In Re: Petition of Empire District Electric Company to Obtain a Financing Order			
Procedural Conference Before: Judge Morris L. Woodruff March 01, 2022			
Vol 01			
PHIPPS REPORTING Raising the Bar!			

1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	STATE OF MISSOURI
3	
4	
5	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
6	Procedural Conference
7	via WebEx
8	March 1, 2022
9	Volume 1
10	
11	
12	
13	In The Matter of the Petition) of The Empire District Electric) File No. EO-2022-0040
14	Company d/b/a Liberty to Obtain) a Financing Order that
15	Authorizes the Issuance of) Securitized Utility Tariff)
16	-
17	MORRIS L. WOODRUFF, Presiding
18	CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
19	
20	
21	REPORTED BY:
22	Tracy Taylor, CCR No. 939
23	Job Number: 236513
24	
25	

Page 2 1 APPEARANCES 2 DIANA C. CARTER 428 E. Capitol Avenue, Suite 303 3 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 573.289.1961 4 Diana.Carter@LibertyUtilities.com The Empire District Electric Company FOR: 5 DAVID WOODSMALL 6 308 E. High Street, Suite 204 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 7 david.woodsmall@woodsmalllaw.com FOR: Midwest Energy Consumers Group 8 NATHAN WILLIAMS 9 Department of Commerce & Insurance 200 Madison Street, Suite 650 10 PO Box 2230 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 11 opcservice@opc.mo.gov Office of the Public Counsel FOR: 12 CURTIS STOKES 13 Department of Economic Development 200 Madison Street, Suite 800 14 PO Box 360 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360 15 staffcounselservice@psc.mo.gov Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission FOR: 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Page 3 1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: So we're on the record 2 at this point. And this is the matter of the petition 3 of Empire District Electric Company, doing business as 4 Liberty, to obtain a financing order that authorizes the issuance of securitized utility tariff bonds for 5 6 qualified extraordinary costs. It's File Number 7 EO-2022-0040. And we're here today for a procedural conference. 8 9 Let's start out by asking -- taking the 10 entries of appearance beginning with Liberty. 11 MS. CARTER: Good morning. This is Diana 12 Carter for the Empire District Electric Company, doing 13 business as Liberty. 14 MR. WOODSMALL: And for Staff? 15 MR. STOKES: This is Curt Stokes on 16 behalf of Staff, 200 Madison Street, PO Box 360, 17 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. MR. WOODSMALL: And Public Counsel? 18 19 MR. WILLIAMS: Nathan Williams, Chief 20 Deputy Public Counsel, PO Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. 21 22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And for MECG? 23 MR. WOODSMALL: Good morning, Your Honor, David Woodsmall. 24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And I believe that's all 25

Page 4 1 the parties. The main reason I requested that we have 2 this procedural conference is in response to the 3 proposed procedural schedule that was scheduled last 4 week.

5 Unfortunately, I must report that the proposed hearing dates of June 20th through June 24th 6 are not available on the Commission's schedule. 7 It's 8 conflict with the MARC conference in Chicago and 9 several of the commissioners will be attending that and will also want to be able to attend this hearing. 10 11 So we need to come up with another date. 12 What I got from the commissioners, the previous week, 13 that would be the week of the 13th I believe it would be, would be -- would be available for them if it's 14 15 available to you. And then you might want to just --16 other dates in the schedule as well to match that. 17 The other thing I noticed, that the 18 commissioners as well noticed from the proposed 19 procedural schedule, was the concept of consolidating 20 this case with the -- which is the Storm Uri docket, with the Asbury securitization docket and suggesting 21 that in the schedule that the motion to consolidate 22 would be filed on April 25. 23 24 I just have some questions about that if

25 you can all -- if somebody can answer these for me.

www.phippsreporting.com (888) 811-3408

Page 5 1 First of all, have the parties all agreed upon 2 consolidation at this point or is this something that Liberty is going to be proposing and then we'll decide 3 4 Anybody want to address that? later? 5 MS. CARTER: Judge --6 MR. WOODSMALL: For a non-Liberty party, 7 this is MECG. We certainly agree to the 8 consolidation. And the main reason behind that is 9 there are economics involved if we can put together 10 the Uri with the Asbury securitization. Instead of 11 having two bond issuances, we can combine them into 12 one bond issuance and save those issuance costs. So we're certainly amenable to putting these two cases 13 together on a common procedural schedule. 14 15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And Ms. Carter, I 16 think -- go ahead. 17 Oh, I'm sorry. MS. CARTER: I was going 18 to say the reasoning behind allowing time then was 19 although we are all in agreement, the parties in the 20 docket, we didn't know if anyone else would intervene -- move to intervene in the Asbury docket. 21 22 So we wanted to allow time for interventions in that docket and then ask for consolidation, knowing that we 23 24 wouldn't be able to bind potential future parties to 25 the Asbury docket to our agreement here to

