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JUDGE DIPPELL: This is Case
No. ER-2010-0356 and also hearing some issues on ER-2010-0355. These are Kansas City Power and Light Company and KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Companies request to make changes to their electric service tariffs.

My name's Nancy Dippe11. I'm the regulatory law judge assigned to this part of the hearing. We've had previous weeks of hearing related to some joint issues of these two companies and also to the specifically KCPL side of the company. And this week was originally set to hear the GMO-only side. We have a few carryover issues that we'11 need to deal with.

We're going to begin with entries of appearance. And let's start with the Company, KCP\&L.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Judge. Let the record reflect the appearance of Heather Humphrey, Roger Steiner, Karl Zobrist, Susan Cunningham, and myself James Fischer on behalf of KCPL Greater Missouri Operations Company and companion case, I guess, Kansas City Power and Light Company.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
office of Public Counsel?
MR. MILLS: On behalf of the Office of the Public Counsel and the public, my name is Lewis mills. My address is Post Office Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
Staff?
MR. WILLIAMS: Nathan williams, Jaime Ott, Kevin Thompson, Eric Dearmont appearing on -- will be appearing this week on behalf of the Staff of the Public Service Commission.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. And Annette slack, is that right?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, and Annette Slack. I apologize for the omission. If you want the address, it's PO Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
City of Lee's Summit? Anyone here for them?
City of Kansas City?
City of St. Joseph?
Missouri Department of Natural Resources?
AARP and Consumer Council of Missouri?
Missouri Gas Energy?
MR. COOPER: Dean L. Cooper and Todd J.
Jacobs appearing on behalf of Southern Union Company doing business as Missouri Gas Energy.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Union Electric Company?
MS. GIBONEY: James Lowery and Sarah Giboney
here on behalf of Union Electric doing business as Ameren
Missouri.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Empire District Electric Company?

MS. CARTER: James Swearengen, Russ Mitten and Diana Carter for the Empire District Electric Company.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Dogwood Energy?
MR. LUMLEY: Car1 Lumley appearing on behalf of Dogwood Energy LLC.

JUDGE DIPPELL: The Federal Executive Agencies?

CAPT. MCNEILL: Captain Shayla McNei11 on behalf of the Federal Executive Agencies, more specifically whiteman Air Force Base.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Missouri Retailers
Association?
Mr. Wagner?
Hospital Intervenors?
Ag Processing, Sedalia Industrial Energy Users?

MR. CONRAD: On behalf of that group, please show the appearance of Stuart $W$. Conrad and David L. Woodsmall with the law firm of Finnegan, Conrad and Peterson. Our main office is in Kansas City, but I think we have provided the reporter with the addresses of the two offices we have, Your Honor. Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
IBEW Locals 1464, 1613 and 412?
And is there anyone else that needs to make an entry that I missed?

A11 right. We11, then 1et's begin by taking care of just a few preliminary things. Staff, I believe, had an outstanding motion to accept some schedule --late-filed schedules to its testimony of Mr. Featherstone.

MR. WILLIAMS: There's one schedule that pertains to the direct testimony of Mr. Featherstone -Featherstone and two schedules that pertain to the surrebuttal testimony of mike Scheperle.

JUDGE DIPPELL: And I had no objection to those being late filed. Is there any objection?

MR. STEINER: Just to be clear, these are things that should have been included in their prefiled testimony?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
MR. STEINER: No objection.
JUDGE DIPPELL: And this was -- these were provided some time ago.

Al1 right, then that motion will be granted.
MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, in terms of how they are premarked for identification, since they are associated with some testimony, would it be okay to keep the same
number and then affix a letter like $S$ to it to indicate that it's part of that testimony?

JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm fine with that. We had
a little bit of a problem with that in a previous hearing in that it didn't actually get attached to the exhibit that the court reporter had. And then we had to go back and stick it in. So if you will be sure that the correct -that the schedules are, in fact, attached to the exhibit that you give to the court reporter --

MR. WILLIAMS: We11, my suggestion because they are not, is to have a separate exhibit number, but -JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm sorry. You wanted to mark them separately?

MR. WILLIAMS: But as opposed to say for example, Mr. Featherstone's direct is GMO 215. My suggestion is for this schedule that wasn't prefiled when it should have been to just be marked as 215 s . JUDGE DIPPELL: okay. we can do that. If you will remind me when we get to admitting those.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
Okay. And then I believe there was another
item of testimony that Empire and Public Counse1 wanted to bring up before we --

MR. MILLS: Yes, Judge. And I don't recal1
what if you were in the hearing room at the end of the KCPL portion of the hearing but $I$ refrained from offering the revenue requirement rebuttal testimony of Barb Meisenheimer, Exhibit KCPL 404 because I understood that Empire wished to make an objection or a comment or an offer -- wish to respond to that offer in some fashion. And so counsel for Empire and I agreed that we would take that up today. And if it's okay with, Your Honor, we'11 proceed to do that. JUDGE DIPPELL: okay. MR. MILLS: And I wil1 offer KCPL 404 at
this time.
JUDGE DIPPELL: And let me just -- just so that it's clear to me because I missed part of that -MR. MILLS: okay. JUDGE DIPPELL: -- exchange and the
transcript for that part hasn't come back yet. MR. MILLS: okay. JUDGE DIPPELL: So this is -- tell me again what piece of testimony is this.

MR. MILLS: This is the -- this is the revenue requirement rebuttal testimony of Barb Meisenheimer and the specific issue that she's addressing is the mention of an IEC in the direct testimony of KCPL.

JUDGE DIPPELL: okay. And is -- that is a
different piece of testimony from the GMO Barb Meisenheimer testimony?

MR. MILLS: That's correct.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. That means I do not, in fact, have it in front of me.

MR. MILLS: Okay.
JUDGE DIPPELL: So I will attempt to hear your issue, but I may have to give you an answer after I've had a chance to actually look at it.

MR. MILLS: Okay. Thank you.
MS. CARTER: And Judge, Empire objects to a portion of KCPL Exhibit 404. It's Page 3, Lines 12 through 16. That is in the 355 --

JUDGE DIPPELL: Ms. Carter, could I get you to go ahead and come up to a microphone, so that -- in case some other judge who was more knowledgeable about this was 1istening --

MS. CARTER: And not fled the building?
JUDGE DIPPELL: -- he can hear what you have to say.

MR. MILLS: would you like a copy of that testimony to follow along?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes. That would be --
Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much.
Okay. Go ahead, Ms. Carter.

MS. CARTER: We object to that portion, Page 3, Lines 12 through 16 on the basis that the testimony is not responsive to the question asked, is not legally relevant or material with regard to the issues in the case and is prejudicial and misleading.

On Page 3 of the testimony, Ms. Meisenheimer is asked if past IECs have been effective in addressing fue1 and purchase power recovery. As part of her answer, beginning on Line 12, she states that one of Empire's prior IECs was to remain in effect for three years and then continues on with regard to her opinions on Empire's IEC; if it should have been terminated, could have been terminated, and what happened because of that termination.

As stated, the testimony does not respond to the question asked regarding a prior effectiveness of IECs. It's a gratuitous add-on, attacking Empire and the prior decisions of the Commission.

Second, even if you assume that anything to do with an IEC is relevant at this time in the case, the testimony of Ms. Meisenheimer still is not relevant to the issue of whether an IEC would be appropriate for KCP\&L.

Allegations regarding Empire's request to terminate its second IEC and the litigation stemming are not relevant to the Commission setting rates for KCP\&L as part of the proceeding in this matter.

Third, the testimony is prejudicial and misleading. Empire did not breach its contract with the parties as stated in that testimony. The orders of the Commission that are now final make that quite clear that those were Commission findings as well as the findings of the Western District.

Ms. Meisenheimer's testimony is misleading in multiple ways and as I have stated it isn't responsive even to the question asked. And IECs in general, I don't believe, are material or relevant in this case, but certainly not Empire's prior IECs cannot be relevant to any issue to be decided in the KCP\&L case at this time.

If the Commission deems the issue relevant and material and admits the testimony, then Empire would ask that in order to complete the record that three orders be admitted into evidence as we11, marked as Exhibit 801 is the report and order in Empire's 2006 rate case, ER-2006-0315.

Marked as Exhibit 802 is the report and order in Empire's 2008 rate case, ER-2008-0093. And marked as Exhibit 803 is the Western District Court of Appeals opinion in WD 71988.

And those three orders would complete the record with regard to whether or not Empire's IEC could be terminated and the litigation stemming from that that was
all in decided in favor of the Commission and Empire and not in favor or Public Counsel.
(Wherein; Empire District Exhibit Nos. KCP\&L
801, KCP\&L 802 and KCP\&L 803 were marked for identification.)
(Wherein; OPC Exhibit No. KCP\&L 404 was marked for identification.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: And Mr. Mills, your
response?
MR. MILLS: We11, I have a number of responses, but first of all the testimony was responsive to testimony by KCPL witness Rush, which was itself the subject of a Staff motion in limine to remove that testimony from the record.

The Commission decided not to remove that testimony from the record and so I think it would be entirely inappropriate to strike responsive testimony to that testimony.

I won't say that, you know, if the Commission wants to go back and remove everything having to do with IECs from the entire record, I certainly would not object to that, but to allow the positive testimony from Mr. Rush to stand and have the counter testimony by Ms. Meisenheimer to be stricken, I think would be unfair and prejudicial.

Second, this testimony was filed as rebuttal testimony in the normal course of the procedural schedule. If Empire disagreed with it, the appropriate course would have been for them to have filed surrebuttal testimony pointing out why they disagreed with her and then the Commission would have the full record about whether or not they agreed with Empire's interpretation or Ms. Meisenheimer's interpretation.

To simply strike the testimony now because Empire doesn't like it, I think is procedurally incorrect. The response should have been to file responsive testimony.

And finally, I don't think that Empire has even through these exhibits found anything to prove that the testimony's inaccurate.

In the first case $i n$ which the IEC came at issue, the Commission agreed that test-- that the tariffs and the testimony of Empire requesting a fuel adjustment clause be stricken from the case because it found that Empire was precluded from requesting a fuel adjustment clause in that case, which is entirely consistent with the testimony that Ms. Meisenheimer has given in those four lines that Empire objects to.

And finally, with respect to her final
statement that ultimately expensive litigation followed, I think that's entirely accurate. It doesn't opine that, you
know, Public Counse1 was successful in that litigation or unsuccessful, but ultimately it is true and Empire's documents I think prove this, that litigation followed.

So I think the testimony is accurate. The proper response would have been to file responsive testimony rather than to strike it. I think to the extent that the other testimony about the IEC is relevant in this case, then so is that testimony. So I would urge the Commission to -- to reject the motion to strike that testimony.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. I'm going to overrule the objection to the testimony and allow. Was there any other objection to the rebuttal testimony of Barbara Meisenheimer? Is that the only pending objection?

I'm going to allow that Exhibit 40 -- KCPL
Exhibit 404. It will be admitted.
(Wherein; OPC Exhibit No. KCP\&L 404 was received into evidence.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: And Ms. Carter, you've made an offer of Exhibits 801, 802 and 803?

MS. CARTER: Yes.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection to those orders coming into the record?

MR. WILLIAMS: That's in the KCPL case. Correct?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
MS. CARTER: Yes.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes. It is. I had to stop and think. Those would be KCPL 801, 802 and 803.

Then $I$ will admit those exhibits.
(Wherein; Empire District Exhibit Nos. KCP\&L 801, KCP\&L 802 and KCP\&L 803 were received into evidence.) JUDGE DIPPELL: And Mr. Mil1s, do you need your copy back? Thank you.

A11 right. Then I think with that, unless there are any other pending motions or items that need to be taken up --

MR. WOODSMALL: Real briefly, Your Honor, before you get started on opening statements. There are some witnesses that are scheduled for tomorrow; Greg Meyer on behalf of the Industrials, Melissa Hardesty on behalf of GMO and Marvin Rollison on behalf of GMO.

A number of the parties have discussed waiving cross on those three witnesses. I just wanted to bring that to your attention in case the Commission has questions, we can make them available. But if the Commission doesn't have questions or if no party has a problem, we'd like to not bring them in tomorrow.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Tel1 me again those witnesses.

MR. WOODSMALL: Greg Meyer on behalf of the Industrials, Melissa Hardesty on behalf of GMO and Marvin Rollison on behalf of GMO. Is that correct Karl?

MR. ZOBRIST: I'm sorry. I was distracted. what was the question?

MR. WOODSMALL: Did I recite accurately that those three witnesses --

MR. ZOBRIST: I wasn't listening to the --
MR. WOODSMALL: Car1, can you -- we are attempting to waive cross on --

MR. LUMLEY: Judge, I indicated in my e-mail that I had questions for Rollison and was waiting to see what Staff's position was and was willing to reconsider it, but nobody's come back to me to indicate what's happened since then. So we probably need to talk about that.

And frankly, I'd like to have discussions about other witnesses too in terms of who has questions and who doesn't.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
MR. WOODSMALL: Okay.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. We will take that -and are there other scheduling issues?

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, at this point we don't have GMO low-income weatherization issue on the schedule.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: So we need to make
arrangements for that. And --
MR. STEINER: I think if you just ask
Mr. Rush when he's on the stand your GMO weath-- low-income weatherization -- I thought it was handled last week, but apparently Staff has questions, so the Company doesn't have an objection to them asking Mr. Rush questions. Is that okay with Staff?

MS. SLACK: Our understanding was that the KCPL portion of the low-income weatherization was all that was heard last week. The week before last. we didn't specifically have anything to ask, but we did not at that time admit Mr. Warren's testimony for the GMO.

JUDGE DIPPELL: okay.
MS. SLACK: So if there's any cross for Mr. Warren on that matter --

MR. STEINER: There is none, so if that's the issue, we can just get his testimony admitted.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Would you like to go ahead and offer Mr. Warren's testimony?

MS. SLACK: I would, but I also know that the -- there was another party to the case that want -- may want to ask questions and I'm not sure. They're not here.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Okay. well, let's take -- let's take that up tomorrow morning then.

MS. SLACK: Okay.
JUDGE DIPPELL: And determine whether -- you can determine if there's somebody else. And if they're not here, I'm not going to worry about that.

MS. SLACK: I'11 go ahead send an e-mail out to the Department of Natural Resources.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Are there other scheduling issues?

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, it's not a scheduling issue, but in response to the queries about questions for Mr. Meyer and Ms. Hardesty. Staff has none on the Crossroads issue.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
MR. STEINER: And Your Honor, the schedule that I've submitted, the Crossroads issue, Ms. Hardesty is not listed as a witness and she is a witness.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
MR. STEINER: So I just wanted to bring that to your attention being overly redundant.

JUDGE DIPPELL: And there were some other notations about witness availability including Mr. Murray. It said available this afternoon. Does that mean that he's only available this afternoon or --

MR. WILLIAMS: My understanding is he wasn't available this morning and wouldn't be available until
mid-afternoon.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
MR. WILLIAMS: So as far as I'm know, he's available after.

JUDGE DIPPELL: But if for some reason we don't get to him.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm not aware of any conflict.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
MR. LUMLEY: I have a witness, Judah Rose, who's informed now that he needs to travel for a family funeral, so if we can make sure he gets on and off tomorrow.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. We can accommodate that.

MR. LUMLEY: Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Any other scheduling items before we then begin with general opening statements and then we will do mini opening statements per issue. If you've already given your general opening statement and don't want to repeat yourself, that would be appreciated. But otherwise, if you want to give an overview of this week's hearing, we will be welcome to hear that.

So we can begin, then, with Mr. Fischer.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Judge. May it please the Commission.

In this case, KCPL Greater Missouri Operations Company, which I think most of us will refer to as GMO throughout the hearing, is requesting a rate increase to recover the cost of service in the service areas formerly served by Aquila Networks MPS and also the territory served by Aquila Networks L\&P.

The amount of the MPS service area proposed rate increase is $\$ 75.8$ mil1ion, which is about a 14.43 percent rate increase. The amount for the L\&P service area is 22.1 miliion or about 13.87 percent. And it's probably helpful as we go through this case -- at least on revenue requirements -- to think of these as two different rate cases since we have the Staff and the Company both doing revenue requirements on these separate service areas. Although when we get to the allocations issue, it does become a little bit more of a rate design issue.

Many of the issues in this case are very similar or identical to the issues that were included in the recent Kansas City Power and Light Company case, which was filed at the same time that this case was filed.

Of course, as everyone knows, the Commission
has recently completed three weeks of hearings on the common issues in KCPL and GMO, including the Iatan 2
prudence issues. And the good news is we don't have to relitigate those issues as the Commission will take up the common issues at the time that you take up KCPL.

Like the recent KCPL rate case, a substantial amount of the rate increase in this case is driven by plant additions. GMO owns an 18 percent interest in Iatan 2, which equates to 153 megawatts. GMO's interest -- ownership share means that over the past several years, the Company has spent $\$ 360$ million dollars in Iatan 2 and none of the costs are yet reflected in their rates.

Another significant driver for the case effecting the L\&P service area is the Company's investment in the AQCS equipment at Iatan 1 . GMO owns 18 percent of Iatan 1, all of which is assigned to the L\&P service area. This service area is the service area that was formerly owned by St. Joseph Light and Power Company, which also had an 18 percent ownership interest in Iatan 1.

Although a majority of the Company's investment in the Iatan 1 environmental equipment was included in the rates as a part of the last GMO case, there is a portion that is yet to be included in this case.

GMO also owns and 8 percent interest in the Jeffrey Energy Center. There's been substantial environmental upgrades related to the Jeffrey 1, 2 and 3
units. The majority of the Company's investments in these environmental upgrades for the Jeffrey 1 and 3 units have been reflected in the Company's rates in the last GMO case.

Some portion is yet to be reviewed here, but the major piece of the Jeffrey unit is the Ia-- is the Jeffrey 2 environmental upgrade, which has not been reflected in rates.

A major difference between the Staff and GMO on this case is the issue related to the allocation of Iatan 2 costs between the L\&P district and the MPS district. This is going to be the very first issue that you'11 hear today.

The Company has allocated 41 megawatts of
Iatan 2 to the L\&P service area and the remaining 112 megawatts to the MPS service area based upon a balancing of the respective baseload capacity needs of L\&P and the baseload needs of MPS as well as a considerable consideration of the rate impacts that the allocation could effect these various service areas.

The Company's proposed allocation of Iatan 2 results in 60 percent of L\&P's 2011 projected peak demand being met with baseload capacity and 61 percent of MPS's projected peak would be met with baseload capacity.

