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PROCEEDINGS
(The Court went on the record at 10:09 a.m)
THE COURT: The Commission is calling
the action in file No. EC- 2016-0001. That is the case of Dzhurinskiy vs. Uni on Electric Company. We're here for a prehearing conference this morni ng. I'mDani el Jordan. I amthe regul at ory I aw judge assigned to this action.

Ve'll begin by taking entries of appearance. And if you have any representatives of clients with you, please introduce them al so. We'll begin with the complai nants.

Mr. Dzhurinskiy, I believe you're on the I ine? Mr. Dzhurinski y?

MR. DZHURI NSKI Y: Yes, yes, I can hear you.

THE COURT: And is Mrs. Dzurinskaya with you?

MR. DZHURI NSKI Y: Yes, my wife.
THE COURT: Very good. I hope I'm pronouncing that correctly.

MR. DZHURI NSKI Y: Yes, that's fine.
THE COURT: And for Amer en?
MS. G BONEY: For Ameren, Sar ah Gi boney, 111 South Ni nth Street, Col unbia, M ssouri 65201.

And here in the hearing roomis Ameren's
representative Cat hy Hart. And then by tel ephone?
ME. TATRO: Wendy Tatro, 1901 Chouteau
Avenue, St. Loui s, M ssouri 63103.
THE COURT: Thank you. And for the
Cormi ssi on staf $f$ ?
MR. W LLI AME: For Commi ssi on staff, William Hampt on Willians II, PO Box 360, Jefferson City, M ssouri 65102.

THE COURT: And is there staff
represent ative today?
MR. WLLI AME: Yes. We do have two staff representatives, $M$ ke Scheperle and $M$ chael St ahl man.

THE COURT: Very good. And for the Of fice of Public Counsel?

MR. OPI TZ: For the Office of Public Counsel, I'mTi m Opitz, PO Box 2230, J efferson City, M ssouri 65102.

THE COURT: Thank you, everyone. We're here to discuss a few matters. First, primarily procedural matters invol ving scheduling. There is a pending notion for summary determination and a motion to extend time rel ated to that motion for summary determination. I imgine that will be --
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certainly can be, and I hope it will be the subject of di scussion amongst the parties as far as scheduling. Any objection to that?

MG. G BONEY: No, Judge.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. OPI TZ: Judge, may I i nqui re?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. OPI TZ: Are you -- based on your order, I was under the impression that we were goi ng to di scuss the motion to continue during the on-the-record portion of this. Are you suggesting now that you're going to leave that to us to di scuss afterwards?

THE COURT: Well, I'masking what's your choi ce? We can di scuss that motion to continue, whi ch basi cally asks to extend time to do di scovery, to respond to the motion for summary det ermination. Does OPC have something that it wants to -- an argument that it wants to make to the Cormíssi on?

MR. OPI TZ: Yes, J udge. Publ ic Counsel would oppose this notion to continue. It's our position that there is no andiguity. The tariff is clear. This case was filed on July 1st of 2015. Ameren had an opportunity and did file a response
to the complaint in answer to the complaint.
Thereafter, staff filed its report in which it articul ated its legal anal ysis and made its recommendation that the compl ai nant is entitled to relief. After a period of days, Ameren Mssouri had the opportunity and did respond substantively to the staff's recommendation. On that same date, public counsel filed its motion for summary determination whi ch Iargel y concurred with the legal arguments of the Commis ssion staf.

Si nce that time the company has made this motion for an extension of time to conduct di scovery. It's my position that there is no di scovery necessary. The tariff language is clear. There's no reason for the del ay here because there's nothing that is necessary to be di scovered.

Wth that said, since this motion has been made, l will say that public counsel will commit to responding as expeditiously to any di scovery sent to us by the company, or any party, so that there is -- you know, if they do want to conduct di scovery, they can do so within the time allowed for by the Commission's rules. And so for those reasons, it's our belief that del aying this procedural schedule serves no purpose other than to
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deny the compl ai nants the relief that the Commission may determine they're entitled to.

THE COURT: Okay. l'Il take some
responses to that. First from Ameren, then from the compl ai nants, and then fromstaff. Ameren?

