

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

On-the-Record Presentation

Wednesday, March 29, 2023
1:00 p.m. - 2:00 p.m.

WebEx

VOLUME 11
Pages 89 - 142

In the Matter of Missouri-American)
Water Company's Request for)
Authority to Implement General Rate) File No. WR-2022-0303
Increase for Water and Sewer)
Service Provided in Missouri)
Service Areas)

RONALD D. PRIDGIN, Presiding
REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

SCOTT T. RUPP, Chairman
GLEN KOLKMEYER, Commissioner

Stenographically Reported By:
Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640

1 APPEARANCES:

2 On behalf of Missouri-American Water Company:

3 Brydon, Swearngen & England, PC
4 312 East Capitol Avenue
5 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456

6 BY: DEAN COOPER, ESQ.
7 dcooper@brydonlaw.com

8 and

9 Missouri-American Water
10 737 Craig Road
11 St. Louis, MO 63141

12 BY: RACHEL NIEMEIER, ESQ.
13 rachel.niemeier@amwater.com

14 On behalf of the Staff of the
15 Public Service Commission:

16 Missouri Public Service Commission
17 200 Madison Street
18 Jefferson City, MO 65101

19 BY: KAREN BRETZ, ESQ.
20 Karen.Bretz@psc.mo.gov

21 On behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel:

22 Office of the Public Counsel
23 200 Madison Street, Suite 650
24 PO Box 2230
25 Jefferson City, MO 65102

BY: LINDSAY VanGERPEN
lindsay.vangerpen@opc.mo.gov

On behalf of the City of St. Joseph, Missouri:

William D. Steinmeier, PC
2031 Tower Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65109

BY: WILLIAM D. STEINMEIER
wds@wdspc.com

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 On behalf of Midwest Energy Consumers Group:

3 308 East High Street
4 Jefferson City, MO 65101

5 BY: TIM OPITZ, ESQ.
6 tim.opitz@opitzlawfirm.com

7 On behalf of Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers:

8 Curtis, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe, PC
9 130 South Bemiston, Suite 200
10 St. Louis, MO 63105

11 BY: DIANA M. PLESCIA
12 dplescica@chgolaw.com

13 On behalf of the Public Water Supply District No. 2
14 of Andrew County:

15 Fischer & Dority
16 2081 Honeysuckle Lane
17 Jefferson City, MO 65109

18 BY: JAMES M. FISCHER, ESQ.
19 jfischerpc@aol.com

20 On behalf of City of Riverside, Missouri:

21 Spencer Fane, LLP
22 304 East High Street
23 Jefferson City, MO 65101

24 BY: JOSEPH P. BEDNAR, ESQ.
25 jbednar@spencerfane.com

On behalf of Sunnydale Properties:

Ellinger Bell
308 East High Street, Suite 300
Jefferson City, MO 65101

BY: STEPHANIE S. BELL, ESQ.
sbell@ellingerlaw.com

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 On behalf of Triumph Foods, LLC:

3 Collins & Jones
4 1010 West Foxwood Drive
5 Raymore, MO 64083

6 BY: JOSHUA HARDEN, ESQ.
7 jharden@collinsjones.com

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 The following proceedings began at 1:00 p.m.:

2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Good afternoon. This is the
3 On-the-Record Presentation for Missouri-American's
4 general rate case, File No. WR-2022-0303. I am Ron
5 Pridgin. I'm the Regulatory Law Judge assigned to
6 preside over this presentation that's being held March
7 29th, 2023, in the Governor Office Building in Jefferson
8 City, Missouri. The time is 1:00 p.m.

9 I would like to get entries of appearance from
10 counsel, please, beginning with Missouri-American Water
11 Company.

12 MR. COOPER: Dean Cooper from the law firm of
13 Brydon, Swearingen & England, PC, appearing on behalf of
14 Missouri-American Water Company.

15 MS. NIEMEIER: Rachel Niemeier appearing on
16 behalf of Missouri-American Water Company.

17 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Cooper, Ms. Niemeier,
18 thank you. On behalf of the Staff of the Commission,
19 please.

20 MS. BRETZ: Karen Bretz for Staff of the
21 Commission.

22 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Bretz, thank you. On
23 behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel, please.

24 MS. VanGERPEN: Lindsay VanGerpen on behalf of
25 OPC.

1 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. VanGerpen, thank you.
2 Consumers Council of Missouri contacted me by phone and
3 will not be appearing today. Any entry on behalf of the
4 Empire District Electric Company? Hearing none. Any
5 entry on behalf of the City of St. Joseph, Missouri?

6 MR. STEINMEIER: Thank you, Your Honor.
7 Please let the record reflect the appearance of William
8 D. Steinmeier of William D. Steinmeier, PC on behalf of
9 the City of St. Joseph.

10 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Steinmeier, thank you. On
11 behalf of Midwest Energy Consumers Group.

12 MR. OPITZ: Thank you, Your Honor. Tim Opitz
13 on behalf of MECG.

14 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Opitz, thank you. On
15 behalf of Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers.

16 MS. PLESCIA: Diana Plescia of the law firm of
17 Curtis, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe on behalf of MIEC.

18 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Plescia, thank you. On
19 behalf of Public Water Supply District No. 2 of Andrew
20 County.

21 MR. FISCHER: James M. Fischer, Fischer &
22 Dority, PC, and our address is 2081 Honeysuckle Lane,
23 Jefferson City, Missouri 65109.

24 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fischer, thank you. On
25 behalf of the City of Riverside, Missouri.

1 MR. BEDNAR: Joe Bednar with Spencer Fain,
2 address 304 East High Street, Jefferson City, Missouri.

3 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Bednar, thank you. On
4 behalf of Sunnydale Properties.

5 MS. BELL: Yes, Your Honor. Stephanie Bell of
6 Ellinger Bell, and I have left my information with the
7 court reporter. Thank you.

8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Bell, thank you. On
9 behalf of Triumph Foods, LLC.

10 MR. HARDEN: Yes. This is Joshua Harden on
11 behalf of Triumph Foods, LLC with the law firm of
12 Collins & Jones, 1010 Foxwood Drive, Raymore, Missouri.

13 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Harden, thank you. Have I
14 overlooked anyone?

15 All right. Hearing nothing. My plan is to
16 call counsel up for parties one at a time and see if
17 they have any presentation or comments on the
18 stipulation and then that party would hopefully be ready
19 to answer any bench questions. Even though we have two
20 stipulations, I thought it would be more efficient if
21 parties were able to address both stipulations at once
22 when you come up to the podium unless that causes the
23 bench or counsel any sort of heartache.

24 Hearing nothing else from the parties. Is
25 there anything else before Missouri-American comes and

1 makes its presentation? Hearing nothing. Mr. Cooper or
2 Ms. Niemeier, whenever you're ready. Mr. Cooper, when
3 you're ready, sir.

4 MR. COOPER: Thank you, Judge. We're very
5 happy to take this opportunity to present the
6 stipulation and agreement that was filed on March the
7 3rd of 2023, and the stipulation and agreement as to
8 rate design and class cost of service that was filed on
9 March 10th of 2023. These two stipulations and
10 agreements, if approved and ordered by the Commission,
11 would resolve all issues in this case except for the
12 affiliate transactions issue which was identified as 3a
13 that was presented to the Commission on March 9th of
14 this month.

15 The two stipulations work in conjunction with
16 one another. In other words, in my view anyway there
17 are no conflicting provisions between the two. The
18 stipulation and agreement that was filed on March the
19 3rd, I'll refer to as the revenue requirement
20 stipulation. There are certainly some other things in
21 there, but I think that's the easiest way to refer to
22 it.

23 The signatories to that revenue requirement
24 stipulation are Missouri-American Water Company, the
25 Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission, the

1 Office of the Public Counsel, the Midwest Energy
2 Consumers Group, the City of St. Joseph and the
3 Consumers Council of Missouri. The remaining parties do
4 not and have not objected nor requested a hearing. The
5 stipulation and agreement as to rate design and class
6 cost of service filed on March 10, I'll call the rate
7 design stipulation, and the signatories to that rate
8 design stipulation are Missouri-American, Staff, OPC,
9 MEEG, MIEC, Public Water Supply District No. 2 of Andrew
10 County, Consumers Council of Missouri, City of St.
11 Joseph and the City of Riverside.

12 There are three parties that did not sign, but
13 again those parties have not objected nor requested a
14 hearing. Thus, both of the stipulations and agreement
15 may be by Commission rule treated as unanimous.

16 Administratively I do want to mention that
17 both stipulations, if approved, contemplate the
18 admission of prefiled testimony into the record. And I
19 guess while I'm up here I want to take the opportunity
20 to at least offer the remaining Missouri-American
21 testimony, Judge, which are Exhibits 1 through 12 and
22 Exhibits 16 through 44. Exhibits 13 to 15 were
23 previously admitted in our last appearance before you.

24 JUDGE PRIDGIN: I believe Mr. Cooper has
25 offered Exhibits 1 through 12 and 16 through 44. Any

1 objections? Hearing none. Exhibits 1 through 12 and 16
2 through 44 are admitted into evidence.

3 (MISSOURI-AMERICAN WATER EXHIBITS 1 THROUGH 12
4 AND 16 THROUGH 44 WERE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE AND MADE A
5 PART OF THIS RECORD.)

6 MR. COOPER: So starting with the revenue
7 requirement stipulation, I'm going to kind of go through
8 and give a high level review of the provisions of that
9 stipulation as a starting point. And I think as a
10 factual matter for the Commission and for others I do
11 think from Missouri-American's point of view it's
12 important to note that since the end of the true-up
13 period in Missouri-American's last general rate case,
14 which would have been December 31st of 2020,
15 Missouri-American has made a little over \$700 million in
16 capital investments net of retirements in the state of
17 Missouri. And certainly for the company that was the
18 driving force of this rate case.

19 Now, in the revenue requirement stipulation
20 the parties agree to an overall annual revenue
21 requirement of \$437.5 million, and that splits out
22 between water at approximately 418.3 million and sewer
23 at approximately 19.2 million. That revenue requirement
24 of 437.5 million represents an increase of approximately
25 \$95 million over present rate revenues; and of that \$95

1 million, approximately 50.3 million equals the amount
2 that is currently being collected through the WSIRA
3 mechanism or the Water and Sewer Infrastructure Rate
4 Adjustment.

5 While that's the headline of the revenue
6 requirement stipulation, there are, as I mentioned,
7 several other provisions of importance to various
8 parties in the case. As to the WSIRA, of course, the
9 WSIRA tariff will be reset to zero as of the effective
10 date of new rates resulting from this proceeding and for
11 purposes of the WSIRA the overall pre-tax weighted
12 average cost of capital is agreed to be 8.65 percent.

13 As the billing determinants Attachments A and
14 B to the revenue requirement stipulation establish those
15 for the purposes of creating rates in this case.
16 There's a provision related to the Tax Cut and Jobs Act
17 of 2017, as there are some adjustments that remain
18 necessary to reflect the impacts of that act.

19 One of those items requires that the TCJA
20 tracker balance as of December 31st of 2022 be applied
21 to the remaining stub period TCJA amortization and the
22 remainder returned to customers as a one-time customer
23 bill credit within 90 days after the effective date of
24 rates.

25 The existing TCJA tracker will be continued to

1 capture the differences between protected excess EADIT
2 and returned to customers as a part of the revenue
3 requirement in this case and then -- excuse me -- to
4 track the differences between the excess EADIT and the
5 actual amortization reported by the company on a going
6 forward basis.

7 As to main breaks and water loss reports,
8 Missouri-American's annual review and reporting
9 regarding those items to include water loss by district
10 is going to be continued. Late payment charges are
11 going to be eliminated for both water and sewer
12 customers. They had previously been 1.5 percent per
13 month. There are details concerning the pensions and
14 OPEBs treatment that are found in Attachment C to the
15 revenue requirement stipulation. I describe this as
16 really not representing any methodology changes but
17 merely an update of information and some clarification.

18 Depreciation rates are attached as Attachments
19 D and E. No changes in those rates from the prior case.
20 In terms of property taxes, there's an amount
21 established for purposes of Section 393.1275. That
22 amount is \$34,063,451, and then additionally the parties
23 have agreed that Missouri-American's deferred property
24 tax balance as of December 31st of 2022 would be
25 included in rate base and amortized over 60 months.

1 As to lead service lines, the company
2 continues to replace customer-owned lead service lines.
3 The deferred costs are going to be amortized over ten
4 years, earned carrying costs that the company's
5 long-term debt rate and earn a long-term debt return on
6 the unamortized balance in the revenue requirement
7 calculation. And from the company's perspective, this
8 is the same treatment the Commission approved in the
9 company's last general rate case.

10 Now, beyond that, the company has agreed to
11 file biennially a lead service line report concerning
12 certain specified items in the stipulation and to meet
13 with parties to discuss aspects of this lead service
14 line program going forward.