So both service areas would have nearly identical percentages of baseload capacity in 2011 using
the Company's allocation proposal for Iatan 2.
Now the Staff is recommending that a substantially larger share of Iatan 2 be allocated to the L\&P service area than what the Company is requesting. Staff proposes to allocate 100 megawatts of Iatan 2 to L\&P, which is about 240 percent more of Iatan 2 than what the Company's proposed. On7y 53 megawatts would be allocated to the MPS service area under the Staff's proposal.

Staff's proposal would have a -- would have 73 percent of L\&P's peak met with baseload capacity and on7y 57 percent of MPS's peak would be met with baseload capacity.

As the GMO witnesses will explain in this case, such an allocation will have an adverse affect on the customers of the L\&P service area, the Company's fue1 adjustment clause mechanism, and the appropriate amount of fuel and purchase power assigned to each of the service territories since baseload intermediate and peak capacity have different -- different fue1 costs.

Staff's proposal would increase the revenue requirement for the L\&P service area by approximately $\$ 20$ million above the Company's request. And as I mentioned, the Company has requested a $\$ 22$ million total increase for L\&P after considering all the other cost drivers in this case.

By adding another $\$ 20 \mathrm{million}$ or so to account for Staff's proposed allocation of Iatan 2, it will have an adverse impact upon GMO's customers that live in St. Joseph and the other L\&P service areas.

Staff acknowledges that its proposed
allocation of 100 megawatts of Iatan 2 -- and I'd like to quote part of their cost of service report -- will potentially cause the rates -- rate increases to L\&P customers to be almost four times the rate increase to MPS customers. And that's from Page 102 of the cost of service report.

This Staff report also goes on to state, Staff realizes that economic conditions are tough and the rate impact of adding 100 megawatts of Iatan 2 investment in cost -- in L\&P's revenue requirement will not be easy for many of its customers.

In support of its proposed allocation despite the severe impact upon L\&P's customers, the Staff simply speculates that L\&P's service area may benefit in the long term and that L\&P might have ended up with a similar result had it not been acquired by Aquila in the year 2000.

But the St. Joseph Light and Power Company was acquired by Aquila more than a decade ago. It makes little sense from the Company's perspective to analyze this
issue, the proper allocation of Iatan 2 based upon an assumption that the St. Joseph Light and Power Company was stil1 in existence as a stand alone company.

The corporate world has changed and the Commission has much more flexibility to properly balance the interest of all customers as a result of that. Instead, the Commission should analyze the issue based upon the electricity needs of the customers in the two service areas. We would urge the Commission to look forward and not back on this issue.

Turning briefly to the fuel rebasing issue.
In the last GMO rate case the Company requested the opportunity to rebase its fuel cost into base rates. The rebasing of fuel costs is effectively moving a portion of the fuel costs collected in the fuel adjustment clause bucket into the base rate bucket.

Fuel rebasing establishes a new base line for future FAC adjustments. Fuel rebasing also includes the base -- in the base rates the 5 percent of fuel costs that are not recovered under the $95 / 5$ sharing mechanism contained in the Company's FAC.

Now, in the last GMO rate case the Staff and other parties opposed the Company's request to rebase its fuel costs into base rates. As a part of the settlement of the GMO case, the Company abandoned its proposal to rebase
fuel costs into base rates, although there were some minor changes to the fue1 adjustment clause that were agreed upon by the parties in that case.

In this case the Staff is arguing that the
Company must rebase its fuel costs in this case and apparently every future case. The Staff proposal would increase the fuel reflected in the base rates for the MPS district by approximately $\$ 13$ million while it would slightly lower the fuel contained in the base rates for the L\&P district. This analysis is based on Staff's analysis of the fuel costs.

Adoption of the fuel rebasing proposal of Staff would also mean that the Company would build into its base rates the 5 percentage points of fuel cost which are not currently recovered in the FAC. And the Company would -- the Company's fue1 costs, which have already been prudently incurred in this case, would not be reflected. The Company's approved the existing 95 -- or excuse me -- the Commission has approved the existing 95 percent, 5 percent sharing mechanism in previous GMO cases, the previous Ameren case and the previous Empire case and we believe it should continue to do so in this case.

As Mr. Gary Rigg, the managing director of Barclays Capital Inc, as he testifies, there's a potential for significant and long-term detrimental repercussions to
the cost of capital for GMO if the Commission adopts the adverse changes being proposed in the faC by the other parties.

He points out that the perceptions of the regulatory process effect access to and the cost of new capital for the Company with investors, underwriters, credit agents, credit rating agencies and researchers, all aware of the importance of a balanced mainstream ratemaking approach on this FAC issue.

Based on these considerations, the Company respectfully requests that the Commission maintain its current policies related to the FAC clause and not mandate a change in the sharing mechanism.

The Staff proposal would serve only to penalize the Company by potentially disallowing a larger percentage of prudently incurred fuel costs.

Another major issue in this case involves the Crossroad plant. In March 2007 the Aquila, Inc. issued a request for proposal for supply resources. The Company received both long-term and short-term proposals representing a variety of third-party suppliers and fue1 sources.

Crossroads, which is a combustion turbine unit located in Mississippi and was owned by an Aquila affiliate was also bid into the RFP process. The Company
conducted a 20-year analysis to determine a preferred resource plan. The analysis showed that the Crossroad plant would result in the lowest 20 -year cost, including the cost of transmission service.

The Company's analysis showed that the cost of acquiring Crossroads at net book value was less than the market value price available for alternatives from competitive sources and less than the cost of GMO providing the capacity and energy itself.

The Company believes that the Crossroads -that Crossroads should continue to be included in rate base in this case at the depreciated net book value, which is the approximate price at which it was bid into the RFP process. Operating costs have also been included based on current costs in this case.

Now according to the Staff's position statement, as $I$ understand it, the Staff is arguing that it was not a prudent decision to add Crossroads to the Company's generating fleet. Instead Staff believes that the Company should have built two more combustion turbines at South Harper. As I mentioned, the Company disagrees with this analysis.

In the alternative though, the Staff -- if the Commission disagrees with Staff on the Crossroads issue, then the Staff would argue that Crossroads should be
reflected at rates that are lower than net book, reflecting a number that was reported in certain GPE financial documents related to the acquisition of Aquila.

The Company does not believe that the Staff's alternative valuation of Crossroads is an appropriate approach either. The valuation that was used for financial disclosure purposes and certain SEC documents was not for an operational facility, but it represented rather a very conservatively the salvage value of the Crossroad turbines.

Therefore this valuation is not appropriate to be used for -- for reflecting a value of an operating generating unit for ratemaking purposes. As I mentioned, instead of reflecting the cost of crossroads in this case, Staff has included in its revenue requirement that the costs that GMO would have incurred in 2005 to install two additional 105-megawatt combustion turbines as South Harper plant, plus a hypothetical short-term 100-megawatt purchase power agreement.

As I understand Staff's position, Staff is arguing that the former Aquila management should have built five combustion turbines at the time they decided to go forward with three turbines at the South Harper site.

The Commission, I think, is quite familiar with the tortured history that South Harper has had over --
even with the existing three turbines. But for ratemaking purposes, staff apparently is suggesting that five combustion turbines should have been built there in 2005 and a hypothetical purchase power agreement should have been used to make up for the need for additional capacity. When the current management acquired GMO, it did not have the luxury of providing needed peaking capacity for the customers in a hypothetical world. It had to find a real world solution for the need for capacity to serve its customers. The lowest cost, real world alternative was found in the Crossroads plant.

This issue is one of the larger issues left in this portion of the case. It's valued at approximately $\$ 14.3$ million. If you have questions on this issue, I'd urge you to talk to Burton Crawford, Darrin Ives, Ed Blunk or Marvin Rollison. They'11 all be available for cross-examination and your questions.

An issue which originally was going to be part of the KCPL rate case, but due to scheduling problems is now going to be part of this case, is the advanced coal investment tax credit. The issue involves whether the Commission should allocate a portion of the advanced coal investment tax credit to GMO even though this would likely result in what is known as a normalization violation.

A normalization violation would result in
the IRS recapturing the advanced coal investment tax credit related to Iatan 2 and all other remaining tax -investment tax credits from the books of both KCPL and GMO. If the credits are recaptured, KCPL alone would be required to pay the IRS an excess of $\$ 52$ miliion and lose the ability to use $\$ 78 \mathrm{million}$ of credits in the future. Now, it's the Company's recommendation that if the Commission believes that it's appropriate to allocate the advanced coal ITC to GMO, KCPL would -- should be ordered -- and I emphasize the word "ordered" -- by the Commission to request approval of the IRS to reallocate the credits to avoid the possibility of a normalization violation.

A related question on this topic is whether the fees incurred in the arbitration that occurred related to the investment tax credit should be recovered in rates. This advanced coal ITC is flowed back to ratepayers much like the investment tax credits that have been flowed back in other areas in prior years.

Therefore, since KCPL entered into the arbitration to maximize the benefits for ratepayers, the Company believes that the arbitration fees should be recovered and included in rates.

Finally, I'd like to have an exhibit marked. It's difficult to see the numbers there.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Are we stil1 on KCPL
exhibits?
MR. FISCHER: No. This is -- this is GMO. JUDGE DIPPELL: Or this is a GMO exhibit.

MR. FISCHER: It's an illustrative exhibit. JUDGE DIPPELL: and for GMO, I believe, it's Exhibit 45. Is that --

MR. FISCHER: I think that's right.
(Wherein; KCPL Exhibit No. GMO 45 was marked for identification.)

MR. FISCHER: Turning first to the L\&P service area, the Company's current case supports a $\$ 24.3$ million rate increase while the Staff's revenue requirement recommendation contained in the reconciliation is for a $\$ 20.3$ mil1ion rate increase.

However, I think this is somewhat misleading since Staff is recommending that approximately $\$ 20 \mathrm{million}$ be added to the revenue requirement of L\&P to reflect Staff's larger proposed allocation of Iatan 2 to the L\&P service area.

The fuel rebasing issue and the fue1 -- and the FAC sharing change both effect the L\&P and the MPS service areas. And the Company does not believe that those particular issues should be adopted by the Commission. The
fue1 costs should not be rebased and the existing FAC sharing mechanism should be maintained.

I've also listed on that first page the major common issues that will be decided as a part of this case that effect GMO that were considered in the KCPL case.

And turning for a minute to the MPS service area. The Company's current case supports a $\$ 71.4$ million rate increase while the Staff's revenue requirement recommendation contained in the reconciliation is for a $\$ 20.2$ million increase.

Again, a large part of the difference is Staff's allocation of substantially less of Iatan 2 to the MPS service area.

The Crossroads issue is worth approximately $\$ 14.3$ million dollars and there's also an issue related to the Jeffrey rebuild, which is worth approximately $\$ 800,000$.

I appreciate your attention today. If you have questions, I'd be happy to try and answer them or my witnesses certainly would be available.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Commissioner, did you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I do. I do have a question.

Mr. Fischer, with regard to the position concerning the South Harper, the two additional turbines
that -- where Staff is arguing that there should be five instead of three, then wasn't that -- I mean, I guess there's nothing that prohibits your from relitigating that issue here. But I mean, hasn't the Commission found that position in the past or at least --

I mean, I recall those discussions being issues and I -- that the Company formerly known as Aquila acquiesced pretty much, is my recollection.

MR. FISCHER: Judge, I was not a part of those Aquila rate cases. But it's my understanding those were settled cases and it was never decided by the Commission.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. Does anybody have a different recollection or -- okay. A11 right.

That's al1 I have, Mr. Fischer.
MR. FISCHER: Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Mr. Fischer.
Did anyone else have an opening? Staff?
MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.
May it please the Commission.
My name's Nathan williams and I'm representing the Staff in the beginning of these hearings this week.

The first issue that you're going to hear this week is the allocation of Iatan 2 between MPS and L\&P.

When Utilicorp United merged with St. Joseph Light and Power Company in 2000 it committed to not changing the former St. Joseph Light and Power Company customer rates because of the merger.

Since that time the rates of customers in about St. Joseph, the L\&P area, have differed from the rates of customers in the remainder of what was then Aquila service area, which has been called MPS, although both have been served by the same utility company; the Company now that is called KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company.

Since that merger in 2000, Staff and the other parties have used the premerger ownership of assets as the basis for allocating costs for determining rates for these two areas, MPS and L\&P, for example, when Aquila built the South Harper station costs of that station were assigned to MPS.

The issue now is how to assign the costs of KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company's ownership share of Iatan 2. Although KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company jointly dispatches its generating units to serve load in both the MPS and L\&P areas of its service territory, and even since it was named Utilicorp United, it has stated it has a long-term goal of having a uniform tariff, including rates, throughout its service territory, KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company is proposing in
this case that Iatan 2 be placed in a separate corporation and in this and in each following rate case the costs of Iatan 2 be allocated between the two areas for setting the rates applicable in each.

In this case KCP\&L Greater Missouri
Operations Company proposes that the cost of Iatan 2 be allocated to the MPS area based on 112 of the 153 megawatts and to the St. Joseph L\&P area based on 41 of the 153 megawatts. An effect of this proposal would be to widen the gap between the rates in the MPS and the L\&P areas.

Since KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company uses all of its generating units to serve all of its customers and the only purpose of assigning ownership of Iatan 2 between MPS and L\&P is because they have differing rates, Staff does not understand or agree with the KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operation Company proposal.

Instead, following the precedent of using the pre-2000 merger ownership of assets as a basis for allocating costs for determining the rates for MPS and L\&P, Staff has relied on the facts that it was St. Joseph Light and Power Company that had an ownership interest in the Iatan station before the construction of Iatan 2.

And it was St. Joseph Light and Power
Company that entered into a long-term purchase power contract with the Nebraska Public Power District for 100
megawatts of baseload capacity that is about to expire, for conservatively proposing that the cost of Iatan 2 be allocated to MPS based on 53 of the 153 megawatts and to L\&P based on 100 of the 153 megawatts.

Staff's proposed assignment of Iatan 2
investment and operating and maintenance costs more correctly matches the proper level of Iatan 2 cost to customers who originally supported the Iatan plant facility and who need replacement of the baseload purchase power capacity that has expired.

Without this amount of capacity, L\&P, if it were a stand-alone utility would not have enough capacity to meet the energy requirements of its customers.

Staff believes MPS should have more baseload capacity, has assigned the remainder of KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company's share of Iatan 2 to MPS.

Like Iatan 2 -- Iatan 1, long-term ownership benefits of Iatan 2 will exceed the shorter term costs through lower fuel and operating costs. In other words, over the long term L\&P customers will be better off with having more Iatan 2 capacity under the proposal that Staff's put forth than under the proposal that KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company has made.

Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.

Commissioner, did you have any questions for

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Nope.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel, did you have an opening?

MR. MILLS: Judge, I don't really have an opening for this portion of the case. I will have a mini opening when you get to the fue1 adjustment clause and rate design later in the week. But I do want to point out and highlight one of the points that I think both the Staff and the Company touched on which is the fact that when the companies filed their tariffs to begin this case, the L\&P tariffs only reflected an increase of $\$ 22.1$ million.

And I believe that it would be unlawful for the Commission to approve an increase greater than the $\$ 22.1$ million. And of course we don't have those final numbers until we get to the True-up and so that this issue may be a little premature, but I certainly wanted the Commission to be aware that that's an issue that's looming in the background of the -- of the Iatan 2 allocation. Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
Commissioner, did you have any questions?
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I don't believe so.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Did the Industrials have
any --

MR. CONRAD: Yes, Your Honor, please. We did not have a general statement. We might reserve until we get to the cost of service -- class cost of service rather.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Federa1 Executive Agencies?

CAPT. MCNEILL: No, ma'am.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Hospital Intervenors?
MDNR?
Kansas City?
Dogwood?
MR. LUMLEY: Judge, Dogwood has entered -presented testimony opposing the inclusion of Crossroads in rate base and operating expense. Since Staff has reserved that opening, we'11 wait as well.

JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. was there anyone else present that wanted to make an opening?

Ameren?
MS. GIBONEY: Actually, Ameren doesn't have an opening statement and only has interest in certain issues in the case. So we would ask to be excused from attending the hearings in which we don't have an interest.

JUDGE DIPPELL: And I should have stated that at the beginning. I will follow the rule that Judge

Pridgin did in the previous hearings and that is if you do not have an issue you may be excused from attendance. However, I will state that if you are not here to make your objection when you need to be here to make your objection, that objection will be waived unless you have the kindness of your fellow attorneys who reserve their offers.

All right. Then, if that's the end of the general openings, is there any additional opening on the Iatan allocation issue. I assume that's the first issue we're going to begin with?

I see heads nodded. Iatan allocation, then.
Do we have additional opening statements to be made on that?

Seeing none, then let's go ahead and begin with the first witness. I believe that's Mr. Rush.

MR. FISCHER: Yes.
(Witness sworn.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead, Mr. Fischer.
TIM RUSH testifies as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. Please state your name for the record.
A. Tim Rush.
Q. Are you the same Tim Rush that has caused to be filed in this case direct, rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony, which has been marked as GMO 32,33 and 35 ?
A. I also -- yes, I am. I also filed rebuttal in the rate design portion of this case.
Q. Do you have any corrections that you need to make to those particular exhibits?
A. I do.
Q. Okay.
A. In my rebuttal testimony on the generic, overall revenue requirements on Page 10, Line -- pardon me, on Page 11, Line 15, I state, Similarly MPS has a contract with Omaha Public Power District. That should be Nebraska Public Power District. That's my only correction.
Q. With that change if I asked you the questions contained in that prefiled testimony, would your answers be the same today?
A. Yes, they would.
Q. And are the schedules accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. Yes, they are.

MR. FISCHER: Judge, I believe that GMO 32 and 33 and 35 may have been admitted in the previous KCPL case, but just to make sure I'd like to move that they be admitted.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right. And I do show that those were previously admitted.

MR. FISCHER: I tender the witness for

1
cross.
JUDGE DIPPELL: I can't read my own notes, but I show that those have been previously admitted.

All right then, is there cross-examination for Mr. Rush from Ameren?

Nope. She's gone.
MGE?
Dogwood?
MR. LUMLEY: No questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Industials?
MR. CONRAD: No questions, Your Honor.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Public Counsel?
MR. MILLS: No questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: And Staff?
MR. WILLIAMS: No questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. We11, that was
pretty simple.
Commissioner Davis, did you have questions for Mr. Rush?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yeah.
QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS:
Q. I've -- all right. Mr. Rush, so what's the big deal here? I mean, put it all out in layman's terms if you would.
A. I'm going to -- I'11 try to explain it from
what I would look at this. When we went into the acquisition -- when we started building Iatan 2 and 18 percent of it was allocated to the GMO properties, one of the important part is to determine the allocation of which division it would go to.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. If you think about -- if you would look at if we allocated it all to L\&P and let them pick up the entire capital cost of that --
Q. Right.
A. -- you would find that the rates would go skyrocketing. If you gave it all to MPS, you may have the same effect. We have to contracts that are expiring very shortly; one for 75 megawatts with the MPS division, one for 100 megawatts with this L\&P division.

