

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF MISSOURI
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Evidentiary Hearing

October 5, 2012

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 26

In the Matter of Union Electric)File No.
Company d/b/a Ameren Missouri's)ER-2012-0166
Tariffs to Increase Its Annual)
Revenues for Electric Service)

MORRIS WOODRUFF, Presiding
CHIEF REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

For Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission:

2 Mr. Kevin Thompson
Public Service Commission
3 200 Madison Street
P.O. Box 360
4 Jefferson City, MO 65102
(573) 751-3234

5 For Office of Public Counsel:

6 Ms. Christina Baker
and Mr. Lewis Mills
7 Office of Public Counsel
200 Madison Street
8 P.O. Box 2230
Jefferson City, MO 65102
9 (573) 751-5565

10 For Ameren Missouri:

Mr. Thomas Byrne
11 and Ms. Wendy Tatro
Attorney at Law
12 1901 Chouteau Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63103
13 (314) 554-2237
Mr. James L. Lowery
14 Smith Lewis, LLC
P.O. Box 918
15 111 S. Ninth Street, Suite 200
Columbia, MO 65205
16 (573) 442-3141

17 For MIEC:

Ms. Carole L. Iles
18 and Mr. Edward Downey
and Diana Vuylsteke
19 Bryan Cave, LLP
Riverview Office Center
20 221 Bolivar Street, Suite 101
Jefferson City, MO 65101-1574
21 (573) 556-6621

22
23 REPORTED BY: Monnie S. Mealy, CCR, CSR, RPR
24 Midwest Litigation Services
3432 W. Truman Boulevard, Suite 207
25 Jefferson City, MO 65109
(573) 636-7551

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Welcome back to
3 another day of the Ameren rate case hearing. And let me
4 ask the parties -- I understand we'll be doing the return
5 on equity and -- issues today. Were we going to take up
6 another witness before we started that?

7 MR. THOMPSON: We're going to take up Lisa
8 Ferguson out of order, but not at the beginning

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Not at the beginning.

10 MR. THOMPSON: We're going to take her up, I
11 think, after lunch is my understanding.

12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. That would be fine. So
13 we will start on the return on common equity issue, and
14 we'll start with mini openings, beginning with Ameren.
15 Openings for Ameren?

16 MR. BYRNE: Oh, sure.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

19 MS. BAKER: Thank you.

20 MS. ILES: Thank you, Tom.

21 MR. BYRNE: May it please the Commission.

22 OPENING STATEMENT

23 BY MR. BYRNE:

24 MR. BYRNE: We are here today to discuss return
25 on equity, which is the largest dollar value issue in this

1 case. All three of the ROE witnesses in this case agree
2 that the legal principles that govern the determination of
3 the appropriate return to be authorized for Ameren
4 Missouri in this case are set forth in Federal Power
5 Commission versus Hope Natural Gas Company and Bluefield
6 Water Works and Improvement Company versus Public Service
7 Commission of West Virginia, two United States Supreme
8 Court decisions that have long set the standard in this
9 area.

10 As Ameren Missouri witness Robert Hevert
11 explains in his direct testimony, the Hope and Bluefield
12 decisions require that the Commission provide the company
13 with an opportunity to earn an ROE that is, No. 1,
14 adequate to attract capital at reasonable terms, thereby
15 enabling it to provide safe and continuing reliable
16 electric service.

17 No. 2, sufficient to ensure the facility's
18 financial integrity. No. 3, commensurate with returns on
19 investments in enterprises having corresponding risk.

20 Only one of the three ROE witness'
21 recommendations satisfies this standard. Ameren Missouri
22 witness Robert Hevert is recommending a return on equity
23 range of 10.2 percent to 11 percent with a specific ROE
24 recommendation of 10.5 percent based primarily on his
25 multi-stage discounted cash flow or DCF analysis, an

1 analysis that this Commission has relied on in many
2 previous cases.

3 Mr. Hevert has also supported his recommendation
4 with other analyses that are commonly relied upon in
5 setting an ROE, including different forms of the DCF
6 model, the capital asset pricing model and risk premium
7 analyses.

8 Mr. Hevert's recommendation is in line with ROEs
9 this Commission has approved in recent cases, and it is in
10 line with recently authorized returns from Commissions in
11 other jurisdictions.

12 The recommendations of the other return on
13 equity witnesses filing testimony in this case are so low
14 that they are completely unreasonable and would be
15 extremely damaging to Ameren Missouri if they are adopted.

16 They do not meet the standards in Hope and
17 Bluefield. If adopted, they will not permit Ameren
18 Missouri to attract capital at reasonable terms to invest
19 in its system, and they are certainly not commensurate
20 with returns on investment in enterprises having
21 corresponding risks because they are far below the
22 authorized returns for other similar utilities across the
23 country.

24 Staff witness David Murray's recommendation,
25 which is a range of 8 percent to 9 percent, is a full 120

1 to 220 basis points below the ROE authorized by this
2 Commission for Ameren Missouri just over a year ago for
3 rates that took effect in July of 2011.

4 It is unimaginable that the cost of equity could
5 have fallen so far in such a short time. Mr. Murray's
6 recommendation is even further below the national average
7 for authorized returns that is currently hovering just
8 above 10.2 percent.

9 Even more significant, Mr. Murray acknowledges
10 that his recommended range is not supported by any of the
11 unconventional, and in some cases, illegitimate rate of
12 return analyses that he performed.

13 His analyses would support a recommendation
14 below 8 percent, but he arbitrarily raised his
15 recommendation to 9 percent because he knows that this
16 Commission could never even consider adopting a
17 recommendation that low. In fact, some of his analyses
18 were explicitly rejected by the Commission just over a
19 year ago, but he is back with them again in this case.

20 The evidence will show that Mr. Murray has no
21 expectation that this Commission will adopt his
22 recommendation. Nor should he. His analysis is extremely
23 unconventional. His recommended return is unsupported by
24 even that analysis, and he remains far outside the
25 mainstream in his approach to estimating the cost of

1 capital.

2 Public Counsel's not sponsoring a witness on
3 this issue, but they have latched on to the low end of the
4 ROE range recommended by Mr. Murray. Even Mr. Murray
5 won't support such an extremely low ROE, and there's
6 certainly no valid reason for this Commission to do so.

7 The MIEC has presented the testimony of witness
8 Mr. Gorman. Mr. Gorman is a well-respected ROE expert who
9 performs conventional and legitimate return on equity
10 analyses. But in this case, Mr. Gorman has selected
11 inputs for his analyses and exercises judgment in
12 selecting which results he will rely on that make his
13 recommendation almost as unreasonable as Mr. Murray's.

14 Specifically, Mr. Gorman's 9.3 percent return on
15 equity is 90 basis points below the ROE authorized by this
16 Commission just over a year ago for Ameren Missouri and a
17 little over 90 basis points below the national average of
18 authorized ROEs, which, again, is hovering just a little
19 above 10.2 percent.

20 His recommendation is much further from the
21 mainstream than it has been in some previous cases where
22 this Commission has relied on Mr. Gorman's analyses as a
23 starting point for determining an ROE for Ameren Missouri.

24 At a minimum, Mr. Gorman's analyses must be
25 adjusted to include reasonable inputs and reasonable

1 selection of results before they could be properly
2 considered in setting Ameren Missouri's return on equity.

3 In some past cases, this Commission has used a
4 zone of reasonableness to help it evaluate competing ROE
5 recommendations. The zone of reasonableness has been a
6 hundred basis points around the national average. So if
7 the national average was 10.2 or so, it would -- the zone
8 of reasonableness would be 9.2 or so to 11.2 or so.

9 There are two reasons that the zone of
10 reasonableness has been considered useful by this
11 Commission. First, it ties to the standards from the Hope
12 and the Bluefield decisions. Other integrated electric
13 utilities or enterprises having corresponding risk to
14 Ameren Missouri and their authorized returns are
15 unquestionably relevant to the return that Ameren Missouri
16 should be authorized.

17 Second, considering the ROEs authorized in other
18 jurisdictions is valuable because it helps to put the
19 subjective recommendations of a few witnesses presenting
20 testimony today into a more objective context.

21 As I said before, estimating ROE is a
22 surprisingly subjective undertaking. Even though lots of
23 the experts use the same type of analyses, their results
24 depend on inputs that they subjectively decide to put in
25 the models and subjective decisions they make about which

1 results to use in making their recommendation.

2 And the problem is that their subjective
3 decisions are often buried in the math. They're in
4 schedules attached to their testimony or in work papers.
5 We'll get into some of those issues today. But the fact
6 is it's difficult to measure exactly how the subjective
7 assumptions of an expert are influencing his results.

8 Looking at how Commissions in the other 49
9 states are dealing with this issue provides a somewhat
10 more objective context in which to view the subjective
11 recommendations in this case, a somewhat more objective
12 context in which to review the subjective recommendations
13 in this case.

14 I don't know if the Commission will use the zone
15 of reasonableness in this case like it has in the past.
16 But if it does, Public Counsel's recommendation is too low
17 to be considered. Staff's recommendation is too low to be
18 considered.

19 Mr. Gorman's recommendation is barely within the
20 zone of reasonableness, at the low end of the zone. He's
21 at 10.3 in the zone. The very bottom of the zone would be
22 10 point -- I'm sorry. He's at 9.3, and the very bottom
23 of the zone would be 9.2 something.

24 In some ways, return on equity is a very boring
25 issue. It revolves around extremely detailed and

1 complicated analyses, and it's easy for anyone to get lost
2 in those analyses. I plan to get into some of those
3 details in cross-examination with the witnesses, but I
4 don't want to do that in my opening statement.

5 So let me leave with you this simple message.
6 If you're confused by this issue, if you don't know what
7 to believe on this issue, if you remember nothing else
8 from my opening statement after you hear five other
9 opening statements, or six, please keep this chart in
10 mind.

11 And I passed it out on paper, but it's on the --
12 on the easel. The chart was included in Mr. Hevert's
13 surrebuttal testimony, and it shows the national average
14 ROE authorized by Public Utility Commissions across the
15 country. And it shows where the recommendations of each
16 of the witnesses filing testimony in this case fall with
17 respect to that average.

18 Mr. Hevert's range starts just above the
19 national average. The national average here is 10.2
20 percent, maybe just a little above. His range starts at
21 10.5 -- or 10.25 and his point recommendation is right
22 here at 10.5 percent, which is just a little above the
23 average.

24 Mr. Hevert believes that this is justifiable
25 based not only on the results of his analyses, but also

1 because the regulatory framework in Missouri, which we
2 discussed, you know, in spite of this Commission's steps
3 to improve it remains less credit supportive than average
4 around the country.

5 On the other hand, Mr. Gorman's recommendation
6 of 9.3 percent is far below the tenth percentile of
7 authorized returns on equity. The -- I -- the dark blue
8 line is the 25th percentile -- or the dark blue area is
9 the 25th percentile, and the light blue line is the 10th
10 percentile, which goes down to about -- maybe a little
11 below 10 percent. Mr. Gorman's recommendation is far
12 below the 10th percentile. OPC's recommendation is almost
13 literally off the chart, and Staff's in between.

14 I would encourage the Commission to adopt an ROE
15 in this case commensurate with Mr. Hevert's
16 recommendation, one that is in the mainstream of
17 authorized ROEs across the country, one that is based on
18 conventional analyses and reasonable inputs, one that will
19 allow us to attract the investments that we need to invest
20 in our system, maintain our access to capital on
21 reasonable returns and provide the company with a return
22 commensurate with enterprises having similar risk as is
23 required by Hope and Bluefield. Thank you.

24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. Any questions?
25 Thank you, Mr. Byrne.

1 MR. BYRNE: Okay.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Opening for Staff?

3 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. Why don't you
4 leave that up, Tom?

5 MR. BYRNE: Sure.

6 MR. THOMPSON: It's pretty. I like it.

7 OPENING STATEMENT

8 BY MR. THOMPSON:

9 MR. THOMPSON: May it please the Commission. In
10 addition to being the largest dollar issue that you're
11 going to face in this case, it is also one of the most
12 complex, detailed and frustrating.

13 As Mr. Byrne told you, rate of return
14 recommendations and rate of return analyses are
15 surprisingly subjective. We bring in experts and we
16 listen to them. And we have to understand and always
17 remember that there's a lot of art in what they're telling
18 us.

19 It's not science. It's not a generating plant.
20 It's not something where the constraints of the physical
21 world, cause and effect operate or at least operate as
22 clearly as lay people can see it in a generating plant.

23 This is a rarified area, an area of expert
24 knowledge, expert analysis, expert opinion. And it's easy
25 for lay people to lose their way when dealing with so

1 esoteric a subject.

2 Now, Mr. Byrne spoke of a mainstream, mainly to
3 say that all the recommendations besides Mr. Hevert's were
4 well outside of it. And I asked him to leave this chart
5 up because, boy, that looks like a stream, doesn't it,
6 meandering through a valley?

7 And I assume -- he never told us in his opening
8 statement what the mainstream was. But I assume the
9 mainstream to which he refers is, in fact, this line, this
10 average of ROE awards by Commissions across the nation
11 over a recent period of time.

12 And you put that on a chart, and it's pretty,
13 and it looks authoritative. And there it is. It's a
14 thing. You can't deny it. It even looks scientific,
15 right? Scientists choose graphs all the time.

16 But this particular graph is misleading because
17 there is a serious, serious, serious flaw in looking to
18 the decisions of other Commissions as your primary
19 starting point for awarding an ROE.

20 What is that flaw? It's circular reasoning.
21 That's the flaw. That's the flaw. If you look at the
22 report of ROE decisions by RRA, Regulatory Research
23 Associates, which is where these numbers come from, you
24 will see that they tend to cluster around the average.

25 And, in fact, for the statisticians among you,

1 you understand that the term average or mean is a measure
2 of central tendency. It's a measure of central tendency.
3 If you take a data set, the average will tell you what's
4 the mid point? Not mid point between the extremes, but
5 the weighted mid point of that data set. Okay? It is one
6 way to talk about a data set. But it's far from the only
7 way.

8 Now, Mr. Byrne told you that the recommendations
9 made by Mr. Murray here and his low end adopted by OPC
10 here and even the recommendation of Mr. Gorman here are so
11 out -- so far outside the mainstream as to be
12 unreasonable. He even said they are so far outside that
13 mainstream that if you were to adopt any of those numbers,
14 it would violate the Constitutional prerequisites set out
15 in the Hope and Bluefield decisions.

16 But I wonder if the Constitution wouldn't be
17 better satisfied by comparing what you award Ameren not to
18 other awarded ROEs, but how about to earned ROEs? After
19 all, the return the investor receives has nothing to do
20 with what the Commission awards. It has to do with the
21 performance of the company in the world. It has to do
22 with market forces.

23 It is, in fact, the earned actual achieved
24 return on equity, not the Commission-awarded return on
25 equity. Think about that first.

1 And as you have already seen in this case from
2 your examination of Mr. Baxter's bar charts and Staff's
3 Exhibit 237 and the prolonged testimony we've had on how
4 those were developed and how they could be reconciled,
5 you've already seen that, No. 1, regulated electric
6 utility companies earn under their awarded ROE much of the
7 time. Not always, but much of the time. At least that
8 seems to be the case with this company.

9 The other thing you've learned is that this ROE
10 thing, it's slippery. It's like a fish. It wiggles.
11 It's hard to get a hold of. You can calculate it in any
12 number of different ways depending on the point you're
13 trying to make. And that's something I want you to keep
14 in mind as you listen to this expert testimony today and
15 as you evaluate this testimony in making your decision.

16 It's math, yes. And Mr. Byrne was absolutely
17 truthful when he told you that the art is hidden in the
18 numbers. We all know that any equation will produce a
19 result dependent on the inputs. Depends on the inputs.

20 I can select inputs for any equation to produce
21 the output is that I want. That's the skill. That's the
22 art of these experts. You are, in a sense, trusting them
23 to have selected the right inputs to give you the answers
24 you need for this case. That's what you're depending on
25 their skill and their integrity to bring to you.

1 The actual equations are fairly simple. And
2 they all use variations of the same three. There's the --
3 the discounted cash flow model. There's the capital asset
4 pricing model. There's the risk premium analysis.
5 They're all ways of measuring risk. And they're all
6 equations used by investors to decide what's the right
7 price to pay for an investment? That's what they are used
8 for. That's why they were invented.

9 We have a very, very robust investment market in
10 this nation, and you are all aware of that. You can
11 invest in bonds, stocks. You can invest in all kinds of
12 things, depending on whether you're risk adverse or
13 whether you're seeking a high return. And these formuli
14 are used by investors and their advisors in deciding what
15 to invest in, in deciding what's the right amount to pay
16 for the expected return.

17 These formuli were not invented to do what we're
18 using them for, which is to figure out what the cost of
19 capital is for a regulated electrical utility company.
20 But, theoretically, they can be adapted to that purpose.
21 And all over this nation, they are used for that purpose.
22 That is the mainstream in doing this work.

23 Now, I want to talk about this zone of
24 reasonableness. And I talked about this in my general
25 opening, and you heard Mr. Byrne talk about it. There is,

1 indeed, a zone of reasonableness created by the United
2 States Supreme Court and referred to by that Court, and it
3 is different from the zone of reasonableness this
4 Commission has used. And I mention it because I think
5 it's important and I believe the Commission should use the
6 Supreme Court's method rather than the one you have been
7 using.

8 Why is that? Because as I started out telling
9 you, the one you're using that keys onto the average has
10 that flaw of circular reasoning. If you're going to be
11 looking at what all the other Commissions are doing in
12 setting a rate, then the rate you set is going to depend
13 on the judgment of those Commissions and not on the
14 judgment of the evidence in front of you. So that's the
15 flaw, the logical flaw in zone of reasonableness tool that
16 you have used in the past.

17 I suggest you use the Supreme Court tool. That
18 tool is based on the Constitutional requirements. You
19 know that a -- a signed return or allowed return that is
20 too low is confiscatory and is unconstitutional, is
21 unlawful.

22 After all, these are private companies owned by
23 private persons. You can't take their property without
24 compensation. But how much compensation? That's the
25 Constitutional question, right? How much compensation is

1 enough? Whereas the Supreme Court has put it, what is the
2 lowest reasonable rate? They don't say you have to set
3 the ROE at the lowest reasonable rate. No. That's a
4 further step. They just say you've got to figure out
5 where it is. That is the proper point to key your
6 analysis from.

7 And then you go from there to set the ROE where
8 it will accomplish the appropriate regulatory purposes as
9 you have identified. Two steps. I suggest to you that
10 the lowest reasonable rate has to be -- has to be the
11 actual cost of common equity.

12 After all, if you're giving the company -- if
13 you're assigning an ROE that will cover its actual cost of
14 capital, then there is no confiscation. They're getting
15 enough money to pay for what they're doing. So the lowest
16 reasonable rate is the cost of equity, COE the experts
17 refer to it.

18 The actual cost of common equity is the lowest
19 reasonable rate. But the return on equity that you assign
20 is not necessarily the same number. In fact, that's your
21 discretion. That's your discretion. You decide where to
22 set the return on equity. And I suggest that you key that
23 off the cost of common equity because you cannot go lower.
24 It would be unlawful.

25 And I suggest to you further there's also a

1 rate-making ceiling. It is also confiscation if you set
2 the return on equity so high that customers are paying an
3 outlandish and unreasonable amount for the service they're
4 receiving.

5 There is some point that is so high, it is also
6 unconstitutional. Where is that point? I don't know.
7 But it is between those points that the zone of
8 reasonableness described by the United States Supreme
9 Court can be found. That's the zone of reasonableness.

10 In this case, I suggest to you that Mr. Murray,
11 with his recommendation of 8 to 9, has brought you the
12 actual cost of common equity. That is what it is costing
13 Ameren Missouri for equity capital.

14 Is that where you should set the rate? Well, we
15 say at the top of that range. And other parties go even
16 higher. I think you can set it wherever you want within
17 that range as long as you state a rational, regulatory
18 purpose for going higher, construction risk, small company
19 risk, financial -- whatever it might be. It's your
20 discretion.

21 And you know and I know the Courts are not going
22 to inquire deeply into any ROE that you set within a zone
23 of reasonableness. That's your discretion in this case.
24 But, please, key off of the right number, which is the
25 actual cost of common equity.

1 Does that mean you can't look at what the other
2 Commissions are doing? Absolutely not. That's a relevant
3 factor. But I don't think it's the appropriate starting
4 point. It's something to consider.

5 And when you're making this decision and you're
6 setting the return on equity for this company, you have a
7 myriad of things to consider, a myriad of things that have
8 been brought to you by the policy witnesses we heard at
9 the outset of this case.

10 Among them are the continued sluggish economy
11 and its effects on the ratepayers, the company's earning
12 history, which has been described to you by the company
13 witnesses, the possible effects of various levels of ROE
14 that you might assign, which there is also testimony on.

15 It is Staff's position that 9 percent -- 9
16 percent is an appropriate ROE award. It is well above the
17 zone of confiscation. Not much above it. In fact, at the
18 top of it. But it satisfies the Constitutional
19 requirements. Thank you.

20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Questions?

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Just one.

22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Go ahead.

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thanks, Mr. Thompson. Did
24 I hear you correctly that you concede the fact that Ameren
25 is -- has earned beneath its allowed ROE?

1 MR. THOMPSON: I think more often than not, it
2 has.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. All right. Thank
4 you.

5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. For
6 Public Counsel?

7 MS. BAKER: Thank you.

8 OPENING STATEMENT

9 BY MS. BAKER:

10 May it please the Commission. Public Counsel
11 has not sponsored a witness on ROE in this particular
12 case. But the Commission has before it four experts
13 basing their opinion on what they feel are the proper
14 market-based and economical-based indicators to make their
15 particular range of reasonable ROE statements toward the
16 Commission.

17 As you've heard already, the reasonable ROE that
18 the U.S. Supreme Court has stated is one for Ameren that
19 is adequate to attract capital at reasonable terms,
20 thereby allowing Ameren Missouri to provide safe and
21 reliable electric service that is sufficient to ensure
22 Ameren Missouri's financial integrity and is commensurate
23 with the return on investments in enterprises having
24 corresponding risks.

25 So this is the statement of what is a reasonable

1 ROE. And everyone has agreed to that, that this is the
2 statement of a reasonable ROE. And a reasonable ROE is
3 one that is not detrimental to the utility. And it is
4 also one that is not detrimental to the -- to the
5 customer.

6 The Commission's charge is to set just and
7 reasonable rates. And part of that determination is to
8 set affordable rates that are not detrimental to the
9 utility. Nearly 45 percent of the revenue requirement of
10 Ameren in this case is based on the issue of return on
11 equity.

12 Customers have gone directly to the
13 Commissioners with their concerns regarding affordable
14 rates in this economy and with the number of rate cases
15 that they are facing in multiple types of utilities.

16 Public Counsel asks that once the Commission
17 sets a reasonable range for the ROE that the Commission
18 implement the low end of that reasonable range to promote
19 affordability for Ameren's customers. Thank you.

20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. For MIEC?

21 OPENING STATEMENT

22 BY MS. ILES:

23 MS. ILES: Good morning. May it please the
24 Commission. My name is Carole Iles. I'm here on behalf
25 of the Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers. We will

1 introduce the testimony of Mike Gorman. The other
2 attorneys have already mentioned that he is our expert.

3 And in his testimony, Mr. Gorman recommends that
4 the Commission authorize an ROE for Ameren Missouri in a
5 range of 9.2 to 9.4 percent. And, specifically, he
6 recommends that the Commission adopt an ROE of 9.3
7 percent, the mid point of his range.

8 And I'm going to point out something about
9 Mr. Byrne's chart here. I just want it to be clear that
10 this apparently shows, based on what he has written here,
11 the allowed ROE calculated as a 12-month rolling average.

12 So when you look at this number here for July of
13 2012, that's telling you the -- that's looking at the
14 average, I guess, from the beginning of the year. Or it's
15 a rolling, so it goes back to July of --

16 MR. BYRNE: Twelve months. Twelve months.

17 MS. ILES: Twelve months. Sorry. So at any
18 rate, an interesting fact that we'll introduce in our
19 testimony is that actually if you look at the second
20 quarter of 2012 and the average authorized ROEs for
21 electric utilities in this country, it is below 10
22 percent. It's 9.92 percent.

23 So there's a lot of different ways you can look
24 at numbers. But when you talk about an ROE below ten
25 being just completely unreasonable, well, if you look at

1 the average for the second quarter of 2012 for electric
2 utilities, and we'll introduce evidence on that issue, it
3 is below 10 percent, even though this chart doesn't
4 reflect that because it -- the average is still above
5 there at this point in the year.

6 And it's significant that the evidence in this
7 case, not just Mr. Gorman's testimony, but the testimony
8 of Mr. Hevert and Mr. Murray all show that the cost of
9 equity has significantly declined since Ameren Missouri's
10 last rate case. And the current trend is for it to
11 continue to decline.

12 Bond yields have declined, both utility bonds
13 and Treasury bonds. And the cost of common equity has
14 declined whether you look at -- regardless of the method
15 of estimating what that cost is, whether you look at a
16 risk premium analysis, which takes into account those bond
17 yields, or if you're looking at a DCF model that simply
18 looks at dividends and capital appreciation, stock
19 appreciation. Either way you look at it, there has been a
20 significant decline in the cost of capital since the last
21 rate case.

22 Mr. Gorman's testimony will also explain why the
23 ROE recommended by Ameren Missouri's witness, Mr. Hevert,
24 should be rejected. As Mr. Byrne explained, Mr. Hevert
25 recommends an ROE in the range of 10.25 to 11. And his

1 specific recommendation is 10.5. And that's significant.

2 What he's asking you to do, what the company's
3 asking you to do is to increase its authorized ROE over
4 the last rate case despite clear evidence that the cost of
5 equity has declined since the last rate case.

6 In sum, the evidence presented to the Commission
7 in this case will show that the appropriate return on
8 equity for Ameren Missouri at this time is, as Mr. Gorman
9 recommends, in the range of 9.2 to 9.4 percent.

10 We recommend that the Commission adopt an ROE of
11 9.3 percent in this case. I also want to note that
12 Mr. Gorman was listed as a witness for the first day of
13 testimony in this case on policy issues. And his
14 testimony does include a discussion of those issues. And
15 so he is certainly available to answer the Commission's
16 questions on that topic as well this morning.

17 We appreciate the Commission accommodating us
18 and taking him out of time on that issue. Thank you.

19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. All right. I
20 believe that's all the openings. Mr. Byrne?

21 MR. BYRNE: Judge, there is a short issue on --
22 I believe on capital structure or cost of debt. We have
23 Mr. Ryan Martin here to testify. And I think MIEC has
24 some questions for him. We were hoping we could take him
25 first because it's a -- I think it will be not as long as

1 the rest of it.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: That's fine. All right. Call
3 Mr. Martin then. If you'll please right your right hand,
4 and I'll swear you in.

5 RYAN MARTIN,
6 being first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole
7 truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY MS. TATRO:

10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. You may inquire.

11 Q (By Ms. Tatro) Would you state your name and
12 business address for the Commission, please?

13 A My name is Ryan Martin, One Ameren Plaza, 1901
14 Chouteau Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri, 63103.

15 Q And are you the same Ryan J. Martin who prefiled
16 direct testimony in this case?

17 A I am.

18 Q Do you have any additions or corrections to make
19 to your testimony?

20 A I do not.

21 Q And if I were to ask you the same questions that
22 are listed in your prefiled written testimony, would your
23 answers be the same?

24 A Yes.

25 MS. TATRO: I move for admission of Exhibit 23

1 and tender the witness for cross-examination.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Exhibit 23 has been
3 offered. Any objections to its receipt? Hearing none,
4 it will be received.

5 (Exhibit 23 was offered and received into
6 evidence.)

7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Cross-examination, we'll begin
8 with MIEC.

9 MS. ILES: Thank you, your Honor. Is my
10 microphone working?

11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I think so.

12 MS. ILES: Okay. Thank you.

13 CROSS-EXAMINATION

14 BY MS. ILES:

15 Q Mr. Martin, good morning.

16 A Good morning.

17 Q My name is Carole Iles. I'm going to ask you
18 just a few questions. At page 5 of your direct testimony,
19 you're sponsoring the company's proposed capital structure
20 in this case, correct?

21 A Correct.

22 Q And the common equity ratio you're recommending
23 in this case is 53 percent, correct?

24 A I believe on page 5 refers to the -- the
25 recommended capital structure as of September 30th, 2001.

1 Q Okay.

2 A The structure recommended in the case as of the
3 true-up date of July 31st is on page 7.

4 Q All right. And what's the common equity ratio
5 you're recommending on page 7?

6 A 52.1 percent.

7 Q Okay. So a little bit lower. 52.1 percent.
8 All right. You're the Assistant Treasurer and Manager of
9 Corporate Finance for Ameren Services Company; is that
10 correct?

11 A I am.

12 Q And as a part of your duties as Assistant
13 Treasurer and Manager of Corporate Finance, you perform
14 studies to estimate ways to maintain the company's
15 financial integrity but minimize its overall cost of
16 capital, correct?

17 A Correct.

18 Q So has the company done any studies that examine
19 whether or not it can reduce its cost of capital while
20 maintaining its current investment grade bond rating?

21 A We are -- we are always evaluating market
22 opportunities. One example would be, recently, we
23 contemplated a transaction to refinance existing higher
24 rate bonds at a lower rate pursuant to a tender offer.
25 That transaction was completed in the third quarter of

1 this year.

2 **Q Look -- sorry -- so -- I'm sorry. Let's talk a**
3 **little bit about that refinance of the bonds at this**
4 **point.**

5 A Uh-huh.

6 **Q When did that happen?**

7 A The -- the bonds themselves were issued on
8 September 6th, but the -- the transaction was actually
9 initiated on August 20th pursuant to a tender offer. It
10 was actually -- there were two parts to the transaction.

11 One, the intent of the first part was to
12 refinance a portion of higher rate debt at a lower rate
13 given current market conditions. And the second part was
14 to refinance a bond maturity that was coming due in
15 September for Ameren Missouri.

16 **Q And as a result of doing that, you were able to**
17 **borrow at significantly lower interest rates; is that**
18 **correct?**

19 A We borrowed at a lower rate. The new bonds,
20 485 million, was issued at a coupon of 3.9 percent.

21 **Q Do you know what the anticipated annual savings**
22 **from this transaction is?**

23 A We estimate that at -- in terms of the entire
24 transaction should generate annual savings of up to
25 \$5 million.

1 MS. ILES: Okay. I have an exhibit that I need
2 to have marked.

3 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Your next number is 528.

4 MS. TATRO: I'm sorry. What number was that,
5 Judge?

6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 528.

7 MS. ILES: Do you need to mark it before I go
8 forward, or can I mark it and -- I should hand this out to
9 everyone. This will be 528.

10 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. And what number is
11 this going to be?

12 MS. ILES: 528.

13 **Q (By Ms. Iles) I'm handing you what's been marked**
14 **as Exhibit 528. What is that? Do you know what it is?**

15 A It's a Data Request from MIEC and our response.

16 **Q All right. And what information did this Data**
17 **Request ask for?**

18 A Well, it says, Please provide the anticipated
19 revenue requirement savings produced by Ameren Missouri's
20 recent bond offer is the question.

21 **Q And how did the company respond?**

22 A Company responded, Ameren Missouri's recent debt
23 issuance occurred after the true-up cutoff date in this
24 case. Consequently, the debt issue has had no impact on
25 the revenue requirement in this case.

1 Q All right. And that's the same transaction that
2 we were just talking about --

3 A Correct.

4 Q -- that you stated will -- you estimate will
5 cost -- will save the company approximately \$5 million?

6 A Correct.

7 Q Annually, but it will not be included in the --
8 it wasn't included in the test year or the true-up period
9 of this case, correct?

10 A The transaction was completed after the true-up
11 date in this case. That's correct.

12 Q Okay. Thank you.

13 MS. ILES: I'd like to move for admission of
14 Exhibit 528.

15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 528 has been offered. Any
16 objections to its receipt? Hearing none, it will be
17 received.

18 (Exhibit 528 was offered and received into
19 evidence.)

20 Q (By Ms. Iles) All right. Let's go back to be
21 what we were talking about at the outset. And that was
22 the capital structure of the company.

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q And that's when we got into this idea -- or the
25 discussion we just pursued about the refinance of the

1 bonds. what about the capital structure of the company in
2 itself? Do you ever do any kind of studies to determine
3 whether you need more debt versus common equity, that kind
4 of thing?

5 A Yeah. We're constantly -- or consistently on a
6 regular basis evaluating capital structure in a variety of
7 ways. We evaluate the company's average -- average
8 weighted cost of debt, the average tenor. We look at key
9 credit metrics that impact credit ratings, try to
10 interpret those to make sure that we have the optimal mix
11 of debt and equity.

12 Again, this is more of an art than a science.
13 The intent here is to balance -- to come up with a
14 reasonable cost of capital and also maintain financial
15 strength and stability that will allow the company to
16 access capital markets as a reasonable cost on a regular
17 basis.

18 Q And which is more expensive, debt or equity?

19 A Well, traditionally -- I guess it could vary,
20 but, traditionally, equity is more expensive than debt.

21 Q And that's true at this time, correct?

22 A That is true.

23 Q Do you know or can you tell me the revenue
24 requirement cost of customers of common equity capital
25 assuming the Commission approves, for example, just for

1 example purposes, a return on equity of say, 10 percent?

2 What would the cost to the customers be?

3 A You're asking me what the revenue requirement
4 impact of that is?

5 Q Correct.

6 A I -- I do not have that information.

7 Q Okay. Would you agree -- when you take a 10
8 percent return on equity and you're determining what the
9 impact is going to be on the revenue requirement, you have
10 to gross up the income taxes, correct, to figure out that?

11 A Correct.

12 Q And would be it be reasonable to conclude that
13 it -- the revenue requirement cost would go from 10
14 percent to around 16 percent because of that tax
15 difference? Is that about right?

16 A You know, without doing the specific
17 calculation, I'm not really in a position to confirm or --

18 Q All right. But it's going to be more than 10
19 percent because of the tax effect?

20 A Correct. It's going to be more because of the
21 tax. Directionally, yes, it would be higher.

22 Q Okay. And what would the cost to customers be
23 if, say, your marginal cost of debt was 5 percent? It
24 would just be 5 percent, correct? You don't do a gross up
25 on the tax on those number?

1 A You know, I'm not responsible for preparing the
2 revenue requirement calculation, so you're asking me
3 questions that I am not directly involved with.

4 Q Okay. All right. I appreciate that. Thank
5 you. I guess what I was trying get at is there is -- it's
6 more than just -- there's more to comparing the numbers
7 than just the straight ROE amount. It's -- when we're
8 determining the cost of common equity, there's more to it
9 than that, correct?

10 A More to what? I'm sorry.

11 Q To determining what the revenue requirement cost
12 is for that common equity.

13 A I -- again, you know, my responsibility in the
14 Treasury Department is to maintain a reasonable capital
15 structure, reasonable mix between debt and equity,
16 factoring in all the costs and benefits of each type of --
17 of financing or capital. I am not responsible for
18 calculating the impact on the revenue requirement to the
19 customers.

20 Q Okay. All right. Well, let's talk about
21 something else, then. How about book value for the
22 company's shareholders? All right. Would you agree that
23 when you build up the common equity ratio, as the common
24 equity ratio increases and you increase your rates to
25 support the greater amount of common equity ratio, that's

1 a way of expanding book value for the company's
2 shareholders?

3 A You're saying if we increase common equity and
4 that results in an increased revenue requirement, does
5 that increase the book value of the company?

6 Q Correct.

7 A You know, one of the ways the equity value is
8 increased is through retained earnings. So to the extent
9 retained earnings are higher or lower, it would impact the
10 book value of the company.

11 Q Does expanding the book value of the company
12 increase the dollar earnings per share of stock if the
13 return on equity doesn't change?

14 A It could or could not. An increase in the book
15 value of the company does not necessarily translate into an
16 increase in earnings per share.

17 Q When you're making capital structure decisions
18 at your company, do you primarily focus on enhancing your
19 shareholders' earnings and minimizing your cost of capital
20 while preserving your financial status?

21 A It's -- in determining the optimal capital
22 structure, again, it's a subtle balance. It's a bit of an
23 art. On one hand, you have the cost of capital.
24 Obviously, you'd want to keep that as low as possible.

25 On the other hand, you have financial strength

1 and stability. As you've -- as you've mentioned, debt is
2 typically a lower cost form of capital. But to the extent
3 that you have an over-reliance upon debt, you increase
4 your cost of financial distress, you weaken your financial
5 strength. That, in turn, could result in an increase in
6 your cost of capital.

7 So there's a subtle balance to look at how much
8 -- what balance is appropriate to give you that reasonable
9 cost of capital and allow you to obtain -- I'm sorry -- to
10 maintain financial strength and security necessary to
11 access markets and access capital when you need it.

12 **Q Thank you. Mr. Martin, as Assistant Treasurer**
13 **and Manager of Finance, do you ever meet with credit**
14 **rating agencies concerning the bond rating of Ameren**
15 **Missouri or Ameren Illinois?**

16 A I do.

17 **Q And in your meetings with these bond rating**
18 **agencies, do your discussions include management's**
19 **perspective on regulatory risk and regulatory mechanisms**
20 **in the jurisdictions where you operate?**

21 A When we meet with them, we generally give them
22 updates on regulatory proceedings. In terms of our
23 perceptions of the risk, we don't -- that is not really
24 the focus. The focus is more on what our experience has
25 been. On their own, the agencies come up with their own

1 perceptions of -- of regulatory risk. For example,
2 Moody's specifically rates the -- their perception of the
3 supportiveness of the regulatory environment in the
4 different jurisdictions.

5 **Q Well, do you know whether they rely on the**
6 **information that you provide them about that?**

7 A Do they rely upon the information that we
8 provide them on rate case proceedings?

9 **Q Regulatory environment.**

10 A We provide them information and they have their
11 own process for how they process that and how it
12 translates into their rating.

13 **Q But it is something you provide to them?**

14 A We provide them with updates, yes.

15 **Q Okay.**

16 A They may -- they may call and ask for an update.
17 They may -- we have regular annual meetings. We go out
18 and provide them with an update on significant company
19 issues. They take that information. They evaluate it
20 independently, and they come up with their credit ratings
21 and positions.

22 **Q When you're in those discussions, I mean, you're**
23 **saying that they -- that they evaluate them independently.**
24 **Do you ever get any push-back on the information that you**
25 **provide them? Is there anything that they do in those**

1 meetings that indicates to you they don't accept what
2 you're telling them?

3 A No. They rely upon us for factual information.
4 And they take that information and they interpret it as
5 they may, you know, based on how they see it.

6 Q Okay.

7 MS. ILES: I have no further questions.

8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: For Public Counsel?

9 MS. BAKER: Thank you. Just a couple.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MS. BAKER:

12 Q You only filed direct testimony in this case; is
13 that correct?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q And your direct testimony was filed in February
16 of 2012?

17 A That is correct.

18 Q And your direct testimony on common equity cost
19 was based on a reasonable range of ROE for Ameren between
20 10.5 and 11.00; is that correct?

21 A Correct.

22 Q And you are aware that Ameren has now lowered
23 its reasonable range for ROE for Ameren to be anywhere
24 between 10.25 and 11.00?

25 A Correct.

1 MS. BAKER: No further questions.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. For Staff?

3 CROSS-EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. THOMPSON:

5 Q Good morning, sir.

6 A Good morning.

7 Q I wonder if you could tell me what Ameren
8 Missouri's imbedded cost of debts is?

9 A Are you asking for it as of a particular date?
10 As of the cutoff date, September -- I'm sorry -- July
11 31st, 2012, it was 5.87.

12 Q How about as of September 30th, if you know?

13 A September 30th, 2011, or are you talking
14 about --

15 Q Of this year.

16 A Of this year. I -- I do not have that specific
17 calculation. Based on our recent -- our transaction in
18 September, it would be slightly lower. I would estimate
19 maybe -- maybe 15, 20 basis points lower.

20 Q Okay. I think in your testimony you state that
21 if the company receives an ROE award that allows it to
22 earn its weighted average cost of capital that is an
23 adequate ROE award?

24 A I think in my testimony I comment that I believe
25 the interest of the company and its ratepayers would be

1 balanced if it is allowed to earn a return equivalent to
2 its weighted average cost of capital. That's in my
3 testimony.

4 **Q Okay. Thank you.**

5 MR. THOMPSON: No further questions.

6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Come up for
7 questions from the Bench. Mr. Chairman?

8 CHAIRMAN GUNN: I don't have anything.

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Jarrett?

10

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION

12 BY COMMISSIONER JARRETT:

13 **Q Good morning. I just have a couple.**

14 **A Good morning.**

15 **Q You remember Ms. Iles was asking you some**
16 **questions about meetings with credit agencies -- agencies?**

17 **A Correct.**

18 **Q And you indicated that you attended those**
19 **meetings regularly; is that correct?**

20 **A Uh-huh. Correct. Uh-huh.**

21 **Q And there's various information that you share**
22 **with those rating agencies. Would you characterize that**
23 **information as facts or opinion?**

24 **A Fact. I would say it's definitely facts.**

25 **Q Okay.**

1 A It's similar to what we might -- we give -- we
2 give more information to rating agencies than we would
3 necessarily, say, the investment community at times
4 because they are considered insiders. So we do provide
5 them with -- with company specific data, again, that we
6 believe would help them form a, you know, appropriate
7 opinion of the company, give them all the information they
8 need to draw reasonable conclusions.

9 **Q Okay. So --**

10 A But -- I'm sorry. They may ask questions, and
11 we respond to their questions, but they are, I would say,
12 overwhelmingly fact-based type inquiries.

13 **Q Well, for example, do you give them information**
14 **about rate cases that you have --**

15 A Yes.

16 **Q -- of Ameren's?**

17 A Yes. But it would be -- that information would
18 be presented to -- as a -- either an update on existing
19 proceedings or a summary of proceedings that have just
20 been completed.

21 **Q All right. Let's talk a little bit about**
22 **summaries that have been completed.**

23 A Uh-huh.

24 **Q What do those summaries consist of? What kind**
25 **of --**

1 A They would consist of -- for example, they would
2 be a summary of the company's position and the position of
3 the Intervenor when you're talking about, you know, for
4 example, the -- the ROE differences in terms of what was
5 put forth as appropriate, the different issues that were
6 being negotiated, you know, certain changes of things we
7 were asking for in terms of, you know, trackers or
8 different mechanisms like that. Just, basically, the
9 specifics of the actual proceeding.

10 **Q Okay. Do you ever get asked questions about,**
11 **you know, what's your opinion on the regulatory climate in**
12 **Missouri?**

13 A No. I think once in a while, there will be a
14 question as how we would characterize the relationship
15 with -- with the Commission. And we kind of -- I mean,
16 generally, in those responses, we talk about what we are
17 working with the Commissions on in terms of what may be
18 constructive changes that would benefit ratepayers and the
19 company. We're asked those types of questions
20 occasionally.

21 **Q Okay. But I guess at this -- what I'm getting**
22 **at is that --**

23 A I'm sorry.

24 **Q You know, there's been -- I'll have to look back**
25 **in the record, but there's either been testimony or**

1 argument that Missouri is less than average when it comes
2 to a regulatory climate.

3 A Okay.

4 Q I guess what I'm asking is, you know, does
5 Ameren ever go in and characterize these rating agencies
6 and say, you know, We got -- we got the shaft in this rate
7 case from the Commission?

8 A No. No. I think we provide the facts and we
9 give updates on maybe certain mechanisms we have been
10 pushing for or requesting that either have been approved
11 or denied. That factors into their decision.

12 And you talk about unsupportive. They -- they
13 do specifically Moody's. They rate, you know, the
14 jurisdictions on their kind of traditional scale. And
15 Missouri is having a lower rating, a less supportive
16 rating, not unsupportive, but less supportive because I
17 think they compare it to other states and other utilities
18 that could have maybe a more beneficial cost recovery
19 mechanism, for example.

20 And they rate it based on that. I think they
21 have their own processes internally where they look at all
22 the options available to the company. Some companies have
23 them. Some don't. And they kind of look at that
24 relatively speaking, and that's how they rate in
25 environment. So we look at their information on -- and,

1 actually, a lot of it is public as well, so we allow them
2 to form their own conclusions. But we don't -- we don't
3 add color to it. We basically give them the facts of, you
4 know, what we're asking for, how the outcome of a
5 proceeding was.

6 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: Thank you. That's all I
7 have.

8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Kenney?

9 CROSS-EXAMINATION

10 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:

11 Q Good morning.

12 A Good morning.

13 Q I have some similar questions in a similar vein
14 regarding the credit rating agencies and their analysis.
15 You said that you provide them factual information, and
16 they evaluate it independently. Do you know whether they
17 conduct any independent research and gather facts separate
18 and apart from what Ameren would provide to them?

19 A I think they do their own market research. And
20 on occasion, they will prepare a piece that expends beyond
21 maybe just an Ameren concern that maybe talks about the
22 whole utility industry, and they will -- they will ask us
23 for information that may contribute to that. But, again,
24 it would be fact -- fact-based information.

25 Q So they may seek out additional research

1 regarding the -- the regulatory environment generally?

2 A Or the industry.

3 Q Right.

4 A Right.

5 Q Or the industry?

6 A Right.

7 Q Do you know whether they conduct any independent
8 research and gather additional factual information about
9 Ameren specifically?

10 A From another source?

11 Q Yes.

12 A I don't know that.

13 Q Okay. You don't know whether they do or don't?

14 A I don't know if they do or do not.

15 Q And which credit rating agencies does Ameren
16 have its relationship with?

17 A We have Standard & Poor's, Moody's and Fitch.

18 Q So all three?

19 A All three. Uh-huh.

20 Q Okay. You indicated that you will prepare -- or
21 that Ameren will prepare summaries of a rate proceeding to
22 provide to them, and there's no colorized factual
23 illustration?

24 A Right.

25 Q Who would prepare that?

1 A It would be prepared within my group.
2 Generally, I would lead that effort. To give you an
3 example, in October, generally October of each year, we go
4 up to New York, and we provide them with an overall
5 company update.

6 In advance of that, we provide them with a slide
7 deck presentation. I think that was provided in this
8 case, an example or the actual document that we presented
9 to them last year. So we'll be going -- going through
10 that process again in the next few weeks in anticipation
11 of our trip up there in the next few months.

12 That's really the most formal communication we
13 have with them. Otherwise, it would be phone calls with
14 -- with just general questions they may have.

15 **Q And as a part of that slide deck presentation,**
16 **do you provide any of the documents or the pleadings that**
17 **are actually in the case, supporting information from**
18 **which you've prepared your summary?**

19 A We don't. We don't provide the actual
20 proceedings. I believe most of those are publicly
21 available. We may -- I think I have seen some
22 presentations where we have links to the different
23 resources where they could get that information. But we
24 don't provide them directly.

25 **Q And the rating agencies in analyzing the credit**

1 **supportive nature of a regulatory environment are**
2 **primarily concerned with Ameren's ability to recover it's**
3 **costs through rates, correct?**

4 A Correct. Their average cost to earn a
5 reasonable return, yes.

6 Q **They don't take into account the reasonableness**
7 **and prudence of Ameren's expenses, just whether those can**
8 **be recovered through rates, correct?**

9 A It's hard to speak as to what they specifically
10 look at. But I would think, yeah, they were more
11 concerned with the mechanisms in place within the State
12 for a utility to recover its, you know, in theory, prudent
13 and incurred costs.

14 Q **But they're not --**

15 A They're not evaluating Ameren.

16 Q **They're not undertaking an independent analysis**
17 **to determine whether those costs were prudently incurred,**
18 **just whether they can get them back in rate base?**

19 A I do not believe so. Without -- without
20 speaking for them, I believe their evaluation would be
21 based on our specifics costs, the nature of them.

22 Q **Okay. Credit metrics was a phrase that you used**
23 **before.**

24 A Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

25 Q **These credit metrics, what exactly does that**

1 **phrase refer to?**

2 A You know, it refers to key measures of either
3 the company's, you know, liquidity, cash flows, their
4 ability to service their debt, their financial strength.
5 For example, you get one of the -- one of the key ratios
6 is kind of a covered ratio that looks at the funds
7 available to service debt relative to the interest cost.

8 So the higher your ratio in that specific case,
9 the more comfort you would have that the company will be
10 able to service its obligations and not fault on its debt.

11 Another one would be the leverage ratio. We
12 look at the amounts of debt relative to total
13 capitalization. And some rating agencies are a little bit
14 more specific than others in providing guidance as to what
15 type of ratios they would expect for certain rating
16 levels.

17 **Q So the credit metrics are metrics that the**
18 **credit rating agencies use to determine the financial**
19 **health and then ultimately to assign their ratings?**

20 A It's one part of it. For -- again, some of the
21 agencies are a little bit more transparent than others. I
22 would say Moody's is very transparent. They basically
23 give you a report card. They tell you what factors are
24 involved. They tell you what the weight is assigned to
25 each factor.

1 For example, I believe the credit metrics in the
2 Moody's or factored into the Moody's rating account for 30
3 percent of the ratings. And that, for example, is
4 supportive in the regulatory environment accounts for 25
5 percent. Cost recovery mechanisms count for 25 percent.
6 Right there, you have 50 percent that's somewhat
7 subjective based on kind of the overall regulatory
8 environment. Relative 30 percent is assigned to the
9 credit metrics.

10 **Q 50 percent of their overall rating would be --**

11 A Well, 25 percent is supportive of the regulatory
12 environment. 25 percent is kind of evaluation of cost of
13 recovery mechanisms.

14 **Q Regulatory mechanisms?**

15 A Regulatory mechanisms. Right.

16 **Q And you characterized that 50 percent as**
17 **subjective?**

18 A Well, it's their subjective evaluation relative
19 to credit metrics, which are very, you know, returnable.

20 **Q Can be -- they can be easily determined through**
21 **some objective measures?**

22 A Right. And they have -- they have a formula.
23 We apply the formula. We can measure our actual metrics
24 relative to their guidance for certain ratings.

25 **Q But the other 50 percent is a subjective**

1 analysis based upon the regulatory environment which we've
2 already established isn't a result of reasonable and
3 prudence, just your ability to recover your cost of rates?

4 A I believe so.

5 Q All right. And then Moody's is relatively
6 transparent. What about S&P and Fitch?

7 A They're a -- S&P is a little bit less
8 transparent. They assign, you know, business risk and
9 financial rate. In terms of actual weightings, they don't
10 provide that. But it's the same type of mix between the
11 business environment and your financial risk.

12 Q But their formula is more proprietary. They
13 don't tell you what it is?

14 A Right.

15 Q Okay. Which of those three, would you say,
16 carries the most weight?

17 A Again, it's hard to say. Just from my -- from
18 my position and experience, it seems like S&P and Moody's
19 carry more weight than Fitch.

20 Q And as between Moody's and S&P?

21 A That's hard to tell between the two. I would
22 say they seem fairly on equal ground.

23 Q So if Moody's credit metrics determinations are
24 transparent, another analyst could come up with its own
25 measure of what an appropriate ROE is and using Moody's

1 **formula to figure out --**

2 A Uh-huh. Well --

3 **Q -- how credit-worthy Ameren would be based upon**
4 **their representation of an ROE. Would you agree with**
5 **that?**

6 A What they could do is they could evaluate that
7 specific part of the equation, which the leverage ratio
8 that we talked about that -- or I guess RO -- I'm sorry --
9 ROE would factor probably more into the regulatory
10 environment, I would think, is the score that would go
11 there.

12 So, again, that would be -- you'd have to make a
13 subjective determination of how you believe they would
14 rate a certain ROE. And, again, this is one part of the
15 overall valuation, I would believe.

16 **Q Okay. And -- and how does -- how does it work**
17 **with Moody's, S&P and Fitch providing the ratings to**
18 **companies in general? How is that -- what's the**
19 **relationship between the company that's requesting the**
20 **rating and the company providing it? Is it -- is it a**
21 **client?**

22 A Oh, we -- well, I believe they --

23 **Q Do you pay for it?**

24 A We do pay for it.

25 **Q All right.**

1 A We pay for the service. But I believe in some
2 cases, the rating agencies will rate that even if they're
3 not being paid. I think it's more rare, but in these
4 cases, yeah, we do pay for the service.

5 **Q Okay. All right.**

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: That's all the questions I
7 have. Thank you.

8 A Thank you.

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Stoll?

10 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I have no questions at this
11 time, your Honor. Thank you.

12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Recross on questions from the
13 Bench, then, beginning with MIEC?

14 MS. ILES: None, your Honor.

15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Public Counsel?

16 MS. BAKER: None. Thank you.

17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Staff?

18 MR. THOMPSON: None. Thank you.

19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Redirect?

20 MS. TATRO: Thank you.

21 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

22 BY MS. TATRO:

23 **Q Mr. Martin, do you recall when Ms. Iles handed**
24 **you DR Request MIEC 243?**

25 A I do.

1 Q Do you still have that in front of you?

2 A I do.

3 Q And that Data Request answer indicated that the
4 refinancing occurred outside of the true-up period?

5 A Correct.

6 Q Can you explain why that occurred after the
7 true-up period rather than before?

8 A Sure. There were, I would say, three main
9 factors that kind of curve the timing of that -- of that
10 transaction. None of them related to specific -- none of
11 them related to the true-up date.

12 The first was really the timing of the approval
13 for the transaction. I believe we started speaking to
14 Staff about the -- the concept of the transaction in May
15 of this year. We filed our application in late June. And
16 we received approval on August 1st, which was, of course,
17 the day after the true-up period. So shortly after that
18 approval on August 1st. We lost the transaction on August
19 20th.

20 Another factor would have been the timing of
21 Ameren's second quarter end, which was on June 30th. It's
22 generally our practice and we believe it's prudent not to
23 access the market or try to sell bonds when the company is
24 in possession of material non-public information.

25 So during that month of July after our June 30th

1 closing date for the quarter, we were in the process of
2 putting together financial statements, putting together
3 disclosures that go into our Form 10-Q, which was filed in
4 this case, I believe, on August 8th.

5 So while the company is in material and
6 preparing those -- I'm sorry -- in possession of material
7 non-public information and preparing disclosures that will
8 go into that 10-Q, we avoid kind of access to the market,
9 and, you know, we consider it somewhat of a quiet period.
10 So that really would have ruled out any kind of
11 transaction during that month of July.

12 And then, lastly, you know, the timing of the
13 transaction was, you know, somewhat -- it was meant
14 somewhat to coincide with the September maturity that I
15 spoke of earlier. Ameren Missouri had \$173 million of
16 bonds maturing in September. So a portion of the proceeds
17 from this new offered transaction of 485 million was used
18 to refinance the \$173 million maturity.

19 Had we done this transaction earlier, say, you
20 know, in June, we would have had to carry that extra debt
21 for a couple months and pay additional interest in advance
22 of using the proceeds to pay off that 173 million.

23 So those were really the three -- three basic
24 reasons for the transaction being timed the way it was.

25 Q Thank you. And then in response to some

1 **questions from Ms. Iles and also from a couple of**
2 **Commissioners, you talked about the communications that**
3 **you've had with the credit rating agencies.**

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q Do you remember that line of questioning?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And you had indicated that the -- these agencies
8 **use other sources besides just the information they get**
9 **from a company. What other sources might that be?**

10 A Again, I can -- I don't mean to speak for the
11 agencies, but my -- my assumption is they're doing their
12 own market research as they are preparing industry pieces.
13 You know, they'll ask us questions, but, you know, my
14 belief is that they are also using other sources and
15 information outside of company specific data to put
16 together their broader industry analysis.

17 Q And do you suppose that they'd be looking at
18 **other utilities in the state of Missouri?**

19 A I believe -- depending on what the focus of
20 their -- of their study or piece was, they could, yeah.

21 Q Specifically, whether they talk about -- I guess
22 **it's Moody's that talks about the regulatory climate --**

23 A Yes.

24 Q -- whether it's supportive or less supportive?

25 A Right.

1 **Q So when they come up with that, would they look**
2 **at Commission orders for KCPL?**

3 **A I believe so. I believe you would reasonably**
4 **expect utilities in the same state to have the same**
5 **regulatory supportive ranking from Moody's. I haven't**
6 **confirmed that or looked at that, but that would seem**
7 **reasonable.**

8 **Q Do they -- and I think you said they compare**
9 **that to results in other states, and that's kind of how**
10 **they come up with this ranking?**

11 **A Well, yeah. The ranking isn't necessarily**
12 **whether a state is supportive or not supportive. It's --**
13 **I think the way they characterize it, it could be more**
14 **supportive to -- most supportive, more supportive, less**
15 **supportive, least supportive. So, yeah, they do make --**
16 **they do make evaluations between the jurisdictions.**

17 **Q Okay. Commissioner Kenney asked you the**
18 **question about whether or not the credit agencies look at**
19 **prudence of an expenditure. Do you remember that**
20 **conversation?**

21 **A Uh-huh.**

22 **Q And you indicated that they really do not, but**
23 **that they look at the results or the structures?**

24 **A Uh-huh.**

25 **Q So you what types of structures do these**

1 **agencies, in your opinion, believe is the most important?**

2 A Well, I think they are looking -- when they look
3 at kind of our cost structure and our cash flows, they're
4 looking at out metrics, I would say. And they want to
5 make sure we have strong metrics that suggests an ability
6 to finance our debt, that generates sufficient cash flows,
7 to maintain financial strength and stability.

8 I think the prudence is evaluated probably more
9 in that perspective in terms of looking at specific costs
10 that maybe go into those different inputs into the -- into
11 the metrics themselves.

12 **Q So do cost recovery mechanisms play a role?**

13 A Well, cost recovery mechanisms would -- I mean,
14 it would certainly play a role in their evaluation of the
15 environment. They would certainly play a role in the
16 strength of the credit metrics.

17 **Q So a utility that has different -- more or --**
18 **more easily accessible cost recovery mechanisms, is that**
19 **considered more supportive or less supportive?**

20 A Yes. That would be -- yeah. That would
21 probably help the rating in a couple of different ways,
22 both in the evaluation -- a subjective evaluation of the
23 regulatory supportiveness and also would show up in the
24 strength of their credit metrics.

25 MS. TATRO: Thank you. I have no further

1 questions.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Then Mr. Martin,
3 you can step down.

4 MR. MARTIN: Thank you.

5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Let's take a break now before
6 we go on to the next witness. We'll come back at 10:00.

7 (Break in proceedings.)

8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Let's come to order, please.
9 And we're back from our break. And Mr. Hevert is taking
10 the stage -- or the stand.

11 MR. THOMPSON: Same thing.

12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yeah. Please raise your right
13 hand.

14 ROBERT HEVERT,
15 being first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole
16 truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

17 DIRECT EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. BYRNE:

19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. You may inquire.

20 MR. BYRNE: Thank you, your Honor.

21 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Can you please state your name
22 for the record?

23 A My name is Robert Hevert. Last name is spelled
24 H-e-v, as in Victor, -e-r-t.

25 Q And that's Robert Hevert, not Hevert?

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: My apologies.

2 A I've heard it every possible way, and I know who
3 you mean.

4 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Mr. Hevert, by whom are you
5 employed?

6 A I am managing partner of Sussex, S-u-s-s-e-x,
7 Economic Advisors.

8 Q And are you the same Robert Hevert who caused to
9 be filed in this case prefiled direct testimony that's
10 been marked as Exhibit 20, prefiled rebuttal testimony
11 that's been marked as Exhibit 21 and prefiled surrebuttal
12 testimony in Highly Confidential and Non-Proprietary form
13 that has been marked as Exhibit 22?

14 A Yes, I am.

15 Q And is the information contained -- well, do you
16 have any corrections to any of that testimony?

17 A No, I do not.

18 Q And is the information contained in that
19 pre-filed testimony true and correct to the best of your
20 knowledge and belief?

21 A Yes, it is.

22 Q And if I were to ask you the questions contained
23 in that prefiled testimony today when you're here under
24 oath, would your answers be the same?

25 A Yes, they would.

1 MR. BYRNE: Your Honor, I'd offer Exhibits 20,
2 21 and 22 and tender Mr. Hevert for cross-examination.

3 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. 20, 21 and 22 have
4 been offered. Any objections to their receipt?

5 MR. THOMPSON: No objection.

6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Hearing none, they will be
7 received.

8 (Exhibits 20, 21, 22HC, 22NP were offered and
9 admitted into evidence.)

10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: For cross-examination, we'll
11 begin with MIEC.

12 MS. ILES: Judge, may I have a moment? I have
13 an exhibit that I was going to ask Mr. Hevert to look at
14 it. And I just noticed when I printed it, the footnotes
15 had dropped off for some unknown reason, and I just need
16 to make a few additions if I could just have a couple of
17 minutes before I do that, before I start. I'm so sorry.

18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Back off the record
19 for a minute.

20 (Break in proceedings.)

21 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We're back on the
22 record, then.

23 MS. ILES: I should know better than to print
24 documents after 8:00 at night.

25 CROSS-EXAMINATION

1 BY MS. ILES:

2 Q Okay. Mr. Hevert, I'm going have this marked as
3 an exhibit and have you take a look at it.

4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Next number is 529. Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.

6 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

7 MR. BYRNE: Thanks.

8 A Do you have an extra?

9 Q (By Ms. Iles) I'm sorry. I'll give you the one
10 that's marked.

11 A Thank you.

12 Q You'll notice on that document there are some
13 little numbers, reference numbers for footnotes. However,
14 there are no footnotes on the document due to an error on
15 my part.

16 And I want to let you know that the first
17 footnote should refer to your direct testimony in the case
18 ER-2011-0028, which is the last Ameren rate case. That's
19 ER-2011-0028, Hevert Direct at 54.

20 The second footnote should be ER-2012-0166, the
21 current case, Hevert Direct at 49. And the third should
22 be ER-2012-0166, Hevert Rebuttal at 113.

23 And the final footnote, No. 4, the utility bond
24 yields come from Mr. Gorman's testimony. I believe it's
25 his direct at page 5.

1 MR. BYRNE: Ms. Iles, what -- footnote to what
2 page number was that again?

3 MS. ILES: 49, direct at 49.

4 Q (By Ms. Iles) So as you can see, these are
5 numbers that I've taken from your testimony and
6 Mr. Gorman's testimony on the issue of cost of capital.
7 Are you -- did you want to have a minute to doublecheck
8 those numbers?

9 A If you don't mind.

10 Q Would you like to see a copy of your testimony
11 from the last case so you can doublecheck that as well?

12 A No. That's fine.

13 Q Okay.

14 A Yes. Thank you.

15 Q You're ready to proceed? Thank you. All right.
16 And let's just kind of walk through this. The first
17 column, Column 1 of this exhibit, shows your constant
18 growth DCF results from Ameren Missouri's last rate case,
19 correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Then the numbers that are shown on there are
22 your mean results. I think you had three and you had a
23 range and that's the mean.

24 A Well, let's be clear about that.

25 Q Okay.

1 A What I show when I produce the constant growth
2 results -- and this is, of course, because of the
3 limitations inherent in the constant growth model -- are
4 three measures of the mean. The mean low, the mean, the
5 mean high.

6 **Q Okay.**

7 A The mean high being the average DCF result based
8 on the highest of three growth rates that we used, the
9 mean being the average based on the average of the growth
10 rates that I use, and the mean low, of course, being the
11 average of the low the three growth rates that I use. And
12 that's a convention that I have consistently applied.

13 And that is, in part, the method by which I used
14 to understand what the range of results and, therefore,
15 the range of estimates may be.

16 **Q And the only numbers -- numbers I've shown on**
17 **this exhibit are the mean numbers, correct?**

18 A That is correct.

19 **Q All right. And then column 2, Rows 1 through 4,**
20 **show the constant growth DCF results included in your**
21 **direct testimony from this case. The final line is an**
22 **average of those three. And, again, it's just the mean,**
23 **not all of your results.**

24 A I'm sorry. Can you state that one more time?

25 **Q Column 2 of this exhibit shows the constant**

1 growth DCF results included in your direct testimony from
2 this case?

3 A Yes. That's correct.

4 Q And finally, Column 3 shows the constant growth
5 DCF results included in your rebuttal testimony from this
6 case, correct?

7 A That's correct.

8 Q And then when I get over to Columns 4 and 5, we
9 show -- I show the difference or the change -- I call it
10 the change, but it's actually the difference between your
11 constant growth DCF results in the prior rate case and
12 this rate case, correct?

13 A Yes. That's correct. For -- again, for the
14 limited purpose of the mean results of the constant growth
15 DCF model. That's correct.

16 Q It's just this one -- now, you looked at -- and
17 you did a number of different analyses, correct?

18 A I did.

19 Q And you looked at a lot of different data
20 points, correct, a lot of different data in determining
21 your recommendation for ROE in this case?

22 A Well, I used a lot of data. And the data, of
23 course, are inputs to the models, and the models, of
24 course, have results. So when you say data, I'm not quite
25 sure what you're referring to.

1 Q When I say data, I'm including both your inputs
2 and your results. I'm just saying you looked at a lot of
3 different things, and this is just one part of what you
4 considered in making your recommendation. I just wanted
5 to be clear on that.

6 A I think that's fair, yes.

7 Q I'm not trying to represent in this exhibit
8 everything you looked at. I'm just trying to tease out
9 one thing so we can get a little clarity on how that one
10 that thing has changed since the last rate case.

11 A I appreciate that.

12 Q Is that clear?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay. So 4 and 5 -- Columns 4 and 5 show us
15 what the change has been since the last rate case between
16 your direct testimony in this case and the prior case and
17 between your rebuttal testimony in the last rate case,
18 correct?

19 A Those are the differences, yes.

20 Q The differences. And so they show that the
21 constant growth DCF results declined since the last rate
22 case, at least as you calculated them, correct?

23 A Based on what we have right here, yes. Correct.

24 Q Well, they don't show they go up, do they?

25 A No. No. I'm just saying that, as you mentioned

1 earlier, there's a fair amount of data in the testimony.

2 But as -- with respect to this particular method, I would
3 agree with it.

4 Q All right. And let's talk a little bit about
5 the DCF -- the constant growth DCF methodology. When you
6 -- when you do that calculation, your points include stock
7 price, correct?

8 A That's an input, yes.

9 Q And dividends?

10 A Correct.

11 Q And do you look at bond yields in that
12 calculation?

13 A Bond yield is not an input to the calculation,
14 no.

15 Q That's right. So you're just looking at stock,
16 not bond yields and not risk premium. It's not a risk
17 premium analysis?

18 A Risk premium analyses, of course, are other
19 methodologies that we use. But in the bond crisis are not
20 an input to this particular model.

21 Q Okay. So when we talk about the constant growth
22 DCF results, we're talking about results that are
23 calculated based on data that have to do with stock price
24 and dividends and various aspects relating to stock value,
25 correct?

1 A I'm not sure what you mean by various aspects
2 relating to stock value. The direct inputs are stock
3 prices, dividends and growth rates.

4 **Q Okay. Stock growth rates, right?**

5 A That's -- that's a very good question. The
6 growth rate, of course, is meant to -- the growth rate, of
7 course, is meant to replicate or represent the rate of
8 capital appreciation over time. So what the model
9 basically is telling you or is trying to represent is you
10 buy a share of stock, and you get two things.

11 You get the yield, and you get the capital
12 appreciation in that stock. The capital appreciation, of
13 course, is the extent to which the price increases over
14 the term during which you hold the stock.

15 And while there are different approaches that
16 people sometimes use, Mr. Gorman and I both use estimated
17 earnings per share growth as the important and relevant
18 measure of growth over time, the idea being, of course,
19 that earnings per share are most closely related to
20 capital appreciation over time.

21 **Q Okay. And I'm not sure if I was clear on this**
22 **before. But when we look at Columns 4 and 5, don't they**
23 **suggest that the cost of equity as calculated based on**
24 **your constant growth DCF calculations have gone down since**
25 **Ameren Missouri's last rate case?**

1 A Well, I think there are two important issues
2 here. One is that I don't disagree that the cost of
3 equity has gone down since the last rate case. The
4 question is by how much.

5 **Q Okay.**

6 A 91 basis points, 62 basis points, I don't think
7 is -- is correct. And one of the reasons that I use, that
8 other people use other models such as the multi-stage DCF
9 model is that there are several limiting assumptions
10 associated with the constant growth model itself. And in
11 large measure, that's why I tend to calculate the results
12 the way I do. We --

13 **Q Okay. Can I interrupt you right there? I think**
14 **we all understand that you didn't rely solely on this**
15 **constant growth DCF, and that's what you're telling me,**
16 **correct?**

17 A What I'm telling you is that there are
18 limitations in the model. And to draw any conclusions
19 with respect to the absolute decrease in the cost of
20 equity as a result of the mean results of this one model,
21 which is subject to many limiting assumptions and
22 constraints, is not something that I would agree with.

23 **Q Okay. So you would not make that conclusion?**

24 A The -- again, when you say that --

25 **Q It's just -- I mean, you just told me you**

1 wouldn't make that?

2 A It's not a yes or no. When you say that
3 conclusion, I agree that the cost of equity has declined
4 somewhat. I don't agree that it has declined to the
5 extent represented in Columns 4 and 5.

6 Q All right. Fair enough. Okay. Let's -- let's
7 look at utility bond yields that are shown. Now, I told
8 you that these -- these numbers are reported in
9 Mr. Gorman's testimony. But do they appear to be correct
10 to you? Do you have any -- I don't think you contested
11 that or disagreed with that part of his testimony.

12 A Oh, no. I have no particular reason to disagree
13 with these.

14 Q Okay. And so, again, we have the A rated
15 utility bond yields shown in Column 1 for the 13-week
16 period ended July 8, 2011, which is around the time of the
17 last Ameren rate case. I think that report and order was
18 issued in July of 2011.

19 And then we have in Column 2, the A rated
20 utility bond yields for the 13-week period ending June
21 15th, 2012. We have the same information for the BAA
22 rated bonds; is that correct?

23 A Yes. That's correct.

24 Q All right. And then, again, over to the right,
25 there's a column that's headed Change. And it shows the

1 difference or how those bond yield rates have changed
2 since July -- or during that period, correct?

3 A And, of course, What that shows is the change in
4 the total. It's not broken down between the change in the
5 Treasury yield, which was probably 120 basis points, the
6 long-term Treasury yield relative to the change in credit
7 spreads. The change in credit spreads, of course, which
8 really truly is the measure of incremental risk associated
9 utilities from a fixed income investor's perspective has
10 not decreased that way.

11 Q But I think -- I'm sorry. So what you just said
12 in that last statement is that Treasury bond yields
13 actually decreased more than the utility bond?

14 A What I'm saying is that --

15 Q No. But I mean, what I just said -- I mean, I
16 know you said more than that. But that's one of the
17 things you just told us, correct? I've only written down
18 here utility bond yields. But you've also indicated the
19 Treasury bond yields have also declined during that period
20 and actually more than utility bond yields?

21 A The -- the -- when you look at bond yields, to
22 me, the -- the important issue is looking at the decrease
23 in the underlying -- the underlying Treasury security of,
24 say, comparable maturity and then the change in the credit
25 spreads.

1 And as we look at credit spreads, one of the
2 things we've noted -- I've noted is that what we refer to
3 as the -- sort of the incremental credit spread, the BAA
4 to A credit spread has actually increased over that time.

5 So I agree with you that the absolute numbers
6 are down, but I don't agree that the analysis should end
7 there.

8 Q Well, certainly. I'm not suggesting that. I'm
9 just trying, for some of us who don't quite have the
10 comprehension of all the complexities, to get some numbers
11 that we can kind of get our hands around. And that's
12 something that at least I am able to do.

