```
Page 1
 1
           BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
                      STATE OF MISSOURI
 2
                 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
 3
                    RULEMAKING HEARING
 4
    In the Matter of the
 5
    Commission's Proposed Rule
    20 CSR 4240-60.050 and
    Proposed Rescission of 20 CSR) File No. SX-2025-0116
 6
    4240-3.305 Relating to Filing)
 7
    Requirements for Sewer
    Utility Applications for
    Certificates of Convenience
 8
    and Necessity
 9
     -- AND --
    In the Matter of the
    Commission's Proposed Rule 20)
10
    CSR 4240-50.060 and Proposed ) File No. WX-2025-0117
    Rescission of 20 CSR
11
    4240-3.600 Relating to Filing)
12
    Requirements for Water
    Utility
13
    Applications for Certificates)
    of Convenience and Necessity )
    -- AND --
14
    In the Matter of the
15
    Commission's Proposed Rule
    20 CSR 4240-10.185 Relating
                                  ) File No. OX-2025-0118
    to Petitions for Water and
16
    Sewer Infrastructure Rate
17
    Adjustment
                      December 18, 2024
18
                    1:00 p.m. - 1:50 p.m.
               James C. Kirkpatrick Building
19
    600 West Main Street, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
2.0
      Volume 1
                        NANCY DIPPELL, Presiding
21
                        DEPUTY CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE
22
                        KAYLA HAHN, Chair
                        GLEN KOLKMEYER,
23
                        JOHN MITCHELL,
                             COMMISSIONERS
24
    Reported By:
    Shelley L. Bartels, RPR, CCR
25
    Job No.: 178642
```



1	APPE	ARANCES:	Page 2
2		MR. JEFFREY SCOTT STACEY Public Service Commission	
3		200 Madison Street P.O. Box 360	
4		Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360 573.751.4140	
5	For:	Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission	
6		MS. ANNA MARTIN	
7		MR. MARC POSTON Office of the Public Counsel 200 Madison Street	
9		P.O. Box 2230 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102	
10	For:	573.751.5324 Office of the Public Counsel	
11		MR. DEAN L. COOPER dcooper@brydonlaw.com	
12		Brydon Swearengen & England, PC 312 E. Capitol Avenue	
13	_	Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 573.635.7166	
14 15	For:	Missouri American Water Company, Confluence Rivers, and Liberty Utilities	
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
2425			
ر ⊿			



	Rulemaking hearing voi i	December	
1	INDEX		Page 3
2	Exhibit Instructions:		
3	Exhibits were retained by PSC.		
4			
5			
6	STAFF EXHIBITS		
7		PAGE	
8	Exhibit 1		
9	Staff's Reply Comments SX-2025-0116	20	
10	Exhibit 2		
11	Staff's Reply Comments WX-2025-0117	20	
12	Exhibit 3		
13	Staff's Reply Comments OX-2025-0118	35	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			



Proceedings began at 1:00 p.m.:

2.2

JUDGE DIPPELL: We can go ahead then and go on the record. The Commission has set this time for a Rulemaking hearing in three cases. They are SX-2025-0116, WX-2025-0117, and OX-2025-0118. And those are all the rules -- rulemaking matters, both proposed rules and proposed rescissions, and I'll just read off those rules. I'm not going to read the whole captions.

The proposed rule in 20 CSR 4240-60.1 -or sorry, .050 is a proposed rule and a proposed
rescission in that same case of 3.305. And then in
the 0117 case, 20 CSR 4240-50.060 is the proposed
rule and the proposed rescission is in 3.600. And in
the 0118 case is 20 CSR 4240-10.185 is the proposed
rule and there is no other rescission in that one.

So my name is Nancy Dippell; I'm the regulatory law judge presiding over this hearing today. And we've come here today for comments.

This -- these rules were published in the Missouri Register on November 15th and this time and place.

We are in the Secretary of State's Office, the James C. Kirkpatrick office building because of our hearing rooms being under some renovations.

So I think with that, what we're going to

2.0

2.2

do, since this is a rule comment hearing, we don't -	
we don't need to take entries of appearance. You	
don't have to be represented by counsel to make	
comments. Anyone can make comments on the rules.	
But I will ask if you're speaking on behalf of a	
company or organization, that you identify that as	
well as yourself when you give your comments. And	
that anyone that would like to give comments speak	
into a microphone. You're welcome to stay at the	
tables if you're at a table with a microphone or you	
can come to the podium.	

I'm going to let Staff go last, but then
I will let anyone else make any further responses as
we go. So if you need to comment on something
someone else said, you can do that, or the prefiled
comments. And we're going to take it each case
separately so that we can keep straight which rules
are being discussed. So we'll just start in
numerical order with the Sewer case first and -- and
go down the line and we'll do the WSIRA case last.
So are there any questions before we get started?

MR. COOPER: Judge, I guess a question

for you. Given that there's some overlap, actually quite a bit between the Sewer and the Water proposed rules, would it be possible just to take those two

1	together?
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: If if we can keep them
3	straight, then I thought about doing it that way.
4	Is that the general consensus, that it's easier to
5	take the Sewer and Water together? We can do that.
6	MR. COOPER: Thank you.
7	JUDGE DIPPELL: Just when you're giving
8	your comments, make sure that you identify if it's
9	pertaining to the Sewer case versus the Water case.
10	I know there were some differences in the comments
11	there, but. Okay. We can do that. So let's go
12	ahead then and begin and I'll ask if OPC wants to
13	starts us off.
14	MS. MARTIN: Sure.
15	JUDGE DIPPELL: We can begin with the
16	Sewer and the Water rules, the first two cases;
17	they're all Water.
18	MS. MARTIN: This is Anna. I can never
19	tell if that's on. I do apologize and please
20	JUDGE DIPPELL: Identify yourself and who
21	you're
22	MS. MARTIN: So my name is Anna Martin.
23	I am associate counsel with the Office of Public
24	Counsel and we are here to provide our comments today
25	on the Sewer and Water CCN proposed rules. I will

say that we have filed additional comments in the WSIRA rule, but we have -- have no oral comments to make at this time. So most of the comments are -- are set up to be mostly about the Water and Sewer rules.

2.2

So the office of the Public Counsel would like to praise the work that PSC Staff has done to improve the Water and Sewer CCN regulations as well as to create the WSIRA rule. From the OPC's point of view, the proposed rules on today's docket clarify the Commission's processes and expectation and -- expectations, excuse me, which benefits the utilities, the Commission Staff, as well as the public.

In addition to the statements that we will be making today, the OPC has filed comments in the three Rulemaking dockets which the Commission Staff has acknowledged and supports. The Public Counsel wishes to recognize in particular Staff's decision to includes requirements from the proposed rule for the Sewer company CCNs in the proposed rule for the Water utility CCNs. The OPC hopes that the Commission takes the OPC's files -- filed comments as well as Staff's agreements into consideration when determining its ultimate treatment of these proposed



rules.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

respond to a few suggested edits from Missouri

American Water Company, which Staff has also shown

support for. Before addressing these points of

disagreement, the OPC would like to state that by and

large we do agree with MAWC's suggestions; there are

merely a few areas we would wish to address. And I

will say again as I stated earlier, the concerns that

we are sharing now do all relate to the proposed CCN

rules.