1 consolidate. 2 Okay. I understand. JUDGE WOODRUFF: Would the current deadline of August 22nd for the 3 4 Storm Uri case also then apply to the Asbury financing order or are you anticipating a single order in the 5 6 two cases? Judge, we were, I believe, 7 MS. CARTER: 8 anticipating a single order here, keeping us on the 9 Storm Uri timeline. The Commission wouldn't be obligated to issue the order on Asbury without 10 11 allowing the 215 days from the filing of the Asbury 12 petition, where they're statutorily obligated to issue 13 the order on Storm Uri within the 215 days of that application filing date. 14 15 We were hoping to keep Asbury -- as 16 Mr. Woodsmall mentioned, we are hoping to bring Asbury 17 in and keep that on the Storm Uri docket so we can 18 have one financing order -- or financing orders issued at the same time so that bonds could then be issued 19 20 together and save money. 21 JUDGE WOODRUFF: So it would be a single bond issuance? 22 That -- that would be the 23 MS. CARTER: 24 hope. This is new for all of us, but it is our 25 understanding that that should be possible.

Page 7 1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And would the 2 Asbury-related bond charges be allocated among the rate classes in the same manner as the Uri-related 3 4 bond charges, or is that something still to be 5 decided? 6 MR. STOKES: I think that would probably 7 be something that is decided. 8 MS. CARTER: I think there are potential 9 issues where maybe there could be differences. We've 10 tried to get as much information as we can from people who have done this before in other states and it does 11 12 seem possible to still have bonds issued together even 13 if you then have to have separate charges on the 14 utility bills. 15 There might be -- I MR. STOKES: Yeah. 16 don't know what you call them, different traunches or two different series of bonds, but one -- one bond 17 issuance or one bond order that would allow the 18 company to save. 19 The big focus -- like MECG, Staff's 20 big focus was saving on the transactional costs by 21 consolidating. 22 Okay. And I'm sure it's JUDGE WOODRUFF: 23 kind of early in the process to be able to answer 24 this, but do we know will we actually need a full week 25 of hearing on this?

Page 8 1 MR. STOKES: I hope not, but I think, you 2 know, we were going to reserve a full week just in 3 case. 4 MR. WILLIAMS: This is Public Counsel. Т 5 anticipate there will be a number of litigated issues. JUDGE WOODRUFF: 6 Okay. I appreciate 7 As I say, this is all new to all of us, so that. 8 we're going to try and come up with the best plan we 9 can. 10 Is there anything else that any party 11 wants to bring up while we're on the record on this? 12 MS. CARTER: Judge, I have a question on 13 dates. 14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. 15 I was trying to check with MS. CARTER: 16 my witnesses on conflict dates and when I add all 17 my -- the Asbury folks in as well, I ended up with 18 more conflict dates than I thought, I guess being a 19 hearing and right there in summertime. 20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Sure. 21 MS. CARTER: You indicated the week 22 before, the 13th through the 17th , was available. Is 23 the weekend -- not weekend, although I hope we 24 don't --25 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Interesting concept.

Page 9 Is the week after that 1 MS. CARTER: Yes. 2 available, after we had proposed -- I'm trying to find dates here -- June 20th to the 24th? 3 4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: So you'd be talking 5 about the week of the 27th through the 1st? 6 MS. CARTER: Yes, 27th to the July 1st. 7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yeah, I don't see 8 anything on the calendar. But of course, that -- that 9 starts squeezing us at the end here. 10 MS. CARTER: Yeah. 11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: So --12 MR. WILLIAMS: This is Nathan Williams. We did look at that prior week and were told there 13 were conflicts that made it unworkable for the 14 15 parties. 16 MS. CARTER: Yes, that's on my end. 17 Thanks, Nathan. One of my main witnesses is out of 18 the country that week, but we may just have to figure 19 that out. And maybe we can get agreement just on her 20 issues at least so that she wouldn't need to testify. MR. STOKES: Judge, what about the week 21 22 of June 6th? Would that be open? I know that kind of 23 squeezes, you know -- moving too far ahead, we don't 24 want to squeeze the parties and we don't want to 25 squeeze the Commission either direction, but --

