STATE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Rulemaking Hearing

August 7, 2018

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 1

In The Matter Of A Proposed)
Rule Regarding An) File No. AX-2018-0241
EnvironmentalImprovement)
Contingency Fund)

MORRIS L. WOODRUFF, Presiding CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

DANIEL Y. HALL, Chairman, COMMISSIONER

REPORTED BY: Beverly Jean Bentch, CCR No. 640 TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

PROCEEDINGS

Started again. We're here for a rulemaking hearing in Commission File No. AX-2018-0241. The subject of this is a proposed rule regarding Rule No. 4 CSR 240-10.095 which concerns an Environmental Improvement Contingency Fund. This is the public hearing comment hearing that was described in the proposed rule when the proposed rule was published in the Missouri Register.

These are generally fairly informal hearings, just a chance for the filing of comments. You don't have to be an attorney. I'm not going to take entries of appearance. I'm not going to swear in anyone as a witness.

I'll let you make your statement. We may have questions. I may have questions for you. The Chairman may have questions for you. And we'll just have -- The purpose, of course, is to try and gather information from the public as to the proposed rule. So we'll begin. Who would like to go first? Mr. Jenkins? If you'd identify yourself and who you're with.

MR. JENKINS: Jim Jenkins representing
Missouri-American Water Company. As the parties are
aware, Missouri-American did file comments in this
rulemaking and was basically asking to make this

applicable for consideration for a company the size of Missouri-American. However, upon reflection and actually taking a closer look at the rule, we decided that it really is not applicable to us. As we read and understand it more, we just don't think it's applicable and are here to listen.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: Do you have any questions?

CHAIRMAN HALL: No questions. Thank you.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: Public counsel?

MR. HALL: Caleb Hall appearing on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel and Ryan Smith from the Office of Public Counsel is joining me as well. Good afternoon, everyone.

The Office of Public Counsel does believe that environmental compliance and quality should be maintained and secured whenever possible. We aren't against those goals. Those are indeed laudible. However, our concern is that this rule as drafted is not properly founded under either common law or Commission statutes that are provided for to address this problem.

The Missouri legislature already saw fit to expressly address environmental compliance issues with SB 179 back in 2005. In fact, they were so sure on this being the way to address the environmental compliance issues that was passed with an emergency clause, the

Commission acted and drafted rules on that issue and created the environmental cost adjustment mechanism. Since we already have an existing statute and regulatory framework to address environmental noncompliance in small utilities, I believe that we should either be looking at presumably there may be deficiencies in this rule based on what I can find from history hasn't been used all that often since its creation. Perhaps we could start over, go back to fixing the rules that we have now which would parsimoniously be in line with then Governor Greitens' executive order to consolidate existing rules.

And secondly, our other recommendation is that if the Commission does not find that the environmental cost adjustment mechanism is a sufficient way to address the goals of the environmental improvement contingency fund rule, then perhaps we can look at the interim rate making framework provided by the Laclede Gas court decision where the court created a framework for the Commission to intervene and create interim rates in the cases of an emergency where a utility has become so financially distraught that it cannot even pay its own workers, it can't possibly meet environmental costs, it cannot provide safe and adequate service.

Since these are two legal avenues to address

1	environmental compliance that have been upheld and
2	created by the courts, we believe that the Commission
3	should adopt at least one of those measures. That way
4	then the goals of the environmental cost, the goals of
5	the environmental improvement contingency fund rule can
6	be met without while surviving judicial review and
7	avoiding unneeded costs for possible litigation going
8	forward.
9	CHAIRMAN HALL: The interim rate concept,
10	that's only applicable after a rate case has been filed,
11	correct?
12	MR. HALL: I do not believe that is the case.
13	CHAIRMAN HALL: How would interim rates help
14	in the situation that we're trying to address here?
15	MR. HALL: So if you have a small water system
16	that becomes so financially impaired in the same manner
17	that a small water system can come to the Commission and
18	ask for assistance in a general ratemaking, we envision
19	a small water utility approaching the Commission and
20	asking for the creation of interim rates. That would
21	have the benefit of setting up this additional revenue
22	flow up front.
23	CHAIRMAN HALL: How would we set up those
24	interim rates without doing a rate case?
25	MR. SMITH: Sure, if I may, Chairman. Under

1	the case that we cited to, they set forth a legal
2	framework on how that would work. Basically there would
3	be an interim rate. The idea would be if you're a
4	utility, small utility that is so financially distressed
5	that maybe you'd go out to certain banks let's just say,
6	for example, they say we're not going to lend to you
7	because your income is at a certain rate right now and
8	your income would need to be at a higher rate to
9	basically cover those debt obligations that would be
10	necessary to invest capital to ensure safe and adequate
11	service. So if you're a utility like that, the Laclede
12	gas case stood for the proposition that if you're so
13	financially distressed you could come to the Commission
14	and request interim rates on that basis.

MR. HALL: Unless I'm misunderstanding your question, Chairman, we saw the Laclede legal framework as similar and analagous to the decoupling statutes that are phrased in the interim rate language and those don't require a full rate case proceeding. So maybe I'm missing something.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Let me ask staff to respond.

OPC is suggesting that instead of this particular mechanism that we look at either interim rates or the environmental cost adjustment mechanism. Does staff believe that either of those two mechanisms would be

1	effective or could be effective?
2	MR. WESTON: I don't think so. So I'm going
3	to actually speak about the ECAM first and then I'll
4	address interim rates.
5	The primary issue with ECAM, particularly for
6	small systems, is the actual 2.5 percent cap of gross
7	income that's required by the statute for we're talking
8	about very small systems or small utilities.
9	Their gross revenue is \$50,000 a year, \$60,000
10	a year or less. 2.5 percent cap of that gross revenue
11	amount is thousands of dollars.
12	CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. And so the 2.5 percent
13	cap is in the statute, it's not in the rule?
14	MR. WESTON: Correct.
15	CHAIRMAN HALL: That eliminates that as an
16	option. How about the interim rate?
17	MR. WESTON: The interim rates for interim
18	rates I don't think it's appropriate for this
19	scenario. Interim rates might be appropriate for a
20	scenario where immediate funds are needed to keep
21	operations going, but the purpose of this rule that
22	we're proposing is to allow a company to begin immediate
23	capital investment, large capital investment to meet
24	ongoing compliance problems with the Department of
25	Natural Resources, EPA or otherwise and to be able to

begin that investment and pay for it simultaneously with an interim rate. You would have to know -- to accomplish that, you would have to know much of the same here but you would also have to be able to have proposed rates already in place. That might be challenging for very small systems who are trying to take advantage of the staff assisted rate case rule who aren't able to do a full explanation of what they think their rate base is.

CHAIRMAN HALL: To do interim rates, wouldn't the company need to know what the problem is, how to fix it, how much it costs to fix it, anything else? Is that it?

MR. WESTON: It would need at least all of those things. The other kind of problem with interim rate suggestion is the fact that it actually implicates a rate case which we suggest that this would be filed at the time of a rate case, the contingency fund. But an interim rate in an actual rate case still is subject to the 11-month process. We're talking about needed capital investment that takes more than 11 months to be installed. You're limiting a period of time for this necessary investment for a rate case period and that's a problem especially if you're trying to update major treatment, drinking distribution facilities.

