1	Page 1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION				
2	STATE OF MISSOURI				
3	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS				
4	PREHEARING CONFERENCE				
5					
6	In the Matter of the Application) of Sullivan Development)				
7	Properties LLC for Change)File No. EO-2024-0251				
	of Electric Supplier)				
8					
9					
10	MONDAY, AUGUST 5, 2024 10:00 a.m.				
11	Jefferson City, MO 65101				
12	via WebEx				
13	VOLUME 2				
14					
15					
16	KAROLIN WALKER, Presiding REGULATORY LAW JUDGE				
17					
18					
19	(Due to the quality of the recorded media, portions were unable to be transcribed and include inaudible				
	portions. The transcript may also include				
20	misinterpreted words and/or unidentified speakers. The transcriber was not present at the time of the				
21	recording; therefore, this transcript should not be considered verbatim.)				
22					
23	TRANSCRIBED BY: MELISSA EICKEN				
24					
25					



1	Page 2 LAW JUDGE WALKER: record. Emily, can			
2	you confirm that you are recording?			
3	EMILY WALTHERS: I am recording.			
4	LAW JUDGE WALKER: Thank you.			
5	EMILY WALTHERS: Yes, ma'am.			
6	LAW JUDGE WALKER: It is August 5th, 2024,			
7	and it's 10:00 a.m. The commission has set this time			
8	for a procedural conference in this case in the matter			
9	of the application of Sullivan Development Properties,			
10	LLC, for a change of electric supplier. The file			
11	number is EO-2024-0251. My name is Karolin Walker.			
12	And I'm the regulatory law judge in this matter.			
13	We're going to begin by allowing attorneys to make			
14	their entry of appearance. The complainant attorneys,			
15	are you present?			
16	MR. KELLOGG: Kevin Kellogg. Yes, Your			
17	Honor. Kevin Kellogg for Sullivan Development			
18	Properties.			
19	LAW JUDGE WALKER: Okay. Ameren Missouri.			
20	MR. HOLTHAUS: Yes, Judge. Bill Holthaus,			
21	Junior, for Ameren Missouri.			
22	LAW JUDGE WALKER: All right. The City of			
23	Farmington.			
24	MR. REID: Scott Reid for the City of			
25	Farmington.			



1 Staff counsel. LAW JUDGE WALKER: Paul Graham for the staff of 2 MR. GRAHAM: 3 the Missouri Public Service Commission. 4 LAW JUDGE WALKER: All right. I just want 5 to set the rules for the conference. The -- we can rule on procedural and substantive issues at the PSC 6 7 according to 20 CSR 4240-2.090, Subsection 6. We're 8 calling to discuss the complainer. We're not here to 9 address outside lawsuits, federal agency issues or 10 actions, any issues that are not relevant to the 11 alleged violation. We have a potential hearing date. 12 The commission has yet to rule on the date, but the 13 two days that everyone agreed on were December 2nd, so we're going to try and get that scheduled for a 14 15 hearing date. And I wanted to get you all together to 16 discuss -- last time we had talked about -- I don't 17 think there's anything in this complaint that the 18 commission can provide relief for, and I'm reluctant 19 to continue the case for monthly status reports, so. 20 I just want to know where the parties are, so. 21 could let me know where you are. 22 MR. REID: City of Farmington agrees with 23 that assessment. I'll let Mr. Kellogg address if --24 if he has -- sees it differently. 25 MR. KELLOGG: So Judge, we just -- I got --



	Page 4
1	me and Mr. Reid spoke on this at the end of last week,
2	a little bit more, to talk about potential annexation
3	of the Sullivan Development Properties with the city.
4	And
5	LAW JUDGE WALKER: Okay.
6	MR. KELLOGG: I've had a brief
7	discussion today, this morning, before this hearing,
8	with the client, and I think that's a route we're
9	going to be exploring here within the next week or
10	two, trying to get something on file for an annexation
11	to see if that's something that we can have you
12	know, at least get before the city council in a
13	reasonable amount of time.
14	LAW JUDGE WALKER: So are you thinking
15	you're going to dismiss the complaint, and then file
16	for annexation and see how that goes?
17	MR. KELLOGG: Preferably, just to see if we
18	can keep this complaint steady for the time being in
19	case we can't get the annexation. I spoke with
20	Mr. Graham for the commission staff, and he said that
21	it might be beneficial to have this case in place for
22	administrative purposes, if we can get the annexation
23	in, so Ameren's issues can be taken care of as well
24	with this.
25	LAW JUDGE WALKER: Any feedback from



Ameren?