13 A I appreciate that.

14 Q All right. Thank you. All right. Now, what
15 about -- do you know anything about how these bond yield
16 rates have -- what they've done since June 15th of this
17 year? They've continued to go down, haven't they?
18 They're actually lower today than they -- than is reported
19 on this exhibit?

20 A I -- I couldn't answer that offhand.

21 MS. ILES: Okay. I'd like to move for the
22 admission of this exhibit. I'm sorry.

23 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 529 has been moved. Any
24 objections to its receipt? Hearing none, it will be
25 received.

1 (Exhibit 529 was offered and received into
2 evidence.)

3 MS. ILES: All right. I'd like to have this
4 marked as an exhibit.

5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. This will be 530.

6 A May I -- may I have --

7 MS. ILES: I'm sorry.

8 MR. LOWERY: He's the most important one.

9 Q (By Ms. Iles) That is correct. Let me be clear
10 about what we're looking at right one.

11 A It's only just Bob.

12 Q I know.

13 A It's okay.

14 Q I said I was handing it to you, and I didn't. I
15 apologize. Can you tell me what that is?

16 A Yes. This is the Regulatory Research
17 Associates' summary of what they refer to as major rate
18 case decisions for January through June 2012.

19 Q All right. So what information does this
20 report?

21 A I'm sorry. What?

22 Q What information does this report?

23 A Well, the -- typically, what these reports are
24 are authorized overall rates of return, authorized equity
25 returns, authorized capital structures, the type of rate

1 base convention, the eventual revenue increase.

2 And there's additional information in the
3 reports as to whether or not a certain case was -- with
4 respect to a distribution only company, whether it
5 included certain elements such as a multi-year rate plan,
6 whether there were elements that were stipulated in the
7 case.

8 So it's a -- it's a report that includes a fair
9 amount of information. I think people typically look at
10 it for issues regarding authorized returns, authorized
11 capital structures and then, again, some of the
12 qualifications around those.

13 **Q All right. And by looking at this document,**
14 **does it tell us what the average ROE authorized for**
15 **electric utilities was in the United States in the first**
16 **quarter of 2012?**

17 A It -- it does. On 2012 for the first quarter,
18 the mean is 10.84. The median is 10.5.

19 **Q And that's reported on page 4 of this document?**

20 A Yes. I'm sorry. I should have made that clear.

21 **Q And does the document also explain that those --**
22 **that average is higher due to the inclusion of some**
23 **decisions in Virginia?**

24 A Yes. And that's one of the points I was making
25 before. RRA does, for example, in the case of Virginia

1 where the company has incentives, the company, largely
2 Virginia Electric Power Company, has incentives with
3 respect to investments in generating assets.

4 And some of these numbers, for example, I
5 believe the 12.4 percent would fall in that category.
6 Yes. And that footnote which is then noted on page 5
7 explains that.

8 **Q Could you read the first paragraph of this**
9 **document that explains that so we'll have that in the**
10 **record?**

11 A I'm sorry. The first paragraph of --

12 **Q On page 1.**

13 A On page 1.

14 **Q Uh-huh.**

15 A The -- the entire first paragraph?

16 **Q Yes, please.**

17 A Sure. The average return on equity (ROE)
18 authorized electric utilities in the first six months of
19 2012 was 10.36 percent (25 observations), slightly higher
20 than the 10.22 percent in calendar 2011.

21 This increase was driven by several
22 surcharge/rider generation cases in Virginia that
23 incorporate ROE premiums. Virginia Statutes authorize the
24 State Corporation Commission to approve ROE premiums of up
25 to 200 basis points for certain generation projects (see

1 the Virginia Commission profile).

2 Excluding these Virginia surcharge/rider
3 generation cases from the data, the average authorized
4 electric ROE was 10.05 percent for the first six months of
5 2012.

6 The average ROE authorized gas utilities for the
7 first six months of 2012 was 9.75 percent (13
8 observations), slightly lower than the 9.92 percent in
9 calendar 2011. We note that this report utilizes the
10 simple mean for the return averages.

11 **Q Okay. And does this document also show us what**
12 **the second quarter average ROE for electric utilities is?**

13 **A** Yes, it does.

14 **Q And what -- what is that number?**

15 **A** Well, for the second quarter for electric,
16 again, on page 4, the average was 9.92. That, of course,
17 included the distribution returns for Commonwealth Edison
18 and for Orange and Rockland. And it also included the
19 really extraordinarily low return of 9.25 percent for
20 Northern State Powers in South Dakota.

21 **Q Now, why do you believe that one's**
22 **extraordinarily low?**

23 **A** Because it is relative to the data.

24 **Q All right. It's just a low number. But there's**
25 **not any explanation you have that suggests that is in a**

1 **different category than the other companies?**

2 A Well, again, this is footnote -- footnoted as B,
3 which says the order followed stipulation or settlement by
4 the parties. Decision particulars are not necessarily
5 precedent setting or specifically adopted by the
6 regulatory body.

7 Q I'm sorry. And then right above it, there's one
8 that's nine six. Would you consider that extraordinarily
9 low?

10 A I think nine six is low. Yes.

11 Q All right.

12 A I wouldn't say it's as low as 9.25. Even I can
13 do that math. But it is lower.

14 MS. ILES: I'd like to move for the admission
15 of --

16 JUDGE WOODRUFF: It will be 530.

17 MS. ILES: -- Exhibit 530.

18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 530 has been offered. Any
19 objections to its receipt? Hearing none, it will be
20 received.

21 (Exhibit 530 was offered and admitted into
22 evidence.)

23 Q **(By Ms. Iles) These are some that are two-sided**
24 **and some that are one-sided. They're all the same**
25 **thing.**

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: This will be No. 531.

2 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

3 Q (By Ms. Iles) Mr. Hevert, I've handed you what's
4 been marked as Exhibit 531. Here's the marked one if you
5 want to see it's the same. You can have that one.

6 A Oh, no. Thank you.

7 Q All right. Can you tell us what that is?

8 A This, again, is another report dated October
9 third, 2012, by S&L, which is the company that holds
10 within it Regulatory Research Associates.

11 Q And what does this report tell us?

12 A Well, I don't know. I've not seen it.

13 Q Okay. Does it report major rate case decisions
14 from July 12 through September 12 on page 2?

15 A Oh, there we go. Thank you. Yes. I see that
16 now.

17 Q And it includes both electric and gas, but it
18 tells you on that chart the service type, correct?

19 A Yes, it does.

20 Q So from looking at this, can you tell us what
21 the authorized return for the electric companies that were
22 reported during this period?

23 A Well, I guess my question is what kind of
24 electric companies? We've got Atomic Electric Power in DC
25 that's a distribution company. Delmarva Power in Maryland

1 is a distribution company. Patomic in Maryland is a
2 distribution company.

3 Q So those three are distribution. Are the other
4 -- are the other electric companies shown, integrated
5 electric companies?

6 A Oh, sorry. I missed Ameren Illinois. So we've
7 got Idaho Power. We've got Entergy, Texas. We've got
8 PacifiCorp, and we've got Oklahoma Gas & Electric.

9 Q So what are the returns on there?

10 A I'm sorry. Pacific -- I'm sorry. I just need
11 to go through my little checklist here again.

12 Q Why don't we just start at the top, and we can
13 just go through them, and you can tell us what your -- I
14 think that will be helpful to everyone if you can tell us
15 what kind of company and what return on equity is.

16 A That's a good system.

17 Q Okay. We'll start with Patomic Electric Power
18 Company.

19 A Distribution.

20 Q And what was its return on equity?

21 A 9.5 percent.

22 Q And then we have South Carolina Electric and
23 Gas. But it doesn't tell us their ROE on that one.

24 A Right.

25 Q We have to go down to PacifiCorp.

1 A PacifiCorp is integrated.

2 Q And what was its authorized ROE?

3 A 9.8 percent.

4 Q All right. And we have Ameren Illinois?

5 A Not integrated.

6 Q And what was its ROE?

7 A 10.05, which is, of course, interesting for it
8 being not an integrated company with a return above T&D
9 companies, but 10.05.

10 Q And then we have Entergy Texas?

11 A Integrated company.

12 Q And what was its ROE?

13 A 9.8 percent. Texas, of course, being recognized
14 as a -- most least credit supported jurisdictions.

15 Q Okay. Then we have Delmarva Power & Light?

16 A Distribution.

17 Q And what was its ROE?

18 A Delmarva in Maryland was 9.81 percent.

19 Q Okay. And then we have Patomic Electric Power
20 Company.

21 A Which is a distribution company in Maryland. It
22 is, of course, affiliated with or a sister company of
23 Delmarva. The 50 basis point difference there had to do
24 with issues surrounding the company's response to storm
25 restoration, so it reflected a -- a reduction for that

1 reason.

2 Q And what was the ROE for that company?

3 A Prior to the reduction, it was 9.81 percent.

4 Afterwards, it was a 9.31 reported.

5 Q That was the authorized, 9.31?

6 A Correct. Yes. After the deduction.

7 Q All right. Then we have PacifiCorp, I think?

8 A Pacificorp, 9.8 percent. Oh, I'm sorry. I
9 forgot to say vertically integrated.

10 Q Integrated. Oklahoma Gas & Electric?

11 A Vertically integrated, 10.2 percent.

12 Q All right. Thank you. I apologize for that. I
13 know it's hard to read.

14 A No. That's okay. Your approach was better than
15 mine.

16 MS. ILES: I'll move for the admission of
17 Exhibit 531.

18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 531 has been offered. Any
19 objections to its receipt? Hearing none, it will be
20 received.

21 (Exhibit 531 was offered and received into
22 evidence.)

23 Q (By Ms. Iles) Mr. Hevert, you state in your
24 testimony -- you stated in your testimony that -- I think
25 it was on page 47 of your direct, you talk about

1 regulatory lag and earnings attrition and that they were
2 among the things you took in account in arriving at your
3 recommended ROE.

4 A I'm sorry. Can you point me to the page and the
5 line?

6 Q Is that correct? Well, I'm sorry.

7 A Oh, direct testimony.

8 Q Direct. It's on page 47. I don't have the line
9 in my notes.

10 A Yes. On 47, we refer to a comment by Moody's
11 and also refer to the extent to which some of the proxy
12 group companies are able to do things such as include
13 construction work and process in rate base used to
14 forecast test years and other types of structures, yes.

15 Q And you took that -- am I correct in stating
16 that you did take that into account in arriving at your
17 recommended ROE?

18 A It was a consideration, yes.

19 Q I believe earlier this week when Barnes
20 testified for the company that it was something that
21 reduced your ROE -- or increased, I said that wrong, your
22 ROE recommendation.

23 A It -- it's a -- it's a consideration -- I think
24 there was discussion this morning regarding the necessity
25 of judgment in this process. And it was a consideration

1 on my part, the fact that while the Commission certainly
2 has done a lot recently to -- to improve the company's
3 situation, vis-a-vis the proxy group, the proxy group
4 companies still have mechanisms available to them that are
5 not available to the company. So, yes, it was -- it was a
6 consideration. I will say I did not attach specific basis
7 points to it.

8 **Q So it's not something you can quantify?**

9 A I think it's -- I think it's -- it can be
10 difficult to quantify. We can look at things like bond
11 yields. We can look at -- and I've looked at this, the
12 extent to which companies may trade in a different pattern
13 before or after, for example, the implementation of a
14 revenue decoupling mechanism or formulate a rate plan.

15 And I think what you can often identify is the
16 presence or not of an effect. But I think putting the
17 effect in specific basis points, at least in my view, is
18 -- is difficult.

19 **Q So you can tell us that it was something you**
20 **considered, but you can't tell us exactly how much it**
21 **increased your recommendation? Is that what you're**
22 **saying?**

23 A I think that's right. But if you look at my
24 recommendation in the context of the range, of course, my
25 original recommendation was at the mid-point of the range

1 and now with the revised recommendations somewhat below
2 the mid-point of that range.

3 And so, again, while I think that this is an
4 issue that does represent an element of incremental risk,
5 I took it into consideration in determining where I think
6 the returns lies within that range.

7 MS. ILES: Okay. No further questions.

8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Public Counsel?

9 MS. BAKER: Thank you.

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MS. BAKER:

12 Q Good morning, Mr. Hevert. I will say it right.

13 A That was very -- that was very nice of you.
14 That makes me nervous, actually.

15 Q All right. From the questioning before, looking
16 at the overall big picture of the way things are right
17 now, you were -- you were asked questions about -- that
18 the overall cost of capital has gone down in the past few
19 years. Would you agree with that on an overall basis?

20 A Yes. I would agree with that.

21 Q And -- and also when asked earlier, the overall
22 yield is also down?

23 A That's correct. Yes. In large measure because
24 of the fairly significant drop in Treasury yields.

25 Q All right. And would you say that this has,

1 **basically, been what's happening since about 2005?**

2 A I'll take a look real quick. Sometimes I think
3 even I have too much paper. I think that's -- I think
4 that's fair, yes.

5 **Q So it's been a good almost seven years of this?**

6 A I -- I would say yes, there's been a -- I refer
7 to it as sort of a drift downward. It's -- it's not a
8 steady sort of linear decline. The numbers bump around a
9 little bit. But I would agree that there's been a -- a
10 long-term secular downward drift in the numbers.

11 **Q All right. And so is there an expectation that**
12 **the economy will rebound substantially within the next few**
13 **years?**

14 A I -- I am not -- boy, I wish I knew the answer
15 to that. That --

16 **Q But your sense of what is going on.**

17 A My -- my sense of what's going on and how it
18 affects the return on equity is -- quite frankly, goes
19 beyond the extent to which the economy may recover.
20 Excuse me.

21 **Q Right. Right.**

22 A For example, I think we've already started to
23 see over the past couple of weeks even increases in
24 expected inflation rates.

25 **Q Right. But as you said, these things do drift**

1 up and down. But you said that the overall cost of
2 capital has gone down and the overall yield has gone down
3 since 2005?

4 A I -- I think that's fair. Yes.

5 Q All right. So it would be fair to say that
6 given -- given the ups and downs of it all that the
7 economy, as it is today, is a new normal?

8 A I -- I've heard that expression. I've never
9 bought into it. The -- when you look at downward drift in
10 the cost of capital, it's really, I think, important to
11 understand what drives those numbers.

12 And -- and that's why, in my view, while it is
13 true that Treasury yields, for example, have fallen
14 considerably, you can't look at the absolute change in
15 Treasury yields and say that the cost of equity has fallen
16 to a corresponding degree.

17 And I think that while there is a downward drift
18 in those numbers, there appears to be -- I don't want to
19 say a limit, but there certainly is not the same type of
20 drop in -- in the cost of equity as there are in Treasury.

21 And so as to the issue of a new normal, I really
22 can't say. We've got so many uncertainties facing the
23 economy right now, the fiscal cliff. Again, the issue of
24 -- sometimes referred to as quantitative easing infinity,
25 the effect that that could have on inflation, which, of

1 course, would then have a reversal in terms of the effect
2 on yields.

3 And so I have a hard time saying that what we're
4 seeing right now will be normal in perpetuity. And, of
5 course, it's in perpetuity that we're looking at for the
6 purpose of cost of equity.

7 **Q Well, I mean, what is normal has now lasted for**
8 **seven years and is not expected to change in the next few**
9 **years. So we're looking at -- at something that basically**
10 **is here to stay for -- for the foreseeable future?**

11 **A** I'm sorry. When you say here to stay, I think
12 the notion of just extrapolating this trend -- this trend
13 that we see here in -- in reduced ROEs, authorized ROEs is
14 inappropriate.

15 I don't think you can say that there will be a
16 continued decline in the cost of equity, again, because
17 while it may be true that things such as Treasury yields
18 have fallen over time, you have to look at why.

19 And if you -- if you understand or -- or if you
20 recognize that in large measure part of the reason for the
21 decline in Treasury yields has been investors looking to
22 preserve capital, to avoid the risk of equity loss, so
23 they buy Treasury yield -- excuse me -- buy Treasury
24 securities for the relative safety.

25 And as they buy securities, of course, the yield

1 goes down. You can't say that the resulting lower yield
2 is a function of people being less risk averse. In fact,
3 they're more risk averse. And so that's why it's a more
4 complicated calculus, I think, than looking at the trend
5 and extrapolating it.

6 **Q All right. So as it is, this movement in the**
7 **business world, then, basically, it's just part of doing**
8 **business. These things go up. These things go down. So**
9 **you're saying this is a business risk, that it is seen by**
10 **every business, including Ameren?**

11 **A** I'm -- I'm sorry. I just want to be sure I
12 understand your question. The -- when you say this is a
13 business risk, I think a lot of companies and a lot of
14 individuals look at capital markets right now and they see
15 uncertainties.

16 And when they see uncertainty, again, they will
17 move to the relative security of Treasuries. And that, of
18 course, brings the yield down. The -- looking forward,
19 there's always uncertainty in the market. Whether or not
20 that uncertainty will be greater or less than the
21 long-term history, I -- I think is a -- is a good
22 question. I think right now there's considerable
23 uncertainty in the market.

24 **Q And there has been since 2005, seven years ago?**

25 **A** Well, I think it's -- it's fair to say that

1 there have been periods during that time, of course, fall
2 of 2008, early 2009, when uncertainty was considerably
3 greater, which brings up another, I think, important
4 point.

5 You talked about sort of the new normal and the
6 -- and the way companies do business now. One of the
7 things that I've seen in working with clients is that
8 since 2008, I think there's been a renewed focus on the
9 part of investors on risk and, in particular, on what's
10 sometimes referred to as -- it's tail risk, the risk
11 associated with a very adverse, possibly low probability,
12 but significant event.

13 I think people now look at risk as not
14 necessarily something that may happen as good and
15 something that may necessarily happen that's bad. But I
16 think they may look at risk as -- as what we saw in late
17 2008, which is that there's a significant disruption in
18 the market, and that disruption means that even highly
19 rated utilities have a difficult time accessing capital.
20 And so --

21 **Q I'm going to cut you off. At this point, I**
22 **think we're moving beyond a little bit of -- of what I'm**
23 **asking for this.**

24 **A Okay. I misunderstood.**

25 **Q We're back to -- we're back to -- yes, I**

1 understand and we agree that there are movements up and
2 down within -- within. But focusing on the overall
3 picture of the economy, it is -- what I'm trying to do --
4 moving on from that, during the local public hearings,
5 you're aware that there's been a lot of customer concern
6 over the affordability of rates. You understand that?

7 A Yes, I do.

8 Q Okay. And you would agree that the goal for the
9 Commission is to set rates that are just and reasonable?

10 A I agree with that. Yes.

11 Q And would you agree that part of determining a
12 reasonable rate is to make rates as affordable as possible
13 without causing detriment to the utility?

14 A I think -- I think that's a -- a way of
15 characterizing the -- the important task that the
16 Commission has of balancing the interests of -- of
17 ratepayers and investors.

18 Q All right. And in your testimony, you state
19 that you calculate a reasonable range of ROE for Ameren to
20 be anywhere between 10.25 and 11.00; is that correct?

21 A In my rebuttal testimony, correct.

22 Q And that is -- and -- and based on this
23 reasonable range, Your recommendation to the Commission is
24 10.5 percent?

25 A Yes. That is correct.

1 Q And -- and as you said in your original filing
2 of the case, you calculated a reasonable range to be
3 anywhere between 10.5 and 11.00?

4 A Correct.

5 Q With an original recommendation of 10.75?

6 A That is correct.

7 Q All right. So between February when -- when
8 your direct testimony was filed and now, your
9 recommendation has moved to what was the bottom of your
10 original range?

11 A Yes. I did two things. One is I moved the low
12 end of the range because, as I said, I recognize that some
13 of the model results have changed. And while you can look
14 at some indicators suggesting that perhaps the -- the
15 model results are not fully indicative of the cost of
16 equity or changes in the cost of equity, I recognize that
17 they've fallen and I think it's fair and important to
18 recognize that and reflect that in the recommendation.

19 Q Okay. So now the -- the 10.25 is your lower end
20 of the reasonable range?

21 A Yes. That is correct.

22 Q All right. And according to your testimony, you
23 believe that the regulatory environment in Missouri is
24 less credit supportive than the regulatory environment
25 prevailing in other most other states. Therefore, your

1 recommendation of an ROE of 10.5 is appropriate; is that
2 correct?

3 A As we talked about a little bit ago, it is -- it
4 is a factor that I considered.

5 Q All right. And I -- I assume that you agree
6 with what you stated before, that a reasonable ROE for
7 Ameren is one that is adequate to attract capital at
8 reasonable terms, thereby enabling Ameren Missouri to
9 provide safe and reliable electric service that's
10 sufficient to insure Ameren Missouri's financial integrity
11 and commensurate with returns on investments in
12 enterprises having corresponding risk; is that correct?

13 A That's correct. And I certainly don't intend to
14 belabor the point. But capital attraction, after what we
15 saw in 2008 is, in my view, a very important criteria.

16 Q All right. So an ROE that meets those
17 requirements of a reasonable -- or that I stated, the
18 three points, would be reasonable and not detrimental to
19 Ameren, in your view?

20 A Yes. That's correct.

21 MS. BAKER: No further questions.

22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. For Staff?

23 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

24 CROSS-EXAMINATION

25 BY MR. THOMPSON:

1 Q Good morning, Mr. Hevert.

2 A Good morning, Mr. Thompson.

3 Q I'm sorry. I apologize. I'll probably
4 mispronounce your name all through this. I apologize in
5 advance. It's not on purpose.

6 A No offense taken, believe me.

7 Q Now, you testified in Ameren Missouri's last
8 rate case, correct?

9 A I did.

10 Q And at that time, you were an employee of
11 Concentric; is that not right?

12 A Concentric Energy Advisors, correct.

13 Q And you are no longer with Concentric Energy
14 Advisors?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q Okay. And you're being paid for your testimony
17 today and for the analyses you've conducted in this case;
18 isn't that correct?

19 A That is correct.

20 Q And I wonder if you could tell us how much
21 you're being paid.

22 A Boy, that is a good question. It's -- it's
23 through a subcontract agreement with Concentric. I do not
24 know the exact hourly rate. My best guess, it's in the
25 \$450 range.

1 **Q Do you know what the estimated total for your**
2 **services is?**

3 **A No. Because I'm no longer at Concentric, I**
4 **really have no sort of insight to that right now.**

5 **Q Okay. And you have a Master's in Business**
6 **Administration; is that correct?**

7 **A I do.**

8 **Q And you're also a chartered financial analyst?**

9 **A I am.**

10 **Q And Mr. Murray also has a Master's in Business**
11 **Administration; is that correct?**

12 **A He does.**

13 **Q And he's also a chartered financial analyst?**

14 **A He, too, endured the pain. Yes.**

15 **Q And it's my understanding that is a difficult**
16 **credential to obtain.**

17 **A In my view, it is. I agree.**

18 **Q And Mr. Gorman also has a Master's in Business**
19 **Administration; isn't that correct?**

20 **A He does.**

21 **Q And he is also a chartered financial analyst?**

22 **A You would think we were the only three in the**
23 **world, but, yeah, he does, too. That's right.**

24 **Q And I know you don't agree with the**
25 **recommendations that either Mr. Murray or Mr. Gorman has**

1 **made in this case, but you accept both of them as expert**
2 **financial analysts, do you not?**

3 A I -- I certainly recognize their credentials,
4 yes.

5 Q **Okay. Now, I sent you a DR in which I asked you**
6 **what you believed your role in this proceeding is. Do you**
7 **recall that?**

8 A No. Well, if I could have a copy of that, it
9 might make it easier.

10 MR. THOMPSON: May I approach?

11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You may.

12 Q **(By Mr. Thompson) I think it's paragraph 2**
13 **there.**

14 A Yes.

15 Q **Okay. I wonder if you could read your response**
16 **there, paragraph 2?**

17 A Paragraph 2, my understanding is that my role in
18 this proceeding is to estimate the required return on
19 equity for Ameren Missouri by using one or more analytical
20 techniques that rely on market-based data for quantifying
21 investor expectations regarding required equity returns
22 adjusted for certain incremental costs and risks
23 consistent with the standards established in Hope and
24 Bluefield that return is based on those available from
25 investments of comparable risk.

1 While I am not an attorney and -- and am not
2 expressing a legal opinion, my understanding is that the
3 company's authorized return on equity should be neither
4 excessive nor confiscatory.

5 **Q Thank you. If I could get that back. Thank**
6 **you, sir. What sort of ROE award would you consider to be**
7 **excessive?**

8 A Well, I think the -- the range that I have
9 established, 10.25 to 11 percent, generally establishes
10 the range that I think is reasonable and would set balance
11 on both ends.

12 **Q Okay. So it's your testimony, then, if I**
13 **understand you correctly, that an ROE award below 10.5**
14 **would be confiscatory?**

15 A No. That's not correct.

16 **Q Okay. Well, then, please explain to me how I**
17 **misunderstood you.**

18 A My range of 10.25 percent to 11 is the range
19 would set the -- in my view, the bounds. So the low end
20 of 10.25 percent is what I say rather than the 10.5 that
21 you just mentioned.

22 **Q I'm sorry. I misspoke. So correcting that**
23 **question, it's your testimony that an award at below 10.25**
24 **would be confiscatory?**

25 A Again, I'm not an attorney. And as to what is

1 confiscatory or what is excessive, I suspect it's more a
2 legal issue as I noted in my discovery response. And I
3 look to the Hope and Bluefield standards as guidelines. I
4 don't look at them as an attorney would look at them. I
5 look at them as an analyst would look at them. And so in
6 my view, the lower bounds, excuse me, of 10.25 percent
7 would satisfy those three criteria.

8 **Q Okay. Is it your opinion that the cost of**
9 **equity and the return on equity set by this Commission are**
10 **the same thing?**

11 A It's my view that the -- excuse me. I'm so
12 sorry. Excuse me for one second. When you called me
13 Mr. Hevert, it really upset me.

14 **Q I apologize again.**

15 A That's okay. I'll get over it. I'm sorry.
16 After all the excitement, I forgot your question.

17 **Q I'm not sure I remember it either.**

18 MR. THOMPSON: Could you read it back, please?

19 (The previous question was read back.)

20 A It -- it's -- well, it's my view that the
21 Commission has broad discretion in setting the -- the
22 allowed return on equity. And the Commission takes into
23 consideration factors that it deems to be relevant and
24 gives them the weight that the things should be afforded.

25 What I provide is my estimate of the cost of

1 equity. Whether or not the Commission sets it at my
2 recommendation, of course, is a function of a number of
3 things. But my recommendation represents the cost of
4 equity.

5 Q (By Mr. Thompson) Okay. Isn't it true that
6 investors are flying to utility stocks because they are
7 safe and less volatile than other stocks?

8 A Well, let's break that down. Let's talk first
9 about safer and less volatile than other stocks. I don't
10 think there's any disagreement among anyone here that
11 utilities are less risky and that the market utilities
12 typically have beta coefficients of less than one. And
13 beta coefficients, of course, are a measure of the
14 relative volatility of a stock.

15 And when I say relative, I mean relative to the
16 broader market. So in that sense, we all agree that
17 utility stocks are less volatile than the overall market
18 and, therefore, are less risky than the overall market. I
19 would agree with that.

20 As to the issue of flying to utility stocks, I'm
21 not sure I agree with that. I recognize that utility
22 stocks are, in some measure, dividend investments. I
23 spent a lot of years at a utility issuing securities. I
24 understand that.

25 But in my view, investors don't own utilities

1 simply for the dividend. And in my view, it's -- I don't
2 believe that an investor would be indifferent between the
3 secured security of a bond and the unsecured and residual
4 claims associated with equity.

5 **Q Well, aren't utility stocks, in fact, much like**
6 **bonds?**

7 A I -- I strongly disagree that any equity is like
8 a bond. And -- and -- and let me explain why. Bond
9 investors, of course, have two things. They have security
10 by the underlying provisions of the bond itself, and they
11 have a priority claim on the cash flows.

12 Bond investors are focused on the company's
13 ability to meet its financial obligations, its debt
14 service obligations in a timely manner during the period
15 over which they hold the bond.

16 Equity investors have no contractual claim on
17 either the cash flows or the assets. Equity investors
18 take the residual risk, which means they get the cash left
19 after the bond holders have been paid.

20 To the extent that you are suggesting that an
21 investor, again, would differentiate between one security,
22 which is secured, which has priority, which has a
23 contractual obligation to make interest and principal
24 payments with a security that has no such obligation and for
25 which you are the residual claimant on the cash flows, I

1 disagree that investors are indifferent between the two.

2 Q Okay. Looking at Exhibit 531 -- do you still
3 have that there?

4 A I'm not sure if I do. So this is the RRA
5 October 3rd report?

6 Q Yes, sir.

7 A Yes. I have that.

8 Q And as you went down through them line by line,
9 I think you identified four integrated utilities for which
10 an ROE award is reported here. And they would be
11 PacifiCorp and Entergy Texas and PacifiCorp again and
12 Oklahoma Gas and Electric. Did I read that correctly?

13 A Yes. Four. Correct.

14 Q Okay. And would you agree with me that three of
15 the four, the reported ROE award is 9.8?

16 A Yes. I would agree with that.

17 Q And for the fourth one, the reported ROE award
18 is 10.2?

19 A Yes. That is correct.

20 Q And would you agree with me that the average of
21 those four numbers is 9.9?

22 A As it turns out, I would agree with that.

23 Q Thank you. Turn to page 113 in your rebuttal
24 testimony.

25 A Yes. I have that.

1 Q Now, on pages 113 and 114, both of those pages
2 are taken up by charts; isn't that correct?

3 A That is correct.

4 Q And on Table -- excuse me. On page 113 is Table
5 19-A?

6 A Correct.

7 Q Summary of Updated Results, Hevert Revised Proxy
8 Group?

9 A Correct.

10 Q And on page 114 is Table 19-B, Summary of
11 Updated Results Combined Proxy Group?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And these tables report the results of your
14 updated analyses, correct?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q Is that the very analyses that are summed up
17 when you say that your range was 10.25 to 11 and your
18 point recommendation is 10.5?

19 A Correct.

20 Q Okay. Now, with respect to each of these two
21 proxy groups, you performed three different constant
22 growth DCF analyses; isn't that correct?

23 A No. I -- I performed three DCF analyses, one
24 constant growth.

25 Q Okay. You can see how easily an attorney

1 becomes confused, or at least this particular attorney.
2 So when you report under constant growth DCF, and I'm
3 looking at the top off Table 19-A, you have a 30-day
4 average, 90-day average and 180-day average. Those are
5 not separate analyses?

6 A Well, they -- they're separate in the sense that
7 the -- what they do is the 30-day average takes each of
8 the companies' stock prices, averages them over a 30-day
9 period and calculates the dividend yield based on that
10 30-day average.

11 The 90-day and 180-day are the same thing. They
12 simply extend the period over which the dividend yield is
13 calculated. And, again, this model calculates the cost of
14 equity as the sum of -- basically, as the sum of the
15 dividend yield and the expected growth rate.

16 Q Okay. Let's talk about growth rate. What
17 growth rate did you use for your constant growth DCF
18 analysis?

19 A Well, if you turn to -- it's -- it's Schedule
20 RBHER-10, you'll see there that we have three different
21 measures of growth. Well, they're not -- that's probably
22 a poor way of explaining it.

23 What I used, as we mentioned earlier, is
24 expected growth and earnings per share. And for the
25 purpose of developing that information, I looked to three

1 sources. First call, Zack's and Value Line. First Call
2 and Zack's are what are referred to as consensus
3 projections. Basically, they serve the analysts covering
4 that particular company and find either the mean or the
5 median growth rate that those analysts project over the
6 coming three to five years.

7 So Value Line -- excuse me -- Zack's and First
8 Call both, then, are consents of services. Value Line, of
9 course, is simply a value line. And it's the growth
10 expectation of the particular value line analyst covering
11 that company.

12 **Q So are you telling me that there is no single**
13 **number you can give me in response to that question?**

14 A I'm sorry. When you say single number, what do
15 you mean?

16 **Q I mean, did you use a series of growth rates in**
17 **conducting your constant growth DCF analysis, or did you**
18 **use one growth rate?**

19 A The answer is yes. The -- I used one growth
20 rate, which is the expected growth and earnings per share.
21 But I used three sources for that growth rate and took
22 those sources for each of the companies. And so it is one
23 number, and that one number is meant to represent the
24 expected growth and earnings per share, but it comes from
25 three different sources.

1 **Q Okay. Did you average what you found in each of**
2 **those sources?**

3 A Yes. And as we talked about a little bit
4 earlier, the average is what goes into the calculation of
5 the mean or the average DCF result.

6 **Q Okay. So -- and what was that average?**

7 A The -- the average over -- excuse me -- in the
8 rebuttal testimony, which is for the period ending July
9 30th, 2012, the average earnings adequate growth rate was
10 5.07 percent.

11 **Q Now, you also performed two multi-stage DCF**
12 **analyses; isn't that correct?**

13 A Yes. That's correct.

14 **Q And it's true, is it not, that a multi-stage DCF**
15 **uses more than one growth rate?**

16 A Yes. the -- the whole point is to -- well, I'll
17 back up. I had mentioned earlier the constant growth
18 model is subject to a number of assumptions and
19 constraints, one of which is the growth rate, the payout
20 ratio, the PE ratio, the PB ratio all stay constant in
21 perpetuity. And I think we all know that that's not
22 necessarily the case.

23 And so the multi-stage model allows you to apply
24 assumptions with respect to your -- what the growth will
25 be over varying stages and the interest of typically

1 timing periods, which I mentioned is a period covered by
2 analysts.

3 The way I run the model, and other people
4 perhaps could come to different thing, a second stage from
5 the transition from the second stage to the long-term
6 period. And there's a long-term growth rate. So, yes,
7 growth rates change, but the model, depending on the
8 construction, allows you to change other assumptions as
9 well.

10 Q Okay. Let me make sure I understood what you
11 just said. You used an initial short-term growth rate.
12 Then there was a second transitional stage. And then,
13 finally, a third long-term stage; is that correct?

14 A That's the first half.

15 Q That the first half. Okay.

16 A That's the first half. Okay. The second half
17 is -- well, we'll back up one step further. The way the
18 -- this model works and the way I've constructed it is
19 that we model cash flows. That's two things. As we
20 talked about earlier, it's the dividend that you receive
21 while you're holding the stock and the price at which you
22 would sell the stock at the end of the holding period. We
23 refer to that as the terminal value. So the price that
24 you would expect to receive when you sell it.

25 Now, not to get complicated, but depending on

1 how you develop the model, that terminal price could be
2 the same thing as just running the model out into forever.

3 But in order to calculate the dividends, the way
4 I run the model is we project the earning per share.
5 We multiply that by the expected payout ratio in order to
6 get the dividends per share.

7 And that's what I said earlier. It's important
8 to recognize that under the constant growth model, which
9 assumes the dividend ratio stays constant in perpetuity,
10 there could be situations where that's not the case. So
11 that's why I model dividends as the product of the
12 expected earnings and the expected payout ratio.

13 **Q With respect to the first of your multi-stage**
14 **analyses, the Gordon growth terminal value --**

15 **A** Yes.

16 **Q -- can you tell me the average growth rate you**
17 **used for Stage 1?**

18 **A** The -- well, again it depends on what we mean by
19 growth rate. The average Stage 1 growth rate in earnings
20 would be that same 5.70 percent. The growth rate in
21 dividends, though, I believe would be less than that
22 because the payout ratio over that period declined.

23 And so while the earnings may have grown at 5.07
24 percent, declining payout ratio means that dividends were
25 slightly lower. So the actual dividend rate would be

1 lower, but I don't know what that number is.

2 Q Okay. And the fact that you don't know what it
3 is, does that suggest you didn't find that to be material?

4 A Not -- not in the least. It simply is a
5 function of the calculation. And, again, I think that the
6 way I developed the model has a degree of insight. I
7 think that's important, which is to say that to the extent
8 that companies or an industry may have changes in its
9 payout ratio, I think is a very important consideration.

10 Q Okay. And what was the value for the
11 transitional stage?

12 A Well, the transitional stage, again, moved from
13 the -- from the short-term growth rate to the long-term
14 growth rate. And so it's a -- it's sort of the -- it's
15 the compound growth rate that moves from one to the other.
16 It's not exactly linear, but it's pretty close.

17 Q Okay. Is there a single number you can give me?

18 A No. Because it changes each year.

19 Q Okay. And how about the long-term growth rate?

20 A The long-term growth rate is 5.67 percent.

21 Q Okay. And in the second multi-stage that you
22 performed, the historical PE terminal value multi-stage
23 model, what was the average growth rate that you used for
24 the first stage in that model?

25 A The same construct.

1 Q Very good. And, again, are you able to tell me
2 what the figure was for the transition stage?

3 A Well, once again, the transition stage goes from
4 the average. Let's talk about the average of 5.07 percent
5 to 5.67 percent on a pro rata basis -- well, on a
6 geometric basis.

7 Q I understand. Thank you. And, again, you used
8 5.67 for the terminal stage; is that correct?

9 A Correct.

10 Q Thank you.

11 MR. THOMPSON: I have a question that is highly
12 confidential.

13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We will go
14 in-camera.

15 REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an in-camera
16 session was held, which is contained in Vol. 27, page
17 1588.

18 * * * * *

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And we are back in regular
2 session.

3 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

4 Q (By Mr. Thompson) And I wonder if you were
5 aware, Mr. Hevert, that one of the things that Ameren
6 Corporation or Ameren Missouri does, excuse me, with
7 respect to this Commission is to provide an integrated
8 resource plan?

9 A I'm aware of many companies providing integrated
10 resource plans, yes.

11 Q Okay. And would you be surprised to know that
12 in the most recent integrated resource plan update
13 provided by Ameren Missouri to this Commission, expected
14 load growth over the next 20 years was estimated at .75
15 percent?

16 A That wouldn't surprise me. No.

17 Q Okay. Thank you. I wonder if you could tell
18 me, sir, what a ring fence is?

19 A A -- well, ring fence is a -- a fairly generic
20 term having to do with the ability to separate sometimes
21 functionally, sometimes physically, sometimes
22 contractually and sometimes administratively the actions
23 of one affiliate from another.

24 Q Okay. And are you aware that Ameren Corporation
25 owns unregulated merchant generation operation?

1 A I am, yes.

2 Q And are you also aware that its performance has
3 not been good lately?

4 A Well --

5 Q Of course, that's in layman's terms.

6 A The same could be said for me. But I'm aware of
7 the results. Yes.

8 Q The opinion has been expressed by Mr. Murray at
9 least that Ameren Missouri's credit rating has been pulled
10 down, to use a lay term, by the effects of the Ameren
11 Corporation merchant generation operation. Are you aware
12 of that testimony?

13 A I'm aware -- I am aware -- I am aware of that
14 testimony, and I am aware that the Standard & Poor's as a
15 matter of a process and practice, typically, looks to the
16 consolidated operations when considering the rating
17 agencies of a subsidiary affiliate. That, of course, is
18 not necessarily the same approach as Moody's or Fitch.

19 Q Okay. So are you aware that the Ameren Board of
20 Directors has considered ring fencing in order to reduce
21 the drag of the merchant generation operation on the
22 credit rating of Ameren Missouri?

23 A I'm not aware of that. But it would not
24 surprise me.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. I have no further

1 questions. Thank you.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We'll come up for
3 questions from the Bench. Mr. Chairman?

4 CHAIRMAN GUNN: I have a couple. Thanks very
5 much.

6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you.

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION

8 BY CHAIRMAN GUNN:

9 Q I want to follow-up just really quick on what
10 Mr. Thompson just asked. I can't buy Ameren Missouri
11 stock, correct?

12 A Correct.

13 Q It's just Ameren Corporation?

14 A Correct.

15 Q So when Standard & Poor's is looking at it,
16 they're looking at it at the corporate level rather than
17 the Ameren Missouri level. So they have to -- or at least
18 they choose to take all the -- all the affiliates and
19 subsidiaries, regulated and non-regulated into account
20 when they're -- when they're doing the ratings?

21 A Well, I think from Standard & Poor's
22 perspective, because they're a credit rating facility and
23 their focus is on the fixed income investor, they look at
24 specific operations of the -- the subject company, in this
25 case, Ameren Missouri. But in the case of Standard &

1 Poor's, they do note and, in fact, typically, it's one of
2 the first sentences that's in their report that says their
3 opinion reflects the effects of the consolidated company.

4 **Q I want to -- I want to look at -- take a look at**
5 **this chart real quick. So Ameren's current allowed ROE is**
6 **10.2?**

7 A Yes, sir.

8 **Q So in the past year, has -- have the conditions**
9 **improved or not improved, the market conditions?**

10 A I think general market conditions have remained
11 -- have remained uncertain. There are certain measures
12 that have gotten a little bit worse. For example, we look
13 at the -- what I refer to as the incremental credit
14 spread, which is the difference between BAA and A stocks,
15 which, in my view, represents the increment of risk that
16 fixed income investors look at moving from a A to -- down
17 to BAA.

18 And that's going up, so that suggests to me that
19 over the past year, that incremental credit spread would
20 suggest slightly higher degree of risk as viewed by the --
21 the fixed income investors.

22 **Q And that's not offset by any decrease in cost of**
23 **equity that you were describing before?**

24 A Well, the -- I think the -- the interaction
25 there is with respect to the Treasury rates because they

1 both -- you can look at long-term Treasury rates and you
2 could say, yeah, the -- the long-term bond rate is a
3 matter of Treasury yields plus a credit spread. At least
4 for the BAA companies, the credit spread does not
5 necessarily stay constant, but has perhaps gone up a
6 little bit.

7 The Treasury yields have gone down. And I think
8 that's in part one of the reasons I would see and I've
9 noticed a somewhat larger cost of equity, which is why I
10 reflected my numbers downwards.

11 The question, of course, becomes, by how much?
12 If the long-term credit has fallen by 120 basis points, is
13 it reasonable to think that cost of equity has fallen 120
14 basis points? I don't think so.

15 **Q So there's no explanation between that, but it**
16 **does reflect some decrease in cost?**

17 **A** It does. And that's why, again, I reduced my
18 recommendation somewhat.

19 **Q And -- and the ten-year Treasury yield has**
20 **decreased significantly since the -- from the first**
21 **quarter of 2010 to the second quarter of 2012, correct?**

22 **A** It -- it has, as have the longer term maturity
23 Treasuries.

24 **Q All right. I want to -- I want to take you back**
25 **to this -- the -- well, I think MIEC's exhibit. And this**

1 -- this says that the -- makes an allowance in computing
2 the average. Or at least mentions that.

3 Virginia seems to have unusually high -- or when
4 taking into account the calculation, Virginia's Regulatory
5 Commission allows premiums on the ROE if they hit certain
6 targets.

7 A That's correct.

8 Q And they specifically mention that they don't
9 think it's -- it's unusual enough for them to note and
10 say, it -- it does skew the average higher.

11 A And I agree with that. And when I look at this
12 data myself, I take out those returns because I -- I think
13 that's fair. I don't think that looking -- or trying to
14 sort of impute that -- that bonus, whatever it turns out
15 to be, should be then reflected.

16 Q Now, you mentioned when -- in your
17 cross-examination, there was one that you thought was
18 unreasonably low, the 9.2 or 9.25?

19 A The 9.25, which was Northern State Powers of
20 South Dakota, I believe, return, it was -- it was very
21 low. My understanding is that, in that case, there was an
22 issue as to whether or not certain renewable assets would
23 be included in rate base. And there was an offset in
24 terms of the offsets and the ROE to be included in the
25 rate base. But even putting that aside, it was a low

1 number.

2 Q But it wasn't low enough or wasn't unusual
3 enough for Regulatory Research Associates to make a
4 specific mention of it and say, This skews the average
5 lower?

6 A Well, that's a really good question.

7 Q Well, the question is, it's not in this
8 regulatory -- I'll get to the second question. I'll let
9 you explain yourself.

10 A Okay.

11 Q But I just want to be clear. They don't mention
12 it as an unusual event worth note that gives people pause
13 when looking at the averages?

14 A In this report?

15 Q In this report.

16 A Right. Right. But Regulatory Research, of
17 course, looks at the specific rate case outcomes in
18 separate reports for specific rate cases. And I -- I
19 don't know offhand, but it could well be that in their
20 review of that particular case they did mention that.

21 Q Are you familiar with Edison Electric Institute?

22 A Yes, sir.

23 Q And are you familiar with their rate case
24 summary reports that they put out?

25 A I do. And my understanding is that much of that

1 is based on this same data source.

2 Q And Ameren is -- is Ameren a member of Edison
3 Electric Institute?

4 A I don't know. But I would not be surprised.

5 Q It's the -- it's the Electric Utility Trade
6 Association, essentially?

7 A Yes, sir.

8 Q All right. I have a financial update rate case
9 summary from the first quarter of 2012 from the Edison
10 Electric Institute. And I'm going to ask if any of the
11 parties object to me asking a couple questions about this.

12 MR. BYRNE: No, your Honor. No, Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Does everybody -- well -- and
14 people can inspect it and see that I've printed it
15 directly off of that. Everybody have any problem with
16 agreeing that the information here is -- I guess you don't
17 have to go as far as saying accurate, but you're free to
18 cross-examine. But we'll at least for this point say
19 that, for what it's worth, it's a relatively reliable
20 source.

21 MR. THOMPSON: Would it be possible to
22 eventually get a copy?

23 CHAIRMAN GUNN: And I can -- I can get printed
24 copies for everybody.

25 MR. BYRNE: Yeah. I guess I'll agree -- I've

1 never seen it before, but I guess I'll agree it's what
2 Edison Electric Institute says.

3 CHAIRMAN GUNN: That's what I'm saying.
4 Everyone agrees I'm not misrepresenting what Edison
5 Electric Institute says, and I'll provide everybody a copy
6 of this for everybody.

7 Q (By Chairman Gunn) But you're familiar with
8 these reports?

9 A Yes, sir, I am.

10 Q All right. And you say it's based on -- and
11 these two reports, there's not a lot of the subjective
12 stuff that goes in here. In -- in EEI's report, there
13 actually is some commentary.

14 A Right.

15 Q But a lot of this is just a reflection of what
16 happened. It's not necessarily -- I don't want to say
17 spinning or -- or -- or commenting on the numbers. Most
18 of what it is saying is, Here's what the data says that
19 we've seen in the last quarter.

20 A I -- I would agree with that. As you say, there
21 is some commentary on some specific issues, but as to the
22 data --

23 Q And I'll give you an example of the some of the
24 commentary that is stated. So it says, for example, on
25 page 1, Shareholder owned electric utilities filed 17

1 cases in Quarter 1 2012, which is a factual statement.

2 But then it follows up saying, A number
3 consistent with the trend of rising rate case activity
4 since the early 2000s. That would be an example of some
5 of the commentary that they appeared in.

6 A Yes, sir.

7 Q But, again, even that is probably based on
8 historical -- historical --

9 A I agree.

10 Q Okay. So I'm going to -- I'm going to read you
11 a -- a paragraph, again, from page 1 and page -- and page
12 2. And it says, The average awarded ROE in Quarter 1 was
13 10.84 percent, which is slightly high -- I'm now stepping
14 out of the quote and saying which is slightly higher than
15 what the Regulatory Research Associates said.

16 And I'm going to go back to the quote. A jump
17 upward from the level in recent years and the highest ROE
18 for any quarter since 2005. And then, However, we do not
19 believe the number indicates a trend change. Virginia
20 Utilities settled five rate cases that reflect premiums
21 earned from performance and other factors, skewing the
22 reported average or the ROE upward.

23 If the Virginia cases are removed from the data
24 set, the average ROE was 10.3 percent, a level much closer
25 to that of recent quarters. The disparity is further

1 reflected in comparison with an averaged requested ROE
2 which for Quarter 1 was 10.57. This is the first time in
3 almost twelve years that the average requested ROE for a
4 quarter was lower than the average.

5 That's probably more than necessary, but I
6 wanted to make sure people didn't think I was reading
7 anything out of context. So EEI also mentioned the
8 Virginia skewing upwards.

9 A Right.

10 Q But they don't mention any other -- any skewing
11 downwards in that, correct?

12 A I would agree with that. And I think that 10.84
13 number is the same --

14 Q It may very well be the same.

15 A Yeah. And it's got the same Virginia cases in
16 there.

17 Q Now, Quarter 2, I have another EEI report from
18 Quarter 2 of 2012. I'm assuming everyone feels the same
19 way about it. They state that the average ROE in Quarter
20 2, 2012, was 9.92, a record low for recent decades. But
21 they do mention -- well, I guess they don't mention --
22 they don't mention any specific rate cases that caused
23 that to go down.

24 But they also note that the average regulatory
25 lag for Quarter 2 shoots through the roof to 11.5 in that

1 quarter. And -- and -- and I'll say, too -- I'll read the
2 quote. It says, Average regulatory lag for Quarter 2,
3 2012 was 11.4 months, well above the ten-month average for
4 recent years.

5 During industry restructuring in the late 1990s
6 and the early 2000s, the volatile regulatory lag increased
7 and the duration rose to almost 13 months. Outside that
8 period, regulatory lag has been fairly consistent at
9 around ten months. Consequently, the increase in Quarter
10 2 is generally unwelcome news.

11 Then they go on to point out that why one of the
12 reasons the regulatory lag has increased is because Hawaii
13 had three cases during the quarter each lasting more than
14 20 months. Everybody here should be happy we're not in
15 Hawaii.

16 MR. BYRNE: I'm not happy about Hawaii.

17 MR. LOWERY: Depends on the reason.

18 Q (By Chairman Gunn) As a regulated utility. Let
19 me put it that way. Fair point. But they -- but they
20 mention a reason why -- they specifically mention an
21 unusual thing which skews those percentages upwards.

22 And, again, I'll -- I'll let everybody see these
23 at the break or even afterwards to make sure that I'm --
24 I'm quoting that correctly. My point is that -- is that
25 there is -- both Regulatory Research Associates as well as

1 EEI mention unusual events that caused that average to be
2 -- to have upward pressure or to look higher than they
3 believe it actually reflects what's happening, correct?

4 A With respect to the rate case lag?

5 Q Well, no. Well -- right. In regulatory -- in
6 the regulatory assets, they mentioned Virginia and EEI
7 mentions Virginia when it comes to rate cases.

8 A Correct.

9 Q There is no corresponding in any form, any rate
10 case decision in the first quarter or the first two
11 quarters of 2012, which the Regulatory -- Regulatory
12 Research Associates covers as well. There is no
13 corresponding -- no corresponding mention of a -- of a
14 case that unusually would cause the average to skew lower.

15 A I don't want to speak for them. Oh, I'm sorry.
16 In terms of your question, I agree with that.

17 Q My question is --

18 A Yeah. Agreed.

19 Q -- there is no mention in there that says that?

20 A Agreed.

21 Q Now, as to your point, there may be individual
22 reports out there that I don't have that say, We think
23 North Dakota or South Dakota, whichever one it is, is a
24 really low ROE. But they haven't chosen to put it into
25 their six month wrap-up of where -- where ROEs are. Fair

1 point?

2 A Fair point. But I think I may have a -- a sense
3 of what's going on with that. When you look at the first
4 quarter, as we mentioned, the Virginia case is where one,
5 two, three, four, five of --

6 Q Seventeen.

7 A In the first quarter?

8 Q Actually, 25.

9 A Well, the RRA data has 12 cases that gave the
10 10.84 percent average. And of those 12, five were
11 Virginia generation cases. And so, clearly, that would
12 skew the results.

13 Q Well, but this says -- if you look at the first
14 sentence on July 26th, it says, Average return on equity
15 authorizing a utility in the first six months of 2012 of
16 10.36, 25 observations. So --

17 A For the first -- for the first -- I understand.

18 Q For the first six months, so --

19 A I'm sorry. I thought you said three.

20 Q So it's -- the Virginia cases account for five
21 out of 25, not 5 out of 12?

22 A Correct.

23 Q And that's -- and that's what they point out,
24 not -- not -- in the first -- EEI does it in the first
25 quarter, but RRA does it within the entire six months?

1 A Agreed. Agreed.

2 Q All right.

3 A And RRA also breaks it out by quarter as well so
4 you can look at the average. And then on -- and, again, I
5 recognize your point that they speak to the first six
6 months. But in that second quarter with respect to lag,
7 you're right, you've got Hawaiian Electric, and you also
8 have Arizona which has a pretty low --

9 Q Yeah. I'm not -- I'm not talking about lag
10 because it's --

11 A Yeah. Understood.

12 Q We're talking about ROEs here. I just -- my --
13 my point is that EEI especially is consistent with RRA. I
14 don't know -- I don't know -- and I -- although Ameren
15 uses ROE, I don't know who makes up ROE.

16 A It's --

17 Q I don't know where they're coming from. EEI is
18 actually the trade association for the electric utilities.
19 So I would assume that what they would put out -- and
20 while I believe they're -- they're very well-respected and
21 I think they are, and I -- I have great respect for them,
22 I would assume that if there was something that
23 significantly caused that ROE number to be pulled down
24 that they would mention it.

25 But, instead, what you have is basically a

1 statement against interest pulling out -- which I give
2 them great credit for, which makes it look like ROEs are
3 higher than they believe that they actually are.

4 A Right. And all I would say to that is whether
5 you look at number of observations, even five and 25 will
6 skew the result. One out of 25 might not affect the mean
7 so much. Perhaps that's why they don't address that.

8 Q Fair enough. So let me ask you the question.
9 When you're looking at -- it is much important and we're
10 in the -- we're in election politics right, so people will
11 tell you don't look at individual polls, look at the
12 trends.

13 A Right.

14 Q And isn't -- isn't the same thing important
15 here? It's not individual numbers. It's not individual
16 ROEs that are being rewarded. You have to look at the
17 trends?

18 A I -- I agree with that.

19 Q And the trend right now, for at least the past
20 six months, is to see ROE awards either stable or going
21 down?

22 A And that's what I say in my testimony.

23 Q Right. They're not going up?

24 A That's correct.

25 Q Okay. So -- thank you for that. All right.

1 Now, I'm going to move on to -- I'm going to move on to
2 your proxy group, and I just have a quick question.
3 So -- so you had -- in your original proxy group, you
4 excluded Empire, Empire District?

5 A Correct.

6 Q And that was because they had suspended their
7 dividend after the tornado?

8 A Correct.

9 Q But then in the -- in the revised proxy group,
10 you added them back in because of the reinstitution of
11 their dividend after a certain period of time being able
12 to financially recover from the tornado?

13 A There were two factors. One is that they had
14 reinstated the dividend. And the second was the
15 expectation that it would not be suspended again in the
16 future.

17 Q Fair enough.

18 A So it would be sustainable.

19 Q And my question isn't so much about that as much
20 as what exactly -- because that's the only change in your
21 revised proxy group, correct? That was the only company
22 that was added in? There were no other revisions to the
23 companies that you took?

24 A Correct.

25 Q What exactly was the effect of adding Empire

1 back in? How did -- how did your numbers change based on
2 the adding in of Empire?

3 A Well, I may have -- I'm sorry.

4 Q That's all right. Take your time.

5 A I don't think it's specifically spelled out.
6 It's certainly something that I can -- it is certainly
7 something that I can calculate. But I don't know that I
8 have it. I don't know that I say it in my testimony.

9 Q That's one of the reasons why I'm asking you.

10 A It's -- it's a good question.

11 Q And I'm by no means an expert, you know. I went
12 to law school because there is no math on the Bar exam,
13 and there is a lot of math. So I'm asking just for a
14 little bit of -- of an explanation.

15 A I'm sorry. It's not in there. Although it
16 certainly is a number that I can calculate.

17 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Okay. Well, all right. I'll
18 ask that that number -- number be given to us at some
19 point, maybe even -- I don't know when that's appropriate
20 to do that.

21 MR. BYRNE: Sure. I -- Judge -- or,
22 Mr. Chairman, here's what I was thinking about asking, and
23 maybe this would be worth throwing out now.

24 You asked him a bunch of questions on those EEI
25 reports, which I don't think he's looked at. I was

1 wondering if we might take a break for lunch so he could
2 read those and after that --

3 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Sure. Absolutely.

4 MR. BYRNE: I'm sure they're what you say they
5 are, but maybe there's something else that would be
6 relevant. And then we could maybe -- I don't know, Mr.
7 Hevert. Can -- how hard is it to do that Empire
8 calculation? Could you do it over lunch?

9 A I'll give it a try. Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Which I think it -- I will stop
11 now. I think we can do the rest of the Commissioners, and
12 then we can -- it will probably be just about time for a
13 break or after if we can get everything else done and we
14 can come back.

15 And by the way, if you don't feel comfortable
16 doing it and you don't feel comfortable with how I've
17 characterized this report, I absolutely want you to let me
18 know that.

19 A I appreciate that.

20 CHAIRMAN GUNN: And we can -- we can deal with
21 it at the time. I think it's an absolutely fair point. I
22 sprung it on you. I asked the Judge if it was a problem.
23 And I certainly want to give all the -- all the parties an
24 opportunity to review these and make sure that how I --
25 how I described them is accurate and fair to all the

1 parties.

2 So they're pretty short. They're within --
3 they're -- I think one is nine pages and one is ten pages.
4 And most of them are historical -- it's historic data.
5 So -- but they're right up here, and we can get a copy for
6 everybody. I'll ask for the folks to start bringing down
7 copies as we're doing it. So that's all the questions I
8 have. Thank you very much. I appreciate your testimony.

9 A Thank you.

10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Jarrett?

11 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: Yes.

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY COMMISSIONER JARRETT:

14 Q It's still morning. Good morning, Mr. Hevert.

15 A Good morning.

16 Q You also testified in the Ameren's previous rate
17 case ER-2011-0028; isn't that right?

18 A Yes, sir, I did.

19 Q Okay. And are you somewhat familiar with the
20 report and order that we issued in that case?

21 A Yes, sir, I am.

22 Q All right. In that case, we found that the
23 national average allowed ROE was 10.3 percent.

24 A Yes.

25 Q What period would that have reflected?

1 A I -- I believe that was -- it was either the
2 most recent six or twelve months. I don't recall which.

3 **Q Okay. And you were here when Mr. Byrne gave his**
4 **opening and he indicated that the current national average**
5 **for ROE was around 10.2?**

6 A About that.

7 **Q Do you agree with that?**

8 A Yeah. That's -- I think for the -- well, hold
9 on one second. And -- and I know there are, depending
10 upon the time frame as we're sitting here, depending upon
11 the time frame that you choose and the companies that you
12 include or exclude, it can be a little bit different over
13 time. I'm sorry.

14 Yeah. I believe it's -- it's about 10.2. For
15 some reason, I'm thinking I may have calculated 10.15 --
16 oh, here we go. The 12 months ended June 30th, 2012, I
17 had calculated, and this is on page 4 of my rebuttal
18 testimony, the average as being 10.15, but among the
19 contiguous states, of course, there's only one, which was
20 OG&E, and that was 10.2. So in that range.

21 **Q So anywhere from 10.15 to 10.2? Is that what**
22 **you're saying?**

23 A For -- for the -- for the purpose of the -- the
24 average that I calculated during that time. Yes.

25 **Q Okay. I believe the average for the last**

1 calendar year, 2011, was 10.22. Does that sound right?

2 A I -- I don't know offhand, but that does not
3 sound off base.

4 Q Well, I'm just trying -- you know, because in
5 the past, the Commission has used the zone of
6 reasonableness.

7 A Yes, sir.

8 Q And I'm trying to get some specificity as to
9 what we should use as the average to go 100 basis points
10 above and 100 basis points below. Should we use 10.2?

11 A I think 10.2 is a good number.

12 Q Okay. Thank you. I wanted to ask a few
13 questions about Exhibit 530, which is the RRA report. Do
14 you still have that with you?

15 A Yes, sir. I do.

16 Q And just to be clear, and I think you cleared it
17 up with Chairman Gunn, the data on page 4 is essentially
18 the exact same data that's in the EEI reports. The 2012
19 first quarter average RR -- or RRA reports is 10.84, the
20 same as the EEI?

21 A Correct.

22 Q And for second quarter, it is 9.92, the same as
23 EEI?

24 A Yes, sir.

25 Q Okay. I want to focus on page 4, the 2012 rate

1 cases that are listed there. Now, you had mentioned, I
2 think, in -- in some of the examination from -- I can't
3 remember which attorney, but you had referenced Footnote
4 B, which is on page 5. And what is Footnote B on page 5?

5 A Footnote B on page 5 relates to -- Footnote B on
6 page 5 simply reads, Order followed, stipulation or
7 settlements by parties. Decision particulars not
8 necessarily precedent setting or specifically adopted by
9 the regulatory body.

10 Q Okay. So now as I -- as I look down that list
11 of electric companies, starting with Hawaii Electric Light
12 Company, it has D by it. So does that mean that that was
13 -- that was -- case was reached by settlement?

14 A Oh, I'm sorry. Here we are. Yeah. Excuse me.
15 I think the -- there's either in total or in part reached
16 by settlement. And that's -- that's part of one of the
17 issues here where there's a stipulation, it could be a
18 stipulation as to -- it could be a partial stipulation.

19 Q Okay. We don't know if that 10.0, for example,
20 whether that was a settlement number or whether that was a
21 number that was actually awarded by the Commission absent
22 a settlement?

23 A That's -- that's -- that's correct.

24 Q Okay.

25 A And I'm sorry for hesitating. I should know

1 this because I have filed testimony for Hawaii Electric,
2 but I just can't recall whether that was a litigated
3 or a settled number.

4 Q And, actually, if you look at -- at the list,
5 seven of those, there was at least a partial settlement?

6 A Right. Right.

7 Q And like I said, we don't know on those ROEs
8 whether that was a settled number or whether it was a
9 disputed number that the Commission ultimately decided?

10 A That -- that's correct. And not -- not to
11 interrupt. But that's why I like to use the -- I like to
12 use a long period of history with lots of rate cases and
13 look at these numbers relative to rates. So that's --
14 that's one thing, because it sort of takes out the effect
15 of any individual case.

16 But -- but, on the other hand, there are
17 partially stipulated amounts. We don't know what those
18 stipulations may have related to. I agree with you on
19 that.

20 Q Okay. I have a couple of questions on Exhibit
21 531, which is that estimate. It's also ROA but --

22 A Yes. I have that.

23 Q On the -- on the back page of that, the major
24 rate case decisions from July 2012 to settlement 2012, you
25 had mentioned -- I want to make sure I understood because

1 you had mentioned like, for example, PacifiCorp And it has
2 a 9.8.

3 Is there any -- and this is from Utah. Is there
4 anything unusual in Utah that we ought to consider in that
5 9.8 that might be different from Missouri?

6 A I -- I just don't know enough about Utah to be
7 able to say.

8 Q What about Entergy Texas?

9 A In the -- excuse me. The only thing I would say
10 about Texas is that it is considered by RRA and by
11 Standard & Poor's to be among the least credit supportive
12 jurisdictions.

13 Q Now, you had talked a little bit, I think, the
14 -- what was it? There was one that was 9.25. It may not
15 even be on this. I think it's on the other one.

16 A Yeah. There were -- there were -- there was
17 two. There was a 9.25 for Northern States Power in South
18 Dakota. And -- and then there is, although this was a
19 distribution case, the Patomic Electric Power Maryland of
20 9.31 percent.

21 Q Okay. Well, there was one there was a
22 difference of -- I think it was -- it was a difference
23 because you said they were -- it was a punitive action
24 because of the storm issues.

25 A That was the Pepco, the Patomic Electric case,

1 9.31. And you can see that it's exactly 50 basis points
2 different than the -- the sister company, Delmarva Power &
3 Light.

4 Q Now, is that -- is that what the order said?

5 A Yes.

6 Q That the ROE is 9.8, but we're going to penalize
7 you 50 basis points?

8 A To that effect, yes. And the only thing I would
9 say is that both of those reflect a 50 basis points
10 reduction for the company's revenue decoupling mechanism.

11 Q Okay.

12 A So the top line number would have been 10.31.

13 Q Okay. Thank you. Going back to -- to 531, the
14 back page, look that the charts on major rate case
15 decisions.

16 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: No. I think I've asked
17 all the questions I need, and I don't have any further
18 questions.

19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. Commissioner
20 Kenney.

21 CROSS-EXAMINATION

22 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:

23 Q Good morning.

24 A Good morning, sir.

25 Q Can you pronounce your last name?

1 A It's Hevert, but I'm willing to go with
2 whatever.

3 Q I will call you Mr. Hevert. Thank you. I have
4 some questions. I want to start with some follow-up on
5 some of the other questions that some of the other
6 attorneys asked. And I want to start with your hourly
7 rate, which you indicated was about \$450 an hour?

8 A Well --

9 Q Is it a flat rate contract and you're computing
10 what it would turn out to be per hour?

11 A It's the -- again, I -- I'm subcontracting on
12 this agreement through Concentric. And I don't recall
13 exactly what the hourly rate is. That's -- that's what it
14 is through Concentric.

15 My rate with my new firm is lower than that.
16 But on Concentric, that's what it is.

17 Q And are you paid the same to prepare your
18 testimony to appear here in Missouri?

19 A Yes, sir.

20 Q And you were deposed in this case?

21 A Not -- not in this case, no, sir.

22 Q Okay. And would your rate have been the same
23 had you been deposed?

24 A Yes, sir.

25 Q Okay. And then I looked at your direct

1 testimony, and it's got your -- your CV and it's got about
2 nine pages of cases in which you've testified at FERC and
3 various other State regulatory bodies. Is that list
4 exhaustive?

5 A It's exhausting, but --

6 Q I didn't say that. But it was good reading.
7 But I'm weird.

8 A Yeah. As of -- as of that time, yes.

9 Q Have you ever testified for a non-utility, so,
10 for instance, on behalf of a ratepayer advocate or Office
11 of Public Counsel?

12 A Not for those agencies, no, sir.

13 Q Any non-utility industrial consumers?

14 A No. Not that I can recall.

15 Q Okay. And you said you worked at a utility,
16 too, right?

17 A Yes, I did.

18 Q So that makes -- that's fair enough then. Let
19 me go back to some of the questions -- you were in the
20 room when Mr. Martin was testifying about the credit
21 reporting agencies and credit metrics and all that?

22 A Yes, sir, I was.

23 Q So you heard some of the questions that I asked?

24 A Yes, sir.

25 Q And would you agree with the assertion that in

1 **assessing whether a particular regulatory body is credit**
2 **supportive, Moody's, S&P and Fitch are only concerned with**
3 **the mechanism by which the utility is able to recover its**
4 **costs and expenses?**

5 A Well, I think what they're -- what the rating
6 agencies are focused on broadly is the utility's ability
7 to meet its debt service obligations. And to the extent
8 that there are mechanisms in place that improve that
9 likelihood, improve that probability, then, yes, I agree
10 that's a focus.

11 Q And you would agree that they are not -- by
12 they, I mean Moody's and S&P and Fitch, they're not making
13 assessments or judgments as to the prudence and
14 reasonableness of the company's expenditures as that term
15 is used in regulatory parlance?

16 A I -- I think that's generally true, although I
17 could not speak to how they look at specific
18 circumstances.

19 Q Okay. All right. And I just want to follow up
20 on another question that you were asked -- Mr. Thompson
21 was asking you about Mr. Murray and Mr. Gorman's
22 qualifications. And you guys are all MBAs and CFAs,
23 right?

24 A Yes, sir.

25 Q And he asked you whether you recognized

1 Mr. Murray and Mr. Gorman as experts. And you know
2 responded that you recognized their credentials, which I
3 think is slightly a nuance -- it's a nuance answer that I
4 don't know was directly responsive to Mr. Thompson's
5 question. Do you recognize Mr. Murray and Mr. Gorman as
6 experts?

7 A I believe that they have experience and
8 knowledge well in excess of a lay person. So yes, in that
9 regard, I agree with that.

10 Q That they are experts?

11 A Yes, sir.

12 Q Okay. And then you were asked about whether an
13 ROE below 9 -- or 10.25, which I think was the low end of
14 your range --

15 A Yes.

16 Q -- whether anything lower than that would be
17 confiscatory, and I think you indicated you're not a
18 lawyer?

19 A Right.

20 Q You cited Hope and Bluefield in your testimony.
21 And so you have some familiarity with the legal
22 terminology that's used in rate cases and some of the
23 legal standards, right?

24 A Yes, sir.

25 Q Would it be fair to say, however, that you don't

1 **feel that you're legally qualified to offer an opinion as**
2 **to whether Mr. Murray's ROE recommendations are**
3 **confiscatory?**

4 A From a legal point of view, I don't -- do not
5 consider myself qualified.

6 Q And then many of the other questions that I was
7 going to ask have already been answered and asked. And
8 Mr. -- there is some testimony, and I don't remember where
9 read it, but there's the distinction between cost of
10 equity and return on equity. Are those two distinct terms
11 that are -- terms of art that have distinct meanings?

12 A Well, what I would say is that I use them as the
13 same. And, in fact -- in fact, on -- right in the front
14 of my direct testimony I actually have a little footnote
15 there saying that I use the two terms interchangeably. In
16 my view, they're the same thing.

17 Q And Mr. Murray, you read his testimony, I'm
18 sure?

19 A Yes.

20 Q He distinguishes between cost of equity and
21 return on equity.

22 A He does.

23 Q And do you take issue with his distinction?

24 A I think for -- for this purpose what we're
25 trying to do, which is understand the return required by

1 investors, that the cost of equity is, in fact, the return
2 on equity.

3 When you look at the methods that we use, which
4 is that -- we look at data from thousands of investors in
5 the process that they use to form prices. And we infer
6 from that the return that they require. And that required
7 return on equity, in my judgment, is the same thing as the
8 cost of equity. So I do not see them as separate issues.

9 Q I want to talk a little bit about the
10 construction of a proxy group. And the whole idea of
11 constructing this proxy group is to try to put together a
12 group of enterprises that are of similar risk, correct?

13 A Correct.

14 Q And that similar risk refers to the risk to the
15 investor's capital. Is that -- is that the risk that
16 we're trying to identify?

17 A Yeah. I think that's fair to say. We're trying
18 to -- and I'll just back up one -- one quick step, which
19 is to say that a lot of this cost of equity information is
20 based upon the notion of opportunity cost, meaning the
21 return you would get on one investment is the term that
22 you forgo by not investing somewhere else as a similar
23 risk. So in that perspective, yes, I agree with you.

24 Q So it's -- it's a term of economic art or
25 charter financial analyst art and a legal term of art,

1 correct?

2 A I would agree with that.

3 Q And the enterprise's risk is a measure of its
4 financial health as well?

5 A An enterprise's --

6 Q The measure -- the measure of an enterprise's
7 risk can help you determine its financial health?

8 A I -- I think they're highly related. The
9 company's financial health, both current and expected,
10 would be a consideration in determining risk, so I think
11 the two are moved together. Right.

12 Q And here I think a few days ago, we had a
13 discussion -- and I don't -- I don't remember what
14 context, but we were talking about the possibility that
15 with constructing a proxy group comprised of solely
16 electric utilities that you can get into an echo chamber
17 of sorts where your ROEs are self-perpetuating,
18 self-justified because you're looking at electric
19 utilities.

20 Is it possible in constructing a proxy group for
21 purposes of assessing ROE to identify enterprises of
22 similar business risks that are not electric utilities?

23 A The -- I have seen people do that. I have seen
24 people look at companies in sectors beyond utilities. And
25 in order to do that, they'll look at parameters such as

1 value lines -- safety ranking, value lines, financial
2 safety rating, beta coefficients, credit ratings. And
3 they'll use the expected return on equity of the proxy for
4 utilities. That does happen, but not often.

