BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

STATE OF MISSOURI

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Evidentiary Hearing

January 21, 2011

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 19

In the Matter Of the Application of Kansas City Power and Light Company for Approval to Make Certain Changes in Its Charges for Electric Service to Continue Implementation of Its Regulatory Plan)))File No. ER-2010-0355))
In the Matter of the Application)
of KCP&L Greater Missouri)
Operations Company for Approval)File No. ER-2010-0356
to Make Certain Changes in Its)
Changes for Electric Service.)

RONALD D. PRIDGIN, Presiding SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE TERRY M. JARRETT, KEVIN GUNN, ROBERT S. KENNEY, COMMISSIONERS

REPORTED BY: Jennifer Leibach, CCR No. 1780 TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

1 APPEARANCES 2 DOUG HEALY, Attorney at Law Healy & Healy 3 939 North Boonville Avenue Springfield, MO 65802 417.864.8800 4 FOR: MJMEUC 5 6 DAVID WOODSMALL, Attorney at Law STUART CONRAD, Attorney at Law 7 Finnegan, Conrad & Peterson 428 E. Capitol, Suite 300 Jefferson City, MO 65101 8 573.635.2700 9 FOR: AGP/SIEUA/MEUA 10 CARL J. LUMLEY, Attorney at Law 11 Curtis, Heinz, Garrett & O'Keefe 130 S. Bemiston, Suite 200 12 Clayton, MO 63105 314.725.8788 13 Dogwood Energy, LLC FOR: 14 TODD J. JACOBS, Attorney at Law DEAN COOPER, Attorney at Law 15 3420 Broadway 16 Kansas City, MO 64111 816.360.5976 17 Southern Union Company d/b/a Missouri Gas Energy FOR: 18 THOMAS R. SCHWARZ, JR., Attorney at Law 19 Blitz, Bardgett & Deutsch 308 E. High Jefferson City, MO 65101 20 573.634.2500 21 For: Missouri Retailers Association 22 MARK W. COMLEY, Attorney at Law Newman, Comley & Ruth, PC 23 601 Monroe Street, Suite 301 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0537 24 573.634.2266 FOR: City of Kansas City 25

1 MARK W. COMLEY, Attorney at Law Newman, Comley & Ruth, PC 2 601 Monroe Street, Suite 301 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0537 3 573.634.2266 FOR: City of Lee's Summit 4 5 MICHAEL TRIPP, Attorney at Law Smith Lewis, LLP 6 111 S. 9th Street Columbia, MO 65201 7 573.443.3141 FOR: Ameren Missouri 8 9 JAMES SWEARENGEN, Attorney at Law RUSS MITTEN, Attorney at Law DIANA C. CARTER, Attorney at Law 10 Brydon, Swearengen & England 11 312 E. Capitol Avenue P.O. Box 456 12 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0456 573.635.0427 13 FOR: The Empire District Electric Company 14 ARTHUR PERRY BRUDER, Attorney at Law 15 1000 Independence Avenue, SW Washington D.C. 20585 16 202.586.3409 FOR: U.S. Department of Energy 17 18 JAMES FISCHER, Attorney at Law LARRY DORITY, Attorney at Law Fischer & Dority, P.C. 19 101 Madison Street, Suite 400 20 Jefferson City, MO 65101 573.636.6758 21 FOR: Kansas City Power & Light Company 22 23 24 25

1 HEATHER A. HUMPHREY, Attorney at Law ROGER STEINER, Attorney at Law 2 Kansas City Power & Light Company P.O. Box 418679 3 Kansas City, MO 64141-9679 816.556.2314 FOR: Kansas City Power & Light Company 4 5 KARL ZOBRIST, Attorney at Law 6 SUSAN CUNNINGHAM, Attorney at Law SNR Denton US LLP 7 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100 Kansas City, MO 64111 8 816.460.2400 FOR: Kansas City Power & Light Company 9 10 CHARLES HATFIELD, Attorney at Law Stinson Morrison Hecker, LLP 11 230 W. McCarty Street Jefferson City, MO 65101 12 573.636.6263 FOR: Kansas City Power & Light Company 13 GLENDA CAFER, Attorney at Law 14 Cafer Law Office, LLC 15 3321 Southwest Sixth Street торека, кs 66606 16 785.271.9991 FOR: Kansas City Power & Light Company 17 MICHAEL AMASH, Attorney at Law 18 Blake and Uhlig PA 19 753 State Ave., 475 Kansas City, KS 66101 20 913.321.8884 IBEW Locals 412, 1613 and 1464 FOR: 21 22 WILLIAM STEINMEIER, Attorney at Law William D. Steinmeier PC 23 P.O. Box 104595 Jefferson City, MO 65110-4595 24 573.659.8672 The City of St. Joseph, Missouri FOR: 25

```
1
   CAPT. SHAYLA MCNEILL, Attorney at Law
        United States Air Force
 2
        119 Sugar Sand Lane
        Santa Rosa Beach, FL 32459
 3
         312.371.2673
    FOR: The Federal Executive Agencies
 4
 5
   SARAH MANGELSDORF, Attorney at Law
        P.O. Box 899
 6
        Jefferson City, MO 63130
        573.751.0052
 7
    FOR: Missouri Department of Natural Resources
 8
   JOHN R. KINDSCHUH, Attorney at Law
 9
        Bryan Cave LLP
        13220 Metcalf, Suite 320
10
        Overland Park, KS 66213
        913.338.7700
11
    FOR: MIEC and FORD
12
   JOHN B. COFFMAN, Attorney at Law
        John B. Coffman, LLC
13
        871 Tuxedo Boulevard
        St. Louis, MO 63119
14
         314.395.8002
15
    FOR: AARP and Consumers Council of Missouri
16
   ROBERT WAGNER
17
          Robert Wagner
    FOR:
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 STEVE DOTTHEIM, Chief Deputy Counsel NATHAN WILLIAMS, Deputy Counsel JAIME OTT, Legal Counsel 2 KEVIN THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel 3 JENNIFER HERNANDEZ, Legal Counsel SARAH KLIETHERMES, Legal Counsel ERIC DEARMONT, Legal Counsel 4 ANNETTE SLACK, Legal Counsel 5 MEGHAN MCCLOWERY, Legal Counsel Public Service Commission 200 Madison Street 6 P.O. Box 309 7 Jefferson City, MO 65102 573.751.6514 FOR: The Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission 8 9 LEWIS MILLS Office of Public Counsel 200 Madison Street 10 P.O. Box 2230 11 Jefferson City, MO 65102 12 FOR: Office of Public Counsel 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Г

1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Good morning. We are on the
2	record. It is about 8:45 a.m. I believe we are on Friday,
3	January 21st, and I think, as we left it last night,
4	Mr. Giles would be the next witness. He is on the stand, and
5	I will administer an oath here in just a moment.
6	Is there anything from counsel before we move
7	on to Mr. Giles?
8	MS. OTT: Staff would just like to offer
9	Exhibit 250.
10	MR. FISCHER: No objection.
11	JUDGE PRIDGIN: 250, and that's HC. That's
12	been offered. I hear no objection. It is admitted.
13	(Exhibit No. 250 was received into evidence.
14	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Anything further from counsel
15	before Mr. Giles is sworn? All right.
16	(The witness was sworn.)
17	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you very much, sir. If
18	you would, please have a seat. And, Mr. Fischer, anything
19	before he stands cross?
20	MR. FISCHER: Yes, Judge.
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	QUESTIONS BY MR. FISCHER:
23	Q. Mr. Giles, would you state your name and
24	address for the record?
25	A. Chris Giles, G-i-l-e-s, 1200 Main Street,

1 Kansas City, Missouri. 2 Are you the same Chris Giles that caused to be **Q**. 3 filed in this case direct and rebuttal testimony? Yes. 4 Α. 5 For just your information, your direct has 0. been marked as 24-HC and -NP and your rebuttal 25-HC and -NP. 6 7 Do you have any corrections or changes you need to make to your testimony or exhibits? 8 9 Α. NO. 10 Q. If I were to ask you the questions that are 11 contained in your pretrial testimony today, would your 12 answers be the same? 13 Yes. Α. 14 And are they true and correct to the best of **Q**. 15 your knowledge and belief? 16 Α. Yes. 17 And do your attached exhibits accurately 0. depict what they're intended to show? 18 19 Α. They do. 20 MR. FISCHER: Judge, I'd move for the 21 admission of KCP&L Exhibit 24-HC and -NP and Exhibit 25-HC 22 and -NP and tender the witness for cross. 23 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any objections? Hearing none, KCP&L 24 and 25, both NP and HC, are admitted. 24 Before we proceed to cross, just while I'm thinking of it, 25

Г

1	Commissioners Kenney and Gunn are participating from the
2	St. Louis office, and so you may occasionally see them on
3	your screen, and there may be a bit of a delay if they ask
4	questions or say something, so I apologize.
5	We will work through that, and I apologize for
6	the technological problems we had this morning. I believe
7	we're all squared away. I think we'll be fine. We may just
8	have a little bit of a delay if they speak, so try to be
9	patient, and we'll work with that.
10	All right. Let me see who has
11	cross-examination. Ms. Ott, I assume you will?
12	MS. OTT: Yes.
13	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Mills?
14	MR. MILLS: A little bit.
15	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Schwarz?
16	MR. SCHWARZ: No.
17	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Mills, to you, sir.
18	CROSS-EXAMINATION
19	QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLS:
20	Q. Mr. Giles, let me give you a hypothetical
21	about a construction situation in a change order.
22	Hypothetically speaking, say the design drawings prepared by
23	Burns & Mc put a particular component in upside down. When
24	you get to the field, the component is installed according to
25	the drawings; later on someone realizes that's upside down.

1 would a change order be issued to correct that 2 if the component needed to be put in the right way? 3 My response would be I think so, but those are Α. questions best for Mr. Archibald. 4 5 Okay. And really -- okay. So let's assume Q. that it would be issued for a situation like that. 6 7 Under those circumstances, would it be prudent for KCP&L to put the component in the right way? 8 9 I'm not linking your two questions. Α. 10 **Q**. Okay. Assuming that the component is 11 important and it needs to be put in the right way to work, 12 would it be prudent for KCP&L to issue a change order to make sure that component is put in the right way? 13 14 Α. Yes. 15 would it be reasonable for ratepayers to pay 0. the cost of that correction? 16 17 Yes. Α. 18 Why is that? Q. well, no construction project is perfect. 19 Α. Ι 20 mean, there will be errors, there will be omissions, and as long as those errors and omissions aren't prudent -- or 21 22 imprudent, it's part of the project. 23 Okay. Let me take that hypothetical a bit 0. further. Let's assume that it was an unreasonable mistake 24 25 for that component to be drawn in wrong, it was just a

Г

1	bone-headed mov	ve, nobody somebody was way too tired,
2	working way too	o hard would have ever made that mistake (sic).
3		Does that change your answer any?
4	Α.	No.
5	Q.	Okay.
6		MR. MILLS: No further questions.
7		JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Mills, thank you.
8	Ms. Ott?	
9		CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	QUESTIONS BY M	S. OTT:
11	Q.	Good morning, Mr. Giles.
12	Α.	Good morning.
13	Q.	Have you had any formal training in project
14	management?	
15	Α.	NO.
16	Q.	How about formal training in project cost
17	management?	
18	Α.	I have an MBA degree, and my concentration was
19	accounting and	cost control, so I have an education
20	background. I	've not worked as a cost engineer, cost auditor
21	or anything of	that nature.
22	Q.	Do you have any formal training with project
23	integration?	
24	Α.	No.
25	Q.	Project scope management?

Г

1	A. Are you referring to project as in a
2	construction project or any type of project?
3	Q. Any type of project.
4	A. I have years of experience as a manager,
5	director, and officer of KCP&L where I've been involved in
6	many projects that I would have managed the project.
7	Q. So it would be your work experience that's
8	your formal training?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Do you have any formal training in project
11	scope management related to construction?
12	A. NO.
13	Q. Do you have formal training in project time
14	management?
15	A. Are you referring to construction or projects
16	in general?
17	Q. How about construction?
18	A. NO.
19	Q. Do you have formal training related to
20	construction in project quality management?
21	A. NO.
22	Q. How about formal training in construction
23	related to project procurement management?
24	A. NO.
25	Q. And formal training with related to

1	construction in project risk management?
2	A. NO.
3	Q. Are you a project management professional?
4	A. NO.
5	Q. Are you an expert on matters related to
6	auditing?
7	A. I have 35 years experience with Kansas City
8	Power & Light Company related to rate case audits and
9	prudence audits. I don't know that that would qualify me as
10	an expert, but I have significant experience with them.
11	Q. Have you ever done a completed an audit?
12	A. No. As I mentioned before, I've never worked
13	as an auditor.
14	Q. Okay. So are you an expert in cost
15	accounting?
16	A. I have a background in cost accounting. I
17	don't know how to quantify myself as an expert or not.
18	Q. Are you an expert in cost engineering?
19	A. NO.
20	Q. Are you a professional engineer?
21	A. I am not.
22	Q. And are you a certified public accountant?
23	A. NO.
24	Q. And from reading your background, your
25	undergraduate degree is in economics?

r	EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011
1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And you said you hadn't performed an audit,
3	but I think we were talking about rate cases. Have you ever
4	performed a construction audit?
5	A. No. As I stated earlier, I have extensive
6	experience with prudence audits and rate case audits, but I
7	have never worked as an auditor.
8	Q. Now, you stated you have been on different
9	rate cases throughout your tenure at KCP&L.
10	Are you familiar with the term cost of service
11	versus rate design used in a rate case?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. What does cost of service mean to you?
14	A. Exactly what it states. It's the cost to
15	serve customers.
16	Q. And what does rate design mean to you?
17	A. Rate design is the tariffs or pricing that
18	would reflect the cost of service.
19	Q. And in your experience with rate cases here at
20	the Missouri Public Service Commission, have you ever filed
21	pre-filed testimony in rate cases?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. And what area did you primarily serve as a
24	witness in?
25	A. I have served in many different areas over my

1 career. 2 Which was your primary? Were you more of a --**Q**. 3 did you do rate design or cost of service? Both. 4 Α. 5 which one did you primarily do? Q. There was not a primary role for me in those. 6 Α. I was manager, director, senior director and vice-president 7 of regulatory affairs during my career, and I've testified on 8 a variety of issues, including cost of service, allocations, 9 specific issues related to adjustments by Staff, rate design, 10 11 a number of topics. 12 Q. Okay. What type of revenue requirement issues did you file testimony on in the ER-2009-0089 case? 13 I don't recall. 14 Α. 15 In this current rate case, what revenue 0. requirement issues did you file testimony on? 16 17 I am totally -- my testimony, both my direct Α. and my rebuttal testimony, are related to the prudent 18 19 decisions of the Iatan 1 and 2 projects. 20 **Q**. Do you remember any of your testimony from the 21 ER-2009-0089 case, what subject matters you would have 22 provided testimony on? 23 I would be the policy witness for the company, Α. including regulatory. So my overall testimony would have 24 25 covered just about every topic in the case.

1 Did you file specifically related to rate Q. 2 design? 3 I don't believe so. I believe Mr. Rush did. Α. Throughout the past few days, there's been 4 0. 5 some testimony that KCP&L had requested Mr. Henderson and Mr. Schallenberg to participate in some of the activities 6 7 regarding to the Iatan project. Do you recall such testimony? 8 9 Α. I sure do. 10 **Q**. Okay. Did you hear that Mr. Blanc testified 11 that you and Mr. Downey requested Mr. Henderson and 12 Mr. Schallenberg to participate in the cost -- the cost of reforecast of Iatan? 13 I don't believe -- I wouldn't characterize it 14 Α. as we requested. We offered. 15 Offered? 16 **Q**. 17 To have the Staff participate, observe, learn Α. everything they could about what we were doing and how we 18 19 were doing it on the reforecast. 20 MS. OTT: Okay. I'd like to have an exhibit marked, so I guess we'd be at 251, and it is a chain of 21 22 e-mails from -- the initial one was started on February 26th, 23 2008. 24 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Ott, I have as 251 a PEP, so I believe this would be 252. 25

Г

1	MS. OTT: Oh, which one was 251?
2	MR. SCHWARZ: The PEP.
3	JUDGE PRIDGIN: The project execution plan, I
4	believe, was offered yesterday as 251. This would be 252.
5	Does counsel agree? Maybe my notes are wrong. Does that
6	sound right? We'll go with 252.
7	(Exhibit No. 252 was marked for identification
8	by the Court Reporter.)
9	BY MS. OTT:
10	Q. Okay. When you read the first e-mail that was
11	sent from Wess Henderson to both you and Mr. Downey, it seems
12	to be a verification of a phone call that you had with
13	Mr. Dottheim and Mr. Wess Henderson. Do you see that?
14	A. I do.
15	Q. Okay. Do you see Mr. Schallenberg's name
16	anywhere in this e-mail?
17	A. Not in if you're referring to the one on
18	the bottom of the page from Wess Henderson is that
19	correct?
20	Q. That's correct.
21	A. No, I don't see Mr. Schallenberg's name on
22	this particular e-mail.
23	Q. Do you know why Mr. Schallenberg wouldn't have
24	participated in that phone call?
25	A. I do not.
l	

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 Do you see Mr. Elliott's name? Q. 2 NO. Α. 3 Do you know why Mr. Elliott wasn't requested 0. to be in on that phone call? 4 5 Α. NO. 6 Is this about the time when Mr. Elliott was Ο. 7 making site visits? Mr. Elliott had started site visits long 8 Α. before this date. 9 Okay. Wouldn't you think Mr. Elliott would be 10 Q. involved in the reforecast if he was on site? 11 12 we already had discussed this with Α. He knew about it. 13 Mr. Elliott. And when did you discuss that with 14 Q. Mr. Elliott? 15 16 As soon as the reforecast process began. Α. And what's that date? 17 0. 18 It would have been in the last quarter, Α. perhaps even the spring of 2007. So Mr. Elliott had started 19 his work at site early in '07. Continuing discussions with 20 21 Mr. Elliott on his routine visits, we would have told him we 22 were about to conduct a reforecast. So Mr. Elliott was well 23 aware of what the company was doing. So if Mr. Elliott was aware, wouldn't it be 24 **Q**. important for him to be on the phone call with Mr. Dottheim 25

1 and Mr. Henderson regarding the reforecast? 2 Α. NO. 3 Now, your response to Mr. Henderson, you 0. mention that this is nothing more than KCP&L's continued 4 5 attempt to be transparent regarding the design, construction and schedule of the projects. Do you see that? 6 7 I do. Α. Okay. Do you believe KCP&L has been as 8 Q. transparent as possible regarding this Iatan project? 9 10 Α. Absolutely. No question. 11 Q. Are you familiar with documents being withheld 12 based on attorney-client privilege? I am aware there are documents withheld based 13 Α. on attorney-client privilege, but none of those documents 14 15 have anything to do with any item that Staff would need to conduct its audit. None of those documents relate to any of 16 17 the cost control system or any documents related to KCP&L's identification and explanation of cost overruns. 18 19 Q. If you've never done a construction audit, how do you know what documents Staff needs to conduct its 20 21 construction audit in prudence review? 22 It's common sense. Α. Now, are you familiar that restrictions were 23 0. placed on R and Os at a point in the audit? 24 No, I'm not aware of that. 25 Α.

1 You were not aware that they were only Q. 2 viewable on site? 3 I'm not aware of that, no. Α. Let's go back to this e-mail. Now, you 4 0. Okav. 5 responded to Mr. Henderson's e-mail on April 7th, 2008. That's a good month after -- oh, he sent it on the 26th of 6 7 February, and then you responded on the 4th of March of 2008, and then Mr. Henderson responded to you on April 7th, 2008. 8 Did you ever respond to Mr. Henderson's 9 request that you set up a meeting involving KCP&L, the KCP 10 staff and the Missouri Public Service Commission? 11 12 Α. Are you referring to --The top e-mail here. 13 Q. 14 The top e-mail? Α. 15 He's asked for dates for you and other 0. appropriate KCP&L to be available to have this meeting on 16 17 reforecast. I don't believe we had a meeting. I believe 18 Α. we covered it in a phone call. 19 20 Q. Do you have any documentation that you 21 responded to Mr. Henderson's April 7th, 2008, e-mail? 22 Like I said, I believe it was in a phone Α. NO. 23 call. when was that phone call? 24 Q. 25 I don't recall. Α.

,	EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011
1	Q. Do you know who was on the phone call?
2	A. I don't.
3	Q. So you don't remember anything about this
4	phone call?
5	A. Well, it was clear to me, after the response
6	from Mr. Henderson, that the Staff really had no interest in
7	attending these meetings. I would have followed that up
8	either with a call to Mr. Henderson or to Mr. Schallenberg
9	and, in fact, I didn't discover until the hearing in April of
10	2009 when we had a what we called a mini hearing on cost
11	control system and discovery request, Mr. Dottheim in that
12	hearing mentioned that
13	Q. Is this related to that phone call you're
14	talking about?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. This conversation happened on your phone call
17	that you don't recall happening?
18	A. NO.
19	Q. You don't recall who was on the call?
20	A. I'm just pointing out that Mr. Dottheim said
21	the Staff felt co-opted, whatever that meant.
22	MR. FISCHER: Judge, I would ask for the
23	witness to be allowed to answer the question that was on the
24	table.
25	MS. OTT: I don't believe his question was

1 responsive. He was going on to finding out something later, 2 and I was directly asking about a phone call. 3 JUDGE PRIDGIN: You can re-ask your question, Ms. Ott. 4 5 BY MS. OTT: 6 So you said you don't recall who's on the Q. 7 phone call, you don't remember the phone call, but now you remember Mr. Dottheim was on the phone call? 8 No, I didn't say that. 9 Α. 10 **Q**. Okay. Well --11 I never got a good explanation in my mind of Α. 12 why Staff declined our offer. And what I was about to explain to you was that I found that answer in the April 2009 13 hearing when Mr. Dottheim, along this same line of 14 15 questioning, indicated the Staff felt co-opted from doing that with KCP&L. 16 17 But doesn't Mr. Henderson here request to set 0. 18 up a meeting? He does. 19 Α. 20 Regarding the reforecast? Q. 21 He wanted to know what we had in mind. Α. Yes. 22 Thank you. Now, in your response you say, Q. 23 "Our expert consultants have indicated it's normal to have a reforecast at 70 percent." 24 25 who are those expert consultants you're

1	referring to i	n this e-mail?
2	Α.	Mr. Dan Meyer.
3	Q.	Only Mr. Meyer?
4	Α.	Mr. Meyer, his Staff, other members of the
5	Schiff Hardin	team.
6	Q.	Now, did Mr. Price initiate the reforecast?
7	Α.	No.
8	Q.	was the reforecast completed before
9	Mr. Price's de	parture from KCP&L?
10	Α.	No, I don't believe it was.
11	Q.	And who was Mr. Price?
12	Α.	Mr. Price was vice-president of construction.
13	Q.	And do you know when he left?
14	Α.	I believe he left in roughly the first quarter
15	of 2008.	
16	Q.	Okay. I'm going to go back to the
17	transparency c	of material.
18		Now, you stated that they've withheld
19	information th	at they believe they being KCP&L and GMO
20	that Staff doe	esn't need to conduct their construction and
21	prudence revie	w. Is it your understanding that KCP&L must or
22	is required to	withhold these documents?
23	Α.	I'm not an attorney. I don't know.
24	Q.	Have you reviewed all of the documents in
25	which KCP&L's	withheld from the Staff?

1 NO. Α. 2 So how do you know Staff doesn't need the Q. 3 documents to conduct its audit? I am very familiar with the cost control 4 Α. 5 system, the documents contained within that system, and I 6 have reviewed most all of those documents. I'm well aware of what is there, what would be needed to do an audit in a 7 prudence review. And in my 35 years's experience with KCP&L, 8 KCP&L not only provided explanations of cost overruns, KCP&L 9 provided every decision, every document, every justification 10 11 for every dollar spent on that project. Staff got more than 12 they bargained for. who makes the decision to withhold the 13 Ο. information from Staff? 14 15 KCP&L attorneys. Α. 16 which attorneys? Q. 17 It could be any one of KCP&L's attorneys on Α. It could be Roger Steiner, it could be Heather 18 staff. Humphrey, Bill Riggins, any of our outside counsel. 19 20 Primarily, it's KCP&L attorneys. 21 would any Schiff Hardin attorneys make the Q. 22 decision to withhold information? 23 Schiff Hardin attorneys may recommend Α. Schiff Hardin does not make decisions for Kansas 24 decisions. 25 City Power & Light.

1 Do you know if they made any recommendations Q. 2 to withhold information? 3 Yes, I'm sure they did. Α. I'm going to show you a document. I'm sorry, 4 0. I only have one copy of this one. I'm going to hand you a 5 letter that was actually from Ms. Schatz to me, accompanied 6 with some invoices from Staff data requests 411 and 413. 7 Ι want you to take a look at that. 8 And in response to a Staff data request that 9 10 is attached behind, is the majority of that document 11 redacted? 12 Α. Appears so, yes. And everything but basically the memo and the 13 Q. intro is blacked out? 14 15 Α. Yes. Do you believe that's being transparent? 16 Q. 17 well, as I -- this particular document, as I Α. indicated earlier, has nothing to do with Staff's audit. 18 Isn't this --19 Q. 20 would not impact them whatsoever. Α. 21 This particular document is related to Q. 22 Schiff's scope of services? 23 That's correct. Α. And if Staff's reviewing the prudency of a 24 **Q**. 25 \$20 million expenditure towards the project, don't you think

Γ

1	that being transparent on the scope of their service would be
2	necessary for Staff to review?
3	A. There were other documents that Staff reviewed
4	that indicated their scope of service. I don't know
5	particularly why that one was deemed attorney-client.
6	Q. Now, do you recall that Staff was inquiring
7	into some gifts being given by vendors at the Iatan site?
8	A. I am aware of, at a minimum, 25 data requests
9	related in some way, some form to gifts and gratuities.
10	Q. Okay. And did you indicate that those
11	there weren't gifts weren't being offered?
12	A. Could you rephrase your question?
13	Q. Did you indicate that gifts were not being
14	offered from vendors at the Iatan site?
15	A. NO.
16	Q. Were you ever offered gifts?
17	A. No. I believe the response to all of those
18	questions because we repeatedly got the questions and we
19	repeatedly answered in the same manner it's against
20	KCP&L's policy to accept gifts other than gifts and
21	gratuities of nominal value. And we responded to all of
22	those data requests consistently and continuously.
23	Q. How do you define "nominal value?"
24	A. It's a nominal value. There's no set dollar
25	limit on it in the policy.

Г

1	Q. Okay. So is it nominal value in relation to a
2	particular individual? Because something nominal to me may
3	not be nominal to you.
4	A. No, it's not a particular individual.
5	Q. So if there's no set dollar value on what is
6	nominal, how does somebody know if they're receiving a gift
7	that is nominal or not?
8	A. Well, if there's any question, one would go to
9	their supervisor and say, I've been offered this, is this
10	nominal value? Would you consider this to be more than a
11	nominal value? Do I need your approval for this particular
12	item?
13	I can provide you examples. I've worked for
14	the company for 35 years. It's never been an issue to me
15	and of what is nominal value. Have I attended baseball
16	games with tickets provided by vendors? Yes. Have I gone to
17	Salt Lake City to attend the Winter Olympics? No.
18	Q. So you've accepted baseball tickets or tickets
19	of some sort?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. From vendors?
22	A. It was not, I might add, directly from a
23	vendor. It was an employee of the company who got the
24	tickets from a vendor, and the vendor didn't attend the ball
25	game. But that's what I would consider of nominal value.

Г

1	Q.	Do you remember what type of seats you had at
2	that game?	
3	Α.	Regular baseball ticket seats.
4	Q.	Was it a Royals game?
5	Α.	I have attended Royals games, yes.
6	Q.	Was that particular gift a Royals game?
7	Α.	Yes. My example was
8	Q.	It might make a difference of nominal value or
9	not.	
10	Α.	And I might add, it's infrequent. I've
11	probably attended events sponsored by someone other than the	
12	company, in 35	years, three times.
13	Q.	So why do you accept the nominal gifts or what
14	you deem as nor	ninal?
15	Α.	why?
16	Q.	Yes.
17	Α.	There's no reason not to.
18	Q.	Now, you were an employee of KCP&L in its last
19	rate case, ER-2	2009-0089?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	when did you leave KCP&L?
22	Α.	The end of June 2009.
23	Q.	Now, in that rate case, were you aware that
24	KCP&L had refu	sed to provide Staff information related to
25	Iatan 2?	

1 Α. That's not correct. 2 Did they object to DRs that requested 0. 3 information from Iatan 2? In January of 2009, the Staff submitted the --4 Α. I should say the accounting staff submitted its first set of 5 6 data requests on the Iatan 1 and 2 projects. We received about 150 data requests about 30 days before Staff was to 7 file its testimony in that case. As I indicated, there were 8 150 of them. we had to respond to those fairly quickly. 9 So at the time, KCP&L objected to providing 10 Unit 2 data because we wanted to focus on the Unit 1 data. 11 12 And we wanted Staff to focus on -- as it turns out, Staff pointed out that, hey, you know, we need Unit 2 information 13 because it also impacts common facilities, and we said, yes, 14 you do, and we provided it. 15 Did you ever ask for an extension to provide 16 0. the information on Iatan 2? 17 I don't recall. 18 Α. whose recommendation was it to not allow Staff 19 Q. to have the information related to Iatan 2? 20 21 we -- the initial objection was based on a Α. group discussion. There were several individuals in the 22 23 meeting. were you one of those individuals? 24 Q. 25 I was. Α.

r	EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011		
1	Q. And who else was in that meeting with you?		
2	A. I don't recall. It was a large group.		
3	Q. Can you recall any of the members in that		
4	meeting?		
5	A. NO.		
6	Q. Do you know when that meeting took place?		
7	A. It was shortly after we received the data		
8	request, sometime in January of 2009.		
9	Q. Was it your personal recommendation not to		
10	give the Staff this information?		
11	A. I would have felt comfortable giving them the		
12	information, yes. But I was also concerned that the time it		
13	would take for us to provide Unit 2 data and still meet the		
14	deadline concerned me, so I was more focused on let's get		
15	them the Unit 1 information, we can follow-up with Unit 2.		
16	Q. Do you know what grounds the objection to		
17	provide that information was on?		
18	A. I don't.		
19	Q. If I handed you a copy of one of the DRs,		
20	would it refresh your memory?		
21	A. I would imagine.		
22	Q. And isn't the objection relevance? Is the		
23	objection relevance?		
24	A. I don't follow your question.		
25	Q. The objection is: "KCP&L objects to this data		

request to the extent it calls for information pertaining to
 Iatan 2 and, therefore, seeks discovery of the information
 which is irrelevant, immaterial, and inadmissible." Do you
 see that?

A. I do.

5

25

Q. So KCP&L didn't believe it was relevant at7 that point for Staff to audit Iatan 2?

A. It was not relevant in -- as I stated earlier, 9 when KCP&L first objected to this particular request, the 10 rate case we were involved in was the Unit 1 rate case. So 11 Unit 2 data was not relevant to the Unit 1 rate case. That 12 was the basis for the objection.

Subsequently, we realized that was incorrect because common facilities also were part of the Unit 1 rate case, and we provided the data. It did not impact the Unit 1 rate case whatsoever, nor has it impacted this case whatsoever.

18 Q. When did you realize that the information was 19 relevant?

A. It was very shortly after we submitted it. I
would say probably -- it may have even been sooner than we
filed -- than Staff filed their testimony.

Q. Was that after Staff contacted KCP&L to obtainthe information?

A. No, I don't believe so. We -- we had

1	initially thought that all the common facilities were	
2	budgeted separately in the Unit 1 budget and the Unit 2	
3	budget so that each unit would have separate common	
4	facilities in those budgets. It was right about this time we	
5	discovered that it was incorrect that there was not a budget	
6	for common associated with each unit.	

7 In fact, the contracts, the way they were let and the way the work progressed, there was no distinction of 8 9 common at all. So we had to at that point, say, well, we've 10 got to figure out how to allocate actual cost to common. SO 11 that was right around the February 2009 time frame, and we 12 worked -- and we notified Staff of that. We gave them the information, and we worked through that process with Staff 13 over the next three to four months. 14

Q. So it was in February of 2009 when you realized it was relevant for Staff to have information to have Iatan 2; did I get that correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 MR. FISCHER: Judge, I think I'm going to 20 object to this line of questioning at this point. We're 21 talking about a previous rate case, and the Commission has 22 already ruled on this specific issue finding that the KCP&L 23 did not unreasonably conduct its discovery or the discovery processes that KCP&L used were not unreasonable, and it seems 24 like we're plowing old ground that we've now plowed in a 25

1 previous rate case and in the 259 case. 2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. Ms. Ott? 3 MS. OTT: This information is going to the There is testimony throughout Mr. Giles's 4 transparency. 5 direct and rebuttal testimony that they had been transparent. This clearly shows at one point they were withholding 6 information. I'm actually done with this line of 7 questioning. 8 We can move on. MR. FISCHER: I would say the Commission has 9 10 already ruled on that specific issue and found the company 11 was not unreasonable, Judge. 12 MS. OTT: This isn't going to reasonableness. 13 It's going to transparency. JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'll overrule. Ms. Ott? 14 15 BY MS. OTT: Did you ever review the Schiff Hardin invoices 16 0. 17 in 2008 that were provided to Staff? I did not review the Schiff Hardin invoices on 18 Α. 19 a routine basis. There was a period of time where Staff had 20 requested actual receipts for Schiff Hardin expenses for two 21 months. I believe those two months were February, March of 22 2009. 23 I reviewed each of those, and based upon my review. I found nothing unreasonable or inappropriate, so I 24 passed them along to Staff. 25

Г

1	Q. So wait, I just want to make sure I you		
2	said you reviewed only February and March of 2009 invoices?		
3	A. No, actual receipts that ties to the invoices.		
4	I did not review the invoices for services. I reviewed		
5	expense receipts for those two months. That's the extent of		
6	my review.		
7	Q. So do you believe providing Staff with		
8	redacted invoices is being fully transparent?		
9	A. I have not seen the invoices you're referring		
10	to, so I can't answer that question.		
11	Q. If I showed you an invoice that's redacted,		
12	could you give an opinion on it?		
13	A. We'll see.		
14	Q. I'm handing you Schiff Hardin Invoice 1267523		
15	dated June 30th, 2008, to Ms. Lora Cheatum.		
16	Now, is there any information, descriptive		
17	information available on these invoices other than the date,		
18	the name, the position and the hours worked?		
19	A. I can't tell just from glancing at this		
20	what what some of these numbers are, but it appears that		
21	you're correct.		
22	Q. So there's actually no no information		
23	contained within it that describes what duties these Schiff		
24	Hardin employees performed?		
25	A. Well, based on the first page, it appears that		

1 they have only redacted their legal work, but I can't tell 2 for sure. 3 Now, were you in the room yesterday when 0. Mr. Davis said Schiff provided more than legal work? 4 5 Α. Yes, I was. 6 Do they provide separate invoices for their Ο. 7 legal and non-legal work? I don't know. I'm not familiar with Schiff 8 Α. 9 invoices. 10 **Q**. would you agree the entire document, majority of it is blacked out? 11 12 There is a substantial amount of redaction, Α. 13 yes. Now, if you go to actually the -- after the 14 Q. 15 first page, after the cover sheet, the second entry, it's on April 1st, 2008, and there's project control analyst, Eric 16 17 Gould; do you see that? I do. 18 Α. 19 Q. And Mr. Gould, he does not provide legal 20 services? 21 That's correct. Α. 22 And the information pertaining to what job he Q. 23 did is redacted? That's correct. 24 Α. 25 Thank you. Do you know who Carl Morano is? Q.

Г

1	Α.	I believe Mr. Morano was at one time an	
2	auditor for Er	nst & Young. That's the extent of my knowledge	
3	of Mr. Morano.		
4	Q.	Are you aware of any work that Mr. Morano	
5	would have don	e for the Iatan project?	
6	Α.	No.	
7	Q.	Did you review the Alstom contract audit?	
8	Α.	I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.	
9	Q.	I said did you review the Alstom contract	
10	audit?		
11	Α.	I did.	
12	Q.	Did Mr. Morano perform that audit?	
13	Α.	I don't know.	
14	Q.	Do you know if KCP&L was required to approve	
15	Schiff's annual labor rate increases?		
16	Α.	I don't know.	
17	Q.	Did you ever read the Schiff KCP&L contract?	
18	Α.	I believe I did at some point.	
19	Q.	So you don't remember from that contract	
20	whether or not	KCP&L was required to approve any labor	
21	increases?		
22	Α.	NO.	
23	Q.	Do you know if Schiff ever requested an	
24	increase for labor?		
25	Α.	I don't know any details regarding the Schiff	
1 Hardin billing or invoices other than what I testified to 2 earlier, my review of two months of expense receipts in 2009. 3 Do you recall a meeting with Staff regarding 0. mileage of Burns & Mc employees? 4 5 I have met with Staff several times. I know Α. there were some questions Staff had regarding mileage. 6 7 So you remember discussing that with Staff? Q. I do. 8 Α. Do you remember stating that if it was up to 9 Q. 10 you, you would give Staff the information KCP&L was 11 withholding? 12 Α. I don't know what you're referring to. Related to the mileage of Burns & 13 Q. 14 Mc employees. 15 Again, I don't know what you're referring to. Α. You'll need to be more specific. 16 17 Do you ever remember making a statement to 0. Staff that you would provide Staff the information KCP&L was 18 withholding, any of the information? 19 20 Α. withholding regarding what? I can't follow 21 you. You'll have to give me a little more. 22 withholding documents, not providing Staff Q. with documents, do you ever recall making that statement to 23 Staff? 24 Without a little more specificity, I cannot 25 Α.

1 answer your question. So you never remember telling staff you would 2 **Q**. 3 provide information, if it was up to you, that KCP&L was withholding or redacting? 4 Absent a better definition of what we were 5 Α. talking about, no, I cannot answer that. I don't know. 6 7 Did you review the data KCP&L provided to Q. Mr. Dave Elliott? 8 9 Α. NO. 10 **Q**. Do you know if KCP&L ever objected to 11 providing information to Mr. Elliott? 12 Α. Not that I'm aware of. Did they ever provide Mr. Elliott with 13 Q. redacted information? 14 15 I don't believe any information Mr. Elliott Α. ever requested was attorney-client privilege. I can't say 16 17 for sure, but I'm not aware of any attorney-client information Mr. Elliott requested. 18 So any invoice Mr. Elliott would have reviewed 19 Q. 20 wouldn't have been attorney-client privilege, there would 21 have been no information redacted based on that ground? 22 Could you restate that? Α. 23 So would Mr. -- was Mr. Elliott provided 0. invoices? 24 25 I'm sure he was. Α.

Г

1	Q. Okay. And any of that information in those				
2	invoices, they wouldn't have been redacted; is that what				
3	you're stating?				
4	A. That's correct.				
5	Q. Why would that information not be redacted?				
6	A. As I indicated earlier, the only information				
7	that has ever been redacted is what was termed				
8	attorney-client privilege. I'm not aware of any information				
9	Mr. Elliott requested to review that would have been deemed				
10	attorney-client privilege.				
11	Q. Do you remember having a meeting with the				
12	Staff to discuss the May 2008 crane accident?				
13	A. I do.				
14	Q. Do you remember who was present at that				
15	meeting?				
16	A. No, I don't.				
17	Q. Were there attorneys present at that meeting?				
18	A. Yes.				
19	Q. Who would have been the attorney for KCP&L?				
20	A. I don't recall. It could have been any one of				
21	a number of individuals.				
22	Q. Would there have been any Schiff Hardin				
23	attorneys at that meeting?				
24	A. Possibly.				
25	Q. You don't recall, though?				

A. NO.

1

Q. Do you recall indicating to Staff that KCP&L
3 would not be seeking recovery of the rates of the crane
4 accident?

5 There was a -- yes, I do recall. There was a Α. question of -- at that point in time, I believe there was a 6 7 couple -- I can't remember the amount, but there was an amount being accrued or held in case KCP&L had some 8 responsibility or incurred some costs for the crane accident. 9 And my point to Staff was, unless KCP&L actually has to pay 10 11 something, we would not continue to have that accrual, and it 12 would not be charged to customers.

Q. And is that what you stated to Staff duringthat meeting?

A. Yeah. My -- yes, my -- my thought process was and what I was trying to convey to Staff was that if we don't incur any costs, which I didn't think we would because it was definitely not KCP&L's fault, obviously, customers wouldn't be billed for that.

Q. And were you in the room yesterday when
Mr. Davis read some of his testimony from the acquisition
case that stated that KCP&L was not liable for the crane?
A. Yes, I was here.

Q. And do you agree with that statement that hemade -- that he read?

1 Α. That's my understanding, yes. You stated -- are you a consultant for KCP&L 2 Q. 3 or a contractor? I'm a consultant. 4 Α. 5 How much are you being paid per hour? Q. 6 \$200 an hour. Α. 7 Do you have any other payment in addition to Q. that, such as a retainer? 8 \$2,500 a month. 9 Α. Plus -- so that's in addition to your \$200 an 10 **Q**. 11 hour? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Are you required to work a certain amount a Q. month to reach that \$2,500 a month retainer? 14 15 NO. Α. Are you receiving a pension from KCP&L? 16 Q. 17 Α. NO. will you be receiving a pension one day? 18 Q. 19 Α. I have received my pension. And how much was that? 20 Q. 21 MR. FISCHER: Judge, I think I'm going to 22 object to this line of questioning. I think it may be 23 relevant to some Staff adjustment, but it seems like it ought to be in-camera, if nothing else, and this seems to be 24 25 irrelevant, really, to the real issues in this case.

Γ

1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Ott?
2	MS. OTT: I believe there is testimony that is
3	taking Mr. Giles's payment out of the rate case and
4	there's and I'm more than happy to go in-camera to have
5	this discussion if we're getting into highly confidential
6	information.
7	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. If it pertains to
8	something that's being litigated in rates, I mean, I'll
9	overrule, we'll go in-camera. Hold on just a moment.
10	MR. FISCHER: Judge, I would also object to
11	references to his pension. There is nothing in the rate case
12	about taking Mr. Giles's pension out of the case. While the
13	Staff seems to think that they should exclude his current
14	salary, there's nothing about his past performance or any
15	kind of pension payments or any other arrangements in the
16	past that's relevant to this case.
17	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Ms. Ott, any
18	response?
19	MS. OTT: I think this all goes to his
20	compensation and being compensated, possibly, in a way that
21	is viewed as double compensation.
22	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. I'll overrule.
23	I'll give you some leeway.
24	(REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an in-camera
25	session was held, which is contained in Volume 20, pages 1047

1	to 1047 of the transcript.)
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
22	
24	
25	
25	

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

г	EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011
1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: We are back in public session.
2	CHRIS GILES testified as follows:
3	BY MS. OTT:
4	Q. Do you have a contract with KCP&L for your
5	services?
6	A. My contract is actually with an employment
7	group called Next Source.
8	Q. And do they have a contract with KCP&L?
9	A. They do.
10	Q. On average, how many hours a week do you work
11	for KCP&L?
12	A. I have worked about an average of 40 hours a
13	week since I retired.
14	Q. And is that because there's a pending rate
15	case, or is that going to be typical going forward after the
16	completion of this rate case?
17	A. It's primarily been because of this rate case.
18	I have, obviously, a great deal of knowledge of the
19	regulatory plan, the history of the Iatan project, all the
20	way up to when I retired. And I've continued to work on the
21	Iatan project since I retired. So my role has primarily been
22	rate case related, both Kansas and Missouri.
23	Q. Has KCP&L told you what your role is as it
24	relates to interactions with the Staff?
25	A. I have never had a specific instruction one

1 way or another. 2 Has anyone ever suggested what your role Q. 3 should be with its relationship with Staff? Α. 4 NO. 5 How about in meetings, has anybody told you 0. what your role is in relation to meeting with Staff 6 7 personnel? No. My role -- I have never been expressly 8 Α. told what my role -- or if you're getting to the question of 9 what my authority is, I have had the authority to deal with 10 11 Staff in the same manner I always dealt with Staff. 12 Q. So are you allowed to make key decisions for KCP&L? 13 14 You'll have to define better what you mean by Α. "key" decisions. 15 Do you have the authority to make decisions on 16 0. behalf of KCP&L? 17 18 Α. You'll have to be more specific. 19 Q. Do you have authority to make -- to enter into 20 a settlement agreement? 21 I didn't hear you. Α. 22 Do you have authority to enter into a **Q**. settlement agreement? 23 Not without KCP&L's approval, no. 24 Α. 25 Do you have authority to tell other KCP&L Q.

1 witnesses what questions they can or cannot answer to Staff? 2 Are you saying -- you'll have to put that into Α. 3 context. I can't answer. So in a meeting, if a Staff member asked 4 0. 5 another KCP&L employee a question, do you have authority to tell that other KCP&L employee not to answer Staff's 6 7 question? 8 Α. Yes. And who gave you that authority? 9 Q. 10 Α. As I indicated earlier, I have the same level 11 of authority with my relationships with Staff as I had always 12 had at KCP&L. who informed you that when you retired, your 13 0. role was going to be exactly the same when you were -- as a 14 15 contractor? I didn't say it would be exactly the same. 16 Α. Ι 17 said my relationship in dealing with the Commission Staff was the same. 18 But who informed you that your relationship in 19 Q. your role with Staff was going to be the same? 20 21 It was not a specific inform. It was implied, Α. 22 for lack of a better term. That's why I would be in the 23 meetings. I was there representing regulatory in these meetings you're referring to, so that if Staff -- for 24 instance, if Staff were -- we were in a meeting to discuss a 25

Г

1	particular topic, we gathered individuals to address that					
2	topic, and I s	aw that Staff was going beyond the topic, I				
3	definitely had	authority to say that's beyond the scope of				
4	this meeting.	That's why I was in the meeting.				
5	Q.	Was Mr. Blanc in those meetings?				
6	Α.	NO.				
7	Q .	Were any KCP&L attorneys in the meeting?				
8	Α.	I'm sure there were.				
9	Q.	So would you state, then, you have management				
10	authority at K	CP&L?				
11	Α.	NO.				
12	Q.	Do you know if Black & Veatch made a proposal				
13	for an EPC con	tract for Iatan 2?				
14	Α.	They did not.				
15	Q.	I want to show you a document. It's a				
16	presentation m	ade to Mr. Chether, Mr. Downey on				
17	November 23rd,	2005. It's an Iatan 2 project procurement				
18	options. And	on slide 25, there's a negotiated EPC option,				
19	and if you cou	ld read the very first bullet under EPC based				
20	on Black & Vea	tch reference plant.				
21	Α.	Are you referring to just the bullet?				
22	Q.	There. Does it appear that they were making				
23	an EPC on Iata	n 2?				
24	Α.	No.				
25	Q.	Recommendation?				

Γ

1	A. No, absolutely not. The the meeting you're
2	referring to is to be clear I was in this meeting, and
3	we were we had brought Black & Veatch and Burns &
4	McDonnell in to see what the procurement options were, and we
5	were actually looking at both Black & Veatch and Burns &
6	McDonnell as owner's engineer for the for the Iatan 1 and
7	2 projects and when Black & Veatch they both presented
8	various options for how we could proceed with contracts.
9	We had not been able to get a EPC contract or
10	interest in the project and, in fact, Black & Veatch in this
11	particular meeting told us they would not be able to do an
12	EPC contract at that time. They would have to wait one year
13	before they could make such a proposal, and even then, we
14	would not have any cost estimate for an EPC contract.
15	Q. So that slide doesn't say that, "As an example
16	an EPC based on Black & Veatch reference plant and that Black
17	& Veatch has developed an 850-megawatt net supercritical
18	reference plant with a defined cost of 1,100 to 1,300
19	kilowatts, \$2,005"?
20	A. That's what it says. A reference plant
21	Q. So that wasn't
22	A is not an EPC proposal.
23	Q. Then why would EPC be in the heading?
24	A. As I indicated, Black & Veatch was willing to
25	do an EPC contract, but they had they had several

restrictions.			
Q. But they did offer you an EPC proposal?			
A. No, they did not.			
Q. All right. I'll move on.			
A. In order to			
Q. Thank you. I'll take that back.			
Mr. Giles, were you in attendance at a			
presentation to KCP&L for an Iatan 2 expansion project on			
November 8th, 2005, by Black & Veatch?			
A. NO.			
Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to show you a copy of			
their presentation. And in particular, if you go to the			
tabbed page, can I have you read that highlighted section			
well, read the title and the highlighted section into the			
record, the two bullet points.			
A. Okay. You want me to read			
Q. The title and the two bullet points.			
A. "Please refer to our approach section of the			
presentation. Black & Veatch believes in order to have the			
best chance to reach the June 2010 milestone, KCP&L must			
release the engineer to complete any remaining conceptual			
design and to start"			
MR. FISCHER: Judge, can I ask that we go			
in-camera? I think it's probably HC and Mr. Giles is not			
familiar with this document, apparently. He wasn't at the			

1 meeting, but I -- therefore, he can't alert me if it's HC. 2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: I understand. All right. 3 Just a moment. We'll go HC. MR. MILLS: Judge, before we go in-camera, can 4 5 we just have the attorneys review it to see if it is HC? 6 MR. HATFIELD: It's marked HC. 7 MR. MILLS: It appears to be -- I think we've gone in-camera a lot more than we need to, and I'm afraid 8 we're about to do it again. 9 10 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. 11 MR. MILLS: But if the attorneys have reviewed 12 it and they are asserting on the record that it is highly 13 confidential, then I guess I have no choice but to go along. 14 Judge, that document was just MR. FISCHER: 15 handed to me for about two seconds here. Let me take a look 16 at it. Every page is marked highly confidential. I would 17 ask we go in-camera. 18 JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Hearing no objection, just a moment, please. 19 (REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an in-camera 20 21 session was held, which is contained in Volume 20, pages 1055 22 to 1058 of the transcript.) 23 24 25

1		 	
1	1		
2	2		
3	3		
4	4		
5	5		
6	6		
7	7		
8	8		
9	9		
10	0		
11	1		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	5		

			<u> </u>	
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	 	 		

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

1			 <u> </u>	
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				
	•			

Г

1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: We are back in public forum.
2	MR. MILLS: And, Judge, before we proceed, can
3	I get you to ask KCP&L to explain why that entire discussion
4	of preliminary negotiations that never led to anything with a
5	firm that wasn't involved in the project needs to be shielded
6	from the public view?
7	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fischer?
8	MR. FISCHER: Judge, those are clearly
9	sensitive contract negotiations that were occurring with an
10	outside firm that had it marked as confidential information,
11	and they should not be spread on the public record merely
12	because time has passed.
13	MR. MILLS: Judge, the presumption ought to be
14	that everything is public unless there's a necessity to have
15	it kept from the public view. I don't see that anybody will
16	be harmed by keeping that would be harmed by releasing
17	that information, and nothing in Mr. Fischer's explanation
18	has given me any reassurance on that.
19	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. well, I'm not
20	prepared to rule from the bench on that. If that's something
21	you want you know, if you want to challenge the
22	designation of HC, you're welcome to file a motion. I'll
23	give the company a chance to file a response.
24	MR. MILLS: Thank you.
25	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Ott, you can continue.

1 CHRIS GILES testified as follows:

2 BY MS. OTT:

Q. Can you tell me the reason why meeting June 2010 completion date was important for completing the Iatan 2 project?

6 I, in fact, list four reasons in my Α. Yes. 7 testimony. I'd be glad to go through those again. Number 1, costs were heated or the market was heated as other witnesses 8 have testified. We knew, based on what we were already 9 seeing, that the sooner this unit can be completed, procured, 10 11 contracted, the cheaper it was going to be. But every delay 12 was going to simply result in more costs. So that was one 13 reason.

Another reason is we had committed in our regulatory plan to attempt to meet a June 2010 date, and we wanted to meet that commitment, if possible. We needed capacity, both KCP&L and our partners needed the capacity in June of 2010.

And there was one more reason I listed in my testimony I'm trying to recall. Oh, very important reason. The off-systems sales market at that time was, for lack of a better term, booming. The price for off-system sales was substantial, and the off-system sales market would be even further enhanced once Iatan 2 came online. So we saw that the sooner we brought this plant online, the more power we

Г

1	could sell into the market, and that sale of that power into
2	the market would reduce revenue requirement in every rate
3	case going forward.
4	So for all of those reasons, it was a date we
5	wanted to meet, if at all possible, given given
6	consideration for cost and getting it done efficiently.
7	Q. What period does KCP&L consider to be its
8	summer peak load?
9	A. Summer peak can occur any time between June
10	and September, and most all the time and I can't recall
11	maybe early in my career, outside the bounds of July and
12	August, but typically, it's in July or August.
13	Q. Does KCP&L have a summer rate?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. And what is that period in which they're
16	allowed to charge for the summer rate?
17	A. I don't recall.
18	Q. Do you know what the date of KCP&L's system
19	peak was for this past year?
20	A. I do not.
21	Q. Was Iatan 2 complete to meet the majority of
22	the summer peak load?
23	A. No. Iatan 2 was completed as a base load
24	unit, so yes, it has an it would be available on peak
25	days. It's also very valuable throughout the year. As I

Г

1	indicated, it would provide low cost power, low cost
2	incremental power throughout the year, which would lower
3	rates for customers and give the company the opportunity to
4	sell excess power during the evening time, during non
5	when our retail customers were not needing the power, we
6	could sell it into the market at a substantial profit, and
7	that profit is credited back against the revenue requirement
8	in our rates in our rate cases.
9	So it's not it was not built just as a
10	peaking unit. It was built as a base load unit to serve
11	energy requirements throughout the year.
12	Q. That wasn't my question. My question was:
13	Was Iatan 2 complete to meet the the entirety of the
14	summer adjusted rates, the peak season?
15	A. I, obviously, didn't understand it the first
16	time, and I'm not understanding it this time.
17	Q. Was it important for KCP&L to have the project
18	completed in June to meet the summer peak?
19	A. It was when we first
20	Q. It's yes or no.
21	A. Well, yes, in 2005.
22	Q. Okay. Thank you.
23	A. It was important. That's one of the reasons I
24	listed in my testimony.
25	Q. Did it ever become not important for KCP&L to

1 meet --2 Yes. Α. 3 -- the summer peak? 0. It became less important as the project 4 Yes. Α. 5 we had a severe economic recession in 2007, '8, progressed. 6 and '9, even that continues to this day that has reduced our need for peak capacity during the summertime. So as the 7 plant progressed in its development and construction, what 8 was perceived as a -- as a need in 2005 had changed and was 9 10 not needed necessarily for the summer peak of 2010 because of 11 the economic recession. 12 In December of 2005, do you know how far Q. behind the schedule of Iatan 2 was? 13 It was not behind schedule at all. We hadn't 14 Α. 15 started. 16 why did KCP&L pay Alstom an incentive to meet 0. the June 2010 date? 17 I don't believe we did. 18 Α. 19 Q. Mr. Giles, are you familiar with the R and O 20 360, which is the JLG incident construction resurfacing? 21 I am familiar with the JLG resurfacing, yes. Α. 22 Did you testify in Kansas that KCP&L would not **Q**. be charging the cost of this R and O to Kansas ratepayers? 23 I may have in the 2000 -- or the Iatan 1 rate 24 Α. I don't recall. 25 case.

Г

1	Q. So you don't recall, or you stated that you
2	would not be charging that R and O to Kansas ratepayers?
3	A. I don't recall.
4	Q. I'm going to hand you a portion of your
5	testimony in the Kansas rate case Docket 09-KCPE-246-RPS.
6	It's date-stamped June 5, 2009, and this is the rebuttal
7	testimony of Chris B. Giles, and then particularly maybe this
8	will refresh your memory if you did or did not make that
9	statement.
10	A. Do you want me to read this?
11	Q. Sure.
12	A. The underlying section says, "The three
13	remaining items are those that KCP&L chose not to challenge
14	in its rebuttal testimony, although KCP&L maintained then, as
15	now, that its management's actions were reasonable and do not
16	support a finding of imprudence."
17	Q. So were you making a
18	A. I think the language speaks for itself is my
19	testimony.
20	Q. So you did not you were not going to charge
21	the Kansas ratepayers for R and O 360?
22	A. As I indicated, I just read my testimony, and
23	that's what it says is that KCP&L was not going to challenge
24	that particular and I must say what I read is I'm not
25	sure what it's referring to, but what it says is, on that

1 particular topic, whatever that might have been, we weren't challenging it, but we were not admitting imprudence. 2 3 Are you challenging -- are you charging it to 0. Missouri ratepayers in this case? 4 5 Well, we're not charging Missouri ratepayers Α. for anything in this case, but the question, if you're asking 6 me is it included in our cost of the plant for this case, 7 8 yes. Thank you. Let's go to page 14 of your direct 9 Q. 10 testimony. On line 15, you discuss that -- are you there? 11 Mr. Giles, are you -- do you see that? 12 Α. Yes. You state that Schiff has a unique combination 13 Q. 14 of skills. Do you see that? Maybe I'm on the wrong --I don't -- I think there's a reference issue. 15 Α. 16 Oh, sorry. I'm on page 4, line 15. I said Q. 17 that backwards. 18 Α. Yes. who at Schiff Hardin has these unique skills? 19 Q. Their entire team. The team that I am 20 Α. 21 familiar with would be Ken Roberts, Carrie Okizaki, Eric 22 Gould, Amanda Schermer, Jay Wilson Associates, Dan Meyer. 23 So is there unique skills on an individual Q. basis or collectively? 24 25 I would say both. Α.

Г

1	Q. Do you know if there are any other law firms
2	that specialize in construction law?
3	A. I know of one, but I'm not I'm not familiar
4	with really how much of a specialty construction law is. I
5	know I'm trying to think of their name. Duane Morris was
6	affiliated or hired Pegasus, so I know they have some
7	expertise specialty in construction, but that's the limit of
8	my knowledge.
9	Q. Did you ever do analysis to determine whether
10	there are other law firms that have construction law groups
11	or
12	A. I didn't, no.
13	Q. Okay. Let's go to page 4 of your rebuttal.
14	A. Okay.
15	Q. Here you state the cost overruns for Iatan 1,
16	starting it's around line 21 going over to the next page.
17	A. I assume yes, go ahead.
18	Q. Do you see that?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. Do you know what that number is on a
21	percentage basis for Iatan 1?
22	A. Are you asking what was the increase from the
23	control budget to the reforecasted budget as a percent?
24	Q. I'm asking what percentage of the cost
25	overruns is on a percentage basis?

Г

1	A. Well, as I stated, KCP&L used the difference
2	between the control budget and the final actual or this case
3	what's referred to in my testimony as a is the May of '08
4	forecast, 376 million compared to 484 million. That
5	difference is about 28 percent, I believe.
6	Q. Do you know what the labor market was in 2009
7	and 2010?
8	A. The labor the extent of my knowledge, the
9	labor market was more labor was available in '9 and '10 than
10	was in '6 and '7.
11	Q. Do you know anything about 2008?
12	A. Well, as the economy recessed, my presumption
13	and my observation with the project is that labor
14	availability was not an issue.