So the first area of concern for the OPC regards MAWC's proposed changes to the, both the Sewer and the Water proposed rules. That's in subsection two. They requested the addition of the statement "unless a public vote has been held." The -- the OPC is concerned with this addition because there have been instances, two recent instances of communities voting to approve the sale of a municipal water system which then had unforeseen issues with the public. If the Utility is not required to inform a system's existing customers when it files a CCN for that system, it may not notify individuals who are unaware that such a vote even took place and were not members of the voting public.



Further, for sister -- system customers who have concerns or comments that they would like to -- the Commission to consider when reviewing the CCN application, they will not be given the information required to make those public comments.

2.2

The second concern that the OPC has found with MAWC's additions to the proposed Water and Sewer CCN rules is -- can be seen in section 3 as well as in the subsection of section 3 which is subsection 3A9. In both portions of the proposed rule, MAWC suggests including languages that would account for instances where the system that the eligible utility is seeking to buy from does not have the information that the regulation requires. However, one of the benefits that the Commission will gain through the promulgation of these rules is the guidance and specificity that the rule otherwise provides.

It is well-known that bad facts make for bad law. Therefore, the OPC believes that creating a regulation with an acquired system's failed bookkeeping in mind undercuts the goals of the proposed regulation. Rather, the OPC believes it would be appropriate to promulgate the rules as written and permit the -- the acquiring utility to

1	request a warver with the commission to account for
2	the system's poor prior bookkeeping.
3	And other than that, we have no further
4	comments to make at this time.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. And I forgot
6	to acknowledge that Commissioner Mitchell is online
7	and Commissioner Kolkmeyer has also joined us.
8	Commissioners, do either of you have any
9	questions for Public Counsel at this time?
LO	COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: No. Thank you,
L1	Judge.
L2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Commissioner
L3	Kolkmeyer.
L4	COMMISSIONER MITCHELL: No, not at this
L5	time.
L6	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Commissioner
L7	Mitchell. And if I I'll ask if you all have
L8	questions at the end of each commenter. And if if
L9	I don't hear a response, we'll just assume that you
20	don't. And if you have questions as we go, just jump
21	in. I know it can be cumbersome to mute and unmute
22	and try to make sure you're muted when you want to be
23	muted and not when you don't want to be.
24	So, all right. Then I'll just go to
25	Mr. Cooper. I am not sure who all you're



representing today. I heard it was several -- several entities.

MR. COOPER: That's true, your Honor.

But first I believe Mr. LaGrand is going to be making some comments on behalf of Missouri American Water Company.

JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Mr. LaGrand.

MR. LAGRAND: Thank you, Judge. My name is Brian LaGrand. I'm the rates director for Missouri American Water, and I've provided comments on all three rules last week. I appreciate Staff's efforts in -- in putting these rules together. I think a lot of it, you know, a lot of it lays out the process that we -- that we currently follow between our application and discovery requests. I think a lot of this just kind of formalizes things that were being already today, so that's, you know, that's great.

And I -- and I see that Staff I believe in most cases had agreed with some of proposed changes we made. And the -- and the changes we made, we proposed were really more in just the, you know, from our experience in the implementation of these, you know, in execution of these applications and some of the pitfalls that can come up.



2.2

Page 12

so I think, you know, one area I want to
talk about and I'll address the comments the
comments that OPC made because they're related. In
both the Sewer and the well, in the Sewer
proposal, Staff's initial draft, it included a
requirement that we file a very detailed rate base
calculation using uniform system of account
designations and so forth. You know, we had noted
that was not in the Water rule, and I think OPC had
suggested it would be best to have that in both
rules. I think Staff agreed with OPC.

So one area of concern about that for us, and this kind of ties in with OPC's other concern, is that with these acquisitions or acquisitions that are part of a -- of a CCN case -- and I know not every CCN case is always an acquisition -- but the -- a lot of times the data that is listed out here is, just is not available. You know, I've been involved in between 40 and 50 acquisitions that Missouri American Water has done in the last 15 years in some capacity. And, you know, we've literally had to sort through shoe boxes of receipts, and Staff I'm sure has experienced some of that as well. Even some larger communities that we have acquired don't have, you know, the records that are listed here.



2.2

so when it comes to the rate base
calculation, I think there's that one in
particular I think has some concerns for us because,
number one, a rate base determination is not made by
the Commission as part of a of a certificate case.
That's made in a rate case. So it's unclear why that
level of specificity would be required for a CCN
application. And because because that's not part
of the acquisition of the CCN case, that also creates
an issue with one of OPC's suggestions about the I
think their two suggestions were to include like a
purchase agreement, and that's something that the
Company does today, and I don't think the Company has
really concerns about that.

But their second suggestion was -- was talking about whether or not there's an acquisition premium and if there's a plan of recovery. Without knowing rate base, like knowing definitive what rate base is, I -- you can't say for sure that there is a premium or there is not a premium. So I think things related to rate base I think are best -- are best resolved in the context of a rate case itself because those -- because, like I said, rate case determination not -- is not made currently in the certificate cases.



2.2

Page 14

And one maybe final comment on OPC's		
concern about the qualifier that we had suggested for		
section 3 which, you know, which which provides,		
you know, these things will be required or will be		
provided if available, you know, I don't know that		
there's been any acquisition that I've been involved		
in, like I said it's between 40 and 50 of them, where		
they've had everything on this list, you know.		
Sometimes, you know, these are not always they're		
often not sophisticated buyers, they're not large		
cities being acquired. It could be a subdivision, it		
could be a mom-and-pop operation where they they		
don't even have financial statements.		

You know, so in OPC's suggestion that we file a waiver, like a waiver would be requested every single case because the way -- the way it was drafted is that if any of one of these things were not -- not included, then the case could be subject to dismissal. And if that's the, you know, if a case could be dismissed because we can't produce an electric bill, you know, that's really going to tamp down some of the utilities' interest in making these transactions. And there's a lot of time and effort that goes into getting up to the point where the application is filed.



1	You know, we provide all the information
2	that we have and work with the sellers to get things
3	for Staff, the requests and data requests and, you
4	know, we provide a lot of information up front as
5	well. But I think the I think it's important to
6	have an "if available" qualifier in there because
7	it's a this this whole list of things is great
8	in a perfect world, but I don't think we've ever done
9	an acquisition that would that would have all
10	these things.
11	I think that and those comments apply
12	to both the Water and the Sewer rules, I have the
13	same comments for both.
14	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Mr. LaGrand.
15	Commissioners, are there any questions for Missouri
16	American at this time? Not hearing any, so thank you
17	sir. Mr. Cooper.
18	MR. COOPER: Thank you, Judge. I'm going
19	to have very brief comments for Confluence Rivers
20	Utility Operating Company, Inc. and for Liberty
21	Utilities Missouri Water, LLC, and then just a couple
22	of tag ons to Mr. LaGrand in terms of Missouri
23	American Water Company.
24	I'll start by saying that Confluence
25	Rivers has asked me to convey that they have no

2.2

Page 16

objection to the comments, the reply comments I guess
I would -- I would refer to them that the Staff filed
late yesterday.

Liberty Utilities has asked me to convey that they are supportive of Missouri American's comments in this -- in these Rulemakings, both Water and Sewer.

The few additional things I'd like to say, first, and this is just kind of a wordsmithing thing. If the 12B that Staff has proposed in both Water and Sewer with its filing yesterday remains in the rule, I think it does need a little bit of rewriting. It talks currently about whether an acquisition premium exists and if the purchasing facility intends to seek recovery of the cost on the ratepayer. It probably reads better if it says whether an acquisition premium exists and if the purchasing utility intends to seek recovery of such premium in future rates.

