:13 370:7,7	hold-harmless
383:19 397:3	293:1 437:3	519:6 520:3,4	370:25 371:2	490:7
458:21 462:14	Hello 359:11,12	520:6,7	383:21 384:7,8	holding 433:18
493:16 504:12	help 102:25	Herbert's 240:9	387:17 388:3	holds 281:5
hearing 82:6	122:12 125:5	413:13 514:18	404:23 408:5	292:13
94:8 95:2	142:21 154:4	here-today	414:12,21	holistic 199:17
101:5 102:17	159:16 169:17	314:14	415:5 489:13	hollowed 275:10
103:4,7 121:24	171:19 174:21	Hermann	500:7,17	hollowing 275:3
134:4 151:4	184:14 201:15	501:19,23	513:19,20	Holly 392:9,10
159:19 164:19	255:25 257:5	Hickory 90:7	higher-use	home 122:2
169:8 171:22	321:22 357:14	271:4 322:14	207:23	145:1 161:14
187:3 219:15	362:8 424:2,5	466:16,18	highest 107:13	168:1 483:15
262:19 280:9	426:7 429:5	468:1	242:2 268:25	Homeowners
280:11 313:25	452:8 471:24	Hicks 84:1	269:7 274:3,3	217:9
318:17,22,22	482:25 483:4,4	high 83:16,23	408:2 445:2,3	homes 121:18,19
324:18 328:22	484:24 486:19	84:9 89:14	highlight 102:18	122:14,16
333:1 339:12	helpful 88:13	102:24 103:14	103:20	125:10
342:18,23	187:10 374:15	105:14 134:23	highlighted	homogenous
343:1 412:25	helping 107:17	164:16 168:8	225:25 226:2	244:18
416:2 439:17	169:16,23	210:20,21	280:18 400:5	honest 275:25
439:20 440:4	186:17 285:19	227:15 247:19	highly 85:19	372:19 450:7
440:10 452:18	445:11	274:25 275:11	130:19 175:17	honestly 450:13
453:16,17	helps 107:18	323:3 341:16	189:1	Honor 108:18
458:10,13	140:22 187:9	364:14 373:9	Hill 452:13	117:14,25
468:3 472:7	201:8,14	481:19 487:22	Hillcrest 171:22	118:9,13 126:4
495:4 511:1,7	253:14 423:24	491:4,21 497:3	172:2,4,6	130:17 143:24
511:9,12	Henderson	497:3,5,16	Hills 90:7	149:12 179:10
516:17	314:13,17	505:8	250:24 271:4	189:15 193:25
hearings 102:19	Herbert 185:15	high-cost 252:15	322:14 466:16	194:7 196:5,13
103:20,21	240:24 241:4	252:18 253:4,8	466:18 468:1	196:21,25
143:3,11	245:7,10 331:2	253:17 263:14	historic 92:25	210:6 214:14

	1	1	1	1
215:10,14	house 161:6	516:16	170:8,14,15	318:8 419:13
218:1 219:10	household	identified 117:8	176:6,11 178:7	importance
223:12,14	122:17,17	157:19 240:22	178:10 180:3	108:25 281:2
225:18 229:23	housing 335:2	254:17 322:12	187:16,17	important 96:16
233:11 234:22	Hubs 416:3	358:4 397:5	201:11 203:13	108:22 119:7,8
235:1,5 240:7	huge 97:3	442:3	228:1 259:5,7	139:14 141:5
240:15 260:23	156:12 479:5	identifies 284:11	259:7,16,22	145:11 249:3
290:16 291:1,3	486:1 488:12	identify 122:7	260:8,10	259:6 265:3
292:3 293:11	hundred 505:20	125:3 159:15	267:22 268:3	266:10 278:17
296:20,21	hundreds	159:23 322:10	274:18 293:19	280:20 282:10
298:22 331:4	254:15	345:16 398:8	293:25 294:7	304:1 306:13
331:17 334:5	hybrid 249:16	442:15,20	297:24 299:5	306:14 314:4
334:12,14	249:16,23	443:13	299:10 320:15	317:4 368:20
338:23 342:14	311:2 328:2	ignore 374:3	381:16,17	368:25 408:7
344:9 349:2	469:11 471:17	ignored 106:23	388:21,24	433:17,17
354:21 365:6	Hyman 258:9	202:19	389:20 390:4	465:25 471:19
369:17 371:21	347:24	ignores 254:14	397:23 399:6,9	484:4 507:16
378:11 379:19	Hyman's 347:25	263:10 266:22	436:8 445:25	importantly
382:25 392:19	hypothetical	ignoring 388:16	446:4 473:19	112:19 141:14
393:1 398:25	286:13 413:3,7	III 83:2	486:1,5 513:15	imposed 297:8
405:24 411:20	Hypothetically	ill 173:19	impacted 122:15	impossible
448:2,3 449:14	436:7	illegal 264:3	143:1	152:23 287:13
492:21,25	hypotheticals	271:19	impacting 441:6	288:10
493:2 495:25	373:19	Illinois 152:2,4	impacts 182:22	impressed
504:18 514:15		182:13,18,19	186:18,20	166:17
514:17	I	182:23 183:2	187:11,11	impression
honored 136:14	i.e 266:1,6	208:4,7 222:9	256:3 258:11	171:17,25
hope 262:23	480:13	222:11,12	258:16 259:13	174:13
270:2 438:25	ice 428:8	224:21,22	349:23 361:5	improved 90:15
474:20 475:1	idea 92:5 118:25	245:20,22	390:14 405:10	improvement
hoped 146:2	188:13 190:18	246:2 391:12	450:4 486:4	204:4 368:9
hopefully 257:7	260:3 276:11	521:5	impeding	369:11 489:5
261:17 402:17	302:21 305:12	Illinois's 224:13	469:22	improvements
436:24 485:15	317:10 344:13	illustration	implement	89:19 90:14
515:8	398:7 496:7	399:5	82:14 418:11	98:2 126:18,23
hoping 122:11	502:4	imaginable	implementation	127:9 141:21
199:18	identical 284:11	470:3	281:15 416:12	268:8 270:14
horizon 129:19	identification	imagine 106:15	420:22	270:15 279:19
Horizontal	85:2,4,6	431:11	implicated	283:25 295:6,7
265:24	135:10 195:11	immediate 90:3	249:4	295:24 296:7
horns 304:19	213:4 344:20	immediately	implication	297:1,6 307:14
hottest 92:20	345:14,20,25	90:4 166:13	193:6 294:14	336:23 368:3
	246 5 404 2			
hours 194:4	346:5 401:9	impact 91:25	implications	412:22 413:4
	346:5 401:9 448:17 516:14	impact 91:25 169:21,22,23	implications 294:18 300:1	412:22 413:4 425:6 431:7

	1	1	1	
434:19 435:19	221:10,13	246:14 263:3	243:8 256:2	231:5 275:8
improving	270:5 356:24	270:10 279:21	263:7 283:22	305:11 309:9
431:14	409:5 467:15	283:1,2,3,5,23	298:1 324:8,9	393:6 403:8,10
imprudent	includes 231:4	285:18 286:3	336:18 363:23	488:2
486:12	245:20 269:12	294:4,9 295:10	369:21 388:6	individual's
in-camera 130:3	317:20 353:12	299:11 306:23	390:17 395:13	155:10
130:22 131:2	353:15 355:21	310:9,17	404:10 408:22	individually
190:10	355:24 357:1	312:11 316:12	411:12 455:9	200:10 210:17
in-home 154:18	363:2 384:22	322:3,4 324:20	460:19 497:16	individuals
154:25 158:16	445:8 466:7,25	326:5 336:20	increasing 93:5	285:22 309:6
in-house 163:18	including	349:12,25	171:24 174:19	341:7
163:19 252:20	126:24 127:4	354:6,17 356:4	246:10 279:25	industrial 83:14
inability 114:2	223:19 245:24	356:19 361:19	incumbent	108:10 109:19
inaccurate	246:1 248:24	362:13,20	266:2	112:23 113:24
399:12	355:18 454:11	363:16 364:10	incurred 252:18	174:8 177:8
inappropriate	income 104:17	379:5,12,20	254:5 282:8	181:7 207:21
150:18	106:17 112:25	381:5,8,22	incurs 244:2	217:3 261:9
inappropriately	114:8 268:24	384:25 394:20	independently	262:11 263:1
164:14	268:25 269:7	394:23,24	102:4	270:18 302:8
incentive 142:8	269:12,13	395:24,25	index 227:14	351:18 352:1
213:24 253:7	283:15 301:18	400:9 402:25	228:12 517:1	352:24 360:20
253:19 275:1	301:19,21	403:12,14,20	520:1	370:14,17
425:22 426:1	307:17,20	403:21 404:3	indicate 127:22	371:10 377:1
430:21 494:9	incomes 104:2,3	404:16,19,22	242:12 347:23	388:14 500:11
incentives	335:9	405:12 407:14	395:10 475:3	500:12,13
284:12,17	incomplete	407:20,24	indicated 188:9	industrial/co
493:7	398:11	408:5 435:25	211:16 216:6	500:8
incentivize	inconsistent	446:12,19,24	241:18 350:8	industrials
142:15	106:22 263:12	447:2 448:6	351:11,25	180:25 181:4,4
inch 350:3 356:2	266:21	451:24 453:6,8	357:20 376:7	181:8 217:6
356:3 383:19	incorporate	453:9,11,14,18	387:10 409:4	371:8
385:25 393:13	271:23	454:2,5,7,12	432:14,18	industries
inclining 204:14	incorporating	454:16,17,23	442:10,18	418:15 441:7
204:16,20	119:15	456:4 457:11	458:2 474:23	510:19
207:11,18	incorrect 477:23	457:15 458:17	501:8	industry 90:22
include 115:22	increase 82:14	459:19,21	indicates 91:18	90:23,24
116:1,6,11,14	85:9 106:16	460:15 480:21	316:21 394:4	162:17,18
116:19 207:20	107:25 111:8,9	485:24	indicating	163:1 168:9
213:9,12,15	114:15 120:10	increased	299:11	236:21 256:19
249:5 385:13	136:9 170:11	181:17,21	indicative 393:8	275:2 312:24
included 112:9	177:11,19,25	316:9 379:6	individual 155:2	483:6 507:21
134:19 147:16	193:7 201:7,13	increases 103:16	155:13 156:20	508:16
187:21 220:17	227:20,25	104:3 105:23	157:12,24	inequitable
220:19,19	228:21 246:12	180:6,19 193:3	160:5 176:7,17	307:11 420:6
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

	ı	1	1	
inequities 109:4	infringe 223:7	97:9 266:16	324:17	488:18 489:15
278:23 314:24	inherently	366:21 412:5	intervened	490:3 512:17
inequity 109:18	307:11	434:15,17	306:11	513:18,20
inflation 431:22	inhibit 121:14	483:6 507:9	intervenor	investment's
influenced	121:15 267:11	508:5	427:15	485:25
433:12	initial 419:21	interconnection	intervenors	investments
inform 155:21	488:15	507:8,15	278:1	90:14 91:13
information	injurious 100:19	interest 98:13	introduce	92:13 93:10
85:23 117:11	innovation	101:17,18	240:17	119:23 129:18
154:13 155:3,4	266:9	102:6,7,10	introducing	141:16 177:1,2
157:3,13,14,23	input 337:11	108:4 110:4	248:20	177:4 253:7
158:19 160:2	inputs 484:12	252:24 258:3	invest 253:4	279:8,11 281:6
162:11,19	inquire 95:24	281:23 284:8,9	420:11 464:8	284:1 429:13
163:21,22	188:22 442:16	285:19 286:16	invested 90:13	487:12,17
164:2 167:25	inside 247:17	286:17 293:3	92:11 191:11	513:14
186:19,23	insist 516:5	296:4 301:1	investigate	investor 134:15
187:16 196:3	install 120:2	374:24 422:22	192:12	investor-owned
214:12 224:13	installing 122:10	430:25 465:14	investigation	221:6 222:22
224:17,20	144:25	509:6	156:9 300:25	509:7
290:3 295:9	instance 364:14	interested	304:18	invests 253:13
299:22 323:25	403:25 407:5,8	139:11 142:15	investigative	425:2 489:11
332:9 356:11	instances 287:19	166:7 256:24	192:15	invitation 85:22
357:25 358:7,9	302:13	312:18 441:23	investing 178:16	86:1 87:5
400:14 402:20	institute 204:17	443:24 512:19	investment	involve 501:25
405:20 410:4	insufficient	515:24	90:11 92:1,14	involved 202:10
421:10 438:19	203:10	interesting	93:4,5,8 95:14	304:10 327:11
441:10 443:21	insurmountable	169:25	107:11 128:24	327:17 335:17
informative	503:24	interests 101:15	136:23 169:19	335:19 336:17
511:23	integral 317:3	316:18 330:9	191:6,7 192:5	341:8 415:19
informed 244:12	intend 86:19,20	476:13	193:12,14,16	415:21 427:24
infrastructure	328:7	interfering	198:15 199:14	442:6 501:15
92:9,12 129:18	intends 86:1	282:14	243:10 253:5,5	510:22
178:17 180:7	intensive 90:19	interim 316:2	279:6 280:6	involvement
199:13 200:6	90:21,22,23	intermittent	282:16 283:21	508:21
200:19 237:2	intent 387:12,20	121:7	284:15 296:8,9	involving 103:5
238:14 253:14	388:5 496:24	intermittently	299:6 318:1	IOU 222:8
275:21 279:6,8	intentional	121:18	425:3,4 426:24	Iowa 222:4,4,7,8
279:11,12	357:9,10	internal 125:9	431:2 435:22	ironically 317:5
280:6,8 283:21	inter-class 316:8	internalities	444:10,13,15	irrelevant 373:2
283:25 295:25	inter-customer	265:19	444:18 464:2,6	373:3
431:7,14,25	266:7	internally 217:9	464:11,14	Island 221:13
510:18	interaction	interpretation	468:25 473:19	isolated 108:24
infrastructures	168:6,15	277:21	476:1 486:12	158:18
431:9	interconnected	interpreted	487:9 488:12	ISRS 87:14,15
			l	

91:24 92:5,12	314:7,14	515:21	159:22 165:3	197:1,3,5,10
92:23 246:13	315:19 321:6	items 363:25	289:14 495:14	197:13,17
353:12,15	327:8 328:15	476:7	jobs 90:15 117:2	207:7 208:11
384:23 385:1,4	329:1,2,5	iterations	Joe 84:8 150:9	208:13,15,17
385:5,14	391:5 398:2	308:13	150:21 170:4,5	208:24 210:1,4
394:15,22	406:12 409:21		180:1 254:4	212:4,10,14
435:20	418:8,18	J	255:13 318:9	214:17,25
issue 85:9,13	433:13 436:25	J 82:20 351:21	374:25 376:1	215:3,5,7,9,11
99:19 100:12	463:19 469:19	352:24 357:5	377:4 378:2	215:13,15,17
100:13 101:24	484:9 491:14	384:21	436:19 446:2	215:19,22,25
108:9,13,14,17	497:5 511:19	jagged 391:25	471:10 508:11	217:14,17,20
108:22 110:15	511:20 513:12	James 251:5	Joe's 356:21,21	217:22,24
111:6 112:1,2	514:9 515:22	401:10,14,19	357:4 376:12	218:2,5,10,13
113:15 121:8	517:2 518:10	402:1,7 519:16	376:14 377:9	219:13,19,23
121:10,21,22	issued 199:23	521:21,23,24	John 93:23	223:10,13
122:6,9,14	issues 99:23	522:1	194:16,21,24	225:10,16
125:5,17	101:16,20,23	Jamie 84:19	517:17	229:7,9,11,16
142:14 144:20	102:18 103:11	248:19 328:11	join 310:3	229:21 231:20
144:21 145:11	104:9,23	Jamie's 328:6	Jones 82:17 85:7	231:25 232:11
145:11,12	105:11 108:25	Janice 313:13	85:17 87:19,23	232:14,18
146:1,1 154:5	109:7,8 110:7	January 90:12	88:2,4,8 94:4	233:12 234:2,8
156:2,9,12	113:4 121:9,23	Jeff 306:9	98:18,20 99:14	234:16,19,21
157:2 159:16	145:7 156:6	440:21 452:11	108:5,10,15	234:23,25
159:18 160:9	157:10,18,19	483:16 485:4,4	113:13 114:17	235:2,4,6,9,11
160:16,22	159:23 165:4	499:11 500:11	114:23 115:1	235:13,16
161:25 165:14	165:17 166:7,8	504:11 510:11	117:19 118:2,6	238:3,5,9,19
169:6 188:11	166:12,15	Jefferson 82:8	118:8,10,12	238:23 239:10
192:9,23,24	167:3,11,15,16	83:5,8,13,16	125:25 126:2	239:16,20,25
199:5 201:24	168:21 189:18	83:24 84:10,17	127:14 128:7	240:3,14
202:13 205:2	198:15 199:9	84:21 97:6	130:12,24	246:21 248:13
205:18 207:1	204:20 209:15	105:13 109:12	134:1 135:5	248:16 251:19
229:15 232:8	209:16 249:4	179:25 231:3	137:11,18	252:2 257:9,22
237:4,6 239:1	251:14 257:2	231:14 250:5	143:15,19,22	260:7,11,20
239:4,9 240:3	274:10 280:13	250:25 271:7,7	143:25 146:25	261:5,9,13,19
240:22 246:25	280:24 288:5	283:18 322:22	149:6 153:3	261:24 262:2
247:1 251:24	288:21 300:17	403:13 439:16	166:1 173:23	271:16 272:14
252:5,20 254:2	300:20 301:9	470:12 471:12	174:2 179:9,12	273:9,11
258:6 262:16	305:14 308:19	504:8	181:12 183:14	276:20 286:24
262:22 274:11	323:4 326:17	JEFFREY 84:1	188:2 189:1,5	287:2 288:24
275:6,20 277:9	327:7,25	Jersey 391:11	189:9,14 194:1	289:4 290:8,14
280:17,25	332:17 333:15	392:7,8,12	194:3,9,12,17	290:17,19,23
283:14 298:3	360:1,3 421:8	Jim 312:3	194:20 196:7	290:25 291:2
299:2 300:6	441:5,5 463:23	Jo 273:19	196:15,18,20	291:16,18,20
303:13 313:14	514:20 515:19	job 139:16	196:22,24	291:23 292:1

				1
293:12 296:18	448:1,8,12,18	286:2,18	508:10 510:25	499:9,24
298:20 299:17	449:6 459:12	287:23 288:7	511:1 516:15	500:24 507:7
299:19 300:3	461:3 465:1	289:10,13	518:17 521:3,3	508:5
303:5,7 305:19	476:19,22,25	290:12 291:8	521:5	Joseph's 434:14
305:22 306:1,3	492:18,22,24	291:12 292:8	Joplin's 181:16	JOSHUA 84:12
306:5,7 308:7	493:1 494:5,11	292:13,20	193:3 225:10	judge 82:17 85:7
311:13,15	495:24 500:24	293:19 294:2,7	225:12 270:9	85:16,17 86:19
319:21 320:21	501:1 502:6,9	294:14,16,24	270:15 283:6	86:20 87:19,23
320:23 321:4	504:17 506:7	294:25 295:16	284:3 294:9	88:1,2,4,8 94:4
324:5 326:6	513:25 514:8	295:19,20,25	296:4 297:25	94:6 98:18,19
327:20 330:21	514:12,16	296:1,7,25	298:8 366:20	98:20 99:14
330:23,25	515:1,4,10,13	297:8,10,12	367:1 412:11	108:5,10,12,15
331:9,13,16	515:17,21	298:6,10 299:2	424:21	113:13 114:17
333:22 334:3,6	516:3	299:3,10,14	Joseph 84:2,3	114:23 115:1
334:9,11,13	JOP 289:18,25	301:10 308:3	97:6 102:10	117:19 118:2,4
338:11,13,15	290:7,9,10	308:15 323:6	105:6,7 109:14	118:6,8,10,12
338:18,21,24	Jop 442:8	323:13 334:13	110:24 126:3	125:25 126:2
339:7 341:25	Joplin 83:25	334:17 343:9	126:15 128:15	127:14 128:7
342:13 344:6,8	97:7 102:10	343:22 355:23	169:8 173:24	130:12,24
344:11,16,22	106:1 109:13	355:25 356:20	197:1 208:20	134:1 135:5,7
348:25 358:17	110:23 118:10	356:21 357:3	215:11 229:7	137:11,18
358:23 359:2,8	126:19 180:1	363:3,13 365:7	235:2 250:8	143:15,19,22
360:5,8 365:4	181:21 182:11	365:12 366:17	266:18 269:3	143:25 146:25
365:7 369:15	193:2,7,10,12	366:24 367:9	270:24 271:6	149:6,7 153:3
371:19 374:7,9	193:15 196:22	367:25 368:21	279:4 291:16	165:25 166:1,2
378:12 380:7	208:20 215:7	372:3 377:3	301:10 306:7	172:3 173:22
380:10,13,20	223:13 224:16	378:2 399:2,4	306:10,11,15	173:23 174:1,2
382:13,16,24	225:8,14	400:7 411:21	306:18,21,23	179:8,9,12
383:1 384:12	234:23 250:10	412:2,5,8,10	307:12,17,19	181:12 183:14
384:15 385:17	254:4 255:13	413:6 420:25	307:21 308:2	188:2,3 189:1
386:16 392:16	266:17 269:2	422:14,18	308:15 309:5	189:5,9,11,14
392:23 396:5	270:2,3,6,7,9	424:2,6,11,12	312:7,8 313:10	194:1,3,9,12
396:12,15,18	270:13,23	424:13 425:6	313:12 316:9	194:17,20
396:25 397:9	271:11 276:20	425:11,19	316:24 317:18	196:7,15,18,20
398:13 399:16	276:23 277:8	426:1,6,7,8	318:7,12,17,23	196:22,24
400:1,18 406:2	277:10,13,22	427:4 429:24	319:2,14	197:1,3,5,10
406:9,17,23	279:4,20,20,21	431:19 436:19	322:18,19	197:13,16,17
409:10,17	279:23 280:4	446:2 461:6,6	338:11 371:20	207:7 208:11
410:3 411:8,19	280:10,11	463:18 471:4	399:3 425:12	208:13,15,17
411:21 413:8	281:22 282:22	483:25 487:10	426:25 427:14	208:24 210:1,2
426:10 432:9	282:23,25	488:10 490:9	429:25 431:18	210:4 212:4,10
437:9,11,14,21	283:3,5,10,15	493:1 495:6,8	432:9 434:5,10	212:14 214:17
438:7 439:4,7	283:20,23	499:10,24	436:8 437:4	214:25 215:3,5
439:11,13	285:17,21	507:7,20 508:4	470:18 476:3	215:7,9,11,13
-				

		Ì	Ì	
215:15,17,19	311:23 319:21	492:18,22,24	Kathleen 331:7	152:4
215:22,24,25	320:21,23	493:1 494:5,11	331:18,22	KEVIN 84:19
217:14,17,20	321:4 324:5	495:24 500:24	519:2 521:8,9	key 106:25
217:22,24	326:6 327:20	501:1 502:6,9	KCPL 256:12	258:14
218:2,5,10,13	330:21,23,25	504:17 506:7	keep 92:23	kick 326:22
219:13,19,21	331:9,13,16	511:12 513:25	139:14 140:21	kids 170:20
219:23,24	333:22 334:3,6	514:8,12,16	141:21 142:21	kind 103:20
223:10,13	334:9,10,11,13	515:1,4,10,13	153:12 296:4	122:10 141:16
225:10,16	338:11,13,15	515:17,21	302:9 311:25	141:20 153:23
229:7,9,11,15	338:18,21,24	516:3	314:3 375:21	156:2 157:17
229:16,20,21	339:7 341:25	judgment	378:2 382:13	159:18 170:23
231:20,25	342:13 344:6,8	244:12 286:7	396:8 406:11	173:7 202:3
232:11,14,18	344:11,16,22	422:25 423:2	408:4 466:1	230:3 272:23
233:12 234:2,8	348:25 358:17	judicial 301:6	467:23 499:16	303:18 304:23
234:14,16,19	358:19,23	303:2	keeping 177:18	314:15 322:16
234:21,23,25	359:2,8,24	jump 104:23	274:17 357:19	326:21 335:14
235:2,4,6,9,11	360:5,8,15	322:6	471:16	350:24 368:8
235:13,16	365:4,7 369:15	June 312:22	KEITH 84:8	372:2 389:8
238:3,5,9,22	371:19 374:7,9	justifiable	KENNARD	398:19 470:13
238:23 239:8	374:11 378:12	111:12	82:17	480:8,24
239:10,16,20	380:7,10,13,20	justification	Kenney 82:19	481:19 488:7
239:25 240:3	382:13,16,24	286:8 465:8	98:19,21 99:9	488:24 493:5
240:14 246:21	383:1 384:9,12	justifications	99:12 149:6,7	499:13
248:13,16	384:15 385:17	285:1	149:16,21,24	kinds 161:21
251:19 252:2	386:16 392:16	justifies 103:12	185:19 208:11	207:24 330:3
257:9,22 260:5	392:23 396:5	justify 304:6,24	208:12 217:17	391:1
260:7,11,20	396:12,15,18	317:15	217:18 272:14	Kirkland 150:16
261:5,9,13,19	396:25 397:9		272:18 273:1,6	kiss 382:14,15
261:24 262:2	398:13,16	K	287:4 288:6,22	kit 490:18
271:16 273:9	399:16 400:1	K.T 84:12	296:17 300:14	knew 154:9
273:11 276:20	400:18 401:3	Kansas 84:13,14	305:22,23	157:2,6 158:1
286:24 287:2,5	406:2,9,15,17	264:7 285:10	311:14 318:16	159:17 271:20
288:24 289:4	406:23,24	508:4,11	320:1,14,19	knocking 464:21
290:8,14,17,19	409:10,12,17	Karl 245:13,14	330:21,22	know 86:6,24
290:23,25	410:3 411:8,19	Kartmann	339:5,9 342:2	94:9 95:10
291:2,16,18,20	411:21 413:8	115:24 119:2	385:18,20	99:7 105:18,20
291:23 292:1	426:10 432:9	129:3 135:25	406:15 437:24	114:11 122:8
293:12 296:18	437:9,11,14,21	137:5 150:7	438:5 476:22	123:9 125:14
298:20 299:17	438:4,7 439:4	338:9 457:25	476:23 490:14	128:2 136:13
299:19 300:3	439:7,11,13	458:10,22	517:12 519:3	136:17,25
303:5,7 305:19	448:1,8,12,18	459:2,6 520:9	519:12	137:4 138:7,23
305:22 306:1,3	449:6 459:12	522:3	Kenney's 111:19	140:6 143:3
306:5,7 308:7	461:3 465:1	Kartmann's	Kenny 385:17	144:12,14,16
311:13,15,21	476:19,22,25	138:1	Kentucky 152:2	146:14 147:7
		•	•	•