15	Q. Okay. So at any point did the rates go down
16	to reflect this or labor rates decrease reflect the
17	availability of more employees available?
18	A. I don't know.
19	Q. Do you know if KCP&L had any reduction in
20	labor rates to reflect the recession?
21	A. The Iatan 1 and 2 projects were union projects
22	and paid union wages, so it's unlikely that, to the best of
23	my knowledge, that a union would reduce their union labor
24	rates depending on the economy.
25	Q. So if they were using union rates, then their

1 rates would have only increased every year throughout the 2 project? 3 I don't know that. It would be whatever the Α. union rate was at the time the union performed the work. 4 Ι 5 don't follow the labor union's rates. 6 Let's go to page 18 of your direct. **Q**. 7 Α. Okay. 8 There is a Q and A that says at line 16: Q. 9 "Were any of the increases of the Iatan 2 project costs the result of management imprudence by KCP&L?" And you say, "Not 10 11 to my knowledge, no." 12 Α. Are we at direct? 13 Q. Yes. 14 And page again? Α. 15 18. Q. Line, please. 16 Α. 17 Line 16. Q. 18 Okay. I see it. Thank you. Α. So is it your testimony that you disagree with 19 Q. all of the recommendations on Mr. Walt Drabinski? 20 21 Absolutely. Α. 22 How about, do you disagree with all of the Q. 23 recommended prudence adjustments from KCP&L's witness, Dr. Chris Nielsen? 24 25 It's KCP&L's position that they do disagree Α.

1 with Mr. Nielsen and Mr. Davis has testimony on -- to that 2 effect. I do not testify on --3 So you don't have an opinion on that? Q. 4 Α. NO. 5 And so, then, you also disagree with all of Q. 6 the adjustments made by Staff? 7 Α. Yes. Let's go to page 22 of your direct. 8 Q. 9 Α. Okay. Here, there are risks that KCP&L identified on 10 Q. 11 the Iatan project, correct? 12 Α. That's correct. And in the section for Alstom on this -- we 13 Q. 14 need to go in-camera. 15 Thank you. One moment, JUDGE PRIDGIN: please. 16 (REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an in-camera 17 session was held, which is contained in Volume 20, pages 1070 18 19 to 1073 of the transcript.) 20 21 22 23 24 25

1			<u> </u>	
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				

1		
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		

			<u>01 21 2011</u>	
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	 	 		

1		 	
1	1		
2	2		
3	3		
4	4		
5	5		
6	6		
7	7		
8	8		
9	9		
10	0		
11	1		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25	5		

Г

1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Let me interrupt just briefly,			
2	make sure Commissioners in St. Louis are able to participate.			
3	Commissioner Gunn, Commissioner Kenney?			
4	COMMNISSIONER GUNN: (Inaudible.)			
5	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner Gunn, I'm sorry,			
6	we didn't hear you. Commission Kenney?			
7	COMMISSIONER GUNN: We're here. Can you hear			
8	us?			
9	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Very good. Thank you.			
10	COMMISSION GUNN: Thank you.			
11	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Ott, before we resume, can			
12	I inquire roughly how much more cross you think you'll have			
13	on Mr. Giles? I'm trying to determine when to break.			
14	MS. OTT: We probably should take a break.			
15	JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'm showing 10:30. Let's			
16	resume at 10:45. Thank you. We are off the record.			
17	(A break was held.)			
18	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. We are back on the			
19	record. Before Ms. Ott resumes cross-examination of			
20	Mr. Giles, I just wanted to inform the parties, because we			
21	have a point-to-point connection with St. Louis now, even			
22	though we are, say, in intermission or recess and I've muted			
23	the Webcast, the people at point-to-point in St. Louis can			
24	still hear you. So if there's something you don't want the			
25	folks in St. Louis to hear, you'll it would be safer if			

you left the room. 1 2 And in all honesty, it's probably simply safer 3 that you leave the room anyway just in case I make an error with the technology, or like this morning we have some sort 4 5 of problem with the connection. It's probably just simply a safer practice to just simply watch what you say in this room 6 and just assume it's being broadcast to the public. 7 Anything further before we resume 8 cross-examination? All right. Mr. Giles, you are still 9 10 under oath, sir, and Ms. Ott, when you're ready. 11 CHRIS GILES testified as follows: 12 BY MS. OTT: I'm not sure if I told you to go to page 6 of 13 Q. your rebuttal or not, so if we could turn to page 6, line 20. 14 15 Α. Okay. 16 And you state that the decision to fast track Q. 17 was made on the basis of our quality expert advice from our external advisors. Who are these advisors you're speaking 18 19 of? 20 I would say Burns & McDonnell and Schiff Α. 21 Hardin. 22 And you state that the decision to fast track Q. was done to meet KCP&L's early schedule milestones, correct? 23 You see how the sentence extends? 24 25 Yes. Α.
1 Why was it so important to meet these Q. 2 milestones? 3 The early milestones, as Mr. Bell testified Α. yesterday, those are on the critical path for the project. 4 5 So it was necessary to have foundations in place in order to begin structural steel erection on the boiler. 6 7 Was KCP&L willing to incur additional costs Q. just to make the June 2010 goal for the completion of 8 Iatan 2? 9 10 Α. NO. In fact, KCP&L had an opportunity to meet 11 the June 1, 2010, date as late as mid-summer '09. And when 12 we did the reforecast during that period, we evaluated what it would cost to meet a June 1, 2010, date and made the 13 decision to extend the project so that we would not incur 14 15 additional costs. And it was a deliberate decision. 16 would you have had to fast track the project 0. 17 to meet the June 2010, an additional fast track decision? 18 Α. NO. Did KCP&L not pursue the wind investment in 19 Q. 20 the regulatory plan because the market conditions at the time 21 would not make it a prudent decision? 22 MR. FISCHER: Assumes facts not in evidence that the wind -- the second wind was part of the regulatory 23 24 plan. I'll lay the foundation. 25 MS. OTT:

1 Thank you. JUDGE PRIDGIN: 2 BY MS. OTT: 3 were you part of the regulatory plan Q. negotiations? 4 5 Α. Yes. 6 was there a section in the regulatory plan Ο. related to a wind investment? 7 8 The regulatory plan contemplated a 100 Α. Yes. megawatt wind project to come online in 2008. 9 It was not a 10 requirement of the regulatory plan. It was an option, and 11 the agreement was to evaluate whether it was appropriate to 12 build another hundred megawatts in that time frame. KCP&L did that evaluation, determined that due to market conditions 13 it was not prudent to pursue that investment. 14 15 Thank you. Over the past few days, there have 0. been a lot of discussion about what a "definitive estimate" 16 17 means. 18 Α. Yes. what is your definition of definitive 19 Q. 20 estimate? 21 I am glad you asked that because I have been Α. 22 waiting patiently to answer it. 23 Did you memorize it last night? Q. I have to answer that by going back to 2005 24 Α. when KCP&L, and myself included, were negotiating the 25

Г

1	regulatory plan and the document that, obviously, was created
2	as a result of those negotiations. At that time, that
3	particular topic and I know this was a question of at
4	least Commissioner Kenney there was that was the least
5	discussed topic of any item contained in that regulatory
6	plan, and to explain why that was the case
7	Q. But I want to know what your definition is. I
8	don't are you trying to give me your definition in 2005 or
9	what you think the definition is today?
10	A. Well, if you would allow me to finish.
11	Q. Well, I'm asking for the definition, not
12	the
13	A. I don't have a definition today and I didn't
14	have one then.
15	Q. Okay. Thank you.
16	A. But I'm explaining to you why.
17	Q. I didn't ask why you don't have a definition.
18	I just want to know what your definition was.
19	A. Well, I will correct my testimony.
20	Q. I
21	A. The definition to me
22	MS. OTT: Judge, this is not responsive.
23	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yeah, I'll sustain. I mean,
24	just try I know she's giving you quite a bit of leeway in
25	asking you to explain, but I think the question was, you

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 know, do you have a definition and then --2 THE WITNESS: Well, there are -- well --3 BY MS. OTT: You stated you didn't have an answer. 4 **Q**. 5 In 2005 --Α. 6 MS. OTT: Judge --7 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. Go back and -- can you rephrase your question, Ms. Ott? 8 9 BY MS. OTT: 10 Q. I said, what was your definition of definitive 11 estimate in 2005? I believe you said you didn't have one and 12 you don't have one today. 13 well, I was attempting to correct the "have Α. one today." I don't have one today, but the industry that 14 15 Mr. -- has one. I wasn't aware in 2005 of an industry definition, and I had no definition, and there was not a 16 17 definition contained in the regulatory plan. 18 You stated you had been around in rate cases Q. 19 over several years with KCP&L, correct? 20 Yes. Α. 21 would you have been involved in a rate case Q. 22 back in 1980 in ER-81-42? 23 I believe -- well, I was definitely here and Α. I'm familiar with that docket number, yes. 24 25 Do you know who Mr. David McCoy is? Q.

1 Mr. McCoy was a long-time employee of KCP&L. Α. I have a copy of Mr. McCoy's direct testimony 2 Q. 3 from that case. Now, on page 3 of Mr. McCoy's direct testimony, he defines what a definitive estimate is. Can you 4 5 read how Mr. McCoy, back in 1980, defined a definitive estimate? 6 Page 3 of his testimony is actually the 7 Α. Case No. ER-81-42, definitive estimate, and I don't know that 8 he's not quoting something here. 9 10 Q. well, if you don't feel comfortable reading it 11 _ _ 12 I don't feel comfortable reading it because Α. there's a lot of testimony that precedes this where he 13 qualifies what this means. 14 15 MS. OTT: Judge, can I (sic) take administrative notice of Mr. McCoy's testimony? 16 JUDGE PRIDGIN: That was filed in the docket 17 18 that --MS. OTT: In the '81 case. It's a Commission 19 20 case. 21 MR. MILLS: Judge, I'm going to object again 22 because there's, obviously, a lot of testimony there. I have not had an opportunity to see it. I think part of the 23 procedure under 536 is that parties have an opportunity to 24 look at something that the Commission is considering taking 25

1 official notice of, and there may be, just looking at the 2 document, it appears to be 50, 60 pages long, and there may be a great deal of stuff that's irrelevant to this case, and 3 I object to it both on the basis that I haven't seen it and 4 5 on the fact that there may be a great deal of irrelevant 6 information. 7 If Ms. Ott wants to narrowly focus the portion with respect to the definitive estimate, I may not have an 8 objection. But without reviewing the document, I don't know. 9 10 MS. OTT: Well, on page 1, it is a 11 construction budget manual, and it's citing the construction 12 budget manual. We can take official notice of the entire 13 budget manual if that would make everyone happy. 14 MR. FISCHER: I would join Public Counsel in 15 that objection. It's not an order of the Commission, and I think certainly that person's not available for 16 17 cross-examination. JUDGE PRIDGIN: Well, I'm going to overrule. 18 I mean, I think Commission can take notice of what has been 19 20 filed in its cases. I mean, whether it's -- whether it's 21 relevant or whether it is persuasive in any way is another question, but it's notice of what has been filed as testimony 22 in a prior case in the Commission's records. 23 MR. MILLS: So, Judge, you're not taking this 24 25 into this case as evidence; you're simply taking notice that

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 this was filed in a previous case? 2 JUDGE PRIDGIN: That's correct. It hasn't 3 been offered as evidence. I was asked to take notice. BY MS. OTT: 4 5 Let's go to page 8 of your rebuttal testimony. 0. On line 22, you mention the R&Os -- strike that. I've 6 7 already covered it. Do you know if the Iatan project team 8 employees are still making trips to Iatan 2? 9 I don't. 10 Α. 11 Q. Do you know if mileage has been charged since 12 the in-service date for mileage to Iatan 2? I don't. 13 Α. 14 Do you know if other expense reports are --**Q**. people are submitting under the project after it's been in 15 16 service? 17 would you restate? Α. 18 Do you know if there are expense reports still Q. charged to the Iatan 2 project? 19 20 I don't know. Α. 21 Now, you're familiar with Section Q of the Q. 22 regulatory plan of the stipulation and agreement, correct? 23 I believe, if that's the cost control system Α. 24 language, yes. 25 Is it possible for KCP&L to create a Okay. Q.

1 list, whether it be five pages, ten pages, a hundred pages, 2 that lists all the cost overruns and explains why they were 3 incurred? It's a yes-or-no question. I don't know of any format -- I can't conceive 4 Α. 5 of a format --6 So no? **Q**. -- where one could do that. 7 Α. Okay. I want to go back to something 8 Q. Okay. we were talking earlier when you said that Schiff had some --9 Schiff employees were all uniquely experienced. 10 11 Can you tell me how Ms. Schermer is uniquely 12 experienced for this project? I don't have Ms. Schermer's resume in front of 13 Α. I know Ms. Schermer is a very knowledgeable, very 14 me. 15 articulate and thorough attorney regarding contracts, contract administration and construction projects. 16 17 So do you know if she's had any experience on 0. large power plant construction projects before? 18 I know Ms. Schermer from my work with her. 19 Α. 20 But you don't know anything about her Q. 21 credentials? 22 I do not. Α. 23 Okay. How about Ms. Okizaki, do you know Q. anything about her credentials? 24 25 I have worked with Ms. Okizaki throughout Α. NO.

1 the life of the project, extremely bright, intelligent 2 attorney that very much knows the construction industry and 3 practices in contracts. But you don't know what her experience was 4 0. prior to your Iatan 2 project involvement? 5 6 Α. NO. 7 Do you know if Ms. Schermer has any prior Q. experience working on rate cases? 8 9 Α. NO. 10 **Q**. And the only rate case she's worked on with 11 you is this current rate case? 12 Α. I don't know what Ms. Schermer has done in her I know what she did for us on the project. 13 past. 14 Is she doing rate case work or just Ο. 15 construction -- work related to the construction project? She's not doing rate case work that I'm aware 16 Α. 17 of. So you're not aware if she's billed KCP&L for 18 Q. 19 doing work on this rate case? 20 Α. All of the Schiff Hardin attorneys, as well as 21 our attorneys, review and comment on testimony, so to the 22 extent you're terming testimony preparation as rate case 23 work, then yes, she's done that. So are they billing them to the Iatan project, 24 **Q**. 25 or are they billing them to rate case expense?

Γ

2 testimony, it would be rate case expense. 3 Q. Okay. Now, since you were involved in the stipulation and agreement to set up the regulatory plan, were aware that the construction project was going to be subject to regulatory review, correct? 7 A. Could you restate that? I'm not sure I	you
4 stipulation and agreement to set up the regulatory plan, 5 were aware that the construction project was going to be 6 subject to regulatory review, correct?	you
5 were aware that the construction project was going to be 6 subject to regulatory review, correct?	-
6 subject to regulatory review, correct?	
7 A. Could you restate that? I'm not sure I	
8 understand the question.	
9 Q. Okay. Well, since you were involved from	the
10 beginning of setting up the regulatory plan, you were away	are
11 that the Iatan construction projects would be subject to	
12 regulatory review?	
13 A. Yes.	
Q. Okay. Now, yesterday there was several	
15 comments that your consultants and auditors would give v	erbal
16 reports. Wouldn't it be prudent, if you know you're sub	ject
17 to regulatory review, to have some documentation to supp	ort
18 the assessments given by auditors?	
19 A. You'll have to be more specific. I don't	
20 understand.	
21 Q. If you know you're subject to regulatory	
22 review, if you know that Staff is going to ask you data	
23 requests and ask for documentation to prove expenses, if	
24 you're going to have expenses charged and there's no	
25 documentation to support it because it was given verball;	

Γ

1	you knew you were subject to regulatory review, why wouldn't
2	you document those conversations or those assessments?
3	A. I'm not aware that KCP&L ever verbally
4	approved an expense receipt or an expense charge. I'm not
5	Q. Maybe I'm not being clear. Mr. Davis had
6	stated that Lawgon or for example, would give verbal
7	reports of their audit and not write put something in
8	writing.
9	So if you know you're subject to regulatory
10	review, why wouldn't you ask Lawgon or whatever auditor or
11	assessor, Strategic Talent Solution to document the work they
12	were doing, knowing you were subject to regulatory review?
13	A. Lawgon did not do an audit.
14	Q. Assessment. I mean, an assessment, an audit,
15	a review.
16	A. Like I said, Lawgon did not do an audit.
17	Q. But they did an assessment. If they did a
18	verbal assessment and you knew you were subject to regulatory
19	review, why wouldn't you have that memorialized in writing?
20	A. I'm not trying to be argumentative with you,
21	but assessment of what?
22	Q. Did Lawgon do assessments of the project?
23	A. I don't know.
24	Q. Who's Mr. John Grimwade?
25	A. Mr. Grimwade, again, was a long-term employee

1 of KCP&L. He had a variety of roles within the company 2 during my career there. 3 what was his relationship to the Iatan 0. construction project? 4 5 Initially, Mr. Grimwade was senior director, I Α. 6 believe was his title, of construction. 7 Is he currently with KCP&L? Q. No. he's not. 8 Α. How about Terry Murphy? 9 Q. Terry Murphy reported to John Grimwade early 10 Α. in the project. I'm not sure what his title was. 11 12 Q. Is he with KCP&L anymore? 13 NO. Α. 14 And Bill Riggins, he was general counsel; is Ο. 15 that correct? Did you ask me if Bill Riggins was general 16 Α. counsel? 17 18 Q. Yes. 19 Α. Yes. 20 And he's no longer there anymore? Q. 21 Α. NO. 22 How about Carl Churchman? **Q**. 23 Carl Churchman was vice-president of Α. construction. He left the company shortly upon completion of 24 the construction work. 25

2A.I believe he left the company mid-summer 2009.3Q.And Mr. Jerry Reynolds, he was the attorney in4regards to construction?5A.Mr. Reynolds was onsite at the Iatan project6for most of the time the project was progressing, yes.7Q.He was an attorney?8A.Yes, he was.9Q.And he's no longer there?10A.No.11Q.And Lora Cheatum, what was her role?12A.Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was13vice-president of procurement early in the project.14Q.And she an employee of KCP&L?15A.No.16Q.And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley?17A.Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his18title was senior vice-president of production, and at one19time production and construction.20Q.And he's no longer employed with KCP&L?21A.No, he's not.22Q.Now, would you say these individuals gained23valuable experience working on the Iatan construction24project?	1	Q.	And when was that?
3Q.And Mr. Jerry Reynolds, he was the attorney in4regards to construction?5A.Mr. Reynolds was onsite at the Iatan project6for most of the time the project was progressing, yes.7Q.He was an attorney?8A.Yes, he was.9Q.And he's no longer there?10A.No.11Q.And Lora Cheatum, what was her role?12A.Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was13vice-president of procurement early in the project.14Q.And is she an employee of KCP&L?15A.No.16Q.And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley?17A.Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his18title was senior vice-president of production, and at one19time production and construction.20Q.And he's no longer employed with KCP&L?21A.No, he's not.22Q.Now, would you say these individuals gained23valuable experience working on the Iatan construction24project?			
 regards to construction? A. Mr. Reynolds was onsite at the Iatan project for most of the time the project was progressing, yes. Q. He was an attorney? A. Yes, he was. Q. And he's no longer there? A. No. Q. And Lora Cheatum, what was her role? A. Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was vice-president of procurement early in the project. Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? A. No. Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 			
A.Mr. Reynolds was onsite at the Iatan projectfor most of the time the project was progressing, yes.7Q.8A.9Q.9Q.10A.11Q.12A.13vice-president of procurement early in the project.14Q.15A.16Q.17A.18No.19A.19No.10A.10A.11Q.12A.13Cheatum was I believe her title was14Q.15A.16Q.17A.18title was senior vice-president of production, and perhaps his18title was senior vice-president of production, and at one19time production and construction.20Q.21A.22Q.23Now, would you say these individuals gained23valuable experience working on the Iatan construction24project?	3	Q.	And Mr. Jerry Reynolds, he was the attorney in
 for most of the time the project was progressing, yes. Q. He was an attorney? A. Yes, he was. Q. And he's no longer there? A. No. Q. And Lora Cheatum, what was her role? A. Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was vice-president of procurement early in the project. Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? A. No. Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 	4	regards to con	struction?
 7 Q. He was an attorney? 8 A. Yes, he was. 9 Q. And he's no longer there? 10 A. No. 11 Q. And Lora Cheatum, what was her role? 12 A. Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was 13 vice-president of procurement early in the project. 14 Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? 15 A. No. 16 Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? 17 A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his 18 title was senior vice-president of production, and at one 19 time production and construction. 20 Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? 21 A. No, he's not. 22 Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained 23 valuable experience working on the Iatan construction 24 project? 	5	Α.	Mr. Reynolds was onsite at the Iatan project
 A. Yes, he was. Q. And he's no longer there? A. No. Q. And Lora Cheatum, what was her role? A. Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was vice-president of procurement early in the project. Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? A. No. Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 	6	for most of th	e time the project was progressing, yes.
 9 Q. And he's no longer there? 10 A. No. 11 Q. And Lora Cheatum, what was her role? 12 A. Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was 13 vice-president of procurement early in the project. 14 Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? 15 A. No. 16 Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? 17 A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his 18 title was senior vice-president of production, and at one 19 time production and construction. 20 Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? 21 A. No, he's not. 22 Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained 23 valuable experience working on the Iatan construction 24 project? 	7	Q.	He was an attorney?
 A. No. Q. And Lora Cheatum, what was her role? A. Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was vice-president of procurement early in the project. Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? A. No. Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 	8	Α.	Yes, he was.
 Q. And Lora Cheatum, what was her role? A. Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was vice-president of procurement early in the project. Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? A. No. Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 	9	Q.	And he's no longer there?
 A. Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was vice-president of procurement early in the project. Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? A. No. Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 	10	Α.	No.
 13 vice-president of procurement early in the project. 14 Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? 15 A. No. 16 Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? 17 A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his 18 title was senior vice-president of production, and at one 19 time production and construction. 20 Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? 21 A. No, he's not. 22 Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained 23 valuable experience working on the Iatan construction 24 project? 	11	Q.	And Lora Cheatum, what was her role?
 14 Q. And is she an employee of KCP&L? 15 A. No. 16 Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? 17 A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his 18 title was senior vice-president of production, and at one 19 time production and construction. 20 Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? 21 A. No, he's not. 22 Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained 23 valuable experience working on the Iatan construction 24 project? 	12	Α.	Ms. Cheatum was I believe her title was
 A. No. Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 	13	vice-president	of procurement early in the project.
 Q. And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley? A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 	14	Q.	And is she an employee of KCP&L?
 A. Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his title was senior vice-president of production, and at one time production and construction. Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project? 	15	Α.	No.
18 title was senior vice-president of production, and at one 19 time production and construction. 20 Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? 21 A. No, he's not. 22 Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained 23 valuable experience working on the Iatan construction 24 project?	16	Q.	And Steve Easley, who is Steve Easley?
19 time production and construction. 20 Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? 21 A. No, he's not. 22 Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained 23 valuable experience working on the Iatan construction 24 project?	17	Α.	Mr. Easley was vice-president, and perhaps his
Q. And he's no longer employed with KCP&L? A. No, he's not. Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project?	18	title was seni	or vice-president of production, and at one
21 A. No, he's not. 22 Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained 23 valuable experience working on the Iatan construction 24 project?	19	time productio	n and construction.
Q. Now, would you say these individuals gained valuable experience working on the Iatan construction project?	20	Q.	And he's no longer employed with KCP&L?
<pre>23 valuable experience working on the Iatan construction 24 project?</pre>	21	Α.	No, he's not.
24 project?	22	Q.	Now, would you say these individuals gained
	23	valuable exper	ience working on the Iatan construction
	24	project?	
A. I can't speculate to what they gained.	25	Α.	I can't speculate to what they gained.

Г

1	Q. D	oo you know if KCP&L did anything to retain
2	these employees	before they left?
3	A. I	know in one particular case, Mr. Churchman,
4	I know Mr. Downe	ey attempted I should say not
5	Mr. Churchman.	It was Mr. Price. Mr. Price was
6	vice-president c	of construction, and I know Mr. Downey
7	attempted to ret	cain
8	Mr. Price.	
9	Q. E	But you don't know if KCP&L tried to retain
10	any of the other	r employees?
11	A. N	No, I don't know.
12	Q. L	et's go to page 13 of your rebuttal, I think.
13	And you're discu	ussing how many the change orders in which
14	Mr. Elliott revi	ewed.
15	N	Now, he only was provided change orders of the
16	dollar value of	\$50,000 or greater?
17	А. Т	That's correct.
18	Q. C	okay. How many change orders were there under
19	the dollar value	e of \$50,000?
20	A. I	I don't know.
21	Q. C	oo you have a guess of how many there would
22	be?	
23	A. N	١٥.
24	Q. C	oo you know if that would be voluminous to
25	provide to Staff	F?

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 Α. I don't know. 2 Do you know who would know that? 0. 3 Mr. Archibald. Α. MS. OTT: I don't have any further questions. 4 5 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Ott, thank you. Let me see if we have any bench questions. Commissioner Jarrett? 6 7 EXAMINATION 8 OUESTIONS BY COMMISSION JARRETT: Yes. Good morning, Mr. Giles. 9 Q. 10 Α. Good morning. 11 It's still morning, barely. I want to just Q. 12 start out, do you still have Exhibit 252? That's that chain of e-mails that Ms. Ott had given you earlier. 13 14 I do. Α. 15 All right. If you would go down to the bottom 0. e-mail, which is from Wess Henderson to Bill Downey and Chris 16 17 Giles, with a copy to Steve Dottheim, subject Iatan construction project. 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 And that is addressed to Mr. Downey and you; **Q**. 21 is that correct? 22 That's correct. Α. And Mr. Henderson indicates that this is a 23 0. follow-up on your phone call to Steve Dottheim and myself 24 last Wednesday, February 20th. 25

Γ

1	Do you recall that February 20th phone call?
2	A. I do. I mean, I recall that we made a phone
3	call and invited the Staff to observe the process, yes.
4	Q. What process was that?
5	A. We were engaged in identifying all of the
6	costs. At this point in time we knew we had exceeded the
7	contingency for Unit 1, and the reforecast process was about
8	to embark for both Unit 1 and Unit 2. Unit 2, by that time
9	frame, was roughly 70 percent engineered and Unit 1 was 100
10	percent engineered.
11	So we were embarking upon this critical time
12	frame where we knew the reforecast would have significant
13	value to understanding how the costs were progressing and
14	why. So that that's why we made the call.
15	Q. All right. And then Mr. Henderson asked for
16	more specificity and wanted to know what had changed to have
17	the Staff become more involved. Is your prior answer
18	basically
19	A. Basically, that's what I was explaining to
20	Mr. Henderson was that we were at a critical juncture here
21	and there would be a lot of significant discussion on cost
22	and schedule at that point and wanted to make sure they had
23	the opportunity to understand it.
24	Q. And basically, that is what you put in writing
25	and responded to Mr. Henderson's e-mail, which is the next

1 e-mail up, dated March 4th -- from 2008, March the 4th, from 2 you to Mr. Henderson and Bill Downey with a carbon copy to Steve Dottheim, Bill Riggins and Terry Bassham? 3 That was my written response to inform 4 Α. Yes. 5 Mr. Henderson of -- of why -- it wasn't -- it wasn't that things had -- it wasn't that we were trying to get Staff more 6 involved. We were hoping to have Staff involved from the day 7 one of the project, and Mr. Elliott had been onsite beginning 8 in about 2007. 9 10 No one from the auditing or accounting staff 11 had been onsite or had any discussions with us. So this was 12 a way -- other than our guarterly meetings, I should say. SO this was our way to say, look, we were at a critical juncture 13 here. Mr. Elliott's been onsite. We'd like to have the 14 accounting staff come up as well, or anyone, basically, Staff 15 wanted to come. 16 17 All right. And then I think you indicated 0. that instead of a face-to-face meeting, you had a phone 18 conference with Mr. Henderson? 19 20 Α. I believe we talked by phone after that. Ι 21 somehow got the definite impression Staff would not be taking 22 us up on our offer, and they did not. We never scheduled a time for them to come and review anything at that time. 23 AS the work was progressing, they did not attend any of those 24 25 sessions.

1 Do you recall, was something said by anyone Q. 2 from Staff that led you to get that impression? 3 I don't recall that -- you know, we had these Α. quarterly meetings that were ongoing, and I don't remember 4 if -- perhaps in one of those quarterly meetings it was 5 brought up and said, well, we're not -- we're not going to do 6 it, or if it just sort of went away, you know. 7 8 Q. Okay. We were -- we were reporting to Staff every 9 Α. 10 quarter, and at this particular time frame, we completed --11 this was in February/March of '08. We came down and 12 presented the reforecast in May of '08. So the next meeting might have been, well, here it is, we're finished with it. 13 14 Okay. I'm finished with 252, so you can put 0. 15 that aside. 16 Now, Ms. Ott had asked you several questions 17 about discovery requests, data requests where she -- her questions -- several of her questions talked about KCP&L 18 19 withholding information. 20 How many rate cases would you say you've been involved in, in your career, ballpark? I know it's a lot. 21 22 Fifteen, twenty. Α. 23 And as part of your job with KCP&L, would you 0. normally assist in answering or answering data requests in 24 25 rate case discovery?

Γ

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. In your experience in those 15 to 20 rate
3	cases, would it be common for the company to claim
4	attorney-client privileges on some data requests?
5	A. Yes. It's it would be, I believe, in every
6	case, there's a certain amount of attorney-client privilege
7	that is I don't know the term, but yes.
8	Q. Right. And I know you're not a lawyer, so I'm
9	not asking for a legal opinion, but just given your
10	experience in that many rate cases and in answering and
11	assisting in answering data requests, is it your
12	understanding that a proper attorney-client privilege claim
13	is a legitimate response to a discovery request?
14	A. Yes. That's been my experience, and unlike a
15	lot of the past cases I've been involved with, in this
16	particular case, one, we had a hearing last April on this
17	very topic of attorney-client privilege, and the Commission
18	found in that case that the company was forthcoming.
19	Since that time, we've also had a special
20	master appointed, and to my knowledge, the special master has
21	withheld or upheld the company's claims most of the time.
22	There's a few things he's found that we should give up. The
23	ones that I've observed, as I stated earlier, none of it
24	would have impacted the Staff's ability to do its audit and
25	its prudence determination.

Г

1	Q. Right. And I believe the special master
2	received probably 60 or 70,000 documents from KCP&L. Does
3	that sound about right to you?
4	A. I would say yes.
5	Q. And did the special master complain that you
6	didn't give him what you were ordered to give him?
7	A. No, not that I'm aware of.
8	Q. All right. And in your experience in these
9	rate cases, is it common for there to be discovery disputes
10	between Staff and the company?
11	A. It's very common. It's very common in
12	Missouri, yes.
13	Q. And are those usually worked out?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. All right. Ms. Ott asked you a little bit
16	about the definitive estimate.
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. I think you were in the middle of explaining
19	what you believed about the definitive estimate, and so I
20	will just ask you: Tell me what you want to tell me about
21	the definitive estimate.
22	A. I'd be glad to. In 2004, 2005 when we were
23	negotiating the regulatory plan, the stipulation and
24	agreement, Mr. Featherstone and I had both experienced the
25	wolf Creek case, and we had experienced it together.

Mr. Featherstone and I had a very brief conversation that
 basically said, look, Wolf Creek did not have documentation.
 They did reforecasts that you couldn't document what they
 did.

5 At the end of the day, Mr. Featherstone had to get the company to create what he called these reconciliation 6 7 packages, which basically was go back after the fact and explain everything. He indicated he did not want that in 8 9 Iatan 1, and my thought process at that time was I certainly 10 don't want it either. And what I wanted, my goal was I want 11 to give you every document, every decision-making process, 12 everything we do on this project as we are doing it.

13 And we will create a cost control system that 14 we will manage to -- I mean, that will be our management 15 day-to-day of this project, and we will explain -- and at the time it was any cost identified, explain any cost overruns, 16 at any point in time, whether it's three months after the 17 project or five years when it's completed, you won't have to 18 19 wait until the end. You'll have it every step of the way. 20 So that was the mind-set. And when we selected the term "definitive estimate," it wasn't defined. 21 22 It wasn't even discussed what that meant. To me, what it meant, we will get you the budget that we're going to manage 23 to as soon as we decide this is the budget. And we called it 24 definitive estimate in the document. It could have been 25

called anything. It's the budget we're going to give you to
 track to.

3 As we were completing the evaluation and vetting the control -- what we call the control budget, which 4 was completed in December of '06, I learned for the first 5 time from Mr. Meyer, who was helping us with this progress, 6 with this estimate, he said, you know, Chris, definitive 7 estimate in the industry is when a project is more like 70 8 percent engineered. So you got a bit of a problem here. 9 10 And I said, well, I understand that, but it 11 doesn't really matter because this is what we're going to 12 track to, this December '06 control budget that was 20 to 25 percent engineered at that time. And so when we went down to 13 explain to the Staff and the other parties, we had the 14 15 budget, it's now January of '07, right after the board had approved it, and I said to the Staff, I did not want anyone 16 17 thinking we were pulling a fast one, that, hey, now they're saying the definitive estimate's not going to be known for 18 19 two more years. I didn't want that. 20 So I went into that meeting and said, look, 21 definitive estimate in the industry is later, but I don't 22 Doesn't matter. We're going to track to this budget care. I'm handing you, and we're going to call it control budget 23

24 estimate, and it's going to be, for purposes of tracking, the

25 same as the definitive estimate in this document. We went

1 through all that. There was no confusion. Nothina. 2 And who did you go through that with, if you **Q**. 3 recall? It was everybody that was involved with the 4 Α. 5 project up to that point. Mr. Henderson would have been 6 there, Mr. Elliott, Mr. Warren Wood. I don't believe 7 Mr. Hyneman was there or Mr. Schallenberg. Was Mr. Featherstone? 8 Q. 9 Α. Mr. Featherstone was, yes. Do you recall the questions from 10 **Q**. Okay. 11 Ms. Ott regarding the fast-tracking? 12 Α. Yes. why did the company decide to use the 13 Q. 14 fast-tracking method? 15 we really didn't have any choice from the Α. standpoint of meeting a summer even of 2010 timeline. We did 16 17 not have -- in order to get an EPC contractor, prepare bids and get it out on the street and get responses, that would 18 have taken about a 12-month period. We didn't have time to 19 20 do that, so in order to meet the June or summer 2010 deadline, it could be done, but the early -- early 21 22 engineering would have to proceed immediately and continue. For instance, Burns & Mc said we can design the foundations, 23 get them on schedule, and continue to work on the other items 24 25 as you build the foundations.

Г

1	And I think Mr. Bell, as he testified
2	yesterday, it's common to do that. I've been working
3	recently with some more construction projects and and the
4	interesting thing is that, even on an EPC contract and I
5	asked this of Mr. Bell aren't they also fast tracked? And
6	his response was yes, they are all fast tracked because
7	they're not going to wait a year to start construction. It's
8	just the normal way you do it today.
9	Q. And Ms. Ott also asked you some questions
10	regarding EPC versus multi-prime methods?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Can you describe the process the company used
13	to decide which of those methods to use?
14	A. Yes. We had a considerable amount of
15	discussion and right off the and one thing that's been a
16	little bit confusing, I think, is you can do an EPC for the
17	entire project, you know, it's called a full-wrap EPC,
18	engineer, procure, construct.
19	We had no interest from anyone in doing that
20	kind of a project. So the there just wasn't anyone at
21	that point in time that could do it that would take on that
22	risk given the market conditions, the lack of having built
23	coal units for some time. So they kind of all pulled back
24	and said, well, we're not going to build that.
25	The next best option for KCP&L, then, was can

we get major components of the project under an EPC. And
 that's when the company went out and got the bid from Alstom
 and others to do the boiler and AQCS equipment for both units
 all under an EPC contract and were able to secure that. And
 then went out and got the turbine from Toshiba in a process.

6 So what was remaining, then -- and I'm getting 7 a little more technical than I should, but it's basically the 8 balance of plant, how do you connect all this stuff together, 9 you know, the electrical, mechanical, water, all this stuff 10 that's not part of these packages.

11 And KCP&L had thought we could go out and get 12 individual packages on, for instance, say we'll get a mechanical, we'll get an electrical, we'll develop these 13 packages and put them out for bid. We did not have anyone 14 15 interested in EPC for that scope of work, the balance of 16 plant work. So we were progressing down this path to have 17 multiple contractors for the balance of plant, and that's when Kiewit had a job cancel and came in and said, look, 18 19 we'll do it for you, we'll take that as basically an EPC and 20 do all of that balance of plant work.

And we were fortunate that Kiewit became available because we're not even sure, when we hired Kiewit, that we would have enough competition for those packages even. So that's -- that's kind of the progression of the whole contracting strategy.

1 All right. Do you recall how many firms you Q. 2 contacted about the possibility of entering into an 3 **EPC** contract? My recollection is that Mr. Jones was the Α. 4 individual that did that, but there were all of the large 5 I mean, it was -- which is about five to six. 6 ones. I mean. there are not a lot of them. Bechtel, Floor, Washington 7 Group, Kiewit. All the big ones were contacted. 8 9 Q. You were here yesterday when I was -- when 10 Mr. Jones was on the stand --11 Α. Yes. 12 -- were you not? And listened to all of his Q. 13 testimony? 14 I did. Α. 15 I want to ask you about the reporting from 0. KCP&L to Staff. He indicated you may have some more 16 17 information about how that worked. And my understanding is that there were quarterly reports given to Staff. 18 Those were called -- I can't remember -- K 19 20 Reports or something like that? 21 Yes. There were -- beginning in, I believe it Α. 22 was in the first quarter of '06, we started preparing 23 quarterly -- what we called the quarterly report, and it included as part of that report the cost portfolio or the K 24 25 Report was attached, which is essentially the cost report.

Γ

1	So the quarterly report was an extensive narrative of
2	everything that had happened in that quarter at the project
3	and everything we projected was going to happen in the future
4	as far as risks, opportunities, the status of it.
5	There was about a 45-day delay from the end of
6	the quarter until we got the report prepared and sent to
7	Staff and the other parties. So once we gave them the
8	report, we had a team of people come to Jefferson City every
9	quarter to answer questions on that report and at the same
10	time give all the parties an update since it's now 45 days
11	later. We would cover that 45 days in that meeting and say,
12	well, since the report, here's what's happened, whether this
13	cost went up, this cost went down, we've identified a
14	potential issue here and here's how we're going to mitigate
15	it.
16	So that was really, as it turned out, the most
17	valuable to me, the most valuable item discussed in those
18	meetings was not what we had written, but what had happened
19	since we had written it. And we spent a lot of time
20	discussing that.
21	Q. All right. So, for example, using I think one
22	of Mr. Mills's examples, if a pump had been designed,
23	engineered and it was put in upside down in the design and it
24	was discovered and there had to be extra expense incurred in
25	fixing that, something like that would be in that quarterly

1 report and Staff would be made aware of that? 2 Α. Yes. 3 And then I think he also -- Mr. Jones also 0. said something about there were monthly reports as well? 4 5 we also prepared monthly status reports Α. Yes. and K Reports. We were not providing that to anyone 6 throughout the project development and execution, but as part 7 of the discovery process, Staff requested and got all of 8 those monthly reports as well. 9 Okay. And I don't know if you may know this 10 **Q**. 11 or not, but are you aware that City Utilities of Springfield 12 is currently constructing a coal-fired generation plant? I was not aware of that. 13 Α. 14 I won't ask you about it then. Q. 15 were you involved in the prudence review in Kansas Corporation Commission regarding the prudence of the 16 17 Iatan project? 18 Α. I was, yes. 19 Q. All right. And did Mr. Drabinski, was he the 20 person hired by the Staff to perform the prudence audit? 21 Yes, that's correct. Α. 22 Did you have any big discovery disputes and **Q**. 23 trouble over information with him and his Staff? None, with him or the KCC Staff themselves. 24 Α. Mr. Drabinski was a consultant hired by them to -- to do part 25

Г

1	or all of the prudence review, but they also had a team of
2	accountants and engineers that we also answered data requests
3	related to the project, both Unit 1 and Unit 2, and we never
4	had any disputes regarding discovery.
5	Q. Do you recall, did did he ask KCP&L or his
6	Staff ask KCP&L for information on Schiff Hardin and their
7	legal bills? Did they review those as part of their audit?
8	A. I don't believe Mr. Drabinski did. Whether
9	their Staff did or the accounting staff did or not, I'm not
10	sure, but I don't believe Mr. Drabinski focused on Schiff
11	Hardin.
12	Q. Did Mr. Drabinski focus on any gifts or
13	gratuities that employees might have gotten at KCP&L?
14	A. Nothing, no.
15	COMMISSIONER JARRETT: All right. I don't
16	have any further questions of Mr. Giles. Thank you.
17	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner Jarrett, thank
18	you very much. Commissioner Gunn.
19	EXAMINATION
20	QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER GUNN:
21	Q. Hi. Can you hear me okay?
22	A. I can.
23	Q. Great. Thank you. I don't have too many. I
24	just have a couple. I want to clarify some things.
25	Your explanation between the CBE and the

1 definitive was very helpful, but in terms of the CBE versus 2 the reforecast, when we're talking about being 15 percent over, are we talking about the CBE or are we talking about 3 the reforecast? 4 5 The CBE. Α. 6 Okay. So the 15 percent is the -- is the **Q**. reforecast? 7 No. The -- if you looked at the -- the CBE 8 Α. was a 1.685 billion. 9 10 **Q**. Okay. 11 The current projected estimate at completion Α. 12 is 1.948 billion. 13 Q. Okay. 14 And that difference between the control budget Α. 15 1.685 and 1.948 is about 15 to 16 percent. 16 **Q**. Okay. 17 The reforecast that was completed in May of Α. 2008 was 1.901 billion, and the difference between that 18 19 reforecast and the current estimate at completion, I believe, 20 is less than two percent. 21 Thank you. That's helpful. Q. I want to talk a little bit about the change 22 23 orders with Mr. Elliott. 24 Α. Okay. And, in general, has it been -- Staff 25 Q.

described kind of this dual process where the engineering was
 approved as a change order, which is a separate inquiry from
 the financial or auditing function.

Has that -- has that been your understanding
about how that process has worked in the past?

A. No, not in the past. And I'm going to need to
7 clarify this a little bit. In the past, Mr. Elliott had done
8 most of the analysis as far as change orders and anything to
9 do with the -- what I would call the construction side of the
10 audit.

11 Now, Mr. Elliott and Mr. Featherstone, who 12 typically was the primary Staff person in the audit or accounting side, would work and discuss things together and 13 come up with a recommended disallowance or not. Now, that 14 15 doesn't mean they couldn't disagree and doesn't mean Mr. Featherstone didn't put something in on his own, but they 16 17 always worked together and they always talked. What -- what I have observed on this project 18 is the Staff has now defined Mr. Elliott's work as 19 20 engineering work. The Staff auditors, as a separate cost, 21 sort of work and never the two shall meet or talk. And that 22 is what I've observed and based on Mr. Elliott's deposition is what has occurred on this project. Mr. Elliott --23 24 Q. So ---- said that he did not talk and Staff 25 Α.

1 auditors did not talk to him. Mv --2 So previously, it was a joint **Q**. 3 recommendation -- any disallowance was a joint recommendation between engineering and the auditor? 4 I have never seen -- I mean, basically, what I 5 Α. want to explain, I have never seen a disallowance proposal 6 7 that was separate, yes. It was a Staff-recommended disallowance. 8 Have you seen -- I'm sorry, go ahead. Please 9 Q. 10 go ahead. I'm sorry. 11 I just wanted to add that in the -- in the Α. 12 past, whatever Mr. Elliott had recommended, whether he 13 recommended a disallowance or not, was what the auditors or accounting staff adopted. There was -- there was never any 14 difference. 15 So that was going to be my question -- my next 16 0. 17 So you have never had an incident where an auestion. engineering change order was accepted by Mr. Elliott and 18 19 disallowed by the auditing staff in any previous -- your experience in any previous project? 20 21 Not that I'm aware of. Α. 22 Okay. Thank you. I want to -- just a quick Q. question on the EPC that you talked about. 23 24 Now, you said you contacted -- you went out 25 and there was no interest on the EPC, and through

1 Commissioner Jarrett's questions, you said you talked to 2 about five or six companies. 3 was that a formal kind of RFP process, or was it just an informal picking up the phone, are you-guys 4 5 interested in bidding on this? My understanding is that it was picking up the 6 Α. 7 phone conversation at that point. It never -- and Mr. Roberts or Mr. Downey may be able to confirm this. 8 9 Typically, on a project like the Iatan 1 and 2 project, you would send out some sort of a request for interest and 10 11 qualifications. 12 In this particular instance, when the -- the 13 way you get that interest list is to make the phone calls. So early on, when Mr. Jones and others made the phone calls, 14 15 they could not get anyone even interested in an EPC contract because of the market and the risk that they all perceived 16 and the fact they hadn't done these for so long was also a 17 18 part of it. But to answer your question, I don't believe it was a formal RFP. 19 20 Do you know, did that take place when you were Q. 21 looking for interest for the entire project as well as when 22 you had the balance of plant issues, or did it just happen at the very beginning? 23 24 There were -- there were two separate calls. Α. Initially, it was the -- the call to -- for the entire 25

1 project. Once no interest was there for that, then there was 2 a second period of, once we went out and said we're going to 3 go out and do an EPC on the boiler and AQCS. Now let's go 4 out and see if there's any interest in the balance of plant 5 as an EPC contract.

That was a separate event that occurred later and was performed by Mr. Jones, and that's when he found there's no interest, even in the balance of plant piece of the work, and we didn't have any interest until Kiewit contacted us and said let's -- we've had a job cancel and we're looking for work, basically.

Q. Okay. All right. I'm going to move on to the regulatory plan. When you were negotiating the regulatory plan, was there any understanding reached about how the adequacy of the cost control plan would be judged?

A. Absolutely no discussion whatsoever. There
was no discussion of what definitive estimate was or meant.
There was no discussion of what cost overruns meant, and
there was no discussion of what format or what documents or
what process would be used in the cost control system.

Q. Internally to KCP&L, when you were developing the cost control system, did you have discussions about adequacy or how you would -- you would present it to the Commission or the Commission Staff?

A. My instructions and conversations with the

25

Г

1	folks that were working on the cost control system document,
2	which included Mr. Jones and Schiff Hardin, my instructions
3	to them was exactly what I was thinking when I signed it
4	when we signed agreement, which was I want the Staff to be
5	able to see every decision and every document and every
6	decision point we make on this project.
7	So even if and the and they told me,
8	well, you know, we're going to put in everything that's
9	they entered in the industry. And when I looked at it and
10	saw that there was reforecast, you know, that typically you
11	do a reforecast once the unit is closer engineered and I was
12	told 70 percent, again at 90 percent, and my instructions was
13	make this system flexible enough that it can cover what we
14	are going to use to manage this project day-to-day.
15	So that if Staff walks in one day and says, I
16	want to know where your budget is today and I want to know
17	what you expect it to be tomorrow and are you going to be
18	over or are you going to be under, we can answer that
19	question.
20	Q. So under that you just mentioned that in
21	the cost control system, you were putting in what you believe
22	to be industry standards plus things in order to achieve that
23	transparency?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. How much of that was kind of brand new that

1 had never been seen by the Missouri Staff before? 2 I believe all of it. And that was one of the Α. 3 problems we had -- or not a problem. That was one of the concerns Mr. Featherstone had when we first set out to do the 4 5 regulatory plan. The last case that -- the last big project we had was Wolf Creek, and it had no cost control system at 6 7 all. So this -- so as far as you can tell, this was 8 Q. 9 a brand new from beginning to end? Even though the industry 10 had used it for Missouri, this was a brand new process? 11 Α. Yes. 12 All right. Thank you. I'm going to move on Q. to Schiff Hardin a little bit. Had you worked with them 13 before in previous projects? 14 15 No. My first time was this project with the Α. Iatan Unit 1 and 2. 16 17 were you involved in their selection? 0. I was involved in a -- in a couple of -- of 18 Α. 19 ways. One, I was a member of the executive oversight 20 committee as an officer of the company, and that committee 21 approved the hiring of Schiff Hardin. I was also involved 22 working with Mr. Downey very closely, and I recall an interview we had with Mr. Roberts and Mr. Gould, I believe, 23 and may have been other Schiff Hardin people. 24 25 But I -- I fully understood what Mr. Downey
was or hoping to accomplish with Schiff Hardin. And based on
 my experience with prior construction projects, you know, it
 was absolutely necessary to hire someone like Schiff Hardin
 for this project given not only relatively inexperienced
 senior management with construction but also in knowing how
 past construction projects had progressed.

7 And if I may, the way I can explain that, in past large construction projects, KCP&L -- and I assume this 8 is probably other utilities as well -- didn't involve their 9 10 senior management and definitely someone in my position as 11 vice-president of regulatory affairs, they weren't involved 12 in the project. In other words, the -- the construction 13 group, the senior leadership went off and built it, and you hoped at the end of the day it came back on schedule and on 14 15 budget.

And to his credit, Mr. Downey did not want 16 17 that to happen on this project. He wanted oversight not only from himself and the EOC, the officer committee, he wanted an 18 19 expert in the industry to come in and also provide that 20 independent oversight and knowledge of project controls and 21 costs so that, not only was senior management not ever 22 surprised, neither would be the regulators because we were going to maintain that same transparency with them. 23 24 In past projects, the best way I can describe 25 it is there were lots of surprises, and no one in today's

1 environment wants a surprise at the end of the day. 2 So would you say you have -- you understood **Q**. 3 what Mr. Downey was trying to do, that's what you just described what he was trying to do? 4 5 He wanted not only to have oversight Α. Yes. from KCP&L officers; he wanted assistance. And the company 6 7 needed assistance from an expert such as Schiff Hardin that knew the contract law, knew the contractors themselves, had 8 experience with them so that when Alstom came in and said, 9 10 look, here's my story on this, you've got a Schiff Hardin 11 sitting there saying, look, I know that's not the case. 12 You know, they had that oversight ability to 13 not only ferret out what the contractors were saying, but to 14 some extent even our own construction personnel. So it was 15 sort of an independent. You know, you may have a project leader out there to protect his own interest, doesn't tell 16 17 you everything you need to know until it's too late. And part of Schiff Hardin's responsibility was to ensure that 18 19 didn't happen. 20 Q. So you've made a couple references to experts 21 like Schiff Hardin or an expert such as Schiff Hardin. What 22 was the EOC's understanding as to why there was no competitive process to determine who that expert was going to 23 24 be? 25 well, initially, on the decision to hire Α.

Γ

1	someone like Schiff Hardin, it was pretty well-described at
2	the EOC that this was the top firm, this was the firm that
3	had the contacts with the vendors, had the contacts with the
4	contractors that was best for the work.
5	At the time that we actually hired Schiff
6	Hardin, I don't think anyone on the EOC anticipated the scope
7	of their work as it ended up. So that we we at first
8	expected that this project would not be a \$20 million Schiff
9	Hardin bill, but more like a, you know, \$10 million Schiff
10	Hardin bill or even \$5 million at one point when I first was
11	involved. So there wasn't seemed to be a necessity to go
12	out with an RFP and get bids.
13	As the project progressed and contract work,
14	contract administration project controls, all of those items
15	continued to be a focus, you know, basically the Schiff
16	Hardin bills ended up being larger than what we had
17	anticipated. Had we known that back in 2005, probably should
18	have and would have done an RFP.
19	Q. So who who was it that convinced or
20	educated the EOC that Schiff Hardin was the top firm?
21	A. I recall that our general counsel was very
22	involved at that point, Mr. Bill Riggins. Mr. Downey had
23	considerable contacts with his former employer, Commonwealth
24	Edison, and his boss there, Mr. Tom Maiman, and I believe
25	Mr. Maiman, who was very familiar with that end of the

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011

Г

1	business because he had built many more projects at
2	Commonwealth than KCP&L had. So and you can probably get
3	this better clarified from Mr. Downey when I think he follows
4	me as a witness.
5	But I think Mr. Downey would tell you that
6	Mr. Maiman and his knowledge of the industry was largely
7	based on on his decision to hire Schiff.
8	Q. Okay. So Commonwealth Edison had the
9	experience with Schiff Hardin, Mr. Downey had experience with
10	Commonwealth Edison, received a referral, then Mr. Downey and
11	Mr. Riggins told the EOC that Schiff Hardin was the top firm?
12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Okay. Now, so you said that that bills
14	were anticipated to be initially between \$5 million and \$10
15	million; is that correct?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. Was that contemplated in the CBE?
18	A. I believe that was in the and I can't say
19	for sure. Mr. Archibald could give you a better number. By
20	the time we did the CBE, I think the estimate that Schiff had
21	provided to us was, for both projects, somewhere between 13
22	and 17 million.
23	Q. Okay. So had Schiff already been hired by the
24	time that estimate had been given?
25	A. Yes.

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011

1 Q. So they -- so they were -- the EOC said we 2 think it's going to be \$5 million to \$10 million. You retain 3 Schiff Hardin, then they give you the estimate of 13 to 17 million, and then you include that in a CBE? 4 5 That's my recollection, yes. Α. 6 So even though you had a potential \$12 Ο. Okay. 7 million increase in the budgeting for this, was there any 8 questioning of that? That, I can't -- I don't know. 9 Α. Was there any question and discussion of that 10 **Q**. 11 at the EOC? 12 Α. Not that I'm aware of. So the EOC had no problem with the difference 13 Q. 14 of the original estimates and those that were included in the 15 CBE? I don't know that the executive or the 16 Α. 17 oversight committee had any knowledge of the -- the number of 13 to 17. It was just rolled into the budget in the -- I 18 19 mean, no, I don't know of any questions specifically that said, well, how much of this is Schiff Hardin. 20 21 Did the EOC review the CBE in detail? Q. 22 It did. And, again, Mr. Archibald or Α. Mr. Downey could give you more specifics, but I don't think 23 it would have been a line item on the -- on the budget the 24 25 EOC was looking at. It would have been in the indirect

1 costs. I could be wrong.

Q. So typically, for other vendors, when you have a \$5 million to \$10 million bill, do you still not go through a competitive -- any competitive processes in order to determine who would give you the best product, best service alue?

A. I think on services, it's probably reaching
8 the point where you should probably do an RFP. But I -- I -9 I am probably the wrong individual to ask that. It's
10 probably Forrest or Mr. Downey.

Q. Well, let me ask you this: Did the EOC -- was there any discussion or questions about having a non- -having a competitive or non-competitive award?

A. Not that I recall.

Q. Okay. So were there any questions at the
EOC about rates or volume discounts or anything like that
that Schiff Hardin may have been provided?

A. No, not that I can recall.

Q. Was any direction given to Mr. Downey and
Mr. Riggins from the EOC regarding hiring Schiff Hardin?
A. No, other than, you know, the EOC was
comfortable that Schiff Hardin was -- was needed, and would
be an asset. There was not much discussion, if any, on their
individual bills.

25

Q.

14

18

So let me -- let me ask you this about the

EOC: What issues, if any, did they question regarding this project? I mean, if a \$5 million to \$10 million expenditure wasn't questioned or didn't have any discussion, what items actually did have discussions?

A. Any items that would be of any significance on
the project, the relationships with the contractors, Alstom,
the settlement with Alstom. Just about any major issue or
concern on the construction side of the -- of the project
would have been discussed, reviewed, and approved by the EOC.
It's not atypical that services type contracts would not be a
focus on a construction project.

Q. Was there any -- was there any item brought to the -- would Mr. Downey typically bring items to the EOC for approval and discussion?

A. Typically, it would be the leadership team ofthe project.

Q. Was there any -- was there ever an item brought by the leadership team to the project that was not approved by the EOC?

A. Yes. There were various projects -- you know, various items or issues that would come before the EOC where the EOC would instruct the project team to no, we don't -what you're providing to us is not selling us on this decision. You need to go back and figure out and do some more work. And then it would come back and either be

approved in a revised format or be done a different way,
 perhaps.

3	Q. What types of issues were those?
4	A. Well, one of the main ones I can think of is
5	later on in the project when we were and since this is the
6	most recent example, when we entered into the startup
7	process, the startup team and the project leadership team had
8	a date that they thought they could realistically set for the
9	project. And that particular date was so far out from where
10	we were focused, we said no, that's not you know, just
11	telling us to put this date out there and this is where we
12	think we're going to come in. The EOC ordered the or
13	directed the leadership team to do a risk assessment and that
14	risk assessment was to be evaluated.
15	Everything that could go wrong in startup and
16	identify a best case and a most likely case of a worst case
17	of various items that would delay the startup of the unit.
18	And rather than just accepting the farthest out date the
19	startup team had given us, went back and said, look, I want
20	to know what would cause this delay and what's the
21	probability of it happening.
22	And so that's that's a real good example of
23	the EOC saying no, we're not going to accept that, and we
24	want you to come back with a probabilistic risk assessment of
25	why you think this date could be met and what's the

1 likelihood of it being met. 2 COMMISSIONER GUNN: Thank you, sir. I think 3 that's all I have. 4 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner Gunn, thank you. 5 **Commissioner Kenney?** 6 EXAMINATION 7 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY: 8 Good morning. We still have five more minutes Q. 9 into morning, so good morning. How are you? 10 Α. Good morning. Fine. 11 Q. Oh, my watch seems to have stopped. 12 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Or perhaps time stopped, I'm 13 not sure. 14 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY: 15 All right. Mr. Giles, I won't take up too 0. 16 much more of your time. I want to start by talking about the 17 discussion you just had with Commissioner Gunn about the contract for Schiff's services because I'm a little confused 18 as to the timing. There's a document that we have that was 19 20 attached to somebody's testimony, and it's an HC document, 21 but it's the contract for legal services between Kansas City 22 Power & Light and Schiff. 23 Do we need to go in-camera to discuss it? 24 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Counsel? 25 MR. FISCHER: You're fine for now,

1 Commissioner. 2 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, I just want to 3 talk about the date of execution of the contract. MR. FISCHER: That's fine. 4 5 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So I don't think that's too controversial. 6 7 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY: The date of execution is January 17, 2007, but 8 Q. all the discussions we've been having indicate that Schiff 9 was hired in 2005 or 2006. 10 11 Are you aware of another contract for legal 12 services that was executed prior to the one that I'm looking 13 at? 14 No, I'm not aware of -- of either, actually. Α. I'm not aware of the contract, the one you're referring to. 15 But Mr. -- Schiff Hardin was actually hired in August of 2005 16 and had started work in August 2005. I don't know, and 17 Mr. Downey or Mr. Roberts could better give you dates. 18 19 Q. Okay. Fair enough. But as far as you know, 20 they were hired in August '05? 21 They were -- I know for a fact they were Α. Yes. working on the project in August of '05. 22 23 Okay. Now, you discussed earlier the whole 0. conversation about the control budget estimate as you 24 25 understood it and its relationship to the definitive estimate

Г

1	and your understanding of the control budget estimate of 2006
2	was intended to be the definitive estimate against which cost
3	overruns would be measured, correct?