The other thing in response to OPC's comment about the public vote language that had been proposed in both Water and Sewer by Missouri American Water Company, I would just note that in this rule when we're talking about a seller, we're necessarily talking about a seller that's not currently regulated



Page 17

by this Commission. It's going to be a municipality, it's going to be a water district, it's going to be a homeowner's association, it's going to be maybe somebody that should be regulated but is not at that point in time. And so I think we start really from the spot that we're going to be dealing with entities that are not going to have records in the same way that a regulated entity would.

And I say that because certainly, it's my belief anyway, that where we're talking about a seller that is a regulated utility, we're really going to be talking about the Commission's rule of 20 CSR 4240-10.105 which requires approval of the Commission for the sale of those regulated assets, and that's why I make that mention. And so then what we're talking about, a public vote here, we really are -- we're talking about a municipality, we're talking maybe about a water district, but public entities that certainly have responsibility to interact with their -- with their customers in a way some other entities might not.

In regard to that section 9 comment, and this -- it really wraps into that, the section 9 comment where Missouri American had proposed the additional language about any available support



Τ	documentation, I think it it recognizes the nature
2	of the seller in these matters as well as the, sort
3	of the experience that Mr. LaGrand had mentioned in
4	terms of what you are able to acquire and what
5	what you're not able in some situations to acquire
6	from some of these sellers. Thank you very much.
7	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. And Chair
8	Hahn has joined us. Are there any Commission
9	questions for Mr. Cooper at this time? All right.
10	Thank you, Mr. Cooper. Is there anyone else before
11	Staff that would like to make a comment? All right.
12	Let's go with Staff then.
13	MR. STACEY: Good afternoon. Scott
14	Stacey, deputy counsel, Staff Counsel's Office here
15	for Staff. And we file Staff filed a comments and
16	Staff responses late yesterday in relation to the
17	comments that were filed by OPC as well as MAWC and
18	provided responses to that. We were generally
19	responsive or supportive of the changes.
20	There was an error in one of our I
21	take that back; that's for the WSIRA rule.
22	We're generally supportive of the of
23	the request of OPC as well as MAWC, and we made those
24	comments in responses within that document.
25	But I do have with me Curt Gateley, and



1	may want to have or say something as well.
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Gateley.
3	MR. GATELEY: Curt Gateley here for
4	Staff. Regarding Mr. Cooper's wordsmithing on 12B,
5	his suggestions regarding putting in "utility"
6	instead of "facility" and some of the other word
7	changes, those are reasonable. I think that it's
8	it's more clear with those changes.
9	Regarding the section that had the most
10	comments from Mr. LaGrand about information that may
11	not be available when they're making an acquisition,
12	I understand. I understand the points that they're
13	making. This is information that our auditors
14	request right now as part of these acquisitions in
15	attempting to be able to provide an informed opinion
16	to the Commission. So right now if they submit those
17	DRs and a company doesn't have the information,
18	that's their response. This isn't my the work
19	that I do. This is requested by our auditors. I
20	personally think that if available, the kind of
21	changes that Missouri American has proposed is the
22	best fit for what we're doing right now.
23	JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Did you have
24	something further, Mr. Stacey?
25	MR. STACEY: Yes, Judge. OPC and the



1	candidate, they had a concern with the "unless public
2	vote was held" statement that was MAWC wanted to
3	put into it. Staff has talked it over and or
4	discussed it, and we agree that it probably should
5	not go in, should be taken back out.
6	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Since the Staff
7	filed reply comments after the official written
8	comment period was ended, I'm going to go ahead and
9	mark those as exhibits and and include them with
10	the comments today. So I will mark the as
11	Exhibit 1, Staff's reply comments in the SX-2025-0116
12	case, and as Exhibit 2 Staff's reply comments in
13	the WX-2025-0117 case.
14	(Staff Exhibits 1 and 2 were marked for
15	identification.)
16	JUDGE DIPPELL: Commissioners, are there
17	any questions for Staff at this time? All right.
18	I'm not hearing any.
19	Was there were there any further
20	replies? After hearing everyone's comments, anyone
21	want to make any more comments based on the CCN rules
22	for Water or Sewer? Go ahead, Mr. LaGrand.
23	MR. LAGRAND: Thank you, Judge. I just
24	want to respond to what Mr. Gateley had said. One

25

thing maybe I neglected to mention in my previous

comments, that, you know, at the time we file the
application, you know, there from that point
there's a, you know, we go through, you know, DR
process with Staff. And even after we if the
transaction's approved and even after we take
ownership, like, we get better information as we go
along. I mean, we may not know all the assets at the
time it's acquired. We may, once we take ownership
of it, we may then learn more about, oh, here's some
more information about assets. And that information
will be collected and curated much more thoroughly in
advance of a rate case than and so our information
will be much, much better at that point than it would
be at the time the application filed. Because the
application's filed, you know, six months or more
before the transaction actually happens. So I think
that's one of the benefits of of pushing some of
that to the rate case is that you have more time to
get better information together that people can rely
on.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Thank you. Are

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other comments for these rules? Public Counsel.

MS. MARTIN: Thank you. So the OPC would like to discuss the MAWC's comments about not having



2.2

Page 22

the data that's available. The OPC believes that the regulation should be made for ideal cases. It should not be made with a -- with several ways to wriggle out of these requirements. If -- again, if the utility is not able to provide that information that is requested at the time, then they do have the opportunity for a waiver. They could also just inform the Commission that the data is not available at that time but they are working on it.

So that is the OPC's main concerns regarding watering down the language about the availability of data and things like that. It is true that there may be instances where there's data that is -- that the Commission would like that is not available. And I do think that, especially because the rule does grant Commission discretion, it says that the Utility is or Company is subject to -- that their CCN case is subject to dismissal. Not "shall be dismissed." It allows for the discretion of the Commission.

And I -- from, you know, my years watching this Commission, it does appear that you guys are pretty reasonable and able to work with these companies in consideration of their CCN applications. So if something's not available, they

just need to inform the Commission they need to provide a waiver. I don't think that that's too hard to do.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Poston.

MR. POSTON: Yes. Marc Poston, also for the Office of Public Counsel. I just want to respond about the comments regarding the notice and whether that a notice would not go out if a public vote had been held. I just thought, you know, we should err on the side of giving the people that are the most impacted by a sale of their system an opportunity to tell the Commission. They could before the sale, obviously, most of the people probably for the sale or against it, but I think they could have some important things to tell the Commission. And if we don't give them a notice of the CCN application, they won't have an opportunity to tell the Commission.

And I want to give one brief example.

And it's the City of Bolivar. That system when it was acquired, there was a vote of the -- of the people there, but that system actually expanded beyond the boundaries of the city. And so there was people served by that system that didn't even get to vote on it. And so if -- if they don't get a notice here, they wouldn't have gotten notice, an



1 opportunity to even vote in the first instance as 2 well, so. That's all I have. Thank you. 3 JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Thank you very much. Are there any other comments on the 4 5 certificate cases? 6 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Judge, this is 7 Commissioner Kolkmeyer. 8 JUDGE DIPPELL: Oh, go ahead, 9 Mr. Commissioner. 10 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Yes. I'm 11 somewhat confused. Is the -- is the vote of the 12 people still in there? Is that before or after it 13 comes to the Commission? 14 The way the rule is set JUDGE DIPPELL: 15 out right now, it is that the notice goes out if 16 there hasn't been a vote. Is that correct? 17 COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Yeah. I'm 18 not -- I'm talking about the notice. I'm talking 19 about the vote itself. Is that in the proposed -- is 20 that -- the proposed rule, is that still in place, 21 the vote before it comes to the Commission or after 2.2 the Commission rules on it? 23 I -- oh, go ahead. MR. COOPER: 24 JUDGE DIPPELL: Sorry. 25 MR. COOPER: Mr. Poston.