		ı	1	1
147:18,21	365:20,21,22	483:22,22	L	356:4 383:21
149:9,17 150:4	365:23,23	484:5,6 485:23	L 82:17 521:8,9	425:10,14
151:18,18	366:8 367:7	485:24 486:2	lack 281:21	426:5 430:10
152:17,20	368:24 374:15	488:10,11	330:6 418:10	430:25 463:6
153:25 155:1,9	376:5 380:18	489:5,6,10,11	441:18 496:22	479:4 497:10
156:11 157:7	387:16 388:13	489:17,24	lacks 277:11	499:3 500:13
157:15,20,25	389:8,12	490:1 491:13	Laclede 428:5	500:22 510:12
158:2,24 159:7	395:18 396:7	491:13,15,20	508:4	513:15
160:15 161:12	398:6,14	491:21,22,23	Ladue 269:11	largest 100:5
162:11,13	402:18 409:11	491:24,25	269:12	114:4 256:11
163:24 164:20	409:13 412:9	492:2,3,5,8	lagoons 89:3	405:6 424:7
169:20 171:15	413:18 414:14	493:10,11	laid 397:12	Larkin 252:21
175:12 179:5	415:6 420:23	495:4,5,6	Lake 121:6	Larry 83:7
180:13 183:1,4	422:11 426:23	496:15,21	250:5,11	128:12 312:2
183:9 186:7	427:8,23 428:3	497:18,18,20	Lakewood	lasting 123:5
187:1,2,15,22	428:10,19,24	497:21 498:20	250:11	lastly 91:23
190:6,8,9,20	429:5,18 430:1	500:1,3,21	landscape 91:4	116:18
193:20 203:5	431:16,24	501:14 502:3	language 324:17	late 107:4
207:24 222:10	433:7 435:16	503:18,19	large 120:9	143:16 145:16
222:14,16	435:19 436:15	504:11 507:15	121:20 154:1	192:24,24
227:20 231:14	442:17,17	507:19 508:3	156:16 169:15	507:23
236:20 258:22	443:6,16,17,18	508:10 510:7,8	175:8 176:3	law 82:17 83:2,3
260:15,16,19	444:2,3,4	510:18 511:13	178:24 191:8	83:3,7,12,18
261:11,13,14	445:17,21	512:23 513:5	217:3,5 243:9	83:22,22 84:1
261:24 268:2,9	446:21 447:7	513:11,12	268:7 284:17	84:4,5,8,8,12
269:12 272:10	448:3,25	515:6 516:3,7	327:25 340:23	99:21 104:15
275:7,10,19	449:21 450:13	knowing 153:15	351:21 352:1	226:20 227:1
276:2,7 279:1	450:15 453:6	231:14	367:20 388:14	247:3 277:1
280:6 285:17	456:1,5 457:5	knowledge	389:23 424:8	320:17 336:6
288:9,14,17	457:25 459:24	117:11 123:8	425:4 427:8,23	418:9 428:16
291:5 292:7	460:16,16	193:8 196:3	467:1 478:9	428:16 462:18
297:20 304:8	462:1,4,8	202:4 210:8	494:20,22	462:20,23
310:16 311:6	467:10 470:24	214:12 222:10	497:15,16	463:15 503:9
321:22 322:17	470:25 471:2	290:4 305:2	499:17 502:21	lawful 255:3
322:18 323:21	472:1,2,21	357:25 358:8	503:2 509:19	lawfully 100:18
324:1 325:1,7	473:11,14,14	366:22 382:21	largely 91:3	lawfulness
325:25 326:7	474:22 475:11	382:22 405:15	145:13 192:24	419:14
327:7 330:12	475:21 477:3	405:21 433:1	larger 139:5	lawyer 84:1
333:5 336:12	478:19,23,23	434:16	152:14 171:7	126:4,5 197:2
336:22 337:24	479:2,4,5,23	known 160:23	241:2,20 243:6	215:12 229:8
338:5,8 340:17	482:5,6,8,13	274:14	243:6 255:19	235:3 291:17
340:19,21,22	482:15,19,20	Kobe 309:15	274:9 312:10	303:19 306:8,9
357:7,11,16	483:1,5,7,8,11	311:20	319:15 350:20	338:12 371:21
359:24 364:13	483:14,15,21	Krueger 416:9	351:17,18,25	371:22 432:10
	<u> </u>	<u>l</u>	<u>l </u>	<u> </u>

	I	Ī	l	
432:11 500:25	legislature	206:8,10,11,12	248:1,1,2	190:13 200:25
517:8 518:15	303:23 418:4,8	206:13 207:4	line 107:18	216:16 222:21
519:9,18	493:9,13,19	241:25 243:23	116:7,7,11,12	223:23 230:1
lays 252:22	499:1	246:1 247:7,9	116:15,15,19	273:16 282:21
lead 121:15	legitimate	247:19 258:15	117:1,2 195:19	288:8 301:16
157:16 285:6	469:19	268:24 315:16	195:19 213:23	310:14 321:14
308:1	Leland 83:18	316:3 321:24	213:23 214:3,3	341:5 343:8
lead-up 155:18	113:18	349:10 350:13	217:10 224:6	348:23 391:25
leading 198:21	length 424:20	356:18 370:7	309:15 315:8	470:10 476:1
198:23	Leslie 289:6,10	373:21 386:1	318:15 346:17	477:2 489:13
leads 330:20	518:18 521:4	415:16 437:2	347:24 348:1	493:21 497:4
367:23 368:4	lesser 103:6	458:17 465:23	350:3 351:16	500:20 513:19
451:18	lesson 319:24	465:23 470:19	362:8,13,21	live 110:9
leaking 121:15	320:2	484:3 489:14	371:1,5,10	325:21 390:4
151:1	let's 85:14 87:23	492:12	384:21 385:10	431:3 472:13
leaks 103:23	88:8 114:19	levels 93:8 116:9	385:22 391:25	472:14 481:1,2
104:7 105:1	166:13 179:12	125:6 202:6,21	394:4 461:1	491:18 504:13
159:7 167:15	179:13 183:16	251:4 269:1,7	475:2 477:3	lives 106:13
340:22	194:5 239:3,20	282:15 350:9	497:16	243:24 244:1
leaning 99:1,3	239:25 240:4	393:7,13	lines 138:2 319:8	244:23 334:22
learned 511:19	261:15 290:14	Liberty 442:6,22	319:10 346:25	472:17
leave 110:21	300:5 318:11	life 129:14	346:25 347:2	living 106:14
286:25 350:25	321:1,2,4,7	193:18,21	347:23 348:1	LLC 82:23 84:1
359:21,23	330:25 353:5	305:13 341:4	350:15 370:24	345:7
451:25 452:6	360:8,8 366:2	344:4	383:17	load 319:16
454:20	377:22 384:21	light 84:14	list 108:16	local 102:17
leaves 414:1	385:10 394:18	507:8	128:20 208:19	117:2 143:3,11
leaving 180:1	413:2,2,10	lights 483:11	220:19 442:4	160:6 162:11
499:24	437:25 438:9	likelihood	listed 221:19	165:10,20
led 498:8	448:21 464:12	488:16	223:1 351:2,3	254:9 307:3
Lee 127:19	473:1,1 480:3	likewise 102:13	354:24	318:22 412:24
308:10	480:3,3,5		listen 164:12	425:1 427:3
left 351:16	487:2 488:10	285:6	listened 339:24	440:3 472:3,7
452:21 515:22	491:10,10	Lillian 106:13	415:25	511:1,6,8,8,11
legal 247:2,13	499:7 516:12	limit 123:18	listening 507:19	locale 255:1
248:8 251:13	letter 135:24	224:8 293:8	Listing 521:9	locality 265:4,7
251:14 255:6	153:14 154:11	459:19	lists 199:24	277:4,5
276:25 304:22	446:10 522:3	limited 122:19	284:5 376:25	localized 484:3
336:10 419:13	level 89:14	222:25 242:21	413:15 506:14	locally 254:9,11
419:15	105:22 114:11	271:3 316:22	literally 159:24	254:11
legislation	130:8 136:17	limiting 446:19	391:2	located 244:5
493:15	136:21,23	447:2 455:22	little 91:1 97:4	273:18 294:15
legislative 301:7	139:16 202:13	456:12	111:17 121:4	485:19
493:6	202:14 205:13	limits 247:18,18	175:5 182:3	location 241:10
			l	

242:8 250:22	198:24 200:9	374:23,25	193:12 264:15	361:18 363:3
451:11 506:15	200:12 203:25	376:14 377:6	271:23 323:21	363:14,17,19
locations 250:1	222:17 227:21	379:16 380:12	338:8 339:22	364:9 368:21
390:3	228:3 231:10	383:6,24	340:5,9 343:19	369:21 370:7
lodge 398:17	246:8 263:24	387:13,16	362:24 402:13	370:17,21
logic 390:18	276:2 288:10	388:12,13,16	402:16 413:22	371:1,11,15
470:8	295:5 302:18	393:11 414:8	422:10 431:8	377:3 379:1,3
logical 373:25	309:18 310:10	443:11,17	456:21 468:11	379:6,18 381:2
long 90:8 95:22	318:11 358:21	454:18 466:4	471:20 472:4,9	381:5,16
103:24 118:20	361:24 364:3,8	468:14 469:20	478:2,8,15,19	384:23,25,25
154:4,5 155:20	365:17 375:10	479:23 484:7,8	479:7 483:5	394:15,24
159:5 162:12	375:13 376:1	484:24 488:7	485:18 489:16	403:13 410:15
163:4 188:13	376:21,23	490:3 499:5	491:15,16	427:5 430:3,4
255:6 276:2	381:2,14,22	501:18 504:4	492:4 495:4	435:20 446:2
278:23 293:1,6	407:7 422:12	507:13	496:17 497:22	470:12 471:11
293:6 294:23	430:3,21 436:6	looks 118:2	497:25 498:3	471:12 479:5,8
295:24 296:1,3	442:18 443:8	167:23 218:5	508:1 509:14	483:18,23
296:10 297:15	443:19 444:2	330:3 349:1	512:4	484:1 485:8
297:18 304:10	451:21 454:14	357:5 371:5	lots 97:4 122:12	499:8 510:11
314:23 380:3	457:20 467:13	386:20 407:4	loud 318:4	love 423:11
381:12 436:25	468:22 472:15	450:15	Louis 83:20 84:6	low 92:22 109:7
485:15 489:16	478:3 479:22	loops 161:18	92:2,4,8 97:5	153:12 205:17
504:10	482:9 486:17	lose 476:7	103:22 109:12	333:5 444:25
long-term	487:2,8,9,12	losers 477:25	111:8 112:10	low-cost 252:17
274:10 275:24	487:15 488:2	478:18 480:12	174:9 176:4,13	263:15 266:25
294:13,18	491:2 492:1	480:17 481:9	176:16,23	267:5
298:25 299:2	499:6,8 504:9	481:17	177:1,5,8	low-income
299:25 390:7	506:11	losing 494:25	179:5,23 180:6	110:17 113:1
longer 93:4	looked 104:14	loss 154:10	180:25 181:3,8	114:8 151:16
155:10 162:24	182:16 199:15	201:11 267:14	226:10,10	151:17,22,23
163:6,14,15,16	199:16,17	lost 343:25	228:9,13,17	254:4 301:23
173:6,13	221:18 222:11	344:4	246:13 250:3,3	301:24 341:20
193:18 209:7	223:17 302:22	lot 96:2,3 97:13	254:4 262:11	446:1,4 515:23
368:7 377:2	445:5 451:24	103:18 109:23	263:2,6 266:19	lower 92:22
longer-term	456:25 484:16	119:5 121:25	269:2,3,6,17	105:4 111:10
274:12	507:21	122:2 138:14	269:18 270:23	112:10 139:19
look 92:3 99:20	looking 92:16	141:2,4,17	271:5,10,14	139:22 153:10
101:3 106:11	122:4 125:11	148:20,23	283:8 307:14	153:18 174:15
109:9,10	136:3 138:23	156:8 157:6	321:19 322:15	269:14 284:23
124:10 127:8	153:11 165:7	159:15 163:12	322:15 323:7	295:1 319:17
128:16 135:14	168:12 170:11	163:13 171:14	323:13 326:3	319:17 350:11
138:18,19	199:11,22	171:22 174:11	353:13 355:23	362:24 370:25
148:18 153:14	200:25 288:10	176:9,14	355:25 356:5	371:3,6,17
158:25 177:22	297:22 357:4	183:18 193:11	357:6 361:10	387:16,16,17

388:2 392:11	286:22 298:13	98:15 119:4	128:17 129:4	195:10,15,24
408:6 414:10	319:8 438:14	128:21 172:23	135:9 195:10	196:6,9,11
414:20 451:4	454:9 465:22	267:11	213:4 218:25	213:4,10,12,15
455:5 488:5	465:24 466:1	manager 105:7	224:15 233:14	213:19,24
513:2	471:19 475:8	401:17 418:24	240:11 289:17	214:8,15,15,15
lower-cost 275:2	484:2,4	428:1	344:20 345:13	214:16,21
lowered 201:22	maintained	managing	345:19,24	344:19 345:14
lowest 242:1	267:13 278:5	267:12	346:4 347:4	345:20,25
269:1,7	278:19 310:2	mandates 91:8	348:22 352:14	346:5,13,15
Luckily 487:22	314:5,8 317:2	manner 168:11	401:8,22 402:5	347:13 348:23
lump 444:25	319:14 467:22	180:11 419:24	413:14 448:16	359:3,4,6
507:10	maintaining	453:20 513:2	516:13,15	378:20 379:15
lunch 150:14	255:19 438:21	Manor 250:12	520:1	381:14,24
239:6 289:2	452:23 490:2	map 484:16	Martin 347:23	448:14,16
321:2 487:7	maintains 357:2	Maple 250:13	Maryland	449:6,8,10
	maintenance	250:25	111:25,25	520:2,2,4,5,7,8
M	244:10,15	Marc 83:22	masking 282:16	520:10,11,13
M 82:18 89:11	456:24	84:15 99:18	masks 105:8	520:14,16,17
89:14,18	major 129:17	380:8	253:5	520:19,19,20
136:24	279:19 313:13	March 82:7	massive 280:12	520:21,22,22
M-a-r-k-e	315:18,18,19	156:23,24,25	505:13	520:23,25
218:21	371:8 392:4,7	156:25 160:12	materials 161:19	MAWC's 116:8
MA 331:3	392:12 404:6	160:17 332:11	math 310:21	maximum
machines	405:1 428:8	332:12 516:18	490:11	110:10
122:22	434:18 436:8	mark 280:11	Matt 471:1	mayor 105:1
mad 490:7 491:1	470:14	344:14	matter 82:13	109:10 151:4
Madison 83:8	majority 92:13	Marke 218:6,9	110:9 206:13	180:14 291:7
84:20	205:16 222:23	218:15,18,21	239:7 308:3	302:11 331:5,7
magnitude	223:3 253:23	218:22 219:12	312:5 368:18	331:25 332:1
316:13	435:20 464:17	220:1 225:20	368:18 397:19	333:19 335:24
MAIDA 82:20	464:19 485:19	229:25 232:11	505:15	335:25 336:17
mailings 187:6,7	501:12	252:20,22	matters 264:12	336:18 337:18
main 84:13 89:1	mak 474:12	254:8 257:18	285:12 372:11	339:10 343:11
148:8 204:19	makers 263:21	257:19 268:10	459:13	McDermott
281:3 289:10	303:22	268:12,22,24	MAW 273:20	98:24 221:10
319:1 390:13	making 157:11	269:4,10 270:5	274:4	245:14,17
417:10,16	253:3 280:14	497:5 514:10	MAW's 274:15	284:4,22
420:3 465:7	399:21 409:25	515:2 518:2	MAWC 85:1	514:12
main 357:2	430:18 436:8	521:13,14,16	91:20 92:2,10	McDermott's
mains 319:7	455:20 492:9	521:17	92:15 115:16	221:15
489:7	493:6 495:13	Marke's 461:11	115:23 116:2,7	McDonald 84:5
maintain 120:7	managed 106:21	marked 85:1,4,5	116:18,24	Meadows 250:5
148:24 180:2	267:14	115:16,23	117:7,15,15,20	250:24 251:1
253:10 267:10	management	116:2 124:8,9	117:21,21,23	271:4 322:14
		_		

	I	1	1	
454:1,5 466:14	median 268:25	mess 487:21	270:22	216:23,24
466:17 467:16	283:15 307:17	met 118:17	Mexico 105:10	million 89:16,21
467:21 468:1	307:20 335:9	150:6,9	105:12 109:13	89:23 90:13
meals 104:19	medical 113:3	meter 104:9	180:1 250:4	92:11 100:6
mean 86:16 96:6	medicine 104:19	105:11 146:1,1	282:24 348:10	107:25 137:2
98:10 139:19	meet 244:20	155:21 156:1,2	348:15,16	191:11,14
142:5 151:7	meeting 118:18	188:11 192:9	403:13 429:25	306:22 310:8
183:25 200:9	120:20 121:1	192:23,23	470:13 471:13	328:25,25
201:7 203:18	121:25 152:22	283:7,12	483:23 500:12	329:7,7,10
205:19,21	160:7 189:20	321:18 349:23	Mexico's 473:22	349:11 354:5
224:3 227:22	189:23 332:14	350:16,17	Meyer 245:13	356:18 362:17
228:20 231:12	332:15,15	356:2,3,4	MGE 507:22	364:22 365:14
253:2 255:2	333:5 339:16	383:13,22	508:3	366:6 370:16
272:24 325:12	342:22 343:3	384:3,5 393:13	MIC 301:10	370:16 379:2
325:14 330:5	471:8	meters 106:5	Michigan 96:13	379:11,17
353:14,16	meetings 169:1	107:4 145:10	microphone	381:3,5,8
358:23 371:2,3	169:3 342:5	155:3 156:4,7	392:24	402:25 407:20
373:22 383:13	member 439:23	156:9,10,12	mid 149:18	435:19 450:17
387:21 389:19	441:2	157:2,14 322:1	middle 109:17	453:2 458:15
390:23,24	members 139:6	350:4,18,19	130:4 388:4,4	491:8
403:9 407:18	150:6 339:25	351:14,17	485:4	mind 92:23
439:9 443:17	440:18 441:14	371:2 384:6,7	middling 97:5	98:16 140:1
444:4 463:14	448:22,24	393:8	midwest 207:25	172:10,12
470:4,4 474:10	memory 247:20	method 375:20	MIEC 85:5	311:25 325:25
474:12 495:16	463:3	424:5 478:10	118:6 174:1,2	357:19 405:17
496:21,23	mention 297:7	478:11 495:3	196:18 208:19	406:11 426:17
498:11,19	318:19 328:20	metric 269:2	215:3 219:23	minds 303:24
499:7 500:20	mentioned	Metro 174:9	234:19 248:6	mine 210:3
503:23 505:19	117:18 129:9	176:4,14,23	255:13 262:15	mini 88:1
515:21	178:1 246:25	228:9 250:3	267:19 268:10	minimal 281:17
meaning 310:20	247:8 283:19	262:12 263:6	288:1 290:19	283:23,24
meaningful	298:24 299:9	266:19 269:2,4	308:15 334:9	327:24 451:25
93:10 246:19	328:21 402:12	269:6,17,18	355:19 360:14	minimize 102:25
means 86:24	404:3 421:12	271:5,10,14	369:19 406:23	170:15 249:7
281:19 284:14	425:15 430:20	326:3 356:5	409:23 473:14	282:11 388:23
326:4 494:25	442:25 453:17	357:6 361:11	492:22 521:1,1	423:23
meant 179:2	473:9 475:7	361:18 363:17	MIEC's 324:17	minimum
measures 116:20	479:12 482:3	363:19 364:9	miles 88:25 89:3	110:10
mechanical 89:2	483:25 493:23	377:3 379:1,3	244:1 254:15	minor 386:14
275:20	502:16	379:6,18 381:2	319:10,11	minute 163:3
mechanism	Meramec	381:5,16 385:1	322:18 366:24	minutes 99:22
203:17,19,23	250:25 466:16	403:13 410:15	373:11 412:7	194:8 220:3
204:9 206:5	468:2 470:15	430:4 470:12	472:17	239:14 273:19
208:2 209:5	482:23	metropolitan	military 216:21	minutia 373:23
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

		I	I	Ī
misleading	212:6 215:1	432:19,23	514:22	147:2,3 149:25
220:16,22	219:20 221:8	433:9,14	modified 201:17	150:1 153:6,7
222:3 225:21	221:13,14	436:18 440:20	201:20 203:16	166:4,5 174:4
226:3,14	223:20 226:6	441:7,15 442:5	204:3 206:15	174:5 181:14
missed 157:11	226:13,20	442:21 443:1,6	moment 130:14	181:15 197:21
363:5	229:21 235:13	443:13 444:9	199:11 311:17	197:22 198:4
missing 360:13	235:25 236:3	444:19 447:7	312:20 317:14	209:1,2,3
mission 109:22	236:14,17,20	448:1 456:23	341:25 473:1	212:10,12
Mississippi	240:5,19	457:17 461:20	momentarily	216:4,5 220:1
111:25 112:1	241:11 249:5,8	466:4 470:15	316:25	220:2,5 222:17
Missouri 82:2,8	249:10,21,24	471:1 472:3	Monday 241:11	273:14 313:24
82:15 83:5,8	254:20,21	476:10 478:9	money 94:16	316:21 317:22
83:13,14,16,17	255:11 256:10	478:20 479:6,8	141:2 202:17	323:19 327:15
83:20,24 84:2	256:12,14,19	479:18 482:9	205:24 285:21	331:7 359:18
84:6,7,10,13	257:23 258:1	485:3 492:19	285:23 287:18	360:4 413:15
84:17,21,22	261:9 262:21	497:14 501:9	428:21 429:3	424:24 434:12
85:8 88:8,11	264:8 268:18	501:16,17	464:8 487:4	437:20,25
88:12,21,22	268:19,22	503:10 504:17	490:8	motion 134:4
89:5,9,10 90:1	269:20,22	506:12 508:22	monopoly 282:2	motivating
90:11,12 91:18	270:18,23	509:2,9 510:16	Montebello	294:9
93:16,20,22	273:18 275:9,9	517:6 518:6	121:6 333:3	motivation
96:8,22,23	276:5 277:25	519:5,14	month 106:14	400:22
97:3 98:6,13	279:19 283:12	Missouri-Ame	107:12 113:5	Mount 392:9,10
99:21,25 100:7	284:4 285:10	82:13 83:6	120:6,15	Mountain 445:9
100:15,20	285:16 286:1	mistake 150:15	134:20,23	mouse 261:21,22
102:8 107:17	286:16 287:16	347:18,21	136:8,9 155:6	move 93:13
107:17 108:6	289:11 292:1	394:3	228:7,8 301:25	137:9 141:8
108:10 110:9	295:6 300:17	mistaken 512:14	350:10,12,13	145:4 232:4
114:20,21	300:18 307:6	Mister 287:5	362:18,23	233:25 239:3,9
115:9 118:2,18	308:12 312:8	mitigate 243:8	364:22 385:25	246:19 261:21
127:22 128:15	312:15 331:3	255:25 455:11	394:19	275:1 284:2
128:19,21,22	332:13 334:6	455:15	monthly 136:6	286:20 295:11
129:7 134:10	337:22 338:21	mixing 499:25	496:13	295:14 396:22
134:12 136:1	339:15 342:5	Moberly 273:19	months 118:22	406:9 426:17
136:10,14	344:8 345:9	model 204:7	157:4 461:15	426:20 474:10
137:5 141:12	359:9,14	327:3 356:25	morning 88:10	512:5 513:7
149:10,14	401:18 406:20	364:5 374:17	93:19 94:7	moved 134:3
155:24 164:9	408:3,19	397:20 398:17	108:20 114:23	173:9 221:16
164:25 172:5	415:19 422:15	449:18 499:14	118:15,16	306:19 404:4
172:18 173:5	422:20,24	modeling 361:5	126:6,7 127:17	436:20
182:16 189:20	426:4,23 428:6	models 297:21	127:18 128:10	movement
194:15 196:8	429:7,9 430:13	310:10 326:24	128:11 134:8,9	140:17 269:24
196:16 202:25	430:23 431:3	354:1	135:12,13,18	305:5 328:12
204:5 208:19	431:10 432:14	modifications	137:24,25	390:16 392:1
			<u> </u>	l