4	A. Correct. Yes, sir.
5	Q. And you mentioned a conversation in which you
6	went back to Staff and said, you know, I don't want anybody
7	to think we're trying to pull the wool over anybody's eyes or
8	pull a fast one. Here's my understanding of what definitive
9	estimate means. I have since come to learn that it's a term
10	of art that has a different meaning in the industry and you
11	attempted to clear that up with Staff. Is that a fair
12	summary of your testimony?
13	A. Yes. That's exactly what I did.
14	Q. And you said Mr. Featherstone was present at
15	that discussion, right?
16	A. Yes, he was.
17	Q. And you may have said this, I just missed it.
18	Whom else from our Staff would have been present during the
19	discussion, that specific discussion?
20	A. Anyone attending the the budget meeting
21	and there were signup sheets in those meetings that we
22	could probably get and verify exactly, but based on the
23	timing of events at that time, Mr. Henderson would have been
24	there, Mr. Warren Wood. I don't know I'm very well, I
25	don't know Mr. Schallenberg was in that meeting or not. I

1 don't believe Mr. Hyneman was because Mr. Hyneman didn't come 2 on to the project until '09. 3 MR. FISCHER: Judge, can I approach the witness with an exhibit that's been introduced in the case 4 5 that does have the signup sheet on the cost control meeting? 6 JUDGE PRIDGIN: You may. 7 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Is that the July 11, 2006, meeting, Mr. Fischer? 8 9 MR. FISCHER: Maybe this is not the same 10 meeting then. I'm sorry. I apologize. I thought that was 11 the meeting he was discussing. 12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: That's what I want to 13 ask. 14 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY: 15 Is that the meeting you're referring to, 0. Mr. Giles, or is this a different meeting? 16 17 No. This would have been -- not when we Α. 18 presented the --19 Q. The cost control system? 20 Right. But when we actually presented the Α. 21 control budget estimate, and that meeting occurred in January 22 of 2007. 23 MR. FISCHER: I'm sorry. We don't have a 24 signup sheet for that. 25 THE WITNESS: But I know Mr. Henderson,

1 Mr. Warren Wood, Mr. Dave Elliott, Mr. Cary Featherstone were 2 all in that meeting. 3 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY: And it's your recollection that a signup sheet 4 0. 5 does exist for that meeting? 6 Yes. Staff typically always has a signup Α. 7 sheet and, I assume, keeps those signup sheets. Okay. What is your -- what is your 8 Q. understanding of the significance of the definitive estimate 9 10 being based upon the 2006 control budget estimate? 11 Α. I don't think it has any significance. Ι 12 don't think it -- what -- what the -- what the document was 13 intended to do was to say when are you going to start tracking costs, and the way the document in Q was set up, we 14 15 called that -- we would track costs above the definitive estimate, and it doesn't matter what you call it. We ended 16 17 up calling it the control budget estimate, but it was the first budget we presented to Staff, and it was the budget we 18 19 always tracked costs to throughout the life of the project. 20 Q. So the significance of it is the timing at 21 which Kansas City Power & Light began tracking costs? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Not necessarily the dollar amount? Q. 24 Correct. Α. 25 Is it fair to say that it was always Okay. Q.

1 understood that that budget would increase because only 20 2 to 25 percent of the engineering had been completed at that 3 point?

A. I wouldn't personally characterize it as
saying we knew the budget would increase. I think the -- we
knew it was 20 to 25 percent engineered at that time. We
knew we needed to do a reforecast when it was further
engineered. I personally can't say that I anticipated it
would increase, but we would look at it.

10 **Q**. Okay. Did you think it wouldn't increase? 11 Α. My -- my expectations were it was much more 12 likely to increase than anything. And basically, it's 13 because we were 20 to 25 percent engineered. The market was very competitive and very at risk for price increases, and 14 I -- I would expect it to have gone up. But I -- I can't say 15 that it was not the best estimate we could come up with at 16 17 the time. The control budget estimate was a very thorough and very much vetted and reviewed budget with a contingency. 18 19 So on the -- on the basis of all the information we had at the time, we felt it was a good budget 20 21 but recognized that we would need to relook when the project 22 was closer to 70 percent engineered. 23 And then there was another forecast done in 0. April of 2010 when it was about 90 percent engineered or 24

1125 TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC 573.886.8942 www.tigercr.com

25

almost to completion?

1 There was actually a -- a reforecast Α. Yes. 2 done in the summer of 2009. 3 Q. Okay. And that was to -- when the project was 90 4 Α. 5 percent engineered, that particular budget didn't change the total cost. It came in the same and -- which is not 6 7 surprising. We've gone from 70 to 90 percent, and a year later the budget was still good at 1.901. Then we did an 8 estimate at completion in November 2010 that brought it up 9 10 to 1.948. 11 Q. Gotcha. I want to talk a little bit about 12 the -- and I don't remember who you had this conversation with, but you were discussing -- I think it was with 13 Ms. Ott -- the discussion of the invoices from Schiff. 14 15 Do you remember having a discussion regarding the invoices you received from Schiff Hardin? 16 17 I do, yes. Α. 18 were you a part of the process of reviewing Q. 19 those invoices before they got paid? 20 Α. No. I was not involved at all with invoice review of Schiff. 21 22 Okay. There was some discussion regarding **Q**. whether Kansas City Power & Light would be requesting the 23 costs of the May 23rd, 2008, crane accident. Do you recall 24 that discussion? 25

г	EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011
1	A. Yes, I do.
2	Q. What is KCP&L's position as you understand it
3	to be today?
4	A. As I understand it today, they're and I can
5	say this potentially because I'm not sure. My understanding
6	is there is some potential costs that KCP&L may incur as a
7	result of some sort of insurance dispute.
8	Q. Is this highly confidential information since
9	it's an ongoing commercial dispute?
10	A. I think it probably is.
11	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Counsel, can you verify?
12	MR. FISCHER: Yes, sir.
13	(REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an in-camera
14	session was held, which is contained in Volume 20, pages 1128
15	to 1130 of the transcript.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
L	

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

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

			<u> </u>	
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	 	 		

1 CHRIS GILES testified as follows: 2 BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY: 3 I just want to make sure that we all are 0. defining our terms the same way. So the comprehensive energy 4 5 plan and the stip in that case was the same thing? 6 Yes. The way that -- the way I used to Α. 7 characterize it and still do is the comprehensive energy plan was the -- the investment in the five-year business plan for 8 The regulatory plan enabled us to implement it. 9 KCP&L. But all that's embodied in 10 **Q**. Gotcha. Okay. 11 that stipulation and agreement from the 2005 case? 12 Α. Yes. were you involved directly with the 13 Q. 14 negotiation of that stipulation and agreement? 15 Yes, I was. Α. And then let me ask you this question, then. 16 0. 17 If you know, you know; and if you don't, that's okay. Who typically would take the first stab at drafting that 18 document? Would it be our Staff, would it be Kansas City 19 20 Power & Light or one of the other parties? Do you know who actually sat down at the word 21 22 processor and cranked out the first draft of the stipulation 23 and agreement? I believe the -- you know, maybe the very 24 Α. first draft, I recall, was drafted by KCP&L. 25

l

2	A. But to give you an idea of how that process
	A. But to give you an idea of how that process
3	went, we actually got in a room together, KCP&L staff, all
4	the other parties that were involved, put it up on a I
5	guess it's called an ELMO, and actually wrote that document
6	together page-by-page all the way down to punctuations and
7	language. So however it started out, it was definitely a
8	group effort when it was completed.
9	Q. Well so let me make sure I understand you.
10	The first draft was drafted by Kansas City Power & Light, and
11	that was put up on an ELMO and you-all went page-by-page,
12	line-by-line?
13	A. Yes. And that occurred over a period of days.
14	Q. Several days?
15	A. Yes.
16	Q. Were you present at all those drafting
17	sessions?
18	A. Yes, I was.
19	Q. Let me do you have a copy of the plan?
20	A. I do not in front of me.
21	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Can somebody provide it
22	to Mr. Giles, please.
23	MR. FISCHER: Yes, sir.
24	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fischer is getting it.
25	BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:

Γ

1	Q. Let's look at Paragraph Q on page 28, Roman
2	numeral three, capital B, number one, Paragraph Q, the
3	what is now becoming the infamous cost control process for
4	construction expenditures paragraph.
5	A. Yes, I see it.
6	Q. Who drafted that particular paragraph? Would
7	that have been in the initial draft that Kansas City Power &
8	Light drafted?
9	A. I believe so, yes.
10	Q. Okay. And I'm really getting into the weeds
11	here. Do you know specifically who at Kansas City Power &
12	Light would have drafted the first draft?
13	A. Probably Mr. Fischer.
14	Q. Okay. All right. Do you know if that
15	paragraph changed at all substantively well, not even
16	substantive. I don't want to qualify it.
17	Do you know if that paragraph changed at all
18	from how it was presented in the very first draft, drafted by
19	Mr. Fischer until the ultimate draft that was signed by the
20	parties, if you know?
21	A. The only thing I can say is I would not
22	anticipate it had changed at all because we did not have any
23	discussion on this paragraph at all. This was the least
24	discussed topic of many topics in this in this drafting.
25	It was not a concern. It did not appear to be a concern to

1 anyone. That's funny how these things turn out, that 2 Q. 3 the least discussed paragraph is now morphed into one of the most discussed paragraphs. 4 5 You're exactly right. And, you know, and that Α. really goes to the heart of the argument because --6 7 Yes, it does. Q. -- had we known, I think we would have spent 8 Α. more time defining these terms. 9 10 **Q**. My thoughts exactly. So there was -- and this 11 is probably redundant, but I just want to be clear. 12 It was never discussed how cost overruns would be identified and explained? 13 14 Α. Never. 15 Are you aware of whether there is any 0. construction industry standard for identifying and explaining 16 17 cost overruns? 18 Α. No, I'm not aware of any. Mr. Meyer may have 19 a better idea, but I know Mr. Meyer in his testimony has said 20 that KCP&L's is in the top 25 percent of the industry. 21 Kansas City Power & Light -- I'm sorry, Kansas Q. 22 City Power & Light what? 23 Cost control system. Α. 24 Oh. And, similarly, the phrase "definitive Q. estimate" was never discussed and what that meant? 25

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011

Г

1	Α.	No, not at all. I know at the time that
2	phrase was use	d in the Wolf Creek order, but I also know that
3	the Kansas sta	tute currently has a definition of definitive
4	estimate, and [.]	that definition, as clearly as it defines it,
5	is the origina	l estimate. But no, we
6	Q.	That's defined in the Kansas order or Kansas
7	statute?	
8	Α.	Kansas statute.
9	Q.	Before or after this agreement was entered
10	into?	
11	Α.	That would have been before this agreement.
12	Q.	But it was never discussed that the intention
13	would be to hav	ve that definition apply to this phrase in this
14	document, righ	t?
15	Α.	No, not at all. It wasn't discussed at all.
16	Q.	All right. Okay. You said that Kansas City
17	Power & Light's	s cost control system is ranked in the top 25
18	percent, and t	nat's Mr. Meyer's testimony?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	It's ranked by what entity or whom?
21	Α.	I think that was Mr. Meyer's opinion rather
22	than	
23	Q.	Oh.
24	Α.	He's indicating that, of all the systems he's
25	seen, he would	rank it within the top 25.

Г

1	Q. Oh, I see. Okay. Were you involved in the
2	drafting of the comprehensive energy plan, construction
3	projects, cost control system?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And were you involved in that go ahead, I'm
6	sorry.
7	A. My involvement was really instructions as to
8	what what I expected in my review of the final product. I
9	didn't work day-to-day on putting it together.
10	Q. Were you at the July 11th, 2006, meeting when
11	this was presented to Staff for the first time?
12	A. I was not in that particular meeting. Mr. Tim
13	Rush, who reported to me at the time, led that meeting.
14	Q. Okay.
15	A. I believe I had some other commitment.
16	Q. And that's the meeting for which we do have
17	the sign-in sheet, right?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Okay. Give me just a second here. Okay.
20	Just so I'm clear on a couple of things, we were talking
21	about the engineering, procurement, construction contracts
22	for the boiler in the AQCS.
23	That was the only portion of the project that
24	had an EPC, correct?
25	A. Yes. The balance of plant was not an EPC. It

was what would be called a construction contract. Burns &
 McDonnell did the engineering, and Kiewit did the execution
 and construction.

Q. Okay. And you guys did the procurement?
A. Yes. There were -- I believe Kiewit did do
some procurement as well in the DOP, but KCP&L had already
procured most of the primary equipment.

Q. Now, I think I read testimony somewhere that Kansas City Power & Light hadn't embarked on a construction project of this size since the Wolf Creek plant, and then maybe the rebuilding of Hawthorn 5 was close but not exactly as large. Is that your recollection?

13 A. Yes.

Q. Do you recall -- well, and let me backup. And there was also some testimony that Ernst & Young did an audit of the relationship among the various contractors, and there was also an entity called Strategic Talent Solutions that did an assessment of the relationship between the contractors.

19 Do you remember that?

20 A. Yes.

Q. Are you aware of whether outside auditors or
consultants were brought in on the Wolf Creek project to
assess the relationship between the parties?

A. I don't recall whether they were brought in
for that purpose or not. I know there was a significant

Γ

1	amount of turnover in KCP&L's internal audit group itself
2	during that case.
3	Q. Okay. Do you know if it's standard to pay
4	outside consultants to assess the relationship among
5	contractors on projects of this size, if you know?
6	A. I don't really know, but I could say that
7	Ernst & Young was really KCP&L was supplementing KCP&L's
8	own internal audit group. Our internal audit group at that
9	time didn't have the construction background and resources,
10	so Ernst & Young wasn't really there other than to supplement
11	KCP&L's own internal auditing group. With the Strategic
12	Talent Solutions group, they had been on KCP&L's list of
13	doing environment or leadership profiles and 360 feedback
14	type things for human resources long before the project
15	began.
16	Q. Oh, I see.
17	A. So it was it wasn't like Strategic Talent
18	Solutions, we went and hired them for this purpose. They
19	were always already onsite and doing work for KCP&L. So
20	when when the executives discovered that, not
21	surprisingly, you've got a lot of people working together for
22	the first time in a lot of different cultural backgrounds,
23	there might be some tensions, and STS was instructed to do
24	this study to go see what could be improved.
25	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Gotcha. Thank you for

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011

Γ

1	your time, sir. I don't have any other questions.
2	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Commissioner Kenney, thank
3	you. I don't have any questions either. This looks to be a
4	pretty natural break to break for lunch. Is there anything
5	further from counsel before we adjourn for lunch? All right.
6	We will stay in recess until 1:45. I'll see if we have
7	anything further from counsel, and then we will resume
8	Mr. Giles's examination. Thank you.
9	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Judge, real quick. I
10	asked about this this can or cannot be I don't think it
11	needs to be on the record.
12	(An off-the-record discussion was held.)
13	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Good afternoon. We are back
14	on the record. When we adjourned for lunch, I believe bench
15	questions were finished for Mr. Giles and we are back for
16	recross-examination. Is there anything from counsel before
17	we begin? Recross, Mr. Schwarz?
18	MR. SCHWARZ: Yes.
19	JUDGE PRIDGIN: When you're ready, sir.
20	MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you.
21	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Schwarz, this is HC,
22	correct, that you're putting on the board? It's not being
23	broadcast, that's why I'm asking.
24	MR. SCHWARZ: I'm not going to put it on the
25	board. There's no Commissioners, I'm not sure they can read

1 it anyway. 2 RECROSS-EXAMINATION 3 QUESTIONS BY MR. SCHWARZ: Good afternoon, Mr. Giles. 4 0. 5 Good afternoon. Α. You talked at length about the control budget 6 **Q**. 7 estimate, did you not? T did. 8 Α. And I've handed you what is the control budget 9 Q. 10 estimate, have I not? 11 Α. Um. 12 Let me represent that it is. Take a look at Q. it and see if you're familiar with that. 13 14 Yes, there are four columns on this and the Α. 15 last column is titled December '06 control budget estimate. Okay. Would you take a look at number -- down 16 0. 17 the left-hand side, there are numbers numbering the groupings of the cost estimates. Would you take a look at number 18 19 seven, and the one, two, three, four -- fifth, sixth and 20 seventh items down, "escalation for labor, non-boiler APC," 21 "escalation materials, non-boiler APC" and "escalation 22 indirects;" is that correct? 23 Α. Correct. 24 And if you go over to the CBE column, it **Q**. 25 indicates that those are all included, does it not?

r	E`	IDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011
1	А	Yes.
2	Q	Likewise, if you look at number eight on
3	owners's	ndirects under it's the second line from the
4	bottom, i	says "Escalation on indirects," does it not?
5	А	Yes.
6	Q	And that, too, is included in the right-hand
7	column?	
8	А	Yes.
9	Q	And then line number ten is "project costs
10	without co	itingency and financing?"
11	А	Correct.
12	Q	And the total of that is 1 billion, 465
13	million?	
14	А	Yes.
15	Q	Okay. So if you add up all those costs
16	including	the expected escalation of those costs, in December
17	of '06 you	come up with 1.465 billion; is that correct?
18	А	Yes, excluding contingency.
19	Q	Excluding contingencies and financing?
20	А	Correct.
21	Q	A non-trivial item?
22	А	Correct.
23	Q	And there has been much testimony that at the
24	time of t	s December '06 control budget estimate, there was
25	already a	oillion dollars under contract on the project, do

you recall that? 1 2 I believe that's correct. Α. 3 So that would suggest that maybe 465 million 0. was still on contract? 4 5 Correct. Α. 6 Okay. And if you go just below that, you have Ο. an owner's contingency of a 145 million and a low probability 7 high impact contingency of 75 million, correct? 8 9 Α. Correct. That totals 220 million? 10 **Q**. 11 Yes. Α. 12 And that's additional contingencies over the Q. project costs including the expected escalations? 13 14 Α. Yes. 15 And I want to continue from over here, if I 0. And these figures would have been vetted by Schiff 16 may. Hardin? Schiff Hardin was on board at this stage? 17 18 Α. Yes. And Burns & McDonnell? 19 Q. 20 They provided input, yes. Α. 21 And the executive oversight committee? Q. 22 Yes. Α. 23 And the project team? Q. 24 Correct. Α. 25 You suggested in one of your answers to one of Q.

Г

1	the Commissioner's questions that Mr. Jones had talked to
2	five or six possible EPC contractors. Do you recall that?
3	A. I do.
4	Q. Are you aware that Mr. Jones only identified a
5	single EPC contractor in his testimony of Washington Mutual
6	that he had spoken to?
7	A. I discussed two different queries by Mr. Jones
8	and the query that I was referring to, I saw an e-mail where
9	he had contacted more than one.
10	Q. Okay.
11	MR. SCHWARZ: I think that's all that I have.
12	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Schwarz, thank you. Mr.
13	Mills?
14	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
15	QUESTIONS BY MR. MILLS:
16	Q. The two just to follow-up, the two
17	different sets of inquiries about EPCs, the first one was
18	about an EPC for the entire project, correct?
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. Is it your testimony that for that one,
21	Mr. Jones talked to five or six contractors or for the second
22	one?
23	A. My understanding, it was for the first one.
24	Q. Okay. Now one of the questions that you had,
25	I believe it was from Commissioner Gunn, had to do with the κ

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 reports. When did the K reports start being produced? 2 would have been first quarter after the Α. 3 control budget. I thought you had testimony that there 4 0. Okav. 5 were some in early 2006? 6 Α. There were K reports for other projects, but I don't believe there was one for Iatan --7 8 Q. Okay. -- until the control budget was established. 9 Α. 10 **Q**. Because by definition, the K reports track 11 changes from the control budget? 12 Α. Correct. Okay. Now you had a number of questions about 13 Q. 14 the Schiff Hardin expenses, and with respect to charging to 15 plant as opposed to expense in this rate case expense, did KCP&L take the same approach in Missouri as it did in Kansas? 16 17 To the best of my knowledge, yes. Α. In response to one of the Commissioner's 18 Q. 19 questions, you made reference to a project leader who doesn't 20 tell you what you need to know until it's too late. Do you 21 recall that? 22 I do. Α. Did a situation like that ever arise on the 23 0. 24 Iatan projects? 25 I believe I was referring to other Α. NO.

1 projects, past projects where that could happen. 2 Has it ever happened in your experience at Q. 3 KCP&L? I wasn't nearly as involved with the other 4 Α. 5 projects as this one, but, you know, subject to saying I'm 6 speculating, I'm sure it happened on at least Wolf Creek. Now with respect to the definitive estimate as 7 Q. that term is used in the CEP, isn't the significance for 8 calling for a definitive estimate in the CEP that the parties 9 thought a definitive estimate would be an accurate estimate 10 11 and early in the process? 12 Α. No. that was not discussed at all. 13 Q. So how do you know what the other parties 14 thought it meant? I don't. I know it was not discussed and I 15 Α. know it's not what I took it to mean. 16 17 Okay. You took it to mean something other 0. 18 than what the industry standard definition is; is that 19 correct? 20 No, at that time I didn't even know what the Α. 21 industry standard was. 22 Do you now? Q. 23 Α. Yes. And at the time that you drafted the CEP, did 24 Q. you take it to mean something other than what the industry 25

1 standard you have later learned? 2 Α. Yes. 3 So with respect to your understanding 0. Okav. of the use of the term "definitive estimate" in the CEP. it 4 5 was your understanding that that meant that you'd come up with a pretty good budget within six months of the deadline. 6 7 It was my understanding we would come up with Α. the best budget we could within that six-month period and 8 that would be what we tracked to for the project, yes, that's 9 10 correct. 11 Q. Now you had some questions, I believe they 12 were from Commissioner Kenny, about the actual drafting process of the CEP. Were either Bob Schallenberg or Cary 13 Featherstone present during some or all of those drafting 14 sessions? 15 16 Α. Yes. Both of them? 17 0. I am not sure about Mr. Featherstone, but I 18 Α. 19 recall Mr. Schallenberg being at every meeting, yes. 20 Q. Now you were also asked some questions about 21 the cost control document that was provided to the parties in 22 July of 2006. Do you recall that? 23 I do. Α. was that document provided to the parties 24 **Q**. significantly in advance of the July 11, 2006 meeting? 25

01-21-2011 EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 1 Α. I don't recall. 2 Is it possible it was provided to parties at Q. 3 the meeting? I don't have any knowledge or recollection 4 Α. 5 when it was provided. 6 You don't have any memory of sending it out in Q. the advance of the meeting? 7 8 Α. NO. Okay. If it had been provided either at or 9 Q. shortly before the meeting, would that perhaps explain the 10 lack of immediate feedback? 11 12 I don't know that I've said there was any lack Α. of immediate feedback. 13 14 It's a fairly lengthy document, is it not? **Q**. 15 It is. Α. Fair amount of detail, correct? 16 Q. 17 Very thorough. Α. MR. MILLS: That's all I have. Thank you. 18 19 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Mills, thank you. 20 Ms. Ott? 21 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION** 22 QUESTIONS BY MS. OTT: 23 Mr. Giles, going back to the definitive 0. estimate, did Schiff Hardin ever define "definitive estimate" 24 25 for you?
Г

1	A. I believe I testified that Mr. Meyer, who is a
2	subcontractor to Schiff, was the individual that first
3	pointed out to me that in the industry, here is what a
4	definitive estimate typically represents, so yes, Mr. Meyer
5	was the individual that pointed that out to me.
6	Q. Did any employee of Schiff Hardin, not a
7	contractor of Schiff Hardin, ever define what definitive
8	estimate meant to you?
9	A. NO.
10	Q. Okay.
11	A. Mr. Meyer.
12	Q. But he's a contractor, he's not an actual
13	employee of Schiff Hardin?
14	A. Correct.
15	Q. Now did the control budget have contingencies
16	because the project wasn't significantly engineered?
17	A. That would be one of the reasons, yes.
18	Q. You were talking about the quarterly reports.
19	Who developed the reports that you provided during those
20	quarterly meetings?
21	A. The contents of the report were a shared
22	responsibility of various individuals on the project
23	leadership team and their subordinates. They would do a
24	draft of the of the report. The report would be reviewed
25	by myself, Schiff Hardin a number of people. And

1 ultimately, it was reviewed by Mr. Downey as well before it 2 was transmitted. 3 So KCP&L employees did the first draft of 0. those reports? 4 5 Α. Yes. 6 Okay. With Commissioner Gunn, you had some **Q**. 7 discussions with change orders and Mr. Elliott. Have you ever seen Mr. Elliott sponsor an adjustment in a case? 8 I don't know. 9 Α. 10 **Q**. Have you ever seen Mr. Elliott sponsor a 11 disallowance in a case? 12 Α. I don't know. Now, you also with Mr. -- Commissioner Gunn 13 Q. spoke of the controlled budget estimate. Did that control 14 15 budget estimate include \$40 million for unit trains, railcars? 16 Yes, it did, 37 million. 17 Α. Did -- and KCP&L decided not to obtain those 18 **Q**. 19 railcars, correct? Not to own the railcars. Our decision in 20 Α. 21 economic evaluation indicated it would be more cost effective 22 to lease them. 23 Did KCP&L ever adjust this control budget 0. estimate to not reflect the purchase of those railcars? 24 25 Α. NO.

Г

1	Q. Now, going back to Mr. Elliott, did he ever
2	inform you that he did not look at the cost of the of
3	Iatan?
4	A. Not me personally. I understand he did inform
5	Mr. Davis of that, but he never discussed it with me
6	directly.
7	Q. With Commissioner Jarrett, you were having
8	some discussions about Mr. Drabinski and Burns & Mc, and
9	there wasn't any discovery issues at the KCC. Did KCP&L
10	prevent Mr. Drabinski from meeting with Burns & Mc?
11	A. NO.
12	Q. Were you aware of any other parties in the
13	Kansas rate case that had concerns about information being
14	withheld about Schiff Hardin?
15	A. Not that I'm aware of.
16	Q. Now, you were having conversations about
17	Mr. Maiman and Mr. Downey and Schiff Hardin, how that
18	relationship was established. And I just want to be clear.
19	Mr. Downey and Mr. Maiman were contacts or former co-workers
20	from Commonwealth Edison, correct?
21	A. Mr. Maiman and who did you say?
22	Q. Mr. Downey.
23	A. That's my understanding, yes.
24	Q. And then Maiman is the one who recommended
25	Mr. Downey to you at Schiff Hardin?

A. That's my understanding. Mr. Downey will
 follow me, he's probably better to answer that, but that's my
 understanding.

Q. And Mr. Maiman is a contractor for Schiff?
A. I don't know that he was at that time or not.
And he's not today. He was at some point. Mr. Downey can
7 give you more detail.

Q. Okay. Going back to the control budget
9 estimate that was drafted when it was 20 to 25 percent
10 engineered. Wasn't the point of the contingency within that
11 control budget to capture the increases that would go above
12 and beyond the control budget estimate?

13 A. Yes.

14 Now, you were also discussing that you **Q**. 15 expected there to be budget increases with the project. SO when you were talking about "expected," are you talking about 16 17 expected over the 200 -- 200 million contingency or was that meant to be you expected increases because of the 18 19 contingency -- there was a contingency built in? 20 Α. I think that was in response to a question 21 from, I believe, Commissioner Gunn, and I believe my response 22 was that the control budget estimate was the best estimate we 23 had at the time. And including the contingency, I didn't think it was accurate to say that we didn't believe that was 24 a good budget. Mr. Gunn inquired whether I expected it to go 25

1 I believe my response was I would expect it to go up, if up. 2 anything. 3 Above the contingency? 0. Above the 1.685 total budget. 4 Α. 5 So you didn't think the amount built in for Q. the contingency was adequate to recover what you thought the 6 cost of the plant would be? 7 At the time -- as I stated, at the time we did 8 Α. the budget, we thought we had a good budget. And I was 9 10 responding to his question in retrospect. And given that the 11 commodity market was increasing beyond what we had 12 anticipated in the control budget, I would have expected the 13 budget to go up rather than down. 14 You were also having some conversations where Q. 15 you and Mr. Featherstone had worked on Wolf Creek together and had some concerns with the reconciliation packages. And 16 17 then you were talking about the drafting of the CEP. Did you have any discussions with Mr. Featherstone prior to, I 18 believe you said Mr. Fischer drafted the CEP, that -- about 19 what should be contained within that document? 20 21 Well, the only discussions we had were as I --Α. as I've testified. We both wanted some language that we 22 23 would have a cost control system that explained overruns and we put the language in and that was the end of the 24 It didn't last more than five minutes. 25 discussion.

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 Was that prior, though, to Mr. Fischer Q. 2 drafting -- taking the first draft? 3 Yes. Α. Okay. Going back to the crane accident and 4 0. 5 you said that the only thing would be the accrual on the 6 books. Did KCP&L pay Schiff and Packer Engineering any money related to the crane acciden? 7 I believe we did. 8 Α. Do you know how much money that was? 9 Q. I don't know if it got charged to the 10 Α. NO. 11 project or not. 12 Ο. You were also discussing EPC and multi-prime, and you stated that the only EPC was the boiler in the AQCS. 13 Do you know if the Pullman Power had an EPC for the chimney? 14 I don't know if Pullman was an EPC. I know 15 Α. subsequent to my testimony, it's been pointed out to me that 16 17 there were smaller EPC contracts other than Alstom on the project. I was focused mainly on the large ones. 18 19 MS. OTT: I have nothing further. 20 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Ms. Ott, thank you. Redirect? 21 MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Judge. 22 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 23 OUESTIONS BY MR. FISCHER: Mr. Giles, I think I'd like to begin with 24 **Q**. where we began, the regulatory plan itself. There were a lot 25

Г

1	of questions about that. Could you give a little more
2	background on how that regulatory plan came to be, since
3	you're the primary witness that was there?
4	A. Sure. The regulatory plan was the culmination
5	of a long process that KCP&L undertook beginning in
6	late-2003, early-2004. KCP&L actually developed a tentative
7	comprehensive energy plan, a five-year plan based on input
8	from a variety of stakeholders, consumers, commissions,
9	regulatory staffs, the public in general.
10	Once that preliminary CEP, or comprehensive
11	energy plan, had been developed, I did a presentation along
12	with John Grimwade in April, 2004, to the Commissioners in an
13	open agenda session. And in that presentation, I indicated
14	that in order for KCP&L to move forward with any of these
15	projects, we needed a collaboration with the Staff, the OPC,
16	and any other public that would be interested in joining
17	that. I believe it was in May of 2004, the Commission opened
18	a workshop docket.
19	At the same time, the Kansas Commission also
20	opened a workshop docket. And it was the expectation that
21	during these collaborations, we would be able to come to an
22	agreement in a stipulation, in separate agreements, one for
23	Missouri and one for Kansas, that would enable the KCP&L to
24	move forward and actually implement and execute the
~ -	

25 comprehensive energy plan. We began that process after the

1 Commission's Order, which was sometime in May or June of '04, 2 and we did not culminate that process with an agreement in Missouri until I believe it was May of '08. In Kansas, it 3 was August, '08. 4 5 And then subsequent to that agreement, we had an amended agreement in Missouri to reflect any items the 6 7 Missouri parties wanted to pick out of the Kansas agreement. So the final amended agreement, I believe, was in August 8 of '08. 9 10 **Q**. The actual drafting of that particular 11 agreement was of interest to one of the Commissioners. DO 12 you recall how long it took for us to get to a final draft of 13 that agreement? 14 Yes, it took -- it took probably six months of Α. 15 collaboration to even get to the point where we could begin to draft the agreement. It took another three months to 16 17 actually draft the agreement. 18 Ο. Do you recall the original piece of paper that 19 we looked at was pretty thin? 20 Yes, it was very thin. We worked day after Α. 21 day and after a certain period of time, we all sat in the 22 same -- we decided we had to speed this up. We all got in the same room, got it on an ELMO and went line-by-line for a 23 period of days on the language. 24 And nights, if I recall? 25 Q.

1 Yes, late into the evening. Α. 2 what were some of the provisions that were 0. 3 added that we hadn't thought about? Do you recall some of those? 4 5 Some of them, for instance, that the parties Α. requested, no, we would not be able to use a rider, a single 6 7 issue rate-making item that came out of the Senate Bill 379, I think it was -- or 179, I can't recall -- but we would not 8 be able to use that until the year 2015. There were other 9 10 provisions such as the amortization, the rate case schedule. 11 we had programs for demand-side management, we had 12 transmission and distribution projects. There were a number of provisions both the company received -- as I would 13 characterize it, benefits to the company and benefits to the 14 15 parties. There were a number of appendices that were 16 0. 17 added later on, not the original draft; is that right? Correct. We -- we had appendices that 18 Α. discussed pension trackers, amortization, credit metrics, 19 financing, credit rating, rate freeze with both a moratorium 20 21 on a rate reduction and a limit to the number of cases we 22 could file and what time period. It was a pretty exhaustive, 23 difficult negotiation.

Q. And I believe you indicated you had
discussions with one of the Staff people about that, what

1 became Paragraph Q; is that right? 2 That language was added based on a Yes. Α. 3 conversation Mr. Featherstone and I had had and it was the least talked about issue anywhere in the document. 4 would that have been likely one that was added 5 0. on the ELMO while we were talking those nights? 6 7 No, I believe it was in the document very Α. early on. 8 Okay. And we were doing this in what year, 9 Q. 10 what year were we drafting? 11 Α. We were drafting this document in 2005, in the 12 March, April time frame. And then after that stipulation was actually 13 Ο. 14 signed, were there -- were there further hearings or 15 proceedings to consider it? Yes, the stipulation was done unanimous. 16 Α. And 17 in terms of we didn't know what parties were interested that had not participated, for instance, and I believe a couple of 18 parties requested a hearing. The Commission ordered a 19 20 hearing on the stipulation and agreement and I don't recall 21 all the parties, but I believe Sierra Club may have been one 22 that wanted that hearing. The hearing was held. The 23 Commission ultimately approved the agreement. Do you recall if any -- if that order got 24 Q. 25 appealed?

1	A. I do recall the order was appealed. I don't
2	recall which party appealed, but I recall all the appeals
3	were were not granted.
4	Q. Well, it sounds like a big effort. Why did
5	KCP&L go through all that trouble of trying to work out a
6	regulatory plan?
7	A. Much like the situation KCP&L's in today,
8	there is no predetermination statute or provision in
9	Missouri. And used to be in the last time we built power
10	plants, both Iatan 1 and wolf Creek, utilities typically made
11	the decision based on their resource needs, plan the
12	capacity, built it, and then filed a rate case to recover the
13	costs.
14	In the environment that KCP&L was operating in
15	in 2004, that's not that was not possible to do. Credit
16	rating agencies, investors have a much more visible presence
17	with utilities. And to announce a major project, let alone a
18	comprehensive energy plant project of the magnitude and the
19	dollars KCP&L had planned, absent some assurance that the
20	prudence of going forward was supported, we would have been
21	downgraded by our credit rating agencies and potentially
22	downgraded below investment grade.
23	Q. To your knowledge, had the Commission
24	previously approved such a comprehensive regulatory plan?
25	A. No. We were the first to have such an

Γ

1	approval in Missouri and Kansas, and to my knowledge, the
2	first in the country to have such a plan. We actually
3	KCP&L actually won an award from the Edison Electric
4	Institute for this innovative approach to regulatory.
5	Q. Was this a collaborative approach with a lot
6	of different parties of the Commission?
7	A. It was a collaborative approach and obviously
8	KCP&L could not have obtained what it needed without the
9	support and cooperation of the Commission Staff, consumer
10	counsels, and other parties.
11	Q. Was a similar effort going on in Kansas at the
12	same time?
13	A. Yes, a parallel effort was ongoing in Kansas
14	and initially the workshop collaborations were held jointly
15	until we got far enough down the the path that we were
16	negotiating individual agreements. At that time, the
17	meetings broke up to separate collaboration; one with
18	Missouri, one with Kansas.
19	Q. Was there a provision in the Missouri
20	regulatory plan that parties could bring back provisions from
21	the Kansas regulatory plan if they found it desirable?
22	A. Yes. The agreement that was struck in
23	Missouri since we were in continuing discussions with
24	Kansas the parties wanted what was termed or most favored
25	"nation clause," which essentially said that once we approve

1 this agreement or the Commission approves it, if Kansas 2 approves a different agreement, we have the ability to read through that agreement and take any provision out of it that 3 we deem should be in the Missouri agreement. 4 5 were there also provisions about joint owners 0. in the regulatory plan in Missouri? 6 7 Yes, there were. There was -- at that time, Α. many individual utility companies and cooperatives were 8 interested in coal capacity, and particularly in Iatan 2. 9 We 10 had a variety of partners that would have taken various 11 shares. And in that agreement, we identified the partners 12 and the shares based on a, at that time, I believe 13 800-megawatt unit. 14 And subsequently, when we became aware of 15 another party interested, we expanded that to a 50 -- an 16 850-megawatt unit and added another partner that was not part 17 of the Missouri list but became a part of the Kansas, which 18 was KEPCO. 19 Q. There was discussion about the concept of 20 transparency. what does that mean to you? 21 what transparency means to me, and it was Α. 22 inherent in my mind at the time of the 2005 agreement and 23 throughout the construction of the project is that KCP&L would provide ongoing contemporaneous data to the parties, to 24 25 the Staff as the project was developed and executed so that

Г

1	they knew every decision we were making, when we made it, why
2	we made it. And any cost increase in the scheduled
3	deviations were documented and Staff had access to all of
4	those thought processes and decisions.
5	Q. Were those provided to the signatory parties
6	in Missouri on a quarterly basis?
7	A. Yes, we used the quarterly reports to inform
8	all the parties and we subsequently followed up with a
9	face-to-face meeting with all the parties that chose to
10	attend. And in those meetings, we not only went through the
11	quarterly report but gave a realtime update as of that very
12	morning of any activities, problems, issues, cost of the
13	plant.
14	MR. FISCHER: Judge, I'd like to have an
15	exhibit marked.
16	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Do you have a number?
17	MR. FISCHER: Is it 71 or is it it would be
18	a I guess still an HC exhibit.
19	JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'm not showing a 71, but I
20	could be wrong. Mr. Fischer, I think this is 70.
21	(Exhibit No. 70-HC was marked for
22	identification by the Court Reporter.)
23	BY MR. FISCHER:
24	Q. Mr. Giles, would you take a look at what has
25	been marked as Exhibit 70-HC and describe what that is?

Г

1	A. This is the strategic infrastructure
2	investment status report, 2006, dated April 28th, 2006, in
3	Case No. EO-2005-0329 and this is the quarterly report that I
4	was referring to. This would be the first quarter it was
5	prepared, which was as it indicates, 2006, first quarter.
6	Q. Were you involved in the preparation of this
7	document?
8	A. Yes, I was.
9	Q. What kind of information is included in this
10	document, if you could summarize in a high level?
11	A. There is an introduction in this particular
12	one and that may have been because it was the first
13	exhaustive summary. It details the wind project status,
14	actual plant expenditures, wind project schedule, bid
15	specifications, contracts, transmission studies,
16	interconnection agreement. It does a similar for the La
17	Cygne SER project, which was active at that time. Describes
18	in detail the bid specifications, contractor selection
19	evaluation, milestone project schedule.
20	There are exhibits attached that show
21	projected and actual expenditures through the quarter and the
22	variance and percent, various A B&W Babcock Wilcox
23	critical path project schedule, summary of activities. Then
24	we begin with the Iatan project status update, describes
25	Unit 2, steam turbine and generator, requests for proposal

Г

1	that went to GE, Mitsubishi, Siemens and Toyota, updates the
2	status of the Unit 2 boiler and SER system, unit 12 AQCS
3	systems. Again, bid specifications, project permits, summary
4	of actual planned expenditures, milestone schedule, and then
5	that's followed with the same type of review for the T and D
6	projects and
7	Q. I notice there on Page 33 as an Exhibit A.
8	What does that relate to?
9	A. Exhibit A is the pro Iatan project cost
10	summary. This precedes the control budget development, so
11	basically what is shown here is the KCP&L costs to date,
12	engineering services, and legal and financial services. It
13	shows in this first quarterly report the total expenditures
14	were about \$8.1 million.
15	MR. FISCHER: Judge, I'd move for the
16	admission of 70-HC.
17	JUDGE PRIDGIN: 70-HC is offered, any
18	objections? Hearing none, 70HC is admitted, and that's KCP&L
19	70нс.
20	(Exhibit No. 70-HC was received into
21	evidence.)
22	BY MR. FISCHER:
23	Q. Mr. Giles, were there other quarterly reports
24	that were filed excuse me, that were distributed to the
25	signatory parties along the way?

1 Yes, this same format was used and a report Α. 2 was prepared and provided to all the parties each and every 3 quarter. I believe the December, 2010 report is being worked on as we speak. 4 5 Would -- would this document show the 0. evolution of the project, the schedules, the costs, and all 6 7 the essential information that you provided to the signatory parties? 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 MR. FISCHER: Judge, I'd ask that we reserve 11 another exhibit, 71. we'd like to -- I don't have copies 12 yet, but I'd like to reserve an exhibit to introduce into the record, the other exhibit -- the other guarterly reports that 13 were provided. 14 15 JUDGE PRIDGIN: And I'm sorry, those would be 16 all of the remaining quarterly reports? 17 MR. FISCHER: There would be 23 others, I 18 guess. 19 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. Thank you. 20 BY MR. FISCHER: And would you -- would you be involved in the 21 Q. 22 preparation of those other quarterly reports? 23 Yes, I have reviewed and been involved in each Α. report since this first one to the last one that's being 24 25 worked on right now. I should also point out that in

Г

1	addition to these reports, when we met with the parties
2	quarterly, we provided them the latest schedule for the
3	project, level one schedule and we also provided them the
4	most recent cost data that we had available.
5	Q. That would be the K report?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. And that schedule document was a large
8	document, wasn't it, that had the critical path and a lot of
9	the information on it?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Okay. Was any of this done in the spirit of
12	transparency?
13	A. Absolutely. It was all done in the spirit of
14	transparency and it was the company's objective KCP&L's
15	objective and my personal objective that that's how we set
16	the process up and that's how we were going to do it. And
17	it's exactly what we did.
18	Q. There was some questions on cross-examination
19	about that topic and the withholding of information, I
20	believe. When KCP&L asserted its legal privilege related to
21	attorney-client information, was that an indication of the
22	lack of transparency?
23	A. No, not at all. It's there was nothing in
24	the agreement and nothing to my knowledge in the vein of
25	transparency that obligates the company to give up its legal

1 rights under -- under either.

Q. Did the Commission hold a proceeding that
ended up with an order that addressed whether KCP&L was being
unreasonable in withholding documents from the Staff as
related to the Iatan audits?

6 Yes. That hearing was held, I believe in Α. 7 April of 2009 -- or pardon me, 2010. I'm getting my years mixed up here. And it was a direct result of a response 8 KCP&L had made to the Commission Staff's December 31, 2009, 9 10 audit report. And in that report, Staff made allegations 11 that they could not complete their audit, one, because of 12 withheld documents; and two, because the cost control system somehow was inadequate. So KCP&L responded to that and the 13 Commission held a hearing. 14

15 The Commission found that KCP&L had not been 16 withholding documents and upheld the Commission's position. 17 At that time, the Commission did not rule on whether the 18 cost -- the -- not the class --

19 Q. Cost control?

A. -- the cost control system was appropriate or
not, therefore, Staff has continued to assert that.

Q. At the time of that hearing, what was your impression of where -- or slightly before that hearing in the depositions that occurred, what was your impression of where the audit status -- what was the audit status? What was your

1 impression?

2 well, the -- the audit did not actually begin, Α. 3 my understanding, on Unit 1 until after the rate case was I'm aware from depositions Mr. Hyneman joined 4 concluded. that audit effort in August of '08. When the audit report 5 was issued in December 31, 2009, other than various expense 6 7 reports, mileage charges of that nature, give some gratuities, the audit staff had not completed what I would 8 call a prudence audit. 9

10 Q. Had you seen Mr. Elliott involved out in the11 plant before that time?

A. Yes, Mr. Elliott was onsite in early '07 and I
believe he had at least monthly site visits. And he was well
aware of daily, if not weekly, activities at the plant.

Q. What was your impression of what Mr. Elliott16 was doing during that period?

17 Up until the time the Staff filed its Α. testimony in the last rate case, ER-0089, which I think was 18 19 in February of 2008, I may be wrong on my date. But in any 20 event, my understanding was Dave Elliott was actually up at 21 the site doing what I anticipated when I drafted the 22 regulatory plan. He was going to follow this project from its inception and was going to be onsite looking at the 23 documents and reviewing those documents and seeing how the 24 25 company was running the project and what kind of decisions it

1 was making and whether those decisions were explained or not. 2 Did Mr. Elliott generally attend the guarterly **Q**. 3 meetings that we held in Jefferson City as well? Yes, he did. 4 Α. 5 There was some discussion, I think, with one 0. of the Commissioners and we were looking for an attendance 6 7 sheet about a meeting where you talked about the -- the reforecast process. 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 MR. FISCHER: I'd like to have an exhibit 11 marked. 12 JUDGE PRIDGIN: I believe we're up to 72? (Exhibit No. 72 was marked for identification 13 14 by the Court Reporter.) 15 BY MR. FISCHER: 16 Mr. Giles, will you take a moment to look at 0. what this document is? 17 This is the document that details the 18 Α. Yes. 19 presentation outline to the regulatory plan signatories on 20 January 22nd, 2007, and this would have been the meeting that 21 we presented the cost estimate for Iatan 2. And the 22 particulars on this is an introduction by myself; status update Iatan 2 and Iatan 1 was Brent Davis; level 1 and 3 23 schedules cost control system, Terry Foster; cost estimate 24 Iatan 2, and this was the December '06 estimate, Davis; cost 25

Γ

1	control system La Cygne, John Grimwade. And attached to this
2	is a sign-up sheet.
3	This is the meeting I referred to when I
4	explained to the Commission Staff and the other parties all
5	the people that attended this meeting, that KCP&L was using
6	this control budget estimate to track costs. And as part of
7	its regulatory plan stipulation and agreement, this is the
8	budget that is referred to as the definitive estimate.
9	Q. I may have misspoke whenever I asked about
10	that. It's not the reforecast meeting, it's the original
11	meeting?
12	A. This is the original control budget meeting.
13	Q. And is Mr. Dave Elliott's name listed on the
14	attendance list?
15	A. Yes, Mr. Elliott, Mr. Warren Wood, Mr. Bob
16	Schallenberg, Mr. Wess Henderson, Ms. Lena Mantle are the
17	attendees I see from Staff, and also Mr. Warren Wood from
18	Staff at that time. Mike Taylor, who's an engineer that
19	works with Mr. Elliott. I believe that's all the Staff
20	personnel.
21	MR. FISCHER: I'd move for the admission of
22	the exhibit.
23	JUDGE PRIDGIN: 72 has been offered, any
24	objections? Hearing none, 72 is admitted.
25	(Exhibit No. 72 was received into evidence.)

1 BY MR. FISCHER:

5

Q. Mr. Giles, I believe you had some questions
about the -- what the EOC does from the Commission -4 Commissioners?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. Could you explain or elaborate upon what
7 the -- what the EOC's involvement was in reviewing the
8 particular costs in the CBE or the process generally?

9 Α. In general, the EOC did not run the project. 10 The project leadership team and the -- whether it was the 11 senior director or vice-president of construction would run 12 the project. In the EOC meetings, there was always an update and identification of potential risks, cost increases, 13 schedule deviations, plus everything else that was going very 14 15 well with the project and the status update. The EOC did not approve or disapprove of routine management decisions at the 16 It was kept apprised and any decisions it made were 17 site. very substantial strategic type decisions. 18

Q. I think there was some questions about Schiff
Hardin in that process and whether what the expectations were
in terms of total budget. A \$20 million expenditure on a \$2
billion project would be approximately what percent?
A. One percent.

Q. Would you expect if you didn't have the
expertise of a Schiff Hardin or someone similar to that, that

1 costs could have gone up by more than one percent? 2 I object, calls for speculation. MR. MILLS: 3 Mr. Fischer? JUDGE PRIDGIN: BY MR. FISCHER: 4 5 well, based on -- based on your experience at 0. the -- at Iatan 1 and 2, do you have an opinion about whether 6 it was important to have proper management in place? 7 Absolutely. The value Schiff team -- Schiff 8 Α. Hardin's team brought to the project saved the company and 9 its customers well over, in my opinion, what we paid for 10 their services. At the time we hired Schiff Hardin and 11 12 included their fees in costs under control budget, as I testified earlier, I believe it was between \$5 and \$10 13 million. And after -- in hindsight, would we have gone out 14 for an RFP, we probably should have and would today. On the 15 other hand, do I think we would have still hired Schiff 16 17 Hardin? Absolutelv. 18 The company's cost control system that we've **Q**. 19 been talking about, is that the same cost control system 20 that's used in Kansas? 21 It's the same system in Kansas, it's the same Α. 22 system we used for each CEP project, including the wind 23 project, the SER project at La Cygne. Did Mr. Drabinski at the KCC proceeding use 24 **Q**. 25 this cost control system to your knowledge?

Г

1	A. Yes, he did.
2	Q. You were asked a question by by Ms. Ott
3	about whether you disagreed with Walt Drabinski. Do you
4	remember that question?
5	A. I do.
6	Q. And I believe you said you did; is that
7	correct?
8	A. I do disagree with his conclusions.
9	Q. Would you explain why you disagree?
10	A. Mr. Drabinski did not conduct a, what I would
11	call a prudence audit and what our experts have described as
12	a prudence audit. Mr. Drabinski took what he describes
13	himself as a holistic approach and basically by using certain
14	information early on in the project, early audit reports,
15	early project conclusions or risks that were identified, he'd
16	take some of those risks as absolutes that they happened when
17	I know in fact the risk never materialized and the company
18	mitigated many of those risks, if not all of them.
19	So Mr. Drabinski would take an audit finding,
20	for instance, and say, well, this must have cost some money,
21	has no basis to support that. He did not identify imprudent
22	decisions and follow-through to the next step and identify
23	the consequences of those decisions.
24	Q. Is that do you have an understanding of
25	what Missouri law requires at all on the two-step process?

A. Yes, I have read Mr. Blanc's testimony and I
 am -- I understand the two-step process and agree with what
 Mr. Blanc had written.

4 Q. Okay. Do you have other -- other comments 5 about Mr. Drabinski and why he was wrong?

A. Mr. Drabinski ignores and totally obscures
substantial information the company has provided to him in
assessing his disallowance. For instance, he believes,
evidently, that the project definition report set the cost
for the plant. He believes that the schedule, even, that
was --

MR. SCHWARZ: I'm going to object at this stage as calling for speculation. What Mr. Drabinski believes is reflected in his testimony and the Commission is certainly encouraged to read that. And the speculations of Mr. Giles as to what Mr. Drabinski may or may not mean or understand by the words he's written is nothing more than speculation.

19MR. FISCHER: Let me rephrase the question.20BY MR. FISCHER:

Q. Mr. Giles, will you explain why you believe
Mr. Drabinski's analysis is incorrect?

23A.Yes.Mr. Drabinski ignores facts that have24been provided to him by the company, that the -- for

25 instance, the project definition report was nothing more than

Г

1	a conceptual coal plant that was used in the very initial
2	resource analysis back in 2004 conducted by KCP&L to
3	determine whether the CEP should contain a coal plant. That
4	was never a budget for the plant.
5	The schedule contained in that document was
6	never a schedule that was contemplated or ever could have
7	been obtained because the schedule actually had construction
8	starting before we had a regulatory plan that would allow us
9	to start construction. So that's just one example. But
10	overall, Mr. Drabinski doesn't have an imprudent
11	decision-making and a nexus to connect costs to that decision
12	anywhere in his report or his testimony.
13	Q. And I believe your surrebuttal testimony goes
14	into that in some more depth, does it not?
15	A. Yes, it does.
16	Q. You were also asked a question, I believe,
17	regarding whether you disagreed with the Staff's adjustments.
18	Do you recall that question?
19	A. I do.
20	Q. I know you don't address every Staff
21	adjustment in your testimony, but do you have some that you
22	would like to elaborate on why you disagree?
23	A. Well, the first of all, the idea that any
24	costs that exceeded the control budget estimate is certainly
25	unfounded based on the Staff's allegation that they could

Г

1	not track the costs on as they specifically state KCPU did
	not track the costs, or as they specifically state, KCP&L did
2	not explain the cost overruns. That's simply incorrect. It
3	has been provided to Staff, all the documents that do contain
4	those explanations, including the key document, the
5	reforecast document that led up to the May of '08 budget
6	number of 1.09 billion. So that particular adjustment is
7	totally without merit.
8	Q. Mr. Giles, before you go on to the next point,
9	have you ever seen an adjustment in your 35 years with KCP&L?
10	A. Yes, 35 years, I've never seen a
11	recommendation to disallow all costs above the control budget
12	estimate
13	Q. Okay.
14	A in any proceeding.
15	Q. Go right ahead.
16	A. The adjustment Staff proposes for the Alstom
17	settlement has no basis. Obviously in my mind, Mr. Elliott
18	examined that construction and what what was occurring
19	during that time. He had the basis and the knowledge to make
20	such a recommendation, which he did not. I don't believe the
21	Staff auditors and accountants took the time and effort to
22	figure out exactly what that settlement was about.
23	Q. Now you're talking about the Alstom Unit 1
24	settlement; is that right?

Q. And that's about two-thirds of their
 adjustments on Unit 1; is that right?

3 That's correct. Another related adjustment is Α. Staff proposes to impose LDs, liquidated damages, that it 4 proposes KCP&L could have received from Alstom, had it asked 5 6 for them, when in fact, they make no determination that the LD clauses would ever have been hit. That's another example. 7 In fact, there's extensive company testimony on those two 8 issues that identify that one, the LDs could not be 9 implemented, and two, the value of that settlement was worth 10 11 more than the settlement payment.

12 Another one as an example, Staff is proposing to disallow mileage charges to the site of KCP&L employees 13 that actually were transferred to the site or volunteered for 14 15 such and primary location of their homes was in the Kansas City area. And obviously to me, it is patently unfair to 16 17 require an employee that lives in Independence, Missouri to relocate for five years to Iatan and not pay them mileage to 18 drive that distance. 19

20 Q. Did you see a lot of data requests on that 21 topic in the audit?

A. In the Iatan 1 and Iatan 2 audits, we were immersed in data requests related to mileage charges. Staff requested every log at the gate to Iatan, to check whether individuals were actually at the site when they drove to the

1 site. We have many of those. Similar data requests for 2 Burns & McDonnell employees who were under a separate 3 contract --Ms. Ott asked you about that, I think she 4 0. suggested you initially withheld that information. Do you 5 remember that conversation? 6 7 I do. Α. Can you describe what they were asking for 8 Q. that you had a question about? 9 Under the terms of Burns & McDonnell's 10 Α. Yes. 11 contract, they would pay their employees mileage if they 12 weren't already on a per diem to travel to the Iatan site. What Staff was requesting the company provide was the home 13 address of every Burns & McDonnell employee that traveled to 14 15 the site. Did they want that on a monthly basis? 16 **Q**. 17 Yes. Α. And why did they want that? 18 Q. 19 Α. I can only suppose they wanted to check to see if the mileage from, say, Overland Park to the Iatan site 20 21 was, in fact, 50 miles versus 45 or 55. 22 Do you have any idea how many documents you Q. provided in relationship to mileage issues? 23 Thousands. 24 Α. 25 well that brings up a question. How many Q.

l

1	documents would you have to review to understand the cost
2	control system?
3	A. It would be less than a thousand would be my
4	guess. Change orders, recommendation to award, purchase
5	orders, contingency log. Maybe a large three-ring binder,
6	three or four of those would all be required.
7	Q. Is that what Mr. Drabinski would have
8	reviewed?
9	A. Yes. We provided Staff over 1,200 expense
10	reports of individuals. So we have provided thousands and
11	thousands and thousands of documents to the Staff. Whether
12	they looked at them all, I can't say. But it would
13	certainly the documents they were needing to look at that
14	were provided to do their audit is substantially less than
15	what they have been provided.
16	Q. There was also a question I believe from Staff
17	regarding whether you adjusted the CBE to take out railcars,
18	do you recall that?
19	A. I do.
20	Q. Did you adjust the CBE for any reason?
21	A. Absolutely no reasons. We did not adjust it.
22	We felt like our agreement was to track costs to that budget.
23	Q. Increases and decreases?
24	A. Increases and decreases, and that's what we
25	did.

Γ

1	Q. And then when the company did the reforecast,
2	did you continue to track it to, what?
3	A. We tracked both to the control budget estimate
4	and the reforecasted budget estimate because that's how we
5	were managing the project. We managed the project and we
6	provided all the data that we used to manage the project to
7	the Staff and tracked to both budgets.
8	MR. FISCHER: Thank you very much, Mr. Giles.
9	I appreciate your patience.
10	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Fischer, thank you. Mr.
11	Giles, thank you. You may step down. This looks to be a
12	convenient time as any to break. If I'm not mistaken, Mr.
13	Downey will be the next witness?
14	MR. FISCHER: Yes.
15	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Anything further
16	from counsel before we break?
17	MS. OTT: Yes, I'm not sure if I offered
18	Exhibit 252 into the record. If I didn't, I'd like to do it
19	at this time.
20	JUDGE PRIDGIN: I show that you did not. 252
21	has been offered. Any objections? Hearing none
22	MR. STEINER: What exhibit is that?
23	JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'm sorry, 252 has been
24	offered. That's the e-mail.
25	MR. SCHWARZ: Before we break, I would like to

Г

1	ask counsel if they actually want hard copies of the
2	schedules for Mr. Drabinski's testimony? You've got them
3	electronically, and I'm going to bring them in at some stage.
4	I'm in the process of vetting them for the company's HC
5	markings. Do you want the direct and rebuttal are about
6	260 pages altogether, and I'll bring in copies of those
7	together.
8	But does anybody want hard copies of
9	schedules? Do Commissioners want hard copies of schedules?
10	It's about two, three feet.
11	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Before we go off the record, I
12	think Ms. Ott made an offer.
13	MR. FISCHER: No objection, Your Honor.
14	JUDGE PRIDGIN: No objection. It is admitted
15	and I'm sorry, thank you very much. We'll go off the record.
16	(Exhibit No. 252 was received into evidence.)
17	(A break was held.)
18	JUDGE PRIDGIN: We're back on the record. I
19	understand Mr. Downey is our next witness and he's at the
20	witness stand. He needs to be sworn in. Is there anything
21	before I administer an oath and he stands examination? All
22	right, hearing nothing, Mr. Downey, if you'll raise your
23	right hand to be sworn, please.
24	(The witness was sworn.)
25	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you very much, sir.