2.2

JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead, Mr. Poston.

MR. POSTON: Okay. I was going to say the way I understand it is the notice, the way that the rule was published, the notice would be required. And Missouri American Water Company has proposed that the notice would not go out if there had been a public vote on the sale of the system. And that's the part that we're opposing, the addition of that.

JUDGE DIPPELL: And that would be a notice before it comes to the Commission or after it comes to the Commission? I think that was the Commissioner's question.

MR. GATELEY: This is Curt Gateley for Staff. The rule itself does not require a vote. The vote that occurs is for those entities where a vote is necessary. Not all entities or acquisitions would involve a voting group, but the discussion is about whether or not an additional notice would go out if a vote happened. And the points were raised where not every customer of a municipality, for example, is necessarily offered an opportunity to vote, so that's a, for those customers an additional notice would -- might be the first time that they had seen that a purchase was going to happen.

MR. COOPER: Judge, I --



2.2

COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Okay. I just
have somewhat of an issue about the public voting on
it and then approving it and then coming for a CCN.
It's like it's almost backwards to me. That we need
to approve it, we need to assess the whole situation,
go through all the books and everything and approve
the CCN and then it go to vote of the people if that
vote is necessary.

MR. COOPER: Commissioner, this is Dean Cooper. I guess I want to say two things. I want to agree with Mr. Gateley who -- who had indicated that I don't know that the rule impacts the vote process. The votes that are required by the municipalities are separately required by statutes, and -- and so that's where that comes from.

I think that as a matter of practice, the timing has been I guess the way that you have been frustrated with it, that is, the vote has come first prior to the application for the Commission, partially because -- and I don't know that you all see these much of the time, but there are a number of votes that are taken where the sale of the utility assets by a municipality does not pass. And so those -- those cases never make it to the -- to the Commission and they never require Staff's review,

that sort of thing.

2.2

It may be tough to even come in for an application to the Commission before the vote because at that point you're talking about a purely speculative transaction. The municipality at that point does not have any authority to sell those assets to the potential purchaser.

So while I certainly understand the frustration with the order we're doing it now, I think there's probably some -- there are some reason that it happens in that order that are -- probably still assist the process.

COMMISSIONER KOLKMEYER: Okay. I'm aware of, and I wasn't on the commission at that time, I know one water system that the voters turned down.

I guess more what I'm -- and not -frustrated with is the dollar amount. So it was -it was put to the vote of the people that this is
what we're going to sell it for, this -- here's the
dollars. And then when our Staff reviewed
everything, the system wasn't worth that much money,
but the voters had already approved those dollars.
And that's where I guess we could have just turned it
down and they had to go back to the vote of the
people. But that to me was the biggest frustration



	Rule making hearing voi i December 16, 20.
1	Page 28 was the dollar amount that was put for the sale was
2	already predetermined before we even our Staff was
3	able to look at it.
4	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Commissioner.
5	Is there are there any other Commission questions?
6	All right. Anything further before we oh,
7	Mr. LaGrand, you had another comment.
8	MR. LAGRAND: Thank you, Judge. Just one
9	very briefly brief comment on the topic of the
10	documentation. This is kind of responsive to
11	something that OPC had said. Just to clarify, you
12	know, the documentation that that is being
13	provided is not the Utility's documentation; you
14	know, it's the City's documentation. So, you know,
15	we're it would be different if it was our
16	documentation. We have, you know, extensive and
17	obviously, the Commission, you know, has access to a
18	lot of our records, books and records. But when it's

20 we're being asked to provide, it -- you know, our ability to, you know, track that down or, you know, 21

a -- when they aren't our books and records that

22 create that is -- is more limited than it would be if

23 it was our own records.

19

24

25

And OPC would like to JUDGE DIPPELL: make another response.



1	MS. MARTIN: In response to that I would
2	say that the acquiring Company, given that it is a
3	regulated utility under the PSC, is required to prove
4	its case and, therefore, if those documents are
5	required to prove its case, then it is the duty of
6	the acquiring utility to provide those documentations
7	and/or the reason why they cannot provide those
8	documentation or that documentation, sorry.
9	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Is there anything
10	further for the Water and Sewer certificate rules?
11	All right. I think that concludes that
12	part. We can then move on to the Water and Sewer
13	Infrastructure Rate Adjustment rule which is we
14	commonly refer to as WSIRA. Are there comments from
15	OPC on you said that you didn't have any comments
16	on this rule. Is that correct?
17	MS. MARTIN: At this time the OPC does
18	not have additional comments to the ones that they
19	have filed. I want to say reframe, but I can't
20	remember what the word is. We may have comments
21	regarding any responses that are given at today's
22	hearing.
23	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Did Missouri
24	American have comments regarding this rule?
25	MR. LAGRAND: Just very briefly. Yeah, I

1	think again the the rule proposed that was it
2	was just drafted I think, you know, mirrors a lot of
3	what is being done today and I think it bears a lot
4	of similarities to the exist to the ISRAs rules.
5	So I think and so I think we were we only had
6	some minor comments and I think Staff agreed with
7	those, so appreciate Staff's willingness to look at
8	our suggestions.
9	JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Mr. Cooper.
10	MR. COOPER: Again, I guess in addition
11	to Missouri American and on behalf of Liberty
12	Utilities and Confluence Rivers, and we believe that
13	the adjustments that Staff made through its filing
14	that was made yesterday are appropriate and we'd
15	support those. Thank you.
16	JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. And,
17	Commissioners, if you have any comments or questions
18	as we go, just jump in please.
19	Did Staff have additional comments on the
20	Water and Sewer Infrastructure Rate Adjustment rule?
21	MR. STACEY: Again, this is Scott Stacey
22	with Staff Counsel's Office here for Staff. Like we
23	said, I stated before, we are in support of the
24	changes by OPC and as well as MAWC. And we filed

that within our comments in Staff responses.

25

2.2

Page 31

However, there was an issue involving subparagraph or subsection C -- or subsection D which would be under I believe subsection 4. Or no, subsection 3, I'm sorry. Subsection 3, subsection D where it states, For requirements listed in this section requiring review or approval by a certified engineer, the items shall be signed, sealed, and dated by a Missouri registered professional engineer.

That was an error in stating that Staff would accept that change, remove it from -- from the regulation and would like to leave that in. And I have Curtis Gateley here to respond to that.

MR. GATELEY: Curt Gateley for Staff.

Generally speaking staff engineers have encountered across several situations documents submitted by a professional engineer expressing the opinion of a professional engineer without the seal. For this rule in particular, if a Utility feels it necessary to retain the services of a professional engineer for a document, then that engineer should seal that document.

We have had instances where engineering documents were submitted purporting to state the condition and function of physical equipment that engineers later had to admit they never actually



2.2

Page 32

viewed or inspected to be able to make that kind of determination. We've had situations across cases where we've asked for copies of engineering documents that an applicant was replying on and when we get them, they're incomplete. And in most instances where they're incomplete, they're going to have to create a complete one anyway for the Department of Natural Resources' requirements.