15 There is a call center operational audit that
16 has been agreed to, and the details of that are found in
17 Attachment F to the stipulation. There is a tank
18 painting tracker which will establish a regulatory asset
19 or liability related to tank painting and inspection
20 expense and a base amount of 1.9 million approximately
21 that's been established in the stipulation related to
22 that tracker.

23 In the company's next rate case, the deferred
24 balance will be amortized over five years with no rate
25 base treatment as to the balance according to the

1 stipulation.

2 There was testimony you probably recall about
3 main extensions and the company's rules in that regard
4 that are found in its tariff. The parties have agreed
5 to tariff changes related to that subject. The changes
6 are going to remove the 120-day time frame, remove the
7 four times annual revenue requirement in all instances
8 and implement a 75/25 sharing mechanism as to total
9 costs state wide.

10 So I guess that's a difference from when you
11 may have last considered those rules is that going
12 forward the main extension will not be different for St.
13 Louis County versus the remainder of the state.

14 There is an assistance to troubled systems.
15 Our system's provision costs related to that are going
16 to be amortized over 60 months, and the company has
17 agreed to participate in both the critical needs program
18 and the rehousing pilot program. The company will
19 provide \$250,000 of annual funding to the critical needs
20 program. It will provide \$100,000 of annual funding to
21 the rehousing pilot program, and that funding by
22 stipulation would be shared 50/50 between the company
23 and its customers.

24 Moving on to the rate design stipulation. The
25 agreed to customer charges, volumetric rates and flat

1 rates for both water and sewer customers are reflected
2 in Attachments A and B to the rate design stipulation.
3 I think a review of those reveals that there's no change
4 to the existing tariff groups or districts. However,
5 from the company's point of view, I point out that meter
6 charges for water are consistent across the state for
7 Rate A, Rate B, Rate J and Private Fire charges
8 regardless of tariff district and that Rate B, which
9 applies to sale for resale customers, is a single tariff
10 state wide rate for both meter charges and volumetric
11 rates.

12 There are two additional provisions found in
13 that rate design stipulation. One as to the cost of
14 service calculations. And the company agrees to file in
15 its next general rate case certain cost of service
16 analysis or analyses and to provide benchmarking as
17 described in the stipulation.

18 And then as to certain community data,
19 Missouri-American agrees to meet with Staff, OPC and any
20 other interested stakeholders at least three times
21 before it files its next general rate case to discuss
22 certain specific, community specific data as it pertains
23 to Rate A customers in both districts.

24 Missouri-American believes that these
25 stipulations and agreements represent just and

1 reasonable resolution to this rate case and requests the
2 Commission issue an order approving these stipulations
3 and agreements and authorizing the company to file
4 tariffs to implement the terms thereof.

5 In addition to Ms. Niemeier who entered her
6 appearance in the case today, I also have with me in the
7 room Mr. Brian LaGrand who is director of rates and
8 regulatory support for Missouri-American and on the
9 WebEx we have Mr. Charles Rea who's the senior director
10 of rates and regulatory. And as always if we're unable
11 to answer any questions today, we certainly will seek to
12 obtain that information and get back to you as quickly
13 as possible. That's all I have, Judge.

14 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Cooper, thank you. Let me
15 see if we have any bench questions. Mr. Chairman?

16 CHAIRMAN RUPP: No questions for the counsel,
17 but I will have some questions for your Witness Rea.
18 But if you want to proceed with the rest of the other
19 counsel is totally fine. A lot of the questions will be
20 similar concept for all. Do you want me to ask them
21 now, Judge?

22 JUDGE PRIDGIN: If you'd like. It's certainly
23 up to you, Mr. Chairman, if you'd like. Or if you'd
24 prefer to hear from counsel and ask questions later.

25 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Let's hear from counsel.

1 Questions are going to be kind of specific to one topic.

2 MR. COOPER: Sounds good. Thank you,
3 Chairman.

4 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Cooper, thank you. Any
5 presentation on behalf of Staff? Ms. Bretz, when you're
6 ready.

7 MS. BRETZ: Thank you. I would also ask for
8 Staff's exhibits to be entered into the record. I
9 apologize I don't have the numbers but everything that
10 hasn't been entered so far and I believe we filed a list
11 too.

12 JUDGE PRIDGIN: You did. Does counsel want me
13 to go through and get numbers? I can do that for you if
14 you'd like or I can simply just -- I can simply show
15 later that Staff has offered the exhibits and they've
16 been admitted without objection. First let me ask does
17 anybody have any objection to Staff offering its
18 exhibits? Hearing none. Staff's exhibits are admitted
19 into evidence. Ms. Bretz, when you're ready.

20 MS. BRETZ: I'm not going to repeat anything
21 that Mr. Cooper has already stated, but I would like to
22 add that Staff believes that the two stipulations, the
23 one entered -- the one filed on March 3rd and then the
24 one filed on March 10th we believe are a reasonable
25 resolution of this case and provides just and reasonable

1 rates to Missouri-American customers. Therefore, Staff
2 requests that the Commission issue an order approving
3 these stipulations and order Missouri-American to file
4 new tariff sheets reflecting the parties' agreements,
5 and many Staff members are available for further
6 questions either here physically in the room or on the
7 telephone. Thank you.

8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Bretz, thank you. Any
9 bench questions for now?

10 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Just one. The elimination of
11 the late fee --

12 MS. BRETZ: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN RUPP: -- was that proposed by Staff?

14 MS. BRETZ: I believe that was primarily
15 driven by OPC.

16 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Okay. And then is there any
17 Staff witnesses here today?

18 MS. BRETZ: Yes, I believe that most of our
19 witnesses are available today either present in the
20 hearing room or on the phone.

21 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Cool. Thank you. That's all
22 I have.

23 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner Kolkmeyer, any
24 questions? Hearing none.

25 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Sorry, I couldn't get

1 off mute. No, no, Judge, not at this time.

2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you, Commissioner, and
3 Ms. Bretz. Thank you very much.

4 MS. BRETZ: Thank you.

5 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Anything from Office of the
6 Public Counsel? Ms. VanGerpen.

7 MS. VanGERPEN: Just very briefly, Your Honor.
8 I would also ask that OPC's remaining exhibits be
9 entered into the record, and I believe that's Exhibits
10 202 to 219, I believe.

11 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. VanGerpen, thank you.
12 Exhibits 202 through 219 have been offered. Any
13 objections? Hearing none. Exhibits 202 through 219 are
14 admitted into evidence.

15 (OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL EXHIBITS 202 THROUGH
16 219 WERE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS
17 RECORD.)

18 MS. VanGERPEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Again,
19 as Ms. Bretz said, I'm not going to repeat anything that
20 Mr. Cooper said, but OPC is a signatory to both the
21 March 3rd and March 10th stipulations, and we agree with
22 those and would ask the Commission to approve both of
23 them.

24 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Any questions for
25 Public Counsel? Hearing none. Ms. VanGerpen, thank

1 you.

2 MS. VanGERPEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

3 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Consumers Council of Missouri
4 is not present today. Any presentation from the Empire
5 District Electric Company? Anything from the City of
6 St. Joseph, Missouri?

7 MR. STEINMEIER: No, thank you, Your Honor.

8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Anything from
9 Midwest Energy Consumers Group? Mr. Opitz, when you're
10 ready.

11 MR. OPITZ: Good afternoon and may it please
12 the Commission. Tim Opitz on behalf of MECG. MECG was
13 a signatory to the two stipulations. I want to
14 reiterate what the counsel before me have said that I
15 believe these are reasonable resolution of the issues in
16 this case for all customers between the districts and
17 among the different classes.

18 And then second, I want to take the
19 opportunity to note for the Commission my appreciation
20 of its Staff and, of course, the Office of the Public
21 Counsel and the other parties. Particularly when it
22 comes to settlement, you might not always see it but
23 there's a lot of work that goes on, weekends, late
24 nights, early hours, and I'm appreciative of the efforts
25 of our state employees. With that, I want to note my

1 appreciation so the Commission is aware of it and I want
2 to ask that you approve these stipulations and
3 agreement.

4 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Opitz, thank you. Any
5 questions for Mr. Opitz?

6 CHAIRMAN RUPP: What office is he running for?

7 MR. OPITZ: I'll run away from any election.
8 Thank you.

9 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Opitz, thank you. Before
10 I forget, I do have Staff's Exhibit List. I may
11 inadvertently go through an exhibit more than once, but
12 I show Staff's exhibits as Nos. 100 through 140. Does
13 anyone have any objection to those exhibits being
14 admitted into evidence? Hearing none. Exhibits 100
15 through 140 are admitted into evidence.

16 (STAFF'S EXHIBITS 100 THROUGH 140 WERE
17 RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.)

18 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any presentation from MIEC?
19 Ms. Plescia, when you're ready.

20 MS. PLESCIA: Thank you. May it please the
21 Commission. I'm just here to say that the MIEC also is
22 very appreciative of the efforts of the parties. We are
23 signatories to the rate design stipulation and a lot of
24 hard work went into it. And I think a lot of progress
25 was made especially in terms of setting the stage for

1 future data in future rate cases. And we have our
2 witness Jessica York with us today from Brubaker &
3 Associates. Her testimony is Exhibits 350, 351 and 352,
4 and she is here today and available for questions.
5 That's all I have.

6 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right, Ms. Plescia. Thank
7 you. Were you offering those into evidence?

8 MS. PLESCIA: I'm sorry. I'd like to offer
9 those into evidence.

10 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Any objections?
11 Exhibits 350, 351 and 352 are admitted.

12 (MIEC'S EXHIBITS 350, 351 AND 352 WERE
13 RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.)

14 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any questions for MIEC?

15 CHAIRMAN RUPP: No.

16 MS. PLESCIA: Thank you.

17 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Plescia, thank you.

18 JUDGE PRIDGIN: On behalf of Public Water
19 Supply District No. 2, Andrew County? Mr. Fischer, when
20 you're ready, sir.

21 MR. FISCHER: Just briefly, Judge. For the
22 Commission, the Public Water Supply District No. 2 of
23 Andrew County is a not-for-profit water district that is
24 outside the City of St. Joseph and it takes all of its
25 water, 12 million gallons I think a month, from

1 Missouri-American. We did support the rate design
2 stipulation. We are served by Rate B which is a single
3 tariff across the state, and we would encourage the
4 Commission to adopt the rate design stipulation as a
5 reasonable compromise among all the parties. We didn't
6 have any testimony. So I don't have anything to offer.
7 I would answer any questions that you might have.

8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fischer, thank you. Any
9 questions? Mr. Fischer, thank you.

10 On behalf of the City of Riverside, Missouri?
11 Mr. Bednar, when you're ready, sir.

12 MR. BEDNAR: I don't have anything to add to
13 the other counsel other than I too am appreciative to
14 all the work of the Staff and the Company, their
15 witnesses. The City of Riverside obviously relies on
16 that, but the efforts to reach a compromise are
17 appreciated. We look forward to continued discussion to
18 move towards a better determination of true residential
19 ratepayers. With that in mind, I have nothing else to
20 say, and I am not running for office either. Thank you.
21 At least no current plans.

22 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Bednar, thank you.
23 Anything from Sunnydale Properties?

24 MS. BELL: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

25 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Bell, thank you. Triumph

1 Foods?

2 MR. HARDEN: Thank you, Your Honor. Joshua
3 Harden on behalf of Triumph Foods. Nothing really to
4 add here. Triumph Foods is just real quickly one of the
5 largest industrial consumers of water for
6 Missouri-American Water in the state. It is under a
7 special water contract with Mo-Am. We do not object to
8 any of the settlement agreements in this case. And with
9 that, we have filed some testimony by Brian Collins on
10 behalf of Triumph, Exhibit 750, Exhibit 751 and Exhibit
11 752 I'd like to offer into evidence.

12 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Harden, thank you. Any
13 objections? Exhibits 750, 751, 752 are admitted into
14 evidence.

15 (TRIUMPH FOODS' EXHIBITS 750, 751 AND 752 WERE
16 RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE AND MADE A PART OF THIS RECORD.)

17 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Harden, anything further?

18 MR. HARDEN: No. Thank you very much.

19 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Any questions for
20 Triumph Foods? All right. Hearing none. Thank you.

21 Let me go back and see if we have any bench
22 questions on the presentations or the stipulations.
23 Mr. Chairman?

24 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Yeah, Judge. Thank you for
25 the opportunity. Where to begin. Is MIEC's Witness

1 York available? Could I ask some questions.

2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Absolutely.

3 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Great.

4 MS. PLESCIA: Yes. Would you like for Ms.
5 York to sit closer to a microphone?

6 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Yeah, come on up to the
7 microphone so we can hear your answers.

8 MS. PLESCIA: Sure.

9 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. York, let me ask you to
10 raise your right hand to be sworn, please. Do you swear
11 the evidence you're about to give will be the truth, the
12 whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?

13 THE WITNESS: I do.

14 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, when
15 you're ready.

16 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Great. Thank you.