01-21-2011 EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 1 Mr. Fischer or Mr. Hatfield? 2 MR. FISCHER: Mr. Hatfield. 3 DIRECT EXAMINATION OUESTIONS BY MR. HATFIELD: 4 5 Could you state your name for the record, Q. please? 6 7 William Downey. Α. And Mr. Downey, are you the same William H. 8 Q. Downey who's filed testimony in this case? 9 10 Α. I am. 11 Q. And you filed -- did you file both direct and 12 rebuttal? 13 Α. Yes, I did. 14 Is that the only testimony you filed? **Q**. 15 Α. Yes. And your direct testimony has been marked for 16 **Q**. 17 the record as Exhibit 21 and your rebuttal as Exhibit 22. IS the testimony you gave in those exhibits still true and 18 19 accurate today? 20 Yes. Α. 21 Do you have any -- do you need to update or Q. 22 change that testimony in any way? 23 I do not. Α. And are there exhibits attached to your 24 Q. testimony? 25

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 There are. Α. 2 Do they accurately reflect what you were 0. 3 trying to depict with those exhibits? 4 Α. Yes. 5 MR. HATFIELD: Judge, I'm sure there's no cross, but I'll tender him anyway. 6 7 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Hatfield, thank you. Did T offer the exhibits? 8 MR. HATFIELD: JUDGE PRIDGIN: I don't believe vou did. 9 MR. HATFIELD: Let's offer them. 10 11 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Exhibit 21 and 22, both NP and 12 HC are offered. Any objections? MR. SCHWARZ: No objections from the MRA, 13 14 Judge. 15 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Hearing none --16 MR. WILLIAMS: Let me make an inquiry first. 17 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Yes, you may. Is this the only time that 18 MR. WILLIAMS: 19 Mr. Downey will appear in the hearing? 20 MR. HATFIELD: What's that? 21 MR. WILLIAMS: Is this the only time Mr. 22 Downey's testifying? He's not going to be testifying again 23 later? MR. HATFIELD: I believe that's correct. 24 He's only listed on schedule for this portion of the hearing. 25

Г

1	MR. WILLIAMS: I have no objection.
2	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. No objections
3	being voiced. 21 and 22-NP and -HC are admitted.
4	(Exhibit Nos. 21 and 22, both NP and HC, were
5	received into evidence.)
6	JUDGE PRIDGIN: He's been offered for cross.
7	Mr. Schwarz?
8	MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you, Judge.
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION
10	QUESTIONS BY MR. SCHWARZ:
11	Q. Good afternoon, sir.
12	A. Good afternoon.
13	Q. You were here yesterday afternoon for
14	Mr. Jones's testimony?
15	A. Yes, I was.
16	Q. And I thought it was very helpful he explained
17	that there can be, like, a matrix for reporting, some for
18	governance and then some for specific operational or
19	functional activities. Do you recall that? So he reported
20	to Ms. Cheatum for governance and to Mr. Easley, I think it
21	was, for the project purposes?
22	A. He reported to the project director to
23	implement the purchasing function.
24	Q. Right.
25	A. He reported to Ms. Cheatum, who was in charge
1 of corporate purchasing for purchasing, process, procedure, 2 governance. 3 Right. And in your direct testimony, you 0. defined executive management as the chairman, the president, 4 the chief operating officer, chief financial officer and the 5 executive vice-presidents. And I'd like to ask you, and my 6 frame of reference will be the first guarter of 2006, okay? 7 How many executive vice-presidents were there? 8 At that point, there may have been none. 9 Α. 10 **Q**. Okay. And when is the first time that you 11 recall that you had an executive vice-president? 12 Α. Probably 2008. Okay. And who -- executive vice-president, 13 Q. 14 I'm not much of a corporate kind of guy, so executive 15 vice-presidents are typically executive vice-presidents of HR. some kind of functional --16 17 Actually, often those are senior Α. vice-presidents. The executive vice-president, our company 18 has a broader operational role across --19 Would the title just be executive 20 Q. 21 vice-president? 22 It could be. Α. 23 well, going to the first guarter of 2008, how Q. many executive vice-presidents did you have? 24 25 Α. One.

1 Q. And what was that title? 2 Executive vice-president, utility operations; Α. 3 John Marshall was the individual. Okay. And then the senior management was the 4 Q. same individuals plus the other vice-presidents. How many 5 6 other vice-presidents -- and going back to the first quarter of 2006, how many other vice-presidents would there be? 7 Are you referring to the company in total --8 Α. 9 Q. T ---- or the executive oversight committee? 10 Α. 11 I'm talking about company. I'm trying to Q. 12 figure out who constitutes senior management. 13 The senior management is the group that you Α. just mentioned. The vice-presidents would not be considered 14 15 senior management. They might have been included -- some vice-presidents, as I think I've indicated before, may have 16 17 been included on the executive oversight committee for specific reasons. 18 well, I'm looking at page 2 of your direct, 19 Q. 20 and it says, "Senior management consists of the same 21 individuals plus the company's other vice-presidents." It's 22 line 17, I think. 23 I see what you're saying. The officer group Α. constitutes the senior group of executives in the company and 24 we -- we subdivided a bit. 25

Г

1	Q. Let me rephrase. I think I'm getting a little
2	better feel. In the first quarter of 2006, who constituted
3	senior management?
4	A. I believe my statement there indicates the
5	chairman and myself, the CFO. And it says executive
6	vice-presidents. Could have said senior vice-presidents.
7	That's probably a correction.
8	Q. Okay. That's the
9	A. Mr. Easley was a senior vice-president at the
10	time.
11	Q. Right. So you would have considered him
12	executive management?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And who would have been considered senior
15	management? I take it that's a step lower?
16	A. Yes, so that would include the other corporate
17	officers who might be corporate vice-presidents. Lora
18	Cheatum was a vice-president.
19	Q. How many vice-presidents? And I'm not going
20	hold you to it.
21	A. I don't remember the exact number, six to
22	eight.
23	Q. Okay. That's helpful. And then the executive
24	oversight committee would have been drawn from that group?
25	A. That's correct.

1 And was there a finite number of people on Q. 2 the -- I mean, on the executive oversight committee? 3 No, and it adjusted over time depending on the Α. roles people played, changes that were made in management. 4 5 On page 4, you state that in the summer of 0. 2005, you named Steve Easley, who is the senior 6 7 vice-president of supply -- actually, you say you place the CE projects under his control. For purposes of the CEP 8 projects, as the head of that, would he have had -- would he 9 have been chair of the project team? How would he have been 10 11 referenced as -- as head of the CEP projects? 12 Α. He had direct line authority over the functional -- or the people who were doing the project. 13 14 Okay. And in his capacity as head of the CEP, Q. 15 to whom did he directly report? He was not head of the CEP. I chaired the 16 Α. 17 CEP. CEP was a policy-level oversight group. Mr. Easley had direct authority -- direct line authority for the work. 18 19 Q. Okay. And who were his direct reports, say in the first -- late 2005, early 2006? 20 21 Mr. Grimwade, who was senior director for the Α. 22 comprehensive energy planned projects would have reported 23 directly to Mr. Easley. And would that have been his only direct 24 **Q**. 25 report, with respect to the projects?

r	EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011
1	A. I believe so.
2	Q. Would Mr. Easley at that stage still have had
3	other people as direct reports who weren't project related?
4	A. Yes, he would.
5	Q. Okay. And would that have included other
6	vice-presidents?
7	A. I can't recall his exact organization, but
8	very likely, yes.
9	Q. Okay. So if I understand the EOC was I
10	don't want it changed as time went on and as circumstances
11	warranted, is that safe to say?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. I also understand that it the membership
14	was not determined ex-officio, that is if you were the VP of
15	this or the VP of that, you were on the EOC. That was
16	something people were selected individually for their
17	individual strengths and so forth to be on the EOC; is that
18	correct?
19	A. Yes.
20	Q. Okay. Now, in I didn't notice in your
21	testimony any definition or description of the project team,
22	the Iatan project team. I have in front of me a March 31,
23	2006, comprehensive energy plan report where some names are
24	listed. If it's not HC but it lists, for instance, John
25	Grimwade as senior director of construction projects.

01-21-2011 EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 1 Yes. Α. 2 And when was Mr. Grimwade a member of the 0. 3 project team, his dates? I don't recall the exact dates, although he 4 Α. was part of the initial organization as we were launching it. 5 6 He would have been the first head of the projects. Okay. And operationally, anyone working -- he 7 Q. was at the top of the chain of command of anyone who was 8 working on the Iatan projects? 9 10 Α. Yes. 11 Q. Okay. It lists Terry Murphy as director of 12 construction, Iatan 2. When was Terry Murphy there? Pardon me, I'm -- keeping dates in my head is 13 Α. interesting. Mr. Murphy would have joined us in February of 14 15 2006. Okay. And he didn't stay for the entirety of 16 0. 17 the project? No, he was there briefly. 18 Α. 19 Q. And when he left, would it have been likely he would have been replaced on the project team? 20 21 That's correct. Α. 22 And would it -- whoever replaced him also have Q. been director of construction? 23 24 Yes. Α. Jeffrey Fleenor, when -- was he there 25 Okay. Q.

1 the entire project time? 2 No, he was initially the head of Α. 3 engineering --Okay. 4 0. 5 -- for the project. Α. 6 Steven Jones, procurement manager, and we've **Q**. 7 had him yesterday, I don't need -- David Darevan (phonetic), who's identified as the start up manager of Iatan 2. 8 Ι wouldn't assume he was very active at that stage. 9 10 Α. NO. 11 Okay. Q. 12 But he was on the team? Q. 13 Yes. Α. 14 And then it has remaining staff positions, Q. project controls manager, cost engineer, lead scheduler, 15 major project leads, electrical, mechanical, et cetera, and 16 17 safety manager, those would have been people who reported to 18 one of the above, one of the earlier, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Fleenor, Mr. Jones and Mr. Darevan? 19 20 Yes. Α. 21 Okav. So, the impression that I have is that Q. 22 Grimwade, Murphy, Fleenor, Jones, Darevan were the management 23 level -- senior management level of the project and then there were other managers of individual functions who 24 reported to them and likely people under those, would that be 25

1 accurate? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Okay. And on the same page, it says Burns & 0. McDonnell owners engineers, but Burns & McDonnell was never 4 5 considered part of the project team, were they? 6 They were owners engineer for the project and Α. they also provided additional supplemental Staff. 7 Right, but the KCP&L project was KCP&L 8 Q. employees? 9 10 Α. That's correct. 11 Q. Okay. Thank you. I'm not done, but thank 12 you. That was a good fake, though. 13 Α. 14 I got your hopes up. Do you have your 0. 15 testimony with you? I do. 16 Α. 17 Sorry. Now would you look at page 77? 0. Of my direct? 18 Α. Of rebuttal. I'm in rebuttal. What you say 19 Q. on line 16 is -- and I'll read it -- "The CBE has been the 20 21 basis for comparing the Project's cost velocity and variances 22 since that time that," time being December of 2006? 23 Uh-oh. I think I've got the highly Α. confidential version. What line, 16? 24 25 Lines 16 and 17 on page 77 of your rebuttal. Q.

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 Α. And what's the sentence again? 2 "The CBE," do you have that? 0. 3 MR. HATFIELD: May I approach, Judge, just to make sure? 4 5 JUDGE PRIDGIN: You may. 6 THE WITNESS: Okay. 7 BY MR. SCHWARZ: 8 So, that's your testimony there, "the CBE is Q. the basis for comparing the Project's cost velocity and 9 variance since" December of 2006? 10 11 Α. Yes. 12 Okay. Now, if you would turn to the last line Q. on page 44 of that rebuttal testimony, carrying over to the 13 second line. 14 Let me just get organized here. 15 Α. well you're not a lawyer, it shouldn't take 16 **Q**. 17 Are you a lawyer? you as long. 18 No, I am not. Α. 19 MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Schwarz, is what you're 20 referring to designated as HC? 21 MR. SCHWARZ: It is indeed. 22 THE WITNESS: Page 44, line. --23 BY MR. SCHWARZ: It's line 23, that sentence, and going over to 24 Q. 25 the next page.

1	MR. SCHWARZ: I'm going to ask a question, I
2	think it involves HC material. I'd ask that we go in-camera.
3	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Just a moment,
4	please.
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18 19	
20	
20	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	r		 01 L1 L0	
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				



1 answers would be essentially the same as his? 2 I'm not quite sure how to answer that. Α. 3 well, and that's a perfectly good answer. 0. Have you had a chance to look at it? 4 5 Α. Yes. And would you agree that on line 10, the 6 **Q**. 7 project costs without contingency and financing as of the December 6 CBE was 1 billion, 465 million? 8 9 MR. HATFIELD: And Judge, I'm sorry to 10 interrupt. Just to keep our record clear, can we refer to it 11 by exhibit number? 12 MR. SCHWARZ: This is the CBE that is in Mr. Grabinski's Schedule 2. 13 14 MR. HATFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Schwarz. 15 THE WITNESS: That's what this document says. BY MR. SCHWARZ: 16 17 Is there any doubt in your mind that this is 0. the 2006 CBE that was provided to Mr. Drabinski by KCP&L? 18 I've none seen it before. It hasn't crossed 19 Α. 20 my desk. 21 You haven't seen the 2006 CBE? Q. 22 I did, I haven't seen this piece of paper. Α. 23 Okay. And that's fine. All right. Q. I don't disagree with the number on it. 24 Α. 25 Yes. And under number seven, it has Q.

provisions for escalation of three items and it indicates 1 2 that they're included in the numbers. 3 Α. Yes. And the same for number eight down there. 4 0. 5 second from the bottom, it has an indication that escalation 6 on indirects is included in that number? 7 Α. Yes. And if you tot up the owner's contingency and 8 Q. low probability high impact contingency under number 10, that 9 totals \$220 millions? 10 11 Α. Yes. 12 And the grand total is one billion, six Q. hundred eight-five million? 13 14 Α. Yes. 15 And it is -- the buck stops with you as far as 0. KCP&L is concerned, does it not, sir? 16 17 Yes. Α. And it is the company's position, despite the 18 Q. various apparently personal positions espoused by other 19 20 witnesses, it is the company's position this document is the 21 definitive estimate required by the regulatory agreement? 22 The number is the definitive estimate. Α. 23 Do you recall when you alerted the partner --0. the partners in the Iatan project of the change from the 24 25 partner closing to the December 6 estimate?

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 Α. I do not recall those specific dates. 2 Okay. Okay. 0. 3 MR. SCHWARZ: I think that's all that I have. Thank you, sir. 4 5 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Schwarz, thank you. Mr. Mills. 6 7 MR. MILLS: Thank you. 8 CROSS-EXAMINATION 9 OUESTIONS BY MR. MILLS: Mr. Downey, just to follow-up with a couple of 10 **Q**. 11 questions on that same document, if you take -- Mr. Schwarz 12 had you look at line number ten, which is the project costs without contingency and financing, and that totals 1 billion 13 465 million; is that correct? 14 15 Α. Yes. Now, do you see that the first item under 16 **Q**. 17 number eight, the railcars? I do. 18 Α. 19 Q. And as the project developed, KCP&L did not 20 actually buy those railcars; is that correct? 21 That's correct. Α. 22 So -- and you can either do the math or take Q. my word for it, but if you take the 37 million away from the 23 1 billion, 465 million that's shown on line ten, you would 24 have 1 billion, 428 million. Do you either agree with it or 25

1 accept it? 2 The math sounds about right. Α. 3 Ultimately, Iatan 2 will come in at about 1.9 0. billion or a little bit more: is that correct? 4 5 Α. Yes. Roughly half a billion dollars higher than we 6 Ο. 7 just talked about without the railcars, correct? Off of which number, the 1,465? 8 Α. Taking the railcars out --9 Q. 10 Α. But you're not putting the contingency --11 COURT REPORTER: One at a time, please. 12 BY MR. MILLS: You're absolutely correct, I'm not including 13 Q. 14 the contingency in that number. 15 Sounds about right. Α. Where did that half a billion dollars 16 Okay. Q. 17 go and why? 18 Α. well, I think we have a number of witnesses, 19 and particularly Mr. Archibald and Dan Meyer, who will walk 20 through that in great detail. There are many puts and takes 21 to this original budget and they can go through all of them 22 painfully for you, but they fall into a series of categories including design maturity, price escalation, scope growth, 23 24 among others. And how much of that half a billion is in each 25 Q.

1 of those three?

A. I would say that the largest part is in design
maturation. And there's a pie chart somewhere in somebody's
testimony, I think probably Mr. Meyer's that will go through
all that.

Q. Now, is it your understanding that you -- that
7 as the progress -- as the project goes on, that you would
8 write somebody a check labeled design maturation?

9 A. No, I think that the category comes from very
10 detailed analysis, particularly as we reforecasted multiple
11 times as the project progressed. These were analytical
12 frameworks that helped us to understand the changes that were
13 occurring in the project.

Q. Okay. So with more specificity, what sorts -what specific changes under design maturation and how much of
that encompasses the half a billion dollars?

A. As I said, I don't have a number in my head.
It's in Mr. Meyer's testimony and Mr. Archibald's.

Q. From your broad perspective as the CEO, what is your understanding, where did that half a billion dollars go and why?

A. Design maturation, which transferred into growth and quantities, growth in the labor that installed those quantities was a principle driver, scope growth in the project as the design matured and we -- there was new

Г

1	understanding about new things that had to be done and added
2	to the work, that was another category. Price escalation,
3	2006, '7, saw enormous price escalation in this whole
4	construction arena, so that was another driver.
5	Q. Let me stop you there. Is there not several
6	lines for escalations already in that number that we're
7	talking about, that 1.4?
8	A. And we would have referred to those as
9	known-unknowns. For example, in 2005 and '6 when we were
10	putting escalation numbers in for price, we would have been
11	looking at what we knew from traditional cost escalation.
12	But it turned out that '6 and '7 were anything about normal.
13	If you look backward and tried to forecast price escalation
14	in 2006, 2007, you'd have been totally inaccurate.
15	Q. Okay.
16	A. Because the industry experienced something we
17	were not aware of when we were doing the original estimates.
18	Q. So what prices escalated?
19	A. Virtually every component, every piece of
20	material that went into the plants.
21	Q. Okay.
22	A. There were 124 plants where orders were placed
23	in this time frame. One utility even announced 11. Now,
24	they all were subsequently not built, but the market in this
25	period of time became bizarre and prices escalated wildly. I

1 think in 2007, prices in general on this stuff escalated 40 2 percent. 3 But you had some of this stuff under contract? 0. we did. 4 Α. 5 Okay. And you had some escalations already Q. built into this estimate? 6 7 Α. Yes. Now, I believe you said that the largest 8 Q. category was design maturation. 9 10 Α. Yes. 11 Q. Isn't a layman's -- isn't it accurate that a 12 way to describe design maturation from a layman's point of view is we now know more than we did when we started? 13 14 I think that's one way of looking at it. For Α. a person who's not involved in power plants, if you think 15 about when you redo your kitchen, and you know, you and your 16 wife set the original budget and then you get into the job --17 having personally experienced this myself, I remember the 18 overrun. You know, that's the kind of thing that happens. 19 20 You get into the job and things happen and the complexity of this facility is enormous. And so during that maturation, 21 22 you learn a lot of things and things change and you see that kind of growth. 23 And isn't the point of escalations to try to 24 **Q**. 25 deal with some of that, at least?

1 Yes. Α. 2 Now as you pointed out, the numbers Okay. Q. 3 that I've been talking about did not include the \$220 million worth of contingencies. But ultimately the plant came in 4 5 significantly above even the numbers for the contingencies; 6 is that not correct? 7 Fifteen percent. Α. In terms of dollars, that is several hundred 8 Q. million, correct? 9 10 Α. Yes. 11 Q. Do you have in your own mind a breakdown of 12 the amounts that are over and above even the contingencies included in the control budget estimate or do you look at it 13 more of a point from numbers above the line items here? 14 IS 15 that question clear to you? 16 Α. NO. 17 It's probably not. I can tell from your 0. expression that it wasn't. There was a -- this number that 18 we've been talking about that doesn't include the 19 20 contingencies, and the contingencies really are unspecified, 21 they are the unknown-unknowns. When you try to, in your own 22 mind, track where the overruns went, do you make any 23 distinction between the numbers that are assigned to that 24 contingency amount and the overruns that are above the 25 contingency amount?

1 I don't believe that I do. I know, for Α. 2 example, that in the purchasing that we did on a lot of the 3 engineered products, that the end result was very close to our original budget. So the escalation occurred on a number 4 5 of those other things. But I don't break it out. I don't have in my head a sort that tries to end that. You have to 6 go through multiple iterations to get there. 7

Q. And just in conclusion, have I given you an
9 adequate opportunity for you to tell me how you understand
10 where that half a billion dollars went and why?

A. Well, I gave you some general categories of area. And as we work through the project, each and every week, each and every month, you know, I think we -- I and the members of the team had a good understanding of where costs were growing and why. And I've tried to summarize them in a couple of key categories for you.

Q. And I guess my next question will be, then:
Can you give me as much detail now as you possibly can,
please?

A. I don't have in my head or I don't have in front of me the whole group of things. I've given you the general categories and I am not sure what kind of detail you want.

Q. As much detail as you have in your head.
A. This is a \$1.9 billion project over five years

1 with lots of growth in lots of different areas. I've 2 summarized it at a high level for you. 3 MR. MILLS: Those are all the questions I have, thank you. 4 5 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Mills, thank vou. Mr. Williams. 6 7 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Judge. I have several questions, in fact. 8 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION 10 QUESTIONS BY MR. WILLIAMS: 11 Q. Mr. Downey, why are projects sometimes started 12 before design is completed? Because the decision is made that it's prudent 13 Α. 14 to do that. It takes into account the environment in which you're doing it and it's best practice on very large 15 projects, particularly with long lead time, items to do that. 16 17 well, is one of the reasons to avoid price 0. 18 escalations by locking into prices? 19 Α. Yes. 20 And wasn't that one of the reasons Kansas City **Q**. 21 Power & Light Company gave for fast tracking the Iatan 22 project? 23 It was an important reason, yes. Α. was that reason accomplished? 24 Q. I believe so for a significant part of the 25 Α.

1 project. 2 Kansas City Power & Light Company hired **Q**. 3 Dr. Neilsen to review the Iatan project costs, did it not? Yes. 4 Α. 5 And Dr. Neilsen recommended some 0. disallowances, did he not? 6 7 Α. Yes. Why didn't Kansas City Power & Light -- or did 8 Q. Kansas City Power & Light accept those disallowances? 9 I believe that we, you know, we put his 10 Α. 11 testimony forward, obviously, but we had disagreements with 12 some of the conclusions. why didn't you accept his disallowances? 13 Q. 14 Because our -- our own team of experts Α. 15 disagreed. what was the basis of the disagreements other 16 0. than the dollar amount? 17 I think Brent Davis, who was up before, 18 Α. testified and there were decisions made and there was a 19 20 different point of view with regard to those decisions. 21 who made the decision to accept or reject Q. 22 Dr. Neilsen's recommendations on disallowances for Iatan 23 costs? I believe the collective wisdom of the team 24 Α. 25 came together, and as we presented that testimony, we felt we

Г

1	went with the positions of the experts that we had in our own
2	group. There were two decisions that were involved in each
3	case. There was an interpretation of our own management team
4	that was different from Dr. Neilsen's.
5	Q. Who were the who were the members of the
6	team? You're referring to "team."
7	A. The project leadership team in particular. I
8	think Mr. Davis, for example, had some disagreements with the
9	disallowances that Dr. Neilsen recommended.
10	Q. So Mr. Davis made the decision about whether
11	to accept the disallowances?
12	A. No, he made the case and it was accepted.
13	Q. And who was it that he made the case to, the
14	individuals or individual?
15	A. Well, generally, ultimately it rests with me
16	as to how we present it, but also our regulatory team and
17	general counsel and group that's involved in coming forth on
18	these cases.
19	Q. So if I understand you correctly, ultimately
20	you made the decision?
21	A. Ultimately.
22	Q. Is that a yes?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Give me a minute here. Mr. Downey, have you
25	taken any college courses or do you have a college degree in

1 project management? 2 Α. No, I do not. 3 Have you taken any college courses or do you Q. have a college degree in project cost management? 4 5 Α. No, I do not. Have you taken any college courses or do you 6 Q. 7 have a college degree in project integration? No, I do not. 8 Α. Have you taken any college courses or do you 9 Q. 10 have a college degree in project schedule management? 11 Α. No, I do not. 12 Have you taken any college courses or do you Q. 13 have a college degree in project time management? 14 No, I do not. Α. 15 Have you taken any college courses or do you Q. have a college degree in project quality management? 16 17 No, I do not. Α. 18 Have you taken any college courses or do you Q. 19 have a college degree in project procurement management? 20 No, I do not. Α. 21 Have you taken any college courses or do you Q. 22 have a college degree in project risk management? 23 Α. No, I do not. Are you a project management professional? 24 Q. 25 No, I'm not. Α.

Are you familiar -- do you know what a project 1 Q. management professional is? 2 3 Α. Yes. what is it? 4 0. 5 It's someone with a certification with regard Α. 6 to the skills and the educational component of techniques for managing large, complex projects or even small projects. 7 There's a discipline to it and they're trained in courses for 8 it and certifications. 9 10 **Q**. Have you taken any of those courses or 11 training? 12 Α. No, I have not. Do you know who issues that certification? 13 Q. I don't. 14 Α. 15 Do you consider yourself an expert on matters Q. of accounting? 16 17 Α. NO. Do you consider yourself an expert on matters 18 Q. of auditing? 19 No, I do not. 20 Α. 21 Do you consider yourself to be an expert on Q. 22 matters of cost accounting? 23 No, I do not. Α. Do you consider yourself to be an expert on 24 **Q**. matters of cost engineering? 25

1 No, I do not. Α. 2 Back whenever the Iatan project was started, Q. 3 what was the scope of your responsibilities with Kansas City Power & Light Company? 4 5 I was the president and chief executive Α. officer of Kansas City Power & Light, the operating company, 6 and I was president and chief operating officer of our 7 holding company, Great Plains Energy. 8 MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, may I have an exhibit 9 10 marked? 11 JUDGE PRIDGIN: You may. 12 (Exhibit No. 253 was marked for identification 13 by the Court Reporter.) 14 MR. WILLIAMS: May I approach the witness? 15 JUDGE PRIDGIN: You may. BY MR. WILLIAMS: 16 17 Mr. Downey, I'm providing you a copy of what I 0. believe has been marked as KCP&L 253. Would you take a look 18 at that exhibit, if you have not already? 19 20 Α. I have. 21 And do you recognize it? Q. 22 I do. Α. 23 what is it? Q. It's an organizational chart dated December, 24 Α. 2009. 25

1 Q. And does it accurately reflect the organization of Kansas City Power & Light Company at the date 2 3 shown in December of 2009? 4 Α. Yes. 5 MR. WILLIAMS: I would like to offer Exhibit 6 KCP&L 253 at this time. 7 JUDGE PRIDGIN: 253 is offered, any objections? 8 9 MR. HATFIELD: No, sir. JUDGE PRIDGIN: KCP&L 253 is admitted. 10 11 (Exhibit No. 253 was received into evidence.) 12 BY MR. WILLIAMS: Now, turning your attention to that exhibit, 13 Q. 14 on the level at which your name appears as president and 15 chief operating officer, on that same level, is Mr. Bassham shown as executive vice-president, finance and strategic 16 development, chief financial officer? 17 18 Α. Yes. And is W.G. Riggins shown as general counsel 19 Q. and chief legal officer? 20 21 Yes. Α. 22 And is B.B. Curry shown as senior Q. 23 vice-president, human resources and corporate secretary? 24 Yes. Α. 25 And they're all at the same level as you were Q.

at that point in time in that organization chart, are they 1 2 not? 3 I'm not sure what you mean by that. Α. NO. they're not. I mean, because they are on the same line in 4 5 the org chart? 6 well, what do those lines in the Q. 7 organizational chart reflect? 8 well, it's a typical organizational chart, but Α. you said "same level." I'm not sure what you mean by 9 "level." 10 11 Q. well, you-all reported to the chairman and 12 chief executive officer, Mr. Chesser, did you not? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Did you have the same levels of responsibility Q. 15 or were they different? They were different. 16 Α. 17 And how were they different? 0. I was the chief operating officer and all the 18 Α. 19 utility operations reported to me, up through me. And 20 Mr. Bassham, as is fairly typical in organizations, had the 21 financial organization reporting to him. Mr. Riggins was 22 the -- had the legal organization, and some other additional 23 duties reporting to him. But the operating organization reported to me. Barbara Curry was the head of human 24 25 resources and corporate secretary.

Г

1	Q. So how would you rank the hierarchy of
2	Mr. Bassham, Mr. Riggins, yourself and Ms. Curry?
3	A. Mr. Bassham was head of the financial
4	organization. I was the number two executive and still am in
5	the company. I'm also a member of the board of directors of
6	the company along with Mr. Chesser.
7	Q. So are you saying that you were at a level
8	above the other Mr. Bassham and Mr. Riggins and Ms. Curry
9	at that time?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Has the level of responsibility you have had
12	at Kansas City Power & Light Company changed during the
13	period of the Iatan construction project?
14	A. When we acquired Aquila and
15	MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, I believe that question
16	calls for a yes-or-no response.
17	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Are you able to answer that
18	question yes or no?
19	THE WITNESS: Would you repeat the question?
20	BY MR. WILLIAMS:
21	Q. Has your level of responsibility at Kansas
22	City Power & Light Company changed since this organization
23	chart in December of 2009?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. And has it declined during the period of the

1 Iatan project?

2

3

A. No, it's different.

Q. And how is it different?

A. We acquired an additional company and at that
time the company elected to consolidate our structure to
incorporate the new -- we eliminated a -- an unregulated
company and we put together two regulated companies.

And in that process, Mr. Chesser and I changed positions relative to the -- the utility, function of the utility operating companies. My position at the holding company level did not change, we changed responsibilities inside the operating companies.

Q. And I -- I'm going to ask you some further questions to clarify because I don't fully understand your answer. Whenever you talk about acquiring another company, are you talking about Great Plains Energy's acquisition of Aquila?

18 A. Yes.

19Q.And are you talking about the merger of Aquila20and Kansas City Power & Light Company or something else?

A. No, that's what I'm talking about, the merger
of those two companies.

Q. Well, it's my understanding they have not
merged is my understanding --

A. well, I used the word "acquisition." You used

1 the word "merger," so I --2 Well, I'm not trying to put words in your **Q**. 3 If I've misspoken, let me know. mouth. I said that we've acquired. 4 Α. 5 well, you said that you acquired and you Q. talked about merging the company, so I was trying to 6 7 understand what you meant by that? we acquired, and we have -- we have 8 Α. functionally put a lot of things together. 9 10 Q. So operationally, there have been a lot of 11 mergers, is that what you're saying? 12 MR. HATFIELD: Judge, I'm going to object as 13 not relevant to anything we're here to talk about today. 14 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Mr. Williams? 15 MR. WILLIAMS: I think the scope of what Mr. Downey does is relevant to what we're doing here today 16 17 and that also reflects on his -- the attention he can put to Iatan 2 as well as what he's doing at Kansas City Power & 18 19 Light Company. And we do have both companies involved in the cases here in front of the Commission. 20 21 JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'll overrule. 22 THE WITNESS: Would you repeat your question? 23 MR. WILLIAMS: I would if I could. COURT REPORTER: "So operationally, there have 24 been a lot of mergers, is that what you're saying?" 25

Γ

1	THE WITNESS: A lot of mergers where?
2	BY MR. WILLIAMS:
3	Q. Well, let me ask it this way: Who provides
4	the operation services for Kansas City Power & Light and
5	Greater Missouri Operations Company, which is the successor
6	name of Aquila?
7	A. Yes, the leadership team was consolidated into
8	a single leadership team. I hold the positions similar
9	position for GMO to this one. We function as a single
10	management team for both organizations.
11	Q. So you're saying your responsibilities have
12	expanded because you're also providing the same function for
13	KCP&L's Greater Missouri Operations Company?
14	A. It's a bigger set of operations, yes.
15	Q. Well, setting aside what you do for KCP&L
16	Greater Missouri Operations Company and just focusing on
17	Kansas City Power & Light Company alone, have your
18	responsibilities changed since December of well, during
19	the Iatan construction project, which is roughly a five-year
20	period, have your responsibilities at Kansas City Power &
21	Light Company itself changed?
22	A. In 2008, when we acquired Aquila, we we
23	made these changes with Mr. Chesser myself.
24	Q. And what are those changes you're referring
25	to?

Γ

1	A. Mr. Chesser previously had been chief
2	executive officer of our holding company. And ever so often,
3	not only the regulated operations of KCP&L, which and I
4	reported to him in that instance, but we also had an
5	unregulated retail electric supply business that had sales in
6	excess of a billion dollars and he oversaw that and there was
7	a separate CEO of that business who reported in to him as
8	well.
9	when we sold that business and became
10	primarily regulated in the acquisition of Aquila, he took
11	responsibility as CEO of not only the holding company but the
12	utilities, which we have been operating off of a common brand
13	name and common operations.
14	Q. And what is that common brand name?
15	A. KCP&L.
16	Q. Are you aware of the \$125 million advanced
17	coal federal income tax credit that Kansas City Power & Light
18	Company received from the Internal Revenue Service for
19	Iatan 2?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Did not the Empire District Electric Company
22	seek allocation of a portion of that coal tax credit for
23	Iatan 2 based on its ownership interest in Iatan 2?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. And wasn't it successful in obtaining that

1 allocation? 2 It did obtain that allocation. Α. 3 Do you know why KCP&L Greater Missouri 0. Operations Company did not seek for a portion of the coal tax 4 credit for Iatan 2 to be allocated to it based on its 5 6 ownership interest in Iatan 2? 7 I'm not the expert on that, but I believe we Α. applied for that prior to the acquisition and feel it's 8 appropriate where it is. 9 Who are "we?" 10 **Q**. 11 Α. The company. 12 who is the company? Q. 13 well, we have tax experts involved. I'm not Α. 14 the tax expert of the company. 15 Well, you're --Q. I do think Melissa Hardesty will be testifying 16 Α. 17 and she would probably be the appropriate one to answer that question. 18 19 MR. HATFIELD: Judge, if I could just 20 interject briefly. That issue is actually in the GMO only 21 part of the case. I don't want to object to these questions 22 because Mr. Downey is here to answer whatever questions you have during this portion of the case, but just in case the 23 Commissioners were wondering, there are witnesses on that 24 schedule to discuss that in a GMO only portion. 25

Г

1	MR. WILLIAMS: I believe that issue is present
2	in the Kansas City Power & Light Company case as well because
3	the Staff has done a reduction of the tax credit in
4	proportion to the ownership interest of KCP&L Greater
5	Missouri Operations Company.
6	MR. HATFIELD: I have no objection to the
7	questioning, Judge.
8	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Since we have no objections,
9	we can continue.
10	BY MR. WILLIAMS:
11	Q. Well, was it your decision as to whether or
12	not I'm going ask again: Why didn't KCP&L Greater
13	Missouri Operations Company also seek for a portion of the
14	coal tax credit for Iatan 2 be allocated to it based on its
15	ownership interest in Iatan 2?
16	A. As I said, that's a tax question. I'm not the
17	tax expert and Melissa Hardesty, who will be a witness in the
18	GMO case, is an appropriate person to ask that question on.
19	Q. Do you know?
20	A. I don't.
21	Q. Do Kansas City Power & Light Company and KCP&L
22	Greater Missouri Operations Company make strategic decisions
23	separately?
24	A. There are decisions that we have to make
25	keeping those legal entities in mind. There are decisions we
Г

1	make in common, there are decisions we have to make
2	separately because of the separate legal entities.
3	Q. Well, is seeking the advance coal tax credit
4	something that would be done on a separate basis?
5	A. Again, I refer you to Melissa Hardesty.
6	Q. You don't know if that would be something that
7	would be done separately or jointly?
8	A. I'm not the tax expert on these issues.
9	Q. Is your answer you don't know?
10	A. I'm not the tax expert.
11	MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, would you direct the
12	witness to respond to the question? I believe he's being
13	non-responsive to his answer.
14	JUDGE PRIDGIN: I will sustain it. I think
15	Mr. Williams was asking you
16	THE WITNESS: I don't know.
17	MR. HATFIELD: Judge, we agreed to do this
18	issue by issue, and you know, I'm being advised, maybe
19	arguably in this case, but we agreed to do this issue by
20	issue. I don't want him back, but I don't know how long
21	we're going to want to spend on this when the witness has
22	told us there's another witness on this and we have a
23	schedule. So I mean, if you want to direct him to answer
24	this question now at this time, obviously you're the judge.
25	JUDGE PRIDGIN: I guess I'll wait to see if we

1 have an objection to the question. So far what we're getting is questions to which Mr. Downey says he doesn't know the 2 answer and --3 MR. HATFIELD: I'm sorry, I thought you were 4 5 directing him to answer the question. 6 JUDGE PRIDGIN: And I did, and Mr. Downey said he didn't know. 7 MR. WILLIAMS: I believe it was answered and 8 9 as to agreement to try these issues by issue, my recollection 10 is that the company chose the order in which this case is 11 being tried. 12 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 13 Q. Do you know if Great Plains Energy, Kansas City Power & Light Company, and/or KCP&L Greater Missouri 14 15 Operations Company have any plans for the merger of Kansas City Power & Light Company and KCP&L Greater Missouri 16 17 Operations Company? And when I say "merge," I'm talking about a legal merger. 18 19 Α. we certainly have talked about it and I 20 believe we've even talked to the Staff about it. 21 well, the question is whether you have any Q. 22 plans, not whether you've talked about it. Do you have any 23 plans? I believe we're talking about it and the idea 24 Α. 25 that we would ultimately merge the two organizations, we are

1 thinking about it. Do you have any date in mind by which the 2 **Q**. 3 merger might be accomplished or -- or when you would like to effectuate the merger? 4 5 Not specifically at this time. Α. within the next ten years? 6 Ο. That would seem reasonable. 7 Α. Within the next five years? 8 Q. MR. HATFIELD: I believe it's been asked and 9 10 answered, Judge. 11 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Overruled. I think he's 12 trying to pin him down on a certain date. THE WITNESS: I don't have a certain date. 13 14 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 15 I am just trying to find the best date I can 0. get. Within the next five years? 16 17 well, I know that we came into the Staff to Α. 18 talk about recently context of when we might do that. And so we're certainly interested in entertaining discussions about 19 20 it. I'm just asking whether or not the companies 21 Q. 22 would like to effectuate a merger within the next five years. 23 MR. HATFIELD: Judge, before we continue on merger, I think I'm going to have to ask that we go into HC, 24 25 talking about combining operations and when that might

happen. JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. We'll go in-camera. Just a moment. (REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an in-camera session was held, which is contained in Volume 20, pages 1224 to 1225 of the transcript.)

			<u>01 21 20</u>	
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				

			OT LT LO	
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				
1				

Г

1			JUDGE PRIDGIN: We're back in public forum.
2	BY MR. WI	LLIAMS	5:
3	Q		Do you know how many hours you charged to
4	Iatan 2 co	onstru	uction project in 2005?
5	А		I don't.
6	Q		would it be 0 hours?
7	А		No. It would have probably been fairly low,
8	though, i	n 200!	5.
9	Q		How low is fairly low?
10	А		I have no idea the number.
11	Q		A hundred hours?
12	А		I have no idea.
13	Q		Did you charge 21.5 hours to the Iatan 2
14	construct	ion p	roject in 2006?
15	А		I have no idea.
16	Q		Did you charge 64.6 hours to the Iatan 2
17	construct	ion p	roject in 2007?
18	А		I have no idea.
19	Q		Did you charge 178.7 hours to the Iatan 2
20	construct	ion p	roject in 2008?
21	А		I have no idea.
22	Q		Did you charge 343.3 hours to the Iatan 2
23	construct	ion p	roject in 2009?
24	А	•	I have no idea.
25	Q	•	Did you charge 252 hours to the Iatan 2

1 construction project in 2010?

- 2
- A. I have no idea.

3 Do those hours that I've asked you about in 0. the different years correlate or do you believe they 4 correlate with how much time you've put in on the Iatan 2 5 construction project in those years? And I don't mean 6 precisely, but generally, did you work, you know, roughly 7 three times as much in 2007 as you did in 2006 and roughly 8 three times as much in 2008 as in 2007 and roughly twice as 9 much in 2009 as 2008? 10

11 Α. I suspect what they correlate to are meetings 12 on my calendar. My secretary keeps my calendar. She records what I'm sure it doesn't account for is hours that 13 the time. I might work in the evening or on the weekends or whenever if 14 15 it's not on the calendar, it's probably not recorded there. So it would reflect meetings of the oversight committee, it 16 17 would reflect my weekly trips out to the plant site. It would reflect what's on the calendar as opposed to the time I 18 19 put into the project that's not on the calendar.

Q. So by your answer, are you saying that what you've charged to the Iatan 2 construction project or what's been charged to the Iatan 2 construction project for your time has been what's reflected on your calendar and not necessarily all of the time you've spent on the project? A. If I spend four hours on a Saturday reading

1 material, that's not reflected on the -- in there. Τ 2 don't -- I don't work a 40-hour week. I work almost all the 3 time and that's not recorded in the company's book of records. 4 5 who prepares your time sheets? Q. My assistant. 6 Α. 7 And do you review them? Q. I do. 8 Α. And before you sign off on them, you ensure 9 Q. 10 they're correct and accurate? 11 Α. Between her and I, we review them and look at 12 it and she goes over it with me when I sign it. And as I said, it reflects what's on the calendar. 13 14 what calendar are you referring? **Q**. 15 She keeps my calendar. Α. So it's a work calendar? 16 Q. 17 Yes. Α. And what kind of information is kept in that 18 Q. 19 calendar? You mentioned meetings. 20 It's the schedule of my time, meetings that Α. 21 I'm in, where I am. 22 And when say your time, are you talking about Q. a 40-hour workweek, 8:00 to 5:00? 23 If I have meetings that extend beyond that, 24 Α. they'll be in that calendar. 25

Г

1	Q. So it will be the normal workday plus if there
2	was time that went beyond the end of the normal workday?
3	A. I haven't worked a normal workday in any time
4	since I can remember.
5	Q. But you also said you worked on weekends and
6	that time I gather is not reflected in your calendar, so I'm
7	trying to get an understanding.
8	A. If I go home at nights and I spend two hours
9	sitting in a chair at home doing work, I don't put it on my
10	calendar.
11	Q. So is what's put on your calendar when you're
12	spending time on work at work? And when I say that, I'm
13	talking physically at your workplace.
14	A. It could be at my workplace, could not be at
15	my workplace. I could be in meetings I could be in
16	meetings anywhere in the country.
17	Q. But it wouldn't be while you're at home?
18	A. I don't try to record the hours I work when
19	I'm at home.
20	Q. Who built Wolf Creek?
21	A. I'm not sure I understand your question.
22	Q. The Wolf Creek nuclear reactor that's part of
23	the Kansas City Power & Light Company portfolio of generation
24	assets, you're familiar with that?
25	A. Yes.

1 Q. Do you know who built it? 2 well, it was a joint venture of Westar and Α. 3 Kansas City Power & Light and Kansas Electric Power 4 Cooperative. 5 who managed the construction of the generating Q. facility? 6 7 I was not here at the time. I have no idea. Α. Would you -- in your direct testimony on 8 Q. page 3 at lines 8 to 9, I'll give you a moment to find it. 9 10 Α. I'm there. 11 Q. You mention there, do you not, that Kansas 12 City Power & Light Company had engaged in a building of a number of smaller construction projects and rebuilt 13 Hawthorn 5, do you not? 14 15 Α. Yes. 16 what are the smaller construction projects 0. 17 that you're referring to there? Probably larger retrofits on existing 18 Α. coal-fired units. We have an annual capital budget and some 19 20 of those projects can be very significant. We have one under 21 way right now at La Cygne, at our La Cygne power plant that's 22 very large. Those kind of projects. They'd be in the 23 multi-million dollars in terms of scope and cost. You said probably retrofit to larger coal 24 Q. plants. Did you prepare your direct testimony? 25

1 Yes, I did. I meant -- that's what I meant. Α. 2 I meant retrofit work. 3 So it's not probably, that is what you meant? 0. 4 Α. Yes. 5 So it doesn't include the construction of 0. 6 combined cycle and combustion turbine generators? 7 Yes, we've built multiple of those stations Α. even in the last ten years since I've been here, West Gardner 8 facility would be one that comes to mind. 9 And what retrofits of larger coal plants were 10 Q. 11 you referring to? 12 Α. We've done work at Hawthorn, we've done work at La Cygne, we've done projects at Montrose, more recently 13 in the acquired organizations at Sibley. 14 15 what type of work are you referring to that 0. you're characterizing as retrofits? 16 Environmental equipment, boiler tube 17 Α. 18 replacement, various components at the plant, turbine 19 generators. 20 **Q**. And when you -- when you reference various 21 components, you also said boiler tubes and turbine 22 generators. Are those some of the components you're 23 referring to or does components mean something else? Yes, these plants -- we have a fleet that's 24 Α. 25 aging and there are significant components to those plants

Г

1	that we and we schedule maintenance and refurbishment
2	outages, even with regard to Iatan 1 when we we install
3	the the new environmental control equipment in the 2008
4	time frame, we probably did 50 to 70 million dollars worth of
5	non-CEP work inside Iatan 1 that included an entirely new
6	digital control system and included additional equipment in
7	the boiler and in other parts of the plant.
8	Q. And since you've mentioned a cost of some of
9	those projects, what type of costs are you talking about for
10	a total value of the project? Are we talking about a hundred
11	million dollar projects to a million dollar projects?
12	A. Well, the current one at La Cygne is in the
13	hundred million dollar neighborhood.
14	Q. And what is the current project at La Cygne?
15	A. There's a major amount of of work being
16	done, a variety of items, complete gutting of much of the
17	boiler support equipment.
18	Q. And the others you mentioned, Hawthorn,
19	Montrose, Sibley, what kind of order of magnitude are the
20	dollars on those projects?
21	A. Sibley, I think it's in the 70 million dollar
22	range.
23	Q. Montrose?
24	A. Montrose, over the last decade, we've probably
25	done 25, 30 million dollars worth of work on collective

Г

1	project	5.	
2		Q.	Well, is 70 million you're referencing on
3	Sibley,	over w	hat time frame is that project?
4		Α.	Probably two years.
5		Q.	And the La Cygne project you mentioned?
6		Α.	That's currently underway.
7		Q.	How far along are you on that project?
8		Α.	I was actually supposed to be down there this
9	past we	ek and	didn't get there, probably about halfway
10	through	that o	utage right now.
11		Q.	And how long is this outage you're referring
12	to?		
13		Α.	About four months.
14		Q.	And the Hawthorn project you referenced, how
15	many do	llars w	ere involved in that?
16		Α.	I don't recall specific dollars.
17		Q.	Do you recall a time frame?
18		Α.	It goes back a couple years.
19		Q.	And rather than just specific dollars, can you
20	ballparl	k it?	
21		Α.	I don't have a number on Hawthorn.
22		Q.	Did not Kansas City Power & Light Company hire
23	an engi	neering	firm to prepare the definitive estimate of the
24	Iatan co	onstruc	tion project?
25		Α.	Are you referring to Burns & McDonnell?

1 well, that could be the engineering firm, Q. 2 It would be. sure. 3 We hired Burns & McDonnell as the owners Α. engineer and they prepared an estimate, yes. 4 5 Is that the definitive estimate that they Q. 6 prepared? 7 They prepared it but ultimately it was KCP&L's Α. control budget estimate, which they prepared and had 8 commented and was critiqued, but ultimately we own the 9 10 estimate. 11 Q. If I understand your answer correctly, you're 12 saying Burns & McDonnell prepared the definitive estimate for the Iatan construction project, but it was Kansas City Power 13 & Light Company that adopted that estimate as the definitive 14 estimate? 15 16 Α. Yes. Why was a law firm, in this case Schiff 17 0. Hardin, needed to review the definitive estimate prepared by 18 Burns & McDonnell for the Iatan construction project? 19 20 Mr. Dan Meyer in particular, and he will be Α. 21 testifying later, is a cost-control, cost-estimating expert 22 in the construction industry and we wanted his input and 23 review of it and found it very valuable. So you retained the law firm specifically for 24 **Q**. Mr. Meyer -- Meyer's services? 25

Γ

1	A. No, Mr. Meyer was one of an array of services
2	that came together and was part of the unique skill set of
3	that Schiff Hardin organization. It was one of a number of
4	things that they brought to the table that we found very
5	valuable and Mr. Meyer has, from the original control budget
6	estimate, through every reforecast, has been a constant in
7	terms of critiquing and evaluating and giving us an
8	independent view of the numbers.
9	Q. Is Mr. Meyer an attorney?
10	A. Not that I'm aware of.
11	Q. On page 3 of your direct testimony, at line 17
12	you used the term internal resources. Do you see that?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Where you use that term "internal resources"
15	there, what do you mean?
16	A. Direct employees.
17	Q. What do you mean by "direct employees"?
18	A. An actual employee of KCP&L as opposed to a
19	contractor or consultant.
20	Q. And when you say KCP&L, do you mean Kansas
21	City Power & Light Company?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Do you accept responsibility for the Iatan
24	construction project?
25	A. I am the responsible executive for the

1 project. 2 Are you accountable for the Iatan construction **Q**. 3 project? I believe so. 4 Α. 5 Are you a member of the executive oversight Q. 6 committee? I'm the chairman of it, and I have been since 7 Α. it was founded. 8 when was the executive oversight committee 9 Q. founded? 10 11 Α. well, informally, we assembled as early as 12 2005. we formalized that in early 2006, February of 2006. would you please identify the members of the 13 Q. executive oversight committee when it was created and any 14 15 changes in that membership of that committee since it was 16 created? 17 I'm not sure that I have that in my head. but Α. I believe it was -- I don't have the original -- maybe it's 18 19 in my testimony, I can't recall. I know that Mr. Bassham was 20 on the committee, Mr. Easley was on the committee, Mr. 21 Riggins was on the committee, Barbara Curry was on the 22 committee. I believe Mr. Giles was on the committee. There could have been others. Those are the names that I recall 23 24 right now. 25 And those names are -- you're referring to in Q.

01-21-2011 EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 1 2005 when it was an informal committee? 2 2006 when it was formalized. Α. 3 And you testified earlier you were also a 0. member when it was formally designated in 2006? 4 5 Α. Yes. Is Mr. Bassham still a member of the executive 6 Ο. 7 oversight committee? 8 Α. Yes. Is Mr. Easley still a member of the executive 9 Q. 10 oversight committee? 11 Α. NO. 12 Q. Do you know whenever he no longer -- became no longer a member of the executive oversight committee? 13 14 when he left the company, which would have Α. been sometime in -- I can't recall the date he left. 15 16 Do you know which year it was even? **Q**. 17 2009. Α. Is Mr. Riggins still a member of the executive 18 Q. oversight committee? 19 20 NO. Α. 21 Do you know when he became no longer a member Q. 22 of the executive oversight committee? 23 He left the company just recently. Α. Was that in this last year? 24 Q. 25 Last quarter of last year. Α.

Г

1	0	Tt's Ms Suppy is it not?
1	Q.	It's Ms. Curry, is it not?
2	Α.	No, it's Mrs. Curry.
3	Q.	Mrs. Curry. Do you know is Mrs. Curry still a
4	member of the o	executive oversight committee?
5	Α.	She retired last year.
6	Q.	Do you know when last year?
7	Α.	Not exactly, but middle of the year.
8	Q.	Is Mr. Giles still a member of the executive
9	oversight comm	ittee?
10	Α.	No, he's not. Not officially. He's not a
11	he's a consulta	ant to the company.
12	Q.	Do you know when his membership in the
13	executive over	sight committee ended?
14	Α.	when he retired.
15	Q.	Do you know when he retired?
16	Α.	From the company?
17	Q.	Do you remember when retired from the company?
18	Α.	You're really testing my memory. It would
19	have been I	think it could have been 2008.
20	Q.	So to the best of your recollection, it would
21	have been 2008	?
22	Α.	Somewhere in 2008, I think.
23	Q.	Were Mr. Easley, Mr. Riggins, Mrs. Curry or
24	Mr. Giles repla	aced as members of the executive oversight
25	committee?	
24	Mr. Giles repla	

Г

1	A. Yes, Mr. Hydebrink (phonetic), who's the	
2	senior vice-president of our supply group, which is	
3	generation that's replaced Mr. Easley on that committee.	
4	Q. And would that have been about the time	
5	Mr. Easley retired?	
6	A. Yes.	
7	Q. Or left KCP&L?	
8	A. Yes.	
9	Q. I shouldn't say retired.	
10	A. Yes.	
11	Q. And Mr. Hydebrink is still a member of th	е
12	committee?	
13	A. Yes, he is.	
14	Q. Did anyone else become a member of the	
15	committee?	
16	A. Mr. Blanc, he's head of regulatory. Our	
17	vice-president of purchasing, Maria Jenks, is now on the	!
18	committee. I'm sure I'm forgetting somebody.	
19	Q. Well, Mr. Giles, I believe, was regulator	y and
20	I believe Mr. Blanc is currently.	
21	A. Yes, right.	
22	Q. Did Mr. Blanc become a member of the exec	utive
23	oversight committee about the time Mr. Giles left?	
24	A. Yes.	
25	Q. And Mr. Riggins, I believe, was in legal.	Did

1 someone else replace him?

A. I don't believe we have at this point. And we're beginning to transition down as the project winds down. We haven't yet closed out the EOC, but much of the work is obviously done on that and ultimately, at some point this year, we will officially close that out for the Iatan project and the CEP projects.

Q. Mr. Downey, for making essential decisions,
9 does the executive oversight committee receive all necessary
10 information it needed on a timely basis?

11 Α. The oversight committee was not necessarily 12 the decision-making body. It was an oversight body. It was not the decision-making body. It would have been involved in 13 hearing about decisions to be made and listening to them. 14 15 But there's a line organization that is decision-making authority and responsibility. The oversight committee did 16 17 not run the project, the line organization ran the project. But you also testified, I believe, that the 18 Q. 19 executive oversight committee made recommendations? 20 Yes, it's part of good governance to have that Α. 21 group and their input and ideas. But ultimately, the line 22 organization had decision-making responsibility. 23 And did the line organization rely on the 0. executive oversight committee's recommendations? 24 I would -- I would describe it as a discussion 25 Α.

and a questioning and a challenging and it clearly would
 listen to -- very strongly -- the input and advice of that
 group. But ultimately, the line organization had to make the
 decisions.

Q. Well, do you know of any instance where the
executive oversight committee made some recommendation that
the line organization declined to adopt?

A. NO.

8

9 Q. And in making its recommend -- or for making 10 its recommendations, did the executive oversight committee 11 receive all the information it needed to make those 12 recommendations on a timely basis?

13 A. I believe they did.

Q. And what type of -- what types of information did the executive oversight committee receive for making its recommendations?

A. Well, I think there was a standard set of reports each month. Early on, the oversight committee was meeting even as frequently as weekly. As time progressed, we moved to a monthly format in which they received regular updates on status of all sorts of issues. Early on, it was the engineering status and then the key purchasing decisions that were made.

As we moved to construction, it would have been construction status, they would have learned about the

1 development of the organization, they would have seen and 2 heard about our cost control system, they would have been 3 immersed in our earned value system and every month they 4 would have seen the output of those -- that system. They 5 would have seen the financial reports from the cost control 6 system.

7 Anytime there was a major issue with a site, they would have had detailed briefings on that. When we had 8 the crane collapse and fatality there, they would have had 9 10 very detailed briefings on that. When we uncovered the 11 metallurgical issues around T-23, we would have briefed the 12 committee and we would have brought the independent experts in to allow the committee to question and understand those 13 issues. So anything of significance during the project would 14 15 have very timely been brought forward to the oversight committee for their awareness. 16

Q. And you mentioned the committee's meetings gather -- I think it was meetings -- started out weekly and changed to monthly. Do you know about the time frame when that change occurred and the frequency?

A. I don't recall exactly. I would say that early on in the project, as we were getting started up -- I don't recall the exact date.

24 Q. 2005, 2007?

25 A. I'd say 2000 --

г	EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011
1	Q. 2007?
2	A. I would say early or late 2006.
3	Q. And you mentioned standard reports. What do
4	those include?
5	A. The financial reporting, the earned value
6	reporting, the schedules. You know, progress on schedule and
7	cost. The progress on purchasing, in 2006, we committed a
8	billion dollars of spend on the projects so they would have
9	been hearing about that all the way through 2006, progress on
10	engineering, progress with contractors, disputes with
11	contractors, they would have heard all of that.
12	Q. Now whenever I asked you about the executive
13	oversight committee making decisions, you said no, they make
14	recommendations. You referenced line organization. What's
15	the line organization you're talking about?
16	A. The project team, the head of construction,
17	first Mr. Grimwade followed by Mr. Murphy, our
18	vice-presidents of construction, Mr. Price, then Mr.
19	Churchman. Those would have been the the line
20	organization reporting first to Mr. Easley and then
21	ultimately to me.
22	Q. Would that have Mr. Easley is not with the
23	company now, is he?
24	A. That's correct.
25	Q. So whenever you're talking about those

1 individuals and those positions, are we talking about 2 whenever the committee was first established? 3 Those were the individuals over time, Α. NO. over the five-year period. 4 5 The individuals who made the decisions, is 0. that what you're saying? 6 7 The individuals responsible for the line Α. organization, yes. Mr. Grimwade was the first one. 8 It's my ignorance, I'm still not understanding 9 Q. what you're meaning by line organization. Are you saying 10 11 these are the individuals over what you're describing as a 12 line organization? Yes, so in the beginning, Mr. Easily had 13 Α. responsibility for -- let's just stick with the Iatan 14 15 projects. That's fine. 16 0. And so as senior vice-president of generation 17 Α. and then construction as well, he was the head of the line 18 organization. Mr. Grimwade was -- reported directly to him 19 20 and then the project manager, the initial one was Terry 21 Murphy and -- and Terry Murphy's whole organization. That's 22 the line organization. They were responsible for the 23 execution of the project. And that's the Iatan project, correct? 24 Q. 25 Yes. Α.

Г

1	Q. Were Mr. Easley, Mr. Grimwade and Mr. Murphy
2	all employees of Kansas City Power & Light Company?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Were they all employees of Kansas City Power &
5	Light Company before the Iatan project team started to be put
6	together?
7	A. Mr. Easley and Mr. Grimwade were; Mr. Murphy
8	was not.
9	Q. Why was Mr. Murphy hired?
10	A. We were seeking an experienced large
11	construction project executive.
12	Q. What was it about Mr. Murphy's qualifications
13	that caused Kansas City Power & Light Company to hire him?
14	A. I think the year that we hired him, he was
15	named one of the hundred top large project managers by
16	Engineering News Record, so I mean, that was one of many. He
17	was recommended, he had worked on many other projects and was
18	recommended to us and had that kind of background.
19	Q. Do you know of any specific projects that he
20	worked on before you hired him?
21	A. I believe he the Ontario project. I can't
22	remember the specific name of the organization, but he had
23	just come off of a large project. Not unusual for these
24	individuals.
25	Q. Do you know if he had been was ever

Г

1	characterized and I'm going to use some words that if				
2	they're inaccurate, tell me and how you would characterize				
3	Mr. Murphy in terms of what you understood about his				
4	activities at the I think it was a project for Ontario				
5	Power Generation. But had he been described as pushing				
6	management changes on the site and overhauling				
7	problem-plagued culture?				
8	MR. HATFIELD: I'm going to object, it's a				
9	compound or ambiguous question. I'm not sure I understand				
10	what he wants the question to answer.				