1 CHAIRMAN HALL: The proposed rule envisions 2 that the company could roll this cost into the customer 3 charge before the improvement is used and useful? 4 MR. WESTON: Yes. 5 CHAIRMAN HALL: Would that also be the case 6 for interim rates? MR. WESTON: I don't think so. I think that's 7 8 part of the issue. 9 CHAIRMAN HALL: Explain that. 10 MR. WESTON: The interim rate suggests that 11 there's some kind of ongoing expense lack of funds that 12 are needed that are already spent or need to be recouped 13 that have been spent. And in a standard rate case, even 14 an interim rate case, the requirement is those moneys 15 are spent up front and they are recouped through rates. 16 The purpose of this regulation is to allow the company 17 to make the investment and recover it in rates 18 simul taneously. 19 CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Let me have OPC respond 20 to that because I think that is the distinction. 21 MR. HALL: I think staff is pointing out some 22 key logistical differences between interim rates and 23 EICF. We can understand why staff would then think that 24 this contingency fund would be preferential to the 25 interim rate. However, you're still coming up against

the threshold of what's legal and what the Commission 1 2 can do. CHAIRMAN HALL: 3 Right. I understand that. 4 But from a practical perspective, do you agree with 5 staff that the interim rates concept would not allow the 6 utility to start receiving the funds to finance the 7 improvement before the improvement has been made? I 8 think that's a critical component. 9 MR. HALL: I think the distinction that I see 10 is that once an interim rate is approved that small 11 utility is then in a better position to then go to a 12 lender and seek additional revenue from that angle. 13 CHAIRMAN HALL: So you think you could get the 14 interim rate prior to expending the moneys necessary for 15 the improvement and before actually starting or 16 completing the project? 17 MR. HALL: Not necessarily before a compliance 18 -- not necessarily before a compliance upgrade becomes 19 used and useful but rather with the promise and the 20 securing of interim rates additional lending and revenue 21 streams from outside, banks and other facilities are 22 then -- the small utility then has access to those 23 avenues. 24 MR. WESTON: If I might respond. Part of the 25 issue with using interim rates in this fashion is that

1	those rates are only set are only in place until an
2	actual rate case sets final rates. And unless those
3	final rates are allowed to include a potentially
4	unfinished plant, capital investment, which I think we
5	all have accounting concerns with, the point of the EICF
6	is that it will be in effect until the project is done
7	and then that will go away and rates will be set based
8	on the actual rate base at that time. So the idea is
9	that the contingency fund would allow for the funding of
10	the project for a known period of time, for the actual
11	cost of the project, all of that information up front
12	and identified and then it goes away when that is
13	completed where if you set it on an interim rate basis
14	that is going to go away either at a subsequent rate
15	case when natural rates are set, which probably cannot
16	be more than 11 months later based on our understanding
17	of how interim rates work, and then that project is not
18	yet completed. So either the return have to change
19	again and not recoup the actual cost of the project,
20	which is not used and useful which we'd have problems
21	with, or you're going to have to allow for some other
22	kind of mechanism that calls for the prerecoupment of
23	incomplete capital.

25

1	help in the discussion is that the Laclede interim rate
2	framework applies when you have these emergency
3	situations whereas staff's proposed rule is just
4	applying to the small water and sewer utilities
5	general I y.
6	We imagine that when you have a small utility
7	
8	CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, a small water or sewer
9	utility with a serious environmental problem.
10	MR. HALL: Right. And we imagine that when
11	you have one of those small sewer or water utilities
12	with an emergency situation, that will encompass all if
13	not significantly all of these cases of environmental
14	noncompliance. So if staff is looking to create a rule
15	that's available for all small utilities outside of this
16	emergency situation, well, then OPC falls back on its
17	concerns that we need to have a proper legal foundation.
18	So far I mean, staff is citing sorry.
19	CHAIRMAN HALL: When you're describing or
20	discussing a proper legal foundation, you're really
21	addressing single issue ratemaking issues, right?
22	MR. HALL: I haven't heard it phrased that
23	way.
24	CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, the used and useful
25	statutory requirement doesn't apply to water and sewer

1	correct?
2	MR. HALL: That is technically correct,
3	Chairman, yes.
4	MR. WESTON: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN HALL: So the Legal concerns around
6	this rule have to do with single issue ratemaking; is
7	that correct?
8	MR. WESTON: Staff certainly proposed the rule
9	as being a part of a rate case so as to address and
10	avoid any kind of specifics in ratemaking issues.
11	CHAIRMAN HALL: So then when OPC talks about a
12	legal foundation, what are you talking about?
13	MR. HALL: We're talking about that you have
14	to find something that either the courts have accepted
15	or that you have an express statutory policy to support
16	what the Commission is proposing to do.
17	CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. So you're not talking
18	about any prohibitions. You think that we've got to
19	find specific statutory authority for this mechanism?
20	MR. HALL: Yes. The Commission is a creature
21	of statute.
22	CHAIRMAN HALL: With broad discretion to set
23	just and reasonable rates.
24	MR. HALL: With setting just and reasonable
25	rates, you are correct, Chairman. However, I would not

agree that it has broad authority for outside mechanisms or other possible creation of other revenue streams.

CHAIRMAN HALL: You keep talking about outside mechanisms. And as staff points out, this would be part of a rate case.

MR. HALL: It's part of the rate case, you're correct, but OPC does not see it as part of a rate. The proposed rule says that the EICF is going to be part of a customer charge on the bill. Does that -- That could either be envisioned as a separate surcharge such as a --

CHAIRMAN HALL: It wouldn't be a separate surcharge because there is case law on that issue. But if it was part of the customer charge.

MR. HALL: Respectfully, we see taking -- If you take a surcharge and then you hide it within the fixed customer charge, it still seems to contravene the logic of the cases that have found that the Commission cannot create an extra statutory surcharge.

MR. WESTON: If I might interrupt briefly.

This is not a surcharge. This is not a legal surcharge

-- this is not a surcharge. Staff did not want to have
any question whether or not this was a surcharge.

Surcharge, that word has got a commonplace language use.

It also has a commission more term of art use. And yes,

there are past cases that have found surcharges to be unconstitutional needing specific statutory authority. However, the Commission does have express statutory authority to create contingency funds. That exists within the statute. We're not talking about a surcharge, a charge that exists in perpetuity that can be adjusted outside of a rate case. We're talking about a specifically determined amount created via a rate case identified, supported by documentation that the Commission relies on that allows for the specific recoupment of a particularized cost or costs meant to make environmental improvements.

We're not talking about an FAC charge. We're talking specifically about a charge, an ability to recoup specifically for a fund to make reimbursements for a very specific investment. I think that's a very important legal distinction.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: Is this really a rate design question?

MR. WESTON: No. Although the reason why we suggest that it be on or in the customer charge is because it needs to be identified for rate design purposes the idea that you're addressing fixed costs rather than a variable cost. You know what the fixed costs of the installation of the project will be. So

1	it's appropriate to go into a customer charge which
2	tends to recover fixed costs rather than variable ones.
3	That's the identification I'm putting in the customer
4	charge. Now that I've said that, I have to find it.
5	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Did public counsel have
6	further comments?
7	MR. HALL: I guess staff is saying that
8	there's statutory authority for contingency funds. I
9	know of no such statute that uses that phrase, provides
10	for any type of fund creation mechanism. The staff does
11	cite to general cost setting authority in 393.270. OPC
12	generally sees environmental compliance as part of the
13	cost of service of providing water and sewer services.
14	If that's the case, then perhaps these utilities except
15	in these cases of emergency situations should be coming
16	in for these rate cases and having those costs factored
17	into the rate base.
18	Furthermore, when you look at PSC statutes,
19	the only time environmental concerns are expressly
20	addressed it's in the ECAM statute or in underutilized
21	for not the Commission's fault, because of DNR's
22	inability to partner with the PSC and 393.147's loan
23	program.
24	MR. SMITH: Chairman, this is Ryan Smith, OPC.

Another reason we were thinking interim rates may be

25

more of an attractive option for a small utility is if there is such an emergency and you would have to wait in that general rate case, then that is quite a bit of time under which presumably there could be an emergency that isn't being quenched by emergency rate relief. Instead, that emergency essentially continues forward up until the conclusion of the general rate case.