	I	1	1	
moving 99:1	N 83:1 361:24	246:11 283:2	481:2 482:8,9	net 246:14
204:22 221:16	362:8,20	445:20 486:4	487:14 488:14	394:23
224:5,5 281:21	364:16,25	necessarily	488:17 489:7,8	neutral 436:11
300:6 305:4	370:15 371:10	142:21 174:18	489:18,22	neutrality
316:2 347:13	N-a-t-e-l-l-e	174:25 230:4	494:23 514:19	440:19 441:14
350:15 376:7	232:23	326:12 389:10	516:6	never 172:10,12
402:13 436:19	name 113:18	403:9 415:1,12	needed 141:21	279:23 301:19
445:19 465:13	115:5 127:19	443:9 468:19	148:10 151:5	325:25 327:6
475:18,19,19	128:12 194:23	470:6 483:12	152:24 192:6	336:19 510:15
476:13 477:5,6	212:18 218:17	489:4 490:1	296:8,9 299:6	new 91:7,8
488:21 489:17	232:22 240:18	494:15 501:15	339:17	97:16,16,18,18
491:3 513:6	247:14 257:25	501:25	needless 253:7	99:2 120:2,19
multiple 103:15	262:10 273:14	necessary 95:14	316:12	123:9 126:10
165:13 506:21	276:22 289:8	98:9 192:5	needs 93:12	129:22 173:1
508:19	290:21 312:2	240:17 420:11	94:17 97:16	192:5 193:9
multiply 256:3	331:20 332:5	431:1 458:16	108:1 110:5,6	202:10,11
municipal	334:16 340:1	476:2 516:10	121:11 130:2	203:20,23
221:25 222:1	345:1 359:13	necessity 264:11	194:16 199:14	207:14,15
255:21 278:1	401:13,14	285:12 341:4	200:6,19 236:1	208:1 275:20
353:3 446:16	471:9,9 506:14	need 91:4 92:2	237:1,3 255:17	276:17 302:21
472:22 501:16	name's 99:17	93:14 94:11	275:6,23,24	303:24,25,25
municipalities	174:6 308:10	97:18 141:1,2	296:12 328:24	304:3 305:5,7
217:5 257:8	360:19	141:17 183:15	341:11 386:7	305:7,8 310:15
276:1 493:24	Nancy 361:25	199:4 237:21	411:16 454:2	313:10 317:18
501:23	NARUC 313:15	239:8 240:10	485:18 510:19	317:24 318:3
municipality	Natelle 232:15	243:4 246:8	negate 454:25	318:19 322:24
217:3 494:2	232:20,23	249:5 253:5	negative 404:1	332:8 336:13
music 308:14	518:7 522:5	254:2 260:17	negatively 143:1	336:22 340:12
Myers 84:19	national 96:16	260:19 261:14	170:14	391:11 392:7,8
248:18,19	nationally 99:10	263:24 276:3	negotiations	392:12 434:23
251:18,25	nationwide 91:3	285:21,23	409:9	456:6 471:8
281:10 282:13	107:15 510:20	289:21 312:16	neighbor 504:9	473:19 475:10
290:16 327:21	natural 282:2	322:12 326:17	neighborhood	480:8 481:5
334:5 382:25	287:11 426:22	328:7,20	328:25 329:9	488:13,14
396:10 401:3	428:10 483:2	340:12,13	453:2	494:8,8,10
401:11 405:24	507:21 508:16	341:11,21	neighbors	499:23
409:7 459:4,10	nature 165:17	346:8 348:15	121:20 154:20	newer 442:6
460:24 494:3	314:14 487:7	368:2,8 378:5	269:5	newly 271:1
506:8,19	near 179:13	380:13,14,14	neighbors'	423:25
518:12 519:16	185:21 296:9	386:20 397:2	504:5	news 96:12
519:23	296:10 307:13	431:6 439:3	neither 264:10	nice 111:17
myth 112:6	458:16 472:14	447:3 450:13	285:11 397:21	309:7
	nearly 90:13	459:21 460:2	462:8	night 428:6
N	191:11 245:12	474:14,15	nervous 207:25	429:1 514:3

nine 396:8	137:24 147:4	169:9 171:5	O'Keefe 83:19	272:1 288:18
nits 399:11	149:25 188:5	175:9 179:19	Oaks 121:6	327:11,17
nodded 332:6	216:6 222:9	181:19 221:24	333:2 340:2,3	328:18 340:20
non-Arnold	285:20 297:2	223:21 227:14	object 292:22	435:13 501:22
452:4 453:18	317:22 424:24	227:15 242:23	366:13 380:4	occasioned
non-benefiting	441:21 446:10	252:22 255:18	396:23,25	265:18
279:16	474:20 517:7	341:9,9 346:5	397:6 406:19	occupation
non-interconn	520:16	346:13,15	409:7 411:5	331:23
308:22	Norton's 457:25	347:1,14,16,20	438:6,6,6	occur 249:2
non-rate 199:5	not-for-profit	347:22,22	459:4	256:1 455:12
non-residential	312:6	348:8,24 361:1	objected 85:12	467:3
375:6,18	not-too-distant	375:7,7 377:19	270:21	occurred 123:13
non-sewer 409:5	435:1 463:21	380:12 381:12	objecting 301:15	294:25 424:15
non-unanimous	Notably 245:19	396:16 398:24	397:18	occurring 425:8
145:14 242:22	note 131:1 246:3	414:10,20	objection 117:19	off-sets 89:18
257:1 258:25	281:11 313:20	457:4,5 480:7	137:11 143:25	offer 86:15 87:5
270:20 274:7	316:20 420:17	numbered	196:7 214:17	104:10,12
281:25 287:24	noted 315:13	199:21 347:11	225:10 298:16	117:15 143:16
292:9,12 293:2	449:23 507:7	numbering	326:15 328:8	146:3 196:6
294:6 310:5	notes 266:8	349:2	333:23 359:2	214:15 219:10
316:20 355:17	267:7 268:10	numbers 120:14	379:19,22	225:8 261:1
361:6 362:5	268:16,19,22	130:6 156:7	380:1,7,19	290:7 298:16
364:22 366:2	269:4,10 270:7	169:18 177:13	383:10 398:17	326:25 333:20
398:23 402:24	270:12	177:23 178:14	411:8 413:7,8	449:5 493:7
409:21 410:9	notice 123:13	186:2 190:11	449:6 459:12	offered 143:23
434:11 445:15	224:21 264:5	190:14,15	460:24 461:3	145:22 155:22
445:18 450:17	265:13 362:13	241:3 272:20	494:3,5,11	198:22 229:1
456:6 473:13	403:23 407:16	293:22 312:4	objections	240:12 268:16
512:16	521:5	346:16 347:9	143:22 219:13	277:20 284:21
non-unanimo	noticed 165:9	358:21 365:24	234:8 290:8	339:18 400:25
310:16	357:11	386:19 393:17	358:17 406:2	offering 401:5
noon 239:2	notify 443:3	397:3,7 400:24	objective 313:18	448:14
359:20,21	noting 248:22	402:21 414:15	497:9	offers 285:2
514:25 515:5,9	November	416:23 435:10	objectives 389:2	405:25
normal 125:16	155:24 156:3	435:13,15	389:3,15,21	Office 84:5,18
193:20	156:17,17	436:3 450:6,14	obligation	85:11 99:14,18
normally 234:6	157:3 192:20	457:1 492:10	430:17 441:9	109:5 110:15
northwest	nuclear 483:9	506:16	observed 314:13	110:16 111:14
273:18	number 85:8	numerous	observes 266:12	112:3 134:6
Norton 93:22	87:10,12,16	315:14	266:20 268:12	162:10 197:11
114:22,23	128:2 139:5		obvious 308:1	215:19 218:5
115:3,6 118:1	140:1,3,5	0	obviously	225:22 227:10
127:17 128:10	152:1,14	O 89:11,14,18	172:13 204:21	252:3 270:24
134:8 135:12	154:15 156:12	136:24	237:19 244:2	274:8 291:24
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

299:17 377:13	175:16 176:2	362:15 363:1,9	omissions	419:19 439:13
395:2 415:23	177:17 178:1	363:16,22	397:13	509:8 511:21
417:8 422:18	178:11 183:11	364:1 365:17	on-the-record	521:12,12,14
461:7,18 497:5	183:16 187:1	366:1,9,12,16	281:8 420:4,14	521:15,17
508:20,23,24	187:24 189:14	367:8,14	once 204:17	OPC's 152:16
509:18 518:1	192:4 193:13	368:20 369:14	257:2 300:9	218:25 219:13
officer 343:25	193:24 194:1	372:22 377:16	315:22 323:13	248:6 514:4
officers 344:3	194:12 198:8	379:8 380:25	488:15 490:5	open 110:22
official 264:5	199:20,25	381:14 383:12	491:5 498:2	302:20 314:3
265:13	200:1,3,14	384:9 385:7,9	one-inch 350:16	opened 342:9
officials 189:22	202:7 207:24	385:16 386:15	350:19 384:6	opening 88:5
303:22,25	208:9 210:18	386:21 387:25	one-off 165:4	108:9,13,17
offset 171:25	212:3,4 214:6	389:19 392:14	one-page 421:13	111:6 113:15
oftentimes	218:2,5 221:2	394:5 396:12	one-time 326:19	114:18 119:6
217:11 287:10	223:4 224:12	407:11,17	one-way 206:17	129:10 145:8
oh 346:15 353:8	224:20 225:7	409:16 410:3,6	206:19,21	162:10 191:9
368:22,23	230:17,23	411:10,18	207:1 211:12	220:4 239:5,17
378:4 380:2	236:13,15	413:21 414:8	211:16	240:5 248:13
393:25 395:9	237:25 238:20	416:9 417:22	ones 114:1,13	248:16 254:18
396:25 439:11	238:25 248:13	418:1 419:12	166:25 198:21	258:4,5 264:20
469:7 482:16	252:1 257:22	419:21 421:6	248:10 387:18	267:25 289:2
509:11	261:5 271:25	423:22 425:21	388:4 484:20	300:6 315:17
okay 87:18,23	288:24 290:22	433:22 435:9	484:21,22	317:6 321:5
99:12,14	293:9 296:14	437:21 442:23	500:22	387:10 420:15
108:10,15	299:9,16 300:3	453:14,21	ongoing 98:7	517:3,3,4,4,5
114:19 116:23	300:5 303:9	454:6 462:10	192:15 297:7	518:11,12,12
118:2 119:5	305:17 320:25	463:17 466:22	online 318:20	518:13,13,14
125:1 129:2,16	324:15,23	467:10 468:3	OPA 352:24	518:14,15,15
130:10,24	325:5 326:7	469:7,18	353:1	518:16
135:23 136:13	327:16,19	471:23 473:1	OPC 155:2,5	openings 88:1
136:17,25	328:4 329:23	476:16 477:22	158:3 159:2	235:24
137:4,13,18,21	329:24 330:13	481:5 484:13	162:10 179:12	openly 179:1
138:11 139:25	330:16,18	488:7,16	183:14,16	operate 217:5
140:14,16	331:9 335:11	490:12 493:13	208:22 219:11	operates 129:8
144:11 145:3,5	336:3,12	493:21 494:13	219:17 220:10	222:5
146:6,21	337:18 338:10	498:1,13,24,24	220:14,17	operating 116:8
147:18 149:1,3	339:4 340:8,18	498:24,25	235:11 248:6	223:19 224:1
149:20 151:11	342:8 343:8	505:21 512:4	257:12 260:11	242:9 244:14
152:7 153:2,14	344:8 350:22	514:2,16	263:20 277:25	250:1 267:10
155:8,13,16	351:13 355:13	515:11	287:25 308:15	267:14,15,17
158:3 159:2	357:14 359:20	old 92:4 147:22	313:22 321:9	267:17 451:11
169:5 172:10	359:23 360:8	147:25 247:20	325:6 338:19	456:24 470:16
172:12,16	360:24 361:3	264:8 332:23	342:2 355:18	470:20
174:2,20 175:2	361:17 362:12	340:19	378:15 417:3,5	operation
			<u> </u>	

	1		1	
244:10 471:24	275:14 278:1	116:16	overnight	352:4,6,7,8,13
483:20	295:2,21	original 349:8	400:12	352:14,14,23
operational	303:21 308:25	349:17 351:10	overruled 380:7	352:25 353:4
157:10 503:5,5	326:9 327:5,6	352:21 364:6	overseeing	353:10 354:23
operations	346:21 354:20	370:3,15 372:2	430:17	357:5 370:16
88:11 89:24	373:11 387:15	407:13	oversight 486:11	371:1,5 375:13
128:21 138:3	410:13	originally	513:9	378:22 383:16
222:22,23	opposes 262:15	118:17 204:8	owned 96:22	384:2 385:22
353:3 470:24	270:3	308:24 351:10	221:25 222:1	393:23 394:9
471:3,14	opposing 175:12	404:18,23	497:14	395:4 403:17
opinion 102:1	294:19 465:17	outcry 317:13	owner 478:7	403:23 407:2,9
225:3 236:7	opposition	426:25 427:8	owners 428:18	407:13 413:24
288:14 291:13	103:25 104:20	outlier 470:13	ownership	413:25 440:7,8
320:3 336:15	104:23 105:16	outliers 348:5	136:10	475:3 506:14
419:22 420:8	105:17 106:2	outlook 274:12	owning 105:14	506:17
445:15 447:8	294:10 326:14	275:15 276:7	Ozark 251:1	pages 116:6
450:4,9 468:17	option 142:18	outside 247:18	445:9	131:2 213:23
469:24 478:12	142:19 302:7	248:2 252:21		265:11 269:10
483:19 493:12	302:12	279:11 311:21	P	347:10 353:6
495:9 507:1	options 198:14	312:7	P 82:19 83:1,1	354:13
513:22	198:18 296:24	outsource	p.m 239:15	paid 127:4
OPITZ 84:16	314:3	163:17	packet 383:16	150:13 193:14
opportune	order 85:21	over-investment	Pacman 300:22	193:17,19
317:16	112:10 123:25	253:14 420:5	page 111:17	295:8 296:25
opportunities	141:21 148:14	465:16 512:6,7	116:7,11,12,14	472:24
168:11	167:24 199:22	513:8	116:15,19	painful 306:17
opportunity	256:6 281:24	overall 102:8	117:1,2 136:4	316:1,5
88:1,5 95:13	300:13 307:8	110:18 119:12	138:1 179:20	paper 413:22
258:19 323:25	320:5 323:14	139:23 165:2	195:19,19	papers 172:15
358:21 400:15	363:15 390:17	170:15 191:6	198:13 213:23	187:22 400:25
400:19,19	399:14 423:6	222:6,7 228:10	214:3,3 222:12	par 322:4
420:10 444:10	430:19 454:1	322:4 349:11	224:24,25	paragraph
444:12,17	457:12 467:3	354:5 371:16	250:15 263:1	136:3 144:12
447:15 449:17	503:7 512:11	381:17,22	266:12,20	154:14 502:18
464:2,7,11,21	ordered 260:8	389:11,15,20	267:8 268:15	parameters
511:20,24	ordering 309:13	390:1 393:8,19	268:24 269:4	125:7 353:9
512:20,25	orders 309:14	393:20 403:14	318:10,11	356:24 398:4
oppose 105:6,10	467:14	407:24 408:12	346:16,18,19	pardon 458:6
106:1 175:9	organic 107:16	451:24 484:22	346:19,21,24	parent 134:12
316:22 336:4	140:8	486:4 510:18	347:9,9,10,11	146:8 198:6,8
389:5 444:19	organization	513:15	347:11,22,25	216:9
444:22,23	155:11,20	overlooking	348:9,14	parents 170:20
opposed 170:18	172:24	137:19	349:19 350:25	park 158:20
253:25 255:14	organizational	overly 444:5	351:13,15	216:11
	l		l	
-				

147:18 150:22	228:5 265:5,6	party's 86:17	297:5 301:25	484:12
152:11 175:17	265:7 281:1	pass 114:2,14	302:2 373:16	perc 92:19
176:15,24	313:3 332:19	374:20	408:1 414:11	percent 87:17
177:3 178:12	334:22 410:1	passed 220:25	414:21 415:5	91:18,19 92:19
178:14 182:4	446:19	250:14 312:12	416:14 472:8	92:22,22
282:24 298:6,8	particularly	316:19 413:14	472:11	109:11,12,13
336:24	166:7 318:10	422:12 493:15	pays 505:9	109:14,14
Parkville's 298:9	508:21	patently 278:19	PC 83:4,7	114:10 128:3
parochial 330:8	parties 85:23	path 313:3,5	pending 90:8	140:7,8 146:17
343:12 374:24	93:2 94:12,25	481:10,22	Pennsylvania	146:18 160:2
part 88:13 95:2	102:9 106:23	paths 313:1	221:6,8 224:9	163:2,3 164:11
101:25 153:9	155:22 175:9	patterns 266:10	390:24,24	165:1 168:4
153:22 162:25	183:15 202:2	Paul 83:3 185:15	391:11 392:3	170:12 171:25
172:4 173:6	209:21 226:15	240:9,24 245:7	people 91:6 96:6	177:19,20
192:9 201:4	235:24 242:24	344:10,24	96:18,19 97:17	181:7,17 201:8
213:18 240:11	247:6 255:21	345:3,13,19,23	103:24,25	201:9 203:7
241:1 245:19	259:1,4,15,22	346:4 519:6	104:2,18	205:7,8,15
267:20 269:5	260:7,15 261:2	pay 95:15	106:12 109:7	206:6 216:12
281:17 298:9	263:23 271:2	104:19 105:15	139:3 142:22	216:13,17
306:25 307:24	278:9 300:12	106:16 109:11	148:4 165:21	221:24,25
316:23 317:3	302:22 322:6	110:10 113:5	166:24 167:9	227:24 228:10
332:11 336:25	326:23 328:17	169:14 174:25	169:12,16,24	228:16,17,18
363:16 367:9	355:18 398:1	252:17 253:24	171:4,6,17,19	228:18,21
369:1 390:22	399:14 400:4	254:5 277:13	171:23 176:9	246:11,11,15
414:1 421:1	401:6 402:19	280:5,8,20,21	186:17 187:9	271:11,12,13
427:4,7 435:24	462:15 465:24	281:4 297:14	275:1,13	283:1,2,3,5,12
470:22 472:1	471:20 476:3	319:16 334:21	280:20 282:20	286:3 294:5,7
472:25 478:9	482:6 491:18	335:1 340:25	305:9,15	295:10 299:12
478:24 479:18	512:15,24	341:8 367:10	306:17,20	299:12 306:24
495:11 502:25	514:20,23	367:11 390:5	307:12 308:2,2	310:10,13,15
511:3	parties' 258:12	410:1 417:11	308:3 332:14	310:17,18
partial 270:16	328:10	417:18 431:21	333:14,14	316:10 323:5,8
272:19	partner 240:19	460:12 464:15	340:5,6,24	324:22 326:4
partially 247:12	partnership	481:2 489:23	341:9 343:5	326:20 353:11
participant	343:17	payer 243:18	367:9 399:15	354:16 355:21
439:19	parts 402:13	302:6	402:21 427:3,9	355:23,23
participate	504:13	payers 302:13	429:4,5 431:11	356:4 362:7,20
316:16	party 86:16 87:6	420:7	464:21 471:14	362:21 363:13
participated	113:14 137:19	paying 103:1	472:13,15,23	363:13,19
337:21 338:2,3	255:17 272:25	109:10 127:5	478:22 480:20	370:20 384:21
419:8,18	321:14 397:20	178:12 228:2	483:5,14 490:7	393:14,15,15
particular	397:22 398:18	253:25 268:9	490:25 491:23	393:25 394:20
101:15 162:3	422:19 496:15	277:17 283:11	504:4 505:25	394:23,25
187:18 227:8	512:19	283:20 286:2	people's 428:17	395:11,17,19
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	<u> </u>			ı
395:23 396:1	153:17 203:25	510:1,3	384:11 399:3	Platte 102:13
403:8,11 404:2	488:5 489:16	phone 159:5	412:1 413:2,3	105:1 109:9,11
404:2,11 405:6	489:18	164:25 458:1,7	413:25 414:13	111:2 119:20
405:7,8,9	periods 103:24	phonetic 203:6	414:22 512:13	120:2,8 121:11
407:14,15	163:5	phosphate 125:6	512:15,17	122:11 126:9
408:13,14,15	person 100:24	phrase 171:23	513:10	129:12,17
410:11,13	101:1,6 121:21	physical 252:7	planning 129:19	147:8,15,20
445:6 454:3,5	155:20 165:19	pick 323:11	399:21	148:10 169:2
454:16,17,24	168:1 176:11	408:9 479:10	plans 120:1	179:21 180:7
456:24 457:12	185:16 265:4,6	picking 152:17	323:20,22	181:4,6 182:4
457:15 459:21	272:9 462:11	477:25 478:18	324:2 326:12	185:18 189:18
460:15,18	472:10 483:24	478:24 480:11	369:12 412:21	190:11 250:8
488:19 505:12	personal 418:21	480:17 481:8	412:25 433:5	250:23 268:25
percentage	personally 145:3	481:16	plant 96:22	269:9 271:12
94:20 164:25	185:6 390:21	picks 399:12	97:16,16,18,18	274:23 283:8
203:5 210:20	personnel	picture 148:18	120:2,11	283:19 298:7
210:21 299:11	145:21,24	piece 466:2	126:10,16	307:14,19
322:3 324:21	persons 226:23	491:15	129:17,23	309:22 317:19
349:25 363:23	perspective	pile 160:21	170:4 175:18	317:23,25
385:12 394:19	157:17 168:23	Ping-Pong	175:21 176:15	318:13,20
395:8,14,18	199:17 206:6	278:14	176:23 178:12	323:3 326:18
403:20,20	241:8 245:16	pinpoint 122:13	178:14 179:2	326:25 332:18
450:4	247:13 248:9	pipe 178:25	182:4 185:18	336:24 348:3
percentage-wise	313:20 341:5	pipelines 508:9	185:20 190:12	355:21 361:25
146:14	343:10 391:20	pipes 91:13	190:21 193:9	362:14 364:12
percentages	469:20 476:14	121:14 252:11	193:17,21	364:13,16,24
92:17 369:24	476:15	332:24 333:6	243:25 244:2	364:25 369:22
371:15 393:5	persuade 313:8	piping 89:4	254:15 266:17	370:5,19,20,24
394:6 407:6	Petry 213:13,16	pitting 301:17	268:7 270:14	371:6,16 393:5
perception	520:10,12	place 92:23	279:20 280:21	434:6,7,14,19
307:2 308:2	PGA 508:12	123:22 193:10	313:10 317:25	434:25 452:12
perfect 246:6,17	PGA/ACA	200:2 221:21	318:3,15,20	454:14,19
317:7	508:8	269:24 339:17	336:23,23	500:12,15
perfectly 205:11	Ph.D 245:17	435:12	373:10 427:14	play 95:21
perform 259:16	phase 130:5	placed 313:11	427:19 476:3	371:14 472:25
performance	190:24 191:2	places 263:8	482:15 483:1,2	please 94:7
103:16 116:20	phenomenon	288:8 354:6	489:6	99:17 108:19
performing	201:21 221:21	488:20	plant's 193:18	108:20 113:18
107:22	Phil 116:2,24	plan 182:5,6,10	plants 88:24	114:24 115:5
performs 107:23	195:16 213:20	182:14 190:17	89:3 91:13	188:25 194:23
period 92:21,24	philosophical	190:18 239:15	127:2,6 129:8	212:18 218:17
104:11,12	294:11 306:16	250:21 318:1	186:6,9 190:19	218:19 230:9
136:21 138:3,7	philosophy	326:9 330:1,2	252:10 266:17	232:22 248:18
138:25 140:10	315:25 430:9	366:13,17	483:10	252:4 256:3,6
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l

			-	
257:25 262:10	466:10 481:25	418:3 426:20	259:23,24	99:16,18 108:5
273:13 276:21	497:1	430:24 432:1,3	271:18 291:6	108:24 113:21
289:8 300:8	Pointe 250:13	432:4,6 433:18	291:10 300:19	134:7 183:17
306:8 308:4,9	251:2 424:9	441:5 445:13	303:13 304:7,9	190:13 197:12
312:1 322:8	466:16,18	465:19 473:25	304:14,25	208:23,25
331:21 345:1,2	467:22 468:1	493:6,9 517:2	312:17 319:12	210:3 215:21
346:11 349:6	473:15	policy-making	347:25 378:21	218:8,16
351:14,15	pointed 109:22	109:1	387:11 416:8	219:10 232:1
353:13 355:14	111:5 226:21	policymakers	417:8,22,24,24	235:12 238:7
356:16 401:12	226:22 314:22	304:20 330:12	426:18 427:8	238:10,11,21
490:25	328:11 404:15	poor 103:3,7,12	428:1 436:10	252:4 257:15
pleasure 108:21	436:16 437:2	103:16,23,24	436:22 447:4	257:18 262:4
plenty 458:23,24	475:10,24	104:6,7,22,25	450:9 452:23	264:19 282:17
462:14	476:2 483:15	105:1,24,24	460:21 461:6	287:7 291:25
plight 114:7	510:7	106:5,8,9	462:12 465:12	299:18 321:11
plumbing	pointing 410:21	158:4 159:3	467:25 468:14	325:18,23
161:19	points 105:8	162:12 167:14	469:16 471:18	326:2 338:20
plus 152:6	319:9 482:3,6	309:16	474:13 509:9	342:3 358:19
270:24	policies 99:21,23	poorly 106:20	511:21	358:25 378:16
pneumonia	103:13 226:1,4	population	positions 85:24	380:12,17,24
173:19	278:18 314:4,8	114:10 305:4,5	101:13 102:7	382:15,17
PO 83:4 84:16	policy 85:14	341:18	232:3 233:7	395:1 396:20
84:20	88:2 95:4,21	portion 116:23	263:23 312:19	396:22 397:2
point 86:7 95:8	96:5 99:20	127:6,11 176:3	426:16 462:16	439:9,14,15
95:8,15,19,20	100:2,12,13,14	176:17 177:4	509:12	457:7 463:25
129:19 131:1	100:16,20	182:8 193:16	positive 104:4	502:11,12
144:18,21	101:4,10 102:2	193:19 195:15	199:20 318:24	514:5,11 517:4
147:24 153:22	102:12,14,20	195:18,23	328:12,17,19	517:10,15,19
157:5 161:17	106:18 107:6,9	213:19 214:2	possibility	518:2,5,9,12
170:2,5,10	109:3,17 110:2	312:18 411:12	302:18 474:7,9	519:4,10,19,22
173:8 178:9	112:17 113:16	440:6 463:23	497:8 501:18	potential 266:3
180:6 182:23	113:21 114:19	479:20 485:2	possible 120:13	296:24 464:10
190:23 200:12	226:5 239:1	portions 115:18	122:5 140:22	464:12 465:16
227:7 228:18	243:3 245:15	116:1,5 117:7	153:13 154:22	potentially
238:22 254:8	247:1,4 249:4	213:22,25	249:7 266:6	139:5 192:4
275:21 277:20	249:14 251:22	214:8	295:18 316:18	351:19 446:24
284:2 295:11	252:15 254:17	portrayed 236:6	323:6 469:25	447:3 460:3
310:14 311:24	254:18 255:10	posed 282:20	496:8 505:16	469:10
326:2 339:20	257:4,6,7	506:10	505:18,22	poverty 105:22
357:11,12	300:10,11	position 86:5	515:7	114:11 269:1,7
360:10 392:11	302:20 304:19	87:1,2,3	possibly 171:7	269:13,13
424:25 433:16	313:14 314:3	101:21 109:16	322:12 341:6	power 84:14
437:13 445:24	320:10 326:17	110:12 126:14	Poston 84:15	262:2,6
458:14 461:22	328:1 400:23	173:1,9 237:11	86:19 87:2	powering 262:5
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