11	JUDGE PRIDGIN: I'm going to overrule. I				
12	mean, I think I understood the question.				
13	THE WITNESS: Would you repeat the question?				
14	BY MR. WILLIAMS:				
15	Q. Do you know if in terms of his activities at				
16	the Ontario project, Mr. Murphy had been characterized as				
17	having overhauled a problem-plagued culture at the committee				
18	and pushed management changes onsite?				
19	A. I don't recall that specific, I don't know.				
20	Q. Did you have any understanding about what				
21	Mr. Murphy had done at the Ontario power site?				
22	A. My understanding was that he was successful.				
23	You know, I did not as I said, Mr. Easley at the time was				
24	in charge of this and was a part of the he was a lead as a				
25	part of this hiring. What I know is Mr. Murphy came highly				

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011 1 recommended and had a long background. I don't remember the 2 specifics. 3 So are you saying that Mr. Easley made the 0. hiring decision for hiring Mr. Murphy? 4 5 He would have been the lead on that. Other Α. 6 people would have been involved. Our human resource people would have been involved. I think I probably interviewed 7 Mr. Murphy myself and there were other people who would have 8 interviewed. When we hire the key people, we try to have 9 multiple inputs. That's -- hiring is one of the more 10 11 challenging decisions that any organization makes and it's 12 not an exact science, so we try to get multiple inputs. So you're -- basically you're saying you 13 Q. 14 relied on his general reputation and other people in your 15 organization for the hiring of Mr. Murphy? 16 Yes. Α. 17 Do I understand correctly that the executive 0. oversight committee didn't have any control over the 18 financing or authorization of expenditures on the Iatan 19 20 project?

A. That's correct.

Q. Could the Iatan project manager approve
expenditures on the Iatan project without the approval of the
vice-president of construction?

25 A. Yes.

1 Mr. Downey, you approved some settlements with Q. 2 Kiewit and Alstom: is that correct? 3 Α. Yes. Did you obtain approval from the board of 4 0. 5 directors of Kansas City Power & Light Company before you 6 approved those settlements? If they required such approval. 7 Α. In some cases, they did not, depending on the level of those 8 settlements. the dollar level. 9 would the dollar level where board of director 10 Q. 11 approval be highly confidential? 12 Yes, I think. Α. 13 MR. HATFIELD: Okay. 14 MR. WILLIAMS: I guess go in-camera for the 15 question. 16 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. We'll go in-camera for 17 just a moment, please. BY MR. WILLIAMS: 18 At what dollar level would the settlement need 19 Q. to be before it required board of director approval whenever 20 you were the one approving the settlement? 21 22 I should have the specific number in my head, Α. 23 I don't. But I don't believe that there were any settlement agreements that reached that level. In fact, I'm certain 24 there weren't. 25

Г

1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Is that all we need for in					
2	camera?					
3	MR. WILLIAMS: Probably more than we needed as					
4	it turns out.					
5	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Can we go back into public					
6	then?					
7	MR. HATFIELD: I don't think that needs to be					
8	HC.					
9	JUDGE PRIDGIN: We're going back to public.					
10	We are in public forum.					
11	MR. MILLS: And Judge, while we were					
12	in-camera, I think counsel for KCP&L decided that that					
13	portion did not need to be HC, so can we instruct that the					
14	transcript be prepared accordingly?					
15	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Any objections?					
16	MR. HATFIELD: No objection, Your Honor.					
17	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. If I can order then					
18	that immediately proceeding in-camera session be made public.					
19	Thank you.					
20	BY MR. WILLIAMS:					
21	Q. And am I correct in understanding that your					
22	approving settlements with Kiewit and Alstom didn't require					
23	any approval by the executive oversight committee; is that					
24	correct?					
25	A. I would have shared that those settlement					

1 processes and outcomes with the oversight committee, but I 2 had the authority to do it. 3 You didn't have to share it with them, did 0. 4 you? 5 I did. Α. 6 I understand, but you weren't required to, Ο. 7 were you? 8 I believe our culture and our informal policy Α. would have said that, yes, I did. 9 Did the executive oversight committee make 10 Q. 11 recommendations regarding the settlement with Kiewit and 12 Alstom that you approved? I'm sorry, would you repeat that? 13 Α. 14 Did the executive oversight committee make **Q**. 15 recommendations regarding the settlements with Kiewit and Alstom that you approved? 16 17 No, I don't believe they did. Α. Why don't we do it this way: For approving 18 Q. the settlements in Kiewit and Alstom, what role did the 19 20 executive oversight committee play? 21 I think the confusion, the executive oversight Α. 22 committee is not an unusual kind of structure in large 23 organizations. And it's an input and advice -- they were not the line authority. They -- we wanted to make sure that our 24 25 executives from across the organization understood what was

Г

1	going on, was involved, could question and challenge. But					
2	they were not in the line of approval. Now, did we listen to					
3	them, yes, because it's important. But this is not an					
4	unusual structure in big corporations, but they are not the					
5	line authority for this.					
6	There is a line organization that's very					
7	clear. The signature authorities are very clear and approval					
8	lines are very clear. The oversight committee is not in that					
9	approval line, but we consult with them and we ask for their					
10	input and we want them to be aware of all that's going on in					
11	this. We had three to 4,000 people working on this one					
12	project. We don't have we have about 3,000 people in the					
13	entire rest of the company.					
14	This was our way of engaging our entire senior					
15	leadership team in what was going on on a very focused					
16	project. But they were there was not a sign-off sheet or					
17	an approval authority within the oversight committee. Their					
18	functions was very different than the line organizations					
19	function.					
20	Q. I think I'm hearing your quibbling with my use					
21	of the word "recommendation." Did the oversight committee					
22	provide its input in written format?					
23	A. NO.					
24	Q. Or did it					
25	A. No, it was in the discussion in the monthly					

1 meetings.

2 Q. Mr. Downey, did Alstom provide you and your 3 wife a trip to Pebble Beach with all expenses paid by Alstom 4 except airfare?

A. I did go to Pebble Beach with the Alstom
senior leadership after we successfully completed the
negotiation of the contract, and I did pay for -- our company
paid for the airfare. I was their guest at the -- at Pebble
Beach.

10 Q. And when you said their "guest," whose guest 11 were you?

12 A. Alstom's.

Q. So Alstom paid for your accommodations and
whatever you did in Pebble Beach is that what you're saying?
A. Yes.

Q. And likewise, Mr. Downey, did Alstom provide
you and your wife a trip to Newport, Rhode Island with all
expenses paid by Alstom except for airfare?

A. We did go to that event and I know I paid our
own airfare. I'm not sure about the hotel, whether we paid
it or not, I can't recall.

22 Q. What is Pebble Beach?

25

A. Well, we stayed at a hotel there and it is aresort area.

Q. What kind of activities do they have at that

1 resort? 2 A variety of different ones, including golf. Α. 3 Is it known for any particular activity? 0. Golf. 4 Α. 5 Are you a golfer? Q. I play golf, badly. 6 Α. 7 I hope Alstom didn't take too much advantage Q. of you on the golf course then. 8 9 when you signed the settlement agreement with 10 Alstom for the JLG and soil stabilization settlements, did 11 Kansas City Power & Light Company have any basis for 12 believing that it was at fault? The JLG settlement was part of a broader set 13 Α. of initiatives and strategy we had with -- with Alstom. 14 15 First of all, the JLG incident raised safety issues, so --16 MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, I think he's going 17 beyond the scope of the question in his answer. I ask that 18 you direct him to answer the question as posed. 19 JUDGE PRIDGIN: Okay. Just to be clear, 20 Mr. Williams, will you ask the question again, please? 21 BY MR. WILLIAMS: 22 when you signed the agreement with Alstom for **Q**. the JLG and soil stabilization settlements, did Kansas City 23 24 Power & Light Company have any basis for believing it was at 25 fault?

Г

1	MR. HATFIELD: Judge, I think we may need to					
2	be HC here.					
3	MR. WILLIAMS: I'm fine with going HC.					
4	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. Just a moment, HC.					
5	We'll go in camera for just a moment.					
6	(REPORTER�S NOTE: At this point, an in-camera					
7	session was held, which is contained in Volume 20, pages 1255					
8	to 1257 of the transcript.)					
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23 24						
24 25						
20						

1	1			
2	2			
3	3			
4	4			
5	5			
6	6			
7	7			
8	8			
9	9			
10	0			
11	1			
12	2			
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25	5			
	r			
----	---	--	--	--
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				

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

Г

1	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Because of the hour and
2	because of the weather, I'm just inquiring how much more
3	cross-examination do you think you have.
4	MR. WILLIAMS: A lot.
5	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. And Mr. Fischer, I
6	thought I saw you grabbing a microphone, did you have
7	somebody
8	MR. FISCHER: Well, I was going to inquire the
9	same thing. It looked like if Mr. Downey was going to need
10	to come back, we probably ought to talk about scheduling of
11	next week and I know the folks from Kansas City want to stay
12	and get get as much done as we can, but if it's going to
13	be next week, we might as well take a break.
14	JUDGE PRIDGIN: All right. I'm inclined to
15	to call it a night. Is there is there anything before
16	counsel or any objection or anything from counsel before we
17	go off the record?
18	MR. WILLIAMS: I'm certainly not going to
19	stand in your way.
20	JUDGE PRIDGIN: Thank you. All right. If
21	there's nothing further, we will readjourn at 8:30 Monday
22	morning. Thank you. We are off the record.
23	
24	
25	

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 STATE OF MISSOURI ss:) 3 COUNTY OF GASCONADE) 4 5 I, JENNIFER L. LEIBACH, Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Court Reporter, CCR #1780, and Certified 6 Realtime Reporter, the officer before whom the foregoing 7 matter was taken, do hereby certify that the witness/es whose 8 testimony appears in the foregoing matter was duly sworn; 9 that the testimony of said witness/es was taken by me to the 10 11 best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting 12 under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which 13 14 this matter was taken, and further that I am not a relative 15 or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in 16 the outcome of the action. 17 18 19 20 Court Reporter 21 22 23 24 25

1	INDEX	
2	KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT'S EVIDENCE	
3	CHRIS GILES:	1010
4	Direct Examination by Mr. Fischer Cross-Examination by Mr. Mills Cross-Examination by Ms. Ott	1010 1012 1014
5		1014 1055 1090
6	Questions by Commissioner Gunn Questions by Commissioner Jarrett	1104 1120
7		1128 1140
8	Recross-Examination by Mr. Mills Recross-Examination by Ms. Ott	1143 1147
9	Redirect Examination by Mr. Fischer	1153
10	WILLIAM DOWNEY:	
11		1181 1183
12		1198 1205
13		1224
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
l		

Г

1	EXHIBIT INDEX		
2		MARKED	RCV 'D
3	Exhibit No. 21-NP Direct Testimony of William Downey		1183
4	Non-Proprietary		1105
5	Exhibit No. 21-HC Direct Testimony of William Downey		1183
6	Highly Confidential		
7 8	Exhibit No. 22-NP Rebuttal Testimony of William Downey Non-Proprietary		1183
9	Exhibit No. 22-HC		1100
10	Rebuttal Testimony of William Downey Highly Confidential		1183
11	Exhibit No. 70-HC Strategic Infrastructure Investment	1161	1163
12	Status Report	1101	1105
13	Exhibit No. 72 Presentation Outline to the	1168	1169
14	Regulatory Plan Signatories		
15	Exhibit No. 250-HC Recommendation to Award Letter		1010
16	Exhibit No. 252		
17	Chain of E-mails	1020	1180
18	Exhibit No. 253 Organizational Chart	1210	1211
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	PENILARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-4	
\$	1175:5	1197:9	1198 1260:12
\$1.9 1204:25	09 1076:11	10:30 1074:15	11th 1136:10
\$10 1114:9	1123:2	10:45 1074:16	12 1163:2
1115:14 1116:2	09-KCPE-246-	100 1077:8	1200 1010:25
1110.2	RPS 1064:5	1091:9	1205 1260:12
1118:2	1	1000 1006:15	1210 1261:18
1171:13	$\frac{1}{1 \ 1018:19}$	101 1006:19	1210 1201:10 1211 1261:18
\$12 1116:6	1032:6,11	1010 1260:3	1224 1223:5
\$125 1217:16	1033:15	1261:15	1260:13
\$2 1170:21	1034:10,11,1 4,15 1035:2	1012 1260:4	1225 1223:6
\$2,005	1052:6	1014 1260:4	124 1201:22
1052:19	1060:7 1063:24	1020 1261:17	1255 1254:7
\$2,500 1044:9,14	1066:15,21	104595	1257 1254:8
\$20 1028:25	1067:21	1007:23	1267523
1114:8	1076:11,13 1081:10	1047 1045:25 1046:1	1037:14
1170:21	1091:7,8,9	1055 1054:21	12-month
\$200	1096:9	1260:5	1098:19
1044:6,10	1104:3 1108:9	1058 1054:22	13 1089:12 1115:21
\$220 1197:10 1203:3	1111:16	1070 1069:18	1116:3,18
\$40 1149:15	1141:12 1158:10	1073 1069:19	130 1005:11
\$5 1114:10	1167:3	1090 1260:5	13220 1008:9
1115:14	1168:23	11 1123:7	14 1065:9
1116:2	1171:6 1175:23	1146:25	145 1142:7
1117:3 1118:2	1176:2,22	1201:23	1464 1007:20
1171:13	1196:8	1100 1007:7	15 1065:10,16
\$50,000	1198:13,24,2 5 1232:2,5	1104 1260:6	1094:2
1089:16,19	1,100 1052:18	111 1006:6	1105:2,6,15
\$8.1 1163:14	1,200 1178:9	1120 1260:6	150 1032:7,9
0	1,300 1052:18	1128 1127:14	16 1068:8,17
$\frac{0}{01063:19}$	1,465 1199:8	1260:7	1105:15 1191:20,24,2
1064:21	1.09 1175:6	1130 1127:15	5
1226:6	1.4 1201:7	1140 1260:7	1613 1007:20
04 1155:1	1.465 1141:17	1143 1260:8	17 1115:22
05 1121:20,22	1.685	1147 1260:8	1116:3,18 1121:8
06 1097:5,12	1105:9,15	1153 1260:9	1121:8
1101:22 1140:15	1152:4	1161 1261:11	1191:25
1141:17,24	1.9 1199:3	1163 1261:11	1235:11
1168:25	1.901 1105:18	1168 1261:13	178.7 1226:19
07 1021:20	1126:8	1169 1261:13	1780 1004:23
1097:15 1167:12	1.948 1105:12,15	1180 1261:17	1259:6
08 1067:3	1126:10	1181 1260:11	179 1156:8
1093:11,12	1:45 1139:6	1183 1260:11	18 1068:6,15
1155:3,4,9	10 1067:9	1261:3,5,7,9	19 1004:9
1167:5	1196:6	119 1008:2	1980 1079:22

EVIL	PENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-2	2011
1080:5	1151:17	1226:17	2011 1004:7
		1227:8,9	
1st 1038:16	2000 1063:24	1242:24	2015 1156:9
	1242:25	1243:1	202.586.3409
2	2004 1095:22		1006:16
2 1018:19	1154:12,17	2008 1019:23	20585 1006:15
1031:25	1158:15	1023:5,7,8,2	
1032:3,6,11,	1174:2	1 1026:15 1036:17	20th 1090:25
1032:3,6,11, 13,17,20	2005 1051:17	1037:15	1091:1
1033:13,15	1053:9	1037:15	21 1004:7
1034:2,7,11	1062:21	1042:12	1066:16
1035:2,17	1063:9,12	1067:11	1181:17
1051:13,17,2	1077:24	1077:9	1182:11
3 1052:7	1078:8	1092:1	1183:3,4
1053:8	1079:5,11,15	1105:18	21.5 1226:13
1060:4,24	1095:22	1126:24	21-нс 1261:5
1061:21,23 1062:13	1114:17	1167:19	-
1062:13	1121:10,16,1	1184:12,23	21-NP 1261:3
1067:21	7 1131:11 1157:11	1216:22	21st 1010:3
1068:9	1160:22	1226:20	22 1069:8
1076:9	1187:6,20	1227:9,10	1082:6
1082:9,12,19	1201:9	1232:3 1238:19,21,2	1181:17
1084:5	1226:4,8	2	1182:11
1091:8	1236:12		1183:4
1104:3	1237:1	2009 1024:10	220 1142:10
1108:9	1242:24	1025:13	
1111:16	2006 1121:10	1031:22	2230 1009:10
1160:9	1122:1	1032:4 1033:8	22-нс 1261:9
1162:25	1123:8	1035:11,15	22nd 1168:20
1163:2	1124:10	1036:22	
1168:21,23,2 5 1171:6	1136:10	1037:2	22-NP 1183:3
1176:22	1144:5	1040:2	1261:7
1185:19	1146:22,25	1064:6	23 1164:17
1189:12	1162:2,5	1067:6	1192:24
1190:8	1184:7	1088:2	230 1007:11
1196:13	1185:7	1126:2	23rd 1051:17
1199:3	1186:2	1166:7,9	1126:24
1215:18	1187:20	1167:6	
1217:19,23	1188:23 1189:15	1210:25	24 1011:24
1218:5,6	1191:22	1211:3	24-нс
1219:14,15	1192:10	1213:23 1226:23	1011:6,21
1226:4,13,16	1196:18,21	1220.25	25 1011:24
,19,22,25	1201:3,14	1237:10	1029:8
1227:5,21,22	1226:14		1051:18
20 1045:25	1227:8	2010 1053:20	1097:12
1054:21	1236:12	1060:4,15,18	1125:2,6,13
1069:18	1237:2,4	1063:10,17 1067:7	1134:20
1075:14	1243:2,7,9	1076:8,11,13	1135:17,25
1094:2 1097:12	2007 1021:19	,17	1151:9
1125:1,6,13	1063:5	1098:16,20	1232:25
1127:14	1092:9	1125:24	250
1151:9	1121:8	1126:9	1010:9,11,13
1223:5	1123:22	1164:3	250-нс
1254:7	1168:20	1166:7	1261:15
200 1005:11	1201:14	1227:1	251
1009:6,10	1202:1		1019:21,24
1003.0,10	1	I I	1013.21,24

EVIL	PENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1020:1,4	33 1163:7	1092:1	1007:7
252 1019:25	3321 1007:15		64141-9679
1020:4,6,7 1090:12	3420 1005:15	5	1007:3
1090.12	343.3 1226:22	5 1064:6 1137:11	65101
1179:18,20,2	35 1016:7	1230:14	1005:8,20 1006:20
3 1180:16 1226:25	1027:8	5:00 1228:23	1007:11
1220.23	1030:14 1031:12	50 1081:2	65102
253	1175:9,10	1160:15	1009:7,11
1210:12,18	360 1063:20	1177:21 1232:4	65102-0456
1211:6,7,10, 11 1261:18	1064:21	536 1080:24	1006:12
259 1036:1	1138:13	55 1177:21	65102-0537 1005:23
259 1030.1	37 1149:17 1198:23	573.443.3141	1006:2
1011:6,21	376 1067:4	1006:7	65110-4595
260 1180:6	379 1156:7	573.634.2266	1007:23
26th 1019:22	J/J 11J0. <i>1</i>	1005:24	65201 1006:6
1023:6	4	1006:3	65802 1005:3
28 1067:5	4 1065:16	573.634.2500 1005:20	66101 1007:19
1133:1	1066:13 1187:5	573.635.0427	66213 1008:10
28th 1162:2	4,000 1251:11	1006:12	66606 1007:15
3	40 1048:12	573.635.2700	
$\frac{3}{3}$ 1080:3,7	1202:1	1005:8	$\frac{7}{7 \ 1067:10}$
1168:23	400 1006:19	573.636.6263	1201:3,12
1230:9 1235:11	40-hour	1007:12	70 1025:24
3,000 1251:12	1228:2,23	573.636.6758 1006:20	1091:9
30 1032:7	411 1028:7	573.659.8672	1097:8 1110:12
1232:25	412 1007:20	1007:24	1125:22
300 1005:7	413 1028:7	573.751.0052	1126:7
301 1005:23	417.864.8800	1008:6	1161:20 1232:4,21
1006:2	1005:4	573.751.6514	1233:2
308 1005:19	418679 1007:2	1009:7	70,000 1095:2
309 1009:6	428 1005:7 1198:25	6	70нс
30th 1037:15	44 1192:13,22	6 1067:10	1163:18,19
31 1166:9	44 1192:13,22 45 1102:10,11	1075:13,14	70-нс 1161:21,25
1167:6 1188:22	1177:21	1196:8 1197:25	1163:16,17,2
312 1006:11	4520 1007:7	1201:9,12	0 1261:11
312.371.2673	456 1006:11	60 1081:2	71 1161:17,19
1008:3	45-day 1102:5	1095:2	1164:11
314.395.8002	465 1141:12	601 1005:23 1006:2	72 1168:12,13 1169:23,24,2
1008:14	1142:3	63105 1005:12	5 1261:13
314.725.8788	1196:8 1198:14,24	63119 1005:12	75 1142:8
1005:12	475 1007:19	63130 1008:14	753 1007:19
320 1008:9	484 1067:4		77 1191:17,25
32459 1008:2	4th 1023:7	64.6 1226:16	785.271.9991
	4UII 1023.7	64111 1005:16	

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	<u>VOL. 19 01-21-</u>	2011
1007:16	able	according	1218:8
7th	1052:9,11 1074:2	1012:24	across
1023:5,8,21	11074:2	accordingly	1184:19
	1108:8	1249:14	1250:25
8	1110:5	account	action
8 1063:5	1154:21	1205:14	1259:13,17
1082:5	1156:6,9	1227:13	actions
1230:9	1213:17	accountable	1064:15
8:00 1228:23	absent 1041:5	1236:2	active
	1158:19	accountant	1162:17
8:30 1258:21	absolutely	1016:22	1190:9
8:45 1010:2	1022:10		activities
800-megawatt	1052:1	accountants 1104:2	1019:6
1160:13	1068:21	1175:21	1161:12
81 1080:19	1109:16		1162:23
816.360.5976	1112:3	accounting 1014:19	1167:14
1005:16	1165:13	1014.19	1183:19
	1171:8,17	1032:5	1246:4,15
816.460.2400	1178:21 1199:13	1092:10,15	1252:25
1007:8		1104:9	activity
816.556.2314	absolutes	1106:13	1253:3
1007:3	1172:16	1107:14	actual
850-megawatt	accept	1209:16,22	1035:10
1052:17	1029:20	accrual	1036:20
1160:16	1031:13	1043:11	1037:3
871 1008:13	1119:23	1153:5	1067:2
899 1008:5	1199:1 1206:9,13,21	accrued	1146:12
	1200.9,13,21	1043:8	1148:12 1155:10
8th 1053:9	1235:23	accurate	1162:14,21
	accepted	1145:10	1163:4
9	1030:18	1151:24	1235:18
9 1063:6	1107:18	1181:19	actually
1067:9 1230:9	1207:12	1191:1	1028:6
	accepting	1202:11	1036:7
90 1110:12	1119:18	1228:10	1037:22
1125:24 1126:4,7	access 1161:3	accurately	1038:14
,		1011:17	1043:10
913.321.8884	acciden	1182:2 1211:1	1048:6
1007:20	1153:7		1052:5 1080:7
913.338.7700	accident	achieve 1110:22	1114:5
1008:10	1042:12		1118:4
939 1005:3	1043:4,9 1126:24	acquired	1121:14,16
9th 1006:6	1126:24	1213:14	1123:20
		1214:4 1215:4,5,8	1126:1
	accommodation s 1252:13	1215.4,5,8	1131:21
<u>A</u> a.m 1010:2		1231:14	1132:3,5
	accompanied	acquiring	1154:6,24 1155:17
AARP 1008:15	1028:6	1214:15	1157:13
ability	accomplish		1159:2,3
1094:24	1112:1	acquisition 1043:21	1167:2,20
1113:12	accomplished	1214:16,25	1174:7
1160:2 1259:11	1205:24	1217:10	1176:14,25
1233.11	1222:3		1180:1
	8	8	ł

EVIDENTIARY	HEARING	VOL.	19	01-21-2011
-------------	----------------	------	----	------------

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1184:17	adjustments	afraid 1054:8	20
1187:7	1018:10	afternoon	alert 1054:1
1198:20 1218:20	1068:23 1069:6	1139:13	alerted
1233:8	1174:17	1140:4,5	1197:23
add 1030:22	1176:2	1183:11,12,1	allegation
1031:10	administer	-	1174:25
1107:11	1010:5	against 1029:19	allegations
1141:15	1180:21	1023:13	1166:10
added	administratio	1122:2	allocate
1156:3,17	n 1083:16	agencies	1035:10
1157:2,5 1160:16	1114:14	1008:3	allocated
1201:1	administrativ	1158:16,21	1218:5
addition	e 1080:16	agenda	1219:14
1044:7,10	admission 1011:21	1154:13	allocation
1165:1	1163:16	aging 1231:25	1217:22 1218:1,2
additional	1169:21	AGP/SIEUA/	
1076:7,15,17	admitted	MÉUA 1005:9	allocations 1018:9
1142:12 1191:7	1010:12	agreed	allow 1032:19
1212:22	1011:24 1163:18	1220:17,19	1078:10
1214:4	1169:24	agreement	1174:8
1232:6	1180:14	1049:20,23 1077:11	1242:13
address	1183:3	1082:22	allowed
1010:24	1211:10	1085:4	1024:23
1051:1 1174:20	admitting	1095:24 1110:4	1049:12 1061:16
1177:14	1065:2	1131:11,14,2	alone 1158:17
addressed	adopt 1241:7	3 1135:9,11	1216:17
1090:20	adopted	1154:22	already
1166:3	1107:14 1234:14	1155:2,5,6,7 ,8,11,13,16,	1021:12
adequacy		17	1035:22
1109:15,23	advance 1146:25	1157:20,23	1036:10 1060:9
adequate	1147:7	1159:22	1082:7
1152:6 1204:9	1220:3	1160:1,2,3,4 ,11,22	1115:23
adjourn	advanced	1162:16	1137:6
1139:5	1217:16	1165:24	1138:19 1141:25
adjourned	advantage	1169:7 1178:22	1177:12
1139:14	1253:7	1178:22	1201:6
adjust	advice	1221:9	1202:5
1149:23	1075:17 1241:2	1253:9,22	1210:19
1178:20,21	1250:23	agreements	Alstom
adjusted	advised	1154:22	1039:7,9 1063:16
1062:14	1220:18	1159:16 1248:24	1069:13
1178:17 1187:3	advisors	ahead 1066:17	1100:2
adjustment	1075:18	1107:9,10	1113:9 1118:6,7
1044:23	affairs	1136:5	1153:17
1149:8	1018:8	1175:15	1175:16,23
1174:21	1112:11	Air 1008:1	1176:5
1175:6,9,16 1176:3	affiliated	airfare	1248:2 1249:22
	1066:6	1252:4,8,18,	±∠¬J.∠∠

EVIDENTIARY	HEARING	VOL.	19	01-21-2011
-------------	---------	------	----	------------

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	<u>VOL. 19 01-21-</u>	2011
1250:12,16,1	1232:15	1094:10,11	1215:13
9		,	1242:14
1252:2,3,5,1	amounts 1203:12	answers 1011:12	1258:15,16
3.16.18		1142:25	Anytime
1253:7,10,14	analysis	1196:1	1242:7
,22	1066:9 1106:8		
Alstom's	1173:22	anticipate 1133:22	anyway 1075:3 1140:1
1252:12	1174:2		1182:6
altogether	1200:10	anticipated	
1180:6	analyst	1114:6,17 1115:14	anywhere 1020:16
am 1016:21	1038:16	1125:8	1157:4
1018:17		1152:12	1174:12
1022:13	analytical 1200:11	1167:21	1229:16
1027:4		anybody	APC
1029:8	and/or	1049:5	1140:20,21
1063:21	1221:14	1059:15	apologize
1065:20 1077:21	ANNETTE	1122:6	1012:4,5
1117:9	1009:4	1180:8	1123:10
1146:18	announce	anybody's	
1173:2	1158:17	1122 : 7	apparently 1053:25
1181:10	announced	anymore	1197:19
1192:18	1201:23	1087:12,20	
1204:22	annual	anyone 1049:2	appealed 1157:25
1213:4	1039:15	1092:15	1158:1,2
1222:15 1228:21	1230:19	1093:1	,
1235:25	answer 1014:3	1097:16	appeals 1158:2
1249:21	1024:23	1099:19,20	
1259:12,14	1025:13	1100:14	appear
Amanda	1037:10	1103:6	1051:22 1133:25
1065:22	1041:1,6	1108:15 1114:6	1182:19
AMASH 1007:18	1050:1,3,6	1122:20	
	1077:22,24 1079:4	1134:1	appears 1028:12
ambiguous	1091:17	1189:7,8	1037:20,25
1246:9	1102:9	1239:14	1054:7
amended	1108:18	anything	1081:2
1155:6,8	1110:18	1010:6,14,18	1211:14
Ameren 1006:7	1151:2	1014:21	1259:9
among 1137:16	1196:2,3	1022:15	appendices
1138:4	1213:17 1214:15	1024:3	1156:16,18
1199:24	1214.13	1059:4 1065:6	Application
amortization	1220:9,13,23	1067:11	1004:11,15
1156:10,19	1221:3,5	1075:8	applied
amount	1227:20	1083:20,24	1218:8
1038:12	1234:11	1089:1	apply 1135:13
1043:7,8	1246:10	1092:23	
1044:13	1253:17,18	1097:1	appointed 1094:20
1094:6	answered	1106:8 1117:16	
1099:14	1029:19	1125:12	appreciate
1124:23 1138:1	1104:2 1221:8	1139:4,7,16	1179:9
1138:1	1222:10	1152:2	apprised
1152:5		1179:15	1170:17
1203:24,25	answering 1093:24	1180:20	approach
1206:17	1033.74	1201:12	1053:18
L	ł		F

FVTDENTTARY	HFARTNG	VOL.	19	01-21-2011
	TICARTINO	VOL:	т,	01 21 2011

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1123:3 1144:16	1162:2 1166:7	asserted 1165:20	1158:19 attached
1159:4,5,7 1172:13 1192:3	AQCS 1100:3 1109:3 1136:22	asserting 1054:12	1011:17 1028:10 1101:25
1210:14 appropriate 1023:16	1153:13 1163:2	assess 1137:23 1138:4	1120:20 1162:20 1169:1
1077:11 1166:20 1218:9,17	Aquila 1213:14 1214:17,19	assessing 1173:8	1181:24 attempt
1219:18 approval	1216:6,22 1217:10	assessment 1086:14,17,1 8,21	1022:5 1060:15
1004:12,16 1030:11 1049:24	Archibald 1013:4 1090:3	1119:13,14,2 4 1137:18	attempted 1089:4,7 1122:11
1118:14 1159:1 1247:23	1115:19 1116:22 1199:19	assessments 1085:18 1086:2,22	attempting 1079:13
1248:4,7,11, 20 1249:23	Archibald's 1200:18	assessor 1086:11	attend 1030:17,24 1092:24
1251:2,7,9,1 7	area 1017:23 1176:16 1204:12	asset 1117:23 assets	1161:10 1168:2
approve 1039:14,20 1159:25 1170:16	1252:24 areas 1017:25 1205:1	1229:24 assigned 1203:23	attendance 1053:7 1168:6 1169:14
1247:22 approved	arena 1201:4	assist 1093:24	attended 1030:15
1086:4 1097:16 1106:2	aren't 1013:21 1099:5	assistance 1113:6,7	1030:15 1031:5,11 1169:5
1111:21 1118:9,19	arguably 1220:19	assistant 1228:6 assisting	attendees 1169:17
1119:1 1157:23 1158:24	argument 1134:6	1094:11 associated	attending 1024:7 1122:20
1248:1,6 1250:12,16	argumentative 1086:20	1035:6 Associates	attention 1211:13
approves 1160:1,2	arise 1144:23 arrangements	1065:22 Association	1215:17 attorney
approving 1248:21 1249:22	1045:15 array 1235:1	1005:21 assume	1005:2,6,10, 14,15,18,22 1006:1,5,9,1
1250:18 approximately	art 1122:10 ARTHUR	1012:11 1013:5,24 1066:17	0,14,18 1007:1,5,6,1
1170:22	1006:14 articulate	1075:7 1112:8	0,14,18,22 1008:1,5,8,1
1023:5,8,21 1024:9	1083:15 aside 1093:15	1124:7 1190:9	2 1026:23 1042:19 1083:15
1025:13 1038:16 1094:16	1216:15 assembled	Assumes 1076:22	1084:2 1088:3,7
1125:24 1154:12	1236:11 assert	Assuming 1013:10	1235:9 1259:15
1157:12	1166:21	assurance	attorney- client

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1022:12,14 1029:5	1016:8,9 1017:6	1085:5,10 1086:3	Barbara 1212:24
1041:16,17,2	1166:5	1095:7	1236:21
0 1042:8,10	1176:22	1103:1,11,13 1107:21	Bardgett
1094:4,6,12, 17 1165:21	August	1116:12	1005:19
attorneys	1061:12 1121:16,17,2	1121:11,14,1	barely
1027:15,16,1	0,22	5 1134:15,18 1137:21	1090:11
7,20,21,23 1042:17,23	1155:4,8 1167:5	1143:4	bargained 1027:12
1051:7	authorities	1150:12,15	base 1061:23
1054:5,11	1251:7	1160:14 1167:4,14	1062:10
1084:20,21	authority	1201:17	baseball
atypical 1118:10	1049:10,16,1	1217:16 1235:10	1030:15,18 1031:3
audit 1016:11	9,22,25 1050:5,9,11	1251:10	
1017:2,4	1051:3,10	awareness	based 1022:12,13
1022:16,19,2	1187:12,18	1242:16	1032:21
1,24 1027:3,7	1240:16 1250:2,24	away 1012:7	1036:23 1037:25
1028:18	1251:5,17	1093:7 1198:23	1041:21
1034:7 1039:7,10,12	authorization	1130.23	1051:19
1086:7,13,14	1247:19	B	1052:16 1060:9
,16 1094:24	availability 1067:14,17	B&W 1162:22	1106:22
1103:20 1104:7	available	B.B 1211:22	1112:1 1115:7
1106:10,12	1023:16	Babcock	1122:22
1137:15 1138:1,8	1037:17	1162:22	1124:10
1166:10,11,2	1061:24 1067:9,17	background	1154:7 1157:2
5	1081:16	1014:20 1016:16,24	1158:11
1167:2,5,8,9 1172:11,12,1	1100:22	1138:9	1160:12
4,19 1176:21	1165:4	1154:2 1245:18	1171:5 1174:25
1178:14	Ave 1007:19	1247:1	1217:23
auditing	Avenue 1005:3 1006:11,15	backgrounds	1218:5 1219:14
1016:6 1092:10	average	1138:22	basically
1106:3	1048:10,12	backup	1028:13
1107:19 1138:11	avoid 1205:17	1137:14	1091:18,19,2
1209:19	award 1117:13	backward 1201:13	4 1092:15 1096:2,7
auditor	1159:3 1178:4	backwards	1100:7,19
1014:20	1261:15	1065:17	1107:5 1109:11
1016:13 1017:7	aware	badly 1253:6	1114:15
1039:2	1021:23,24	balance	1125:12
1086:10 1107:4	1022:13,25 1023:1,3	1100:8,15,17 ,20 1108:22	$1163:11 \\ 1172:13$
auditors	1027:6	,20 1108.22 1109:4,8	1247:13
1085:15,18	1029:8 1031:23	1136:25	basis 1034:12
1106:20	1031:25	ball 1030:24	1036:19 1065:24
1107:1,13 1137:21	1041:12,17	ballpark	1065:24
1175:21	1042:8 1079:15	1093:21 1233:20	1075:17
audits	1084:16,18		1081:4

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1125:19	1028:10	1164:3	1099:25
1161:6	1063:13,14	1165:20	1112:24
1172:21		1166:6	1114:4
1175:17,19	belief	1167:13	1117:5
	1011:15	1167:15	
1177:16	believe		1119:16
1191:21		1169:19	1125:16
1192:9	1010:2 1012:6	1170:2	1144:17
1206:16		1171:13	1146:8
1220:4	1019:3,14,25	1172:6	1151:22
1240:10	1020:4	1173:21	1205:15
1241:12	1022:8	1174:13,16	1222:15
1253:11,24	1023:18,22	1175:20	1238:20
Bassham	1024:25	1178:16	1259:11
1092:3	1026:10,14,1	1182:9,24	better 1041:5
1211:15	9 1028:16	1186:4	1049:14
1212:20	1029:17	1188:1	1050:22
1213:2,3,8	1034:6,25	1195:24	1060:22
1236:19	1036:21	1202:8	1115:3,19
1230.19	1037:7	1204:1	1121:18
	1039:1,18	1205:25	1121:18
Beach 1008:2	1041:15	1206:10,24	1151:2
1252:3,5,9,1	1043:6	1210:18	
4,22	1045:2	1213:15	1186:2
became 1063:4	1063:18	1218:7	beyond
1100:21	1067:5	1219:1	1051:2,3
1157:1	1079:11,23	1220:12	1151:12
1160:14,17	1082:23	1221:8,20,24	1152:11
1201:25	1087:6	1222:9	1228:24
1201.25	1088:2,12	1227:4	1229:2
	1092:20	1236:4,18,22	1253:17
1237:12,21	1094:5	1239:19,20,2	
Bechtel	1095:1	5 1240:2,18	bid 1100:2,14
1101:7	1098:6	1241:13	1162:14,18
become	1101:21	1245:21	1163:3
1062:25	1104:8,10	1248:23	bidding
1091:17	1105:19	1250:8,17	1108:5
1239:14,22	1108:18	,	bids 1098:17
,	1110:21	believed	1114:12
becoming	1111:2,23	1095:19	
1133:3	1114:24	believes	bigger
begin 1076:6	1115:18	1053:19	1216:14
1139:17	1123:1	1173:8,10,14	bill 1027:19
1153:24	1131:24		1087:14,16
1155:15	1133:9	believing	1090:16
1162:24	1136:15	1253:12,24	1092:2,3
1167:2	1137:5	Bell 1076:3	1114:9,10,22
	1139:14	1099:1,5	1117:3
beginning	1142:2	· ·	1156:7
1085:10	1143:25	Bemiston	
1092:8	1144:7,25	1005:11	billed
1101:21	1146:11	bench 1059:20	1043:19
1108:23	1148:1	1090:6	1084:18
1111:9	1151:21,24	1139:14	billing
1154:5	1152:1,19	benefits	1040:1
1240:3	1153:8	1156:14	1084:24,25
1244:13	1154:17		
behalf	1155:3,8	best 1011:14	billion
1049:17	1156:24	1013:4	1105:9,12,18
	1157:7,18,21	1053:20	1141:12,17,2
behind	1160:12	1067:22	5 1170:22
	1 1100.12		

	EVIDENTIARY	HEARING	VOL.	19	01-21-2011
--	-------------	---------	------	----	------------

	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1175:6	1169:15	1242:8,10	8
1196:8	body	briefly	1125:1,5,17,
1197:12	1240:12,13	1074:1	18,20
1198:13,24,2	boiler 1076:6	1189:18	1126:5,8
5	1100:3	1218:20	1140:6,9,15
1199:4,6,16, 25	1109:3	bright 1084:1	1141:24 1144:3,9,11
1200:16,20	1136:22	bring 1118:13	1146:6,8
1204:10,25	1153:13	1159:20	1148:15
1217:6	1163:2	1180:3,6	1149:14,15,2
1243:8	1231:17,21 1232:7,17	brings	3
bills 1104:7		1177:25	1151:8,11,12 ,15,22,25
1114:16	bone-headed 1014:1	broad 1200:19	1152:4,9,12,
1115:13 1117:24	-	broadcast	13 1163:10
	book 1228:3	1075:7	1169:6,8,12
binder 1178:5	books 1153:6	1139:23	1170:21
bit	booming	broader	1171:12 1174:4,24
1012:3,8,14 1013:23	1060:22	1184:19	1175:5,11
1078:24	Boonville	1253:13	1178:22
1095:15	1005:3	Broadway	1179:3,4
1097:9	boss 1114:24	1005:15	1199:21
1099:16	bottom	broke 1159:17	1202:17 1203:13
1105:22 1106:7	1020:18	brought	1203.13
1111:13	1090:15	1052:3	1230:19
1126:11	1141:4 1197:5	1060:25	1234:8
1185:25		1093:6	1235:5
1199:4	Boulevard 1008:13	1118:12,18 1126:9	budgeted
bizarre		1137:22,24	1035:2
1201:25	bounds 1061:11	1171:9	budgeting
Black		1235:4	1116:7
1051:12,20	Box 1006:11 1007:2,23	1242:12,15	budgets
1052:3,5,7,1 0,16,24	1007.2,25	BRUDER	1035:4
1053:9,19	1009:6,10	1006:14	1179:7
blacked	brand 1110:25	Bryan 1008:9	build 1077:12
1028:14	1111:9,10	Brydon	1098:25 1099:24
1038:11	1217:12,14	Í006:10	
Blake 1007:18	break	buck 1197:15	building 1230:12
Blanc 1019:10	1074:13,14,1	budget	
1051:5	7 1139:4	1035:2,3,5	built 1062:9,10
1173:3	1179:12,16,2 5 1180:17	1066:23	1099:22
1239:16,20,2	1204:5	1067:2	1112:13
2	1258:13	1081:11,12,1	1115:1
Blanc's	breakdown	3 1096:23,24 1097:1,4,12,	1151:19
1173:1	1203:11	15,22,23	1152:5 1158:9,12
Blitz 1005:19	Brent 1168:23	1105:14	1201:24
board 1097:15	1206:18	1110:16	1202:6
1139:22,25	brief 1096:1	1112:15 1116:18,24	1229:20
1142:17	briefed	1121:24	1230:1
1213:5 1248:4,10,20	1242:11	1122:1,20	1231:7
	briefings	1123:21	bullet
Bob 1146:13	DITETTIYS	1124:10,17,1	1051:19,21

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1053:15,17	1093:21	1162:3	1154:10
Burns 1012:23	Carl 1005:10	1167:3,18 1181:9	1171:22 1174:3
1040:4,13 1052:3,5	1038:25 1087:22,23	1207:3,12,13	1187:8,11,14
1075:20	Carrie	1218:21,23	,16,17
1098:23	1065:21	1219:2,18 1220:19	1240:7
1137:1 1142:19	carrying	1221:10	certain 1004:12,16
1150:8,10	1192:13	1234:17	1044:13
1177:2,10,14 1191:3,4	CARTER	cases 1017:3,9,19,	1094:6 1155:21
1233:25	1006:10	21 1062:8	1172:13
1234:3,12,19	Cary 1124:1 1146:13	1079:18	1222:12,13 1248:24
business	case 1011:3	1081:20 1084:8	
1115:1 1131:8	1016:8	1093:20	certainly 1081:16
1217:5,7,9	1017:6,11 1018:13,15,2	1094:3,10,15 1095:9	1096:9
buy 1198:20	1,25	1156:21	1173:15 1174:24
	1031:19,23	1207:18	1178:13
<u>C</u> Cafer 1007:14	1032:8 1034:10,11,1	1215:20 1248:8	1221:19 1222:19
	5,16 1035:21	categories	1258:18
calendar 1227:12,15,1	1036:1 1043:8,22	1199:22	CERTIFICATE
8,19,23	1044:25	1204:11,16,2 2	1259:1
1228:13,14,1 5,16,19,25	1045:3,11,12	category	certification
1229:6,10,11	,16 1048:15,16,1	1200:9	1209:5,13
camera 1249:2 1254:5	7,22 1061:3 1063:25	1201:2 1202:9	certification s 1209:9
cancel	1064:5	cause 1119:20	certified
1100:18	1065:4,6,7 1067:2	caused 1011:2	1016:22 1259:6
1109:10	1075:3	1245:13	certify
capacity 1060:17	1078:6 1079:21	Cave 1008:9	1259:8
1063:7	1080:3,8,19,	CBE 1104:25 1105:1,3,5,8	cetera
1158:12		1115:17,20	1190:16
1160:9 1187:14	1081:3,23,25 1082:1	1116:4,15,21 1140:24	CFO 1186:5
capital	1084:10,11,1	1170:8	chain 1019:21 1090:12
1133:2	4,16,19,22,2 5 1085:2	1178:17,20	1189:8
1230:19	1089:3	1191:20 1192:2,8	1261:17
Capitol 1005:7	1093:25 1094:6,16,18	1195:23	chair 1187:10 1229:9
1006:11	1095:25	1196:8,12,18 ,21	chaired
CAPT 1008:1	1111:5 1113:11	CCR 1004:23	1187:16
capture	1119:16	1259:6	chairman
1151:11	1123:4	CE 1187:8	1184:4 1186:5
carbon 1092:2 care 1097:22	1131:5,11 1138:2	CEO 1200:19	1212:11
	1144:15	1217:7,11	1236:7
career 1018:1,8	1149:8,11 1150:13	CEP 1145:8,9,24	challenge 1059:21
1061:11	1156:10	1146:4,13	1064:13,23
1087:2	1158:12	1152:17,19	_ , _

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VO	DL. 19	01-21-2011
------------------------	--------	------------

1251.1			
1251:1 challenging 1065:2,3 1241:1 1247:11 chance 1053:20 1059:23 1196:4 change 1012:21 1013:1,12 1014:3 1089:13,15,1 8 1105:22	1086:4 1183:25 1226:13,16,1 9,22,25 1246:24 charged 1043:12 1082:11,19 1085:24 1153:10 1226:3 1227:21,22 charges 1004:12 1167:7	1153:14 choice 1054:13 1098:15 chose 1064:13 1161:9 1221:10 Chris 1010:25 1011:2 1048:2 1060:1 1064:7 1068:24 1075:11 1090:16	1210:3,6 1211:2 1213:12,22 1214:20 1215:18 1216:4,17,20 1217:17 1219:2,21 1221:14,16 1229:23 1230:3,12 1233:22 1234:13 1235:21 1245:2,4,13 1248:5
1106:2,8 1107:18 1126:5 1149:7 1178:4 1181:22 1197:24 1202:22 1214:11 1242:20 changed	1176:13,23 charging 1063:23 1064:2 1065:3,5 1144:14 CHARLES 1007:10 chart 1200:3 1210:24 1212:1,5,7,8	1097:7 1131:1 1260:3 Churchman 1087:22,23 1089:3,5 1243:19 circumstances 1013:7 1188:10 citing	1253:11,23 1258:11 1260:2 claim 1094:3,12 claims 1094:21 clarified 1115:3 clarify
1063:9 1091:16 1133:15,17,2 2 1188:10 1213:12,22 1214:8,11 1216:18,21 1242:19 changes 1004:12,16,1	1213:23 1261:18 cheaper 1060:11 Cheatum 1037:15 1088:11,12 1183:20,25 1186:18	1081:11 City 1004:8,11 1005:8,16,20 ,23,24 1006:2,3,12, 20,21 1007:2,3,4,7	1104:24 1106:7 1214:14 class 1166:18 clause 1159:25 clauses 1176:7 Clayton
7 1011:7 1144:11 1187:4 1200:12,15 1216:23,24 1236:15 1246:6,18 characterize 1019:14	check 1176:24 1177:19 1200:8 Chesser 1212:12 1213:6 1214:8 1216:23 1217:1	,8,11,12,16, 19,23,24 1008:6 1009:7,11 1011:1 1016:7 1027:25 1030:17 1102:8 1103:11 1120:21	1005:12 clear 1024:5 1052:2 1086:5 1122:11 1134:11 1136:20 1150:18 1196:10
1125:4 1131:7 1156:14 1246:2 characterized 1246:1,16 characterizin g 1231:16 charge 1061:16	Chether 1051:16 chief 1009:1,2 1184:5 1210:5,7 1211:15,17,2 0 1212:12,18 1217:1 chimney	1120.21 1124:21 1126:23 1131:19 1132:10 1133:7,11 1134:21,22 1135:16 1137:9 1168:3 1176:16 1205:20	1203:15 1251:7,8 1253:19 clearly 1036:6 1059:8 1135:4 1241:1 close 1137:11 1204:3 1240:6

EVIL	PENILARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
closed 1240:4	combination	1215:20	1187:2
	1065:13	Commissioner	1227:16
closely 1111:22	combined		1236:6,9,14,
	1231:6	1074:3,5,7 1078:4	15,20,21,22
closer		1078.4	1237:1,7,10,
1110:11	combining	1104:15,17,1	13,19,22
1125:22	1222:25	8,20 1108:1	1238:4,9,13,
closing	combustion	1120:2,4,5,7	25
1197:25	1231:6	,14,17	1239:3,12,15
		1121:1,2,5,7	,18,23
Club 1157:21	comes 1200:9	1123:7,12,14	1240:9,11,16
coal 1099:23	1231:9	1124:3	,19
1160:9	comfortable	1131:2	1241:6,10,15
1174:1,3	1033:11	1132:21,25	,18
1217:17,22	1080:10,12	1138:25	1242:12,13,1
1218:4	1117:22	1139:2,9	6 1243:13
1219:14	coming	1143:25	1244:2
1220:3	1207:17	1146:12	1246:17
1230:24		1149:6,13	1247:18
1231:10	Comley 1005:22	1150:7	1249:23
coal-fired	1005.22	1151:21	1250:1,10,14
1103:12		1260:5,6,7	,20,22
1230:19	command	Commissioners	1251:8,17,21
Coffman	1189:8	1012:1	committee's
1008:12,13	comment	1074:2	1240:24
· · · ·	1084:21	1139:25	1242:17
collaboration	commented	1154:12	COMMNISSIONER
1154:15	1234:9	1155:11	1074:4
1155:15 1159:17		1168:6	commodity
	comments	1170:4	1152:11
collaboration	1085:15	1180:9	1132.11
s 1154:21	1173:4	1218:24	common
1159:14	commercial	Commissioner'	1022:22
collaborative	1127:9	s 1143:1	1032:14
1159:5,7	Commission	1144:18	1034:14
collapse	1004:1		1035:1,3,6,9 ,10 1094:3
1242:9	1009:5,8	COMMISSIONERS 1004:21	
	1017:20		1095:9,11 1099:2
collective	1023:11	commissions	1217:12,13,1
1206:24	1035:21	1154:8	4 1220:1
1232:25	1036:9	Commission's	
collectively	1050:17	1081:23	Commonwealth
1065:24	1074:6,10	1155:1	1114:23
college	1080:19,25	1166:16	1115:2,8,10 1150:20
1207:25	1081:15,19	commitment	
1208:3,4,6,7	1090:8	1060:16	companies
,9,10,12,13,	1094:17	1136:15	1108:2
15,16,18,19,	1103:16	committed	1160:8
21,22	1109:24	1060:14	1214.7, 10, 12
Columbia	1154:17,19 1157:19,23	1243:7	,22 1215:19
1006:6	1158:23		1222:21
	1159:6,9	committee	company
column	1160:1	1111:20	1004:12,16
1140:15,24 1141:7	1166:2,9,14,	1112:18	1005:17
1 1 1 4 1 . /		1116:17	1006:13,21
	15.17 1169:4		
columns	15,17 1169:4 1170:3	1142:21	1007:2,4,8,1

EVIDENTIARY HEARING	VOL.	19	01-21-2011
---------------------	------	----	------------

	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1021:23 1030:14,23	company's 1094:21	1125:25 1126:9	1077:13 1099:22
1031:12 1036:10 1059:23 1062:3 1087:1,24	1165:14 1171:18 1180:4 1185:21 1197:18,20	complex 1209:7 complexity 1202:20	conduct 1021:22 1022:16,20 1026:20
1087:1,24 1088:2 1094:3,18 1095:10 1096:6	1228:3 compared 1067:4	<pre>component 1012:23,24 1013:2,8,10,</pre>	1027:3 1035:23 1172:10 conducted
1098:13 1099:12 1100:2 1111:20	comparing 1191:21 1192:9	13,25 1201:19 1209:6 components	1174:2 conference 1092:19
1113:6 1156:13,14 1165:25	compensated 1045:20 compensation	1100:1 1231:18,21,2 2,23,25	confidential 1045:5 1054:13,16
1167:25 1171:9 1172:17 1173:7,24	1045:20,21 competition 1100:23	compound 1246:9 comprehensive	1059:10 1127:8 1191:24 1248:11
1176:8 1177:13 1179:1 1184:18	competitive 1113:23 1117:4,13 1125:14	1131:4,7 1136:2 1154:7,10,25 1158:18,24	1261:6,10 confirm 1108:8
1184:18 1185:8,11,24 1205:21 1206:2	complain 1095:5	1187:22 1188:23 conceive	confused 1120:18 confusing
1210:4,6,8 1211:2 1213:5,6,12, 22	complete 1053:21 1061:21 1062:13 1166:11	1083:4 concentration 1014:18 concept	1099:16 confusion 1098:1 1250:21
$1214:4,5,7,1\\1,15,20\\1215:6,19\\1216:5,13,16\\17,21$	1232:16 completed 1016:11 1026:8	1160:19 conceptual 1053:21 1174:1	connect 1100:8 1174:11
,17,21 1217:2,11,18 ,21 1218:4,11,12	1060:10 1061:23 1062:18 1093:10	concern 1118:8 1133:25	connection 1074:21 1075:5 Conrad
,14 1219:2,5,13, 21,22 1221:10,14,1	1096:18 1097:5 1105:17 1125:2	concerned 1033:12,14 1197:16	1005:6,7 consequences 1172:23
5,16,17 1229:23 1230:12 1233:22 1234:14	1132:8 1167:8 1205:12 1252:6	concerns 1111:4 1150:13 1152:16	consider 1030:10,25 1061:7 1157:15 1209:15,18,2
1235:21 1237:14,23 1238:11,16,1 7 1243:23 1245:2,5,13	completing 1060:4 1097:3 completion	concluded 1167:4 conclusion 1204:8	1,24 considerable 1099:14 1114:23
1249:2, 9, 19 1248:5 1251:13 1252:7	1048:16 1060:4 1076:8	conclusions 1172:8,15 1206:12	consideration 1061:6
1253:11,24	1087:24 1105:11,19	conditions 1076:20	considered 1185:14