The interim rate framework under Laclede essentially would allow for that emergency to be quenched but then at the time of the rate case you would roll that into regular rates and so it would just be part of the utility's rates going forward and there wouldn't be -- I think as staff has it proposed or the Commission has it proposed in the rule, I think it's something like reasonably anticipated project within a five-year time horizon. You know, I could envision a lesser period of time that might be more appropriate. I hope that explanation was somewhat helpful in terms of our intent.

And I would say public counsel is encouraged that staff in their comments I think said that there was a banker's organization they reached out to that was generally supportive of their proposed rule. Although we do have some questions about the legal authority, that was something that was encouraging to public

1 counsel because we do recognize that utilities can 2 struggle find findings. So we were encouraged by 3 staff's interviewing of the banking organization and 4 relaying that in their comments. 5 MR. WESTON: Chairman, I'm sorry to interrupt. 6 I've been trying to find the reference to contingency 7 funds which is in the statute. It it under 393.270.4. 8 I am trying to pull it up on my phone. The Revisor 9 Missouri.gov page keeps crashing on my phone. So I'm 10 unable to --11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I've got a copy of the 12 statutes back here. 13 MR. WESTON: Thank you, Judge. So it says sub 14 4 is in determining the price to be charged for gas, 15 electricity, or water the commission may consider all 16 facts which in its judgment have any bearing upon a 17 proper determination of the question although not set 18 forth in the complaint and not within the allegations 19 contained therein -- this is the 270 which talks about 20 complaints for rate cases -- with due regard, among 21 other things, to a reasonable average return upon 22 capital actually expended and to the necessity of making 23 reservations out of income for surplus and 24 contingencies. This is a contingency fund. 25 MR. SMITH: Chairman, I think that same

1	statute he just referenced said capital actually
2	expended. I thought I heard that. So I'm not sure that
3	is quite as authoritative as staff may have wished.
4	MR. HALL: Staff's use of the word contingency
5	in the proposed rule is an adjective. In that statute
6	it's a noun. I think that's an interesting reading of
7	the statute at best I would say. But if OPC can comment
8	on putting aside our disagreement on the foundation of
9	the rule, with the proposed rule itself section (6) on
10	the reporting provision, that every quarter after
11	receiving approval, the small utility shall submit
12	documentation to staff and public counsel. We had
13	concern about at what point, within every quarter is it
14	the beginning of every quarter, the end, the middle.
15	Any type of clarification of what the Commission
16	believes is better either the beginning or the end would
17	be appreciated.
18	CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah, I thought I agreed with
19	that suggestion. Does staff have a thought on that?
20	MR. WESTON: We think that reporting every
21	quarter in common practice is usually at the end of the
22	quarter. OPC's suggestion to clarify that is
23	appropri ate.
24	CHAIRMAN HALL: Is appropriate?
25	MR. WESTON: We think that's fine. We think

1

4 5

> 6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

16

15

17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

25

it's obvious that to report what happened in the quarter would have to occur at the end of the quarter. clarification makes it clearer.

MR. HALL: For further clarification, if the EICF is not going to be a separate surcharge, we would still suggest that the charge be prominently displayed, at least separately displayed on a customer's bill so the customer knows what part of their bill is attributed to the EICF so at least there's some transparency and possibly some revisions within the text of the rule itself because when it just says as part of the customer charge, our office was unclear as to whether that meant a surcharge or within the fixed charge or some other tertiary charge that we had not thought of.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Does staff have a response to issue No. 12 of OPC?

MR. WESTON: I think the language of the proposed regulation as actually printed in the register assaults that concern, that statement that the EICF should be trued up and reviewed to determine that if it should, and then three options are provided, remain in effect at a current rate, remain in effect at a different rate or be terminated. The language of the regulation itself identifies that these are an exclusive or list, either one or the other or the third, and the

1	unnecessary verbiage is actually just the way the rule
2	is presented.
3	CHAIRMAN HALL: Does staff have a response to
4	Missouri American's suggestion its third its
5	suggestion at paragraph 3 of its comments? Just making
6	it clear that
7	MR. WESTON: Yeah, my response would be I
8	suppose that makes it clear that it would be the
9	Commission directing the general counsel to seek civil
10	penalties from a procedural and operational standpoint
11	of how the Commission operates. That makes sense.
12	CHAIRMAN HALL: And does that mirror other
13	statutory language?
14	MR. WESTON: It mirrors the actual operations
15	of the Commission. It explains how that authority is
16	di vi ded and created.
17	CHAIRMAN HALL: In Missouri, DNR has
18	jurisdiction over safe drinking water, correct?
19	MR. WESTON: That's correct.
20	CHAIRMAN HALL: So if there was a problem with
21	lead in the water from pipes, service lines or
22	otherwise, DNR would investigate and issue orders
23	related thereto, correct?
24	MR. WESTON: They are the primary water
25	quality agency, yes.

1 CHAIRMAN HALL: 0kay. So would their rules, 2 regulations and orders be considered environmental 3 because they are an environmental agency? 4 MR. WESTON: Would they be considered 5 environmental? 6 CHAIRMAN HALL: I'm looking at the Rule (4)(A)1. 7 (4)(A) is a list of necessary improvements and 8 then 1, the list, and they only include those 9 improvements that are directly related to environmental 10 rul es. 11 MR. WESTON: Yes. 12 CHAIRMAN HALL: I'm wondering if we -- and it 13 would relate to rules, regs and orders issued by DNR, 14 EPA or other regulatory authority, city ordinances, 15 state attorney general. Is environmental modifying all 16 of that? 17 MR. WESTON: I wouldn't say that it's 18 modifying all of that, but let me give you an example of 19 other agencies that might have pertinent orders that 20 could affect this. For example, a local health 21 department or a county health department. They can 22 identify if there's an issue with water which would be 23 DNR's wheel house, but they can identify if buildings can 24 continue to be occupied or not. And if there's such a 25 problem that water is not being provided, the health

1 department might be able to order certain behavioral 2 responses, localized responses to that. 3 departments are also responsible for specific septic 4 on-site systems. 5 CHAIRMAN HALL: My question is, would those --6 Is that regulation environmental? I'm wondering if 7 maybe we need to remove the word environmental. 8 MR. WESTON: And just make it rules, 9 regulations? 10 MR. HALL: Perhaps it could be necessary to 11 provide safe and adequate service or sub type maybe even 12 to a Commission rule or a Commission statute. CHAIRMAN HALL: I wouldn't want a situation 13 14 where there was a health agency, be it state, county or 15 local that would issue an order or have a regulation 16 requiring a utility to take certain action and this 17 contingency fund not be deemed applicable. 18 Chairman, I generally agree that MR. WESTON: 19 we wouldn't want it to miss anything. We would want to 20 be very careful then that other local authority orders 21 that come at the end of that list of potential 22 directives from other governmental agencies wouldn't 23 necessarily accidentally pick up something completely 24 unintended. I suppose that would still have to fall 25 within the Commission's determination of the

1	appropriateness of the request.
2	CHAIRMAN HALL: And I think OPC's suggestion
3	that maybe if we were to delete environmental, we
4	instead tie it to
5	MR. HALL: Is your concern, Chairman, that
6	you're going to have an order or regulation unrelated to
7	environmental concerns that then a utility then attempts
8	to use as a basis for receiving an EICF?
9	CHAIRMAN HALL: If there's a governmental
10	entity that is telling or ordering a utility, a small
11	water or sewer utility to take certain action, I think
12	that this contingency fund should be available whether
13	or not it is tied to an environmental standard but it
14	could be determining what exactly an environmental
15	standard is. If it's a standard issued by an
16	environmental entity, is it an environmental standard.
17	I think we need to make that clear.
18	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Along those lines, we've got
19	orders of the agencies and the state attorney general.
20	Should we also have orders of the courts? Anybody want
21	to respond to that?
22	MR. WESTON: I think that's a fine addition,
23	Judge.
24	JUDGE WOODRUFF: You nodded your head and then
25	started writing but I think that did get on the record

MR. WESTON: Sorry. Yes, Judge, I think that's appropriate.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: Public counsel have any other comments?