We have to balance those interests with what's going on there. So what we did is we turned to our own energy analysis group, did a study, tried to evaluate what's the right allocation between the two and came up with what we proposed in this case.

Additionally, you have the fuel allocation that goes along with it. What we do now is we dispatch the fuel for the whole system. Then we come back and we allocate it between the MPS and the L\&P divisions.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. So if you think about it, if it all went to L\&P, the Iatan 2, then there would -- they don't need all that energy.
Q. Right.
A. So then what we do is we turnaround and give it to the MPS division at cost. And it would all be at the variable cost. That's the way the allocation process works. So --
Q. This is like an Ameren joint dispatch agreement?
A. Now you're starting to understand our concern. What we do today for Kansas City Power and Light is we look at the entire thing like its -- for example, Iatan is treated as one unit for Kansas City Power and Light Company and we go through an analysis between Kansas and missouri and we allocate that.
we do the same with wolf Creek, La Cygne, et cetera. Our hope here is to do the same thing so that we can go through in each case, evaluate the proper allocation and determine where it should go so that we balance the interest of both divisions.
Q. Okay. And forgive me because I didn't -- I didn't bring the documents down here today and the -- the energy plan that this commission approved for Aquila to join was much -- much more sparse and less detailed than

KCP\&L's. Would you agree with that?
A. Are you talking about the integrated resource plan?
Q. Yeah. No. Not the integrated -- but we -didn't we approve some sort of -- we approved something for Empire. I thought we approved something for Aquila.
A. You're talking about the comprehensive energy plan?
Q. Yes.
A. We did not -- there was only a financial piece approved for the GMO business that dealt with the securitization of assets. There was no --
Q. Right.
A. -- comprehensive energy plan.
Q. Okay. That's right. Because there was no mention of how -- there are no documents out there from the time that said this is how this energy is going to be divided up between L\&P and Missouri Public Service?
A. That's correct. And one of the things that we committed to is we were going to the comprehensive energy plan for KCP\&L --
Q. Uh-huh.
A. -- is we talked with parties and we actually kind of presented what our intent was late in the process prior to us filing the case. Obviously, I think we should
have been probably presenting it much earlier of why we were planning to do it. But the intent was to try and look at the analysis of what is the right way to allocate so that we serve both interests of MPS and L\&P.
Q. uh-huh.
A. By putting it in what the call ECorp, which is -- serves both the MPS and L\&P division --
Q. Uh-huh.
A. -- putting the plant there, it would allow us to look forward to how is the proper allocation as things change, for example, between the load growth that may happen in MPS and L\&P over time. At that's what we've been trying -- that's what our position is, is we want to look at that whole process of how do we -- rather than assigning a plant to MPS or assigning it to L\&P, to look generically at how do we want to serve the best interests in the long term because these plants last a lot longer than a year or two. Down the road, at some point, you might have a need different than you do today.
Q. okay. which is sort of like -- which is sort of like the whole, you know, RTO argument that costs are going to shift and change over time.
A. And that -- that is a reality. Yes, that is
true. And what we do at Kansas City Power and Light, we look at the Kansas division and the Missouri division and
we have to balance those interests. We come to the Commission, to you, talk about how those allocations would occur. The same way we do in Kansas.

And we were looking to do that same thing with the GMO operation. It simply happens to be within divisions, not within state or both states.
Q. Now, Ms. Mantle doesn't agree with you.
A. That's correct.
Q. What is your -- what is your mental impression of why Ms. Mantle disagrees with you?
A. I think her main concern is that we have a 100-megawatt contract that's expiring that is in the L\&P division. We have a 75-megawatt contract expiring in the MPS division.
Q. uh-huh.
A. And those are relatively inexpensive baseload generation. Her concern is that basically when St. Joseph Light and Power Company purchased Iatan in the '70s --
Q. uh-huh.
A. -- it had the right -- part of the agreement is if future plants were built at that site, they would have kind of first rights. That was their impression.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. And I think she's wanting to carry those
rights along with the L\&P division. The problem is that I believe that L\&P, if they were a stand alone -- which is a lot of speculation -- could not afford to buy 100 megawatts of Iatan, as is proposed by Staff. We don't know all that and she talked about it in her testimony.

We don't know all of those facts. They might have wanted to buy a lot, but MPS might have wanted to buy a lot. But the fact is St. Joe Light and Power doesn't exist anymore. It's part of an entity called GMO.
Q. That's true. It is part of an entity, which is called GMO, but I guess do you think it's Ms. Mantle's point that there -- there be a specific amount of generation tied to that group of customers served by the old St. Joe Light and Power so that they have certainty?
A. And I -- I think she may be thinking that way, but I also think the way the Company's proposed it gives her exactly that opportunity. If we put this Iatan 2 in this ECorp above the L\&P and MPS divisions, and later on we decide that instead of 41 they need 61, and we do that in the next case, we can look at allocating it that way. We can look at it just like we do when we look at the Kansas/Missouri properties at KCP\&L.

We can try to make sure that the interests of L\&P and MPS are represented in that entity. I think if you go to the analysis that Ms. Mantle presented in the
book it talks about, you know, what is most advantageous for each MPS and L\&P?

If you look at L\&P the interest is to maximize the megawatts. If you look at MPS, it's to maximize the megawatts. So each one of them, you know, want the most that they can get. Actually, the one that we selected is in the middle. It balances both interests.
Q. And in terms of percentage you were 60 and 61.
A. Exactly. As far as the baseload energy loads.
Q. Right. Right. And really what we're talking about here is 12 megawatts capacity, roughly?
A. I'm not sure I understand the 12 megawatts?
Q. Going back to --
A. The difference is 59 megawatts.
Q. The difference is 59 megawatts. I was -okay. I was thinking back to one of Mr. Fischer's slides there.
A. It was 112 megawatts was one of the numbers. We have 112 going to MPS and 41 going to L\&P. Staff recommends 100 to L\&P and 53 to the MPS division.
Q. Right. So --
A. So that difference is that 59 megawatts.
Q. Right.
A. That we're looking at. The delta is.
Q. Okay.
A. And that represents about $\$ 20$ million in revenue requirements. And so you can think about, you know, another $\$ 20$ million for the L\&P division is probably another 12 percent or so increase in prices.
Q. okay. I'11 -- I'11 ask the Staff this question too.
A. I understand that.
Q. Anything else -- is there anything else I need to know about this?
A. Well, I do -- I do believe that the fuel adjustment is a significant issue with this whole context of the allocation. Because if you put all of the -- the way the current allocation works is if you allocate all of the capacity to one utility or the other -- whichever it goes to -- and it's heavily weighted that way, then they're going to pay the fixed costs and the variable costs.
what we do today on the fuel adjustment is we give the other utility -- the other division gets the energy that's left over, the unneeded energy, at the variable cost. So if you imagine, let's say it's -- let's say the fixed cost if 5 cents a kilowatt hour -- that's an average -- and the variable cost is 1 cent, what you would have if everything went to L\&P you would charge them 5
cents for all the energy produced -- everything produced.
Q. Right.
A. But you would give MPS energy at 1 cent because -- anything's that left over. And there will be a significant amount of energy left over, meaning that's not needed for the peak load. It's, you know, off-peak energy. It's times when they're just -- not everything's being run. It's definitely your cheaper energy.

So you have significant issues on the fuel adjustment.
Q. Right. So this thing fits hand in glove with the fuel adjustment?
A. It does. Yes.
Q. Okay. And when you take all of that into account, I mean, is there some way that your formula maximizes revenues for the Company versus Ms. Mantle that maximizes lower costs to the ratepayers, you know, in the form of more off-system sales or something like that?

I mean, I'm trying to figure out what the difference is here.
A. I think it is a zero gross sum gain. I think it doesn't matter to the Company if it is all to L\&P or all to MPS because theoretically we get all the money.
Q. uh-huh.
A. It is a significant issue to customers and
balancing those interests of needs. So I think it goes more to just -- then to the Company's side; it goes to the customers' side. Because in -- if you look at the allocation of Mr. Fischer put up on the screen, it's \$20 million whether -- the delta is of this 59 megawatts.
Q. Right.
A. You know, it's determining who -- which side gets it, whether it's L\&P or MPS, the Company in some regards may be indifferent, but it's not indifferent because it's a concern for addressing customer needs also. But as far as financially, it would have essentially no bearing if we're able to recover all those dollars.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: A11 right. No further questions.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any recross based on commissioner questions?

MR. WILLIAMS: Staff has some.
JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. Go ahead.
Mr. Mills?
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MILLS:
Q. Mr. Rush in the long term wouldn't the Company maximize its profits if the services that it provides to its customers are properly priced?
A. Absolutely. Yes.
Q. If customers gets the -- get the proper
price signals, but the customers and the Company are better off?
A. Yes.

MR. MILLS: That's all I have.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Mr. Williams?
MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q. Mr. Rush, what is the relative sizes of L\&P and MPS in terms of numbers of customers?
A. I believe the L\&P business has approximately 60,000 customers. I believe the MPS division has approximately 180,000 customers.
Q. And of the L\&P customers, how many approximately are industrial customers that would be users of baseload energy? or to put it in another way, essentially run 24/7?
A. I don't -- I don't know the number of customers. I know that in the L\&P division there is a higher proportion of customers that use energy around the clock. Essentially, you're talking about 24/7. We have a higher load factor at the L\&P division than we do MPS.
Q. And how do those load factors compare then?
A. I don't know the exact numbers. I can give you -- I believe it's in the mid-50s, 50 percent, 55 percent for the L\&P division. I believe it's close to 50 ,
like 48 or 49 percent for the MPS division.
Q. Are L\&P customers now benefiting from St. Joseph Light and Power Company's investment in Iatan 1 ?
A. They are today, yes.
Q. And didn't they experience a significant rate increase when Iatan 1 came online?
A. There were some substantial increases at Light and Power. Yes. I was actually there at that time, so yes.
Q. Now, you talked about 100-megawatt purchase power agreement that's going to expire relatively soon, I believe you indicated. Do you know when that purchase power agreement is set to expire?
A. I'm not sure of the exact month. It's this year and I believe it may be in May of this year.
Q. And that's been assigned to L\&P, is it not?
A. It was. It was actually entered into prior to the acquisition from -- by Aquila or it was Utilicorp Corp at the time.
Q. And then you also referenced a 75-megawatt agreement that's been assigned to MPS that you say is about to expire?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you know when that agreement's to expire?
A. I believe it is next year in 2012. And it's
prob-- I think it's relatively the same time, in May.
Q. What ownership interest does KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company have in wolf Creek?
A. It has none.
Q. And wasn't the reason KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company didn't have any kind of a regulatory plan regarding Iatan 2 is because the plan that was done for Kansas City Power and Light Company, and I believe Empire as well, was based on maintaining credit ratings and at the time it was named Aquila, Aquila did not have an investment great credit rating?
A. I don't know all the facts, but $I$ kind of understand that's one of the reasons. I -- there may have been others.

I was going to make one comment back to earlier. You talked about when St. Joe Light and Power acquired the Iatan 1 unit. I was there during that time and it was an extremely financial burden on the company that essentially crippled it for a long time.

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, would you direct him to only answer the questions asked him. If he wanted to elaborate further before, he certainly could have. And I'm sure he'11 have an opportunity on redirect.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Mr. Rush, I believe you've answered his question.

Mr. Williams, do you have additional

MR. WILLIAMS: Just, I believe a few more.
BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q. Isn't Iatan 2 the lowest cost generating unit for KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company in terms of fuel usage and operations?
A. It will be.
Q. And the partners that constructed Iatan 2, the Empire District Electric Company, KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company, Kansas City Power and Light Company and some others, do their ownership interests change based on their capacity or generating needs?
A. Could you say that one more time?
Q. Those that constructed Iatan 2 and have invested in it, do their ownership interests change based on their needs in the future?
A. Between --
Q. Are they --
A. Between districts?
Q. Between the companies? Or are they fixed?
A. I believe at Empire District, which serves four jurisdictions as well as FERC that they do shift their ownership interests based on their load requirements for each district. So I believe that they --
Q. My question is -- I'm asking amongst the owners whether the ownership interests change. My understanding is, for example, KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company owns 18 percent of Iatan 2.
A. And that will not change. That's correct.
Q. And none of the other owners in Iatan 2's interest change as well, do they? I'm not talking about at some kind of a division level. I'm talking about ownership interest in Iatan 2.
A. That would be my understanding.

MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
Is there any redirect?
MR. FISCHER: Yes, Judge. Just briefly.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. Mr. Rush in answer to one of the Commissioner's questions you indicated you were trying to balance the interest of the Company, I believe?
A. That's correct.
Q. What company are you talking about here?
A. In GMO we have two billing divisions. We have what's called the L\&P division. We have the MPS division. And we're trying to make sure that we look out for the interest. We do -- we do load forecast, for example, for both L\&P and MPS and try to define what the needs of those two divisions. And that's the interest that I'm talking about.
Q. Are the -- is the MPS a separate corporation from the L\&P?
A. No, it is not.
Q. So it's --
A. No. They're all one corporation.
Q. I believe you were asked some questions about -- that led to an answer that -- how you treat other plants during rate cases?
A. That's correct.
Q. If the Commission adopted the Staff's proposal with a fixed amount going to L\&P, would that -would that be consistent with how you do other plants?
A. It -- it would not be how we do Kansas City Power and Light's companies allocation on their needs because we look at both the Missouri side and the Kansas side and allocate it based on needs. So no, it would not.
Q. Can you describe for the Commission how you do that allocation process for KCP\&L and how it would work for GMO?
A. We11, how we do it for KCP\&L today is we go through an analysis of looking at demands. And actually each state has two different looks that they see. One says if we want it allocated on a 12 CP method and one state
says they want it on a 4 CP method. And we actually look at both of those and we respect that they're -- each jurisdiction has its own interest.

Anyway, they go through and they make an allocation of all the plants necessary to serve those customers' needs based on those allocation factors; 12 CP for Kansas and a 4 CP for Missouri.

And that defines the asset base that gets assigned in a rate case. what we're trying to do here for KCPL Greater Missouri Operations Company is set up a similar situation where we would put Iatan 2 up in an area that is available to both the MPS and the L\&P divisions and go through an analysis whether it's a 12 CP or a 4 CP or a load factor analysis.

We attempt to do a -- to do all of those in the analysis prepared by Mr. Crawford in trying to ascertain what is the appropriate balancing aspect for the L\&P and MPS divisions. That's how we derived the 41 megawatts for L\&P and the 112 megawatts for MPS.
Q. Do you know, did you look at those kinds of allocations in developing your proposal in this case?
A. We actually did, yes. And they were presented in his testimony.
Q. Mr. Williams asked you about the expiration of a purchase power agreement.
A. That's correct. Yes.
Q. Are there more than one purchase power agreements that are expiring?
A. There are. There are two of them. There's one with -- they're both with Nebraska Public Power District. But one was purchased -- they entered into in the old St. Joe Light and Power division. It has stil1 retained to be assigned to that division. And it expires this year.

And as I said before, we another one that is from the nuclear plant, $I$ think it's Cooper nuclear plant, for 75 megawatts. And it expires, $I$ believe, in 2012.
Q. Did the Company take the expiration of those contracts into account in developing its proposal?
A. Yes, we did. Yes.
Q. How did you do that?
A. Mr. Crawford could explain it better, but I believe what the analysis looked at is a 20-year period of time to try to balance the interest on a present value of revenue requirements basis to try to make sure that we looked at the balancing aspects of what the needs were over this long period of time.
Q. In answer to one of the Commissioner's questions you said, $I$ believe, that if you allocated all of the Iatan 2 cost to L\&P the rates would skyrocket for L\&P?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you quantify that in some way?
A. I would -- I would say that it would go up at least in the range of $\$ 40$ miliion because $I$ said that de7ta or the 59 megawatts is -- is worth approximately $\$ 20$ million and I would say adding that other 50 -some megawatts that would be 100 percent of it going to L\&P would be another 20 megawa-- $\$ 20$ miliion. So $I$ would say on top of what we've asked, which is 20 million -- $\$ 22$ miliion, rates would go up another 40 million. So it would be a total increase of about $\$ 60 \mathrm{mil1ion}$.
Q. $\quad 60$ or 40 ?
A. The total would be 60. I believe it would be 40 for the first -- the delta 59 , which is the issue in this case. There's another 53 that would go on. And there was already an assignment of 41 that we've already included in the rate request.
Q. The Commissioner also asked you about the fue1 adjustment clause?
A. Right. Yes.
Q. Can you explain what your concern is regarding the fuel adjustment clause if the Staff's proposal was developed -- was adopted?
A. Well, in the past -- and I believe it was in the last case I did, we presented testimony about how many
megawatt hours are actually being shifted between L\&P to MPS at cost. Because -- because basically st. Joe was heavily -- heavy baseload oriented utility.

And what was happening is we were providing very inexpensive energy to the MPS division. Vice versa; MPS was charging St. Joe for some peaking energy that it needed, but it was a much smaller number than that. And our concern is that if you put everything to L\&P and use the same fuel adjustment allocation method, it would put two -- it would be charging L\&P for essentially the fixed cost and giving MPS all the benefits of it.
Q. And I believe in answer to one of the Commissioner's questions you said this is a zero sum gain. what does that mean?
A. Basically, we're asking for an increase for the GMO business. This essentially is a rate design issue within that if you think about it. Because it's simply saying, okay, we have this increase. It's a total increase of the sum of the MPS and the L\&P request. with regard to this issue; if it goes from one bucket -- if it leaves on bucket, it goes to the other bucket.

So it kind of says that that number is not going to change. That's really not -- you know, it's the total that's in there that we're looking at.

MR. FISCHER: That's all I have. Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Before I excuse you, Mr. Rush, I just want to -- I want to go back to the offer of exhibits.

I've looked back in my notes and I have that they were entered, but then I had a note that said there may be an objection from OPC as to GMO only issues. So just to make sure that they actually got admitted, let me ask if there is any objection.