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1186:11,14 1191:5	1175:18 1188:25	1069:18 1078:5	continuing 1021:20
<pre>considering 1080:25</pre>	1189:12,23 1201:4 1213:13	1079:17 1127:14 1152:20	1159:23 continuously
consistently 1029:22	1216:19 1226:4,14,17	1174:5 1223:5	1029:22 contract 1039:7,9,17,
consists 1185:20	,20,23 1227:1,6,21, 22	1254:7 contemplated	1039.7,9,17, 19 1048:4,6,8
consolidate 1214:5	1230:5,13,16 1231:5	1077:8 1115:17 1174:6	1051:13 1052:9,12,14
consolidated 1216:7	1233:24 1234:13,19,2 2 1235:24	contemporaneo us 1160:24	,25 1059:9 1083:16 1099:4
constant 1235:6	1236:2 1241:24,25	contents 1148:21	1100:4 1101:3
constituted 1186:2	1243:16,18 1244:18 1245:11	context 1050:3	1108:15 1109:5 1113:8
constitutes 1185:12,24	1247:24 consult	1222:18 contingencies	1114:13,14 1120:18,21
construct 1099:18	1251:9 consultant	1141:19 1142:12	1121:3,11,15 1137:1 1141:25
constructing 1103:12	1044:2,4 1103:25	1148:15 1203:4,5,12, 20	1142:4 1177:3,11
construction 1012:21 1013:19	1235:19 1238:11	contingency 1091:7	1202:3 1252:7
1015:2,11,15 ,17,20,22	consultants 1025:23,25 1085:15	1125:18 1141:10,18	contracted 1060:11
1016:1 1017:4 1022:5,19,21	1137:22 1138:4	1142:7,8 1151:10,17,1 9,23	contracting 1100:25
1026:12,20 1063:8,20	consumer 1159:9	1152:3,6 1178:5	contractor 1044:3 1050:15
1066:2,4,7,1 0 1081:11 1083:16,18	consumers 1008:15	1196:7 1197:8,9 1198:13	1098:17 1143:5
1084:2,15 1085:5,11	1154:8 contacted	1199:10,14 1203:24,25	1148:7,12 1151:4 1162:18
1087:4,6,24, 25 1088:4,19,23	1034:23 1101:2,8 1107:24	continue 1004:13 1043:11	1235:19 contractors
1089:6 1090:18	1109:10 1143:9	1059:25 1098:22,24	1100:17 1113:8,13
1099:3,7 1106:9 1112:2,5,6,8	contacts 1114:3,23 1150:19	1142:15 1179:2 1219:9	1114:4 1118:6 1137:16,18
,12 1113:14 1118:8,11	contain 1174:3	1219.9 1222:23 continued	1138:5 1143:2,21
1133:4 1134:16 1136:2,21	1175:3 contained	1022:4 1048:20	1243:10,11 contracts 1035:7
1137:1,3,9 1138:9	1011:11 1027:5	1114:15 1166:21	1052:8 1083:15
1160:23 1170:11 1174:7,9	1037:23 1045:25 1054:21	continues 1063:6	1084:3 1118:10 1136:21

EVIL	PENILARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1153:17	1121:6	1011:14	corrections
1162:15		1011:14	1011:7
1102.13	convenient		1011.7
control	1179:12	1020:19,20	correctly
1014:19		1028:23	1207:19
1022:17	conversation	1032:1	1234:11
1024:11	1024:16	1035:17	1247:17
1027:4	1096:1	1037:21	
1038:16	1108:7	1038:21,24	correlate
	1121:24	1042:4	1227:4,5,11
1066:23	1122:5	1069:11,12	cost 1013:16
1067:2	1126:12	1075:23	
1082:23	1157:3	1078:19	1014:16,19,2
1096:13	1177:6		0
1097:4,12,23		1079:13,19	1016:14,16,1
1105:14	conversations	1082:2,22	8
1109:15,20,2	1086:2	1085:6	1017:10,13,1
2 1110:1,21	1109:25	1087:15	4,18
1111:6	1150:16	1089:17	1018:3,9
1121:24	1152:14	1090:21,22	1019:12
1121.24		1103:21	1022:17,18
	convey	1115:12,15,1	1024:10
1123:5,19,21	1043:16	6 1122:3,4	1024.10
1124:10,17	convinced	1124:24	
1125:17		1136:24	1035:10
1133:3	1114:19		1052:14,18
1134:23	COOPER	1139:22	1061:6
1135:17	1005:15	1140:22,23	1062:1
1136:3		1141:11,17,2	1063:23
1140:6,9,15	cooperation	0,22	1065:7
1141:24	1159:9	1142:2,5,8,9	1066:15,24
	Cooperative	,24	1076:13
1144:3,9,11	1230:4	1143:18,19	1082:23
1146:21		1144:12	1082:25
1148:15	cooperatives	1145:19	
1149:14,23	1160:8	1146:10	1091:21
1151:8,11,12			1096:13,16
,22	co-opted	1147:16	1101:24,25
1152:12,23	1024:21	1148:14	1102:13
1163:10	1025:15	1149:19	1106:20
1166:12,19,2	copies	1150:20	1109:15,18,2
0 1168:24	1164:11	1156:18	0,22
1169:1,6,12		1172:7	1110:1,21
1171:12,18,1	1180:1,6,8,9	1175:25	1111:6
$\begin{array}{c c} \pm \pm 7 \pm 7 \pm 5 \pm 26, \pm 0, \pm 0 \\ 0, \pm 5 \pm 14, \pm 10, \pm 0, \pm 14, \pm$	copy 1028:5	1176:3	1122:2
9,25 1174:24	1033:19	1182:24	1123:5,19
1175:11	1053:11	1186:25	
1178:2	1080:2	1188:18	1126:6
1179:3	1090:17	1189:21	1133:3
1187:8	1092:2		1134:12,17,2
1203:13	1132:19	1191:10	3 1135:17
1232:3,6		1198:14,20,2	1136:3
1234:8	1210:17	1	1140:18
1235:5	corporate	1199:4,7,13	1146:21
1242:2,5	1184:1,14	1203:6,9	1149:21
1247:18	1186:16,17	1228:10	1150:2
	1211:23	1243:24	1152:7,23
controlled	1212:25	1244:24	1161:2,12
1149:14		1247:21	1162.0
	Corporation	1248:2	1163:9
controls	1103:16		1165:4
1112:20		1249:21,24	1166:12,18,1
1114:14	corporations	correction	9,20
1190:15	1251:4	1013:16	1168:21,24,2
controversial	correct	1186:7	5 1170:13

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1171:18,19,2 5 1172:20 1173:9 1175:2 1178:1	1114:21 1120:24 1127:11 1139:5,7,16 1179:16	1131:22 create 1082:25 1096:6,13	1205:9 1258:3 1260:4,5,11, 12,13
1190:15 1191:21 1192:9 1201:11	1180:1 1207:17 1211:19 1249:12	created 1078:1 1236:14,16	culminate 1155:2 culmination 1154:4
1208:4 1209:22,25 1230:23	1258:16 1259:12,15 counsels	credentials 1083:21,24 credit 1112:16	cultural 1138:22 culture
1232:8 1242:2,5 1243:7 cost-control	1159:10 country 1159:2 1229:16	1156:19,20 1158:15,21 1217:17,22 1218:5	1246:7,17 1250:8 CUNNINGHAM
1234:21 cost- estimating	COUNTY 1259:3 couple 1043:7	1219:3,14 1220:3 credited	1007:6 current 1018:15
1234:21 costs 1043:9,17	1104:24 1111:18 1113:20 1136:20	1062:7 Creek 1095:25 1096:2	1045:13 1084:11 1105:11,19 1232:12,14
1060:8,12 1068:9 1076:7,15 1091:6,13	1157:18 1198:10 1204:16 1233:18	1111:6 1135:2 1137:10,22 1145:6	currently 1087:7 1103:12 1135:3
1112:21 1117:1 1124:14,15,1 9,21 1126:24	course 1253:8 courses 1207:25	1152:15 1158:10 1229:20,22 critical	1233:6 1239:20 Curry 1211:22
1127:6 1141:9,15,16 1142:13 1158:13	1208:3,6,9,1 2,15,18,21 1209:8,10 Court 1004:24	1076:4 1091:11,20 1092:13 1162:23	1212:24 1213:2,8 1236:21 1238:1,2,3,2
1163:11 1164:6 1169:6 1170:8	1020:8 1161:22 1168:14 1199:11	1165:8 critiqued 1234:9	3 Curtis 1005:11
1171:1,12 1174:11,24 1175:1,11 1178:22	1210:13 1215:24 1259:6,20	critiquing 1235:7 cross 1010:19	customers 1017:15 1043:12,18 1062:3,5
1196:7 1198:12 1204:14 1206:3,23	cover 1038:15 1102:11 1110:13	1011:22,25 1074:12 1182:6 1183:6	1171:10 cycle 1231:6 Cygne 1162:17
1232:9 Council 1008:15	covered 1018:25 1023:19 1082:7	crossed 1196:19 cross-	1169:1 1171:23 1230:21 1231:13
counsel 1009:1,2,3,4 ,5,9,12 1010:6 14	co-workers 1150:19 crane 1042:12	examination 1012:11,18 1014:9 1074:19	1232:12,14 1233:5
1010:6,14 1020:5 1027:19 1081:14	1043:3,9,22 1126:24 1153:4,7 1242:9	1075:9 1081:17 1165:18	D.C 1006:15 d/b/a 1005:17
1087:14,17	cranked	1183:9 1198:8	daily 1167:14

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
damages 1176:4	1190:7 Davis 1038:4	1196:8 1197:25	1025:12 1213:25
Dan 1026:2 1065:22 1199:19	1043:21 1069:1 1086:5	1210:24 1211:3 1213:23	1241:7 decrease 1067:16
1234:20 Darevan	1150:5 1168:23,25 1206:18	1216:18 decide 1096:24	decreases 1178:23,24
1190:7,19,22 data 1028:7,9	1207:8,10 day 1044:18	1098:13 1099:13	deem 1031:14 1160:4
1029:8,22 1032:6,7,11 1033:7,13,25	1063:6 1092:7 1096:5	decided 1149:18 1155:22	deemed 1029:5 1042:9
1034:11,15 1041:7 1085:22	1110:15 1112:14 1113:1	1249:12 decision	define 1029:23 1049:14
1093:17,24 1094:4,11 1104:2	1115:1 1155:20,21 days 1019:4	1027:10,13,2 2 1075:16,22 1076:14,15,1	1148:7
1160:24 1165:4 1176:20,23	1032:7 1061:25 1077:15	7,21 1110:5,6 1113:25	1052:18 1080:5
1177:1 1179:6	1102:10,11 1132:13,14 1155:24	1115:7 1118:24 1149:20	1096:21 1106:19 1135:6
date 1021:9,17 1037:17	day-to-day 1096:15	1158:11 1161:1 1174:11	1184:4 defines 1080:4
1060:4,15 1061:4,18 1063:17	1110:14 1136:9 deadline	1205:13 1206:21	1135:4 defining
1076:11,13 1082:12 1119:8,9,11,	1033:14 1098:21 1146:6	1207:10,20 1219:11 1247:4	1131:4 1134:9 definite
18,25 1121:3,8 1163:11	deal 1048:18 1049:10	decision- making 1096:11	1092:21 definitely 1043:18
1167:19 1211:2 1222:2,12,13	1081:3,5 1202:25 dealing	1174:11 1240:12,13,1 5,22	1051:3 1079:23
,15 1237:15 1242:23	1050:17 dealt 1049:11	decisions 1018:19	1112:10 1132:7 definition
dated 1037:15 1092:1 1162:2	DEAN 1005:15 DEARMONT	1027:24 1049:12,15,1 6 1161:4	1041:5 1077:19
1210:24 dates 1023:15 1121:18	1009:4 decade 1232:24	1167:25 1168:1 1170:16,17,1	1078:7,8,9,1 1,13,17,18,2 1 1079:1,10,16
1189:3,4,13 1198:1	December 1063:12	8 1172:22,23 1206:19,20 1207:2	,17 1135:3,4,13
date-stamped 1064:6 Dave 1041:8	1097:5,12 1140:15 1141:16,24	1219:22,24,2 5 1220:1 1240:8,14	1144:10 1145:18 1173:9,25
1124:1 1167:20	1164:3 1166:9 1167:6	1240:0,14 1241:4,22 1243:13 1244:5	1188:21 definitive 1077:16,19
1169:13 David 1005:6 1079:25	1168:25 1191:22 1192:10	1244:5 1247:11 declined	1079:10 1079:10 1080:4,5,8 1081:8

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19	01-21-2011
-----------------------------	------------

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1095:16,19,2 1 1096:21,25 1097:7,18,21 ,25 1105:1 1109:17 1121:25 1122:2,8 1124:9,15 1134:24 1135:3 1145:7,9,10 1146:4 1147:23,24 1148:4,7 1169:8 1197:21,22 1233:23 1234:5,12,14 ,18 degree 1014:18 1016:25 1207:25	<pre>describe 1099:12 1112:24 1161:25 1177:8 1202:12 1240:25 described 1106:1 1113:4 1172:11 1246:5 describes 1037:23 1162:17,24 1172:12 describing 1244:11 description 1188:21 descriptive</pre>	VOL. 19 01-21- 1204:18,22,2 4 detailed 1200:10 1242:8,10 details 1039:25 1162:13 1168:18 determination 1094:25 1176:6 determine 1066:9 1074:13 1113:23 1117:5 1174:3 determined 1077:13 1188:14	1122:10 1123:16 1138:22 1143:7,17 1159:6 1160:2 1205:1 1206:20 1207:4 1212:15,16,1 7 1214:2,3 1227:4 1251:18 1253:2 difficult 1156:23 digital 1232:6 di rect 1010:21 1011:3,5 1018:17
1207:25 1208:4,7,10, 13,16,19,22 delay 1012:3,8 1060:11 1102:5 1119:17,20 deliberate 1076:15 demand-side 1156:11 Denton 1007:6 Department 1006:16 1008:7 departure 1026:9 depending	1037:16 design 1012:22 1017:11,16,1 7 1018:3,10 1019:2 1022:5 1053:22 1098:23 1102:23 1199:23 1200:2,8,15, 22,25 1202:9,12 1205:12 designated 1192:20 1237:4 designation 1059:22	Deutsch 1005:19 develop 1100:13 developed 1052:17 1148:19 1154:6,11 1160:25 1198:19 developing 1109:21 development 1063:8 1103:7 1163:10 1211:17 1242:1 deviations	1018:17 1036:5 1065:9 1068:6,12 1069:8 1080:2,3 1166:8 1180:5 1181:3,11,16 1184:3 1185:19 1187:12,18,1 9,24 1188:3 1191:18 1220:11,23 1230:8,25 1235:11,16,1 7 1253:18 1260:3,11 1261:3,5 directed 1119:13
1067:24 1187:3 1248:8 depict 1011:18 1182:3 deposition 1106:22 depositions 1166:24 1167:4 depth 1174:14 Deputy 1009:1	designed 1102:22 desirable 1159:21 desk 1196:20 despite 1197:18 detail 1116:21 1147:16 1151:7 1162:18 1199:20	1161:3 1170:14 DIANA 1006:10 diem 1177:12 difference 1031:8 1067:1,5 1105:14,18 1107:15 1116:13 different 1017:8,25 1119:1	directing 1221:5 direction 1117:19 1259:12 directly 1025:2 1030:22 1131:13 1150:6 1187:15,23 1244:19 director

LVIDENTIANT TRAKING VOL. 19 UI-21-20	EVIDENTI	ARY HEARING	HEARING VOL. 19	01-21-201	1
--------------------------------------	----------	-------------	-----------------	-----------	---

EVIL	DENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1015:5	1035:23	1251:25	1147:14
1018:7	1093:17,25	discussions	1152:20
1087:5	1094:13	1021:20	1157:4,7,11
1170:11	1095:9	1021.20	1162:7,10
1183:22	1103:8,22	11092.11	1164:5
1187:21	1104:4		1165:7,8
1188:25	1150:9	1118:4 1121:9	1168:17,18
1189:11,23	discuss	1121.9	1174:5
1248:10,20	1021:14	1149.7	1175:4,5
directors	1042:12	1152:18,21	1196:15
1213:5	1050:25	1156:25	1197:20
1248:5	1065:10	1159:23	1198:11
	1106:13	1222:19	documentation
disagree	1120:23		1023:20
1068:19,22,2	1218:25	dispute	1085:17,23,2
5 1069:5		1127:7,9	5 1096:2
1106:15	discussed	disputes	
1172:8,9	1021:12	1095:9	documented
1174:22	1078:5	1103:22	1161:3
1196:24	1096:22	1104:4	documents
disagreed	1102:17	1243:10	1022:11,13,1
1172:3	1118:9		4,16,17,20
1174:17	1121:23	distance	1026:22,24
1206:15	1133:24	1176:19	1027:3,5,6
	1134:3,4,12,	distinction	1029:3
disagreements	25	1035:8	1040:22,23
1206:11,16 1207:8	1135:12,15	1203:23	1095:2
	1143:7	distributed	1109:19
disallow	1145:12,15	1163:24	1166:4,12,16
1175:11			1167:24
1176:13	1156:19	distribution	1175:3
disallowance	discussing	1156:12	1177:22
1106:14	1040:7	District	1178:1,11,13
1107:3,6,8,1	1089:13	1006:13	Dogwood
3 1149:11	1102:20	1217:21	1005:13
1173:8	1123:11	docket 1064:5	
disallowances	1126:13	1079:24	dollar
1206:6,9,13,	1151:14	1080:17	1027:11
22 1207:9,11	1153:12	1154:18,20	1029:24
	discussion	,	1030:5
disallowed	1032:22	document	1089:16,19
1107:19	1045:5	1027:10 1028:4,10,17	1124:23 1206:17
disapprove	1059:3		1232:11,13,2
1170:16	1077:16	,21 1038:10 1051:15	1232.11,13,2
discipline	1091:21	1051:15	1248:9,10,19
1209:8	1099:15	1053.25	, ,
	1109:16,17,1	1078:1	dollars
discounts	8,19 1116:10	1081:2,9	1141:25
1117:16	1117:12,23	1086:2,11	1158:19
discover	1118:3,14	1096:3,11,25	1199:6,16
1024:9	1120:17	1097:25	1200:16,20
discovered	1122:15,19	1110:1,5	1203:8
1035:5	1126:14,15,2	1120:19,20	1204:10
1102:24	2,25 1133:23	1124:12,14	1217:6
1138:20	1139:12	1131:19	
	1152:25	1132:5	1232:4,20,25
discovery	1160:19	1135:14	1233:15,16,1
1024:11	1168:5	1146:21,24	9 1243:8
1034:2	1240:25	, · · ·	done 1016:11

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1022.10	1150,17 10 2	1151.0	1024.9
1022:19	1150:17,19,2	1151:9	1034:8
1036:7	2,25	1152:19	1040:2
1039:5	1151:1,6	1167:21	1042:6
1061:6	1179:13	drafting	1050:10
1075:23	1180:19,22	1131:18	1083:9
1084:12,23	1181:7,8,9	1132:16	1090:13
1098:21	1182:19	1133:24	1094:23
1106:7	1198:10	1136:2	1121:23
1108:17	1205:11		1171:13
1114:18	1207:24	1146:12,14	1190:18
1119:1	1210:17	1152:17	1237:3
1125:23	1215:16	1153:2	
1126:2	1218:22	1155:10	early 1021:20
1157:16	1221:2,6	1157:10,11	1061:11
	1240:8	drawings	1075:23
1165:11,13		1012:22,25	1076:3
1191:11	1248:1		1087:10
1201:1	1252:2,16	drawn 1013:25	1088:13
1219:3	1258:9	1186:24	1098:21
1220:4,7	1260:10	drive 1176:19	1108:14
1231:12,13	1261:3,5,7,9		1144:5
1232:16,25	Downey's	driver	1145:11
1240:5	1182:22	1200:24	1157:8
1246:21		1201:4	1167:12
1258:12	downgraded	drave 1176.25	1172:14,15
	1158:21,22	drove 1176:25	
DOP 1137:6	Dr 1068:23	DRs 1032:2	1187:20
Dority		1033:19	1236:11,12
1006:18,19	1206:3,5,22		1241:18,21
	1207:4,9	dual 1106:1	1242:22
Dottheim	Drabinski	Duane 1066:5	1243:2
1009:1	1068:20		early-2004
1020:13	1103:19,25	due 1077:13	1154:6
1021:25	1104:8,10,12	duly 1259:9	
1024:11,20	1150:8,10	•	earned 1242:3
1025:8,14	1171:24	during 1018:8	1243:5
1090:17,24	1172:3,10,12	1043:13	Easily
1092:3		1062:4	1244:13
	,19 1172.5 C 12	1063:7	1244:15
double	1173:5,6,13,	1076:12	Easley
1045:21	16,23	1087:2	1088:16,17
doubt 1196:17	1174:10	1122:18	1183:20
	1178:7	1138:2	1186:9
DOUG 1005:2	1196:18	1146:14	1187:6,17,23
Downey	Drabinski's	1148:19	1188:2
1019:11	1173:22	1154:21	1236:20
1020:11	1180:2	1167:16	1237:9
1051:16		1175:19	1238:23
1089:4,6	draft	1202:21	1239:3,5
1090:16,20	1131:22,25	1213:12,25	
1092:2	1132:10	1216:18	1243:20,22
1108:8	1133:7,12,18	1218:23	1245:1,7
1111:22,25	,19 1148:24	1242:14	1246:23
	1149:3		1247:3
1112:16	1153:2	duties	economic
1113:3	1155:12,16,1	1037:23	1063:5,11
1114:22	7 1156:17	1212:23	1149:21
1115:3,5,9,1			
0 1116:23	drafted		economics
1117:10,19	1131:25	<u> </u>	1016:25
1118:13	1132:10	earlier	economy
1121:18	1133:6,8,12,	1017:5	1067:12,24
1149:1	18 1145:24	1028:18	1007.12,24

	JENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	
Edison	y 1180:3	1137:9	1136:2
1114:24			1154:7,11,25
1115:8,10	eliminated 1214:6	embarking 1091:11	1158:18
1150:20			1187:22
1159:3	Elliott	embodied	1188:23
educated	1021:3,6,8,1	1131:10	1210:8
1114:20	0,13,15,19,2	Empire	1221:13
	1,22,24	1006:13	Energy's
education 1014:19		1217:21	1214:16
	,15,18,19,23 1042:9	employed	ongagad
educational	1089:14	1088:20	engaged 1091:5
1209:6	1092:8	1259:13,15	1230:12
effect 1069:2	1098:6	employee	_
effective	1105:23	1030:23	engaging
1149:21	1106:7,11,23	1030:25	1251:14
	1107:12,18	1050:5,6	engineer
effectuate	1124:1	1080:1	1014:20
1222:4,22	1149:7,8,10	1086:25	1016:20
efficiently	1150:1	1088:14	1052:6
1061:6	1167:10,12,1	1148:6,13	1053:21
effort 1132:8	5,20 1168:2	1176:17	$1099:18 \\ 1169:18$
1158:4	1169:15,19 1175:17	1177:14	1190:18
1159:11,13	-	1235:18	1191:6
1167:5	Elliott's	1259:15	1234:4
1175:21	1021:1	employees	
eight 1141:2	1092:14	1037:24	engineered 1091:9,10
1186:22	1106:19,22 1169:13	1040:4,14	1091:9,10
1197:4		1067:17	1102:23
1198:17	ELMO	1082:9	1110:11
eight-five	1132:5,11	1083:10 1089:2,10	1125:6,8,13,
1197:13	1155:23 1157:6	1104:13	22,24 1126:5
either 1024:8		1149:3	1148:16
1096:10	else 1033:1	1176:13	1151:10
1118:25	1044:24	1177:2,11	1204:3
1121:14	1122:18	1191:9	engineering
1139:3	1170:14 1214:20	1235:16,17	1016:18
1146:13	1231:23	1245:2,4	1098:22
1147:9	1239:14	employer	1106:1,20
1166:1	1240:1	1114:23	1107:4,18
1198:22,25	e-mail	employment	1125:2 1136:21
elaborate	1020:10,16,2	1048:6	1136.21
1170:6	2	enable	1153:6
1174:22	1023:4,5,13,	1154:23	1163:12
elected	14,21 1026:1		1190:3
1214:5	1090:16	enabled	1209:25
electric	1091:25	1131:9	1233:23
1004:13,17	1092:1	encompasses	1234:1
1006:13	1143:8	1200:16	1241:22
1159:3	1179:24	encouraged	1243:10
1217:5,21	e-mails	1173:15	1245:16
1230:3	1019:22	energy	engineers
electrical	1090:13	1005:13,17	1104:2
1100:9,13	1261:17	1006:16	1191:4
1190:16	embark 1091:8	1062:11	England
electronicall	embarked	1131:4,7	1006:10

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
enhanced 1060:24 enormous	1116:1,11,13 ,21,25 1117:11,16,2	1137:15 1138:7,10 error 1075:3	1135:4,5 1140:7,10,15 1141:24
1201:3 1202:21	0,21 1118:1,9,13, 19,21,22	errors 1013:20,21	1145:7,9,10 1146:4 1147:24
ensure 1113:18 1228:9	1119:12,23 1170:3,9,12, 15	escalated 1201:18,25 1202:1	1148:4,8 1149:14,15,2 4
enter 1049:19,22	1188:9,15,17 1240:4 EOC's 1113:22	escalation 1140:20,21	1151:9,12,22 1168:21,24,2 5 1169:6,8
entered 1110:9 1119:6	1170:7 EPC	1141:4,16 1197:1,5 1199:23	1174:24 1175:12 1179:3,4
1135:9 entering 1101:2	1051:13,18,1 9,23 1052:9,12,14	1201:2,3,10, 11,13 1204:4 escalations	1197:21,22,2 5 1202:6 1203:13
entertaining 1222:19	,16,22,23,25 1053:2 1098:17	1142:13 1201:6 1202:5,24	1233:23 1234:4,5,8,1 0,12,14,15,1
entire 1038:10 1059:3	1099:4,10,16 ,17 1100:1,4,15,	1205:18 espoused 1197:19	8´1235:6 estimates 1116:14
1065:20 1081:12 1099:17	19 1101:3 1107:23,25 1108:15	essential 1164:7	1140:18 1201:17
1108:21,25 1143:18 1190:1	1109:3,5 1136:24,25 1143:2,5,18	1240:8 essentially 1101:25	estimate's 1097:18 et 1190:16
1251:13,14 entirely 1232:5	1153:12,13,1 4,15,17 EPCs 1143:17	1159:25 1196:1 established	evaluate 1077:11
entirety 1062:13 1189:16	equipment 1100:3 1137:7	1144:9 1150:18 1244:2	evaluated 1076:12 1119:14
entities 1219:25	1231:17 1232:3,6,17	estimate 1052:14	evaluating 1235:7 evaluation
1220:2 entity 1135:20	ER-0089 1167:18 ER-2009-0089	1077:16,20 1079:11 1080:4,6,8	1077:13 1097:3 1149:21
1137:17 entry 1038:15	1018:13,21 1031:19 ER-2010-0355	1081:8 1095:16,19,2 1 1096:21,25 1097:7,8,21,	1162:19 evening
environment 1113:1 1138:13	1004:12 ER-2010-0356	109717,8,21, 24,25 1105:11,19 1109:17	1062:4 1156:1 1227:14
1158:14 1205:14 environmental	1004:16 ER-81-42 1079:22	1115:20,24 1116:3 1121:24,25	event 1109:6 1167:20 1252:19
1231:17 1232:3 EO-2005-0329	1080:8 erection 1076:6	1122:1,2,9 1123:21 1124:9,10,16	events 1031:11 1122:23
1162:3 EOC 1112:18	Eric 1009:4 1038:16	,17 1125:16,17 1126:9	everybody 1098:4
1114:2,6,20 1115:11	1065:21 Ernst 1039:2	1134:25	everyone

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1081:13	1175:18	1235:25	1160:15
everything	example 1031:7	1236:5,9,14 1237:6,9,13,	1216:12
1019:18 1028:13	1051:7	18,22	expansion 1053:8
1059:14	1086:6	1238:4,8,13, 24 1239:22	expect
1096:8,12	1102:21	1240:9,19,24	1110:17
1102:2,3 1110:8	1119:6,22 1174:9	1241:6,10,15	1125:15
1113:17	1176:7,12	1243:12	1152:1 1170:24
1119:15	1201:9	1245:11 1247:17	-
1170:14	1204:2 1207:8	1249:23	expectation 1154:20
evidence 1010:13	examples	1250:10,14,2	expectations
1076:22	1030:13	0,21	1125:11
1081:25	1102:22	executives 1138:20	1170:20
1082:3 1163:21	exceeded	1185:24	expected
1169:25	1091:6	1250:25	1114:8 1136:8
1180:16	1174:24	exhaustive	1141:16
1183:5 1211:11	except 1252:4,18	1156:22 1162:13	1142:13
1260:2	excess 1062:4	exhibit	1151:15,16,1 7,18,25
Evidentiary	1217:6	1010:9,13	1152:12
1004:6	exclude	1011:21	expenditure
evidently	1045:13	1019:20 1020:7	1028:25
1173:9	excluding	1020.7	1118:2 1170:21
evolution	1141:18,19	1123:4	expenditures
1164:6	excuse 1163:24	1161:15,18,2 1,25	1133:4
exact 1186:21 1188:7		1163:7,9,20	1162:14,21
1189:4	execute 1154:24	1164:11,12,1	1163:4,13 1247:19,23
1242:23 1247:12	executed	3 1168:10,13 1169:22,25	expense
	1121:12	1179:18,22	1037:5
exactly 1017:14	1160:25	1180:16	1040:2
1050:14,16	execution 1020:3	1181:17 1182:11	1082:14,18 1084:25
1110:3 1122:13,22	1103:7	1183:4	1085:2
1134:5,10	1121:3,8	1196:11 1210:9,12,19	1086:4 1102:24
1137:11	1137:2 1244:23	1211:5,11,13	1144:15
1165:17 1175:22	executive	1261:1,3,5,7	1167:6
1238:7	1008:3	,9,11,13,15, 16,18	1178:9
1242:21	1111:19	exhibits	expenses 1036:20
examination	1116:16 1142:21	1011:8,17	1085:23,24
1010:21 1090:7	1184:4,6,8,1	1162:20	1144:14
1104:19	1,13,14,15,1	1181:18,24 1182:3,8	1252:3,18
1120:6 1139:8	8,20,24 1185:2,10,17	exist 1124:5	experience 1015:4,7
1153:22	1186:5,12,23	existing	1016:7,10
1180:21	1187:2 1210:5	1230:18	1017:6,19 1027:8
1181:3 1260:3,9,11	1211:16	ex-officio	1027:8
examined	1212:12	1188:14	1084:4,8
	1213:4 1217:2	expanded	1088:23

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1094:2,10,14	1078:16	1230:6	1242:9
1095:8	1091:19	1230.0	
1107:20	1095:18		fault 1043:18
1112:2	1134:16	fact 1024:9	1253:12,25
1113:9		1035:7	favored
1115:9	explains	1052:10	1159:24
1145:2	1083:2	1060:6	
1171:5	explanation	1076:10	Featherstone
	1022:18	1081:5	1095:24
experienced	1025:11	1096:7	1096:1,5
1083:10,12	1059:17	1108:17	1098:8,9
1095:24,25	1104:25	1121:21	1106:11,16
1201:16		1172:17	1111:4 1122:14
1202:18	explanations	1176:6,8	1122:14
1245:10	1027:9 1175:4	1177:21	
expert		1205:8	1146:14,18
1016:5,10,14	expression	1248:24	1152:15,18 1157:3
,17,18	1203:18	facts 1076:22	
1025:23,25	expressly	1173:23	February
1075:17	1049:8	fair 1121:19	1019:22
1112:19		1122:11	1023:7
1113:7,21,23	extend	1124:25	1035:11,15
1209:15,18,2	1076:14	1147:16	1036:21
1,24	1228:24		1037:2
1218:7,14	extends	fairly 1032:9	1090:25
1219:17	1075:24	1147:14	1091:1
1220:8,10	extension	1212:20	1167:19
1234:21	1032:16	1226:7,9	1189:14
expertise		fake 1191:13	1236:12
1066:7	extensive	fall 1199:22	February/
1170:25	1017:5		March
	1102:1 1176:8	familiar	1093:11
experts 1113:20		1017:10	federal
1172:11	extent 1034:1	1022:11,23	1008:3
1206:14	1037:5	1027:4	1217:17
1207:1	1039:2	1038:8	
1218:13	1067:8	1053:25	feedback
1242:12	1084:22	1063:19,21	1138:13
	1113:14	1065:21	1147:11,13
explain	external	1066:3 1079:24	feel
1025:13	1075:18	1079.24	1080:10,12
	extra 1102:24	1114:25	1186:2
1078:6,25		1140:13	1218:8
1096:8,15,16 1097:14	extremely	1209:1	fees 1171:12
11097:14	1084:1	1229:24	feet 1180:10
1107:6	eyes 1122:7		
1147:10	-,	farthest	felt 1024:21
1147.10		1119:18	1025:15
1172:9	F face to face	fast	1033:11
1173:21	face-to-face	1075:16,22	1125:20
1175:2	1092:18	1076:16,17	1178:22
	1161:9	1097:17	1206:25
explained	facilities	1099:5,6	ferret
1134:13	1032:14	1122:8	1113:13
1152:23	1034:14	1205:21	
1168:1	1035:1,4	fast-tracking	field 1012:24
1169:4	facility	1098:11,14	Fifteen
1183:16	1202:21	·	1093:22
explaining		fatality	

EVIDENTIARY HEARI	ING VOL.	19 (01-21-2011
-------------------	----------	------	------------

fifth $1140:19$ $1121:4$ $1243:17,20$ figure $1244:16$ $1244:2,8$ FL $1035:10$ $1254:3$ Fischer Fl $118:24$ $1254:3$ Fischer Fl $1175:22$ finish $1006:18,19$ $1010:10,18,2$ figures $1078:10$ $1010:10,18,2$ fl $1142:16$ $1093:13,14$ $1024:22$ fl file $1093:13,14$ $1035:19$ fl $1004:12,16$ finite $1187:1$ $1044:21$ fl $1018:13,16$ Finnegan $1045:10$ fo $1019:1$ $1005:7$ $1053:23$ fo $1059:22,23$ firm $1059:7,8$ $1156:22$ $1114:2,20$ $1181:11$ $1115:11$ $1120:25$ fo $1017:20$ $1234:1,17,24$ $1123:3,8,9,2$ $firms$ $1034:22$ $firms$ $31127:12$ fo $108:17$ $1066:1,10$ $1132:23,24$ fi $108:120,22$ $1101:1$ $1153:1,21,23$ fo $1163:24$ $1026:14$ $1161:14,17,2$ fi $1163:24$ $1026:14$ $1161:14,17,2$ fo $1163:14,17,14$ $1034:9$ $1163:15,22$ fo	
final 1067:2 1038:15 1164:10,17,2 1136:8 1051:19 0 1168:10,15 1155:8,12 1062:15,19 1169:21 finance 1097:5 1171:3,4 1211:16 1101:22 1173:19,20 financial 1111:4,15 1179:8,10,14 1106:3 1114:7,10 1180:13 1163:12 1131:18,22,2 1258:5,8 1211:17 5 1132:10 1260:3,9 1212:21 1136:11 Fischer's 1213:3 1138:22 1059:17 1242:5 1144:2 1096:18	<pre>ixing 1102:25 L 1008:2 leenor 1189:25 1190:19,22 leet 1231:24 lexible 1110:13 loor 1101:7 ocus 1032:11,12 1081:7 1104:12 1114:15 1118:11 ocused 1033:14 1104:10 119:10 1153:18 1251:15 ocusing 1216:16 olks 1074:25 1110:1 1258:11 ollow- through 1172:22 ollow-up 1033:15 1090:24 1143:16 1198:10 orce 1008:11 orecast 1067:4 1125:23</pre>
1136:8 1050:19 0 1168:10,15 fo 1155:8,12 1051:19 1169:21 fo finance 1097:5 1171:3,4 1771:3,4 1211:16 1101:22 1173:19,20 fo financial 1111:4,15 1179:8,10,14 fo 1106:3 1114:7,10 1180:13 fo 1163:12 1131:18,22,2 1258:5,8 fo 1211:17 1133:12,18 1260:3,9 fo 1212:21 1136:11 Fischer's fo 1242:5 1138:22 1059:17 fo	ollow- through 1172:22 ollow-up 1033:15 1090:24 1143:16 1198:10 orce 1008:1 ORD 1008:11
1243:5 1144:2 1096:18 financially 1148:2 1096:18 1259:16 1149:3 1101:6 financing 1153:2 1108:2 1141:10,19 1158:25 1143:2,21 1156:20 1159:2 1152:25 1196:7 1162:4,5,12 1176:18 1198:13 1163:13 1204:25 1247:19 1164:24 1222:8,16,22 finding 1182:16 five-year 1025:1 1184:7,10,23 1131:8 1035:22 1185:6 1154:7 1064:16 1186:2 1216:19 11772:19 1187:20 1244:4	

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011				
formalized 1236:12	frameworks 1200:12	gate 1176:24 gather 1229:6	1010:4,7,15, 23,25 1011:2	
1237:2	freeze	1242:18	1012:20	
formally	1156:20		1014:11	
1237:4		gathered	1053:7,24	
_	frequency	1051:1	1063:19	
format	1242:20	GE 1163:1	1064:7	
1083:4,5	frequently	_	1065:11	
1109:19	1241:19	general	1074:13,20	
1119:1	-	1015:16	1075:9	
1164:1	Friday 1010:2	1087:14,16	1090:9,17	
1241:20	front 1083:13	1105:25 1114:21	1104:16	
1251:22	1132:20	1154:9	1120:15	
former	1188:22	1154.9	1123:16	
1114:23	1204:21	1202:1	1132:22	
1150:19	1215:20	1202:1	1139:15	
Forrest	full-wrap	1207:17	1140:4	
1117:10	1099:17	1211:19	1147:23	
		1247:14	1153:24	
forth 1188:17	fully 1037:8		1161:24	
1207:17	1111:25 1214:14	generally	1163:23	
forthcoming		1168:2	1168:16	
1094:18	function	1170:8	1170:2	
fortunate	1106:3	1207:15	1173:16,21	
1100:21	1183:23	1227:7	1175:8	
	1214:9	generating	1179:8,11 1195:23	
forum 1059:1	1216:9,12	1230:5	1236:22	
1195:18	1251:19	generation	1238:8,24	
1226:1	functional	1103:12	1239:19,23	
1249:10	1183:19	1229:23	,	
forward	1184:16	1239:3	G-i-l-e-s	
1048:15	1187:13	1244:17	1010:25	
1061:3	functionally	1246:5	GILES 1048:2	
1154:14,24	1215:9	generator	1060:1	
1158:20		1162:25	1075:11	
1206:11	functions		1131:1	
1242:15	1190:24	generators	1260:3	
Foster	1251:18	1231:6,19,22	Giles's	
1168:24	funny 1134:2	getting	1036:4	
foundation	future 1102:3	1045:5	1045:3,12	
1076:25		1049:9	1139:8	
		1061:6	given 1029:7	
foundations	G	1100:6	1059:18	
1076:5	gained	1132:24	1061:5	
1098:23,25	1088:22,25	1133:10	1085:18,25	
founded	game 1030:25	1166:7	1090:13	
1236:8,10	1031:2,4,6	$1186:1 \\ 1221:1$	1094:9	
frame 1035:11	games 1030:16	1242:22	1099:22	
1077:12	1031:5		1101:18	
1091:9,12	Gardner	gift 1030:6	1112:4	
1093:10	1231:8	1031:6	1115:24	
1157:12		gifts	1117:19	
1184:7	Garrett	1029:7,9,11,	1119:19	
1201:23	1005:11	13,16,20	1152:10	
1232:4	Gas 1005:17	1031:13	1204:8,21	
1233:3,17	GASCONADE	1104:12	giving	
1242:19	1259:3	Giles	1033:11	

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1078:24 1235:7 glad 1060:7	1199:20 1210:8 1214:16 1221:13	guess 1019:21 1054:13 1089:21 1132:5	1102:2,12,18 1145:2,6 1172:16
1077:21 1095:22	greater	1132:5 1161:18 1164:18	happens 1202:19
glancing 1037:19	1004:15 1089:16 1216:5,13,16	1178:4 1204:17	happy 1045:4 1081:13
GLENDA	1218:3	1220:25	hard 1014:2
1007:14	1219:4,12,22	1248:14	1180:1,8,9
GMO 1026:19	1221:14,16	guest	Hardesty
1216:9	Grimwade	1252:8,10	1218:16
1218:20,25	1086:24,25	Gunn 1004:20	1219:17
1219:18	1087:5,10	1012:1	1220:5
goal 1076:8 1096:10	1154:12 1169:1 1187:21	1074:3,4,5,7 ,10 1104:18,20	Hardin 1026:5 1027:21,23,2
golf 1253:2,4,6,8	1188:25 1189:2	1120:2,4,17 1143:25	4 1036:16,18,2 0 1037:14,24
golfer 1253:5	1190:22	1149:6,13	1040:1
	1243:17	1151:21,25	1042:22
gone 1030:16 1054:8 1125:15	1244:8,19 1245:1,7	1260:6 gutting	1042.22 1065:19 1075:21
1126:7	ground	1232:16	1084:20
1171:1,14	1035:25		1104:6,11
Gotcha	1041:21	guy 1184:14 guys 1137:4	1110:2 1111:13,21,2
1126:11	grounds		4 1112:1,3
1131:10	1033:16		1113:7,10,21
1138:25	group 1032:22	half	1114:1,6,9,1
gotten	1033:2		0,16,20
1104:13	1048:7	1199:6,16,25	1115:9,11
Gould	1101:8	1200:16,20	1116:3,20
1038:17,19	1112:13	1204:10	1117:17,20,2
1065:22	1132:8	halfway	2 1121:16
1111:23	1138:1,8,11,	1233:9	1126:16
	12	hand 1028:5	1142:17
governance	1185:13,23,2	1064:4	1144:14
1183:18,20	4 1186:24	1171:16	1147:24
1184:2	1187:17	1180:23	1148:6,7,13,
1240:20	1204:21		25
grabbing	1207:2,17	handed	1150:14,17,2
1258:6	1239:2	1033:19	5 1170:20,25
Grabinski's	1240:21	1054:15	1171:11,17
1196:13	1241:3	1140:9	1234:18
grade 1158:22	groupings	handing	1235:3
	1140:17	1037:14	Hardin's
grand 1197:12	groups	1097:23 happen 1102:3	1113:18 1171:9
granted	1066:10	1108:22	harmed
1158:3	growing	1112:17	
gratuities 1029:9,21	1204:15	1113:19	1059:16 Hatfield
1104:13	growth	1145:1	1007:10
1167:8	1199:23	1202:20	1054:6
great 1048:18	1200:23,24 1202:23	1223:1 happened	1181:1,2,4
1081:3,5 1104:23	1205:1	1024:16	1182:5,7,8,1 0,20,24

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-2	2011
1192:3 1196:9,14	1200:17 1204:6,20,24	1139:12 1157:22	1239:16 1253:16
1211:9 1215:12 1218:19	1212:24 1213:3 1236:17	1159:14 1166:6,14 1168:3	hey 1032:13 1097:17
1219:6 1220:17	1230:17 1239:16 1243:16	1180:17 1223:5	Hi 1104:21
1221:4	1243:10 1244:18 1248:22	1254:7	hierarchy 1213:1
1246:8 1248:13	heading	helped 1200:12	high 1005:19 1142:8
1249:7,16 1254:1	1052:23 Healy 1005:2	helpful 1105:1,21	1162:10 1197:9
1260:11	hear 1010:12 1019:10	1183:16 1186:23	1205:2 higher 1199:6
haven't 1081:4	1019:10 1039:8 1049:21	helping 1097:6	highlighted
1196:21,22 1229:3 1240:4	1074:6,7,24, 25 1104:21	Henderson	1053:13,14 highly 1045:5 1054:12,16
having	heard 1242:2	1019:5,11 1020:11,13,1	1127:8
1042:11 1099:22	1243:11 hearing	8 1022:1,3 1023:8	1191:23 1246:25
1117:12,13 1121:9	1004:6 1011:23	1024:6,8 1025:17 1090:16,23	1248:11 1261:6,10
1126:15 1150:7,16	1024:9,10,12 1025:14	1090:10,20 1091:15,20 1092:2,5,19	hindsight 1171:14
1152:14 1202:18 1246:17	1054:18 1094:16	1098:5	hire 1112:3 1113:25
Hawthorn	1157:19,20,2 2 1163:18	1123:25 1169:16	1115:7 1233:22
1137:11 1230:14	1166:6,14,22 ,23 1169:24 1179:21	Henderson's	1245:13 1247:9
1231:12 1232:18	1179.21 1180:22 1182:15,19,2	1023:5,9,21 1091:25	hired 1066:6 1100:22
1233:14,21 HC 1010:11	5 1240:14 1243:9	hereby 1259:8 here's	1100.22 1103:20,25 1114:5
1011:24 1053:24	1251:20	1102:12,14 1113:10	1115:23 1121:10,16,2
1054:1,3,5,6 1059:22	hearings 1157:14	1122:8 HERNANDEZ	0 1138:18 1171:11,16
1120:20 1139:21	heart 1134:6 heated 1060:8	1009:3	1206:2 1234:3
1161:18 1180:4	Heather	he's 1023:15 1080:9	1245:9,14,20 hiring
1182:12 1183:3,4	1007:1 1027:18	1087:8,20 1088:9,20,21	1111:21 1117:20
1188:24 1192:20 1193:2	Hecker 1007:10	1094:22 1135:24 1148:12	1246:25 1247:4,10,15
1222:24 1249:8,13	he'd 1172:15 Heinz 1005:11	1148.12 1151:2,6 1173:17	history 1048:19
1254:2,3,4	held 1043:8	1180:19 1182:22,24	hit 1176:7
head 1187:9,11,14 ,16	1045:25 1054:21	1183:6 1215:18	hold 1045:9 1166:2
,10 1189:6,13 1190:2	1069:18 1074:17 1127:14	1220:12 1222:11	1186:20 1216:8
	112/.14	1238:10,11	

EVI	DENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
holding	1167:4	1210:2	1134:13
1210:8	hypothetical	1213:13	1143:4
1214:10 1217:2,11	1012:20	1214:1 1215:18	$1160:11 \\ 1172:15$
	1013:23	1216:19	1190:8
holistic 1172:13	Hypotheticall	1217:19,23	identify
home 1177:13	y 1012:22	1218:5,6	1119:16
1229:8,9,17,		1219:14,15	1172:21,22
19	$\frac{I}{700000000000000000000000000000000000$	1226:4,13,16	1176:9
homes 1176:15	Iatan 1018:19 1019:7,13	,19,22,25 1227:5,21,22	1236:13
honesty	1022:9	1232:2,5	identifying
1075:2	1029:7,14	1233:24	1091:5 1134:16
Honor 1180:13	1031:25	1234:13,19 1235:23	-
1249:16	1032:3,6,17,	1236:2	ignorance 1244:9
hope 1253:7	20 1034:2,7 1035:17	1240:6	
•	1039:5	1244:14,24	ignores 1173:6,23
hoped 1112:14	1048:19,21	1245:5 1247:19,22,2	I''I'I 1036:14
hopes 1191:14	1051:13,17,2	3	1045:8,22,23
hoping 1092:7 1112:1	3 1052:6 1053:8	IBEW 1007:20	1053:4,6
	1060:4,24		1059:22
hotel	1061:21,23	I'd 1011:20 1019:20	1076:25
1252:20,23	1062:13	1060:7	1078:23 1139:6
hour	1063:13,24 1066:15,21	1095:22	1180:6
1044:5,6,11 1258:1	1067:21	1153:24	1182:6
hours 1037:18	1068:9	$1161:14 \\ 1163:15$	1191:20
1048:10,12	1069:11	1164:10,12	1215:21 1220:25
1226:3,6,11,		1168:10	1230:9
13,16,19,22,	1082:8,9,12, 19 1084:5,24	1169:21	I'm 1011:25
25	1085:11	1179:18 1184:6	1013:9
1227:3,13,25 1229:8,18	1087:3	1193:2	1022:25
HR 1184:16	1088:5,23 1090:17	1242:25	1023:3
	1090:17	idea 1132:2	1024:20 1026:16,23
human 1138:14 1211:23	1103:17	1134:19	1027:6
1212:24	1108:9	1174:23	1028:3,4,5
1247:6	1111:16	1177:22 1221:24	1035:19
Humphrey	1144:7,24 1150:3	1226:10,12,1	1036:7 1037:14
1007:1	1158:10	5,18,21,24	1037:14
1027:19	1160:9	1227:2	1039:8
hundred	1162:24	1230:7	1041:12,17,2
1077:12 1083:1	1163:9 1166:5	ideas 1240:21	5 1042:8 1044:4,21
1197:13	1168:21,23,2	identificatio	1044.4,21
1203:8	5 1171:6	n 1020:7 1022:18	1051:8
1226:11		1161:22	1053:11
1232:10,13	4 1177:12,20 1188:22	1168:13	1054:8 1059:19
1245:15	1189:9,12	1170:13	1060:20
Hydebrink 1239:1,11	1190:8	1210:12	1062:16
	1197:24	identified	1064:4,24
Hyneman 1098:7	1199:3 1205:21	1069:10 1096:16	1065:14,16 1066:3,5,24
1123:1	1205.21	1102:13	1074:5,13,15
	,		
EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
--	---	--	--
1075:13 1078:11,16	1227:13 1228:21	1171:7 1205:23	1253:15 inclined
1079:24 1080:21 1081:18 1084:16	1229:6,12,19 ,21 1230:10 1235:10 1236:7,17	1251:3 impose 1176:4 impression 1092:21	1258:14 include 1116:4 1149:15
1085:7 1086:3,4,5,2 0 1087:11 1093:14 1094:8	1239:18 1244:9 1246:1,8,9,1 1 1248:24 1250:13	1092:21 1093:2 1166:23,24 1167:1,15 1190:21	1186:16 1203:3,19 1231:5 1243:4
1095:7 1097:23 1100:6 1104:9	1251:20 1252:20 1254:3 1258:2,14,18	<pre>improved 1138:24 imprudence 1064:16</pre>	included 1065:7 1077:25 1101:24
1106:6 1107:9,10,21 1109:12	imagine 1033:21 immaterial	1065:2 1068:10	1110:2 1116:14 1140:25
1111:12 1116:12 1120:12,18 1121:12,14,1	1034:3 immediate	<pre>imprudent 1013:22 1172:21 1174:10</pre>	1141:6 1162:9 1171:12
5 1122:24 1123:10,23 1127:5 1133:10	1147:11,13 immediately 1098:22 1249:18	inaccurate 1201:14 1246:2	1185:15,17 1188:5 1197:2,6 1203:13
1133:10 1134:18,21 1136:5,20 1139:23,24,2 5 1145:5,6	immersed 1176:23 1242:3	inadequate 1166:13 inadmissible	1232:5,6 including 1018:9,24 1141:16
1150:15 1161:19 1164:15 1166:7	impact 1028:20 1034:15 1142:8	1034:3 inappropriate 1036:24 Inaudible	1142:13 1151:23 1171:22 1175:4
1167:4 1173:12 1179:12,17,2	1197:9 impacted 1034:16 1094:24	1074:4 in-camera 1044:24	1199:13,23 1253:2 income
3 1180:3,4,15 1182:5 1184:14	impacts 1032:14	1045:4,9,24 1053:24 1054:4,8,17, 20	1217:17 incorporate 1214:6
1185:11,19 1186:1,19 1189:13 1191:11,19	<pre>implement 1131:9 1154:24 1183:23</pre>	1069:14,17 1120:23 1127:13 1193:2	incorrect 1034:13 1035:5 1173:22
1193:1 1196:2,9 1199:13 1208:25	<pre>Implementatio n 1004:13 implemented</pre>	1223:3,4 1248:14,16 1249:12,18	1175:2 increase 1039:24
1210:17 1212:3,9 1213:5	1176:10 implied 1050:21	1254:6 1260:5,7,13 incentive 1063:16	1066:22 1116:7 1125:1,5,9,1 0,12 1161:2
1214:13,21 1215:2,12 1218:7,13 1219:12,16	important 1013:11 1021:25 1060:4,20	inception 1167:23	increased 1068:1 increases
1220:8,10,18 1221:4,17 1222:21,24	1060:4,20 1062:17,23,2 5 1063:4 1076:1	incident 1063:20 1107:17	1039:15,21 1068:9 1125:14

EVIDENTIARY	HEARING	VOL.	19	01-21-2011
-------------	---------	------	----	------------

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1151:11,15,1	indication	1074:20	inherent
8 1170:13	1165:21	1074.20	1160:22
1178:23,24	1197:5	1150:2,4	
· · · ·		1161:7	initial
increasing	indirect		1019:22
1152:11	1116:25	informal	1032:21
incremental	indirects	1108:4	1133:7
1062:2	1140:22	1237:1	1174:1
	1141:3,4	1250:8	1189:5
incur 1043:17	1197:6	informally	1244:20
1076:7,14		1236:11	initially
1127:6	individual		1035:1
incurred	1030:2,4	information	1087:5
1043:9	1065:23	1011:5	1108:25
1083:3	1100:12	1026:19	1113:25
1102:24	1101:5	1027:14,22	1115:14
indeed	1117:9,24	1028:2	1159:14
1192:21	1148:2,5	1031:24	1177:5
	1159:16	1032:3,13,17	1190:2
Independence	1160:8	,20	
1006:15	1185:3	1033:10,12,1	initiate
1176:17	1188:17	5,17	1026:6
independent	1190:24	1034:1,2,18,	initiatives
1112:20	1207:14	24	1253:14
1113:15	individually	1035:13,16	
1235:8	1188:16	1036:3,7	innovative 1159:4
1242:12	individuals	1037:16,17,2	
		2 1038:22	input 1142:20
INDEX 1261:1	1032:22,24 1042:21	1040:10,18,1	1154:7
indicate	1042.21	9	1234:22
1029:10,13	1088:22	1041:3,11,14	1240:21
1121:9	1148:22	,15,18,21 1042:1,5,6,8	1241:2
indicated	1176:25	1042:1,5,6,8	1250:23
1025:15,23	1178:10	1045:6	1251:10,22
1023:13,23	1185:5,21	1059:10,17	inputs
1020:10	1207:14	1081:6	1247:10,12
1023:4	1244:1,3,5,7	1093:19	
1042:6	,11 1245:24	1101:17	inquire
1050:10	,	1103:23 1104:6	1074:12 1258:8
1052:24	industry	1104.6	
1062:1	1079:14,15	1123.20	inquired
1064:22	1084:2	1127.8	1151:25
1092:17	1097:8,21	1162:9	inquiries
1096:8	1110:9,22	1162.9	1143:17
1101:16	1111:9	1165:9,19,21	
1149:21	1112:19	1172:14	inquiring
1154:13	1115:6	1172.14	1029:6
1156:24	1122:10	1177:5	1258:2
1185:16	1134:16,20	1228:18	inquiry
	1145:18,21,2	1240:10	1106:2
indicates	5 1148:3	1240.10	1182:16
1090:23	1201:16	· ·	in-service
1140:25	1234:22	informed	1082:12
1162:5	inexperienced	1050:13,19	
1186:4	1112:4	infrastructur	inside
1197:1	infamous	e 1162:1	1214:12
indicating	1133:3	1261:11	1232:5
1043:2			install
1135:24	inform	<pre>infrequent 1031:10</pre>	1232:2
	1050:21	1031.10	

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
installed 1012:24 1200:23	1 1109:1,4,8,9 1113:16	1158:16 invited 1091:3	1193:2 involving 1023:10
instance 1050:25 1098:23 1100:12 1108:12 1156:5 1157:18 1172:20	1155:11 1217:23 1218:6 1219:4,15 interested 1100:15 1108:5,15 1154:16	<pre>invoice 1037:11,14 1041:19 1126:20 invoices 1028:7 1036:16,18</pre>	irrelevant 1034:3 1044:25 1081:3,5 Island 1252:17
1173:8,25 1188:24 1217:4 1241:5	1157:17 1160:9,15 1222:19 1259:16	1037:2,3,4,8 ,9,17 1038:6,9 1040:1 1041:24	isn't 1028:19 1033:22 1036:12 1145:8 1202:11,24
instead 1092:18 Institute	interesting 1099:4 1189:14	1042:2 1126:14,16,1 9	issue 1013:12 1030:14 1035:22
1159:4 instruct 1118:22	interject 1218:20 intermission	involve 1112:9	1036:10 1065:15 1067:14
1249:13 instructed 1138:23	1074:22 internal 1138:1,8,11	involved 1015:5 1021:11 1034:10	1102:14 1118:7 1156:7 1157:4
instruction 1048:25	1217:18 1235:12,14 Internally	1059:5 1079:21 1085:3,9	1218:20 1219:1 1220:18,19,2
instructions 1109:25 1110:2,12 1136:7	1109:21 interpretatio n 1207:3	1091:17 1092:7 1093:21 1094:15	0 1221:9 1242:7 issued 1013:1,6
insurance 1127:7 integration	interrupt 1074:1 1196:10	1098:4 1103:15 1111:17,18,2 1 1112:11	1167:6 issues 1018:9,10,12
1014:23 1208:7 intelligent	interview 1111:23 interviewed	1114:11,22 1126:20 1131:13 1132:4	,16 1044:25 1108:22 1118:1,21 1119:3
1084:1 intended 1011:18 1122:2 1124:13	1247:7,9 intro 1028:14 introduce 1164:12 introduced	1132:4 1136:1,5 1145:4 1162:6 1164:21,23 1167:10	1150:9 1161:12 1176:9 1177:23 1209:13
intention 1135:12 interactions	1123:4 introduction 1162:11	1202:15 1207:2,17 1215:19	1220:8 1221:9 1241:21 1242:11,14
1048:24 interconnecti on 1162:16	1168:22 investment 1076:19	1218:13 1233:15 1240:13 1247:6,7	1242.11,14 1253:15 item 1022:15 1030:12
interest 1024:6 1052:10 1099:19 1107:25	1077:7,14 1131:8 1158:22 1162:2 1261:11	1251:1 involvement 1084:5 1136:7 1170:7	1030:12 1078:5 1102:17 1116:24 1118:12,17 1141:21
1108:10,13,2	investors	involves	1156:7

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1198:16	1135:20	1205:1	1202:17,20
items 1064:13	1138:3 1139:22	1215:3 1227:3	John
1098:24 1114:14	1141:3	1231:8	1008:8,12,13 1086:24
1118:3,5,13,	1144:20		1087:10
21 1119:17	1145:16 1147:14]	1154:12
1140:20 1155:6	1153:16	JACOBS	1169:1 1185:3
1197:1	1165:17,23	1005:14	1183:24
1203:14	1169:10 1171:21	JAIME 1009:2	join 1081:14
1205:16 1232:16	1180:10	JAMES	joined 1167:4
	1185:21	1006:9,18	1189:14
iterations 1204:7	1188:24 1192:24	January 1004:7	joining
it's 1013:22	1200:18	1010:3	1154:16
1017:14	1203:17	1032:4	joint
1022:22	1205:13,15	1033:8 1097:15	1107:2,3
1025:23 1027:20	1209:5 1210:24	1121:8	1160:5 1230:2
1029:19,24	1212:8	1123:21	jointly
1030:4,14	1214:2,23	1168:20	1159:14
1031:10 1036:13	1216:14 1218:8	Jarrett	1220:7
1038:15	1222:9	1004:19 1090:6,8	Jones
1048:17	1227:15	1104:15,17	1101:4,10 1103:3
1051:15,17	1228:16,20 1231:3	1150:7	1103:35
1053:24 1054:1,6	1232:21	1260:5,6,7	1109:7
1061:12,25	1236:18	Jarrett's 1108:1	1110:2
1062:9,20	1238:1,2 1240:20	Jay 1065:22	1143:1,4,7,2 1
1064:6,25 1066:16	1244:9	Jefferson	<u> </u>
1067:22	1246:8	1004:8	Jones's
1068:25	1247:11 1250:23	1005:8,20,23	1183:14
1075:2,5,7 1080:19	1251:3	1006:2,12,20 1007:11,23	Joseph
1081:11,15,2	1258:12	1007.11,25	1007:24
0,22 1082:15	I've 1014:20	1009:7,11	JR 1005:18
1083:3 1090:11	1015:5 1016:12	1102:8 1168:3	judge 1004:19
1093:21	1018:8		1010:1,11,14 ,17,20
1094:5	1030:9,13	Jeffrey 1189:25	1011:20,23
1095:11 1096:17,18	1031:10 1048:20	Jenks 1239:17	1012:13,15,1
1097:1,15,24	1074:22	Jennifer	7 1014:7 1019:24
1099:2,7,17	1082:6	1004:23	1020:3
1100:7 1102:10	1094:15,23 1099:2	1009:3	1024:22
1113:17	1106:22	1259:5	1025:3 1035:19
1116:2	1140:9	Jerry 1088:3	1036:2,11,14
1117:7,9 1118:10	1147:12 1152:22	JLG	1044:21
1120:20,21	1175:10	1063:20,21 1253:10,13,1	1045:1,7,10, 17,22 1048:1
1122:9	1185:16	5,23	1053:23
1124:4 1125:12	1191:23	job 1038:22	1054:2,4,10,
1127:9	1196:19 1203:3	1093:23	14,18 1059:1,2,7,8
1132:5	1204:15,21	$1100:18 \\ 1109:10$,13,19,25
	,	TT03:T0	, _, _, _,

EVIDENTIARY	HEARING	VOL.	19	01-21-2011