PowerPoint	142:1,5,11,19	135:25 150:6	prices 280:5	295:15 296:5
99:16 179:20	142:21 143:1	192:20 212:23	508:17	299:24 304:12
226:22	191:16,20,25	345:6	pricing 97:24	306:20 307:5
PR 413:10	192:1	Presiding 82:17	98:23 99:2	308:16,24,25
practical 505:15	preparation	press 421:11	111:16,24	310:2 311:7,11
praises 308:16	128:23	pressed 273:4	112:6,8 119:7	313:4,10,19
pre-approval	prepare 289:16	pressure 333:5	120:7 140:18	314:19,21
512:22	360:22,24,25	pressures	141:11,24	315:6,9,10,13
pre-approve	prepared 115:11	244:21	142:1,19,25	315:21,21
512:24	188:17 195:5	pretty 121:22	152:3 182:25	316:7,15 321:6
pre-filed 401:5	212:24 218:23	168:8 239:24	183:21 184:4	335:13 337:25
pre-tax 87:11	245:8 259:20	248:7 310:23	184:11 191:21	338:6 349:9
precise 456:18	345:11,18,22	333:6 398:7	191:24 210:22	354:4 356:19
480:1	346:2 357:18	457:2 479:13	220:12,21	356:22 364:5
predecessor	358:5 360:11	501:9 504:10	221:3,20 222:2	367:19 385:11
150:7 153:15	360:21 376:9	previous 299:22	222:6,18,24,24	389:25 399:24
173:2 457:25	401:19,20	304:14 307:4	223:2 224:2,8	416:6,12,17
predict 205:10	448:22,23,24	314:12,16	225:4,6 230:2	417:6,10,17
205:11	466:6 499:13	354:12 356:9	230:2,6,13	418:5,5,11,12
predictable 93:9	prescribe 227:2	previously 279:2	240:4,22 241:7	418:14,14
predicted	presence 143:9	281:9,24	243:1,3,14,16	419:14,17
202:16	present 93:20	285:11 316:11	243:17 245:6	420:5,18
predicts 202:14	118:20 265:16	332:2 345:19	245:17 246:4	421:21 422:3,4
preface 436:2	298:7 332:23	345:24 347:4	247:15 248:21	436:20,21
487:18	349:24 352:11	357:20,20	249:19,20	449:19 461:12
prefer 257:15	353:6,14,19	372:10 385:13	253:11,13,20	461:12,13,19
500:5	354:14 357:3	PRH-1A 347:1,4	255:20 256:23	462:5,13,13
preferable	370:18 379:17	PRH-2 347:1,4	262:15 263:3,8	465:9 482:21
206:18	381:4 385:10	PRH-6 348:8	263:10,16,17	497:25 504:23
preference	385:10 415:25	413:11,12	263:20 264:1,2	504:25 505:3
100:23 254:23	416:10 511:21	445:6	264:16 266:21	505:17,22,24
265:3 272:3	511:24	price 107:13	266:23 268:3,6	513:6,7 518:10
277:4 310:21	presentation	181:3 230:8	268:11,13,17	primarily 94:8
preferences	420:4 448:5	244:22 253:2	268:21 270:4,8	113:21 243:1
278:10	presented	253:10,16	274:22 275:14	329:21 477:7
preferential	106:20 110:20	263:17,19	275:17 277:24	primary 280:17
100:3 101:8	288:1 294:22	266:24 270:6	278:2,4,6,9	411:2,13
226:25	445:6	282:14 337:10	279:22,24	principal 282:6
prejudice	presenting	371:9 372:23	280:1,3 282:4	principle 100:17
100:25 254:23	178:20	390:5 431:22	282:10 286:20	307:25 311:10
265:8 277:6	presently 382:4	446:12 447:17	286:22 288:12	500:2 507:3
prejudices	president 93:22	447:18,20,21	291:12 292:14	principles
278:10	94:2 115:10	priced 221:15	292:21 293:7	248:24 253:21
premium 141:24	118:21 128:19	506:1	294:20 295:13	263:13 265:11

	1	•		•
266:22 282:3	167:9 262:4	368:19,24,25	411:17	propose 203:19
389:11 465:20	287:13 339:23	372:12,14,24	properly 429:14	242:17 322:2
507:2,5	340:4,5,21	372:25	494:17,19	322:24 327:5
print 326:19	465:12	products 374:18	Prophetic 316:4	329:19 397:22
prior 92:5	procedure 511:4	profess 272:10	proponents	423:3 452:22
129:13 157:20	procedures	professional	243:16	proposed 99:25
157:20 188:17	502:22	98:15	proportionately	182:5,6 203:17
303:11 314:12	proceed 115:2	professor 245:23	227:25	204:8 208:2,5
318:21 356:11	212:15 240:14	program 165:6	proposal 112:15	208:6,7 224:21
392:8 462:6,7	289:5 290:14	213:24	184:23,24	229:3 240:25
479:6	proceeding	programs	185:4 187:4,20	240:25 241:2
private 98:10	88:14 115:12	217:10	209:8 241:15	241:22 242:7
113:25 265:17	195:6 212:25	prohibited	249:12,15	242:14,15,22
284:8 305:9	281:8 312:19	264:25	251:7 255:12	243:20 250:2,7
privately-owned	315:17 317:5	prohibition	257:16,16	250:9 252:24
428:23 472:22	345:12 420:14	437:7	272:7,7 292:19	253:1 255:23
privileged 409:8	proceedings	prohibitions	292:25 293:21	256:6 317:17
410:3	82:5 316:17	255:5	294:1,2,4,10	323:4 329:5
proactive	process 121:13	prohibits 277:2	299:13 307:18	349:17,25
124:22 339:20	121:16 122:9	project 98:7	349:9 355:17	351:10 352:11
probably 86:3	158:21 160:19	190:12 214:4	355:20 356:15	352:19 353:16
89:22 106:10	161:2,4 192:12	368:9	364:6,15,20	353:17 354:16
140:6 146:19	281:15 315:3	projecting	366:3 370:3,15	354:16 376:24
156:25 158:25	369:4 420:22	129:21	370:15,23	381:4 382:5
236:8 237:4	456:18,20	projection 154:9	372:2 375:4	394:19 395:14
239:14 240:17	479:20 492:17	projects 367:16	377:11,12,24	395:16,24
257:19,20	496:9 497:1,3	367:20 389:23	379:1,16 381:3	398:18 403:4,5
275:5 350:11	497:7 498:8	prominent	382:19,19	404:16,20,24
350:12 351:18	499:2 512:3,22	222:19	398:5,9 434:5	407:8,9 435:24
386:9 390:25	processed	promise 280:3	435:3 445:16	444:20 445:14
464:1 485:18	368:16	promote 243:7	446:5 449:22	445:22 446:1
500:19 514:2	processes 95:25	243:10,12	451:3 482:14	449:19,24
problem 101:11	419:5	284:13 390:7	506:22,23	469:10 509:25
101:22 122:7	processing	promotes 281:6	proposal344	521:5 522:6
125:2,4,21	412:18 427:15	promoting	520:24	proposes 250:20
145:16,17	Procurement	266:9	proposals 248:5	375:15
160:4 161:17	507:25	promotion	248:21 251:24	proposing 176:3
268:14,18	produce 136:18	118:25	257:13 258:12	202:9 224:7
271:1 299:6	148:4 269:17	pronouncing	258:20 260:15	241:18 250:17
349:2 439:1	produced	270:3	261:1 271:18	251:3 259:4,15
473:6 498:1	201:10	proper 264:11	274:15 323:15	321:19,22
505:25	product 96:8	265:15 285:12	369:20,20	323:16 377:15
problems 154:17	244:18,22	308:20 314:18	377:15 382:1,8	397:23 398:6,8
158:7 166:24	254:13 302:15	337:10 397:11	512:21	422:2,3,4
			<u> </u>	

436:24 451:14	123:19 130:18	99:14,19,19,20	287:8 291:20	511:8,9,11,15
452:19 454:7	130:21 157:13	100:13,14,16	291:24 299:17	512:19 518:1,6
454:24 455:24	163:20 186:2	100:19,20	301:1,3 302:22	519:15
457:8,11 473:3	186:23 187:16	101:13 102:2	305:9 307:2,3	pull 153:20
508:15 509:19	188:19 190:10	102:11,14,16	308:1 311:16	159:25 502:17
510:2,4 513:1	198:13 241:9	102:17,19,20	312:3,6 313:14	pulling 158:24
proposition	244:21 256:11	103:4,20,21	314:3,4,8	pump 252:10
320:12	269:21 277:16	106:7,18 107:6	318:17 320:10	pumped 244:19
protect 282:2	313:17 332:12	107:9,13 108:4	327:25 333:1	pumping 244:3
286:15 302:13	400:10 427:20	109:5,25 110:2	337:3,11	373:10
316:17	435:10 502:23	110:15,16	338:15 339:11	punitive 460:22
protected	510:16	111:14 112:3	342:18,23	460:23
302:17	provides 88:16	112:17 113:25	343:25 344:3	purchase 142:8
protection	95:12 241:12	121:24 128:7	351:18 353:2	142:12 183:22
217:10 313:16	256:17 264:20	128:13 134:6	355:11 374:9	184:8 284:18
protocol 125:12	265:1 284:16	143:3,11 145:7	377:1,13 391:4	285:16 422:22
proud 308:14	285:1 508:4	151:4 159:19	395:2 397:21	429:10 442:10
provide 87:10	510:15	160:6 162:12	401:18 403:25	444:3 464:3
88:14 93:17	providi 479:3	164:18,19	409:22 412:24	479:6 506:1
97:13 98:15	providing	165:10,20	415:23 417:8	purchased
100:23,25	154:25 158:15	178:21,21,23	422:19,22	285:25 426:4
101:10 107:8	263:11 373:1	179:3,19	425:1 426:15	446:22 463:9
113:7 117:16	390:2 415:17	180:24 186:21	426:21,25	467:1,11,12
141:19 142:7	425:25 438:19	186:24 187:3	427:3,7,22	473:8 475:14
145:23 155:17	478:13 480:1	187:22 197:5	430:24,24	508:3 510:10
164:1 186:19	492:3,8,11	197:11 215:19	431:6 437:11	510:11,12
188:8,14	495:1,5,7,9,17	218:6 225:22	439:9,16 440:3	purchases
216:22 217:2,9	provision 144:7	227:10 228:25	440:9,11,12,19	478:20
233:18 245:15	145:4 227:1	229:11 232:3	441:3,5,9,14	purchasing
249:11 251:6	265:18 363:18	233:1 235:6	441:19,20	142:8,16
254:6,22 259:3	466:25 467:7	245:18,23,24	443:22 445:13	446:15 464:4
259:17 266:18	provisions 324:4	248:17 249:4	447:14 461:8	473:10 479:7
287:19 298:15	proximity 242:9	249:14 252:3	461:10,18	pure 300:11
321:24 337:11	451:11	252:24 253:23	462:4,7 467:1	purport 356:10
337:12 339:17	prudence	254:17 255:10	472:3,4,7	377:12
343:14 386:22	427:13	255:14 264:7	473:12 485:2	purportedly
425:22 431:1	prudent 259:14	265:11 270:24	493:9 497:6	284:23
487:10 488:15	286:21	272:6 274:8	501:11 502:6	purporting
490:9 493:7	PSC 484:21,24	275:13 277:10	502:10,21	349:7
503:10 508:9	501:14	278:15,17	503:1,2,7	purports 135:24
provided 82:15	public 82:1 83:9	280:9,10,15	508:1,20,23,24	352:17 355:15
89:13 90:15	83:10 84:15,18	281:23 282:3	509:1,2,6,9,11	378:22
92:15 96:7,14	84:22 85:11	282:15 284:9	509:18,19	purpose 259:7
106:22 122:24	88:19,19 98:13	284:25 286:17	510:22 511:1,7	277:15 282:1
	<u> </u>			<u>l</u>

	Ī	i i		ı
399:6	189:18 244:20	513:5 516:8	234:24 235:1,3	400:20 405:18
purposes 115:12	284:12 300:20	question's	235:5,8,10,12	406:11,14,18
148:8 195:5	323:4 332:16	378:18	235:15,16,19	406:22 411:20
212:25 252:10	quantified 275:5	questioning	238:1,4,6,13	426:9,10
264:17 345:14	quarter 136:8	461:2 477:3	246:24 251:19	437:10 438:2,9
345:20,24	239:2	questions 93:21	257:11 259:20	439:4,14,23
346:4 394:16	quest 385:19	117:5 118:4,7	261:6 262:23	440:1,2 441:4
449:20 502:25	question 98:25	118:9,11	271:15 272:16	448:10 457:7
push 97:24	111:20 115:13	125:24 137:8	273:8,10	461:5 464:25
194:4	115:19 126:4	137:21,23	276:14,15,25	465:1,4 466:23
pushes 326:22	144:11 146:19	143:12 145:7	289:24 290:6	476:16,20,24
put 86:8 109:20	149:2,9 151:11	146:22 147:1,6	290:16,18,23	477:1 492:19
123:22 126:10	154:12 155:23	149:24 151:12	290:24 291:1	492:21,25
143:14 161:18	157:22 160:15	153:5 157:8	291:15,17,19	494:7,14
193:10 201:16	161:11 167:8	166:3,14	291:22,25	495:23 500:23
204:16 221:14	168:10 172:17	173:24 179:18	293:10,12,15	500:25 502:8
247:5 274:7	185:2,15 195:6	181:10 183:13	296:15,17,18	506:21 507:6,8
309:9 366:17	200:15,22	183:18,19	296:19 298:21	508:20 511:10
397:22 400:13	201:1 213:1	184:16 186:16	299:16,18,22	511:14,17,22
408:5 426:6	221:4 222:21	188:5 189:12	303:5 305:20	512:1,2 514:6
436:24 438:13	243:4 251:12	189:17 191:4	305:23 306:2,4	514:21,23
445:2,3,3	255:4 272:5	191:15 192:8	308:6 311:13	516:5 517:11
447:12,13	282:20 287:5	193:25 195:22	319:20,21,23	517:11,12,12
451:17,22	299:21 306:16	196:17,19,21	320:3 321:10	517:13,18,18
466:21 478:23	324:6,12 325:6	196:23,25	324:5 334:5,8	517:21 518:8
485:4 490:13	326:8 368:11	197:2,4,7,9,12	334:12,18	518:20 519:3
491:18,24	369:2 372:3	197:15,17,20	338:10,12,14	519:11,11,12
495:11 503:11	379:9 380:5,15	207:9 208:16	338:17,20,23	519:12,13,20
503:17 512:9	380:23 381:1	208:18 210:2	338:24 339:1,2	519:20
514:18,24	381:19 384:20	210:12,18	339:9 342:1	quick 386:10
puts 211:1	385:19 389:13	211:11 212:3	344:5 357:21	440:10 502:18
putting 169:18	394:14,16	214:6 215:2,4	358:12 360:2,5	quickly 96:15
276:7 500:2	411:6 436:3	215:6,8,10,12	360:21 364:1	207:10 450:24
0	437:24 438:1	215:14,16,18	365:2,4,6	quite 97:7,7
Q	439:25 440:19	215:21,23,25	369:14,15	173:12 190:25
qualification	440:22 441:13	216:3,7 217:15	371:19 372:1	306:17 316:18
115:13 213:1	441:14 443:2	217:18,21,23	374:8 382:23	452:10 496:21
Qualifications	451:18 462:17	217:25 219:6	382:24,25	quo 140:18
520:16,18	463:25 469:18	219:21 223:9	383:3 384:14	206:18 242:25
qualifies 255:4	474:21 480:9	223:17 225:7	384:17,24	432:22,23
quality 104:5	484:14 485:13	225:16 229:6,8	385:20 386:17	454:20
105:2,12,25	486:8 494:4	229:10,14,19	387:4,5,6	quote 306:25
106:9 120:22	503:9 504:21	231:19,20,22	392:17 393:4	307:2,6 315:23
121:8,9 161:5	506:9 511:9	231:23 232:2	395:2 396:4	316:3 317:7
				l

quoted 100:15	106:24 107:25	292:19 293:18	389:22 390:7	497:18 500:15
299:10 317:6	109:3,7 110:11	298:1,5,8,8	391:1,3 392:4	504:9 505:4,13
quotes 220:23	112:8,11	303:11,13	392:5,6,6	508:6,12,22
quoting 246:4	113:11 114:15	308:12 312:18	393:5,6 397:24	509:19,20
315:16	119:6,13 120:5	312:21,23	401:21,25	510:5 511:3
	120:10 138:8,9	313:1 314:12	402:3,15	514:19 515:5
R	152:24 153:22	314:15 315:24	406:12,16,18	515:22 521:19
R 83:1,2 84:1	154:10 161:1	316:12,14	408:2,4 410:23	rate's 481:19
344:24 345:3	177:11 178:19	317:9,10,12	411:3,6 415:20	rate-base 142:10
345:13,19,24	180:5,21,21	319:13,17	420:19,21	142:11 313:11
346:4 383:25	181:17 185:11	321:16,25	421:2,2 422:4	502:23
383:25	186:12 189:25	323:23 324:1,7	422:7 423:15	rate-making
R-o-s-e 331:22	191:10 193:8	326:3,20 327:6	423:23 424:14	93:15 102:7
race 94:9	198:9,18,25	328:16 331:9	426:7 434:21	248:24 249:1
raise 113:2	199:6,7,12	331:12 335:16	435:18,18,23	249:14 252:9
114:24 194:17	200:5,13,17	335:17 336:17	435:24 437:6	257:4 281:14
212:11 218:10	202:14 204:9	337:3 341:12	437:15,17	282:6,11
255:24 331:13	205:10 206:5,9	345:7 346:17	438:1,2,8,12	335:12 343:10
469:19	206:13,14	346:20 349:23	438:14,15,17	420:21 460:22
raised 104:9	207:5,13,16,19	349:25,25	438:21 442:7	502:23,25
105:11 145:7	208:2,8 210:9	350:3,16	444:16 446:6	ratepayer 110:5
301:10 323:3	210:13 211:18	351:17,21	446:12 449:25	112:20,21
420:3	218:24 227:15	352:10,23,24	450:1 454:7,12	268:2 301:20
raises 254:17	228:13,17	353:14,16,17	454:17,18	301:24 302:10
Ralph 220:17	230:14,17	353:19 354:14	455:3,11,15	335:15 341:10
252:21 313:22	231:16,17	354:15 355:2	456:3 457:15	ratepayers
RAM 203:22	241:19 243:7,8	357:4,5 359:16	457:18 459:19	100:4 109:11
204:19	243:9 245:7,11	361:5,19	459:22 465:18	112:18 113:8
ramifications	246:7,14	364:10,17,20	466:13,14,20	120:8 123:24
286:19	247:17 249:1,7	364:21 367:23	467:6,11,18,19	182:7 192:3
random 155:19	251:10 252:7	368:4 370:18	467:19,21,22	265:22 269:8,8
range 140:7	256:1,2,16	370:18,20,25	467:24,24	277:13 280:3
203:7 228:3	258:4,9 259:23	370:25 371:1	468:16 469:1,5	281:4 286:9
256:7	265:14,14	371:10 373:3	469:16,17	294:3 298:15
ranges 283:15	266:5 267:24	373:17 375:2,6	472:10,16	304:17 323:18
Rankin 250:12	268:7 269:13	375:16,18	473:5 475:16	389:20 416:15
rate 82:14 85:9	269:13 271:11	376:12,15,16	477:20,24	426:1
87:11 89:6,12	271:13 274:11	376:17,19,22	478:5 479:16	ratepayers'
89:17,25 90:10	274:16,18	376:23,24	479:17 480:11	266:1
92:10 94:9,15	277:23,25	377:2,8,8	481:4,6 482:14	rates 91:12,15
94:16 95:1	280:13,16	383:8 384:10	483:1 487:15	93:18,24 94:21
98:9 101:9	281:15 283:23	385:4,10	488:1,5,8,21	94:23 95:6,8
103:5,16	283:24 285:7	387:17,24	488:25 489:25	95:11,11 96:2
105:14,23	285:25 286:14	388:3,3,23	490:7 496:10	98:16 100:21

101:5,12	285:18 294:24	477:5,8 478:1	453:25	479:15 481:11
102:23,25	295:20 297:17	479:22 480:18	real 122:6 130:6	484:9 486:5
104:19 105:16	297:19,21	485:21 486:9	180:3 246:14	491:25 499:12
105:22 109:8	299:22 303:3	487:9 489:1	278:13 279:25	505:16 507:15
109:23 110:19	304:13,16	490:3 497:16	280:2 329:1,2	reason 86:21,23
111:6,7,10	306:23 307:1,7	503:19,23,24	390:21 399:8	112:10 121:17
112:11,18	310:9,12	503:25 504:5	428:14 440:10	135:3 139:22
113:23 136:18	316:10,11	504:12 505:4,6	440:13 502:18	144:24 145:21
136:21 140:21	317:8 321:19	505:8,11,19	510:20 512:9	154:15 173:12
140:21 141:7	321:23 323:3	506:4 507:15	513:21	177:10 244:22
141:22 142:22	324:19 325:4	512:12 513:20	real 515:22	252:25 267:9
142:25 152:12	327:2 337:10	521:6	realign 246:18	267:20 270:6
169:14,21,22	337:12 341:14	rating 102:2	reality 249:1,8	279:22 286:10
171:24,24	352:11,11,19	ratings 164:17	312:10	337:14 347:9
173:4,9 180:17	353:6,12	166:18	realize 126:13	372:23 384:25
180:18 181:16	354:16 355:20	ratio 375:21	159:18 239:1	423:13,22
183:8 187:4,21	357:3,4 363:15	rationale 244:25	431:21 433:8	425:21 432:21
193:3 195:3	363:17 364:14	387:7 468:5	reallocate	433:14 438:3,7
197:24 201:21	365:18 371:16	502:14	488:20	458:13 460:4
203:12 204:15	371:17 375:11	Raw 428:16	really 100:12	473:2 474:14
204:16,18	375:15,21	RCS-16 313:22	104:18 108:24	477:7 504:3
206:9,10	376:20 379:17	re 112:23	138:17 144:20	reasonable
211:23 224:21	383:23 384:22	380:13 461:16	159:10 160:3	93:18 95:9,10
226:21,22	385:2,6 387:14	re-ask 380:14,14	160:25 170:21	95:13,23 96:2
227:3,8,21	387:15 388:14	re-jigger 481:20	170:23 171:8	100:22 101:12
237:24 241:8	388:17,19,21	re-offer 399:18	171:13 174:16	109:23 112:16
241:25 242:1,2	390:7,12,15	reach 95:1 181:7	186:7,7 202:9	119:16 126:21
242:4 243:11	393:18 408:6	328:10 329:17	202:12 203:15	141:22 142:22
243:18,20	409:5 414:12	442:15 443:6,7	210:13 226:4	227:2,15
246:6,9,10,18	414:21 419:25	reached 94:12	252:6,12	228:19 237:24
246:20 247:17	420:10 421:12	310:6	280:24 284:7	259:15 264:23
247:24,25	421:22 422:6	reaches 237:12	287:18 294:18	269:19 277:5
248:2 251:3	422:13 424:3	476:13	310:20 326:16	278:3 286:21
253:22,24	424:16 426:3	reaction 86:2	327:6,8,24	302:1 303:3
254:21 256:6,9	430:15 444:25	read 106:6	328:1 330:5	304:13,16
258:15 259:9	445:2,3 449:24	173:15 238:12	331:11 336:11	307:1,25 311:5
265:11,16,21	451:25 452:6,9	303:10,19	364:19 377:14	341:12,14,22
267:8 269:1,7	452:11,14,21	318:18 340:11	377:17 381:16	389:7 430:15
270:9 274:4,25	452:23 454:9	348:3 440:6	387:14,21	432:1 478:11
275:11 276:4	456:5 457:12	461:14,15	429:3 431:16	495:16 496:13
277:7,12,12	462:20 466:21	502:17	431:21 432:3	reasonableness
278:3,12	467:18 468:18	reading 128:25	435:16 440:24	111:12 228:24
279:21,25	469:5 470:1,3	198:12 231:13	445:10 471:23	260:16 280:16
282:1,7 285:5	472:12,24	344:12 361:17	474:10 478:17	reasonably