Missouri American in their comments stated that whether or not a document requires an engineer's seal is a matter for the -- for the Board of Architects, Professional Engineers, et cetera.

I'm familiar with dozens of regulations with DNR that require a seal right now, and we have a similar requirement that appears in both the Sewer and the Water CCNs that Missouri American did not object to. Staff is not asking for every time a document happens to be drafted by a person who's an engineer must have a seal. But in those instances where the documents are this is the professional opinion of an engineer, that engineer should have to seal it. And ultimately if they don't provide the seal -- we license these professionals for a reason. If they don't provide the seal, then essentially they're not taking any kind of legal responsibility

Т	for the professional opinion that they express.
2	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Thank you.
3	MR. STACEY: And just for clarification
4	it is subsection 4, subsection D.
5	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Are there any
6	commissioner questions for Staff? Are there any
7	additional responses to any of those comments or that
8	change?
9	COMMISSIONER MITCHELL: Just one, Judge,
10	this is Commissioner Mitchell. And I think that
11	Staff's position is consistent with what the duties
12	and responsibilities of a registered professional
13	engineer in the state of Missouri are, so. I believe
14	that to be consistent based on my experience.
15	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Thank you,
16	Commissioner. Are there any other responses?
17	Mr. LaGrand.
18	MR. LAGRAND: Yes, thank you, Judge.
19	Just wanted to respond to the Staff on that, that
20	topic of engineering seal. In our comments we filed
21	one of the, you know, the first thing I noted was
22	that to the to Missouri American it was unclear
23	what requirements in the in the WSIRA filing this
24	replied to. And that statement really comes from,
25	you know the you know between TSPAs and WSTPA

1	cases, the, you know, ten or more of those that I've
2	been involved in, you know, the WSIRA is is a
3	historic case. These are these are things the
4	information that Staff reviews are things that have
5	already happened. You have invoices. It's not a
6	it's not a here's the plan for what we're going to
7	do; it's what we have done.

So I don't know that -- I'd be curious to -- you know, either in this form or in a private discussion for Staff to provide some examples of what types of things that they were envisioning this would -- this would cover. Because we just -- we just primarily weren't really sure what in a WSIRA case, what types of documents would this reply to.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MR. LAGRAND: Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Cooper.

MR. COOPER: Yeah. Judge, just to add to that a little bit. I think that part of what

Mr. LaGrand is talking about is the way this requirement reads. You know, it's very vague and abstract in terms of saying, If there's anything that requires review. Well, I don't know -- I don't know if it becomes an argument before the Commission, if the Commission is qualified necessarily to make that

1	decision. And that was the purpose for the comment
2	that was provided by Missouri American in that
3	regard.
4	Mr. Gateley also mentioned that is there
5	is a requirement for a seal in both the proposed
6	Water and Sewer CCN rules, but in that context it's
7	very clear what's being discussed. What's being
8	discussed there is new construction, and it makes
9	sense that some sort of engineer seal would be
10	appropriate in that instance. So I think it's sort
11	of the unlimited, unclear aspect of how that shows up
12	in the WSIRA rule that we find problematic.
13	JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Thank you for that
14	clarification. Are there any other comments or any
15	commissioner questions or comments?
16	I will also, since the response comments
17	were made in the record, I will mark those as Exhibit
18	No. 3 for the OX-2025-0118 case, the response
19	comments of Staff.
20	(Staff Exhibit 3 was marked for
21	identification.)
22	Did Staff have anything further?
23	MR. STACEY: No, Judge.
24	JUDGE DIPPELL: Were there any other
25	comments about the WSIRA rule? I'm not seeing any.



Page 36 I appreciate everyone who made comments and participated and came to Jefferson City today to participate. And I believe that that concludes this hearing and we can go off the record. Thank you. (Off the record at 1:50 p.m.)





		additions 9:7	application's
0	5	address 8:8 12:2	21:15
0117 4:13	50 12:19 14:7	addressing 8:5	applications
0118 4:15		Adjustment 29:13	11:24 22:25
050 4:11	9	30:20	apply 15:11
	9 17:22,23	adjustments 30:13	approval 17:13 31:6
1	· 	admit 31:25	approve 8:19
1 20:11,14	A	advance 21:12	26:5,6
12B 16:10 19:4	ability 28:21	afternoon 18:13	approved 21:5 27:22
15 12:20	abstract 34:22	agree 8:7 20:4	
15th 4:21	accept 31:10	26:11	approving 26:3 Architects 32:12
1:00 4:1	access 28:17	agreed 11:20	
1:50 36:5	account 9:12 10:1	12:11 30:6	area 8:12 12:1,12
	12:7	agreement 13:12	areas 8:8
2	acknowledge 10:6	agreements 7:24	argument 34:24
2 20:12,14	acknowledged	ahead 4:2 6:12	aspect 35:11
20 4:10,13,15	7:18	20:8,22 24:8,23 25:1	assess 26:5
17:12	acquire 18:4,5	American 8:4	assets 17:14 21:7, 10 26:23 27:7
	acquired 9:21	11:5,10 12:19	assist 27:12
3	12:24 14:11 21:8 23:20	15:16,23 16:22	
3 9:8,9 14:3 31:4	acquiring 9:25	17:24 19:21 25:5 29:24 30:11 32:9,	associate 6:23
35:18,20	29:2,6	16 33:22 35:2	association 17:3
3.305 4:12	acquisition 12:16	American's 16:5	assume 10:19
3.600 4:14	13:9,16 14:6 15:9	amount 27:17	attempting 19:15
3A9 9:10	16:14,17 19:11	28:1	auditors 19:13,19
	acquisitions 12:14,19 19:14	and/or 29:7	authority 27:6
4	25:16	Anna 6:18,22	availability 22:12
4 31:3 33:4	add 34:18	apologize 6:19	aware 27:13
40 12:19 14:7	addition 7:15	appearance 5:2	В
4240-10.105 17:13	8:15,17 25:8 30:10	appears 32:15	
4240-10.185 4:15	additional 7:1	applicant 32:4	back 18:21 20:5 27:24
4240-50.060 4:13	16:8 17:25 25:18,	application 9:4	backwards 26:4
4240-60.1 4:10	22 29:18 30:19 33:7	11:15 13:8 14:25 21:2,14 23:16 26:19 27:3	bad 9:19,20