MR. MILLS: I have no objection. I think at the time, we had not even begun to look at the GMO issues.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Right. Okay.
MR. MILLS: And I looked at those. I have no objection.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Just to clarify. Those three exhibits, 32, 33 and 35 are admitted.
(Wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit Nos. GMO 32, GMO 33, and GMO 35 were received into evidence.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Mr. Rush. I believe that's all for now.
(Witness excused.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: And next witness,
Mr. Crawford.
(Witness sworn.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
You may go ahead with direct.
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BURTON CRAWFORD testifies as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. Please state your name and address for the record.
A. Burton L. Crawford, 1200 Main, Kansas City, Missouri.
Q. Are you the same Burton Crawford who caused to be filed in this case certain testimony that's been marked as GMO 10, GMO 11 and GMO 12 , both high1y confidential and NP versions of your direct, rebuttal and surrebuttal respectively?
A. I am.
Q. Do you have any changes or corrections that need to be made to those testimonies?
A. I do not.
Q. And are the exhibits accurate to the best of your knowledge?
A. Yes.

MR. FISCHER: Judge, if I could, I'd like to have these marked by the court reporter and offer those into evidence --

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
MR. FISCHER: -- and tender the witness.
(wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit Nos. GMO 12 NP and GMO 12 HC were marked for identification.)
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JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any objection -again, according to my notes $I$ have that 10 has already been admitted, but I'11 just -- that may not be correct.

Are there any objections to 10 and 11 and 12? GMO 10,11 , and 12 ?

Seeing none then, I will admit those.
(Wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit Nos. GMO 10, GMO 11, GMO 12 NP and GMO 12 HC were received into evidence.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: And what cross-examination am I going to have? Same?

All right. Then Staff, cross-examination.
MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Judge. I'm going to have a couple of exhibits. I believe it would be GMO 249 and GMO 250.
(Wherein; Staff Exhibit Nos. GMO 249 and GMO 250 were marked for identification.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
MR. WILLIAMS: GMO 249 would be form 1 for calendar year 2008 for L\&P. And 250 would be the FERC Form 1 for calendar year 2008 for MPS.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Crawford. Did you bring a calculator here with you today?
A. I do not have a calculator.
Q. Are you familiar with FERC Form 1's for

KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company in particular for 2008?
A. I'm not --
Q. Not at all?
A. I know what FERC Form 1 generally is, but am I familiar with that particular document; no.

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, may I approach?
JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q. I'm handing you what's been marked as GMO 249 and also what's been marked as GMO 250 and I'm providing you with a calculator. Do you know how to use that?
A. Is that a Reverse Polish Notation HP? No.
Q. It's a Texas Instrument.
A. All right.
Q. Could you take a look at what's been marked as GMO 249 and what's been marked as GMO 250 ?
A. (Witness complied.)
Q. And what is GMO 249?
A. $\quad 249$ appears to be a piece from FERC Form 1 for Light and Power.
Q. And did you look at the particular pages of that FERC Form 1 that are included in that exhibit?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And do the numbers on there appear correct?
A. I have no reason to doubt them.
Q. Then on what's been marked as GMO 250, did you have an opportunity to review the numbers on the selected pages from the FERC Form 1 that are included in that exhibit?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And do those numbers appear correct to you?
A. Again, I have no reason to doubt them.
Q. Is there sufficient information in those sheets from the FERC Form 1 to calculate based on megawatt hours of usage the relative percentages of residential, commercial and industrial customers for L\&P if you look at GMO 249 in 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. And how would you go about doing that calculation?
A. I'm sorry did you say the commercial as a percent or a particular group as a percent?
Q. Well, I'm looking at -- let's start with residential. If you wanted to find out the based on kilowatt hours of usage what percentage residential is over the total usage, what calculation would you perform and which numbers would you use that appear on this exhibit?
A. Well the megawatt hours sold for residential
for Light and Power in 2008, this document is showing 794,126 megawatt hours sold. Out of the total of $2,166,099$. So I would simply take the megawatt hours sold to residential and divide it by the total sales.
Q. Would you do that calculation?
A. If I can figure out your calculator.

It looks like about 36.7 percent.
Q. And if you were to do the same type of calculation for commercial what result would you get?
A. $\quad 35.1$ percent.
Q. And for industrial?
A. 28.3.
Q. And then would you do the same for Exhibit GMO 250, which is for MPS, is it not?
A. For residential $I$ get 46.3. I get 40.6 for commercial and I get 12.8 for industrial.
Q. Okay. For MPS do the percentages you calculated for residential, commercial and industrial appear correct to you? I mean, do they reflect KCPL Greater Missouri Operations Company's system?
A. I have -- I have no reason to doubt them.
Q. We11, have you done this type of calculation in the past?
A. On an individual customer class basis, no.
Q. Do industrial customers typically use --
need more baseload capacity than residential customers?
A. Yes.
Q. And do they also need more baseload capacity than commercial customers in general?
A. In general, yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'd like to offer -- I'11
offer GMO 249 and GMO 250 at this time?
JUDGE DIPPELL: Do we have any objection?
MR. FISCHER: No objection.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right, then I'11 admit GMO 249 and GMO 250.
(Wherein; Staff Exhibit Nos. GMO 249 and GMO 250 were received into evidence.)

MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any questions from
Commissioner Davis?
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any redirect?
MR. FISCHER: Yes, briefly.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. Mr. Crawford, you were asked some questions regarding the relative percentages between the MPS and the L\&P divisions regarding residential, commercial and industrial. Do you recall those questions?
A. Yes.
Q. Does a 4 CP or a 12 CP allocation methodology take into account any of those relative differences between the divisions when you're allocating power plants?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you explain how that would work? or why that would be a factor?
A. In terms of allocating plant, like we would between Missouri and Kansas or as we have done with Iatan 2 between Light and Power and MPS, the 12 CP and 4 CP would stand for 12 coincident peak and 4 coincident peak are a relative measure of -- if the demand for those systems and one of the methods that we had had looked at is -- was based on peak and peak loads for industrials generally are a -- because their load is relatively flat, they're average load is similar to their peak load.
Q. Looking at those kinds of percentages in the future, would you expect those percentages to change over time?

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, I'm going to object.
This is calling for speculation.
JUDGE DIPPELL: I believe it's within the realm of the question and I'11 let him answer if he knows.

THE WITNESS: Yes. I would expect them to change over time.

BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. Does the Company's proposed allocation methodology in this case take into account changing percentages like that?
A. Yes, it would.
Q. How would that be the case?
A. The methodology looks over an extended period of time to changes in load or peak and energy where these sheets are focused on energy. And the Company individually forecasts the needs of the customers in those areas and the allocation methodology takes that -- takes that into account.
Q. Would the methodology that fixes the allocation take those kinds of change in percentages into account?
A. It would not.

MR. FISCHER: That's all I have. Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Mr. Crawford.
I believe that's al1 for Mr. Crawford at
this time.
(Witness excused.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Next witness is Mr. Blanc.
MR. FISCHER: Yes, Judge.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Let the record reflect that
is a fancy looking calculator from where I sit.
(witness sworn.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Direct for Mr. Blanc?
CURTIS BLANC testifies as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY FISCHER:
Q. Please state your name and address for the record.
A. My name is Curtis Blanc and my business address is KCP\&L, 1200 Main Street, Kansas City, Missouri.
Q. Are you the same Curtis Blanc who caused to be filed in this case and also the companion Kansas City Power and Light case testimony, direct rebuttal, surrebuttal, which have been now marked as GMO Exhibit 10 HC and NP, GMO 11 HC and NP and GMO 12 HC and NP?

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, I believe he's just stated Mr. Crawford's testimony.

MR. FISCHER: I'm sorry. I did. I looked at the wrong numbers. BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. 4, 5, and 6; direct, rebuttal, and surrebuttal?
A. That's correct. Yes.
Q. okay. I believe we've already introduced your direct and your rebuttal, but I've got a surrebuttal that I'd like to give to the court reporter.
(Wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit Nos. GMO 4, GMO 5
and GMO 6 were marked for identification.)
BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. If I were to ask you the same questions that are contained in that today, would your answers be the same?
A. Yes, they would.
Q. Do you have any corrections at all?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Are the exhibits that are attached accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. Yes, they are.

MR. FISCHER: Judge, I would move for the admission of 4, 5, and 6, I believe.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right.
MR. FISCHER: And tender the witness.
JUDGE DIPPELL: And you stated something there that confused me, Mr. Fischer. Were they KCPL versions of Mr. B7anc testimony 7, 8, and 9? KCPL 7, 8, and 9, is that --

I have that this is GMO 4, 5, and 6.
MR. FISCHER: Yes.
JUDGE DIPPELL: I wanted to make sure I wasn't confusing --

MR. FISCHER: Yes. I have GMO 4, 5, and 6. JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
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MR. FISCHER: I'm not sure if they were admitted earlier, but I move for admission at this time.

JUDGE DIPPELL: I do not show that they have been.

Is there any objection to GMO Exhibits 4, 5, and 6 ?

Then they will be admitted.
(Wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit Nos. GMO 4, GMO 5 and GMO 6 were received into evidence.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: what cross-examination am I going to have?

All right. We'11 start with the Industrials. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CONRAD:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Blanc. These weren't your exhibits, but do you have 249 and 250 up there?
A. I do not.

Thank you.
Q. I will see if we can shorten this up a little bit if you would just look at both of them and the column I think that Mr. Crawford was looking at is the column that is identified, Megawatt Hours Sold.
A. I see that column, yes.
Q. You've seen a FERC Form 1 before.
A. I have.
Q. Is there anything in that column that shows you anything about the time of day that those megawatt hours were sold?
A. I don't know the simple answer. I'm not familiar enough with how the different numbers are calculated.
Q. We11, it's just a listing of total megawatt hours sold and it looks like -- correct me if I'm wrong -is for a whole year. Right.
A. That would certainly be true for the megawatt hours sold column.
Q. It doesn't break it out by month or day Or --
A. No.
Q. -- season.

That's true on 249 and 250 ?
A. Those are annual numbers.
Q. Yeah. okay. So they're just -- they're just sums. If you go to the very back page of either report, down near at the bottom it is just a total billed number in that column. Right?
A. Correct.

MR. CONRAD: Thank you, sir. That's all I've got.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there cross-examination

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Judge.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Blanc.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Does KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company have a long-term goal of having a uniform tariff throughout its service area?
A. A long-term goal, but not to the detriment of the customers.
Q. And what steps has -- if any, has KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations taken towards unifying its tariff in terms of its rates?
A. So far in this rate case, none. The rates reflect the cost to service their respective customers and there wasn't anything done intentionally to bring the rates together or further apart, just cost to serve.
Q. What about in prior rate cases?
A. Same answer.

MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any questions from
Commissioner Davis?
QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Blanc.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. So I mean, do you get the impression that it's Staff just doesn't want you consolidating anything and that you're just supposed to maintain St. Joe Power and Light by St. Joe Power and Light and Missouri Public Service is Missouri Public Service for all perpetuity. I mean, is that -- is that the -- is that the inference that we're supposed to get or --
A. I guess I'm a little confused on that part myself based in part on Mr. Williams' last line of questions. On the one hand a lot of the argument -Staff's position, I should say, seems to be based on what happened pre-2000, more than a decade ago when L\&P was still an independent company and utility.

But then at the same time they seem to want us to do things to bring the rates more in line with one another. And what I was suggesting is we could have certainly allocated more of Iatan 2 to St. Joe than we believe St. Joe needed to equalize the rates, but I wouldn't see that as appropriate and the Company wouldn't see that as appropriate.
we looked at how much capacity L\&P customers needed and how much capacity MPS customers needed. And that was the basis. I mean, could we have given MPS more than they deserved to bring their rates up; sure, but that wouldn't have been right.
Q. Okay. And so what Staff's proposal does is in essence equalize the rates between L\&P -- or -- yeah, L\&P and the Missouri Public Service?
A. I think it's a step in that direction, but it's a very big step in my mind to do in one case. The rate impact according to Staff's own report would be four times for L\&P what it is for MPS. And the issue is there the companies are just very different sizes. And L\&P is much smaller than MPS.

I mean, L\&P's total revenue requirement is 159 million compared to MPS's 525. So anything you put to L\&P is going to have a significant impact on rates.
Q. So sort of like doing business in SPP and comparing like Empire Electric to KCP\&L isn't it?
A. I don't know those numbers as we11, but certainly KCP\&L is a larger member of SPP, if it's based on load, than Empire Electric. That's correct.
Q. Empire Electric's just a small member of SPP?
A. Based on load I think that's correct.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: All right. Thank you, Mr. Blanc. No further questions.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there further cross-examination based on the Commissioner's question? Mr. Williams?

RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q. Mr. Blanc, hasn't Staff worked with KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company to substantially cause KCP\&L's -- KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company to be tariffed throughout its territory aside from rates?
A. I don't understand the question. I'm sorry. Can you try again?
Q. Hasn't Staff worked with KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company to make KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operation Company's tariff as uniform as it can throughout its territory with the exception of rates?
A. Yeah. I'm pausing because my recollection is the general rules and regs were common between MPS and L\&P prior to the acquisition. So if Staff worked with Aquila to consolidate the general rules and regs, $I$ have no reason to dispute that. That would have just occurred prior to the acquisition, so I'm just not that familiar.
Q. And which acquisition are you referring to?
A. I would be referring to the acquisition of Aquila Inc by Great Plains Energy.
Q. So you're not familiar with the acqu-acquisition of St. Joseph Light and Power Company by UtiliCorp United in 2000?
A. Yeah, generally. But I thought your question is if staff worked with the Company to consolidate
the tariffs of MPS and L\&P and I was simply saying that the rules and regs had been consolidated, but that was before the GPE acquisition. So I don't know what Staff's role with Aquila was to bring those together. But I presumed they worked together.

MR. WILLIAMS: And that was the clarification I was looking for. Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any redirect?
MR. FISCHER: Just briefly.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. Mr. Blanc, I believe you were asked a question about whether it's GMO's goal to have uniform rates some day in the future?
A. Yes. I was asked that.
Q. Is it appropriate to use a allocation of a single power plant to accomplish that goal?
A. No, not at all and that's what I was trying to explain to Commissioner Davis is particularly to try and do so much in a single rate case and to use one power plant to do it, in my mind wouldn't be appropriate. That's something that has to be done very deliberately over a long period of time.
Q. Could that be an issue if -- if someday KCPL and GMO attempt to merger?
A. Yes.
Q. Are there other methods besides allocating power plants that could be used to achieve a more uniform rate structure throughout a company.
A. Sure. There's any number of things. You could look at all of the Company's cost and compare them as opposed to just the allocation of one plant and that would be better.
Q. Would that be something the Company might look at in the future?
A. Sure.
Q. Even if the Company -- excuse me -- even if the Commission adopted the Staff's proposal to allocate Iatan 2, mostly to L\&P, would that accomplish an equalization of rates?

MR. WILLIAMS: Judge, I think we're getting way beyond the scope of cross with these questions. what I asked him was about whether or not the Company had a long-term goal of getting uniform rates throughout its service area.

MR. FISCHER: I believe there was an answer to perhaps the Commissioner's question about whether -- or the equalization. I believe he was assuming there was an equalization in Staff's methodology. I just wanted to clarify that.

JUDGE DIPPELL: I will allow the question.
objection overruled.
THE WITNESS: My understanding is there wouldn't be an equalization. It would raise L\&P's rates disproportionately. I would say that they would still be less than MPS's.

MR. FISCHER: That's all I have.
Thank you, Judge.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you, Mr. Blanc.
All right. That's the end of his testimony.
(Witness excused.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: We've been going almost two hours, so I'm going to take a short 10-minute break and then we will return with Staff's witness on this issue. And then I believe we will be going from there to the joint issue that came up, the Advanced Coal Credit.

MR. STEINER: That's correct.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right. Let's go ahead and go off the record and return at five after, please.
(A recess was taken.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: All right. We're back on the record. And I believe that was all of Company's witnesses for that particular issue and next is Staff, has Ms. Mantle.
(Witness sworn.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Go ahead with
direct, Mr. williams.
LENA MANTLE testifies as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q. What is your name?
A. My name is Lena M. Mantle.
Q. Lena, did you prefile testimony in this case that consists of portions, I believe Pages 90 through 103, in the Staff report requirement cost of service that's been marked for identification as Exhibit No. GMO 210 and rebuttal testimony that's been marked for purposes of identification as Exhibit No. GMO 232 and also surrebuttal testimony that's been marked for purposes of identification as Exhibit No. GMO 233 in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. And are all three of those portions of your testimony and -- is a11 of your testimony contained some highly confidential materials?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any changes to those -- that portion of the Staff report that's been marked as Exhibit No. GMO 210 HC or GMO 232, your rebuttal testimony or GMO 233, your surrebuttal testimony?
A. I have no changes.
Q. Then are they your testimony here today?
A. Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: with that, I would offer Pages 90 through 103 of the Staff report, GMO 210 and also the rebuttal testimony and surrebuttal testimony of Lena $M$. Mantle, GMO 232 and GMO 233.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection to those exhibits?

Then seeing none, I will admit are -- are you just offering those pages of 210 or -- I show it's already been admitted.

MR. WILLIAMS: I believe it has, but I wanted to do make sure it was identified to this particular witness.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Al1 right. I will admit 210, 232 and 233.
(Wherein; Staff Exhibit No. GMO 210 HC, GMO 232 and GMO 233 were received into evidence.)

MR. WILLIAMS: And with that, I'11 offer the witness for examination by others.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right. what cross-examination will I have for Ms. Mantle? Any?

Company? Al1 right. Mr. Fischer.
MR. FISCHER: Thank you, judge.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Mantle.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I just have a few -- I just have a few questions for you. Do you have the cost of -- Staff's cost of service study with you there, the -- the particular page that's Mr. Williams mentioned?
A. Yes.
Q. I'd like to refer you to Page 94.
A. Okay.
Q. There at Lines 9 through 11, I believe it kind of lays out the Staff's position that the Staff's recommending that 100 megawatts of GMO's 153 megawatts share of Iatan 2 be allocated to L\&P; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And 53 megawatts would go to MPS --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that right?

Then if -- and if you go to the next line or next sentence, excuse me, it says Staff primarily bases its position on St. Joseph Light and Power Company's resources when GMO and St. Joe Light and Power merged; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, that merger between St. Joe Light and Power and the former Aquila Inc. occurred, what, in the year 2000 is that your recollection?
A. Yes.
Q. Would it be correct to conclude that Staff's
recommendation in this case on the current allocation of Iatan 2 is based primarily upon St. Joseph Light and Power's resources that existed ten years ago?
A. St. Joe Light and Power's resources of ten years ago, MPS's resources -- they have added resources since that merger took place.
Q. Well, I'm just trying to understand your sentence there. Staff primarily bases its position on St. Joseph Light and Power Company's resources when GMO and -- and St. Joe Light and Power merged?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that mean that you're primarily basing it upon the resources that existed at the time of that merger?
A. Primarily, but we did -- I did look at other things other than just that.
Q. Okay. If you turn to Page 95 at Line 16 and 17 , it seems to indicate that MPS and L\&P generations jointly dispatched, is that your understanding?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. Now following the merger of Aquila Inc. and St. Joe Light and Power company, is it your understanding that Aquila jointly dispatched the generation units that served the MPS service area and the L\&P service areas?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if -- if you go to your schedule, which is attached, Schedule 4, the LMN schedu7e 4, do you --
A. I want to ask my attorney for that because I -- I was looking earlier and I could not find that in my printout that I had.
Q. I can give you a copy if you need it.