		·	1	
190:16	receive 126:23	258:18 377:11	91:13 205:12	506:7,9,19
reasoned 306:25	127:1 176:23	455:20	207:3 329:3	517:16,19
307:6	176:25 279:9	recommended	381:25	518:5,21 519:4
reasoning	281:5 319:6	180:21 258:9	recovery 93:10	519:13,23
497:12	364:21 413:4	recommending	191:20,25	reduce 202:18
reasons 141:4	received 117:23	375:4 476:4	201:10 207:2	253:14 255:25
202:8 204:19	123:17 126:15	reconfigures	211:1 284:15	295:20 297:19
222:19 252:23	129:4 137:16	499:15	379:3,12,18	297:21 469:5
268:16 270:4	144:3 165:2	record 85:7,10	381:4 382:3,9	488:25
284:6,10,21	183:20 184:16	92:20 103:12	395:19 396:1	reduced 103:17
286:11,13	189:17 191:15	107:13 111:13	419:23 425:5	180:3 209:23
443:9 472:18	196:11 214:22	117:22 134:5	recross 173:23	285:7 297:17
475:9 482:19	219:18 225:14	134:23 137:14	179:9,14	423:15 487:6
491:24	234:12 246:9	144:2 186:3	183:15 188:2	reduces 363:10
Rebuttal 92:15	269:17 283:3	196:10 214:20	208:17 217:24	468:16
116:24 195:16	290:12 334:1	219:11,16	238:5,7,9,20	reducing 112:17
213:13 218:23	359:7 406:8	225:13 234:11	298:20 342:1	reduction
218:24 240:9	449:10	255:7 260:21	392:16 492:18	271:12,13
240:24 242:13	receivership	289:9,9 290:11	492:23 494:4	294:23 323:5
251:8 258:9	90:9	312:2 321:5	Recross-Exam	386:5 488:19
289:17 345:23	receives 95:16	331:21 333:25	174:3 179:15	reductions
347:13,17	95:18 166:21	344:14 345:2	181:13 183:17	393:5,6
348:9 357:18	307:16 364:16	346:12 358:16	188:4 208:25	refer 148:21
385:21 401:20	364:20	359:5 396:15	238:11 296:22	217:8 222:14
401:21 432:13	recess 194:14	398:15 401:13	298:23 342:3	265:10 449:21
432:17 434:1,4	240:2 321:3	406:6 449:9	493:3 496:5	reference 225:20
475:2 512:10	396:14	472:6 495:19	501:3 502:12	240:8 264:19
520:6,10 521:4	recognition	516:12	504:19 517:13	referenced
521:14,16,23	93:10 311:3	Recording	517:14,14,15	211:12 281:9
521:24	319:3 491:21	164:11	517:15,19	282:13 314:6
REC'D 520:1	recognize 86:4	records 267:10	518:9,20,21	references
recalculated	135:15 233:15	recover 112:21	519:4,21,21,22	189:19 311:19
477:6	244:6 256:23	205:14 282:7	519:22,23	referred 173:6
recall 103:7	278:17 314:4	302:14,17	Redfield 250:5	192:23 377:6
130:7 179:6,7	320:9 382:7	307:8 329:4	271:6 322:21	referring 450:11
193:4 247:14	recognized	381:10 424:14	322:22 430:5	463:7,11
247:22 318:18	89:12	454:2,7 457:12	466:18 468:2	497:21
333:8 409:2,14	recognizing	recovered 192:2	redirect 189:14	refined 417:25
409:16,18	323:2	329:19 385:5	189:16 210:4,7	418:1
410:2 439:22	recollection	395:15 425:4	217:25 231:25	reflect 233:22
461:16,22,22	130:20	447:3	232:1 238:6,20	319:17 386:5
461:25 464:3	recommend	recoveries 425:7	299:19,20	389:25 500:17
recarbonation	505:18 512:11	425:9	342:13,15	reflected 365:18
122:10 125:5	recommendati	recovering	392:18,20	Reflection
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

		•		
reflective 377:14	146:18 151:14	201:9 217:12	455:19 456:1	reply 282:12,12
reflects 129:7	216:8,13 408:3	258:6 421:7	504:24 505:1	report 106:25
312:17 318:25	418:15 419:25	relation 191:6	remind 310:19	188:24 189:3,5
354:11 356:1	428:19,20	relationship	reminded	189:6,7 192:12
356:17	446:18 484:21	134:10 142:4	314:11	206:18 210:9
refresh 130:20	484:23 485:1	343:17 509:16	reminds 490:5	210:13 211:13
refrigerators	501:11	relationships	render 320:11	251:10 375:14
122:21	regulation 91:5	139:6 266:5	rendered 264:22	376:6 402:2
refund 202:17	101:9 245:19	relative 166:14	264:22 368:11	506:18 521:20
206:11,24	245:24 337:3	167:14	368:13	REPORTED
regard 113:22	regulations	relatively 120:9	renews 258:17	82:22
114:16 116:18	101:6,12	176:7 180:11	rep 164:13	reporter 218:20
191:16 242:19	152:22 226:23	186:4 193:9	168:19	232:22
328:3 358:23	254:21 275:20	429:23 497:15	repackage	REPORTER'S
regarding 148:9	287:11 429:19	510:9	487:25	131:1
149:9 258:3	regulator's	relatives 472:14	repay 104:13	REPORTING
282:15 299:2	313:20	releases 421:11	repayment	82:23
313:4 320:2	regulatory 82:17	relevant 85:24	104:11	reports 506:13
393:4 395:2	85:14 88:2	reliable 141:19	repeat 230:9	represent
418:4,8,10	93:24 94:2	430:15	300:9 309:3	113:19 127:19
420:24 448:11	95:4,21 96:5	relief 110:19	414:18 417:14	174:8 177:7
462:12,18,18	99:20 100:2,12	111:2 113:7	456:9	228:10 240:19
462:20,24	103:13 109:3	274:11 298:16	repeated 154:19	244:9 262:11
504:22	113:16,21	496:16 503:10	repeatedly	273:15 292:6
regardless	114:19 195:3	reluctant 516:1	161:14 253:22	303:15 308:10
241:10 431:3	197:24 212:23	relying 91:21	439:23	312:3 360:19
433:6 479:9	229:1 239:1	92:25	rephrase 157:22	377:12 450:9
regards 110:17	246:1 252:14	remain 110:25	200:15 205:5	508:23 509:3
251:12 301:14	254:18 284:23	251:3 292:14	replace 91:9	representatives
301:16 305:10	284:24 314:2	remaining 99:23	147:19 148:14	270:22 323:6
369:20,21	417:25 517:2	103:11 117:17	152:11 175:21	440:11
399:2 440:19	rehabilitate	271:8 324:8	replaced 107:1,2	represented
441:15 443:1	516:9	remains 92:14	121:12 151:5	102:5,9 267:3
region 343:18	reimburse 95:11	remarkable	172:19 173:3	308:11 422:18
471:4	reinforce 109:2	372:20,21	173:10 185:21	427:9
registered	reject 252:25	remarks 258:2	489:19	representing
347:10	rel 264:6 277:9	259:20 404:4	replacement	101:14 262:12
regular 385:6	285:10	remember 169:8	92:8,12 119:1	262:13 276:16
regularly 411:1	relate 102:20	190:3 191:17	129:16 167:15	278:15 303:16
411:11	372:1	210:23 211:13	336:23	306:9 312:11
regulate 430:12	related 121:10	308:4 339:11	replacements	359:14
485:9	136:24 156:2,7	413:17 432:16	125:15 173:17	represents
regulated	168:2 169:1	439:25 440:21	replacing 168:23	128:13 508:24
146:11,15,17	190:11 199:6	440:22 453:5	489:7	509:4,18
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

	1	1	1	ı
reps 164:10	128:14 302:15	414:5 415:1,4	response 104:7	497:17
repugnant 145:4	319:2,4,14	453:21 488:11	104:25 130:18	resulting 119:13
request 82:13	352:24 355:4	500:8,18	163:22 167:9	244:15 316:13
85:8 130:18,22	374:25 375:2	residentials	167:14 179:17	results 263:13
154:19 179:16	376:4,12,15,22	403:11	186:16 187:8	266:24 505:3
260:6 291:12	377:2,8 404:2	residents 102:12	457:6 494:13	retain 356:22
396:10	449:25	102:15 179:5	responsibilities	retained 245:4
requested	researched	181:23 182:11	128:23 402:16	245:15
300:24,24	252:23	249:5,8 269:14	416:24 454:16	rethink 460:2
321:25	resell 355:9	273:18 280:4,6	458:3 492:1	retire 119:2
requesting	resent 310:1	281:18,22	495:22	437:1 485:15
209:7 261:4	reserve 303:23	282:21,25	responsibility	retired 112:25
276:9	reserved 376:22	283:4,11,14,20	94:19 101:25	119:3 129:13
requests 163:23	residence 368:12	284:3 285:18	252:13 301:6,7	retiree 113:4
258:10	368:13	285:22 295:8,9	301:8 302:9	retirement
require 277:13	resident 109:20	306:14 332:23	404:21,25	317:24
373:11 464:14	120:6 280:12	334:25 335:8	408:8,25	return 87:11,12
required 104:11	334:21	340:10 415:10	409:23 452:5	92:18 93:11
104:12 283:25	resident's	415:11 420:25	454:4 457:14	95:13 199:8
307:13	301:18,18	422:14 424:2	458:4 491:22	315:9 444:14
requirement	residential	resolution	responsible	444:17 464:10
89:19 94:14	109:18 110:4	237:12,15	98:12 128:20	464:13 473:1
192:10 218:24	110:18 112:20	resolve 161:8	343:12 471:4	513:17,20
238:15 257:3	113:8,11,23,24	165:11,22	rest 111:1	returning
258:13,14	114:3,3,7,13	253:22 257:2	146:21 354:10	113:10
259:1,3,19	128:1,4 136:7	315:20 329:16	354:12,13	returns 92:21
260:1,3 307:9	204:15 207:18	resolved 145:13	355:19 356:8	revenue 89:18
310:6 323:10	207:20 228:7	209:16 327:8	357:7 392:12	91:2,14 93:11
349:11 354:5	228:17 262:13	329:14 333:15	425:9 447:5,6	94:11,14
356:18 363:11	263:5 268:23	Resource 287:11	447:17 499:10	136:18 184:21
363:12,13	273:20 295:2	Resources 217:8	restate 411:10	192:10 198:22
385:24 386:2,6	298:5 302:6,10	respect 96:5	restaurant 309:7	202:12 203:22
402:24 403:19	302:12,16	265:5,9 277:7	restricted	205:7,17 209:4
453:1,1 456:6	309:20,21	346:7 350:2	108:14	209:10 218:23
479:25 480:19	310:12 318:12	353:8 358:2	result 95:23 96:2	238:15 257:3
505:7 506:18	329:21,22	respective 85:24	111:4 113:8	258:13,14,20
requirements	335:15 341:10	250:17	137:1 209:10	258:21 259:1,3
93:6 152:22	348:10 350:4	respectively	249:18 253:9	259:19,25
258:21,21	350:20 355:22	256:13 401:23	259:9 269:18	260:2 274:18
274:18 388:6	377:1 383:20	respond 106:24	293:19 294:23	307:9 310:5
412:18 505:11	388:7,11	166:25	299:14 342:23	323:10 328:23
requires 104:16	393:12 394:18	responded 85:22	385:24 416:13	349:11 352:9
252:16 268:5	403:10,12	responding	420:5 455:24	352:12 354:5
resale 113:25	407:9 413:15	266:9	456:11 476:9	356:18 363:11

	l	l	Ī	ı
363:12,14	revisited 496:2	354:2,3 361:7	482:23 485:3	109:2 144:17
378:24,25	revitalizing	361:9,13,19,22	Riverside 84:11	331:24 441:20
379:5,23 380:6	273:25	361:23 362:4,7	85:3 104:24	roll-in 394:15
381:7 385:24	reward 107:7	363:20,21	105:2,5 108:19	rolled 182:24
386:2,6 388:6	RFP 501:19	364:8,18 365:2	118:12 143:18	385:1
393:20 394:2	Rhode 221:13	366:15 371:7	143:23 144:1,3	rolling 353:12
396:1 402:24	rider 151:17	371:16 377:20	147:12 149:11	384:22
403:18 404:21	riders 151:16	379:18 381:6	151:4 190:2	room 95:3 313:3
404:24 405:4	ridiculous	382:8 384:13	196:24 208:20	328:22 333:14
405:10,11	373:23	386:12 394:7	215:9 220:8	416:2 427:5,6
408:7,24	right 87:4 97:10	403:7 405:24	225:17 228:1	440:23 441:1
416:24 448:6,6	112:14 114:24	407:6,23	234:25 250:13	441:21,25
452:4 453:1,1	121:21 122:5	410:13 411:23	263:25,25	468:3,8 513:23
453:8,9,11	124:7 125:18	414:4,4,10	264:18 271:23	Root 203:6
454:4,13,15,25	130:4,5 141:18	419:19 425:4	291:2 300:7	Rose 302:11
455:24 456:6	148:7,13,22	433:10,16	301:25 303:12	331:7,18,22
456:12 457:8	157:18 164:23	434:2 435:5,11	303:21 305:6	333:19 519:2
457:14 458:3	165:6 167:22	436:5,13	315:4 317:20	521:8,9
459:23 460:5	168:16,18,22	437:19,22	331:5,25 332:1	Rose's 109:10
477:16 479:24	170:10 171:13	439:20 442:17	332:12,22	180:14
479:25 480:19	174:24,25	447:10 448:19	333:23,24	roughly 126:15
491:22 492:1	176:15 178:7	449:4 450:1	334:1 335:19	329:8,9,11
495:22 505:7	185:12,16	451:6,12,16	335:23 336:1,3	391:8 394:9,22
505:11 506:18	189:7 191:1,22	454:3,14 455:2	336:8,14,25	455:18 457:21
revenues 91:19	194:18 201:16	457:9,23 460:8	337:2,9,21,24	round 207:20
91:21 93:6	204:10,11	466:8,19 480:3	338:2,6 356:16	routing 164:9
201:9 202:6,20	208:9 209:19	482:18 486:7	369:16 398:22	row 260:24
206:3 210:21	212:11 218:10	494:21 496:3	426:11 470:18	RSM 202:9
210:22 246:15	221:24 224:11	498:9 499:22	471:7,10	203:25
280:14 310:15	224:17 225:25	500:15 503:18	482:15 495:24	RT 376:25
395:3,15,20,21	231:5 232:10	504:15 505:16	511:19,20	rule 337:4
403:4,6 405:7	232:11 235:16	513:4 514:10	519:1 520:24	398:16 497:13
408:13,14	238:23 239:4	514:16 515:3	521:7,7,9,10	498:7
review 156:14	239:10 242:13	515:23 516:12	Riverside's	rulemaking
206:19 223:3	244:17 261:19	ring 318:4,5	482:17	229:1 301:11
258:19 292:24	262:3,9 272:12	rip 490:12	road 275:18	303:1 497:7,21
reviewed 198:11	288:16 290:14	risk 103:13	289:1 326:22	498:12
224:12,18	292:10,13	107:19 108:2	326:22 368:2,6	rules 418:18
335:22	293:12 303:24	211:2 360:13	390:12 472:17	run 141:1 154:4
reviewing	304:19 316:4	512:7 513:8	491:6	154:5 239:23
188:24	327:23 329:24	risks 512:5	roads 340:22	294:23 296:1
revised 376:25	331:13 341:1	Riss 121:6	ROE 85:20,24	331:6 381:23
378:5 397:16	341:23 349:3	river 148:7	92:16	382:1 428:13
revisit 485:22	352:4,5,12	470:15,15	role 100:13	450:6,14
	l	l		l

	_			_	
473:17,18	sake 378:18	481:5 490:11	312:25 456:19	246:9 250:15	
running 374:14	sale 128:14	496:15 502:19	SCOTT 82:19	261:15 263:2,4	
399:23 429:14	319:2,4,14	scale 139:15,18	scratched 348:2	263:6 267:2	
runs 128:3	374:25 375:2	148:12 175:3	screen 261:21	282:25 283:23	
177:24 239:21	376:22 377:2	scary 150:25	se 377:3	286:21 288:3	
428:15	404:2 449:24	scenario 352:10	search 222:25	288:11 300:12	
Rupp 82:19	sales 93:1	354:1 356:20	268:13	309:21 318:6	
87:20,22 153:3	113:24 352:24	392:21 399:23	seated 218:14	321:10 325:25	
153:4,5 165:24	355:4 376:3,12	415:9 500:5	232:19 344:23	327:25 328:14	
166:14 208:13	376:14 377:8	scenarios 261:3	396:19	329:13 330:19	
208:14 217:20	samples 161:20	375:1 381:23	second 93:23	339:7 341:21	
217:21 273:7	sandwich 261:3	394:7 397:21	94:9,15 180:20	351:16 355:1	
276:16 280:10	satisfaction	schedule 111:17	180:20 200:1	359:4 366:2	
306:1,2 330:23	164:17,24	240:8,10,23	224:24,25	369:22 375:8	
330:24 386:16	166:23	241:4 262:19	244:8 245:13	375:25 377:22	
386:17 399:24	satisfied 161:10	313:21 344:13	256:4 331:1	378:4 381:15	
476:25 477:1	168:5,5,17	347:1 348:8,14	343:1 352:25	383:17,22	
493:4 501:6	282:10	356:8 387:15	354:21 364:2	385:9 390:21	
504:21 513:5	satisfy 470:1	388:5,10	370:16 376:24	392:17 394:20	
517:12 519:12	save 146:21	413:11 445:6	387:19 403:17	400:18,20	
Rupp's 496:7,25	229:13 258:2	514:18	404:7 407:9	401:1 406:4	
rural 312:7,11	273:7	scheduled	423:13 485:10	431:19 435:2	
484:15	saving 411:6	224:21 262:18	515:16	435:15 441:23	
	savings 89:17,23	521:6	second-to-last	445:12 449:8	
<u> </u>	saw 114:9 283:5	schedules 297:2	440:7	449:17 465:24	
S 83:1,19 352:12	306:23 324:4	358:2 374:15	seconds 163:9	467:14 468:24	
383:25	339:11 378:18	374:23 376:1	section 264:18	474:2 475:15	
s 276:10	saying 97:24	378:17,19	277:2,21 336:7	475:25 478:18	
418:13	104:1 138:17	437:15,18	383:17 400:10	486:20 490:5	
S&P 107:12,12	162:1,6 174:16	438:11,13	451:8 498:15	505:8,13	
134:20	176:8 204:2	439:1	502:24	515:18	
Saddlebrooke	321:12 322:7	scheme 178:15	Sections 254:19	seeing 214:19	
251:2 466:16	409:18 454:21	229:1,1 249:16	sector 305:9	234:10 361:19	
466:18,19	456:8,10 469:2	328:2 449:19	see 86:17 92:17	363:17 364:10	
safe 93:17 96:10	474:3 480:17	449:22 509:20	93:5 96:13,15	408:22 426:18	
96:14,24 97:1	498:6,6	509:20,23,24	117:20 119:19	477:20	
141:19 204:1	says 100:16	scholarship	120:9 130:25	seek 267:21	
206:15 237:24	190:3 206:22	391:16	136:11 137:13	436:10 443:3	
249:6 431:3	246:5 309:7	school 487:3,4	143:25 148:18	seeking 475:4	
454:10 465:7	321:17 324:7	487:19,23	164:13 169:24	seeks 256:14	
safety 106:9	326:3 337:2	490:6 496:1	178:24 180:14	288:2	
343:25 344:3	350:3 353:11	school's 486:24	196:9 207:25	seen 96:12	
428:10	383:25 384:6	schools 486:24	222:12 224:24	123:15 124:2,4	
Saint 370:25	384:21 407:8	science 244:13	225:12 241:3	124:5 135:20	

135:22 162:7	separate 100:9	166:8 167:6,20	217:12 245:4	140:14 171:24
177:23 202:11	100:10 102:4	167:24 168:1	265:18 277:15	174:14 241:13
224:18 242:20	105:3 168:1	168:18 176:22	281:4 287:20	241:17,20
248:10 293:22	172:15 189:24	176:25 195:3	343:13	242:19 245:2
295:9 297:21	224:25 231:15	198:2,4 212:22	serving 93:12	249:9 250:20
299:10,12,15	252:8,12,16	217:10 227:4	100:6 105:20	250:22,23,25
310:11 318:10	254:5,16	233:2 237:24	139:17 165:3	251:1,3 257:3
336:20 435:14	267:10 351:24	241:9,12	244:24	257:5 268:19
499:21	399:3 475:23	243:11 247:15	session 131:2	287:12,20
sees 279:25	separately 102:9	248:17 249:23	439:20 511:10	323:9 328:22
segment 217:1,7	307:8	249:25 253:17	set 101:11 109:2	329:21 355:25
222:7	septic 105:15	254:9 256:17	109:17 110:2	363:3,12,19,20
sell 138:24	serial 156:7	263:11 264:7	162:3 200:18	365:14,18
183:23 184:2,5	serious 104:15	264:22,24	201:21 202:21	400:8 401:17
184:5	121:23 288:7	265:5,8,15,21	247:25 258:15	404:14,17
selling 140:20	serve 139:15	277:10,14	304:22 307:7	407:13,14,19
141:5	165:8 191:21	282:7 287:8	385:4 389:3	407:23 408:1,2
sells 355:8	244:1 284:7	288:13 301:3	419:13 430:8	408:3,6,19,23
Senate 490:16	312:7 319:18	307:8,9 319:3	457:22	409:4,21,23
send 161:6	416:11,19,21	319:15 339:10	sets 206:8	410:2,7,8
308:20 337:10	417:12,18	341:10 368:11	setting 202:2	418:24 428:2
429:4 442:11	served 86:6	368:12,14	211:23 243:18	428:15 430:11
sending 263:18	100:8 252:17	373:9 390:1,2	243:20 282:1	441:6 446:6
429:11	270:23 350:18	391:4 399:11	399:2 462:20	447:7 451:15
Senior 82:17	373:9	401:18 408:19	settle 121:13,20	451:23 452:4,7
84:16	serves 105:19	415:17 419:25	203:24	452:9,11,12,14
sense 95:16	301:1 329:22	430:16 431:4	settlement 310:6	452:22 453:6
112:15 148:20	374:4 390:25	440:12 441:19	326:20 349:10	453:11,12
170:6 171:12	service 82:1,15	441:20 457:13	409:3,9,19	454:18,22
174:22 221:19	82:15 84:22	478:13 480:1	458:24	455:3,9,10,16
227:22 325:16	88:15,16 93:17	480:14 481:10	settling 203:24	455:16,23
431:25 468:11	93:25 94:3,21	485:2 489:12	seven 199:3	456:2,2,13
468:12 470:6	95:12,15,17	492:3,8,12	210:16 220:3	457:9 459:22
507:10 509:8	96:6,7 97:3,4	495:1,6,7,9,17	429:23 510:8	462:20 466:11
sensitive 114:6	97:10,11,17	501:12 503:1,1	seven-forty	466:15 477:5
114:16 249:3	103:3,8,12,23	503:7 505:20	384:1	477:13,21
301:22	103:24 104:7	507:13,14	seventh 199:4	480:4 482:10
sent 233:20	104:22,25	508:4 509:1,2	severe 160:3	484:14,15,18
344:2 402:8	105:24 106:5,8	509:10 510:15	sewage 97:12,13	485:16,16
446:11	110:1,2 119:24	510:16 518:1,6	428:16	487:16 491:13
sentence 136:11	136:19 154:3	519:15 521:19	sewer 82:14 90:7	shape 340:20
348:3 421:14	158:4 159:3	services 113:6	96:6 97:16,18	share 144:9
sentiment 102:22	162:12,20	216:21,22	105:13,16 135:1 136:6	188:16 254:15
102.22	164:10,13	217:2,2,9,10	133.1 130:0	257:7 268:23
L	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1

				1
343:13,18	491:22	182:17 349:20	111:4 113:8	simple 110:8
404:25 432:2	shock 152:24	350:9 362:2	120:14 121:22	simply 250:21
443:10	180:5 243:9	387:23 388:7	126:18 129:22	306:15 352:8
shared 98:2	246:7 249:7	448:5	152:1 191:5	388:16 417:11
102:22 181:25	256:1 285:25	shown 241:10	200:19 235:22	417:18 430:10
252:13 343:22	316:14 317:9	262:25 268:24	235:25 236:1,3	490:7
355:22 398:1	317:12 423:23	290:1 305:14	236:17,19,24	singing 308:16
432:2 447:5	455:11,15	352:6,25	236:25 237:3,4	single 99:4
shareholders	459:22 468:16	393:23 451:4	237:8 242:18	111:16,22
98:11 107:24	469:1,6,16,17	shows 155:18	279:5 284:1	114:4 119:11
153:19 185:8	481:13 497:18	180:3 240:24	296:8 299:5	119:20 126:25
447:21 458:5	505:5,14	349:22,22,24	348:4 361:21	141:9 144:25
sharing 180:7,10	shocked 301:16	352:8,19 354:8	364:17 368:3,8	151:24 152:5
297:9 374:18	332:16	354:14 355:16	370:10 373:8	152:13 183:21
447:9	shocking 286:3	355:19 361:10	373:15 413:4	224:3 230:8
sheer 316:13	short 151:12	362:13 387:14	416:13 454:24	254:6 274:22
sheet 376:25	230:11,17	402:23 404:7	455:9 457:2,4	302:12 309:11
379:16 381:15	272:18 275:15	413:25 457:14	459:1 465:17	338:9 361:18
402:25 403:18	296:3,9 299:23	459:20	479:13	362:3,3 364:9
404:7,13	396:11,12	sic 277:6	significantly	364:14,15
405:12,12	short-term	side 89:1 103:22	258:22 277:13	375:2,11 376:3
492:11	154:5 274:11	104:24 121:8	283:16 284:2	376:24 377:7,8
shielded 280:7	276:6 295:23	195:20 339:23	499:11	389:24 476:6
shift 103:13	shorter 489:18	408:8 440:14	sim 500:19	487:25 488:25
107:19 108:2	shortfall 137:2	452:5 483:6	similar 177:1	504:23
221:11,12	184:17,21,25	sight 466:1	242:9 244:21	single-district
279:14,15	185:3 365:14	sign 123:18	249:25 256:20	274:22
286:8 295:15	365:18	270:18 327:22	268:23 272:6	single-issue
379:17 404:14	show 90:21	signal 253:10,16	282:17 353:23	220:12 221:3
405:4 407:13	99:25 107:23	309:16	356:8 393:17	222:24
407:14,19	124:10 130:14	signals 253:2	393:17,18	single-rate
408:8 416:14	164:21 224:25	263:19 282:14	394:6 397:25	386:23
418:21 452:5	233:14 281:16	308:20 337:10	410:9 421:18	single-tariff
shifted 379:2	297:24 349:7	signatories	429:25 450:15	97:23 111:23
408:25 410:12	352:18 355:15	316:22	451:11 455:24	112:6 140:17
410:12 415:15	376:13 378:23	signatory 325:7	470:16,19,20	141:24 142:1
477:17,19	393:14 394:6	signed 123:22	471:13,21	142:18,25
shifting 101:24	399:6 410:6	154:11 270:21	486:18 488:23	152:3 182:14
404:20 405:11	450:5 454:12	274:6 287:24	498:5 500:20	182:25 184:4
410:14	showdown	292:8,8 324:18	508:14,17	184:11 191:21
shifts 256:1	315:18	361:6 409:23	510:9	191:24 220:20
316:8 404:6	showed 187:3	significance	similarities	221:7,15,20
409:24 457:20	343:5	210:19 351:7	256:20 410:22	222:2,18,24
469:8,10	showing 168:3	significant 111:2	similarly 429:23	223:2 224:1,8