EVID	ENITARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	
1069:15	judged	1206:2,8,9	1062:17,25
1074:1,5,9,1	1109:15	1210:3,6	1063:16,22
		1210:3,0	1064:13,14,2
1,15,18	July	1211.2 1212.12	1004.13,14,2 2 1067.1 10
1077:1	1061:11,12	1213:12,21	3 1067:1,19
1078:22,23	1123:7	1214:20	1068:10
1079:6,7	1136:10	1215:18	1069:10
1080:15,17,2	1146:22,25	1216:4,17,20	1076:7,10,19
1 1081:18,24		1217:17	1077:12,25
1082:2	juncture	1219:2,21	1079:19
1090:5	1091:20	1221:13,15	1080:1
1104:17	1092:13	1229:23	1082:25
1120:4,12,24	June 1031:22	1230:3,11	1084:18
1123:3,6	1037:15	1233:22	1086:3
1127:11	1053:20	1234:13	1087:1,7,12
1132:24	1060:3,15,18	1235:20	1088:14,20
1139:2,9,13,	1061:9	1245:2,4,13	1089:1,9
19,21	1062:18	1248:5	1093:18,23
1143:12	1063:17	1253:11,23	1095:2
1147:19	1064:6	1258:11	1099:25
1153:20,21	1076:8,11,13	1260:2	1100:11
1161:14,16,1			1101:16
9 1163:15,17	,17 1098:20	KARL 1007:5	1104:5,6,13
1164:10,15,1	1155:1	ксс 1103:24	1109:21
9 1168:12	justification	1150:9	1112:8
1169:23	1027:10	1171:24	1113:6
1171:3			1115:2
		KCP 1023:10	1127:6
1179:10,15,2 0,23	<u> </u>	KCP&L 1004:15	
	Kansas	1011:21,24	1131:9,25
1180:11,14,1	1004:11	1013:8,12	1132:3
8,25	1005:16,24	1015:5	1137:6
1182:5,7,9,1	1006:21	1017:9	1138:7,19
1,14,15,17	1007:2,3,4,7	1019:5	1144:16
1183:2,6,8	,8,12,16,19	1022:8	1145:3
1192:3,5	1011:1	1023:10,16	1149:3,18,23
1193:3	1016:7	1025:16	1150:9
1195:18	1027:24	1026:9,19,21	1153:6
1196:9	1048:22	1027:8,9,15,	,,,,,,,,,
1198:5	1063:22,23	20	23
1205:5,7	1064:2,5,21	1031:18,21,2	1158:5,14,19
1210:9,11,15	1103:16		1159:3,8
1211:7,10	1120:21	4 1032:10 1033:25	1160:23
1213:15,17	1124:21		1163:11,18
1215:12,14,2	1126:23	1034:6,9,23	1165:20
1 1218:19	1131:19	1035:22,24	1166:3,9,13,
1219:7,8	1132:10	1039:14,17,2	15 1169:5
1220:11,14,1	1133:7,11	$0\ 1040:10,18$	1174:2
7,24,25	1134:21	1041:3,7,10	1175:1,9
1221:6	1135:3,6,8,1	1042:19	1176:5,13
1222:10,11,2	6 1137:9	1043:2,8,10,	1191:8
3 1223:2	1144:16	22 1044:2,16	1196:18
1226:1	1144.10	1048:4,8,11,	1197:16
1246:11		23	1198:19
1248:16	1154:19,23	1049:13,17,2	1210:18
1249:1,5,9,1	1155:3,7	5	1211:6,10
1,15,17	1159:1,11,13	1050:5,6,12	1216:15
1253:16,19	,18,21,24	1051:7,10	1217:3,15
1254:1,4	1160:1,17	1053:8,20	1217.3,13
1258:1,5,14,	1171:20,21	1059:3	1218.5
20	1176:15	1060:17	1221:14,16
20	1205:20	1061:7,13	1221.14,10
		,	

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1235:18,20 1239:7 1249:12 KCP&L's 1022:4,17 1026:25 1027:17 1029:20 1043:18 1049:24 1061:18 1068:23,25 1075:23 1127:2 1134:20 1138:1,7,11, 12 1158:7 1165:14 1216:13 1234:7 Ken 1065:21 Kenney 1004:20 1012:1 1074:3,6 1078:4 1120:5,7,14 1121:2,5,7 1123:7,12,14 1122:5,7 1138:25 1139:2,9 Kenny 1146:12 KEPCO 1160:18 KEVIN 1004:20 1009:2 key 1049:12,15 1175:4 1204:16 1241:22 1247:9 Kiewit 1100:18,21,2 2 1101:8 1109:9 1137:2,5	KINDSCHUH 1008:8 kitchen 1202:16 KLIETHERMES 1009:3 knew 1021:13 1060:9 1086:1,18 1091:6,12 1113:8 1125:5,6,7 1161:1 1201:11 knowledge 1011:15 1039:2 1048:18 1066:8 1067:8,23 1068:11 1094:20 1115:6 1116:17 1144:17 1144:17 1147:4 1158:23 1159:1 1165:24 175:19 knowledgeable 1083:14 known 1097:18 1114:17 134:8 1253:3 known- unknowns 1201:9 KS 1007:15,19 1008:10 La 1162:16 1169:1 171:23 1230:21	1039:15,20,2 4 1067:6,8,9,1 3,16,20,23 1068:5 1140:20 1200:23 1ack 1050:22 1060:21 1099:22 1147:11,12 1165:22 Lake 1030:17 Lane 1008:2 1anguage 1064:18 1082:24 1132:7 1152:22,24 1157:2 1arge 1033:2 1083:18 1101:5 112:8 1137:12 1153:18 1165:7 1178:5 1205:15 1209:7 1230:22 1245:10,15,2 3 1250:22 1argely 1115:6 1arger 1114:16 1230:18,24 1231:10 1argest 1200:2 1202:8 LARRY 1006:18 1ast 1010:3 1021:18 1031:18 1077:23	<pre>1167:18 1192:12 1231:8 1232:24 1237:24,25 1238:5,6 1ate 1076:11 1113:17 1144:20 1156:1 1187:20 1243:2 1ate-2003 1154:6 1ater 1012:25 1025:1 1097:21 102:11 109:6 1119:5 1126:8 1146:1 1156:17 1182:23 1234:21 1atest 1165:2 1aunching 1189:5 1aw 1004:19 1005:2,6,10, 14,15,18,22 1006:1,5,9,1 0,14,18 1007:1,5,6,1 0,14,18,22 1006:1,2,4,1 0,1113:8 1172:25 1234:17,24 Lawgon 1086:6,10,13 ,16,22 1ay 1076:25 1ayman's</pre>
1248:2 1249:22 1250:11,15,1 9 kilowatts	1231:13 1232:12,14 1233:5 labeled	1090:25 1094:16 1111:5 1140:15 1152:25 1158:9	1202:11,12 LD 1176:7 LDS 1176:4,9 lead 1190:15
1052:19	1200:8 labor	1164:24	1205:16 1246:24

	ENILARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1247:5	1219:25	1006:21	1082:6
	1220:2	1007:2,4,8,1	1116:24
leader	1221:18	2,16 1016:8	1141:3,9
1113:16	1239:25	1027:25	1185:22
1144:19		1120:22	1187:12,18
leadership	legitimate	1124:21	1191:20,24
1112:13	1094:13	1126:23	1192:12,14,2
1118:15,18	Leibach	1131:20	2,24 1196:6
1119:7,13	1004:23	1132:10	1198:12,24
1138:13	1259:5	1133:8,12	1203:14
1148:23	Lena 1169:16	1134:21,22	1212:4
1170:10		1137:9	1235:11
1207:7	length 1140:6	1205:21	1240:15,17,2
1216:7,8	lengthy	1206:2,8,9	1,23
1251:15	1147:14	1210:4,6	1241:3,7
1252:6		1211:2	1243:14,15,1
leads 1190:16	less 1063:4	1213:12,22	9
	1105:20	1214:20	1244:7,10,12
learn 1019:17	1178:3,14	1215:19	,18,22
1122:9	let's	1216:4,17,21	1250:24
1202:22	1013:5,24	1217:17	1251:2,5,6,9
learned	1023:4	1219:2,21	,18
1097:5	1033:14	1221:14,16	
1146:1	1065:9	1229:23	line-by-line
1241:25	1066:13	1230:3,12	1132:12
	1068:6	1233:22	1155:23
lease 1149:22	1069:8	1234:14	lines 1191:25
least 1078:4	1074:15	1235:21	1201:6
1133:23	1082:5	1245:2,5,13	1212:6
1134:3	1089:12	1248:5	1230:9
1145:6	1109:3,10	1253:11,24	1251:8
1157:4	1133:1	Light's	linking
1167:13	1182:10	1135:17	1013:9
1202:25	1244:14	1260:2	
leave 1031:21	letter 1028:6		liquidated
1075:3	1261:15	likelihood	1176:4
led 1059:4	level 1050:10	1120:1	list 1060:6
1093:2	1162:10	likely	1083:1
1136:13	1162:10	1119:16	1108:13
1175:5	1168:23	1125:12	1138:12
	1190:23	1157:5	1160:17
Lee's 1006:3	1205:2	1188:8	1169:14
leeway	1203.2	1189:19	listed
1045:23	5 1212:9,10	1190:25	1060:19
1078:24	1213:7,11,21	likewise	1062:24
	1214:11	1141:2	1169:13
left-hand 1140:17	1248:8,9,10,	1252:16	1182:25
	19,24		1188:24
legal		limit 1029:25	listen 1241:2
1009:2,3,4,5	levels	1066:7	1251:2
1038:1,4,7,1	1212:14	1156:21	
9 1094:9	Lewis 1006:5	line 1025:14	listened
1104:7	1009:9	1035:20	1101:12
1120:21	liable	1036:7	listening
1121:11	1043:22	1044:22	1240:14
1163:12		1065:10,16	lists 1083:2
1165:20,25	life 1084:1	1066:16	1188:24
1211:20	1124:19	1068:8,16,17	1188:24
1212:22	Light 1004:11	1075:14	1103.11

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
litigated	long-time	1119:4	1015:4
1045:8	1080:1	mainly	1018:7 1190:6,8,15,
little	Lora 1037:15	1153:18	17 1244:20
1012:8,14	1088:11	maintain	1247:22
1040:21,25 1095:15	1186:17	1112:23	managers
1099:16	lot 1054:8	maintained	1190:24
1100:7	1077:16 1080:13,22	1064:14	1245:15
1105:22	1091:21	maintenance	managing
1106:7	1093:21	1232:1	1179:5
1111:13 1120:18	1094:15	major 1100:1	1209:7
1126:11	1101:7	Ī118:7	MANGELSDORF
1154:1	1102:19	1158:17	1008:5
1186:1	1138:21,22 1153:25	1190:16	manner
1199:4	1159:5	1232:15 1242:7	1029:19
lives 1176:17	1165:8		1049:11
LLC 1004:24	1176:20	majority 1028:10	Mantle
1005:13	1202:22	1028:10	1169:16
1007:14	1204:2 1215:9,10,25	1061:21	manual
1008:13	1215:3,10,25	manage	1081:11,12,1
LLP 1006:5	1258:4	1096:14,23	3
1007:6,10	lots 1112:25	1110:14	March 1023:7
1008:9	1205:1	1179:6	1036:21
load	Louis 1008:14	managed	1037:2 1092:1
1061:8,22,23 1062:10	1012:2	1015:6	1157:12
	1074:2,21,23	1179:5 1230:5	1188:22
Locals 1007:20	,25		Maria 1239:17
	low 1062:1	management	MARK 1005:22
location 1176:15	1142:7	1014:14,17,2 5	1006:1
	1197:9 1226:7,9	1015:11,14,2	marked 1011:6
locking 1205:18	,	0,23	1019:21
	lower 1062:2 1186:15	1016:1,3	1020:7
log 1176:24 1178:5		1051:9 1068:10	1054:6,16
	LUMLEY 1005:10	1096:10	1059:10
long 1013:21 1021:8		1112:5,10,21	1161:15,21,2 5 1168:11,13
1021.8	lunch 1139:4,5,14	1156:11	1181:16
1108:17	1139.4,3,14	1170:16	1210:10,12,1
1138:14		1171:7 1184:4	8 1261:Í
1154:5	Madison	1185:4,12,13	market
1155:12 1192:17	1006:19	,15,20	1060:8,21,23
1205:16	1009:6,10	1186:3,12,15	1061:1,2
1220:20	magnitude	1187:4	1062:6
1233:11	1158:18	1190:22,23 1207:3	1067:6,9 1076:20
1247:1	1232:19	1207:5	1077:13
longer	Maiman	13,16,19,22,	1099:22
1087:20	1114:24,25	24 1209:2	1108:16
1088:9,20	1115:6	1216:10	1125:13 1152:11
1237:12,13,2 1	1150:17,19,2 1,24 1151:4	1246:6,18	1201:24
long torm	1,24 II)I.4	management's	markings

main 1007:7 1010:25

long-term 1086:25

management's
 1064:15

manager

markings 1180:5

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-2	2011
Marshall 1185:3 master	1122:17 1123:6 1126:24	1177:10 MCNEILL 1008:1	1076:1,10,13 ,17 1098:20 1106:21
1094:20 1095:1,5	1127:6 1134:18 1142:16	mean 1013:20 1017:13,16	meeting 1023:10,16,1
material 1026:17 1193:2	1154:17 1155:1,3	1045:8 1049:14 1078:23	8 1025:18 1032:23 1033:1,4,6
1201:20 1228:1	1157:21 1162:12 1167:19	1081:19,20 1086:14	1040:3 1042:11,15,1 7,23 1043:14
materialized 1172:17	1169:9 1173:16 1175:5	1091:2 1096:14 1101:6	1049:6 1050:4,25
materials 1140:21	1179:11 1182:17	1106:15 1107:5 1116:19	1051:4,7 1052:1,2,11 1054:1
math 1198:22 1199:2 matrix	1184:9 1185:16 1192:3,5	1118:2 1145:16,17,2	1060:3 1092:18 1093:12
1183:17 matter	1210:9,11,14 ,15 1254:1	5 1160:20 1173:16 1187:2	1097:20 1098:16
1004:11,15 1097:11,22 1124:16 1259:8,9,14	maybe 1020:5 1061:11 1064:7 1065:14	1212:3,4,9 1220:23 1227:6 1231:23	1102:11 1122:20,25 1123:5,8,10, 11,15,16,21
matters 1016:5 1018:21	1086:5 1123:9 1131:24 1137:11	1235:15,17,2 0 1245:16 1246:12	1124:2,5 1136:10,12,1 3,16 1146:19,25
1209:15,18,2 2,25	1142:3 1178:5 1220:18	meaning 1122:10 1244:10	1147:3,7,10 1150:10 1161:9
maturation 1200:3,8,15, 22	1236:18 1236:18 MBA 1014:18	means 1077:17 1080:14	1168:7,20 1169:3,5,10,
1202:9,12,21 matured 1200:25	Mc 1012:23 1040:4,14	1122:9 1160:21 meant 1024:21	11,12 1241:19 meetings
maturity 1199:23	1098:23 1150:8,10 McCarty	1096:22,23 1109:17,18	1024:7 1049:5 1050:23,24
may 1012:2,3,7	1007:11 MCCLOWERY	1134:25 1145:14 1146:5	1051:5 1092:12
1027:23 1030:2 1034:21	1009:5 McCoy 1079:25	1148:8 1151:18 1215:7	1093:4,5 1102:18 1122:21
1042:12 1044:22 1063:24	1080:1,5 McCoy's 1080:2,3,16	1231:1,2,3 measured	1148:20 1159:17 1161:10
1067:3 1081:1,2,5,8 1093:12	McDonnell 1052:4,6	1122:3 mechanical 1100:9,13	1168:3 1170:12 1227:11,16
1101:16 1103:10	1075:20 1137:2 1142:19	1190:16 meet 1033:13	1228:19,20,2 4 1229:15,16
1105:17 1108:8 1111:24	1177:2,14 1191:4 1233:25	1060:15,16 1061:5,21 1062:13,18	1242:17,18 1252:1 megawatt
1112:7 1113:15 1117:17	1234:3,12,19 McDonnell's	1063:1,16 1075:23	1077:9 megawatts

	PENILART HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1077:12	merge	1088:2	1198:6,7,9
MEGHAN 1009:5	1221:17,25	MIEC 1008:11	1199:12
Melissa	merged	Mike 1169:18	1205:3,5 1249:11
1218:16	1214:24	mileage	1260:4,8,12
1219:17	merger	1040:4,6,13	Mills's
1220:5	1214:19,21	1082:11,12	1102:22
member 1050:4	1215:1 1221:15,18	1167:7	mind
1111:19	1222:3,4,22,	1176:13,18,2	1025:11,21
1189:2 1213:5	24	3 1177:11,20,2	1160:22
1236:5	mergers	3	1175:17
1237:4,6,9,1	1215:11,25	miles 1177:21	1196:17
3,18,21	1216:1		1203:11,22 1219:25
1238:4,8	merging	<pre>milestone 1053:20</pre>	1222:2
1239:11,14,2 2	1215:6	1162:19	1231:9
	merit 1175:7	1163:4	mind-set
members 1026:4	met 1040:5	milestones	1096:20
1033:3	1119:25	1075:23	mini 1024:10
1204:14	1120:1	1076:2,3	minimum
1207:5	1165:1	million	1029:8
1236:13	metallurgical	1028:25	minute
1238:24	1242:11	1067:4	1207:24
membership	Metcalf	1114:8,9,10 1115:14,15,2	minutes
1188:13 1236:15	1008:9	2 1116:2,4,7	1120:8
1238:12	method	1117:3	1152:25
memo 1028:13	1098:14	1118:2	missed
	methods	1141:13	1122:17
memorialized 1086:19	1099:10,13	1142:3,7,8,1 0 1149:15,17	Missouri
	metrics	1151:17	1004:2,8,15
memorize 1077:23	1156:19	1163:14	1005:17,21
	Meyer	1170:21	1006:7
memory 1033:20	1026:2,3,4	1171:14	1007:24 1008:7,15
1064:8	1065:22 1097:6	1196:8 1197:13	1009:8
1147:6	1134:18,19	1198:14,23,2	1011:1
1238:18	1148:1,4,11	4,25	1017:20
mention	1199:19	1203:3,9	1023:11
1022:4	1234:20,25	1217:16	1048:22 1065:4,5
	1235:1,5,9	1232:4,11,13 ,21,25	1095:12
1230:11	Meyer's	1233:2	1111:1,10
mentioned 1016:12	1135:18,21 1200:4,18	millions	1144:16
1024:12	1234:25	1197:10	1154:23 1155:3,6,7
1110:20	MICHAEL	mills 1009:9	1158:9
1122:5	1006:5	1012:13,14,1	1159:1,18,19
1185:14	1007:18	7,19	,23
1228:19 1232:8,18	microphone	1014:6,7	1160:4,6,17
1233:5	1258:6	1054:4,7,11 1059:2,13,24	1161:6 1172:25
1242:17	middle	1039:2,13,24	1176:17
1243:3	1095:18	1081:24	1216:5,13,16
merely	1238:7	1143:13,15	1218:3
1059:11	mid-summer	1147:18,19	1219:5,13,22
L	1076:11	1171:2	1221:14,16

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1259:2	1177:16 1241:20	1230:23	1124:23 1227:24
misspoke 1169:9	1242:19	multiple 1100:17	1240:11
misspoken	1251:25	1200:10	necessary
1215:3	months	1204:7	1029:2
mistake	1035:14	1231:7	1076:5
	1036:21	1247:10,12	1112:3
1013:24 1014:2	1037:5 1040:2	multi-prime	1240:9
mistaken	1096:17	1099:10	necessity
1179:12	1146:6	1153:12	1059:14
mitigate	1155:14,16	Murphy	1114:11
	1233:13	1087:9,10	negotiated
1102:14	Montrose	1189:11,12,1 4 1190:18,22	1051:18
mitigated	1231:13	1243:17	negotiating
1172:18	1232:19,23,2	1244:21	1077:25
Mitsubishi	4	1245:1,7,9	1095:23
1163:1	Morano	1246:3,16,21	1109:13
MITTEN 1006:9	1038:25	,25	1159:16
	1039:1,3,4,1	1247:4,8,15	negotiation
mixed 1166:8 MJMEUC 1005:4	2	Murphy's	1131:14 1156:23
мо	moratorium 1156:20	1244:21 1245:12	1252:7
1005:3,8,12,	morning	muted 1074:22	negotiations
16,20,23	1010:1		1059:4,9
1006:2,6,12,	1012:6	Mutual 1143:5	1077:4
	1014:11,12	myself	1078:2
1007:3,7,11,	1075:4	1016:17	neighborhood
23 1008:6,14	1090:9,10,11	1077:25	1232:13
1009:7,11	1120:8,9,10	1090:24	Neilsen
moment 1010:5	1161:12	1148:25	
1045:9	1258:22	1168:22	1206:3,5
1054:3,19		1186:5	1207:9
1069:15	morphed	1202:18	Neilsen's
1168:16	1134:3	1216:23	1206:22
1193:3 1223:3	Morris 1066:5	1247:8	1207:4 neither
1230:9	Morrison	N	1112:22
1248:17	1007:10		1259:12
1254:4,5	motion 1059:22	narrative 1102:1	net 1052:17
Monday	mouth 1215:3	narrowly	Newman
1258:21		1081:7	1005:22
money 1153:6,9	move 1010:6 1011:20	NATHAN 1009:1	1006:1
1172:20	1014:1	nation	Newport
Monroe	1036:8	1159:25	1252:17
1005:23	1053:4	natural	News 1245:16
1006:2	1109:12	1008:7	nexus 1174:11
month 1023:6	1111:12 1154:14,24	1139:4	Nielsen
1044:9,14	1163:15	nature	1068:24
1204:13	1169:21	1014:21	1069:1
1241:18	moved	1167:7	night 1010:3
1242:3	1241:20,24	nearly 1145:4	1077:23
monthly 1103:4,5,9	MRA 1182:13	necessarily	1258:15
1167:13	multi-million	1063:10	nights

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1155:25 1157:6 1229:8 nobody 1014:1	1069:17 1127:13 1223:4 1254:6	1246:8 objected 1032:10 1034:9 1041:10	1175:17 1176:16 1206:11 1220:24 1240:5
nominal 1029:21,23,2 4 1030:1,2,3,6	notes 1020:5 nothing 1022:4 1028:18	1041:10 objection 1010:10,12 1032:21	occasionally 1012:2 occur 1061:9
,7,10,11,15, 25 1031:8,13,14	1036:24 1044:24 1045:11,14	1033:16,22,2 3,25 1034:12 1054:19	occurred 1106:23 1109:6
non 1062:4 1117:12 non-boiler	1059:17 1098:1 1104:14 1153:19	1081:9,15 1180:13,14 1183:1 1219:6	1123:21 1132:13 1166:24
1140:20,21 non-CEP 1232:5	1165:23,24 1173:17,25 1180:22	1221:1 1249:16 1258:16	1204:4 1242:20 occurring 1059:9
non- competitive 1117:13	1258:21 notice 1080:16 1081:11 12 10	objections 1011:23 1163:18 1160:24	1059:9 1175:18 1200:13 offer 1010:8
none 1011:23 1022:14,16 1094:23 1103:24 1163:18 1169:24	1081:1,12,19 ,22,25 1082:3 1163:7 1188:20 notified	1169:24 1179:21 1182:12,13 1183:2 1211:8 1219:8 1249:15	1025:12 1053:2 1092:22 1180:12 1182:8,10 1211:5
1179:21 1182:15 1184:9 1196:19	1035:12 November 1051:17 1053:9	objective 1165:14,15 objects	offered 1010:12 1019:15,16 1020:4
non-legal 1038:7	1126:9 NP 1011:6,21,22	1033:25 obligates 1165:25	1020:4 1029:11,14,1 6 1030:9 1082:3
Non- Proprietary 1261:4,8	,24 1182:11 1183:4	obscures 1173:6	1163:17 1169:23 1179:17,21,2
non- responsive 1220:13	nuclear 1229:22 numeral	observation 1067:13 obtain	4 1182:12 1183:6 1211:7
non-trivial 1141:21 nor 1034:16	1133:2 0	1034:23 1149:18 1218:2	office 1007:14 1009:9,12
1259:13,16 normal	oath 1010:5 1075:10 1180:21	1248:4 obtained	1012:2 officer
1025:23 1099:8 1201:12 1229:1,2,3	object 1032:2 1035:20 1044:22	1159:8 1174:7 obtaining 1217:25	1015:5 1111:20 1112:18 1184:5
normally 1093:24 North 1005:3	1045:10 1080:21 1081:4	obviously 1043:18 1048:18	1185:23 1210:6,7 1211:15,17,2
NOS 1183:4	1171:2 1173:12 1215:12	1062:15 1078:1	0 1212:12,18 1217:2 1259:7
NOTE 1045:24 1054:20	1218:21	1080:22 1159:7	officers

EVII	DENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1113:6	1105:6,10,13	1083:23,25	1217:3,13
1186:17	,16,24	old 1035:25	1218:4
official	1107:22 1109:12	Olympics	1219:5,13,22 1221:15,17
1081:1,12	1115:8,13,23	1030:17	1222:25
officially	1116:6	omissions	opinion
1238:10 1240:6	1117:15	1013:20,21	1037:12
	1121:19,23 1124:8,25	ones 1094:23	1069:3
off-system 1060:22,23	1125:10	1101:6,8	1094:9
	1126:3,22	1119:4	1135:21 1171:6,10
off-systems 1060:21	1131:10,17	1153:18 1253:2	
	1132:1		opportunities 1102:4
off-the- record	1133:10,14 1135:16	ongoing 1093:4	_
1139:12	1136:1,14,19	1127:9	opportunity 1062:3
oh 1020:1	1137:4	1159:13	1076:10
1023:6	1138:3	1160:24	1080:23,24
1060:20	1140:16 1141:15	online	1091:23
1065:16	1142:6	1060:24,25	1204:9
1120:11 1134:24	1143:10,24	1077:9	opposed
1135:23	1144:4,8,13	onsite 1088:5	1144:15 1227:18
1136:1	1145:17 1146:3	1092:8,11,14 1138:19	1235:18
1138:16	1140.3	1167:12,23	option
okay	1148:10	1246:18	1051:18
1013:5,10,23	1149:6	Ontario	1077:10
1014:5 1016:14	1151:8 1153:4	1245:21	1099:25
1018:12	1155:4	1246:4,16,21	options
1019:10,20	1164:19	OPC 1154:15	1051:18 1052:4,8
1020:10,15	1165:11	open 1154:13	
1021:10 1022:8		opened	order 1012:21 1013:1,12
1023:4	1175:13 1184:7,10,13	1154:17,20	1053:5,19
1025:10	1185:4	operating	1076:5
1026:16	1186:8,23	1158:14	1081:15
1029:10 1030:1		1184:5	1098:17,20 1106:2
1036:2	1188:5,9,20 1189:7,11,16	1210:6,7 1211:15	1107:18
1042:1	,25	1212:18,23	1110:22
1053:11,16	1190:4,11,21	1214:10,12	1117:4
1054:10	1191:3,11	1217:12	1135:2,6
1062:22 1066:13,14	1192:6,12 1196:23	operation	1154:14 1155:1
1067:15	1198:2	1216:4	1157:24
1068:7,18	1199:16	operational	1158:1
1069:9	1200:14	1183:18 1184:19	1166:3
1075:15 1078:15	1201:15,21		1221:10 1232:19
1079:7	1202:5 1203:2	operationally 1189:7	1249:17
1082:25	1248:13,16	1215:10,24	ordered
1083:8,23	1249:17	operations	1095:6
1085:3,9,14 1089:18	1253:19	1004:16	1119:12
1093:8,14	O'Keefe	1185:2	1157:19
1098:10	1005:11	1212:19 1216:5,13,14	orders
1103:10 1104:21	Okizaki 1065:21	,16	1089:13,15,1 8 1105:23
1104.21	1 1003.21	,	0 1103.23

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1106:8	1236:23	1027:19	,16,19,24
1149:7		1027.19	,10,19,24 1241.6 10 15
	otherwise		1241:6,10,15
1178:4,5	1259:16	1061:11	,18 1242:15
1201:22	0++ 1000.2	1137:21	1243:13
org 1212:5	Ott 1009:2	1138:4	1247:18
-	1010:8	overall	1249:23
organization	1012:11,12	1018:24	1250:1,10,14
1188:7	1014:8,10	1174:10	,20,21
1189:5	1019:20,24	-	1251:8,17,21
1211:2	1020:1,9	overhauled	owners 1160:5
1212:1,21,22	1024:25	1246:17	1191:4,6
,23	1025:4,5	overhauling	1234:3
1213:4,22	1036:2,3,12,	1246:6	
1235:3	14,15		owner's
1240:15,17,2	1045:1,2,17,	Overland	1052:6
2,23	19 1048:3	1008:10	1142:7
1241:3,7	1059:25	1177:20	1197:8
1242:1	1060:2	overrule	ownership
1243:14,15,2	1074:11,14,1	1036:14	1217:23
0	9 1075:10,12	1045:9,22	1217:25
1244:8,10,12	1076:25	1045:5,22	1219:4,15
.19.21.22	1077:2	1215:21	1219:4,15
,19,21,22 1245:22	1078:22	1246:11	owners's
1247:11,15	1079:3,6,8,9		1141:3
1250:25	1080:15,19	Overruled	
1251:6	1081:7,10	1222:11	
	1082:4	overrun	P
organizationa	1090:4,5,13	1202:19	P.C 1006:19
T 1210:24	1093:16		P.O 1006:11
1212:7,8	1095:15	overruns	1007:2,23
1261:18	1098:11	1022:18	1008:5
organizations	1099:9	1027:9	1009:6,10
1212:20	1126:14	1066:15,25	
1216:10	1147:20,22	1083:2	PA 1007:18
1221:25	1153:19,20	1096:16	packages
1231:14	1172:2	1109:18	1096:7
1250:23	1177:4	1122:3	1100:10,12,1
1251:18	1179:17	1134:12,17	4,23 1152:16
	1180:12	1152:23	Packer 1153:6
organized	1260:4,5,8	1175:2	
1192:15		1203:22,24	page 1020:18
original	ought 1044:23	oversaw	1037:25
1116:14	1059:13	1217:6	1038:15
1135:5	1258:10		1053:13
1155:18	outage	oversight	1054:16
1156:17	1233:10,11	1111:19	1065:9,16
1169:10,12		1112:17,20	1066:13,16
1199:21	outages	1113:5,12	1068:6,14
1201:17	1232:2	1116:17	1069:8
1202:17	outcome	1142:21	1075:13,14
1204:4	1259:17	1185:10,17	1080:3,7
1235:5		1186:24	1081:10
1236:18	outcomes	1187:2,17	1082:5
os 1022:24	1250:1	1227:16	1089:12
	outline	1236:5,9,14	1133:1
others 1100:3	1168:19	1237:7,10,13	1163:7
1108:14	1261:13	,19,22	1185:19
1164:17	output 1242:4	1238:4,9,13,	1187:5
1199:24	-	24 1239:23	1191:3,17,25
1232:18	outside	1240:9,11,12	1192:13,22,2
l	1	<u> </u>	. ,

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
5 1230:9 1235:11	1064:24 1065:1	1160:10,11 1197:24	1062:10 Pebble
page-by-page 1132:6,11	1078:3 1089:3	party 1158:2 1160:15	1252:3,5,8,1 4,22
pages 1045:25 1054:21	1093:10 1094:16 1108:12	passed 1036:25	Pegasus 1066:6
1069:18 1081:2 1083:1	1119:9 1126:5	1059:12 past 1019:4	pending 1048:14
1127:14 1180:6	1133:6 1136:12 1155:10	1045:14,16 1061:19 1077:15	pension 1044:16,18,1
1223:5 1254:7	1162:11 1170:8	1077:15 1084:13 1094:15	9 1045:11,12,1 5 1156:19
paid 1044:5 1067:22	1175:6 1207:7 1234:20	1106:5,6,7 1107:12	people 1074:23
1126:19 1171:10 1252:3,8,13,	1253:3 particularly	1112:6,8,24 1145:1 1233:9	1074:23 1082:15 1102:8
18,19,20 painfully	1029:5 1064:7	patently 1176:16	1111:24 1138:21
1199:22 paper 1155:18	1160:9 1199:19	path 1076:4 1100:16	1148:25 1156:25 1169:5
1196:22 paragraph	1200:10 1205:16	1159:15 1162:23	1187:1,4,13 1188:3,16
1133:1,2,4,6 ,15,17,23	particulars 1168:22 parties	1165:8 patience	1190:17,25 1247:6,8,9,1 4 1251:11,12
1134:3 1157:1	1074:20 1080:24	1179:9 patient	PEP 1019:24 1020:2
paragraphs 1134:4 parallel	1097:14 1102:7,10 1131:20	1012:9 patiently 1077:22	per 1044:5 1177:12
1159:13 pardon 1166:7	1132:4 1133:20	pay 1013:15 1043:10	<pre>perceived 1063:9</pre>
1189:13 Park 1008:10	1137:23 1145:9,13 1146:21,24	1063:16 1138:3	1108:16 percent
1177:20 participate	1147:2 1150:12	1153:6 1176:18 1177:11	1025:24 1066:23 1067:5
1019:6,12,17 1074:2	1155:7 1156:5,15 1157:17,19,2	1252:7 payment	1091:9,10 1097:9,13
participated 1020:24 1157:18	1 1159:6,10,20	1044:7 1045:3	1105:2,6,15, 20 1110:12 1125:2,6,13,
participating 1012:1	,24 1160:24 1161:5,8,9 1163:25	1176:11 payments	22,24 1126:5,7
particular 1012:23	1164:2,8 1165:1	1045:15 PC 1005:22 1006:1	1134:20 1135:18 1151:9
1020:22 1028:17,21	1169:4 1259:13,16	1007:22 peak	1162:22 1170:22,23
1030:2,4,11 1031:6 1034:9	partner 1160:16 1197:23,25	1061:8,9,19, 22,24	1171:1 1202:2 1203:7
1051:1 1052:11 1053:12	partners 1060:17	1062:14,18 1063:3,7,10 peaking	percentage 1066:21,24,2
1033.12	I	μεακτηγ	

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL	DL. 19 01-21-2011
-------------------------	-------------------

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
5	1049:7	plan 1004:14	1231:18
	1113:14	1020:3	1232:7
perfect	1169:20	1048:19	_
1013:19		1060:15	plants
perfectly	person's	1076:20,24	1158:10
1196:3	1081:16	1077:3,6,8,1	1201:20,22
perform	perspective	0 1078:1,6	1202:15
	1200:19	1079:17	1230:25
1039:12		1082:22	1231:10,24,2
1103:20	persuasive	1085:4,10	5
performance	1081:21	1095:23	play 1250:20
1045:14	pertaining	1109:13,14,1	1253:6
performed	1034:1	5 1111:5	nlayed 119714
1017:2,4	1038:22	1131:5,7,8,9	played 1187:4
1037:24	pertains	1132:19	please
1068:4	1045:7	1136:2	1010:18
1109:7		1153:25	1053:18
	Peterson	1154:2,4,7,1	1054:19
perhaps	1005:7	1,25	1068:16
1021:19	phone	1158:6,11,24	1069:16
1088:17	1020:12,24	1159:2,20,21	1107:9
1093:5	1021:4,25	1160:6	1132:22
1119:2	1023:19,22,2	1167:22	1180:23
1120:12	4	1168:19	1181:6
1147:10	1024:1,4,13,	1169:7	1193:4
period	16	1174:8	1199:11
1036:19	1025:2,7,8	1188:23	1204:19
1061:7,15	1090:24	1261:14	1236:13
1076:12	1091:1,2	planned	1248:17
1098:19	1092:18,20	1158:19	1253:20
1109:2	1108:4,7,13,	1163:4	plowed
1132:13	14	1187:22	1035:25
1146:8	phonetic		plowing
1155:21,24	1190:7	plans	1035:25
1156:22	1239:1	1221:15,22,2	
1167:16		3	plus 1044:10
1201:25	phrase 1134:24	plant 1051:20	1110:22
1213:13,25	1134.24	1052:16,18,2	1170:14
1216:20		0 1060:25	1185:5,21
1244:4	physically	1063:8	1229:1
permits	1229:13	1065:7	point 1022:24
1163:3	pick 1155:7	1083:18	1034:7
PERRY 1006:14		1100:8,16,17	1035:9,20
	picking 1108:4,6	,20 1103:12	1036:6
person		1108:22	1039:18
1103:20	pie 1200:3	1109:4,8	1043:6,10
1106:12 1202:15	piece 1109:8	1136:25	1045:24
1202:15	1155:18	1137:10	1054:20
	1196:22	1144:15	1067:15
personal	1201:19	1152:7	1069:17
1033:9	pin 1222:12	1158:18	1091:6,22
1165:15	•	1161:13	1096:17
1197:19	placed	1162:14	1098:5
personally	1022:24	1167:11,14 1173:10	1099:21
1125:4,8	1201:22		1108:7
1150:4	Plains 1210:8	1174:1,3,4 1203:4	1110:6
1202:18	1214:16	1203.4	1114:10,22 1117:8
	1221:13	1230:21	1125:3
personnel	_	1630.61	1123.3

EVIL	PENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1127:13	1197:19	1219:2,21	1042:14,17
1151:6,10	1207:1	1221:14,16	1109:23
1155:15	1214:9	1229:23	1122:14,18
1164:25	1216:8	1230:3,12,21	1132:14,18
	1244:1		
1175:8	1244:1	1233:22	1146:14
1184:9	possibility	1234:13	1207:16
1202:12,24	1101:2	1235:21	1219:1
1203:14		1245:2,4,13	presentation
1206:20	possible	1246:5,21	1051:16
1212:1	1022:9	1248:5	1053:8,12,19
1223:4	1060:16	1253:11,24	1154:11,13
1240:2,5	1061:5	1260:2	1168:19
1254:6	1082:25	practice	1261:13
pointed	1143:2	1075:6	
1032:13	1147:2	1205:15	presented
1148:3,5	1158:15		1052:7
1153:16	possibly	practices	1093:12
1203:2	1042:24	1084:3	1123:18,20
	1045:20	precedes	1124:18
pointing	1204:18	1080:13	1133:18
1024:20		1163:10	1136:11
points	potential		1168:21
1053:15,17	1102:14	precisely	1206:25
	1116:6	1227:7	president
point-to-	1127:6	predeterminat	1184:4
point	1170:13	ion 1158:8	1210:5,7
1074:21,23	potentially		1210:3,7
policy	1127:5	pre-filed	
1018:23	1158:21	1017:21	Presiding
1029:20,25		preliminary	1004:18
1250:8	power 1004:11	1059:4	presumption
	1006:21	1154:10	1059:13
policy-level	1007:2,4,8,1	nnonanation	1067:12
1187:17	2,16 1016:8	preparation	-
portfolio	1027:25	1084:22 1162:6	pretrial
1101:24	1060:25		1011:11
1229:23	1061:1	1164:22	pretty 1114:1
	1062:1,2,4,5	prepare	1139:4
portion	1083:18	1098:17	1146:6
1064:4	1120:22	1230:25	1155:19
	1124:21	1233:23	1156:22
	1126:23	prepared	
1182:25	1131:20	1012:22	prevent
	1132:10	1012.22	1150:10
1218:4,23,25	1133:7,11	1102:6	previous
1219:13	1134:21,22	1102.0	1035:21
1249:13	1135:17	1162:5	1036:1
posed 1253:18	1137:9	1162:5	1082:1
position	1153:14		1107:19,20
1037:18	1158:9	1234:4,6,7,8 ,12,18	1111:14
1068:25	1202:15	,12,10	previously
1112:10	1205:21	1243.14	1107:2
1127:2	1206:2,8,9	prepares	1158:24
1166:16	1210:4,6	1228:5	1217:1
1197:18,20	1211:2	preparing	
1214:10	1213:12,22	1101:22	price
1214:10	1214:20		1026:6,11,12
	1215:18	presence	1060:22
positions	1216:4,17,20	1158:16	1089:5,8
1190:14	1217:17	present	1125:14
L	Į	p	

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1199:23 1201:2,3,10, 13 1205:17	1192:5 1193:3 1195:18	1119:21 1142:7 1197:9	1171:24 1175:14 1249:18
1243:18 prices 1201:18,25	1198:5 1205:5 1210:11,15 1211:7,10	probably 1031:11 1034:21	proceedings 1004:5 1157:15
1202:1 1205:18 Price's 1026:9	1213:17 1215:14,21 1219:8	1053:24 1074:14 1075:2,5 1095:2	process 1021:16 1035:13 1043:15
pricing 1017:17	1220:14,25 1221:6 1222:11 1223:2	1112:9 1114:17 1115:2 1117:7 8 0 1	1091:3,4,7 1096:9,11 1099:12
PRIDGIN 1004:18 1010:1,11,14 ,17 1011:23	1226:1 1246:11 1248:16	1117:7,8,9,1 0 1122:22 1127:10 1133:13	1100:5 1103:8 1106:1,5 1108:3
1012:13,15,1 7 1014:7 1019:24	1249:1,5,9,1 5,17 1253:19 1254:4 1258:1,5,14,	1134:11 1151:2 1155:14 1171:15	1109:20 1111:10 1113:23
1020:3 1025:3 1036:2,14 1045:1,7,17,	20 primarily 1017:23	1184:12 1186:7 1200:4	1119:7 1126:18 1132:2 1133:3
22 1048:1 1054:2,10,18 1059:1,7,19, 25 1069:15	1018:5 1027:20 1048:17,21 1217:10	1203:17 1218:17 1226:7 1227:15	1145:11 1146:13 1154:5,25 1155:2
1074:1,5,9,1 1,15,18 1077:1	primary 1018:2,6 1106:12	1230:18,24 1231:3 1232:4,24 1233:4,9	1165:16 1168:8 1170:8,20
1078:23 1079:7 1080:17 1081:18	1137:7 1154:3 1176:15	1247:7 1249:3 1258:10	1172:25 1173:2 1180:4 1184:1
1082:2 1090:5 1104:17 1120:4,12,24	<pre>principle 1200:24 prior 1081:23 1084:5,7</pre>	problem 1075:5 1097:9 1111:3	1214:8 processes 1035:24
1123:6 1127:11 1132:24	1091:17 1112:2 1121:12	1116:13 problem- plagued	1117:4 1161:4 1250:1
1139:2,13,19 ,21 1143:12 1147:19 1153:20	1152:18 1153:1 1218:8 privilege	1246:7,17 problems 1012:6	processor 1131:22 procure 1099:18
1161:16,19 1163:17 1164:15,19 1168:12	1022:12,14 1041:16,20 1042:8,10	1111:3 1161:12 procedure	procured 1060:10 1137:7
1169:23 1171:3 1179:10,15,2	1094:6,12,17 1165:20 privileges	1080:24 1184:1 proceed	procurement 1015:23 1051:17
0,23 1180:11,14,1 8,25 1182:7,9,11,	1094:4 pro 1163:9 probabilistic	1011:25 1052:8 1059:2 1098:22	1052:4 1088:13 1136:21 1137:4,6
15,17 1183:2,6	1119:24 probability	proceeding 1166:2	1190:6

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1208:19	1048:19,21	1160:23,25	1162:21
produced 1144:1	1051:17 1052:10	1162:13,14,1 7,19,23,24	projects 1015:6,15
product	1053:8 1059:5	1163:3,9 1164:6	1018:19
1117:5	1060:5	1165:3	1022:6
1136:8	1062:17	1167:22,25	1032:6 1052:7
production	1063:4	1170:9, 10, 12	1067:21
1088:18,19	1067:13 1068:2,9	,15,22 1171:9,22,23	1083:16,18
products	1069:11	1172:14,15	1085:11
1204:3	1076:4,14,16	1173:9,25	1099:3 1111:14
professional	1077:9	1179:5,6	1112:2,6,8,2
1016:3,20	1082:8,15,19 1083:12	1183:21,22 1187:10,13	4 1115:1,21
1208:24 1209:2	1083.12 1084:1,5,13,	1188:3,21,22	1118:20
1259:5	15,24 1085:5	1189:3,17,20	1136:3 1138:5
profiles	1086:22	1190:1,5,15,	1144:6,24
1138:13	1087:4,11	16,23	1145:1,5
profit	1088:5,6,13, 24 1090:18	1191:5,6,8 1196:7	1154:15
1062:6,7	1092:8	1197:24	1156:12
programs	1096:12,15,1	1198:12,19	1163:6 1187:8,9,11,
1156:11	8 1097:8	1200:7,11,13	22,25
progress	1098:5 1099:17,20	,25 1204:12,25	1188:25
1097:6	1100:1	1205:22	1189:6,9
1200:7	1102:2	1206:1,3	1205:11,16 1209:7
1243:6,7,9,1 0	1103:7,17	1207:7	1230:13,16,2
	1104:3	1208:1,4,7,1	0,22 1231:13
progressed 1035:8	1106:18,23 1107:20	0,13,16,19,2 2,24 1209:1	1232:9,11,20
1063:5,8	1107:20	1210:2	1233:1
1112:6	1109:1	1213:13	1240:7 1243:8
1114:13	1110:6,14	1214:1	1244:15
1200:11 1241:19	1111:5,15 1112:4,12,17	1216:19 1226:4,14,17	1245:17,19
	,20 1113:15	,20,23	Project's
<pre>progressing 1088:6</pre>	1114:8,13,14	1227:1,6,19,	1191:21
1091:13	1118:2,6,8,1	21,22,24	1192:9
1092:24	1,16,18,22 1119:5,7,9	1232:10,14 1233:3,5,7,1	proper
1100:16	1121:22	4,24	1094:12 1171:7
progression	1123:2	1234:13,19	
1100:24	1124:19	1235:24	proportion 1219:4
project	1125:21 1126:4	1236:1,3 1240:3,6,17	
1013:19,22	1126:4	1240:3,6,17	proposal 1051:12
1014:13,16,2 2,25	1137:10,22	1243:16	1052:13,22
1015:1,2,3,6	1138:14	1244:20,23,2	1053:2
,10,13,20,23	1141:9,25	4	1107:6
1016:1,3	1142:13,23 1143:18	1245:5,11,15 ,21,23	1162:25
1019:7			proposes

1310 TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC 573.886.8942 www.tigercr.com

1144:19

1151:15

1146:9

1020:3

1022:9

1027:11

1028:25 1038:16

1039:5

1148:16,22

1153:11,18

1158:17,18

1246:4,16 1247:20,22,2

3 1251:12,16

projected

1102:3

1105:11

proposes 1175:16 1176:4,5

proposing 1176:12

protect

1113:161159:191178:41144:2prove 1085:231160:31178:41144:2provideprovisions1183:231184:11184:7,231031:241160:51239:171186:21033:13,171197:11241:221237:251033:13,171197:11241:221092:121040:181016:9purpose1092:121041:3,131017:61138:181102:1,25112:191027:81097:241166:6,7,111160:241097:81183:121163:13,231177:131031:5,16,2purpose1148:18,20107:641167:91187:81163:13,231177:131103:15,16,2pursue1166:24provided1167:91187:81163:13,23103:25prudent1034:151032:15103:215prudent1136:201022:10103:215prudent1139:201022:10103:215pudent1139:221033:81115:211035:7,12,211139:201022:101036:171035:161139:221033:241144:191005:161139:221033:241144:191007:141100:211003:241144:191007:171033:141100:211036:171031:141139:221033:241144:191007:171038:141139:221036:171038:161139:221033:241144:191007:171038:141139:22108:16 <th< th=""><th></th><th>PENILARY HEARING</th><th>VOL. 19 01-21-</th><th>2011</th></th<>		PENILARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	1113.16	1159.19	1178.4	1144.2
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	prove 1085:23			1164:3
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	provide			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1030:13	1156:2,10,13		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1031:24			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		1197:1		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		prudence	1243:7	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			purpose	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			1137:25	1093:4,5
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				1102:1,25
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			1187:8	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			pursue	1164:13,16,2
provided 1018:22 1027:9,10 1030:16 1028:241167:9 1172:11,12 prudency 1028:241077:14 pushed 1246:18 pushing 1246:51108:2 queries 143:7 query 1143:8 query 1143:8 query 1143:8 query 1143:81032:15 1036:17 1038:4 1038:4 1041:7,23 1041:7,23 1041:7,23 1041:7,23 1165:1 1115:21 11265:13 1115:21 11265:13 1117:17 1144:20 1144:20 1146:21,24 1146:21,24 1165:2,3 1161:5 1161:5 1161:5 1161:5 1161:5 1161:5 1161:5 1161:5 1177:241077:14 11110 11245:12 1009:5,8,9,1 1007:20 1009:5,8,9,1 1107:20 1161:5 1017:20 1164:2,7,14 1164:21,24 1165:2,3 1178:9,10,14 1177:23 1177:24 1177:23 1177:3 1177:3 1176:14 1177:25 1177:3 1177:3 1177:3 1176:14 1177:25 1177:3 1177:3 1177:3 1177:3 1177:3 1177:3 1177:3 1177:3 1177:14 11111122:7,8 1016:9 1029:23 1029:23 1029:23 1021:16 1029:24 1021:18 1016:17 1020:23,24 1021:18 1016:17 1021:18 1016:17 1021:18 1021:18 1021:18 1021:18 1021:181077:14 1022:10 1022:10 1021:18 1023:11 1023:12 1023:12 1023:14,15 1023:14,15 1023:14,15 1023:14,15 1023:14,15 1023:14,15 1023:14,15 1023:14,15 1023:14,15 1023:24 1021:18 1021:18 1021:18 1021:18 1021:18 1021:18 1021:18 1021:18 1116:10 1021:18 1116:10 1122:24 1021:18 1116:10 1122:24 1021:1811077:14 1102:10 1126:10 1126:10 1126:10 1126:10 1126:10 1126:10 1126:10				
provided 1018:22 1172:11,12 prudency pushed 1246:18 queries 1143:7 1030:16 1028:24 pushing 1246:5 query 1143:8 1032:15 prudent 1013:7,12,21 pushing 1246:5 query 1143:8 1036:17 1018:18 putting 1077:14 10122:10 1089:15 1085:16 1139:22 1022:3 1117:17 1009:5, 8, 9, 11 1109:10 1037:4 1144:220 public 1004:1 1199:10 1037:10 1144:220 1009:5, 8, 9, 11 1201:10 1041:1 1144:220 public 1004:1 1201:10 1041:1 1144:29 1009:5, 8, 9, 12 1043:6 1144:19 1017:20 Q Q 1161:5 1023:11 1245:12 1065:6 1177:3 1081:14 1065:16 1079:8 1177:23 1154:9,16 qualifies 1079:8 1177:23 1249:5,9,10,14 1195:12 1085:16 1191:7 1249:5,9,10,14 11028:12 1085:16 1216:3 p	,			1168:2
1027:9,10 prudency 1246:18 1143:7 1030:16 1028:24 pushing query 1143:8 1032:15 prudent 1246:5 query 1143:8 1036:17 1013:7,12,21 pushing 1022:10 1038:4 1076:21 11022:1 1024:23,25 1041:7,23 1077:14 1110:21 1029:12 1085:16 1139:22 1030:8 1024:23,25 1117:17 1205:13 1139:22 1033:24 1144:20 public 1004:1 1199:10 1037:10 1144:19 107:20 1041:1 1043:6 1144:19 107:20 1043:6 1043:6 1146:2,7,14 1048:1 1065:6 1079:8 116:5 1029:1,6,11, 1245:12 1065:6 1177:7,24 1059:1,6,11, 1245:12 1065:6 1177:9,10,14 1195:18 1080:14 1081:22 1078:18 18 10110:19 1079:8 1032:10 pulled 1075:17 1133:16				queries
1027.9.10prudenty1170.101032:15prudent1028:241034:151013:7,12,211036:171013:7,12,211038:41076:211041:7,231077:141089:151085:161115:211205:131114:220public 1004:11146:21,241009:5,8,9,11146:21,241009:5,8,9,11146:2,7,141029:1,8,111161:51023:111164:51039:1,6,11,1165:2,31059:1,6,11,1177:231154:9,161177:231154:9,161177:231154:9,161177:231154:9,161177:231154:9,161177:231249:5,9,10,1177:231249:5,9,10,1199:71249:5,9,10,1191:71249:5,9,10,1191:71249:5,9,10,1192:71097:171032:10pulled1037:710097:171037:710097:171037:710097:171037:710097:171037:71007:16,171133:14,151174:16,181103:61153:14,151041:11116:101133:14,151174:16,181103:61153:14,151041:111107:221041:111107:221041:111107:221041:111107:16,171132:101177:9,25104:121177:9,25104:131107:16,171122:101177:19				
1032:15 prudent 1246:5 question 1034:15 1013:7,12,21 1018:18 puts 1199:20 1022:20 1038:4 1076:21 1110:21 1025:3 1022:12 1089:15 1085:16 1136:9 1033:24 1029:12 1117:17 1205:13 1199:10 1037:10 1041:1 1142:20 public 1004:1 11201:10 1041:1 1043:6 1142:20 public 1004:1 1201:10 1041:1 1043:6 1144:27 public 1004:1 1201:10 1041:1 1043:6 1144:19 1077:20 0 1049:9 1043:6 1161:5 1023:11 gualification 1065:6 1049:9 1164:2,7,14 1048:1 1245:12 1078:3,25 1079:8 1173:7,24 14,15 1075:7 qualifies 1079:8 1079:8 1177:23 1154:9,16 1108:14 1088:12 1078:3,25 1199:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1088:3			1246:18	
1032:15 prudent 1246:5 question 1034:15 1013:7,12,21 puts 1199:20 1022:10 1038:4 1076:21 1110:21 1029:12 1041:7,23 1077:14 1110:21 1029:12 1115:21 1205:13 1139:22 1033:24 1117:17 public 1004:1 1139:22 1033:24 1142:20 public 1004:1 1201:10 1041:1 1446:21,24 1009:5,8,9,1 1201:10 1041:1 1446:22,7,14 1048:1 1205:13 1044:6 1161:5 1023:11 1205:16 1049:9 1164:2,7,14 1048:1 1245:12 1078:3,25 1177:724 1045:14 1065:6 1079:8 1177:73 1154:9,16 1016:9 1083:3 1177:23 1154:9,16 1015:20 1078:3,25 1199:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1196:18 18 qualify 1083:3 1032:10 pulled 1208:16 1131		1028:24	pushing	query 1143:8
1034:13 1036:17 1038:4 1013:7,12,21 1018:18 1076:21 puts 1199:20 putting 1110:21 1022:10 1024:23,25 1041:7,23 1077:14 1110:21 1029:12 1089:15 1085:16 1139:22 1030:8 1117:17 public 1004:1 1139:22 1033:24 1142:20 public 1004:1 1201:10 1041:1 1146:21,24 1009:5,8,9,1 1041:1 1043:6 1161:5 1023:11 gualification s 1108:11 1062:12 1165:2,3 1059:1,6,11, 1173:7,24 1245:12 1065:6 1178:9,10,14 1195:18 1016:9 1083:3 1178:9,10,14 1192:7,8 1015:20 1077:6,17,2 1191:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1032:10 pulled 1075:17 1118:1 provides pulling 1099:23 1016:17 11208:16 1032:10 pulling 1097:17 1016:17 1122:2,4 1041:11 1105:14,15 1200:23,24 1174:16,18 1041:22 1097:17		prudent		question
1038:1/ 1018:18 putting 1024:23,25 1041:7,23 1077:14 110:21 1029:12 1089:15 1075:13 1136:9 1033:24 1117:17 1205:13 1139:22 1033:24 1142:20 public 1004:1 1201:10 1037:10 1142:20 public 1004:1 1201:10 1041:1 1146:21,24 10075:6,8,9,1 1201:10 1041:1 1146:2,7,14 10075:7 1043:6 1049:9 1161:5 1023:11 1245:12 1065:6 1173:7,24 14,15 1075:7 1043:6 1078:3,25 1175:3 1081:14 1080:14 1062:12 1177:23 1154:9,16 1021:10 1062:12 1177:23 1154:9,16 1017:16,17,2 1078:3 1191:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1191:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1032:10 pulled 1075:17 1116:10 1032:10 pulling 1016:17			$n_{1} + c_{1} = 1100 \cdot 20$	
1038:4 1041:7,23 1076:21 1077:14 putting 1110:21 1025:3 1009:12 1089:15 1085:16 1136:9 1030:8 1117:17 1205:13 1139:22 1033:24 1142:20 public 1004:1 1199:10 1037:10 1144:20 public 1004:1 1201:10 1041:1 1144:20 public 1004:1 1201:10 1041:1 1144:19 1077:20 qualification 1050:5,7 1161:5 1023:11 qualifies 1062:12 1177:7,24 1043:1 1062:12 1043:6 1177:23 1154:9,16 1079:8 1079:8 1177:23 1154:9,16 1080:14 1081:22 1178:9,10,14 1195:18 1016:19 1085:8 1191:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1007:16,17,2 1196:18 18 quality 1106:19 1085:8 1032:10 pulled 1208:16 1131:16 1032:10 pulling 1016:17 1152:10 1040:22 pullman		1018:18	•	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				
1111/:1/ public 1004:1 1199:10 1037:10 1142:20 1009:5,8,9,1 1201:10 1041:1 1146:21,24 1009:5,8,9,1 2 1041:1 1147:2,5,9 1017:20 qualification 1050:5,7 1161:5 1023:11 qualifies 1050:5,7 1165:2,3 1059:1,6,11, 1245:12 1065:6 1173:7,24 14,15 1075:7 qualifies 1079:8 1177:23 1154:9,16 qualify 1083:3 1178:9,10,14 1195:18 1016:9 1085:8 1191:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1196:18 18 qualify 1035:20 1116:10 provides pull 1122:7,8 1015:20 1116:10 1131:16 providing 1099:23 quantify 1131:16 1131:16 1040:22 pullman 1200:23,24 1172:2,4 1174:16,18 1041:11 1153:14,15 quarter 1174:16,18 1177:9,25 1036 pullman 1200:23,24 1177:9,25 1021:18 1177:9,25				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			1201:10	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		1009:5,8,9,1		
1148:19 1017.20 qualification 1050:5,7 1161:5 1023:11 1048:1 1062:12 1164:2,7,14 1048:1 1245:12 1065:6 1173:7,24 14,15 1075:7 qualifies 1078:3,25 1175:3 1081:14 1080:14 1081:22 1177:23 1154:9,16 1080:14 1081:22 1178:9,10,14 1195:18 1016:9 1085:8 1191:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1196:18 18 1015:20 1110:19 provides pull 1122:7,8 1015:20 1116:10 1032:10 pulled 1099:23 1016:17 1116:10 1037:7 1097:17 1016:17 1152:10 1172:2,4 1041:11 Pullman 1153:14,15 quarter 1172:2,4 1103:6 1153:14,15 quarter 1177:9,25 1118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1172:2,4				
1161:51023.111048:11062:121164:2,7,141059:1,6,11,1245:121065:61175:31048:11245:121065:61175:31081:141245:121078:3,251175:31081:141080:141081:221177:231154:9,161016:91083:31178:9,10,141195:181016:91083:3,151179:61226:11133:161107:16,17,21191:71249:5,9,10,1133:161107:16,17,21196:18181015:201110:19providespulled1099:231075:171032:10pulling1099:231016:171037:71097:171097:171122:2,41041:111153:14,151200:23,241173:191103:61153:14,15quarter1174:16,181118:23pump 1102:221021:181172:2,4				
1164:2,7,14 1048:1 1048:1 1048:1 1165:2,3 1059:1,6,11, 1245:12 1065:6 1173:7,24 14,15 1075:7 qualifies 1078:3,25 1175:3 1081:14 1080:14 1081:22 1177:23 1154:9,16 1080:14 1081:22 1177:23 1154:9,16 1080:14 1081:22 1177:23 1154:9,16 1016:9 1083:3 119:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1196:18 18 1015:20 1110:19 provides pull 1122:7,8 1075:17 1116:10 1205:20 1116:10 1131:16 1131:16 providing 1099:23 quantify 1131:16 1032:10 pulling 1016:17 1151:20 1040:22 1097:17 quantify 1152:10 1040:22 1097:17 quantities 1172:2,4 1103:6 1153:14,15 quarter 1174:16,18 1118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1177:9,25			qualification	