MR. HALL: We have a suggestion that perhaps more environmentally -- I hesitate to say this because it is not that energy is not an environmental issue or that the Commission doesn't deal with environmental concerns but OPC suggests that perhaps DNR, EPA or another pure environmental law focused agency might be better suited for setting up a compliance schedule or at least should be included in the creation of a compliance schedule.

MR. WESTON: Staff agrees that the rule -- the reg that's proposed identifies the schedule to try to get the requested improvement done would be based on or include those kinds of compliance schedules that are put forth from an environmental administrative agency. I don't think that that's an issue. We don't necessarily need DNR or EPA coming in and negotiating with staff about what a compliance schedule is or set one forward when we're talking about trying to put in the length of time for a contingency fund that allows the company to meet compliance with that schedule. If that schedule is external, we're not going to want to create problems

with that. So whatever the fund would be intended to do have to work within that already issued order or court order involving that compliance schedule.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: We're talking about subparagraph (4)(C), is that the schedule we're talking about, schedule for completion of the list of improvements?

MR. WESTON: Yes.

MR. HALL: Yes, Judge.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: Then moving over to staff, any additional comments that you'd like to make?

MR. WESTON: Aside from the comments that we filed, I think just the one thing we want to make very clear, the idea of this rule is to try to prevent an emergency situation. The idea is that if a utility -- small utility is beginning to encounter some financial constraints and it's prevented that utility from making necessary capital investment to meet environmental compliance or to meet safety and adequacy standards that the utility will have an option or if they cannot obtain standard financing to hold that up front, those costs up front and pay for it all and then be able to keep itself fiscally solvent that it could do this and pay as it goes. We think that's important.

The example I have is we have utilities that

1	do a very good job that are very small that have to put
2	up personal property or real estate as collateral that
3	is not utility property to try to cover loans here. We
4	don't want that kind of situation being the case. And
5	something like this might be able to provide those kinds
6	of small utilities the ability to put in the capital and
7	not have the painful kind of costs that are involved
8	with that initial up front investment.
9	JUDGE WOODRUFF: You're talking about where
10	the owner has to put their house up as collateral?
11	MR. WESTON: Exactly, that's exactly right.
12	We want to try to avoid those kinds of situations. That
13	facility might be running perfectly fine and not be in a

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE WOODRUFF: Anything else from staff? MR. WESTON: I have nothing further.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: Anyone else in the room wishing to make a comment?

does not happen or become any worse.

true emergency, but this would at least make sure that

MR. JENKINS: This is Jim Jenkins with Missouri-American. Listening to the conversation and being familiar with the regulatory process, I do commend the Commission parties for looking into this. It's a challenge. What you've got is a ratemaking process that really sets rates on one-year increments and then you've

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

got a list of environmental type of projects out there that a small utility could encounter. So unless that small utility just files a rate case, continuous rate cases, which is really not practical, it's not practical for a company the size of Missouri-American to do that, that utility finds itself in a situation that's a problem. I think that's what the parties are raising. When I look at it, what you're trying to do is set up a fund. And that fund you've got, it's a third-party fund if I read this correctly. It's set up, you know, you can make it a third party or they can designate it as a fund and you have that base rate case to start, certain amount going into this fund and then there's procedures that are accessed by the parties for, you know, so those moneys are spent on the actual environmental projects that you've identified. A little cumbersome but it's certainly something that's certainly probably a better approach than filing back to back rate cases for a company that's the size that we're talking about here, but that's a challenge that I hear you running into and then you've got your protections in treating those funds as contributions too. That's my comments.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: Anyone else?

CHAIRMAN HALL: I have a question. What if instead of environmental we put health and safety? So

1 under (4)(A)(1)A are directly related to health and safety rules, regulations, orders, et cetera? 2 3 JUDGE WOODRUFF: What about environmental, 4 heal th and safety, three options? 5 CHAIRMAN HALL: Oh, yeah. It would make for a 6 very odd acronym. 7 MR. HALL: If I might respond that I believe 8 if it was just a health and safety contingency fund 9 that's still going to -- well, from our perspective it's 10 going to run into our position on the lead line case where the evidence as to whether or not health or safety 11 12 is actually being affected will be up for dispute. 13 so we may have future concerns on why customer charges 14 are increasing for unsubstantiated health problems. 15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: My thought on it was if 16 there's an order from the EPA to prevent pollution 17 that's killing fish in a stream, that's not really 18 health or safety but it would be environmental. 19 MR. WESTON: That is a compliance issue that 20 small utilities may encounter is they're unable to 21 properly treat and they're discharging things that could 22 lead to true not human health and safety but 23 environmental which frankly if a discharge is killing 24 fish, then it's dangerous to human health and safety, 25 yes.

AX-2018-0241

1	MR. SMITH: One concern I guess that I hadn't
2	thought about until now is just it does seem if we're
3	making the scope of any EICF so large that it
4	encompasses the entirety of the cost of service almost,
5	and I don't think that's the intent, but if we broaden
6	it that big, that could sort of swallow the rate case
7	rule and such where it's more of an EICF request. We're
8	talking about five years or possibly longer. I don't
9	know what to do about that. I just thought I'd raise
10	it, something I thought about.
11	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Any other comments?
12	MR. HALL: Nothing further.
13	MR. WESTON: No, thank you, Judge.
14	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Then we are adjourned.
15	(Off the record.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	I, Beverly Jean Bentch, RPR, CCR No. 640,
4	Certified Court Reporter with the firm of Tiger Court
5	Reporting, LLC, within the State of Missouri, do hereby
6	certify that I was personally present at the proceedings
7	had in the above-entitled cause at the time and place
8	set forth in the caption sheet thereof; that I then and
9	there took down in Stenotype the proceedings had; and
10	that the foregoing is a full, true and correct
11	transcript of such Stenotype notes so made at such time
12	and place.
13	
14	
15	Beverly Jean Bentch, CCR No. 640
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