	•	ī	•	
225:4,5 230:2	sit 148:19 221:2	slightly 357:6,6	319:6 322:10	429:12 472:16
230:6,12	261:6 368:22	386:10 392:11	350:20 423:24	504:7
249:19 278:1,9	474:25 476:8	426:5 483:13	424:17 426:5	somebody's
286:20 306:20	site 223:1	SLM 375:16	462:24 464:9	373:11
308:25 313:9	sites 88:25	slow 104:25	472:5 473:20	somewhat 88:13
313:14,19	sits 148:22	slowly 346:11	478:14,14	111:9 226:3,14
314:19,21	sitting 339:7	small 90:3 97:7	479:2,10	316:1 453:23
315:6,9,21	486:6	97:8,15 98:1	484:14 485:24	soon 188:15
335:13 337:25	situation 93:4	138:15 141:12	486:1,2,2	203:12
338:6 418:4,12	155:21 158:18	142:8,12,16,24	499:2 500:14	sooner 485:22
418:13 419:16	163:12 168:19	174:20,23	500:17 501:7	sophisticated
420:4,19	169:2 192:13	176:7 178:18	510:12	204:7
421:21 422:3	211:1,21	222:7 243:12	Smith 220:17,17	sorry 86:20
436:19,21	228:21 318:7	247:11 274:2	220:23 252:21	140:3 144:9,11
461:12 462:5	329:12 407:21	274:16 275:10	313:23 514:4	156:19,23
462:13 475:16	441:9 473:18	275:10 283:10	Smith's 111:15	163:25 172:1
482:21 489:25	situations	285:16,20,25	smooth 152:13	180:20 190:8
505:22,23	140:24 281:11	286:6 287:11	477:9	198:8 199:25
513:6,7	420:17 497:23	288:4,19 294:4	social 265:17	210:11 230:10
single-tariffed	six 90:1,2 155:6	299:11 322:25	274:21 275:4	234:4 238:8
421:2	162:9 199:9,21	414:2 427:24	socialization	257:19 262:8
single-zone	200:12 210:16	428:4,4,12	111:11 178:24	290:20 303:8
488:8	284:5 332:22	431:1 432:15	343:9	346:15 347:18
sir 88:3 180:4	six-factor	442:19 446:17	socialize 176:2,9	351:23 353:17
197:23 200:22	199:12 200:5	464:3,4,13	socialized 102:1	353:18,21
212:10,14	200:17	466:25 471:5	257:4 270:11	357:11 358:25
218:11,13	six-inch 351:17	473:16,21,22	socializing	362:7,15
226:8 248:11	size 97:6 171:1	473:22 478:4,4	174:12	365:22 366:11
292:11,15,18	171:14 190:22	478:19,20	soften 121:10	371:3 380:2
296:11 297:3	349:23 350:6	479:15,16,17	softeners 122:22	387:4 392:25
298:12 299:8	350:18 351:14	480:4 484:15	softening 121:12	394:1 413:22
299:15 308:7	383:13 384:4,5	484:18 488:18	158:7	419:9 435:8
320:20 329:9	393:8 429:25	493:14,15,25	sole 262:16	437:16 439:11
344:22 346:7	478:10 510:9	496:11 497:13	solely 181:21	439:13 446:13
347:6,15	sized 429:23	498:18,23	329:12 367:6	447:6 450:12
348:18,21	sizes 321:25	500:7 502:21	412:15	466:1 477:12
350:18 353:1	356:4 383:22	502:24 503:3,4	solution 125:2	sort 119:8 212:1
358:11 365:8	skipping 339:6	smaller 119:12	268:13 323:12	228:1 437:5
381:19 382:3	skirmish 315:16	141:17 169:23	solve 122:9	456:11 461:19
382:11 395:1	sliced 492:4	176:19 255:18	125:5 157:10	463:4 465:13
396:3,18	slide 114:9	271:1 272:20	205:2	465:25 491:22
460:22 462:25	361:24	274:23 275:3	somebody	504:22 513:9
464:24 486:16	slight 405:11	276:13 285:22	261:11 295:23	soul 95:5
506:6	432:23 456:4	288:2 311:3	331:3 360:25	sound 147:24

148:1 239:7	277:8 324:10	481:20 494:23	301:10 306:7	471:11,12
373:3	335:13 420:16	513:14	306:10,11,15	476:3 479:5,8
sounds 123:14	420:25 423:20	spreading 253:6	306:18,21,23	483:18,23
179:22 330:17	423:24 425:15	423:24 424:22	307:12,14,17	484:1 485:8
336:10 341:22	510:25	425:10,13	307:19,21	499:8,9,24
459:8	specificity	446:20 469:23	308:2,15 309:5	500:24 507:7
source 252:10	415:17 492:12	494:23	312:7,8 313:10	508:5,11
294:15 299:2	spectrum 505:16	spreads 177:5	313:12 316:9	510:11
367:2,5 412:11	speculative	367:19	316:24 317:18	St 446:13
412:14 463:19	436:7	spreadsheet	318:7,9,12,17	stability 243:7
463:23 470:14	spell 218:19	386:22	318:23 319:2	337:12 367:23
sources 97:11	232:22	Spring 250:12	319:14 321:19	368:4 389:22
419:2	spelled 353:9	445:9	322:15,15,18	390:8
south 289:10	Spencer 84:1,9	St 83:20 84:2,3,6	322:19 323:7	stabilization
322:23	spend 103:18	92:2,4,8 97:5,6	323:13 326:3	141:7 198:22
southwest	130:9 140:25	97:6 102:10	338:11 353:13	202:12 204:9
463:23 471:3	178:19 191:6	103:22 105:6,7	355:23,25	206:5 208:2
485:2 501:9,13	191:13 199:10	109:12,14	356:5,21,21	209:5
spacing 494:20	200:24 487:14	110:24 111:8	357:4,6 361:10	stable 140:22
speak 86:10	spent 98:24	112:10 126:3	361:18 363:3	staff 84:19,19,22
327:21 330:14	178:15 488:4	126:15 128:15	363:14,17,19	85:12,19,21,21
331:6 336:11	508:1	150:9,21 169:8	364:9 368:21	86:22 94:5
336:16 337:16	spirit 271:3	170:4,5 173:24	369:21 370:7	96:4 97:20
speaking 171:21	spite 110:16	174:9 176:4,13	370:17,21	98:25 99:3
227:17 309:4	spoke 221:22	176:16,23	371:1,11,15,20	108:24 109:5
320:7 324:10	222:10	177:1,5,8	374:25 376:1	110:14 135:6,8
340:10 372:11	spoken 287:25	179:5,23 180:1	376:12,14	135:9,15 137:1
435:13 436:7	423:16 433:11	180:6,25 181:3	377:3,3,9	137:10,16
463:2 474:11	sponsored	181:8 197:1	378:2 379:1,3	139:5 145:16
speaks 498:18	220:11 313:12	208:20 215:11	379:6,18 381:2	145:17,23
specific 110:25	313:15 342:21	226:9,10,10	381:5,16	146:3,4 148:23
139:25 156:6	sponsoring	228:9,13,17	384:23,25,25	150:6 155:3,5
180:2 199:15	251:9 402:2,8	229:7 235:2	394:15,24	155:21,22
199:16 221:12	sporadic 339:24	246:13 250:3,3	399:3 403:13	157:3,6,7,13
265:20 325:9	spot 247:6 343:8	250:4,8 254:4	410:15 425:12	157:14,23
325:14,16	spread 127:7	254:4 255:13	426:25 427:4,5	158:1,2 164:6
326:8 393:5	152:14 169:19	262:11 263:2,6	427:13 429:24	164:8 172:18
400:24 427:10	169:21 170:7	266:18,19	429:25 430:3,4	179:11 183:14
427:18 433:7	177:2 408:16	269:2,3,3,6,17	431:18 432:9	188:2,10,23
497:9 499:16	413:6 424:11	269:18 270:23	434:5,10,14	197:13 210:1
specifically	424:18 426:7	270:24 271:5,6	435:20 436:8	211:12 215:22
113:22 156:13	435:2,5,7	271:10,14	436:19 437:4	224:7 229:18
182:10 236:20	446:23 453:13	279:4 282:24	446:2,2 470:12	232:14,15
260:6 266:15	453:19 480:12	283:8 291:16	470:18 471:10	233:1,6 234:1
	_			, · · ·

234:2,10,12	427:14,25	312:21 317:17	251:13 276:25	177:6 178:16
236:6,9 241:3	429:2 436:23	319:12 328:2,6	standby 312:15	185:20 194:23
241:18,23	438:13 439:7,8	354:4,7,19	standing 427:5	212:18 218:17
242:6 243:21	439:10,23	366:13,16	441:1	221:7,15
244:11 245:21	440:19 441:2	375:4,20 376:6	standpoint	222:10 226:1,5
246:5,16	441:11,15,19	377:10,10,11	221:6 293:5	226:14 230:15
248:17,19,23	441:22 442:1,4	379:15 381:3	stands 92:1	230:18 246:2
248:25 249:3	443:20 446:18	389:6 398:7,9	283:23 353:1	246:19 254:13
249:11,16,19	447:14 448:3	402:2 403:1	start 85:14	256:17 257:5
249:21,23	448:22,24	404:9,23	87:24 88:8	264:6 266:15
250:16,17,20	453:25 454:19	413:25 416:1	103:22 114:19	269:16 274:4
251:2,5,13	457:19 465:22	419:22 433:19	158:15 183:19	277:9 284:13
253:1 255:23	469:10 473:3	434:5 435:2,11	200:4 239:15	285:10 286:17
256:9 260:11	475:3 495:14	441:8 445:21	248:22 273:24	289:8 296:13
267:20,25	496:14 498:2,8	446:5 447:4	277:1 309:13	300:11 301:19
270:20 271:18	500:1,4 501:14	449:18 450:9	311:19 321:11	302:13 303:4
272:7 277:25	502:1,2 503:20	451:2 467:25	330:25 378:20	303:16 304:17
281:10,11,13	505:11 506:23	468:6 469:15	420:9 426:2	305:3 307:15
282:5,9,13	507:1,23	471:18 474:12	448:21 454:1	308:4 331:20
285:1,2,3,6,7	508:15 509:11	474:20 485:6	479:11,23	335:11 345:1
285:15,24	510:4 511:16	497:24 499:7	481:8,10 486:3	368:10 383:14
286:10,12	511:21 512:19	506:13,17	491:6 494:19	386:23 390:1
290:15 294:10	516:13 518:6	522:6	494:23,24	390:25 391:3
302:21 311:1	519:14 521:18	staffing 116:8	495:12 497:8	401:12 408:3
312:22 314:13	521:19,21,22	stage 430:2	513:14 515:8	422:5 428:16
317:9 327:21	521:24 522:1,2	452:1	started 106:21	430:12 431:2
327:22 329:5	522:4,6	stand 240:13	144:18 149:10	431:10 441:7
334:4 340:23	Staff's 86:4,4,5	241:5 261:20	158:13 190:23	463:24 476:10
369:20 370:23	87:3 106:24	274:17 315:25	348:25 401:4	481:5 484:16
371:9 375:14	137:11,13	331:8 357:21	490:19,22	485:3 486:22
375:15,24	182:5 189:7	362:17 375:24	starting 318:2	487:3,5,6,9,16
377:12 382:24	198:9,17	378:8 400:13	321:16 432:2	488:1 501:11
397:21 401:2,4	206:18 210:9	406:16 446:10	466:15 488:18	504:14
401:6,8 402:8	210:13 233:7	450:22,25	starts 121:19	stated 185:19
402:11 403:3	233:14 234:8	stand-alone	207:22 298:4	222:20 278:16
404:17 405:3	237:11 241:11	142:23 173:8	511:9	278:21 281:10
405:24,25	242:12,15	283:17 495:8	state 82:2 88:12	281:24 317:1
406:4,7 413:14	248:6,20	standard 168:9	89:8 90:12,16	366:12 397:8
416:3,5,10,16	249:15 250:2,7	272:1,4 284:12	100:7 101:25	419:22 420:17
419:19,20,22	250:9,16 251:6	467:23	103:2 104:24	statement
420:3,15,17,17	251:9 256:7	standards 91:4	112:2 115:5	113:15 129:10
420:20,23	257:13,16	162:17,18	128:22 142:6	145:15 154:16
422:1 423:11	274:15 293:20	163:1 229:2	154:7 167:12	162:11 191:10
424:5 426:16	294:1,4 307:18	244:20 247:2	170:12 173:8	220:14,17

260:8 264:20	265:13	stewards 174:21	217:14,15	286:12 336:5,8
267:25 273:3	stations 252:11	stick 464:12	231:23 238:1	416:12
312:17 315:17	373:12	sticker 481:13	261:18 262:8	straight 391:25
318:24 337:7	statistics 88:15	sticking 463:18	272:15,16	straightforward
337:15 353:11	89:13	stip 87:12	296:15 305:19	120:25
414:16 417:13	status 140:18	145:14 364:22	305:20 319:22	strategy 107:15
417:21 420:1,2	206:18 242:25	366:2	319:23 326:6,7	135:1 138:12
438:11 440:9	432:22,23	stipulated 273:5	327:10,13,16	139:12 140:16
440:24,25	436:11 454:20	stipulatio	327:19 328:4,5	153:9,18 165:6
456:15 477:23	statute 95:19	294:6	329:6,13,23	184:12,15
485:14 517:3,3	100:21 101:4	stipulation	330:13,16	streamlining
517:4,4,5	255:4 264:14	86:12 94:13	339:2 384:15	116:16
518:11,12,12	285:14 302:25	192:10 209:11	384:16,17	street 83:13,16
518:13,13,14	304:18 466:23	232:4 238:15	394:13 476:19	83:23 84:2,9
518:14,15,15	466:24 467:5	239:6,17	476:20 490:18	84:13,20
518:16	467:13 498:22	242:22 257:1	490:21,23	154:20 239:11
statements 88:5	499:19,20	258:25 270:16	517:11,18	239:12 472:11
114:18 119:6	statutes 95:5,6,7	270:21,25	519:11,20	504:8
220:4 239:5	100:15 101:10	271:2,2 272:19	StoneBridge	strenuously
240:5 248:16	254:20	272:21 274:7	134:1,2 197:8	315:12
254:19 300:6	statutory 277:11	281:25 287:24	208:21 215:17	stress 204:17
321:5	stay 252:11	288:18 292:9	229:12 235:9	314:7
states 100:21,22	278:22 314:23	292:13 293:3	250:10 251:2	strict 249:19
111:20,21,23	381:12 432:22	294:6 316:21	291:23 320:23	strictly 311:6
112:1 136:4	437:1 455:6,7	316:25 321:1	338:18 378:15	395:11
138:2 151:12	486:15,16,17	324:4,18 326:8	439:7 502:9	strike 397:7
151:15,16,17	staying 504:7	361:6 362:6	stop 149:1	strikes 249:12
151:20,24	steam 249:16	377:13 398:20	156:15 161:22	strong 515:10
152:6 190:20	step 99:4,6	398:23 402:24	201:15 223:9	strongly 255:23
208:3 216:23	194:1 204:9,11	409:22 410:10	322:7 481:23	307:4
220:11,19	212:5 218:3	410:14,18,20	481:23 498:1	structural
221:1,3,18	232:12 238:24	434:11 445:15	stopped 156:4	147:24 172:24
222:18,25	300:4 327:23	445:18 448:4	storage 88:25	structurally
223:1,17,18,19	344:6 374:1	450:18 456:7	244:4 252:11	147:23,25
223:25 313:15	396:5 480:4	473:13	373:13	structure 266:14
391:5,8 414:7	514:1	stipulation's	storefronts	274:16 286:15
440:10 442:7	Stephanie 83:22	363:18	273:23	319:13 375:5
442:24	276:22 334:16	stipulations	stories 106:12	375:16,18
statewide 257:7	365:12	278:5	storm 428:8,9	469:25 473:11
325:10,13,15	STEPHEN	stock 107:13	STP 278:2,11,20	474:5,6,15
325:19 328:13	82:18	134:15,17,22	281:13 282:10	510:5
328:16 349:14	stepped 152:20	Stoll 82:18	282:13 284:2,5	structures
356:2,6 400:3	159:21	146:25 147:1	284:6,16,18,22	438:15,17,21
static 91:1	steps 89:7	207:7,8,9	285:2,6,15,24	struggle 104:3
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	1	1	1	1
273:25 473:12	347:11 383:21	318:21 454:8	312:14 338:15	467:3 509:5
481:16 492:7	subsi 134:13	516:4	355:11 367:2,5	Supreme 95:22
struggles 101:22	subsidiary	suggested 93:1	374:9 412:11	100:16 247:23
104:17	134:14	302:11 313:17	412:14 419:2	264:8 285:10
struggling	subsidies 263:13	317:5 438:21	437:11 463:19	surcharge
138:17 184:9	263:22 266:24	suggesting	463:23 470:15	202:21 206:12
249:9 422:16	416:13	148:14 255:6	502:6	246:14 394:15
431:1 480:25	subsidization	259:21 433:3	supplying	sure 88:4 120:13
481:21 484:9	282:11	480:16	149:10	130:16 136:20
484:20 491:9	subsidize 270:13	suggestion	support 93:25	144:14,14
502:15 503:11	270:15 271:11	277:21 490:15	103:17 105:5	145:2 148:11
stuck 309:17	294:17 295:17	suggestions	106:3 107:8	153:24 158:17
students 114:8	307:14,19	513:1	112:4 117:17	175:16 178:16
studies 90:21	415:13	suggests 285:6	195:4 197:25	184:22 187:6
391:16	subsidized	347:23	227:16 228:14	194:9 201:6
study 245:9	253:17 279:3	suit 155:14	228:15 249:17	204:22 205:12
313:14,17,21	subsidizing	Suite 83:8,13,19	249:19 256:23	216:10,18
452:25	252:15 267:22	83:23 84:13,20	274:13,14,17	231:18 237:22
stuff 125:10	267:22 268:2	suited 503:5	275:16,16	239:21 247:6
481:6 483:23	269:8,14	summary	277:23 279:24	260:7 270:17
487:20 488:13	277:15 282:23	111:15 180:16	282:4 286:11	287:23 303:3
subdivision	297:15 415:10	276:9	286:12 297:16	303:19 316:1
332:21,22	subsidy 253:19	summer 207:16	299:23 318:25	321:11 340:9
333:3 339:25	266:6 459:23	207:17	319:12 325:15	344:16 359:2
340:1	459:25	summers 92:20	325:19 330:2	362:16 366:11
subdivisions	substantial	summoned	335:13 341:20	377:23 392:21
305:8	90:11 193:7	262:21	389:11 423:23	397:4,11
subject 265:6	242:17 278:23	sundaes 459:14	460:14,17	400:17 409:25
277:5 358:13	283:22 314:24	super 451:6	514:21	414:20 416:2
367:4	416:12,20,22	superior 328:2	supported 227:9	430:18 433:24
submit 143:17	426:24 486:5	supervision	227:11 416:5	450:14,19,20
189:6 233:3	substantially	358:5	417:5 462:5	456:10 457:24
252:19 259:22	219:8 404:23	supervisor 471:3	supporting 98:5	464:19 472:1
397:16 512:12	substitute	Supplemental	423:13 425:21	474:9 484:11
512:16	141:24 142:1	199:23 210:10	460:5,18	505:13
submitted 94:13	suburbs 305:7	345:18 357:18	461:19	surface 121:14
245:8 271:24	successfully	520:4	supportive	244:18 254:10
421:11	107:14	supplies 244:19	170:5 328:13	367:2 368:15
submitting	sudden 310:17	supply 83:9,10	supports 249:21	368:23 369:2,9
501:18	428:25 429:17	128:7,13 197:5	255:7 274:5	412:12,19
subsection	478:24	229:11 235:6	398:23 416:16	surprise 183:4,6
264:20 265:1	sufficient 107:25	266:10 276:4	suppose 239:15	398:3 462:1,4
502:20	suggest 222:18	291:20 299:3,3	supposed 123:2	surprised
subsequent	287:21 311:19	311:16 312:4	428:19,20	136:25 137:3
	l	l	l	

			I	I
332:16,20	122:11 125:5	141:17 142:16	500:3 501:7,10	taken 89:7 146:3
462:9	138:20 142:9	148:19 158:16	501:17 502:16	192:19 194:14
Surrebuttal	142:13 148:24	174:20 178:18	506:11,15	226:15,16
195:6 198:12	154:18 165:16	183:22 184:8,9	508:5 510:12	232:7 240:2
213:16 218:24	186:1 253:18	185:9 207:15	510:13	244:18 291:10
251:8 268:15	255:1 263:18	207:16 221:24	systems/ 174:23	301:11 321:3
346:3 357:18	275:19 295:8	222:1 230:7		333:10 343:11
401:22 520:7	295:19 319:5	231:5,15	<u>T</u>	396:14 440:24
520:12,15	328:23 329:3	243:13 247:11	T 82:19 383:25	takes 101:13
521:17 522:1	329:21 340:12	252:8,15,16,17	table 248:5	240:12 309:10
surround 280:14	340:13,15	252:18 253:8,8	309:25 346:16	363:10,11
surrounding	368:3 412:5	253:13 254:1,5	tail 305:14	425:5
88:15 92:4	420:5 422:20	254:14,16	319:17	talk 108:22
survey 124:25	423:25 425:7	257:5 268:19	take 86:1,13,14	111:11 140:19
167:6,23 168:2	426:3,5,5	268:20 271:1	96:9 101:21	161:7 168:23
168:16,16	429:10,17,22	285:17,25	103:10 124:10	179:18 226:3
surveys 164:25	434:20 442:3	305:8,11 311:3	135:14 138:18	239:5 240:21
166:25 167:18	442:16,19	323:1,9 366:20	148:7 155:19	260:20 275:12
168:13	443:3,25	372:5 390:6,9	188:14 194:12	282:21 296:24
survival 110:5	444:10,13	390:20,25	202:12 219:19	297:2 320:25
suspicion 329:16	446:16,18	404:17 423:11	227:5 229:14	323:21 332:24
sustainability	457:9,18 464:9	424:19 428:4	237:21 239:5,6	343:10 360:9
305:10	464:9 472:22	428:12,13,21	239:14,25	360:12 361:3
sustainable	472:23 473:6	429:13,23	240:5 241:23	381:21 429:8,9
178:17	478:4,4,9,20	430:12,25	245:3 259:11	440:16 452:2
sustained 411:8	479:10,15,19	431:1 432:15	264:5 265:12	452:17 467:16
413:8 459:12	481:5 483:16	432:25 434:14	275:24 287:12	472:8,9 480:5
461:3 494:5,11	485:8,9,24	441:24 442:9	287:21 289:2	483:5 490:16
SW-2011-0103	486:2 489:21	442:11 443:8	302:9 311:21	494:13 495:21
251:14,18	493:22 495:12	443:12,13	313:1 321:2	516:6
281:10 419:10	497:15 500:7	445:12 448:5	322:20,25	talked 87:12
swear 159:1	501:19 503:11	462:24 464:3,5	323:7,13 331:2	98:23 170:3
Swearengen	503:12,17	464:22 465:10	346:11 360:3	173:12 178:13
83:4	506:14	465:13 466:7	367:4 374:1	179:1 182:3
swings 403:24	systems 88:19	466:12,12	384:21 385:10	274:21 315:2,2
switch 261:25	88:20 89:10	467:11 468:6	396:12 404:15	315:3 420:15
281:13 420:19	90:1,2,4,15,18	472:5 473:4,9	408:7,19,24	421:4 452:20
463:17	98:6,14 100:9	473:10,16	425:23 428:20	457:3 458:1
sworn 194:16	100:11 107:17	474:4,18	430:20,22,25	464:4 476:2
sy 442:19	125:9 128:21	475:10 478:14	435:12 451:3	493:4,21 504:3
symbol 205:20	135:1 138:5,14	478:14 479:2	452:4 454:20	512:15
system 89:4 90:5	138:15,17,23	484:19 485:1	457:16 469:15	talking 94:24
90:7 102:4	140:3,5,20	493:8,25	480:3 484:24	97:23 110:3,18
110:23 121:16	141:2,12,16,17	497:14 499:23	487:8 499:7	151:5 152:9