MR. FISCHER: May I approach? I can do it quickly.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. I've highlighted the portion I'm going to ask you about.
A. Okay.
Q. There at the top of that page it indicates that after GMO, then named Utilicorp, merged with St. Joseph Light and Power Company, GMO began jointly dispatching L\&P and MPS's units to economically meet the combined energy requirements of L\&P and MPS. No distinction was made as to what generating unit was serving that load; is that right?
A. Serving "what" load. Yes, that is correct.
Q. Oh, serving what load. I'm sorry. What does that mean to you to jointly dispatch generation units in that context?
A. It's my understanding that the dispatchers
see one load. They do not see MPS load and Light and Power load, although they are measured separately. So we do have those measurements. And they have a list of units to dispatch.

They dispatch -- now, would be probably Iatan 2 first. They dispatch Iatan 1 second and probably Sibley -- Jeffrey or sibley next. And regardless of who owns them, it doesn't make any difference, they dispatch economically based on other requirements of the generating unit.
Q. So Iatan 2 would be jointly dispatched between L\&P and MPS based on economics?
A. It would be dispatched to meet the load at that hour regardless of where that load was coming from.
Q. Whether it was in St. Joe or in -- in Raytown?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you believe that it's appropriate for GMO to jointly dispatch its generation units to economically meet the combined energy requirements of LPS and -- and MPS -- L\&P and MPS?
A. I believe there's been benefits to MPS. I do not know that there's been benefits to Light and Power, but that has been the way that it has been done since the two merged.
Q. We11, do you believe it's appropriate to jointly dispatch?
A. If you're treating them as one company, yes.
Q. Are they one company?
A. They are one company.
Q. Would you agree -- well, wouldn't you agree that it's not appropriate for just the MPS customers to receive the benefits of the merger between St. Joseph Light and Power Company and -- and Aquila?
A. I would agree with that.
Q. Both groups have been -- excuse me. Both groups of customers should receive benefits, if any, wouldn't you agree?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, following the merger of Aquila and -and St. Joe Light and Power, was the L\&P service area served only by units that were located in or near the service area that was owned by St. Joe Light and Power Company?
A. Are you asking me if Light and Power's loads were served only by the St. Joe Light and Power's units?
Q. Right.
A. They were served by their units, the pro-or the purchased power contract from NPPD, which is in Nebraska, came from Nebraska. And then on a few peaking hours they did receive some energy back from MPS at cost.
Q. Well, whenever Aquila and St. Joe Light and Power merged, after that time, was the L\&P service area served only by units that were located in the L\&P area?
A. They were served by L\&P units. The NPPD contract -- contract, which I believe came out of the gentleman generating plant in Nebraska, and then there were a few hours out of the year where they did receive some energy from MPS and I do believe there's some off-system sales purchases, spot market purchase, that's served St. Joe customers.
Q. Well, following that merger, the L\&P service area was no longer served by a stand alone St. Joseph Light and Power Company. Right?
A. That is correct. They were allocated those costs, but the -- the plants were dispatched together, but they were allocated costs from their own units and from the NPPD contract.
Q. Okay. Well, isn't true then that by jointly dispatching Aquila generation plants following the merger of St. Joe Light and Power, customers in both the L\&P service area and the MPS service area would have received power from generation plants that were located throughout the combined service territory?
A. I believe due to the laws of physics, most
of the power generated in the St. Joe area is going to serve those customers and most of the -- the power plants from further away are going to serve the load closest to it. That's just the physical characteristics of electricity. So I cannot say that -- that St. Joe customers got any power from sibley. I don't know.
Q. You can't say that they can't. You can't tell the difference between KWH from Sibley and one that's in Iatan?
A. Yeah. They don't put tags on those electrons once they're generated.
Q. Okay. You'd have to agree L\&P customers might have received power from Sibley?
A. They might have.
Q. And L\&P customers might have received power
from Iatan 1?
A. L\&P customers did receive power from --
Q. MNS -- how about MPS customers?
A. They did. They have received power from

Iatan 1.
Q. Going back to your cost of service report at Page 98, Lines 10 through 16, there it indicates the Staff examined five different allocation scenarios on how to allocate Iatan 2; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Do you agree that there might be more than one allocation scenario for allocating Iatan 2 that would be reasonable?
A. Sure.
Q. Scenario 2, as I understand it, the allocation of 100 megawatts to L\&P and 53 megawatts to MPS, that's the allocation scenario that Staff ultimately close to recommend in this case; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And then the scenario 4 that you looked at, that -- is that the scenario that GMO is recommending in this case?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you turn to Page 99 of your cost of service report?
A. Yes.
Q. There's -- at Line 12 it says scenarios 1,2 and 3 are reasonable for GMO if the only consideration is L\&P's needs as a stand alone utility; is that right?
A. That's what it says, yes.
Q. Okay. Then if we go up to Line 4, it says scenario 5 above, all of Iatan 2 allocated MPS would be the most appropriate scenario if the only consideration is MPS's needs as a stand alone utility; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. So scenario 5 is okay if you look at MPS as a stand alone utility. And the others; 1, 2 and 3 are appropriate if you're considering L\&P as a stand alone utility; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. But I believe you said that it -- they are not really stand alone companies. Correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Is there another scenario in between those two that would balance those interests?
A. I believe scenario 4 is -- would lower -more closely meet MPS's needs than Light and Power's needs. If -- if I had to -- to say whether scenario 4 was MPS or Light and Power as a stand alone, it would be more beneficial to MPS.
Q. But it's in the middle isn't? It's between those two? 1, 2 and 3 go to -- to L\&P -- or excuse me, MPS and the other way around. I'm sorry.
A. Yes. 1, 2 and 3 are reasonable for GMO if the only consideration is L\&P's needs as a stand alone utility.
Q. Wouldn't you agree that scenario 4 does find some common ground between those scenarios?
A. Yes.
Q. Would it be correct to conclude that the
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Staff is recommending that the Commission allocate approximately 240 percent more of Iatan 2 to L\&P than what the Company's recommending? About 2.4 times more?
A. It is more than twice. I don't know --
Q. okay.
A. -- exactly.
Q. If you turn to Page 102 of the Staff's cost of service report -- and I'm not sure if I have the line number, but it states the Staff's position on 100 megawatts for L\&P will potentially cause the rate increase to L\&P customers to be almost four times the rate increase to L\&P customers. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then turning back to Page 95 of the Staff's report on Line 2 it states, Staff realizes that economic additions are tough and the rate impact of adding 100 megawatts Iatan 2 investment and costs of L\&P's revenue requirement will not be easy for many of its customers; is that right?
A. That's what it says, yes.
Q. Is it correct that if the Staff wins this issue and the Commission adopts your recommendation, the revenue requirement for L\&P will be increased by approximately 18 to $\$ 20$ million above what it would have been if the Company's position had prevailed?
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A. That would be the capital cost only. of course the fuel cost will be less then because Light and Power will have more of the -- of its energy generated by Iatan 2, which means a lower fuel cost. So they net about 15 million.
Q. So that's what Staff thinks the impact would be in taking the fuel costs into account along with the capital cost, 15 million?
A. And that is a change -- that is the change to Light and Power. So it incorporates the fact that Light and Power's been paying capacity payments for NPPD capacity for the past ten years. Probably a bit longer than that but --

So it's incremental change to Light and Power. It's not the whole -- the whole impact of adding Iatan 2.
Q. You mentioned that expiration of that purchased power contract. Did you take into account the other expiration of the other contract that's involved?
A. Yes, I did. And it is to expire in 2014, which will give GMO more time to be looking for additional capacity.
Q. Is it your understanding the Company's requested that the L\&P customers receive a $\$ 22.1$ million total rate increase?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. Will the Staff have any concerns if the Commission grants the Company substantially more than the tariffs for the L\&P service area requested as a result of the adoption of Staff's Iatan 2 allocation issue?
A. I believe that would be the outcome if the Commission adopted all of Staff's positions. As -- to be concerned about it, I'm -- you know, of course they should be concerned about the impact on the customers, but I assume you're alluding to the fact that you only asked for 22 million and it would be more than 22 million.
Q. Well, no. I'm really asking whether the Staff would have a concern about that. We asked for 101 mil1ion total company.
A. So would the Staff be worried that our position is greater than the Company's?
Q. I'm just really asking whether you have any concerns if the Commission grants substantially more than the tariffs for L\&P had -- what the Company asked for, whether that would be a concern to the Staff?
A. No. The concern of the Staff is to get the costs to the correct customers and to -- for the long term looking at what those customers wil1 need and what they will be paying in the long run, not just next year.
Q. Is it your understanding that GMO's proposal
to allocate 41 megawatts of Iatan 2 capacity to the L\&P customers would have a less severe impact on the L\&P customers than Staff's proposal?
A. Yes. However, it would increase their fuel cost more.
Q. But I believe you indicated in your proposal increased their rates four times with the MPS customers?
A. Based on the numbers that were given to me at the time direct was written.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let's turn to Page 98 of the Staff's cost of service report. At Lines 20 and 21 you state, because separate resource plan studies are not available for MPS and L\&P, the Staff does not know GMO's exact needs to separately serve its MPS and L\&P customers; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is that statement true because GMO does not -- or does joint capacity planning for the entire system including both MPS and L\&P?
A. Yes.
Q. GMO doesn't separately plan for just the MPS customers; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Nor does it separately plan for L\&P
customers?
A. That is correct.
Q. It plans to serve its entire customer base?
A. Yes.
Q. Then on -- on Lines 21 through 24 of Page 98 you state, the capacity needs of MPS and L\&P that Staff has previously discussed in this report are based on Staff's knowledge of resource planning, generation plant characteristics and load of MPS and L\&P when GMO and SJLP merged in 2000 and GMO's current resource plans; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Based on the information that you had available, is it correct that Staff attempted to determine the capacity needs for MPS and L\&P separately?
A. We did look at what the generation resources of each were at the time they were merged. I do believe they're still forecasting them by L -- MPS and Light and Power.

And we did look at -- yeah how -- and Mr. Crawford had attached to his testimony a schedule that was sort of a capacity balance sheet for MPS and Light and Power. So I looked at that limited information that was available, yes.
Q. We11, you attempted to determine the separate capacity needs for the different service areas; is
that -- is that true?
A. Based on my knowledge of the resource planning and the for -- the load increases and -- that we've seen.
Q. I think you just indicated you looked at Burton Crawford's testimony; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. He testified that the Staff's allocation of Iatan 2 would result in a larger share of L\&P's retai 1 load being met with baseload resources compared to MPS. Do you have any reason to ask -- to disagree with that?
A. No. That would be correct.
Q. And I think he also indicated that under Staff's proposal L\&P would have 73 percent of its peak load met with baseload capacity while leaving MPS with 57 percent. Do you have any reason to disagree with that?
A. Is that in his testimony?
Q. Yes. I think Page 14.
A. Of his rebuttal testimony?
Q. Yes.
A. Are you talking about the top of Page 15.
Q. I believe that's --
A. Lines 2 and 3.
Q. I believe that's right. Then the Lines 4 and 7 go on. I'm going to ask you about that. But yeah,
is that -- is that true that under Staff's proposal L\&P would have 73 percent of its peak met by baseload capacity?
A. I did not check that number, but it does not seem unreasonable to me.
Q. Sounds right to -- about 57 percent of MPS's peak would be met with baseload?
A. Actually, I'm surprised it's that high, but yes.
Q. okay. And then going on down to Lines 4 through 7 , the Company's proposed $112 / 41$ allocation results in 60 percent of L\&P's 2011 projected peak met with projected capacity and 61 percent of MPS 2011 projected peak met with baseload capacity. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any disagree with those -- those numbers?
A. No. I believe that's what his allocation methodology results in.
Q. Okay. Then on Line 11 on Page 95 you indicate that GMO committed to not changing the rates in the L\&P service area at the time of the filing of the merger application; is that right?
A. Are we back to my testimony now?
Q. No. I'm sorry. We're back on the cost of service report, yeah?
A. Okay.
Q. At Page 95 at Line 11?
A. Yes. That's what it says.
Q. Okay. And there you're talking about the -the merger that occurred between the former Aquila, Inc. and St. Joe Light and Power. Right?
A. I don't know whether it was called UtiliCorp or Aquila, but yes.
Q. That merger --
A. That merger.
Q. -- back in 2000, not when Great Plains

Energy acquired Aquila, Inc?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Then you go onto state on Line 12 , GMO expressed a long-term goal of having one rate schedule rather than two, single tariff pricing; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Does Staff have a goal of having one rate schedule rather than two or single tariff pricing for the entire GMO service territory?
A. That is something we'd like to move toward, but that's not the reason that we have the position that we have here in this case.
Q. Is single tariff pricing for electric companies generally desirable from Staff's perspective?
A. Yes.
Q. Is the goal of having a single tariff or single rate structure a primary reason for staff's recommendation on this issue?
A. No.
Q. Is it a factor then?
A. It is a factor, but it's not the primary reason.
Q. The primary reason is looking back at the allocation on the resources that occurred that they had at the time at the previous merger; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Rather than allocating a higher percentage of Iatan 2 to the L\&P customers, wouldn't there be more direct methods of phasing in changes to rate structures of a company that could eventually result in a single tariff?
A. There could be, yes.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you. That's all I have.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you.
Commissioner Davis, do you have questions
for Ms. Mantle?
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Just a few.
QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS:
Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Mantle.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. okay. So why is it in the -- in the public interest to choose Staff plan -- Staff's proposal on this issue over that of the Company's?
A. Iatan 2 is a very valuable resource.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. It will provide inexpensive energy for at least half of a century most likely, 50 years.
Q. uh-huh.
A. And Staff believes in taking a long-term look, not just at -- we look at the rate impacts, that is important. I read every public comment that comes in regarding the case. I hear customers say that they can't take this, but I do know that down the road if you do short term fixes all the time, it's going to be more expensive in the long run.

St. Joe's management back before it merged with Aquila made -- entered into a baseload purchase power contract with NPPD, Nebraska Public Power District.
Q. Right. Hundred megawatts?
A. Yes. And it was -- it was one of the reasons that St. Joe's Light and Power rates have stayed so low for as long as they have.
Q. Cheap deal.
A. That and Iatan 2. And -- and then they -do have their Lake Road coal -- coal plant so they have
quite a bit of base capacity and they have a larger industrial base. So there is more need for baseload for Light and Power than in GMO.

It was Staff's position -- it is Staff's position that had it been able to, St. Joe would have taken as much of Iatan 2 as it could have. Now, I don't know enough about the financial parameters to -- based on its actions, how much of Iatan 1 that it tried to acquire back when Iatan 1 was being built and then also the -- the baseload capacity purchased power agreement that it entered into.

We can see that St. Joe was -- had a tendency toward baseload and getting its customers the cheapest energy for the long run that it could.
Q. A11 right. We11, to my knowledge, they weren't -- they weren't set on being energy moguls like the Green family, but -- okay.

KCPL has proposed a -- an E holding company or something of -- of that nature here. And that -- is that not -- and I guess could you tell me why, in your opinion again, that is not sufficient?
A. That will change every rate case. And also their methodology results in no matter what, St. Joe's only going to get about a third of Iatan. It does not -- it does not look at their load characteristics other than the
peak load and the load -- load factor it's narrowly based just on those.

It does look at the peaks for 20 years and the percentage of baseload to serve those peaks, but to serve peaks you need to -- or to serve the load you need to look at all hours of the year and what's required. The ECorp will just allow that to float back and forth and St. -- or St. Joe Light and Power's customers -- this case may end up with more, next case less.

And this has to do, too, with fuel being allocated to Light and Power's customers and so they may -this case, if they're given a larger percentage of Iatan 2, then they have lower fuel costs.

Next case, oh that gets moved over to GMO, so now their fuel costs jump. And you're just going to have this going back and forth for -- I don't know, until they decide to merge the tariffs, merge the rates, do something. I don't know. If we do this for 50 years, it's going to get pretty complicated pretty soon.
Q. Well, but I mean, that is sort of what the RTO pricing structure is all about. I mean, or at least that's sort of the premise that -- that they are selling the construction of new transmission on is all of the -the member owners like KCP\&L, GMO should -- should pay for al1 these costs up front and then we'11 go out -- or the

RTOs will go out and collect the money from whoever's purchasing at the time over the next 20 years.

And so they will be made whole plus a robust profit margin for those who are actually building the lines. But -- I mean, that's just sort of -- I mean, that sort of seems like the model that they are -- they are using and I guess I'm just --
A. Well, you're talking about transmission lines.
Q. I'm talking about -- I'm talking about transmission, but it seems sort of analogous to me as well. I mean, I understand why you would want each utility to have -- have a fixed amount of -- of generation, but here where the two utilities in question, L\&P and Missouri Public Service, have been owned together jointly now for more than a decade, I mean I don't think they're going to get split up any time soon.

So I guess I'm finding -- help me
understand. What -- what am I missing here, Ms. Mantle?
A. We face those same questions, the same mind boggling questions that you are facing right now and, you know, Mr. Blanc did state that their long-term goal is to have the same tariffs for every -- everyone, although they have not done anything to move toward that.

Staff's purpose isn't to -- to get the
tariffs closer, but that is one of the results of Staff's allocation.
Q. Okay. So refresh for my recollection, I mean, what is the -- what is the primary purpose of Staff making its proposal? what is it that you most feel the need to accomplish? Is it to ensure that St. Joe Power and Light has -- is it to replace that 100-megawatt contract or is it to have a steady designated amount of baseload for all perpetuity? I mean what -- what's the gist?
A. The gist is, yes, we -- we -- we believe it's important to not be going back and forth every case to decide how much cost is going to get allocated. We're talking about your capacity -- or your capital cost and we're talking about fuel cost.

So we've got a fixed cost here and we've got variable cost. And when you switch those back and forth throughout the years you're going to -- you'11 probably end up with some mismatches much like Mr. Rush was talking about between Kansas and missouri.