1165:2,3 1039.1,0,11, 1179.11 1078:3,25 1173:7,24 14,15 1075:7 1081:14 1079:8 1175:3 1081:14 1080:14 1080:14 1177:23 1154:9,16 1080:14 1081:22 1178:9,10,14 1195:18 1016:9 1083:3 1191:7 1226:1 1016:9 1085:8 1191:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1107:16,17,2 1196:18 18 1015:20 1116:10 provides pull 1122:7,8 1015:20 1116:10 1032:10 pulled 1099:23 1016:17 1118:1 1040:22 pulling 1097:17 1016:17 1152:10 1041:11 Pullman 1153:14,15 quarter 1174:16,18 1174:16,18 1177:9,25 1021:18 1177:9,25	1164:2,7,14			
1173:7,24 14,15 1075:7 qualifies 1079:8 1175:3 1081:14 1080:14 1081:22 1177:23 1154:9,16 1016:9 1083:3 1178:9,10,14 1195:18 1016:9 1083:3 1191:7 1249:5,9,10, 1133:16 1007:16,17,2 1196:18 18 1015:20 1107:16,17,2 1016:3 1099:23 1015:20 1116:10 1032:10 pulled 1099:23 1016:17 1131:16 1040:22 pullman 1097:17 quantify 1152:10 1041:11 1153:14,15 1020:23,24 1173:19 1103:6 1153:14,15 1021:18 1177:9,25	1165:2,3	1059:1,6,11,	-	
1175:3 1177:23 1178:9,10,14 ,15 1179:61081:14 1154:9,16 1195:18 1226:1 1249:5,9,10, 1196:181080:14 qualify 1016:9 1133:161081:22 1083:3 1085:8 1006:9 1107:16,17,2 3 1108:18provides 1216:3pull 1122:7,8 1032:10 1037:7 1040:22pull 1122:7,8 1097:171015:20 1015:20 1015:20 1016:171108:18 1015:20 1116:10providing 1037:7 1040:22pulling 1153:14,15 pump 1102:221080:14 qualify 1016:171081:22 1083:3 1085:8 1107:16,17,2 3 1108:18 1107:16,17,2 3 1108:181015:20 1015:20 1016:171116:10 1151:20 1116:101037:7 1040:22 1041:11 1103:6 1118:23pulling 1102:221021:18103:6 1118:23pump 1102:221021:18			qualifies	1079.8
1177:231134.9,101178:9,10,141195:181191:71226:11191:71249:5,9,10,1196:1818providespull 1122:7,81216:3pulled1032:101099:231032:10pulling1040:221097:171040:22Pullman1103:61153:14,151118:23pump 1102:221118:23pump 1102:22	1175:3	1081:14	1080:14	
1178:9,10,14 ,15 1179:6 1191:7 1196:181193.18 1226:1 1249:5,9,10, 1249:5,9,10, 181016:9 1133:161085:8 1107:16,17,2 3 1108:18provides 1216:3pull 1122:7,8 1015:20 1015:201015:20 1015:20 1116:101101:19 1118:1provides 1032:10 1037:7 1040:22pull 1122:7,8 1097:171015:20 1097:171116:10 1118:1providing 1037:7 1040:22 1041:11 1103:6 1118:23pulling 1153:14,15 pump 1102:221016:17 quantities 1021:181085:8 1107:16,17,2 1133:16 1133:16 1107:5:17 1116:10	1177:23		aualify	
,151179:61226:11010:91191:71249:5,9,10,1133:161107:16,17,21196:18181015:2011101:9providespull 1122:7,81015:201116:101216:3pulled1208:161131:16providing1099:231016:171151:201032:10pulling1016:171152:101037:71097:171097:171016:171040:22Pullman1153:14,151200:23,241118:23pump 1102:221021:181177:9,25	1178:9,10,14			
1191:7 1249.3,9,10, 1196:18 18 quality 3 1108:18 provides pull 1122:7,8 1015:20 1110:19 1216:3 pulled 1208:16 1118:1 providing 1099:23 quantify 1131:16 1032:10 pulling 1097:17 1016:17 1152:10 1040:22 Pullman 1200:23,24 1173:19 1103:6 1153:14,15 quarter 1174:16,18 1118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1177:9,25	,15 1179:6			
1196:18 18 quarty 110:19 provides pull 1122:7,8 1015:20 1110:19 1216:3 pulled 1208:16 1118:1 providing 1099:23 quantify 1131:16 1032:10 pulling 1097:17 quantify 1151:20 1040:22 Pullman 1200:23,24 1173:19 1103:6 pump 1102:22 quarter 1177:9,25	1191:7			
provides 1216:3pull 1122:7,81013.20 1075:171116:10providing 1032:10 1037:7pulled 1099:231208:161118:1pulling 1037:71099:23quantify 1016:171151:20 1152:101040:22 1041:11 1103:6 1118:23pullman 1153:14,15 pump 1102:221013.20 1075:171116:10 1175:17providing 1099:23pulled 1099:231116:10 1131:16pulling 1040:22pulling 1016:171152:10 1172:2,4pulling 1102:221016:171172:2,4 1200:23,24pump 1102:22pump 1102:221021:18	1196:18	18		
1216:3 pulled 1075:17 1118:1 providing 1099:23 quantify 1131:16 1032:10 pulling 1016:17 1151:20 1040:22 Pullman 1200:23,24 1173:19 1032:6 pump 1102:22 1097:18 1177:9,25	nrovides	bull 1122:7.8		
providing1099:23quantify1131:161032:10pulling1016:171151:201037:71097:171097:1711120:22,41041:11Pullman1200:23,241173:191103:61153:14,15quarter1177:9,251118:23pump 1102:221021:181178:16		• •		
providing pulling quantify 1151:20 1032:10 pulling 1016:17 1152:10 1037:7 1097:17 quantifies 1172:2,4 1041:11 1153:14,15 1200:23,24 1173:19 118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1177:9,25			1208:16	
1032:10 pulling 1016:17 1152:10 1037:7 1097:17 quantities 1172:2,4 1041:11 1153:14,15 1200:23,24 1173:19 1103:6 1153:14,15 quarter 1177:9,25 118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1178:16		т099:53	quantify	
1037:7 1097:17 1097:17 1172:2,4 1041:11 Pullman 1200:23,24 1173:19 1103:6 1153:14,15 quarter 1177:9,25 1118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1178:16		pullina		
1040:22 Pullman 1172.2,4 1041:11 1153:14,15 1200:23,24 1173:19 1103:6 1153:14,15 quarter 1177:9,25 1118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1178:16				
1041:11 1153:14,15 11200:25,24 1174:16,18 1103:6 1153:14,15 quarter 1177:9,25 1118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1178:16				
1103.0 quarter 1177:9,25 1118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1178:16			1200:23,24	
1118:23 pump 1102:22 1021:18 1178:16			quarter	
		pump 1102:22	1021:18	
1210:17 1026:14 1173:10	1210:17			1178:16
	1216:12			
	provision			
1158.9 purchase 1102.2 6 9 1207.17				
1158:8 1149:24 1102:2,6,9 1213:15,18,1	11,0.0	1149:24	,,,,,	1213:13,18,1

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
9 1215:22	1221:2	1095:9	1034:18
1218:18 1219:16,18	1260:5,6,7	1144:15 1150:13	realized 1034:13
1220:12,24	quibbling 1251:20	1156:10,20,2	1034.15
1221:1,5,21 1229:21	quick 1107:22	1 1158:12 1167:3,18	realizes
1242:13	1139:9	rate-making	1012:25
1246:9,10,12 ,13 1248:15	quickly	1156:7	really 1013:5
1251:1	1032:9	ratepayers	1024:6 1044:25
1253:17,18,2	quite 1078:24 1196:2	1013:15 1063:23	1066:4
0 guastianad	quoting	1064:2,21	1097:11 1098:15
<pre>questioned 1118:3</pre>	1080:9	1065:4,5	1102:16
questioning		rates 1043:3 1045:8	1133:10 1134:6
1025:15	<u>R</u> R&Os 1082:6	1062:3,8,14	1136:7
1035:20 1036:8	railcars	1067:15,16,2	1138:6,7,10
1044:22	1149:16,19,2	0,24,25 1068:1,5	1203:20 1238:18
1116:8 1219:7	0.24 1178:17	1117:16	realtime
1241:1	1198:17,20 1199:7,9	rather	1161:11
questions	raise 1180:22	1119:18 1135:21	1259:7
1010:22	raised	1152:13	re-ask 1025:3
1011:10 1012:4,19	1253:15	1233:19	reason 1031:17
1013:4,9	ran 1240:17	rating	1060:3,13,14
1014:6,10 1029:18	range 1232:22	1156:20 1158:16,21	,19,20 1178:20
1040:6	rank 1135:25	RCV'D 1261:1	1205:23,24
1050:1 1090:4,6,8	1213:1	reach 1044:14	reasonable
1093:16,18	ranked 1135:17,20	1053:20	1013:15 1064:15
1098:10 1099:9	rate 1016:8	reached 1109:14	1222:7
1102:9	1017:3,6,9,1	1248:24	reasonablenes
1104:16,20	1,16,17,19,2 1	reaching	s 1036:12
1108:1 1116:19	$\overline{1018}:3,10,15$	1117:7	reasons
1117:12,15	1019:1 1031:19,23	reactor	1060:6 1061:4
1120:7 1139:1,3,15	1034:10,11,1	1229:22 reading	1062:23
1140:3	4,16 1035:21 1036:1	1016:24	1148:17 1178:21
1143:1,15,24 1144:13,19	1039:15	1080:10,12	1185:18
1146:11,20	1045:3,11	1227:25	1205:17,20
1147:22 1153:23	1048:14,16,1 7,22	readjourn 1258:21	reassurance 1059:18
1155.25	1061:2,13,16	ready 1075:10	rebuilding
1165:18	1062:8 1063:24	1139:19	1137:11
1170:2,19 1181:4	1064:5	1195:19	rebuilt
1183:10	1068:4 1079:18,21	real 1044:25 1119:22	1230:13
1195:25 1198:9,11	1079:18,21	1139:9	rebuttal
1205:3,8,10	,14,16,19,22	realistically	1011:3,6 1018:18
1214:14	,25 1085:2 1093:20,25	1119:8	1036:5
1218:21,22	1094:2,10	realize	1064:6,14

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
$\begin{array}{c} 1066:13\\ 1075:14\\ 1082:5\\ 1089:12\\ 1180:5\\ 1181:12,17\\ 1191:19,25\\ 1192:13\\ 1261:7,9\\ \hline recall\\ 1018:14\\ 1019:8\\ 1023:25\\ 1024:17,19\\ 1025:6\\ 1029:6\\ 1032:18\\ 1033:2,3\\ 1040:3,23\\ 1042:20,25\\ 1043:2,5\\ 1060:20\\ 1061:10,17\\ 1063:25\\ 1064:1,3\\ 1091:1,2\\ 1093:1,3\\ 1098:3,10\\ 1101:1\\ 1104:5\\ 1111:22\\ 1114:21\\ 1117:14,18\\ 1126:24\\ 1131:25\\ 1137:14,24\\ \end{array}$	<pre>receipt 1086:4 receipts 1036:20 1037:3,5 1040:2 receive 1240:9 1241:11,15 received 1010:13 1032:6 1033:7 1044:19 1095:2 1115:10 1126:16 1156:13 1163:20 1169:25 1176:5 1180:16 1183:5 1211:11 1217:18 1241:20 receiving 1030:6 1044:16,18 recent 1119:6 1165:4 recently 1099:3 1222:18</pre>	1238:20 recommend 1027:23 1241:9 recommendatio n 1032:19 1033:9 1051:25 1107:3 1175:11,20 1178:4 1241:6 1251:21 1261:15 recommendatio ns 1028:1 1068:20 1206:22 1240:19,24 1241:10,12,1 6 1243:14 1250:11,15 recommended 1068:23 1106:14 1107:12,13 1150:24 1206:5 1207:9 1245:17,18 1247:1 reconciliatio n 1096:6 1152:16	<pre>recover 1152:6 1158:12 recovery 1043:3 Recross 1139:17 recross- examination 1139:16 1140:2 1143:14 1147:21 1260:7,8 redacted 1028:11 1037:8,11 1038:1,23 1041:14,21 1042:2,5,7 redacting 1041:4 redaction 1038:12 Redirect 1153:20,22 1260:9 redo 1202:16 reduce 1061:2 1067:23 reduced 1063:6</pre>
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<pre>1115:10 1126:16 1156:13 1163:20 1169:25 1176:5 1180:16 1183:5 1211:11 1217:18 1241:20 receiving 1030:6 1044:16,18 recent 1119:6 1165:4 recently 1099:3 1222:18 1231:13 1237:23 recess 1074:22 1139:6 recessed 1067:12 recognize 1210:21 recognize 1210:21 recognized 1125:21 recollection 1101:4 1116:5</pre>	<pre>ns 1028:1 1068:20 1206:22 1240:19,24 1241:10,12,1 6 1243:14 1250:11,15 recommended 1068:23 1106:14 1107:12,13 1150:24 1206:5 1207:9 1245:17,18 1247:1 reconciliatio n 1096:6</pre>	1028:11 1037:8,11 1038:1,23 1041:14,21 1042:2,5,7 redacting 1041:4 redaction 1038:12 Redirect 1153:20,22 1260:9 redo 1202:16 reduce 1061:2 1067:23 reduced 1063:6 1259:11 reduction 1067:19 1156:21 1219:3 redundant 1134:11 refer 1053:18 1196:10 1220:5 reference 1051:20 1052:16,18,2 0 1065:15 1144:19 1184:7 1231:20 referenced
1237:13 1242:21,23 1246:19 1252:21	1124:4 1137:12 1147:4 1221:9	1081:23 1227:12 1228:4	1187:11 1233:14 1243:14

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
references 1045:11	1021:11,16,2 2 1022:1	1259:5	1032:20 1040:13
1113:20	1023:17	regular 1031:3	1048:22
referencing	1025:20,24	1241:20	1077:7
1233:2	1026:6,8		1084:15
referral	1076:12 1091:7,12	regulated 1214:7	1104:3 1153:7
1115:10	1093:12	1217:3,10	1165:20
referred	1105:2,4,7,1	regulators	1166:5
1067:3	7,19	1112:22	1176:3,23
1169:3,8	1110:10,11	regulatory	1188:3 1259:12
1201:8	1125:7 1126:1	1004:13,19	
referring	1168:8	1018:8,24	relates 1048:24
1015:1,15 1020:17	1169:10	1048:19	
1020:17	1175:5	1050:23 1060:15	relation
1026:1	1179:1 1235:6	1076:20,23	1030:1 1049:6
1037:9		1077:3,6,8,1	relationship
1040:12,15	reforecasted 1066:23	0 1078:1,5	1049:3
1050:24 1051:21	1179:4	1079:17 1082:22	1050:17,19
1052:2	1200:10	1085:4,6,10,	1087:3
1064:25	reforecasts	12,17,21	1121:25
1121:15	1096:3	1086:1,9,12,	1137:16,18,2 3 1138:4
1123:15	refresh	18 1095:23	1150:18
1143:8 1144:25	1033:20	1109:13 1111:5	1177:23
1162:4	1064:8	1112:11	relationships
1185:8	refurbishment	1131:9	1050:11
1192:20	1232:1	1153:25	1118:6
1207:6 1216:24	refused	1154:2,4,9 1158:6,24	relative
1228:14	1031:24	1159:4,20,21	1214:9 1259:14
1230:17	regard	1160:6	
1231:11,15,2	1206:20 1209:5	1167:22	relatively 1112:4
3 1233:11,25 1236:25	1232:2	1168:19 1169:7	
reflect	regarding	1174:8	release 1053:21
1017:18	1019:7	1197:21	
1067:16,20	1022:1,5,9	1207:16	releasing 1059:16
1149:24	1025:20	1239:16,19 1261:14	relevance
1155:6	1039:25 1040:3,6,20		1033:22,23
1182:2 1211:1	1083:15	reject 1206:21	relevant
1212:7	1098:11	relate	1034:6,8,11,
1227:16,17,1	1099:10 1103:16	1022:16	19 1035:16
8	1103:16	1163:8	1044:23 1045:16
reflected	1117:20	related	1045:16
1173:14 1227:23	1118:1	1015:11,19,2	1215:13,16
1228:1	1126:15,22	3,25	relied
1229:6	1174:17 1178:17	1016:5,8 1018:10,18	1247:14
reflects	1250:11,15	1019:1	relocate
1215:17	regards	1022:17	1176:18
1228:13	1088:4	1024:13	relook
reforecast	Registered	1028:21 1029:9	1125:21
1019:13,19		1025:5	

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	
rely 1240:23	1162:2,3	2 1165:1	required
remaining	1163:13 1164:1,3,24	1167:7 1172:14	1026:22 1039:14,20
1053:21 1064:13	1165:5	1178:10	1039:14,20
1100:6	1166:10	1187:19	1178:6
1164:16	1167:5	1188:3	1197:21
1190:14	1173:9,25 1174:12	1241:18 1242:5	1248:7,20 1250:6
remember	1187:15,25	1243:3	requirement
1018:20 1024:3	1188:23 1261:12	represent	1018:12,16
1025:7,8		1140:12	1061:2 1062:7
1031:1	reported 1004:23	representing	1077:10
1039:19 1040:7,9,17	1087:10	1050:23	requirements
1041:2	1136:13	represents 1148:4	1062:11
1042:11,14	1183:19,22,2 5 1187:22	reputation	requires
1043:7 1093:4	1190:17,25	1247:14	1172:25
1101:19	1212:11,19,2 4 1217:4,7	request	reserve
1126:12,15 1137:19	1244:19	1023:10	1164:10,12
1172:4	Reporter	1024:11 1025:17	resort 1252:24
1177:6	i020:8	1023:17	1253:1
1186:21 1202:18	1161:22 1168:14	1033:8	resource
1229:4	1199:11	1034:1,9 1094:13	1158:11
1238:17	1210:13	1108:10	1174:2 1247:6
1245:22 1247:1	1215:24 1259:1,6,7,2	requested	resources
	0	1019:5,11,15	1008:7
repeat 1213:19	REPORTER S	1021:3 1032:2	1138:9,14
1215:22	1254:6	1036:20	1211:23 1212:25
1246:13 1250:13	REPORTER'S	1039:23	1235:12,14
repeatedly	1045:24 1054:20	1041:16,18 1042:9	respect
1029:18,19	1069:17	1103:8	1081:8
rephrase	1127:13	1156:6 1157:19	1144:14 1145:7
1029:12	1223:4	1176:24	1146:3
1079:8 1173:19	reporting 1004:24	requesting	1187:25
1186:1	1093:9	1126:23	respond
replace	1101:15	1177:13	1023:9 1032:9
1240:1	1183:17 1212:21,23	requests	1220:12
replaced	1243:5,6,20	1028:7 1029:8,22	responded
1189:20,22 1238:24	reports	1032:6,7	1023:5,7,8,2 1 1029:21
1239:3	1082:14,18	1085:23 1093:17,24	1029:21
replacement	1085:16 1086:7	1093:17,24	1166:13
1231:18	1101:18,20	1104:2	responding
report	1103:4,5,6,9	1162:25 1176:20,23	1152:10
1101:23,24,2	1144:1,6,10 1148:18,19	1177:1	response
J1102:1,6,8,9	1149:4	require	1013:3 1022:3
,12 1103:1	1161:7 1163:23	1176:17	1024:5
1148:21,24 1161:11	1164:13,16,2	1249:22	1025:22
1161:11	1104:13,10,2		1028:9

EVIL	DENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	
1029:17	resumes	1136:8	1099:22
1045:18	1074:19	1163:5	1108:16
1059:23	resurfacing	1178:1	1119:13,14,2
1092:4	1063:20,21	1206:3	4 1125:14
1094:13	· · ·	1228:7,11	1172:17
1099:6	retail 1062:5	1234:18,23	1208:22
1144:18	1217:5	reviewed	risks 1069:10
1151:20,21	Retailers	1026:24	1102:4
1152:1	1005:21	1027:6	1170:13
1166:8	retain	1029:3	1172:15,16,1
1213:16	1089:1,7,9	1036:23	8
responses	1116:2	1037:2,4	•
1098:18		1041:19	Robert
	retained	1054:11	1004:20
responsibilit	1234:24	1089:14	1008:16,17
ies 1210:3 1214:11	retainer	1118:9	Roberts
1216:11,18,2	1044:8,14	1125:18	1065:21
	retired	1148:24	1108:8
, v	1048:13,20,2	1149:1	1111:23
responsibilit	1 1050:13	1164:23	1121:18
y 1043:9	1238:5,14,15	1178:8	Roger 1007:1
1113:18	,17 1239:5,9	reviewing	1027:18
1148:22		1028:24	role 1018:6
1212:14	retrofit	1081:9	1048:21,23
1213:11,21	1230:24	1126:18	1049:2,6,8,9
1217:11 1235:23	1231:2	1167:24	1049:2,0,0,9
	retrofits	1170:7	1030:14,20
1240:16,22 1244:14	1230:18	revised	1184:19
	1231:10,16	1119:1	1250:19
responsible	retrospect		
1235:25	1152:10	Reynolds	roles 1087:1 1187:4
1244:7,22	revenue	1088:3,5	
responsive	1018:12,15	RFP 1108:3,19	rolled
1025:1	1061:2	1114:12,18	1116:18
1078:22	1062:7	1117:8	Roman 1133:1
rest 1251:13	1217:18	1171:15	RONALD
restate	review	Rhode 1252:17	1004:18
1041:22	1022:21	rider 1156:6	
1041:22	1026:21		room 1038:3
1085:7	1027:8	Riggins	1043:20
	1029:2	1027:19	1075:1,3,6 1132:3
restrictions	1036:16,18,2	1087:14,16	1155:23
1022:23 1053:1	4 1037:4,6	1092:3 1114:22	1195:22
	1039:7,9	1114.22	Rosa 1008:2
rests 1207:15	1040:2	1117:20	
result	1041:7	1211:19	roughly
1060:12	1042:9	1212:21	1026:14
1068:10	1054:5	1213:2,8	1074:12
	1084:21	1236:21	1091:9 1199:6
	1085:6,12,17	1237:18	1216:19
1166:8 1204:3	1086:1,10,12	1238:23	1227:7,8,9
	,15,19	1239:25	
resume	1092:23	right-hand	routine
1074:11,16	1103:15	Ĭ141:6	1021:21 1036:19
	1104:1,7	rights 1166:1	1170:16
1083:13 1139:7	1116:21	risk 1016:1	
1133.7	1126:21	IISK TOTO'T	Royals

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1031:4,5,6	1146:13,19	1083:9,10	1029:1,4
rule 1059:20	1169:16	1084:20	1051:3
1166:17	Schallenberg'	1104:6,10	1100:15
	s 1020:15,21	1110:2	1114:6
ruled 1035:22 1036:10	Schatz 1028:6	1111:13,21,2	1199:23
		4 1112:1,3 1113:7,10,18	1200:24 1210:3
run 1170:9,11 1240:17	schedule 1022:6	,21	1215:15
-	1063:13,14	1114:1,5,8,9	1230:23
running 1167:25	1075:23	,15,20	1253:17
	1091:22	1115:7,9,11,	screen 1012:3
Rush 1019:3 1136:13	1098:24	20,23 1116:3,20	season
	1112:14 1156:10	1117:17,20,2	1062:14
RUSS 1006:9	1162:14,19,2	2 1120:22	seat 1010:18
Ruth 1005:22	3 1163:4	1121:9,16	seats
1006:1	1165:2,3,7	1126:14,16,2	1031:1,3
	1170:14	1 1142:16,17 1144:14	second
<u>S</u>	1173:10 1174:5,6,7	1147:24	1038:15
safe 1188:11	1182:25	1148:2,6,7,1	1076:23
safer 1074:25	1196:13	3,25	1109:2
1075:2,6	1208:10	1150:14,17,2	1136:19
safety	1218:25	5 1151:4 1153:6	1141:3 1143:21
1190:17 1253:15	1220:23 1228:20	1170:19,25	1192:14
	1232:1	1171:8, 11, 16	
salary 1045:14	1243:6	1234:17	seconds
sale 1061:1	scheduled	1235:3	1054:15
	1092:22	Schiff's	secretary
sales 1060:21,22,2	1161:2	1028:22 1039:15	1211:23
3 1217:5	scheduler	1120:18	1212:25
Salt 1030:17	1190:15	Schwarz	1227:12
	schedules	1005:18	section
Sand 1008:2	1164:6	1012:15,16	1053:13,14,1 8 1064:12
Santa 1008:2	1168:24 1180:2,9	1020:2	1069:13
SARAH 1008:5	1243:6	1139:17,18,2	1077:6
1009:3	scheduling	0,21,24 1140:3	1082:21
sat 1131:21	1258:10	1143:11,12	secure 1100:4
1155:21	Schermer	1173:12	seeing
Saturday	1065:22	1179:25	1060:10
1227:25	1083:11,14,1	1182:13 1183:7,8,10	1167:24
saved 1171:9	9 1084:7,12	1192:7,19,21	seek 1217:22
saw 1051:2	Schermer's	,23 1193:1	1218:4
1060:24	1083:13	1195:19,20,2	1219:13
1110:10 1143:8	Schiff 1026:5	$\frac{1}{1106.12}$ 1/ 1	seeking
1201:3	1027:21,23,2	1196:12,14,1 6	1043:3 1220:3
1258:6	4 1036:16,18,2	0 1198:3,5,11	1245:10
Schallenberg	0 1037:14,23	1260:7,11	seeks 1034:2
1019:6,12	1038:4,8	science	
1020:23	1039:17,23,2	1247:12	seem 1222:7
1024:8	5 1042:22 1065:13,19	scope 1014:25	seemed 1114:11
1098:7 1122:25	1075:20	1015:11	
±±сс.с.,		1028:22	seems 1020:11

EVIL	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1035:24 1044:23,24	1075:24 1192:1,24	session 1045:25	SHAYLA 1008:1
1045:13	separate	1048:1	sheet 1038:15 1123:5,24
1120:11 seen 1037:9	1035:3 1038:6	1054:21 1069:18	1124:4,7 1136:17
1081:4	1106:2,20	1127:14 1154:13	1168:7
1107:5,6,9 1111:1	1107:7 1108:24	1223:5	1169:2 1251:16
1135:25	1109:6	1249:18 1254:7	sheets
1149:8,10 1167:10	1154:22 1159:17	sessions	1122:21
1175:9,10	1177:2 1217:7	1092:25 1132:17	1124:7 1228:5
1196:19,21,2 2 1242:1,4,5	1220:2,4	1146:15	she's 1078:24
selected	separately	sets 1143:17	1083:17 1084:10,16,1
1096:21 1188:16	1035:2 1219:23	setting 1085:10	8,23
selection	1220:2,7	1216:15	shielded 1059:5
1111:17 1162:18	September 1061:10	settlement	shortly
sell 1061:1	SER 1162:17	1049:20,23 1118:7	1033:7 1034:20
1062:4,6	1163:2 1171:23	1175:17,22,2 4 1176:10,11	1087:24
selling 1118:23	series	1248:19,21,2	1147:10
Senate 1156:7	1199:22	3 1249:25 1250:11	showed 1037:11
send 1108:10	serve 1017:15,23	1253:9,13	showing
sending 1147:6	1062:10	settlements 1248:1,6,9	1074:15 1161:19
senior	served 1017:25	1249:22	shown 1163:11
1004:19	service	1250:15,19 1253:10,23	1198:24 1211:3,16,19
1018:7 1087:5	1004:1,13,17	seven 1140:19	,22
1088:18 1112:5,10,13	1009:5,8 1017:10,13,1	1196:25 seventh	shows 1036:6 1163:13
,21 1170:11	8,20 1018:3,9	1140:20	Sibley
1184:17 1185:4,12,13	1023:11	several	1231:14
,15,20,24	1029:1,4 1082:16	1032:22 1040:5	1232:19,21 1233:3
1186:3,6,9,1 4 1187:6,21	1117:5 1217:18	1052:25 1079:19	sic 1014:2
1188:25 1190:23	services	1085:14	1080:15 Siemens
1211:22	1028:22	1093:16,18 1132:14	1163:1
1239:2 1244:17	1037:4 1038:20	1201:5 1203:8	Sierra
1251:14 1252:6	1048:5 1117:7	1203:8	1157:21 sign
sense 1022:22	1118:10	severe 1063:5	1228:9,12
sensitive	1120:18,21 1121:12	share 1250:3	signatories 1168:19
1059:9	1163:12 1171:11	shared 1148:21	1261:14
sent 1020:11 1023:6	1216:4	1249:25	signatory
1102:6	1234:25 1235:1	shares 1160:11,12	1161:5 1163:25
sentence			1164:7

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011				
signature 1251:7	1127:12 1132:23	1230:13,16 Smith 1006:5	1180:15 1191:17	
signed 1110:3,4	1139:1,19 1180:25 1183:11	SNR 1007:6 soil	1196:9 1221:4 1250:13	
1133:19 1157:14 1253:9,22	1197:16 1198:4	1253:10,23 sold 1217:9	sort 1030:19 1075:4	
significance 1118:5	1211:9 site 1021:7,8,11,	Solution 1086:11	1093:7 1106:21 1108:10	
1124:9,11,20 1145:8 1242:14	20 1023:2 1029:7,14 1167:13,21	Solutions 1137:17	1113:15 1127:7 1204:6	
significant 1016:10 1091:12,21	1170:17 1176:13,14,2	1138:12,18 somebody 1014:1	sorts 1200:14 1241:21	
1137:25 1205:25	5 1177:1,12,15 ,20_1227:17	1030:6 1132:21 1200:8	sound 1020:6 1095:3	
1230:20 1231:25	1242:7 1246:6,21	1239:18 1258:7	sounds 1158:4 1199:2,15	
significantly 1146:25 1148:16 1203:5	sitting 1113:11 1229:9	somebody's 1120:20 1200:3	Source 1048:7 Southern 1005:17	
sign-in 1136:17	situation 1012:21 1013:6	somehow 1092:21 1166:13	Southwest 1007:15	
sign-off 1251:16	1144:23 1158:7	someone 1012:25	speak 1012:8 1164:4	
signup 1122:21 1123:5,24	six 1101:6 1108:2 1143:2,21	1031:11 1112:3,10 1114:1	speaking 1012:22 1075:18	
1124:4,6,7 sign-up 1169:2	1146:6 1155:14 1186:21	1170:25 1209:5 1240:1	speaks 1064:18 special	
similar 1159:11	1197:12 six-month 1146:8	sometime 1033:8	1094:19,20 1095:1,5	
1162:16 1170:25 1177:1	sixth 1007:15 1140:19	1155:1 1237:15 somewhere	specialize 1066:2	
1216:8 similarly	size 1137:10 1138:5	1115:21 1137:8	specialty 1066:4,7	
1134:24 simply	skill 1235:2 skills	1200:3 1238:22	specific 1018:10 1035:22	
1060:12 1075:2,5,6 1081:25	1065:14,19,2 3 1209:6	sooner 1034:21 1060:10,25	1036:10 1040:16 1048:25	
1175:2 single 1143:5	SLACK 1009:4 slide 1051:18 1052:15	sorry 1028:4 1039:8	1049:18 1050:21	
1156:6 1216:8,9 sir 1010:17	slightly 1166:23	1065:16 1074:5 1107:9,10	1085:19 1122:19 1183:18	
1012:17 1075:10	small 1209:7 smaller	1123:10,23 1134:21 1136:6	1185:18 1198:1 1200:15	
1120:2 1122:4	1153:17	1164:15 1179:23	1233:16,19 1245:19,22	

	PENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	
1246:19 1248:22	Springfield 1005:3	1102:7 1103:1,8,20,	1134:16 1138:3
specifically 1019:1 1116:19	1103:11 squared 1012:7	23,24 1104:6,9 1105:25 1106:12,19,2	1145:18,21 1146:1 1241:17 1243:3
1133:11 1175:1 1222:5	ss 1259:2 St 1007:24 1008:14	0,25 1107:14,19 1109:24	standards 1110:22
1234:24 specification s 1162:15,18	1012:2 1074:2,21,23	1110:4,15 1111:1 1122:6,11,18	standpoint 1098:16
1163:3 specificity	,25 stab 1131:18 stabilization	1124:6,18 1131:19 1132:3	stands 1010:19 1180:21
1040:25 1091:16 1200:14	1253:10,23 staff	1136:11 1154:15 1156:25	start 1053:22 1090:12 1099:7
specifics 1116:23 1247:2	1009:2,8 1010:8 1018:10	1159:9 1160:25 1161:3	$1120:16 \\ 1124:13 \\ 1144:1$
speculate 1088:25	1019:17 1022:15,20 1023:11	1166:4,10,21 1167:8,17 1169:4,17,18	1174:9 1190:8 started
speculating 1145:6 speculation	1024:6,21 1025:12,15 1026:4,20,25	,19 1174:20 1175:3,16,21 1176:4,12,23	1019:22 1021:8,19 1063:15
1171:2 1173:13,18	1027:2,11,14 ,18 1028:7,9 1029:2,3,6	1177:13 1178:9,11,16 1179:7	1101:22 1121:17 1132:7
speculations 1173:15 speed 1155:22	1031:24 1032:4,5,7,1 2,19 1033:10	1190:14 1191:7 1219:3	1202:13 1205:11 1210:2
spend 1220:21 1227:25	1034:7,22,23 1035:12,13,1 6	1221:20 1222:17	1240:2 1242:18,22 1245:5
1229:8 1243:8 spending	1036:17,19,2 5 1037:7 1040:3,5,6,7	Staff- recommended 1107:7	starting 1066:16 1174:8
1229:12 spent 1027:11 1102:19	,10,18,22,24 1041:2 1042:12	staffs 1154:9 Staff's	startup 1119:6,7,15, 17,19
1102.19 1134:8 1227:24	1043:2,10,13 ,16 1044:23 1045:13	1028:18,24 1050:6 1094:24	state 1004:2 1007:19
spirit 1165:11,13 spoke 1149:14	1048:24 1049:3,6,11 1050:1,4,11,	1166:9 1174:17,25 stage 1142:17	1010:23 1051:9 1065:13
spoken 1143:6 sponsor	17,20,24,25 1051:2 1069:6	1173:13 1180:3 1188:2	1066:15 1075:16,22 1175:1
1149:8,10 sponsored	1085:22 1089:25 1091:3,17	1100:2 1190:9 stakeholders	1181:5 1187:5 1259:2
1031:11 spread 1059:11	1092:6,7,10, 15,21	1154:8 stand 1010:4	stated 1017:5,8
spring 1021:19	1093:2,9 1095:10 1097:14,16	1101:10 1180:20 1258:19	1026:18 1034:8 1043:13,22
	1101:16,18	standard	1044:2

	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1064:1 1067:1	Steven 1190:6 stick 1244:14	STUART 1005:6 studies	suggest 1142:3
1079:4,18 1086:6 1094:23 1152:8 1153:13	Stinson 1007:10 stip 1131:5	1162:15 stuff 1081:3 1100:8,9 1202:1,3	suggested 1049:2 1142:25 1177:5
statement 1040:17,23 1043:24 1064:9 1186:4	stipulation 1082:22 1085:4 1095:23 1131:11,14,2 2 1154:22 1157:12 16 2	subcontractor 1148:2 subdivided 1185:25 subject	Suite 1005:7,11,23 1006:2,19 1007:7 1008:9 summarize
states 1008:1 1017:14	1157:13,16,2 0 1169:7 stop 1201:5	1018:21 1085:6,11,16 ,21	1162:10 1204:15
stating 1040:9 1042:3	stop 1201.3 stopped 1120:11,12	1086:1,9,12, 18 1090:17	summarized 1205:2
stations 1231:7	stops 1197:15 story 1113:10	1145:5 submitted 1032:4,5	summary 1122:12 1162:13,23
<pre>status 1102:4 1103:5 1162:2,13,24 1163:2 1166:25 1168:22 1170:15 1241:21,22,2 5 1261:12</pre>	strategic 1086:11 1137:17 1138:11,17 1162:1 1170:18 1211:16 1219:22 1261:11	1032:4,5 1034:20 submitting 1082:15 subordinates 1148:23 subsequent 1153:16 1155:5	1163:3,10 summer 1061:8,9,13, 16,22 1062:14,18 1063:3,10 1098:16,20 1126:2 1187:5
statute 1135:3,7,8 1158:8	strategy 1100:25 1253:14	subsequently 1034:13 1160:14	summertime 1063:7
stay 1139:6 1189:16 1258:11	street 1005:23	1161:8 1201:24	Summit 1006:3 supercritical 1052:17
stayed 1252:23	1006:2,6,19 1007:7,11,15 1009:6,10	substantial 1038:12 1060:23	supervisor 1030:9
steam 1162:25 steel 1076:6	1010:25 1098:18	1062:6 1170:18 1173:7	<pre>supplement 1138:10</pre>
Steiner 1007:1	strengths 1188:17 strike 1082:6	substantially 1178:14	supplemental 1191:7 supplementing
1027:18 1179:22 Steinmeier	strongly 1241:2	substantive 1133:16	1138:7 supply 1187:7
1007:22 step 1096:19	struck 1159:22	substantively 1133:15	1217:5 1239:2
1172:22 1179:11 1186:15	structural 1076:6	successful 1217:25 1246:22	support 1064:16 1085:17,25
Steve 1009:1 1088:16	structure 1214:5 1250:22	<pre>successfully 1252:6</pre>	1159:9 1172:21 1232:17
1090:17,24 1092:3 1187:6	1251:4 STS 1138:23	successor 1216:5	supported 1158:20
		Sugar 1008:2	suppose

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1177:19	1227:11	1138:12,17	1220:3,8,10
supposed 1233:8	sustain 1078:23	talk 1105:22 1106:21,25	Taylor 1169:18
1233:8 sure 1013:13 1019:9 1028:3 1037:1 1038:2 1041:17,25 1051:8 1064:11,25 1074:2 1075:13 1085:7 1087:11 1091:22 1100:22 1104:10 1115:19 1120:13 1127:5	1078:23 1220:14 Sw 1006:15 Swearengen 1006:9,10 sworn 1010:15,16 1180:20,23,2 4 1259:9 system 1022:17 1024:11 1027:5 1061:18 1082:23 1096:13 1109:20,22		1169:18 1169:18 team 1026:5 1065:20 1082:8 1102:8 1104:1 1118:15,18,2 2 1119:7,13,19 1142:23 1148:23 1170:10 1171:8,9 1187:10 1188:21,22 1189:3,20 1190:12 1191:5 1204:14
1127:5 1131:3 1132:9 1139:25 1145:6 1146:18 1154:4 1179:17 1182:5 1192:4 1196:2 1204:22 1212:3,9 1227:13 1229:21 1234:2 1236:17 1239:18 1246:9 1250:24 1252:20 surprise	1110:1,13,21 1111:6 1123:19 1134:23 1135:17 1136:3 1152:23 1163:2 1166:12,20 1168:24 1169:1 1171:18,19,2 1,22,25 1178:2 1232:6 1242:2,3,4,6 systems 1135:24 1163:3 	1199:7 1215:6 1221:19,20,2 2 talking 1017:3 1024:14 1035:21 1041:6 1083:9 1105:2,3 1120:16 1136:20 1148:18 1151:16 1152:17 1157:6 1171:19 1175:23 1185:11 1201:7 1203:3,19	1206:14,24 1207:3,6,7,1 6 1216:7,8,10 1243:16 1245:5 1251:15 technical 1100:7 techniques 1209:6 technological 1012:6 technology 1075:4 ten 1083:1 1141:9 1198:12,24 1222:6
1113:1 surprised	T-23 1242:11 tabbed	1214:16,19,2 1 1221:17,24	1231:8 tender
1112:22	1053:13	1222:25 1228:22	1011:22 1182:6
surprises 1112:25	table 1024:24 1235:4	1229:13 1232:9,10	tensions 1138:23
surprising 1126:7	taking 1045:3,12 1080:25	1243:15,25 1244:1	tentative 1154:6
<pre>surprisingly 1138:21</pre>	1081:24,25	tariffs 1017:17	tenure 1017:9
surrebuttal 1174:13	1153:2 1199:9	tax 1217:17,22 1218:4,13,14	term 1017:10 1050:22 1060:22
SUSAN 1007:6 suspect	Talent 1086:11 1137:17	1210:4,13,14 1219:3,14,16 ,17	1094:7 1096:21 1122:9

EVIDENTIARY	HEARING	VOL.	19	01-21-2011
-------------	---------	------	----	------------

	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1145:8	1045:2	1078:15	1116:5
1146:4	1043.2	1090:5	1119:10,22
1235:12,14	1062:24	1104:16,17,2	1120:3
-		3 1105:21	1120.3
termed 1042:7	1064:5,7,14,		
1159:24	19,22	1107:22	1122:13
torming	1065:10	1111:12	1123:4,12
terming	1067:3	1120:2,4	1131:10,17
1084:22	1068:19	1138:25	1134:2
terms 1105:1	1069:1	1139:2,8,20	1135:6,18
1131:4	1078:19	1143:12	1136:16
1134:9	1080:2,4,7,1	1147:18,19	1139:23
1157:17	3,16,22	1153:20,21	1142:2,12
1170:21	1081:22	1164:19	1143:11
1177:10	1082:5	1179:8,10,11	1146:9
1203:8	1084:21,22	1180:15,25	1147:18
1230:23	1085:2	1182:7	1150:23
1235:7	1101:13	1183:8	1151:1,2
1246:3,15	1120:20	1191:11	1158:15
,	1122:12	1196:14	1163:5,18
Terry 1004:19	1134:19	1198:4,5,7	1164:24
1087:9,10	1135:18	1205:4,5,7	1165:15,16
1092:3	1137:8,15	1249:19	1169:19
1168:24	1141:23	1258:20,22	1171:20
1189:11,12	1143:5,20		1174:9
1244:20,21	1144:4	that's	1175:2,25
testified	1153:16	1010:11	1176:1,3,7
1018:8	1167:18	1012:25	1178:24
1019:10	1173:1,14	1015:7	1179:4,24
1040:1	1174:12,13,2	1020:20	1182:24
1048:2	1 1176:8	1023:6	1186:7,8,15,
1060:1,9	1180:2	1028:16,23	23,25
1075:11	1181:9,14,16	1030:25	1189:21
1076:3	,18,22,25	1032:1	1191:10
1099:1	1183:14	1037:5,11	1192:8
1131:1	1184:3	1038:21,24	1192:3
1148:1	1188:21	1039:2	1198:3,21,24
1152:22	1191:15	1042:4	1202:14,19
1171:13	1192:8,13	1044:1,10	1202:14,19
1206:19	1200:4,18	1045:8,16	1214:21
	1206:11,25	1050:22	1214.21
1237:3		1051:3,4	1227:19
1240:18	1230:8,25	1052:20	1227:19
testify	1235:11	1059:20	
1063:22	1236:19	1062:23	1229:22 1230:21
1069:2	1259:9,10 1261.2570	1064:23	
testifying	1261:3,5,7,9	1066:7	1231:1,24
1182:22	testing	1069:12	1233:6 1239:3
1218:16	1238:18	1081:3	
1234:21	thank 1010:17	1082:2,23	1243:24
	1014:7	1089:17	1244:16,21,2
testimony	1025:22	1090:12,22	4 1247:10,21
1011:3,8,11	1038:25	1091:14,19	1251:6,10
1017:21	1053:6	1094:14	themselves
1018:13,16,1	1059:24	1099:15	1103:24
7,18,20,22,2	1062:22	1100:2,10,17	1113:8
4 1019:5,8	1065:9	,24 11Ó3:Ź1	thereafter
1032:8	1063:18	1105:21	1259:11
1034:22	1069:15	1109:7	
1036:4,5	1074:9,10,16	1110:8	therefore
1043:21	1077:1,15	1113:3,11	1034:2
		· ·	

EVIL	PENILARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1054:1	1009:2	1151:6	1028:25
1166:21	thorough	1158:7 1171:15	Toyota 1163:1
there's 1019:4	1083:15 1125:17	1181:19	track
1019.4	1147:17	1215:13,16	1075:16,22
1030:5,8	thoughts	today's	1076:16,17 1097:2,12,22
1031:17	1134:10	1112:25	1124:15
1037:22 1038:16	thousand	TODD 1005:14	1144:10
1045:4,14	1178:3	Tom 1114:24	1169:6 1175:1
1048:14	thousands	tomorrow	1178:22
1051:18 1059:14	1177:24	1110:17	1179:2
1065:15	1178:10,11	top	1203:22
1074:24	three-ring 1178:5	1023:13,14 1114:2,20	tracked
1080:13,22 1085:24	throughout	1115:11	1099:5,6 1124:19
1094:6,22	1017:9	1134:20	1146:9
1109:4,8	1019:4	1135:17,25 1189:8	1179:3,7
1120:19 1139:25	1036:4 1061:25	1245:15	trackers
1176:8	1062:2,11	Topeka	1156:19
1182:5	1068:1	1007:15	tracking 1097:24
1200:3 1209:8	1083:25 1103:7	topic 1018:25	1124:14,21
1220:22	1124:19	1051:1,2 1065:1	1205:21
1232:15	1160:23	1078:3,5	traditional
1240:15 1258:21	ticket 1031:3	1094:17	1201:11
thereto	tickets	1133:24 1165:19	trained 1209:8
1259:16	1030:16,18,2	1176:21	
They'd	ties 1037:3	topics	training 1014:13,16,2
1230:22		1018:11	2
they'11	TIGER 1004:24	1133:24	1015:8,10,13
1228:25	Tim 1136:12	Toshiba 1100:5	,19,22,25 1209:11
they're 1011:18	timeline 1098:16	tot 1197:8	trains
1030:6	timely	total 1126:6	1149:15
1061:15	1240:10	1141:12	transcript
1097:17 1099:7	1241:12 1242:15	1152:4	1004:5 1046:1
1127:4	-	1163:13 1170:21	1054:22
1197:2	tired 1014:1	1185:8	1069:19
1209:8 1211:25	title 1053:14,17	1197:12	1127:15 1223:6
1212:4	1087:6,11	1232:10	1249:14
1228:10 1246:2	1088:12,18	totally 1018:17	1254:8
they've	1184:20 1185:1	1173:6	transferred
1026:18	titled	1175:7	1176:14 1200:22
thin	1140:15	1201:14	transition
1155:19,20	today 1011:11	totals 1142:10	1240:3
THOMAS	1078:9,13	1197:10	transmission
1005:18	1079:12,14 1099:8	1198:13	1156:12 1162:15
THOMPSON	1110:16	towards	
	1127:3,4		transmitted

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 19 01-21-2011						
1149:2	1215:2,6	1110:10	1242:13			
transparency	1222:12,15	1117:2	1246:9			
1026:17	1229:7	1118:13,15	1247:17			
1036:4,13	tube 1231:17	1124:6	1250:6			
1110:23	tubes 1231:21	$1131:18 \\ 1148:4$	understanding			
1112:23	turbine	1158:10	1026:21			
1160:20,21	1100:5	1184:15	1044:1 1062:16			
1165:12,14,2 2,25	1162:25		1082:10			
,	1231:6,18,21	U	1091:13			
transparent 1022:5,9	turn 1075:14	U.S 1006:16	1094:12			
1028:16	1134:2	Uhlig 1007:18	1101:17			
1029:1	1192:12	•	1106:4			
1036:5	turned	Uh-oh 1191:23	1108:6 1109:14			
1037:8	1102:16	ultimate	1113:22			
travel	1201:12	1133:19	1122:1,8			
1177:12	turning	ultimately	1124:9			
traveled	1211:13	1149:1 1157:23	1127:5			
1177:14	turnover	1197.25	1143:23			
tried 1089:9	1138:1	1203:4	1146:3,5,7 1150:23			
1201:13	turns 1032:12	1207:15,19,2	1151:1,3			
1204:15	1249:4	1 1221:25	1167:3,20			
1221:11	Tuxedo	1234:7,9	1172:24			
tries 1204:6	1008:13	1240:5,21 1241:3	1200:6,20			
trip	twenty	1241.5	1201:1 1204:14			
1252:3,17	1093:22		1204:14			
TRIPP 1006:5	twice 1227:9	Um 1140:11	1229:7			
trips 1082:9	two-step	unanimous	1244:9			
1227:17	1172:25	1157:16	1246:20,22			
trouble	1173:2	uncovered	1249:21			
1103:23	two-thirds	1242:10	understood			
1158:5	1176:1	undergraduate	1111:25			
true 1011:14	type 1015:2,3	1016:25	1113:2 1121:25			
1181:18	1018:12	underlying	1125:1			
try 1012:8	1031:1	1064:12	1246:3,12			
1078:24	1118:10	understand	1250:25			
1202:24	1138:14 1163:5	1054:2 1062:15	undertook			
1203:21 1221:9	1170:18	1085:8,20	1154:5			
1229:18	1231:15	1091:23	underway			
1247:9,12	1232:9	1097:10	1233:6			
trying	1241:14	1127:2,4	unfair			
1043:16	types 1119:3	1132:9 1150:4	1176:16			
1060:20	1241:14	1173:2,17	unfounded			
1066:5	typewriting	1178:1	1174:25			
1074:13	1259:11	1180:19	union 1005:17			
1078:8 1086:20	typical	1188:9,13	1067:21,22,2			
1092:6	1048:15	1200:12	3,25 1068:4			
1113:3,4	1212:8,20	1204:9 1207:19	union's			
1122:7	typically	1214:14	1068:5			
1158:5	1061:12	1215:7	unique			
1182:3 1185:11	1106:12	1229:21	1065:13,19,2			
TT0).TT	1108:9	1234:11				

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
3 1235:2	update 1102:10	1243:5 variance	version 1191:24
uniquely 1083:10,11 unit	1161:11 1162:24 1168:23	1162:22 1192:10	versus 1017:11 1099:10
1032:11,13 1033:13,15 1034:10,11,1	1170:12,15 1181:21	variances 1191:21	1105:1 1177:21
4,15 1035:2,3,6 1060:10	updates 1163:1 1241:21	variety 1018:9 1087:1 1154:8	vetted 1125:18 1142:16
1061:24 1062:10 1091:7,8,9	upheld 1094:21 1166:16	1134.8 1160:10 1232:16 1253:2	vetting 1097:4 1180:4
1104:3 1110:11 1111:16 1119:17	upon 1036:23 1087:24 1091:11	various 1052:8 1118:20,21	vice- president 1018:7
1119:17 1149:15 1160:13,16 1162:25	1124:10 1170:6 upside	1119:17 1137:16 1148:22	1026:12 1087:23 1088:13,17,1
1163:2 1167:3 1175:23	1012:23,25 1102:23 usually	1160:10 1162:22 1167:6	8 1089:6 1112:11 1170:11
1176:2 United 1008:1	1095:13 utilities	1197:19 1231:18,20	1184:11,13,1 8,21 1185:2 1186:9,18
units 1099:23 1100:3 1230:19	1103:11 1112:9 1158:10,17 1217:12	Veatch 1051:12,20 1052:3,5,7,1 0,16,17,24	1187:7 1211:16,23 1239:2,17
unknown- unknowns 1203:21	utility 1160:8	1053:9,19 vein 1165:24	1244:17 1247:24 vice-
unless 1043:10 1059:14	1185:2 1201:23 1212:19 1214:9,10	velocity 1191:21 1192:9	presidents 1184:6,8,15, 18,24
unlike 1094:14	V	vendor 1030:23,24	1185:5,6,7,1 4,16,21 1186:6,17,19
unlikely 1067:22	valuable 1061:25	vendors 1029:7,14 1030:16,21	1188:6 1243:18 view
unreasonable 1013:24 1035:24 1036:11,24	1088:23 1102:17 1234:23 1235:5	1114:3 1117:2 venture	1059:6,15 1202:13 1206:20
1166:4 unreasonably	value 1029:21,23,2	1230:2 verbal	1235:8 viewable
1035:23 unregulated	4 1030:1,5,10, 11,15,25	1085:15 1086:6,18 verbally	1023:2 viewed
1214:6 1217:5	1031:8 1089:16,19	1085:25 1086:3	1045:21 Virtually 1201:19
unspecified 1203:20 unusual	1091:13 1117:6 1171:8	verification 1020:12	visible 1158:16
1245:23 1250:22 1251:4	1176:10 1232:10 1242:3	verify 1122:22 1127:11	visits 1021:7,8,21 1167:13

EVIDENTIARY	HEARING	VOL. 1	19 01	21-2011
-------------	---------	--------	-------	---------

voiced 1183:31138:10,17we're 1012:71028:20volume 1004:91148:161045:51034:16,171054:211150:91054:31150:91069:181151:101065:51169:91177:141203:181093:6,131214:151223:51205:201096:231214:151234:71217:251207:241237:141089:241120:111109:2,111092:24volunteeredwatch 1075:61129:2,111039:201176:14ways 111:191109:2,111039:20volutteeredwater1109:1,1,221081:20,21wages 1067:22we'd 1019:211258:21122:17wages 1067:22we'd 1019:211074:231108:181095:16,171064:111222:121096:17wait 1037:11090:251226:11134:151095:19weeksday1222:191126:231096:19weeks1133:101249:91134:151097:221228:28 1090:161172:31077:221228:28 1090:161172:31122:131169:161172:31166:31122:141224:131022:11,13,11166:3,17wait 1099:191258:11,13west 1231:81172:3wait 1099:191258:11,13west 1231:81172:310177:221228:28 1090:161172:31122:141224:181122:121176:241124:11067:141094:191222:111124:151026:7<	EVIL	DENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
1033.20 described 1218:22 1190:8 1114:11 1114:1 1252:14 1202:15	<pre>voiced 1183:3 volume 1004:9 1045:25 1054:21 1069:18 1117:16 1127:14 1223:5 1254:7 voluminous 1089:24 volunteered 1176:14 VP 1188:14,15 www.G 1211:19 wages 1067:22 Wagner 1008:16,17 wait 1037:1 1052:12 1096:19 1099:7 1220:25 waiting 1077:22 walk 1199:19 walks 1110:15 Walt 1068:20 1172:3 warranted 1188:11 Warren 1098:6 1122:24 11068:20 1172:3 warranted 1188:11 Warren 1098:6 1122:24 11069:15,17 Washington 1006:15 1101:7 1143:5 wasn't 1021:3 1052:21 1053:25 1059:5 1062:12 1079:15 1092:5,6 1096:21,22</pre>	<pre>1138:10,17 1145:4 1148:16 1150:9 1151:10 1165:8 1203:18 1205:20 1217:25 watch 1075:6 1120:11 water 1100:9 ways 1111:19 weather 1258:2 Webcast 1074:23 we'd 1019:21 1092:14 1164:11 Wednesday 1090:25 weeds 1133:10 week 1048:10,13 1204:13 1228:2 1233:9 1258:11,13 weekends 1227:14 1227:17 1241:19 1258:11,13 weekends 1227:14 1227:7 1241:19 1242:18 welcome 1059:22 we'll 1012:7,9 1020:6 1037:13 1045:9 1054:3 1100:12,13,1 9 1180:15 1223:2 1248:16 1254:5</pre>	<pre>we're 1012:7 1035:20,25 1045:5 1054:9 1065:5 1074:7 1093:6,13 1096:23 1097:1,11,22 ,23 1099:24 1100:22 1102:14 1105:2 1109:2,11 1110:8 1119:12,23 1122:7 1168:12 1180:18 1201:6 1215:13,16 1220:21 1221:1,24 1222:19 1226:1 1240:3 1249:9 Wess 1020:11,13,1 8 1090:16 1169:16 West 1231:8 Westar 1230:2 we've 1035:9,25 1054:7 1094:19 1102:13 1109:10 1121:9 1126:7 1171:18 1190:6 1203:19 1215:4 1221:20 1231:7,12,13 1232:24 whatever 1024:21 1065:1 1068:3 1086:10</pre>	1028:20 1034:16,17 1109:16 whenever 1169:9 1210:2 1214:15 1227:14 1237:12 1243:12,25 1244:2 1248:20 whether 1039:20 1066:9 1077:11 1081:20,21 1083:1 1096:17 1102:12 1104:8 1107:12 1126:23 1134:15 1137:21,24 1151:25 1166:3,17 1168:1 1170:10,20 1171:6 1172:3 1174:3,17 1168:1 1170:10,20 1171:6 1172:3 1174:3,17 1168:1 1170:10,20 1171:6 1172:3 1174:3,17 1168:1 1170:10,20 1171:6 1172:3 1174:3,17 1168:1 1170:10,20 1171:6 1172:3 1174:3,17 1168:1 1170:24 1178:11,17 1207:10 1219:11 1221:21,22 1222:21 1252:20 whoever 1189:22 whole 1100:25 1121:23 1204:21 1244:21 whom 1122:18 1135:20 1187:15 1259:7 who's 1025:6 1086:24 1169:18
1118:3 1114:1 1252:14 1202:15	1099:20	well-	1218:22	1181:9
	1114:11	described	1218:22 1252:14	1190:8
		1114:1		

EVID	ENTIARY HEARING	VOL. 19 01-21-	2011
<pre>whose 1032:19 1252:10 1259:8 wife 1202:17 1252:3,17 Wilcox 1162:22 wildly 1201:25 William 1007:22 1181:7,8 1260:10 1261:3,5,7,9 Williams 1009:1 1182:16,18,2 1183:1 1192:19 1205:6,7,10 1210:9,14,16 1211:5,12 1213:15,20 1215:14,15,2 3 1216:2 1219:1,10 1220:11,15 1221:8,12 1222:14 1226:2 1246:14 1248:14,18 1260:12,13 willing 1052:24 1076:7 Wilson 1065:22 wind 1076:19,23 1077:7,9 1162:13,14 1171:22 winds 1240:3 Winter 1030:17</pre>	1094:21 1150:14 1166:12 1177:5 withhold 1026:22 1027:13,22 1028:2 withholding 1036:6 1040:11,19,2 0,22 1041:4 1093:19 1165:19 1166:4,16 witness 1010:4,16 1011:22 1017:24 1018:23 1024:23 1068:23 1079:2 1115:4 1123:4,25 1154:3 1179:13 1180:19,20,2 4 1192:6,22 1196:15 1210:14 1213:19 1215:22 1216:1 1219:17 1220:12,16,2 1,22 1222:13 1246:13 witnesses 1050:1 1060:8 1197:20 1199:18 1218:24 Wolf 1095:25 1096:2 1111:6 1135:2 1137:10,22 1145:6	<pre>wondering 1218:24 Wood 1098:6 1122:24 1124:1 1169:15,17 WOODSMALL 1005:6 wool 1122:7 work 1012:5,9 1013:11 1015:7 1021:20 1035:8 1038:1,4,7 1039:4 1044:13 1048:10,20 1068:4 1083:19 1084:14,15,1 6,19,23 1086:11 1087:25 1092:24 1008:24 1100:15,16,2 0 1106:13,19,2 0,21 1109:9,11 1114:4,7,13 1118:25 1121:17 1136:9 1138:19 1158:5 1121:17 1136:9 1138:19 1158:5 1187:18 1201:2 1204:12 1227:7,14 1229:9,12,18 1231:2,12,15 1232:5,15,25 1240:4 workday 1229:1,2,3 worked 1014:20 1016:12 1017:7</pre>	1084:10 1095:13 1101:17 1106:5,17 1111:13 1152:15 1155:20 1164:3,25 1229:3,5 1245:17,20 working 1014:2 1084:8 1085:1 1088:23 1099:2 1110:1 1111:22 1121:22 1138:21 1189:7,9 1251:11 workplace 1229:13,14,1 5 works 1169:19 workshop 1154:18,20 1159:14 workweek 1228:23 worst 1119:16 worth 1176:10 1203:4 1232:4,25 write 1086:7 1200:8 writing 1086:8,19 1091:24 written 1092:4 1102:18,19 1173:3,17 1251:22 wrong 1013:25 1020:5 1065:14 117:1,9 1119:15
	1135:2	1014:20	1065:14
wisdom	1145:6	1017:7	1119:15
1206:24	1158:10	1035:12,13	1167:19
withheld	1229:20,22	1037:18	1173:5
1022:11,13 1026:18,25	won 1159:3	1048:12 1083:25	wrote 1132:5

	HEARING	 <u>т</u> ,	
Y			
years's 1027:8			
yes-or-no 1083:3 1213:16			
<pre>yesterday 1020:4 1038:3 1043:20 1076:4 1085:14 1099:2 1101:9 1183:13 1190:7</pre>			
yet 1164:12 1240:4			
you-all 1132:11 1212:11			
you-guys 1108:4			
you'll 1040:16,21 1049:14,18 1050:2 1074:12,25 1085:19 1096:19 1180:22			
Young 1039:2 1137:15 1138:7,10			
<pre>yourself 1209:15,18,2 1,24 1213:2</pre>			
you've 1022:19 1030:18 1093:20 1113:10,20 1138:21 1180:2 1221:22 1227:5,21,24 1232:8			
Z ZOBRIST 1007:5			