MS. G BONEY: Judge, I think it became apparent after Ameren's answer was filed and staff filed its report that the tariff is interpreted differently, at least by the company and by staff, whi ch gi ves some indication that there might be an ambi guity. And if the Commission determined that the tariff was anbi guous, then applying the rul es of stat utory construction it would resort to evi dence, which means fact of the tariff's intended meani ng. And those are the facts that we would like to di scover and devel op, basically what the parties' interpretations are.

And that is important, what the parties mean. Because the tariff, as you know, is not only a Iaw, but it's also a species of contract and generally reached by negotiation anong OPC and staff and the company and potentially other parties. So that would be if the Commission determined it was anbi guous, we would still need to be able to show facts.

Even if the Cormi ssi on determined that it was not ambi guous, that it was pl ain meaning, the company's still entitled to present evi dence that that pl ai n meani ng leads to an absurd or illogi cal result, and we would al so like to obvi ously devel op some facts, do some di scovery to show that there is an obvi ous, absurd and illogi cal result with both staff and OPC's interpretation. So those would be the reasons that we would like to conduct some di scovery.

And it really wasn't as apparent that that would be necessary until staff's report was filed and then OPC's motion for summary determination was filed. And as to any possible del ay, this is not meant to minimize in any way the i mportance of the complaint, but this is the first time that this particular tariff has come before the Cormíssion in a complaint. And so we think it merits taking some time to devel op this.

And in addition there is a, rel atively speaki ng, low dollar amount invol ved. And so, for example, this is not a case where compl ai nant is facing a di sconnection for a thousand-dollar bill or something like that. We're tal king about, you know, we'll say in the range of $\$ 5$ a month while
we' re trying to come to a concl usion of this complaint. And so we don't see any reason -- while there's no reason to inordi natel y del ay it, we don't see any reason that we cannot devel op this compl aint as it deserves to be devel oped.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Dzhurinskiy, did you have anything to say about Ameren's request for more time to put together the facts of its case?

MR. DZHURI NSKI Y: I do thi nk a little out of proportion. I agree with the staff there is no -- there is no reason to make a di scovery and make it a longest time to finally evolve. I believe it's not just because of my complaint, it's probably because of thousands of people in this state. That is why Ameren wants to make this case continue. I don't think it's right. I agree with the staff you need to make a summary determination. There is nothing to di scover anymore. Anything is just stat utes and rul es and regul ations.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you,
Mr. Dzhurinskiy. Staff, anything to add in this regard?

MR. WLLI AMB: I'd like to add two points.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. W LLI AMS: At the outset of this complaint, there was a factual question as to whet her or not Mr. Dzhurinskiy had recei ved assistance, which is a payment was made froma I ow i ncore assi stance program Si nce July 1st, । bel ieve when this case was initiated, that has been suppl emented in the record through OPC's filing on Septenber 14th.

Because there's no other outstanding facts with regard to the application of the tariff itself, the language itself, we believe that there's -- we're unsure as to what further facts remai $n$ undi scovered regarding the tariff itself and Mr. Dzhurinskiy's application.

Wth regard to the issue of interpretation and the issues claimed by Ameren in thei $r$ answer in reply to staff's brief, Ameren has attempted to use extrinsic evi dence to prove the existence of an ambi guity in a clear tariff.
Courts have rul ed against this time and time again. You know, the Commission has -- and in recent years been rul ed agai nst by the courts for interpreting unambi guous tariffs. And we would just like to see that, you know, the Commission follow the rule of I aw.
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THE COURT: Okay. I want to do a little bit of probing as to this action. I want to first clarify what remedi es the parties are seeking.

First, Mr. Dzhurinskiy, I understand that you want your bill corrected. Aml right with that? Aml right about that?

MR. DZHURI NSKI Y: Yes, I would like my bill to be corrected. And I also raise a situation that invol ves the future, how it's going to be set. Because it's supposed to be determination, what exactly, not just only at this time Ameren is going to correct my bill. What's going to be next?

Because they are going to apply for a mediation agai n . And I (hard to hear) a guess.