17 JESSICA YORK,

18 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

19 QUESTIONS

20 BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

21 Q. I appreciate you taking the time to be here
22 today. It's probably a little unorthodox on a
23 stipulation on the record, but your counsel made a
24 comment that the data and the stuff that was in here is
25 going to set the stage for a future rate case. I kind

1 of want to follow up on that. Specifically your
2 testimony regarding the Staff's recommendation to get
3 rid of the inclining block rate for Mexico, Missouri. I
4 believe you had testimony that St. Louis County
5 customers have significantly higher water usage than the
6 rest of the state. And what factors did you discover,
7 like why is there higher significant water usage rate in
8 that area?

9 A. In St. Louis County, I believe I was just
10 looking at the average use per customer compared to
11 outside St. Louis County.

12 Q. Okay. Do you believe that one of the
13 contributing factors could be the higher like household
14 income in St. Louis County relative to the rest of the
15 states for higher water usage?

16 A. Not necessarily. I mean, I haven't looked
17 into the factors that would drive that specifically.
18 But if there's more residential customers, for example,
19 that happen to have irrigation systems or something than
20 there are outside the county, for instance, then that
21 could be a factor that's contributing to higher use per
22 customer in St. Louis County.

23 Q. Okay. So if the Commission were to order an
24 inclining block rate for St. Louis County or another
25 service area that met any criteria, what would MIEC's

1 position be on that?

2 A. I would not recommend an inclining block rate
3 for Missouri-American's service territory, at least not
4 in St. Louis County. That kind of rate structure I
5 think would be more suited towards a water system that's
6 facing some kind of capacity constraint either with
7 supply or infrastructure. I'm not aware of that being
8 an issue for Missouri-American, at least not in St.
9 Louis County.

10 Q. You would only look at it if there was a
11 supply or an infrastructure issue?

12 A. Right. I mean, if you are going to do that
13 kind of rate structure, you know, it would need to be
14 specifically designed for each individual customer
15 class. Usually that would be geared towards residential
16 or small commercial users and have more seasonal use
17 rather than large volume users that had more stable
18 usage patterns. And I mean, if you're going to do that,
19 you really need to understand the demand patterns of the
20 various customer classes and the price elasticity of
21 demand. If you're recovering a greater proportion of
22 your revenue requirement through a higher priced usage
23 block and it motivates customers to curtail usage out of
24 that block, then you might be in a position where you've
25 got more revenue volatility for the utility and they're

1 not, you know, recovering enough of their fixed costs
2 which then could maybe end up causing rates need to be
3 reset at a higher level for the lower volume blocks too
4 which might be harmful for, you know, low income or even
5 fixed income customers.

6 CHAIRMAN RUPP: All right. So you answered
7 the question that I had. Thank you.

8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. York, thank you. Any
9 further questions? First, Commissioner Kolkmeyer, any
10 questions for MIEC?

11 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: No, Judge. Thank
12 you.

13 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner, thank you.
14 Any further questions, Mr. Chairman?

15 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Yeah. Is the Company's
16 Witness Rea was on the phone?

17 MR. COOPER: He is on the WebEx.

18 THE WITNESS: Yes, I am on WebEx. Hopefully
19 you can hear me and see me.

20 CHAIRMAN RUPP: I can. Wonderful. Thank you
21 for joining us today.

22 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Rea, could I ask you to
23 raise your right hand to be sworn, please? Do you swear
24 the evidence you're about to give will be the truth,
25 whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God?

1 THE WITNESS: I do.

2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman,
3 when you're ready.

4 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Sure.

5 CHARLES REA,
6 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

7 QUESTIONS

8 BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

9 Q. Thanks again for taking time out of your day
10 to answer some of these questions. So regarding your
11 direct testimony regarding the discontinuing of the
12 inclining block rate pilot program, one of the things
13 you noted was that Mexico's service area has low
14 seasonal variability of water usage and it's one of the
15 most economically depressed part of the company's
16 territory. The company's affordability analysis found
17 that parts of St. Louis County has household incomes
18 more than three times that of Mexico; is that correct?

19 A. That's correct, yes.

20 Q. So Staff states that its rationale for
21 recommending ending the inclining block rate pilot is
22 that Mexico did not have a water shortage or supply
23 issues and does not have significant costs to meet peak
24 day demands. Is the Company aware of any service areas
25 in its territory that are having water shortages, supply

1 issues or that incur significant cost to meet demand
2 days?

3 A. I don't think the Company is aware of any
4 situations like that except perhaps in and around the
5 City of Joplin, and I am not an expert specifically on
6 that issue but I believe that the Company has some
7 concerns around supply issues in Joplin. Other than
8 that, I'm not aware of any part of the service territory
9 where there are such concerns.

10 Q. Is that specifically with the Joplin reservoir
11 issue?

12 A. I believe that's the case, although in all
13 honesty there are Missouri-American witnesses that are
14 better prepared to discuss this than I am.

15 Q. Okay. Great. So Witness York in her
16 testimony said that St. Louis County customers had
17 significantly higher water usage to customers across the
18 rest of the state. I think somewhat up to 50 percent
19 higher usage. Do you agree with that testimony?

20 A. I agree that residential customers in the St.
21 Louis County territory have somewhat higher usage than
22 customers outside of St. Louis County. For industrial
23 customers, I think that may also be true, but that is
24 due to the nature of -- that can be very specific to the
25 nature of the customers we're talking about. For

1 residential, yes, I would generally agree. I don't know
2 if it's 50 percent higher, but it is higher.

3 Q. Okay. Do you believe that one of the
4 contributing factors could be the higher household
5 incomes in St. Louis County relative to the rest of the
6 Company's territory as you described in your testimony?

7 A. I do actually. We have seen in Missouri and
8 in our Missouri service territory and in other areas
9 that American Water serves that there is a correlation,
10 a positive correlation between household income and
11 seasonal discretionary use of water meaning that
12 generally speaking as household income increases those
13 homes and families and customers are more likely to use
14 water in the summertime for things like lawn irrigation,
15 swimming pools, things like that than customers with
16 lower household incomes. It does not surprise me at all
17 that usage would be higher in St. Louis County than
18 outside of St. Louis County, and it doesn't -- and I
19 would certainly point to kind of the economics of the
20 different service territories and THE demographics of
21 the customers in the service territories as one reason
22 why that would be the case.

23 Q. Okay. So in your opinion, could a basic
24 inclining block rate design that was used for Mexico's
25 service area, could that be used for St. Louis County or

1 any other service area that met Staff's identified
2 criteria?

3 A. Potentially it could, but there are a lot of
4 drawbacks to that too. And I think Ms. York touched on
5 some of those. I would say two things. First of all,
6 not every place in St. Louis County has the kind of
7 demographics that we're talking about. There are
8 certainly areas in St. Louis County where household
9 incomes are not very high. And so it's not as if
10 everybody in St. Louis County is the same. And then the
11 other thing I would point out, in addition to what Ms.
12 York talked about, you certainly could end up in
13 situations where you're charging higher rates to say
14 customers that are in multi-family buildings that are
15 all master metered where the usage looks high but
16 there's really not any seasonal use of water and
17 household income of the people in those facilities may
18 not be very high at all. So there certainly can be --
19 In addition to what Ms. York talked about, there
20 certainly can be some unintended consequences if you
21 decide to just apply an inclining block rate structure
22 to a relatively large service territory without really
23 understanding the demographics of the customers you're
24 talking about.

25 CHAIRMAN RUPP: I think you've answered all

1 the questions that I had.

2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

3 Commissioner Kolkmeier, any questions for this witness?

4 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: No, thank you, Judge.

5 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner, thank you.

6 Mr. Rea, thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, any further
7 questions?

8 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Staff Witness Roth I think is
9 the one that probably would answer.

10 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Roth, if you'll please
11 raise your right hand to be sworn.

12 Do you swear that the evidence you're about to
13 give will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but
14 the truth so help you God.

15 THE WITNESS: I do.

16 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, when
17 you're ready.

18 KERI ROTH,
19 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

20 QUESTIONS

21 BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

22 Q. Do you have any idea what I'm going to ask you
23 about?

24 A. I have a guess.

25 Q. So similar questions I've asked. So does

1 Staff agree that -- So what are all Staff's reasons for
2 getting rid of the inclining block rate in Mexico
3 besides the economically depressed parts of the
4 territory?

5 A. So my understanding based on the usage data
6 that we were given, it really didn't play any effect.
7 It increased a little bit, but it was very steady. It
8 never did decrease.

9 Q. Do you believe that's because of the
10 demographics of where the pilot was done with versus,
11 you know, pilot program in a different service territory
12 that had different economic factors?

13 A. I don't know that I have a good answer for you
14 on that, because this was my first time really looking
15 at inclining block rate and pilot program. So I don't
16 have a lot of background knowledge on how it would
17 affect other areas based on demographics and stuff.

18 Q. So do you think a service area that had higher
19 household incomes would be a better candidate for an IBR
20 than Mexico?

21 A. I would probably mimic more what the other two
22 witnesses have already talked about just from my
23 understanding of everything, but I would also have to go
24 back and talk to other staff members.

25 Q. So does Staff believe that households that

1 have higher income use more or less water than
2 households that have lower income?

3 A. I would say higher.

4 Q. So in Staff's opinion, could a basic IBR rate
5 design plan that was used in Mexico be tailored to be
6 used in St. Louis County or any other service area that
7 met Staff's identified criteria?

8 A. From the little discussion that I've had with
9 other staff members, I don't think it would be
10 recommended for St. Louis County. Beyond that, I can't
11 say any more.

12 Q. And St. Louis County is on a separate rate
13 than the rest of the state?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. So if Staff had to choose between an
16 IBR putting a one statewide rate for everybody, where
17 would Staff come down?

18 A. I would have to go back and talk to other
19 staff members before I could answer that. I'm sorry.

20 CHAIRMAN RUPP: That's all right. I didn't
21 think I'd get an answer. All right. Cool. That's all
22 I have. Thank you very much.

23 THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

24 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
25 Commissioner Kolkmeyer, any questions?

1 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: No, thank you, Judge.

2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you, Commissioner. Mr.
3 Chairman, further questions?

4 CHAIRMAN RUPP: I don't want to leave OPC out
5 of the fun.

6 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Dr. Marke, do you want to come
7 forward and be sworn, please, sir. If you'll raise your
8 right hand to be sworn. Do you swear the evidence
9 you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth
10 and nothing but the truth so help you God?

11 THE WITNESS: I do.

12 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman,
13 when you're ready.

14 DR. GEOFF MARKE,
15 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

16 QUESTIONS

17 BY CHAIRMAN RUPP:

18 Q. Similar line of questioning. Could an IBR be
19 designed in St. Louis County that targeted more affluent
20 areas that had much more seasonal? Just talk to me your
21 thoughts on an IBR could potentially reduce usage, sends
22 a price signal and things of that nature but yes, it
23 could hurt the multi-family people and things of that
24 nature. From the Office of the Public Counsel's
25 position that represents the ratepayers, where do you

1 guys fall and what would you think the pros and the cons
2 of looking at IBRs outside of a different location other
3 than Mexico to get different data or apply it to St.
4 Louis County?

5 A. Okay. So I'm going to approach this as a
6 two-armed economist. On the one hand, the other hand,
7 right. So on the one hand I would say, yeah, I mean, we
8 can design anything, right. It comes down to what's the
9 policy objective that we want to accomplish with the
10 rate or the price signals that we're sending. So I've
11 been pretty vocal in past American Water cases that I
12 believe I'm in favor of district specific pricing and
13 zonal pricing is probably a better proxy for the give
14 and take of data and trying to simplify things. But in
15 the future where you wanted to send more distinct price
16 signals for a given district or zone that was facing
17 large capital investments or had a large number of
18 people move into that area or that was facing a drought,
19 all of that makes sense. You'd want to apply that sort
20 of price signal in that situation but not necessarily to
21 somebody that's not experiencing that.

22 Now, the Commission has been moving away
23 towards that, more towards single tariff pricing. Now
24 we're at two zones. If you look at the utilities that
25 largely have an IBR in place, they're largely municipal

1 utilities. They're largely out west.

2 So we can draw two conclusions from that.

3 One, a lot of that is situationally driven due to
4 weather, climate, drought conditions, and the other one
5 is the municipal nature of it which is it's very local,
6 right. Those taxpayers, ratepayers both, all of that is
7 tied within that given water source and that
8 infrastructure. Again, that's very different than what
9 we're facing here in any of our zones. Even when we
10 talk about St. Louis, St. Louis is a very big zone.
11 Perhaps the mean average is higher than the other zone
12 but within that distribution you're going to have
13 customers that are all over the place, right, customers
14 that have pools and irrigation systems and whatnot and
15 those that don't. Then you might have outliers like a
16 mass metered apartment, situation like that.

17 There is the concern -- The other issue with a
18 municipal system -- I think revenue sufficiency is a
19 factor for municipal systems too, but it's obviously a
20 different factor for an investor-owned utility. So I
21 can understand the utility's apprehension with moving
22 forward to an IBR.