AX-2018-0241

			I	
A	affect 22:20	appropriateness	based 4:7 11:7	careful 23:20
A)1 22:7	afternoon 3:13	24:1	11:16 25:16	case 5:10,12,24
ability 15:14	agencies 22:19	approval 19:11	basically 2:25	6:1,12,19 8:7
27:6	23:22 24:19	approved 10:10	6:2,9	8:17,18,19,23
able 7:25 8:4,7	agency 21:25	art 14:25	basis 6:14 11:13	9:5,13,14 11:2
23:1 26:22	22:3 23:14	aside 19:8 26:12	24:8	11:15 13:9
27:5	25:10,18	asking 2:25 5:20	bearing 18:16	14:5,6,13 15:7
above-entitled	agree 10:4 14:1	assaults 20:19	beginning 19:14	15:8 16:14
31:7	23:18	assistance 5:18	19:16 26:16	17:3,7,10 27:4
accepted 13:14	agreed 19:18	assisted 8:7	behalf 3:10	28:3,12 29:10
access 10:22	agrees 25:14	attempts 24:7	behavioral 23:1	30:6
accessed 28:14	ahead 2:2	attorney 2:12	believe 3:14 4:5	cases 4:21 12:13
accidentally	allegations	22:15 24:19	5:2,12 6:25	14:18 15:1
23:23	18:18	attractive 17:1	29:7	16:15,16 18:20
accomplish 8:3	allow 7:22 9:16	attributed 20:8	believes 19:16	28:4,18
accounting 11:5	10:5 11:9,21	August 1:7	benefit 5:21	cause 31:7
acronym 29:6	17:9	authoritative	Bentch 1:23	CCR 1:23 31:3
acted 4:1	allowed 11:3	19:3	31:3,15	31:15
action 23:16	allows 15:10	authority 13:19	best 19:7	certain 6:5,7
24:11	25:23	14:1 15:2,4	better 10:11	23:1,16 24:11
actual 7:6 8:19	American's 21:4	16:8,11 17:24	19:16 25:11	28:12
11:2,8,10,19	amount 7:11	21:15 22:14	28:17	certainly 13:8
21:14 28:15	15:8 28:13	23:20	Beverly 1:23	28:17,17
addition 24:22	analagous 6:17	available 12:15	31:3,15	CERTIFICATE
additional 5:21	angle 10:12	24:12	big 30:6	31:1
10:12,20 26:11	anticipated	avenues 4:25	bill 14:9 20:7,8	Certified 31:4
address 3:20,22	17:15	10:23	bit 17:3	certify 31:6
3:24 4:4,15,25	Anybody 24:20	average 18:21	briefly 14:20	cetera 29:2
5:14 7:4 13:9	appearance 2:13	avoid 13:10	broad 13:22	Chairman 1:18
addressed 16:20	appearing 3:10	27:12	14:1	2:16 3:8 5:9,13
addressing	applicable 3:1,4	avoiding 5:7	broaden 30:5	5:23,25 6:16
12:21 15:23	3:5 5:10 23:17	aware 2:24	buildings 22:23	6:21 7:12,15
adequacy 26:19	applies 12:2	AX-2018-0241		8:10 9:1,5,9,19
adequate 4:24	apply 12:25	1:13 2:4	C	10:3,13 12:8
6:10 23:11	applying 12:4		C 2:1 26:5	12:19,24 13:3
adjective 19:5	appreciated	B	Caleb 3:10	13:5,11,17,22
adjourned 30:14	19:17	back 3:23 4:9	calls 11:22	13:25 14:3,12
adjusted 15:7	approach 28:18	12:16 18:12	cap 7:6,10,13	16:24 18:5,25
adjustment 4:2	approaching	28:18,18	capital 6:10 7:23	19:18,24 20:15
4:15 6:24	5:19	banker's 17:22	7:23 8:21 11:4	21:3,12,17,20
administrative	appropriate	banking 18:3	11:23 18:22	22:1,6,12 23:5
25:18	7:18,19 16:1	banks 6:5 10:21	19:1 26:18	23:13,18 24:2
adopt 5:3	17:17 19:23,24	base 8:8 11:8	27:6	24:5,9 28:24
advantage 8:6	25:2	16:17 28:12	caption 31:8	29:5
auvantage 0.0				

		Ī	I	I
challenge 27:24	4:20 5:2,17,19	24:7 25:9	26:21 27:7	decoupling 6:17
28:20	6:13 10:1	29:13	counsel 3:9,11	deemed 23:17
challenging 8:5	13:16,20 14:18	conclusion 17:7	3:12,14 16:5	deficiencies 4:6
chance 2:11	14:25 15:3,10	consider 18:15	17:20 18:1	delete 24:3
change 11:18	17:14 18:15	consideration	19:12 21:9	department
charge 9:3 14:9	19:15 21:9,11	3:1	25:3	7:24 22:21,21
14:14,17 15:6	21:15 23:12,12	considered 22:2	county 22:21	23:1
15:13,14,21	25:8 27:23	22:4	23:14	departments
16:1,4 20:6,12	Commission's	consolidate 4:11	course 2:18	23:3
20:13,14	16:21 23:25	constraints	court 1:23 4:18	described 2:8
charged 18:14	COMMISSIO	26:17	4:19 26:2 31:4	describing 12:19
charges 29:13	1:18	contained 18:19	31:4	design 15:18,22
CHIEF 1:17	common 3:19	contingencies	courts 5:2 13:14	designate 28:11
cite 16:11	19:21	18:24	24:20	determination
cited 6:1	commonplace	contingency	cover 6:9 27:3	18:17 23:25
citing 12:18	14:24	1:14 2:6 4:16	crashing 18:9	determine 20:20
city 1:8 22:14	company 2:23	5:5 8:18 9:24	create 4:20	determined 15:8
civil 21:9	3:1 7:22 8:11	11:9 15:4 16:8	12:14 14:19	determining
clarification	9:2,16 25:23	18:6,24 19:4	15:4 25:25	18:14 24:14
19:15 20:3,4	28:5,19	23:17 24:12	created 4:2,19	differences 9:22
clarify 19:22	complaint 18:18	25:23 29:8	5:2 15:8 21:16	different 20:23
clause 3:25	complaints	continue 22:24	creation 4:8	directing 21:9
clear 11:25 21:6	18:20	continues 17:6	5:20 14:2	directives 23:22
21:8 24:17	completed 11:13	continuous 28:3	16:10 25:12	directly 22:9
26:14	11:18	contravene	creature 13:20	29:1
clearer 20:3	completely	14:17	critical 10:8	disagreement
closer 3:3	23:23	contributions	CSR 2:5	19:8
collateral 27:2	completing	28:22	cumbersome	discharge 29:23
27:10	10:16	conversation	28:16	discharging
come 5:17 6:13	completion 26:6	27:21	current 20:22	29:21
23:21	compliance 3:15	copy 18:11	customer 9:2	discretion 13:22
coming 9:25	3:22,24 5:1	correct 5:11	14:9,14,17	discussing 12:20
16:15 25:20	7:24 10:17,18	7:14 13:1,2,7	15:21 16:1,3	discussion 12:1
commend 27:22	16:12 25:11,12	13:25 14:7	20:8,11 29:13	displayed 20:6,7
comment 2:7	25:17,21,24	21:18,19,23	customer's 20:7	dispute 29:12
19:7 27:19	26:3,19 29:19	31:10		distinction 9:20
comments 2:11	component 10:8	correctly 28:10	D	10:9 11:25
2:24 16:6	concept 5:9 10:5	cost 4:2,15 5:4	D 2:1	15:17
17:21 18:4	concern 3:18	6:24 9:2 11:11	dangerous 29:24	distraught 4:22
21:5 25:4	19:13 20:19	11:19 15:11,24	DANIEL 1:18	distressed 6:4,13
26:11,12 28:22	24:5 30:1	16:11,13 30:4	deal 25:8	distribution
30:11	concerns 2:6	costs 4:23 5:7	debt 6:9	8:25
commission 1:2	11:5 12:17	8:12 15:11,23	decided 3:3	divided 21:16
2:4 3:19 4:1,14	13:5 16:19	15:25 16:2,16	decision 4:19	DNR 21:17,22