I woul d, like I expl ai ned to the Commi ssion staff and other counsel, l cannot rely on my application that l use as far as heating my hore. So now for two months l'min recei pt again, and I would like to know what Ameren is going to do, not just only to correct my bill, what actions they are goi ng to do to correct everything, what's been assessed in this right.

THE COURT: Very good.
MR. DZHURI NSKI Y: You' II probably hear from other customers. It's not about me. It's not
just fighting for my \$5 a month. It's fighting for ot her families, several thousand dollars, customers who recei ve assi stance the same way like us, most probabl y si nce ' 07.

THE COURT: Well, I thi nk you rai se an i mportant point there, Mr. Dzhurinskiy, and I will turn now to staff and ask what remedi es staff is goi ng to ask the Commi ssi on to make.

MR. W LLI AMS: Judge, our primary concern in thi s case is Ameren's asserted defense of its interpretation of the tariff. We were concerned that Areren bel ieves it has the authority to unilaterally interpret and apply its tariff wi thout notification to the Commi ssi on regarding how it's going to be applied. And it's an authority that has not been extended to i ndi vi dual s in the past under law. It's not an authority that has been extended to compani es in the past.

We bel ieve that if it is Ameren's belief that they're not entitled to compensate, or l guess remedy Mr. Dzhurinskiy due to the tariff's I anguage, their proper recourse is to file corrected tariff sheets with the definitions as they bel ieve or as they -- I guess that meets their i ntent with the Commission for its consideration
and approval.
The notion of going through a compl ai nt process for the Commission to di scover how it is appl ying its tariff is not in the interest of the Commi ssi on. I thi nk it undermines the regul at ory scheme, and I think ultimately it creates -- it has I arger implications than this case al one.

THE COURT: Is staff planning to seek an order to file -- for filing of a new tariff?

MR. W LLI AMS: That is something that we can di scuss. I think that this is -- this was somet hing that we had contempl at ed. Because like I sai d, and even Mr. Dzhurinskiy mentioned this as well, some of the arguments that were incl uded in Ameren's response go beyond this complaint itself. And what we want to do is make sure that the tariffs that are filed on record are bei ng i mpl emented to the understanding of the customers.

THE COURT: Okay. And Office of Public Counsel, are you pl anning to seek any further remedi es such as I mentioned in di scussi ons with staff or any others?

MR. OPI TZ: Thank you, Judge. Our primary remedy that we're seeking is summary determination in favor of the compl ai nants, finding
that the compl ai nants meet the qualifications that are listed in Ameren's tariff sheet. Within that same order, we would ask that the Commission requi re Ameren to excl ude the compl ai nants and all ot her qual ifying low-income customers from paying this rider EEIC charge.

We would not be in favor of an order for requiring the filing of a new tariff. It's my position that the tariff is clear and unambi guous. And it's simply a matter of Ameren Mssouri not following its tariff. And so the long and short of it is we would seek an order requiring themto follow the tariff that's on file. A tariff that was drafted by the company that was the underlying reason for the tariff was a stipulation agreement to whi ch the company was a si gnatory and one of the primary drafters.

THE COURT: Okay. Before I get to
Areren, I want to do a little probing of the larger issues that Mr. Dzhurinskiy and the other parties have stated, or at least implied in this action. And I think my first question will be for Ameren's representatives. I'mgoing frommy memory of what's been filed in this action so far. Ameren has residential customers of a million, a
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million- point-2, 1.2 milli on.
ME. HART: 1. 2.
THE COURT: 1.2 million . And anyone el se feel free to jump in if they have some numbers they think are better. And then if l al so recall further, the number of residents that may be eligible, the other residents as Mr. Dzhurinskiy mentions, eligible for this benefit to have this charge removed fromthei r bill, 3 percent of that customer base?

MS. GI BONEY: That was the testimony of
Bill Davis during the rate case.
THE COURT: That's my recollection.
MS. GI BONEY: Direct testimony that was
filed by Bill Davis in the rate case.
THE COURT: And I'mnot real good with moving deci mal points around. How many people is that, 3 percent of a million? I don't have my cal culator. That's back on the bench.

ME. Gl BONEY: 30,000, pl us another.
THE COURT: PI us another, counsel ?
MB. G BONEY: I can't do that math.
THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. But somewhere up from 30, 000 peopl e?