23 All of this then is conditioned on the fact
24 that we're going to actually send these price signals on
25 a consistent basis to customers, right, that they'll

1 know hey, the more you use the more you pay. There's a
2 whole branding message that's necessary with that.
3 There are a number of places that have moved to stuff
4 like water budgets. The idea that -- And this is where
5 you've got really, really finite data in a given area
6 where you can look at a household and say well, the
7 average household of X number of people would consume
8 this much water on average and then anything above that
9 they're getting charged in excess of. That could help
10 with the revenue sufficiency.

11 The other thing I'd point out with St. Louis
12 is when we talk about Rate A or in particular you're
13 saying residential but you're also throwing in
14 commercial customers in there too. I've actually kind
15 of -- I don't know the answer to this, but my first
16 reaction to this would be like car washes and stuff like
17 that. I would imagine they'd use a larger pipe to use
18 the water. If not, I mean, somebody like that would
19 definitely be hurt by an inclining block rate. So
20 again, the message that I guess I would put on is we can
21 design anything. You can move it forward with that. An
22 inclining block rate would help out lower income
23 customers that use less on average. That was at least
24 the impetus behind sticking it in Mexico. The
25 differentials were very small. That's why you really

1 didn't see much of an action one way or the other.

2 I think there is absolutely value in inclining
3 block rate if you face a drought like situation bar
4 none. We see that take place out west. You see that in
5 California.

6 I agree or, you know, clearly, you know,
7 Joplin has been a source of, you know, much discussion
8 over the last few years, but generally when I'm at, you
9 know, the -- conferences or NARUC conferences and we
10 talk about water situations in Missouri, I always
11 counter with we're in the exact opposite situation.
12 We've got flood problems. We have a lot of excess
13 water. It doesn't make a whole lot of policy sense for
14 our office to push forward with an IBR today given those
15 constraints.

16 Q. So let's just have a policy discussion here
17 because we've been pushing for -- some of us have been
18 pushing for a state wide one rate. I think the impetus
19 behind that I think was they're so many troubled water
20 systems out there that this would provide an easier
21 avenue for an organization to buy these smaller systems
22 and fix them which they would never get fixed on
23 themselves. That was kind of the policy driving I think
24 that they got us to where we are today. But every time
25 we go a step down that road we get farther away from

1 some type of localized price signal. And so how do you
2 address those basically competing bookends from a policy
3 standpoint of yeah, so we're going to have people that
4 are using more and things of that nature and we've gone
5 to this larger rate system across various large
6 geographic areas with various different rate cases, but
7 at what point does that no longer become a good public
8 policy, you know, continuing if there's not the impetus
9 to hey, there's a lot of troubled systems out there and
10 this will make it easier and this will make it easier
11 and then is an inclining block rate the antithesis of
12 that. So just talk to me.

13 A. My own personal preference again was for zonal
14 pricing. That position came over like about over four
15 different cases. In full, you know, disclosure, the
16 position that -- the person that had my job before me
17 was all for single tariff. We agree to disagree on
18 things. Even within our own office we've had
19 discussions on whether it makes -- It's a give and take.
20 The give that you get out of single tariff pricing is
21 simplicity. It makes it easier for class cost of
22 service studies. It makes it easier to generalize, you
23 know, and come up with an allocator that you can put
24 across districts. And like you said, it's easier in
25 theory to acquire systems, right. You can throw the

1 money back in and it's generalized across the
2 population. The disadvantage to that is it mutes price
3 signals, it mutes the actual cost causation factor,
4 right.

5 My testimony went in at length that there is
6 no connection to the water we're drinking in this
7 building and the water treatment plant in St. Louis
8 County. It's a different water source. And I think
9 something is not just lost in the price signal but in
10 how -- I mean, the reality is, you know, it does cost
11 different to live in different places, it just does.
12 You know, I always joke on a policy level that if we
13 could get the rural customers to foot the bill for lead
14 lines in the inner cities and inner city customers to
15 foot the bill for, you know, internet service, we'd have
16 a happy medium. But it does cost different and the idea
17 behind rate of return regulation, you know. One of the
18 principles really is that cost causation to get that. I
19 think zonal pricing gets you to that happy medium, but
20 even then it's imperfect, right. I can say this with
21 confidence right now, we aren't facing a drought issue.

22 You do raise -- Like there's a question of how
23 big do you want these differentials, like how much
24 conserved water is enough. Is it just for the sake of
25 conserving. We can sit here and say there's probably

1 cost savings associated with chemicals and maybe if
2 we're deferring a future plant treatment. Again, I
3 don't think that's an issue right now for any of our
4 districts or at least not in St. Louis County. So could
5 the situation absolutely arise? Definitely. And it's
6 something worth having in the back of your pocket. But
7 if, you know, my advice if you're interested in going
8 down this route or for future commissioners to consider
9 this issue, there is, you know, there's built impact
10 analysis that we can, you know, conduct. American
11 Water, and I'm not going to speak for Mr. Rea. He's
12 clearly the expert and has the information there, but
13 the company has come a long way in collecting data and
14 being able to, you know, process it. And that's one of
15 the things -- that's one of the conditions within the
16 stipulation is actually looking at I think Mr. Bednar --
17 well, the true residential rate, to look at that.

18 There are definitely things that we can do to
19 look at it but probably direction would be --

20 Q. That's kind of why I wanted to have this
21 conversation was because I have a concern that we're
22 getting rid of the Mexico pilot program and it will
23 easily be spun that IBRs don't work because if I didn't
24 like them, that's the first thing I'd point to is well,
25 they tried one back here and it didn't work. And I

1 agree with you that American Water has come a long way
2 with their data and so, you know, they're having the
3 ability to get more granular data and things with
4 technology that is there. That was a concern of setting
5 up for future rate cases that if the public policy
6 driver for how we got to where we are today is no longer
7 relevant that don't want the public policy to be that
8 IBRs don't work and there isn't a case for them
9 especially now that the company can have much better
10 data and we can do a little bit more diving into
11 different areas. So that's really kind of what I wanted
12 us to flush out here because there wasn't --

13 A. I will say I did an IBR presentation to the
14 Commission about a decade ago on the electric side and
15 there wasn't much information on water at that time but
16 there has been since. I mean, like that's one way of
17 looking at this. The dialogue over this issue I think
18 is really going to play out in western states. You're
19 going to see more of a localized impact if there are
20 huge fluctuations. I was in Arizona last year. That
21 place is just expanding exponentially. I don't know
22 where they're going to get the water from if it's not
23 replenished. So I think you will see that play out.
24 That will be part at least in the background if that's
25 any consolation.

1 Q. I wasn't trying to win or lose on an argument.
2 I wanted to have that conversation because that was
3 something with the stipulation --

4 A. I think it's a legitimate fear though, right,
5 because, you know, you could look back and say we tried
6 this and we failed, right.

7 Q. With stipulations they're great. We love
8 stipulations when everyone can get into the room. At
9 times it does take away an opportunity for us to flush
10 out some policy discussions and get things talked about
11 and didn't want that opportunity to go by here because I
12 don't think I'll be here for the next rate case. Of
13 course, I've been saying that for four years. Yeah,
14 that was just as easily -- I mean, we could have a
15 single rate for the whole state next go-around.

16 A. Right.

17 Q. Or maybe stay there for a while, maybe reverse
18 course after a while. I don't know how it plays out.
19 Just didn't want it to be on the record that IBRs don't
20 work in Missouri, because I think they still should
21 definitely be part of the conversation even in the
22 situation we're in with just two rates for the state.

23 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you.
24 Commissioner Kolkmeyer, any questions for Public
25 Counsel?

1 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Not for Public
2 Counsel other than a comment to the Chairman.
3 Mr. Chairman, you've had some very good discussion here.
4 So thank you for bringing up the conversation. Thank
5 you, Judge.

6 CHAIRMAN RUPP: No problem.

7 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Dr. Marke, thank
8 you. Mr. Chairman, any further questions?

9 CHAIRMAN RUPP: Does anybody else want to
10 weigh in on the IBR discussion? All don't jump at once.

11 MR. BEDNAR: I would, Your Honor, just real
12 quick. Joe Bednar from the City of Riverside. I want
13 to echo what Dr. Marke said. I left out OPC and Dr.
14 Marke earlier in my thanks for the participation. I
15 think the discussion even in the settlement discussions
16 about these issues were important and represented real
17 dialogue that you're looking for, but I think the key
18 that he touched upon real residential usage when you
19 look at Rate A and the number of different users within
20 that I think that's kind of the first step to get to the
21 next step. Otherwise, it can be kind of a blind
22 throwing darts at a dart board hoping for the result. I
23 think identifying the true residential ratepayer, the
24 low income user, the fixed income user and looking at
25 those respects and see what it really is could be

1 helpful in identifying and protecting everybody so that
2 they have just and reasonable rates. That's all I have
3 to add. I appreciate the discussion.

4 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Bednar, thank you.
5 Mr. Chairman, any further questions?

6 CHAIRMAN RUPP: I just want to thank
7 everyone's indulgences today. I appreciate it.

8 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. Commissioner
9 Kolkmeyer, any further questions or comments?

10 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: No. Thank you,
11 Judge.

12 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner, thank you.
13 Anything further from counsel or from the bench before
14 we conclude? All right. Hearing nothing, that will
15 conclude the on-the-record presentation in File No.
16 WR-2022-0303. Thank you very much. We are off the
17 record.

18 (Thereupon, the hearing concluded at 2:00
19 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

I N D E X

1		
2		Page
3	Entries of Appearance	93
4	Presentations by:	
5	Mr. Cooper	96
6	Ms. Bretz	105
7	Ms. VanGerpen	107
8	Mr. Opitz	108
9	Ms. Plescia	109
10	Mr. Fischer	110
11	Mr. Bednar	111
12	Mr. Harden	112
13	MIEC's Witness:	
14	JESSICA YORK	
15	Questions by Chairman Rupp	113
16	Company's Witness:	
17	CHARLES REA	
18	Questions by Chairman Rupp	117
19	Staff Witness:	
20	KERI ROTH	
21	Questions by Chairman Rupp	121
22	OPC's Witness:	
23	DR. GEOFF MARKE	
24	Questions by Chairman Rupp	124
25	Comment by Mr. Bednar	134
	Certificate of Reporter	142

E X H I B I T I N D E X

1			
2			Received
3	Missouri-American's Exhibits:		
4	1 Direct Testimony of Patrick L. Baryenbruch		98
5	2 Rebuttal Testimony of Patrick L. Baryenbruch		98
6	3 Direct Testimony of Ann E. Bulkley (Public and Confidential)		98
7	4 Rebuttal Testimony of Ann E. Bulkley (Public, Confidential and Highly Confidential)		98
8	5 Surrebuttal Testimony of Ann E. Bulkley		98
9	6 Surrebuttal Testimony of Melissa Ciullo		98
10	7 Direct Testimony of Jennifer M. Grisham		98
11	8 Rebuttal Testimony of Jennifer M. Grisham		98
12	9 Surrebuttal Testimony of Jennifer M. Grisham		98
13	10 Direct Testimony of Jeffrey T. Kaiser		98
14	11 Requirement Rebuttal Testimony of Jeffrey T. Kaiser (Public and Confidential)		98
15	12 Surrebuttal Testimony of Jeffrey T. Kaiser		98
16	16 Rebuttal Testimony of Derek Linam		98
17	17 Direct Testimony of Rebecca B. Losli (Public and Confidential)		98
18	18 Rebuttal Testimony of Matthew A. Lueders		98
19	19 Direct Testimony of Matthew S. Mason		98
20	20 Rebuttal Testimony of Matthew S. Mason		98
21	21 Surrebuttal Testimony of Matthew S. Mason		98
22	22 Direct Testimony of James S. Merante (Public and Confidential)		98
23	23 Direct Testimony of Robert V. Mustich (Public and Confidential)		98
24	24 Direct Testimony of Thomas O'Drain		98
25	25 Direct Testimony of Charles B. Rea		98
26	26 Rebuttal Testimony of Charles B. Rea (Revenue Requirement)		98
27	27 Rebuttal Testimony of Charles B. Rea (Rate Design)		98
28	28 Surrebuttal Testimony of Charles B. Rea		98
29	29 Surrebuttal Testimony of Nicholas Santillo Jr. (Public and Confidential)		98
30	30 Direct Testimony of Michael L. Schwarzell		98

E X H I B I T I N D E X
(Continued)