5 **Q You anticipated my question. My next question**
6 **was going to be what are the mechanisms one would use to**
7 **construct another proxy group not composed of electric**
8 **utilities? And you said value line, beta coefficients and**
9 **other mechanisms are other criteria that one could use?**

10 A They are. They are metrics that people would
11 consider, measures of investment risks.

12 **Q Have you ever constructed a proxy group for an**
13 **electric utility not comprised of utilities?**

14 A No, I have not.

15 **Q But you've seen it done?**

16 A I've seen it done.

17 **Q And would you say that to construct such a proxy**
18 **group is consistent with your profession and would yield**
19 **appropriate ROE?**

20 A I'm sorry. Do you mean a proxy group beyond --
21 it -- it could. But the reason I don't do it is because,
22 in practice, investors actually do look at separate
23 sectors. And utilities tend to be a separate sector. And
24 even within utilities, electric utilities tend to be a
25 separate sector.

1 So what I try to do is look at the market the
2 way investors would. And since investors do distinguish
3 among various sectors in the economy, that's why I tend to
4 focus on the utility sector.

5 **Q For purposes of what we're doing here, though,**
6 **do you think there would be value in doing that, not maybe**
7 **as to supplant a utility, electric utility proxy group,**
8 **but perhaps to supplement it?**

9 A And I should say in the -- the circumstances
10 where I've seen that approach taken, it was for that
11 purpose, not just to supplant, as a supplement.

12 **Q Oh, not to -- not strictly for regulatory**
13 **purposes?**

14 A Well, in rate cases in this type of application,
15 I have seen -- I have seen people do that.

16 **Q So you've seen it done, and it's not outside the**
17 **main?**

18 A I've seen it done. I'll be honest. I don't
19 know how frequently it's accepted by regulatory
20 Commissions, but I certainly have seen it applied in
21 cases.

22 **Q Okay. In your direct testimony, you ran a**
23 **constant growth DCF and then one multi-stage DCF with one**
24 **terminal?**

25 A That's correct.

1 Q Okay. And then in your rebuttal testimony, you
2 ran a second multi-stage with a second terminal value for
3 the --

4 A That's correct. Yes.

5 Q And then Mr. Gorman also includes in his
6 analysis a sustainable growth DCF model. Why would you
7 not have done also a sustainable growth DCF model?

8 A I -- in my view, the sustainable growth model is
9 problematic now for electric utilities because it -- it
10 makes some assumptions that I don't think necessarily
11 hold.

12 If you -- it assumes that when -- that the --
13 that the primary driver of growth is the amount of
14 earnings retained and your expected return on equity. And
15 there's another term, which has to do with the extent of
16 shares that you receive and the book values of those
17 shares.

18 But when you look at electric utilities,
19 especially now, you have to, in my view, break apart that
20 component, that retention, times the expected return on
21 equity and see whether or not you think those are likely
22 to remain stable over the coming period.

23 And as we talked about, I think payout ratios,
24 which is sort of the inverse of -- of retention rate, are
25 changing over time. And so you can't really assume that

1 they're going to be stable over the next few years.

2 And when you look at the return on equity piece,
3 the expected return, I think you see, also, that as
4 utilities are in the middle of a capital spending cycle,
5 the expected return is somewhat diluted by some of the
6 investments that they make, for example.

7 So when you put those two things together, I
8 think they become -- there's a lot of moving parts that
9 result -- result in an expected growth rate that's low.
10 And so, too -- and I think Mr. Gorman, you know, to his
11 credit, he understood that and accepted that and did not
12 give that result much weight.

13 **Q So of all of the different methodologies by**
14 **which one can calculate ROE, you also ran a CAPM and risk**
15 **premium analysis. The DC -- putting aside what we've said**
16 **in prior rate orders, because I know all of you guys**
17 **comment on the fact that we've accepted it in prior rate**
18 **orders. Putting that aside, independently of whatever any**
19 **Commission has said, is it your opinion that -- that the**
20 **DCF is -- well, let me state that differently -- that the**
21 **multi-stage DCF methodology is the most accurate and**
22 **reliable measure of ROE?**

23 **A** I -- in my view, the multistage DCF allows you
24 to really think about what's driving the numbers and
25 allows you to make assumptions that are reasonable within

1 that context. And so for that reason, these days, I -- my
2 view is that that's a model that I -- I do tend to prefer.

3 Q So then if we -- I mean, the Commission was
4 reaching its determination, the fight, so to speak, is in
5 valuing the credibility of the inputs. Would that be
6 fair?

7 A The -- I would agree with that. Yes.

8 Q All right. Let me ask a couple more questions
9 about the regulatory environment. Now, you said in your
10 direct testimony that you didn't make explicit adjustments
11 for the regulatory environment, but you did take it into
12 consideration?

13 A Yes, sir.

14 Q So can you -- can your consideration be
15 quantified?

16 A I would be reluctant to quantify it. I think --

17 Q You marked this down for not being as credit
18 supportive as maybe somebody else in another state.

19 A I -- I think so. But the -- when I look at the
20 -- where the recommendation wound up, both in my direct
21 testimony and subsequently in the rebuttal testimony, it's
22 at the mid-point of the range and then toward the lower
23 end of the range.

24 And so I do think it's a consideration. And I
25 do think that when you look at, for example, what some of

1 the rating agencies have said, that is something to be
2 taken into account.

3 Again, though, I think it's fair and appropriate
4 to recognize that over time the Commission has instituted
5 some policies and designs that have been helpful to the
6 company. And I think that, likewise, needs to be taken
7 into consideration.

8 Q And -- and so -- and you mentioned the credit
9 rating agencies. When you use the phrase credit
10 supportive, you're using it in the same fashion, with the
11 same meaning as the credit reporting agencies would use as
12 well?

13 A Yes, sir.

14 Q And so, again, I think we already established
15 when assessing credit supportiveness, they're only looking
16 at cost recovery mechanisms and the utility's ability to
17 recover their costs, not just necessary or reasonableness
18 or prudence of expenditures, right?

19 A Well, I think -- right. Yeah. From the
20 perspective of Moody's, you look at mechanisms that are in
21 place. And I think in large measure -- well, two things
22 happen. One is you're able to get a sense to which those
23 mechanisms may improve the specific metrics.

24 They've talked about this morning the cash flow
25 coverage metrics, and then there's the more qualitative

1 assessment that Moody's would make that also factors in to
2 the assignment of the eventual credit rating. So there's,
3 I think, really those two parts.

4 Q They're not looking at just prudence of the
5 expenditures as we use the term, as regulators would look
6 at the prudence of the expenditures?

7 A Yeah. I think the -- generally, not perhaps, on
8 a case specific basis, they might.

9 Q And then I think you heard Mr. Martin testify
10 that Moody's is the most transparent in putting forth the
11 criteria that they use and their credit metrics?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Would you agree with that?

14 A I would.

15 Q So another expert, another financial analyst,
16 could take their ROE recommendation and plug it into
17 Moody's formula and see if their ROE recommendation would
18 still lead to a particular credit rating?

19 A Yeah. The -- the only issue there is that --

20 Q I mean, they can do that, right?

21 A They could. But it's -- because the metrics
22 themselves cover -- I don't want to say a wide range, but
23 there's a range over which the metrics will fall and still
24 relate to a specific ratings category.

25 And as you -- as you go through the calculation

1 to see what would happen on a proforma basis, you can have
2 fairly wide ranges of assumed cost equity ROEs that would
3 satisfy those criteria.

4 And I think, in large measure, that's partly why
5 rating agencies such as Moody's explicitly recognize that
6 there's a qualitative aspect to assigning the ratings.

7 **Q So you wouldn't necessarily be able to produce**
8 **the exact result that a Moody's analyst would produce, but**
9 **could you get a general idea?**

10 A I -- I think that's fair.

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I don't have any other
12 questions. Thank you.

13 A Thank you.

14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Stoll?

15 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I have no questions, your
16 Honor. But I do want to thank Mr. Hevert for his
17 testimony.

18 A Thank you.

19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Jarrett? You had
20 something else?

21 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: Yeah. I'm sorry. Just
22 real quick, a couple quick questions.

23 RECROSS EXAMINATION

24 BY COMMISSIONER JARRETT:

25 **Q Your range is from 10.25 to 11?**

1 A Correct.

2 Q If we ultimately decide anywhere within your
3 range, would you consider that to be reasonable?

4 A Yes, sir.

5 Q Okay. The second thing, I wanted to flesh out
6 just a little bit from Commissioner Kenney's questions and
7 your answers about using companies and proxy groups that
8 are not electric utilities. And you indicated you had
9 seen that in a few cases. Can you tell us which
10 Commissions have done that in your experience and when
11 they did it?

12 A Well, I -- I guess that's the thing. I've seen
13 witnesses use it, but I'm not sure that I've seen
14 Commissions necessarily embrace that approach.

15 Q Okay. So you're not aware of any Commission
16 that has actually embraced that and used it in making a
17 decision?

18 A I am not aware of that. Correct.

19 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: Okay. Thank you.

20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Kenney?

21 RECROSS EXAMINATION

22 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:

23 Q Are you aware of any Commission that has
24 explicitly rejected it?

25 A I can't think of that offhand. No.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: All right.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. And then we will
3 break for lunch now, and we'll come back at -- let's say
4 at 1:30.

5 MR. BYRNE: I have something, Judge.

6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. We're on the record.

7 MR. BYRNE: We had committed to take Ms.
8 Ferguson out of -- out of order, and we talked about
9 taking her after lunch. I think given the fact that we've
10 got to go to calculate things and read things, it might be
11 a good use of the Commission's time to take Ms. Ferguson
12 immediately after lunch.

13 Obviously, I'm going to miss the baseball game
14 no matter what happens, but --

15 COMMISSIONER GUNN: Not necessarily.

16 MR. BYRNE: But anyway, that's what I would
17 suggest, that after lunch we take Ms. Ferguson and go
18 back.

19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Anybody have a problem with
20 doing that? That's what we'll do, then, and then we'll
21 have Mr. Hevert -- Hevert back after we're done with Ms.
22 Ferguson.

23 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We are on break
25 now till 1:30.

1 (Break in proceedings.)

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Let's come to order, please.
3 We're back from lunch, and I believe there's been some
4 changes in the plans. Mr. Byrne, do you want to explain
5 what's going on?

6 MR. BYRNE: Yes. We had talked about before the
7 lunch break taking Ms. Ferguson, but Mr. Hevert has a
8 flight that he might miss if we do that. So the parties
9 have generously agreed to let us finish up with
10 Mr. Hevert, and then we would take Ms. Ferguson after
11 that.

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: You don't want to stay
13 here with us?

14 A I would love to, but my wife would be angry.

15 COMMISSIONER GUNN: Fair enough.

16 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Well, we are at the
17 moment on questions from the Bench for Mr. Hevert. And,
18 Mr. Chairman, you had some documents you wanted to offer?

19 COMMISSIONER GUNN: Did the parties get a chance
20 to review -- review these documents?

21 MR. BYRNE: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Was it a fair representation
23 what I said? Does anybody have any comments about what I
24 said or any corrections or --

25 MR. BYRNE: We believe it was a fair

1 representation of what you said.

2 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Does anybody object -- anybody
3 object to these being marked as Commission's A and B and
4 entered into the record?

5 MR. BYRNE: No. No objection.

6 MS. BAKER: No.

7 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Judge, I'd like to offer these
8 two documents, Quarter 1, 2012 Financial Update from EEI
9 as A, and Quarter 2, 2012 Financial Update Rate Case
10 Summary as Commission Exhibit B.

11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Commission Exhibits
12 A and B have been offered. Any objections to their
13 receipt? Hearing none, they will be received.

14 (Commission Exhibits A and B were offered and
15 received into evidence.)

16 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And I believe there was a
17 question you had pending before the break as well that the
18 witness was going to try to answer.

19 RECROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY CHAIRMAN GUNN:

21 Q The witness was going to try to do a
22 calculation. I asked about what effect the inclusion of
23 the Empire District Electric Company had on his
24 calculations.

25 A It turns out that I had done that calculation in

1 -- in the testimony. It is actually on page 93 of my
2 rebuttal testimony. And including Empire in the group is
3 -- 14 to 15 basis points is the effect. And that's based
4 on the multi-stage approach, which, as we talked about, is
5 the approach that we primarily focused on.

6 **Q Can you point to the line? It's on page 93 in**
7 **your rebuttal testimony. Is that 6 through 9? No?**

8 A No. I'm sorry. There's a table. Table 15.
9 And it would be -- and it would be the difference between
10 Step 3 and Step 2. So 9.56 less 9.42.

11 **Q Got it. And that starts on Line 4 on page 93?**

12 A Yes. Correct.

13 CHAIRMAN GUNN: All right. Thank you very much.

14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Anything else?

15 CHAIRMAN GUNN: No. I don't have anything else

16 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Then we'll move to
17 questions -- recross based on questions from the Bench,
18 beginning with MIEC.

19 RECROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY MS. ILES:

21 **Q Mr. Hevert, in response to Chairman Gunn's**
22 **question just now, you pointed to page 93 of your rebuttal**
23 **testimony where you made that adjustment -- made**
24 **adjustments to Mr. Gorman's multi-stage DCF model,**
25 **correct?**

1 A That's correct.

2 Q And you also make the same adjustments to his
3 constant growth DCF model, and I believe that's -- those
4 calculations are shown on page 79 of your rebuttal
5 testimony?

6 A Yes. That's correct.

7 Q And the -- the effect of including Empire
8 Electric -- Empire District Electric Company in the proxy
9 group would be the difference between Step 2 and Step 3 on
10 that chart, correct?

11 A That's right.

12 Q Which is 32 basis points, right?

13 A It is for the constant growth. But, of course,
14 again, we talked about -- we could have done the
15 calculation for all of the methods. But because we
16 focused on the multi-stage, that was the basis of my
17 response.

18 Q Okay. I understand. I just wanted to make
19 clear it's different depending on the methodology.

20 A I agree with that.

21 Q Okay. Then another question in response to
22 Commissioner Jarrett's questions, he pointed out, I
23 believe, and you may recall, that in Exhibit 4 -- or 530,
24 the RRA from -- showing the major case -- major rate case
25 decisions from January through June of 2012.

1 But according to the footnotes on page 5, which
2 relate to the numbers shown on page 4, the Footnote B
3 shows that some of those ROEs were set in cases that
4 involved settlement, correct? Do you recall that --

5 A Yes, I do.

6 Q -- those questions? So in your experience in
7 working on rate cases, isn't it true that rate cases
8 frequently are either partially or fully resolved through
9 a stipulation?

10 A As a -- as a general proposition?

11 Q Yes.

12 A Is your question are certain aspects of any
13 given case settled rather than fully litigated?

14 Q Right. They -- they are, aren't they? I mean,
15 they're -- it's not unusual -- I mean, obviously, just
16 looking at this chart, that B footnote shows up on a lot
17 of those decisions?

18 A Yeah. And I think we talked about that this
19 morning.

20 Q Right.

21 A So I would agree with that.

22 Q Right. I didn't think that was controversial.
23 Also in your experience, I mean, in trying to figure out,
24 well, what does that tell us about the ROE, we know that
25 if a company has entered into a stipulation that involves

1 the ROE, wouldn't it be reasonable to assume that they
2 consider whatever settlement they're entering into as a
3 fair -- a fair return for them?

4 A Well, I -- I think the company would take into
5 consideration the -- the give and take involved in -- in
6 settlement. And so there would be aspects of the case
7 that, that they perhaps trade off for something else. But
8 on balance, the company would consider the totality of the
9 outcome to be reasonable.

10 Q Right. But there wouldn't be any reason
11 necessarily to assume that because there was a partial or
12 full stipulation that those ROEs are unusually low or
13 lower than they would have been had the Commission issued
14 a decision?

15 A You know, I can't answer that because, as we
16 said, the stipulation, settlements typically involve some
17 give and take. And as to what the ROE would have been
18 absent that give and take, I think it's hard to say.

19 MS. ILES: All right. That's all.

20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And from Public Counsel?

21 MS. BAKER: No questions. Thank you,

22 Mr. Hevert.

23 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. For Staff?

24 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

25 RECROSS EXAMINATION

1 BY MR. THOMPSON:

2 Q Mr. Hevert, you'll recall that Commissioner
3 Jarrett was asking you about the numbers in the RRA
4 report, and you agreed with him that with respect to 2011,
5 the average, the 10.2 is a good number, I think was what
6 you used, the words you used? Do you recall that?

7 A Yes. I recall that.

8 Q Okay. Do you recall the RRA regulatory focus
9 there, Exhibit 530?

10 A I'm sorry. You said that 2010 -- I'm sorry.
11 Could you repeat your question?

12 Q I thought that you told Commissioner Jarrett
13 that 10.2 was a good number for 2011.

14 A See, I -- I thought that question had to do with
15 the 12 months ended June 30th, 2012.

16 Q Well, there was a question about that as well.

17 A Okay.

18 Q What I wanted to direct your attention to is
19 that paragraph that you were asked to read by Ms. Baker on
20 the first page of Exhibit 530 where it talks about
21 excluding the Virginia surcharge rider generation cases.

22 A Yes. I recall that.

23 Q And it says that with those excluded, the
24 average authorized electric ROE was 10.05. Did I read
25 that right?

1 A Which exhibit was this?

2 Q Exhibit 530, the Regulatory Focus for July 6th,
3 2012.

4 A Right. And this would be the first paragraph?

5 Q First paragraph on the first page. And I have a
6 copy of it if you need it.

7 A Oh, no. I've got it right here. Thank you,
8 though. Yes. I'm sorry. Yes, there is.

9 Q Okay. And don't you agree that 10.05 is a
10 better number, at least for the period under consideration
11 there?

12 A Well, I think the 10.05 does -- as I said
13 earlier, what I have done, which is to exclude for the
14 purpose of -- for the limited purpose of looking at the
15 average authorized return, the generation cases in
16 Virginia. So it's -- which is not to say there's not
17 information in those cases. But for the purpose of this
18 calculation, I do exclude that and I agree with that.

19 Q Okay. Then to follow up on a question that
20 Commissioner Kenney asked you, whether or not cost of
21 equity and return on equity are the same thing, do you
22 recall that question?

23 A I do.

24 Q And you indicated that you thought, for the
25 purpose of what we're doing here, they were the same thing

1 since you're attempting to calculate the return required
2 by investors.

3 A Yes.

4 Q Okay. But there's another way to look at that
5 cost of equity, isn't there? Just -- in other words, in
6 the same way that with return on equity, there is, in
7 fact, the company's objective earned return on equity that
8 can be deduced from its operations, the results of its
9 operations, isn't there an objective return -- or cost of
10 equity that can be deduced?

11 A I'm sorry. Are you suggesting that the
12 accounting return on book equity is the same thing as the
13 market required return on common equity?

14 Q I'm suggesting it's a different way of looking
15 at return on equity. Don't you agree?

16 A I think that what you're suggesting has been
17 often referred to as the comparable earnings approach,
18 which is an approach that really has not been given much
19 traction recently. I don't think comparable earnings is a
20 -- a way of estimating the -- the return for two reasons.

21 One is it's historical. It's backward looking.
22 We're looking forward. And we're trying to understand
23 what the return will be and what the required return on
24 the market is going forward.

25 And in so doing, we use market-based data as

1 opposed to accounting-based data. So I think those two
2 distinctions, the use of market versus accounting based
3 data and using forward versus backward looking data are
4 two reasons why I don't think using historical earned
5 return on book equity is an appropriate method.

6 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. No further questions.

7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Redirect?

8 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. BYRNE:

10 **Q Mr. Hevert, just real quickly, Chairman Gunn**
11 **asked you some questions about those EEI reports that had**
12 **been marked as exhibits. Did you get a chance to look at**
13 **those over the lunch hour?**

14 A Yes, I did.

15 **Q And, you know, was what Chairman Gunn**
16 **represented about those reports basically a fair**
17 **representation?**

18 A Yes. I think it's a fair representation. It's
19 fact-based. There's some commentary, as we discussed, but
20 on balance, it's generally fact-based analysis.

21 **Q Okay. You -- earlier this morning, you were**
22 **given some exhibits by Ms. Iles, and I'd like to go**
23 **through them if I might.**

24 The first exhibit she gave you was 529, which
25 **says Cost of Capital Analyses, Changes Since Ameren**

1 **Missouri's -- Last Ameren Missouri Rate Case. Can you see**
2 **that one?**

3 A Yes, I do.

4 Q Okay. And -- and as I understand this exhibit,
5 at the top, it shows the results of your constant growth
6 DCF from the last rate case and it compares it to your
7 position on -- in your direct testimony and your position
8 in your rebuttal testimony, and then it calculates the
9 difference; is that correct?

10 A Yes. That's correct.

11 Q Let me ask you, first of all, are you primarily
12 relying on your constant growth DCF analysis?

13 A No. As we discussed this morning, most of the
14 witnesses in this case -- I think we all give considerable
15 weight to the multi-stage and not so much the constant
16 growth model.

17 Q And, I mean, what's wrong with the constant
18 growth model?

19 A As we said, the constant growth model is really
20 subject to a number of limiting assumptions. And to the
21 extent those assumptions do not hold, in reality, they can
22 give you biased and unreliable results.

23 And in my view, when the market is this
24 volatile, when you see results change that much over a
25 short period of time, you have to wonder the extent to

1 which those assumptions play into that change. And -- and
 2 I think that's in large measure, again, why we tend to
 3 give more weight to other forms of the model, the
 4 multi-stage form of the model instead of this one.

5 Q I mean, to the extent that that -- I guess,
 6 basically, it shows from your last rate case
 7 recommendation on the constant growth DCF model until your
 8 rebuttal, there's a -- looks like a 91 basis point
 9 difference; is that correct?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q Does that suggest that Ameren Missouri's cost of
 12 equity is 91 base points lower than it was last time?

13 A No. As I said this morning, I don't disagree
 14 that the cost of equity has fallen somewhat, but,
 15 certainly, not 91 basis points worth.

16 Q Okay. I guess the same -- I guess the lower
 17 part of the exhibit shows declines in A rated utility bond
 18 yields and BAA rated utility bond yields. And it looks to
 19 me like -- well, this doesn't tie to your testimony, but
 20 it looks to me like what they're trying to show is during
 21 the period when the rates were set in the last rate case
 22 until, I guess this last summer, there's been a decline in
 23 bond yields; is that true?

24 A That's what this shows. Yes.

25 Q Okay. And, I mean, does that suggest to you

1 **that there's a comparable reduction in Ameren Missouri's**
2 **cost of equity?**

3 A No. Again, for two reasons. One is, as I
4 mentioned earlier this morning, when you look at the
5 composition of that return, Treasury yields and the credit
6 spread, you'll see that, in fact, when you're looking at
7 BAA bonds, for example, the credit spread has increased
8 over the past year.

9 So while the -- the Treasury rates has fallen,
10 the credit spread, the increment required by investors to
11 be compensated for the risk, has actually gone up. And in
12 my view, it's important to look at both of those things.

13 I recognize the Treasury yields have fallen.
14 But it's also important to understand that the incremental
15 return required spread over Treasuries has somewhat gone
16 up. That of course, extends to the cost of equity as
17 well, the equity risk premium having gone up even as --
18 especially as Treasury yields have gone down.

19 Q **So does Exhibit 529 tell you anything about the**
20 **magnitude in any change on return on equity between the**
21 **last case and now?**

22 A I don't believe so. No.

23 Q **Regulatory Focus, which is Exhibit 530, Ms. Iles**
24 **marked and put in the record. That's the major rate case**
25 **decisions from RRA from January the -- through June of**

1 2012; is that correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q I wanted to ask you a couple of questions.

4 First of all, there's been some discussion about how the
5 actual results for the first six months of 2012 were 10.36
6 percent. But then that was adjusted down to 10.22 percent
7 to take out these Virginia decisions; is that right?

8 A Yes. That's correct.

9 Q And my understanding is all of your analyses
10 takes out the Virginia decisions; is that right?

11 A It does. Yes.

12 Q And that chart, for example, that we have up on
13 the easel, that excludes the Virginia decisions, doesn't
14 it?

15 A Yes, it does.

16 Q Okay. And my question is, is there any -- is
17 there any value -- is there any value to looking at the
18 Virginia decisions in addition to the other decisions?

19 A Well, I think the -- the Virginia decisions --
20 well, I'd say for the sake of consistency, I did take them
21 out of all of my analyses. And I think it's appropriate
22 to do that.

23 But when you look at the Virginia decisions and
24 you recognize that what the Commission has done is to
25 provide an incentive for in-state generation. So the

1 Commission essentially identified a -- a public objective
2 and developed incentives in order to meet that public
3 objective, which is in the form of the premium allowed on
4 the rate of return.

5 Q And -- and are those some of the same issues
6 we're struggling with in Missouri?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Okay. I notice -- if you look on page 4 of the
9 exhibit that has the electric utility decisions, the -- I
10 guess it's the first and second quarter both. And I --
11 Chairman Gunn asked you about the whole -- a question
12 about Hawaii, and I think there is a 20-month -- you know,
13 there was a 20-month period of time for the rate case. Do
14 you recall that question?

15 A Yes, I do.

16 Q But I noticed that the decision on Hawaii has an
17 I by it. Do you know what I means?

18 A The -- the footnote -- the I indicates that
19 interim rates were implemented prior to the issuance of
20 the final order.

21 Q And -- and does -- would interim -- is there any
22 relationship between interim rates and the length of the
23 regulatory process?

24 A Well, the longer the process, the -- the more
25 detrimental it would be not to have interim rates put in.

1 The lag would be extraordinary. The interim rates, of
2 course, is a way of mitigating that.

3 **Q Do you know about any other -- any other things**
4 **about Hawaiian regulation or any aspects that are relevant**
5 **to that in Hawaiian regulation?**

6 A Well, Hawaii Electric -- and I believe Maui as
7 well have, for example, decoupling mechanisms which
8 decouple the revenue from usage. And in addition, they
9 have a -- a revenue adjustment mechanism and a combination
10 of those two things are, in some sense, the functional
11 equivalent of a formula rate plan such that revenues are
12 meant to be separated from volumes and, at the same time,
13 expenses are subject to an increase, a formula increase
14 outside of the context of a full rate case proceeding.

15 **Q Okay. I noticed, you know, one of the footnotes**
16 **-- by some of these footnotes is D. can you tell me what**
17 **D is?**

18 A D means that it applies to electric delivery
19 only, so these are companies that do not have generating
20 access.

21 **Q When you do your averages, do you include or**
22 **exclude the D companies?**

23 A We're focused on vertically generated companies
24 that own generation as well as distribution. I tend to
25 exclude the distribution only companies.

1 **Q And why is that?**

2 A Well, because the Commissions that have
3 jurisdiction over those companies typically view them as
4 being less risky than vertically integrated companies
5 because they don't have generation and the operating
6 regulatory financial risk associated with generating
7 assets.

8 **Q I believe Commissioner Jarrett asked you about**
9 **the 2011 returns. Do you recall that?**

10 A Yes.

11 MR. BYRNE: I'd like to mark an exhibit if I
12 could.

13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Your next number is
14 69.

15 **Q (By Mr. Byrne) Can you identify that exhibit,**
16 **Mr. Hevert?**

17 A This, again, is a Regulatory Research Associates
18 report, and it's major rate case decisions for calendar
19 year 2011.

20 **Q And the first page, what does it show for the**
21 **average return for electric utilities?**

22 A On the first page, it says the average return on
23 equity authorized electric utilities was 10.22 percent.

24 MR. BYRNE: Okay. Your Honor, I'd offer that
25 exhibit.

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Exhibit 69 has been offered.
2 Any objections to its receipt? Hearing none, it will be
3 received.

4 (Exhibit 69 was offered and received into
5 evidence.)

6 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Okay. I'd like to talk to you
7 about Exhibit 531, which was S&L RRA data for the third --
8 I guess it's for the third quarter. It's the single page
9 document. And do you have that?

10 A Yes, I do.

11 Q Okay. And I think there's -- there's a list of
12 all the companies. I think it's electric and gas
13 companies, distribution and non-distribution. And I think
14 there were only a handful of companies that you identified
15 that were electric, fully integrated. Can you tell me
16 what those are?

17 A Those were PacifiCorp, Entergy Texas, PacifiCorp
18 again and Oklahoma Gas & Electric.

19 Q Okay. And I think you said Entergy Texas --
20 well, what was the -- Entergy Texas got a 9.8 percent
21 return on equity. Do you have any explanation for that?

22 A Well, the one observation I would have, again,
23 is that Texas typically is considered to be among the
24 least credit supportive jurisdictions.

25 Q How -- how about the PacifiCorp Utah decision?

1 **Do you have any knowledge about that?**

2 A Well, I think as we were talking about just a
3 bit earlier, the PacifiCorp decision was a settlement, and
4 it's my understanding it was -- involved a multi-year
5 settlement. It involved the deferral of some substantial
6 investments.

7 And so there were elements of the case that,
8 again, would be beneficial to the company as part of the
9 entire settlement and as part of the -- of the overall
10 case.

11 Q I -- I think -- well, do you remember -- or
12 maybe could you -- could you tell me if you don't remember
13 what the average of integrated electric utility returns on
14 equity for the quarter was? I think it was 9.9 percent;
15 is that right?

16 A It was 9.9. Correct.

17 Q All right. And do you have any -- I mean, is
18 there any issue with relying on a single quarter of data
19 with a handful of data points in it?

20 A Well, I think any analysis where you're trying
21 to understand some measure of central tendency is --
22 relies on more data than less. And I think in a
23 circumstance where you have four observations, I think
24 it's hard to draw conclusions from that regarding the
25 level of returns, the level of required returns overall

1 for the electric utility industry.

2 Q I mean, do you know if this Commission has
3 typically relied on a single quarter's worth of data, or
4 have they looked at longer periods of time?

5 A My -- my recollection is the Commission has
6 looked at six and 12-month periods.

7 Q Okay. Commissioner Kenney asked you some
8 questions about the idea of having a proxy group composed
9 of non-utility companies. Do you remember that question?

10 A Yes, I do.

11 Q And I think that ties in with an issue that's
12 come up before, which is the idea that if you use utility
13 companies in the proxy group, you're -- you're sort of
14 engaged in a circular exercise. Do you -- do you know
15 what I'm talking about?

16 A I do.

17 Q And -- and could you address that? Is there a
18 problem with circularity when you use utility companies in
19 proxy groups?

20 A Well, it -- it is not an issue that concerns me
21 for this purpose, really, for a couple of reasons. One is
22 that, just as a factual matter as we've been noticing
23 today, the numbers have been drifting downward.

24 And if there were sort of a self-perpetuating
25 cycle, you would imagine that there would be no such drift

1 over time. But we have seen the numbers come down. And
2 as I've said, even based on my analyses, I've suggested
3 somewhat of a downward drift. And I think those two
4 things are consistent.

5 But when I look at the way Commissions typically
6 arrive at authorized returns, they are market based, use
7 the same methods that we use here. So Commissions will
8 look to the same types of models, the same types of data.

9 By necessity, you have to use proxy groups
10 because you cannot rely -- for the reasons we talked about
11 a minute ago, you can't rely on a single company. There
12 could be all sorts of the anomalies that would be in the
13 data that could significantly skew your result.

14 And you also have the issue of opportunity cost
15 and comparable risk, comparable return standards. So it's
16 important to use proxy groups in developing the cost of
17 equity. But the methodologies are market-based.

18 And I think the other important consideration is
19 that it is an observable data point that is of value to
20 the financial community. Investors notice it. It's the
21 reason that Regulatory Research Associates publish this
22 data.

23 So it's information that's noted, relied upon by
24 the financial community. But at their core, these
25 decisions really are market-based decisions.

1 Q If you look -- and I know you're saying
2 currently there's a -- there's a drift downward that's
3 being reflected. But if you look back in history, have
4 utility commissions increased and decreased authorized
5 returns on equity as market conditions change?

6 A They do.

7 Q And -- and so, for example, what were returns on
8 equities back in the late '70s and early '80s, if you
9 know?

10 A Well, certainly much higher during periods of
11 higher inflation. Higher long-term interest rates, for
12 example, they were higher then.

13 Q How about in the '90s, if you know?

14 A Same thing. The returns in the '90s were in the
15 mid 11, close to 12 percent range.

16 Q Okay. You -- you talked a little bit to some of
17 the Commissioners about the impact of having or not having
18 regulatory mechanisms in your rate, return on equity
19 analysis. And I think you said, you know, since maybe
20 there are fewer of them in Missouri, you took that into
21 consideration, but it wasn't -- you couldn't particularly
22 quantify it. Do you remember the -- that discussion?

23 A Yes, I do.

24 Q And I guess what I wanted to ask is about a
25 particular mechanism and whether you took it into account

1 when you estimated your return on equity. And that is
2 what Ameren Missouri's requesting in this case, which is
3 plant in service accounting. Is that taken into account
4 in your return on equity estimate or not?

5 A It is. And, again, going back to the notion
6 that estimating the cost of equity is a comparative
7 analysis, when you look at the type of mechanisms that are
8 in place, the ability for some companies to include
9 construction work in progress in rate base and earn a
10 current return on it or to use a forecasted -- fully or
11 partially forecast test year for the purpose of developing
12 the rate base, those are elements that serve the purpose
13 of trying to have companies address the dilutive effect of
14 making substantial capital investments between rate cases.

15 And so when you look to the fact that a lot of
16 these companies have that ability or have such mechanisms,
17 by comparison, in my view, the plant in service accounting
18 structure is not incrementally risk mitigating. It does
19 not bring the cost of equity down.

20 Q So how many basis points of adjustment should
21 the return on equity be adjusted downward if -- if Ameren
22 Missouri gets plant in service accounting?

23 A None. Again, because the other -- the proxy
24 companies have the ability in large measure to -- to have
25 those types of mechanisms available to them.

1 Q I think in response to one of the Commissioners'
2 questions, you were talking about using Value Line,
3 Zack's, First Call growth rates for your constant growth
4 analysis, and you -- and you mentioned using the mean or
5 the median. Do you recall that?

6 A Yes.

7 Q When would you use the mean, and when would you
8 use the median?

9 A Well, the -- the median, of course, is a number
10 that takes into account the effect of outlying
11 observations, numbers that are very high, very low
12 relative to the average.

13 And so to the extent that there's significant
14 outliers, you would use the median as opposed to the mean.

15 Q And if there are not significantly outliers?

16 A Typically, the mean.

17 Q Mr. Thompson asked you -- well, I'm not even
18 sure if it was Mr. Thompson addressed it in his opening
19 statement. Someone asked but, you know, at what points
20 rates become confiscatory. Do you recall those questions?

21 A I do.

22 Q And I guess my question to you is -- I know
23 you're not a lawyer, but do you think this Commission
24 should set Ameren's Missouri's return on equity at the
25 edge of legal confiscation?

1 A I think that would be -- I think a rate that's
2 so low to be considered, as you describe it, at the edge
3 of confiscation would be -- would put the company in a
4 difficult financial position.

5 Again, we have to remember that the return on
6 equity is important, not only for the purpose of providing
7 a compensatory return to shareholders, but also for the
8 purpose of maintaining the company's financial integrity
9 and, therefore, enabling its access to the capital
10 markets. So I think for those reasons we have to be very
11 careful along those lines.

12 MR. BYRNE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Hevert.

13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Mr. Hevert, you can step down
14 and get on your plane.

15 MR. HEVERT: Thank you so much.

16 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Thank you

17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. It's my
18 understanding, then, we're going to move on to
19 Ms. Ferguson on severance cost.

20 MR. THOMPSON: That's my understanding, Judge.

21 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Are we going to do openings on
22 that issue now or wait Tuesday to do that?

23 MR. LOWERY: I'm not going to do one because I'm
24 not prepared to do one.

25 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. That's fine by me. Go

1 ahead and bring Ms. Ferguson up, then. Good afternoon.

2 MS. FERGUSON: Good afternoon.

3 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Raise your right hand, and I'll
4 swear you in.

5 LISA FERGUSON,
6 being first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole
7 truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. THOMPSON:

10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. You may inquire.

11 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

12 Q (By Mr. Thompson) State your name, please.

13 A Lisa Ferguson.

14 Q And are you the same Lisa Ferguson that
15 contributed to the Staff revenue requirement cost of
16 service report and also prepared or caused to be prepared
17 surrebuttal testimony designated as Exhibit 232-HC?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Is that all your testimony, or did I miss a
20 piece?

21 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 232NP.

22 Q (By Mr. Thompson) 232NP?

23 A I'm sorry. I believe that's all.

24 Q Okay. Do you have any corrections to any of
25 that testimony?

1 A I do not.

2 Q And if I asked you those questions today, would
3 your answers be the same?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And is the information contained in those pieces
6 of testimony true and correct to the best of your
7 knowledge and belief?

8 A Yes.

9 MR. THOMPSON: At this time, your Honor, I will
10 offer Exhibits 232 and 233 and tender Ms. Ferguson for
11 cross-examination.

12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 232 and 233 have been offered.
13 Any objections to their receipt? Hearing none, they will
14 be received.

15 (Exhibits 232 and 233 were offered and received
16 into evidence.)

17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Cross-examination, we begin
18 with MIEC.

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. DOWNEY:

21 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Ferguson.

22 A Good afternoon.

23 Q I'm Ed Downey. I represent the MIEC. Since we
24 did not have opening statements, could you just briefly
25 tell us what the issue is that we're addressing this

1 **afternoon?**

2 A Sure. We're addressing VS11 severance costs.
3 These were severance costs that were incurred by the
4 company in the end of 2011. The severance costs -- the
5 Staff considers them to be non-recurring costs. And we
6 consider them non-recurring because we -- we can't tell or
7 predict them in the future. They're irregular costs that
8 don't happen on a regular basis.

9 That being said, there's usually two occurrences
10 where Staff would allow a non-recurring cost. And one of
11 those would be where there is an act of God and the
12 company can recover those costs through an AAO.

13 The other is -- is if a company incurs a large
14 amount of costs upfront in order to have future costs,
15 which is what's happening in this case.

16 If they -- what we usually do is we allow the
17 company to have a chance to recover those costs. If they
18 do not recover those costs, we give them an ability to
19 recover those costs as long as they have an added cost
20 recovery through amortization?

21 In this case, the company has recovered their
22 costs by the effective date of rates, and I believe
23 anything that we would consider giving them in future
24 rates would be considered double recovery.

25 **Q Okay. What is the amount of these voluntary**

1 **separation 2011 costs?**

2 A They're \$25.8 million.

3 Q **Okay. And have you calculated the resultant**
4 **cost savings through the operation of law date, which**
5 **would be January 2nd of 2013?**

6 A Yes, I have.

7 Q **And let me ask you a question. Is this a highly**
8 **confidential number?**

9 A I'm under the understanding that the total
10 amount is not, but the individual numbers might be; is
11 that correct?

12 MR. LOWERY: The total number is not.

13 Q **(By Mr. Downey) Okay. would you tell the**
14 **Commission what the cost savings were or what they're**
15 **expected to be by that date?**

16 A What I have calculated --

17 Q **Yes.**

18 A -- as cost savings? Yes. I have calculated
19 approximate cost savings of \$26 million.

20 Q **And is that a conservative number?**

21 A Yes, it is.

22 Q **Would you explain what you mean?**

23 A This number includes only the amount of payroll,
24 the payroll taxes, and the benefits that are comprised by
25 the employees that left. And I -- I originally had a -- a

1 more general calculation. I have since then refined my
2 calculation. And these salary savings are based off of
3 the actual dates that these employees left employment at
4 Ameren Missouri. That is the same for the benefits and
5 the payroll taxes. I have since in my refined calculation
6 added a calculation for the capitalized piece in addition
7 to the O&M piece.

8 **Q Did you consider any kind of incentive**
9 **compensation savings?**

10 A No, I did not. And that's -- that's usually a
11 very large number. I also did not consider any future
12 pension and OPEB savings. There's -- other things that we
13 could consider, such as future payroll increases. I
14 didn't include any of that, and any training cost, any
15 equipment cost, anything that would be in relation to
16 these employees leaving.

17 **Q Okay. To state the obvious, then, your**
18 **calculated cost savings exceeds the actual VS11 costs that**
19 **Ameren incurred; is that correct?**

20 A Yes, it does.

21 **Q Did you review MIEC witness Steve Carver's**
22 **testimony?**

23 A Yes, I did.

24 **Q And did he estimate a VS11 savings as well?**

25 A Yes, he did.

1 **Q Is his the same or different than yours?**

2 A His is slightly different than mine.

3 **Q Do you know why?**

4 A I believe it's because he didn't do -- he didn't
5 calculate the exact times that these employees left
6 Ameren. So I believe his salary is just slightly
7 different.

8 **Q Okay. Do you know if the company agrees that**
9 **the cost savings and the amount of the VS11 cost that**
10 **Ameren incurred are roughly equal?**

11 A I'm sorry. Can you say that again?

12 **Q Do you know if the company agrees that the cost**
13 **savings resulting from VS11 is roughly equal to the cost**
14 **of implementing VS11?**

15 A Roughly. Yes.

16 MR. DOWNEY: Okay. Thank you. Nothing further.

17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Public Counsel?

18 MR. MILLS: Those were most of my questions, but
19 I do have one more.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. MILLS:

22 **Q The savings that you and Mr. Downey talked**
23 **about, are those persistent savings that will last beyond**
24 **calendar year 2012?**

25 A In reference to anything --

1 Q The savings from the employees leaving that
2 you've calculated. You've calculated an annual amount
3 roughly for calendar year 2012, correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And will those savings persist beyond the
6 effective date of rates in this case?

7 A They will persist.

8 MR. MILLS: Okay. That's all I had. Thank you.

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. For Ameren?

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. LOWERY:

12 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Ferguson.

13 A Good afternoon.

14 Q Do you have a copy of your testimony, both the
15 part of the direct case, the direct report and your
16 surrebuttal? You have that with you; is that true?

17 A I do. Yes.

18 Q And do you have a copy of your deposition with
19 you?

20 A I do.

21 Q Mr. Downey took some of my questions away as
22 well, so I won't have nearly as many for you. I think in
23 response to Mr. Mills' question, you indicated -- well,
24 let me back up.

25 The -- the revised calculation that you talked

1 about with Mr. Downey, it's a calculation you actually --
2 I don't know whether you completed it, but you provided it
3 to the parties yesterday afternoon; isn't that right?

4 A Yes, I did.

5 Q And that revised calculation is not exactly an
6 annual number, right, because you have -- you took in
7 account payroll and benefit savings and associated taxes
8 for employees who left in the latter part of 2011 pursuant
9 to this program, correct?

10 A Yes. It's from when each employee left to the
11 effective date.

12 Q Right. And so -- since a relatively small
13 number of employees relative to the total left before
14 January 1, 2012, and also since you picked up two days in
15 2013, your number is not exactly an annual number, right?

16 A I guess you would not consider it an annual
17 number.

18 Q Well, here's what I'm trying to get at. Your
19 number is -- is payroll and benefit savings and associated
20 taxes covering a period of more than 12 months, right, for
21 some of these employees?

22 A Yes. But I don't understand how an annual
23 number -- I don't understand the importance of that.

24 Q That's not my question. My question is, is it
25 an annual number or not?

1 A No.

2 Q The annual number, though, the annual payroll
3 and benefits savings and associated taxes would be a
4 little bit less than that total; is that fair to say?

5 A Probably, yes.

6 Q But not significantly less; is that fair to say?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Okay. So the -- the O&M that will be reflected
9 in the revenue requirement used to set rates in this case,
10 and that would be through 7/31/12, right, through the
11 true-up period?

12 A Yes.

13 Q The O&M that's going to be reflected is going to
14 be lower by almost as much as the number that you came up
15 with. It's going to be lower by almost that much because
16 all of these roughly 340 employees left as a result of
17 this program, right?

18 A I believe the capital and O&M would both be
19 lower.

20 Q Okay. I'm just talking about O&M at this point,
21 just so we're clear.

22 A Okay.

23 Q I think your calculation is that -- we'll just
24 look at the O&M piece. I think your calculation is that
25 the total savings, capital and O&M, again, this -- this

1 number that isn't exactly an annual number was around \$26
2 million, right?

3 A Yes.

4 Q The O&M piece of that is roughly \$25 million,
5 correct?

6 A Yes. Uh-huh.

7 Q So the operations and maintenance expenses
8 reflected in the revenue requirement upon which rates will
9 be based in this case are going to be lower by probably
10 not 25 million, but something close to 25 million as a
11 result of these roughly 340 employees leaving pursuant to
12 this program, right?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay. And -- and that's why, you know, a
15 program like this, and this program in particular, can
16 provide substantial benefits to ratepayers because we end
17 up with that reduced test year or trued up test year level
18 of cost; isn't that right?

19 A That's true. But there's also benefits to the
20 company.

21 Q But there are -- that 24 plus million dollars
22 benefit is going to be baked into rates, right?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And -- and that -- that benefit -- putting aside
25 whatever benefit you say the company may get, that

1 benefit, customers are going to get it next year, and if
2 there's not another rate case the next year unless these
3 employees were hired back; isn't that true?

4 A These cost savings, you will have recovered your
5 cost by cost savings. On a going forward basis, we will
6 have annualized your payroll levels to met what is needed.

7 Q But you didn't answer my question, Ms.
8 Ferguson. The rates set in this case are using a revenue
9 requirement that is, can we agree, approximately 24
10 million plus lower on the O&M side than it otherwise would
11 have been if these roughly 340 people had not left as a
12 result of the program? True or false?

13 A True.

14 Q And so -- and then we'll calculate rates based
15 on a revenue requirement that's 24 million lower, right?

16 A True.

17 Q And if there are no new rates before 12/31/13,
18 then customers will pay rates reflected that lower revenue
19 requirement through all of '13, correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And if there are no new rates before 12/31/14,
22 customers will pay rates that are also based on that lower
23 revenue requirement throughout all of '14, correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q So for those two years, customer rates in total,

1 if you assume normalized sales and the sales don't vary,
2 will have in total then \$48 million lower roughly than
3 they would have been had these 340 employees not left as a
4 result of this program. Isn't that true?

5 A Yes.

6 Q It's not Staff's position that the VS11 program
7 is imprudent, is it?

8 A No, it's not.

9 Q And as we just discussed, it's obviously not the
10 Staff's position that the program won't benefit
11 ratepayers; isn't that true?

12 A That is true.

13 Q It's also true that the company did not have to
14 offer this program at all; isn't that right?

15 A That is true.

16 Q In other words, the company could have chosen to
17 continue to employ these 340 people or roughly 340 people
18 and continue to pay them, right?

19 A That's true.

20 Q And had the company done that, then the trued up
21 test year O&M used to set rates in this case would have
22 been approximately 24 plus million higher than it's going
23 to be; isn't that right?

24 A That's true.

25 Q So in '13 and '14 in my hypothetical when

1 there's no new rates, customers would have paid about 48
2 million plus more in rates than they're going to pay;
3 isn't that right?

4 A That's true.

5 Q Because of the company's decision to engage in
6 this program; isn't that right?

7 A That's true.

8 Q All else being equal, if the company cannot
9 obtain a financial benefit as a result of a severance
10 program, then even you would agree that perhaps that would
11 provide a disincentive for the company to offer such a
12 program in the future, right?

13 A I don't believe it does provide a disincentive.

14 Q Well, you said at your deposition -- would you
15 turn to page 73, please?

16 A 73.

17 Q Line No. 16 and confirm that I'm reading the
18 question and answer correctly. Question -- and this
19 wasn't my question, but I'm going to read it anyway.

20 Question: I don't want to beat this to death
21 either, but if the company can't, for whatever reason,
22 obtain a financial benefit as a result of a severance
23 program, do you think that provides a disincentive for
24 that company to offer that or a similar severance program
25 in the future?

1 Answer: I don't know. There could be benefits
2 other than financial.

3 Question: Managerial efficiencies, things of
4 that nature?

5 Answer: Right. There could be other
6 possibilities.

7 Question: What if I am talking just purely
8 about financial benefits?

9 Answer: All else being equal, perhaps yes.
10 Did I read that accurately?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Now, I want to talk about your revised
13 calculation is a little bit that you sent us yesterday.
14 And I think your point is that in addition to O&M savings
15 in the form of lower payroll benefits and the taxes
16 associated with that -- and I'm putting aside your
17 theories or your contention or your belief about pension
18 and OPEB. I'm putting that aside. Do you follow me?

19 A Okay.

20 Q But in addition to O&M savings, you claim that
21 there's about an additional million dollars of savings for
22 the company associated with the portion of these 340
23 employees' salaries that historically had been allocated
24 to capital, right?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And when I say allocated to capital, what that
2 means is you have employees paid \$60,000 a year. Perhaps
3 25 percent of that employee's salary gets capitalized on
4 the company's books because it's deemed under the
5 accounting rules that they're working on a capital project
6 or something of that nature, right?

7 A Yes.

8 Q That's the capital portion we're talking about
9 here, right?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Okay. Now, let me -- let me ask you this. It's
12 my understanding that the company and the Staff have
13 agreed or they very nearly agree on both plant in service
14 and the depreciation reserve balances that will be used to
15 set rates in this case as of 7/31/12?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay. Now, when the company allocates some part
18 of an employee's salary, benefits and taxes, the
19 associated taxes to capital as opposed to O&M, that part
20 would be booked in construction work in progress while the
21 capital project is being built and before it goes into
22 service; is that true?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And then after the plant goes into service,
25 effectively, that amount of money shifts to plant in

1 service, right? Shift is my word.

2 A Correct.

3 Q When the roughly 340 employees that took the
4 severance left, did the company's CWIP balance go down by
5 an amount equal to the cumulative salary, benefits and
6 taxes for those employees that had previously been booked
7 for CWIP but not been moved to plant in service?

8 A That, I don't know.

9 Q You don't know?

10 A No.

11 Q Well, let's -- let's explore that for a minute.
12 If I had an employee who will be working and, let's say,
13 from the beginning of their employment until now there had
14 been X percent of their salary and benefits allocated to
15 capital, and let's say that that was \$50,000. And that --
16 it just so happens that that \$50,000 was all on projects
17 that were still in CWIP. Are you with me so far?

18 A Okay.

19 Q Let's say they got fired on that day. All
20 right? Or they left. It doesn't really matter. They
21 left. So they left. They went somewhere else. Did
22 \$50,000 come out of CWIP on that day?

23 A I would assume if they're not working anymore on
24 the capital project it would not be included in CWIP any
25 longer.

1 Q No. I think you're changing my hypothetical.
2 \$50,000 of their salary and benefits has already been
3 booked for CWIP. It was booked to CWIP already before
4 they left. Okay?

5 A Okay.

6 Q So it's sitting in CWIP. They're working on a
7 -- they're working on an electrostatic precipitator at the
8 Labadie plant, and \$50,000 of their work has been booked
9 to that project and that precipitator is not yet in
10 service so it's still sitting in CWIP, right?

11 A Okay.

12 Q And they left, right?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Was the \$50,000 of work, was it already done or
15 not?

16 A I would assume not.

17 Q Their \$50,000 of work? When they left, did the
18 \$50,000 worth of the contribution to the project suddenly
19 -- if they installed four valves and a pump, did the pump
20 and the four valves get removed from the electrostatic
21 precipitator the day they left?

22 A I would assume not.

23 Q Okay. I'm sorry. I must have misunderstood
24 you. The \$50,000 of their salary that had already been
25 booked to CWIP, it stayed in CWIP when they left, didn't

1 it?

2 A Okay.

3 Q I need you to answer yes or no.

4 A Yes.

5 Q So when they left, the CWIP balance didn't go
6 down by that \$50,000, did it?

7 A From the scenario we're talking about, I would
8 agree.

9 Q And that's true of the other -- all the other
10 cumulative amount of payroll, benefits and taxes booked to
11 CWIP associated with the work of these roughly 340
12 employees, that -- that cumulative number, whether it's
13 half a million dollars, ten million dollars, I have no
14 idea what it is, that number also didn't get removed from
15 CWIP when those people separated from the company, right?

16 A That may be true. But regardless to that, there
17 are other savings outside of the capital piece. So if you
18 would like to remove the capital piece, there are other
19 savings that we could consider.

20 Q You said that may be true. Is it true or not?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Okay. Now, when those -- now let's take another
23 scenario. Let's say that we had these 340 employees or
24 so, and, cumulatively, they had -- had \$5 million of their
25 time and benefits and taxes allocated to projects that had

1 already gone into service at the -- at the time they left.

2 Are you with me?

3 A Okay.

4 Q In that case, plant in service didn't go down by
5 that \$5 million when they left either, did it?

6 A No.

7 Q Okay. Now, your theory is that because these
8 roughly 340 employees left that there would be less plant
9 to put into service than if they had still been there;
10 isn't that right?

11 A Salaries as a part of plant? Is that what
12 you're --

13 Q Your theory is that because they left that
14 there's going to be less plant put into service
15 prospectively than had they stayed around, right?

16 A The capitalized piece of salary. Not just in
17 plant.

18 Q Plant in service can be expressed in dollars,
19 right?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. So your theory is that the dollars that
22 will be capitalized into plant and service is going to be
23 less because these -- prospectively because these 340 --
24 roughly 340 people left because your theory is that the
25 other resources of the company, other employees are not

1 going to fully take up the slack, and the company's not
2 going to be putting as much plant in service as if these
3 employees had stayed around; isn't that true?

4 A I didn't say that.

5 Q Well, then what's the basis for your calculation
6 that you sent us yesterday? You've done a calculation
7 that took the amount of the capitalized portion of these
8 340 employees salary, right?

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q That's what you did. And then you applied
11 composite depreciation rate to it, right?

12 A Uh-huh.

13 Q And you said the company's going to save roughly
14 \$125,000 annually in depreciation expense on the theory
15 that the plant in service balance is going to be less by
16 that seven million dollars, right?

17 A By the salaries that are being capitalized.
18 These salaries wouldn't be there any longer if these
19 employees are gone.

20 Q That's right. That's right. So you're
21 assuming --

22 A That doesn't mean a piece of plant, and that
23 doesn't mean --

24 Q So you're assuming -- so you're assuming that
25 the capitalized portion of these folks' salaries and --

1 well, let's look at the number.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Ms. Ferguson, while there's a
3 break, you need to get closer to the microphone. Thank
4 you.

5 Q (By Mr. Lowery) Do you have your work paper with
6 you?

7 A Not the full work paper, no.

8 Q Does -- for 2012, does about 7.4 million,
9 7.5 million, does that sound about like the number we're
10 talking about?

11 A For the capital piece, yes.

12 Q For 2011, it was about 300,000. Does that sound
13 about right?

14 A I believe so.

15 Q What you did was you made an assumption that
16 plant in service in 2012, when we get to the end of the
17 2012 that the dollars in plant and service were going to
18 be less by about seven and a half million dollars because
19 these employees are gone, right?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And what that has to mean is you're assuming
22 that the other employees of the company aren't going to do
23 that seven million dollars of work -- or aren't going to
24 do work that -- that ends up being allocated -- seven and
25 a half million dollars is being allocated to plant in

1 **service, right?**

2 A Yes.

3 Q So if -- if other employees take up the slack,
4 **then your number would be too high, wouldn't it?**

5 A I don't think so.

6 Q Well --

7 A Because those salaries would already be included
8 in capital.

9 Q The employees that left at the end of 2012 --

10 A No. Employees that are picking up the slack are
11 already in the capital piece.

12 Q That's true. That's absolutely true.

13 A So on a forward -- on a forward going basis,
14 that would be less for those who left.

15 Q But you're assuming, are you not, that the plant
16 in service balance at the end of 2012 is going to be seven
17 and a half million dollars less because you're assuming
18 that the employees who left, had they been there, they
19 would have had seven and a half million dollars of their
20 salaries and benefits put into plant in service during
21 2012, right?

22 A Yes.

23 Q But because they're gone, that won't happen,
24 right?

25 A Yes.

1 Q But if other employees -- if other employees did
2 all of the work that they would have done had they been
3 there, then that seven and a half million dollar figure
4 would go away, right?

5 A Perhaps. But the effect is not seven million
6 dollars.

7 Q Okay.

8 A And irregardless as to if you remove the capital
9 piece, there is still sufficient savings.

10 Q So your -- but the bottom line is even with your
11 calculation, you're attributing an additional \$130,000 or
12 so of ongoing depreciation expense savings?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Now, the rest of your roughly million dollars of
15 capital-related savings that you came up with relates to
16 return, right?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Okay. I'd like for you to explain to me and to
19 the Commission how the reduction in a company's return
20 constitutes a savings to the company from a severance
21 program.

22 A The capitalized piece of the salaries has, as
23 Mr. Lowery said, a depreciation piece and also a return
24 that's earned on it because it's -- as a part of rate
25 base.

1 If the amount of capital is removed for rate
2 base, then they would not earn a return on that piece. So
3 the savings of these salaries that -- that affect rate
4 base would not earn that return.

5 **Q Ms. Ferguson, is the return that a company**
6 **receives on its rate base a cost of the company or a**
7 **benefit to the company?**

8 A I don't know as it could be a cost, but -- but
9 you would not have received it without this piece.

10 **Q If the company doesn't receive a return, is that**
11 **a savings that the company gets to -- gets the benefit of?**

12 A No. If you want to look at it like that, no.

13 **Q Isn't that the only way you can look at it?**

14 A I suppose. But --

15 **Q Well --**

16 A -- yet again, irregardless, with this
17 approximate 900,000 and 130,000, the company will have
18 received cost savings.

19 **Q Let's start over. I will give you,**
20 **theoretically, that if the company's plant in service**
21 **balance is \$7.5 million lower at the end of the 2012**
22 **because these employees are no longer around and the**
23 **company doesn't put as much plant in service, I will give**
24 **you, theoretically, that the company's depreciation**
25 **expense will go down, assuming your composite depreciation**

1 expense is right by \$130,000 a year. I'll concede that
2 point to you. But it makes no sense to me that you could
3 claim that the company is getting a benefit of \$900,000 a
4 year because it is going to earn on a smaller rate base
5 because it has a lower plant in service balance.

6 Now, is it still your contention that that
7 \$900,000 is a benefit, it is a savings generated by the
8 VS11?

9 A I believe so.

10 MR. LOWERY: Well, I guess we'll leave it at
11 that.

12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Anything else?

13 MR. LOWERY: No.

14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. We'll come up for
15 questions from the Bench then. Chairman Gunn?

16 CHAIRMAN GUNN: I don't have any questions.

17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Jarrett?

18 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: I have no questions.

19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Kenney?

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions. Thank you.

21 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commissioner Stoll?

22 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I have no questions. Thank
23 you.

24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: No questions from the Bench, so
25 no recross. Any redirect?

1 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Ms. Ferguson, you
3 can step down. All right. And then we'll go back to the
4 ROE issues. We'll take a break before we do that. And
5 we'll come back at 2:45.

6 (Break in proceedings.)

7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Let's come back to
8 order. We're back on the record.

9 MR. LOWERY: Your Honor, I have a -- I guess a
10 process comment or question, and then -- and then I don't
11 know if it's a request or a proposal.

12 But on the process comment, Mr. Gorman had
13 policy testimony and was actually scheduled as a policy
14 witness and wasn't able to be here, and we agreed to take
15 that up today.

16 I'm actually going to do the cross-examination
17 on the policy issue, and I was wondering if it might make
18 sense to do that as a sort of a separate mini issue. But,
19 you know, you could do that in an ROE cross by Mr. Byrne
20 and go through the whole thing. It's completely up to
21 you. Mr. Byrne is handling the ROE portion, and I'm just
22 questioning on another narrow issue.

23 JUDGE WOODRUFF: How do the parties feel about
24 that?

25 MS. ILES: We have the same issue.

1 MR. DOWNEY: Judge, we have the same issue. I'm
2 here for the -- for the earnings attrition part, and
3 Carole is handling ROE.

4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Well, let's -- let's go ahead
5 and do the policy portion first, and -- and then we'll do
6 it all over again for the ROE.

7 MR. LOWERY: And then I guess I would throw this
8 out and would certainly understand if this doesn't work,
9 but we are -- we have an open day -- or almost a nearly
10 open day on Tuesday that we didn't have before.

11 I think it's going to be a real challenge to
12 probably even get completely done with this issue today.
13 I would suggest we might consider if the Commissioners are
14 Cardinal baseball fans that we adjourn early enough that
15 we might be able to see that game today and we just start
16 first thing Tuesday morning and finish this issue up.

17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I think that would be
18 acceptable. We want -- maybe just to do the first, the
19 policy issue today and then worry about ROE on Tuesday?

20 MR. LOWERY: That would be acceptable to the
21 company.

22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Is that acceptable to the other
23 parties?

24 MS. VUYLSTEKE: Your Honor, I think that it
25 would be possible to have Mr. Gorman available to come in

1 on Tuesday. If that's the Commission's preference, we're
2 certainly happy to do that. If it's possible to finish
3 Mr. Gorman on ROE and then take the other witnesses on ROE
4 on Tuesday.

5 We know all Commissioners are able to be here
6 today, and so we certainly would like to present
7 Mr. Gorman this afternoon if -- if the Commission doesn't
8 mind and then maybe move on to the rest of ROE on Tuesday.

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: That would be -- Mr. Murray is
10 the only other ROE witness. But I think that's likely --

11 MR. THOMPSON: I'm advised that Mr. Murray is
12 not available on Tuesday.

13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: He's not available on Tuesday.

14 MR. LOWERY: Oh.

15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. I guess that means --

16 MR. LOWERY: There went that idea.

17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We'll be slogging
18 on, and I guess we can watch the Cardinals game on tape.
19 Okay. At this point, then, we're going to be doing --
20 well, I need to swear him in first.

21 MICHAEL GORMAN,
22 being first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole
23 truth, and nothing but the truth, testified as follows:

24 DIRECT EXAMINATION

25 BY MS. ILES:

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. We're going to do
2 the policy issue separately first. And so direct.

3 MS. ILES: Well, it's all -- he only has one set
4 of testimony.

5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You can go ahead and offer it
6 all at this time then.

7 MS. ILES: That's all I'm going to do.

8 **Q (By Ms. Iles) Would you state your name and**
9 **address for the record, please?**

10 A My names is Michael Gorman. My address is 16690
11 Swingley Rich Road, Chesterfield, Missouri.

12 **Q Ad are you the same Michael Gorman who caused to**
13 **be prepared and filed in this case direct and surrebuttal**
14 **testimony on behalf of MIEC, which is marked as Exhibits**
15 **507, 508 and 509, and that's Direct Highly Confidential**
16 **Direct NP and the surrebuttal testimony?**

17 A Yes.

18 **Q Do you have any corrections to your testimony?**

19 A I do. In my direct testimony, my Schedule
20 MPG-21, the rate of returns were -- are incorrect on that
21 schedule. The common equity balance was -- the incorrect
22 total common equity balance of the utility was used in
23 developing those returns on equity. So I've corrected
24 that schedule using the total reported common equity
25 balance for Ameren Missouri.

1 **Q And did you prepare a substitute schedule?**

2 A I did. A revised Schedule MPG-21.

3 MS. ILES: Your Honor, should we have this
4 marked as an exhibit, or how do we do that?

5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yeah. Let's mark it as a
6 separate exhibit. It will be 532.

7 MS. ILES: Thank you.

8 MR. DOWNEY: Judge, what was the number?

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 532.

10 MR. DOWNEY: Thank you.

11 **Q (By Ms. Iles) The exhibit has been marked as**
12 **532. Is that your substitute schedule?**

13 A Yes.

14 **Q Is there anything else you wanted to tell the**
15 **Commission about that?**

16 A The -- the error in the original schedule is I
17 did not include a component of common equity capital, the
18 line item referred to as Paid In Capital. And that had
19 the effect of understating total common equity from the
20 balance sheet and overstating a return on equity. So the
21 revised schedule includes that correction.

22 MS. ILES: I guess I need to move for the --

23 **Q (By Ms. Iles) Or do you have any other**
24 **corrections to your testimony?**

25 A I do not.

1 MS. ILES: I'd like to move for the admission of
2 Exhibits 507, 508, 509 and 532 and tender the witness for
3 cross.

4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. 507, 508, 509 and
5 532 have been offered. Any objections to their receipt?
6 Hearing none, they will be received.

7 (Exhibit Nos. 507, 508, 509 and 532 were offered
8 and received into evidence.)

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: For cross-examination, we'll
10 begin with Public Counsel.

11 MS. BAKER: No questions on this issue. Thank
12 you.

13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Staff?

14 CROSS-EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. THOMPSON:

16 Q I only have one policy question for you. During
17 the policy portion of this hearing last week, there was
18 talk about whether or not it would be appropriate to make
19 an ROE adjustment if the Commission granted plant in
20 service accounting to the company as a device to
21 ameliorate earnings attrition. Do you have an opinion as
22 to whether or not such an adjustment would be appropriate?

23 A I do. The -- my recommended return on equity is
24 based on the company's current investment risk. If
25 regulatory mechanisms are implemented which reduce that

1 risk, then it would be appropriate to consider a reduction
2 to the authorized return on equity to reflect a risk that
3 is lower than the risk of the company that currently
4 stands without those enhanced regulatory mechanisms.

5 I do recommend, however, staying within my
6 recommended return on equity range. The ability to
7 accurately estimate the -- the increments for -- for
8 implementing mechanisms that reduces the existing
9 operating risk of the company would be difficult to gauge.
10 But staying within my recommended range, I think, would be
11 appropriate.

12 Q So when you say staying within your recommended
13 range, would you mean a reduction from 9.3 to 9.2?

14 A In this case, yes.

15 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. No further questions.

16 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. For Ameren?

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. LOWERY:

19 MR. LOWERY: You took away 95 percent of my
20 cross-examination, which everybody's probably going to be
21 happy about. I do have an exhibit I'd like to get marked,
22 your Honor

23 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right.

24 MR. LOWERY: -- to speed things up.

25 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You're up to No. 70.

1 Q (By Mr. Lowery) Mr. Gorman, I've handed you
2 what's been marked for identification as Exhibit No. 70.
3 Would you agree that the graph on the first page of
4 Exhibit 70 is either remarkably similar to or identical to
5 the revised Schedule MPG-1 that was just put into the
6 record?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And the only reason I'm going through this is
9 I'd like to ask you to verify, if you would, whether or
10 not the calculations shown on all of the other pages of
11 Exhibit 70 -- which you recognize to be your work paper as
12 revised, do you not?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Would you verify that the calculations of the
15 ROE to comment on those pages of Exhibit No. 70 are
16 accurate and -- and I guess I'll ask you a compound
17 question to speed this up, and that the additional equity
18 that has been added to your original work paper is also
19 accurate?

20 A I believe it to be accurate. Yes.

21 MR. LOWERY: With that, your Honor, I move for
22 the admission of Exhibit 70.

23 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Exhibit 70 has been offered.
24 Any objections to its receipt? Hearing none, it will be
25 received.

1 (Exhibit 70 was offered and received into
2 evidence.)

3 MR. LOWERY: And if you'll bear with me just a
4 second, your Honor, I might not have any more questions.

5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay.

6 MR. LOWERY: Those are all my questions, your
7 Honor.

8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: We'll come up for questions
9 from the Bench on policy questions. Chairman Gunn?

10 CHAIRMAN GUNN: No questions.

11 COMMISSIONER JARRETT: No questions on policy.

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No, thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions, your Honor.

14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. No need for
15 recross. Any redirect?

16 MR. DOWNEY: I think just one question.

17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay.

18 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. DOWNEY:

20 Q Okay. Mr. Gorman, the calculations shown on the
21 spreadsheet that is a part of Exhibit 70, are those the
22 same calculations that you used to create MIEC Exhibit
23 532?

24 A They are effectively the same calculations. I
25 revised the way I developed the total common equity

1 capital in my revised schedule. But the effective -- the
2 effect of including the premium on capital stock as shown
3 on Schedule 70 is the same correction that I included in
4 my revised Schedule 21.

5 **Q All right. And does -- does this revised**
6 **schedule in any way change any of the opinions you gave in**
7 **your testimony?**

8 A No.

9 MR. DOWNEY: Thank you. Nothing further. I
10 guess those were two questions.

11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. We'll let you slide this
12 time. All right. Then we'll start the process over again
13 on the ROE issue. We can begin with Public Counsel.

14 MS. BAKER: Thank you.

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION

16 BY MS. BAKER:

17 **Q Good afternoon, Mr. Gorman.**

18 A Good afternoon.

19 **Q You were here whenever questions were asked of**
20 **Mr. -- Mr. Hevert. In your -- in your experience, has the**
21 **cost of capital gone down in the past few years?**

22 A It -- it has been on a declining trend over the
23 last few years. I think more recently in the last six
24 months or so, it has -- has had a very noticeable drop and
25 declined quite a bit throughout 2012.

1 **Q** All right. And in your experience, has the
2 **overall yield also gone down?**

3 **A** The bond yields have also decreased in a very
4 **significant way, yes.**

5 **Q** And do you know among the economic community, is
6 **there an expectation that the economy will rebound**
7 **substantially within the next couple of years?**

8 **A** Well, I think there's a great debate on how long
9 it will take the economy to recover from this recession.
10 But I do think there is an optimism that the -- the
11 economy has made a turn in the road. And it does appear
12 as though it will start strengthening throughout 2013 and
13 forward.

14 **Q** All right. And fluctuations in the economy are
15 **a normal part of business, aren't they?**

16 **A** Yes.

17 **Q** Okay. Let's see. There were questions that
18 **were asked earlier about a DCF analysis using a**
19 **non-electric company proxy group. Do you remember that**
20 **questioning?**

21 **A** I do. Yes.

22 **Q** Okay. Have you ever performed a DCF analysis
23 **using a non-electric company proxy group?**

24 **A** You know, I -- specifically, I think the
25 question was a non-regulated proxy group.

1 **Q A non-regulated proxy group. Right.**

2 A And I have not. And I have argued against the
3 use of a non-regulated proxy group for reliably estimating
4 a utility market return. So I -- I would continue to do
5 that here.

6 **Q All right. Whenever you are looking at**
7 **non-regulated business entities such as Fortune 500**
8 **companies and the like, do you see that their returns have**
9 **lowered significantly in the economy lately?**

10 A Well, I have a schedule on my testimony that
11 that shows both corporate and utility bonds as well as
12 Treasury bonds. And it shows that -- that investment
13 grade utilities -- or securities cost have decreased
14 recently.

15 That is shown on my Schedule 13. Under Column 6
16 and 7, I show AAA and BAA corporate bond yields that are
17 -- Columns 2 and 3, I show the single A and BAA utility
18 bond yields. And as you can see, the corporate and
19 utilities as well as the Treasury bond yields which are
20 shown under Column 1 have all decreased over the last few
21 years.

22 **Q And for a non-regulated business entity, they**
23 **have more risk than a regulated monopoly such as Ameren.**
24 **Would you agree with that statement?**

25 A Generally speaking, yes.

1 Q Okay. So it would be logical to expect that in
2 the economy today, given a regulated monopoly with much
3 lower risk that it would have returns that are somewhat
4 lower than a Fortune 500 company would have?

5 A I would agree with that. And the difficulty,
6 again, if you would look at my Schedule MPG-13 is that a
7 non-regulated company or a regulated company, even if they
8 had the same risk characteristics such as a BAA bond
9 rating as an example, the market price is a non-regulated
10 security differently than the price of a regulated
11 security.

12 And that's evidenced by simply tracking
13 difference in bond yields. For a utility bond yield with
14 a BAA rating versus a non-regulated corporate bond with a
15 BAA rating, the BAA rating indicate they're comparable in
16 risk, but the market simply values them differently, and
17 the cost of capital for a non-regulated company is
18 distinct and separate from the cost of capital of a
19 utility company.

20 You make the same analogy with a AAA rated bond
21 rating of a corporate relative to the U.S. Treasury
22 securities whereas a piece -- it says they're rated AAA,
23 where Moody's and Fitch does.