base 12:6 13:1,4,	captions 4:9	5:4,7,8,16 6:8,10,	29:2
18,19,21	case 4:12,13,15	24 7:1,2,3,16,23	complete 32:7
based 20:21 33:14	5:16,19,20 6:9	9:2,5 10:4 11:5,10	-
bears 30:3	12:15,16 13:5,6,9,	12:2,3 15:11,13,	concern 8:12 9:6 12:12,13 14:2
	22,23 14:16,18,19	19 16:1,6 18:15,	20:1
began 4:1	20:12,13 21:12,18	17,24 19:10 20:7, 10,11,12,20,21	
begin 6:12,15	22:18 29:4,5 34:3,	21:1,22,25 23:7	concerned 8:17
behalf 5:5 11:5	14 35:18	24:4 29:14,15,18,	concerns 8:9 9:2
30:11	cases 4:4 6:16	20,24 30:6,17,19,	13:3,14 22:10
belief 17:10	11:20 13:25 22:2	25 32:9 33:7,20	concludes 29:11
	24:5 26:24 32:2	35:14,15,16,19,25	36:3
believes 9:20,23	34:1	36:1	condition 31:24
22:1	CCN 6:25 7:8 8:10,	commission 4:3	Confluence 15:19,
benefits 7:12 9:15	23 9:3,8 12:15,16	7:13,17,23 9:3,15	24 30:12
21:17	13:7,9 20:21	10:1 13:5 17:1,14	
biggest 27:25	22:18,24 23:16 26:3,7 35:6	18:8 19:16 22:8,	confused 24:11
bill 14:21	·	14,16,20,22 23:1,	consensus 6:4
bit 5:24 16:12	CCNS 7:21,22	12,15,17 24:13, 21,22 25:10,11	consideration
34:19	32:16	26:19,25 27:3,14	7:24 22:24
	certificate 13:5,25	28:5,17 34:24,25	consistent 33:11,
Board 32:11	24:5 29:10	Commission's	14
Bolivar 23:19	certified 31:6	7:11 17:12	construction 35:8
bookkeeping 9:22	cetera 32:12		
10:2	Chair 18:7	commissioner 10:6,7,10,12,14,	context 13:22 35:6
books 26:6 28:18,		16.0,7,10,12,14,	convey 15:25 16:4
19	change 31:10 33:8	26:1,9 27:13 28:4	Cooper 5:22 6:6
boundaries 23:22	cities 14:11	33:6,9,10,16	10:25 11:3 15:17,
	city 23:19,22 36:2	35:15	18 18:9,10 24:23,
boxes 12:22	City's 28:14	Commissioner's	25 25:25 26:9,10
Brian 11:9		25:12	30:9,10 34:17,18
briefly 28:9 29:25	clarification 33:3 35:14	Commissioners	Cooper's 19:4
building 4:23	clarify 7:10 28:11	10:8 15:15 20:16	copies 32:3
buy 9:13		30:17	correct 24:16
buyers 14:10	clear 19:8 35:7	commonly 29:14	29:16
buyers 14.10	collected 21:11	communities 8:19	cost 16:15
	comment 5:1,14	12:24	counsel 5:3 6:23,
	14:1 16:21 17:22,	companies 22:24	24 7:6,19 8:2 10:9
calculation 12:7	24 18:11 20:8	company 5:6 7:21	18:14 21:23 23:6
13:2	28:7,9 35:1	8:4 11:6 13:13	Counsel's 18:14
candidate 20:1	commenter 10:18	15:20,23 16:23	30:22
capacity 12:20	comments 4:19	19:17 22:17 25:5	couple 15:21
Jupusity 12.20			
			1



draft 12:5

cover 34:12
create 7:9 28:22 32:7
creates 13:9
creating 9:20
CSR 4:10,13,15 17:13
cumbersome 10:21
curated 21:11
curious 34:8
Curt 18:25 19:3 25:13 31:13
Curtis 31:12
customer 25:20
customers 8:22 9:1 17:20 25:22
D
data 12:17 15:3
22:1,8,12,13
22:1,8,12,13 dated 31:8
, , ,
dated 31:8
dated 31:8 dealing 17:6
dated 31:8 dealing 17:6 Dean 26:9
dated 31:8 dealing 17:6 Dean 26:9 decision 7:20 35:1
dated 31:8 dealing 17:6 Dean 26:9 decision 7:20 35:1 definitive 13:18
dated 31:8 dealing 17:6 Dean 26:9 decision 7:20 35:1 definitive 13:18 Department 32:7
dated 31:8 dealing 17:6 Dean 26:9 decision 7:20 35:1 definitive 13:18 Department 32:7 deputy 18:14
dated 31:8 dealing 17:6 Dean 26:9 decision 7:20 35:1 definitive 13:18 Department 32:7 deputy 18:14 designations 12:8

determining 7:25

differences 6:10

Dippell 4:2,17 6:2,

7,15,20 10:5,12,

Rulemaking
16 11:7 15:14 18:7 19:2,23 20:6, 16 21:21 23:4 24:3,8,14,24 25:1, 9 28:4,24 29:9,23 30:9,16 33:2,5,15 34:15,17 35:13,24
director 11:9
disagreement 8:6
discovery 11:15
discretion 22:16, 19
discuss 21:25
discussed 5:18 20:4 35:7,8
discussion 25:17 34:10
dismissal 14:19 22:18
dismissed 14:20 22:19
district 17:2,18
DNR 32:14
docket 7:10
dockets 7:17
document 18:24 31:20,21 32:10,18
documentation 18:1 28:10,12,13, 14,16 29:8
documentations 29:6
documents 29:4 31:15,23 32:3,20 34:14
dollar 27:17 28:1
dollars 27:20,22
dozens 32:13

drafted 14:16 30:2 32:18
DRS 19:17
duties 33:11
duty 29:5
E
earlier 8:9
easier 6:4
edits 8:3
effort 14:23
efforts 11:12
electric 14:21
eligible 9:13
encountered 31:14
end 10:18
ended 20:8
engineer 31:7,8, 16,17,19,20 32:19,21 33:13 35:9
engineer's 32:11
engineering 31:22 32:3 33:20
engineers 31:14, 25 32:12
entities 11:2 17:6, 19,21 25:15,16
entity 17:8
entries 5:2
envisioning 34:11
equipment 31:24
err 23:9
error 18:20 31:9

essentially 32:24 everyone's 20:20 examples 34:10 excuse 7:12 execution 11:24 **Exhibit** 20:11,12 35:17,20 **exhibits** 20:9,14 **exist** 30:4 existing 8:22 **exists** 16:14,17 expanded 23:21 expectation 7:11 expectations 7:12 experience 11:23 18:3 33:14 experienced 12:23 express 33:1 expressing 31:16 extensive 28:16 F

facility 16:15 19:6

facts 9:19

failed 9:21

feels 31:18

familiar 32:13

file 12:6 14:15 18:15 21:1

filed 7:1,16,23 14:25 16:2 18:15,

files 7:23 8:23

17 20:7 21:14,15

29:19 30:24 33:20



filing 16:11 30:13	group 25:17	23:15	issues 8:21
33:23	guess 5:22 16:1	improve 7:8	items 31:7
final 14:1	26:10,17 27:16,23 30:10	include 13:11 20:9	
Finally 8:2	guidance 9:17	included 12:5	J
financial 14:13	guys 22:23	14:18	James 4:22
find 35:12	guys 22.20	includes 7:20	Jefferson 36:2
fit 19:22	Н	including 9:11	joined 10:7 18:8
follow 11:14	Lloha 10:0	incomplete 32:5,6	judge 4:2,18 5:22
forgot 10:5	Hahn 18:8	individuals 8:24	6:2,7,15,20 10:5,
form 34:9	happen 25:24	inform 8:22 22:8	11,12,16 11:7,8 15:14,18 18:7
formalizes 11:16	happened 25:19 34:5	23:1	19:2,23,25 20:6,
found 9:6	hard 23:2	information 9:4,14 15:1,4 19:10,13,	16,23 21:21 23:4 24:3,6,8,14,24
front 15:4	hear 10:19	17 21:6,10,12,19	25:1,9,25 28:4,8,
frustrated 26:18	heard 11:1	22:5 34:4	24 29:9,23 30:9,
27:17	hearing 4:4,18,23	informed 19:15	16 33:2,5,9,15,18 34:15,17,18
frustration 27:9,	5:1 15:16 20:18,	Infrastructure 29:13 30:20	35:13,23,24
function 31:24	20 29:22 36:4	initial 12:5	jump 10:20 30:18
future 16:19	held 8:16 20:2		
	23:9	inspected 32:1 instance 24:1	K
G	historic 34:3	35:10	kind 11:16 12:13
gain 9:16	homeowner's 17:3	instances 8:18,19	16:9 19:20 28:10
Gateley 18:25	Honor 11:3	9:12 22:13 31:22	32:1,25
19:2,3 20:24	hopes 7:22	32:5,19	Kirkpatrick 4:23
25:13 26:11		intends 16:15,18	knowing 13:18
31:12,13 35:4	I	interact 17:20	Kolkmeyer 10:7, 10,13 24:6,7,10,
general 6:4	ideal 22:2	interest 14:22	17 26:1 27:13
generally 18:18,22 31:14	identification	invoices 34:5	
give 5:7,8 23:16,	20:15 35:21	involve 25:17	L
18	identify 5:6 6:8,20	involved 12:18 14:6 34:2	Lagrand 11:4,7,8,
giving 6:7 23:10	impacted 23:11	involving 31:1	9 15:14,22 18:3 19:10 20:22,23
goals 9:22	impacts 26:12	ISRAS 30:4 33:25	28:7,8 29:25
Good 18:13	implementation	issue 13:10 26:2	33:17,18 34:16,20
grant 22:16	11:23	31:1	language 16:21 17:25 22:11
great 11:18 15:7	important 15:5		17.20 22.11