		Received
3	Missouri-American's Exhibits:	
4	31 Rebuttal Testimony of Michael L. Schwarzell (Public and Confidential)	98
5	32 Direct Testimony of Wesley E. Selinger	98
6	33 Rebuttal Testimony of Wesley E. Selinger (Revenue Requirement)	98
7	34 Rebuttal Testimony of Wesley E. Selinger (CCOS)	98
8	35 Surrebuttal Testimony of Wesley E. Selinger	98
9	36 Rebuttal Testimony of J. Cas Swiz (Public and Confidential)	98
10	37 Surrebuttal Testimony of J. Cas Swiz	98
11	38 Direct Testimony of Richard C. Svindland	98
12	39 Direct Testimony of Harold Walker, III	98
13	40 Surrebuttal Testimony of Harold Walker, III	98
14	41 Rebuttal Testimony of Takisha D. Walker	98
15	42 Direct Testimony of John M. Watkins	98
16	43 Rebuttal Testimony of John M. Watkins	98
17	44 Surrebuttal Testimony of John M. Watkins (Public and Confidential)	98
18	Staff's Exhibits:	
19	100 Direct Testimony of Kimberly K. Bolin (Cost of Service)	109
20	101 Direct Testimony of Alexis L. Branson (Cost of Service)	109
21	102 Direct Testimony of Amanda Coffey (Cost of Service)	109
22	103 Direct Testimony of Keith D. Foster (Cost of Service)	109
23	104 Direct Testimony of Andrew Harris (Cost of Service)	109
24	105 Direct Testimony of Courtney Horton (Public and Confidential) (Cost of Service)	109
25	106 Direct Testimony of Randall T. Jennings (Public and Confidential) (Cost of Service)	109
26	107 Direct Testimony of Sherrye Lesmes (Cost of Service)	109
27	108 Direct Testimony of Amanda C. McMellen (Cost of Service)	109

E X H I B I T I N D E X
(Continued)

		Received
1	E X H I B I T I N D E X	
2	(Continued)	
3	Staff's Exhibits:	
4	109 Direct Testimony of Angela Niemeier	
5	(Public and Confidential) (Cost of	
	Service)	109
6	110 Direct Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson	
	(Cost of Service)	109
7	111 Direct Testimony of Ashley Sarver	
	(Cost of Service)	109
8	112 Direct Testimony of Charles Tyrone	
	Thomason (Cost of Service)	109
9	113 Staff Accounting Schedules	
	(Public and Confidential)	109
10	114 Direct Testimony of Keri Roth	
	(Class Cost of Service)	109
11	115 Rebuttal Testimony of Kimberly K. Bolin	
	(Cost of Service)	109
12	116 Rebuttal Testimony of Keith D. Foster	
	(Cost of Service)	109
13	117 Rebuttal Testimony of Courtney Horton	
	(Cost of Service)	109
14	118 Rebuttal Testimony of Randall T.	
	Jennings (Cost of Service)	109
15	119 Rebuttal Testimony of Sherrye Lesmes	
	(Cost of Service)	109
16	120 Rebuttal Testimony of Amanda C.	
	McMellen (Cost of Service)	109
17	121 Rebuttal Testimony of Angela Niemeier	
	(Cost of Service)	109
18	122 Rebuttal Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson	
	(Cost of Service)	109
19	123 Rebuttal Testimony of David C. Roos	
	(Public and Confidential) (Cost of	
	Service)	109
20	124 Rebuttal Testimony of Ashley Sarver	
	(Cost of Service)	109
21	125 Staff Accounting Schedules (Public and	
	Confidential) (Cost of Service)	109
22	126 Rebuttal Testimony of James A. Busch	
	(Class Cost of Service)	109
23	127 Rebuttal Testimony of Keri Roth (Class	
	Cost of Service)	109
24	128 Rebuttal Testimony of Daronn A.	
	Williams (Class Cost of Service)	109
25	129 Surrebuttal Testimony of Kimberly K.	
	Bolin	109

E X H I B I T I N D E X
(Continued)

		Received
3	Staff's:	
4	130 Surrebuttal Testimony of Alexis L. Branson	109
5	131 Surrebuttal Testimony of Keith D. Foster	109
6	132 Surrebuttal Testimony of Courtney Horton (Public, Confidential and Highly Confidential)	109
7	133 Surrebuttal Testimony of Randall T. Jennings (Public, Confidential and Highly Confidential)	109
8	134 Surrebuttal Testimony of Sherrye Lesmes	109
9	135 Surrebuttal Testimony of Amanda C. McMellen	109
10	136 Surrebuttal Testimony of Angela Niemeier	109
11	137 Surrebuttal Testimony of Jarrod J. Robertson	109
12	138 Surrebuttal Testimony of Keri Roth	109
13	139 Surrebuttal Testimony of Ashley Sarver	109
13	140 Accounting Schedules (Public and Confidential)	109
14		
15	OPC's Exhibits:	
16	202 Direct Testimony of John A. Robinett	107
16	203 Rebuttal Testimony of John A. Robinett	107
17	204 Surrebuttal Testimony of John A. Robinett	107
18	205 Direct Testimony of David Murray (Public and Confidential)	107
19	206 Rebuttal Testimony of David Murray (Public and Confidential)	107
20	207 Surrebuttal Testimony of David Murray (Public and Confidential)	107
21	208 Direct Testimony of John S. Riley (Public and Confidential)	107
22	209 Rebuttal Testimony of John S. Riley	107
22	210 Surrebuttal Testimony of John S. Riley (Public and Confidential)	107
23	211 Direct Testimony of Lena M. Mantle	107
24	212 Rebuttal Testimony of Lena M. Mantle	107
24	213 CCOS Rebuttal Testimony of Lena M. Mantle	107
25	214 Direct Testimony of Angela Schaben (Public and Confidential)	107

E X H I B I T I N D E X
(Continued)

		Received
3	OPC's Exhibits:	
4	215 Rebuttal Testimony of Angela Schaben (Public and Confidential)	107
5	216 Surrebuttal Testimony of Angela Schaben	107
	217 Rebuttal Testimony of Cassidy Weathers	107
6	218 Surrebuttal Testimony of Cassidy Weathers	107
7	219 Rebuttal Testimony of Jordan Seaver	107
8	MIEC's Exhibits:	
9	350 Direct Testimony of Jessica A. York (Public and Confidential)	110
10	351 Rebuttal Testimony of Jessica A. York	110
11	352 Surrebuttal Testimony of Jessica A. York (Public and Confidential)	110
12	Triumph's Exhibits:	
13	750 Surrebuttal Testimony of Brian C. Collins	112
14	751 Rebuttal Testimony and Schedule of Brian C. Collins (Confidential)	112
15	752 Rebuttal Testimony and Schedule of Brian C. Collins (Public)	112
16		
17	(All exhibits were retained by the Missouri Public Service Commission.)	

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

1 STATE OF MISSOURI)

2 COUNTY OF COLE)

3 I, Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640, do
4 hereby certify that I was authorized to and did
5 stenographically report the foregoing Public Service
6 Commission On-the-Record Presentation and that the
7 transcript, pages 89 through 141, is a true record of my
8 stenographic notes.
9

10 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
11 employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties,
12 nor am I a relative or counsel connected with the
13 action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

14 Dated this 17th day of April, 2023.

15 *Beverly Jean Bentch*
16 _____

17 Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

<hr/> \$ <hr/>	107:21	17 137:15	304 95:2
\$100,000 102:20	11 137:12	17th 142:14	31 138:4
\$250,000 102:19	110 136:7 141:9, 10,11	18 137:16	31st 98:14 99:20 100:24
\$34,063,451 100:22	111 136:7	19.2 98:23	32 138:5
\$437.5 98:21	112 136:8 141:13, 14,15	1:00 93:1,8	350 110:3,11,12 141:9
\$700 98:15	113 136:10	<hr/> 2 <hr/>	351 110:3,11,12 141:10
\$95 98:25	117 136:13	2 94:19 97:9 110:19,22	352 110:3,11,12
<hr/> 1 <hr/>	12 97:21,25 98:1,3 110:25	20 137:17	38 138:10
1 97:21,25 98:1,3	120-day 102:6	2017 99:17	393.1275 100:21
1.5 100:12	121 136:15	202 107:10,12,13, 15	3a 96:12
1.9 101:20	124 136:18 139:20	2020 98:14	3rd 96:7,19 105:23 107:21
10 97:6	125 139:21	2022 99:20 100:24	<hr/> 4 <hr/>
100 109:12,14,16 138:16	126 139:22	2023 93:7 96:7,9 142:14	40 138:11
101 138:17	127 139:23	203 140:16	41 138:12
1010 95:12	128 139:24	2081 94:22	418.3 98:22
102 138:18	129 139:25	210 140:22	43 138:13
103 138:19	13 97:22	211 140:23	437.5 98:24
104 138:20	130 140:4	213 140:24	44 97:22,25 98:2,4
105 136:5 138:21	131 140:5	214 140:25	<hr/> 5 <hr/>
107 136:5 138:24 140:15,16,17,18, 19,20,21,22,23, 24,25 141:4,5,6,7	133 140:7	215 141:4	5 137:8
108 136:6 138:25	134 136:19	216 141:5	50 118:18 119:2
109 136:6 138:16, 17,18,19,20,22, 23,24,25 139:4,5, 6,7,8,9,10,11,12, 13,14,15,16,17, 18,19,20,21,22, 23,24,25 140:4,5, 6,8,9,10,11,12,13	135 140:9	218 141:6	50.3 99:1
10th 96:9 105:24	136 140:10	219 107:10,12,13, 16 141:7	50/50 102:22
	137 140:11	25 137:21	<hr/> 6 <hr/>
	138 140:12	29 137:24	60 100:25 102:16
	140 109:12,15,16 140:13	29th 93:7	640 142:4,17
	141 142:8	2:00 135:18	65109 94:23
	142 136:20	<hr/> 3 <hr/>	
	15 97:22	30 137:25	
	16 97:22,25 98:1,4		

7	action 128:1 142:13	agreement 96:6,7, 18 97:5,14 109:3	appearing 93:13, 15 94:3
7 137:9	actual 100:5 130:3	agreements 96:10 103:25 104:3 106:4 112:8	applied 99:20
75/25 102:8	add 105:22 111:12 112:4 135:3	agrees 103:14,19	applies 103:9
750 112:10,13,15 141:13	addition 104:5 120:11,19	Alexis 138:17 140:4	apply 120:21 125:3,19
751 112:10,13,15 141:14	additional 103:12	allocator 129:23	appreciated 111:17
752 112:11,13,15 141:15	additionally 100:22	Amanda 138:18, 25 139:15 140:9	appreciation 108:19 109:1
8	address 94:22 95:2,21 129:2	American 119:9 125:11 131:10 132:1	appreciative 108:24 109:22 111:13
8.65 99:12	Adjustment 99:4	amortization 99:21 100:5	apprehension 126:21
89 142:8	adjustments 99:17	amortized 100:25 101:3,24 102:16	approach 125:5
9	Administratively 97:16	amount 99:1 100:20,22 101:20	approve 107:22 109:2
90 99:23	admission 97:18	analyses 103:16	approved 96:10 97:17 101:8
93 136:2	admitted 97:23 98:2 105:16,18 107:14 109:14,15 110:11 112:13	analysis 103:16 117:16 131:10	approving 104:2 106:2
96 136:4	adopt 111:4	Andrew 94:19 97:9 110:19,23 138:20	approximately 98:22,23,24 99:1 101:20
98 137:4,5,6,7,8,9, 10,11,13,14,15, 16,17,18,19,20, 21,22,23,24,25 138:4,5,6,7,8,9, 10,11,12,13,14	advice 131:7	Angela 139:4,16 140:10,25 141:4,5	April 142:14
9th 96:13	affect 122:17	Ann 137:5,6,8	area 114:8,25 117:13 119:25 120:1 122:18 123:6 125:18 127:5
A	affiliate 96:12	annual 98:20 100:8 102:7,19,20	areas 117:24 119:8 120:8 122:17 124:20 129:6 132:11
ability 132:3	affluent 124:19	answers 113:7	argument 133:1
absolutely 113:2 128:2 131:5	affordability 117:16	antithesis 129:11	arise 131:5
accomplish 125:9	afternoon 93:2 108:11	apartment 126:16	Arizona 132:20
Accounting 139:8, 21 140:13	agree 98:20 107:21 118:19,20 119:1 122:1 128:6 129:17 132:1	apologize 105:9	Ashley 139:6,20
acquire 129:25	agreed 99:12 100:23 101:10,16 102:4,17,25	appearance 93:9 94:7 97:23 104:6 136:2	
act 99:16,18			