ME. GI BONEY: Yeah.
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THE COURT: Okay, all right. And do I al so remenber that this program of removing the charge started in June of 2015, according to the tariff? Does that sound right?

MS. G BONEY: I think that's correct. Wendy, do you recall? Wasn't it the June billing?

MR. OPI TZ: I believe it was the June billing.

THE COURT: Let me get some more vol ume on here. Try that again.

MS. TATRO. I'd have to look. We did have it implemented alittle bit earlier than the rate case final order because we implemented it with the change in the EEIC rider.

STAFF REPRESENTATIVE: It was I ate May, May 27th.

THE COURT: So we' re I ooki ng at I ate May.

MS. G BONEY: But the June billing.
THE COURT: So where are we now? Ve' re in October, four months, 4 times 30, at least 120 days. All right. Does staff counsel remenber of $f$ the top of its head its authority, the Commission's authority to seek penalties fromthe circuit court? Aml correct that's a thousand dollars maximer
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MR. WLLI AME: Yeah, it's a thousand dollars per day per offense.

THE COURT: Okay, per offense. So a thousand dollars for, say, 120 days so far times 30, 000 customers. That's a lot of zeros, isn't it?

MS. G BONEY: Those are company cust oners.

MS. TATRO: Yeah, those are company customers who are al ready recei ving the di scount. Those are customers that -- when Mr. Davis came up with that number, that was customers that were certainly recei ving LI HEAP or the other qual ifying assistance. So those have al ready been opted out aut omatically. The system does that aut omatically. The difference here is, he's not getting assistance on the Ameren Mssouri bill.

THE COURT: Okay. So we al ready have accounted for those 30,000 people. Those are the peopl e we know about.

Mb. TATRO. Ri ght.
MS. G BONEY: That woul d be -- Judge, just to be clear, those are people who would be -that we thi nk would be eligi ble based on poverty level s, whether or not they' ve applied for LI HEAP or recei ved it is a totally different issue.
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THE COURT: Okay. So those are peopl e-- so that was my question. These are people that are eligible. You're telling me they're eligible, but not necessarily getting it today. We don't know.

ME. GI BONEY: Who based on thei $r$ income I evel would apply to recei ve it, just based on what we think their income level is. But we don't know whether they have applied, and we don't know whet her they' ve been determined to be eligible because there's other things that could affect your el i gi bility.

THE COURT: Staff counsel, want to take up on this?

MR. W LLI AMS: Yeah, Judge. I bel ieve that the program was set up to automatically flag i ndi vi dual s who have recei ved LI HEAP assi stance. There should not be an application process necessary.

MB. GI BONEY: You have to apply for LI HEAP.

MR. W LLI AMB: Well, I under st and that.
MB. TATRO. I think you guys are tal king past each other.

MR. W LLI AMS: I bel i eve we are.
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THE COURT: Let's gi ve the reporter a break here. And why don't I inquire on those? And we can do it in kind of question and answer.

Staff's idea is that the customers are flagged when they recei ve assistance. Is that correct?

MR. W LLI AME: Yes.
THE COURT: That's your readi ng, okay. How do they get flagged for -- to Ameren when they recei ve assistance for a LI HEAP bill? What does the tariff provide with that?

MR. W LLI AMS: The answer, Judge, is that there's no automatic flagging invol ved when assistance is provided to another utility.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. W LLI AMB: I bel i eve that the initial question was regarding the 3 percent that was contemplat in representing the case. That was with regard to Ameren customers who are recei ving LI HEAP or some of the other program assi stance applied to Ameren.

MS. Gl BONEY: I don't thi nk that's exactly correct. I believe the 3 percent number was the number of Ameren customers that Ameren estimated would be, if they applied, potentially el igi ble to recei ve LI HEAP or energy assi stance.
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THE COURT: That's my recollection of the record.

MR. W LLI AMS: Okay.
THE COURT: My question is, of course Ameren knows when its customers get assi stance.

ME. G BONEY: Correct.
THE COURT: How does it know? What flags Ameren as to LI HEAP or anyone el se?

