

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

In the Matter of Spire Missouri Inc.)	
d/b/a Spire's Request for Authority to)	
Implement a General Rate Increase for)	
Natural Gas Service Provided in the)	Case No. GR-2025-0107
Company's Missouri Service Areas)	

RESPONSE TO ORDER DIRECTING FILING AND REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

COMES NOW the Office of the Public Counsel (“OPC”) and for its *Response to Order Directing Filing and Request for Extension*, states as follows:

1. On June 25, 2025, Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers (“MIEC”) filed its *Motion to File Testimony Responding to the Commission Staff's June 30 Class Cost of Service Study and any Related Testimony* in the above styled case.
2. That same day, this Commission issued an *Order Directing Filing* that ordered any party who wished to respond to MIEC’s filing to do so by June 30, 2025.
3. Pursuant to that Commission order, the OPC now files this motion.
4. The basis of MIEC’s motion lies in its desire for an opportunity to file a potential response to surrebuttal testimony that it expects will be filed today, June 30, 2025, by the Commission’s Staff (“Staff”).
5. However, MIEC indicates that it is not sure if such testimony will be needed. This is because Staff has not yet filed the testimony.
6. As it stands, MIEC’s request is therefore premature.

7. There is little reason for the Commission to grant leave to file responsive testimony when the party seeking leave is not yet sure it intends to actually file said responsive testimony.

8. That point notwithstanding, should the Commission nevertheless decide to grant MIEC leave to file hypothetical responsive testimony, then the same should be granted to all other parties in the case.

9. Giving MIEC alone the opportunity to respond to Staff's surrebuttal would be a clear prejudice to all other parties to the case who have not been afforded the same opportunity.

10. A better solution, though, would be to postpone ruling on the requested motion (and also grant an extension to all parties who would wish to respond to said motion) until after the Staff's surrebuttal is filed.

11. Once Staff has filed its surrebuttal, all parties (including MIEC) will know whether there is even a reason to request leave to file a response to it.

12. To that end, the OPC requests the Commission extend the deadline to file a response to MIEC's motion until July 3, to give all parties time to review Staff's surrebuttal testimony and determine whether responsive testimony would be warranted.

WHEREFORE, the Office of the Public Counsel respectfully requests the Commission extend the deadline for parties to file a response to MIEC's motion until July 3rd 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ John Clizer
John Clizer (#69043)
Senior Counsel
Missouri Office of the Public
Counsel
P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, MO 65102
Telephone: (573) 751-5324
Facsimile: (573) 751-5562
E-mail: john.clizer@opc.mo.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the forgoing have been mailed, emailed, or hand-delivered to all counsel of record this thirtieth day of June, 2025.

 /s/ John Clizer