140:12	based 122:5,17	117:12,21 119:24	California 128:5
aspects 101:13	basic 119:23	120:21 122:2,15	call 95:16 97:6
asset 101:18	123:4	127:19,22 128:3	101:15
assigned 93:5	basically 129:2	129:11	candidate 122:19
assistance 102:14	basis 100:6	blocks 116:3	capacity 115:6
Associates 110:3	126:25	board 134:22	capital 98:16
attached 100:18	Bednar 95:1,3	Bolin 138:16	99:12 125:17
Attachment	111:11,12,22	139:10,25	capture 100:1
100:14 101:17	131:16 134:11,12	bookends 129:2	car 127:16
Attachments	135:4 136:7,19	branding 127:2	carrying 101:4
99:13 100:18	began 93:1	Branson 138:17	Cas 138:8,9
103:2	begin 112:25	140:4	case 93:4 96:11
attorney 142:11	beginning 93:10	breaks 100:7	98:13,18 99:8,15
audit 101:15	behalf 93:13,16,	Bretz 93:20,22	100:3,19 101:9,23
authorized 142:5	18,23,24 94:3,5,8,	105:5,7,19,20	103:15,21 104:1,6
authorizing 104:3	11,13,15,17,19,25	106:8,12,14,18	105:25 108:16
avenue 128:21	95:4,9,11 105:5	107:3,4,19 136:5	112:8 113:25
average 99:12	108:12 110:18	Brian 104:7 112:9	118:12 119:22
114:10 126:11	111:10 112:3,10	141:13,14,15	132:8 133:12
127:7,8,23	believes 103:24	briefly 107:7	cases 110:1
aware 109:1 115:7	105:22	110:21	125:11 129:6,15
117:24 118:3,8	Bell 95:5,6,8	bringing 134:4	132:5
	111:24,25	Brubaker 110:2	Cassidy 141:5,6
B	bench 95:19,23	Brydon 93:13	causation 130:3,
	104:15 106:9	budgets 127:4	18
	112:21 135:13	building 93:7	causing 116:2
	benchmarking	130:7	CCOS 138:7
	103:16	buildings 120:14	140:24
back 104:12	Bentch 142:4,17	built 131:9	CCR 142:4,17
112:21 122:24	Beverly 142:4,17	Bulkley 137:5,6,8	center 101:15
123:18 130:1	biennially 101:11	Busch 139:22	Certificate 136:20
131:6,25 133:5	big 126:10 130:23	buy 128:21	142:1
background	bill 99:23 130:13,		certify 142:5,10
122:16 132:24	15	C	Chairman 104:15,
balance 99:20	billing 99:13	calculation 101:7	16,23,25 105:3
100:24 101:6,24,	bit 122:7 132:10	calculations	106:10,13,16,21
25	blind 134:21	103:14	109:6 110:15
bar 128:3	block 114:3,24		112:23,24 113:3,
Baryenbruch	115:2,23,24		6,14,16,20 116:6,
137:4,5			
base 100:25			
101:20,25			

14,15,20 117:2,4, 8 120:25 121:2,6, 8,16,21 123:20,24 124:3,4,12,17 133:23 134:2,3,6, 8,9 135:5,6 136:10,13,15,18	Collins 95:12 112:9 141:13,14, 15	competing 129:2	considered 102:11
change 103:3	comment 113:24 134:2 136:19	compromise 111:5,16	consistent 103:6 126:25
charged 127:9	comments 95:17 135:9	concept 104:20	consolation 132:25
charges 100:10 102:25 103:6,7,10	commercial 115:16 127:14	concern 126:17 131:21 132:4	constraint 115:6
charging 120:13	Commission 93:18,21 96:10, 13,25 97:15 98:10 101:8 104:2 106:2 107:22 108:12,19 109:1,21 110:22 111:4 114:23 125:22 132:14 141:17 142:7	concerns 118:7,9	constraints 128:15
Charles 104:9 117:5 136:12 137:21,22,23 139:7	Commissioner 106:23,25 107:2 116:9,11,13 121:3,4,5 123:25 124:1,2 133:24 134:1 135:8,10,12	conclude 135:14, 15	consume 127:7
chemicals 131:1	commissioners 131:8	concluded 135:18	consumers 94:2, 11,15 97:2,3,10 108:3,9 112:5
choose 123:15	community 103:18,22	conclusions 126:2	contacted 94:2
cities 130:14	company 93:11, 14,16 94:4 96:24 98:17 100:5 101:1,10 102:16, 18,22 103:14 104:3 108:5 111:14 117:24 118:3,6 131:13 132:9	conditioned 126:23	contemplate 97:17
city 93:8 94:5,9, 23,25 95:2 97:2, 10,11 108:5 110:24 111:10,15 118:5 130:14 134:12	company's 101:4, 7,9,23 102:3 103:5 116:15 117:15,16 119:6 136:11	conditions 126:4 131:15	continued 99:25 100:10 111:17 138:1 139:1 140:1 141:1
Ciullo 137:8	compared 114:10	conduct 131:10	continues 101:2
clarification 100:17		conferences 128:9	continuing 129:8
class 96:8 97:5 115:15 129:21 139:10,22,23,24		confidence 130:21	contract 112:7
classes 108:17 115:20		Confidential 137:6,7,13,15,19, 20,24 138:4,9,14, 21,23 139:4,9,19, 21 140:6,7,8,13, 18,19,20,21,22,25 141:4,9,11,14	contributing 114:13,21 119:4
climate 126:4		conflicting 96:17	conversation 131:21 133:2,21 134:4
closer 113:5		conjunction 96:15	Cool 106:21 123:21
Coffer 138:18		connected 142:12	Cooper 93:12,17 96:1,2,4 97:24 98:6 104:14 105:2,4,21 107:20 116:17 136:4
COLE 142:3		connection 130:6	correct 117:18,19
collected 99:2		cons 125:1	correlation 119:9, 10
collecting 131:13		consequences 120:20	cost 96:8 97:6
		conserved 130:24	
		conserving 130:25	

99:12 103:13,15 118:1 129:21 130:3,10,16,18 131:1 138:16,17, 18,19,20,21,23, 24,25 139:4,6,7,8, 10,11,12,13,14, 15,16,17,18,19, 20,21,22,23,24	critical 102:17,19 current 111:21 curtail 115:23 Curtis 94:17 customer 99:22 102:25 114:10,22 115:14,20 customer-owned 101:2 customers 99:22 100:2,12 102:23 103:1,9,23 106:1 108:16 114:5,18 115:23 116:5 118:16,17,20,22, 23,25 119:13,15, 21 120:14,23 126:13,25 127:14, 23 130:13,14 Cut 99:16	debt 101:5 decade 132:14 December 98:14 99:20 100:24 decide 120:21 decrease 122:8 deferred 100:23 101:3,23 deferring 131:2 demand 115:19,21 118:1 demands 117:24 demographics 119:20 120:7,23 122:10,17 Depreciation 100:18 depressed 117:15 122:3 Derek 137:14 describe 100:15 design 96:8 97:5, 7,8 102:24 103:2, 13 109:23 111:1,4 119:24 123:5 125:8 127:21 137:23 designed 115:14 124:19 details 100:13 101:16 determinants 99:13 determination 111:18 dialogue 132:17 134:17 Diana 94:16	difference 102:10 differences 100:1, 4 differentials 127:25 130:23 direct 117:11 137:3,5,9,11,15, 16,18,19,20,21,25 138:5,10,12,16, 17,18,19,20,21, 22,24,25 139:4,5, 6,7,9 140:15,17, 20,23,25 141:9 direction 131:19 director 104:7,9 disadvantage 130:2 disagree 129:17 disclosure 129:15 discontinuing 117:11 discover 114:6 discretionary 119:11 discuss 101:13 103:21 118:14 discussion 111:17 123:8 128:7,16 134:3,10,15 135:3 discussions 129:19 133:10 134:15 distinct 125:15 distribution 126:12 district 94:4,19 97:9 100:9 103:8 108:5 110:19,22, 23 125:12,16
	<hr/> D <hr/>		
costs 101:3,4 102:9,15 116:1 117:23 Council 94:2 97:3, 10 108:3 counsel 93:10,23 95:16,23 97:1 104:16,19,24,25 105:12 107:6,15, 25 108:14,21 111:13 113:23 133:25 134:2 135:13 142:11,12 Counsel's 124:24 counter 128:11 county 94:20 97:10 102:13 110:19,23 114:4, 9,11,14,20,22,24 115:4,9 117:17 118:16,21,22 119:5,17,18,25 120:6,8,10 123:6, 10,12 124:19 125:4 130:8 131:4 142:3 court 95:7 Courtney 138:21 139:12 140:5 creating 99:15 credit 99:23 criteria 114:25 120:2 123:7	Daronn 139:24 dart 134:22 darts 134:22 data 103:18,22 110:1 113:24 122:5 125:3,14 127:5 131:13 132:2,3,10 date 99:10,23 Dated 142:14 David 139:18 140:17,18,19 day 117:9,24 142:14 days 99:23 118:2 Dean 93:12		

districts 103:4,23 108:16 129:24 131:4	117:15 122:3	evidence 98:2,4 105:19 107:14,16 109:14,15,17 110:7,9,13 112:11,14,16 113:11 116:24 121:12 124:8	130:21
diving 132:10	economics 119:19	exact 128:11	fact 126:23
Dority 94:22	economist 125:6	excess 100:1,4 127:9 128:12	factor 114:21 126:19,20 130:3
draw 126:2	effect 122:6	excuse 100:3	factors 114:6,13, 17 119:4 122:12
drawbacks 120:4	effective 99:9,23	exhibit 109:10,11 112:10	factual 98:10
drinking 130:6	efficient 95:20	exhibits 97:21,22, 25 98:1,3 105:8, 15,18 107:8,9,12, 13,15 109:12,13, 14,16 110:3,11,12 112:13,15 137:2 138:3,15 139:3 140:14 141:3,8, 12,16	failed 133:6
drive 95:12 114:17	efforts 108:24 109:22 111:16	existing 99:25 103:4	Fain 95:1
driven 106:15 126:3	elasticity 115:20	expanding 132:21	fall 125:1
driver 132:6	election 109:7	expense 101:20	families 119:13
driving 98:18 128:23	electric 94:4 108:5 132:14	experiencing 125:21	farther 128:25
drought 125:18 126:4 128:3 130:21	eliminated 100:11	expert 118:5 131:12	favor 125:12
due 118:24 126:3	elimination 106:10	exponentially 132:21	fear 133:4
duly 113:18 117:6 121:19 124:15	Ellinger 95:6	extension 102:12	fee 106:11
<hr/>	Empire 94:4 108:4	extensions 102:3	file 93:4 101:11 103:14 104:3 106:3 135:15
E	employee 142:11	<hr/>	filed 96:6,8,18 97:6 105:10,23,24 112:9
<hr/>	employees 108:25	F	files 103:21
EADIT 100:1,4	encourage 111:3	face 128:3	financially 142:13
earlier 134:14	end 98:12 116:2 120:12	facilities 120:17	fine 104:19
early 108:24	ending 117:21	facing 115:6 125:16,18 126:9	finite 127:5
earn 101:5	Energy 94:11,15 97:1 108:9		Fire 103:7
earned 101:4	England 93:13		firm 93:12 94:16 95:11
easier 128:20 129:10,21,22,24	entered 104:5 105:8,10,23 107:9		Fischer 94:21,24 110:19,21 111:8,9 136:7
easiest 96:21	entries 93:9 136:2		fix 128:22
easily 131:23 133:14	entry 94:3,5		fixed 116:1,5 128:22 134:24
East 95:2	equals 99:1		flat 102:25
echo 134:13	establish 99:14 101:18		flood 128:12
economic 122:12	established 100:21 101:21		
economically	everyone's 135:7		

fluctuations 132:20	generalize 129:22	happy 96:5 130:16,19	108:2,7 111:24 112:2 134:11
flush 132:12 133:9	generalized 130:1	hard 109:24	hoping 134:22
follow 114:1	generally 119:1,12 128:8	Harden 95:10,13 112:2,3,12,17,18 136:8	Horton 138:21 139:12 140:5
Foods 95:9,11 112:1,3,4,20	GEOFF 124:14 136:17	harmful 116:4	hours 108:24
FOODS' 112:15	geographic 129:6	Harold 138:10,11	household 114:13 117:17 119:4,10, 12,16 120:8,17 122:19 127:6,7
foot 130:13,15	give 98:8 113:11 116:24 121:13 124:9 125:13 129:19,20	Harris 138:20	households 122:25 123:2
force 98:18	go-around 133:15	headline 99:5	huge 132:20
foregoing 142:6	God 113:12 116:25 121:14 124:10	hear 104:24,25 113:7 116:19	hurt 124:23 127:19
forget 109:10	good 93:2 105:2 108:11 122:13 129:7 134:3	hearing 94:4 95:15,24 96:1 97:4,14 98:1 105:18 106:20,24 107:13,25 109:14 112:20 135:14,18	<hr/> I <hr/>
forward 100:6 101:14 102:12 111:17 124:7 126:22 127:21 128:14	Governor 93:7	heartache 95:23	IBR 122:19 123:4, 16 124:18,21 125:25 126:22 128:14 132:13 134:10
Foster 138:19 139:11 140:5	granular 132:3	Heinz 94:17	IBRS 125:2 131:23 132:8 133:19
found 100:14 101:16 102:4 103:12 117:16	great 113:3,16 118:15 133:7	held 93:6	idea 121:22 127:4 130:16
Foxwood 95:12	greater 115:21	helpful 135:1	identified 96:12 120:1 123:7
frame 102:6	Grisham 137:9,10, 11	hey 127:1 129:9	identifying 134:23 135:1
full 129:15	Group 94:11 97:2 108:9	high 95:2 98:8 120:9,15,18	Ill 138:10,11
fun 124:5	groups 103:4	higher 114:5,7,13, 15,21 115:22 116:3 118:17,19, 21 119:2,4,17 120:13 122:18 123:1,3 126:11	imagine 127:17
funding 102:19, 20,21	guess 97:19 102:10 121:24 127:20	Highly 137:7 140:6,8	impact 131:9 132:19
future 110:1 113:25 125:15 131:2,8 132:5	guys 125:1	homes 119:13	impacts 99:18
<hr/> G <hr/>	<hr/> H <hr/>	honesty 118:13	imperfect 130:20
gallons 110:25	hand 113:10 116:23 121:11 124:8 125:6,7	Honeysuckle 94:22	impetus 127:24 128:18 129:8
Garrett 94:17	happen 114:19	Honor 94:6,12 95:5 107:7,18	
geared 115:15			
general 93:4 98:13 101:9 103:15,21			