AX-2018-0241

	1	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
22:13 25:9,20	energy 25:7	19:2	finds 28:6	28:12,13 29:8
DNR's 16:21	ensure 6:10	expending 10:14	fine 19:25 24:22	funding 11:9
22:23	entirety 30:4	expense 9:11	27:13	funds 7:20 9:11
documentation	entity 24:10,16	Explain 9:9	firm 31:4	10:6 15:4 16:8
15:9 19:12	entries 2:12	explains 21:15	first 2:20 7:3	18:7 28:21
doing 5:24	environmental	explanation 8:8	fiscally 26:23	further 16:6
dollars 7:11	2:6 3:15,22,24	17:18	fish 29:17,24	20:4 27:17
drafted 3:18 4:1	4:2,4,14,16,23	express 13:15	fit 3:21	30:12
drinking 8:25	5:1,4,5 6:24	15:3	five 30:8	Furthermore
21:18	12:9,13 15:12	expressly 3:22	five-year 17:16	16:18
due 18:20	16:12,19 22:2	16:19	fix 8:11,12	future 29:13
	22:3,5,9,15	external 25:25	fixed 14:17	
E	23:6,7 24:3,7	extra 14:19	15:23,24 16:2	G
E 2:1,1	24:13,14,16,16		20:13	G 2:1
ECAM 7:3,5	25:7,8,10,18	F	fixing 4:9	gas 4:18 6:12
16:20	26:18 28:1,15	FAC 15:13	flow 5:22	18:14
effect 11:6 20:22	28:25 29:3,18	facilities 8:25	focused 25:10	gather 2:18
20:22	29:23	10:21	foregoing 31:10	general 5:18
effective 7:1,1	Environmenta	facility 27:13	forth 6:1 18:18	16:11 17:3,7
EICF 9:23 11:5	1:14	fact 3:23 8:16	25:18 31:8	21:9 22:15
14:8 20:5,9,19	environmenta	factored 16:16	forward 5:8	24:19
24:8 30:3,7	25:6	facts 18:16	17:6,12 25:21	generally 2:10
either 3:19 4:5	envision 5:18	fairly 2:10	found 14:18	12:5 16:12
6:23,25 11:14	17:16	fall 23:24	15:1	17:23 23:18
11:18 13:14	envisioned	falls 12:16	foundation	give 22:18
14:10 19:16	14:10	familiar 27:22	12:17,20 13:12	go 2:2,20 4:9 6:5
20:25	envisions 9:1	far 12:18	19:8	10:11 11:7,14
electricity 18:15	EPA 7:25 22:14	fashion 10:25	founded 3:19	16:1
eliminates 7:15	25:9,20 29:16	fault 16:21	framework 4:4	goals 3:17 4:16
emergency 3:25	especially 8:24	file 1:13 2:4,24	4:18,19 6:2,16	5:4,4
4:21 12:2,12	essentially 17:6	filed 5:10 8:17	12:2 17:8	goes 11:12 26:24
12:16 16:15	17:9	26:13	frankly 29:23	going 2:12,13
17:2,4,5,6,9	estate 27:2	files 28:3	front 5:22 9:15	5:7 6:6 7:2,21
26:15 27:14	et 29:2	filing 2:11 28:18	11:11 26:21,22	11:14,21 14:8
encompass	evidence 29:11	final 11:2,3	27:8	17:12 20:5
12:12	exactly 24:14	finance 10:6	full 6:19 8:8	24:6 25:25
encompasses	27:11,11	financial 26:16	31:10	28:13 29:9,10
30:4	example 6:6	financially 4:22	fund 1:14 2:7	good 3:12 27:1
encounter 26:16	22:18,20 26:25	5:16 6:4,13	4:17 5:5 8:18	governmental
28:2 29:20	exclusive 20:24	financing 26:21	9:24 11:9	23:22 24:9
encouraged	executive 4:11	find 4:7,14	15:15 16:10	Governor 4:11
17:20 18:2	existing 4:3,12	13:14,19 16:4	18:24 23:17	Greitens' 4:11
encouraging	exists 15:4,6	18:2,6	24:12 25:23	gross 7:6,9,10
17:25	expended 18:22	findings 18:2	26:1 28:9,9,9	guess 16:7 30:1
	511ponaou 10.22		20.1 20.2,2,2	
	•	•		•

	l 27.10	15.05	21.15	17.0
H	house 27:10	15:25	31:15	17:8
Hall 1:18 3:8,10	human 29:22,24	installed 8:22	Jefferson 1:8	language 6:18
3:10 5:9,12,13	I	intended 26:1	Jenkins 2:20,22	14:24 20:17,23
5:15,23 6:15	idea 6:3 11:8	intent 17:19	2:22 27:20,20	21:13
6:21 7:12,15		30:5	Jim 2:22 27:20	large 7:23 30:3
8:10 9:1,5,9,19	15:23 26:14,15	interesting 19:6	job 27:1	laudible 3:17
9:21 10:3,9,13	identification	interim 4:17,20	joining 3:12	law 1:17 3:19
10:17 11:24	16:3	5:9,13,20,24	Judge 1:17 2:2	14:13 25:10
12:8,10,19,22	identified 11:12	6:3,14,18,23	3:7,9 15:18	lead 21:21 29:10
12:24 13:2,5	15:9,22 28:16	7:4,16,17,17	16:5 18:11,13	29:22
13:11,13,17,20	identifies 20:24	7:19 8:2,10,15	24:18,23,24	legal 4:25 6:1,16
13:22,24 14:3	25:15	8:19 9:6,10,14	25:1,3 26:4,9	10:1 12:17,20
14:6,12,15	identify 2:21	9:22,25 10:5	26:10 27:9,16	13:5,12 14:21
16:7 19:4,18	22:22,23	10:10,14,20,25	27:18 28:23	15:17 17:24
19:24 20:4,15	imagine 12:6,10	11:13,17 12:1	29:3,15 30:11	legislature 3:21
21:3,12,17,20	immediate 7:20	16:25 17:8	30:13,14	lend 6:6
22:1,6,12 23:5	7:22	interrupt 14:20	judgment 18:16	lender 10:12
23:10,13 24:2	impaired 5:16	18:5	judicial 5:6	lending 10:20
24:5,9 25:5	implicates 8:16	intervene 4:20	jurisdiction	length 25:22
26:9 28:24	important 15:17	interviewing	21:18	lesser 17:17
29:5,7 30:12	26:24	18:3		let's 2:2 6:5
happen 27:15	improvement	invest 6:10	<u>K</u>	limiting 8:22
happened 20:1	2:6 4:16 5:5	investigate	keep 7:20 14:3	line 4:10 29:10
head 24:24	9:3 10:7,7,15	21:22	26:22	lines 21:21 24:18
health 22:20,21	25:16	investment 7:23	keeps 18:9	list 20:25 22:7,8
22:25 23:2,14	improvements	7:23 8:1,21,23	key 9:22 11:24	23:21 26:6
28:25 29:1,4,8	15:12 22:7,9	9:17 11:4	killing 29:17,23	28:1
29:11,14,18,22	26:7	15:16 26:18	kind 8:15 9:11	listen 3:6
29:24	inability 16:22	27:8	11:22 13:10	Listening 27:21
hear 28:20	include 11:3	involved 27:7	27:4,7	litigation 5:7
heard 12:22	22:8 25:17	involving 26:3	kinds 25:17 27:5	little 28:16
19:2	included 25:12	issue 4:1 7:5 9:8	27:12	LLC 1:23 31:5
hearing 1:6 2:3	income 6:7,8 7:7	10:25 12:21	know 8:2,3,11	loan 16:22
2:7,7	18:23	13:6 14:13	15:24 16:9	loans 27:3
hearings 2:10	incomplete	20:16 21:22	17:16 28:10,14	local 22:20
help 5:13 12:1	11:23	22:22 23:15	30:9	23:15,20
helpful 17:18	increasing 29:14	25:7,19 29:19	known 11:10	localized 23:2
hesitate 25:6	increments	issued 22:13	knows 20:8	logic 14:18
hide 14:16	27:25	24:15 26:2		logistical 9:22
higher 6:8	informal 2:10	issues 3:22,25		longer 30:8
history 4:7	information	12:21 13:10	L 1:16	look 3:3 4:17
hold 26:21	2:18 11:11		lack 9:11	6:23 16:18
hope 17:18	initial 27:8	<u>J</u>	Laclede 4:18	28:8
horizon 17:16	installation	Jean 1:23 31:3	6:11,16 12:1	looking 4:6