24 While the AAA rating would indicate a Treasury
25 security has the same investment risk as a AAA

1 corporation, you look at the yield difference between a
2 Treasury and a AAA corporate, and they're just not the
3 same. So the risk measures would indicate comparable
4 risk, but the market valuation and pricing security is
5 just very different.

6 So I question whether or not you can reliably
7 estimate utility's cost of capital for a regulated company
8 using non-regulated securities.

9 **Q Okay. You also heard testimony about the art in**
10 **choosing the inputs to -- to basically reflect what one is**
11 **seeking from the model results to be. Did you hear**
12 **testimony like that this morning?**

13 A I don't remember specifically the -- the use of
14 the word art. But I do recall Mr. Hevert describing the
15 -- the -- the type of data used in these bonds.

16 **Q Okay. Does it surprise you that given the**
17 **inputs that Ameren chose for its study that their results**
18 **show the highest ROE reasonable range?**

19 A It -- I -- it does not surprise me. And I did
20 respond to Mr. Hevert's ROE studies, and I believe that he
21 has overstated fair return on equity for Ameren Missouri
22 in this case.

23 And I outlined those criticisms and offered some
24 modifications to the studies to produce what I believe to
25 be a more reasonable or more accurate estimate of what

1 Ameren Missouri's cost of equity is in this case.

2 Q And one of the other things that -- that was
3 discussed was the -- the credit -- or the environment of
4 the regulatory system in Missouri and the fact that
5 Mr. Hevert gave a little bit of a bump to his ROE because
6 of the regulatory climate in Missouri; is that correct?

7 A That's my understanding, yes.

8 Q Okay. But states do go about their regulatory
9 rate setting a little bit differently, such as don't
10 states like Illinois, for example, use an average year
11 rate -- rate base?

12 A Well, for a future test year, they do.
13 Historical test year, often, they will use end of year.

14 Q And does --

15 A And, you know, more recently, Illinois has
16 adopted a formula rate methodology for electric utilities.
17 So the -- within that formula rate process, it was a very
18 -- very disputed issue. But I believe the Commission
19 ultimately adopted the recommendation for use of an
20 average rate base in that formulary process.

21 Q Are there other states that -- that also use
22 this average rate base mechanism?

23 A I think it's -- it's fairly common for use of
24 future test years. So I --

25 Q Okay. And in Missouri, generally, aren't we in

1 **this case specifically using the actual rate base as the**
2 **true-up cutoff date?**

3 A Yes. Well, the true-up date rate base.

4 Q Right.

5 A Which would be at the end of the true-up period
6 rate base.

7 Q Yes. So isn't that a part of the process in
8 Missouri that's favorable to utilities? They get their
9 rate base actually stated as of the true-up date rather
10 than averaged or forecast?

11 A Generally speaking, the rate base at the very
12 end of the true-up period would be higher than the average
13 rate base over the entire 12-month period leading up into
14 the true-up period.

15 So it is more favorable to the utility to use a
16 higher rate base because it produces a higher revenue
17 requirement. So I would agree with that.

18 Q So you would agree that that is at least one
19 example of -- I'm sure there are several -- where Missouri
20 has a better or a more favorable environment for the
21 utility in its rate-making?

22 A I'd say that's one element of the rate making
23 calculus that is favorable for the utility. Yes.

24 Q All right. In your testimony, you calculate
25 that a reasonable range for ROE is between two -- 9.2 and

1 9.4. And your recommended ROE is 9.3; is that correct?

2 A Correct.

3 Q And I assume that you agree with the statements
4 earlier that a reasonable ROE for Ameren is one that is,
5 one, adequate to attract capital at reasonable terms
6 thereby enabling Ameren Missouri to provide safe and
7 reliable electric service that is sufficient to ensure
8 Ameren Missouri's financial integrity and is commensurate
9 with returns on investments in enterprises having
10 corresponding risks?

11 A Yes.

12 Q So, therefore, in your opinion, at a return on
13 equity range of anywhere between 9.2 and 9.4, Ameren is
14 adequately able to attract capital at reasonable terms
15 enabling it to provide safe and reliable electric service?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And anywhere within that range, Ameren's
18 financial integrity is ensured?

19 A I believe so. Yes.

20 Q And last, and given your research, a return on
21 equity anywhere between 9.2 and 9.4 is commensurate with
22 the returns of other similar enterprise like Ameren who
23 have similar risks?

24 A Well, it's similar measure of what the cost of
25 capital is for those companies based on today's

1 marketplace.

2 Q Okay. So you -- you do believe that your --
3 that your recommendation meets that -- meets that
4 requirement?

5 A Yeah. My -- my studies are specifically
6 designed to accomplish measuring a return on equity that
7 meets that standard.

8 Q All right. And so Ameren would receive a
9 reasonable return on equity anywhere between 9.2 and 9.4.
10 That's your recommendation? Or that is your -- your
11 opinion?

12 A Correct.

13 MS. BAKER: Okay. No further questions.

14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. For Staff?

15 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. THOMPSON:

18 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Gorman.

19 A Good afternoon.

20 Q Are you familiar with the zone of reasonableness
21 analytical method that has been used by this Commission in
22 the past?

23 A Generally, yes.

24 Q And do you understand that to essentially
25 encompass a range of 100 basis points above and 100 basis

1 points below the average of awarded ROEs as reported by
2 Regulatory Research Associates?

3 A That's my understanding.

4 Q Do you believe that that method is flawed by a
5 circularity of reasoning?

6 A I believe if you use it by itself, it would
7 certainly be flawed. I believe considering what other
8 Commissions are awarding is -- is appropriate information
9 to consider in estimating what a fair return on equity is.

10 But the trend in those authorized returns, I
11 think, are important, particularly when they are
12 considered along with reasonable estimates of what the
13 current market cost of equity is.

14 Q And I know you're not an attorney, right?

15 A Correct.

16 Q But you are familiar with the parameters that
17 are set by the Hope and the Bluefield decisions insofar as
18 you have to work with them in creating your testimony?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Do you have an opinion as to what the points of
21 confiscation would be with respect to awarding an ROE to
22 Ameren Missouri?

23 A Well, I -- based on my studies, I think a fair
24 estimate of the current market return on equity is within
25 my range of 9.2 to 9.4. So I wouldn't be comfortable in

1 this market recommending return on equity lower than 9.2.

2 Q Okay. And you were here, were you not, for the
3 testimony by Mr. Hevert?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And did you understand him to testify that he
6 used growth rates based on earnings per share projections
7 drawn from Zack's, First Call and --

8 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Value Line.

9 Q (By Mr. Thompson) -- Value Line?

10 A Yes. For his constant growth DCF model. That's
11 correct.

12 Q And, also, I believe, for the initial stage of
13 his two multi-stage DCF models?

14 A Correct.

15 Q And the number that he used was 5.07.

16 A For the group average growth rate, I believe --
17 yeah. I have to check the number, but that sounds
18 correct.

19 Q Okay. If I told you that's what his testimony
20 was, would you have any reason to disagree?

21 A I would not.

22 Q Okay. And do you consider that an appropriate
23 growth rate figure to use?

24 A I think over the next three to five years, I
25 think it's probably a pretty reasonable estimate to expect

1 the growth rate through those companies.

2 Whether or not it can be sustained indefinitely,
3 I think is a separate issue, and it's an important issue
4 of the constant growth DCF model. 5.07 is not
5 significantly higher than the consensus analysts
6 projection of future GEP growth which is 4.9 percent. So
7 I think it's higher than what I would be comfortable
8 concluding is a reasonable estimate of long-term
9 sustainable growth. But I think it's close.

10 **Q What is the figure that you would be comfortable**
11 **with?**

12 A That would not be reasonable or that --

13 **Q I think you said that 5.07 is higher than what**
14 **you would be comfortable with for long-term sustainable**
15 **growth. So my follow-up question is, well, what -- what**
16 **is the figure you would be comfortable for long-term**
17 **sustainable growth?**

18 A In my testimony, I used a growth rate of 4.9
19 percent.

20 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. That's all I have. Thank
21 you.

22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: For Ameren?

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION

24 BY MR. BYRNE:

25 **Q Good afternoon, Mr. Gorman.**

1 A Good afternoon.

2 Q Do you have a calculator with you?

3 A Yes, I do.

4 Q Do you have your deposition that I took last --
5 September 18th with you, by chance?

6 A I did not bring that, no.

7 Q Okay. I've got -- fortunately, I've got an
8 extra copy for you.

9 A I was hoping you would.

10 MR. BYRNE: May I approach, your Honor?

11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You may.

12 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Here's your deposition. I think
13 I have one for your attorney, too.

14 MR. BYRNE: Ms. Iles, do you need a copy of the
15 deposition?

16 MS. ILES: No. I brought mine.

17 MR. THOMPSON: I could use one.

18 MR. BYRNE: Sure.

19 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Mr. Gorman, I was going to start
20 by asking you a follow-up to a couple of the questions
21 that Mrs. Baker asked you. And one was you -- you had a
22 discussion with her about -- and I think you basically
23 said you didn't think it was appropriate to use
24 non-regulated companies in a proxy group to determine a
25 return on equity for a regulated company. Do you remember

1 **that?**

2 A Well, let me clear that up if that's what I
3 said. What I intended to say is I don't think you can
4 reliably estimate --

5 **Q Okay.**

6 A -- a regulated company's return on equity with a
7 non-regulated proxy group because of the differences in
8 the market valuation and pricing of securities for
9 non-regulated companies versus the regulated companies.

10 **Q Okay. And so -- and I guess I -- I guess,**
11 **therefore, you don't see a problem with circularity in**
12 **using regulated companies in a proxy group?**

13 A Well, I do not. As long as you use market --
14 observable market data and you're trying to capture how
15 investors value securities and their return requirements
16 for making investments in utility companies, I -- I don't
17 think there's a -- I do not believe that there's a
18 circularity in using those models to estimate fair
19 compensation, particularly when you can -- can also look
20 at the results of the regulatory decisions.

21 If authorized returns on equity were
22 consistently too low, you would hear credit rating
23 agencies being critical of regulatory Commissions'
24 authorized returns. We're not seeing that.

25 Credit rating agencies are rating utility

1 industry stable. That's an indication that regulatory
2 treatment is supportive of credit standing, which includes
3 fair compensation and the ability to maintain adequate
4 access to capital.

5 So there is market evidence that suggests that
6 the way things are being done is accomplishing the
7 objective.

8 **Q Okay. Ms. Baker also asked you a question about**
9 **updating rate base to the end of the true-up period, and I**
10 **think you -- I think you said that was a positive thing**
11 **about the regulatory frame work in Missouri. Is that a**
12 **fair summary of what you said? Or what exactly did you**
13 **say about that?**

14 **A** I think she asked me whether or not the use of
15 an end of true-up period rate base was more beneficial to
16 investors than the use of an average rate base within the
17 true-up period.

18 And my comment was it is more beneficial because
19 it results in a higher rate base normally, which results
20 in a higher revenue requirement and earnings entitlement
21 for the companies.

22 **Q I mean, is it less beneficial than having**
23 **projected rate base?**

24 **A** It's not necessarily less beneficial. I mean,
25 you need to consider how the future test year would be

1 developed in forecasting what a rate base would be and
2 whether or not there's restrictions to properly reflect
3 what sales growth might be with growth in customers,
4 growth in unit sales per customer, changes in operating
5 costs throughout that same time period and changes in cost
6 of capital.

7 So that -- that's a pretty complicated issue. I
8 don't know if you can necessarily generalize it. But
9 there are forms of future test years, which I don't think
10 more accurately reflect the utility's cost of service when
11 the rates are actually in effect than Missouri's procedure
12 of the true-up mechanism is able to -- to put rates into
13 effect, which provides a -- a reasonable opportunity to
14 earn their cost of capital.

15 Q Okay. I'd like to ask you some questions about
16 Staff Witness Murray's position on return on equity. Have
17 you read Mr. Murray's testimony?

18 A It was a while ago, but, yes, I have.

19 Q And are you aware that Mr. Murray is -- is
20 asserting that cost of capital witnesses such as you and
21 Ameren Missouri witness Mr. Hevert and -- and other --
22 this Commission and other Commissions are not properly
23 estimating the cost of equity when they set return?

24 A Generally, I -- I do recall some language to
25 that effect. I don't know exactly that he said it that

1 way, but --

2 **Q And he believes that the actual cost of equity**
3 **is much lower than anyone is recommending in this case.**
4 **Are you aware of that?**

5 A I do understand that to be his position.

6 **Q Do you agree with him?**

7 A I do not. I -- I -- my clients hire me to
8 estimate the cost of capital in a way that provides fair
9 compensation but not excessive compensation to AmerenUE
10 that will -- will allow them to maintain the financial
11 integrity and provide high quality and reliable service.
12 It's important to my client.

13 They want competitive rates, but they also want
14 high quality, reliable service. So they asked me to do my
15 best job of estimating what the fair compensation is for a
16 utility to accomplish all the objectives we just
17 described, and I think I've done that.

18 **Q Well, maybe you just said this. What would**
19 **happen if the Commission sets an ROE that's too low? What**
20 **are the negative consequences to your clients and, I**
21 **guess, to my client?**

22 A Well, if you take it to the extreme, if the
23 return is too low, then there could be a couple negative
24 consequences. One is the utility's cash flow metrics may
25 not be adequate to support its bond rating.

1 The second consideration is that the utility may
2 because it has a fiduciary responsibility to manage its
3 investors' capital prudently may limit capital investments
4 in utility plant and equipment, and that could have an
5 effect on service quality and reliability. And those two
6 factors may result in the service area incurring greater
7 costs because certain companies business and homes that
8 operate with the assumption that they're going to get high
9 quality, reliable service.

10 **Q Mr. Murray argues in his testimony that instead**
11 **of -- or -- or perhaps in addition to using the**
12 **traditional analyses like, you know, DCF analyses we've**
13 **talked about and CAPM and risk premium analyses, that cost**
14 **of capital experts should look at what investment analysts**
15 **are using to estimate the value of the utility stocks and**
16 **even when investment analysts use to value stocks or**
17 **assets outside of the regulated arena. Are you aware of**
18 **that testimony of his?**

19 A I'm aware that he considers projected returns by
20 some money managers, yes.

21 **Q I mean, why don't you use information like that**
22 **in estimating the cost of equity?**

23 A Well, I am concerned about the reliability of
24 the accuracy of the projections. My analysis is based to
25 the greatest extent possible on information that is

1 available to investors, that investors may rely on to
2 value the prices of the securities, including the
3 companies in my proxy group.

4 Because I'm trying get a sense of what
5 investors' expectations are in reaching the values of
6 those prices in my proxy based on DCF studies. Because if
7 -- the available market information concerning those
8 companies, specifically being a proxy for what investors
9 are likely expecting from those companies, is the best
10 information I think that's available to estimate what
11 investors' return requirements are to assume the
12 investment risk of the utility companies included in my
13 proxy groups.

14 So I believe that starting the analysis with
15 observable utility stock prices for a proxy group that is
16 measured to be reasonable and consistent with the
17 investment risk of the underlying company or observable
18 utility bond yields, measured beta estimates which is tied
19 to stock price variations relative to the market. Ties
20 the entire analysis to the focus of the proxy group, or at
21 least focus of the industry, which I believe is -- is the
22 best estimate for capturing what investor current return
23 requirements are.

24 **Q Mr. Murray did a multi-stage DCF analysis that**
25 **had three stages; is that correct?**

1 A Again, I looked at his testimony a while ago,
2 but I believe that's correct.

3 Q Well, and -- and my understanding is that when
4 you do a multi-stage DCF analysis, the growth rate you use
5 in Stage 3 is a pretty important input to that; is that
6 fair to say?

7 A I think all the data is pretty important to
8 input into that model. But, yeah, the long-term
9 sustainable growth rate is driving the growth and the
10 longest period of dividend within that cash flow
11 projections.

12 Q Would it be fair to say that growth rate in
13 Stage 3 has a big impact on the result that's produced by
14 the multi-stage model?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Okay. And Mr. Murray used a 3 to 4 percent
17 growth rate from his Stage 3. Do you -- do you recall
18 that other --

19 A I would have to verify that.

20 Q Okay. Assume with me that he did use a 3 to 4
21 percent growth rate for Stage 3. Do you think that's an
22 appropriate growth rate for Stage 3 of a multi-stage DCF
23 model?

24 A If I thought that was the appropriate third
25 state growths rates, I would have used that in my model.

1 For the reasons outlined in my testimony, I did not use a
2 growth rate of 3 or 4 percent. I used one of 4.9.

3 Q Okay. Let's discuss your recommendation. As
4 you testified before, you're recommending a 9.2 percent to
5 a 9.4 percent range, right?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And my understanding from your deposition is
8 that you agree that any -- any point within that range
9 would be reasonable; is that true?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Okay. Mr. Gorman, would you agree with me that
12 estimating the appropriate return for regulated electric
13 utility is not an exact science?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And is that why experts like you and Mr. Hevert
16 typically provide a range for your recommended ROE and Mr.
17 Murray, too, has a range for his recommended ROE as well
18 as a specific point recommendation?

19 A Well, yes. I think that's why all of us use
20 more than one methodology to try and estimate the current
21 market rate of cost of equity.

22 Q Would you agree with me that a basic tenant of
23 finance is the risk return trade-off?

24 A I do.

25 Q So that investors require a higher return more

1 for more risky investments?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And would you also agree that an important
4 consideration on setting return on equity for an electric
5 utility is the risk that the utility faces?

6 A Yes.

7 Q All else being equal, would it be fair to say
8 that a utility facing a higher risk should get a higher
9 return and a utility facing a lower risk should get a
10 lower return?

11 A Well, I don't know what you mean by all else
12 equal. By if a utility is facing higher risk because of
13 imprudence or unreasonable management, then I wouldn't
14 agree with that.

15 Q Okay.

16 A But if the management and prudence and
17 management-induced problems were not a factor, then higher
18 risk companies should get a higher risk return.

19 Q Fair enough. And I think you would agree with
20 me, would you not, that Ameren Missouri competes for
21 capital with other electric utilities?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. And I -- we've had a lot of discussion
24 about RRA data. And I assume you would agree that RRA is
25 a -- a reputable firm and provides reliable data?

1 A I do.

2 Q And I think on Schedule MPG-11, which is one of
3 the schedules in the risk premium analysis, you have a
4 list of returns for integrated electric utilities or maybe
5 electric utilities?

6 A Yeah. This is an electric utility industry
7 average return. I do not agree with Mr. Hevert that it's
8 appropriate to separate integrated electrics from wires or
9 distribution only companies because I think that's too
10 simplistic of a consideration of risk differentials.

11 Q So these numbers would include both wires only
12 and integrated electric utilities?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Do you have your calculator? Do you -- could
15 you tell me what the average authorized return on equity
16 for electric utilities for the past five years was?

17 A Based on my Schedule MPG-11, which goes through
18 the end of 2011 for that five-year period --

19 Q Okay.

20 A -- 10.37 percent for the period 2007 through
21 2011.

22 Q Could you do the same calculation for the last
23 ten years?

24 A 10.56.

25 Q Okay. Now, as I understand it, you and

1 Mr. Hevert used the same proxy group of companies at least
2 in your direct testimony; is that correct?

3 A In our direct testimony, that is correct.

4 Q But then he added Empire, and you did not; is
5 that correct?

6 A Correct.

7 Q Okay. We had a couple of documents --

8 MR. BYRNE: May I approach the witness?

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You may.

10 Q (By Mr. Byrne) We had a couple of documents that
11 were entered into the record as exhibits, and they were
12 the RRA -- the RRA information from calendar year 2011,
13 which Exhibit 69, and the RRA data for the first six
14 months of 2012, which was Exhibit No. 530.

15 And so I'm going to give you a copy of those.
16 And what I tried to do, Mr. Gorman, was to mark within
17 that document the proxy group companies that had reported
18 authorized ROEs. And I'd like to walk through the
19 document, if you would, the two documents and let me know
20 if I did it right. Maybe we could start with the calendar
21 year 2011 document.

22 A All right.

23 Q And I show on -- on the -- I guess starting on
24 page 5 of that document, it's the list of all the
25 decisions, and I show Public Service Company of Oklahoma

1 the first company on the list being an AEP subsidiary; is
2 that correct?

3 A It's noted as that. I believe that's correct.
4 Yes.

5 Q Okay. And they -- and then they got a 10.15
6 percent ROE; is that correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And the next one I had is Wisconsin Public
9 Service. Is that one of the companies in one of the proxy
10 group companies, if you know?

11 A In my proxy group companies?

12 Q Yeah. In the common group of proxy companies
13 that you and Mr. Hevert had in direct testimony.

14 A Yes.

15 Q Okay. And that shows an ROE of 10.3 percent; is
16 that correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And the next one I have is Appalachian
19 Power/Wheeling Power, and that's shown as a subsidiary of
20 AEP; is that correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And that shows 10 percent; is that correct?

23 A It is.

24 Q And then the next one is Kansas City Power &
25 Light Company?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And that shows 10 percent; is that correct?

3 A It does.

4 Q And then Ottertail Power, and that's in your
5 group; is that not right?

6 A It is.

7 Q And it shows 10.74 percent; is that correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And then the next two are KCPL Greater Missouri
10 Operations, and those are in your proxy group, too, right?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And there's 10 percent, 10 percent for two
13 decisions for that company; is that correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And then Empire is marked, but it's really not
16 in your proxy group. And at any rate, there's no
17 authorized return specified, correct?

18 A It is.

19 Q And if you turn the page, there is another --
20 there is an Appalachian Power decision and Appalachian
21 Power is in your proxy group; is that correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And that's 10.9 percent; is that correct?

24 A AEP is in my proxy group. Appalachian Power is
25 the subsidiary, yes.

1 Q And that shows 10.9 percent for Appalachian
2 Power?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And Columbus Southern Power is also a subsidiary
5 of AEP; is that correct?

6 A It is.

7 Q And it shows 10 percent for them?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And Ohio Power is also a subsidiary of AEP?

10 A Yes.

11 Q And it shows 10.3 percent for them?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And Upper Peninsula Power is also in your proxy
14 group; is that true?

15 A Yes, it is.

16 Q And that's 10.2 percent?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And that's all the reported returns on that
19 document; is that correct?

20 A Well, there's one for Georgia Power. No. I'm
21 sorry. Yes. That is correct.

22 Q Okay. And can you take a look and see if I've
23 missed any? Are those all the -- are those all the
24 companies within your proxy group that are on that
25 document?

1 A I believe it is.

2 Q Okay. And then on the next document, which is
3 Exhibit 530, which should be a lot shorter, I'm looking at
4 page 4 where they start listing the company and the
5 company's authorized returns. The first one I marked was
6 Indiana Michigan Power, which I believe is a subsidiary of
7 AEP; is that correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q You have it at 10.2 percent return on equity,
10 correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And then Idaho Power, that's in your proxy
13 group, correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And that is a 9.9 percent ROE?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And then Gulf Power, which is a Southern Company
18 subsidiary?

19 A Correct.

20 Q And that's in your proxy group, correct?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And 10.05 percent ROE?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And Arizona Public Service, that's in your proxy
25 group; is that correct?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And at 10 percent ROE. And that's the last one
3 on that list. Can you take a look at that list to make
4 sure I didn't miss any?

5 A It appears to be.

6 Q And isn't it true that of all those data points
7 we just went over, only one, Idaho Power, got below a 10
8 percent return on equity, and they got 9.9 percent; is
9 that correct?

10 A Yeah. For the time period these rate cases took
11 place, that is correct.

12 Q Okay. I -- okay. I -- I'd like to take a look
13 at your analyses. My understanding is you did three types
14 of analyses models in your testimony, discounted cash flow
15 analyses, and I know you did a couple different -- several
16 different kinds of those, and risk premium analyses and a
17 capital asset pricing model analysis; is that correct?

18 A It is.

19 Q Okay. And my understanding is the upper bound
20 of your range, which is 9.4 percent, was based on results
21 of your DCF analyses; is that correct?

22 A Yes, sir.

23 Q And the lower bounds you have in your range was
24 based upon your risk premium analyses; is that correct?

25 A Yes.

1 **Q** Okay. So let's talk about the one that didn't
2 figure into the range, which is the capital asset pricing
3 model or CAPM. Can you briefly explain how a CAPM
4 analysis works?

5 A CAPM analysis estimates a firm specific risk
6 factor above a risk free rate. The firm specific risk
7 factor is calculated by developing what is referred to a
8 company specific beta estimate and multiplying that beta
9 estimate by the market risk premium.

10 The product of multiplying the beta times the
11 market risk premium produces a very specific risk factor.
12 And you add that to what is the risk free rate, which I
13 use a proxy for as the 30-year Treasury bond rate, and the
14 sum of those two components, the firm specific risk
15 component and the Treasury bond yield produces the CAPM
16 return estimate for the company.

17 **Q** And what were -- what was the result of the CAPM
18 analysis? What return -- return on equity did it produce?

19 A Shown on page 36, it produced a return of 8.7
20 percent.

21 **Q** And can you explain why you didn't use that
22 result in your -- in developing your recommendation?

23 A Well, I was a little concerned about the
24 reliability of that result because, essentially, the
25 market risk premium I'd used reflected more normal risk

1 premium levels where the risk free rate, the Treasury bond
2 rate was at a very low level.

3 So I was concerned that it was a bit of a
4 mismatch between firm specific risk component, which
5 doesn't reflect the -- the general belief, including
6 myself, that market risk premiums are a little high for
7 risky securities and -- and applying that with a risk free
8 rate.

9 So based on those parameters and my assessment
10 in consideration of the results of the other models, I
11 thought CAPM return estimate was too low in this case.

12 **Q Isn't it true that you were also using a**
13 **projected Treasury bond rate in your capitalization?**

14 A I always do that. Yes.

15 **Q Okay. And what -- what was the projected rate**
16 **that you were using?**

17 A Three point -- 3.7 percent.

18 **Q And for what period was that projected?**

19 A It would have been two years out at the time of
20 the forecast. It would have been out through about June
21 of 2014.

22 **Q And do you know what the actual 30-year Treasury**
23 **bond rate was at the time you filed your direct testimony?**

24 A It was 3 percent.

25 **Q And I'm assuming if you would have used -- if**

1 you would have used the 3 percent as the Treasury bond
2 component, then your result would be an even 70 points
3 lower; is that true?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. And do you know, by the way, what the
6 30-year Treasury bond rate is right now?

7 A I believe it's fallen under 3. I can't tell you
8 exactly what it is, but I'm fairly certain it's less than
9 3 percent now.

10 Q And the CAPM model reflects point for point a
11 reduction in the -- in the Treasury bond rate; is that
12 correct?

13 A Well, the way I employ it, it does because I
14 don't measure the market risk premium with my risk free
15 rate estimate. But if you did, the market risk premium
16 would adjust with changes in the risk free rate.

17 Q And didn't you also testify that Treasury bond
18 yields are really higher than a true risk free rate?

19 A yes.

20 Q So -- so if you use a really true risk free
21 rate, the result would have been even -- even lower than
22 it was; is that correct?

23 A Well, that's -- that's true every time I file
24 testimony, including this time.

25 Q Okay. And I think you testified that we're in a

1 market that does not reflect normal valuations of
2 Treasury; is that true?

3 A I think there's a very, very profound flight to
4 quality in the existing marketplace and low risk
5 securities like Treasuries and like utility securities are
6 being sold at a premium.

7 Q And, I mean, what -- okay. And is it -- are you
8 saying that the -- that the rate of return on Treasury
9 bonds is lower than normal? Is that your point?

10 A The price of Treasury bonds is higher than
11 normal and the yield is lower.

12 Q Okay. Okay. And is the only reason for that
13 the flight to quality, or does Government monetary policy
14 affect that as well?

15 A Well, on the short end of the curve, Government
16 monetary policy impacts Treasury bill yields and possibly
17 Treasury notes. It's debatable whether or not the Federal
18 Reserve can actually impact the long end of the yield
19 curve. I believe they have limited inputs on it.

20 Under monetary policy, what's going on at the
21 Fed now with them buying corporate securities, it's having
22 an impact I think on bond yields. But that's because of
23 the extraordinary economic conditions we're in right now.

24 Q And my understanding is when you calculated your
25 market risk premium, you may have said this already, but

1 when you calculated your market risk premium group, your
2 CAPM, you looked at the achieved return in stock
3 investments versus Treasury bond investments with a data
4 set that started in 1926 and up till the present; is that
5 correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Okay. And isn't it true that you use historical
8 information like this because, over the long run, the
9 expectation is that the market will revert to what it has
10 done in the past?

11 A Well, that is the -- the assumption for use of
12 long historical time periods and then the way I've done it
13 for measuring the market risk premium. So that is the
14 assumption I'm making --

15 Q Okay.

16 A -- in this case. But --

17 Q No. That's -- let me -- let me ask you a little
18 about your risk premium analysis. And I think we talked
19 about this a bit in your deposition. Can -- well, first
20 of all, can you briefly explain how the risk premium
21 method works?

22 A Well, risk premium, like the CAPM, relies on
23 observable bond yields as a starting point for estimating
24 your required return for common equity securities. A risk
25 premium that I use starts with the Treasury bond yield and

1 estimates an appropriate equity risk premium to add to
2 that bond yield estimated with the market required return
3 on common equities for utility companies.

4 That equity risk premium will change over time
5 based on the investment risk perceptions of the
6 marketplace that equity securities is relative to debt
7 securities.

8 So I attempt to gauge what an appropriate equity
9 risk premium over Treasury bond yields is by looking at a
10 relative spread of Treasuries and utility securities to
11 get a sense of how the market perceives the utility
12 industry at that time and whether or not they're pricing
13 utility securities to produce a premium return, an average
14 return or maybe a below average return.

15 In this instance, I thought market was pricing
16 utility securities for an above average equity risk
17 premium, so I incorporated that in my first risk premium
18 study over Treasury bonds.

19 The second risk premium study was over
20 observable utility bond yields. And again, it required
21 measuring what the contemporary equity risk premium would
22 be for utility bond yields, estimate the return on equity.
23 And, again, it required gauging what the market's risk
24 assessment is for equity securities versus debt
25 securities, which is approximated by comparisons at

1 utility valuations relative to Treasury securities and
2 then estimating what appropriate equity risk premium is
3 over utility bond yields in this marketplace.

4 Q Just so I understand, I mean, what you need in
5 order to do a risk premium is you need a risk free rate,
6 and then you need a market premium to go on top of it? Is
7 that true? And you add those two things together, and
8 that's the number that is produced?

9 A Well, you need an observable utility bond
10 yield --

11 Q Okay.

12 A -- and an equity risk premium.

13 Q Okay.

14 A The risk free rate was from the CAPM study.

15 Q Okay. But you've also -- you've done two
16 separate CAPM studies, one using Treasury bond rates,
17 correct?

18 A Yes. And I do characterize that as risk free
19 rate in my CAPM. But I -- it's a fair characterization,
20 but I don't call it risk free rate in this bond.

21 Q I think what you did is you have two premium
22 risk analyses, and then you averaged your results, and
23 that average is what constituted the lower boundary of
24 your range; is that correct?

25 A Well, I developed a range based on my risk

1 premium study and then developed a point estimate using
2 the risk premium model which is how I also interpreted the
3 results of my DCF study and ultimately my CAPM study.

4 Q Okay. Let's take a look at your two risk
5 premium analyses. And my understanding is for your risk
6 premium analyses, you used data from 1986 to 2011 to
7 calculate the risk premium in both of those studies; is
8 that correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Okay. And -- and the first one used Treasury
11 bonds, right?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And my understanding is the results of your two
14 separate risk premium analyses are set out on Schedule
15 MPG-11 and MPG-12 attached to your direct testimony,
16 correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Okay. Well, let's take them individually. I
19 went ahead and made a blow-up of -- this is unfortunately
20 where we start to get down to the weeds, but there's no --
21 there's no avoiding it.

22 I went ahead and blew up MPG-11. And I'm hoping
23 you can tell me -- well, let me -- let me walk through how
24 I think it works, and you can tell me if I'm right or
25 wrong.

1 Okay. On MPG-11, you've got all the years from
2 1986 to 2011. That's the first column that just lists the
3 years, right?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And the second column, Authorized Electric
6 Return, that's the electric utility return based on RRA
7 data or average electric utility return for each of those
8 years based on RRA, correct?

9 A Industry average, yes.

10 Q So like, for example, the 10.22 is here for
11 2011. That's a number we've been talking about today,
12 correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Okay. The next column has Treasury bond yields.
15 And as I understand it, that is 20-year Treasury yields,
16 the average for each of those years; is that correct?

17 A It's the long-term bond. Yes.

18 Q Okay. They just didn't have a 30-year bond or
19 -- it could be 30 years once they had them?

20 A No. It was 20 years because there was a period
21 during the '90s when the U.S. Government went to surplus
22 budgets that they stopped selling 20-year Treasury bonds
23 and the data wasn't available for part of the analysis.

24 Q Okay. And this last column is indicated risk
25 premium, and that's each year you subtract the Treasury

1 bond yields from the authorized electric return for that
2 year, and then you get an indicated risk premium for that
3 year, right?

4 A Yes.

5 Q And there's 26 different years with 26 different
6 indicated risk premiums, right?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Okay. So then, as I understand it, to figure
9 out a risk premium, the first thing you did with this data
10 set is you threw out the three highest results and the
11 three lowest results; is that correct?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Okay. And the three highest results, I'm going
14 to mark them with a plus. And let's see. I think they
15 were -- no. Let me catch up with my notes here. Okay.
16 It looks like the three highest results were 6.41 from
17 2009; is that correct? I'm going to put a little plus
18 here, so hope I don't get it wrong.

19 A Yes.

20 Q That's the highest result. And so you threw it
21 out. And the next highest result was 6.31 from 2011, so
22 you threw out that result; is that correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And then the next highest result is 6.18 from
25 2008, so you threw out that result; is that correct?

1 A Yes.

2 Q So for the -- for the high results that you
3 threw out, you threw out the results for three out of the
4 last four years; isn't that correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. Then you threw out the lowest results,
7 too. And I think the low -- the lowest result was 3.83
8 way back in 1988. So I'm going to put a minus sign by
9 that one. You threw that out because it was too low,
10 right?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And then the next lowest was 1994 at 3.97,
13 right?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Put a minus sign by that. And then the next
16 lowest one was 4.09 from 1990. So I put a minus sign by
17 that, right?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Is that -- am I doing all right so far?

20 A Yeah.

21 Q And then my understanding is after you threw the
22 three highest and the three lowest out, you established
23 your range with the highest remaining risk premium and
24 lowest remaining risk premium; is that correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And in this instance, the highest remaining risk
2 premium was the one from 1986, right? I'm going to circle
3 that if that was one of the bounds of your range. Is that
4 true?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And the lowest risk premium, coincidentally
7 enough, was the next year, 4.41 percent in 1987, right?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Okay. And so -- and then -- well, and then, as
10 I understand it, once you had this range established --
11 well, in order to -- for these risk premiums to be turned
12 into a return on equity, you've got to add back in the
13 Treasury bond yield; is that right?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And so as I understand it, you took these two
16 numbers and you added the 3.7 percent, which is what
17 you're using as a Treasury bond yield. I understand it's
18 not current. It was a projected two years into the
19 future, but that's what you're using, right?

20 A It is.

21 Q Okay. So you would add 3.7 to 6.13, and that
22 would be the top of your range. Do you know what that
23 ended up being? Can you -- can you add those two numbers
24 together?

25 A That's at page 30 of my testimony. And the high

1 end of the range was 9.83 percent. It's on page 30, line
2 10. And the low end of the range was 8.11 percent shown
3 on line 9.

4 Q Okay. And then my understanding is that you
5 weighted the high end of the range, which was 9.83?

6 A Yes.

7 Q You weighted that two to one -- or weighted it
8 two-thirds, and you rated the low end of your range, which
9 is 8.11 percent, up one-third; is that correct?

10 A It is.

11 Q And so then for this, it gave you a result of
12 9.3 percent, right?

13 A 9.26, and I rounded it to 9.3.

14 Q Okay. And so -- I mean, what obviously struck
15 me about this is, you know, throughout the -- you threw
16 out three out of the last four years for being too high,
17 and the ones that you threw out for being too low were in
18 1998 and 1990 and 1994. That's correct, isn't it?

19 A That's how it turned out in this case, yes.

20 Q Sure. And then what you -- but what you ended
21 up doing is you're using risk premium from 1986 and 1987
22 to figure out what our return on equity should be here in
23 2000 -- I guess it's 2013 by the time the rate come into
24 effect; isn't that correct?

25 A That's a -- that's a fair -- I mean, that's not

1 how the analysis --

2 Q Just please answer --

3 A -- is structured, but that's the result of the
4 analysis.

5 Q Okay. And wouldn't you agree with me that the
6 financial conditions prevailing back in 1986 and 1987 were
7 completely different from the financial conditions that
8 are prevailing now?

9 A Not completely different. The reason I
10 selected --

11 Q No. No. I'm not -- I'm not asking you the
12 reason that you did it. I'm asking you if the financial
13 conditions are completely different. Yes or no?

14 A The financial conditions are the reason I
15 selected this time period.

16 Q Well, isn't it true -- just look at your chart.
17 My gosh. Isn't it true authorized electric returns were
18 14 percent and 13 percent in -- you know, almost 14
19 percent, almost 13 percent in '86 and '87; isn't that
20 true?

21 A It is.

22 Q Isn't it true that Treasury bond yields were 7.8
23 and 8.5 percent back in those years? Isn't that true?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Do you know what the Dow Jones industrial

1 **average was in 1986?**

2 A It was less than it is now.

3 **Q Would you believe it was less than 2,000?**

4 A Subject to check.

5 **Q Okay.**

6 MR. BYRNE: All right. Your Honor, I've got
7 copies of this chart that I would like to mark and offer
8 as an exhibit.

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Your next number is
10 71.

11 MR. THOMPSON: I'm sorry, Judge. What did you
12 say the next number is?

13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 71.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN GUNN: Premarked. Nicely done.

17 **Q (By Mr. Byrne) Okay. Well, let's look at the**
18 **next chart, which I think is MPG-12. And this, I believe,**
19 **was your second risk premium analysis; is that correct?**

20 A Yes.

21 **Q And I think --**

22 MR. BYRNE: Oh, your Honor, I'd like to offer
23 Exhibit 71, if that's what it was.

24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. 71 has been
25 offered. Any objections to its receipt? Hearing none, it

1 will be received.

2 (Exhibit 71 was offered and received into
3 evidence.)

4 Q (By Mr. Byrne) You know, before I leave the
5 other one, I think I'll ask you, wouldn't it -- wouldn't
6 it have been possible to use more recent data to do your
7 analysis, Mr. Gorman?

8 A If you're attempting to increase the return on
9 equity estimate by manipulating the date, you could, yes.

10 Q So, for example, if I wanted to use the most
11 recent five years of data and do the same analysis that
12 you did, what -- what result would it produce?

13 Let me see if I can walk you through it. If you
14 only used the last five years data, one, two, three, four,
15 five, the high end of your return would be 6.41 percent,
16 correct?

17 A Are we throwing out the high and the low or --

18 Q No. This is -- this is instead of the data set
19 after the high and low have been thrown out. If you use
20 the last five years --

21 A So excluding them --

22 Q The last five years as the whole data set.
23 That's what I'm asking.

24 A Throwing out the high and low is a way of trying
25 to capture the central tendency of all the data.

1 Q sure. I'm not doing that here. I'm asking if
2 you used the last years of data, what would it be?

3 A You're asking me if I used the last five years
4 of data and I didn't try to capture the central tendency
5 of the data net end, then yes.

6 Q Okay.

7 A The high end of the data would be 6.41 percent.

8 Q 6.41 percent, plus you have to add 3.7 percent,
9 don't you?

10 A Yes.

11 Q What would that be?

12 A 10.1 percent.

13 Q Okay. And what -- and the low end would be 5.53
14 percent plus 3.7 percent. What would that be?

15 A 9.2.

16 Q And what if you weighted the high end two-thirds
17 like you did in your analysis and the low end one-third?
18 What would that result be?

19 A 9.8.

20 Q And what if you just used the simple average of
21 the last five years of risk premium? What would that
22 simple average be?

23 A The risk premium would be 6.1 percent. And with
24 the bond yield of 3.7, it would be 9.8 percent.

25 Q So that would also be 9.8 percent?

1 A Yes.

2 Q What about ten years of data? If you used ten
3 years of data, the highest ROE -- or the highest risk
4 premium would still be 6.41 percent; is that correct? And
5 so if you add 3.7, that, again, would be -- the high end
6 of your range would be ten 10.1 percent, correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q But the low end would move that to 5.37 percent
9 from 2007. And so if you add 3.7 to that, that would be
10 9.07 would be the low end; is that correct?

11 A It is.

12 Q And if you weighted the high end two-thirds and
13 the low end one-third, it would produce 9.75 percent; is
14 that correct?

15 A 9.76. Yes.

16 Q Okay. And what if, again, you just used a
17 simple average of the last ten years of risk premium? I
18 calculate a 5.9 percent risk premium; is that correct?

19 A I'm sorry. You got what?

20 Q I got 5.9 percent.

21 A Yes.

22 Q And then if you add 3.7, that yields 9.6
23 percent; is that correct?

24 A It is.

25 Q Okay. Now we'll get into the other one. Sorry,

1 this is the part where it gets boring.

2 MR. THOMPSON: Oh.

3 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Okay. So that I've reproduced
4 MPG-12, which, again, I think is your second risk premium
5 analysis. And this one uses A rated utility bond yields
6 in the place of the Treasuries from the last chart; is
7 that correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And it's the same 26 years' worth of data?

10 A Correct.

11 Q Okay. And so -- so, again, you threw out the
12 three highest and the three lowest. The highest one looks
13 to me like it's 5.18 percent in 2011; is that correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q The most recent year of data. And then the next
16 highest is 4.89 in 2009; is that right? Wait.

17 A 4.88.89.

18 Q 4.88. Is that the highest?

19 A 2010. Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah. 2006.

20 Q Yeah. You're right. Thanks. I'm sorry. 2006,
21 4.89?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. And then I must have mistyped. And then
24 what's the third highest, if you know?

25 A And I think it's the 4.88.

1 Q Then it goes to 4.88. Okay. So the three
2 highest this time were in 2001, 2010 and 2006. How about
3 the three lowest? I think 2.30 in 1988 is the lowest.
4 Does that sound right to you?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Minus --

7 A 2.89 in '87.

8 Q 2.89 is the second lowest?

9 A Well, 2.84 in '91 -- or '90.

10 Q Okay. So these are the three lowest are 1987,
11 1988 and 1990, right?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And so then, again, you pick the lowest and the
14 highest of the remaining, which it looks like -- I think
15 those were in, I think, 1994. The 3.03 is the lowest; is
16 that correct?

17 A I will my doublecheck my testimony.

18 Q Okay. I show 3.03 as being the lowest and 4.62
19 in '98 being the highest?

20 A Yes.

21 Q So at least these -- you know these are '95 and
22 '98. No. '94 and '98.

23 A Yes.

24 Q So at least they're a little more current. But
25 still Clinton era.

1 MR. BYRNE: Okay. Your Honor, I also have
2 copies of this I'd like to mark as an exhibit if I could.

3 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Your next number is 72.

4 Q (By Mr. Byrne) I'm going to ask you to do the
5 same thing again with this chart. Mr. Gorman, if you pick
6 out the last five years worth of data, if you set your --
7 the high end of your range at the high point in the last
8 five years, it would be 5.18, correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And if you added -- and what risk premium are
11 you adding to those for the -- for the bond yield?

12 A To this, I'm adding the bond yield that's
13 appropriate for AmerenUE, which is a BAA bond yield of
14 5.01 percent.

15 Q Okay. So if you add the 5.18 plus the 5.01
16 percent, that would be a 10.2 percent ROE on the high end;
17 is that correct?

18 A 10.19 , yes.

19 Q Okay. And then the low end of the range would
20 be the risk premium of 3.93 percent from 2008; is that
21 correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And if you add 5.01 to that, that would yield
24 8.94 percent; is that correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And if you weighted the high end two-thirds and
2 the low end one-third, what would that result be?

3 A 9.77.

4 Q Okay. And, again, could you calculate it
5 averaging the last five years of risk premiums?

6 A Five-year average of 4.54 gets a return on
7 equity estimate of 9.55.

8 Q Okay. And if you did the same thing over ten
9 years, my understanding is that 5.18 would still be the
10 highest risk premium; is that correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q So it would still be 10.2 percent on the high
13 end of your range, but the low would now be 3.79 percent,
14 correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And that would -- so that would yield a return
17 of 8.8 percent; is that correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And if you weight the highest end two-thirds and
20 the lowest end one-third, that would be 9.73 percent; is
21 that correct?

22 A 9.73.

23 Q Yeah.

24 A Yes.

25 Q And then, finally, if you averaged the risk

1 **premiums of the last ten years, what result would that**
2 **produce?**

3 A It's 4.47. That would be 9.48.

4 MR. BYRNE: Okay. Judge, I'd like to offer
5 Exhibit 72 into the record.

6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Exhibit 72 has been offered.
7 Any objections to its receipt?

8 MR. THOMPSON: I'm going to object, Judge,
9 because while entertaining, this lengthy cross has shown
10 that it's possible to manipulate the data set used by
11 Mr. Gorman to achieve different results than the results
12 he did achieve. But it's not his testimony. And I think
13 it's -- it's, frankly, irrelevant.

14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I'm going to overrule the
15 objection, and it will be admitted.

16 (Exhibit 72 was offered and received into
17 evidence.)

18 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

19 **Q (By Mr. Byrne) Let's talk a little bit about**
20 **your DCF analysis, Mr. Gorman. It's my understanding the**
21 **high end of your range, 9.4 percent, is based on your**
22 **discounted cash flow or DCF analysis; is that correct?**

23 A Yes.

24 **Q And my understanding is you did three separate**
25 **DCF analyses; is that correct?**

1 A Yes.

2 Q You did a constant growth DCF analysis; is that
3 correct?

4 A Using an analyst's growth rates, yes.

5 Q And you also did a constant growth sustainable
6 growth version of the model; is that correct?

7 A It is.

8 Q And then you did a multi-stage version of the
9 model; is that correct?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Okay. And with regard to the sustainable growth
12 version of the model, it's my understanding that it
13 produced an ROE estimate of 8.63 percent; is that correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q And that result was even lower than your CAPM
16 result; is that correct?

17 A It is.

18 Q Which you testified that you didn't use because
19 it was too low; is that correct?

20 A I testified I didn't use it because it was too
21 low for the concerns I had with the level of Treasury bond
22 yields and the way the market risk premium was measured in
23 my model.

24 Q Okay. Fair enough. But in any event, it's my
25 understanding that your sustainable growth model results

1 do not play a part in your ROE recommendation in this
2 case; is that correct?

3 A That is true, but not for the reasons I decided
4 not to rely on the CAPM results.

5 Q But, nonetheless, it didn't play a role in your
6 -- in your recommendation; is that true?

7 A Well --

8 Q Do you have your deposition? Because I think we
9 talked about this in your deposition.

10 A Well, but I didn't use it in developing my
11 range, but --

12 Q That's answers my question.

13 A Well, no.

14 Q That answers my question. Okay. Then the
15 remaining DCF analyses that you conducted produced ROEs of
16 9.3 percent for the constant growth, correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And 9.38 percent for the multi-stage growth; is
19 that correct?

20 A I -- yeah. I rounded that up to 9.40 percent.
21 But --

22 Q Okay.

23 A But for purposes of summarizing the results of
24 the DCF studies.

25 Q And then, as I understand it, from reading your

1 testimony to be conservative, you picked 9.4 percent,
2 which was the highest -- or the higher of the two for your
3 -- for the top end of your range; is that correct?

4 A That is correct.

5 Q Okay. I -- Mr. Gorman, I'd like to show you a
6 copy of your testimony from Case No. ER-2010-06.

7 MR. BYRNE: Your Honor, may I approach the
8 witness?

9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You may.

10 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Okay. And do you recognize that
11 document?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And in that case, I don't know if you recall,
14 but you had two separate proxy groups. And do you -- do
15 you recall that? Maybe you can take a look at it and see
16 if you recall that.

17 A Yes. There is two proxy groups here.

18 Q Okay. And what were the names of the proxy
19 groups?

20 A One was Integrated Electric Utilities, and the
21 other one was S&P Electric Utilities.

22 Q Okay. And my understanding is you did six
23 separate DCF analyses in that case -- three separate DCF
24 analyses, but using two proxy groups in each analysis; is
25 that correct?

1 A Yeah. The later description is correct.

2 Q Okay. So I'd like to walk you through the
3 results of your analyses in that case. And I have another
4 chart that has these results. And I want to -- I want you
5 to verify that I've accurately produced the results. So
6 the first thing -- the first result was the constant
7 growth DCF for Integrated Electric Utilities, okay? And I
8 think that is shown -- you have a schedule for that?

9 A MPG-6.

10 Q MPG-6. And on MPG-6, that has an average of
11 12.02 and a median of 11.03, which are on this chart; is
12 that correct?

13 A Do you have a copy I could --

14 Q Oh, sure. Actually, I do. I hate that I have
15 to acknowledge that I'm getting old.

16 MR. BYRNE: In fact, as long as I'm doing it,
17 I'll have it marked as an exhibit.

18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: It will be 73.

19 Q (By Mr. Byrne) And so it shows -- my chart -- or
20 actually, Exhibit 73 shows 12.2 for the mean and 11.03 for
21 the median for your constant growth DCF Integrated
22 Electric Utilities proxy group; is that correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Okay. And then how about the constant growth
25 result for the S&P Electric Utilities? I show a mean of

1 11.99 percent and a median of 11.01 percent. Is that
2 correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And for the next one, I show the constant growth
5 sustainable growth for the Integrated Electric Utilities
6 with a mean of 10.68 and a median of 10.2; is that
7 correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And then for the next one, I show the
10 sustainable growth for the S&P Electric Utilities, the
11 mean of 11.59 percent and the median of 11.5 percent; is
12 that correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And then for the multi-stage DCF for the
15 Integrated Electric Utilities proxy group, I show a mean
16 of 10.73 and a median of 10.25 percent; is that correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And for the multi-stage DCF S&P Electric
19 Utilities proxy group, mean is 10.51 and the median is
20 10.06 percent; is that correct?

21 A It is.

22 Q And isn't it true that in that case, when you
23 chose to use the median, which I -- you chose to use the
24 median, which in every case was lower than the mean in
25 that -- in that case; is that true?

1 A Well, based on the analysis at that time that's
2 the reason you would choose --

3 Q Well, I mean, I just want to know if it's true
4 or not. Maybe on redirect you can explain why.

5 A Trying to save a little time. It's true for the
6 constant growth. It's true for the constant growth with
7 sustainable growth. And it's true for the multi-stage
8 growth.

9 Q Okay. I'll hand you your testimony from the
10 last rate case, which was Case No. ER-2011-0028. Do you
11 recognize that testimony, Mr. Gorman?

12 A Yes.

13 Q And, again, I think in this case, you only had
14 one proxy group; is that correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And you did three -- you did three DCF studies;
17 is that correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And, again -- well, maybe I can get you a -- I
20 guess you already have that. And, again, the -- can you
21 confirm that I've correctly put on Exhibit 73 and on this
22 chart the -- the results of your studies?

23 I show for the constant growth a mean result of
24 10.31 and a median of 10.17; is that correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And for the sustainable growth, I show a mean of
2 10.26 and a median of 9.67; is that correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And for the multi-stage DCF, I show a 9.65
5 percent for the mean and a 9.86 percent for the median; is
6 that correct?

7 A It is.

8 Q And then my understanding is, in this case, you
9 -- your -- your recommendation or your -- your DCF result
10 resulted from averaging the three results; is that
11 correct?

12 A Pardon me?

13 Q Your -- your -- the summary of your DCF -- the
14 DCF result that you used was an average of those three
15 results; is that correct? And I'm -- specifically, I'm
16 looking on page 24 of your testimony.

17 A No. My -- I used the highest estimate of the
18 model, multi-stage model of 9.4 in this case. In the
19 other cases, I considered -- gave some weight to the other
20 models.

21 Q Okay. You didn't -- you didn't -- look on page
22 24 of your testimony.

23 A One six?

24 MR. LOWERY: Tom, he's confused. He's looking
25 at his current testimony.

1 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Oh, I'm sorry. I'm looking at.
2 Your 2011-0028 testimony.

3 A I'm sorry.

4 Q I apologize for the confusion. And all your DCF
5 results are on a table, Table 2 on page 24. Do you see
6 that?

7 A Yes.

8 Q And it looks to me like you used the average of
9 all of the medians of the three studies; is that correct?

10 A It is.

11 Q And isn't it true that the average of the
12 medians produces a lower result than the average of the
13 means would have for those studies? I mean, I haven't
14 done the math, but the constant growth, 10.31 is higher
15 than 10.17. 10.26 is a lot higher than 9.67. And --

16 A I would suspect it would be higher. Yes.

17 Q Okay. But then along comes the current case.
18 And, again, you did -- I don't have to hand you anything
19 because this is all in the record. But, again, you did
20 three DCF studies. You did a constant growth. You did a
21 sustainable growth. And you did a multi-stage growth.

22 But this time, instead of picking the median to
23 use for your result, you picked the mean; isn't that
24 correct?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And if you would have picked the -- the mean
2 result, your constant growth was 9.3 percent. But if you
3 would have picked the median, it would have been 9.9
4 percent; is that right?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And the mean for your multi-stage was 9.38
7 percent. But if you would have picked the median, it
8 would have been 9.7 percent; isn't that right?

9 A Yes. And the sustainable growth would have been
10 8.47 percent instead of 8.63.

11 Q That's true. Mr. Gorman, isn't it true that you
12 told me in your deposition that the reason that you use a
13 median rather than a mean is to account for outliers?

14 A Well, generally, yes. But, I mean, the --

15 Q Okay.

16 A Well, what you're trying to describe is what the
17 central --

18 Q I think that answers my question. I just asked
19 if that's what you told me during your deposition, and you
20 said yes. So -- yeah.

21 MR. BYRNE: I guess, your Honor, I'd like to
22 offer Exhibit 73.

23 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 73 has been offered. Any
24 objections to its receipt? Hearing none, it will be
25 received.

1 (Exhibit 73 was offered and received into
2 evidence.)

3 Q (By Mr. Byrne) I tried to do a scattered plot
4 graph. And I'll -- I know it's a little bit hard to see
5 on the chart, so I'll give it to you.

6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Will this be 74?

7 MR. BYRNE: Yes.

8 Q (By Mr. Byrne) And the scattered plot graph that
9 I just gave you that is on the board tries to show a
10 comparison of the results of your proxy group for your
11 constant growth DCF model in this case, which is on the
12 bottom with the results from your constant growth DCF
13 model from the last case, Case No. ER-2011-0028, which is
14 on top.

15 Let me ask you this: Can you confirm for me
16 that those scatter plots reflects the data in your
17 constant growth DCF schedules for those two cases?

18 A Well, I would need the data used to produce this
19 graph. But --

20 Q Well, the data is on the schedules in your
21 testimony that you have that -- for the -- for the
22 constant growth.

23 A I would need to confirm that that data used to
24 produce this graph is consistent with the data on my
25 schedules.

1 Q Okay. Well, then we'll just -- I guess we can
2 walk through it. Let's start with ER-2011-0028. And do
3 you have -- still have your testimony from that case?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. And I believe your constant growth DCF
6 model is shown on -- I believe it's shown on Schedule
7 MPG-4; is that correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q So looking at the scatter plot graph, the first
10 result is from American Electric Power Company; is that
11 correct?

12 A It is.

13 Q 9.05. Do you see it on the scatter plot graph?

14 A It appears to be there.

15 Q Okay. The next one is Cleco Corporation, 7.71.
16 Do you see it as the next dot on the scatter plot graph?

17 A Yes.

18 Q The next one is DPL, 11.05. Do you see it as
19 the next dot on the scatter plot graph?

20 A I do.

21 Q Then the next one doesn't have an ROE. Then the
22 next one is Idacorp, which is 8.18. See it as the next
23 point on the scatter plot graph?

24 A It appears to be.

25 Q And the next one is 10.7. Do you see that as

1 the next point on the scatter plot graph?

2 A Appears to be.

3 Q The next one is 12.81. That's the next point,
4 correct?

5 A Appears to be.

6 Q 10.31 is the next one, correct?

7 A Appears to be.

8 Q And 9.97 is the next one --

9 A Appears to be.

10 Q -- correct? 10.03 is the next one?

11 A Appears to be.

12 Q And 13.28 is the next one?

13 A Appears to be.

14 Q Okay. And then same with your testimony in this
15 case. Well, perhaps you could just do the same thing on
16 your own with the testimony in this case. Or would you
17 like me to walk through it plot by plot?

18 A It appears to reflect this data.

19 Q And I guess the point of me making these scatter
20 plot graphs is -- is to show the -- the relative outliers
21 in ER-2011-0028 where you used the median and this case,
22 ER-2012-0166, where you used the mean. Isn't the most
23 outlying point on either of these graphs the 5 point -- I
24 guess it's just a little over 5 percent result that's on
25 -- that's in this case? Isn't that the most outlying

1 point on either of those graphs?

2 A In terms of being the furthest away from the
3 average?

4 Q Yes.

5 A Probably is, yes.

6 Q I mean, aren't there about as many outliers on
7 the ER-2012-0166 scatter plot graph as there are on the
8 ER-2011-0028 scatter plot graph?

9 A Well --

10 Q It's a yes or no question.

11 A Could you repeat the question?

12 Q Aren't there about as many outliers in this case
13 as there were in the last case? If anything, it appears
14 to be there's more outliers in this case; isn't that
15 correct?

16 A Are you asking how I interpreted the results of
17 the data or --

18 Q No. I'm asking you, isn't it true there's as
19 many or more outliers on the scatter plot graph for this
20 case as there are on the scatter plot graph for that case?
21 Yes or no?

22 A In this case, they are six points above the
23 average. In this case, they were four -- in this case,
24 it's four points below. In the last case, there was one,
25 two, three, four right on the average and median with

1 three above and three below.

2 Q Okay. Let's try it for your multi-stage growth.

3 And I tell you what, your -- let's try it for the
4 multi-stage growth. Again, I've put together a scatter
5 plot graphs, and I can walk you through them, or could you
6 just check to see if --

7 A I'll agree to it subject to check.

8 Q Okay. And, again, doesn't -- doesn't this show
9 about the same amount of outliers in both this case and
10 the last case?

11 A I probably will need a copy of that to check it.

12 Q I'm sorry. Yeah. Let me --

13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: It will be 75, then.

14 A Well, there are outliers. But, again, in the
15 last case, there were more observations kind of scattered
16 on the median and means than there was in this case.
17 There's more of a dispersion of the results in this case
18 than there was in the last case.

19 MR. BYRNE: Your Honor, I'd offer Exhibits 74
20 and 75 for the record.

21 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 74 and 75 have been offered.
22 Any objections to their receipt? Hearing none, they will
23 be received.

24 (Exhibits 74 and 75 were offered and admitted
25 into evidence.)

1 MS. ILES: What was the number? I'm sorry.

2 MR. LOWERY: 75 was the last one, Carole.

3 MR. BYRNE: If I can have just a minute, your
4 Honor. I'm disorganized.

5 Q (By Mr. Byrne) Mr. Gorman, I'd like to ask you a
6 couple of questions about the growth rate in Stage 3 of
7 your multi-stage analysis. I think we talked a little bit
8 about it earlier.

9 My recollection is you used a 4.8 percent growth
10 rate for Stage 3; is that correct?

11 A It is.

12 Q And can you tell me where you got that 4.9
13 percent?

14 A 4.9 percent is an average of the consensus of
15 economists projections of GEP growth rate over the next
16 five and ten-year periods.

17 Q Okay. And doesn't that create some degree of a
18 problem for an analyst because what you're really trying
19 to do is project growth that doesn't begin until year '11
20 in Stage 3 of the multi-stage growth model? Isn't there a
21 disconnect between using five-year and ten-year data to --
22 to project growth that's to occur beginning in year '11
23 and continuing to infinity?

24 A There -- there is a problem with identifying
25 publicly available forecasts by independent economists of

1 GEP growth rates longer than ten years. And the growth
2 rate used in the model covers a period longer than ten
3 years.

4 **Q I mean, I guess the problem is there really**
5 **isn't market-based information available; is that fair to**
6 **say?**

7 A Well, there are some individual analysts that
8 project long-term growth rates. And I think I identified
9 some of those in my testimony. But it's the only source
10 of consensus economist projections, which is my preferred
11 source because I think it better captures what the likely
12 expectations of investors are.

13 MR. BYRNE: Okay. Thank you. That's all the
14 questions I have.

15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Then we'll come up for
16 question from the Bench. Commissioner Kenney?

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION

18 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:

19 **Q Hello.**

20 A Good afternoon.

21 **Q I just have a few questions. You were here when**
22 **I was questioning Mr. Hevert about some of the things I**
23 **asked him about. I was going to ask you about the whole**
24 **notion of using non-regulated utility proxy groups, but I**
25 **think you sufficiently answered that under questioning**

1 **from other counsel, so I'll skip all that.**

2 A If I would be permitted, I've got --

3 **Q Sure.**

4 A Utilities compete with non-regulated companies
5 for capital.

6 **Q Right.**

7 A So it's not my position that the investment
8 returns for those companies utilities compete with for
9 capitals are irrelevant. My point is that the -- the
10 ability to accurately estimate a return for those
11 companies which truly are valued by the marketplace in a
12 comparable way that utility securities is valued and the
13 cost of capitals are set is highly uncertain.

14 And some risk factors that suggest that they're
15 comparable in risk and you would expect to get the same
16 cost of capital, when there is observable evidence on that
17 what cost of capital is, you can see that they're not the
18 same, even though you would think they would be the same
19 because they're comparable risk.

20 **Q So you could construct a proxy group of**
21 **comparable risk, but the value placed on their stock would**
22 **be different?**

23 A Well, I think the reliability of your cost
24 estimate to identify what the investors required return
25 for the utility securities are would be highly

1 problematic.

2 **Q** So would you argue, then, that there would be no
3 value in constructing such a proxy group as a supplement
4 to the typical proxy group?

5 **A** I think all data points are worth giving some
6 consideration, so I wouldn't say there's no value.

7 **Q** Okay.

8 **A** I would just caution the use of a non-regulated
9 proxy group in estimating a fair return.

10 **Q** Okay. Fair enough. So let me just ask a few
11 questions, and then I'll try to get us out of here. What
12 -- what's your hourly rate?

13 **A** \$215.

14 **Q** And is that the same for deposition and trial?

15 **A** It is.

16 **Q** Were you deposed?

17 **A** Yes.

18 **Q** Okay. And have you -- I looked at your CV, and
19 I saw that there was a list of agencies for which you
20 sponsored -- entities for which you had sponsored
21 testimony in front of different regulatory bodies.

22 **A** Uh-huh.

23 **Q** Have you sponsored testimony for an Office of
24 Public Counsel or residential ratepayer advocate entity?

25 **A** I have worked for Office of Public Counsel here

1 in Missouri and Washington state.

2 Q That -- that was when you were employed by
3 Office of Public Counsel, or you were employed as an
4 expert by --

5 A No. My current employment.

6 Q Okay. And have you ever sponsored testimony for
7 -- on behalf of a regulated utility?

8 A I've been hired as an advisor to the regulators
9 to make decisions, but I've never offered testimony on
10 their behalf.

11 Q For regulators?

12 A Yes.

13 Q In which states?

14 A Actually, I was in the providence of New
15 Finland.

16 Q Okay. How about an investor-owned utility?

17 A I sponsored testimony once on behalf of a
18 investor-owned utility.

19 Q Okay.

20 A I've been hired by utilities to do studies, but
21 I've only sponsored testimony in their behalf once.

22 Q Okay. Now, Mr. Murray refers in his testimony
23 to the terms cost of equity and return on equity as
24 different and distinct concepts. What's your -- your
25 opinion about defining those two terms distinctly?

1 A I'm not sure how Mr. Murray is drawing that
2 distinction. I mean, the cost of equity is -- is the cost
3 to the utility to be able to attract equity capital. A
4 return on equity, I suppose, would be what investors
5 receive after they -- they make an investment in a
6 company.

7 Q And I think you heard my discussion earlier
8 about the credit rating agencies and their notions in
9 assessing risk has more do with the utility's ability to
10 recover its costs and their assessment of the regulatory
11 environment in which the utility is operating. Would you
12 agree with me, though, that the credit rated -- credit
13 rating agencies don't make any determination or pass any
14 judgments upon the prudence of the utility's expenditures?

15 A Yes. It's my understanding credit rating
16 agencies are -- are focused exclusively on the utility's
17 ability to meets the debt service requirements of the bond
18 holders.

19 Q Exclusively?

20 A Exclusively.

21 Q Okay. And I think -- we talked about Moody's
22 and S&P and Fitch's and how Moody's credit metrics are
23 more transparent. And I think in your testimony, you used
24 your proposed ROE and ran it through whatever metrics
25 Moody's utilized and came up with the conclusion that your

1 ROE wouldn't -- wouldn't cause any damage to their -- to
2 Ameren's credit rating; is that correct?

3 A Well, I used S&P benchmark, not Moody's.

4 Q Okay.

5 A And the reason I used S&P's is because they are
6 focused exclusively on investor capital.

7 Q Okay.

8 A Third party off balance sheet obligations.
9 Moody's ratios, on the other hand, include zero cost
10 capital components such as deferred taxes, which is
11 relevant, but -- but it's also -- the way it's treated
12 here in Missouri, those are rate-based offsets, so it just
13 seemed more of a direct comparison of a return on equity
14 and depreciation of rates and expense recoveries to rely
15 on Standard & Poor's benchmarks.

16 And, also, Standard & Poor's has some published
17 guidelines to help gauge whether or not they are within
18 the range adequate to support an investment pre pondere.

19 Q Could you perform the same analysis with
20 Moody's?

21 A I could. They would be slightly different
22 ratios, and you could use Moody's medians as a way of
23 judging the adequacy of their ratio. But Moody's does not
24 publish a benchmark like S&P does.

25 Q Okay. And then would you offer an opinion one

1 way or the other on whether Mr. Murray's ROE
2 recommendations are legally confiscatory?

3 A I can't. It's the legality of it.

4 Q Okay. And a similar question that I asked
5 Mr. Hevert, do -- do you consider Mr. Hevert and
6 Mr. Gorman -- I mean, Mr. Murray, rather, to be experts?

7 A Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. All right. That's
9 all I have. Thank you.

10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Commissioner Stoll?

11 COMMISSIONER STOLL: One quick question.

12 CROSS-EXAMINATION

13 BY COMMISSIONER STOLL.

14 Q Earlier in your conversation with Mr. Byrne, you
15 mentioned that you didn't use the results of the analysis
16 of the capital asset pricing method.

17 A Correct.

18 Q Would you care to elaborate on that at this
19 time?

20 A I performed the analysis, and I showed what the
21 results were. But I was concerned with whether or not
22 that model was producing a reliable result now because I
23 think there is a -- a large risk premium in the
24 marketplace today relative to risk free proxies, Treasury
25 securities.

1 Treasury bond yields right now are very low and
2 have been low as long as we've been in economic distress
3 as a country. One would expect and we see this with
4 utility securities and with corporate securities, that
5 there is a -- an above average risk premium for -- for
6 increasing levels of risk in the marketplace.

7 But my CAPM analysis had a market risk premium
8 that was based more on average risk premiums over time
9 rather than above average risk premium that I think exists
10 in today's marketplace. So I think it produced a return
11 that was too low.

12 Q So I -- I guess -- so, obviously, then, in -- if
13 other economic conditions existed, then you may have used
14 that analysis?

15 A This is -- only for about the last year or year
16 and a half, I -- I either have not used the CAPM or I put
17 some very, very strong cautions on use of the CAPM.

18 As the economy recovers and market turns to more
19 normal conditions, I likely will start using the CAPM
20 again as part of my estimates to support my return on
21 equity recommendations.

22 COMMISSIONER STOLL: Okay. Thank you.

23 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We'll go to recross
24 based on questions from the Bench, beginning with Public
25 Counsel.

1 MS. BAKER: No questions. Thank you.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: For staff?

3 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

4 RECROSS EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. THOMPSON:

6 Q You'll recall, Mr. Gorman, a series of questions
7 -- I guess they were "what if" questions from Mr. Byrne
8 relating to your Schedules MPG-11 and MPG-12.

9 MR. BYRNE: I'm going to object. This is not
10 based on questions from the Bench.

11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: He just said it was questions
12 from Mr. Byrne.

13 MR. THOMPSON: They were questions from
14 Mr. Byrne.

15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. I'll sustain the
16 objection.

17 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.

18 Q (By Mr. Thompson) Well, let me ask one question,
19 then, based on what Commissioner Kenney asked. You stated
20 that you consider Mr. Murray and Mr. Hevert to be experts
21 in financial analysis?

22 A I do.

23 Q Do you consider Mr. Byrne to be an expert in
24 financial analysis?

25 A I do not.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. No further questions.

2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Recross Ameren?

3 MR. BYRNE: No, thank you.

4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Redirect?

5 MS. ILES: Thank you, your Honor.

6 RECROSS EXAMINATION

7 BY MS. ILES:

8 Q Mr. Gorman, Mr. Byrne asked you a number of
9 questions about the results reported in the RRA documents
10 that have been admitted into testimony -- into evidence
11 from one -- which is Ameren 69 showing the rate decisions
12 from calendar 2011 and then Exhibit 530, which is the
13 major case decisions from January through June of 2012.
14 Do you remember Mr. Byrne asking you about those?

15 A I do.

16 Q What conclusions do you draw from the
17 information that he pointed out to you in his
18 cross-examination of you?

19 A Well, the conclusions I draw is the findings are
20 not that surprising because capital market costs a couple
21 years ago were higher than they are today. AmerenUE's --
22 or Ameren Missouri's last authorized return on equity was
23 10.2 percent.

24 The focus of my testimony is to provide evidence
25 of why its cost of equity is no longer that high. I

1 suspect that if I would have offered testimony for all
2 these other proxy companies in the regulatory Commissions
3 addressing their authorized return on equity, I would have
4 provided similar evidence.

5 So what's relevant in this case, I believe, or I
6 submit to the Commission for your consideration is what
7 the current market cost of equity is for Ameren Missouri
8 and these other companies, not what was their last
9 authorized return on equity.

10 I agree that it's relevant because the markets's
11 looking at it. But nevertheless, the return which is fair
12 to the company and fair to investors is what the current
13 market cost of equity is.

14 And I say that because it's not always going to
15 be a lower number. There will be instances where the
16 return in a rate case may be higher than the last
17 authorized return on equity.

18 And if the utility has a right to expect to
19 increase on return on equity in a rate case, I think
20 customers have the right to expect you to decrease the
21 return on equity in a rate case if the return on equity
22 suggests that's a fair thing to do.

23 **Q Mr. Byrne also asked you some questions about**
24 **your equity risk premium calculations, specifically, your**
25 **Schedule MPG-12 and MGP -- or MGP -- MPG-11 and MPG-12,**

1 **which are Exhibits 61 and 62. Do you remember those**
2 **questions?**

3 A Yes.

4 Q And, specifically, he asked you about -- and he
5 asked you a number of questions about the time period
6 reflected on these schedules and the fact that they go
7 back to 1986. Can you explain why you used the time
8 period that you did?