2	MR. HOLTHAUS: We all we agree, Judge,
3	that annexation is really the only route to switching
4	suppliers here. We're uncertain that the case needs
5	to be kept open, but it I mean, I guess I don't see
6	any harm to stay in it until we get further results
7	from the annexation process.
8	MR. REID: Judge, if I may, I just don't
9	see why this case needs to stay pending. If
10	Mr. Kellogg's client applies for annexation, the city
11	will either grant or deny it based upon, you know,
12	how whether they think it's beneficial for the City
13	of Farmington for this particular property to be
14	annexed. If Farmington annexes the property, great.
15	They'll provide service. If they don't annex, then
16	Mr. Sullivan is going to have to use Ameren. I don't

do with either route that this matter goes. It's

19 going to go one of the two ways, and I don't -- I

20 don't know how the Public Service Commission needs to

know how the Public Service Commission has anything to

21 be involved or in this particular situation, it's

22 either going to be part of the city, and then service

23 | will be provided or not, and then Ameren will be the

24 | supplier.

17

25

LAW JUDGE WALKER: Well, what is the relief

```
Prehearing Conference Vol II
                                                          Page 6
 1
    the complainant would like from the commission?
 2
                MR. KELLOGG:
                               I mean, ideally, we would
 3
    request an order that somebody gives them power.
    Both -- no party is here willing to give power due to
 4
 5
    either cost or being outside the city limits, and I
    understand the position of the staff and all the other
 6
 7
    parties here, and I would just -- we're looking for
 8
    any relief where we can find it.
 9
                MR. HOLTHAUS:
                                Ameren is willing to provide
10
    power.
11
                               Is that $300,000 or
                MR. KELLOGG:
12
    something?
13
                MR. HOLTHAUS: I think it was closer to 75.
                               I think I've seen different
14
                MR. KELLOGG:
    numbers on that, but I thought I seen a lot higher
15
                        I -- that's what we would be
16
    than that.
                Yeah.
17
    looking at.
                 I was -- if we could at least, so I can
18
    have an opportunity to at least get the annexation
19
    application in with the city, ask for this case to at
20
    least be continued out another month or two, so we can
    see about that route, and if it looks like progress on
21
22
    there, we'll dismiss.
23
                LAW JUDGE WALKER:
                                    I'm still not hearing
24
    any relief the commission can grant the complainant,
```



but I don't have a pending motion to dismiss in front

25

1	Page 7 of me. If I did, that would be different. So I guess
2	the thing to do is, order a status report from the
3	complainant once a month? To determine whether
4	this has this application for annexation been
5	filed.
6	MR. KELLOGG: No, Your Honor. We'll be
7	filing that here in the next couple of weeks.
8	LAW JUDGE WALKER: Okay.
9	MR. KELLOGG: But we've been talking with
- 0	the city about different issues along with that, that
.1	aren't part of this record.
_2	LAW JUDGE WALKER: All right. Is there any
_3	further discussion?
4	MR. REID: No, Your Honor.
-5	LAW JUDGE WALKER: No.
-6	MR. GRAHAM: Not not from staff, Your
_7	Honor.
-8	MR. HOLTHAUS: Nothing from Ameren, Judge.
_9	LAW JUDGE WALKER: Okay. Well, thank you
20	all for participating in the prehearing conference,
21	and we'll terminate the conference now.
22	MR. REID: Thank you.
23	(Audio ended.)
24	
5	