158:22,22	476:7 488:8	473:4 487:13	203:8,16 204:3	213:9,10,13,16
170:2 179:20	504:23 515:23	487:14	204:4 205:1	213:19 217:16
184:2 186:17	tariffed 488:1	ten-minute	206:16,23	218:25 219:4,7
222:2 224:4	tariffs 168:21	104:8	315:25 521:11	220:11,15,18
298:1 344:15	170:1 231:8,11	ten-year 512:15	tested 310:20	220:24 221:10
368:4 369:24	231:14 275:15	tend 287:14	testified 115:3	221:16,22
388:9 394:2	331:12 376:21	398:13 485:18	169:10 185:20	225:21 233:3
421:1 440:12	task 503:24	tended 165:10	185:25 194:21	234:7 235:23
449:13,16	taught 245:25	tendency 100:18	209:18 212:16	237:22 240:9
477:10 486:21	tax 486:22,22	tender 118:1	218:15 232:20	240:12,24
486:23 487:25	taxes 335:4	196:14 214:23	285:20 289:6	242:13 246:5
498:5 502:13	Taylor 82:22	219:11 234:15	317:22 331:18	252:19 256:7
talks 280:23	team 157:9	333:19	344:24 375:25	258:10 262:25
416:18	159:14,22	tenders 406:1	391:4 401:10	268:1 270:1
Taneycomo	161:15,22	term 175:2	410:23 416:3	289:17,21
250:11	471:6	230:1 276:2	417:2 435:17	296:16 297:1
tangentially	technical 262:17	278:23 293:8	441:22	302:11 307:3
262:13 463:22	technically	295:24 296:3,3	testifies 375:15	313:12,22,24
tanks 88:25	207:22	296:10 297:15	testify 146:18	317:22 318:23
252:11 373:13	techniques	297:18 299:23	173:20 184:3	328:15 329:2
tap 368:20	93:16	314:23 424:20	262:21 411:1	330:8 332:2,7
483:17	telephone	termed 243:8	411:11 456:17	332:10 333:1
target 139:25	124:25 167:21	terminate 315:8	testifying 104:10	333:17 334:19
153:10 363:14	tell 95:20 102:5	terminated	209:4	335:11 340:4
tariff 98:23 99:2	102:9,11,13	107:6 145:18	testimonies	340:11,21
99:4 104:14	107:16 147:23	166:10	251:8 358:3	342:17,18
111:16,22	168:17 177:17	termination	405:14	345:13,16,19
112:5,14	189:9,10	188:10	testimony 85:13	345:23 346:4
119:11,11,21	230:11 245:5	terms 86:11	89:14 91:17	346:13,25
119:21 126:25	326:13 352:6	88:14 224:7	92:15 93:20	347:4,8,13
126:25 127:5,7	366:10 387:25	280:23 389:19	105:4 109:10	348:9 357:19
141:11 149:14	414:3 443:18	terrain 391:2	111:15 112:4	367:14 368:10
151:23,24	459:2 474:25	terrible 150:24	115:13,16,19	369:2 382:20
152:5,13	478:12	340:20	115:22,24	382:20 385:21
183:21 224:3	telling 106:12	territories	116:2,6,20,24	389:4 395:10
230:25 245:16	178:23 382:12	489:12	117:3 128:17	397:3,7,8
288:12 302:12	460:14	territory 103:8	129:3,7 138:2	398:19 401:5
338:9 341:20	temporary	319:15	148:9 171:4	401:21,22
349:9 354:4	463:5	Terry 440:8	173:2,10,14	404:18,24
356:19 364:5	tempted 261:1	tes 322:20	180:14 183:21	416:1 417:9
376:24 377:5	ten 92:16 143:7	test 89:15,17	195:6,10,13,16	420:12 421:16
385:11 386:23	183:5 202:25	92:25 161:18	195:18 198:13	421:20 423:7
422:4 449:19	336:18,20	190:3 201:17	199:23 210:10	432:13,17
461:19 465:9				
TU1.17 TUJ.7	368:6 429:16	201:20 202:3	211:15 213:1,6	434:1,4 438:20

445:25 447:13	197:7,15,19	347:6 348:18	168:22 169:25	193:6 198:20
451:17,20,22	201:5 207:6	348:21 349:2	230:4 320:2	199:4 200:8
452:18 453:6	208:10 209:25	353:4,8,22	328:20 384:1	202:5 203:9
458:9 461:11	212:14 215:23	355:13 358:11	438:8 440:10	208:9 209:3
461:21,24	217:13,15,19	365:2 369:15	482:12,18	216:11 220:16
462:14 473:10	218:4,13	371:18 374:5,8	things 92:6	221:11 222:15
475:2,25	219:21 229:10	374:11,14	94:19 103:21	223:21 227:20
476:21 477:4	229:15,19	377:18 378:7,9	125:14,15	227:21 228:20
495:19 496:9	231:22,23	384:14,16	141:3,6 150:19	229:25 231:3
512:10,10	232:10,13,18	385:16,18,19	151:3 159:15	236:6,23 237:2
520:3,4,6,7,9	234:14,18	386:12,18	159:21 161:21	237:9 246:16
520:10,12,13	237:25 238:1	387:1 392:14	163:12 164:6	257:18 260:14
520:15 521:2,4	238:18,22	392:25 394:5	165:17 168:24	260:18 261:4
521:8,13,14,16	240:15 246:20	395:1 396:3,18	172:25 211:7	261:20 267:24
521:17,21,23	246:21 248:12	401:3 405:13	274:20 335:2,6	271:21 273:2,4
521:24 522:1	248:14,15	407:16 432:8	341:7 343:19	275:6,23
testing 122:12	251:15 252:1,2	432:10 437:8	373:21 397:4	282:17 287:25
thank 87:7,19	257:8,9,21,22	437:10 439:2	397:14 472:5	288:1,14,16
87:22 94:3,4,6	260:4,22 261:5	440:17 447:24	482:7,22 487:7	293:14 300:9
98:17,18,21	261:8,19	447:25 448:2	516:6	300:16,20
99:12,13 108:4	272:12,13,16	448:19 449:14	think 86:9,12	301:2,15,22,24
108:5,9 113:12	273:6 276:14	464:24 476:17	87:2,9 88:12	302:3 303:22
113:13 114:16	276:15,19	476:18,21,24	93:14 96:6	304:1,15 305:1
114:17 115:1	286:22,23	492:14,15	98:4 99:7	310:3 311:5,7
117:25 118:4	288:22,23	495:23 502:5	107:1 108:23	311:9 314:6,18
118:24 124:12	289:4 290:18	504:15,18	112:6 114:12	318:17 320:7
125:23,25	291:14,19	506:6 513:4,24	114:12 119:22	320:12,17,25
126:1 127:12	292:3 293:9	513:25 515:12	120:19 127:6	321:12,15
127:13,14	296:14,15	thankful 113:9	130:21 140:19	322:7,20 325:7
128:5 129:21	298:19 299:16	Thankfully	141:13 144:20	326:23 329:9
135:4,5,7	300:2,3 303:4	250:14	146:17 148:4	329:15,17,18
137:4,7,15	305:17,18,20	thanks 338:17	149:1 150:5	329:18 330:5
143:10 144:10	305:24 306:5,6	374:20	151:4,7,25	330:11 331:4
146:22,24	308:7 311:12	theirs 491:3	153:25 154:4,5	338:1 340:15
149:4,7,20,21	311:14,15,22	theme 103:1	157:9 159:22	340:19 343:20
153:2,4 165:25	311:23 319:19	104:18 106:10	162:9 164:17	343:21 344:10
166:2 169:5	319:23 320:19	themes 102:19	165:2,3,24	347:15,19
173:21,22	320:21,22	102:21 106:8	166:18 168:9,9	348:25 350:8
181:11,12	326:1 327:20	theory 274:13	169:16,23	353:16 357:10
187:24 188:3	331:16,17	thereof 418:10	170:24 171:8	372:22 375:13
188:18,21	334:8 338:14	therewith	176:6 178:9	376:6,11 377:7
189:11,12,13	339:1,2,10	264:25	179:17 185:1,7	377:7 384:12
194:2,20	341:23 342:12	they'd 333:10	185:10 190:23	384:20 386:7
196:13,17	344:7,9,18,22	thing 87:9 96:17	191:19 192:19	394:13 395:9
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

397:3,5,17	489:14 490:2	thought 144:16	442:17 445:8	164:15 167:5,9
398:7 399:12	492:12 493:19	240:9 257:14	446:14 451:5,9	167:14 168:18
399:13 400:4	493:23 494:15	261:22 272:23	453:20 468:22	170:2,10,13
404:3 407:7	494:16,18,24	321:21 323:24	473:24 475:9	178:2,9 180:20
408:6 411:5,6	495:13 496:9	336:19 375:9	475:18,22	185:6 196:5
411:23 414:25	496:12,24,24	388:20 394:2	476:13 480:6	200:25 206:1
419:15 421:11	497:7,12,22,23	421:10 433:25	482:4 484:13	214:14,23
423:15 424:3	498:2,3,5,25	482:18 486:21	485:6,14 486:9	220:25 223:8
424:12,23,23	499:4,24 505:7	492:16 497:1,3	486:14,15,16	225:8 233:25
425:3,11,18,20	507:1,4 512:8	498:7	486:17 493:23	239:22,22
426:2 430:20	512:9,14,23	thoughtful	497:25 498:8	246:6,17
430:24 431:5,8	513:22 514:2	253:12	499:14 502:14	249:17 251:3
432:6,22	515:4,13,15	thousand 121:6	503:21	255:19 256:4
433:17,17	thinking 157:1	333:2 340:2,3	three-district	259:2 260:17
435:16,22	502:4 505:8	505:10	249:15 328:2	263:22 289:22
436:16 441:18	507:20,22	thousands 107:4	513:10	290:7 298:6,7
443:2,23 444:1	513:3	254:3 286:1	three-fifths	298:17 303:16
445:5,10,17,18	thinks 121:15	threat 433:2	321:17	303:17,21
446:6,13,18	263:25	three 90:22	three-fourths	305:13 306:24
447:4,16 448:8	third 94:1 144:7	93:21 111:24	321:18	313:10 314:11
449:23 450:2	144:12 154:14	112:15 151:19	three-quarter	315:1,1,15,23
452:3,10,13	284:10 346:17	151:21 159:1	356:3	315:25 317:7
453:4 455:2,19	352:8 378:22	170:20 179:3	three-to-two	317:16 333:16
455:19 456:7,7	407:1,7 423:22	181:17 198:4	316:6	336:21 344:10
456:8,15,16	Thompson	241:16,19	three-year	346:9 358:13
457:19 459:1	84:19 87:25	242:3 249:22	203:21,24	360:1,7 368:2
459:13 460:10	88:3,7 94:6	249:24 250:10	three-zone	372:9 386:6
462:14 463:10	98:18,22 99:6	250:23 257:2	110:22	392:4 417:20
465:11,21,25	99:11,13	260:14 265:24	threw 171:23	419:20 421:12
467:16 468:17	108:23 109:22	270:22 311:2	throw 302:21	424:21 425:1
469:2 470:5,10	135:7,11 137:9	321:17 324:24	487:5	427:11 435:15
470:19 471:9	137:15 146:4	328:25 329:7	thrown 230:3	441:3 442:8,13
471:15,18	149:18 188:3,4	329:10 333:14	Tieman 84:1	450:22 458:9
472:24 473:9	188:22 189:3,8	349:10,15	TIGER 82:23	458:21 461:23
473:23 474:3,7	189:11 197:15	350:9 351:8,11	tim 260:16	463:5 475:17
474:11,15,20	210:2 215:23	354:9,19 366:7	time 89:7,20	480:17 482:21
475:9 476:6,9	229:19 232:15	366:7 375:7,20	92:21,24 98:24	485:16 488:5
476:10 477:14	232:21 233:10	379:16 381:15	103:18 104:7,8	488:16 489:16
477:18 479:14	233:13,18,21	382:8 391:9,10	104:25 109:6,6	489:18 496:4
479:19 480:15	233:25 234:3,5	392:5,6 393:13	117:14 126:13	497:2 508:1,20
482:4,8,20	234:14 238:21	400:9 403:2,2	138:7,25 139:4	509:17
483:12 484:4	282:19 517:3	405:9,12	140:10 154:11	timeline 123:15
485:8 486:6	517:10,15	407:25,25	156:3 162:14	158:25 162:6
488:23 489:11	518:8	408:15 425:7	162:15 164:10	timely 93:9
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	l	l	I	
168:11	402:13 405:18	344:3	Tracy 82:22	126:10,16
times 90:22,23	420:8 421:15	torturous 313:5	traded 439:12	127:2 129:8,13
148:20 159:5	422:6,24 423:8	total 87:11,11	traditional 91:5	129:23 185:18
162:13,23,24	425:8 426:18	89:14 97:22	93:15 263:12	190:12 191:2
162:25 163:5,6	429:15,18	228:2 265:21	266:21	193:9,21
163:15,16,22	431:6 436:22	273:21,21	trail 207:23	243:25 244:2
177:11,16	445:20 453:15	352:12 379:11	train 486:20	252:10 266:17
222:16 263:2	458:10 460:14	395:15,20,21	training 233:23	266:17 279:20
300:12 310:22	462:15 473:12	453:1	233:23	306:22 317:23
315:14 373:19	474:25 476:8	totality 227:21	transcript 82:5	317:25 318:3
402:13 429:5	488:24,24	totally 134:3	318:18 342:16	318:19 369:4
441:4 478:19	492:1 493:16	463:2	360:10 440:7,8	373:10 412:18
489:14	499:13 507:20	touch 122:1	transfer 454:13	419:5 434:23
timing 145:20	516:1	485:15	454:25 455:25	482:16 489:6
158:17 187:7	told 97:4 104:13	touched 158:6	transformation	489:15
192:19 260:20	145:17 149:19	478:2	214:4	tremendous
TIMOTHY	170:4 180:23	touchtone 337:3	transmission	371:15 374:16
84:16	187:4 188:10	tough 231:13	244:2 319:5	399:13 427:1
tiny 288:8	329:10 333:12	402:22	transparency	trend 99:10
tired 398:5	432:18 491:7	tour 150:10,22	267:8 268:5	236:10,12,16
title 197:23	tomorrow	toured 150:21	281:2,3,5,22	391:19,22,25
289:14 471:2	245:14 262:22	touts 265:20	301:12,14	trendline 203:2
today 91:1 93:5	331:6 358:20	266:4	315:3 317:3	203:3
96:5 98:17	359:16 360:4	town 118:17	318:6 496:8,18	trends 93:11
117:8 150:2	360:13 384:11	120:20 121:1	496:22	tri-headed 301:5
173:12 178:9	397:1 400:14	121:25 160:7	transparent	Tri-State's 90:5
178:11 182:3	400:25 406:13	189:20 262:20	157:17 267:14	Tri-States
195:13,24	406:16 411:7	273:25 274:16	travel 514:18	250:12 424:9
201:22 213:7	438:22,24	332:13,15	traveling 262:24	425:16 466:19
214:9 219:7	450:23,25	333:5 339:13	travels 121:19	468:2 473:15
221:2 240:21	514:9 515:14	339:13,16,17	tread 437:14	Tri-States'
241:6 242:23	516:11	340:10 342:5	treat 96:23	425:16
254:18 258:1	tonight 483:16	342:22 343:2	148:23 369:2	tried 94:25
258:18 262:21	516:2	471:7	treated 244:20	159:16 322:10
264:15 276:25	top 130:7 237:9	towns 274:2	254:11 265:24	322:10 330:5
277:2,22 278:8	309:22 351:1	275:10	265:25 266:18	394:5 398:3
279:18 287:25	352:22 353:10	tra 455:9	308:23 368:15	Trip 240:18
291:12 293:2	354:8,19	track 162:13	treating 369:8	Triumph 134:2
298:7 313:2	363:22 383:17	tracked 165:19	treatise 265:10	197:8 208:21
315:1 331:24	385:21 454:1	tracker 203:16	treatment 88:24	215:17 229:18
333:17 334:17	466:15	206:17,19,21	89:2 91:13	235:9 291:23
336:8 357:21	topic 88:1 317:4	207:2 211:12	96:22 97:12,13	320:24 338:18
373:5 376:6	topics 210:16	211:16	98:9 120:2,10	378:15 502:9
378:3 395:19	tornado 343:23	trackers 205:1	121:11 122:4	trouble 442:3

	I	I		ı
troubled 90:4	490:10,25	two 90:23 94:10	294:24 353:3	171:10 174:7
98:6,14 138:15	497:13 511:16	117:17 150:15	353:23 419:14	175:4,7,15,19
142:9,13,16	511:22 514:24	170:17,20	447:8 465:8	175:22 176:10
174:14,20,23	516:10	179:3 194:4	471:13 486:12	178:22 185:24
243:12 311:3	trying 106:15	201:2 207:20	487:15 488:17	188:1,7 226:11
426:5 432:15	125:3,16	222:5 233:19	500:5 506:15	298:2 374:6
432:25 433:15	148:13 153:20	235:25 237:13	types 166:25	392:15 466:5
441:24 442:16	154:2 157:9	237:14,21	190:6 211:4	504:6
443:25 444:9	159:15,21,22	241:17 242:3,4	471:16	ultimately
464:9 465:13	160:4 162:22	245:4 250:7,23	typical 202:20	100:13 202:2
474:18 493:8	168:10,20	252:8,19	350:4	277:20 316:16
493:22 501:8	169:2 191:19	256:11 284:21	typically 128:3	422:23 425:25
true 105:8	200:16 223:7	318:12 320:3	138:19 161:5	427:16 465:14
117:10 120:1	241:25 313:8	325:12 328:25	163:1 190:18	497:24
145:19 159:14	321:13 339:20	329:7 333:13	191:14 202:19	UMSL 103:22
186:8,10 196:2	374:16 387:12	341:9 348:11	203:23 350:17	unable 114:14
214:11 268:3	388:2 408:5	349:10 351:8		173:19 287:12
290:4 297:24	444:5,6 460:23	351:11 353:6	U	unaffordable
329:4 357:24	464:22 465:19	354:9,19 356:9	uh-huh 120:17	505:5 506:5
358:8 370:23	471:24 473:7	356:11 371:1	120:21,24	unavailable
405:21 414:16	480:12 484:2,9	373:12 375:7	121:2 122:20	359:15
431:14,17	484:10,10	375:19 397:13	122:23 123:4,7	unaware 120:19
448:25 468:20	489:25 491:17	403:1,2 404:19	123:10 124:20	121:23 181:9
478:13 493:10	495:2,14	404:21 405:8	126:20 127:11	unbelievable
truly 201:6	tuck-in 148:21	405:12 408:14	127:24 128:6	428:7
trumpet 243:16	turn 93:19	409:24 420:3	129:1,11	uncertain
trumps 465:20	261:11 262:2,6	421:3,14 435:3	138:10 140:13	323:11
trunk 319:8	279:14 348:21	435:6,7 436:9	141:10 142:17	unclear 158:1
trust 96:23	351:13 356:14	442:25 453:13	143:8 148:6	uncommon
107:7	370:2,14	453:19 470:13	149:5 150:8	164:19
truthfully	378:22 383:16	470:17 475:16	151:2,6,8	under 287:7
436:16	403:17 413:10	475:19 476:7,7	152:19 158:5	under-charge
try 122:5,13	413:24 424:21	485:12,21	158:11 159:4,6	104:11,13
148:18 153:12	443:20 483:17	two-inch 350:17	159:8 160:10	under-paying
161:7 164:22	498:15	350:23 384:7	160:14,18,24	227:23 286:6
165:7 167:24	turned 211:17	two-question	162:4,16	422:16
171:19 174:18	turning 138:1	168:16	163:19 165:15	under-perfor
201:3 222:21	318:24 352:13	two-thirds 91:22	165:18 166:9	284:18
227:21 262:2	353:4,22	two-way 203:16	166:16,20,22	undergraduate
328:10 363:6	354:23 355:13	type 112:5	167:1,4,7,10	245:25
402:20 408:4	357:17,17	151:22 155:13	167:13,17,19	underground
420:12 472:19	379:15 451:1	201:17 203:8	167:22 168:7	482:24
477:17,19,20	turnout 318:9	204:2 205:1	169:7,11	underlying
487:24 490:9	twice 104:12	288:11 292:22	170:19,22	311:9

	ı	1	1	1
underneath	213:3 232:8,9	unfortunately	315:7 334:20	204:20 205:9
451:8	293:25 300:23	262:18 409:12	336:6,9	205:11,12,13
understand	323:10 359:15	423:10	unreasonably	207:4 209:18
110:23 123:23	361:4 364:4	uniform 230:14	242:7	209:19,23
144:6,19	372:15 375:11	230:17 250:19	unrecouped	211:5,17,22
145:10 148:3	387:11 414:6	308:24 321:19	153:20	238:13 312:16
152:16 169:16	416:4 423:8	321:23,25	unregulated	401:21 505:10
169:24 170:6	431:6,13 434:1	438:12 449:25	146:11,16	usages 349:24
170:16 171:8	441:18 452:16	456:2	216:8,13,17,19	354:15
171:19 172:14	466:11 469:4	unions 134:2	unrepaired	use 91:1,8
175:8 177:7	496:25 514:5	197:10	103:23	148:22 202:17
183:20 186:18	understands	unique 294:16	unresolved	203:20 228:6
187:10,10	267:19 431:17	297:13 302:3,4	160:20	253:19 259:12
200:16 257:12	understood	uniqueness	unsure 186:25	265:15 286:8
270:20 273:2	372:12	301:3	unsurprised	298:4 339:24
280:21 292:9	undertake 376:7	unit 174:15	462:9	340:24 376:23
297:9,12	undertaking	258:13 267:17	untrue 337:15	385:22 416:16
316:15,24	136:14	United 190:20	unwarranted	423:22
325:2 330:7,18	undue 100:23,25	216:23 313:15	107:20	user 113:11
354:6 366:16	254:22 255:5,8	units 98:1	upcoming	228:7
369:1 375:3	265:3,8 266:4	universally	336:23 434:18	user's 370:17
378:6 385:3,8	277:3,5 310:20	243:10	512:18	users 110:17,18
389:12 397:15	310:24	University 246:2	update 221:11	312:15 351:25
398:4 399:22	unduly 100:3	unjust 101:7	updated 489:22	388:14 500:8,9
403:16 431:11	101:8 226:25	226:24 264:23	upgrade 425:5	uses 113:4
444:8,8 451:1	uneconomically	272:2,4,22	485:25 489:20	203:21 207:10
451:2 457:21	266:2	300:14 334:20	upgrades 127:2	349:12
460:20 474:19	unequally	unjustly 101:7	275:19 281:20	usually 166:24
480:16 481:25	265:25	226:24	367:10,11	186:4 198:21
482:25 487:23	unequals 265:25	unlawful 315:7	upgrading	utilities 90:20,20
512:20,25	unfair 263:16	336:5,9	275:18	90:21 245:25
514:3,3	270:6,12	unprecedented	upheld 316:16	254:12 284:25
Understandab	278:19 281:22	316:13	uphill 273:25	320:5 355:8,9
280:19	286:7 300:20	unprofessional	upstairs 239:10	507:13,17,19
understandable	341:16	110:13	upwards 486:3	509:7 510:11
314:2	unfairly 109:21	unreasonable	urge 114:6,15	utility 90:5 96:8
understanding	295:15	100:2,23,25	255:23 256:25	104:19 150:18
107:5 115:15	unfairness	101:7 226:24	302:17	172:8 198:9,17
123:12 124:21	278:13	227:8 254:22	urges 99:20	198:25 221:6
125:18 128:16	unfilled 117:2	255:5,8 264:3	usage 93:3	222:22 245:18
143:2 145:12	unforeseen	264:23 265:3,8	106:22 109:19	265:11,16
170:25 186:13	275:20	272:2,4,22	109:19 201:6	282:3 285:19
192:22 195:9	unfortunate	277:4 278:10	201:15,20,23	312:21 337:3
202:23 209:13	249:8	310:21,24	202:6,13,15,19	337:11,13
	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>	I

	I	I	I	I
418:18 463:6	374:15 375:1	253:20	504:8,10	242:24 500:1
467:1,1 498:18	393:7,8 397:24	violating 428:15	walking 481:22	warranted
498:23 499:2	416:11,19,21	428:16	want 88:5 109:1	256:21 269:23
502:21,22,24	441:4 448:5	violation 227:1	110:24 120:22	warranties
503:2,3,4	455:15 472:18	336:6	130:14 144:23	217:11
506:15	491:24	Virginia 391:14	144:25 145:6	warranty 217:10
utility's 91:12	vary 109:9	virtue 243:17	168:25 174:19	Warren 250:4
202:5 284:8	244:16	virtues 245:6	174:21 180:2	250:24
utilized 502:24	vastly 227:23	visits 122:2	183:23 184:1,5	Warrensburg
utmost 108:25	416:24,25	vital 315:19	189:6,9 194:4	83:21 105:21
	vegetarian	voiced 268:11	200:9,12	109:15 111:9
V	309:12,17,24	voices 313:8	204:21 239:2	113:19 114:9
V 277:10 354:8	VerDouw	voicing 325:15	239:13 240:21	114:10 127:15
vacation 262:19	213:10 520:13	325:19	253:24 258:5	127:20 179:25
262:24	verge 141:18	volatility 112:17	260:11 261:2	197:3 208:21
vacuum 249:2	317:12	113:10 300:15	267:4 272:24	215:13 229:9
valid 264:8	verified 397:4	volume 82:9	274:16 295:5	235:4 250:11
Valley 250:12	verify 186:25	131:2 156:4	301:11,14	255:15 280:18
445:9	414:16	volumetric	322:6 326:11	291:18 308:8
value 86:12	version 400:3	91:15,21 93:1	327:8 339:23	308:11,11,17
228:23 320:8	versions 400:2	94:23 228:22	360:1,3,20	308:18 309:24
320:13 469:12	versus 111:6	324:9 325:1,3	361:3 366:11	309:24 310:8
valued 343:20	210:20 216:8	352:22 508:7	372:9 373:18	310:12,17
values 343:14	264:7 301:18	vote 309:10,11	390:11 392:4	315:11 338:13
variability	369:9,22	316:6	396:20,23,25	366:18,20,23
201:25	402:15 419:16	votes 309:12	397:10,15	367:11 369:12
variable 91:11	468:6 472:22	481:14 490:25	428:18 433:5	374:7 377:3
91:14,21 200:8	513:9		437:14,25	412:1,4,10,22
201:10,13	vertical 265:25	W	447:20,22	412:24 413:3,5
205:21,25	viability 276:13	W 83:7	461:13 481:11	424:17 425:12
210:22,22	276:14	wa 436:18	486:20,20	429:25 437:9
212:1	viable 274:16	wait 159:5	488:3 490:2	471:5 473:21
varies 122:17	vice 94:1 212:23	162:12,14,15	493:5 502:17	501:1
various 95:25	view 95:15	162:24,25	504:20 505:2	Warrensburg's
114:5 125:6	138:11 139:21	163:5,6,15,16	509:22 514:23	309:21 310:9
172:25 178:21	204:14 275:22	261:18 317:11	wanted 282:21	367:5 412:7,14
180:17 235:24	275:24 298:25	360:4 383:25	296:23 342:4	Warrenton
241:2,25 242:8	317:10 373:4	397:2 437:20	375:3 394:14	226:10
242:10 244:24	428:25 433:12	waiter 309:7	427:9 433:13	Warsaw 105:24
246:18 251:23	465:8 500:1	waiting 324:12	433:16,22	washing 122:22
258:11 260:25	views 418:22,25	waive 108:9	437:5 506:9	wasn't 104:13
261:3 308:13	Village 320:23	walk 194:10	wanting 154:21	112:1 154:13
349:24 351:1	violate 100:1	200:9 239:21	339:16	157:6 184:22
352:4 354:15	violates 101:9	321:9 477:22	wants 134:15	187:2 277:19