1	Page 10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yeah. I don't see			
2	anything on the calendar for that week. I'll also			
3	mention here, the proposed procedural schedule also			
4	suggests that if the Commission wanted to expedite			
5	transcripts, that briefing could be moved up a week.			
6	We will certainly expedite transcripts to you can			
7	keep that in mind when you're coming up with a			
8	proposed schedule. Anything else we need to discuss			
9	while we're on the record?			
10	MS. CARTER: Judge, would you give us a			
11	day or so to figure it out then and we propose a new			
12	hearing date?			
13	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Sure. If you'd give me			
14	something well, tomorrow would be ideal.			
15	MR. STOKES: Okay.			
16	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And if you all want to			
17	stay on the line here and discuss this amongst			
18	yourselves, I'll go ahead and drop off and you can			
19	discuss it this way, or if you have other arrangements			
20	you want to make, feel free. At this point then, we			
21	are off the record.			
22	(Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at			
23	8:40 a.m.)			
24				
25				

1	Page 11
2	
	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
3	
4	I, Tracy Thorpe Taylor, CCR No. 939, within the
5	State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the
6	foregoing proceeding was duly taken by me to the best
7	of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting
8	under my direction; that I am neither counsel for,
9	related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the
10	action in which this deposition was taken, and
11	further, that I am not a relative or employee of any
12	attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto,
13	nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome
14	of the action.
15	Tracy It Jaylor
16	\mathcal{O}
17	Tracy Thorpe Taylor, CCR
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

		April	3:16,20
1	8	4:23	briefing
13th	8:40	arrangements	10:5
4:13 8:22	10:23	10:19	bring
17th		Asbury	6:16 8:11
8:22	A	4:21 5:10,21,	business
lst		25 6:4,10,11,	3:3,13
9:5,6	a.m.	15,16 8:17	
·	10:23	Asbury-related	C
2	add	7:2	
	8:16	attend	calendar 9:8 10:2
200	address	4:10	
3:16	5:4	attending	call 7:16
20th	agree	4:9	
4:6 9:3	5:7	August	Carter
215	agreed	6:3	3:11,12 5:5
6:11,13	5:1	authorizes	15,17 6:7,2 7:8 8:12,15
2230	agreement	3:4	21 9:1,6,10
3:20	5:19,25 9:19		16 10:10
22nd	ahead	В	case
6:3	5:16 9:23		4:20 6:4 8:
24th	10:18	beginning 3:10	cases
4:6 9:3	allocated		5:13 6:6
25	7:2	behalf	
4:23	allowing	3:16	charges 7:2,4,13
27th	5:18 6:11	big	
9:5,6	amenable	7:19,20	check
	5:13	bills	8:15
3	anticipate	7:14	Chicago
	8:5	bind	4:8
360	anticipating	5:24	Chief
3:16	6:5,8	bond	3:19
	appearance	5:11,12 6:22	City
6	3:10	7:2,4,17,18	3:17,20
65102	application	bonds	classes
3:17,21	6:14	3:5 6:19	7:3
6th		7:12,17	combine
9:22	apply 6:4	Box	5:11

Commission			find
6:9 9:25 10:4	D	E	9:2
Commission's	date	early	focus
4:7	4:11 6:14	7:23	7:19,20
commissioners	10:12	economics	folks
4:9,12,18	dates	5:9	8:17
common	4:6,16 8:13,	Electric	free
5:14	16,18 9:3	3:3,12	10:20
company	David	Empire	full
3:3,12 7:19	3:24	3:3,12	7:24 8:2
concept	day	end	future
4:19 8:25	10:11	9:9,16	5:24
concluded	days		
10:22	6:11,13	ended 8:17	G
conference	deadline		
3:8 4:2,8	6:3	entries	give
conflict	decide	3:10	10:10,13
4:8 8:16,18	decide 5:3	EO-2022-0040	Good
conflicts		3:7	3:11,23
9:14	decided	expedite	guess
	7:5,7	10:4,6	8:18
consolidate	Deputy	extraordinary	
4:22 6:1	3:20	3:6	H
consolidating	Diana		hearing
4:19 7:21	3:11	F	4:6,10 7:25
consolidation	differences	feel	8:19 10:12
5:2,8,23	7:9	10:20	Honor
costs	direction		3:23
3:6 5:12 7:20	9:25	figure 9:18 10:11	
Counsel	discuss		hope 6:24 8:1,23
3:18,20 8:4	10:8,17,19	File	
country	District	3:6	hoping
9:18	3:3,12	filed	6:15,16
current	docket	4:23	
6:3	4:20,21 5:20,	filing	I
Curt	21,23,25 6:17	6:11,14	ideal
3:15	drop	financing	10:14
	10:18	3:4 6:4,18	information