Just to -- I mean and also the fact that if that 100-megawatt purchase power agreement is not replaced with something, st. Joe Light and Power is going to be using more of MPS's capacity. It's going to get allocated MPS's most expensive gas units or whatever unit is on at the time. It will get the highest cost. It will not get
the South Harper, which is the most efficient CT.
It will get the CT -- the cost for the CT that's most expensive at that hour because it -- the way the fuel costs are allocated is we look at what -- at -they're dispatched as one load and so that's historical. We know that there's -- you know, how much of Iatan 2, Iatan 1 and so forth.

For St. Joe they will -- the first piece of their load will be Iatan 2; how much of their load was covered by Iatan 2 , how much of it's covered by Iatan 1 because that will be a little bit more expensive based on their capacity ownerships of that.
Q. Right.
A. And then when you get to --
Q. They're going to get their -- they're going to get their 18 percent of Iatan 1 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And then -- and I'm sorry. When, again, does the -- the 100-megawatt contract with NPPD expire again?
A. May of this year, 2011.
Q. So May of 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. So you've got -- you've got 100 megawatts going off of St. Joe Power and Light's books and, what, 75
going off of --
A. MPS.
Q. -- MPS's?
A. But that's not until 2014.
Q. 2014. okay. So -- so they're going to have a need for that almost contemporaneously with the end of this rate case or even the end of this rate case?
A. Yes.
Q. And so you're saying we should -- we should go ahead and set it there now?
A. Yes.
Q. And bite the bullet and make the people in St. Joe pay for it up front, which now as I understand it, it will be an additional 20 million on top of whatever -the capital expense would be 20 million additional to --
A. That's what I understand, yes.
Q. Now, you said that there would be a $\$ 15$ million reduction in fuel and capacity charges; is that correct or --
A. The -- the difference between having all of Iatan 2 and either st. Joe or MPS and none of it is 15 million. So that's how much the fuel costs will fluctuate.
Q. Okay. Okay. So that's -- that's the universe?
A. That's -- that yeah that's extremes.
Q. That's -- that's the universe, so it would be -- it would be some percentage of that. So now explain to me again why they would not -- you know, so it's not a joint -- so you -- under --

Help me understand Mr. Rush's proposal because I thought I understood it, but I guess I don't based on what I'm hearing from you now. So if we don't -if we don't allocate it the way you want it allocated, we allocate it the way Mr. Rush wants it allocated in this ECorp, you're saying that it -- he's saying that it would just kind of float back and forth but you're saying no, that's not the case.

They would -- anything over their --
whatever it is, 100-megawatts or whatever, would then -they would be purchasing that either on the open market from SPP or they would have to get it from -- what is it the -- the cheapest gas-fired or wouldn't even be the cheapest gas-fired plant. It would be the most expensive gas-fired plant; is that correct?
A. Yes. And my understanding what Mr. Rush was -- was talking about was there are times of year when there -- St. Joe does have excess baseload capacity or -baseload energy. And at that time that is flowed through to MPS at cost. But it's dependent first upon what the St. Joe load is. They get first priority.
Q. Right.
A. They get that cheapest energy. You could not necessarily count on when that's going to be available for MPS. So it's -- it's not like we know we're going to get -- we've got 100 for summer and 53 for the spring and fal1 or -- or any type of combination.

It was as based on what is St. Joe's load in that hour and -- and MPS's load in that hour. According to Staff, 100 megawatts it have would be priced at the Iatan 2 cost and 53 megawatts would be priced for MPS at Iatan 2.
Q. Okay. Now --
A. And actually what -- if there is baseload transferred, it's going to be the most expensive baseload, which for St. Joe I believe is Lake Road baseload. Iatan 2 first will always go to St. Joe.
Q. okay. Let me skip back to something here. okay. Is it Staff's position that the former CP method is superior to 12 CP or vice-versa?
A. That is for jurisdictional allocation and we did not -- this is not jurisdictional allocations. We did not treat this like a jurisdictional allocation factor. This would be the only unit that would be allocated that way out of all the units owned by GMO.

It's -- it's -- when you do Kansas and you do Missouri, you're allocating every plant. You're not allocating one plant.
Q. Right.
A. And so this is -- this is a completely -this isn't the same as jurisdictional allocation.
Q. okay. It's -- it's not the same as jurisdictional allocation?
A. No. Because we -- we've got plants that are allocated 100 percent to each of those two entities and each of those two. MPS has all Sibley. Iatan 1 is all of St. Joe. If you were doing a jurisdictional allocation, you would merge all those costs together and St. Joe would pay for part of Sibley and MPS would pay for part of Iatan 1.

You allocate an average cost. It's -- it's every plant, but that is not what -- how it's been set up in GMO to do the fuel cost and to allocate both the capital cost and the fuel cost.
Q. okay. And you're saying once again, that it is in the long-term -- it is in the long-term best interest of the people of St. Joe, Missouri to -- to take your proposal, which would cost them $\$ 20$ million more up front, but would help them avoid some fuel costs and some capacity charges and give them, basically, guaranteed generation certainty for the next 30,40 , 50 years.
Q. And if you count fue 1 savings of 4 to $\$ 5$
million a year, it doesn't much going up against the 20 , but over 50-year time period, you're talking over a half a billion dollars of savings based on their allocation.
Q. okay.
A. That's not discounted, that's just a simple multiplication. I don't have the discounted flow in front of me.
Q. Now, I'm looking back there at Mr. Conrad. He hasn't taken a position in this case -- or on this issue -- this issue.
A. Yes.
Q. I mean, he represents al1 those industrial consumers up there in St. Joe and, you know, he's faced some pretty thorny rate design decisions here in the past where -- like American water. I mean, literally I think he represented in one case that rate design issue was what put Frisky's Cat Food out of business or something like that.

So I am mindful that this could -- could put those -- particularly those industrial customer who are struggling, but $I$ mean -- there's all customers, I mean this could be -- could lead to some pretty serious rate shock for them. I don't know. But I mean what do you say to that?
A. Well, first thing, Mr. Conrad has industrial customers both in MPS and Light and Power, so how he
handles that, I don't know. But second of all, one thing that has not been discussed much, but has been done in the past would be a phase-in of the increase.
Q. So are you saying that there should be a phase-in?
A. I think that's a possibility if -- if -given the concern and I -- I agree -- I understand your concern with what it might do to the industrial customers cost and what that would do to the St. Joe community.
Q. So is this something that if -- if we were going to go down this road, then is this an issue we would need to take additional evidence on? I mean, I know you're not a lawyer, but -- if our -- if our decision has to be based on competent and substantial evidence and we decide that, yes, we're going to -- to go with Staff's position and then a phase-in might be in order and we have to have our decision supported by competent substantial evidence, which I understand that's a legal term, but anyway, I mean obviously there's going to be something in the record to back that up.

We would have to -- do you think we would have to take some more evidence on that or we run the risk of just may -- I mean, getting in trouble and Mr. Mills or somebody could sue me for making stuff up?
A. He's done that before I think, so -- no,

I'm -- it is a legal question and $I$ don't know how it was handled with Callaway and wolf creek.
Q. Right.
A. But I do know those were phased in and they may have even tried to phase-in Iatan 1 costs at St. Joe.
Q. Okay. And -- now let me ask you this: Okay. St. Joe is roughly about one fourth the size of MPS?
A. About one-third.
Q. One-third. One-third, one fourth. So you got all those people in MPS that maybe there's not as much industrial load, but there's a lot more people over there and if you push more of the generation to L\&P, then that means that there's less available for MPS.

And does this proposal -- does your proposal work to the -- I mean it seems like at some point somebody's going to win and somebody's going to lose here and it seems like if -- if St. Joe benefits, then MPS loses. Is that a fair characterization?
A. I think that's what this is all about, because as I said previously, Iatan 2 is an asset that both MPS and Light and Power would like to have if they were stand alone utilities.
Q. Right. Well, and they're -- they're not stand alone, but they're -- they're owned jointly. And you're saying that the asset can't be shared because of the
way fuel and purchased power costs get apportioned?
A. Because I look at the history of what's happened with GMO between MPS and Light and Power and, you know, M-- MPS has added the South Harper CTs, they need some additional capacity also. They had an NPPD contract. All this has been added onto -- to MPS. And Staff has long said to MPS you -- before they merged with St. Joe even, you need some more baseload.

But we don't think that MPS should get additional baseload to the detriment of St. Joe. It's like all of a sudden, you know, we replaced what MPS needed, their capacity needs, they met those with new.
Q. Right.
A. They didn't say oh, well, St. Joe could use a little bit of this -- this high efficiency CTs, so let's give them a portion of that. So now when it comes around to Iatan 2, it is oh, well, MPS, yeah. Yeah. Let's give them more because it's going to impact their rates -- or it's going to impact St. Joe's rates too much.

That wasn't a consideration with MPS when we were adding capacity to it through the past few years. It's like all of a sudden the books have flipped. St. Joe needs additional capacity, but we're going to give it to MPS.
Q. Right. Well, some people would say that

St. Joe Light and Power and Missouri Public Service are under more enlightened management than they were in the past?
A. I believe some of what I've talk about has happened while they've been under the enlightened management that they currently have. I believe Crossroads --
Q. okay.
A. I haven't heard that any of that's going to be al-- if it's allowed, that any of that will be allocated to Light and Power. That's all been MPS. It hasn't been well, let's give Light and Power a little bit.
Q. Right.
A. You know, when South Harper finally got to be legal, none of that was given to -- to Light and Power even after the enlightened management took over.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: A11 right. Ms. Mantle,
I appreciate your time this afternoon. Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Further cross-examination based on bench questions.

MR. CONRAD: Yes.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Conrad?
RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. CONRAD:
Q. Into the breach. Into the valley of death rode the 600.

Ms. Mantle just a couple of things. If I understood your responses to Mr. Fischer's questions, it was that L\&P would have something like a four times the level of increase that you -- that would be the case for MoPub; is that right?
A. No. I don't believe it's -- in my -- part of the Staff report it was pertaining only to the capital cost and the fuel cost of Iatan 2 . It's not the whole increase.
Q. Okay. But you did indicate in response to Commissioner Davis that it was 20 million that would shift?
A. Based on my numbers from my report, I see that there is a 20 per-- $\$ 20$ million difference between the Staff's scenario and the GMO scenario for capital cost. For total cost, I see 15 million.
Q. We11, I thought you answered the commissioner's question with 20 million. Maybe -- maybe I misremembered the number.
A. I --
Q. Was that just ballpark or --
A. I don't particularly remember his question so I'm -- I can't say.
Q. Well, you do remember, though, that you indicated I thought -- I caught it twice that the asset that we're talking about here was going to pump out power
into the grid for about 50 years?
A. I'm -- that -- I'm not a depreciation expert, but $I$ know that coal power plants last a long time.
Q. Okay. So -- so the point of the -- of your proposal if I understand it, is that you'd pay -- that the Light and Power people would pay more now in exchange for $20,30,40,50$ years of -- of lower -- lower costs. I think you -- you put half a billion on the number; is that -- do you recall that?
A. Yes. I recall that. And that would be the same as what they've done with Iatan 1.
Q. Now, let me ask you know a question. If the result of that proposal was to cause, as the commissioner was suggesting, residential customers, commercial customers, industrial customers to suddenly decide that St. Joe isn't really the place that they wanted to continue to do business, would they be too concerned about what rate might be in place 30 or 40 or 50 years down the road?
A. I believe they would be taking a short-term look at the cost, but no they would not be looking at 30 or 40 years down the road.
Q. So in other words, your deal is pie in the sky by and by?
A. I believe that the coal plants have shown that they stay to be low cost. I don't know that it's pie
in the sky.
Q. Okay. But we -- we have established that they might not -- that particular customer might not be there 30 or 40 or 50 years. Right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know right now if sherwood Medical is conducting operations in St. Joe?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you know right now if Quaker Oats is conducting operation in St. Joe?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you know now if the -- what used to be a fairly large stockyard operation in St. Joseph is there now?
A. No, I don't.
Q. So you're -- you don't know that those are there or not?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. Let me ask you this one: Do you plan on being where you are right now 50 years from now?
A. I hope to be in heaven 50 years from now.
Q. We11, I share that, but somewhere other than here. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. And if you were where you described as
opposed to some other location, in any of those events would you be too concern about what utility rates would be here in missouri?
A. No.

MR. CONRAD: Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there
anything from Staff? oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Staff's witness.

MR. FISCHER: I just had a couple.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. FISCHER:
Q. Ms. Mantle, as I understood your -- your concern or criticism of the Company's proposal in answer to Commissioner Davis was that the Company's proposal was not fixed; is that right? I mean the allocation is not fixed?
A. That's one of the concerns, yes.
Q. Is another way of expressing that criticism that the Company's proposal is more flexible than Staff?
A. I believe it could be pitched that way.
Q. Okay. You talked about this 4 CP and 12 CP were jurisdictional allocations are not relevant here I think. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. When the Commission looks at KCP\&L's
jurisdictional allocations and over the years Kansas grows faster than missouri or vice-versa, does the use of that
kind of a jurisdictional factor change the allocations of power plants to where the load is growing?
A. It changes where the cost recovery of every single plant is going. It's different here in that we have plants that are 100 percent allocated to Light and Power and 100 percent allocated to MPS.

Between Kansas and in Missouri, you don't have plants that are only missouri and plants that are only Kansas. And then let's pick this third plant and we're going to divide between the two of them. That's not -- not how jurisdictional allocation factors are applied. They're applied to a number.
Q. Well, if the Commission eventually got to your goal of single tariff pricing between L\&P and MPS, is there any reason you couldn't allocate all the plants in GMO the same way you're talking about?
A. That's a way that could be done, yes.
Q. If the -- if the Commission doesn't do that, and adopts Staff's proposal in this case, how would you treat the next additional plant like a wind generator?
A. That's a good question. And $I$ know Aquila and then GMO talked -- told Staff many times that they were going to come and talk to us and we were going to work out to allocate this and -- and all this -- the parties were going to work together. And we didn't hear anything about
it until right before the rate case was filed.
Q. Well, I'm not talking about Iatan 2. I'm really just trying to look to the future. What would we do in the future?
A. I don't know. But I think it's something -it's nothing something we should wait until there's a rate case to try to figure out. We know now that there's a problem. We knew there was a problem when Iatan 2 was being built.

Staff repeatedly told UtiliCorp, Aquila or whoever KCPL, GMO -- we repeatedly told the Company that there was going to be problems with the allocation of Iatan 2. And we were repeatedly told, yeah we're going to come in and work with you and we're going to figure this out.
Q. Would Staff be willing to talk about how to implement a merger between KCP\&L and GMO?
A. Sure.

MR. FISCHER: Okay. Thank you. That's all
I have.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Commissioner you had something else?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I'm sorry. Hopefully I'm not going to throw too many wrenches in this deal, but can I go back and ask Ms. Mantle one question?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.

FURTHER QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS:
Q. Okay. Ms. Mantle, I've seen your position and going back to the position that Mr. Fischer had in his opening statement and I think you had -- your position is what, 112?
A. No. Their position is 112 to MPS, 41 to Light and Power.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. And ours is 100 to Light and Power and 53 to MPS .
Q. Okay. What if we were to split the difference between those two positions? How does that make you fee1? Better? Worse? I mean if you hate it, te11 me. That's fine.
A. No. And -- and I mean one of the reasons Staff put the position in that we did was to give the -the -- the Commission some choices, some opportunity to maybe do exactly like what you say.
Q. It would help if you were telling me that, that it was -- it was kind of a bargaining position for future --
A. Well, it wasn't -- it's very justified and it's got a lot of basis, but that doesn't mean -- I've said repeatedly in my testimony that we don't know exactly what Light and Power need. We don't know exactly what MPS
needs. But we do know Light and Power is losing 100-megawatt contract and we do know that GMO's getting 150 megawatts of baseload.

I mean there's some things that's we do know and a lot that we don't. And we can't -- we couldn't -- I wish I could give you exact -- the right number, the perfect number, but I don't think it exists.
Q. Okay. So if we split the difference between going back to the -- to the -- is it 41 and $53 ?$
A. 41 and 100. St. Joe -- their position is 41 megawatts and our position is 100 to replace the contract.
Q. oh, wow. okay.
A. There's a lot of difference there.
Q. Okay. See, I was -- okay. So if we -- is 70 an acceptable number? I mean, is it -- it's better than 40. I'm just not sure if that's --
A. I believe that would be acceptable. What gives St. Joe some additional baseload capacity, it would give them the -- the cheaper energy. It wouldn't be as big an impact on the capital cost on their rates and that's -this is all just a balancing act. How -- how do we do this a11.
Q. Okay. Now, I'm -- I'm going to complicate things. I'm going to keep asking -- hopefully this will only last another minute or two here.

Are you familiar with the MISO market at
A. No.
Q. okay. Well, hypothetically let's just say that in -- in SPP and SPP North they move to a day ahead market here in a year or two where by in essence, the utility would have to bid in all of its generation and bid in all of its -- its requirements into that market. I mean would that -- would that affect how this plays out at all or --
A. It would be my understanding you would have a GMO node.
Q. Uh-huh.
A. You wouldn't have a Light and Power and an MPS. And you would still have this, how do we allocate those costs to Light and Power and MPS.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. No mass. No mass.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there further recross examination based on the commissioner's questions?

A11 right. Then is there redirect from
Staff?
MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Thank you, judge.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WILLIAMS:
Q. Ms. Mantle, you remember when Mr. Fischer
directed you to Page 95 of the cost of service report and in particular, directed your attention to Lines 1 through 3?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that the full expression of your -- of Staff's thoughts on that issue or was there some additional thoughts that followed that?
A. The rest of the paragraph reads: However, in the long run, as they are with Iatan 1, Light and Power customers will reap the benefits of this low cost baseload unit for many years to come.
Q. And do you remember Mr. Fischer asked you a number of questions about joint dispatch between -- of the units that have been assigned to MPS and to L\&P?
A. Yes.
Q. Are those assignments -- do they have anything to do with the actual production of energy or are they just for cost purposes?
A. At the dispatch point, I believe it's based on -- the dispatchers could careless whether they're MPS or Light and Power. It's based on economics. But then those are allocated to Light and Power and MPS on an after-the-fact basis based on who owns what generation.
Q. And what's the purpose of that allocation?
A. That allocation is to -- so that the
generation that's used to serve those two different groups gets allocated correctly. There -- for example, St. Joe has a lot of baseload energy. The results of that is that baseload energy cost is allocated to St. Joe before there's any leftover for MPS. So they get the benefit of what they've paid for in Iatan 1 and what they've paid for in Lake Road before they even merged.
Q. And how do they -- how is that benefit reflected?
A. In lower fuel costs for Light and Power. And I believe that's one of the reasons the rates are so much lower also.
Q. So ultimately it's reflected in customer rates?
A. Yes.
Q. And setting aside Iatan 2 , which is the issue right now, how are the costs of the GMO generating units allocated for purposes of setting rates for the MPS and L\&P area customers?
A. Those costs are all allocated to MPS. All of Sibley's -- the energy generated by Sibley. I guess Jeffrey would probably be their lowest cost units that goes to MPS first and then the Sibley. And whatever -- if St. Joe then has some extra need, whatever that highest cost unit is goes to serve Light and Power customers.
Q. I think you misunderstood my answer -- or my question. I asked if the generating units that is KCPL Greater Missouri Operations Company has, how are the costs of those units allocated out to the MPS and L\&P customers?
A. They're 100 percent allocated to MPS.
Q. For KCP\&L Greater Missouri Operations Company, the entirety something of the company?
A. MPS units are allocated to MPS customers at the -- and Light and Power units are allocated to Light and Power.
Q. And how is it determined what are MPS units and what are Light and Power units?
A. Well, it -- up until now it was easy for Light and Power because it remained constant. And for MPS they did have the units that have been there for a long time, but the South Harper units were expressly built to meet the load requirements once the areas contract.