MR. WLLI AME: I believe this case represents that, that this would be a circunstance where the customer who has recei ved assi stance to another program would notify the company of its recei pt. We have in the Commission rules procedure for billing adjustments where there has been an overcharge in this case. What the customer did was notify Ameren, provide, l believe, a letter of eligi bility, which was agai n, as l mentioned earlier, a point of contention in this case. However, that's been suppl emented where a letter showing di sbursement fromthe Mssouri Department of Social Services the paper was made.

THE COURT: I thi nk that's the state of the record as to Mr. Dzhurinskiy. Ameren's not di sputing that the Dzhurinski ys have recei ved this assistance anymore, is it?

MG. G BONEY: I will say that the company cannot, and this would be a probl emanong all customers of Ameren who recei ve LI HEAP towards thei r primary heat source, which is in Ameren, that's my category, as to that category of people, whi ch incl udes the Dzhurinskiys, Ameren has no way to verify. And I don't mean a practical way, । mean a legal way to verify that those people have recei ved that assi stance.

THE COURT: And can you gi ve me a little bit more background in the law of -- that you're referring to here? Because as l read the tariff, you know, just of $f$ the top of $m y$ head, I didn't see the flagging mechani smto which staff counsel refers. So can you give me a little more background of the Iaw on this? I have a feeling there is sore as far as confidentiality of utility bills, but l'm not real clear. And then l'Il take response frompublic counsel as well.

MS. G BONEY: There woul d be contract provisions that would affect that, and there would al so be legal -- there would be Iaw that would affect that. On the contract side, as a home energy supplier, Ameren Mssouri, and that's a contract we have with the Department of Soci al

Services, they're not permitted to di scl ose any information about anyone who recei ves any type of emergency assistance on the company's bills. We are not permitted to di sclose that to any other utility or anyone el se.

On the Department of Social Services si de, or actually the state generally, I believe it's Section 208. 120 of the M ssouri Revi sed Stat utes, provide that no state empl oyee, period, can di scl ose any information about any applicant or reci pient for benefits unl ess that information directly pertains to that application. So in other words, the Department of Social Services can di scl ose inf ormation about, you know, my application for LI HEAP to my hore energy supplier but cannot di scl ose that to, you know, the public or someone el se.

THE COURT: Ri ght. So we' re tal king about a body of law that rel ates onl $y$, ki nd of indirectly to utilities, it's really social servi ces I aw.

MS. G BONEY: That's right.
THE COURT: And thei $r$ obl igations as to confidentiality and keeping the confidence of inf ormation regarding benefits. Is that where we
look for this?
MB. Gl BONEY: That's correct. And so to extend that issue, if the company were to contact the Department of Social Services and say, can you confirmto me that this particular person who is our customer recei ved energy assi stance towards another utility's bill? I believe that 208. 120 prevents that di scl osure.

THE COURT: They just say no, like the Cormí ssion has to say no when it's asked for inf or mation regar di ng an industry that it's gathered in the course of an investigation. Okay, I understand that idea conceptually. I see where you're pointing me towards.

Office of Public Counsel, do you have anything to add to this conversation?

MR. OPI TZ: Yes, Judge. So in regard to the confidentiality, l believe the situation that woul d be contempl ated is much like the compl ai nants in this case where they di d recei ve LI HEAP fundi ng. They are an Ameren customer, but that LI HEAP fundi ng was not applied to their Ameren utility bill. The customer attempted to provi de inf or mation and event ually was able to provide the I etter showing that they recei ved the fundi ng.
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If it is a step where once that customer has given this information to Ameren and said should be exempt, I believe that there could be some system worked out where if the customer submits a written wai ver or something saying to the social services, or request social services to then contact the company. I don't think this is a barrier that's impossible to get past. And it's -it's something that they must do under this tariff.

THE COURT: l'm seei ng, as
Mr. Dzhurinskiy said earlier, a couple of issues that are invol ved in this complaint. The first is his bill, and l'mpretty sure the resol ution of that will not be complicated. Other issues that are implicated in this action are far more compl icated. So my inclination now, since OPC has asked for a ruling on the motion to extend the time to respond to summary determination, is that l will grant it. I will leave it to the parties to fold the di scussi on of the length of that extension into thei $r$ di scussion of the procedural schedule as a whol e.