			24Index: languagespeopl
languages 9:11	Marc 23:5	municipal 8:20	online 10:6
large 8:7 14:10	mark 20:9,10	municipalities	ons 15:22
larger 12:23	35:17	26:13	OPC 6:12 7:16,22
late 16:3 18:16	marked 20:14 35:20	municipality 17:1, 17 25:20 26:23	8:6,12,17 9:6,20, 23 12:3,9,11
law 4:18 9:20	Martin 6:14,18,22	27:5	18:17,23 19:25
lays 11:13	21:24 29:1,17	mute 10:21	21:24 22:1 28:11,
learn 21:9	matter 26:16	muted 10:22,23	24 29:15,17 30:24
leave 31:11	32:11		OPC's 7:9,23 12:13 13:10 14:1,
legal 32:25	matters 4:6 18:2	N	14 16:20 22:10
level 13:7	MAWC 9:11 18:17, 23 20:2 30:24	Nancy 4:17	Operating 15:20
Liberty 15:20 16:4	MAWC's 8:7,13	Natural 32:8	operation 14:12
30:11	9:7 21:25	nature 18:1	opinion 19:15
license 32:23	members 8:25	necessarily 16:24	31:16 32:21 33:1
limited 28:22	mention 17:15	25:21 34:25	opportunity 22:7 23:11,17 24:1
list 14:8 15:7	20:25	neglected 20:25	25:21
listed 12:17,25 31:5	mentioned 18:3	note 16:23	opposing 25:8
literally 12:21	35:4	noted 12:8 33:21	oral 7:2
LLC 15:21	microphone 5:9,	notice 23:7,8,16,	order 5:19 27:9,11
lot 11:13,16 12:16	mind 9:22	24,25 24:15,18 25:3,4,6,10,18,22	organization 5:6
14:23 15:4 28:18	minor 30:6	notify 8:23	overlap 5:23
30:2,3	mirrors 30:2	November 4:21	ownership 21:6,8
M	Missouri 4:20 8:3 11:5,10 12:19	number 13:4 26:21	OX-2025-0118 4:5 35:18
made 11:21 12:3	15:15,21,22 16:5, 22 17:24 19:21	numerical 5:19	P
13:4,6,24 18:23 22:2,3 30:13,14	25:5 29:23 30:11		
35:17 36:1	31:8 32:9,16	O	p.m. 4:1 36:5
main 22:10	33:13,22 35:2	object 32:17	part 12:15 13:5,8 19:14 25:8 29:12
make 5:3,4,13 6:8	Mitchell 10:6,14, 17 33:9,10	objection 16:1	34:19
7:3 9:5,19 10:4,22 17:15 18:11 20:21	mom-and-pop	occurs 25:15	partially 26:20
26:24 28:25 32:1	14:12	offered 25:21	participate 36:3
34:25	money 27:21	office 4:22,23 6:23	participated 36:2
makes 35:8	months 21:15	7:6 18:14 23:6 30:22	pass 26:23
making 7:16 11:4 14:22 19:11,13	move 29:12	official 20:7	people 21:19 23:10,13,21,23
			25.15,15,21,20



24:12 26:7 27:18,	prior 10:2 26:19	published 4:20	reasonable 19:7
25	•	25:4	22:23
perfect 15:8	private 34:9 problematic 35:12	purchase 13:12	receipts 12:22
period 20:8	-	25:24	recent 8:18
permit 9:25	Proceedings 4:1	purchaser 27:7	recognize 7:19
person 32:18	process 11:14 21:4 26:12 27:12	purchasing 16:14,	recognizes 18:1
personally 19:20	processes 7:11	purely 27:4	record 4:3 35:17
oertaining 6:9	produce 14:20	purporting 31:23	36:4,5
ohysical 31:24	professional 31:8,	purpose 35:1	records 12:25 17:7 28:18,19,23
oitfalls 11:25	16,17,19 32:12,20 33:1,12	pushing 21:17	recovery 13:17
olace 4:21 8:25	professionals	put 20:3 27:18	16:15,18
24:20	32:23	28:1	refer 16:2 29:14
olan 13:17 34:6	promulgate 9:24	putting 11:12 19:5	reframe 29:19
oodium 5:11	promulgation		regard 17:22 35:3
ooint 7:9 14:24 17:5 21:2,13 27:4,	9:16	Q	Register 4:21
6	proposal 12:5	qualified 34:25	registered 31:8
oints 8:5 19:12	proposed 4:7,10,	qualifier 14:2 15:6	33:12
25:19	11,13,14,15 5:24 6:25 7:10,20,21,	question 5:22	regulated 16:25
oor 10:2	25 8:10,13,14 9:7,	25:12	17:4,8,11,14 29:3
oortions 9:10	10,23 11:20,22	questions 5:21	regulation 9:14, 21,23 22:2 31:11
osition 33:11	16:10,22 17:24 19:21 24:19,20	10:9,18,20 15:15 18:9 20:17 28:5	regulations 7:8
Poston 23:4,5	25:5 30:1 35:5	30:17 33:6 35:15	32:13
24:25 25:1,2	prove 29:3,5		regulatory 4:18
potential 27:7	provide 6:24 15:1,	R	relate 8:10
practice 26:16	4 19:15 22:5 23:2 28:20 29:6,7	raised 25:19	related 12:3 13:21
praise 7:7	32:22,24 34:10	rate 12:6 13:1,4,6,	relation 18:16
predetermined	provided 11:10	18,21,22,23	rely 21:19
28:2	14:5 18:18 28:13	21:12,18 29:13	remains 16:11
orefiled 5:15	35:2	30:20	remember 29:20
oremium 13:17,20 16:14,17,19	PSC 7:7 29:3	ratepayer 16:16	remove 31:10
presiding 4:18	public 6:23 7:6,14, 18 8:2,16,21,25	rates 11:9 16:19	renovations 4:24
pretty 22:23	9:5 10:9 16:21	read 4:8	replied 33:24
previous 20:25	17:16,18 20:1	reads 16:16 34:21	replies 20:20
orimarily 34:13	21:22 23:6,8 25:7 26:2	reason 27:10 29:7 32:23	replies 20.20 reply 16:1 20:7,11
primarny 34.13	20.2	02.20	1 cpiy 10.1 20.7,11