7:10		mentioned	order
Interesting	ĸ	6:16	3:4 6:5,8,10,
8:25	heering	mind	13,18 7:18
intervene	keeping 6:8	10:7	orders
5:21		Missouri	6:18
interventions	kind 7:23 9:22	3:17,21	
5:22		money	Р
involved	knowing	6:20	
5:9	5:23	morning	parties
		3:11,23	4:1 5:1,19,24 9:15,24
issuance	L		
3:5 5:12 6:22	Liberty	motion	party
7:18	3:4,10,13 5:3	4:22	5:6 8:10
issuances	litigated	move	people
5:11	8:5	5:21	7:10
issue	0.5	moved	petition
6:10,12		10:5	3:2 6:12
issued	M	moving	plan
6:18,19 7:12	made	9:23	8:8
issues	9:14		PO
7:9 8:5 9:20	Madison	N	3:16,20
	3:16		point
J	main	Nathan 3:19 9:12,17	3:2 5:2 10:20
	4:1 5:8 9:17		potential
Jefferson	make	non-liberty	5:24 7:8
3:17,20	10:20	5:6	
Judge		noticed	previous 4:12
3:1,22,25	manner 7:3	4:17,18	
5:5,15 6:2,7,		number	prior
21 7:1,22	MARC	3:6 8:5	9:13
8:6,12,14,20,	4:8		procedural
25 9:4,7,11,	match	0	3:7 4:2,3,19
21 10:1,10,	4:16		5:14 10:3
13,16	matter	obligated	proceedings
July	3:2	6:10,12	10:22
9:6	MECG	obtain	process
June	3:22 5:7 7:19	3:4	7:23
4:6 9:3,22	mention	open	propose
	10:3	9:22	10:11

proposed 4:3,6,18 9:2 10:3,8 proposing 5:3 Public 3:18,20 8:4 put 5:9 putting 5:13 Q qualified 3:6 question 8:12 questions 4:24 R rate 7:3 reason 4:1 5:8 reasoning 5:18 record 3:1 8:11 10:9,21 report 4:5 requested 4:1 reserve 8:2

response 4:2 S save 5:12 6:20 7:19 saving 7:20 schedule 4:3,7,16,19, 22 5:14 10:3, 8 scheduled 4:3 securitization 4:21 5:10 securitized 3:5 separate 7:13 series 7:17 single 6:5,8,21 squeeze 9:24,25 squeezes 9:23 squeezing 9:9 Staff 3:14,16 Staff's 7:19 start 3:9

9:9 states 7:11 statutorily

starts

6:12 **stay**

10:17

Stokes
3:15 7:6,15
8:1 9:21
10:15

Storm 4:20 6:4,9, 13,17

Street 3:16

suggesting 4:21

suggests 10:4

summertime 8:19

Т

taking 3:9

talking 9:4

tariff

3:5 testify

9:20 **thing** 4:17

thought 8:18 time 5:18,22 6:19

timeline 6:9

today 3:7

told

9:13

10:14

transactional 7:20

transcripts
10:5,6

traunches 7:16

U

understand 6:2 understanding 6:25

unworkable 9:14

Uri

4:20 5:10 6:4,9,13,17

Uri-related 7:3

utility 3:5 7:14

W

wanted
5:22 10:4
week
4:4,12,13

7:24 8:2,21 9:1,5,13,18, 21 10:2,5 weekend 8:23 Williams 3:19 8:4 9:12 witnesses 8:16 9:17 WOODRUFF 3:1,22,25 5:15 6:2,21 7:1,22 8:6, 14,20,25 9:4, 7,11 10:1,13, 16 Woodsmall 3:14,18,23,24 5:6 6:16