9 A I can. And the time period was selected because
10 this is a period over which the observable market evidence
11 indicated utilities had access to equity capital. Go back
12 to -- to some of the cross we had before.

13 The principles of a fair return on equity is
14 fair compensation and the ability to go to the market for
15 additional capital if you need it to fund infrastructure
16 and investments.

17 Since 1986, electric utility stocks have, on
18 average, traded at premiums to book value. What that
19 means is the utility could sell additional shares of
20 common stock without diluting the value of shares --
21 existing shares through existing shareholders.

22 So that's an indication that the valuations that
23 were in part supported by these authorized returns on
24 equity supported the utility's access to external
25 additional equity capital.

1 Prior to 1986, market to book ratios were below
2 one. And that argument didn't hold up for that time
3 period. So this time period was collected specifically to
4 reflect a period where authorized returns on equity
5 contributed towards the valuation of utility securities
6 which supported the utility's access to additional equity
7 capital in the marketplace.

8 Q So I think Mr. Byrne specifically asked you
9 whether the financial conditions in 1986 and 1987 were
10 completely different from current conditions. And I don't
11 think he really gave you a chance to answer that. So
12 would you like to explain?

13 A Well --

14 Q Are there any similarities?

15 A -- there -- the circumstances of the marketplace
16 change constantly. so if -- if Mr. Byrne's point was that
17 authorized returns on equity are lower today and bond --
18 observable bond yields are lower today, that's true.

19 But as can you see, this analysis is attempting
20 to estimate the relationship between the cost of equity
21 and the cost of bond. So that relationship also changes
22 over time, but it's a relative measure that you need
23 historical, observable evidence to get a sense of what
24 that range of equity risk premiums are.

25 And the only way to get that range is to look at

1 historical evidence. And -- and the time period I
2 selected, again, was intentionally selected because the
3 authorized returns on equity must have equaled the
4 investor required returns because the bond -- or the stock
5 prices of the utility securities during that time were
6 premiums to book value which insured the utility had
7 access to external equity capital.

8 Q And then he -- Mr. Byrne led you through a
9 series of recalculations of your risk premium analysis
10 looking at, in each of these cases, five years of data and
11 -- and in another ten case years of data. Do you recall
12 those questions?

13 A I do.

14 Q And I wrote down most of them. I think I was
15 keeping track of them. It seems to me that as you were
16 going through all those, if you did the calculations the
17 way Mr. Byrne wanted you to, all of the ROE calculations
18 came out below 10 percent; isn't that correct?

19 A It is.

20 Q And why did you do the calculations that way?

21 A Well -- well, there were some point estimates
22 that were right at 10 percent, 10.1, 10.2.

23 Q Right. But when you did the weighting and
24 average, I think they all came out below?

25 A Correct. Right.

1 **Q And why didn't you do the calculations the way**
2 **Mr. Byrne had you do them?**

3 A Because I think it's a, you know, self-serving
4 data mining type exercise that Mr. Byrne was going through
5 to try to find a way to find numbers that produced a
6 higher return of equity. I would note that some of the
7 risk premiums he was using were during one of the worst
8 periods of Financial crisis this country has ever
9 experienced.

10 The 2007 through 2009 time period reflected an
11 instance where utility companies in some instances came
12 close to defaulting on their financial obligations because
13 short-term borrowing facilities were shut down. Their
14 utility cost of borrowing for some companies sky-rocketed.

15 For example, Ameren Illinois, during the
16 2008/2009 time period, had the issue of mortgage bond at
17 an interest rate of over 10 percent Because this was a
18 very unique time period that created significant distress
19 on utility companies in particular and the U.S. corporate
20 securities in general.

21 So focusing on a time period largely impacted by
22 one of the worst financial markets we've had in the last
23 hundred years, I don't think is a very credible analysis.
24 Going back ten years, he smoothed that out a little bit.
25 But it's still largely focused on a relatively short time

1 period that was captured to build up to the financial
2 market collapse and then the very slow recovery from that
3 collapse.

4 So I think Mr. Byrne simply found a way to add
5 numbers together to produce a high return on equity
6 without constructing analysis which really captured what
7 my objective was, and that is to get a pretty good sense
8 of what the range in market risk premiums were above
9 Treasury bonds and then again above utility bonds, and
10 then to explore based on current market information where
11 this in that estimated range a reasonable estimate of the
12 current market premium lies.

13 So I think my analysis was more biased, more
14 direct in trying to get as legitimate an estimate of where
15 the current cost of equity is. Mr. Byrne, on the other
16 hand, is simply data mining to come up with a higher
17 return on equity estimate.

18 **Q Now, he also asked you about your sustainable**
19 **growth DCF calculation, which was 8.63 percent. And you**
20 **started to explain how you considered those results, and I**
21 **think he cut you off. Was there something you wanted to**
22 **add about the significance of the sustainable growth**
23 **result that you came up with?**

24 **A** Well, yeah. He kind of lumped it in with the
25 results of my CAPM study, and I -- I took exception to

1 that. My sustainable growth rate DCF analysis is
2 developed ultimately on my Schedule MPG-7. It's developed
3 onto -- the growth rate is actually produced on schedules
4 before that.

5 But the sustainable -- the sustainable growth
6 rate is 4.2 percent for the proxy group. That is not an
7 unreasonable long-term growth rate estimate based on the
8 parameters forecasted by Value Line.

9 It's lower than I think is sustainable in the
10 long-term based on other considerations I see in the
11 utility industry. But based on the sustainable growth
12 rate model, it produces a number of about 4.2 percent.

13 So I'm uncomfortable recommending a return on
14 equity that low in this environment because return on
15 equity estimates have dropped so significantly in the last
16 year, in particular, in the last couple years, and in
17 general, because I think some -- some conservative or
18 caution is necessary in awarding a return on equity for an
19 electric utility company because dropping that authorized
20 return on equity too fast can create financial trouble,
21 even if the return on equity reflects fair compensation in
22 the marketplace.

23 So I considered things like the authorized
24 return on equity ability to support the current dividend
25 payment or whether or not a sustained level of dropped

1 cost of capital will persist. The utility can -- can
2 modify its management of its dividend to reduce the cost
3 of dividend so it can still support it in the sustainable
4 cost capital market environment.

5 If return on equity estimates stay in this low
6 area over indefinite period of time, I eventually will be
7 recommending return on equities lower than I am now.

8 But my concern is that if the cost of capital
9 drops and stays low, the utility needs time to modify its
10 financial housekeeping in order to maintain its financial
11 integrity while receiving a very low authorized return on
12 equity, even if it is consistent with current market
13 costs.

14 Again, the cost of dividends is an issue. The
15 ability to refinance outstanding or imbedded debt -- debt
16 securities takes time. So all of that was -- was in part
17 of my judgment in recommending a return on equity which I
18 thought reflected fair compensation but would also
19 maintain the financial integrity of the utility.

20 **Q Next, Mr. Byrne asked you a bunch of questions**
21 **concerning your use of either a mean or median results in**
22 **your recommendations. Do you recall those questions?**

23 A I do. Yes.

24 **Q Let me just ask you, do other expert -- you've**
25 **testified in a number of cases. You've read testimony by**

1 a number of other expert witnesses over the years. Do
2 other experts only rely on mean or only rely on median, or
3 do they, like you, sometimes use mean and sometimes use
4 median?

5 A Well, I think we heard Mr. Hevert talk about
6 this this morning. In one instance, you would use mean.
7 In other instances, you would use median depending on the
8 central tendency of the results of your proxy group.
9 Which of those two factors best approximate the general
10 tendency of the return on equity estimates within the
11 proxy group?

12 In the last case, I thought the median was a
13 better estimate of it because a lot of the estimates kind
14 of clustered around the median. In this case, it was more
15 of a dispersion above and below the -- the mean -- the
16 median, so, on average, I thought better to describe those
17 high and low estimates.

18 Q Didn't actually the charts that Mr. Byrne had us
19 look at, the scatter charts, actually support what you're
20 just saying?

21 A They absolutely do support it. Mr. Byrne
22 wouldn't let me explain that. But that's precisely why I
23 decided to use a median in the last case and an average in
24 this case or a mean in this case.

25 And, importantly, in both the last case and in

1 this case, even though I used either the mean or the --
2 the mean or the median, I showed both results to be as
3 transparent as possible because I believe in this case the
4 mean best summarizes the overall tendency of the proxy
5 group. In the last couple cases, I thought the median
6 did.

7 Q So just to be real clear, when you look at a
8 chart like on page -- on Exhibit 74, at the top, there are
9 a number of diamonds that are right in the middle. And in
10 a case like that, you're saying that would have -- that
11 would be the type of data set where you would use the
12 median?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And on the bottom, the -- which is for this
15 case, only one of the little diamonds is actually right on
16 the line there. So you would -- you used the mean in this
17 case. That's really what you're talking about, central
18 tendencies?

19 A Yes, that is.

20 MS. ILES: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I
21 understood that. No further questions.

22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Then Mr. Gorman,
23 you can step down. Thank you. And before we go to
24 Mr. Murray, I just want to ask the parties, it's now 5:00.
25 And I know Mr. Murray is not going to be available next

1 Tuesday. Would he be available any other day next week,
2 including Friday, which is --

3 MR. THOMPSON: Are you available another day?
4 He says he would be.

5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. I'll let parties
6 decide amongst themselves when we want to bring him back,
7 and I'll indicate that the Commission will be available on
8 Friday. Mr. Byrne?

9 MR. BYRNE: I mean, there's -- I'm influenced by
10 the Cardinal play-off games going on right now, so I would
11 rather do it next week.

12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. All right. Well, then,
13 that's what we'll do. And you can tell me on Tuesday when
14 -- when you want to take him up, if it's on Friday or at
15 some other time next week.

16 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

17 MR. MURRAY: I'd rather be gone, to be honest
18 with you.

19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I understand that. But you're
20 probably the only one in the room who would.

21 MR. MURRAY: Doing surrebuttal and this case,
22 it's been crazy lately.

23 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. With that, then, we
24 will adjourn until 1 p.m. on Tuesday, correct?

25 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct, Judge. Thank

1 you.

2 MR. LOWERY: Thank you.

3 (The proceedings were concluded at 5:10 p.m. on
4 October 5.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3	Opening Statement by Mr. Byrne	1483
4	Opening Statement by Mr. Thompson	1492
5	Opening Statement by Ms. Baker	1501
6	Opening Statement by Ms. Iles	1502
7		
8	WITNESS: RYAN MARTIN	PAGE
9	Direct Examination by Ms. Tatro	1506
10	Cross-Examination by Ms. Iles	1507
11	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	1518
12	Cross-Examination by Mr. Thompson	1519
13	Cross-Examination by Commissioner Jarrett	1520
14	Cross-Examination by Commissioner Kenney	1524
15	Redirect Examination by Ms. Tatro	1532
16		
17	WITNESS: ROBERT HEVERT	PAGE
18	Direct Examination by Mr. Byrne	1538
19	Cross-Examination by Ms. Iles	1540
20	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	1563
21	Cross-Examination by Mr. Thompson	1571
22	(In-Camera Testimony in Vol. 27, pgs. 1588-1591)	
23	Continued Cross-Examination by Mr. Thompson	1592
24	Cross-Examination by Chairman Gunn	1594
25	Cross-Examination by Commissioner Jarrett	1612

1	I N D E X (CONTINUED)	
2	WITNESS: ROBERT HEVERT (CONTINUED)	PAGE
3	Cross-Examination by Commissioner Kenney	1618
4	Recross Examination by Commissioner Jarrett	1633
5	Recross Examination by Mr. Kenney	1634
6	Recross Examination by Chairman Gunn	1637
7	Recross Examination by Ms. Iles	1638
8	Recross Examination by Mr. Thompson	1641
9	Redirect Examination by Mr. Byrne	1645
10		
11	WITNESS: LISA FERGUSON	PAGE
12	Direct Examination by Mr. Thompson	1660
13	Cross-Examination by Mr. Downey	1662
14	Cross-Examination by Mr. Mills	1666
15	Cross-Examination by Mr. Lowery	1667
16		
17	WITNESS: MICHAEL GORMAN	PAGE
18	Direct Examination by Ms. Iles	1688
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Thompson	1691
20	Cross-Examination by Mr. Lowery	1692
21	Redirect Examination by Mr. Downey	1694
22	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	1695
23	Cross-Examination by Mr. Thompson	1703
24	Cross-Examination by Mr. Byrne	1706
25	Cross-Examination by Commissioner Kenney	1762

1 I N D E X (CONTINUED)

Cross-Examination by Commissioner Stoll 1768

2 Recross Examination by Mr. Thompson 1769

Redirect Examination by Ms. Iles 1770

3

Reporter's Certificate 1783

4

E X H I B I T S

5 AMEREN

6 EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	OFFERED	ADMITTED
-----------	-------------	---------	----------

7 20	Direct Testimony of	1540	1540
------	---------------------	------	------

8	Robert Hevert		
---	---------------	--	--

9 21	Rebuttal Testimony	1540	1540
------	--------------------	------	------

10	of Robert Hevert		
----	------------------	--	--

11 22-HC	Surrebuttal	1540	1540
----------	-------------	------	------

12	Testimony of		
----	--------------	--	--

13	Robert Hevert		
----	---------------	--	--

14 22-NP	Surrebuttal	1540	1540
----------	-------------	------	------

15	Testimony of		
----	--------------	--	--

16	Robert Hevert		
----	---------------	--	--

17 23	Direct Testimony	1507	1507
-------	------------------	------	------

18	of Ryan Martin		
----	----------------	--	--

19 69	RRA Report	1652	1652
-------	------------	------	------

20 70	Graph	1693	1693
-------	-------	------	------

21 71	Chart	1738	1738
-------	-------	------	------

22 72	Chart	1746	1746
-------	-------	------	------

23 73	Chart	1755	1755
-------	-------	------	------

24 74	Chart	1760	1760
-------	-------	------	------

25 75	Chart	1760	1760
-------	-------	------	------

1	MIEC			
	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	OFFERED	ADMITTED
2	507-HC	Direct Testimony of Michael Gorman	1691	1691
3	508-NP	Direct Testimony of Michael Gorman	1691	1691
4	509	Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Gorman	1691	1691
5	528	Data Request & Response	1511	1511
	529	Chart	1551	1551
6	530	RRA Summary of Major Rate Cases January Through June of 2012	1556	1556
9	531	5/13/12 S&L Report	1560	1560
10	532	Substitute Schedule	1691	1691
11		MPG-21		
12	COMMISSION			
13	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	OFFERED	ADMITTED
14	A	EEI Report	1637	1637
15	B	EEI Report	1637	1637
16				
17	STAFF			
18	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	OFFERED	ADMITTED
19	232-HC	Testimony of Lisa Ferguson	1662	1662
21	232-NP	Testimony of Lisa Ferguson	1662	1662
23	233	Testimony of Lisa Ferguson	1662	1662
25		(Original exhibits were retained by PSC.)		

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF MISSOURI)

4) ss.

5 COUNTY OF OSAGE)

6

7 I, Monnie S. Mealy, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
8 Certified Court Reporter #0538, and Registered
9 Professional Reporter, and Notary Public, within and for
10 the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that I was
11 personally present at the proceedings as set forth in the
12 caption sheet hereof; that I then and there took down in
13 stenotype the proceedings had at said time and was
14 thereafter transcribed by me, and is fully and accurately
15 set forth in the preceding pages.

16

17

18

19

20

21 _____
Monnie S. Mealy, CSR, CCR #0539

22 Registered Professional Reporter

23

24

25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

A	1500:2	1664:7	1526:8,19	1689:17
AAA 1693:16	1607:3,17,21	1751:13	1529:23	1769:15,19
1694:20,22	1678:12	accounting	1530:9	1769:25
1694:24,25	1776:21	1640:12	1585:25	1770:6
1695:2	accept 1518:1	1641:2	1645:5	additions
AAO 1659:12	1574:1	1654:3,17,22	1661:3,18	1506:18
ability 1527:2	acceptable	1671:5	1697:1	1540:16
1528:4	1683:18,20	1687:20	1707:2	address
1530:3	1683:22	accounting-b...	1721:22	1506:12
1537:5	accepted	1641:1	Ad 1685:12	1604:7
1578:13	1623:19	accounts	adapted	1651:17
1589:20	1625:11,17	1529:4	1496:20	1654:13
1617:6	access 1491:20	accuracy	add 1524:3	1685:9,10
1627:16	1512:16	1708:24	1720:12	addressed
1654:8,16,24	1516:11,11	accurate	1725:1	1655:18
1659:18	1533:23	1596:17	1726:7	addressing
1688:6	1534:8	1607:25	1731:12,21	1658:25
1705:3	1647:20	1625:21	1731:23	1659:2
1759:10	1656:9	1689:16,19	1736:8	1768:3
1762:9,17	1705:4	1689:20	1737:5,9,22	adequacy
1769:14	1769:11,24	1695:25	1740:15,23	1763:23
1774:24	1770:6	accurately	1773:4,22	adequate
1775:15	1771:7	1670:10	added 1605:10	1484:14
able 1509:16	accessible	1688:7	1605:22	1501:19
1528:10	1537:18	1706:10	1659:19	1519:23
1551:12	accessing	1746:5	1661:6	1571:7
1561:12	1568:19	1759:10	1689:18	1583:9
1587:1	accommodati...	1784:14	1714:4	1698:5
1605:11	1505:17	achieve	1731:16	1705:3
1613:7	accomplish	1742:11,12	1740:10	1707:25
1617:3	1498:8	achieved	adding 1605:25	1763:18
1627:22	1699:6	1494:23	1606:2	adequately
1629:7	1707:16	1724:2	1740:11,12	1698:14
1682:14	accomplishing	acknowledge	addition	adjourn
1683:15	1705:6	1746:15	1492:10	1683:14
1684:5	account	acknowledges	1645:18	1778:24
1698:14	1504:16	1486:9	1647:8	adjust 1722:16
1706:12	1527:6	act 1659:11	1661:6	adjusted
1762:3	1529:2	action 1613:23	1670:14,20	1487:25
absent 1611:21	1561:2,16	actions 1589:22	1708:11	1574:22
1637:18	1591:19	activity 1598:3	additional	1645:6
absolute	1594:4	actual 1494:23	1524:25	1654:21
1548:19	1602:20	1496:1	1525:8	adjustment
1551:5	1627:2	1498:11,13	1534:21	1634:23
1565:14	1653:25	1498:18	1553:2	1647:9
absolutely	1654:3	1499:12,25	1670:21	1654:20
1495:16	1655:10	1522:9	1679:11	1687:19,22

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

adjustments	1496:14	1524:14	1598:9	agrees 1597:4
1626:10	1539:7	1525:15	1599:12	1662:8,12
1634:24	1572:12,14	1526:25	1601:16	ahead 1500:22
1635:2	advocate	1528:13,18	1604:18	1657:1
Administrati...	1616:10	1528:21	1609:7	1683:4
1573:6,11,19	1760:24	1532:2	1612:18	1685:5
administrati...	AEP 1715:1,20	1535:3,7,11	1616:25	1727:19,22
1589:22	1716:24	1536:18	1617:9,11	allocated
admission	1717:5,9	1537:1	1618:9	1670:23
1506:25	1718:7	1590:17	1620:23	1671:1
1511:13	affect 1604:6	1616:12,21	1621:2	1672:14
1551:22	1680:3	1617:6	1626:7	1674:25
1556:14	1723:14	1627:1,9,11	1628:13	1677:24,25
1560:16	affiliate	1629:5	1635:20	allocates
1687:1	1589:23	1704:23,25	1636:21	1671:17
1689:22	1590:17	1760:19	1639:9,18	allow 1491:19
admitted	affiliated	1762:8,13,16	1640:15	1512:15
1540:9	1559:22	ago 1486:2,19	1667:9	1516:9
1556:21	affiliates	1487:16	1669:10	1524:1
1742:15	1591:18	1567:24	1671:13	1659:10,16
1756:24	affordability	1571:3	1674:8	1707:10
1767:10	1502:19	1621:12	1689:3	allowance
1782:6	1569:6	1652:11	1693:24	1594:1
1783:1,13,18	affordable	1706:18	1694:5	allowed
adopt 1486:21	1502:8,13	1710:1	1697:17,18	1497:19
1491:14	1569:12	1767:21	1698:3	1500:25
1494:13	afforded	agree 1484:1	1707:6	1503:11
1503:6	1576:24	1513:7	1711:8,11,22	1520:1
1505:10	afternoon	1514:22	1712:3,14,19	1576:22
adopted	1657:1,2	1531:4	1712:24	1592:5
1485:15,17	1658:21,22	1546:3	1713:7	1608:23
1494:9	1659:1	1548:22	1733:5	1646:3
1556:5	1663:12,13	1549:3,4	1756:7	allowing
1611:8	1664:3	1551:5,6	1762:12	1501:20
1696:16,19	1684:7	1563:19,20	1768:10	allows 1519:21
adopting	1691:17,18	1564:9	agreed 1502:1	1583:23
1486:16	1699:18,19	1569:1,8,10	1601:18,20	1584:8
advance 1526:6	1702:25	1569:11	1603:1,1	1594:5
1534:21	1703:1	1571:5	1632:9	1625:23,25
1572:5	1758:20	1573:17,24	1638:4	ameliorate
adverse	agencies	1577:16,19	1671:13	1687:21
1496:12	1516:14,18	1577:21	1682:14	Ameren
1568:11	1516:25	1579:14,16	agreeing	1481:10
advised	1520:16,16	1579:20,22	1596:16	1482:10
1684:11	1520:22	1594:11	agreement	1483:3,14,15
advisor 1761:8	1521:2	1596:25	1572:23	1484:3,10,21
advisors	1523:5	1597:1,20	1615:12	1485:15,17

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1486:2	1642:1	1553:9	1745:23,24	1764:15,20
1487:16,23	1643:11	1624:13	1746:3	1765:7,14
1488:2,14,15	1644:1	1659:14,25	analysis	1766:21,24
1494:17	1654:2,21	1660:10,23	1484:25	1770:19
1499:13	1661:4,19	1662:9	1485:1	1771:9
1500:24	1662:6,10	1663:2	1486:22,24	1772:23
1501:18,20	1663:9	1671:25	1492:24	1773:6,13
1501:22	1685:25	1672:5	1496:4	1774:1
1502:10	1688:16	1674:10	1498:6	analyst
1503:4	1693:23	1676:7	1504:16	1530:24
1504:9,23	1695:17,21	1680:1	1524:14	1573:8,13,21
1505:8	1696:1	1756:9	1527:16	1576:5
1506:13	1698:4,6,8,13	amounts	1530:1	1582:10
1508:9	1698:22	1528:12	1535:16	1620:25
1509:15	1699:8	1612:17	1546:17	1628:15
1510:19,22	1700:22	analogy	1551:6	1629:8
1516:14,15	1702:22	1694:20	1581:18	1757:18
1518:19,22	1706:21	analyses	1582:17	analysts 1574:2
1518:23	1712:20	1485:4,7	1624:6	1582:3,5
1519:7	1767:2,11,22	1486:12,13	1625:15	1584:2
1523:5	1768:7	1486:17	1641:20	1702:5
1524:18,21	1772:15	1487:10,11	1642:12	1708:14,16
1525:9,15,21	1782:5	1487:22,24	1650:20	1758:7
1527:15	AmerenUE	1488:23	1653:19	analyst's
1531:3	1707:9	1490:1,2,25	1654:7	1743:4
1534:15	1740:13	1491:18	1655:4	analytical
1541:18	AmerenUE's	1492:14	1692:18,22	1574:19
1542:18	1767:21	1544:17	1708:24	1699:21
1547:25	Ameren's	1546:18	1709:14,20	analyzing
1549:17	1502:19	1572:17	1709:24	1526:25
1558:6	1521:16	1580:14,16	1710:4	angry 1632:14
1559:4	1527:2,7	1580:22,23	1713:3	annual 1481:11
1567:10	1533:21	1581:5	1719:17	1509:21,24
1569:19	1592:5	1583:12	1720:4,5,18	1517:17
1571:7,8,10	1608:16	1585:14	1724:18	1663:2
1571:19	1655:24	1641:25	1728:23	1664:6,15,16
1572:7	1698:17	1645:9,21	1733:1,4	1664:22,25
1574:19	1763:2	1652:2	1734:19	1665:2,2
1589:5,6,13	American	1708:12,12	1735:7,11	1666:1
1589:24	1753:10	1708:13	1736:17	annualized
1590:9,10,19	amortization	1719:13,14	1738:5	1667:6
1590:22	1659:20	1719:15,16	1742:20,22	annually
1591:10,13	amount	1719:21,24	1743:2	1511:7
1591:17,25	1496:15	1726:22	1745:24	1676:14
1596:2,2	1499:3	1727:5,6,14	1748:1	anomalies
1603:14	1514:7,25	1742:25	1757:7	1652:12
1641:25	1546:1	1744:15	1763:19	answer

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1505:15	1572:3,4	approach	1523:10	1563:17,21
1533:3	1576:14	1486:25	approves	1574:5
1551:20	1750:4	1560:14	1512:25	1591:10
1564:14	Appalachian	1574:10	approximate	1606:24
1582:19	1715:18	1590:18	1660:19	1607:22
1618:3	1716:20,20	1623:10	1680:17	1614:16
1633:18	1716:24	1630:14	1776:9	1615:6
1637:15	1717:1	1634:4,5	approximated	1616:23
1667:7	apparently	1640:17,18	1725:25	1617:20,25
1669:18	1503:10	1703:10	approximately	1618:12
1670:1,5,9	appear 1549:9	1714:8	1511:5	1619:7
1674:3	1615:18	1745:7	1667:9	1633:22
1733:2	1692:11	approaches	1668:22	1638:19
1770:11	appeared	1547:15	arbitrarily	1639:20
answered	1598:5	appropriate	1486:14	1641:11
1619:7	appears	1484:3	area 1484:9	1646:11
1758:25	1565:18	1498:8	1491:8	1648:8
answers	1719:5	1500:3,16	1492:23,23	1651:7
1495:23	1753:14,24	1505:7	1708:6	1655:17,19
1506:23	1754:2,5,7,9	1516:8	1775:6	1658:2
1539:24	1754:11,13	1521:6	arena 1708:17	1691:19
1630:7	1754:18	1522:5	argue 1760:2	1692:18
1658:3	1755:13	1530:25	argued 1693:2	1703:21
1744:12,14	application	1571:1	argues 1708:10	1705:8,14
1751:18	1533:15	1606:19	argument	1707:14
anticipated	1623:14	1622:19	1523:1	1751:18
1509:21	applied	1627:3	1770:2	1758:23
1510:18	1543:12	1641:5	Arizona 1603:8	1764:4
1622:5	1623:20	1645:21	1718:24	1766:19
anticipation	1676:10	1687:18,22	arrive 1652:6	1767:8
1526:10	applies	1688:1,11	arriving 1561:2	1768:23
anybody	1647:18	1700:8	1561:16	1769:4,5
1631:19	apply 1529:23	1701:22	art 1492:17	1770:8
1632:23	1583:23	1703:23	1495:17,22	1773:18
1633:2,2	applying	1710:22,24	1512:12	1775:20
anymore	1721:7	1711:12	1515:23	asking 1505:2
1672:23	appreciate	1713:8	1619:11	1505:3
anyway	1505:17	1725:1,8	1620:24,25	1513:3
1631:16	1514:4	1726:2	1620:25	1514:2
1669:19	1545:11	1740:13	1695:9,14	1519:9
apart 1524:18	1551:13	approval	aside 1594:25	1520:15
1624:19	1607:19	1533:12,16	1625:15,18	1522:7
apologies	1608:8	1533:18	1666:24	1523:4
1539:1	appreciation	approve	1670:16,18	1524:4
apologize	1504:18,19	1554:24	asked 1493:4	1568:23
1552:15	1547:8,12,12	approved	1522:10,19	1596:11
1560:12	1547:20	1485:9	1536:17	1606:9,13,22

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1638:3	1528:24	1712:24	1580:25	1554:18
1703:20	1529:8	assumed	1581:1	1555:3,6
1733:11,12	assigning	1629:2	1611:3	1557:21
1735:23	1498:13	assumes 1585:9	1700:14	1559:2
1736:1,3	1629:6	1624:12	1703:13	1560:5
1755:16,18	assignment	assuming	attorneys	1566:13
1767:14	1628:2	1512:25	1503:2	1575:3
asks 1502:16	Assistant	1599:18	1615:6	1638:24
aspect 1629:6	1508:8,12	1676:21,24	attract 1484:14	1639:15
aspects	1516:12	1676:24	1485:18	1648:23
1546:24	associated	1677:21	1491:19	1652:6
1547:1	1548:10	1678:15,17	1501:19	1653:4
1636:12	1550:8	1680:25	1571:7	1688:2
1637:6	1568:11	1721:25	1698:5,14	1700:10
1647:4	1578:4	assumption	1762:3	1704:21,24
asserting	1648:6	1535:11	attraction	1713:15
1706:20	1664:7,19	1677:15	1571:14	1714:18
assertion	1665:3	1708:8	attributing	1716:17
1616:25	1670:16,22	1724:11,14	1679:11	1718:5
assessing	1671:19	assumptions	attrition	1728:5
1617:1	1674:11	1489:7	1561:1	1729:1
1621:21	Associates	1548:9,21	1683:2	1733:17
1627:15	1493:23	1583:18,24	1687:21	1767:22
1762:9	1552:17	1584:8	August 1509:9	1768:3,9,17
assessment	1557:10	1624:10	1533:16,18	1769:23
1628:1	1595:3	1625:25	1533:18	1770:4,17
1721:9	1598:15	1642:20,21	1534:4	1771:3
1725:24	1600:25	1643:1	authoritative	1774:19,23
1762:10	1601:12	Atomic	1493:13	1775:11
assessments	1648:17	1557:24	authorize	authorizing
1617:13	1652:21	attach 1562:6	1503:4	1602:15
asset 1485:6	1700:2	attached	1554:23	available
1496:3	association	1489:4	authorized	1505:15
1719:17	1596:6	1727:15	1484:3	1523:22
1720:2	1603:18	attempt 1725:8	1485:10,22	1526:21
1764:16	assume 1493:7	attempting	1486:1,7	1528:7
assets 1554:3	1493:8	1640:1	1487:15,18	1562:4,5
1578:17	1571:5	1735:8	1488:14,16	1574:24
1594:22	1603:19,22	1770:19	1488:17	1654:25
1601:6	1624:25	attended	1490:14	1683:25
1648:7	1637:1,11	1520:18	1491:7,17	1684:12,13
1708:17	1668:1	attention	1503:20	1709:1,7,10
assign 1498:19	1672:23	1638:18	1505:3	1728:23
1500:14	1673:16,22	attorney	1552:24,24	1757:25
1528:19	1698:3	1482:11	1552:25	1758:5
1530:8	1709:11	1575:1,25	1553:10,10	1777:25
assigned	1710:20	1576:4	1553:14	1778:1,3,7

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

Avenue	1609:25	avoiding	1593:4	baked 1666:22
1482:12	1610:9,19	1727:21	1643:18	Baker 1482:6
1506:14	1638:5,24	award 1494:17	1644:7	1483:19
average 1486:6	1639:15	1500:16	1693:16,17	1501:7,9
1487:17	1648:21,22	1519:21,23	1694:8,14,15	1518:9,11
1488:6,7	1650:13	1575:6,13,23	1694:15	1519:1
1490:13,17	1655:12	1579:10,15	1740:13	1532:16
1490:19,19	1696:10,20	1579:17	back 1483:2	1563:9,11
1490:23	1696:22	awarded	1486:19	1571:21
1491:3	1697:12	1494:18	1503:15	1633:6
1493:10,24	1700:1	1495:6	1511:20	1637:21
1494:1,3	1701:16	1598:12	1522:24	1638:19
1497:9	1705:16	1611:21	1527:18	1687:11
1503:11,14	1713:7,15	1700:1	1538:6,9	1691:14,16
1503:20	1725:13,14	awarding	1540:18,21	1699:13
1504:1,4	1725:16	1493:19	1568:25,25	1703:21
1512:7,7,8	1726:23	1700:8,21	1575:5	1705:8
1519:22	1728:7,9,16	1774:18	1576:18,19	1766:1
1520:2	1734:1	awards	1583:17	1780:5,11,20
1523:1	1736:20,22	1493:10	1584:17	1781:22
1527:4	1737:17	1494:20	1589:1	balance
1543:7,9,9,11	1741:6	1604:20	1593:24	1512:13
1543:22	1746:10	aware 1496:10	1598:16	1515:22
1553:14,22	1749:14	1518:22	1605:10	1516:7,8
1554:17	1750:8,11,12	1569:5	1606:1	1575:10
1555:3,6,12	1755:3,23,25	1589:5,9,24	1607:14	1637:8
1555:16	1757:14	1590:2,6,11	1612:23	1641:20
1579:20	1765:5,8,9	1590:13,13	1614:13,14	1672:4
1581:4,4,4,7	1769:18	1590:13,14	1616:19	1674:5
1581:10	1771:24	1590:19,23	1620:18	1676:15
1583:1,4,5,6	1776:16,23	1630:15,18	1631:3,18,21	1678:16
1583:7,9	averaged	1630:23	1632:3	1680:21
1585:16,19	1599:1	1706:19	1653:3,8	1681:5
1586:23	1697:10	1707:4	1654:5	1685:21,22
1587:4,4	1726:22	1708:17,19	1663:24	1685:25
1594:2,10	1741:25		1667:3	1686:20
1595:4	averages	B	1682:3,5,7,8	1763:8
1598:12,22	1555:10	B 1556:2	1730:8	balanced
1598:24	1581:8	1611:4,4,5,5	1731:12	1520:1
1599:3,4,19	1595:13	1633:3,10,12	1733:6,23	balances
1599:24	1647:21	1633:14	1769:7,11	1671:14
1600:2,3	averaging	1636:2,16	1772:24	balancing
1601:1,14	1741:5	1782:4	1778:6	1569:16
1602:10,14	1749:10	1783:15	backward	bar 1495:2
1603:4	averse 1567:2,3	BAA 1549:21	1640:21	1606:12
1608:23	avoid 1534:8	1551:3	1641:3	barely 1489:19
1609:4,18,24	1566:22	1592:14,17	bad 1568:15	Barnes 1561:19

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

base 1527:18	1641:2	1550:5	1507:24	1699:2
1553:1	1652:2,6	1554:25	1519:24	1700:4,6,7
1561:13	1661:2	1559:23	1521:6	1701:12,16
1594:23,25	1666:9	1562:6,17	1526:20	1704:17
1610:3	1667:14,22	1563:19	1527:19,20	1709:14,21
1643:12	1687:24	1587:5,6	1529:1	1710:2
1654:9,12	1698:25	1593:12,14	1530:4	1715:3
1679:25	1700:23	1610:9,10	1531:13,15	1718:1,6
1680:2,4,6	1701:6	1614:1,7,9	1531:22	1722:7
1681:4	1708:24	1628:8	1532:1	1723:19
1696:11,20	1709:6	1629:1	1533:13,22	1734:3,18
1696:22	1713:17	1634:3	1534:4	1753:5,6
1697:1,3,6,9	1719:20,24	1635:12,16	1535:19	1768:5
1697:11,13	1721:9	1643:8,15	1536:3,3	1777:3
1697:16	1725:5	1654:20	1537:1	believed 1574:6
1705:9,15,16	1726:25	1659:8	1541:24	believes
1705:19,23	1728:6,8	1667:5	1554:5	1490:24
1706:1	1742:21	1676:5	1555:21	1707:2
baseball	1748:1	1678:13	1561:19	Bench 1520:7
1631:13	1765:8,24	1699:25,25	1570:23	1532:13
1683:14	1766:10,19	Baxter's	1572:6	1591:3
based 1484:24	1773:10	1495:2	1578:2	1632:17
1490:25	1774:7,10,11	bear 1690:3	1585:21	1634:17
1491:17	basic 1534:23	beat 1669:20	1594:20	1681:15,24
1497:18	1711:22	beginning	1598:19	1690:9
1502:10	basically	1483:8,9,14	1601:3	1758:16
1503:10	1522:8	1503:14	1603:20	1765:24
1518:5,19	1524:3	1532:13	1604:3	1766:10
1519:17	1528:22	1634:18	1609:1,14,25	benchmark
1523:20	1547:9	1672:13	1618:7	1763:3,24
1527:21	1564:1	1757:22	1632:3,25	benchmarks
1529:7	1566:9	1765:24	1633:16	1763:15
1530:1	1567:7	behalf 1502:24	1635:3,23	beneath
1531:3	1581:14	1616:10	1644:22	1500:25
1543:7,9	1582:3	1685:14	1647:6	beneficial
1545:23	1603:25	1761:7,10,17	1648:8	1523:18
1546:23	1641:16	1761:21	1657:23	1650:8
1547:23	1643:6	belabor	1659:22	1705:15,18
1569:22	1695:10	1571:14	1662:4,6	1705:22,24
1574:24	1703:22	belief 1535:14	1665:18	benefit 1522:18
1581:9	basing 1501:13	1539:20	1669:13	1664:7,19
1596:1	basis 1486:1	1658:7	1677:14	1666:22,24
1597:10	1487:15,17	1670:17	1681:9	1666:25
1598:7	1488:6	1721:5	1689:20	1667:1
1606:1	1512:6,17	believe 1490:7	1695:20,24	1668:10
1620:20	1519:19	1497:5	1696:18	1669:9,22
1634:3,17	1548:6,6	1505:20,22	1698:19	1680:7,11

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1681:3,7	1515:22	body 1556:6	1733:22	borrow
benefits	1521:21	1611:9	1736:24	1509:17
1514:16	1528:13,21	1617:1	1738:5	borrowed
1660:24	1530:7	Bolivar	1740:11,12	1509:19
1661:4	1546:4	1482:20	1740:13	borrowing
1665:3	1564:9	bond 1504:12	1743:21	1772:13,14
1666:16,19	1568:22	1504:16	1762:17	bottom
1670:1,8,15	1571:3	1508:20	1765:1	1489:21,22
1671:18	1583:3	1509:14	1770:17,18	1570:9
1672:5,14	1592:12	1510:20	1770:21	1679:10
1673:2	1593:6	1516:14,17	1771:4	1752:12
1674:10,25	1606:14	1541:23	1772:16	1777:14
1678:20	1609:12	1546:11,13	bonds 1496:11	bought 1565:9
best 1539:19	1613:13	1546:16,19	1504:12,13	Boulevard
1572:24	1620:9	1549:7,15,20	1508:24	1482:24
1658:6	1630:6	1550:1,12,13	1509:3,7,19	bound 1719:19
1707:15	1650:3	1550:18,19	1512:1	boundary
1709:9,22	1653:16	1550:20,21	1533:23	1726:23
1776:9	1665:4	1551:15	1534:16	bounds
1777:4	1670:13	1562:10	1549:22	1575:19
beta 1577:12	1691:25	1578:3,8,8,10	1578:6	1576:6
1577:13	1696:5,9	1578:12,15	1644:7	1719:23
1622:2,8	1721:3	1578:19	1693:11,12	1731:3
1709:18	1724:19	1593:2	1695:15	Box 1482:3,8
1720:8,8,10	1742:19	1643:17,18	1723:9,10	1482:14
better 1494:17	1752:4	1643:23	1725:18	boy 1493:5
1540:23	1757:7	1692:3	1727:11	1564:14
1560:14	1772:24	1693:16,18	1728:22	1572:22
1639:10	blew 1727:22	1693:19	1773:9,9	break 1538:5,7
1697:20	blow-up	1694:8,13,13	bonus 1594:14	1538:9
1758:11	1727:19	1694:14,20	book 1514:21	1540:20
1776:13,16	blue 1491:7,8,9	1707:25	1515:1,5,10	1577:8
beyond	Bluefield	1709:18	1515:11,14	1600:23
1524:20	1484:5,11	1720:13,15	1624:16	1607:1,13
1564:19	1485:17	1721:1,13,23	1640:12	1624:19
1568:22	1488:12	1722:1,6,11	1641:5	1631:3,24
1621:24	1491:23	1722:17	1769:18	1632:1,7
1622:20	1494:15	1723:22	1770:1	1633:17
1662:23	1574:24	1724:3,23,25	1771:6	1677:3
1663:5	1576:3	1725:2,9,20	booked	1682:4,6
biased 1642:22	1618:20	1725:22	1671:20	breaks 1603:3
1773:13	1700:17	1726:3,9,16	1672:6	briefly 1658:24
big 1563:16	board 1590:19	1726:20	1673:3,3,8,25	1720:3
1710:13	1752:9	1728:14,17	1674:10	1724:20
bill 1723:16	Bob 1552:11	1728:18	books 1671:4	bring 1492:15
bit 1508:7	bodies 1616:3	1729:1	boring 1489:24	1495:25
1509:3	1760:21	1731:13,17	1738:1	1654:19

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1657:1	1491:25	1758:13	1663:2,2	calendar
1703:6	1492:1,5,13	1764:14	1720:7	1554:20
1778:6	1493:2	1766:7,9,12	1723:24	1555:9
bringing	1494:8	1766:14,23	1724:1	1610:1
1608:6	1495:16	1767:3,8,14	calculates	1648:18
brings 1567:18	1496:25	1768:23	1581:9,13	1662:24
1568:3	1503:16	1770:8	1642:8	1663:3
broad 1576:21	1504:24	1771:8,17	calculating	1714:12,20
broader	1505:20,21	1772:2,4	1514:18	1767:12
1535:16	1538:18,20	1773:4,15	calculation	call 1506:2
1577:16	1538:21	1775:20	1513:17	1517:16
broadly 1617:6	1539:4	1776:18,21	1514:2	1544:9
broken 1550:4	1540:1	1778:8,9	1519:17	1582:1,1,8
brought	1541:7	1780:3,18	1546:6,12,13	1615:3
1499:11	1542:1	1781:9,24	1583:4	1655:3
1500:8	1596:12,25	Byrne's 1503:9	1586:5	1701:7
1703:16	1600:16	1770:16	1594:4	1726:20
Bryan 1482:19	1606:21		1607:8	called 1576:12
budgets	1607:4	C	1628:25	calls 1526:13
1728:22	1609:3	C 1482:1	1633:22,25	capital 1484:14
build 1514:23	1631:5,7,16	1483:1	1635:15	1485:6,18
1773:1	1632:4,6,21	calculate	1639:18	1487:1
built 1671:21	1632:25	1495:11	1661:1,2,5,6	1491:20
bump 1564:8	1633:5	1548:11	1663:25	1496:3,19
1696:5	1641:9	1569:19	1664:1,5	1498:14
bunch 1606:24	1648:11,15	1585:3	1665:23,24	1499:13
1775:20	1648:24	1606:7,16	1670:13	1501:19
buried 1489:3	1649:6	1625:14	1676:5,6	1504:18,20
business	1656:12	1631:10	1679:11	1505:22
1506:12	1682:19,21	1640:1	1713:22	1507:19,25
1530:8,11	1702:24	1662:5	1773:19	1508:16,19
1567:7,8,9,10	1703:10,12	1667:14	calculations	1511:22
1567:13	1703:14,18	1697:24	1547:24	1512:1,6,14
1568:6	1703:19	1727:7	1633:24	1512:16,24
1573:5,10,18	1714:8,10	1737:18	1635:4	1514:14,17
1621:22	1734:6,17,22	1741:4	1689:10,14	1515:17,19
1692:15	1735:4	calculated	1690:20,22	1515:21,23
1693:7,22	1738:3	1503:11	1690:24	1516:2,6,9,11
1708:7	1740:1,4	1545:22	1768:24	1519:22
buy 1547:10	1742:4,19	1546:23	1771:16,17	1520:2
1566:23,23	1745:7,10	1547:23	1771:20	1542:6
1566:25	1746:16,19	1570:2	1772:1	1547:8,11,12
1591:10	1750:1	1581:13	calculator	1547:20
buying 1723:21	1751:21	1609:15,17	1703:2	1552:25
Byrne 1482:10	1752:3,7,8	1609:24	1713:14	1553:11
1483:16,21	1756:19	1660:3,16,18	calculus 1567:4	1563:18
1483:23,24	1757:3,5	1661:18	1697:23	1565:2,10

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1566:22	1675:16,22	Carolina	1548:3	1688:14
1567:14	1676:7,17,25	1558:22	1549:17	1695:22
1568:19	1679:22	carries 1530:16	1552:18	1696:1
1571:7,14	capitals 1759:9	carry 1530:19	1553:3,7,25	1697:1
1620:15	1759:13	1534:20	1557:13	1707:3
1625:4	capital-related	Carver's	1570:2	1721:11
1641:25	1679:15	1661:21	1572:8,17	1724:16
1654:14	CAPM 1625:14	case 1483:3	1574:1	1732:19
1656:9	1708:13	1484:1,1,4	1583:22	1744:2
1665:18,25	1720:3,3,5,15	1485:13	1585:10	1745:6,13,23
1670:24	1720:17	1486:19	1591:25,25	1746:3
1671:1,5,8,19	1721:11	1487:10	1594:21	1747:22,24
1671:21	1722:10	1489:11,13	1595:17,20	1747:25
1672:15,24	1724:2,22	1489:15	1595:23	1748:10,10
1674:17,18	1726:14,16	1490:16	1596:8	1748:13
1677:11	1726:19	1491:15	1598:3	1749:8,18
1678:8,11	1727:3	1492:11	1601:4,10,14	1750:17
1679:8	1743:15	1495:1,8,24	1602:4	1752:11,13
1680:1	1744:4	1499:10,23	1608:17,20	1752:13
1686:17,18	1765:7,16,17	1500:9	1608:22	1753:3
1691:1,2,21	1765:19	1501:12	1611:13	1754:15,16
1694:17,18	1773:25	1502:10	1612:15,24	1754:21,25
1695:7	caption	1504:7,10,21	1613:19,25	1755:12,13
1698:5,14,25	1784:12	1505:4,5,7,11	1614:14	1755:14,20
1705:4	capture	1505:13	1615:20,21	1755:20,22
1706:6,14,20	1704:14	1506:16	1628:8	1755:23,23
1707:8	1735:25	1507:20,23	1633:9	1755:24
1708:3,3,14	1736:4	1508:2	1635:24,24	1756:9,10,15
1712:21	captured	1510:24,25	1636:13	1756:16,17
1719:17	1773:1,6	1511:9,11	1637:6	1756:18
1720:2	captures	1517:8	1642:1,6,14	1767:13
1759:5,16,17	1758:11	1518:12	1643:6,21	1768:5,16,19
1762:3	capturing	1523:7	1644:21,24	1768:21
1763:6,10	1709:22	1526:8,17	1646:13	1771:11
1764:16	card 1528:23	1528:8	1647:14	1776:12,14
1767:20	Cardinal	1534:4	1648:18	1776:23,24
1769:11,15	1683:14	1539:9	1650:7,10	1776:24,25
1769:25	1778:10	1541:17,18	1654:2	1777:1,3,10
1770:7	Cardinals	1541:21	1659:15,21	1777:15,17
1771:7	1684:18	1542:11,18	1663:6,15	1778:21
1775:1,4,8	care 1764:18	1543:21	1665:9	cases 1485:2,9
capitalization	careful 1656:11	1544:2,6,11	1666:9	1486:11
1528:13	Carole 1482:17	1544:12,21	1667:2,8	1487:21
1721:13	1502:24	1545:10,15	1668:21	1488:3
capitalized	1507:17	1545:16,16	1671:15	1502:14
1661:6	1683:3	1545:17,22	1675:4	1521:14
1671:3	1757:2	1547:25	1685:13	1532:2,4

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1554:22	1601:1	1606:6,6,16	1544:9,10	characterizing
1555:3	1603:23	1607:23	1545:15	1569:15
1595:18	1657:16	1623:20	1549:25	charge 1502:6
1598:1,20,23	1685:12	1643:15	1550:3,4,6,7	chart 1490:9
1599:15,22	causing	1653:10	1550:24	1490:12
1600:13	1569:13	1683:8	1565:14	1491:13
1601:7	caution 1760:8	1684:2,6	1566:8	1493:4,12
1602:9,11,20	1774:18	1700:7	1584:7,8	1503:9
1611:1	cautions	Certificate	1598:19	1504:3
1612:12	1765:17	1782:3	1605:20	1557:18
1616:2	Cave 1482:19	1784:1	1606:1	1592:5
1618:22	CCR 1482:23	Certified	1642:24	1635:10
1623:14,21	1784:21	1784:7,8	1643:1	1636:16
1630:9	ceiling 1499:1	certify 1784:10	1644:20	1645:12
1636:3,7,7	Center 1482:19	CFAs 1617:22	1653:5	1733:16
1638:21	central 1494:2	Chairman	1691:6	1734:7,18
1639:15,17	1494:2	1520:7,8	1725:4	1738:6
1654:14	1650:21	1591:3,4,8	1770:16	1740:5
1719:10	1735:25	1596:12,13	changed	1746:4,11,19
1749:19	1736:4	1596:23	1545:10	1748:22
1752:17	1751:17	1597:3,7	1550:1	1752:5
1771:10	1776:8	1600:18	1570:13	1777:8
1775:25	1777:17	1606:17,22	changes 1522:6	1782:21,22
1777:5	certain 1522:6	1607:3,10,20	1522:18	1782:23,24
1783:7	1523:9	1610:17	1570:16	1782:25
cash 1484:25	1528:15	1632:18,22	1586:8,18	1783:5
1496:3	1529:24	1633:2,7,20	1632:4	charter
1528:3	1531:14	1634:13,15	1641:25	1620:25
1537:3,6	1553:3,5	1634:21	1706:4,5	chartered
1578:11,17	1554:25	1641:10,15	1722:16	1573:8,13,21
1578:18,25	1574:22	1646:11	1770:21	charts 1495:2
1584:19	1592:11	1656:16	changing	1580:2
1627:24	1594:5,22	1681:15,16	1624:25	1614:14
1707:24	1605:11	1690:9,10	1673:1	1776:18,19
1710:10	1636:12	1734:16	characteristics	check 1701:17
1719:14	1708:7	1780:24	1694:8	1734:4
1742:22	1722:8	1781:6	characterizat...	1756:6,7,11
catch 1729:15	certainly	challenge	1726:19	checklist
category	1485:19	1683:11	characterize	1558:11
1554:5	1487:6	chamber	1520:22	Chesterfield
1556:1	1505:15	1621:16	1522:14	1685:11
1628:24	1537:14,15	chance 1632:19	1523:5	CHIEF
cause 1492:21	1551:8	1641:12	1536:13	1481:14
1601:14	1562:1	1659:17	1726:18	choose 1493:15
1763:1	1565:19	1703:5	characterized	1591:18
caused 1539:8	1571:13	1770:11	1529:16	1609:11
1599:22	1574:3	change 1515:13	1607:17	1748:2

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

choosing	1610:16	colorized	1758:15	1486:21
1695:10	1635:19	1525:22	1773:16	1487:6,16,22
chose 1695:17	1665:21	Columbia	comes 1523:1	1488:3,11
1747:23,23	1704:2	1482:15	1582:24	1489:14
chosen 1601:24	1777:7	Columbus	1601:7	1491:14
1668:16	cleared	1717:4	1750:17	1492:9
Chouteau	1610:16	column	comfort 1528:9	1494:20
1482:12	clearly 1492:22	1542:17,17	comfortable	1497:4,5
1506:14	1602:11	1543:19,25	1607:15,16	1501:10,12
Christina	Cleco 1753:15	1544:4	1700:25	1501:16
1482:6	client 1531:21	1549:15,19	1702:7,10,14	1502:16,17
circle 1731:2	1707:12,21	1549:25	1702:16	1502:24
circular	clients 1568:7	1693:15,20	coming	1503:4,6
1493:20	1707:7,20	1728:2,5,14	1509:14	1505:6,10,17
1497:10	cliff 1565:23	1728:24	1582:6	1506:12
1651:14	climate	Columns	1603:17	1512:25
circularity	1522:11	1544:8	1624:22	1522:15
1651:18	1523:2	1545:14	commensurate	1523:7
1700:5	1535:22	1547:22	1484:18	1536:2
1704:11,18	1696:6	1549:5	1485:19	1554:24
circumstance	Clinton	1693:17	1491:15,22	1555:1
1650:23	1739:25	combination	1501:22	1562:1
circumstances	close 1586:16	1647:9	1571:11	1569:9,16,23
1617:18	1653:15	Combined	1698:8,21	1576:9,21,22
1623:9	1666:10	1580:11	comment	1577:1
1770:15	1702:9	come 1493:23	1519:24	1589:7,13
cited 1618:20	1772:12	1512:13	1561:10	1594:5
City 1481:7	closely 1547:19	1516:25	1625:17	1610:5
1482:4,8,20	closer 1598:24	1517:20	1682:10,12	1611:21
1482:25	1677:3	1520:6	1689:15	1612:9
1715:24	closing 1534:1	1530:24	1705:18	1625:19
claim 1578:11	cluster 1493:24	1536:1,10	commentary	1626:3
1578:16	clustered	1538:6,8	1597:13,21	1627:4
1670:20	1776:14	1541:24	1597:24	1630:15,23
1681:3	COE 1498:16	1584:4	1598:5	1633:10,11
claimant	coefficients	1591:2	1641:19	1633:14
1578:25	1577:12,13	1607:14	commenting	1637:13
claims 1578:4	1622:2,8	1631:3	1597:17	1645:24
clarity 1545:9	coincide	1632:2	comments	1646:1
clear 1503:9	1534:14	1651:12	1632:23	1651:2,5
1505:4	coincidentally	1652:1	Commission	1655:23
1542:24	1731:6	1672:22	1481:1	1660:14
1545:5,12	collapse 1773:2	1681:14	1482:1,2	1679:19
1547:21	1773:3	1682:5,7	1483:21	1684:7
1552:9	collected	1683:25	1484:5,7,12	1686:15
1553:20	1770:3	1690:8	1485:1,9	1687:19
1595:11	color 1524:3	1732:23	1486:2,16,18	1696:18

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1699:21	1782:1	1514:23,25	1630:7	1521:5,7
1706:22	Commissione...	1515:3	1647:19,22	1522:19
1707:19	1502:13	1518:18	1647:23,25	1523:22
1768:6	1535:2	1640:13	1648:3,4	1526:5
1778:7	1607:11	1685:21,22	1649:12,13	1528:9
1783:12	1653:17	1685:24	1649:14	1531:19,20
Commissioner	1655:1	1686:17,19	1651:9,13,18	1533:23
1483:17	1683:13	1690:25	1654:8,13,16	1534:5
1500:21,23	1684:5	1696:23	1654:24	1535:9,15
1501:3	commissions	1715:12	1693:8	1553:4
1520:9,12	1485:10	1724:24	1698:25	1554:1,1,2
1524:6,8,10	1489:8	1725:3	1702:1	1557:9,25
1532:6,9,10	1490:14	1769:20	1703:24	1558:1,2,15
1536:17	1493:10,18	commonly	1704:9,9,12	1558:18
1541:5	1497:11,13	1485:4	1704:16	1559:8,11,20
1608:10,11	1500:2	Commonwea...	1705:21	1559:21,22
1608:13	1522:17	1555:17	1708:7	1560:2
1614:16,19	1623:20	communicati...	1709:3,8,9,12	1561:20
1614:22	1630:10,14	1526:12	1712:18	1562:5
1629:11,14	1648:2	communicati...	1713:9	1582:4,11
1629:15,19	1652:5,7	1535:2	1714:1,17	1591:24
1629:21,24	1653:4	community	1715:9,10,11	1592:3
1630:6,19,20	1700:8	1521:3	1715:12	1605:21
1630:22	1704:23	1652:20,24	1717:24	1611:12
1631:1,15	1706:22	1692:5	1725:3	1614:2
1632:12,15	1768:2	companies	1759:4,8,11	1627:6
1632:19	Commission's	1495:6	1768:2,8	1633:23
1635:22	1491:2	1497:22	1772:11,14	1635:8
1638:2,12	1502:6	1523:22	1772:19	1636:25
1639:20	1505:15	1531:18	company	1637:4,8
1648:8	1631:11	1556:1	1481:10	1650:8
1651:7	1633:3	1557:21,24	1484:5,6,12	1652:11
1681:17,18	1684:1	1558:4,5	1491:21	1656:3
1681:19,20	Commission-...	1559:9	1494:21	1659:4,12,13
1681:21,22	1494:24	1561:12	1495:8	1659:17,21
1690:11,12	committed	1562:4,12	1496:19	1662:8,12
1690:13	1631:7	1567:13	1498:12	1666:20,25
1701:8	common	1568:6	1499:18	1668:13,16
1734:15	1483:13	1581:8	1500:6,12	1668:20
1758:16,18	1498:11,18	1582:22	1508:9,18	1669:8,11,21
1764:8,10,11	1498:23	1586:8	1510:21,22	1669:24
1764:13	1499:12,25	1589:9	1511:5,22	1670:22
1765:22	1504:13	1593:4	1512:1,15	1671:12,17
1766:19	1507:22	1605:23	1515:5,10,11	1674:15
1780:13,14	1508:4	1609:11	1515:15,18	1675:25
1780:25	1512:3,24	1611:11	1517:18	1677:22
1781:3,4,25	1514:8,12,23	1621:24	1519:21,25	1679:20

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1680:5,6,7,10	1687:24	1712:20	1551:10	1548:23
1680:11,17	1704:6	competing	comprised	1549:3
1680:23	1718:5	1488:4	1621:15	1762:25
1681:3	comparable	competitive	1622:13	conclusions
1683:21	1550:24	1707:13	1660:24	1521:8
1687:20	1574:25	completed	computing	1524:2
1688:3,9	1640:17,19	1508:25	1594:1	1548:18
1692:19,23	1644:1	1511:10	1615:9	1650:24
1694:4,7,7,17	1652:15,15	1521:20,22	concede	1767:16,19
1694:19	1694:15	1664:2	1500:24	conditions
1695:7	1695:3	completely	1681:1	1509:13
1703:25	1759:12,15	1485:14	Concentric	1592:8,9,10
1709:17	1759:19,21	1503:25	1572:11,12	1653:5
1714:25	comparative	1682:20	1572:13,23	1723:23
1715:1,25	1654:6	1683:12	1573:3	1733:6,7,13
1716:13	compare	1733:7,9,13	1615:12,14	1733:14
1718:4,17	1523:17	1770:10	1615:16	1765:13,19
1720:8,16	1536:8	complex	concept	1770:9,10
1753:10	compares	1492:12	1533:14	conduct
1762:6	1642:6	complexities	concepts	1524:17
1768:12	comparing	1551:10	1761:24	1525:7
1774:19	1494:17	complicated	concern	conducted
company's	1514:6	1490:1	1524:21	1572:17
1500:11	comparison	1567:4	1569:5	1744:15
1505:2	1599:1	1584:25	1775:8	conducting
1507:19	1654:17	1706:7	concerned	1582:17
1508:14	1752:10	component	1527:2,11	confidential
1512:7	1763:13	1624:20	1617:2	1539:12
1514:22	comparisons	1686:17	1708:23	1587:12
1515:1	1725:25	1720:15	1720:23	1660:8
1522:2	compensated	1721:4	1721:3	1685:15
1528:3	1644:11	1722:2	1764:21	confirm
1559:24	compensation	components	concerning	1513:17
1562:2	1497:24,24	1720:14	1516:14	1669:17
1575:3	1497:25	1763:10	1709:7	1748:21
1578:12	1661:9	composed	1775:21	1752:15,23
1614:10	1704:19	1622:7	concerns	confirmed
1617:14	1705:3	1651:8	1502:13	1536:6
1621:9	1707:9,9,15	composite	1651:20	confiscation
1640:7	1769:14	1676:11	1743:21	1498:14
1656:8	1774:21	1680:25	conclude	1499:1
1669:5	1775:18	composition	1513:12	1500:17
1671:4	compensatory	1644:5	concluded	1655:25
1672:4	1656:7	compound	1779:3	1656:3
1676:1,13	compete	1586:15	concluding	1700:21
1679:19	1759:4,8	1689:16	1702:8	confiscatory
1680:20,24	competes	comprehensi...	conclusion	1497:20

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1575:4,14,24	1705:25	1773:20	1642:5,12,15	1561:13
1576:1	1764:5	1774:23	1642:17,19	1584:8
1618:17	1766:20,23	considering	1643:7	1620:10
1619:3	considerable	1488:17	1655:3	1654:9
1655:20	1567:22	1590:16	1701:10	1671:20
1764:2	1642:14	1700:7	1702:4	constructive
confused	considerably	considers	1743:2,5	1522:18
1490:6	1565:14	1659:5	1744:16	consumers
1581:1	1568:2	1708:19	1746:6,21,24	1502:25
1749:24	consideration	consist 1521:24	1747:4	1616:13
confusion	1561:18,23	1522:1	1748:6,6,23	contained
1750:4	1561:25	consistency	1750:14,20	1539:15,18
consensus	1562:6	1645:20	1751:2	1539:22
1582:2	1563:5	consistent	1752:11,12	1587:16
1702:5	1576:23	1574:23	1752:17,22	1658:5
1757:14	1586:9	1598:3	1753:5	contemplated
1758:10	1621:10	1600:8	constantly	1508:23
consents	1626:12,14	1603:13	1512:5	contemporary
1582:8	1626:24	1622:18	1770:16	1725:21
consequences	1627:7	1652:4	constituted	contention
1707:20,24	1637:5	1709:16	1726:23	1670:17
Consequently	1639:10	1752:24	constitutes	1681:6
1510:24	1652:18	1775:12	1679:20	contested
1600:9	1653:21	consistently	Constitution	1549:10
conservative	1708:1	1512:5	1494:16	context
1660:20	1712:4	1543:12	Constitutional	1488:20
1745:1	1713:10	1704:22	1494:14	1489:10,12
1774:17	1721:10	consolidated	1497:18,25	1562:24
consider	1760:6	1590:16	1500:18	1599:7
1486:16	1768:6	1592:3	constraints	1621:14
1500:4,7	considerations	constant	1492:20	1626:1
1534:9	1774:10	1542:17	1548:22	1647:14
1556:8	considered	1543:1,3,20	1583:19	contiguous
1575:6	1488:2,10	1543:25	construct	1609:19
1613:4	1489:17,18	1544:4,11,14	1586:25	continue
1619:5	1521:4	1545:21	1622:7,17	1504:11
1622:11	1537:19	1546:5,21	1759:20	1668:17,18
1630:3	1545:4	1547:24	constructed	1693:4
1637:2,8	1562:20	1548:10,15	1584:18	continued
1659:6,23	1571:4	1580:21,24	1622:12	1500:10
1661:8,11,13	1590:20	1581:2,17	constructing	1551:17
1664:16	1613:10	1582:17	1620:11	1566:16
1674:19	1649:23	1583:17,20	1621:15,20	1780:23
1683:13	1656:2	1585:8,9	1760:3	1781:1,2
1688:1	1659:24	1593:5	1773:6	1782:1
1700:9	1700:12	1623:23	construction	continuing
1701:22	1749:19	1635:3,13	1499:18	1484:15

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1757:23	1694:14,21	1563:23	1664:9	1743:16,19
contract	1695:2	1569:20,21	1666:5	1744:2,16,19
1615:9	1723:21	1569:25	1667:19,23	1745:3,4,25
contractual	1765:4	1570:4,6,21	1672:2	1746:1,12,22
1578:16,23	1772:19	1571:2,12,13	1696:6	1747:2,7,12
contractually	corporation	1571:20	1698:1,2	1747:16,20
1589:22	1554:24	1572:8,12,15	1699:12	1748:14,17
contribute	1589:6,24	1572:18,19	1700:15	1748:24
1524:23	1590:11	1573:6,11,19	1701:11,14	1749:2,6,11
contributed	1591:13	1575:15	1701:18	1749:15
1657:15	1695:1	1579:13,19	1709:25	1750:9,24
1770:5	1753:15	1580:2,3,6,9	1710:2	1753:7,11
contribution	correct	1580:12,14	1713:13	1754:4,6,10
1673:18	1507:20,21	1580:15,19	1714:2,3,5,6	1755:15
controversial	1507:23	1580:22	1715:2,3,6,16	1757:10
1636:22	1508:10,16	1583:12,13	1715:20,22	1763:2
convention	1508:17	1584:13	1716:2,7,13	1764:17
1543:12	1509:18	1587:8,9	1716:17,21	1771:18,25
1553:1	1511:3,6,9,11	1591:11,12	1716:23	1778:24,25
conventional	1512:21	1591:14	1717:5,19,21	corrected
1487:9	1513:5,10,11	1593:21	1718:7,10,13	1685:23
1491:18	1513:20,24	1594:7	1718:19,20	correcting
conversation	1514:9	1599:11	1718:25	1575:22
1536:20	1515:6	1601:3,8	1719:9,11,17	correction
1764:14	1518:13,14	1602:22	1719:21,24	1686:21
copies 1596:24	1518:17,20	1604:24	1722:12,22	1691:3
1608:7	1518:21,25	1605:5,8,21	1724:5	corrections
1734:7	1520:17,19	1605:24	1726:17,24	1506:18
1740:2	1520:20	1610:21	1727:8,16	1539:16
copy 1542:10	1527:3,4,8	1611:23	1728:8,12,16	1632:24
1574:8	1533:5	1612:10	1729:11,17	1657:24
1596:22	1539:19	1620:12,13	1729:22,25	1685:18
1597:5	1542:19	1621:1	1730:4,24	1686:24
1608:5	1543:17,18	1623:25	1732:9,18,24	correctly
1639:6	1544:3,6,7,12	1624:4	1734:19	1500:24
1663:14,18	1544:13,15	1630:1,18	1735:16	1575:13
1703:8,14	1544:17,20	1634:12,25	1737:4,6,10	1579:12
1714:15	1545:18,22	1635:1,6,10	1737:14,18	1600:24
1745:6	1545:23	1636:4	1737:23	1669:18
1746:13	1546:7,10,25	1642:9,10	1738:7,10,13	1748:21
1756:11	1548:7,16	1643:9,10	1739:16	corresponding
core 1652:24	1549:9,22,23	1645:1,8	1740:8,17,21	1484:19
corporate	1550:2,17	1650:16	1740:24	1485:21
1508:9,13	1552:9	1658:6	1741:10,14	1488:13
1591:16	1557:18	1660:11	1741:17,21	1501:24
1693:11,16	1560:6	1661:19	1742:22,25	1565:16
1693:18	1561:6,15	1663:3	1743:3,6,9,13	1571:12

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1601:9,13,13	1627:16	1527:3,13,17	couple 1518:9	1647:2
1698:10	1629:2	1527:21	1520:13	1655:9
cost 1486:4,25	1639:20	1537:9	1534:21	Court 1484:8
1496:18	1640:5,9	1574:22	1535:1	1497:2,2,17
1498:11,13	1641:25	1617:4	1537:21	1498:1
1498:16,18	1643:11,14	1627:17	1540:16	1499:9
1498:23	1644:2,16	1659:2,3,4,5	1564:23	1501:18
1499:12,25	1652:14,16	1659:7,12,14	1591:4	1784:8
1504:8,13,15	1654:6,19	1659:14,17	1596:11	Courts 1499:21
1504:20	1656:19	1659:18,19	1612:20	Court's 1497:6
1505:4,22	1657:15	1659:22	1626:8	cover 1498:13
1508:15,19	1659:10,19	1660:1	1629:22	1628:22
1511:5	1660:4,14,18	1661:18	1645:3	coverage
1512:8,14,16	1660:19	1706:5	1651:21	1627:25
1512:24	1661:14,15	1708:7	1692:7	covered 1528:6
1513:2,13,22	1661:18	1762:10	1703:20	1584:1
1513:23	1662:9,9,12	1767:20	1707:23	covering
1514:8,11	1662:13	1775:13	1714:7,10	1582:3,10
1515:19,23	1666:18	counsel 1482:5	1719:15	1664:20
1516:2,4,6,9	1667:4,5,5	1482:7	1757:6	covers 1601:12
1518:18	1680:6,8,18	1501:6,10	1767:20	1758:2
1519:8,22	1691:21	1502:16	1774:16	crazy 1778:22
1520:2	1693:13	1518:8	1777:5	create 1690:22
1523:18	1694:17,18	1532:15	coupon	1757:17
1527:4	1695:7	1563:8	1509:20	1774:20
1528:7	1696:1	1616:11	course 1533:16	created 1497:1
1529:5,12	1698:24	1637:20	1543:2,10	1772:18
1530:3	1700:13	1662:17	1544:23,24	creating
1537:3,12,13	1706:5,10,14	1687:10	1546:18	1700:18
1537:18	1706:20,23	1691:13	1547:6,7,13	credential
1542:6	1707:2,8	1759:1	1547:18	1573:16
1547:23	1708:13,22	1760:24,25	1550:3,7	credentials
1548:2,19	1711:21	1761:3	1555:16	1574:3
1549:3	1759:13,16	1765:25	1559:7,13,22	1618:2
1563:18	1759:17,23	Counsel's	1562:24	credibility
1565:1,10,15	1761:23	1487:2	1566:1,5,25	1626:5
1565:20	1762:2,2	1489:16	1567:18	credible
1566:6,16	1763:9	count 1529:5	1568:1	1772:23
1570:15,16	1767:25	country	1577:2,13	credit 1491:3
1576:8,25	1768:7,13	1485:23	1578:9	1512:9,9
1577:3	1770:20,21	1490:15	1582:9	1516:13
1581:13	1772:14	1491:4,17	1590:5,17	1517:20
1592:22	1773:15	1503:21	1593:11	1520:16
1593:9,13,16	1775:1,2,4,8	1765:3	1595:17	1524:14
1619:9,20	1775:14	1772:8	1609:19	1525:15
1620:1,8,19	costing 1499:12	COUNTY	1635:13	1526:25
1620:20	costs 1514:16	1784:5	1644:16	1527:22,25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1528:17,18	1742:9	1674:10,12	1768:20	1596:1
1529:1,9,19	1769:12	cumulatively	cut 1568:21	1597:18,22
1530:23	cross-examin...	1674:24	1773:21	1598:23
1535:3	1490:3	current	cutoff 1510:23	1602:9
1536:18	1507:1,7,13	1504:10	1519:10	1608:4
1537:16,24	1518:10	1508:20	1697:2	1610:17,18
1550:6,7,24	1519:3	1509:13	CV 1616:1	1620:4
1551:1,3,4	1520:11	1541:21	1760:18	1640:25
1559:14	1524:9	1592:5	CWIP 1672:4,7	1641:1,3,3
1570:24	1540:2,10,25	1609:4	1672:17,22	1649:7
1590:9,22	1563:10	1621:9	1672:24	1650:18,19
1591:22	1571:24	1654:10	1673:3,3,6,10	1650:22
1592:13,19	1591:7	1687:24	1673:25,25	1651:3
1593:3,4,12	1594:17	1700:13,24	1674:5,11,15	1652:8,13,19
1604:2	1608:12	1709:22	cycle 1625:4	1652:22
1613:11	1614:21	1711:20	1651:25	1695:15
1616:20,21	1658:11,17	1731:18		1704:14
1617:1	1658:19	1739:24	D	1710:7
1622:2	1662:20	1749:25	D 1483:1	1712:24,25
1625:11	1663:10	1750:17	1611:12	1714:13
1626:17	1682:16	1761:5	1647:16,17	1719:6
1627:8,9,11	1687:9,14	1768:7,12	1647:18,22	1724:3
1627:15	1688:17,20	1770:10	1780:1	1727:6
1628:2,11,18	1691:15	1773:10,12	1781:1	1728:7,23
1644:5,7,10	1699:16	1773:15	1782:1	1729:9
1649:24	1702:23	1774:24	Dakota	1735:6,11,14
1696:3	1758:17	1775:12	1555:20	1735:18,22
1704:22,25	1764:12	currently	1594:20	1735:25
1705:2	1767:18	1486:7	1601:23,23	1736:2,4,5,7
1762:8,12,12	1780:10,11	1653:2	1613:18	1737:2,3
1762:15,22	1780:12,13	1688:3	damage 1763:1	1738:9,15
1763:2	1780:14,19	curve 1533:9	damaging	1740:6
credit-worthy	1780:20,21	1723:15,19	1485:15	1742:10
1531:3	1780:23,24	customer	dark 1491:7,8	1752:16,18
crisis 1546:19	1780:25	1502:5	data 1494:3,5,6	1752:20,23
1772:8	1781:3,13,14	1569:5	1510:15,16	1752:24
criteria	1781:15,19	1667:25	1521:5	1754:18
1571:15	1781:20,22	1706:4	1533:3	1755:17
1576:7	1781:23,24	customers	1535:15	1757:21
1622:9	1781:25	1499:2	1544:19,20	1760:5
1628:11	1782:1	1502:12,19	1544:22,22	1771:10,11
1629:3	cross-examine	1512:24	1544:24	1772:4
critical 1704:23	1596:18	1513:2,22	1545:1	1773:16
criticisms	CSR 1482:23	1514:19	1546:1,23	1777:11
1695:23	1784:21	1667:1,18,22	1555:3,23	1783:5
cross 1682:19	cumulative	1669:1	1574:20	date 1508:3
1687:3	1672:5	1706:3	1594:12	1510:23