			. , ,
Φ	agrees 3:22	change 2:10	7:13
\$	alleged 3:11	city 2:22,24 3:22	dismiss 4:15 6:22,
\$300,000 6:11	allowing 2:13	4:3,12 5:10,12,22 6:5,19 7:10	25
	_ Ameren 2:19,21	client 4:8 5:10	due 6:4
1	5:1,16,23 6:9 7:18		E
10:00 2:7	Ameren's 4:23	closer 6:13	
	amount 4:13	commission 2:7 3:3,12,18 4:20	electric 2:10
2	annex 5:15	5:17,20 6:1,24	Emily 2:1,3,5
20 3:7	annexation 4:2,	complainant 2:14	end 4:1
2024 2:6	10,16,19,22 5:3,7, 10 6:18 7:4	6:1,24 7:3	ended 7:23
2nd 3:13	annexed 5:14	complainer 3:8	entry 2:14
211u 3.13	annexes 5:14	complaint 3:17	EO-2024-0251
4		4:15,18	2:11
	appearance 2:14	conference 2:8 3:5 7:20,21	exploring 4:9
4240-2.090 3:7	application 2:9 6:19 7:4	confirm 2:2	
5	applies 5:10	continue 3:19	F
	assessment 3:23	continue 5.19	Farmington 2:23,
5th 2:6	attorneys 2:13,14		25 3:22 5:13,14
6	audio 7:23	cost 6:5	federal 3:9
	_	council 4:12	feedback 4:25
6 3:7	August 2:6	counsel 3:1	file 2:10 4:10,15
	- B	couple 7:7	filed 7:5
7		CSR 3:7	filing 7:7
75 6:13	based 5:11		find 6:8
	begin 2:13		front 6:25
Α	beneficial 4:21 - 5:12	date 3:11,12,15	
a.m. 2:7	Bill 2:20	days 3:13	G
actions 3:10	bit 4:2	December 3:13	give 6:4
address 3:9,23	Ы І 4.∠	deny 5:11	Graham 3:2 4:20
administrative	С	determine 7:3	7:16
4:22		Development 2:9,	grant 5:11 6:24
agency 3:9	calling 3:8	17 4:3	great 5:14
agree 5:2	care 4:23	differently 3:24	guess 5:5 7:1
agreed 3:13	case 2:8 3:19 4:19,21 5:4,9 6:19	discuss 3:8,16	
_	7.10,210.7,80.18	discussion 4:7	



Index: \$300,000..guess

Н	15,19	position 6:6	route 4:8 5:3,18
	lawsuits 3:9	potential 3:11 4:2	6:21
harm 5:6	limits 6:5	power 6:3,4,10	rule 3:6,12
hearing 3:11,15	LLC 2:10	Preferably 4:17	rules 3:5
4:7 6:23	lot 6:15	prehearing 7:20	S
higher 6:15		present 2:15	
Holthaus 2:20 5:2 6:9,13 7:18	M	procedural 2:8 3:6	scheduled 3:14
Honor 2:17 7:6,14,	make 2:13	process 5:7	Scott 2:24
17	matter 2:8,12 5:18	progress 6:21	sees 3:24
	Missouri 2:19,21 3:3	Properties 2:9,18 4:3	service 3:3 5:15, 17,20,22
	month 6:20 7:3	property 5:13,14	set 2:7 3:5
ideally 6:2	monthly 3:19	provide 3:18 5:15	situation 5:21
involved 5:21	morning 4:7	6:9	spoke 4:1,19
issues 3:6,9,10 4:23 7:10	motion 6:25	provided 5:23	staff 3:1,2 4:20 6:6
		PSC 3:6	7:16
J	N	Public 3:3 5:17,20	status 3:19 7:2
judge 2:1,4,6,12,	number 2:11	purposes 4:22	stay 5:6,9
19,20,22 3:1,4,25	numbers 6:15	R	steady 4:18
4:5,14,25 5:2,8,25			Subsection 3:7
6:23 7:8,12,15,18, 19	O	reasonable 4:13	substantive 3:6
Junior 2:21	open 5:5	record 2:1 7:11	Sullivan 2:9,17 4:3 5:16
	opportunity 6:18	recording 2:2,3	supplier 2:10 5:24
K	order 6:3 7:2	regulatory 2:12	suppliers 5:4
Karolin 2:11		Reid 2:24 3:22 4:1	switching 5:3
Kellogg 2:16,17	P	5:8 7:14,22	
3:23,25 4:6,17	part 5:22 7:11	relevant 3:10	T
6:2,11,14 7:6,9	participating 7:20	relief 3:18 5:25 6:8,24	talk 4:2
Kellogg's 5:10	parties 3:20 6:7	reluctant 3:18	talked 3:16
Kevin 2:16,17	party 6:4	report 7:2	talking 7:9
	Paul 3:2	reports 3:19	terminate 7:21
	pending 5:9 6:25	request 6:3	thing 7:2
law 2:1,4,6,12,19, 22 3:1,4 4:5,14,25	place 4:21	results 5:6	thinking 4:14
5:25 6:23 7:8,12,	•		



Index: harm..thinking

thought 6:15 time 2:7 3:16 4:13, 18 today 4:7 U uncertain 5:4 understand 6:6 ٧ violation 3:11 W Walker 2:1,4,6,11, 19,22 3:1,4 4:5, 14,25 5:25 6:23 7:8,12,15,19 **WALTHERS** 2:3,5 wanted 3:15 **ways** 5:19 week 4:1,9 weeks 7:7



Index: thought..weeks