	ī	1	1	
12:14 22:6	MORRIS 1:16	on-site 23:4	parsimoniously	29:10
27:23	moving 26:10	once 10:10	4:10	possible 3:16 5:7
		one-year 27:25	part 9:8 10:24	14:2
M	N	ones 16:2	13:9 14:4,6,7,8	possibly 4:23
maintained 3:16	N 2:1	ongoing 7:24	14:14 16:12	20:10 30:8
major 8:24	natural 7:25	9:11	17:12 20:8,11	potential 23:21
making 4:18	11:15	OPC 6:22 9:19	particular 6:22	potentially 11:3
18:22 21:5	necessarily	12:16 13:11	particularized	practical 10:4
26:17 30:3	10:17,18 23:23	14:7 16:11,24	15:11	28:4,4
manner 5:16	25:19	19:7 20:16	particularly 7:5	practice 19:21
Matter 1:13	necessary 6:10	25:9	parties 2:23	preferential
mean 12:18	8:23 10:14	OPC's 19:22	27:23 28:7,14	9:24
meant 15:11	22:7 23:10	24:2	partner 16:22	prerecoupment
20:12	26:18	operates 21:11	party 28:11	11:22
measures 5:3	necessity 18:22	operational	passed 3:25	present 31:6
mechanism 4:2	need 6:8 8:11,14	21:10	pay 4:22 8:1	presented 21:2
4:15 6:23,24	9:12 12:17	operations 7:21	26:22,23	Presiding 1:16
11:22 13:19	23:7 24:17	21:14	penalties 21:10	presumably 4:6
16:10	25:20	option 7:16 17:1	percent 7:6,10	17:4
mechanisms	needed 7:20	26:20	7:12	prevent 26:14
6:25 14:1,4	8:20 9:12	options 20:21	perfectly 27:13	29:16
meet 4:23 7:23	needing 15:2	29:4	period 8:22,23	prevented 26:17
25:24 26:18,19	needs 15:22	order 4:11 23:1	11:10 17:17	price 18:14
met 5:6	negotiating	23:15 24:6	perpetuity 15:6	primary 7:5
middle 19:14	25:20	26:2,3 29:16	personal 27:2	21:24
mirror 21:12	nodded 24:24	ordering 24:10	personally 31:6	printed 20:18
mirrors 21:14	noncompliance	orders 21:22	perspective 10:4	prior 10:14
missing 6:20	4:4 12:14	22:2,13,19	29:9	probably 11:15
Missouri 1:1,8	notes 31:11	23:20 24:19,20	pertinent 22:19	28:17
2:9 3:21 21:4	noun 19:6	29:2	phone 18:8,9	problem 3:20
21:17 31:5	0	ordinances	phrase 16:9	8:11,15,24
Missouri-Ame	$\overline{\mathbf{O}}$ 2:1	22:14	phrased 6:18	12:9 21:20
2:23,24 3:2	obligations 6:9	organization	12:22	22:25 28:7
27:21 28:5	obtain 26:20	17:22 18:3	pick 23:23	problems 7:24
Missouri.gov	obvious 20:1	outside 10:21	pipes 21:21	11:20 25:25
18:9	occupied 22:24	12:15 14:1,3	place 8:5 11:1	29:14
misunderstan	occupied 22.24 occur 20:2	15:7	31:7,12	procedural
6:15	odd 29:6	owner 27:10	plant 11:4	21:10
modifying 22:15	office 3:11,12,14	P	point 11:5 19:13	procedures
22:18	20:12		pointing 9:21	28:13
moneys 9:14	Oh 29:5	P 2:1	points 14:4	proceeding 6:19
10:14 28:15	Okay 7:12 9:19	page 18:9	policy 13:15	proceedings 1:5
months 8:21 11:16	13:17 22:1	painful 27:7	pollution 29:16	31:6,9
11.10	15.17 22.1	paragraph 21:5	position 10:11	process 8:20
			<u> </u>	

AX-2018-0241

	Ī	Ī	I	I
27:22,24	purpose 2:18	28:3,12,18	referenced 19:1	reservations
program 16:23	7:21 9:16	30:6	reflection 3:2	18:23
prohibitions	purposes 15:23	ratemaking 5:18	reg 25:15	Resources 7:25
13:18	put 25:17,22	12:21 13:6,10	regard 18:20	Respectfully
project 10:16	27:1,6,10	27:24	regarding 1:13	14:15
11:6,10,11,17	28:25	rates 4:20 5:13	2:5	respond 6:21
11:19 15:25	putting 16:3	5:20,24 6:14	register 2:9	9:19 10:24
17:15	19:8	6:23 7:4,17,18	20:18	24:21 29:7
projects 28:1,15		7:19 8:5,10 9:6	regs 22:13	response 20:15
prominently	Q	9:15,17,22	regular 17:11	21:3,7
20:6	quality 3:15	10:5,20,25	regulation 9:16	responses 23:2,2
promise 10:19	21:25	11:1,2,3,7,15	20:18,24 23:6	responsible 23:3
proper 12:17,20	quarter 19:10	11:17 13:23,25	23:15 24:6	return 11:18
18:17	19:13,14,21,22	16:25 17:11,12	regulations 22:2	18:21
properly 3:19	20:1,2	27:25	23:9 29:2	revenue 5:21 7:9
29:21	quenched 17:5	reached 17:22	regulatory 1:17	7:10 10:12,20
property 27:2,3	17:10	read 3:4 28:10	4:3 22:14	14:2
proposed 1:13	question 6:16	reading 19:6	27:22	review 5:6
2:5,8,8,19 8:4	14:23 15:19	real 27:2	reimbursements	reviewed 20:20
9:1 12:3 13:8	18:17 23:5	really 3:4 12:20	15:15	revisions 20:10
14:8 17:13,14	28:24	15:18 27:25	relate 22:13	Revisor 18:8
17:23 19:5,9	questions 2:16	28:4 29:17	related 21:23	right 6:7 10:3
20:18 25:15	2:16,17 3:7,8	reason 15:20	22:9 29:1	12:10,21 27:11
proposing 7:22	17:24	16:25	relaying 18:4	roll 9:2 17:11
13:16	quite 17:3 19:3	reasonable	relief 17:5	room 27:18
proposition 6:12		13:23,24 18:21	relies 15:10	RPR 31:3
protections	R	reasonably	remain 20:21,22	rule 1:13 2:5,5,8
28:21	R 2:1	17:15	remove 23:7	2:9,19 3:3,18
provide 4:24	raise 30:9	receiving 10:6	report 20:1	4:7,17 5:5 7:13
23:11 27:5	raising 28:7	19:11 24:8	REPORTED	7:21 8:7 9:1
provided 3:20	rate 4:17 5:9,10	recognize 18:1	1:22	12:3,14 13:6,8
4:18 20:21	5:24 6:3,7,8,18	recommendati	Reporter 31:1,4	14:8 17:14,23
22:25	6:19 7:16 8:2,7	4:13	reporting 1:23	19:5,9,9 20:10
provides 16:9	8:8,16,17,18	record 24:25	19:10,20 31:5	21:1 22:6
providing 16:13	8:19,19,23	30:15	representing	23:12 25:14
provision 19:10	9:10,13,14,25	recoup 11:19	2:22	26:14 30:7
PSC 16:18,22	10:10,14 11:2	15:15	request 6:14	rulemaking 1:6
public 1:2 2:7,19	11:8,13,14	recouped 9:12	24:1 30:7	2:3,25
3:9,11,12,14	12:1 13:9 14:5	9:15	requested 25:16	rules 4:1,9,12
16:5 17:20,25	14:6,7 15:7,8	recoupment	require 6:19	22:1,10,13
19:12 25:3	15:18,22 16:16	15:11	required 7:7	23:8 29:2
published 2:9	16:17 17:3,5,7	recover 9:17	requirement	run 29:10
pull 18:8	17:8,10 18:20	16:2	9:14 12:25	running 27:13
pure 25:10	20:22,23 28:3	reference 18:6	requiring 23:16	28:20
=			- ~	
L				