So that's been educational for me, and I hope this provides al so a framework for the parties' di scussion for the rest of this
conference. So I've made my ruling on that, and I think that's all l had to say as far as this prehearing conference goes. Do the parties have any more matters that I can hel p them with before we go of $f$ the record and I leave the room

MS. G BONEY: Judge, can I ask a
question? So the notion -- you' ve granted our motion to extend the time. And the parties are to determin how I ong that extensi on will last? Is that what I'mgathering?

THE COURT: Ri ght. And if you can't, I'Il make a ruling on that too.

MS. G BONEY: All right, thank you.
THE COURT: l'd like staff to do a few thi ngs. Number 1, let me know when the parties are done so we can lock up and hang up the phone when Ms. Tatro is done.

MR. W LLI AME: Sure.
THE COURT: My hope is that the parties will work out a proposed procedural schedul e today. And so l hope that staff will be able to file a notion for a proposed procedural schedule on behalf of all parties end of today, early tomorrow. Does that sound realistic?

MR. WLLI AME: Yes.
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THE COURT: Okay. And that's all l've got. What el se can I do for the parties while we' re here on the record? Anything?

MR. OPI TZ: Judge, may I ask or inquire as to the contents of the procedural schedule that you might be looking for in this case? As you're aware, I have filed a motion for summary determination. So it's -- it would be my position that there's no need for a hearing or additional testimony. Is that something that you' re looking for in terns of the procedural schedul e?

THE COURT: Well, I see what you're saying. We won't need anything more if the Commission grants the motion for summary det er mination.

MR. OPI TZ: Okay.
THE COURT: So what I' menvi si oni ng is that as resol ution for the motion for summary determination first, and then more stuff after that, if necessary.

MS. TATRO: So, Judge, just to make sure I understand, you're asking us to provi de a procedural schedule that includes dates beyond the determination, and we'll just cancel themif the Commi ssion makes the ruling on the summary
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det er mination?
THE COURT: That's correct.
ME. TATRO: Thank you.
THE COURT: And I thi nk everybody here understands what kinds of things go into a procedural schedule. The parties may want to do prefile testimony. They might not want to. Di scovery deadl i nes are hel pf ul. Di scovery conferences can be hel pful. I can leave a lot of that to the parties. I think you have an idea of what I have in mind.

MB. Gl BONEY: That does rai se a question I had. I imgine that we will want to subpoena for deposition Heather Jones who's the LI HEAP coordinator for the M ssouri Department of Social Servi ces because she's not a party to thi s action. And can we just submit the subpoena to you in an e- nail?

THE COURT: Are we tal ki ng about a subpoena duces tecum?

MS. G BONEY: Well, we' d want to both depose her and gather documents, yes.

THE COURT: Ri ght. So I thi nk -- l'm trying to remember. I'mtrying to remenber whether the PSC has a procedure different from Chapter 536
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for subpoena duces tecum and l don't remenber of $f$ the top of $m y$ head what the regul ation provides.

MB. G BONEY: There is a rule about the subpoenas, but l believe it says submit them to the secretary or the judge. And the reason I'm inquiring is because the sample subpoena that's on the Commission's website just refers to testifying at a hearing. It doesn't refer to a deposition.

THE COURT: For di scovery, whi ch you get under 536.

MB. Gl BONEY: Okay. And maybe Vendy's
familiar with this and l'masking a question I don't need to ask. But it occurred to me this morni ng that --

THE COURT: Yeah. My answer is, I don't know the answer off the top of $m y$ head.

MS. TATRO: I think it's a good
question. I don't know the answer either, Sarah. I haven't done that bef ore.

THE COURT: Okay. What el se can I do for the parties while we're on the record? Not hearing anything. All right, and I've done my instructions to staff, staff counsel, so thank you all for being here. I appreciate your thorough di scussion of these issues. Mb. Tatro by phone and
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Mr. Dzhurinski y by phone, thank you for your pati ence. And with that, l will adjourn this part of the prehearing conference and we will go of $f$ the record.
(The Court went of $f$ the record at 10: 41 a.m)
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