implement 102:8 104:4	instances 102:7	Jobs 99:16	Keith 138:19 139:11 140:5
importance 99:7	interested 103:20 131:7 142:13	Joe 95:1 134:12	Keri 121:18 136:15 139:9,23 140:12
important 98:12 134:16	internet 130:15	John 138:12,13 140:15,16,20,21, 22	key 134:17
inadvertently 109:11	investments 98:16 125:17	joining 116:21	Kimberly 138:16 139:10,25
inclining 114:3,24 115:2 117:12,21 119:24 120:21 122:2,15 127:19, 22 128:2 129:11	investor-owned 126:20	joke 130:12	kind 98:7 105:1 113:25 115:4,6,13 119:19 120:6 127:14 128:23 131:20 132:11 134:20,21
include 100:9	irrigation 114:19 119:14 126:14	Jones 95:12	knowledge 122:16
included 100:25	issue 96:12 104:2 106:2 115:8,11 118:6,11 126:17 130:21 131:3,9 132:17	Joplin 118:5,7,10 128:7	Kolkmeier 106:23,25 116:9, 11 121:3,4 123:25 124:1 133:24 134:1 135:9,10
income 114:14 116:4,5 119:10,12 120:17 123:1,2 127:22 134:24	issues 96:11 108:15 117:23 118:1,7 134:16	Jordan 141:7	
incomes 117:17 119:5,16 120:9 122:19	items 99:19 100:9 101:12	Joseph 94:5,9 97:2,11 108:6 110:24	
increase 98:24		Joshua 95:10 112:2	
increased 122:7		Jr 137:24	
increases 119:12		Judge 93:2,5,17, 22 94:1,10,14,18, 24 95:3,8,13 96:4 97:21,24 104:13, 14,21,22 105:4,12 106:8,23 107:1,2, 5,11,24 108:3,8 109:4,9,18 110:6, 10,14,17,18,21 111:8,22,25 112:12,17,19,24 113:2,9,14 116:8, 11,13,22 117:2 121:2,4,5,10,16 123:24 124:1,2,6, 12 133:23 134:5,7 135:4,8,11,12	
incur 118:1		jump 134:10	
individual 115:14			
indulgences 135:7			
industrial 94:15 112:5 118:22			
information 95:6 100:17 104:12 131:12 132:15			
infrastructure 99:3 115:7,11 126:8			
inspection 101:19			
instance 114:20			
	J		L
	James 94:21 137:18 139:22		Lagrand 104:7
	Jarrold 139:5,17 140:11		Lane 94:22
	Jean 142:4,17		large 115:17 120:22 125:17 129:5
	Jefferson 93:7 94:23 95:2		largely 125:25 126:1
	Jeffrey 137:11,12, 13		larger 127:17 129:5
	Jennifer 137:9,10		largest 112:5
	Jennings 138:22 139:14 140:7		late 100:10 106:11 108:23
	Jessica 110:2 113:17 136:10 141:9,10		law 93:5,12 94:16 95:11
	job 129:16		lawn 119:14
		K	lead 101:1,2,11,13 130:13
		Kaiser 137:11,12, 14	
		Karen 93:20	

leave 124:4	24 115:4,9 117:17 118:16,21,22 119:5,17,18,25 120:6,8,10 123:6, 10,12 124:19 125:4 126:10 127:11 130:7 131:4	matter 98:10	Midwest 94:11 97:1 108:9
left 95:6 134:13		Matthew 137:16, 17	MIEC 94:17 97:9 109:18,21 110:14 116:10
legitimate 133:4		Mcmellen 138:25 139:16 140:9	MIEC's 110:12 112:25 114:25 136:9 141:8
Lena 140:23,24		meaning 119:11	million 98:15,21, 22,23,24,25 99:1 101:20 110:25
length 130:5		MECG 94:13 97:9 108:12	mimic 122:21
Lesmes 138:24 139:14 140:8	love 133:7	mechanism 99:3 102:8	mind 111:19
level 98:8 116:3 130:12	low 116:4 117:13 134:24	medium 130:16,19	Missouri 93:8 94:2,5,15,23,25 95:2,12 96:25 97:3,10 98:17 108:3,6 111:10 114:3 119:7,8 128:10 133:20 141:16 142:2
liability 101:19	lower 116:3 119:16 123:2 127:22	meet 101:12 103:19 117:23 118:1	missouri- american 93:10, 14,16 95:25 96:24 97:8,20 98:3,15 103:19,24 104:8 106:1,3 111:1 112:6 115:8 118:13
Linam 137:14	Lueders 137:16	Melissa 137:8	Missouri- american's 93:3 98:11,13 100:8,23 115:3 137:2 138:3
Lindsay 93:24	<hr/> M <hr/>	members 106:5 122:24 123:9,19	Mo-am 112:7
lines 101:1,2 130:14		mention 97:16	money 130:1
list 105:10 109:10		mentioned 99:6	month 96:14 100:13 110:25
live 130:11	made 98:4,15 107:16 109:17,25 110:13 112:16 113:23	Merante 137:18	months 100:25 102:16
LLC 95:9,11	main 100:7 102:3, 12	message 127:2,20	motivates 115:23
local 126:5	make 128:13 129:10	met 114:25 120:1 123:7	move 111:18
localized 129:1 132:19	makes 96:1 125:19 129:19,21, 22	meter 103:5,10	
location 125:2	Mantle 140:23,24	metered 120:15 126:16	
long 131:13 132:1	Mantle107 140:23	methodology 100:16	
long-term 101:5	March 93:6 96:6,9, 13,18 97:6 105:23,24 107:21	Mexico 114:3 117:18,22 122:2, 20 123:5 125:3 127:24 131:22	
longer 129:7 132:6	Marke 124:6,14 134:7,13,14 136:17	Mexico's 117:13 119:24	
looked 114:16	Mason 137:16,17, 18	Michael 137:25 138:4	
lose 133:1	mass 126:16	microphone 113:5,7	
Losli 137:15	master 120:15		
loss 100:7,9			
lost 130:9			
lot 104:19 108:23 109:23,24 120:3 122:16 126:3 128:12,13 129:9			
Louis 102:13 114:4,9,11,14,22,			

125:18 127:21 moved 127:3 moving 102:24 125:22 126:21 multi-family 120:14 124:23 municipal 125:25 126:5,18,19 Murray 140:17,18, 19 Mustich 137:19 mute 107:1 muters 130:2,3	<hr/> O <hr/>	Opitz 94:12,14 108:9,11,12 109:4,5,7,9 136:6 opportunity 96:5 97:19 108:19 112:25 133:9,11 opposite 128:11 order 104:2 106:2, 3 114:23 ordered 96:10 organization 128:21 outliers 126:15 overlooked 95:14	Patrick 137:3,4 patterns 115:18, 19 pay 127:1 payment 100:10 PC 93:13 94:8,22 peak 117:23 pensions 100:13 people 120:17 124:23 125:18 127:7 129:3 percent 99:12 100:12 118:18 119:2 period 98:13 99:21 person 129:16 personal 129:13 perspective 101:7 pertains 103:22 phone 94:2 106:20 116:16 physically 106:6 pilot 102:18,21 117:12,21 122:10, 11,15 131:22 pipe 127:17 place 120:6 125:25 126:13 128:4 132:21 places 127:3 130:11 plan 95:15 123:5 plans 111:21 plant 130:7 131:2 play 122:6 132:18, 23
<hr/> N <hr/>	offer 97:20 110:8 111:6 112:11 offered 97:25 105:15 107:12 offering 105:17 110:7 office 93:7,23 97:1 107:5,15 108:20 109:6 111:20 124:24 128:14 129:18 on-the-record 93:3 135:15 142:7 one-time 99:22 OPC 93:25 97:8 103:19 106:15 107:20 124:4 134:13 OPC's 107:8 136:16 140:14 141:3 OPEBS 100:14 operational 101:15 opinion 119:23 123:4	<hr/> P <hr/>	p.m. 93:1,8 135:19 pages 142:8 painting 101:18, 19 part 98:5 100:2 107:16 109:17 110:13 112:16 117:15 118:8 132:24 133:21 participate 102:17 participation 134:14 parties 95:16,21, 24 97:3,12,13 98:20 99:8 100:22 101:13 102:4 108:21 109:22 111:5 142:11 parties' 106:4 parts 117:17 122:3 party 95:18 past 125:11
NARUC 128:9 nature 118:24,25 124:22,24 126:5 129:4 necessarily 114:16 125:20 net 98:16 Nicholas 137:24 Niemeier 93:15,17 96:2 104:5 139:4, 16 140:10 nights 108:24 Nos 109:12 not-for-profit 110:23 note 98:12 108:19, 25 noted 117:13 notes 142:9 number 125:17 127:3,7 134:19 numbers 105:9,13			

plays 133:18	preside 93:6	117:12 122:11,15 131:22	putting 123:16
Plescia 94:16,18 109:19,20 110:6, 8,16,17 113:4,8 136:6	pretty 125:11	progress 109:24	<hr/> Q <hr/>
pocket 131:6	previously 97:23 100:12	Properties 95:4 111:23	question 116:7 130:22
podium 95:22	price 115:20 124:22 125:10,15, 20 126:24 129:1 130:2,9	property 100:20, 23	questioning 124:18
point 98:9,11 103:5 119:19 120:11 127:11 129:7 131:24	priced 115:22	proportion 115:21	questions 95:19 104:11,15,16,17, 19,24 105:1 106:6,9,24 107:24 109:5 110:4,14 111:7,9 112:19,22 113:1,19 116:9, 10,14 117:7,10 121:1,3,7,20,25 123:25 124:3,16 133:24 134:8 135:5,9 136:10, 13,15,18
policy 125:9 128:13,16,23 129:2,8 130:12 132:5,7 133:10	pricing 125:12,13, 23 129:14,20 130:19	pros 125:1	quick 134:12
pools 119:15 126:14	Pridgin 93:2,5,17, 22 94:1,10,14,18, 24 95:3,8,13 97:24 104:14,22 105:4,12 106:8,23 107:2,5,11,24 108:3,8 109:4,9, 18 110:6,10,14, 17,18 111:8,22,25 112:12,17,19 113:2,9,14 116:8, 13,22 117:2 121:2,5,10,16 123:24 124:2,6,12 133:23 134:7 135:4,8,12	protected 100:1	quickly 104:12 112:4
population 130:2	primarily 106:14	protecting 135:1	<hr/> R <hr/>
position 115:1,24 124:25 129:14,16	principles 130:18	provide 102:19,20 103:16 128:20	Rachel 93:15
positive 119:10	prior 100:19	provision 99:16 102:15	raise 113:10 116:23 121:11 124:7 130:22
potentially 120:3 124:21	Private 103:7	provisions 96:17 98:8 99:7 103:12	Randall 138:22 139:13 140:7
pre-tax 99:11	problem 134:6	proxy 125:13	rate 93:4 96:8 97:5,6,7 98:13,18, 25 99:3 100:25 101:5,9,23,24 102:24 103:2,7,8, 10,13,15,21,23 104:1 109:23 110:1 111:1,2,4 113:25 114:3,7,24 115:2,4,13 117:12,21 119:24
prefer 104:24	problems 128:12	public 93:23 94:19 96:25 97:1,9 107:6,15,25 108:20 110:18,22 124:24 129:7 132:5,7 133:24 134:1 137:6,7,12, 15,19,20,24 138:4,9,14,21,23 139:4,9,19,21 140:6,7,13,18,19, 20,21,22,25 141:4,9,11,15,16 142:6	
preference 129:13	proceed 104:18	purposes 99:11, 15 100:21	
prefiled 97:18	proceeding 99:10	push 128:14	
prepared 118:14	proceedings 93:1	pushing 128:17, 18	
present 96:5 98:25 106:19 108:4	process 131:14	put 127:20 129:23	
presentation 93:3, 6 95:17 96:1 105:5 108:4 109:18 132:13 135:15 142:7	program 101:14 102:17,18,20,21		
presentations 112:22 136:3			
presented 96:13			