342:8 397:4	122:22 125:14	252:15,16	369:2,9 372:5	517:17 520:15
409:10,13	125:21 126:10	253:17,18,19	374:9 375:7,16	wavered 279:23
457:23 458:15	126:16 127:23	254:1,5,7,9,10	375:19,19	279:23
458:16,17	128:7,13 129:8	254:14,16	381:10 401:17	way 86:8 93:7
462:7 477:13	129:12,17,22	255:1,14	408:8,10,16,18	94:21 96:18
510:21,22	134:11,13,16	256:14,16	409:5 410:1,7	97:10 108:16
waste 372:9	134:19 135:1,2	257:5 263:18	412:12,19	109:24 148:17
wasteful 265:15	138:4 140:14	264:21,22,24	418:17,24	154:20 159:17
wastewater	141:19 146:10	265:1 266:16	427:23,24	169:3 184:11
88:18,20 89:1	146:10 148:3	266:17,19	428:1,4,4,13	204:13 211:25
89:2,3,4 90:2	148:23 149:10	268:18 269:20	428:15,15	221:17 244:25
90:18,20	150:7,16,18	269:22 274:4	429:1 430:11	300:18 310:25
100:10,11	151:1,13,14	274:25 275:19	431:10 432:14	311:5 320:6
119:24 138:4	152:20 154:17	276:4 277:3	432:24 433:9	324:17 366:21
154:1,3,7	154:18 158:7	278:16 279:20	433:14 434:14	376:8 382:2
216:22 217:2	158:10 161:5	280:13 282:20	434:23 437:11	389:24 397:23
217:12 222:1	171:23 172:19	282:22 284:12	440:17,20	405:3 433:20
231:4,5 241:13	173:6 174:14	284:17,18	441:6 442:7	434:15 444:23
243:13 429:18	175:17 181:3,7	286:3 287:9,11	443:14 447:7	465:21 470:3
430:6,6 431:10	182:4 184:12	287:16,19	448:1 451:4,8	470:23 474:23
510:15,16,19	189:18 195:2	291:20 292:1	452:5 454:25	478:12 481:12
watch 123:11	195:20 197:5	294:15 295:1,7	455:10 462:20	482:21 484:5
water 82:13,14	198:2,7,9,17	299:3 300:19	466:12,17,25	487:2,8 490:4
83:6,9,10	198:25 202:18	302:14 305:2,8	467:1 477:17	495:14,15,16
88:17,19,23,24	208:21 212:22	305:11 306:22	480:4 482:10	495:19 496:23
88:25 89:1	215:15 216:22	307:7 308:13	482:23 483:17	498:7,9 499:4
90:1,7,18,20	217:2,8,12	308:22 311:16	484:14,15,18	ways 141:13
90:21 91:9,12	221:8,9,23,24	312:3,8,12,14	485:1,5,9,16	165:7 185:10
91:14 92:4	222:4,23	312:16,21,23	487:16 491:14	390:8 479:1
93:23,25 94:2	223:18,25	313:10 316:9	493:8,14,15,22	491:9 492:4
96:6,7,14,21	229:11,21	317:23,25	496:13 502:6	we'll 108:6
96:23,25 97:11	235:6,13	318:3,14,19,25	502:21,21,24	137:21 156:8
97:12,16,18	236:21 240:6	323:4 326:18	503:2,3,4	186:7 194:12
100:5,8,9,22	240:20 241:2,9	326:25 327:1	504:17 505:20	202:21 219:19
102:4 104:4	241:12,12,13	329:20 332:16	506:1,12	239:5 260:20
105:2,12,25	241:16,19	332:24 333:5	508:22 510:19	270:17 271:22
106:9,16	242:18 243:11	334:21 336:20	517:6 519:5	289:1 298:4
107:10 110:5,6	243:12,24	338:15,21	Water's 100:5	309:11 320:25
112:22 113:5	244:3,17,19	339:23 340:24	103:9 216:12	329:2 359:8
113:11 115:9	245:1 246:9,15	341:4 345:9	255:11	360:11 378:19
116:12,21	247:11 249:6,9	351:2 355:8,8	Watkins 93:24	400:15,18
119:24 120:2	249:15,22,22	355:9,9,11	194:16,17,21	401:1,7 406:9
120:22 121:8,8	249:24 250:2,7	367:2 368:15	194:24 196:14	438:23 447:22
121:10,15,19	250:9 252:8,10	368:21,23	210:8 212:4	488:19 515:8
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	İ	I		Ī
516:10	492:9 495:2,4	weird 110:12	WILLIAM	313:22 317:21
we're 97:22,23	496:19	welcome 319:25	82:19 83:2	331:1,1,15
97:24 99:3	we've 89:13	welfare 100:19	willing 138:23	332:6 339:4
108:13,13	96:12 103:8	wells 244:19	297:13 322:20	344:7,10,21
109:1 110:3	113:23 121:7	254:10 470:17	328:18 330:11	349:4 358:13
122:11,12	122:1,2,3	470:18	374:1 429:10	379:20,23,25
124:24 125:3,6	124:24 139:4	went 107:13	442:10,18	380:2,16,22
125:16 130:4	147:24 152:8	119:10 150:14	457:18,19	384:10 396:17
134:13 153:11	159:25 161:14	168:15 187:6	willingness	399:2 400:13
159:21 165:2,5	162:7,21 164:5	204:19,20	93:14	409:14,20
165:7 168:12	167:12 168:13	206:25 221:18	wind 428:9	415:22 438:10
170:11 173:7	168:13 173:12	288:1 310:9	winners 152:17	438:17,25
178:11 179:20	182:3 194:3	404:9 421:4	477:25 478:18	439:10,12
184:2 191:1	226:15 286:11	427:2 437:17	480:11,17	450:22,25
201:8 202:16	295:5,13	472:2 507:21	481:9,17	461:11 507:19
205:12 207:3,3	301:17 302:22	507:25	winter 203:22	514:4,9 515:1
222:1 240:3	308:19 321:5	WENZEL 84:8	207:17	520:16,18
252:6 277:1	321:15 323:4	weren't 181:25	wisdom 315:24	witness's 130:20
288:17 291:11	323:12 329:1	305:6 327:13	wise 226:25	240:23
294:15 297:13	344:14 358:20	327:16 475:15	514:24	witnesses 93:20
298:1 300:18	373:19 398:3,5	490:8	wish 271:21	93:21 98:23
316:24 320:6	398:9 401:6	Wess 314:13	366:10	106:25 107:2
321:19 323:16	416:25 449:23	west 83:16	wishing 87:6,6	117:16 172:19
324:14 325:18	452:13 458:20	273:19 391:14	witness 85:15	185:2 199:15
325:19,20	458:22 462:14	485:4	87:24 108:12	210:16 238:25
326:20 329:17	473:24 486:13	Western 277:8	114:20,25	245:5 252:19
358:21 363:17	491:16 496:16	whatsoever	115:12 124:10	256:18 396:9
380:12 396:8	515:5	265:6,9	130:11 149:15	448:11 514:8
397:19 398:6	wear 489:17	whistleblower	149:20 185:13	515:14,20
399:11,23	weather 201:25	155:14	188:25 189:13	516:8
400:12 402:14	211:5	Whitebranch	194:2,5,6,19	woman 106:14
411:6,23 414:8	web 222:12	250:11	212:7,12,13,25	wonder 318:8
422:2,3,4	website 182:17	Whoever's	218:4,6,12	472:16
429:2,10 432:2	Wednesday	374:22	220:17 232:13	wonderful
435:13 449:13	514:14	whole-house	232:14,17	194:11 264:1
449:16 465:12	week 122:13	122:25 123:17	234:15 239:2,6	343:17
471:16 473:17	145:18 156:18	123:20 144:18	240:12 241:5	wondering
477:24 478:18	262:19 398:2	wholly 399:19	244:11 246:5	144:8 198:19
480:17 481:2	458:20	wide 403:24	246:16 251:5	199:10 247:2
481:12,22,23	weeks 155:7	503:16	258:8 261:20	378:12
486:6,18,21,23	160:1 446:14	widely 244:16	262:16,16	Wood 116:3,24
487:23 488:18	weighing 95:25	wider 367:20	273:8 284:4	195:16 213:20
490:12 491:3,4	weight 114:14	wilderness 313:8	286:24 288:25	250:13 251:1
491:10,10	276:8 397:15	wildest 336:19	289:3 290:22	Wood's 116:5
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	•	•	•	
Woods 105:1	144:25 174:17	463:7 465:21	508:16 510:21	264:20 289:18
word 227:6	212:2 228:23	469:7 477:2,15	512:17	289:25 290:7,9
245:3 265:3	323:5 325:9	484:20 485:7	years' 336:21	290:10,12
311:21 339:24	364:21 388:22	499:4 500:19	yesterday 85:19	294:5 310:14
348:1 494:21	390:16 422:17	502:2,4 504:2	87:9,13 192:11	310:15,17
words 248:4	460:14 464:17	year 89:15,17	241:11 246:9	312:4 319:10
265:18 460:4	464:22 505:5	91:20,20 92:18	281:1 448:4	333:20,23,24
468:11 476:12	512:22	92:25 106:15	York 202:10,11	334:1 348:9
work 110:9	wow 368:22	140:4 150:9	203:20,23	357:12 371:1
160:4 193:11	WR-2000-281	160:13 164:24	207:14,15	521:3,7
211:16 245:20	264:2	191:14 201:18	208:1	1-R 180:17
245:20 278:18	WR-2015-0301	201:20,21,21	younger 240:19	1,000 318:13
314:5 330:1	82:14 85:8	201:22,23,23	youngest 487:22	1,031 309:23
374:16,18	396:16	202:3,6,6,6,20		348:5
422:7 427:21	written 100:15	203:9,11,16,22	Z	1,500 169:20
483:25	135:24 154:8	204:3,4 205:1	zero 385:4	468:23
worked 152:2	235:22 251:7	206:16,23	428:21	1.1 376:25
164:5 182:23	wrong 263:19	207:19 283:16	zone 112:11	1.15 324:22
189:22 402:19	322:7 444:6	312:16 368:5	228:24 242:2,3	356:4
402:19 426:22	463:3	510:17 512:18	242:3 256:9	1.3 365:14 366:6
426:22 467:7	wrote 417:20	years 92:16	269:19 348:11	1.31 310:10
507:24		126:15 129:23	348:12 351:7	1.5 294:7 299:12
working 113:1	X	136:10 159:1	352:20 354:8,9	1.7 381:20
125:1 139:3,7	X 153:16 171:5	159:13 160:23	354:9 403:2	1:00 239:15
162:2,8 191:1	Y	161:2 162:5,9	445:7,8 469:21	1:30 260:19,25
245:10,18		183:10 193:18	477:6,7 488:2	10 89:3 117:1
281:9 324:14	Y 82:18 239:24	193:23 202:25	zones 112:14	143:6 146:18
333:13 419:7,9	yeah 85:18	203:21 222:11	169:15 224:7	150:13 216:12
419:12 427:23	124:2 130:4	226:18 245:12	241:16,17,22	216:17 218:25
works 93:25	143:21 148:2	245:19 247:20	280:13 349:9	219:11,14,17
94:3 134:11,13	157:5 170:25	271:24 273:22	349:15 351:9	246:11 268:15
134:16,19	172:11 218:8	275:17 279:21	351:10 354:8	273:22 275:17
135:2 169:17	230:11 231:16	283:4,22,24	354:18,18,19	275:17 346:5
171:20 195:2	260:18 271:17	286:4 288:13	354:20 390:19	347:11 355:23
198:7 202:9	293:14 325:18	295:14 297:23	392:4 451:5,15	358:15 359:3,4
212:22 261:15	325:18 326:15	305:15,15	470:1 480:6,6	359:6 362:20
360:25	362:24 364:6	314:6 316:19	480:6,13	363:13 394:23
world 428:25	377:22 379:7	332:22 336:18	481:13 499:7	401:23 405:8,9
482:9,10 508:2	382:16 383:2	368:6 425:5,7	499:14	405:25 406:5,7
worries 428:7,9	383:25 384:12	427:22 429:16	0	408:14,15
worse 269:2,3	387:3 389:5	431:23 437:1		453:20,20
worth 435:19	391:11 432:7	487:13,14	1	472:2 520:7
would 174:17	447:16 450:2 461:25 462:22	488:13,14	1 83:9 85:3	521:14,22
wouldn't 138:24	401.23 402.22	491:16 492:5	140:7,7 246:15	10.35 87:11
			170.7,7 270.13	

	1	l	i	ı
10.85 505:10	127 517:9	15.47 283:8	183 517:15	472:11,17
100 109:14	128 517:9	15.8 393:15	188 517:15	488:14,19
113:5 120:15	13 116:7 213:23	150 88:21 97:17	189 517:16	20,000 298:10
164:11 191:14	241:13,17	191:14	19 241:12,16	307:20 425:19
206:6 228:18	242:19 347:25	150,000 169:22	242:18 269:11	499:10,15
332:14 343:5	451:15 452:9	153 517:12	346:19,21	200 83:19 84:20
101 83:8,13	452:10 454:10	16 82:9 111:17	451:4	316:10
108 517:4	13,700 100:10	131:2 151:15	19 192:24	2000 112:8
11 88:24 115:23	13.22 403:11	151:16 213:23	19.3 370:20	226:7 277:23
116:15 117:2,6	13.3 379:2	223:21,22,24	1900's 147:22	277:24 278:16
117:15,20,21	13.388 379:6	223:25 226:18	194 517:17	278:20,21
117:23 129:4,8	13.72 407:14	283:3 371:6	196 520:15	280:17 282:5,9
214:3 219:1,11	13.85 407:15	492:5	197 517:18	283:1 295:13
219:14,17	130 83:19	16.09 356:3	1990 220:18	306:19 309:4
246:11 256:8	132 131:2	16.2 394:20	1990's 436:17	313:7 314:1,12
309:10 346:18	181:17 283:5	16.29 298:6	1998 461:18	335:17 336:14
347:10,11	286:3 295:10	16.50 354:9	462:6	337:2 404:5
385:10 401:23	133 131:3	357:1	1999 220:24,25	415:19 417:2
405:25 406:5,7	134 517:10	160 366:24	221:12 226:2	418:6 426:18
520:8 521:15	135 517:10	412:7	282:19,22	426:21 427:21
521:24	522:3	160,616,580		430:6,10 431:5
11.33 87:17	137 517:11	407:10	2	436:20 461:7
11.88 256:13	522:3	160,805,000	2 83:10 85:3	462:8 508:21
1100 84:13	14 111:22 116:7	407:12	116:11 140:8	510:1,17
113 517:5	116:11 138:2	1645 357:12	160:2 170:12	2000s 149:13
115 517:7	225:1 346:19	166 517:13	203:7 224:16	2001 92:8
117 520:9,16	379:11	17 116:12 214:3	225:9,11,12,14	2003 278:6
118 517:8	14.42 283:8	268:24 346:25	250:15 312:4	2005 149:13
119 88:25	356:2	347:2 357:13	317:18 318:10	180:19 277:9
11th 156:17	14.45 394:4	430:5	318:11 319:11	427:25
12 89:23 143:3,6	14.50 354:9	17,623 370:19	348:14 354:23	2006 149:13
143:7 219:1,11	14.80 354:9	17.20 386:11	370:16 371:5	180:18,19
219:14,17	140 109:14	17.3 385:12,13	407:13 413:25	336:2,3,17
309:6,10,11	144 521:11	17.40 256:14	516:15 521:5,9	337:18
346:18 383:17	147 517:11	321:23 349:14	2- 181:7	2007 278:6
401:23 405:25	149 517:12	383:19 385:25	2 160:16	297:25 298:4,5
406:5,7 454:11	15 100:6 116:19	386:6,11	2.95 92:22	298:8 337:21
472:3 521:17	138:2 223:19	174 517:13	2:00 286:25	2008 123:13
522:1	223:23 271:24	179 517:14	2:10 311:20	158:13 159:10
12,000 88:17	273:22 275:17	18 177:20 269:4	20 126:15	160:16 278:6
12,128 371:11	279:21 295:14	269:10 310:22	228:16 305:15	283:2 333:10
12.8 393:15	305:15 316:19	346:20	310:13,18	338:3 418:25
120 404:2	346:19 404:2	18.53 283:7	346:25 347:2	428:1
126 517:8	475:3 510:21	181 517:14	431:23 455:18	2009 123:13
			1	

		l	l	1
158:13 159:10	520:10	298 518:21	83:20	214:15,18,21
160:17	221 83:13 92:11	299 518:21	31st 90:12	302:2 520:13
2010 158:22	223 518:3	3	32 112:13 135:8	38.39 298:7,9
278:7 283:4	2230 84:16		135:9,15	380 490:16
338:3 498:17	225 518:4 521:6	3 85:3 111:17	137:10,12,14	383 519:11
2011 281:25	229 518:4	124:9 136:3	137:16 454:3,5	384 265:12
306:12 419:7	23 91:19 205:7	143:13,23	522:2	519:11
421:18	213:15,23	144:1,3 154:15	320 498:20	385 519:12
2012 89:7 92:19	214:8,16,18,21	190:2 195:19	33 233:15 234:1	386 519:12
2014 89:15	350:15 371:3,3	263:1 264:19	234:2,9,10,12	387 519:13
2015 155:25	516:18 520:11	265:1 346:24	323:17 457:22	39 195:10,23
158:23 180:19	230 306:24	348:12 352:6	458:12 459:20	196:6,7,9,11
192:20,24	232 518:5,8	385:22 395:4	460:14 516:13	214:7 520:14
221:11,12	234 522:5	402:5 405:25	522:4	39,000 404:19
2016 82:7 90:12	235 518:8	406:5,7 506:14	33.58 136:9	404:25 453:7
160:17 199:24	238 518:9	506:17 521:10	446:13 457:19	453:12
430:11 516:18	24 88:21	521:19	330 273:20	3917-A 84:5
2017 318:2	24-7 312:16	3,000 350:10	331 519:2	393 519:13
2018 318:3	24.33 136:7	425:17	334 519:3 521:8	393.130 101:2
2020 457:23	24.75 385:10	3:30 321:2	335 117:2	254:19 277:2
205 106:7	240 518:11	30 116:19 123:5	338 265:11	277:21 310:20
207 517:18	248 518:12	163:9 228:17	339 519:3	336:7
208 517:19	25 88:19 100:9	245:19 302:2	34 401:6,8 402:9	393.130.1
21 346:21	111:21,23	390:25	402:11 405:25	264:18
347:23	114:10 116:15	30,000 486:3	406:5,7 407:2	393.140 101:3
21.5 395:23	220:11 221:3	30.1 458:15	410:6 435:11	254:20
210 517:19	223:5 283:2	30.6 107:25	522:6	393.320 466:24
212 517:21	347:12 395:17	349:11 354:5	340 273:21	498:15 502:16
214 520:10,12	25- 486:3	356:18 402:25	322:21	3rd 199:24
520:13,18	252 518:12	407:20 450:17	342 519:4,4	
216 517:21	257 518:13	300 181:7	343,810 179:23	4
218 518:2	262 518:13	319:11 427:3	344 519:7	4 116:6 117:1
219 518:3	273 518:14	300,000 430:4	35 348:5	250:25 266:12
521:13,14,16	276 518:14	301 83:16,23	355,000 499:9	352:14 362:17
521:17	28 302:2	304 84:9	359 519:7 520:3	364:22 370:16
22 82:7 111:22	28,000 499:9	306 518:15	520:4,6,7	383:16 384:21
111:23 116:14	289 518:18	308 83:23	360 84:20 519:8	393:23 394:9
116:15 195:19	29 88:24 138:1	518:15	365 519:8	396:1
213:12 214:3,8	29.02 385:11	31 89:15	369 519:9	4 460:17
214:15,18,21	290 521:4	31.1 310:8	37 350:15	4,000 180:1
220:11,19	291 518:19	311 518:16	371 519:9	4.15 177:19
223:4 347:23	292 518:19	314.496.3777	374 519:10	4.76 92:22
347:24 371:2	293 518:20	84:6	378 519:10	40 116:2,18
383:18 505:9	296 518:20	314.725.8788	38 213:10 214:8	117:7 213:19

214:8 228:21	520:17	362:7,21 366:3	454:13	65101 83:8,13	
245:12 247:20	477 519:20	377:21 378:1	573.522.3304	83:24 84:10	
273:19 371:1	48 344:19	381:15,24	83:17	65102 83:16	
454:24 460:15	348:25 349:3	514:22 520:22	573.556.6622	84:17	
460:18 472:10	358:4,15,23,25	500 90:13	83:14	65102-0360	
40- 283:16	364:3 365:17	107:12 134:20	573.634.2500	84:21	
40-plus 209:15	370:2 374:24	191:11 446:6	83:24	65102-0456 83:5	
400 83:8 319:10	377:6 378:20	491:8	573.634.8115	66 120:6 301:25	
400-some-odd	378:20 383:6	500,000 477:13	84:10	66.20 298:9	
468:24	384:21 393:11	480:13 491:3	573.635.7166	67,000 307:21	
401 519:16	394:17 396:24	491:13	83:5	68 362:9,10	
406 519:17	397:6 437:15	501 519:22	573.636.6758	68,000 283:19	
521:20,21,23	437:16 514:22	502 519:22	83:9	69 456:4	
521:24 522:1,6	520:19	504 519:23	573.751.4140		
409 309:22	49 344:19	506 519:23	84:21	7	
41 116:24 117:7	348:24 353:22	51 344:19	573.751.5558	7 195:19 228:22	
195:15,24	358:15 365:17	351:16 356:15	84:17	345:14 346:14	
411 519:17	377:19,21	358:4,15,24	578.35 348:11	346:15 358:14	
418 318:13	378:1 379:15	359:1 365:18	348:16	359:3,4,6	
42,000 283:16	380:12 449:18	374:24 377:22		394:4 453:2	
426 519:18	450:11 514:22	377:23 382:18	6	520:2	
432 519:18	520:20	396:24 397:7	6 267:8 348:1	7,200 106:15	
433.76 348:12	493 519:21	398:17,24	375:13 387:15	7.1 89:16,21	
348:16	496 519:21	437:16 499:12	388:10 453:2	7:00 343:6	
439 519:19		499:24 514:22	502:20	70 109:13	
44 457:12,15	5	520:23	6,000 179:25	456:24	
459:21	5 85:5 111:17	516 521:6 522:5	6,380.04 370:18	700 329:10	
44,000 307:18	266:20 271:11	52 448:15,16,18	6,700 88:25	700,000 329:11	
448 519:19	271:12 275:17	448:21 449:7,8	6.2 394:25	446:7	
45,000 362:23	323:5,8 326:20	449:10 451:2	6:00 343:6	702 84:2	
450 435:19	348:1,1 355:21	453:24 466:4	60 109:12 163:9	702.92 348:12	
4520 84:13	379:17 385:22	480:20 520:25	193:23 283:1	348:17	
456 83:4	475:2 521:1	53,000 283:18	600 106:14	71 440:8 521:4	
46 89:2 115:16	5,000 136:6	539 488:11	113:4	72 520:3,4,6,7,9	
117:6,15,20,21	298:11 350:11	54 371:5	602 289:10	520:10,12,13	
117:23 128:18	394:18	56 88:19 100:10	63105 83:20	520:15,16	
520:16	5,484 179:21	560,000 477:15	63116-3816 84:6	521:13,14,16	
460,000 88:17	5.3 381:3,5,8	565 366:6	64111 84:13	521:17,20,21	
100:8 127:23	50 109:11	565,000 323:10	64501 84:2	521:23,24	
127:25	227:24 228:18	329:1 355:24	65 105:14 455:4	522:1	
465 519:20	231:5,15	363:2,11,20	477:21	73 136:8	
47 85:1 213:4	283:24 288:9	404:17 405:1,4	65.22 408:2	75 288:9 306:22	
214:8,15,18,21	344:19 355:14	405:8 407:23	452:11,13	76 89:3	
454:16,17	358:15 361:4	408:16 453:18	454:17 455:3	77 201:9	
	<u> </u>				
		COURT REPORT			

			. 1
8	401:23 405:25		
8 195:19 198:13	406:5,7 520:5		
256:13 345:20	521:12,21		
346:13 347:16	9- 499:11		
347:20 358:15	9,000 180:1		
	9:00 516:18		
359:3,4,6 520:4	90 92:19 123:3		
	128:3 146:17		
8,000 350:13	146:17 216:13		
498:18 499:10	221:25 271:13		
8,225.09 371:11	355:23 363:13		
8.7 393:14	363:19 371:10		
80 163:2,3 326:4	371:12 410:13		
405:6,7 408:13	900 273:17		
410:11 453:20	90s 149:18 392:2		
505:12	392:2,13		
80/10/10 408:17	507:24		
800 84:20	91 91:18 201:8		
171:25	205:8,15		
80s 308:12	92 165:1		
461:14	93 395:11		
81 228:10	937 318:14		
816.279.3000	348:5		
84:3	937.23 348:13		
816.460.2545	348:17		
84:14	939 82:22		
82 362:21	94 517:3		
84 221:24	95 283:12 445:6		
84-year-old	96 454:19		
106:14	99 517:4		
85 168:4 520:18)) J17. T		
521:2,8,9,11			
88 517:3			
8th 156:25			
9			
9 92:19 116:7,12			
117:2 213:23			
214:3 218:25			
219:11,14,17			
256:8 333:11			
345:25 347:14			
347:22,22,22			
350:3 358:15			
359:3,4,6			
357.5, 1,0			
	·	•	•