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1511:11	1643:7	1762:17	1646:9	1640:8,10
1519:9,10	1692:18,22	1775:15,15	1648:18	deduction
1533:11	1701:10,13	debts 1519:8	1652:25,25	1560:6
1534:1	1702:4	decades	1700:17	deemed 1671:4
1659:22	1708:12	1599:20	1704:20	deems 1576:23
1660:4,15	1709:6,24	decide 1488:24	1714:25	deeply 1499:22
1663:6	1710:4,22	1496:6	1716:13	defaulting
1664:11	1719:21	1498:21	1761:9	1772:12
1697:2,3,9	1727:3	1630:2	1767:11,13	deferral 1650:5
1735:9	1742:20,22	1778:6	deck 1526:7,15	deferred
dated 1557:8	1742:25	decided 1612:9	decline 1504:11	1763:10
dates 1661:3	1743:2	1744:3	1504:20	defining
David 1485:24	1744:15,24	1776:23	1564:8	1761:25
day 1483:3	1745:23,23	deciding	1566:16,21	definitely
1505:12	1746:7,21	1496:14,15	1643:22	1520:24
1533:17	1747:14,18	decision	declined	degree 1565:16
1672:19,22	1748:16	1495:15	1504:9,12,14	1586:6
1673:21	1749:4,9,13	1500:5	1505:5	1592:20
1683:9,10	1749:14	1523:11	1545:21	1757:17
1778:1,3	1750:4,20	1556:4	1549:3,4	delivery
days 1621:12	1752:11,12	1601:10	1550:19	1647:18
1626:1	1752:17	1611:7	1585:22	Delmarva
1664:14	1753:5	1630:17	1691:25	1557:25
DC 1557:24	1773:19	1637:14	declines	1559:15,18
1625:15	1774:1	1646:16	1643:17	1559:23
DCF 1484:25	deal 1607:20	1649:25	declining	1614:2
1485:5	dealing 1489:9	1650:3	1585:24	denied 1523:11
1504:17	1492:25	1669:5	1691:22	deny 1493:14
1542:18	death 1669:20	1716:20	decouple	Department
1543:7,20	debatable	decisions	1647:8	1514:14
1544:1,5,11	1723:17	1484:8,12	decoupling	depend
1544:15	debate 1692:8	1488:12,25	1562:14	1488:24
1545:21	debt 1505:22	1489:3	1614:10	1497:12
1546:5,5,22	1509:12	1493:18,22	1647:7	dependent
1547:24	1510:22,24	1494:15	decrease	1495:19
1548:8,15	1512:3,8,11	1515:17	1548:19	depending
1580:22,23	1512:18,20	1552:18	1550:22	1495:12,24
1581:2,17	1513:23	1553:23	1592:22	1496:12
1582:17	1514:15	1557:13	1593:16	1535:19
1583:5,11,14	1516:1,3	1612:24	1768:20	1584:7,25
1623:23,23	1528:4,7,10	1614:15	decreased	1609:9,10
1624:6,7	1528:12	1635:25	1550:10,13	1635:19
1625:20,21	1534:20	1636:17	1593:20	1776:7
1625:23	1537:6	1644:25	1653:4	depends
1634:24	1578:13	1645:7,10,13	1692:3	1495:19
1635:3	1617:7	1645:18,18	1693:13,20	1585:18
1642:6,12	1725:6,24	1645:19,23	deduced	1600:17

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

deposed	1531:13	1777:9,15	1719:15,16	1615:25
1615:20,23	1626:4	Diana 1482:18	1729:5,5	1619:14
1760:16	1762:13	difference	1733:7,9,13	1623:22
deposition	determinations	1513:15	1742:11	1626:10,20
1663:18	1530:23	1544:9,10	1759:22	1638:18
1669:14	determine	1550:1	1760:21	1642:7
1703:4,12,15	1512:2	1559:23	1761:24	1657:8
1711:7	1527:17	1592:14	1763:21	1663:15,15
1724:19	1528:18	1613:22,22	1770:10	1684:24
1744:8,9	1621:7	1634:9	differentials	1685:2,13,15
1751:12,19	1703:24	1635:9	1713:10	1685:16,19
1760:14	determined	1642:9	differentiate	1714:2,3
depreciation	1529:20	1643:9	1578:21	1715:13
1671:14	determining	1694:13	differently	1721:23
1676:11,14	1487:23	1695:1	1625:20	1727:15
1679:12,23	1513:8	differences	1694:10,16	1763:13
1680:24,25	1514:8,11	1522:4	1696:9	1773:14
1763:14	1515:21	1545:19,20	difficult 1489:6	1780:9,18
describe	1544:20	1704:7	1562:10,18	1781:12,18
1656:2	1563:5	different	1568:19	1782:7,17
1751:16	1569:11	1485:5	1573:15	1783:2,3
1776:16	1621:10	1495:12	1656:4	Directionally
described	detriment	1497:3	1688:9	1513:21
1499:8	1569:13	1503:23	difficulty	directly
1500:12	detrimental	1517:4	1694:5	1502:12
1607:25	1502:3,4,8	1522:5,8	diluted 1625:5	1514:3
1707:17	1571:18	1526:22	diluting	1526:24
describing	1646:25	1537:10,17	1769:20	1596:15
1592:23	develop 1585:1	1537:21	dilutive	1618:4
1695:14	developed	1544:17,19	1654:13	Directors
description	1495:4	1544:20	direct 1484:11	1590:20
1746:1	1586:6	1545:3	1506:8,16	disagree
1782:6	1646:2	1547:15	1507:18	1548:2
1783:1,13,18	1690:25	1556:1	1518:12,15	1549:12
designated	1706:1	1562:12	1518:18	1578:7
1657:17	1726:25	1580:21	1538:17	1579:1
designed	1727:1	1581:20	1539:9	1643:13
1699:6	1774:2,2	1582:25	1541:17,19	1701:20
designs 1627:5	developing	1584:4	1541:21,25	disagreed
despite 1505:4	1581:25	1609:12	1542:3	1549:11
detailed	1652:16	1613:5	1543:21	disagreement
1489:25	1654:11	1614:2	1544:1	1577:10
1492:12	1685:23	1625:13	1545:16	disclosures
details 1490:3	1720:7,22	1635:19	1547:2	1534:3,7
determination	1744:10	1640:14	1560:25	disconnect
1484:2	device 1687:20	1662:1,2,7	1561:7,8	1757:21
1502:7	diamonds	1695:5	1570:8	discounted

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1484:25	distinct	1775:14	dollars 1666:21	1762:1
1496:3	1619:10,11	document	1670:21	drawn 1701:7
1719:14	1694:18	1526:8	1674:13,13	drift 1564:7,10
1742:22	1761:24	1541:12,14	1675:18,21	1564:25
discovery	distinction	1553:13,19	1676:16	1565:9,17
1576:2	1619:9,23	1553:21	1677:17,18	1651:25
discretion	1762:2	1554:9	1677:23,25	1652:3
1498:21,21	distinctions	1555:11	1678:17,19	1653:2
1499:20,23	1641:2	1649:9	1679:6,14	drifting
1576:21	distinctly	1714:17,19	dot 1753:16,19	1651:23
discuss	1761:25	1714:21,24	double 1659:24	driven 1554:21
1483:24	distinguish	1717:19,25	doublecheck	driver 1624:13
1711:3	1623:2	1718:2	1542:7,11	drives 1565:11
discussed	distinguishes	1745:11	1739:17	driving
1491:2	1619:20	documents	Dow 1733:25	1625:24
1641:19	distress 1516:4	1526:16	Downey	1710:9
1642:13	1765:2	1540:24	1482:18	drop 1563:24
1668:9	1772:18	1632:18,20	1658:20,23	1565:20
1696:3	distribution	1633:8	1660:13	1691:24
discussion	1553:4	1714:7,10,19	1662:16,22	dropped
1505:14	1555:17	1767:9	1663:21	1540:15
1511:25	1557:25	doing 1483:4	1664:1	1774:15,25
1561:24	1558:1,2,3,19	1496:22	1683:1	dropping
1621:13	1559:16,21	1497:11	1686:8,10	1774:19
1645:4	1613:19	1498:15	1690:16,19	drops 1775:9
1653:22	1647:24,25	1500:2	1691:9	due 1509:14
1703:22	1649:13	1509:16	1781:13,21	1541:14
1712:23	1713:9	1513:16	downs 1565:6	1553:22
1762:7	District 1605:4	1535:11	downward	duly 1506:6
discussions	1633:23	1567:7	1564:7,10	1538:15
1516:18	1635:8	1591:20	1565:9,17	1657:6
1517:22	dividend	1607:16	1651:23	1684:22
disincentive	1577:22	1608:7	1652:3	duration
1669:11,13	1578:1	1623:5,6	1653:2	1600:7
1669:23	1581:9,12,15	1631:20	1654:21	duties 1508:12
disorganized	1584:20	1639:25	downwards	d/b/a 1481:10
1757:4	1585:9,25	1640:25	1593:10	
disparity	1605:7,11,14	1684:19	1599:11	E
1598:25	1710:10	1730:19	DPL 1753:18	E 1482:1,1
dispersion	1774:24	1732:21	DR 1532:24	1483:1,1
1756:17	1775:2,3	1736:1	1574:5	1780:1
1776:15	dividends	1746:16	drag 1590:21	1781:1
disputed	1504:18	1778:21	draw 1521:8	1782:1,4
1612:9	1546:9,24	dollar 1483:25	1548:18	earlier 1534:15
1696:18	1547:3	1492:10	1650:24	1534:19
disruption	1585:3,6,11	1515:12	1767:16,19	1546:1
1568:17,18	1585:21,24	1679:3	drawing	1561:19

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1581:23	1624:14	Edward	1670:3	1596:3,5,10
1583:4,17	1640:17,19	1482:18	effort 1526:2	1597:2,5,25
1584:20	1683:2	EEI 1599:7,17	either 1504:19	1603:7,18
1585:7	1687:21	1601:1,6	1521:18	1611:11,11
1639:13	1701:6	1602:24	1522:25	1612:1
1641:21	1705:20	1603:13,17	1523:10	1613:19,25
1644:4	easel 1490:12	1606:24	1528:2	1621:16,18
1650:3	1645:13	1610:18,20	1573:25	1621:22
1692:18	easier 1574:9	1610:23	1576:17	1622:7,13,24
1698:4	easily 1529:20	1633:8	1578:17	1623:7
1757:8	1537:18	1641:11	1582:4	1624:9,18
1762:7	1580:25	1783:14,15	1604:20	1630:8
1764:14	easing 1565:24	EEI's 1597:12	1609:1	1633:23
early 1568:2	easy 1490:1	effect 1486:3	1611:15	1635:8,8
1598:4	1492:24	1492:21	1636:8	1638:24
1600:6	echo 1621:16	1513:19	1669:21	1646:9
1653:8	economic	1562:16,17	1675:5	1647:6,18
1683:14	1539:7	1565:25	1689:4	1648:21,23
earn 1484:13	1620:24	1566:1	1754:23	1649:12,15
1495:6	1692:5	1605:25	1755:1	1649:18
1519:22	1723:23	1612:14	1765:16	1650:13
1520:1	1765:2,13	1614:8	1775:21	1651:1
1527:4	economical-b...	1633:22	1777:1	1696:16
1654:9	1501:14	1634:3	elaborate	1698:7,15
1680:2,4	economist	1635:7	1764:18	1711:12
1681:4	1758:10	1654:13	election	1712:4,21
1706:14	economists	1655:10	1604:10	1713:4,5,6,12
earned 1494:18	1757:15,25	1679:5	electric	1713:16
1494:23	economy	1686:19	1481:10,11	1728:5,6,7
1500:25	1500:10	1691:2	1484:16	1729:1
1598:21	1502:14	1706:11,13	1488:12	1733:17
1640:7	1564:12,19	1706:25	1495:5	1745:20,21
1641:4	1565:7,23	1708:5	1501:21	1746:7,22,25
1679:24	1569:3	1732:24	1503:21	1747:5,10,15
earning	1623:3	effective	1504:1	1747:18
1500:11	1692:6,9,11	1659:22	1553:15	1753:10
1585:4	1692:14	1663:6	1554:2,18	1769:17
earnings	1693:9	1664:11	1555:4,12,15	1774:19
1515:8,9,12	1694:2	1691:1	1557:17,21	electrical
1515:16,19	1765:18	effectively	1557:24,24	1496:19
1547:17,19	Ed 1658:23	1671:25	1558:4,5,8,17	electrics 1713:8
1561:1	edge 1655:25	1690:24	1558:22	electrostatic
1581:24	1656:2	effects 1500:11	1559:19	1673:7,20
1582:20,24	Edison 1555:17	1500:13	1560:10	element 1563:4
1583:9	1595:21	1590:10	1571:9	1697:22
1585:12,19	1596:2,9	1592:3	1579:12	elements
1585:23	1597:2,4	efficiencies	1595:21	1553:5,6

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1650:7	1671:3,18	entering	1662:10,13	1548:3,20
1654:12	employment	1637:2	1669:8	1549:3
embrace	1661:3	enterprise	1670:9	1552:24
1630:14	1672:13	1698:22	1672:5	1554:17
embraced	1761:5	enterprises	1712:7,12	1558:15,20
1630:16	enabling	1484:19	equaled 1771:3	1564:18
Empire 1605:4	1484:15	1485:20	equation	1565:15,20
1605:4,25	1571:8	1488:13	1495:18,20	1566:6,16,22
1606:2	1656:9	1491:22	1531:7	1570:16,16
1607:7	1698:6,15	1501:23	equations	1574:19,21
1633:23	encompass	1571:12	1496:1,6	1575:3
1634:2	1699:25	1620:12	equipment	1576:9,9,22
1635:7,8	encourage	1621:21	1661:15	1577:1,4
1714:4	1491:14	1698:9	1708:4	1578:4,7,16
1716:15	ended 1549:16	enterprise's	equities 1653:8	1578:17
employ	1609:16	1621:3,5,6	1725:3	1581:14
1668:17	1638:15	entertaining	1775:7	1592:23
1722:13	1731:23	1742:9	equity 1483:5	1593:9,13
employed	1732:20	entire 1509:23	1483:13,25	1602:14
1539:5	ends 1575:11	1554:15	1484:22	1619:10,10
1761:2,3	1677:24	1602:25	1485:13	1619:20,21
employee	endured	1650:9	1486:4	1620:1,2,7,8
1572:10	1573:14	1697:13	1487:9,15	1620:19
1664:10	Energy	1709:20	1488:2	1622:3
1672:12	1502:25	entities 1693:7	1489:24	1624:14,21
employees	1572:12,13	1760:20	1491:7	1625:2
1660:25	engage 1669:5	entitlement	1494:24,25	1629:2
1661:3,16	engaged	1705:20	1498:11,16	1639:21,21
1662:5	1651:14	entity 1693:22	1498:18,19	1640:5,6,7,10
1663:1	enhanced	1760:24	1498:22,23	1640:12,13
1664:8,13,21	1688:4	environment	1499:2,12,13	1640:15
1665:16	enhancing	1517:3,9	1499:25	1641:5
1666:11	1515:18	1523:25	1500:6	1643:12,14
1667:3	ensure 1484:17	1525:1	1502:11	1644:2,16,17
1668:3	1501:21	1527:1	1504:9,13	1644:20
1670:23	1698:7	1529:4,8,12	1505:5,8	1648:23
1671:2	ensured	1530:1,11	1507:22	1649:21
1672:3,6	1698:18	1531:10	1508:4	1650:14
1674:12,23	entered 1633:4	1537:15	1512:3,11,18	1652:17
1675:8,25	1636:25	1570:23,24	1512:20,24	1653:5,18
1676:3,8,19	1714:11	1626:9,11	1513:1,8	1654:1,4,6,19
1677:19,22	Entergy 1558:7	1696:3	1514:8,12,15	1654:21
1678:3,9,10	1559:10	1697:20	1514:23,24	1655:24
1678:18	1579:11	1762:11	1514:25	1656:6
1679:1,1	1613:8	1774:14	1515:3,7,13	1685:21,22
1680:22	1649:17,19	1775:4	1518:18	1685:23,24
employee's	1649:20	equal 1530:22	1547:23	1686:17,19

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1686:20	1774:14,15	1508:14	1765:20	1628:2
1687:23	1774:18,20	1509:23	1771:21	eventually
1688:2,6	1774:21,24	1511:4	1774:15	1596:22
1689:17	1775:5,12,17	1519:18	1775:5	1775:6
1690:25	1776:10	1574:18	1776:10,13	everybody
1695:21	equivalent	1576:25	1776:17	1596:13,15
1696:1	1520:1	1612:21	estimating	1596:24
1698:13,21	1647:11	1654:4	1486:25	1597:5,6
1699:6,9	era 1739:25	1661:24	1488:21	1600:14,22
1700:9,13,24	error 1541:14	1688:7	1504:15	1608:6
1701:1	1686:16	1695:7,25	1640:20	everybody's
1703:25	ER-2010-06	1700:24	1654:6	1688:20
1704:6,21	1745:6	1701:25	1693:3	evidence
1706:16,23	ER-2011-0028	1702:8	1700:9	1486:20
1707:2	1541:18,19	1704:4,18	1706:23	1497:14
1708:22	1608:17	1707:8	1707:15	1504:2,6
1711:21	1748:10	1708:15	1708:22	1505:4,6
1712:4	1752:13	1709:10,22	1711:12	1507:6
1713:15	1753:2	1711:20	1724:23	1511:19
1718:9	1754:21	1720:8,9,16	1726:2	1540:9
1719:8	1755:8	1721:11	1760:9	1552:2
1720:18	ER-2012-0166	1722:15	evaluate	1556:22
1724:24	1481:10	1725:22	1488:4	1560:22
1725:1,4,6,8	1541:20,22	1727:1	1495:15	1633:15
1725:16,21	1754:22	1735:9	1512:7	1649:5
1725:22,24	1755:7	1741:7	1517:19,23	1658:16
1726:2,12	esoteric 1493:1	1743:13	1524:16	1687:8
1731:12	especially	1749:17	1531:6	1690:2
1732:22	1603:13	1759:10,24	evaluated	1705:5
1735:9	1624:19	1770:20	1537:8	1735:3
1741:7	1644:18	1773:11,14	evaluating	1742:17
1761:23,23	essentially	1773:17	1508:21	1752:2
1762:2,3,4	1596:6	1774:7	1512:6	1756:25
1763:13	1610:17	1776:13	1527:15	1759:16
1765:21	1646:1	estimated	evaluation	1767:10,24
1767:22,25	1699:24	1547:16	1527:20	1768:4
1768:3,7,9,13	1720:24	1573:1	1529:12,18	1769:10
1768:17,19	established	1589:14	1537:14,22	1770:23
1768:21,21	1530:2	1654:1	1537:22	1771:1
1768:24	1574:23	1725:2	evaluations	evidenced
1769:11,13	1575:9	1773:11	1536:16	1694:12
1769:24,25	1627:14	estimates	event 1568:12	Evidentiary
1770:4,6,17	1730:22	1543:15	1595:12	1481:5
1770:20,24	1731:10	1700:12	1743:24	exact 1572:24
1771:3,7	establishes	1709:18	events 1601:1	1610:18
1772:6	1575:9	1720:5	eventual	1629:8
1773:5,15,17	estimate	1725:1	1553:1	1662:5

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1711:13	1528:5	1735:21	1639:1,2	1723:4
exactly 1489:6	1529:1,3	exclusively	1641:24	1769:21,21
1527:25	1553:25	1762:16,19	1642:4	exists 1765:9
1562:20	1554:4	1762:20	1643:17	expanding
1586:16	1562:13	1763:6	1644:19,23	1515:1,11
1605:20,25	1564:22	excuse 1564:20	1646:9	expect 1528:15
1614:1	1565:13	1566:23	1648:11,15	1536:4
1615:13	1592:12	1576:6,11,12	1648:25	1584:24
1664:5,15	1597:23,24	1580:4	1649:1,4,7	1694:1
1666:1	1598:4	1582:7	1657:17	1701:25
1705:12	1611:19	1583:7	1686:4,6,11	1759:15
1706:25	1613:1	1589:6	1687:7	1765:3
1722:8	1625:6	1611:14	1688:21	1768:18,20
exam 1606:12	1626:25	1613:9	1689:2,4,11	expectation
examination	1644:7	exercise	1689:15,22	1486:21
1495:2	1645:12	1651:14	1689:23	1564:11
1506:8	1647:7	1772:4	1690:1,21,22	1582:10
1532:21	1653:7,12	exercises	1714:13,14	1605:15
1538:17	1694:9	1487:11	1718:3	1692:6
1611:2	1696:10	exhausting	1734:8,23	1724:9
1629:23	1697:19	1616:5	1735:2	expectations
1630:21	1728:10	exhaustive	1740:2	1574:21
1633:19	1735:10	1616:4	1742:5,6,16	1709:5
1634:19	1772:15	exhibit 1495:3	1746:17,20	1758:12
1637:25	exceeds	1506:25	1748:21	expected
1641:8	1661:18	1507:2,5	1751:22	1496:16
1657:8	exception	1510:1,14	1752:1	1564:24
1684:24	1773:25	1511:14,18	1767:12	1566:8
1690:18	excess 1618:8	1539:10,11	1777:8	1581:15,24
1766:4	excessive	1539:13	1782:6	1582:20,24
1767:6	1575:4,7	1540:13	1783:1,13,18	1585:5,12,12
1780:9,15,18	1576:1	1541:3	exhibits 1540:1	1589:13
1781:4,5,6,7	1707:9	1542:17	1540:8	1621:9
1781:8,9,12	excitement	1543:17,25	1633:11,14	1622:3
1781:18,21	1576:16	1545:7	1641:12,22	1624:14,20
1782:2,2	exclude	1551:19,22	1658:10,15	1625:3,5,9
examine	1609:12	1552:1,4	1685:14	1660:15
1508:18	1639:13,18	1556:17,21	1687:2	expecting
example	1647:22,25	1557:4	1714:11	1709:9
1508:22	excluded	1560:17,21	1756:19,24	expenditure
1512:25	1605:4	1579:2	1769:1	1536:19
1513:1	1638:23	1593:25	1783:25	expenditures
1517:1	excludes	1610:13	existed 1765:13	1617:14
1521:13	1645:13	1612:20	existing	1627:18
1522:1,4	excluding	1633:10	1508:23	1628:5,6
1523:19	1555:2	1635:23	1521:18	1762:14
1526:3,8	1638:21	1638:9,20	1688:8	expends

1524:20	1766:20	extend 1581:12	facilities	1598:21
expense	1776:2	extends	1772:13	1605:13
1676:14	explain	1644:16	facility 1591:22	1628:1
1679:12	1504:22	extent 1515:8	facility's	1708:6
1680:25	1533:6	1516:2	1484:17	1759:14
1681:1	1553:21	1547:13	facing 1502:15	1776:9
1763:14	1575:16	1549:5	1565:22	facts 1520:23
expenses	1578:8	1561:11	1712:8,9,12	1520:24
1527:7	1595:9	1562:12	fact 1486:17	1523:8
1617:4	1632:4	1564:19	1489:5	1524:3,17
1647:13	1660:22	1578:20	1493:9,25	factual 1518:3
1666:7	1679:18	1586:7	1494:23	1524:15
expensive	1720:3,21	1617:7	1498:20	1525:8,22
1512:18,20	1724:20	1624:15	1500:17,24	1598:1
experience	1748:4	1642:21,25	1503:18	1651:22
1516:24	1769:7	1643:5	1520:24	fact-based
1530:18	1770:12	1655:13	1524:24	1521:12
1618:7	1773:20	1708:25	1562:1	1524:24
1630:10	1776:22	external	1567:2	1641:19,20
1636:6,23	explained	1769:24	1578:5	fair 1545:6
1691:20	1504:24	1771:7	1586:2	1546:1
1692:1	explaining	extra 1534:20	1592:1	1549:6
experienced	1581:22	1541:8	1619:13,13	1553:8
1772:9	explains	1703:8	1620:1	1564:4
expert 1487:8	1484:11	extraordinary...	1625:17	1565:4,5
1489:7	1554:7,9	1555:19,22	1631:9	1567:25
1492:23,24	explanation	1556:8	1640:7	1570:17
1492:24	1555:25	extraordinary	1644:6	1594:13
1495:14	1593:15	1647:1	1654:15	1600:19
1503:2	1606:14	1723:23	1696:4	1601:25
1574:1	1649:21	extrapolating	1746:16	1602:2
1606:11	explicit	1566:12	1769:6	1604:8
1628:15	1626:10	1567:5	factor 1500:3	1605:17
1761:4	explicitly	extreme	1528:25	1607:21,25
1766:23	1486:18	1707:22	1531:9	1616:18
1775:24	1629:5	extremely	1533:20	1618:25
1776:1	1630:24	1485:15	1571:4	1620:17
experts	explore	1486:22	1712:17	1626:6
1488:23	1672:11	1487:5	1720:6,7,11	1627:3
1492:15	1773:10	1489:25	factored	1629:10
1495:22	expressed	extremes	1529:2	1632:15,22
1498:16	1590:8	1494:4	factoring	1632:25
1501:12	1675:18	e-r-t 1538:24	1514:16	1637:3,3
1618:1,6,10	expressing	F	factors 1523:11	1641:16,18
1708:14	1575:2	face 1492:11	1528:23	1665:4,6
1711:15	expression	faces 1712:5	1533:9	1695:21
1764:6	1565:8		1576:23	1700:9,23

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1705:3,12	1494:6,11,12	fight 1626:4	1528:4,18	1761:15
1707:8,15	1596:17	figure 1496:18	1530:9,11	fired 1672:19
1710:6,12	1672:17	1498:4	1534:2	firm 1615:15
1712:7,19	1730:19	1513:10	1537:7	1712:25
1726:19	fashion	1531:1	1571:10	1720:5,6,14
1732:25	1627:10	1587:2	1573:8,13,21	1721:4
1743:24	fast 1774:20	1636:23	1574:2	first 1488:11
1758:5	fault 1528:10	1679:3	1578:13	1494:25
1760:9,10	favorable	1701:23	1596:8	1505:12,25
1768:11,12	1697:8,15,20	1702:10,16	1620:25	1506:6
1768:22	1697:23	1720:2	1621:4,7,9	1509:11
1769:13,14	February	1729:8	1622:1	1533:12
1774:21	1518:15	1732:22	1628:15	1538:15
1775:18	1570:7	file 1481:10	1633:8,9	1541:16
fairly 1496:1	Fed 1723:21	1722:23	1648:6	1542:16
1530:22	Federal 1484:4	filed 1518:12	1652:20,24	1553:15,17
1563:24	1723:17	1518:15	1656:4,8	1554:8,11,15
1589:19	feel 1501:13	1533:15	1669:9,22	1554:18
1600:8	1607:15,16	1534:3	1670:2,8	1555:4,7
1629:2	1619:1	1539:9	1698:8,18	1577:8
1696:23	1682:23	1570:8	1707:10	1582:1,1,7
1722:8	feels 1599:18	1597:25	1733:6,7,12	1584:14,15
fall 1490:16	fence 1589:18	1612:1	1733:14	1584:16
1554:5	1589:19	1685:13	1766:21,24	1585:13
1568:1	fencing	1721:23	1770:9	1586:24
1628:23	1590:20	filing 1485:13	1772:8,12,22	1592:2
fallen 1486:5	FERC 1616:2	1490:16	1773:1	1593:20
1565:13,15	Ferguson	1570:1	1774:20	1596:9
1566:18	1483:8	final 1541:23	1775:10,10	1599:2
1570:17	1631:8,11,17	1543:21	1775:19	1601:10,10
1593:12,13	1631:22	1646:20	financially	1602:3,7,13
1643:14	1632:7,10	finally 1544:4	1605:12	1602:15,17
1644:9,13	1656:19	1584:13	financing	1602:17,18
1722:7	1657:1,2,5,13	1741:25	1514:17	1602:24,24
false 1667:12	1657:14	finance 1508:9	find 1582:4	1603:5
familiar	1658:10,21	1508:13	1586:3	1610:19
1595:21,23	1663:12	1516:13	1772:5,5	1638:20
1597:7	1667:8	1537:6	findings	1639:4,5,5
1608:19	1677:2	1711:23	1767:19	1641:24
1699:20	1680:5	financial	fine 1483:12	1642:11
1700:16	1682:2	1484:18	1506:2	1645:4,5
familiarity	1781:11	1499:19	1542:12	1646:10
1618:21	1783:20,22	1501:22	1656:25	1648:20,22
fans 1683:14	1783:24	1508:15	finish 1632:9	1655:3
far 1485:21	fewer 1653:20	1512:14	1683:16	1657:6
1486:5,24	fiduciary	1515:20,25	1684:2	1683:5,16,18
1491:6,11	1708:2	1516:4,4,10	Finland	1684:20,22

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1685:2	1493:21	1569:2	1706:1	1640:22,24
1689:3	1497:10,15	1772:21	forecasts	1641:3
1701:7	1497:15	folks 1608:6	1757:25	1667:5
1714:13	flawed 1700:4	1676:25	foreseeable	1678:13,13
1715:1	1700:7	follow 1617:19	1566:10	1692:13
1718:5	flesh 1630:5	1639:19	forever 1585:2	found 1499:9
1724:19	flight 1632:8	1670:18	forgo 1620:22	1583:1
1725:17	1723:3,13	followed	forgot 1560:9	1608:22
1727:10	flow 1484:25	1556:3	1576:16	1773:4
1728:2	1496:3	1611:6	form 1516:2	four 1501:12
1729:9	1627:24	follows 1506:7	1521:6	1579:9,13,15
1746:6,6	1707:24	1538:16	1524:2	1579:21
1753:9	1710:10	1598:2	1534:3	1602:5
fiscal 1565:23	1719:14	1657:7	1539:12	1650:23
fish 1495:10	1742:22	1684:23	1601:9	1673:19,20
Fitch 1525:17	flows 1528:3	follow-up	1620:5	1730:4
1530:6,19	1537:3,6	1591:9	1643:4	1732:16
1531:17	1578:11,17	1615:4	1646:3	1735:14
1590:18	1578:25	1702:15	1670:15	1755:23,24
1617:2,12	1584:19	1703:20	formal 1526:12	1755:25
1694:23	fluctuations	footnote	forms 1485:5	fourth 1579:17
Fitch's 1762:22	1692:14	1541:17,20	1643:3	frame 1609:10
five 1490:8	flying 1577:6	1541:23	1706:9	1609:11
1582:6	1577:20	1542:1	formula	1705:11
1598:20	focus 1515:18	1554:6	1529:22,23	framework
1602:5,10,20	1516:24,24	1556:2	1530:12	1491:1
1604:5	1535:19	1611:3,4,5,5	1531:1	frankly
1701:24	1568:8	1619:14	1628:17	1564:18
1713:16	1591:23	1636:2,16	1647:11,13	1742:13
1735:11,14	1610:25	1646:18	1696:16,17	free 1596:17
1735:15,20	1617:10	footnoted	formulary	1720:6,12
1735:22	1623:4	1556:2	1696:20	1721:1,7
1736:3,21	1638:8	footnotes	formulate	1722:14,16
1740:6,8	1639:2	1540:14	1562:14	1722:18,20
1741:5	1644:23	1541:13,14	formuli	1726:5,14,18
1757:16	1709:20,21	1636:1	1496:13,17	1726:20
1771:10	1767:24	1647:15,16	forth 1484:4	1764:24
five-year	focused	forces 1494:22	1522:5	frequently
1713:18	1578:12	forecast	1628:10	1623:19
1741:6	1617:6	1561:14	1784:11,15	1636:8
1757:21	1634:5	1654:11	fortunately	Friday 1778:2
fixed 1550:9	1635:16	1697:10	1703:7	1778:8,14
1591:23	1647:23	1721:20	Fortune 1693:7	front 1497:14
1592:16,21	1762:16	forecasted	1694:4	1533:1
flat 1615:9	1763:6	1654:10	forward	1619:13
flaw 1493:17	1772:25	1774:8	1510:8	1760:21
1493:20,21	focusing	forecasting	1567:18	frustrating

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1492:12	1696:12,24	1600:10	1746:15	1534:3,8
full 1485:25	1702:6	1617:16	give 1495:23	1537:10
1637:12	1705:25	1628:7	1516:8,21	1538:6
1647:14	1706:9	1641:20	1521:1,2,7,13	1545:24
1677:7	1731:19	1693:25	1523:9	1551:17
fully 1570:15		1696:25	1524:3	1557:15
1636:8,13	G	1697:11	1526:2	1558:11,13
1649:15	G 1483:1	1699:23	1528:23	1558:25
1654:10	game 1631:13	1706:24	1541:9	1567:8,8
1676:1	1683:15	1751:14	1582:13	1587:13
1784:14	1684:18	generate	1586:17	1596:17
function	games 1778:10	1509:24	1597:23	1598:16
1567:2	gas 1484:5	generated	1604:1	1599:23
1577:2	1555:6	1647:23	1607:9,23	1600:11
1586:5	1557:17	1681:7	1625:12	1609:16
functional	1558:8,23	generates	1637:5,17,18	1610:9
1647:10	1560:10	1537:6	1642:14,22	1615:1
functionally	1579:12	generating	1643:3	1616:19
1589:21	1649:12,18	1492:19,22	1659:18	1628:25
fund 1769:15	gather 1524:17	1554:3	1680:19,23	1631:10,17
funds 1528:6	1525:8	1647:19	1714:15	1641:22
further 1486:6	gauge 1688:9	1648:6	1752:5	1656:25
1487:20	1725:8	generation	given 1509:13	1672:4
1498:4,25	1763:17	1554:22,25	1565:6,6	1674:5
1518:7	gauging	1555:3	1606:18	1675:4
1519:1	1725:23	1589:25	1631:9	1679:4
1520:5	general	1590:11,21	1636:13	1680:25
1537:25	1496:24	1602:11	1640:18	1682:3,20
1563:7	1526:14	1638:21	1641:22	1683:4
1571:21	1531:18	1639:15	1694:2	1685:5
1584:17	1592:10	1645:25	1695:16	1696:8
1590:25	1629:9	1647:24	1698:20	1726:6
1598:25	1636:10	1648:5	gives 1576:24	1765:23
1614:17	1661:1	generic	1595:12	1769:6,11,14
1641:6	1721:5	1589:19	giving 1498:12	1777:23
1662:16	1772:20	generously	1659:23	goal 1569:8
1688:15	1774:17	1632:9	1760:5	God 1659:11
1691:9	1776:9	geometric	go 1498:7,23	goes 1491:10
1699:13	generalize	1587:6	1499:15	1503:15
1767:1	1706:8	Georgia	1500:22	1564:18
1777:21	generally	1717:20	1510:7	1567:1
furthest 1755:2	1516:21	GEP 1702:6	1511:20	1583:4
future 1566:10	1522:16	1757:15	1513:13	1587:3
1605:16	1525:1	1758:1	1517:17	1597:12
1659:7,14,23	1526:2,3	getting 1498:14	1523:5	1671:21,24
1661:11,13	1533:22	1522:21	1526:3	1713:17
1669:12,25	1575:9	1681:3	1531:10	1739:1

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

going 1483:5,7	1684:19	1702:25	1541:24	1580:8,11
1483:10	1685:1,7	1703:1	1542:6	1605:2,3,9,21
1492:11	1688:20	1758:20	1549:9	1620:10,11
1497:10,12	1689:8	1773:7	1617:21	1620:12
1499:18,21	1703:19	Gordon	1634:24	1621:15,20
1503:8	1708:8	1585:14	gosh 1733:17	1622:7,12,18
1507:17	1714:15	Gorman	gotten 1592:12	1622:20
1510:11	1723:20	1487:8,8,10	govern 1484:2	1623:7
1513:9,18,20	1729:13,17	1494:10	Government	1634:2
1526:9,9	1730:8	1503:1,3	1723:13,15	1635:9
1540:13	1731:2	1505:8,12	1728:21	1651:8,13
1541:2	1740:4	1547:16	grade 1508:20	1692:19,23
1564:16,17	1742:8,14	1573:18,25	1693:13	1692:25
1568:21	1758:23	1618:1,5	granted	1693:1,3
1592:18	1766:9	1624:5	1687:19	1701:16
1596:10	1768:14	1625:10	graph 1493:16	1703:24
1598:10,10	1771:16	1682:12	1689:3	1704:7,12
1598:16	1772:4,24	1683:25	1752:4,8,19	1709:3,15,20
1602:3	1777:25	1684:3,7,21	1752:24	1714:1,17
1604:20,23	1778:10	1685:10,12	1753:9,13,16	1715:10,11
1605:1,1	good 1502:23	1689:1	1753:19,23	1715:12
1614:6,13	1507:15,16	1690:20	1754:1	1716:5,10,16
1619:7	1519:5,6	1691:17	1755:7,8,19	1716:21,24
1622:6	1520:13,14	1699:18	1755:20	1717:14,24
1625:1	1524:11,12	1702:25	1782:20	1718:13,20
1631:13	1547:5	1703:19	graphs 1493:15	1718:25
1632:5	1558:16	1711:11	1754:20,23	1724:1
1633:18,21	1563:12	1714:16	1755:1	1746:22
1640:24	1564:5	1735:7	1756:5	1747:15,19
1654:5	1567:21	1740:5	great 1603:21	1748:14
1656:18,21	1568:14	1742:11,20	1604:2	1752:10
1656:23	1572:1,2,22	1745:5	1692:8	1759:20
1665:13,13	1587:1	1748:11	greater	1760:3,4,9
1665:15	1590:3	1751:11	1514:25	1774:6
1666:9,22	1595:6	1757:5	1567:20	1776:8,11
1667:1,5	1606:10	1764:6	1568:3	1777:5
1668:22	1608:14,15	1766:6	1708:6	groups 1580:21
1669:2,19	1610:11	1767:8	1716:9	1630:7
1675:14,22	1614:23,24	1777:22	greatest	1651:19
1676:1,2,13	1616:6	1781:17	1708:25	1652:9,16
1676:15	1631:11	1783:2,3,4	gross 1513:10	1709:13
1677:17,22	1638:5,13	Gorman's	1513:24	1745:14,17
1677:23	1657:1,2	1487:14,22	ground	1745:19,24
1678:13,16	1658:21,22	1487:24	1530:22	1758:24
1681:4	1663:12,13	1489:19	group 1526:1	grown 1585:23
1682:16	1691:17,18	1491:5,11	1561:12	growth
1683:11	1699:18,19	1504:7,22	1562:3,3	1542:18

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1543:1,3,8,9	1743:11,25	1686:22	H	1659:15
1543:11,20	1744:16,18	1689:16	H 1782:4	happens
1544:1,4,11	1746:7,21,24	1691:10	half 1584:14,15	1631:14
1544:14	1747:4,5,10	1704:10,10	1584:16,16	1672:16
1545:21	1748:6,6,7,8	1707:21	1674:13	happy 1600:14
1546:5,21	1748:23	1714:23	1677:18,25	1600:16
1547:3,4,6,6	1749:1	1732:23	1678:17,19	1684:2
1547:17,18	1750:14,20	1748:20	1679:3	1688:21
1547:24	1750:21,21	1751:21	1765:16	hard 1495:11
1548:10,15	1751:2,9	1753:1	hand 1491:5	1527:9
1580:22,24	1752:11,12	1754:19,24	1506:3	1530:17,21
1581:2,15,16	1752:17,22	1758:4	1510:8	1560:13
1581:17,17	1753:5	1765:12	1515:23,25	1566:3
1581:21,24	1756:2,4	1766:7	1538:13	1607:7
1582:5,9,16	1757:6,9,15	guidance	1612:16	1637:18
1582:17,18	1757:19,20	1528:14	1657:3	1650:24
1582:19,20	1757:22	1529:24	1748:9	1752:4
1582:21,24	1758:1,1,8	guidelines	1750:18	hate 1746:14
1583:9,15,17	1773:19,22	1576:3	1763:9	Hawaii
1583:19,24	1774:1,3,5,7	1763:17	1773:16	1600:12,15
1584:6,7,11	1774:11	Gulf 1718:17	handed	1600:16
1585:8,14,16	growths	Gunn 1520:8	1532:23	1611:11
1585:19,19	1710:25	1591:4,8	1557:3	1612:1
1585:20	guess 1503:14	1596:13,23	1689:1	1646:12,16
1586:13,14	1512:19	1597:3,7	handful	1647:6
1586:15,19	1514:5	1600:18	1649:14	Hawaiian
1586:20,23	1522:21	1606:17	1650:19	1603:7
1589:14	1523:4	1607:3,10,20	handing	1647:4,5
1623:23	1531:8	1610:17	1510:13	headed
1624:6,7,8,13	1535:21	1631:15	1552:14	1549:25
1625:9	1557:23	1632:15,19	handling	health 1528:19
1635:3,13	1572:24	1632:22	1682:21	1621:4,7,9
1642:5,12,16	1596:16,25	1633:2,7,20	1683:3	hear 1490:8
1642:18,19	1597:1	1634:13,15	hands 1551:11	1500:24
1643:7	1599:21	1641:10,15	happen 1509:6	1695:11
1655:3,3	1630:12	1646:11	1568:14,15	1704:22
1701:6,10,16	1643:5,16,16	1656:16	1622:4	heard 1496:25
1701:23	1643:22	1681:15,16	1627:22	1500:8
1702:1,4,6,9	1646:10	1690:9,10	1629:1	1501:17
1702:15,17	1649:8	1734:16	1659:8	1539:2
1702:18	1653:24	1780:24	1678:23	1565:8
1706:3,3,4	1655:22	1781:6	1707:19	1616:23
1710:4,9,9,12	1664:16	Gunn's	happened	1628:9
1710:17,21	1681:10	1634:21	1597:16	1695:9
1710:22	1682:9	guys 1617:22	happening	1762:7
1711:2	1683:7	1625:16	1564:1	1776:5
1743:2,4,5,6	1684:15,18		1601:3	hearing 1481:5

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1483:3	1580:7	1708:8	1773:16	1578:15
1507:3	1589:5	1721:6	highest 1543:8	1609:8
1511:16	1607:7	1730:2	1598:17	1624:11
1540:6	1608:14	1731:25	1695:18	1642:21
1551:24	1615:1,3	1732:5,16	1729:10,13	1770:2
1556:19	1629:16	1735:15,17	1729:16,20	holders
1560:19	1631:21,21	1735:19,24	1729:21,24	1578:19
1633:13	1632:7,10,17	1736:7,16	1730:22,23	1762:18
1649:2	1634:21	1737:5,12	1731:1	holding
1658:13	1637:22	1740:7,7,16	1737:3,3	1584:21,22
1687:6,17	1638:2	1741:1,12	1738:12,12	holds 1557:9
1689:24	1641:10	1742:21	1738:16,18	homes 1708:7
1734:25	1648:16	1767:25	1738:24	honest 1623:18
1751:24	1656:12,13	1773:5	1739:2,14,19	1778:17
1756:22	1656:15	1776:17	1741:10,19	Honor 1507:9
hearings	1691:20	higher 1499:16	1745:2	1532:11,14
1569:4	1695:14	1499:18	1749:17	1538:20
held 1587:16	1696:5	1508:23	highly 1539:12	1540:1
Hello 1758:19	1701:3	1509:12	1568:18	1596:12
help 1488:4	1706:21	1513:21	1587:11	1629:16
1521:6	1711:15	1515:9	1621:8	1648:24
1537:21	1713:7	1528:8	1660:7	1658:9
1621:7	1714:1	1553:22	1685:15	1682:9
1763:17	1715:13	1554:19	1759:13,25	1683:24
helpful	1758:22	1592:20	hire 1707:7	1686:3
1558:14	1764:5,5	1594:10	hired 1667:3	1688:22
1627:5	1766:20	1598:14	1761:8,20	1689:21
helps 1488:18	1776:5	1601:2	historic 1608:4	1690:4,7,13
hereof 1784:12	1780:17	1604:3	historical	1703:10
hesitating	1781:2	1653:10,11	1586:22	1734:6,22
1611:25	1782:8,10,13	1653:11,12	1598:8,8	1740:1
Hevert 1484:10	1782:16	1668:22	1608:4	1745:7
1484:22	Hevert's	1697:12,16	1640:21	1751:21
1485:3	1485:8	1697:16	1641:4	1756:19
1490:24	1490:12,18	1702:5,7,13	1696:13	1757:4
1504:8,23,24	1491:15	1705:19,20	1724:7,12	1767:5
1538:9,14,23	1493:3	1711:25	1770:23	hope 1484:5,11
1538:25,25	1695:20	1712:8,8,12	1771:1	1485:16
1539:4,8	hidden 1495:17	1712:17,18	historically	1488:11
1540:2,13	high 1496:13	1722:18	1670:23	1491:23
1541:2,19,21	1499:2,5	1723:10	history 1500:12	1494:15
1541:22	1543:5,7	1745:2	1567:21	1574:23
1557:3	1594:3	1750:14,15	1612:12	1576:3
1560:23	1598:13	1750:16	1653:3	1618:20
1563:12	1655:11	1767:21	hit 1594:5	1700:17
1572:1	1678:4	1768:16	hold 1495:11	1729:18
1576:13	1707:11,14	1772:6	1547:14	hoping 1505:24

1703:9	1648:15	Illinois 1516:15	1569:15	1661:14
1727:22	1759:24	1558:6	1570:17	1686:17
hour 1615:7,10	identifying	1559:4	1571:15	1713:11
1641:13	1757:24	1696:10,15	1585:7	1763:9
hourly 1572:24	Iles 1482:17	1772:15	1586:7,9	included
1615:6,13	1483:20	illustration	1604:9,14	1490:12
1760:12	1502:22,23	1525:23	1644:12,14	1511:7,8
housekeeping	1502:24	imagine	1652:16,18	1543:20
1775:10	1503:17	1651:25	1656:6	1544:1,5
hovering	1507:9,12,14	imbedded	1700:11	1553:5
1486:7	1507:17	1519:8	1702:3	1555:17,18
1487:18	1510:1,7,12	1775:15	1707:12	1594:23,24
hundred	1510:13	immediately	1710:5,7	1672:24
1488:6	1511:13,20	1631:12	1712:3	1678:7
1772:23	1518:7	impact 1510:24	importantly	1691:3
hypothetical	1520:15	1512:9	1776:25	1709:12
1668:25	1532:14,23	1513:4,9	improve	includes
1673:1	1535:1	1514:18	1491:3	1553:8
H-e-v 1538:24	1540:12,23	1515:9	1562:2	1557:17
	1541:1,9	1653:17	1617:8,9	1624:5
I	1542:1,3,4	1710:13	1627:23	1660:23
Idacorp	1551:21	1723:18,22	improved	1686:21
1753:22	1552:3,7,9	impacted	1592:9,9	1705:2
Idaho 1558:7	1556:14,17	1772:21	Improvement	including
1718:12	1556:23	impacts	1484:6	1485:5
1719:7	1557:3	1723:16	imprudence	1545:1
idea 1511:24	1560:16,23	implement	1712:13	1567:10
1547:18	1563:7	1502:18	imprudent	1634:2
1620:10	1634:20	implementati...	1668:7	1635:7
1629:9	1637:19	1562:13	impute 1594:14	1691:2
1651:8,12	1641:22	implemented	inappropriate	1709:2
1674:14	1644:23	1646:19	1566:14	1721:5
1684:16	1682:25	1687:25	incentive	1722:24
identical	1684:25	implementing	1645:25	1778:2
1689:4	1685:3,7,8	1662:14	1661:8	inclusion
identification	1686:3,7,11	1688:8	incentives	1553:22
1689:2	1686:22,23	importance	1554:1,2	1633:22
identified	1687:1	1664:23	1646:2	income
1498:9	1703:14,16	important	include	1513:10
1579:9	1757:1	1497:5	1487:25	1550:9
1646:1	1767:5,7	1537:1	1505:14	1591:23
1649:14	1777:20	1547:17	1516:18	1592:16,21
1758:8	1780:6,10,19	1548:1	1546:6	incorporate
identify	1781:7,18	1550:22	1561:12	1554:23
1562:15	1782:2	1552:8	1609:12	incorporated
1620:16	illegitimate	1565:10	1647:21	1725:17
1621:21	1486:11	1568:3	1654:8	incorrect

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1685:20,21	1662:10	indicators	1510:16	1488:24
increase	incurring	1501:14	1513:6	1491:18
1481:11	1708:6	1570:14	1517:6,7,10	1495:19,19
1505:3	incurs 1659:13	indifferent	1517:19,24	1495:20,23
1514:24	indefinite	1578:2	1518:3,4	1537:10
1515:3,5,12	1775:6	1579:1	1520:21,23	1544:23
1515:14,16	indefinitely	individual	1521:2,7,13	1545:1
1516:3,5	1702:2	1601:21	1521:17	1547:2
1553:1	independent	1604:11,15	1523:25	1626:5
1554:21	1524:17	1604:15	1524:15,23	1695:10,17
1600:9	1525:7	1612:15	1524:24	1723:19
1647:13,13	1527:16	1660:10	1525:8	inquire
1735:8	1757:25	1758:7	1526:17,23	1499:22
1768:19	independently	individually	1533:24	1506:10
increased	1517:20,23	1727:18	1534:7	1538:19
1515:4,8	1524:16	individuals	1535:8,15	1657:10
1551:4	1625:18	1567:14	1539:15,18	inquiries
1561:21	Indiana 1718:6	industrial	1549:21	1521:12
1562:21	indicate	1502:25	1552:19,22	insiders 1521:4
1600:6,12	1694:15,24	1616:13	1553:2,9	insight 1573:4
1644:7	1695:3	1733:25	1581:25	1586:6
1653:4	1778:7	industry	1596:16	insofar
increases	indicated	1524:22	1620:19	1700:17
1514:24	1520:18	1525:2,5	1639:17	inspect 1596:14
1547:13	1525:20	1535:12,16	1652:23	installed
1564:23	1533:3	1586:8	1658:5	1673:19
1661:13	1535:7	1600:5	1700:8	instance
increasing	1536:22	1651:1	1708:21,25	1616:10
1765:6	1550:18	1705:1	1709:7,10	1725:15
increment	1609:4	1709:21	1714:12	1731:1
1592:15	1615:7	1713:6	1724:8	1772:11
1644:10	1618:17	1725:12	1758:5	1776:6
incremental	1630:8	1728:9	1767:17	instances
1550:8	1639:24	1774:11	1773:10	1768:15
1551:3	1663:23	infer 1620:5	infrastructure	1772:11
1563:4	1728:24	infinity	1769:15	1776:7
1574:22	1729:2,6	1565:24	inherent	Institute
1592:13,19	1769:11	1757:23	1543:3	1595:21
1644:14	indicates	inflation	initial 1584:11	1596:3,10
incrementally	1518:1	1564:24	1701:12	1597:2,5
1654:18	1598:19	1565:25	initiated	instituted
increments	1646:18	1653:11	1509:9	1627:4
1688:7	indication	influenced	input 1546:8	insure 1571:10
incurred	1705:1	1778:9	1546:13,20	insured 1771:6
1527:13,17	1769:22	influencing	1710:5,8	integrated
1659:3	indicative	1489:7	inputs 1487:11	1488:12
1661:19	1570:15	information	1487:25	1558:4

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1560:9,10,11	1646:19,21	1491:19	1762:4	1576:2
1579:9	1646:22,25	1501:23	1768:12	1577:20
1589:7,9,12	1647:1	1554:3	investor's	1594:22
1648:4	internally	1571:11	1550:9	1619:23
1649:15	1523:21	1574:25	1620:15	1628:19
1650:13	interpret	1577:22	investor-own...	1650:18
1713:4,8,12	1512:10	1625:6	1761:16,18	1651:11,20
1745:20	1518:4	1650:6	involve	1652:14
1746:7,21	interpreted	1654:14	1637:16	1656:22
1747:5,15	1727:2	1698:9	involved	1658:25
integrity	1755:16	1704:16	1514:3	1682:17,18
1484:18	interrupt	1708:3	1528:24	1682:22,25
1495:25	1548:13	1712:1	1636:4	1683:1,12,16
1501:22	1612:11	1724:3,3	1637:5	1683:19
1508:15	Intervenors	1769:16	1650:4,5	1685:2
1571:10	1522:3	investor	involves	1687:11
1656:8	introduce	1494:19	1636:25	1691:13
1698:8,18	1503:1,18	1574:21	in-camera	1696:18
1707:11	1504:2	1578:2,21	1587:14,15	1702:3,3
1775:11,19	invented	1591:23	1780:22	1706:7
intend 1571:13	1496:8,17	1709:22	in-state	1772:16
intended	inverse	1763:6	1645:25	1775:14
1704:3	1624:24	1771:4	irregardless	issued 1509:7
intent 1509:11	invest 1485:18	investors	1679:8	1509:20
1512:13	1491:19	1496:6,14	1680:16	1549:18
intentionallly	1496:11,11	1566:21	irregular	1608:20
1771:2	1496:15	1568:9	1659:7	1637:13
interaction	investing	1569:17	irrelevant	issues 1483:5
1592:24	1620:22	1577:6,25	1742:13	1489:5
interchangea...	investment	1578:9,12,16	1759:9	1505:13,14
1619:15	1485:20	1578:17	issuance	1517:19
interest	1496:7,9	1579:1	1510:23	1522:5
1509:17	1508:20	1592:16,21	1646:19	1548:1
1519:25	1521:3	1620:1,4	issue 1483:13	1553:10
1528:7	1620:21	1622:22	1483:25	1559:24
1534:21	1622:11	1623:2,2	1487:3	1597:21
1578:23	1687:24	1640:2	1489:9,25	1611:17
1583:25	1693:12	1644:10	1490:6,7	1613:24
1604:1	1694:25	1652:20	1492:10	1620:8
1653:11	1708:14,16	1704:15	1502:10	1646:5
1772:17	1709:12,17	1705:16	1504:2	1682:4
interesting	1725:5	1708:3	1505:18,21	issuing 1577:23
1503:18	1759:7	1709:1,1,5,8	1510:24	item 1686:18
1559:7	1762:5	1709:11	1542:6	
interests	1763:18	1711:25	1550:22	J
1569:16	investments	1758:12	1563:4	J 1506:15
interim	1484:19	1759:24	1565:21,23	James 1482:13

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

January	1532:9,12,15	1682:1,2,7,23	July 1486:3	keep 1490:9
1552:18	1532:17,19	1683:1,4,17	1503:12,15	1495:13
1635:25	1538:2,5,8,12	1683:22	1508:3	1515:24
1644:25	1538:19	1684:9,13,15	1519:10	keeping
1660:5	1539:1	1684:17	1533:25	1771:15
1664:14	1540:3,6,10	1685:1,5	1534:11	Kenney
1767:13	1540:12,18	1686:5,8,9	1549:16,18	1483:17
1783:7	1540:21	1687:4,9,13	1550:2	1500:21,23
Jarrett 1520:9	1541:4	1688:16,23	1557:14	1501:3
1520:12	1551:23	1688:25	1583:8	1524:8,10
1524:6	1552:5	1689:23	1602:14	1532:6
1608:10,11	1556:16,18	1690:5,8,14	1612:24	1536:17
1608:13	1557:1	1690:17	1639:2	1541:5
1614:16	1560:18	1691:11	jump 1598:16	1614:20,22
1629:19,21	1563:8	1699:14,15	June 1533:15	1629:11
1629:24	1571:22	1702:22	1533:21,25	1630:20,22
1630:19	1574:11	1703:11	1534:20	1631:1
1638:3,12	1587:13	1714:9	1549:20	1632:12
1648:8	1589:1	1734:9,11,13	1551:16	1639:20
1681:17,18	1591:2,6	1734:24	1552:18	1651:7
1690:11	1606:21	1740:3	1609:16	1681:19,20
1780:13,25	1607:22	1742:4,6,8,14	1635:25	1690:12
1781:4	1608:10	1745:9	1638:15	1701:8
Jarrett's	1614:19	1746:18	1644:25	1734:15
1635:22	1629:14,19	1751:23	1721:20	1758:16,18
Jefferson	1630:20	1752:6	1767:13	1764:8
1481:7	1631:2,5,6,19	1756:13,21	1783:8	1766:19
1482:4,8,20	1631:23,24	1758:15	jurisdiction	1780:14
1482:25	1632:2,16	1764:10	1648:3	1781:3,5,25
job 1707:15	1633:7,11,16	1765:23	jurisdictions	Kenney's
Jones 1733:25	1634:14,16	1766:2,11,15	1485:11	1630:6
Judge 1481:14	1637:20,23	1767:2,4	1488:18	Kevin 1482:2
1483:2,9,12	1641:7	1777:22	1516:20	key 1498:5,22
1491:24	1648:13	1778:5,12,16	1517:4	1499:24
1492:2,3	1649:1	1778:19,23	1523:14	1512:8
1500:20,22	1656:13,17	1778:25	1536:16	1528:2,5
1501:5	1656:20,21	judging	1559:14	keys 1497:9
1502:20	1656:25	1763:23	1613:12	kind 1512:2,3
1505:19,21	1657:3,10,11	judgment	1649:24	1521:24
1506:2,10	1657:21	1487:11	justifiable	1522:15
1507:2,7,11	1658:12,17	1497:13,14	1490:24	1523:14,23
1510:3,5,6	1662:17	1561:25		1528:6
1511:15	1663:9	1620:7	K	1529:7,12
1518:8	1677:2	1775:17	Kansas	1533:9
1519:2	1681:12,14	judgments	1715:24	1534:8,10
1520:6,9	1681:17,19	1617:13	KCPL 1536:2	1536:9
1524:8	1681:21,24	1762:14	1716:9	1537:3

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1542:16	1560:13	1721:22	1492:10	1672:21
1551:11	1572:24	1722:5	lasted 1566:7	1673:4,12,17
1557:23	1573:1,24	1731:22	lasting 1600:13	1673:21,25
1558:15	1583:21	1732:15	lastly 1534:12	1674:5
1661:8	1586:1,2	1733:18,25	latched 1487:3	1675:1,5,8,13
1756:15	1589:11	1735:4	late 1533:15	1675:24
1773:24	1595:19	1738:24	1568:16	1678:9,14,18
1776:13	1596:4	1739:21	1600:5	legal 1484:2
kinds 1496:11	1603:14,14	1745:13	1653:8	1575:2
1719:16	1603:15,17	1748:3	lately 1590:3	1576:2
knew 1564:14	1606:7,8,11	1752:4	1693:9	1618:21,23
know 1489:14	1606:19	1772:3	1778:22	1619:4
1490:6	1607:6,18	1777:25	law 1481:14	1620:25
1491:2	1609:9	knowledge	1482:11	1655:25
1495:18	1610:2,4	1492:24	1606:12	legality 1764:3
1497:19	1611:19,25	1539:20	1660:4	legally 1619:1
1499:6,21,21	1612:7,17	1618:8	lawyer 1618:18	1764:2
1509:21	1613:6	1650:1	1655:23	legitimate
1510:14	1618:1,4	1658:7	lay 1492:22,25	1487:9
1512:23	1623:19	knows 1486:15	1590:10	1773:14
1513:16	1625:10,16		1618:8	length 1646:22
1514:1,13	1636:24	L	layman's	lengthy 1742:9
1515:7	1637:15	L 1482:13,17	1590:5	let's 1509:2
1517:5	1641:15	Labadie	lead 1526:2	1511:20
1518:5	1646:12,17	1673:8	1628:18	1514:20
1519:12	1647:3,15	lag 1561:1	leading	1521:21
1521:6	1651:2,14	1599:25	1697:13	1538:5,8
1522:3,6,7,11	1653:1,9,13	1600:2,6,8,12	learned 1495:9	1542:16,24
1522:24	1653:19	1601:4	leave 1490:5	1546:4
1523:4,6,13	1655:19,22	1603:6,9	1492:4	1549:6,6
1524:4,16	1662:3,8,12	1647:1	1493:4	1577:8,8
1525:7,12,13	1664:2	language	1681:10	1581:16
1525:14	1666:14	1706:24	1735:4	1587:4
1527:12	1670:1	large 1548:11	leaving	1631:3
1528:2,3	1672:8,9	1563:23	1661:16	1632:2
1529:19	1680:8	1566:20	1663:1	1672:11,11
1530:8	1682:11,19	1627:21	1666:11	1672:12,15
1534:9,12,13	1684:5	1629:4	led 1771:8	1672:19
1534:20	1692:5,24	1643:2	left 1578:18	1674:22,23
1535:13,13	1696:15	1654:24	1660:25	1677:1
1539:2	1700:14	1659:13	1661:3	1680:19
1540:23	1706:8,25	1661:11	1662:5	1682:7
1541:16	1708:12	1764:23	1664:8,10,13	1683:4,4
1550:16	1712:11	largely 1554:1	1665:16	1686:5
1551:15	1714:19	1772:21,25	1667:11	1692:17
1552:12	1715:10	larger 1593:9	1668:3	1711:3
1557:12	1719:15	largest 1483:25	1672:4,20,21	1720:1

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1727:4,18	1493:9	1491:13	LLP 1482:19	1509:2
1729:14	1535:5	litigated 1612:2	load 1589:14	1512:8
1734:17	1543:21	1636:13	local 1569:4	1516:7
1742:19	1561:5,8	Litigation	logical 1497:15	1522:24
1753:2	1579:8,8	1482:24	1694:1	1523:21,23
1756:2,3	1582:1,7,8,9	little 1487:17	long 1484:8	1523:25
level 1591:16	1582:10	1487:18	1499:17	1527:10
1591:17	1614:12	1490:20,22	1505:25	1528:12
1598:17,24	1622:8	1491:10	1612:12	1536:1,18,23
1650:25,25	1634:6,11	1508:7	1659:19	1537:2
1666:17	1655:2	1509:3	1692:8	1540:13
1721:2	1669:17	1521:21	1704:13	1541:3
1743:21	1679:10	1528:13,21	1723:18	1546:11
1774:25	1686:18	1530:7	1724:8,12	1547:22
levels 1500:13	1701:8,9	1541:13	1746:16	1549:7
1528:16	1732:1,3	1545:9	1765:2	1550:21
1667:6	1774:8	1546:4	longer 1572:13	1551:1
1721:1	1777:16	1558:11	1573:3	1553:9
1765:6	linear 1564:8	1564:9	1593:22	1562:10,11
leverage	1586:16	1568:22	1646:24	1562:23
1528:11	lines 1622:1,1	1571:3	1651:4	1564:2
1531:7	1656:11	1583:3	1672:25	1565:9,14
Lewis 1482:6	links 1526:22	1592:12	1676:18	1566:18
1482:14	liquidity	1593:6	1680:22	1567:14
lies 1563:6	1528:3	1606:14	1758:1,2	1568:13,16
1773:12	Lisa 1483:7	1609:12	1767:25	1570:13
light 1491:9	1657:5,13,14	1613:13	longest 1710:10	1576:3,4,4,5
1559:15	1781:11	1619:14	long-term	1576:5
1611:11	1783:19,21	1620:9	1550:6	1591:23
1614:3	1783:23	1630:6	1564:10	1592:4,4,12
1715:25	list 1611:10	1653:16	1567:21	1592:16
likelihood	1612:4	1665:4	1584:5,6,13	1593:1
1617:9	1616:3	1670:13	1586:13,19	1594:11
likewise 1627:6	1649:11	1696:5,9	1586:20	1601:2
limit 1565:19	1713:4	1720:23	1593:1,2,12	1602:3,13
1708:3	1714:24	1721:6	1653:11	1603:4
limitations	1715:1	1724:17	1702:8,14,16	1604:2,5,11
1543:3	1719:3,3	1729:17	1710:8	1604:11,16
1548:18	1760:19	1739:24	1728:17	1611:10
limited 1544:14	listed 1505:12	1742:19	1758:8	1612:4,13
1639:14	1506:22	1748:5	1774:7,10	1614:14
1723:19	1611:1	1752:4	look 1493:21	1617:17
limiting 1548:9	listen 1492:16	1754:24	1500:1	1620:3,4
1548:21	1495:14	1757:7	1503:12,19	1621:24,25
1642:20	listing 1718:4	1772:24	1503:23,25	1622:22
line 1485:8,10	lists 1728:2	1777:15	1504:14,15	1623:1
1491:8,9	literally	LLC 1482:14	1504:19	1624:18

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1625:2	1546:15	lot 1492:17	1618:13	1665:19
1626:19,25	1550:22	1503:23	1625:9	1666:9
1627:20	1552:10	1524:1	1637:12	1667:10,15
1628:5	1553:13	1544:19,20	1655:11	1667:18,22
1640:4	1557:20	1544:22	1656:2	1668:2
1641:12	1563:15	1545:2	1704:22	1670:15
1644:4,12	1566:5,9,21	1562:2	1707:19,23	1680:21
1645:23	1567:4,18	1567:13,13	1721:2,11	1681:5
1646:8	1579:2	1569:5	1723:4	1688:3
1652:5,8	1581:3	1577:23	1730:7,9	1694:3,4
1653:1,3	1591:15,16	1597:11,15	1732:2,8,17	1701:1
1654:7,15	1594:13	1606:13	1735:17,19	1707:3
1665:24	1595:13	1620:19	1735:24	1712:9,10
1677:1	1604:9	1625:8	1736:13,17	1719:23
1680:12,13	1621:18	1636:16	1737:8,10,13	1722:3,21
1694:6	1627:15	1654:15	1740:19	1723:9,11
1695:1	1628:4	1712:23	1741:2,13	1726:23
1704:19	1636:16	1718:3	1743:19,21	1743:15
1708:14	1639:14	1750:15	1765:1,2,11	1747:24
1717:22	1640:14,21	1776:13	1774:14	1750:12
1719:3,12	1640:22	lots 1488:22	1775:5,9,11	1768:15
1727:4	1641:3	1612:12	1776:17	1770:17,18
1733:16	1644:6	Louis 1482:12	lower 1498:23	1774:9
1734:17	1645:17	1506:14	1508:7,24	1775:7
1745:15	1693:6	love 1632:14	1509:12,17	lowered
1749:21	1718:3	low 1485:13	1509:19	1518:22
1770:25	1725:9	1486:17	1515:9	1693:9
1776:19	1749:16,24	1487:3,5	1516:2	Lowery
1777:7	1750:1	1489:16,17	1519:18,19	1482:13
looked 1536:6	1753:9	1489:20	1523:15	1552:8
1544:16,19	1768:11	1494:9	1551:18	1600:17
1545:2,8	1771:10	1497:20	1555:8	1656:23
1562:11	looks 1493:5,13	1502:18	1556:13	1660:12
1581:25	1493:14	1515:24	1567:1	1663:11
1606:25	1504:18	1543:4,10,11	1570:19	1677:5
1615:25	1528:6	1555:19,22	1576:6	1679:23
1651:4,6	1590:15	1555:24	1585:25	1681:10,13
1710:1	1595:17	1556:9,10,12	1586:1	1682:9
1724:2	1643:8,18,20	1568:11	1595:5	1683:7,20
1760:18	1729:16	1570:11	1599:4	1684:14,16
looking 1489:8	1738:12	1575:19	1601:14	1688:18,19
1493:17	1739:14	1594:18,21	1615:15	1688:24
1497:11	1750:8	1594:25	1618:16	1689:1,21
1503:13	lose 1492:25	1595:2	1626:22	1690:3,6
1504:17	loss 1566:22	1599:20	1637:13	1749:24
1535:17	lost 1490:1	1601:24	1643:12,16	1757:2
1537:2,4,9	1533:18	1603:8	1665:14,15	1779:2

1781:15,20	maintaining	1735:9	1642:23	1725:23
lowest 1498:2,3	1508:20	manner	1652:6	market-based
1498:10,15	1656:8	1578:14	1653:5	1501:14
1498:18	maintenance	marginal	1693:4	1574:20
1729:11	1666:7	1513:23	1694:9,16	1640:25
1730:6,7,12	major 1552:17	mark 1510:7,8	1695:4	1652:17,25
1730:16,22	1557:13	1648:11	1700:13,24	1758:5
1730:24	1612:23	1686:5	1701:1	Martin
1731:6	1614:14	1714:16	1704:8,13,14	1505:23
1738:12	1635:24,24	1729:14	1705:5	1506:3,5,13
1739:3,3,8,10	1644:24	1734:7	1709:7,19	1506:15
1739:13,15	1648:18	1740:2	1711:21	1507:15
1739:18	1767:13	marked 1510:2	1720:9,11,25	1516:12
1741:20	1783:6	1510:13	1721:6	1532:23
lumped	making 1489:1	1539:10,11	1722:14,15	1538:2,4
1773:24	1495:15	1539:13	1723:1,25	1616:20
lunch 1483:11	1500:5	1541:2,10	1724:1,9,13	1628:9
1607:1,8	1515:17	1552:4	1725:2,11,15	1780:8
1631:3,9,12	1545:4	1557:4,4	1726:6	1782:18
1631:17	1553:24	1626:17	1743:22	Maryland
1632:3,7	1617:12	1633:3	1765:7,18	1557:25
1641:13	1630:16	1641:12	1767:20	1558:1
	1654:14	1644:24	1768:7,13	1559:18,21
M	1697:22	1685:14	1769:10,14	1613:19
Madison	1704:16	1686:4,11	1770:1	Master's
1482:3,7	1724:14	1688:21	1773:2,8,10	1573:5,10,18
magnitude	1754:19	1689:2	1773:12	material
1644:20	manage 1708:2	1716:15	1775:4,12	1533:24
main 1533:8	management	1718:5	marketplace	1534:5,6
1623:17	1712:13,16	1746:17	1699:1	1586:3
mainstream	1775:2	market	1723:4	math 1489:3
1486:25	management's	1494:22	1725:6	1495:16
1487:21	1516:18	1496:9	1726:3	1556:13
1491:16	management...	1508:21	1759:11	1606:12,13
1493:2,8,9	1712:17	1509:13	1764:24	1750:14
1494:11,13	Manager	1524:19	1765:6,10	matter 1481:10
1496:22	1508:8,13	1533:23	1770:7,15	1590:15
maintain	1516:13	1534:8	1774:22	1593:3
1491:20	Managerial	1535:12	markets	1631:14
1508:14	1670:3	1567:19,23	1512:16	1651:22
1512:14	managers	1568:18	1516:11	1672:20
1514:14	1708:20	1577:11,16	1567:14	maturing
1516:10	managing	1577:17,18	1656:10	1534:16
1537:7	1539:6	1592:9,10	1772:22	maturity
1705:3	manipulate	1623:1	markets's	1509:14
1707:10	1742:10	1640:13,24	1768:10	1534:14,18
1775:10,19	manipulating	1641:2	market's	1550:24