120:21 122:2,15 123:4,12,16 125:10 127:12,19, 22 128:3,18 129:5,6,11 130:17 131:17 132:5 133:12,15 134:19 137:23	Rebuttal 137:4,6, 9,12,14,16,17,21, 22 138:4,5,6,8,12, 13 139:10,11,12, 13,14,15,16,17, 18,20,22,23,24 140:16,18,21,23, 24 141:4,5,7,10, 14,15	21	requirement 96:19,23 98:7,19, 21,23 99:6,14 100:3,15 101:6 102:7 115:22 137:12,22 138:6
ratepayer 134:23	recall 102:2	reiterate 108:14	requires 99:19
ratepayers 111:19 124:25 126:6	Received 98:4 107:16 109:17 110:13 112:16 137:2 138:2 139:2 140:2 141:2	related 99:16 101:19,21 102:5, 15	resale 103:9
rates 99:10,15,24 100:18,19 102:25 103:1,11 104:7,10 106:1 116:2 120:13 133:22 135:2	recommend 115:2	relative 114:14 119:5 142:10,12	reservoir 118:10
rationale 117:20	recommendation 114:2	relevant 132:7	reset 99:9 116:3
Raymore 95:12	recommended 123:10	relies 111:15	residential 111:18 114:18 115:15 118:20 119:1 127:13 131:17 134:18,23
Rea 104:9,17 116:16,22 117:5 121:6 131:11 136:12 137:21,22, 23	recommending 117:21	remain 99:17	reset 99:9 116:3
reach 111:16	record 94:7 97:18 98:5 105:8 107:9, 17 109:17 110:13 112:16 113:23 133:19 135:17 142:8	remainder 99:22 102:13	resolution 104:1 105:25 108:15
reaction 127:16	recovering 115:21 116:1	remaining 97:3,20 99:21 107:8	resolve 96:11
ready 95:18 96:2,3 105:6,19 108:10 109:19 110:20 111:11 113:15 117:3 121:17 124:13	reduce 124:21	remove 102:6	respects 134:25
real 112:4 134:11, 16,18	refer 96:19,21	repeat 105:20 107:19	rest 104:18 114:6, 14 118:18 119:5 123:13
reality 130:10	reflect 94:7 99:18	replace 101:2	result 134:22
reason 119:21	reflected 103:1	replenished 132:23	resulting 99:10
reasonable 104:1 105:24,25 108:15 111:5 135:2	reflecting 106:4	report 101:11 142:6	retained 141:16
reasons 122:1	regard 102:3	reported 100:5	retirements 98:16
Rebecca 137:15	regulation 130:17	reporter 95:7 136:20 142:1	return 101:5 130:17
	regulatory 93:5 101:18 104:8,10	reporting 100:8	returned 99:22 100:2
	rehousing 102:18,	reports 100:7	reveals 103:3
		represent 103:25	revenue 96:19,23 98:6,19,20,23 99:5,14 100:2,15 101:6 102:7 115:22,25 126:18 127:10 137:22 138:6
		represented 134:16	revenues 98:25
		representing 100:16	
		represents 98:24 124:25	
		requested 97:4,13	
		requests 104:1 106:2	

reverse 133:17	15,18	97:6 101:1,2,11, 13 103:14,15 114:25 115:3 117:13,24 118:8 119:8,20,21,25 120:1,22 122:11, 18 123:6 129:22 130:15 138:16,17, 18,19,20,22,23, 24,25 139:5,6,7,8, 10,11,12,13,14, 15,16,17,18,19, 20,21,22,23,24 141:17 142:6	108:13
review 98:8 100:8 103:3	rural 130:13		significant 114:7 117:23 118:1
Richard 138:10			significantly 114:5 118:17
rid 114:3 122:2 131:22	S		similar 104:20 121:25 124:18
Riley 140:20,21,22	sake 130:24		simplicity 129:21
Riverside 94:25 97:11 111:10,15 134:12	sale 103:9		simplify 125:14
road 128:25	Santillo 137:24		simply 105:14
Robert 137:19	Sarver 139:6,20 140:12		single 103:9 111:2 125:23 129:17,20 133:15
Robertson 139:5, 17 140:11	savings 131:1	set 113:25	sir 96:3 110:20 111:11 117:2 124:7,12
Robinett 140:15, 16,17	Schaben 140:25 141:4,5	setting 109:25 132:4	sit 113:5 130:25
Ron 93:4	Schedule 141:14, 15	settlement 108:22 112:8 134:15	situation 125:20 126:16 128:3,11 131:5 133:22
room 104:7 106:6, 20 133:8	Schedules 139:8, 21 140:13	sewer 98:22 99:3 100:11 103:1	situational 126:3
Roos 139:18	Schwarzell 137:25 138:4	shared 102:22	situations 118:4 120:13 128:10
Roth 121:8,10,18 136:15 139:9,23 140:12	seasonal 115:16 117:14 119:11 120:16 124:20	sharing 102:8	small 115:16 127:25
route 131:8	Seaver 141:7	sheets 106:4	smaller 128:21
RPR 142:4,17	Section 100:21	Sherrye 138:24 139:14 140:8	sort 95:23 125:19
rule 97:15	seek 104:11	shortage 117:22	Sounds 105:2
rules 102:3,11	Selinger 138:5,6,8	shortages 117:25	source 126:7 128:7 130:8
run 109:7	send 125:15 126:24	show 105:14 109:12	speak 131:11
running 109:6 111:20	sending 125:10	side 132:14	speaking 119:12
Rupp 104:16,25 106:10,13,16,21 109:6 110:15 112:24 113:3,6, 16,20 116:6,15,20 117:4,8 120:25 121:8,21 123:20 124:4,17 134:6,9 135:6 136:10,13,	sends 124:21	sign 97:12	special 112:7
	senior 104:9	signal 124:22 125:20 129:1 130:9	specific 103:22 105:1 118:24 125:12
	sense 125:19 128:13	signals 125:10,16 126:24 130:3	specifically 114:1,
	separate 123:12	signatories 96:23 97:7 109:23	
	served 111:2	signatory 107:20	
	serves 119:9		
	service 96:8,25		

17 115:14 118:5, 10	118:18 123:13 128:18 133:15,22 142:2	studies 129:22	system's 102:15
Spencer 95:1		stuff 113:24 122:17 127:3,16	systems 102:14 114:19 126:14,19 128:20,21 129:9, 25
splits 98:21	stated 105:21	subject 102:5	
spun 131:23	states 114:15 117:20 132:18	sufficiency 126:18 127:10	<hr/> T <hr/>
St 94:5,9 97:2,10 102:12 108:6 110:24 114:4,9, 11,14,22,24 115:4,8 117:17 118:16,20,22 119:5,17,18,25 120:6,8,10 123:6, 10,12 124:19 125:3 126:10 127:11 130:7 131:4	statewide 123:16	suited 115:5	tailored 123:5
stable 115:17	stay 133:17	summertime 119:14	takes 110:24
staff 93:18,20 96:25 97:8 103:19 105:5,15,17,22 106:1,5,13,17 108:20 111:14 117:20 121:8 122:1,24,25 123:9,15,17,19 136:14 139:8,21	steady 122:7	Sunnydale 95:4 111:23	taking 113:21 117:9
staff's 105:8,18 109:10,12,16 114:2 120:1 122:1 123:4,7 138:15 139:3 140:3	Steinmeier 94:6,8, 10 108:7	supply 94:19 97:9 110:19,22 115:7, 11 117:22,25 118:7	Takisha 138:12
stage 109:25 113:25	stenographic 142:9	support 104:8 111:1	talk 122:24 123:18 124:20 126:10 127:12 128:10 129:12
stakeholders 103:20	stenographically 142:6	surprise 119:16	talked 120:12,19 122:22 133:10
standpoint 129:3	step 128:25 134:20,21	Surrebuttal 137:8, 10,13,17,23,24 138:7,9,11,13 139:25 140:4,5,7, 8,9,10,11,12,16, 19,22 141:5,6,10, 13	talking 118:25 120:7,24
starting 98:6,9	Stephanie 95:5	Svindland 138:10	tank 101:17,19
state 98:16 102:9, 13 103:6,10 108:25 111:3 112:6 114:6	sticking 127:24	swear 113:10 116:23 121:12 124:8	targeted 124:19
	stipulation 95:18 96:6,7,18,20,24 97:5,7,8 98:7,9,19 99:6,14 100:15 101:12,17,21 102:1,22,24 103:2,13,17 109:23 111:2,4 113:23 131:16 133:3	Swearengen 93:13	tariff 99:9 102:4,5 103:4,8,9 106:4 111:3 125:23 129:17,20
	stipulations 95:20,21 96:9,15 97:14,17 103:25 104:2 105:22 106:3 107:21 108:13 109:2 112:22 133:7,8	swimming 119:15	tariffs 104:4
	Street 95:2	Swiz 138:8,9	tax 99:16 100:24
	structure 115:4,13 120:21	sworn 113:10,18 116:23 117:6 121:11,19 124:7, 8,15	taxes 100:20
	stub 99:21	system 115:5 126:18 129:5	taxpayers 126:6
			TCJA 99:19,21,25
			technology 132:4
			telephone 106:7
			ten 101:3
			terms 100:20 104:4 109:25
			territories 119:20, 21

territory 115:3 117:16,25 118:8, 21 119:6,8 120:22 122:4,11	throw 129:25	128:19 129:9	126:20
testified 113:18 117:6 121:19 124:15	throwing 127:13 134:22	true 111:18 118:23 131:17 134:23 142:8	utility's 126:21
testimony 97:18, 21 102:2 110:3 111:6 112:9 114:2,4 117:11 118:16,19 119:6 130:5 137:3,4,5,6, 8,9,10,11,12,13, 14,15,16,17,18, 19,20,21,22,23, 24,25 138:4,5,6,7, 8,9,10,11,12,13, 16,17,18,19,20, 21,22,24,25 139:4,5,6,7,9,10, 11,12,13,14,15, 16,17,18,20,22, 23,24,25 140:4,5, 7,8,9,10,11,12,15, 16,17,18,19,20, 21,22,23,24,25 141:4,5,6,7,9,10, 13,14,15	tied 126:7	true-up 98:12	<hr/> V <hr/>
theory 129:25	Tim 94:12 108:12	truth 113:11,12 116:24,25 121:13, 14 124:9,10	Vangerpen 93:24 94:1 107:6,7,11, 18,25 108:2 136:5
thereof 104:4	time 93:8 95:16 102:6 107:1 113:21 117:9 122:14 128:24 132:15	two-armed 125:6	variability 117:14
thing 120:11 127:11 131:24	times 102:7 103:20 117:18 133:9	type 129:1	versus 102:13 122:10
things 96:20 117:12 119:14,15 120:5 124:22,23 125:14 129:4,18 131:15,18 132:3 133:10	today 94:3 104:6, 11 106:17,19 108:4 110:2,4 113:22 116:21 128:14,24 132:6 135:7	Tyrone 139:7	view 96:16 98:11 103:5
Thomas 137:20	topic 105:1	<hr/> U <hr/>	view 96:16 98:11 103:5
Thomason 139:8	total 102:8	unable 104:10	vocal 125:11
thought 95:20	totally 104:19	unamortized 101:6	volatility 115:25
thoughts 124:21	touched 120:4 134:18	unanimous 97:15	volume 115:17 116:3
	track 100:4	understand 115:19 126:21	volumetric 102:25 103:10
	tracker 99:20,25 101:18,22	understanding 120:23 122:5,23	<hr/> W <hr/>
	transactions 96:12	unintended 120:20	Walker 138:10,11, 12
	transcript 142:8	unorthodox 113:22	wanted 125:15 131:20 132:11 133:2
	treated 97:15	update 100:17	washes 127:16
	treatment 100:14 101:8,25 130:7 131:2	usage 114:5,7,15 115:18,22,23 117:14 118:17,19, 21 119:17 120:15 122:5 124:21 134:18	water 93:10,14,16 94:19 96:24 97:9 98:3,22 99:3 100:7,9,11 103:1, 6 110:18,22,23,25 112:5,6,7 114:5,7, 15 115:5 117:14, 22,25 118:17 119:9,11,14 120:16 123:1 125:11 126:7 127:4,8,18 128:10,13,19 130:6,7,8,24
	triumph 95:9,11 111:25 112:3,4, 10,15,20	user 134:24	
	Triumph's 141:12	users 115:16,17 134:19	
	troubled 102:14	utilities 125:24 126:1	
		utility 115:25	

131:11 132:1,15,
22

Watkins 138:12,
13,14

weather 126:4

Weathers 141:5,6

Webex 104:9
116:17,18

weekends 108:23

weigh 134:10

weighted 99:11

Wesley 138:5,6,7

west 126:1 128:4

western 132:18

whatnot 126:14

wide 102:9 103:10
128:18

William 94:7,8

Williams 139:24

win 133:1

witnesses 106:17,
19 111:15 118:13
122:22

Wonderful 116:20

words 96:16

work 96:15 108:23
109:24 111:14
131:23,25 132:8
133:20

worth 131:6

WR-2022-0303
93:4 135:16

WSIRA 99:2,8,9,
11

Y

year 132:20

years 101:4,24
128:8 133:13

York 110:2 113:1,
5,9,17 116:8
118:15 120:4,12,
19 136:10 141:9,
10,11

Z

zonal 125:13
129:13 130:19

zone 125:16
126:10,11

zones 125:24
126:9