	<u></u>		5, 2024IIIdex. replylligstati
12 34:14	responsibility	23,24 33:20 35:5,	situation 26:5
replying 32:4	17:19 32:25	9	situations 18:5
represented 5:3	responsive 18:19	sealed 31:7	31:15 32:2
representing 11:1	28:10	Secretary 4:22	something's
request 10:1	retain 31:19	section 9:8,9 14:3	22:25
18:23 19:14	review 26:25 31:6 34:23	17:22,23 19:9 31:6	sophisticated 14:10
requested 8:15	reviewed 27:20	seek 16:15,18	sort 12:21 18:2
14:15 19:19 22:6		·	27:1 35:9,10
requests 11:15	reviewing 9:3	seeking 9:13	speak 5:8
15:3	reviews 34:4	sell 27:6,19	speaking 5:5
require 25:14 26:25 32:14	rewriting 16:13	seller 16:24,25 17:11 18:2	31:14
	Rivers 15:19,25		specificity 9:17
required 8:22 9:5 13:7 14:4 25:4	30:12	sellers 15:2 18:6	13:7
26:13,14 29:3,5	rooms 4:24	sense 35:9	speculative 27:5
requirement 12:6	rule 4:10,11,14,16 5:1 7:2,9,21 9:11,	separately 5:17 26:14	spot 17:6
32:15 34:21 35:5	17 12:9 16:12,23		Stacey 18:13,14
requirements 7:20	17:12 18:21 22:16	served 23:23	19:24,25 30:21
22:4 31:5 32:8	24:14,20 25:4,14	services 31:19	33:3 35:23
33:23	26:12 29:13,16,24 30:1,20 31:18	set 4:3 7:4 24:14	staff 5:12 7:7,13,
requires 9:14 17:13 32:10 34:23	35:12,25	Sewer 5:19,24 6:5,	18 8:4 11:19 12:11,22 15:3
requiring 31:6	rulemaking 4:4,6	9,16,25 7:4,8,21 8:14 9:8 12:4	16:2,10 18:11,12,
	7:17	15:12 16:7,11,22	14,15,16 19:4
rescission 4:12, 14,16	Rulemakings 16:6	20:22 29:10,12	20:3,6,14,17 21:4 25:14 27:20 28:2
rescissions 4:7	rules 4:6,7,8,20	30:20 32:15 35:6	30:6,13,19,22,25
resolved 13:22	5:4,17,25 6:16,25	sharing 8:10	31:9,13,14 32:17
	7:5,10 8:1,11,14 9:8,16,24 11:11,	shoe 12:22	33:6,19 34:4,10
Resources' 32:8	12 12:11 15:12	shown 8:4	35:19,20,22
respond 8:3 20:24 23:6 31:12 33:19	20:21 21:22 24:22	shows 35:11	Staff's 7:19,24 11:11 12:5 20:11,
response 10:19	29:10 30:4 35:6	side 23:10	12 26:25 30:7
16:20 19:18 28:25		signed 31:7	33:11
29:1 35:16,18		similar 32:15	start 5:18 15:24
responses 5:13	sale 8:19 17:14	similarities 30:4	17:5
18:16,18,24 29:21	23:11,12,13 25:7 26:22 28:1	single 14:16	started 5:21
30:25 33:7,16	Scott 18:13 30:21	sir 15:17	starts 6:13
responsibilities 33:12		sister 9:1	state 8:6 31:23
33.12	seal 31:17,20 32:11,14,19,22,	Jistoi 3.1	33:13
	, , -11		



State's 4:22	system 8:20,23	times 12:17	utility 7:22 8:21
stated 8:9 30:23	9:1,12 12:7 23:11,	timing 26:17	9:13,25 15:20
32:10	19,21,23 25:7	today 4:19 6:24	16:18 17:11 19:5
statement 8:16	27:15,21	7:16 11:1,17	22:5,17 26:22 29:3,6 31:18
20:2 33:24	system's 8:22 9:21 10:2	13:13 20:10 30:3	Utility's 28:13
statements 7:15	9.21 10.2	36:2	Othity 5 20.13
14:13	T	today's 7:10 29:21	V
states 31:5		topic 28:9 33:20	
stating 31:9	table 5:10	tough 27:2	vague 34:21
statutes 26:14	tables 5:10	track 28:21	versus 6:9
stay 5:9	tag 15:22	transaction 21:16	view 7:10
straight 5:17 6:3	takes 7:23	27:5	viewed 32:1
subdivision 14:11	taking 32:25	transaction's 21:5	vote 8:16,24 16:21
subject 14:18	talk 12:2	transactions	17:16 20:2 23:8, 20,24 24:1,11,16,
22:17,18	talked 20:3	14:23	19,21 25:7,14,15,
submit 19:16	talking 13:16	treatment 7:25	19,21 26:7,8,12,
submitted 31:15,	16:24,25 17:10,	true 11:3 22:13	18 27:3,18,24
23	12,16,17,18 24:18 27:4 34:20	turned 27:15,23	voters 27:15,22
subparagraph 31:2	talks 16:13	types 34:11,14	votes 26:13,22 voting 8:19,25
subsection 8:15	tamp 14:21	U	25:17 26:2
9:9,10 31:2,3,4	ten 34:1		
33:4	terms 15:22 18:4	ultimate 7:25	W
suggested 8:3	34:22	ultimately 32:22	waiver 10:1 14:15
12:10 14:2	thing 16:10,20	unaware 8:24	22:7 23:2
suggestion 13:15 14:14	20:25 27:1 33:21	unclear 13:6 33:22	wanted 20:2 33:19
	things 11:16 13:20	35:11	watching 22:22
suggestions 8:7 13:10,11 19:5	14:4,17 15:2,7,10 16:8 22:12 23:15	undercuts 9:22	water 5:24 6:5,9,
30:8	26:10 34:3,4,11	understand 19:12	16,17,25 7:4,8,22
suggests 9:11	thought 6:3 23:9	25:3 27:8	8:4,14,20 9:7
support 8:5 17:25	ties 12:13	unforeseen 8:20	11:5,10 12:9,20 15:12,21,23 16:6,
30:15,23	time 4:3,21 7:3	uniform 12:7	11,22,23 17:2,18
supportive 16:5	10:4,9,15 14:23	unlimited 35:11	20:22 25:5 27:15
18:19,22	15:16 17:5 18:9 20:17 21:1,8,14,	unmute 10:21	29:10,12 30:20 32:16 35:6
supports 7:18	18 22:6,9 25:23	utilities 7:13 15:21	watering 22:11
SX-2025-0116 4:5	26:21 27:14 29:17	16:4 30:12	watering 22.11
20:11	32:17	utilities' 14:22	



week 11:11 well-known 9:19 willingness 30:7 **wishes** 7:19 word 19:6 29:20 wordsmithing 16:9 19:4 work 7:7 15:2 19:18 22:23 working 22:9 **world** 15:8 worth 27:21 wraps 17:23 wriggle 22:3 written 9:25 20:7 **WSIRA** 5:20 7:2,9 18:21 29:14 33:23,25 34:2,13 35:12,25 WX-2025-0117 4:5 20:13 Υ years 12:20 22:21 yesterday 16:3,11 18:16 30:14