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1593:22	1712:11	1529:23	1527:11	1520:16,19
Maui 1647:6	1723:7	1530:25	1529:5,13,14	meets 1571:16
MBAs 1617:22	1726:4	1547:18	1529:15	1699:3,3,7
Mealy 1482:23	1732:14,25	1548:11	1537:12,13	1762:17
1784:7,21	1746:20,25	1550:8	1537:18	member
mean 1494:1	1747:6,11,15	1563:23	1562:4	1596:2
1500:1	1747:19,24	1566:20	1617:8	mention 1497:4
1517:22	1748:3,23	1577:13,22	1622:6,9	1594:8
1522:15	1749:1,5	1621:3,6,6	1627:16,20	1595:4,11,20
1535:10	1750:13,23	1625:22	1627:23	1599:10,21
1537:13	1751:1,6,13	1627:21	1647:7	1599:21,22
1539:3	1751:14	1629:4	1653:18	1600:20,20
1542:22,23	1754:22	1643:2	1654:7,16,25	1601:1,13,19
1543:4,4,4,5	1755:6	1650:21	1687:25	1603:24
1543:7,9,10	1758:4	1654:24	1688:4,8	mentioned
1543:17,22	1762:2	1698:24	median	1503:2
1544:14	1764:6	1722:14	1553:18	1516:1
1547:1	1775:21	1770:22	1582:5	1545:25
1548:20,25	1776:2,3,6,15	measured	1655:5,8,9,14	1575:21
1550:15,15	1776:24	1709:16,18	1746:11,21	1581:23
1553:18	1777:1,2,4,16	1743:22	1747:1,6,11	1583:17
1555:10	1778:9	measures	1747:16,19	1584:1
1566:7	meandering	1528:2	1747:23,24	1594:16
1577:15	1493:6	1529:21	1748:24	1599:7
1582:4,15,16	meaning	1543:4	1749:2,5	1601:6
1583:5	1620:20	1581:21	1750:22	1602:4
1585:18	1627:11	1592:11	1751:3,7,13	1611:1
1604:6	meanings	1622:11	1754:21	1612:25
1611:12	1619:11	1695:3	1755:25	1613:1
1617:12	means 1568:18	measuring	1756:16	1627:8
1622:20	1578:18	1496:5	1775:21	1644:4
1626:3	1585:24	1699:6	1776:2,4,7,12	1655:4
1628:20	1606:11	1724:13	1776:14,16	1764:15
1636:14,15	1646:17	1725:21	1776:23	mentions
1636:23	1647:18	mechanism	1777:2,5,12	1594:2
1642:17	1671:2	1523:19	medians	1601:7
1643:5,25	1684:15	1562:14	1750:9,12	merchant
1650:17	1750:13	1614:10	1763:22	1589:25
1651:2	1756:16	1617:3	meet 1485:16	1590:11,21
1655:4,7,14	1769:19	1647:9	1516:13,21	message 1490:5
1655:16	meant 1534:13	1653:25	1578:13	met 1667:6
1660:22	1547:6,7	1696:22	1617:7	method 1497:6
1676:22,23	1582:23	1706:12	1646:2	1504:14
1677:21	1647:12	mechanisms	meetings	1543:13
1688:13	measure	1516:19	1516:17	1546:2
1705:22,24	1489:6	1522:8	1517:17	1641:5
1708:21	1494:1,2	1523:9	1518:1	1699:21

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1700:4	middle 1625:4	1662:18,21	1488:14,15	1510:19,22
1724:21	1777:9	1663:8,23	1491:1	1519:8
1764:16	Midwest	1781:14	1499:13	1542:18
methodologies	1482:24	mind 1490:10	1501:20	1547:25
1546:19	mid-point	1495:14	1502:25	1571:10
1625:13	1562:25	1542:9	1503:4	1572:7
1652:17	1563:2	1684:8	1505:8	1590:9
methodology	1626:22	mine 1560:15	1506:14	1642:1
1546:5	MIEC 1482:17	1662:2	1509:15	1643:11
1625:21	1487:7	1703:16	1516:15	1644:1
1635:19	1502:20	mini 1483:14	1522:12	1654:2
1696:16	1505:23	1682:18	1523:1,15	1655:24
1711:20	1507:8	minimize	1534:15	1696:1
methods	1510:15	1508:15	1535:18	1698:8
1620:3	1532:13,24	minimizing	1570:23	1706:11
1635:15	1540:11	1515:19	1571:8	1767:22
1652:7	1634:18	minimum	1574:19	misspoke
metrics 1512:9	1658:18,23	1487:24	1589:6,13	1575:22
1527:22,25	1661:21	mining 1772:4	1590:22	mistyped
1528:17,17	1685:14	1773:16	1591:10,17	1738:23
1529:1,9,19	1690:22	minus 1730:8	1591:25	misunderstood
1529:23	1783:1	1730:15,16	1613:5	1568:24
1530:23	MIEC's	1739:6	1615:18	1575:17
1537:4,5,11	1593:25	minute 1540:19	1642:1	1673:23
1537:16,24	Mike 1503:1	1542:7	1646:6	mitigating
1616:21	million 1509:20	1652:11	1653:20	1647:2
1622:10	1509:25	1672:11	1654:22	1654:18
1627:23,25	1511:5	1757:3	1661:4	mix 1512:10
1628:11,21	1534:15,17	minutes	1685:11,25	1514:15
1628:23	1534:18,22	1540:17	1695:21	1530:10
1707:24	1660:2,19	misleading	1696:4,6,25	MO 1482:4,8
1762:22,24	1666:2,4,10	1493:16	1697:8,19	1482:12,15
MGP 1768:25	1666:10,21	mismatch	1698:6	1482:20,25
1768:25	1667:10,15	1721:4	1700:22	model 1485:6,6
Michael	1668:2,22	mispronounce	1705:11	1496:3,4
1684:21	1669:2	1572:4	1706:21	1504:17
1685:10,12	1670:21	misrepresent...	1712:20	1543:3
1781:17	1674:13,13	1597:4	1716:9	1544:15
1783:2,3,4	1674:24	missed 1558:6	1761:1	1546:20
Michigan	1675:5	1717:23	1763:12	1547:8
1718:6	1676:16	Missouri	1768:7	1548:9,10,18
microphone	1677:8,9,18	1481:1,7	1784:3,10	1548:20
1507:10	1677:23,25	1482:1,10	Missouri's	1570:13,15
1677:3	1678:17,19	1484:4,10,21	1481:10	1581:13
mid 1494:4,4,5	1679:3,5,14	1485:15,18	1488:2	1583:18,23
1503:7	1680:21	1486:2	1501:22	1584:3,7,18
1653:15	Mills 1482:6	1487:16,23	1504:9,23	1584:19

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1585:1,2,4,8	money 1498:15	1694:23	1586:12	1583:11,14
1585:11	1671:25	1762:21,22	1621:11	1583:23
1586:6,23,24	1708:20	1762:25	1672:7	1585:13
1624:6,7,8	Monnie	1763:3,9,20	movement	1586:21,22
1626:2	1482:23	1763:22,23	1567:6	1623:23
1634:24	1784:7,21	morning	movements	1624:2
1635:3	monopoly	1502:23	1569:1	1625:21
1642:16,18	1693:23	1505:16	moves 1586:15	1634:4,24
1642:19	1694:2	1507:15,16	moving	1635:16
1643:3,4,7	month 1533:25	1519:5,6	1568:22	1642:15
1695:11	1534:11	1520:13,14	1569:4	1643:4
1701:10	1601:25	1524:11,12	1592:16	1701:13
1702:4	months	1561:24	1625:8	1709:24
1710:8,14,23	1503:16,16	1563:12	MPG-1 1689:5	1710:4,14,22
1710:25	1503:17	1572:1,2	MPG-11	1743:8
1719:17	1526:11	1608:14,14	1713:2,17	1744:18
1720:3	1534:21	1608:15	1727:15,22	1747:14,18
1722:10	1554:18	1614:23,24	1728:1	1748:7
1727:2	1555:4,7	1627:24	1766:8	1749:4,18
1743:6,9,12	1600:3,7,9,14	1636:19	1768:25	1750:21
1743:23,25	1602:15,18	1641:21	MPG-12	1751:6
1749:18,18	1602:25	1642:13	1727:15	1756:2,4
1752:11,13	1603:6	1643:13	1734:18	1757:7,20
1753:6	1604:20	1644:4	1738:4	multi-year
1757:20	1609:2,16	1683:16	1766:8	1553:5
1758:2	1638:15	1695:12	1768:25,25	1650:4
1764:22	1645:5	1776:6	MPG-13	Murray 1486:9
1774:12	1664:20	MORRIS	1694:6	1486:20
models 1488:25	1691:24	1481:14	MPG-21	1487:4,4
1544:23,23	1714:14	mortgage	1685:20	1494:9
1548:8	Moody's	1772:16	1686:2	1499:10
1652:8	1517:2	move 1506:25	1783:11	1504:8
1701:13	1523:13	1511:13	MPG-4 1753:7	1573:10,25
1704:18	1525:17	1551:21	MPG-6 1746:9	1590:8
1719:14	1528:22	1556:14	1746:10,10	1617:21
1721:10	1529:2,2	1560:16	MPG-7 1774:2	1618:1,5
1749:20	1530:5,18,20	1567:17	multiple	1619:17
modifications	1530:23,25	1605:1,1	1502:15	1684:9,11
1695:24	1531:17	1634:16	multiply	1706:19
modify 1775:2	1535:22	1656:18	1585:5	1708:10
1775:9	1536:5	1684:8	multiplying	1709:24
moment	1561:10	1686:22	1720:8,10	1710:16
1540:12	1590:18	1687:1	multistage	1711:17
1632:17	1617:2,12	1689:21	1625:23	1761:22
monetary	1627:20	1737:8	multi-stage	1762:1
1723:13,16	1628:1,10,17	moved 1551:23	1484:25	1764:6
1723:20	1629:5,8	1570:9,11	1548:8	1766:20

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1777:24,25	1663:22	1726:4,5,6,9	1533:24	1554:6
1778:17,21	1671:13	1752:18,23	1534:7	1576:2
Murray's	1683:9	1756:11	non-recurring	1652:23
1485:24	necessarily	1769:15	1659:5,6,10	1715:3
1486:5	1498:20	1770:22	non-regulated	notes 1561:9
1487:13	1515:15	needed 1667:6	1591:19	1723:17
1619:2	1521:3	needs 1627:6	1692:25	1729:15
1706:16,17	1536:11	1775:9	1693:1,3,7,22	notice 1541:12
1764:1	1556:4	negative	1694:7,9,14	1646:8
myriad 1500:7	1568:14,15	1707:20,23	1694:17	1652:20
1500:7	1583:22	negotiated	1695:8	noticeable
	1590:18	1522:6	1703:24	1691:24
N	1593:5	neither 1575:3	1704:7,9	noticed
N 1482:1	1597:16	nervous	1758:24	1540:14
1483:1	1611:8	1563:14	1759:4	1593:9
1780:1	1624:10	net 1736:5	1760:8	1646:16
1781:1	1629:7	never 1486:16	non-utility	1647:15
1782:1	1630:14	1493:7	1616:9,13	noticing
name 1502:24	1631:15	1565:8	1651:9	1651:22
1506:11,13	1637:11	1597:1	normal 1565:7	notion 1566:12
1507:17	1705:24	1761:9	1565:21	1620:20
1538:21,23	1706:8	nevertheless	1566:4,7	1654:5
1538:23	necessary	1768:11	1568:5	1758:24
1572:4	1516:10	new 1509:19	1692:15	notions 1762:8
1614:25	1599:5	1526:4	1720:25	NP 1685:16
1657:12	1627:17	1534:17	1723:1,9,11	nuance 1618:3
1685:8	1774:18	1565:7,21	1765:19	1618:3
names 1685:10	necessity	1568:5	normalized	number
1745:18	1561:24	1615:15	1668:1	1495:12
narrow	1652:9	1667:17,21	normally	1498:20
1682:22	need 1491:19	1669:1	1705:19	1499:24
nation 1493:10	1495:24	1761:14	North 1601:23	1502:14
1496:10,21	1510:1,7	news 1600:10	Northern	1503:12
national	1512:3	nice 1563:13	1555:20	1510:3,4,10
1486:6	1516:11	Nicely 1734:16	1594:19	1513:25
1487:17	1521:8	night 1540:24	1613:17	1541:4
1488:6,7	1540:15	nine 1556:8,10	Nos 1687:7	1542:2
1490:13,19	1558:10	1608:3	Notary 1784:9	1544:17
1490:19	1614:17	1616:2	note 1505:11	1555:14,24
1608:23	1639:6	Ninth 1482:15	1555:9	1577:2
1609:4	1674:3	non-distribut...	1587:15	1582:13,14
Natural 1484:5	1677:3	1649:13	1592:1	1582:23,23
nature 1527:1	1684:20	non-electric	1594:9	1583:18
1527:21	1686:22	1692:19,23	1595:12	1586:1,17
1670:4	1690:14	Non-Propriet...	1599:24	1595:1
1671:6	1703:14	1539:12	1772:6	1598:2,19
nearly 1502:9	1705:25	non-public	noted 1551:2,2	1599:13

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1603:23	1543:16,16	1687:5	obvious	1552:1
1604:5	1543:17	1689:24	1661:17	1556:18,21
1606:16,18	1549:8	1734:25	obviously	1560:18,21
1606:18	1551:5,10	1742:7	1515:24	1633:12,14
1610:11	1554:4	1751:24	1631:13	1649:1,4
1611:20,21	1564:8,10	1756:22	1636:15	1658:12,15
1612:3,8,9	1565:11,18	objective	1668:9	1687:5,7
1614:12	1579:21	1488:20	1732:14	1689:23
1638:5,13	1593:10	1489:10,11	1765:12	1690:1
1639:10	1597:17	1529:21	occasion	1695:23
1642:20	1604:15	1640:7,9	1524:20	1734:25
1648:13	1606:1	1646:1,3	occasionally	1735:2
1655:9	1612:13	1705:7	1522:20	1742:6,16
1660:8,12,20	1625:24	1773:7	occur 1757:22	1751:23
1660:23	1636:2	objectives	occurred	1752:1
1661:11	1638:3	1707:16	1510:23	1756:21,24
1664:6,13,15	1651:23	obligation	1533:4,6	1761:9
1664:15,17	1652:1	1578:23,24	occurrences	1768:1
1664:19,23	1655:11	obligations	1659:9	1782:6
1664:25	1660:10	1528:10	October 1481:7	1783:1,13,18
1665:2,14	1713:11	1578:13,14	1526:3,3	offhand
1666:1,1	1731:16,23	1617:7	1557:8	1551:20
1674:12,14	1772:5	1763:8	1579:5	1595:19
1677:1,9	1773:5	1772:12	1779:4	1610:2
1678:4		observable	offense 1572:6	1630:25
1686:8	O	1652:19	offer 1508:24	Office 1482:5,7
1701:15,17	O 1483:1	1704:14	1509:9	1482:19
1726:8	oath 1539:24	1709:15,17	1510:20	1616:10
1728:11	object 1596:11	1724:23	1540:1	1760:23,25
1734:9,12	1633:2,3	1725:20	1619:1	1761:3
1740:3	1742:8	1726:9	1632:18	offset 1592:22
1757:1	1766:9	1759:16	1633:7	1594:23
1767:8	objection	1769:10	1648:24	offsets 1594:24
1768:15	1540:5	1770:18,23	1658:10	1763:12
1769:5	1633:5	observation	1668:14	OG&E
1774:12	1742:15	1649:22	1669:11,24	1609:20
1775:25	1766:16	observations	1685:5	oh 1483:16
1776:1	objections	1554:19	1734:7,22	1531:22
1777:9	1507:3	1555:8	1742:4	1549:12
numbers	1511:16	1602:16	1751:22	1557:6,15
1493:23	1540:4	1604:5	1756:19	1558:6
1494:13	1551:24	1650:23	1763:25	1560:8
1495:18	1556:19	1655:11	offered 1507:3	1561:7
1503:24	1560:19	1756:15	1507:5	1601:15
1514:6	1633:12	obtain 1516:9	1511:15,18	1609:16
1541:13,13	1649:2	1573:16	1534:17	1611:14
1542:5,8,21	1658:13	1669:9,22	1540:4,8	1623:12

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1639:7	1569:8	1642:4	1717:22	1764:4,8
1684:14	1570:19	1643:16,25	1718:2	1765:22
1734:22	1572:16	1645:16	1719:12,12	1766:17
1738:2,19	1573:5	1646:8	1719:19	1767:2
1746:14	1574:5,15	1647:15	1720:1	1777:20
1750:1	1575:12,16	1648:24	1721:15	1778:12
Ohio 1717:9	1576:8,15	1649:6,11,19	1722:5,25	Oklahoma
okay 1483:12	1577:5	1651:7	1723:7,12,12	1558:8
1492:1	1579:2,14	1653:16	1724:7,15	1560:10
1494:5	1580:20,25	1656:12,25	1726:11,13	1579:12
1501:3	1581:16	1657:24	1726:15	1649:18
1507:12	1583:1,6	1659:25	1727:4,10,18	1714:25
1508:1,7	1584:10,15	1660:3,13	1728:1,14,18	old 1746:15
1510:1,3	1584:16	1661:17	1728:24	once 1502:16
1511:12	1586:2,10,17	1662:8,16	1729:8,13,15	1522:13
1513:7,22	1586:19,21	1663:8	1730:6	1587:3
1514:4,20	1589:11,17	1665:8,20,22	1731:9,21	1728:19
1517:15	1589:24	1666:14	1732:4,14	1731:10
1518:6	1590:19,25	1670:19	1733:5	1761:17,21
1519:20	1595:10	1671:11,17	1734:5,17	ones 1732:17
1520:4,25	1598:10	1672:18	1736:6,13	one's 1555:21
1521:9	1604:25	1673:4,5,11	1737:16,25	one-sided
1522:10,21	1606:17	1673:23	1738:3,11,23	1556:24
1523:3	1608:19	1674:2,22	1739:1,10,18	one-third
1525:13,20	1609:3,25	1675:3,7,21	1740:1,3,15	1732:9
1527:22	1610:12,25	1679:7,18	1740:19	1736:17
1530:15	1611:10,19	1681:14	1741:4,8	1737:13
1531:16	1611:24	1684:15,19	1742:4	1741:2,20
1532:5	1612:20	1690:5,17,20	1743:11,24	ongoing
1536:17	1613:21	1691:11	1744:14,22	1679:12
1541:2	1614:11,13	1692:17,22	1745:5,10,18	OPC 1494:9
1542:13,25	1615:22,25	1694:1	1745:22	OPC's 1491:12
1543:6	1616:15	1695:9,16	1746:2,7,24	OPEB 1661:12
1545:14	1617:19	1696:8,25	1748:9	1670:18
1546:21	1618:12	1699:2,13	1749:21	open 1683:9,10
1547:4,21	1623:22	1701:2,19,22	1750:17	opening
1548:5,13,23	1624:1	1702:20	1751:15	1483:22
1549:6,14	1630:5,15,19	1703:7	1753:1,5,15	1490:4,8,9
1551:21	1631:6	1704:5,10	1754:14	1492:2,7
1552:13	1632:16	1705:8	1756:2,8	1493:7
1555:11	1634:16	1706:15	1757:17	1496:25
1557:13	1635:18,21	1710:16,20	1758:13,15	1501:8
1558:17	1637:23	1711:3,11	1760:7,10,18	1502:21
1559:15,19	1638:8,17	1712:15,23	1761:6,16,19	1609:4
1560:14	1639:9,19	1713:19,25	1761:22	1655:18
1563:7,8	1640:4	1714:7	1762:21	1658:24
1568:24	1641:21	1715:5,15	1763:4,7,25	1780:3,4,5,6

openings	1484:13	OSAGE 1784:5	1565:1,2	1553:19
1483:14,15	1607:24	Ottertail	1569:2	1554:6,12,13
1505:20	1620:20	1716:4	1577:17,18	1555:16
1656:21	1652:14	ought 1613:4	1650:9,25	1557:14
operate	1706:13	outcome	1692:2	1560:25
1492:21,21	opposed	1524:4	1777:4	1561:4,8
1516:20	1641:1	1637:9	overrule	1579:23
1708:8	1655:14	outcomes	1742:14	1580:4,10
operating	1671:19	1595:17	overstated	1587:16
1648:5	optimal	outlandish	1695:21	1597:25
1688:9	1512:10	1499:3	overstating	1598:11,11
1706:4	1515:21	outliers	1686:20	1598:11
1762:11	optimism	1655:14,15	overwhelmin...	1609:17
operation	1692:10	1751:13	1521:12	1610:17,25
1589:25	options	1754:20	over-reliance	1611:4,4,5,6
1590:11,21	1523:22	1755:6,12,14	1516:3	1612:23
1660:4	Orange	1755:19	owned 1497:22	1614:14
operations	1555:18	1756:9,14	1597:25	1634:1,6,11
1590:16	order 1483:8	outlined	owns 1589:25	1634:22
1591:24	1538:8	1695:23	O&M 1661:7	1635:4
1640:8,9	1549:17	1711:1	1665:8,13,18	1636:1,2
1666:7	1556:3	outlying	1665:20,24	1638:20
1716:10	1585:3,5	1655:10	1665:25	1639:5
opinion	1590:20	1754:23,25	1666:4	1646:8
1492:24	1608:20	output 1495:21	1667:10	1648:20,22
1501:13	1611:6	outset 1500:9	1668:21	1649:8
1520:23	1614:4	1511:21	1670:14,20	1669:15
1521:7	1621:25	outside	1671:19	1689:3
1522:11	1631:8	1486:24		1714:24
1537:1	1632:2	1493:4	P	1716:19
1575:2	1646:2,20	1494:11,12	P 1482:1,1	1718:4
1576:8	1659:14	1533:4	1483:1	1720:19
1590:8	1682:8	1535:15	Pacific 1558:10	1731:25
1592:3	1726:5	1600:7	PacifiCorp	1732:1
1619:1	1731:11	1623:16	1558:8,25	1749:16,21
1625:19	1775:10	1647:14	1559:1	1750:5
1687:21	orders 1536:2	1674:17	1560:7,8	1777:8
1698:12	1625:16,18	1708:17	1579:11,11	1780:2,8,17
1699:11	original	outstanding	1613:1	1781:2,11,17
1700:20	1562:25	1775:15	1649:17,17	pages 1580:1,1
1761:25	1570:1,5,10	overall 1508:15	1649:25	1608:3,3
1763:25	1605:3	1526:4	1650:3	1616:2
opinions	1686:16	1529:7,10	page 1507:18	1689:10,15
1691:6	1689:18	1531:15	1507:24	1784:15
opportunities	1783:25	1552:24	1508:3,5	paid 1532:3
1508:22	originally	1563:16,18	1541:25	1572:16,21
opportunity	1660:25	1563:19,21	1542:2	1578:19

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1615:17	1671:17,19	1607:23	1667:6	1503:22
1669:1	1675:11	1608:1	1670:15	1504:3
1671:2	1679:24	1611:7	1674:10	1505:9,11
1686:18	1683:2	1632:8,19	PB 1583:20	1507:23
pain 1573:14	1690:21	1664:3	PE 1583:20	1508:6,7
paper 1490:11	1692:15	1682:23	1586:22	1509:20
1564:3	1697:7	1683:23	penalize 1614:6	1513:1,8,14
1677:5,7	1728:23	1777:24	pending	1513:14,19
1689:11,18	1738:1	1778:5	1633:17	1513:23,24
papers 1489:4	1744:1	partly 1629:4	Peninsula	1529:3,5,5,6
paragraph	1765:20	partner 1539:6	1717:13	1529:8,10,11
1554:8,11,15	1769:23	parts 1509:10	pension	1529:12,16
1574:12,16	1775:16	1625:8	1661:12	1529:25
1574:17	partial 1611:18	1628:3	1670:17	1554:5,19,20
1598:11	1612:5	party 1763:8	people 1492:22	1555:4,7,8,19
1638:19	1637:11	pass 1762:13	1492:25	1558:21
1639:4,5	partially	passed 1490:11	1547:16	1559:3,13,18
parameters	1612:17	Patomic 1558:1	1548:8	1560:3,8,11
1621:25	1636:8	1558:17	1553:9	1569:24
1700:16	1654:11	1559:19	1567:2	1575:9,18,20
1721:9	particular	1613:19,25	1568:13	1576:6
1774:8	1493:16	pattern	1584:3	1583:10
Pardon	1501:11,15	1562:12	1595:12	1585:20,24
1749:12	1519:9	pause 1595:12	1596:14	1586:20
parlance	1546:2,20	pay 1496:7,15	1599:6	1587:4,5
1617:15	1549:12	1498:15	1604:10	1589:15
part 1502:7	1568:9	1531:23,24	1621:23,24	1598:13,24
1508:12	1581:1	1532:1,4	1622:10	1602:10
1509:11,13	1582:4,10	1534:21,22	1623:15	1608:23
1526:15	1595:20	1667:18,22	1667:11	1613:20
1528:20	1617:1	1668:18	1668:17,17	1645:6,6
1531:7,14	1628:18	1669:2	1674:15	1648:23
1541:15	1653:25	paying 1499:2	1675:24	1649:20
1543:13	1666:15	payment	Pepco 1613:25	1650:14
1545:3	1772:19	1774:25	perceives	1653:15
1549:11	1774:16	payments	1725:11	1671:3
1562:1	particularly	1578:24	percent	1672:14
1566:20	1653:21	payout 1583:19	1484:23,23	1688:19
1567:7	1700:11	1585:5,12,22	1484:24	1702:6,19
1568:9	1704:19	1585:24	1485:25,25	1710:16,21
1569:11	particulars	1586:9	1486:8,14,15	1711:2,4,5
1593:8	1556:4	1624:23	1487:14,19	1713:20
1611:15,16	1611:7	payroll	1490:20,22	1715:6,15,22
1643:17	parties 1483:4	1660:23,24	1491:6,11	1716:2,7,12
1650:8,9	1499:15	1661:5,13	1500:15,16	1716:12,23
1663:15	1556:4	1664:7,19	1502:9	1717:1,7,11
1664:8	1596:11	1665:2	1503:5,7,22	1717:16

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1718:9,15,22	perception	1705:9,15,17	pgs 1780:22	1562:14
1719:2,8,8,20	1517:2	1706:5	phone 1526:13	1589:8,12
1720:20	perceptions	1710:10	phrase 1527:22	1647:11
1721:17,24	1516:23	1713:18,20	1528:1	plane 1656:14
1722:1,9	1517:1	1719:10	1627:9	plans 1589:10
1731:7,16	1725:5	1721:18	physical	1632:4
1732:1,2,9,12	perform	1728:20	1492:20	plant 1492:19
1733:18,18	1508:13	1733:15	physically	1492:22
1733:19,19	1763:19	1758:2	1589:21	1654:3,17,22
1733:23	performance	1769:5,8,9,10	pick 1739:13	1671:13,24
1735:15	1494:21	1770:3,3,4	1740:5	1671:25
1736:7,8,8,12	1590:2	1771:1	picked 1664:14	1672:7
1736:14,14	1598:21	1772:10,16	1745:1	1673:8
1736:23,24	performed	1772:18,21	1750:23	1675:4,8,11
1736:25	1486:12	1773:1	1751:1,3,7	1675:14,17
1737:4,6,8,13	1580:21,23	1775:6	picking	1675:18,22
1737:18,20	1583:11	periods 1568:1	1678:10	1676:2,15,22
1737:23	1586:22	1584:1	1750:22	1677:16,17
1738:13	1692:22	1651:4,6	picture	1677:25
1740:14,16	1764:20	1653:10	1563:16	1678:15,20
1740:16,20	performs	1724:12	1569:3	1680:20,23
1740:24	1487:9	1757:16	piece 1524:20	1681:5
1741:12,13	period 1493:11	1772:8	1535:20	1687:19
1741:17,20	1511:8	permit 1485:17	1625:2	1708:4
1742:21	1533:4,7,17	permitted	1657:20	play 1537:12
1743:13	1534:9	1759:2	1661:6,7	1537:14,15
1744:16,18	1549:16,20	perpetuity	1665:24	1643:1
1744:20	1550:2,19	1566:4,5	1666:4	1744:1,5
1745:1	1557:22	1583:21	1674:17,18	play-off
1747:1,1,11	1578:14	1585:9	1675:16	1778:10
1747:11,16	1581:9,12	persist 1663:5	1676:22	Plaza 1506:13
1747:20	1583:8	1663:7	1677:11	pleadings
1749:5,5	1584:1,6,22	1775:1	1678:11	1526:16
1751:2,4,7,8	1585:22	persistent	1679:9,22,23	please 1483:21
1751:10	1600:8	1662:23	1680:2,9	1490:9
1754:24	1605:11	person 1618:8	1694:22	1492:9
1757:9,13,14	1608:25	personally	pieces 1535:12	1499:24
1767:23	1612:12	1784:11	1658:5	1501:10
1771:18,22	1624:22	persons	place 1527:11	1502:23
1772:17	1639:10	1497:23	1617:8	1506:3,12
1773:19	1642:25	perspective	1627:21	1510:18
1774:6,12	1643:21	1516:19	1654:8	1538:8,12,21
percentages	1646:13	1537:9	1719:11	1554:16
1600:21	1664:20	1550:9	1738:6	1575:16
percentile	1665:11	1591:22	placed 1759:21	1576:18
1491:6,8,9,10	1697:5,12,13	1620:23	plan 1490:2	1632:2
1491:12	1697:14	1627:20	1553:5	1657:12

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1669:15	1607:21	1654:20	1668:6,10	1555:20
1685:9	1619:4	1655:19	1706:16	1594:19
1733:2	1634:6	1699:25	1707:5	Power/Wheel...
plot 1752:3,8	1643:8	1700:1,20	1759:7	1715:19
1753:9,13,16	1652:19	1719:6	positions	practice
1753:19,23	1665:20	1722:2	1517:21	1533:22
1754:1,17,17	1670:14	1755:22,24	positive	1590:15
1754:20	1681:2	1760:5	1705:10	1622:22
1755:7,8,19	1684:19	policies 1627:5	possession	pre 1763:18
1755:20	1711:8,18	policy 1500:8	1533:24	precedent
1756:5	1721:17	1505:13	1534:6	1556:5
plots 1752:16	1722:10,10	1682:13,13	possibilities	1611:8
plug 1628:16	1723:9	1682:17	1670:6	preceding
plus 1593:3	1724:23	1683:5,19	possibility	1784:15
1666:21	1727:1	1685:2	1621:14	precipitator
1667:10	1740:7	1687:16,17	possible	1673:7,9,21
1668:22	1753:23	1690:9,11	1500:13	precisely
1669:2	1754:1,3,19	1723:13,16	1515:24	1776:22
1729:14,17	1754:23,23	1723:20	1539:2	predict 1659:7
1736:8,14	1755:1	politics	1569:12	prefer 1626:2
1740:15	1759:9	1604:10	1596:21	preference
point 1487:23	1770:16	polls 1604:11	1621:20	1684:1
1489:22	1771:21	pondere	1683:25	preferred
1490:21	pointed	1763:18	1684:2	1758:10
1493:19	1634:22	poor 1581:22	1708:25	prefiled
1494:4,4,5	1635:22	Poor's 1525:17	1735:6	1506:15,22
1495:12	1767:17	1590:14	1742:10	1539:9,10,11
1498:5	points 1486:1	1591:15,21	1777:3	1539:23
1499:5,6	1487:15,17	1592:1	possibly	Premarked
1500:4	1488:6	1613:11	1568:11	1734:16
1503:7,8	1499:7	1763:15,16	1723:16	premium
1504:5	1519:19	portion	Power 1484:4	1485:6
1509:4	1544:20	1509:12	1554:2	1496:4
1559:23	1546:6	1534:16	1557:24,25	1504:16
1561:4	1548:6,6	1670:22	1558:7,17	1546:16,17
1568:4,21	1550:5	1671:8	1559:15,19	1546:18
1571:14	1553:24	1676:7,25	1613:17,19	1625:15
1580:18	1554:25	1682:21	1614:2	1644:17
1583:16	1562:7,17	1683:5	1715:19,24	1646:3
1587:15	1571:18	1687:17	1716:4,20,21	1691:2
1596:18	1593:12,14	position	1716:24	1708:13
1600:11,19	1610:9,10	1500:15	1717:2,4,9,13	1713:3
1600:24	1614:1,7,9	1513:17	1717:20	1719:16,24
1601:21	1634:3	1522:2,2	1718:6,12,17	1720:9,11,25
1602:1,2,23	1635:12	1530:18	1719:7	1721:1
1603:5,13	1643:12,15	1642:7,7	1753:10	1722:14,15
1606:19	1650:19	1656:4	Powers	1723:6,25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1724:1,13,18	1686:1	1733:6,8	1540:14	procedure
1724:20,22	prepared	previous	1596:14,23	1706:11
1724:25	1526:1,18	1485:2	prior 1544:11	proceed
1725:1,4,9,13	1656:24	1487:21	1545:16	1542:15
1725:17,17	1657:16,16	1576:19	1560:3	proceeding
1725:19,21	1685:13	1608:16	1625:16,17	1522:9
1726:2,5,6,12	preparing	previously	1646:19	1524:5
1726:21	1514:1	1672:6	1770:1	1525:21
1727:1,2,5,6	1534:6,7	pre-filed	priority	1574:6,18
1727:7,14	1535:12	1539:19	1578:11,22	1647:14
1728:25	prerequisites	price 1496:7	private	proceedings
1729:2,9	1494:14	1546:7,23	1497:22,23	1481:3
1730:23,24	presence	1547:13	pro 1587:5	1516:22
1731:2,6	1562:16	1584:21,23	probability	1517:8
1732:21	present 1684:6	1585:1	1568:11	1521:19,19
1734:19	1724:4	1694:9,10	1617:9	1526:20
1736:21,23	1784:11	1709:19	probably	1538:7
1737:4,17,18	presentation	1723:10	1531:9	1540:20
1738:4	1526:7,15	prices 1547:3	1537:8,21	1632:1
1740:10,20	presentations	1581:8	1550:5	1682:6
1741:10	1526:22	1620:5	1572:3	1779:3
1743:22	presented	1709:2,6,15	1581:21	1784:11,13
1764:23	1487:7	1771:5	1598:7	proceeds
1765:5,7,9	1505:6	pricing 1485:6	1599:5	1534:16,22
1768:24	1521:18	1496:4	1607:12	process
1771:9	1526:8	1695:4	1665:5	1517:11,11
1773:12	presenting	1704:8	1666:9	1526:10
premiums	1488:19	1719:17	1683:12	1534:1
1554:23,24	preserve	1720:2	1688:20	1561:13,25
1594:5	1566:22	1725:12,15	1701:25	1590:15
1598:20	preserving	1764:16	1755:5	1620:5
1721:6	1515:20	primarily	1756:11	1646:23,24
1729:6	Presiding	1484:24	1778:20	1682:10,12
1731:11	1481:14	1515:18	problem	1691:12
1741:5	pressure	1527:2	1489:2	1696:17,20
1742:1	1601:2	1634:5	1596:15	1697:7
1765:8	pretty 1492:6	1642:11	1607:22	processes
1769:18	1493:12	primary	1631:19	1523:21
1770:24	1586:16	1493:18	1651:18	produce
1771:6	1603:8	1624:13	1704:11	1495:18,20
1772:7	1608:2	principal	1757:18,24	1543:1
1773:8	1701:25	1578:23	1758:4	1629:7,8
prepare	1706:7	principles	problematic	1695:24
1524:20	1710:5,7	1484:2	1624:9	1720:18
1525:20,21	1773:7	1769:13	1760:1	1725:13
1525:25	prevailing	print 1540:23	problems	1735:12
1615:17	1570:25	printed	1712:17	1737:13

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1742:2	project 1582:5	1530:12	provisions	1527:7
1752:18,24	1585:4	prospectively	1578:10	1530:3
1773:5	1671:5,21	1675:15,23	proxies	1536:19
produced	1672:24	provide	1764:24	1537:8
1510:19	1673:9,18	1484:12,15	proxy 1561:11	1617:13
1710:13	1757:19,22	1491:21	1562:3,3	1627:18
1720:19	1758:8	1501:20	1580:7,11,21	1628:4,6
1726:8	projected	1510:18	1605:2,3,9,21	1712:16
1743:13	1705:23	1517:6,8,10	1620:10,11	1762:14
1744:15	1708:19	1517:13,14	1621:15,20	prudent
1746:5	1721:13,15	1517:18,25	1622:3,7,12	1527:12
1765:10	1721:18	1521:4	1622:17,20	1533:22
1772:5	1731:18	1523:8	1623:7	prudently
1774:3	projection	1524:15,18	1630:7	1527:17
produces	1702:6	1525:22	1635:8	1708:3
1697:16	projections	1526:4,6,16	1651:8,13,19	PSC 1783:25
1720:11,15	1582:3	1526:19,24	1652:9,16	public 1481:1
1750:12	1701:6	1530:10	1654:23	1482:1,2,5,7
1774:12	1708:24	1571:9	1692:19,23	1484:6
producing	1710:11	1576:25	1692:25	1487:2
1764:22	1757:15	1589:7	1693:1,3	1489:16
product	1758:10	1597:5	1703:24	1490:14
1585:11	projects	1645:25	1704:7,12	1501:6,10
1720:10	1554:25	1666:16	1709:3,6,8,13	1502:16
profession	1672:16	1669:11,13	1709:15,20	1518:8
1622:18	1674:25	1698:6,15	1714:1,17	1524:1
Professional	prolonged	1707:11	1715:9,11,12	1532:15
1784:9,22	1495:3	1711:16	1716:10,16	1563:8
profile 1555:1	promote	1767:24	1716:21,24	1569:4
proforma	1502:18	provided	1717:13,24	1616:11
1629:1	pronounce	1526:7	1718:12,20	1637:20
profound	1614:25	1589:13	1718:24	1646:1,2
1723:3	proper 1498:5	1664:2	1720:13	1662:17
program	1501:13	1768:4	1745:14,17	1687:10
1664:9	properly	providence	1745:18,24	1691:13
1665:17	1488:1	1761:14	1746:22	1714:25
1666:12,15	1706:2,22	provides	1747:15,19	1715:8
1666:15	property	1489:9	1748:14	1718:24
1667:12	1497:23	1669:23	1752:10	1760:24,25
1668:4,6,10	proposal	1706:13	1758:24	1761:3
1668:14	1682:11	1707:8	1759:20	1765:24
1669:6,10,12	proposed	1712:25	1760:3,4,9	1784:9
1669:23,24	1507:19	providing	1768:2	publicly
1679:21	1762:24	1528:14	1774:6	1526:20
progress	proposition	1531:17,20	1776:8,11	1757:25
1654:9	1636:10	1589:9	1777:4	publish
1671:20	proprietary	1656:6	prudence	1652:21

1763:24	1535:15	quantified	1567:12,22	questioning
published	1595:24	1626:15	1572:22	1535:5
1763:16	1600:19	quantify	1575:23	1563:15
pulled 1590:9	1601:24	1562:8,10	1576:16,19	1682:22
1603:23	1603:19	1626:16	1582:13	1692:20
pulling 1604:1	1620:11	1653:22	1587:11	1758:22,25
pump 1673:19	1625:7	quantifying	1593:11	questions
1673:19	1644:24	1574:20	1595:6,7,8	1491:24
punitive	1646:25	quantitative	1601:16,17	1500:20
1613:23	1656:3	1565:24	1604:8	1505:16,24
purely 1670:7	1675:9,14	quarter	1605:2,19	1506:21
purpose	1678:20	1503:20	1606:10	1507:18
1496:20,21	1680:23	1504:1	1617:20	1514:3
1499:18	1689:5	1508:25	1618:5	1518:7
1544:14	1706:12	1533:21	1622:5,5	1519:1
1566:6	1729:17	1534:1	1633:17	1520:5,7,16
1572:5	1730:8,15,16	1553:16,17	1634:22	1521:10,11
1581:25	1748:21	1555:12,15	1635:21	1522:10,19
1609:23	1756:4	1593:21,21	1636:12	1524:13
1619:24	1765:16	1596:9	1638:11,14	1526:14
1623:11	putting 1534:2	1597:19	1638:16	1532:6,10,12
1639:14,14	1534:2	1598:1,12,18	1639:19,22	1535:1,13
1639:17,25	1562:16	1599:2,4,17	1645:16	1538:1
1651:21	1594:25	1599:18,19	1646:11,14	1539:22
1654:11,12	1625:15,18	1599:25	1651:9	1563:7,17
1656:6,8	1628:10	1600:1,2,9,13	1655:22	1571:21
purposes	1666:24	1601:10	1660:7	1591:1,3
1498:8	1670:16,18	1602:4,7,25	1663:23	1596:11
1513:1	1676:2	1603:3,6	1664:24,24	1606:24
1621:21	p.m 1778:24	1610:19,22	1667:7	1608:7
1623:5,13	1779:3	1633:8,9	1669:18,18	1610:13
1744:23	P.O 1482:3,8	1646:10	1669:19,20	1612:20
pursuant	1482:14	1649:8	1670:3,7	1614:17,18
1508:24		1650:14,18	1682:10	1615:4,5
1509:9	Q	quarters	1687:16	1616:19,23
1664:8	qualifications	1598:25	1689:17	1619:6
1666:11	1553:12	1601:11	1690:16	1626:8
pursued	1617:22	quarter's	1692:25	1629:12,15
1511:25	qualified	1651:3	1695:6	1629:22
pushing	1619:1,5	question	1702:15	1630:6
1523:10	qualitative	1497:25	1705:8	1632:17
push-back	1627:25	1510:20	1744:12,14	1634:17,17
1517:24	1629:6	1522:14	1751:18	1635:22
put 1488:18,24	quality	1536:18	1755:10,11	1636:6
1493:12	1707:11,14	1547:5	1758:16	1637:21
1498:1	1708:5,9	1548:4	1764:4,11	1641:6,11
1522:5	1723:4,13	1557:23	1766:18	1645:3

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1651:8	quoting	1698:13,17	1527:18	1624:24
1655:2,20	1600:24	1699:25	1530:9	1625:9,16,17
1658:2		1700:25	1531:14	1633:9
1662:18	R	1711:5,8,16	1532:2	1635:24
1663:21	R 1482:1	1711:17	1541:18	1636:7,7
1681:15,16	1483:1	1719:20,23	1542:18	1642:1,6
1681:18,20	rage 1732:1	1720:2	1544:11,12	1643:6,21
1681:22,24	raise 1538:12	1726:24,25	1545:10,15	1644:24
1687:11	1657:3	1730:23	1545:17,21	1646:4,13
1688:15	raised 1486:14	1731:3,10,22	1547:6,6,7,25	1647:11,14
1690:4,6,8,9	ran 1623:22	1732:2,5,8	1548:3	1648:18
1690:10,11	1624:2	1737:6	1549:17	1653:18
1690:13	1625:14	1740:7,19	1552:17,25	1654:9,12,14
1691:10,19	1762:24	1741:13	1553:5	1656:1
1692:17	range 1484:23	1742:21	1557:13	1667:2
1699:13	1485:25	1744:11	1561:13	1676:11
1703:20	1486:10	1745:3	1562:14	1679:24
1706:15	1487:4	1763:18	1569:12	1680:1,3,6
1757:6	1490:18,20	1770:24,25	1572:8,24	1681:4
1758:14,21	1499:15,17	1773:8,11	1581:15,16	1685:20
1760:11	1501:15	ranges 1629:2	1581:17	1696:9,11,11
1765:24	1502:17,18	ranking 1536:5	1582:5,18,20	1696:16,17
1766:1,6,7,10	1503:5,7	1536:10,11	1582:21	1696:20,22
1766:11,13	1504:25	1622:1	1583:9,15,19	1697:1,3,6,9
1767:1,9	1505:9	rare 1532:3	1584:6,11	1697:11,13
1768:23	1518:19,23	rarified	1585:16,19	1697:16,22
1769:2,5	1542:23	1492:23	1585:19,20	1701:16,23
1771:12	1543:14,15	rata 1587:5	1585:25	1702:1,18
1775:20,22	1562:24,25	rate 1483:3	1586:13,14	1705:9,15,16
1777:21	1563:2,6	1486:11	1586:15,19	1705:19,23
quick 1564:2	1569:19,23	1492:13,14	1586:20,23	1706:1
1591:9	1570:2,10,12	1497:12,12	1593:2	1710:4,9,12
1592:5	1570:20	1498:2,3,10	1594:23,25	1710:17,21
1605:2	1572:25	1498:16,19	1595:17,18	1710:22
1620:18	1575:8,10,18	1499:14	1595:23	1711:2,21
1629:22,22	1575:18	1502:14	1596:8	1716:16
1764:11	1580:17	1503:18	1598:3,20	1719:10
quickly	1609:20	1504:10,21	1599:22	1720:6,12,13
1641:10	1618:14	1505:4,5	1601:4,7,9	1721:1,2,8,13
quiet 1534:9	1626:22,23	1508:24,24	1608:16	1721:15,23
quite 1544:24	1628:22,23	1509:12,12	1610:25	1722:6,11,15
1551:9	1629:25	1509:19	1612:12,24	1722:16,18
1564:18	1630:3	1517:8	1614:14	1722:21
1691:25	1653:15	1521:14	1615:7,9,13	1723:8
quote 1598:14	1688:6,10,13	1523:6,13,20	1615:15,22	1726:5,14,19
1598:16	1695:18	1523:24	1618:22	1726:20
1600:2	1697:25	1525:21	1623:14	1732:23

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1748:10	1612:13	1537:21	1611:13,15	1625:24
1757:6,10,15	1643:21	1590:9,16,22	reaching	1628:3
1758:2	1644:9	1591:22	1626:4	1640:18
1760:12	1646:19,22	1617:5	1709:5	1642:19
1767:11	1646:25	1622:2	read 1554:8	1651:21
1768:16,19	1647:1	1627:1,9	1560:13	1652:25
1768:21	1653:11	1628:2,18	1574:15	1672:20
1772:17	1655:3,20	1629:5	1576:18,19	1716:15
1774:1,3,6,7	1659:22,24	1694:9,14,15	1579:12	1722:18,20
1774:12	1663:6	1694:15,21	1598:10	1757:18
1783:7	1665:9	1694:24	1600:1	1758:4
rated 1549:14	1666:8,22	1704:22,25	1607:2	1770:11
1549:19,22	1667:8,14,17	1704:25	1619:9,17	1773:6
1568:19	1667:18,21	1707:25	1631:10	1777:17
1643:17,18	1667:22,25	1762:8,13,15	1638:19,24	reason 1487:6
1694:20,22	1668:21	1763:2	1669:19	1540:15
1732:8	1669:1,2	ratings 1512:9	1670:10	1549:12
1738:5	1671:15	1517:20	1706:17	1560:1
1762:12	1701:6	1528:19	1775:25	1566:20
ratepayer	1706:11,12	1529:3,24	reading 1599:6	1600:17,20
1616:10	1707:13	1531:17	1616:6	1609:15
1760:24	1710:25	1591:20	1669:17	1622:21
ratepayers	1726:16	1622:2	1744:25	1626:1
1500:11	1743:4	1628:24	reads 1611:6	1637:10
1519:25	1758:1,8	1629:6	ready 1542:15	1652:21
1522:18	1763:14	ratio 1507:22	real 1564:2	1669:21
1569:17	rate-based	1508:4	1592:5	1689:8
1666:16	1763:12	1514:23,24	1629:22	1701:20
1668:11	rate-making	1514:25	1641:10	1723:12
rates 1486:3	1499:1	1528:6,8,11	1683:11	1733:9,12,14
1502:7,8,14	1697:21	1531:7	1777:7	1748:2
1509:17	rating 1508:20	1583:20,20	reality 1642:21	1751:12
1514:24	1516:14,14	1583:20	really 1513:17	1763:5
1517:2	1516:17	1585:5,9,12	1516:23	reasonable
1527:3,8	1517:12	1585:22,24	1526:12	1484:14
1530:3	1520:22	1586:9	1533:12	1485:18
1543:8,10,11	1521:2	1763:23	1534:10,23	1487:25,25
1547:3,4	1523:5,15,16	rational	1536:22	1491:18,21
1550:1	1524:14	1499:17	1550:8	1498:2,3,10
1551:16	1525:15	ratios 1528:5	1555:19	1498:16,19
1552:24	1526:25	1528:15	1565:10,21	1501:15,17
1564:24	1528:13,15	1624:23	1573:4	1501:19,25
1569:6,9,12	1528:18	1763:9,22	1576:13	1502:2,2,7,17
1582:16	1529:2,10	1770:1	1591:9	1502:18
1584:7	1531:20	RBHER-10	1595:6	1512:14,16
1592:25	1532:2	1581:20	1601:24	1513:12
1593:1	1535:3	reached	1624:25	1514:14,15

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1516:8	1593:8	1706:24	1752:1	1491:16
1518:19,23	1600:12	1710:17	1756:23	1494:10
1521:8	1606:9	1745:13,15	receives	1499:11
1527:5	1640:20	1745:16	1494:19	1505:1
1530:2	1641:4	1766:6	1519:21	1544:21
1536:7	1644:3	1771:11	1680:6	1545:4
1569:9,12,19	1651:21	1775:22	receiving	1561:22
1569:23	1652:10	receipt 1507:3	1499:4	1562:21,24
1570:2,20	1656:10	1511:16	1775:11	1562:25
1571:6,8,17	1711:1	1540:4	recession	1569:23
1571:18	1744:3	1551:24	1692:9	1570:5,9,18
1575:10	rebound	1556:19	recognize	1571:1
1593:13	1564:12	1560:19	1566:20	1577:2,3
1625:25	1692:6	1633:13	1570:12,16	1580:18
1630:3	rebuttal	1649:2	1570:18	1593:18
1637:1,9	1539:10	1658:13	1574:3	1626:20
1695:18,25	1541:22	1687:5	1577:21	1628:16,17
1697:25	1544:5	1689:24	1585:8	1643:7
1698:4,5,14	1545:17	1734:25	1603:5	1696:19
1699:9	1569:21	1742:7	1618:5	1699:3,10
1700:12	1579:23	1751:24	1627:4	1711:3,18
1701:25	1583:8	1756:22	1629:5	1720:22
1702:8,12	1609:17	receive 1584:20	1644:13	1744:1,6
1706:13	1624:1	1584:24	1645:24	1749:9
1709:16	1626:21	1624:16	1689:11	recommenda...
1711:9	1634:2,7,22	1680:10	1745:10	1484:21
1773:11	1635:4	1699:8	1748:11	1485:12
reasonableness	1642:8	1762:5	recognized	1488:5,19
1488:4,5,8,10	1643:8	received	1559:13	1489:11,12
1489:15,20	1782:9	1507:4,5	1617:25	1490:15
1496:24	recalculations	1511:17,18	1618:2	1492:14
1497:1,3,15	1771:9	1533:16	recollection	1493:3
1499:8,9,23	recall 1532:23	1540:7	1651:5	1494:8
1527:6	1574:7	1551:25	1757:9	1563:1
1610:6	1609:2	1552:1	recommend	1573:25
1617:14	1612:2	1556:20	1505:10	1619:2
1627:17	1615:12	1560:20,21	1688:5	1764:2
1699:20	1616:14	1633:13,15	recommenda...	1765:21
reasonably	1635:23	1649:3,4	1484:24	1775:22
1536:3	1636:4	1658:14,15	1485:3,8,24	recommended
reasoning	1638:2,6,7,8	1680:9,18	1486:6,13,15	1486:10,23
1493:20	1638:22	1687:6,8	1486:17,22	1487:4
1497:10	1639:22	1689:25	1487:13,20	1504:23
1700:5	1646:14	1690:1	1489:1,16,17	1507:25
reasons 1488:9	1648:9	1735:1,2	1489:19	1508:2
1534:24	1655:5,20	1742:16	1490:21	1561:3,17
1548:7	1695:14	1751:25	1491:5,11,12	1687:23

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1688:6,10,12	1667:4	reduces 1688:8	1661:5	Registered
1698:1	recoveries	reduction	reflect 1504:4	1784:8,22
1711:16,17	1763:14	1559:25	1570:18	regular 1512:6
recommending	recovers	1560:3	1593:16	1512:16
1484:22	1765:18	1614:10	1598:20	1517:17
1507:22	recovery	1644:1	1614:9	1589:1
1508:5	1523:18	1679:19	1688:2	1659:8
1701:1	1529:5,13	1688:1,13	1695:10	regularly
1707:3	1537:12,13	1722:11	1706:2,10	1520:19
1711:4	1537:18	refer 1498:17	1721:5	regulated
1774:13	1627:16	1528:1	1723:1	1495:5
1775:7,17	1659:20,24	1541:17	1754:18	1496:19
recommends	1773:2	1551:2	1770:4	1591:19
1503:3,6	recross	1552:17	reflected	1600:18
1504:25	1532:12	1561:10,11	1559:25	1693:23
1505:9	1629:23	1564:6	1593:10	1694:2,7,10
reconciled	1630:21	1584:23	1594:15	1695:7
1495:4	1633:19	1592:13	1599:1	1703:25
record 1522:25	1634:17,19	reference	1608:25	1704:6,9,12
1538:22	1637:25	1541:13	1653:3	1708:17
1540:18,22	1681:25	1662:25	1665:8,13	1711:12
1554:10	1690:15	referenced	1666:8	1761:7
1599:20	1765:23	1611:3	1667:18	regulation
1631:6	1766:4	referred	1720:25	1647:4,5
1633:4	1767:2,6	1497:2	1769:6	regulators
1644:24	1781:4,5,6,7	1565:24	1772:10	1628:5
1682:8	1781:8	1568:10	1775:18	1761:8,11
1685:9	1782:2	1582:2	reflection	regulatory
1689:6	redirect	1640:17	1597:15	1481:14
1714:11	1532:19,21	1686:18	reflects 1592:3	1491:1
1742:5	1641:7,8	1720:7	1601:3	1493:22
1750:19	1681:25	referring	1722:10	1498:8
1756:20	1690:15,18	1544:25	1752:16	1499:17
recover 1527:2	1748:4	refers 1493:9	1774:21	1516:19,19
1527:12	1767:4	1507:24	regard 1618:9	1516:22
1530:3	1780:15	1528:2	1743:11	1517:1,3,9
1564:19	1781:9,21	1620:14	regarding	1522:11
1605:12	1782:2	1761:22	1502:13	1523:2
1617:3	reduce 1508:19	refinance	1524:14	1525:1
1627:17	1590:20	1508:23	1525:1	1527:1
1659:12,17	1687:25	1509:3,12,14	1553:10	1529:4,7,11
1659:18,19	1775:2	1511:25	1561:24	1529:14,15
1692:9	reduced	1534:18	1574:21	1530:1
1762:10	1561:21	1775:15	1650:24	1531:9
recovered	1566:13	refinancing	regardless	1535:22
1527:8	1593:17	1533:4	1504:14	1536:5
1659:21	1666:17	refined 1661:1	1674:16	1537:23

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1552:16	1612:18	1647:4	1731:1	1553:8
1556:6	1621:8	1763:11	1739:14	1555:9
1557:10	relates 1611:5	1768:5,10	1744:15	1557:8,11,13
1561:1	1679:15	reliability	remains	1579:5
1570:23,24	relating	1708:5,23	1486:24	1580:13
1594:4	1546:24	1720:24	1491:3	1581:2
1595:3,8,16	1547:2	1759:23	remarkably	1592:2
1598:15	1766:8	reliable	1689:4	1595:14,15
1599:24	relation	1484:15	remember	1597:12
1600:2,6,8,12	1661:15	1501:21	1490:7	1599:17
1600:25	relationship	1571:9	1492:17	1607:17
1601:5,6,11	1522:14	1596:19	1520:15	1608:20
1601:11	1525:16	1625:22	1535:5	1610:13
1611:9	1531:19	1698:7,15	1536:19	1638:4
1616:3	1646:22	1707:11,14	1576:17	1648:18
1617:1,15	1770:20,21	1708:9	1611:3	1657:16
1623:12,19	relative 1528:7	1712:25	1619:8	1663:15
1626:9,11	1528:12	1764:22	1621:13	1782:19
1638:8	1529:8,18,24	reliably 1693:3	1650:11,12	1783:9,14,15
1639:2	1550:6	1695:6	1651:9	reported
1644:23	1555:23	1704:4	1653:22	1482:23
1646:23	1566:24	relied 1485:1,4	1656:5	1549:8
1648:6,17	1567:17	1487:22	1692:19	1551:18
1652:21	1577:14,15	1651:3	1695:13	1553:19
1653:18	1577:15	1652:23	1703:25	1557:22
1687:25	1612:13	relies 1650:22	1767:14	1560:4
1688:4	1655:12	1724:22	1769:1	1579:10,15
1696:4,6,8	1664:13	reluctant	remove	1579:17
1700:2	1694:21	1626:16	1674:18	1598:22
1704:20,23	1709:19	rely 1487:12	1679:8	1685:24
1705:1,11	1725:6,10	1517:5,7	removed	1700:1
1760:21	1726:1	1518:3	1598:23	1714:17
1762:10	1754:20	1548:14	1673:20	1717:18
1768:2	1764:24	1574:20	1674:14	1767:9
reinstated	1770:22	1652:10,11	1680:1	Reporter
1605:14	relatively	1709:1	renewable	1784:7,8,9,22
reinstitution	1523:24	1744:4	1594:22	Reporter's
1605:10	1530:5	1763:14	renewed	1587:15
rejected	1596:19	1776:2,2	1568:8	1782:3
1486:18	1664:12	relying 1642:12	repeat 1638:11	1784:1
1504:24	1772:25	1650:18	1755:11	reporting
1630:24	relevant	remain	replicate	1616:21
relate 1628:24	1488:15	1624:22	1547:7	1627:11
1636:2	1500:2	remained	report 1493:22	reports
related 1533:10	1547:17	1592:10,11	1528:23	1552:23
1533:11	1576:23	remaining	1549:17	1553:3
1547:19	1607:6	1730:23,24	1552:20,22	1595:18,24

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1597:8,11	1640:1,13,23	1723:18	1522:16	1741:2
1601:22	1644:10,15	residential	responsibility	1742:1
1606:25	1650:25	1760:24	1514:13	1743:15,16
1610:18,19	1724:24	residual 1578:3	1708:2	1746:6,25
1641:11,16	1725:2,20,23	1578:18,25	responsible	1748:23
represent	1759:24	resolved	1514:1,17	1749:9,14
1545:7	1771:4	1636:8	responsive	1750:12,23
1547:7,9	requirement	resource	1618:4	1751:2
1563:4	1502:9	1589:8,10,12	rest 1506:1	1753:10
1582:23	1510:19,25	resources	1607:11	1754:24
1658:23	1512:24	1526:23	1679:14	1764:22
representation	1513:3,9,13	1675:25	1684:8	1773:23
1531:4	1514:2,11,18	respect	restoration	resultant
1632:22	1515:4	1490:17	1559:25	1660:3
1633:1	1657:15	1546:2	restrictions	resulted
1641:17,18	1665:9	1548:19	1706:2	1749:10
represented	1666:8	1553:4	restructuring	resulting
1549:5	1667:9,15,19	1554:3	1600:5	1567:1
1641:16	1667:23	1580:20	result 1495:19	1662:13
represents	1697:17	1583:24	1509:16	results 1487:12
1577:3	1699:4	1585:13	1516:5	1488:1,23
1592:15	1705:20	1589:7	1530:2	1489:1,7
reproduced	requirements	1592:25	1543:7	1490:25
1738:3	1497:18	1601:4	1548:20	1515:4
reputable	1500:19	1603:6,21	1583:5	1536:9,23
1712:25	1571:17	1638:4	1604:6	1542:18,22
request	1704:15	1700:21	1625:9,9,12	1543:2,14,20
1510:15,17	1709:11,23	respond	1629:8	1543:23
1532:24	1762:17	1510:21	1652:13	1544:1,5,11
1533:3	research	1521:11	1665:16	1544:14,24
1682:11	1493:22	1695:20	1666:11	1545:2,21
1783:5	1524:17,19	responded	1667:12	1546:22,22
requested	1524:25	1510:22	1668:4	1548:11,20
1599:1,3	1525:8	1618:2	1669:9,22	1570:13,15
requesting	1535:12	response	1708:6	1580:7,11,13
1523:10	1552:16	1510:15	1710:13	1590:7
1531:19	1557:10	1534:25	1720:17,22	1602:12
1654:2	1595:3,16	1559:24	1720:24	1640:8
require	1598:15	1574:15	1722:2,21	1642:5,22,24
1484:12	1600:25	1576:2	1729:20,21	1645:5
1620:6	1601:12	1582:13	1729:22,24	1695:11,17
1711:25	1648:17	1634:21	1729:25	1704:20
required	1652:21	1635:17,21	1730:7	1705:19,19
1491:23	1698:20	1655:1	1732:11	1719:20
1574:18,21	1700:2	1663:23	1733:3	1721:10
1619:25	reserve	1783:5	1735:12	1726:22
1620:6	1671:14	responses	1736:18	1727:3,13

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1729:10,11	1520:1	1700:9,24	1776:10	1647:8,9
1729:13,16	1527:5	1701:1	returnable	1657:15
1730:2,3,6	1552:24	1703:25	1529:19	1665:9
1742:11,11	1554:17	1704:6,15	returns	1666:8
1743:25	1555:10,19	1706:16,23	1484:18	1667:8,15,18
1744:4,23	1557:21	1707:23	1485:10,20	1667:23
1746:3,4,5	1558:15,20	1709:11,22	1485:22	1697:16
1748:22	1559:8	1711:12,23	1486:7	1705:20
1749:10,15	1564:18	1711:25	1488:14	revenues
1750:5	1574:18,24	1712:4,9,10	1491:7,21	1481:11
1752:10,12	1575:3	1712:18	1552:25	1647:11
1755:16	1576:9,22	1713:7,15	1553:10	reversal 1566:1
1756:17	1594:20	1716:17	1555:17	revert 1724:9
1764:15,21	1602:14	1718:9	1558:9	review 1489:12
1767:9	1619:10,21	1719:8	1563:6	1595:20
1773:20,25	1619:25	1720:16,18	1571:11	1607:24
1775:21	1620:1,6,7,21	1720:18,19	1574:21	1632:20,20
1776:8	1622:3	1721:11	1594:12	1661:21
1777:2	1624:14,20	1723:8	1648:9	revised 1563:1
retained	1625:2,3,5	1724:2,24	1650:13,25	1580:7
1515:8,9	1637:3	1725:2,13,14	1650:25	1605:9,21
1624:14	1639:15,21	1725:14,22	1652:6	1663:25
1783:25	1640:1,6,7,9	1728:6,6,7	1653:5,7,14	1664:5
retention	1640:12,13	1729:1	1685:20,23	1670:12
1624:20,24	1640:15,20	1731:12	1693:8	1686:2,21
return 1483:4	1640:23,23	1732:22	1694:3	1689:5,12
1483:13,24	1641:5	1735:8,15	1698:9,22	1690:25
1484:3,22	1644:5,15,20	1741:6,16	1700:10	1691:1,4,5
1485:12	1646:4	1759:10,24	1704:21,24	revisions
1486:12,23	1648:21,22	1760:9	1708:19	1605:22
1487:9,14	1649:21	1761:23	1713:4	revolves
1488:2,15	1652:15	1762:4	1717:18	1489:25
1489:24	1653:18	1763:13	1718:5	rewarded
1491:21	1654:1,4,10	1765:10,20	1733:17	1604:16
1492:13,14	1654:21	1767:22	1759:8	Rich 1685:11
1494:19,24	1655:24	1768:3,9,11	1769:23	rider 1638:21
1494:24	1656:5,7	1768:16,17	1770:4,17	right 1483:2
1496:13,16	1679:16,19	1768:19,21	1771:3,4	1490:21
1497:19,19	1679:23	1768:21	revenue 1502:9	1493:15
1498:19,22	1680:2,4,5,10	1769:13	1510:19,25	1495:23
1499:2	1686:20	1772:6	1512:23	1496:6,15
1500:6	1687:23	1773:5,17	1513:3,9,13	1497:25
1501:23	1688:2,6	1774:13,14	1514:2,11,18	1499:24
1502:10	1693:4	1774:18,20	1515:4	1501:3
1505:7	1695:21	1774:21,24	1553:1	1505:19
1513:1,8	1698:12,20	1775:5,7,11	1562:14	1506:2,3,3
1515:13	1699:6,9	1775:17	1614:10	1507:2

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1508:4,8	1591:2	1669:3,6,12	1768:18,20	1708:13
1510:16	1593:24	1670:5,24	1771:22,23	1709:12,17
1511:1,20	1595:16,16	1671:6,9	1771:25	1711:23
1513:15,18	1596:8	1672:1,20	1777:9,15,22	1712:5,8,9,12
1514:4,20,22	1597:10,14	1673:10,12	1778:5,10,12	1712:18,18
1519:2	1599:9	1674:15	1778:23	1713:3,10
1520:6	1601:5	1675:10,15	ring 1589:18	1719:16,24
1521:21	1603:2,7	1675:19	1589:19	1720:5,6,6,9
1525:3,4,6,24	1604:4,10,13	1676:8,11,16	1590:20	1720:11,11
1529:6,15,22	1604:19,23	1676:20,20	rising 1598:3	1720:12,14
1530:5,14	1604:25	1677:13,19	risk 1484:19	1720:25,25
1531:25	1606:4,17	1678:1,21,24	1485:6	1721:1,4,6,7
1532:5	1608:5,17,22	1679:4,16	1488:13	1722:14,14
1535:25	1610:1	1681:1	1491:22	1722:15,16
1538:2,12	1612:6,6	1682:2,3,7	1496:4,5,12	1722:18,20
1540:3,18,21	1616:16	1684:17	1499:18,19	1723:4,25
1542:15	1617:19,23	1687:4,13	1504:16	1724:1,13,18
1543:19	1618:19,23	1688:16,23	1516:19,23	1724:20,22
1545:23	1619:13	1690:14	1517:1	1724:24
1546:4,15	1621:11	1691:5,12	1530:8,11	1725:1,4,5,9
1547:4	1626:8	1692:1,14	1546:16,16	1725:16,17
1548:13	1627:18,19	1693:1,6	1546:18	1725:19,21
1549:6,24,24	1628:20	1697:4,24	1550:8	1725:23
1551:14,14	1631:1,2,24	1699:8,14	1563:4	1726:2,5,5,12
1552:3,5,10	1633:11	1700:14	1566:22	1726:14,18
1552:19	1634:13	1711:5	1567:2,3,9,13	1726:20,22
1553:13	1635:11,12	1714:20,22	1568:9,10,10	1726:25
1555:24	1636:14,20	1716:5,10	1568:13,16	1727:2,4,5,7
1556:7,11	1636:22	1722:6	1571:12	1727:14
1557:7	1637:10,19	1723:23	1574:25	1728:24
1558:24	1638:25	1727:11,24	1578:18	1729:2,6,9
1559:4	1639:4,7	1728:3	1592:15,20	1730:23,24
1560:7,12	1641:7	1729:3,6	1620:12,14	1731:1,6,11
1562:23	1645:7,10	1730:10,13	1620:14,15	1732:21
1563:12,15	1648:13	1730:17,19	1620:23	1734:19
1563:16,25	1650:15,17	1731:2,7,13	1621:3,7,10	1736:21,23
1564:11,21	1656:17	1731:19	1625:14	1737:3,17,18
1564:21,25	1657:3	1732:12	1644:11,17	1738:4
1565:5,23	1663:9	1734:6,9,24	1648:6	1740:10,20
1566:4	1664:3,6,12	1738:16,20	1652:15	1741:5,10,25
1567:6,14,22	1664:15,20	1739:4,11	1654:18	1743:22
1569:18	1665:10,17	1751:4,8	1687:24	1759:14,15
1570:7,22	1666:2,12,18	1755:25	1688:1,2,3,9	1759:19,21
1571:5,16,22	1666:22	1759:6	1693:23	1762:9
1572:11	1667:15	1764:8,10	1694:3,8,16	1764:23,24
1573:4,23	1668:14,18	1765:1,23	1694:25	1765:5,6,7,8
1587:13	1668:23	1766:15	1695:3,4	1765:9

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1768:24	1499:22	1622:19	1714:18	1782:19
1770:24	1500:13,16	1625:14,22	1744:15	1783:6
1771:9	1500:25	1628:16,17	role 1537:12,14	ruled 1534:10
1772:7	1501:11,15	1636:24	1537:15	rules 1671:5
1773:8	1501:17	1637:1,17	1574:6,17	run 1584:3
risks 1485:21	1502:1,2,2,17	1638:24	1744:5	1585:4
1501:24	1503:4,6,11	1682:4,19,21	rolling 1503:11	1724:8
1574:22	1503:24	1683:3,6,19	1503:15	running 1585:2
1621:22	1504:23,25	1684:3,3,8,10	roof 1599:25	Ryan 1505:23
1622:11	1505:3,10	1687:19	room 1616:20	1506:5,13,15
1698:10,23	1514:7	1689:15	1778:20	1780:8
risky 1577:11	1518:19,23	1691:13	rose 1600:7	1782:18
1577:18	1519:21,23	1695:18,20	roughly	
1648:4	1522:4	1696:5	1662:10,13	S
1712:1	1530:25	1697:25	1662:15	S 1482:1,15,23
1721:7	1531:4,9,14	1698:1,4	1663:3	1483:1
Riverview	1544:21	1700:21	1665:16	1782:4
1482:19	1553:14	1707:19	1666:4,11	1784:7,21
RO 1531:8	1554:17,23	1711:16,17	1667:11	safe 1484:15
ROA 1612:21	1554:24	1715:6,15	1668:2,17	1501:20
road 1685:11	1555:4,6,12	1718:15,22	1672:3	1571:9
1692:11	1558:23	1719:2	1674:11	1577:7
Robert 1484:10	1559:2,6,12	1737:3	1675:8,24	1698:6,15
1484:22	1559:17	1740:16	1676:13	safer 1577:9
1538:14,23	1560:2	1743:13	1679:14	safety 1566:24
1538:25	1561:3,17,21	1744:1	rounded	1622:1,2
1539:8	1561:22	1753:21	1732:13	sake 1645:20
1780:17	1569:19	1762:24	1744:20	salaries
1781:2	1571:1,6,16	1763:1	Rows 1543:19	1670:23
1782:8,10,13	1575:6,13	1764:1	RPR 1482:23	1675:11
1782:16	1579:10,15	1771:17	RR 1610:19	1676:17,18
robust 1496:9	1579:17	ROEs 1485:8	RRA 1493:22	1676:25
Rockland	1592:5	1487:18	1553:25	1678:7,20
1555:18	1594:5,24	1488:17	1579:4	1679:22
ROE 1484:1,13	1598:12,17	1491:17	1602:9,25	1680:3
1484:20,23	1598:22,24	1494:18,18	1603:3,13	salary 1661:2
1485:5	1599:1,3,19	1503:20	1610:13,19	1662:6
1486:1	1601:24	1566:13,13	1613:10	1671:3,18
1487:4,5,8,15	1603:15,15	1601:25	1635:24	1672:5,14
1487:23	1603:23	1603:12	1638:3,8	1673:2,24
1488:4,21	1604:20	1604:2,16	1644:25	1675:16
1490:14	1608:23	1612:7	1649:7	1676:8
1491:14	1609:5	1621:17	1712:24,24	sales 1668:1,1
1493:10,19	1614:6	1629:2	1714:12,12	1706:3,4
1493:22	1618:13	1636:3	1714:13	satisfied
1495:6,9	1619:2	1637:12	1728:6,8	1494:17
1498:3,7,13	1621:21	1700:1	1767:9	satisfies