	1	1	1	ı
Ryan 3:11 16:24	setting 5:21	28:15	streams 10:21	24:11
	13:24 16:11	staff 6:21,24 8:7	14:2	takes 8:21
S	25:11	9:21,23 10:5	struggle 18:2	talking 7:7 8:20
S 2:1	sewer 12:4,8,11	12:14,18 13:8	sub 18:13 23:11	13:12,13,17
safe 4:24 6:10	12:25 16:13	14:4,22 16:7	subject 2:4 8:19	14:3 15:5,7,13
21:18 23:11	24:11	16:10 17:13,21	submit 19:11	15:14 25:22
safety 26:19	sheet 31:8	19:3,12,19	subparagraph	26:4,5 27:9
28:25 29:2,4,8	significantly	20:15 21:3	26:5	28:19 30:8
29:11,18,22,24	12:13	25:14,20 26:10	subsequent	talks 13:11
saw 3:21 6:16	similar 6:17	27:16	11:14	18:19
saying 16:7	simultaneously	staff's 12:3 18:3	sufficient 4:15	technically 13:2
says 14:8 18:13	8:1 9:18	19:4	suggest 8:17	telling 24:10
20:11	single 12:21 13:6	standard 9:13	15:21 20:6	tends 16:2
SB 3:23	situation 5:14	24:13,15,15,16	suggesting 6:22	term 14:25
scenario 7:19,20	12:12,16 23:13	26:21	suggestion 8:16	terminated
schedule 25:11	26:15 27:4	standards 26:19	19:19,22 21:4	20:23
25:13,15,21,24	28:6	standpoint	21:5 24:2 25:5	terms 17:18
25:24 26:3,5,6	situations 12:3	21:10	suggests 9:10	tertiary 20:14
schedules 25:17	16:15 27:12	start 4:9 10:6	25:9	text 20:10
scope 30:3	size 3:1 28:5,19	28:12	suited 25:11	thank 3:8 18:13
secondly 4:13	small 4:5 5:15	started 2:3	support 13:15	30:13
section 19:9	5:17,19 6:4 7:6	24:25	supported 15:9	thereof 31:8
secured 3:16	7:8,8 8:6 10:10	starting 10:15	supportive	thereto 21:23
securing 10:20	10:22 12:4,6,8	state 1:1 22:15	17:23	thing 26:13
see 10:9 14:7,15	12:11,15 17:1	23:14 24:19	suppose 21:8	thing 20.13 things 8:15
seek 10:12 21:9	19:11 24:10	31:5	23:24	18:21 29:21
sees 16:12			_ :	
sense 21:11	26:16 27:1,6	statement 2:15	surcharge 14:10	think 3:5 7:2,18
separate 14:10	28:2,3 29:20 Swith 2:11 5:25	20:19	14:13,16,19,21	8:8 9:7,7,20,21
14:12 20:5	Smith 3:11 5:25	statute 4:3 7:7	14:21,22,23,24	9:23 10:8,9,13
separately 20:7	16:24,24 18:25	7:13 13:21	15:6 20:5,13	11:4,24 13:18
septic 23:3	30:1	15:5 16:9,20	surcharges 15:1	15:16 17:13,14
serious 12:9	solvent 26:23	18:7 19:1,5,7	sure 3:23 5:25	17:21 18:25
service 1:2 4:24	somewhat 17:18	23:12	19:2 27:14	19:6,20,25,25
6:11 16:13	sorry 12:18 18:5	statutes 3:20	surplus 18:23	20:17 24:2,11
21:21 23:11	25:1	6:17 16:18	surviving 5:6	24:17,22,25
	sort 30:6	18:12	swallow 30:6	25:1,19 26:13
30:4	speak 7:3	statutory 12:25	swear 2:13	26:24 28:7
services 16:13	specific 13:19	13:15,19 14:19	system 5:15,17	30:5
set 5:23 6:1 11:1	15:2,10,16	15:2,3 16:8	systems 7:6,8	thinking 16:25
11:7,13,15	23:3	21:13	8:6 23:4	third 20:25 21:4
13:22 18:17	specifically 15:8	Stenotype 31:9	T	28:11
25:21 28:8,10	15:14,15	31:11		third-party 28:9
31:8	specifics 13:10	stood 6:12	take 2:12 8:6	thought 19:2,18
sets 11:2 27:25	spent 9:12,13,15	stream 29:17	14:16 23:16	19:19 20:14
			l	

AX-2018-0241

	 I	I	I	ı
29:15 30:2,9	unintended	water 2:23 5:15	word 14:24 19:4	4
30:10	23:24	5:17,19 12:4,8	23:7	4 2:5 18:14 22:7
thousands 7:11	unnecessary	12:11,25 16:13	work 6:2 11:17	22:7 26:5 29:1
three 20:21 29:4	21:1	18:15 21:18,21	26:2	
threshold 10:1	unneeded 5:7	21:24 22:22,25	workers 4:23	5
tie 24:4	unrelated 24:6	24:11	worse 27:15	50,000 7:9
tied 24:13	unsubstantiated	way 3:24 4:15	wouldn't 8:10	
Tiger 1:23 31:4	29:14	5:3 12:23 21:1	14:12 17:13	6
time 8:18,22	update 8:24	we'll 2:17,19	22:17 23:13,19	6 19:9
11:8,10 16:19	upgrade 10:18	we're 2:3 5:14	23:22	60,000 7:9
17:3,10,16,17	upheld 5:1	6:6 7:7,22 8:20	writing 24:25	640 1:23 31:3,15
25:23 31:7,11	use 14:24,25	13:13 15:5,7		7
transcript 1:5	19:4 24:8	15:13,13 25:22	X	7 1:7
31:11	useful 9:3 10:19	25:25 26:4,5	Y	/ 1./
transparency	11:20 12:24	28:19 30:2,7	$\overline{\mathbf{Y}}$ 1:18	
20:9	uses 16:9	we've 13:18	yeah 19:18 21:7	
treat 29:21	usually 19:21	24:18	29:5	
treating 28:21	utilities 4:5 7:8	WESTON 7:2	year 7:9,10	
treatment 8:25	12:4,11,15	7:14,17 8:14	years 30:8	
true 27:14 29:22	16:14 18:1	9:4,7,10 10:24	years 50.0	
31:10	26:25 27:6	13:4,8 14:20	\mathbf{Z}	
trued 20:20	29:20	15:20 18:5,13		
try 2:18 25:15	utility 4:21 5:19	19:20,25 20:17	0	
26:14 27:3,12	6:4,4,11 10:6	21:7,14,19,24		
trying 5:14 8:6	10:11,22 12:6	22:4,11,17	1	
8:24 18:6,8	12:9 17:1	23:8,18 24:22	11:9 22:8	
25:22 28:8	19:11 23:16	25:1,14 26:8	1)A 29:1	
two 4:25 6:25	24:7,10,11	26:12 27:11,17	11 8:21 11:16	
type 16:10 19:15	26:15,16,17,20	29:19 30:13	11-month 8:20	
23:11 28:1	27:3 28:2,3,6	wheelhouse	12 20:16	
U	utility's 17:12	22:23	179 3:23	
unable 18:10	\mathbf{V}	wished 19:3	2	
29:20	variable 15:24	wishing 27:19 witness 2:14	2.5 7:6,10,12	
unclear 20:12	16:2		2005 3:23	
unconstitutio	verbiage 21:1	wondering 22:12 23:6	2003 3:23 2018 1:7	
15:2	Volume 1:9		240-10.095 2:5	
understand 3:5		WOODRUFF 1:16 2:2 3:7,9	270 18:19	
9:23 10:3	W	,		
understanding	wait 17:2	15:18 16:5 18:11 24:18,24	3	
11:16	want 14:22	25:3 26:4,10	3 21:5	
underutilized	23:13,19,19	27:9,16,18	393.147's 16:22	
16:20	24:20 25:25	28:23 29:3,15	393.270 16:11	
unfinished 11:4	26:13 27:4,12	30:11,14	393.270.4 18:7	
		JU.11,14		
	ı	I	ı	1