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1484:21	1556:3	schedules	sectors 1621:24	1580:25
1500:18	1592:2	1489:4	1622:23	1581:20
satisfy 1576:7	1594:1	1713:3	1623:3	1593:8
1629:3	1597:2,5,18	1752:17,20	secular	1596:14
save 1511:5	1597:24	1752:25	1564:10	1600:22
1676:13	1598:12	1766:8	secure 1578:24	1604:20
1748:5	1600:2	1769:6	secured 1578:3	1614:1
savings	1601:19	1774:3	1578:22	1620:8
1509:21,24	1602:13,14	school 1606:12	securities	1624:21
1510:19	1638:23	science 1492:19	1566:24,25	1625:3
1660:4,14,18	1641:25	1512:12	1577:23	1628:17
1660:19	1648:22	1711:13	1693:13	1629:1
1661:2,9,12	1694:22	scientific	1694:22	1638:14
1661:18,24	1778:4	1493:14	1695:8	1642:1,24
1662:9,13,22	scale 1523:14	Scientists	1704:8,15	1644:6
1662:23	scatter 1752:16	1493:15	1709:2	1683:15
1663:1,5	1753:9,13,16	score 1531:10	1721:7	1692:17
1664:7,19	1753:19,23	second 1488:17	1723:5,5,21	1693:8,18
1665:3,25	1754:1,19	1503:19	1724:24	1704:11
1667:4,5	1755:7,8,19	1504:1	1725:6,7,10	1717:22
1670:14,20	1755:20	1509:13	1725:13,16	1729:14
1670:21	1756:4	1533:21	1725:24,25	1735:13
1674:17,19	1776:19	1541:20	1726:1	1745:15
1679:9,12,15	scattered	1555:12,15	1759:12,25	1750:5
1679:20	1752:3,8	1576:12	1764:25	1752:4
1680:3,11,18	1756:15	1584:4,5,12	1765:4,4	1753:13,16
1681:7	scenario	1584:16	1770:5	1753:18,22
saw 1568:16	1674:7,23	1586:21	1771:5	1753:25
1571:15	schedule	1593:21	1772:20	1756:6
1760:19	1581:19	1595:8	1775:16	1759:17
saying 1515:3	1685:19,21	1603:6	security	1765:3
1517:23	1685:24	1605:14	1516:10	1770:19
1545:2,25	1686:1,2,12	1609:9	1550:23	1774:10
1550:14	1686:16,21	1610:22	1567:17	seeing 1566:4
1562:22	1689:5	1624:2,2	1578:3,9,21	1704:24
1566:3	1691:1,3,4,6	1630:5	1694:10,11	seek 1524:25
1567:9	1693:10,15	1646:10	1694:25	seeking
1596:17	1694:6	1690:4	1695:4	1496:13
1597:3,18	1713:2,17	1708:1	see 1492:22	1695:11
1598:2,14	1727:14	1725:19	1493:24	seen 1495:1,5
1609:22	1746:8	1728:5	1518:5	1526:21
1619:15	1753:6	1734:19	1542:4,10	1557:12
1653:1	1768:25	1738:4	1554:25	1567:9
1723:8	1774:2	1739:8	1557:5,15	1568:7
1776:20	1783:10	sector 1622:23	1564:23	1597:1,19
1777:10	scheduled	1622:25	1566:13	1621:23,23
says 1510:18	1682:13	1623:4	1567:14,16	1622:15,16

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1623:10,15	separate	1532:1,4	1655:24	1676:16
1623:15,16	1524:17	1557:18	1665:9	1677:18,23
1623:18,20	1581:5,6	1571:9	1667:8	1677:24
1630:9,12,13	1589:20	1578:14	1668:21	1678:16,19
1652:1	1595:18	1617:7	1671:15	1679:3,5
select 1495:20	1620:8	1654:3,17,22	1685:3	Seventeen
selected	1622:22,23	1657:16	1700:17	1602:6
1487:10	1622:25	1671:13,22	1706:23	severance
1495:23	1682:18	1671:24	1724:4	1656:19
1733:10,15	1686:6	1672:1,7	1727:14	1659:2,3,4
1769:9	1694:18	1673:10	1729:10	1669:9,22,24
1771:2,2	1702:3	1675:1,4,9,14	1735:18,22	1672:4
selecting	1713:8	1675:18,22	1740:6	1679:20
1487:12	1726:16	1676:2,15	1742:10	shaft 1523:6
selection	1727:14	1677:16,17	1759:13	share 1515:12
1488:1	1742:24	1678:1,16,20	1777:11	1515:16
self-justified	1745:14,23	1680:20,23	1784:11,15	1520:21
1621:18	1745:23	1681:5	sets 1502:17	1547:10,17
self-perpetua...	separated	1687:20	1577:1	1547:19
1621:17	1647:12	1698:7,15	1707:19	1581:24
1651:24	1674:15	1706:10	setting 1485:5	1582:20,24
self-serving	separately	1707:11,14	1488:2	1585:4,6
1772:3	1685:2	1708:5,6,9	1497:12	1701:6
sell 1533:23	separation	1714:25	1500:6	Shareholder
1584:22,24	1660:1	1715:9	1556:5	1597:25
1769:19	September	1718:24	1576:21	shareholders
selling 1728:22	1507:25	1762:17	1611:8	1514:22
sense 1495:22	1509:8,15	services	1696:9	1515:2,19
1564:16,17	1519:10,12	1482:24	1712:4	1656:7
1577:16	1519:13,18	1508:9	settled 1598:20	1769:21
1581:6	1534:14,16	1573:2	1612:3,8	shares 1624:16
1602:2	1557:14	1582:8	1636:13	1624:17
1627:22	1703:5	session 1587:16	settlement	1769:19,20
1647:10	series 1582:16	1589:2	1556:3	1769:21
1681:2	1766:6	set 1484:4,8	1611:13,16	sheet 1686:20
1682:18	1771:9	1494:3,5,6,14	1611:20,22	1763:8
1709:4	serious 1493:17	1497:12	1612:5,24	1784:12
1725:11	1493:17,17	1498:2,7,22	1636:4	Shift 1672:1
1770:23	serve 1582:3	1499:1,14,16	1637:2,6	shifts 1671:25
1773:7	1654:12	1499:22	1650:3,5,9	shoots 1599:25
sent 1574:5	service 1481:1	1502:6,8	settlements	short 1486:5
1670:13	1481:11	1569:9	1611:7	1505:21
1676:6	1482:1,2	1575:10,19	1637:16	1608:2
sentence	1484:6,16	1576:9	seven 1564:5	1642:25
1602:14	1499:3	1598:24	1566:8	1723:15
sentences	1501:21	1636:3	1567:24	1772:25
1592:2	1528:4,7,10	1643:21	1612:5	shorter 1718:3

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

Shorthand	1720:19	1702:5	1597:9	1599:8,10
1784:7	1732:2	1774:15	1598:6	skews 1595:4
shortly 1533:17	1742:9	similar 1485:22	1608:18,21	1600:21
short-term	1746:8	1491:22	1610:7,15,24	skill 1495:21
1584:11	1753:6,6	1521:1	1614:24	1495:25
1586:13	shows 1490:13	1524:13,13	1615:19,21	skip 1759:1
1772:13	1490:15	1620:12,14	1615:24	sky-rocketed
show 1486:20	1503:10	1620:22	1616:12,22	1772:14
1504:8	1542:17	1621:22	1616:24	slack 1676:1
1505:7	1543:25	1669:24	1617:24	1678:3,10
1537:23	1544:4	1689:4	1618:11,24	slide 1526:6,15
1543:1,20	1549:25	1698:22,23	1626:13	1691:11
1544:9,9	1550:3	1698:24	1627:13	slightly
1545:14,20	1636:3,16	1764:4	1630:4	1519:18
1545:24	1642:5	1768:4	1719:22	1554:19
1555:11	1643:6,17,24	similarities	sister 1559:22	1555:8
1643:20	1693:11,12	1770:14	1614:2	1585:25
1648:20	1715:15,22	simple 1490:5	sitting 1609:10	1592:20
1693:16,17	1716:2,7	1496:1	1673:6,10	1598:13,14
1695:18	1717:1,7,11	1555:10	situation	1618:3
1714:23,25	1746:19,20	1736:20,22	1562:3	1662:2,6
1739:18	shut 1772:13	1737:17	situations	1763:21
1745:5	side 1667:10	simplistic	1585:10	slippery
1746:25	sign 1730:8,15	1713:10	six 1490:9	1495:10
1747:4,9,15	1730:16	simply 1504:17	1554:18	slogging
1748:23	signed 1497:19	1578:1	1555:4,7	1684:17
1749:1,4	significance	1581:12	1556:8,10	slow 1773:2
1752:9	1773:22	1582:9	1601:25	sluggish
1754:20	significant	1586:4	1602:15,18	1500:10
1756:8	1486:9	1611:6	1602:25	small 1499:18
showed	1504:6,20	1694:12,16	1603:5	1664:12
1764:20	1505:1	1773:4,16	1604:20	smaller 1681:4
1777:2	1517:18	single 1582:12	1609:2	Smith 1482:14
showing	1563:24	1582:14	1645:5	smoothed
1635:24	1568:12,17	1586:17	1651:6	1772:24
1767:11	1655:13	1649:8	1691:23	sold 1723:6
shown 1542:21	1692:4	1650:18	1714:13	solely 1548:14
1543:16	1772:18	1651:3	1745:22	1621:15
1549:7,15	significantly	1652:11	1749:23	somebody
1558:4	1504:9	1693:17	1755:22	1626:18
1635:4	1509:17	sir 1519:5	skew 1594:10	somewhat
1636:2	1593:20	1575:6	1601:14	1489:9,11
1689:10	1603:23	1579:6	1602:12	1529:6
1690:20	1652:13	1589:18	1604:6	1534:9,13,14
1691:2	1655:15	1592:7	1652:13	1549:4
1693:15,20	1665:6	1595:22	skewing	1563:1
1715:19	1693:9	1596:7	1598:21	1593:9,18

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1608:19	1662:11	1626:4	1709:8	St 1482:12
1625:5	1673:23	speaking	1749:15	1506:14
1643:14	1717:21	1523:24	1768:24	stability
1644:15	1734:11	1527:20	1769:4	1512:15
1652:3	1737:19,25	1533:13	1770:3,8	1516:1
1694:3	1738:19,20	1693:25	specificity	1537:7
sorry 1489:22	1750:1,3	1697:11	1610:8	stable 1604:20
1503:17	1756:12	specific	specifics	1624:22
1509:2,2	1757:1	1484:23	1522:9	1625:1
1510:4	sort 1551:3	1505:1	1527:21	1705:1
1514:10	1564:7,8	1513:16	specified	staff 1482:1
1516:9	1568:5	1519:16	1716:17	1485:24
1519:10	1573:4	1521:5	speed 1688:24	1492:2
1521:10	1575:6	1528:8,14	1689:17	1519:2
1522:23	1586:14	1531:7	spelled 1538:23	1532:17
1531:8	1594:14	1533:10	1606:5	1533:14
1534:6	1612:14	1535:15	spending	1571:22
1540:17	1624:24	1537:9	1625:4	1637:23
1541:9	1651:13,24	1562:6,17	spent 1577:23	1657:15
1543:24	1682:18	1591:24	spinning	1659:5,10
1550:11	sorts 1621:17	1595:4,17,18	1597:17	1671:12
1551:22	1652:12	1597:21	spite 1491:2	1687:13
1552:7,21	sound 1610:1,3	1599:22	spoke 1493:2	1699:14
1553:20	1677:9,12	1617:17	1534:15	1706:16
1554:11	1739:4	1627:23	sponsored	1766:2
1556:7	sounds 1701:17	1628:8,24	1501:11	1783:17
1558:6,10,10	source 1525:10	1711:18	1760:20,20	Staff's 1489:17
1560:8	1596:1,20	1720:5,6,8,11	1760:23	1491:13
1561:4,6	1758:9,11	1720:14	1761:6,17,21	1495:2
1566:11	sources 1535:8	1721:4	sponsoring	1500:15
1567:11	1535:9,14	specifically	1487:2	1668:6,10
1572:3	1582:1,21,22	1487:14	1507:19	stage 1538:10
1575:22	1582:25	1503:5	spread 1551:3	1584:4,5,12
1576:12,15	1583:2	1517:2	1551:4	1584:13
1582:14	South 1555:20	1523:13	1592:14,19	1585:17,19
1601:15	1558:22	1525:9	1593:3,4	1586:11,12
1602:19	1594:20	1527:9	1644:6,7,10	1586:24
1606:3,15	1601:23	1535:21	1644:15	1587:2,3,8
1609:13	1613:17	1556:5	1725:10	1701:12
1611:14,25	Southern	1594:8	spreads 1550:7	1710:5,13,17
1622:20	1717:4	1600:20	1550:7,25	1710:21,22
1629:21	1718:17	1606:5	1551:1	1757:6,10,20
1634:8	speak 1527:9	1611:8	spreadsheet	stages 1583:25
1638:10,10	1535:10	1692:24	1690:21	1709:25
1639:8	1601:15	1695:13	sprung	stand 1538:10
1640:11	1603:5	1697:1	1607:22	standard
1657:23	1617:17	1699:5	ss 1784:4	1484:8,21

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1525:17	starts 1490:18	1780:3,4,5,6	1682:3	1765:22
1590:14	1490:20	statements	1777:23	1782:1
1591:15,21	1634:11	1490:9	stepping	stop 1607:10
1591:25	1724:25	1501:15	1598:13	stopped
1613:11	state 1481:1	1534:2	steps 1491:2	1728:22
1699:7	1499:17	1658:24	1498:9	storm 1559:24
1763:15,16	1506:11	1698:3	Steve 1661:21	1613:24
standards	1519:20	states 1484:7	stipulated	straight 1514:7
1485:16	1527:11	1489:9	1553:6	stream 1493:5
1488:11	1535:18	1497:2	1612:17	Street 1482:3,7
1574:23	1536:4,12	1499:8	stipulation	1482:15,20
1576:3	1538:21	1523:17	1556:3	strength
1618:23	1543:24	1536:9	1611:6,17,18	1512:15
1652:15	1554:24	1553:15	1611:18	1515:25
standing	1555:20	1570:25	1636:9,25	1516:5,10
1705:2	1560:23	1609:19	1637:12,16	1528:4
stands 1688:4	1569:18	1613:17	stipulations	1537:7,16,24
start 1483:13	1594:19	1696:8,10,21	1612:18	strengthening
1483:14	1599:19	1761:13	stock 1504:18	1692:12
1540:17	1616:3	stating 1561:15	1515:12	strictly 1623:12
1558:12,17	1625:20	statisticians	1546:6,15,23	strong 1537:5
1608:6	1626:18	1493:25	1546:24	1765:17
1615:4,6	1657:12	status 1515:20	1547:2,2,4,10	strongly 1578:7
1680:19	1661:17	Statutes	1547:12,14	struck 1732:14
1683:15	1685:8	1554:23	1577:14	structure
1691:12	1710:25	stay 1566:10,11	1581:8	1505:22
1692:12	1761:1	1583:20	1584:21,22	1507:19,25
1703:19	1784:3,10	1593:5	1591:11	1508:2
1714:20	stated 1501:18	1632:12	1691:2	1511:22
1718:4	1511:4	1775:5	1709:15,19	1512:1,6
1727:20	1560:24	stayed 1673:25	1724:2	1514:15
1753:2	1571:6,17	1675:15	1759:21	1515:17,22
1765:19	1597:24	1676:3	1769:20	1537:3
started 1483:6	1697:9	staying 1688:5	1771:4	1654:18
1497:8	1766:19	1688:10,12	stocks 1496:11	structured
1533:13	statement	stays 1585:9	1577:6,7,9,17	1733:3
1564:22	1483:22	1775:9	1577:20,22	structures
1724:4	1490:4,8	steady 1564:8	1578:5	1536:23,25
1773:20	1492:7	stenotype	1592:14	1552:25
starting	1493:8	1784:13	1708:15,16	1553:11
1487:23	1501:8,25	step 1498:4	1769:17	1561:14
1493:19	1502:2,21	1538:3	Stoll 1532:9,10	struggling
1500:3	1550:12	1584:17	1629:14,15	1646:6
1611:11	1598:1	1620:18	1681:21,22	studies 1508:14
1709:14	1604:1	1634:10,10	1690:13	1508:18
1714:23	1655:19	1635:9,9	1764:10,11	1512:2
1724:23	1693:24	1656:13	1764:13	1695:20,24

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1699:5	1590:17	1640:11,14	1774:24	1555:2
1700:23	1715:1,19	1640:16	1775:3	sure 1483:16
1709:6	1716:25	suggests 1537:5	1776:19,21	1492:5
1726:16	1717:4,9	1555:25	supported	1512:10
1727:7	1718:6,18	1592:18	1485:3	1533:8
1744:24	substantial	1705:5	1486:10	1537:5
1748:16,22	1650:5	1768:22	1559:14	1544:25
1750:9,13,20	1654:14	Suite 1482:15	1769:23,24	1547:1,21
1761:20	1666:16	1482:20,24	1770:6	1554:17
study 1535:20	substantially	sum 1505:6	supporting	1567:11
1695:17	1564:12	1581:14,14	1526:17	1576:17
1725:18,19	1692:7	1720:14	supportive	1577:21
1726:14	substitute	summaries	1491:3	1579:4
1727:1,3,3	1686:1,12	1521:22,24	1523:15,16	1584:10
1773:25	1783:10	1525:21	1527:1	1599:6
stuff 1597:12	subtle 1515:22	summarizes	1529:4,11	1600:23
subcontract	1516:7	1777:4	1535:24,24	1606:21
1572:23	subtract	summarizing	1536:5,12,12	1607:3,4,24
subcontracting	1728:25	1744:23	1536:14,14	1612:25
1615:11	suddenly	summary	1536:14,15	1619:18
subject 1493:1	1673:18	1521:19	1536:15	1630:13
1548:21	sufficient	1522:2	1537:19,19	1655:18
1583:18	1484:17	1526:18	1570:24	1659:2
1591:24	1501:21	1552:17	1613:11	1697:19
1642:20	1537:6	1580:7,10	1617:2	1703:18
1647:13	1571:10	1595:24	1626:18	1719:4
1734:4	1679:9	1596:9	1627:10	1732:20
1756:7	1698:7	1633:10	1649:24	1736:1
subjective	sufficiently	1705:12	1705:2	1746:14
1488:19,22	1758:25	1749:13	supportiveness	1759:3
1488:25	suggest	1783:6	1517:3	1762:1
1489:2,6,10	1497:17	summed	1537:23	1777:20
1489:12	1498:9,22,25	1580:16	1627:15	surplus
1492:15	1499:10	summer	suppose	1728:21
1529:7,17,18	1547:23	1643:22	1535:17	surprise
1529:25	1586:3	supplant	1680:14	1589:16
1531:13	1592:20	1623:7,11	1762:4	1590:24
1537:22	1631:17	supplement	Supreme	1695:16,19
1597:11	1643:11,25	1623:8,11	1484:7	surprised
subjectively	1683:13	1760:3	1497:2,6,17	1589:11
1488:24	1759:14	support	1498:1	1596:4
submit 1768:6	suggested	1486:13	1499:8	surprising
subsequently	1652:2	1487:5	1501:18	1767:20
1626:21	suggesting	1514:25	surcharge	surprisingly
subsidiaries	1551:8	1707:25	1638:21	1488:22
1591:19	1570:14	1763:18	surcharge/ri...	1492:15
subsidiary	1578:20	1765:20	1554:22	surrebuttal

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1490:13	1558:16	1619:23	1620:9	1777:17
1539:11	1696:4	1626:11	1649:6	talks 1524:21
1657:17	S&L 1557:9	1628:16	1670:12	1535:22
1663:16	1649:7	1631:7,11,17	1687:18	1638:20
1685:13,16	1783:9	1632:10	1720:1	tape 1684:18
1778:21	S&P 1530:6,7	1637:4,5,17	1742:19	targets 1594:6
1782:11,14	1530:18,20	1637:18	1776:5	Tariffs 1481:11
1783:4	1531:17	1645:7,20	talked 1496:24	task 1569:15
surrounding	1617:2,12	1674:22	1531:8	Tatro 1482:11
1559:24	1745:21	1676:1	1535:2	1506:9,11,25
suspect 1576:1	1746:25	1678:3	1568:5	1510:4
1750:16	1747:10,18	1682:4,14	1571:3	1532:20,22
1768:1	1762:22	1684:3	1583:3	1537:25
suspended	1763:3,24	1692:9	1584:20	1780:9,15
1605:6,15	S&P's 1763:5	1707:22	1613:13	tax 1513:14,19
Sussex 1539:6	S-u-s-s-e-x	1717:22	1624:23	1513:21,25
sustain	1539:6	1719:3,12	1627:24	taxes 1513:10
1766:15		1727:4,18	1631:8	1660:24
sustainable	T	1745:15	1632:6	1661:5
1605:18	T 1782:4	1778:14	1634:4	1664:7,20
1624:6,7,8	table 1580:4,4	taken 1542:5	1635:14	1665:3
1702:9,14,17	1580:10	1572:6	1636:18	1670:15
1710:9	1581:3	1580:2	1652:10	1671:18,19
1743:5,11,25	1634:8,8	1623:10	1653:16	1672:6
1747:5,10	1750:5,5	1627:2,6	1662:22	1674:10,25
1748:7	tables 1580:13	1654:3	1663:25	1763:10
1749:1	tail 1568:10	takes 1504:16	1708:13	tease 1545:8
1750:21	take 1483:5,7	1576:22	1724:18	techniques
1751:9	1483:10	1581:7	1744:9	1574:20
1773:18,22	1494:3	1612:14	1757:7	tell 1494:3
1774:1,5,5,9	1497:23	1645:10	1762:21	1512:23
1774:11	1505:24	1655:10	talking 1511:2	1519:7
1775:3	1513:7	1775:16	1511:21	1528:23,24
sustained	1517:19	talk 1494:6	1519:13	1530:13,21
1702:2	1518:4	1496:23,25	1522:3	1552:15
1774:25	1527:6	1503:24	1546:22	1553:14
swear 1506:4	1538:5	1509:2	1603:9,12	1557:7,11,20
1657:4	1541:3	1514:20	1621:14	1558:13,14
1684:20	1561:16	1521:21	1650:2	1558:23
Swingley	1564:2	1522:16	1651:15	1562:19,20
1685:11	1578:18	1523:12	1655:2	1572:20
sworn 1506:6	1591:18	1535:21	1665:20	1585:16
1538:15	1592:4	1546:4,21	1670:7	1587:1
1657:6	1593:24	1560:25	1671:8	1589:17
1684:22	1594:12	1577:8	1674:7	1604:11
system 1485:19	1606:4	1581:16	1677:10	1630:9
1491:20	1607:1	1587:4	1728:11	1636:24

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1647:16	1776:8,10	1619:10,11	1505:13,14	1657:25
1649:15	1777:4	1619:15	1506:16,19	1658:6
1650:12	tender 1507:1	1698:5,14	1506:22	1661:22
1658:25	1508:24	1755:2	1507:18	1663:14
1659:6	1509:9	1761:23,25	1518:12,15	1682:13
1660:13	1540:2	test 1511:8	1518:18	1685:4,14,16
1686:14	1658:10	1561:14	1519:20,24	1685:18,19
1713:15	1687:2	1654:11	1520:3	1686:24
1722:7	tenor 1512:8	1666:17,17	1522:25	1691:7
1727:23,24	tenth 1491:6	1668:21	1539:9,10,12	1693:10
1756:3	ten-month	1696:12,13	1539:16,19	1695:9,12
1757:12	1600:3	1696:24	1539:23	1697:24
1778:13	ten-year	1705:25	1541:17,24	1700:18
telling 1492:17	1593:19	1706:9	1542:5,6,10	1701:3,19
1497:8	1757:16,21	testified 1506:7	1543:21	1702:18
1503:13	term 1494:1	1538:16	1544:1,5	1706:17
1518:2	1547:14	1561:20	1545:16,17	1708:10,18
1547:9	1589:20	1572:7	1546:1	1710:1
1548:15,17	1590:10	1608:16	1549:9,11	1711:1
1582:12	1593:22	1616:2,9	1560:24,24	1714:2,3
tells 1557:18	1617:14	1657:7	1561:7	1715:13
ten 1503:24	1620:21,24	1684:23	1569:18,21	1719:14
1600:9	1620:25	1711:4	1570:8,22	1721:23
1608:3	1624:15	1722:25	1572:16	1722:24
1674:13	1628:5	1743:18,20	1575:12,23	1727:15
1713:23	terminal	1775:25	1579:24	1731:25
1737:2,2,6,17	1584:23	testify 1505:23	1583:8	1739:17
1741:8	1585:1,14	1506:6	1590:12,14	1742:12
1742:1	1586:22	1538:15	1604:22	1745:1,6
1758:1,2	1587:8	1628:9	1606:8	1748:9,11
1771:11	1623:24	1657:6	1608:8	1749:16,22
1772:24	1624:2	1684:22	1609:18	1749:25
tenant 1711:22	terminology	1701:5	1612:1	1750:2
tend 1493:24	1618:22	1722:17	1615:18	1752:21
1548:11	terms 1484:14	testifying	1616:1	1753:3
1622:23,24	1485:18	1616:20	1618:20	1754:14,16
1623:3	1501:19	testimony	1619:8,14,17	1758:9
1626:2	1509:23	1484:11	1623:22	1760:21,23
1643:2	1516:22	1485:13	1624:1	1761:6,9,17
1647:24	1522:4,7,17	1487:7	1626:10,21	1761:21,22
tendencies	1530:9	1488:20	1626:21	1762:23
1777:18	1537:9	1489:4	1629:17	1767:10,24
tendency	1566:1	1490:13,16	1634:1,2,7,23	1768:1
1494:2,2	1571:8	1495:3,14,15	1635:5	1775:25
1650:21	1590:5	1500:14	1642:7,8	1780:22
1735:25	1594:24	1503:1,3,19	1643:19	1782:7,9,12
1736:4	1601:16	1504:7,7,22	1657:17,19	1782:15,17

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1783:2,3,4,19	1610:12	theory 1527:12	1567:8,8	1558:14
1783:21,23	1614:13,19	1675:7,13,21	1568:7	1560:7,24
Texas 1558:7	1615:3	1675:24	1570:11	1561:23
1559:10,13	1629:12,13	1676:14	1576:24	1562:9,9,15
1579:11	1629:16,18	they'd 1535:17	1577:3	1562:16,23
1613:8,10	1630:19	thing 1493:14	1578:9	1563:3,5
1649:17,19	1631:23	1495:9,10	1584:19	1564:2,3,3,22
1649:20,23	1634:13	1512:4	1589:5	1565:4,10,17
thank 1483:17	1637:21,24	1538:11	1625:7	1566:11,15
1483:18,19	1639:7	1545:9,10	1627:21	1567:4,13,21
1483:20	1641:6	1556:25	1631:10,10	1567:22,25
1491:23,24	1656:12,15	1576:10	1644:12	1568:3,8,13
1491:25	1656:16	1581:11	1647:3,10	1568:16,22
1492:3	1657:10,11	1584:4	1652:4	1569:14,14
1500:19	1662:16	1585:2	1661:12	1570:17
1501:3,5,7	1663:8	1600:21	1670:3	1573:22
1502:19,20	1677:3	1604:14	1688:24	1574:12
1505:18,19	1681:20,22	1612:14	1696:2	1575:8,10
1506:10	1682:1	1613:9	1705:6	1577:10
1507:9,12	1685:1	1614:8	1726:7	1579:9
1510:10	1686:7,10	1619:16	1758:22	1583:21
1511:12	1687:11	1620:7	1774:23	1586:5,7,9
1514:4	1688:15	1630:5,12	think 1483:11	1591:21
1516:12	1690:12	1639:21,25	1494:25	1592:10,24
1518:9	1691:9,14	1640:12	1497:4	1593:7,13,14
1520:4	1699:15	1653:14	1499:16	1593:25
1524:6	1702:20	1682:20	1500:3	1594:9,12,13
1532:7,8,11	1734:14,15	1683:16	1501:1	1599:6,12
1532:16,18	1742:18	1705:10	1505:23,25	1601:22
1532:20	1758:13	1729:9	1507:11	1602:2
1534:25	1764:9	1740:5	1519:20,24	1603:21
1537:25	1765:22	1741:8	1522:13	1606:5,25
1538:4,19,20	1766:1,3	1746:6	1523:8,17,20	1607:10,11
1541:4,5,6,11	1767:1,3,5	1754:15	1524:19	1607:21
1542:14,15	1777:23	1768:22	1526:7,21	1608:3
1551:14	1778:16,25	things 1496:12	1527:10	1609:8
1557:2,6,15	1779:2	1500:7,7	1531:10	1610:11,16
1560:12	Thanks	1522:6	1532:3	1611:2,15
1563:9	1500:23	1545:3	1536:8,13	1613:13,15
1571:23	1541:7	1547:10	1537:2,8	1613:22
1575:5,5	1591:4	1550:17	1542:22	1614:16
1579:23	1738:20	1551:2	1545:6	1617:5,16
1587:7,10	theoretically	1561:2,12	1548:1,6,13	1618:3,13,17
1589:3,17	1496:20	1562:10	1549:10,17	1619:24
1591:1,6	1680:20,24	1563:16	1550:11	1620:17
1604:25	theories	1564:25	1553:9	1621:8,10,12
1608:8,9	1670:17	1566:17	1556:10	1623:6

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1624:10,21	1701:24,25	third 1508:25	1688:15	1581:20,25
1624:23	1702:3,7,9,13	1541:21	1699:15,17	1582:6,21,25
1625:3,8,10	1703:12,22	1557:9	1701:9	1600:13
1625:24	1703:23	1584:13	1702:20	1602:5,19
1626:16,19	1704:3,17	1649:7,8	1703:17	1701:24
1626:24,25	1705:10,10	1710:24	1734:11,14	1709:25
1627:3,6,14	1705:14	1738:24	1738:2	1719:13
1627:19,21	1706:9	1763:8	1742:8,18	1721:17
1628:3,7,9	1707:17	Thomas	1766:3,5,13	1729:10,11
1629:4,10	1709:10	1482:10	1766:17,18	1729:13,16
1630:25	1710:7,21	Thompson	1767:1	1730:3,22,22
1631:9	1711:19	1482:2	1778:3,16,25	1732:16
1636:18,22	1712:19	1483:7,10,18	1780:4,12,21	1735:14
1637:4,18	1713:2,9	1492:3,6,8,9	1780:23	1738:12,12
1638:5	1722:25	1500:23	1781:8,12,19	1739:1,3,10
1639:12	1723:3,22	1501:1,5	1781:23	1742:24
1640:16,19	1724:18	1510:10	1782:2	1745:23
1641:1,4,18	1726:21	1519:4	Thompson's	1748:16,16
1642:14	1727:24	1520:5	1618:4	1749:10,14
1643:2	1729:14	1532:18	thought	1750:9,20
1645:19,21	1730:7	1538:11	1594:17	1755:25
1646:12	1734:18,21	1540:5	1602:19	1756:1,1
1649:11,12	1735:5	1541:6	1638:12,14	threw 1729:10
1649:13,19	1738:4,25	1557:2	1639:24	1729:20,22
1650:2,11,14	1739:3,14,15	1571:23,25	1710:24	1729:25
1650:20,22	1742:12	1572:2	1721:11	1730:3,3,6,9
1650:23	1744:8	1574:10,12	1725:15	1730:21
1651:11	1746:8	1576:18	1775:18	1732:15,17
1652:3,18	1748:13	1577:5	1776:12,16	1738:11
1653:19	1751:18	1587:11	1777:5	throw 1683:7
1655:1,23	1757:7	1589:3,4	thousands	throwing
1656:1,1,10	1758:8,11,25	1590:25	1620:4	1606:23
1663:22	1759:18,23	1591:10	three 1484:1,20	1735:17,24
1665:23,24	1760:5	1596:21	1496:2	thrown
1669:23	1762:7,21,23	1617:20	1525:18,19	1735:19
1670:14	1764:23	1631:23	1530:15	tie 1643:19
1673:1	1765:9,10	1637:24	1533:8	tied 1709:18
1678:5	1768:19	1638:1	1534:23,23	ties 1488:11
1683:11,17	1770:8,11	1641:6	1542:22	1651:11
1683:24	1771:14,24	1655:17,18	1543:4,8,11	1709:19
1684:10	1772:3,23	1656:20	1543:22	till 1631:25
1688:10	1773:4,13,21	1657:9,11,12	1558:3	1724:4
1690:16	1774:9,17	1657:22	1571:18	time 1486:5
1691:23	1776:5	1658:9	1573:22	1493:11,15
1692:8,10,24	thinking	1682:1	1576:7	1495:7,7
1696:23	1606:22	1684:11	1579:14	1505:8,18
1700:11,23	1609:15	1687:15	1580:21,23	1512:21

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1532:11	1772:25	Tom 1483:20	1523:14	Treasury
1543:24	1775:6,9,16	1492:4	1708:12	1504:13
1547:8,18,20	1778:15	1749:24	traditionally	1514:14
1549:16	1784:13	tool 1497:15,17	1512:19,20	1550:5,6,12
1551:4	timed 1534:24	1497:18	training	1550:19,23
1566:3,18	timely 1578:14	top 1499:15	1661:14	1563:24
1568:1,19	times 1521:3	1500:18	transaction	1565:13,15
1572:10	1624:20	1558:12	1508:23,25	1565:20
1599:2	1662:5	1581:3	1509:8,10,22	1566:17,21
1605:11	1720:10	1614:12	1509:24	1566:23,23
1606:4	timing 1533:9	1642:5	1511:1,10	1592:25
1607:12,21	1533:12,20	1726:6	1519:17	1593:1,3,7,19
1609:10,11	1534:12	1731:22	1533:10,13	1644:5,9,13
1609:13,24	1584:1	1745:3	1533:14,18	1644:18
1616:8	today 1483:5	1752:14	1534:11,13	1693:12,19
1624:25	1483:24	1777:8	1534:17,19	1694:21,24
1627:4	1488:20	topic 1505:16	1534:24	1695:2
1631:11	1489:5	tornado 1605:7	transcribed	1720:13,15
1642:25	1495:14	1605:12	1784:14	1721:1,13,22
1643:12	1539:23	total 1528:12	TRANSCRI...	1722:1,6,11
1646:13	1551:18	1550:4	1481:3	1722:17
1647:12	1565:7	1573:1	transition	1723:2,8,10
1651:4	1572:17	1611:15	1584:5	1723:16,17
1652:1	1651:23	1660:9,12	1587:2,3	1724:3,25
1658:9	1658:2	1664:13	transitional	1725:9,18
1674:25	1682:15	1665:4,25	1584:12	1726:1,16
1675:1	1683:12,15	1667:25	1586:11,12	1727:10
1685:6	1683:19	1668:2	translate	1728:14,15
1691:12	1684:6	1685:22,24	1515:15	1728:22,25
1706:5	1694:2	1686:19	translates	1731:13,17
1719:10	1728:11	1690:25	1517:12	1733:22
1721:19,23	1764:24	totality 1637:8	transparent	1743:21
1722:23,24	1767:21	track 1771:15	1528:21,22	1764:24
1724:12	1770:17,18	trackers	1530:6,8,24	1765:1
1725:4,12	today's	1522:7	1628:10	1773:9
1732:23	1698:25	tracking	1762:23	treated
1733:15	1765:10	1694:12	1777:3	1763:11
1739:2	told 1492:13	traction	Treasurer	treatment
1748:1,5	1493:7	1640:19	1508:8,13	1705:2
1750:22	1494:8	trade 1562:12	1516:12	trend 1504:10
1764:19	1495:17	1596:5	Treasuries	1566:12,12
1765:8	1548:25	1603:18	1567:17	1567:4
1769:5,7,9	1549:7	1637:7	1593:23	1598:3,19
1770:2,3,22	1550:17	traded 1769:18	1644:15	1604:19
1771:1,5	1638:12	trade-off	1723:5	1691:22
1772:10,16	1701:19	1711:23	1725:10	1700:10
1772:18,21	1751:12,19	traditional	1738:6	trends 1604:12

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1604:17	1748:3,5,6,7	1551:9	1530:21	1776:9
trial 1760:14	1750:11	1569:3	1547:10	two-sided
tried 1714:16	1751:11,11	1594:13	1548:1	1556:23
1752:3	1755:18	1610:4,8	1570:11	two-thirds
tries 1752:9	1770:18	1619:25	1578:9	1732:8
trip 1526:11	trued 1666:17	1620:16,17	1579:1	1736:16
trouble	1668:20	1636:23	1580:20	1737:12
1774:20	true-up 1508:3	1640:22	1583:11	1741:1,19
true 1512:21	1510:23	1643:20	1584:19	type 1488:23
1512:22	1511:8,10	1650:20	1597:11	1514:16
1539:19	1533:4,7,11	1654:13	1601:10	1521:12
1565:13	1533:17	1664:18	1602:5	1528:15
1566:17	1665:11	1704:14	1605:13	1530:10
1577:5	1697:2,3,5,9	1709:4	1613:17	1552:25
1583:14	1697:12,14	1735:24	1619:10,15	1557:18
1617:16	1705:9,15,17	1748:5	1621:11	1565:19
1636:7	1706:12	1751:16	1625:7	1623:14
1643:23	truly 1550:8	1757:18	1627:21	1654:7
1658:6	1759:11	1773:14	1628:3	1695:15
1663:16	Truman	Tuesday	1633:8	1772:4
1666:19	1482:24	1656:22	1640:20	1777:11
1667:3,12,13	trusting	1683:10,16	1641:1,4	types 1502:15
1667:16	1495:22	1683:19	1644:3	1522:19
1668:4,11,12	truth 1506:6,7	1684:1,4,8,12	1647:10	1536:25
1668:13,15	1506:7	1684:13	1652:3	1561:14
1668:19,24	1538:15,16	1778:1,13,24	1659:9	1652:8,8
1669:4,7	1538:16	turn 1516:5	1664:14	1654:25
1671:22	1657:6,7,7	1579:23	1667:25	1719:13
1674:9,16,20	1684:22,23	1581:19	1691:10	typical 1760:4
1674:20	1684:23	1615:10	1697:25	typically
1676:3	truthful	1669:15	1701:13	1516:2
1678:12,12	1495:17	1692:11	1708:5	1552:23
1711:9	try 1512:9	1716:19	1714:19	1553:9
1717:14	1533:23	turned 1731:11	1716:9,12	1577:12
1719:6	1607:9	1732:19	1720:14	1583:25
1721:12	1620:11	turns 1579:22	1721:19	1590:15
1722:3,18,20	1623:1	1594:14	1726:7,15,21	1592:1
1722:23	1633:18,21	1633:25	1727:4,13	1637:16
1723:2	1711:20	1765:18	1731:15,18	1648:3
1724:7	1736:4	twelve 1503:16	1731:23	1649:23
1726:7	1756:2,3	1503:16,17	1732:7	1651:3
1731:4	1760:11	1599:3	1735:14	1652:5
1733:16,17	1772:5	1609:2	1745:2,14,17	1655:16
1733:20,22	trying 1495:13	two 1484:7	1745:24	1711:16
1733:23	1514:5	1488:9	1752:17	T&D 1559:8
1744:3,6	1545:7,8	1498:9	1755:25	
1747:22,25	1547:9	1509:10	1761:25	<hr/> U <hr/>

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

Uh-huh 1509:5	1565:11	1732:4	1589:25	1600:21
1511:23	1566:19	1741:9	unreliable	usage 1647:8
1520:20,20	1567:12	1742:20,24	1642:22	use 1488:23
1521:23	1569:1,6	1743:12,25	unsecured	1489:1,14
1525:19	1575:13	1745:22	1578:3	1496:2
1527:24,24	1577:24	1749:8	unsupported	1497:5,17
1531:2	1587:7	1762:15	1486:23	1528:18
1535:4	1602:17	understating	unsupportive	1535:8
1536:21,24	1619:25	1686:19	1523:12,16	1543:10,11
1554:14	1635:18	understood	unusual 1594:9	1546:19
1666:6	1640:22	1584:10	1595:2,12	1547:16,16
1676:9,12	1642:4	1603:11	1600:21	1548:7,8
1760:22	1644:14	1612:25	1601:1	1581:17
ultimately	1650:21	1625:11	1613:4	1582:16,18
1528:19	1664:22,23	1777:21	1636:15	1590:10
1612:9	1683:8	undertaking	unusually	1610:9,10
1630:2	1699:24	1488:22	1594:3	1612:11,12
1696:19	1701:5	1527:16	1601:14	1619:12,15
1727:3	1707:5	unfortunately	1637:12	1620:3,5
1774:2	1713:25	1727:19	unwelcome	1622:3,6,9
uncertain	1726:4	unimaginable	1600:10	1627:9,11
1592:11	1728:15	1486:4	update 1517:16	1628:5,11
1759:13	1729:8	Union 1481:10	1517:18	1630:13
uncertainties	1731:10,15	unique 1772:18	1521:18	1631:11
1565:22	1731:17	unit 1706:4	1526:5	1640:25
1567:15	1744:25	United 1484:7	1589:12	1641:2
uncertainty	1778:19	1497:1	1596:8	1651:12,18
1567:16,19	understanding	1499:8	1633:8,9	1652:6,7,9,16
1567:20,23	1483:11	1553:15	updated	1654:10
1568:2	1573:15	unknown	1580:7,11,14	1655:7,8,14
uncomfortable	1574:17	1540:15	updates	1693:3
1774:13	1575:2	unlawful	1516:22	1695:13
unconstitutio...	1594:21	1497:21	1517:14	1696:10,13
1497:20	1595:25	1498:24	1523:9	1696:19,21
1499:6	1645:9	unquestiona...	updating	1696:23
unconventio...	1650:4	1488:15	1705:9	1697:15
1486:11,23	1656:18,20	unreasonable	upfront	1700:6
underlying	1660:9	1485:14	1659:14	1701:23
1550:23,23	1671:12	1487:13	upper 1717:13	1703:17,23
1578:10	1696:7	1494:12	1719:19	1704:13
1709:17	1700:3	1499:3	ups 1565:6	1705:14,16
understand	1710:3	1503:25	upset 1576:13	1708:16,21
1483:4	1711:7	1712:13	upward	1710:4,20
1492:16	1719:13,19	1774:7	1598:17,22	1711:1,19
1494:1	1723:24	unreasonably	1601:2	1720:13,21
1543:14	1727:5,13	1594:18	upwards	1722:20
1548:14	1730:21	unregulated	1599:8	1724:7,11,25

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1735:6,10,19	1622:23,24	1685:22	1694:21	values 1624:16
1743:18,20	1622:24	1693:4,11,17	1728:21	1694:16
1744:10	1624:9,18	1694:13,19	1772:19	1709:5
1747:23,23	1625:4	1697:15,21		valuing 1626:5
1750:23	1630:8	1697:23	V	valves 1673:19
1751:12	1648:21,23	1704:16,25	vale 1515:15	1673:20
1760:8	1693:13,19	1707:16	valid 1487:6	variations
1763:22	1696:16	1708:1,4,15	valley 1493:6	1496:2
1764:15	1697:8	1709:12,15	valuable	1709:19
1765:17	1712:21	1709:18	1488:18	variety 1512:6
1775:21	1713:4,5,12	1711:13	valuation	various
1776:3,3,6,7	1713:16	1712:5,5,8,9	1531:15	1500:13
1776:23	1745:20,21	1712:12	1695:4	1520:21
1777:11	1746:7,22,25	1713:6	1704:8	1546:24
useful 1488:10	1747:5,10,15	1723:5	1770:5	1547:1
uses 1583:15	1747:19	1725:3,10,11	valuations	1616:3
1603:15	1759:4,8	1725:13,16	1723:1	1623:3
1738:5	1761:20	1725:20,22	1726:1	vary 1512:19
usually 1659:9	1769:11	1726:1,3,9	1769:22	1668:1
1659:16	utility 1490:14	1728:6,7	value 1483:25	varying
1661:10	1495:6	1738:5	1514:21	1583:25
Utah 1613:3,4	1496:19	1758:24	1515:1,5,7,10	vein 1524:13
1613:6	1502:3,9	1759:12,25	1515:11	verify 1689:9
1649:25	1504:12	1761:7,16,18	1546:24	1689:14
utilities	1524:22	1762:3,11	1547:2	1710:19
1485:22	1527:12	1765:4	1582:1,7,8,9	1746:5
1488:13	1537:17	1768:18	1582:10	version 1743:6
1502:15	1541:23	1769:17,19	1584:23	1743:8,12
1503:21	1549:7,15,20	1770:5	1585:14	versus 1484:5,6
1504:2	1550:13,18	1771:5,6	1586:10,22	1512:3
1523:17	1550:20	1772:11,14	1622:1,1,8	1641:2,3
1535:18	1569:13	1772:19	1623:6	1694:14
1536:4	1577:6,17,20	1773:9	1624:2	1704:9
1550:9	1577:21,23	1774:11,19	1645:17,17	1724:3
1553:15	1578:5	1775:1,9,19	1652:19	1725:24
1554:18	1596:5	utility's 1617:6	1655:2	vertically
1555:6,12	1600:18	1627:16	1701:8,9	1560:9,11
1568:19	1602:15	1695:7	1704:15	1647:23
1577:11,11	1616:15	1706:10	1708:15,16	1648:4
1577:25	1617:3	1707:24	1709:2	Victor 1538:24
1579:9	1622:13	1762:9,14,16	1759:21	view 1489:10
1597:25	1623:4,7,7	1769:24	1760:3,6	1562:17
1598:20	1643:17,18	1770:6	1769:18,20	1565:12
1603:18	1646:9	utilized	1771:6	1571:15,19
1621:16,19	1650:13	1762:25	1774:8	1573:17
1621:22,24	1651:1,12,18	utilizes 1555:9	valued 1759:11	1575:19
1622:4,8,13	1653:4	U.S 1501:18	1759:12	1576:6,11,20

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1577:25	1668:6	1670:12	1586:6	1643:3
1578:1	1681:8	1680:12	1599:19	1741:19
1592:15	Vuylsteke	1683:18	1600:19	1749:19
1619:4,16	1482:18	1707:13,13	1607:15	weighted
1624:8,19	1683:24	1746:4,4	1623:2	1494:5
1625:23		1748:3	1640:4,6,14	1512:8
1626:2	W	1777:24	1640:20	1519:22
1642:23	W 1482:24	1778:6,14	1647:2	1520:2
1644:12	wait 1656:22	wanted 1545:4	1652:5	1732:5,7,7
1648:3	1738:16	1599:6	1680:13	1736:16
1654:17	walk 1542:16	1610:12	1690:25	1737:12
viewed 1592:20	1714:18	1630:5	1691:6	1741:1
violate 1494:14	1727:23	1632:18	1692:4	weighting
Virginia	1735:13	1635:18	1705:6	1771:23
1484:7	1746:2	1638:18	1707:1,8	weightings
1553:23,25	1753:2	1645:3	1722:5,13	1530:9
1554:2,22,23	1754:17	1653:24	1724:12	weird 1616:7
1555:1,2	1756:5	1686:14	1730:8	Welcome
1594:3	want 1490:4	1735:10	1735:24	1483:2
1598:19,23	1495:13,21	1771:17	1743:22	well-respected
1599:8,15	1496:23	1773:21	1759:12	1487:8
1601:6,7	1499:16	1777:20	1763:11,22	1603:20
1602:4,11,20	1503:9	Washington	1764:1	Wendy
1638:21	1505:11	1761:1	1770:25	1482:11
1639:16	1515:24	wasn't 1511:8	1771:17,20	went 1579:8
1645:7,10,13	1537:4	1595:2,2	1772:1,5	1606:11
1645:18,19	1541:16	1653:21	1773:4	1672:21
1645:23	1542:7	1669:19	ways 1489:24	1684:16
Virginia's	1557:5	1682:14	1495:12	1719:7
1594:4	1565:18	1728:23	1496:5	1727:19,22
vis-a-vis 1562:3	1567:11	watch 1684:18	1503:23	1728:21
Vol 1587:16	1591:9	Water 1484:6	1508:14	West 1484:7
1780:22	1592:4,4	way 1492:25	1512:7	we'll 1483:4,14
volatile 1577:7	1593:24,24	1494:6,7	1515:7	1489:5
1577:9,17	1595:11	1504:19	1537:21	1503:18
1600:6	1597:16	1515:1	weaken 1516:4	1504:2
1642:24	1601:15	1534:24	weeds 1727:20	1507:7
volatility	1607:17,23	1536:13	week 1561:19	1526:9
1577:14	1610:25	1539:2	1687:17	1538:6
Volume 1481:8	1612:25	1548:12	1778:1,11,15	1540:10
volumes	1615:4,6	1550:10	weeks 1526:10	1554:9
1647:12	1617:19	1563:16	1564:23	1558:17
voluntary	1620:9	1568:6	weight 1528:24	1584:17
1659:25	1628:22	1569:14	1530:16,19	1591:2
VS11 1659:2	1629:16	1581:22	1576:24	1596:18
1661:18,24	1632:4,12	1584:3,17,18	1625:12	1631:3,20,20
1662:9,13,14	1669:20	1585:3	1642:15	1634:16

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1665:23	1671:8	1538:6	1520:6,9	1684:17
1667:14	1674:7	1633:18,21	1524:8	1685:1,5
1681:10,14	1677:9	1661:21	1532:9,12,15	1686:5,9
1682:3,4,5	1682:8	1682:14	1532:17,19	1687:4,9,13
1683:5	1684:1,19	1684:10	1538:2,5,8,12	1688:16,23
1684:17	1685:1	1687:2	1538:19	1688:25
1687:9	1704:24	1706:16,21	1539:1	1689:23
1690:8	1722:25	1714:8	1540:3,6,10	1690:5,8,14
1691:11,12	1723:23	1745:8	1540:18,21	1690:17
1737:25	we've 1495:3	1780:8,17	1541:4	1691:11
1753:1	1530:1	1781:2,11,17	1551:23	1699:14
1758:15	1551:2	witnesses	1552:5	1702:22
1765:23	1557:24	1484:1	1556:16,18	1703:11
1778:13	1558:6,7,7,8	1485:13	1557:1	1714:9
we're 1483:7	1564:22	1488:19	1560:18	1734:9,13,24
1483:10	1565:22	1490:3,16	1563:8	1740:3
1496:17	1597:19	1500:8,13	1571:22	1742:6,14
1512:5	1625:15,17	1630:13	1574:11	1745:9
1514:7	1631:9	1642:14	1587:13	1746:18
1522:19	1651:22	1684:3	1589:1	1751:23
1524:4	1708:12	1706:20	1591:2,6	1752:6
1538:9	1712:23	1776:1	1608:10	1756:13,21
1540:21	1728:11	wonder	1614:19	1758:15
1546:22	1765:2	1494:16	1629:14,19	1764:10
1552:10	1772:22	1519:7	1630:20	1765:23
1566:3,5,9	whichever	1572:20	1631:2,6,19	1766:2,11,15
1568:22,25	1601:23	1574:15	1631:24	1767:2,4
1568:25	wide 1628:22	1589:4,17	1632:2,16	1777:22
1600:14	1629:2	1642:25	1633:11,16	1778:5,12,19
1603:12	wife 1632:14	wondering	1634:14,16	1778:23
1604:9,10	wiggles	1607:1	1637:20,23	word 1672:1
1608:7	1495:10	1682:17	1641:7	1695:14
1609:10	willing 1615:1	WOODRUFF	1648:13	words 1638:6
1614:6	wires 1713:8	1481:14	1649:1	1640:5
1619:24	1713:11	1483:2,9,12	1656:13,17	1668:16
1620:16,17	Wisconsin	1491:24	1656:21,25	work 1489:4
1623:5	1715:8	1492:2	1657:3,10,21	1496:22
1631:6,21	wish 1564:14	1500:20,22	1658:12,17	1531:16
1632:3	witness 1483:6	1501:5	1662:17	1561:13
1639:25	1484:10,20	1502:20	1663:9	1654:9
1640:22,22	1484:22	1505:19	1677:2	1671:20
1646:6	1485:24	1506:2,10	1681:12,14	1673:8,14,17
1647:23	1487:2,7	1507:2,7,11	1681:17,19	1674:11
1656:18	1501:11	1510:3,6	1681:21,24	1677:5,7,23
1658:25	1504:23	1511:15	1682:2,7,23	1677:24
1659:2	1505:12	1518:8	1683:4,17,22	1679:2
1665:21	1507:1	1519:2	1684:9,13,15	1683:8

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1689:11,18	1733:5	1686:5	1765:15,15	1676:6
1700:18	1735:5,5	1699:5	1774:16	yield 1546:13
1705:11	1760:6	1701:17	years 1561:14	1547:11
worked	1763:1,1	1710:8	1563:19	1550:1,5,6
1616:15	1776:22	1713:6	1564:5,13	1551:15
1760:25	wound 1626:20	1715:12	1566:8,9	1563:22
working	wrap-up	1719:10	1567:24	1565:2
1507:10	1601:25	1730:20	1577:23	1566:23,25
1522:17	written	1738:19,20	1582:6	1567:1,18
1568:7	1503:10	1741:23	1589:14	1581:9,12,15
1636:7	1506:22	1744:20	1598:17	1593:19
1671:5	1550:17	1746:1	1599:3	1622:18
1672:12,23	wrong 1561:21	1751:20	1600:4	1692:2
1673:6,7	1642:17	1756:12	1625:1	1694:13
works 1484:6	1727:25	1773:24	1667:25	1695:1
1584:18	1729:18	year 1486:2,19	1691:21,23	1720:15
1720:4	wrote 1771:14	1487:16	1692:7	1723:11,18
1724:21		1503:14	1693:21	1724:25
1727:24	X	1504:5	1696:24	1725:2
world 1492:21	X 1672:14	1509:1	1701:24	1726:10
1494:21	1780:1	1511:8	1706:9	1731:13,17
1567:7	1781:1	1519:15,16	1713:16,23	1736:24
1573:23	1782:1,4	1526:3,9	1721:19	1740:11,12
worry 1683:19	Y	1533:15	1728:1,3,8,16	1740:13,23
worse 1592:12	yeah 1512:5	1551:17	1728:19,20	1741:16
worst 1772:7	1527:10	1586:18	1729:5	yields 1504:12
1772:22	1532:4	1592:8,19	1730:4	1504:17
worth 1595:12	1535:20	1610:1	1731:18	1541:24
1596:19	1536:11,15	1644:8	1732:16	1546:11,16
1606:23	1537:20	1648:19	1733:23	1549:7,15,20
1643:15	1538:12	1654:11	1735:11,14	1550:12,18
1651:3	1573:23	1662:24	1735:20,22	1550:19,20
1673:18	1593:2	1663:3	1736:2,3,21	1550:21
1738:9	1596:25	1666:17,17	1737:2,3,17	1562:11
1740:6	1599:15	1667:1,2	1738:9	1563:24
1760:5	1601:18	1668:21	1740:6,8	1565:13,15
wouldn't	1603:9,11	1671:2	1741:5,9	1566:2,17,21
1494:16	1609:8,14	1681:1,4	1742:1	1593:3,7
1549:1	1611:14	1696:10,12	1758:1,3	1643:18,18
1556:12	1613:16	1696:13,13	1767:21	1643:23
1589:16	1616:8	1705:25	1771:10,11	1644:5,13,18
1629:7	1620:17	1714:12,21	1772:23,24	1692:3
1637:1,10	1627:19	1728:25	1774:16	1693:16,18
1676:18	1628:7,19	1729:2,3	1776:1	1693:19
1678:4	1629:21	1731:7	yesterday	1694:13
1700:25	1636:18	1738:15	1664:3	1709:18
1712:13		1757:19,22	1670:13	1722:18

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1723:16,22	\$48 1668:2	1719:2,7	10.25 1490:21	1599:12
1724:23	\$5 1509:25	1732:2	1504:25	1602:10
1725:9,20,22	1511:5	1771:18,22	1518:24	1610:19
1726:3	1674:24	1772:17	1569:20	10.9 1716:23
1728:14,15	1675:5	10th 1491:9,12	1570:19	1717:1
1729:1	\$50,000	10-Q 1534:3,8	1575:9,18,20	10:00 1538:6
1733:22	1672:15,16	10.0 1611:19	1575:23	100 1610:9,10
1737:22	1672:22	10.03 1754:10	1576:6	1699:25,25
1738:5	1673:2,8,14	10.05 1555:4	1580:17	101 1482:20
1743:22	1673:17,18	1559:7,9	1618:13	11 1484:23
1765:1	1673:24	1638:24	1629:25	1504:25
1770:18	1674:6	1639:9,12	1747:16	1575:9,18
York 1526:4	\$60,000 1671:2	1718:22	10.26 1749:2	1580:17
	\$7.5 1680:21	10.06 1747:20	1750:15	1629:25
Z	\$900,000	10.1 1736:12	10.3 1489:21	1653:15
Zack's 1582:1	1681:3,7	1737:6	1598:24	1757:19,22
1582:2,7		1771:22	1608:23	11.00 1518:20
1655:3	#	10.15 1609:15	1715:15	1518:24
1701:7	#0538 1784:8	1609:18,21	1717:11	1569:20
zero 1763:9	#0539 1784:21	1715:5	10.31 1614:12	1570:3
zone 1488:4,5,7	1	10.17 1748:24	1748:24	11.01 1747:1
1488:9	1 1484:13	1750:15	1750:14	11.03 1746:11
1489:14,20	1495:5	10.19 1740:18	1754:6	1746:20
1489:20,21	1542:17	10.2 1484:23	10.36 1554:19	11.05 1753:18
1489:21,23	1543:19	1486:8	1602:16	11.2 1488:8
1496:23	1549:15	1487:19	1645:5	11.4 1600:3
1497:1,3,15	1554:12,13	1488:7	10.37 1713:20	11.5 1599:25
1499:7,9,22	1585:17,19	1490:19	10.5 1484:24	1747:11
1500:17	1597:25	1560:11	1490:21,22	11.59 1747:11
1610:5	1598:1,11,12	1579:18	1505:1	11.99 1747:1
1699:20	1599:2	1592:6	1518:20	111 1482:15
	1633:8	1609:5,14,20	1553:18	113 1541:22
\$	1664:14	1609:21	1569:24	1579:23
\$125,000	1693:20	1610:10,11	1570:3	1580:1,4
1676:14	1778:24	1638:5,13	1571:1	114 1580:1,10
\$130,000	1st 1533:16,18	1717:16	1575:13,20	12 1557:14,14
1679:11	1:30 1631:4,25	1718:9	1580:18	1602:9,10,21
1681:1	10 1489:22	1740:16	10.51 1747:19	1609:16
\$173 1534:15	1491:11	1741:12	10.56 1713:24	1638:15
1534:18	1503:21	1747:6	10.57 1599:2	1653:15
\$215 1760:13	1504:3	1767:23	10.68 1747:6	1664:20
\$25 1666:4	1513:1,7,13	1771:22	10.7 1753:25	12-month
\$25.8 1660:2	1513:18	10.22 1554:20	10.73 1747:16	1503:11
\$26 1660:19	1715:22	1610:1	10.74 1716:7	1651:6
1666:1	1716:2,12,12	1645:6	10.75 1570:5	1697:13
\$450 1572:25	1717:7	1648:23	10.84 1553:18	12.02 1746:11
1615:7		1728:10	1598:13	12.2 1746:20

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

12.4 1554:5	1556 1783:6,6	1746 1782:22	1543:19,25	2007 1713:20
12.81 1754:3	1560 1783:9,9	1782:22	1549:19	1737:9
12/31/13	1563 1780:20	1755 1782:23	1557:14	1772:10
1667:17	1571 1780:21	1782:23	1574:12,16	2008 1568:2,8
12/31/14	1588 1587:17	1760 1782:24	1574:17	1568:17
1667:21	1588-1591	1782:24,25	1598:12	1571:15
120 1485:25	1780:22	1782:25	1599:17,18	1729:25
1550:5	1592 1780:23	1762 1781:25	1599:20,25	1740:20
1593:12,13	1594 1780:24	1768 1782:1	1600:2,10	2008/2009
13 1555:7	16 1513:14	1769 1782:2	1633:9	1772:16
1600:7	1669:17	1770 1782:2	1634:10	2009 1568:2
1667:19	1612 1780:25	1783 1782:3	1635:9	1729:17
1668:25	1618 1781:3	18th 1703:5	1693:17	1738:16
1693:15	1633 1781:4	180-day 1581:4	1750:5	1772:10
1733:18,19	1634 1781:5	1581:11	2nd 1660:5	2010 1593:21
13-week	1637 1781:6	19-A 1580:5	2,000 1734:3	1638:10
1549:15,20	1783:14,14	1581:3	2.30 1739:3	1738:19
13.28 1754:12	1783:15,15	19-B 1580:10	2.84 1739:9	1739:2
130,000	1638 1781:7	1901 1482:12	2.89 1739:7,8	2011 1486:3
1680:17	1641 1781:8	1506:13	2:45 1682:5	1519:13
14 1634:3	1645 1781:9	1926 1724:4	20 1519:19	1549:16,18
1667:23	1652 1782:19	1986 1727:6	1539:10	1554:20
1668:25	1782:19	1728:2	1540:1,3,8	1555:9
1733:18,18	1660 1781:12	1731:2	1589:14	1610:1
1483 1780:3	1662 1781:13	1732:21	1600:14	1638:4,13
1492 1780:4	1783:19,19	1733:6	1728:20	1648:9,19
15 1519:19	1783:21,21	1734:1	1782:7	1659:4
1634:3,8	1783:23,23	1769:7,17	20th 1509:9	1660:1
15th 1549:21	1666 1781:14	1770:1,9	1533:19	1664:8
1551:16	1667 1781:15	1987 1731:7	20-month	1677:12
1501 1780:5	16690 1685:10	1732:21	1646:12,13	1713:18,21
1502 1780:6	1688 1781:18	1733:6	20-year	1714:12,21
1506 1780:9	1691 1781:19	1739:10	1728:15,22	1727:6
1507 1780:10	1783:2,2,3,3	1770:9	200 1482:3,7,15	1728:2,11
1782:17,17	1783:4,4,10	1988 1730:8	1554:25	1729:21
1511 1783:5,5	1783:10	1739:3,11	2000 1732:23	1738:13
1518 1780:11	1692 1781:20	1990 1730:16	2000s 1598:4	1767:12
1519 1780:12	1693 1782:20	1732:18	1600:6	2011-0028
1520 1780:13	1782:20	1739:11	2001 1507:25	1750:2
1524 1780:14	1694 1781:21	1990s 1600:5	1739:2	2012 1481:7
1532 1780:15	1695 1781:22	1994 1730:12	2005 1564:1	1503:13,20
1538 1780:18	17 1597:25	1732:18	1565:3	1504:1
1540 1780:19	1703 1781:23	1739:15	1567:24	1518:16
1782:7,7,9,9	1706 1781:24	1998 1732:18	1598:18	1519:11
1782:11,11	173 1534:22		2006 1738:19	1549:21
1782:14,14	1738 1782:21	2	1738:20	1552:18
1551 1783:5,5	1782:21	2 1484:17	1739:2	1553:16,17

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

1554:19	2230 1482:8	1711:2	3432 1482:24	5
1555:5,7	23 1506:25	1721:24	36 1720:19	5 1481:7
1557:9	1507:2,5	1722:1,7,9	360 1482:3	1507:18,24
1583:9	1782:17	1757:6,10,20	4	1513:23,24
1593:21	232 1658:10,12	3rd 1579:5	4 1541:23	1541:25
1596:9	1658:15	3.03 1739:15,18	1543:19	1544:8
1598:1	232NP 1657:21	3.7 1721:17	1544:8	1545:14,14
1599:18,20	1657:22	1731:16,21	1545:14,14	1547:22
1600:3	232-HC	1736:8,14,24	1547:22	1549:5
1601:11	1657:17	1737:5,9,22	1549:5	1554:6
1602:15	1783:19	3.79 1741:13	1553:19	1602:21
1609:16	232-NP	3.83 1730:7	1555:16	1611:4,4,5,6
1610:18,25	1783:21	3.9 1509:20	1609:17	1636:1
1612:24,24	233 1658:10,12	3.93 1740:20	1610:17,25	1714:24
1633:8,9	1658:15	3.97 1730:12	1634:11	1754:23,24
1635:25	1783:23	30 1529:2,8	1635:23	1779:4
1638:15	237 1495:3	1728:19	1636:2	5.01 1740:14,15
1639:3	24 1666:21	1731:25	1646:8	1740:23
1645:1,5	1667:9,15	1732:1	1710:16,20	5.07 1583:10
1662:24	1668:22	30th 1507:25	1711:2	1585:23
1663:3	1749:16,22	1519:12,13	1718:4	1587:4
1664:14	1750:5	1533:21,25	4.09 1730:16	1701:15
1677:8,16,17	243 1532:24	1583:9	4.2 1774:6,12	1702:4,13
1678:9,16,21	25 1529:4,5,11	1609:16	4.41 1731:7	5.18 1738:13
1680:21	1529:12	1638:15	4.47 1742:3	1740:8,15
1691:25	1554:19	30-day 1581:3	4.54 1741:6	1741:9
1714:14	1602:8,16,21	1581:7,8,10	4.62 1739:18	5.37 1737:8
1767:13	1604:5,6	30-year	4.8 1757:9	5.53 1736:13
1783:8	1666:10,10	1720:13	4.88 1738:18,25	5.67 1586:20
2013 1660:5	1671:3	1721:22	1739:1	1587:5,8
1664:15	25th 1491:8,9	1722:6	4.88.89 1738:17	5.70 1585:20
1692:12	26 1481:8	1728:18	4.89 1738:16,21	5.87 1519:11
1732:23	1729:5,5	300,000	4.9 1702:6,18	5.9 1737:18,20
2014 1721:21	1738:9	1677:12	1711:2	5/13/12 1783:9
207 1482:24	26th 1602:14	31st 1508:3	1757:12,14	5:00 1777:24
21 1539:11	27 1587:16	1519:11	442-3141	5:10 1779:3
1540:2,3,8	1780:22	314 1482:13	1482:16	50 1529:6,10,16
1691:4	3	32 1635:12	45 1502:9	1529:25
1782:9	3 1484:18	340 1665:16	47 1560:25	1559:23
22 1539:13	1544:4	1666:11	1561:8,10	1614:1,7,9
1540:2,3	1634:10	1667:11	48 1669:1	500 1693:7
22HC 1540:8	1635:9	1668:3,17,17	485 1509:20	1694:4
22NP 1540:8	1693:17	1670:22	1534:17	507 1685:15
22-HC 1782:11	1710:5,13,16	1672:3	49 1489:8	1687:2,4,7
22-NP 1782:14	1710:17,20	1674:11,23	1541:21	507-HC 1783:2
220 1486:1	1710:21,22	1675:8,23,24	1542:3,3	508 1685:15
221 1482:20		1676:8		1687:2,4,7

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 10/5/2012

508-NP 1783:3	1482:21,25	1690:1,21	8.7 1720:19	9.31 1560:4,5
509 1685:15	<hr/> 6 <hr/>	1691:3	8.8 1741:17	1613:20
1687:2,4,7	6 1634:7	1722:2	8.94 1740:24	1614:1
1783:4	1693:15	1782:20	8:00 1540:24	9.38 1744:18
52.1 1508:6,7	6th 1509:8	70s 1653:8	80s 1653:8	1751:6
528 1510:3,6,9	1639:2	71 1734:10,13	86 1733:19	9.4 1503:5
1510:12,14	6.1 1736:23	1734:23,24	87 1733:19	1505:9
1511:14,15	6.13 1731:21	1735:2	1739:7	1698:1,13,21
1511:18	6.18 1729:24	1782:21	<hr/> 9 <hr/>	1699:9
1783:5	6.31 1729:21	72 1740:3	9 1485:25	1700:25
529 1541:4	6.41 1729:16	1742:5,6,16	1486:15	1711:5
1551:23	1735:15	1782:22	1499:11	1719:20
1552:1	1736:7,8	73 1669:15,16	1500:15,15	1742:21
1641:24	1737:4	1746:18,20	1618:13	1745:1
1644:19	61 1769:1	1748:21	1634:7	1749:18
1783:5	62 1548:6	1751:22,23	1732:3	9.40 1744:20
53 1507:23	1769:1	1752:1	9.05 1753:13	9.42 1634:10
530 1552:5	63103 1482:12	1782:23	9.07 1737:10	9.48 1742:3
1556:16,17	1506:14	74 1752:6	9.2 1488:8	9.5 1558:21
1556:18,21	636-7551	1756:19,21	1489:23	9.55 1741:7
1610:13	1482:25	1756:24	1503:5	9.56 1634:10
1635:23	65101-1574	1777:8	1505:9	9.6 1737:22
1638:9,20	1482:20	1782:24	1594:18	9.65 1749:4
1639:2	65102 1482:4,8	75 1589:14	1688:13	9.67 1749:2
1644:23	65109 1482:25	1756:13,20	1697:25	1750:15
1714:14	65205 1482:15	1756:21,24	1698:13,21	9.7 1751:8
1718:3	69 1648:14	1757:2	1699:9	9.73 1741:20,22
1767:12	1649:1,4	1782:25	1700:25	9.75 1555:7
1783:6	1714:13	751-3234	1701:1	1737:13
531 1557:1,4	1767:11	1482:4	1711:4	9.76 1737:15
1560:17,18	1782:19	751-5565	1736:15	9.77 1741:3
1560:21	<hr/> 7 <hr/>	1482:9	9.25 1555:19	9.8 1559:3,13
1579:2	7 1508:3,5	79 1635:4	1556:12	1560:8
1612:21	1693:16	<hr/> 8 <hr/>	1594:18,19	1579:15
1614:13	7.4 1677:8	8 1485:25	1613:14,17	1613:2,5
1649:7	7.5 1677:9	1486:14	9.26 1732:13	1614:6
1783:9	7.71 1753:15	1499:11	9.3 1487:14	1649:20
532 1686:6,9,12	7.8 1733:22	1549:16	1489:22	1736:19,24
1687:2,5,7	7/31/12	8th 1534:4	1491:6	1736:25
1690:23	1665:10	8.11 1732:2,9	1503:6	9.81 1559:18
1783:10	1671:15	8.18 1753:22	1505:11	1560:3
54 1541:19	70 1688:25	8.47 1751:10	1688:13	9.83 1732:1,5
554-2237	1689:2,4,11	8.5 1733:23	1698:1	9.86 1749:5
1482:13	1689:15,22	8.63 1743:13	1732:12,13	9.9 1579:21
556-6621	1689:23	1751:10	1744:16	1650:14,16
1482:21		1773:19	1751:2	1718:15
573 1482:4,9,16				1719:8

1751:3				
9.92 1503:22				
1555:8,16				
1599:20				
1610:22				
9.97 1754:8				
90 1487:15,17				
1739:9				
90s 1653:13,14				
1728:21				
90-day 1581:4				
1581:11				
900,000				
1680:17				
91 1548:6				
1643:8,12,15				
1739:9				
918 1482:14				
93 1634:1,6,11				
1634:22				
94 1739:22				
95 1688:19				
1739:21				
98 1739:19,22				
1739:22				