So we knew that that was not to meet Light and Power requirements, that was to meet MPS's contract -or con-- load. And so we knew how to allocate them because that was the load that had needed them.
Q. And is what Staff's proposing in this case any different than how it's -- in the -- and the Company has done the allocations in the past?
A. Yes.
Q. How so?
A. I mean they've allocated who -- the Light -Light and Power units to Light and Power, more or less everything that's left goes to MPS.
Q. And for Iatan 2, are they continuing that type of allocation?
A. No.
Q. But is Staff?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Fischer directed you to the cost of service report at Page 98 on Lines 10 through 16 , which talk about the allocation scenarios the Staff considered?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall that?

Do -- were any of those scenarios based on equalizing MPS and L\&P rates?
A. No.
Q. And why does it impact L\&P customers so much more than MPS customers depending on how much of the costs of Iatan 2 are allocated to them?
A. Can you ask that question again?
Q. Why does it impact L\&P customers so much more than MPS customers if Ia-- based on the same amount of allocation of Iatan 2 costs to them?
A. There's fewer customers at Light and Power.
Q. Why is it that Staff prefer, in general, single tariff pricing for electric utilities?
A. Because the costs then are -- to that company's ut-- or customers are the same regardless of -if we got the same costs for residential customer if it's a single rate. You don't have to have people living in this area, have one rate and another, another. And it's something that the Commission has -- has done in the past when they -- when I first started working here and they merged Missouri Edison, Missouri Light and Power, Missouri utilities with AmerenUE. They made all their rates -- they equalized them.

It's something that the Commission has typically done in the past in trying -- so that then really they are one company, they're treated as one company. You don't have to worry about how to allocate costs or -- it is -- they're -- the cost is the same to all customers.
Q. Are there characteristics of electric utilities that are different than, say, water utilities that might make single tariff pricing preferable in Staff's view?
A. Water companies -- and I'm not expert on water companies, but they're pretty well self-contained. Electric companies are join -- transmission lines, electricity can travel hundreds of miles to get to its
destination. So you can have a power plant in the middle of Kansas, a nuclear plant generating electricity that can reach Kansas City or wind from west Kansas that reaches Missouri also. It -- that's not as feasible with water, I don't believe.
Q. And in response to a question from Mister -- or from Commissioner Davis about using ECorp, you stated that what the Company had done did not consider load characteristics of MPS and L\&P. What load characteristics were you referring to?
A. I'm referring to 8,760; the hourly load characteristics, the hourly requirements. If you look just at the -- at some basic numbers, you can see that Light and Power just from its load factor number of -- if I have -- I believe in Burton Crawford's testimony it was 59.1 percent. That load factor's 10 percent higher than it is for MPS, which means there's a lot more variable in the MPS load. There isn't as much baseload needed just to economically serve MPS as Light and Power. But you can't just look at one number. I mean that's the reason we do resource planning. That's the reason that it's a lot of work.

It's having to look at every hour and how do you most cost effectively serve every hour of the year, not just the peak hour or not just the minimum load.
Q. And ultimately isn't the issue -- or this issue boiled down to who -- which ratepayers are going to bear what cost related to the operation of Iatan 2? In other words, it's not going to affect the electricity they get; it's going to affect how much they pay for it?
A. That's correct.

MR. WILLIAMS: No further questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. I believe that's a11 for you then, Ms. Mantle, and you may step down.
(Witness sworn.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. with the completion of that, we have finished the Iatan allocation issue and we're ready to move onto the advanced coal credit issue.

Let me just ask, then, the original schedule given our -- our delayed start today that puts us a bit behind for today, but I'm wondering if -- if you think that's an issue, shall we plan to wrap up around 5:00 today or continue into the evening?

MR. FISCHER: We'd like to continue into the evening if that's possible.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Do I have any other opinions?

MR. FISCHER: Well, the issue is I promised Mr. Cline -- and I've not talked to him today.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.

3892

MR. FISCHER: I promised Mr. Cline we'd get to the debt cost issue, which is just two witnesses I believe; Mr. Murray and Mr. Cline. I mean, we could caucus for a minute just to see if -- well, we could caucus about scheduling, but --

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Let's go off the record for about five minutes and let you all discuss the scheduling for the remainder of the evening.
(A recess was taken.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: So the decision during the caucus was that we would go ahead and do the next issue and save the following issue, cost of debt, for tomorrow morning. So let's go ahead then and KCP\&L.

MR. ZOBRIST: Great. Judge, I have a mini opening statement if I could do that.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Go right ahead.
MR. ZOBRIST: Play it please the Commission.
The issue in this segment of the case is whether the Iatan 2 advanced coal project tax credits should -- which were applied for by KCP\&L and awarded to KCPL by the Department of Energy and the Internal Revenue Service, should be reallocated by the Commission to GMO when its predecessor Aquila failed to apply for them.

Melissa Hardesty, who is KCP\&L's director of tax is the company's witness on this issue and she will
explain why a reallocation by the Commission would result in a normalization violation under federal fax statutes and Treasury regulations.

And the result of a normalization violation would cause KCP\&L not only to repay the tax credits it has used, but it would lose all investment tax credits, not just the advanced coal project credits, but all investment tax credits on its books. And it -- and GMO would also lose any ITCs investment tax credits on its books.

Now, we've come to this position as a result of a dispute among the co-owners at Iatan 2. And as a result of KCP\&L having independently proceeded to apply for and receive the tax credits, an arbitration occurred in November of 2009 that was brought by Empire, brought MJMEUC the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission, and by KEPCo, Kansas Electric Power Cooperative.

Empire won, MJMEUC and KEPCo lost. The arbitration panel directed Empire and KCPL to go back to the IRS to seek a modification of the memorandum of agreement that had a11ocated $\$ 125$ million of these tax credits to KCPL. That was finally approved earlier last year and that's why we're really talking about the remaining tax credits of $\$ 107$ million, approximately, for KCP\&L in this case.

I'd like to give you just a little bit of
background about how this issue all arose among the co-owners. It's a little bit tedious, but I think you need to understand that so you understand where we are today.
what we're talking about is a specific section of the internal revenue code, Section 48(a) that was part of the comprehensive Energy Policy Act of 2005 that was signed into law in the summer of 2005. It contained a variety of -- of titles and one of the most important ones dealt with tax incentives.

And this section 48(a) there is a credit for investment in clean coal facilities. And that is what Iatan 2 ultimately qualified for. Now, these provisions were widely publicized in the electric utility industry, not only by the Edison Electric Institute, but by the organizations to which KEPCo and MJMEUC belonged to as we11.

Now, the first public notice from the Internal Revenue source -- Internal Revenue Service about how to apply for these was published early in 2006 and it said a taxpayer had to submit an application to the IRS as well as the Department of Energy. It called for three rounds of applications in 2006, 2007 and 2008. There were $\$ 500$ million of tax credits that were available.

Now, of the three -- of all of the owners the Iatan 2, KCPL is the only one that made an application
in 2006. And it was rejected in 2006 because the -- the statute at the time did not consider advanced coal plants like Iatan 2 that were burning sub by two minutes coal. Congress actually amended 48(a) so Iatan 2, when KCPL applied in 2007, did qualify. And again, it was the only owner that did apply in 2007.

The IRS notified KCPL in April 2008 that it was allocated $\$ 125$ million, but the actual memorandum of an -- of agreement was not finalized until late in 2008 after Aquila had been acquired by Great Plains Energy.

So to recap KCPL was the only company that applied for these tax credits. Aquila did not, MJMEUC did not, Empire did not and KEPCo did not.

Now, the reason I emphasize this once again is because when we got to the arbitration and KCPL was the respondent, the -- the plaintiffs or the petitioners in this case were Empire, MJMEUC and KEPCo, just those three. Aquila at that time be-- you know, was GMO. And it was not a party to the arbitration.

The arbitration resulted in favor of Empire against KCPL, but in favor of KCPL and against MJMEUC and KEPCO. And that's important to remember because the percentages of ownership of the -- of KEPCO and MJMEUC is actually greater. It's a little over 15 percent, whereas Empire's was 12 percent.

So at that point in time, after the arbitration order came down, KCPL although it initially appealed the arbitration award to preserve its rights, it agreed to go with Empire back to the Internal Revenue Service and modify the memorandum of understanding. That was done.

Now, what Staff is saying in this case is that KCPL should have gone back to the IRS not just with Empire, but with GMO and had additional tax credits reallocated from KCPL to GMO. This reallocation, if it had been approved by the Internal Revenue Service, you know, would not have resulted in a normalization violation, but KCPL did not do that at the time.

And the reason is that GMO is bound by the history of Aquila. Aquila never made an application. Aquila nor GMO made any claim against the KCP\&L tax credits. And at the time that GMO was part of the Great Plains Energy family, the question is -- and Staff has raised this -- should GMO should have joined that arbitration.

And KCP\&L felt very strongly at the time that these claims were being made by Empire, MJMEUC and KEPCO, against it that it had acted with due diligence and acted it properly under the joint owner agreement where everybody is responsible for its own taxes.

So the question is now, should the Commission engage in this kind of reallocation and that's where we get to the concept of this normalization violation. And Ms. Hardesty will tell you and has testified, you know, what the implications of that violation are.

And it would not only wipe out all of the tax credits of both companies, the investment tax credits, but it would require KCP\&L to pay what it has already claimed on its tax returns back to the federal government.

There is also a minor point; Staff is seeking an adjustment for the fees and expenses of the arbitration saying that ratepayers did not receive any benefit to say that. We don't believe that's correct. And in fact, these fees and expenses were incurred in defending the Company and we defeated the claims of MJMEUC and KEPCo and preserved the benefits to the KCPL ratepayers. And we believe that that is a benefit for which these expenses are -- were made and our justified.

Even today, the question is why did not KCP\&L act on behalf of GMO. And -- and the issue is really -- it presented the Company with a dilemma because it did not have an arbitration award directing it to go back to the IRS as it did with Empire. And the question is whether KCPL should have voluntarily undertaken to further
decrease the tax credits that it had won for its ratepayers in favor of the GMO taxpayer -- ratepayers.

And there -- we have this belief today that even now we would be criticized if we had voluntarily gone to the IRS because we would have done something to the detriment of our customers even if it would have ultimately benefited the interest of GMO.

And we received no assurances from Staff that if this Commission orders us to do that allocation in these, you know, results of the loss of roughly 134, \$135 million of tax credits, if that would be reflected in either of these companies' cost of service.

We haven't received any assurances to that. So we think that actually the best thing that should be done is simply accept the historical facts as they are and not engage in any more reallocation or potentially a normalization violation.

And that's all I have, judge. Thank you very much.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Are there other mini openings?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Can I --
JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Can I inquire of
Mr. Zobrist?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yeah, Mr. Zobrist. COMMISSIONER DAVIS: A11 right.

Mr. Zobrist, so you went to arbitration with Empire?
MR. ZOBRIST: Right.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: And you know got beat thus7y?

MR. ZOBRIST: We lost to Empire. We defeated the KEPCo and MJMEUC claims.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right. Because MJMEUC doesn't pay taxes?

MR. ZOBRIST: That's right.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: So -- but obvious7y, GMO did not pursue any claims. I mean, I understand that like the assignment of credits might be -- might be a problem, but are you saying that this Commission cannot impute a value to what GMO should have -- have received and make a rate adjustment accordingly?

MR. ZOBRIST: That's exactly correct. If you do that -- and we've got a private letter ruling that was referred to in Ms. Hardesty's testimony -- you wil1 wipe out all the investment tax credits for both companies and you will cause KCPL to have to make a payment back into the Treasury for the tax credits it's taken.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Is the private letter
ruling attached to Ms. Hardesty's testimony?

MR. ZOBRIST: No, but I've got copies. It's
identified. I don't think it's attached to her testimony, but we've got copies of that. And it's been provided to Staff along with a number of other private letter rulings on normalization violation questions where the IRS has said, yes, this would be a violation; no, these circumstances would not give rise to one.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: We11, why didn't the arbitration -- I mean, because that was litigation, did that -- I don't understand how -- how Empire gets paid and how -- why GMO can't get paid.

MR. ZOBRIST: And the reason that they didn't get paid and -- we were directed and we made that very clear to the arbitration panel, we said if you do anything, you know, give us an opportunity to go back to the taxing authority because if you do this the wrong way, you're going to blow it for everybody.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: uh-huh.
MR. ZOBRIST: And they accepted that, so we went back with Empire with the arbitration award and said we've got this private arbitration award that has directed us to come back. And they said okay, based upon that award, we will reallocate the tax credits.
we don't -- we don't have an award for GMO. And GMO, because Aquila was its predecessor, did not make
the application. And KCP\&L felt that it still didn't anything wrong because this was a public act. I mean anybody could, you know, made these application for these tax credits, so GMO did not join in that.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: okay. So is there anything that -- that temporally bars us from directing you to do the same thing now?

MR. ZOBRIST: We don't think we'd be successful, but if the Commission orders us to do so, we will obey your order.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. We11, when one -- one wonders if we don't send someone with you how zealously you will advocate for that.

MR. ZOBRIST: And Commissioner, to be honest, we have said and I think Ms. Hardesty has said this in her testimony, we will work with Staff. we don't have the any problems with allowing Staff to know exactly what we're doing every way because it doesn't matter. I mean GMO and KCP\&L are part of the same company.

You know, there are certain restrictions on whose tax credit this is, but we're relatively agnostic on that issue.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: We11, if you're
agnostic then why don't you go back and -- and start making those requests of the -- the Treasury?

MR. ZOBRIST: We don't have the a basis to do that. We had an arbitration order to go back -COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right. You had an arbitration order there, so you need a piece of paper here?

MR. ZOBRIST: And to be clear, the Commission -- and we'11 show you in these -- these private letter rulings, the Commission should not do the allocation -- the reallocation itself because that's what can result in this normalization violation.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Got it. Got it.
JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right then, Staff?
MS. OTT: May it please the Commission. In 2006, Kansas City Power and Light sought and obtained from the IRS advanced coal federal tax credits related to Iatan 2 in the amount of $\$ 125$ million for the total project.

In 2008, GMO, formally Aquila, sought but was not denied from the IRS its advanced coal tax credit related to Iatan 2 because there were no additional credits available for the Iatan 2 plant. When the IRS initially granted them to KCPL Power and Light, it was for the total plant, not for Kansas City Power and Light specific ownership interest in the project.

Thereafter, one of the Iatan 2 partners, the
Empire District Electric Company, sought a share of its $\$ 125$ million in advanced coal tax credits based on its 12 percent ownership in the Iatan 2 plant. KCPL refused Empire's request and forced Empire to seek relief in arbitration.

The arbitration pane 1 found KCPL had acted in bad faith by seeking and retaining all of the available advanced coal credits related to the Iatan 2 project for itself. It violated its ownership agreement with the partners to the Iatan 2 plant and it awarded Empire a share of the 125 million in tax credits based on its ownership interest.

The other two parties that were a part of that arbitration, KEPCo and MJMEUC, were not granted any relief in the arbitration because KEPCo is a tax exempt entity and mJMEUC is a political subdivision, which neither are entitled to the tax credits. However, GMO which is run by KCP\&L, never sought or obtained from KCPL a similar share of the 125 million in tax credits nor was it involved in an arbitration proceedings.

Since Great Plain Energies and its affiliate file consolidated federal tax return there was no benefit from their shareholders to GMO getting a share of the $\$ 125$ million in tax credits. However, whether KCP\&L and GMO both get a part of the 125 million in tax credits does impact their cost of service and their rates that their customers pay.

To qualify for this advanced coal credit tax credits for Iatan 2 projects the Iatan 2 partners had to build a state of the art generating facility with currently available technology for clean emissions. The pollution control equipment to obtain these emissions is very costly. Each partner had to pay its share of the cost to construct and maintain and operate this power plant.

Although GMO is paying its share of the cost, KCPL in its actions and inactions has deprived GMO of any benefit from the advanced coal tax credits. Based on its ownership share, GMO's cost was service should reflect $\$ 26.5$ million in advanced coal federal income tax credits.

The Staff is requesting that the Commission issue an order similar to the arbitration panel's decision requiring KCPL and GMO to apply to the IRS for an amendment to the memorandum of understanding that would allow GMO to obtain its share of the tax credit equal to $\$ 26.5$ million.

Additionally, KCP\&L incurred roughly
$\$ 450,000$ in legal fees during the test year to arbitrate the advanced tax coal credit. Staff has proposed an adjustment to remove that amount from test year. KCP\&L has incurred additional legal fees to appeal the arbitrator's decision.

The evidence will show that none of the legal fees incurred in a failed attempt to deny the Empire

District Company its share of tax credits have benefited or will benefit the ratepayers. Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Commissioner do you have questions for Ms. Ott?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: So Ms. Ott, I mean, listening to Mr. Zobrist there, it sounded like -- it sort of sounds like you guys are the same page. He says if you give me a slip of paper, an order that says go request this for -- for GMO, they'11 go do it. Is that your understanding?

MS. OTT: I believe so. I don't know what KCP\&L or GMO intends to do.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. That -- you want to strike all their attorney's fees?

MS. OTT: For the arbitration.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right. For the --
the -- for the -- for the arbitration and subsequent litigation with Empire.

MS. OTT: Yes.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: okay. And -- okay. I don't think I have any other questions. Thank you, Ms. Ott.

MS. OTT: Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Were there any other opening statements on this issue?

Seeing none, then let's go ahead with
KCPL's, GMO's first witness.
MR. ZOBRIST: I call Melissa Hardesty.
(Witness sworn.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Mr. Zobrist when you're ready.

MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you.
MELISSA HARDESTY testifies as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Please state your name.
A. Melissa K. Hardesty. And my business
address 1200 Main, Kansas City, Missouri.
Q. And by whom are you employed?
A. Kansas City Power and Light Company.
Q. And what is your position there?
A. Senior director of taxes.
Q. Now, in the KCP\&L case matter 0355 did you prepare both rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. Did you have any corrections to
either of those pieces of testimony?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Okay. And those have been marked as

Exhibits 30 and 31 in the KCP\&L. In the GMO case matter 0356, did you prepare rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. And do you have any corrections to those pieces of testimony?
A. No, I do not.
(wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit Nos. KCPL 30, KCPL 31, GMO 18 and GMO 19 were marked for identification.)

MR. ZOBRIST: And Judge, those have been marked as GMO Exhibits 18 and 19, which I offer at this time.

JUDGE DIPPELL: would there be any objection to KCP\&L Exhibit 30 and 31 and GMO Exhibit 18 and 19?

Seeing no objections, I will admit those four items.
(wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit Nos. KCPL 30, KCPL 31, GMO 18 and GMO 19 were received into evidence.)

MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, I tender the witness for examination. I'm going to give her copies of her testimony in case she needs to refer to them while she's on the stand.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Is there cross -- going to be cross-examination from anyone besides Staff?

A11 right then. Ms. Ott, when you're ready. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. OTT:
Q. Good afternoon. Pursuant to the ownership
agreement in relationship to Iatan 2 , KCPL has about a 55 percent ownership stake in that; is that correct?
A. Approximately.
Q. okay. And GMO has 18 percent?
A. Approximately. well, exactly 18. Yeah.
Q. And Empire, roughly 12 percent?
A. I believe it had 12 percent, yes.
Q. And then KEPCo is almost 12. I think it's a 1ittle shy.
A. Yeah.
Q. And then MJMEUC would be 3.5 percent?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, under the -- are you familiar with the ownership agreement?
A. I have read the ownership agreement.
Q. Now, in particular Section 5.3 F Sub 3 it requires KCPL to provide the owners with their proportionate share of the benefits from the project. Does that sound familiar to you?
A. I believe it talks about the electricity and benefits associated with that, yes.
Q. And then Section 6.5 Sub $D$ it requires KCPL to notify the owners of significant events related to the project. Do you --
A. I believe it said related to the cost of the
construction of the project, yes.
Q. Now, in 2006 KCPL applied for this advanced coal investment tax credit?
A. Prior to my employment there, yes, it did apply in 2006.
Q. Now, isn't it true that KCPL did not include any of the co-owners in its initial application for the credit to the Department of Energy or the IRS?
A. That is true.
Q. And they didn't even notify any of the other partners that they were planning on filing for their application for these advanced coal credits?
A. Again, I wasn't there, but I'm not aware that they did.
Q. Now, KCPL was awarded 125 miliion in advanced tax coal credits. Correct?
A. In April of 2008, it received a certification of -- that allowed it had to claim up to 125 million in tax credits. Correct.
Q. And this amount was for the entire Iatan 2 project?
A. At the time of that announce-- or the letter from the IRS, we were unsure what that really applied towards. This was a new credit and there was a lot of uncertainty as to what the IRS had -- had intended for the

125 million to apply towards.
Q. But in the end, the 125 was for the total unit cost?
A. That was after we -- we found that out after we had applied on behalf of GMO and Empire had applied on behalf of itself. That's what the IRS indicated at that time, which was in -- sometime in 2009.
Q. okay. So just to be clear, the total unit cost for the project, they were only -- the IRS only awarded 125 million in advanced coal tax credits. Correct?
A. That is correct. I just wanted to make sure people understood there was a lot of uncertainty around what the -- the credits were for and was 1ate in 2009 when we figured out how the IRS had determined for the credits to be -- be allocated.
Q. And KCPL did not allocate any of the 125 million in credits to say any of its co-owners. Correct?
A. Because it was allocated to the legal entity KCPL, it was not allowed to allocate any credits to its co-owners.
Q. Now, did you -- so you didn't personally play a part in the decision-making process when KCPL filed its application for the ITCs?
A. Not in the original 2006 application. I was an integral part in the 2007 application, which was the
application that was ultimately approved.
Q. Okay. Do you know who made the decision at KCPL to apply for the investment tax credits?
A. The original application?
Q. Yes.
A. I betieve in the 2006 application it was a -- a group effort between the tax director that previously was employed before me, as well as management, in determining whether or not we -- they thought that the plant would -- would qualify. So I would say it was management along with the tax director.
Q. Now is this management at KCPL or at Great Plains Energy?
A. It would have been both. They are the same.
Q. Now, who made the decision in -- for the second application?
A. Well, after the law was changed it -- and we believe that had we ultimately qualified since our first one was denied. I don't know that there was a decision to apply. It seemed to be a given that we would apply now that we believed we'd qualified, including myself.
Q. So you were a member. Who were the other individuals that discussed that?
A. Well, the application process involved several members out at the plant , as well as management
including the VP of operations for generation, which was Stephen Easley.

Terry Bassham was the CFO. He reviewed the applications. So there was several individuals involved in -- in determining that.
Q. Now, was KCPL in compliance with the ownership agreement when they filed the initial application to the IRS for the credit?
A. I'm not sure that I have expertise to answer that question.
Q. But is it fair to say that the arbitration pane1 found that KCPL was in violation of the ownership agreement when it failed to include its co-owners in the filing for the tax credit?
A. I believe that's how the arbitration pane1 fe7t.
Q. And the outcome of the arbitration pane1 was KCPL and Empire were to apply with the IRS for amendment to the memorandum of understanding that would allow Empire its share of the tax credit?
A. Could you repeat that.
Q. One of the outcomes of the arbitration panel required $K C P L$ and Empire to apply to the IRS for an amendment to the memorandum of understanding that would allow Empire its share of the credit?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, isn't it true if the application to amend the memorandum of understanding was denied or if Empire was denied less than its $\$ 17.7 \mathrm{mil1ion}$ share, then KCPL was to immediately to pay Empire $\$ 17.7$ miliion?
A. That's what the arbitration award said. However, we believed that would be a normalization violation. Therefore, we did everything we could to ensure that we got the reallocation with the IRS.
Q. I understand. But I want -- would like you to answer my question that if the IRS were to deny Empire its share then KCPL -- the arbitration panel stated that KCPL shal1 pay Empire the $\$ 17.7$ milition?
A. I believe I answered yes. I just added to it.
Q. Okay. We11, for clarity of the record I would like to have some Exhibits marked.

JUDGE DIPPELL: okay. will these be -these are joint exhibits. Right? So will we give them KCPL designation?

MS. OTT: I think so because this is an issue in both cases.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right.
MS. OTT: I'11 start with this first one. I'm not sure what number we're on.

JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm looking for that right now. I believe it will be KCPL 295.
(wherein; Staff exhibit No. KCPL 295 HC was marked for identification.)

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: while Ms. -- Ms. Ott is handing out exhibits, can I inquire of Mr. Zobrist again briefly?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Certainly.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Zobrist and this -this is not an issue that's going to need to be Trued-up. Correct?

MR. ZOBRIST: I really hadn't even thought of it as being a True-up issue. I think you're correct. COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. So -- I mean it's possible that we could -- could rule on this issue at any time. Correct? I mean, do we need to have three rounds of post-hearing briefs on this issue?

MR. ZOBRIST: Maybe not three, but how about one? So -- so I think the parties ought to be able to -just have an opportunity to provide the Commission with some language if certain issues are decided in certain ways.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: okay. I mean, and could you maybe explore with the other parties the potential of an expedited briefing schedule on this issue?

MR. ZOBRIST: Sure.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I mean, it's going to be -- if you've got to go back to the IRS it's going to take some time. Correct?

MR. ZOBRIST: Always does.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. I'm sorry.
Thank you.
I'm sorry, Ms. Ott.
BY MS. OTT:
Q. Ms. Hardesty, could you identify the document in front of you?
A. I believe this is the notice to arbitrate sent to the Company by MJMEUC regarding the coal credit arbitration.

MS. OTT: with that, I'd like to offer KCPL --

JUDGE DIPPELL: 295.
MS. OTT: -- 295. And what is it for GMO?
JUDGE DIPPELL: Did you want to mark it -if it's just one exhibit, you just need the one number.

MS. OTT: Okay. Okay. So I'm just trying to be clear about this.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yeah. Would there be any objection to KCPL $295 ?$

MR. ZOBRIST: No objection.

JUDGE DIPPELL: In that case, I wil7 admit
(Wherein; staff Exhibit No. KCPL 295 HC was received into evidence.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: Excuse me.
MR. ZOBRIST: I was just going to say, Mr. Steiner's indicated that at the top it's marked HC. And I don't -- I just haven't read this for a while, so I don't know exactly what's in here, but --

JUDGE DIPPELL: How -- how about I temporarily mark it as HC and if you could review that, Mr. Zobrist, and let us know if it needs to continue under that designation.

MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you, Judge.
JUDGE DIPPELL: And Ms. Ott, I don't know -you're not going to have any further questions about the content of this document then? Okay.

MS. OTT: Your Honor, in order for
efficiency, I'd like to also have another exhibit marked. This is KCPL 296?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
(Wherein; Staff Exhibit No. KCPL 296 HC was marked for identification.)

BY MS. OTT:
Q. Ms. Hardesty, could identify this?
A. I believe it is the notice to arbitrate sent to KCPL by KEPCo or Kansas Electric Power Cooperative regarding the advanced coal credit arbitration.

MS. OTT: And with that I'd like to offer KCPL Exhibit 296.

JUDGE DIPPELL: okay. And I see that -MS. OTT: HC.

JUDGE DIPPELL: It is also similarly designated at the top $\mathbf{H C}$, so at least for now, I will designate it as such. will there be any objection to KCPL 296 HC?

MR. ZOBRIST: No objection.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right. Then, I will admit that document.
(wherein; Staff Exhibit No. KCPL 296 HC was received into evidence.)

MS. OTT: And I'd also like to have marked KCPL 297.
(Wherein; Staff Exhibit No. 297 нС was marked for identification.)

BY MS. OTT:
Q. Ms. Hardesty, could you please identify the document?
A. There appears to be several documents included in this one. On top appears to be the notice of
arbitration or notice of controversy from Empire regarding the advanced coal credit arbitration.

A couple of pages in appears to be the Company's response back to Empire. well, no, this is another letter from Empire to the Company. Without having reading -- read -- read through it, I'm not entirely sure what all is in there.

There's -- these are all apparently from Empire back to the Company regarding the arbitration, I assume. I again, have not read through these entirely so I can't speak to their content.
Q. Would this be Empire's notice for arbitration? Are there indications that they were pursuing controversy the arbitration?
A. It appears so. And apparently some letters to MJMEUC and KEPCo additionally, or at least MJMEUC.

MS. OTT: And with that, I'd like to offer -- we can do HC as we11 -- KCPL 297.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection to $297 ?$

MR. ZOBRIST: No. I have no objection. This does contain multiple letters, none of which I object to. I believe they were all joint exhibits at the arbitration, but it just ought to be described accurately in the record at some point.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right.
MR. ZOBRIST: And pardon me, Judge, it's also highly confidential and we'11 take a look at that to see if it can be declassified.

JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. A11 right. I will admit Exhibit 297. And the -- I'm not sure how more formally we'11 describe it in the record itself, but -- but anyway, we'11 take a look at that and the high1y confidential status.
(Wherein; Staff Exhibit No. KCPL 297 HC was received into evidence.)

BY MS. OTT:
Q. Now, Ms. Hardesty --

MS. OTT: So, Judge is that admitted?
JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.

BY MS. OTT:
Q. Okay. Now, it's fair to say that GMO does -- does not have a notice to arbitrate?
A. It does not.
Q. And GMO's interest were not represented during the arbitration pane1. Correct?
A. It did not join in the controversy, however, the Company kept GMO's interests in mind as part of the arbitration.
Q. Now, who made that decision to not have GMO
join in the arbitration panel?
A. I believe that would have been management; who specifically, $I$ couldn't identify.
Q. Now, who is responsible within Great Plains Energy's corporate structure for representing the interest of GMO?
A. All of the employees are -- represent both KCPL and GMO throughout the Company.
Q. So the same employees that represented KCPL during the arbitration proceeding presumably should have been the ones representing GMO's interest?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, did KCPL charge GMO for the cost associated with KCPL's application for the advanced coal credits?
A. There was a small portion of costs. Not the entire amount of the costs but a small portion that was inadvertently charged to all of the co-owners. And KCPL readily recognized that was an error and we corrected that during the arbitration process.
Q. So it was during the arbitration process that they realized that they charged all the co-owners for their research into whether or not they qualified for the investment tax credit?
A. For a very small amount of cost, yes.
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Q. So when did KCPL refund those charges?

Subsequent to the arbitration or --
A. I believe it was during the arbitration process. I'm not sure of the exact date.
Q. Now, is GMO entitled under the Iatan 2 ownership agreement to seek arbitration with KCPL to obtain its share in the advanced coal credits similar to how Empire did?
A. I believe it is. I'm not an expert in the legal aspects of the operating agreement, but $I$ believe it is.
Q. And now, isn't it true that KCPL and Empire reached an agreement with the IRS from the results of the arbitration pane1?
A. Through the out -- request of both Empire and KCPL, we went back to the IRS in March of 2010 and we were successful, but that was only -- we were notified on September 9th, 2010 that our request had been approved and received documentation back from the IRS at that time.
Q. So the IRS did approve Empire?
A. Yes.
Q. And KCPL's request?
A. But it's been relatively recently.
Q. Now, GPE files consolidated tax returns.
A. Yes, it does.
Q. What are the tax allocation agreements among GPE incorporated and its affiliates?
A. The tax allocation agreement states that each of the subsidiaries should receive the -- pay the costs and the benefits that it has from a tax liability perspective and/or tax credit perspective based on separate company basis. Each -- each subsidiary pays its share or receives benefits for its share of the tax liability or costs or tax benefits of credits.
Q. Now, what percentage of the Iatan 2 construction project costs will GMO customers have to pay once this rate case is complete?
A. I believe it's ownership share of the plant would be the ultimate cost.
Q. So 18 percent?
A. Approximately.
Q. And GMO customers would also have to pay 18 percent of the operating and maintenance costs, payroll and benefits costs and property taxes for the construction project, too?
A. I presume so.
Q. Okay. Now, I believe in Mr. Zobrist's opening, as well as on your rebuttal testimony, you discussed this private letter of ruling. Do you have a
copy of that private letter of ruling?
A. I don't believe I have it up here.

MR. ZOBRIST: I've got copies if you want to use them, counse1.

MS. OTT: I might. One second.
BY MS. OTT:
Q. okay. Are you familiar with the private 1etter of ruling?
A. Yes.
Q. She may be able to answer it without looking at the document, but I'm not sure. Does that private letter of ruling indicate that it does not serve as a precedence for any situation other than under the specific facts and circumstances addressed in that particular private letter of ruling?
A. That's standard 1anguage for al1 private 1etter rulings.
Q. okay. Just a second.

MS. OTT: I have nothing further. Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Commissioner Davis, did you want to ask your question? Do you have time?

QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS:
Q. You kept saying when -- when MS. Ott was
questioning you about the -- the apportionment of the attorneys fees, you kept saying it was a -- a -- a very small amount or something of that nature?
A. Relatively smal1 amount, yes.
Q. Relatively small amount. So what was the exact amount?
A. You know, I -- I don't know have the exact amount, but I shall $I$ believe it was -- the one particular cost we had had -- hired an outside consulting firm to a financial analysis, which $I$ believe was either 30 or $\$ 40,000$, which got spread to all the owners so -- so 15,000 would have been KCPL approximately and the rest would have been accidentally charged.

There was also, I believe, some other internal labor out at the plant that had accidentally been charged. I don't recal1 the total cost, but it was in the -- in the total cost of the plant and the total cost of the applications, the amounts themselves were small and it was only the portion that was allocated out. So it wasn't even the full amount; it was, you know, each ownership's portion.

But it was a relatively small amount. But I don't recall the total amount.
Q. Okay. And then when Ms. Ott was asking you questions about the -- the arbitration with Empire, you
said something to the effect that -- that KCP\&L represented GMO's interest or something of that nature. I don't remember.
A. We did not include GMO in the arbitration, however, we had considered GMO in -- throughout the arbitration process and subsequent when we had the ruling from Empire. we did evaluate GMO.

Everything we did was to avoid a normalization violation and ensure that we didn't have to pay any money back to the IRS or lose credits for any of the ratepayers including Empire and GMO.
Q. Okay. But GMO didn't get any credits?
A. That's correct.
Q. So how was GMO represented?
A. We were -- we did have a dilemma because we purchased Aquila subsequent to getting the allocation of the credits. And we had to evaluate the best options for all the ratepayers that the Company is in charge of ensuring the benefits for. And we believed at the time that KCPL had the stronger case and so we did not have GMO join in the arbitration.

We ultimately lost with one of the parties, and won against one -- our case with the other two. In hindsight, potentially we should have included GMO, but it's hard to say what would happen if we had. We didn't
know what the ultimate outcome was at the beginning of the process and we --
Q. Well --
A. -- believed strongly that we would --
Q. I'm sorry. Go ahead.
A. We believed strongly that KCPL wouldn't have to allocate the credits when we got through the arbitration process. Obviously, we were incorrect.
Q. Right. So you failed against the -- the not-for-profits because they don't pay taxes?
A. They had some very strong arguments in the arbitration process that we should write them a check similar to how Empire wanted us to white them a check.
Q. Right.
A. So we ultimately won against them, but they had some significant arguments for us writing them a check for their portions of the plant.
Q. okay. And so -- so after the Empire decision, you obviously did some -- some analysis about preserving all of the tax credits and making sure that you don't have to pay them all back. But the question is: why wasn't there any consideration of -- of reapportionment to GMO, especially if it all goes into the -- the same pot, so to speak?
A. We believed at that time that it would be
difficult for the IRS to reallocate credits to GMO without an arbitration order like we had with Empire. And that was -- and if we didn't get the reallocation to Empire and GMO and we had to write a check, that that would be a normalization violation and the harm that that would cause was substantial.
Q. Right. Okay. So what is the status of the -- the reallocation of the credits to Empire right now?
A. In September of 2010, we received a revised memorandum of understanding that reallocated the credits to Empire. So we are settled with the Empire reallocation, but that -- like, again, was just a few months ago.
Q. Okay. And so how long did that take?
A. We -- I believe we submitted the first proposal in March and we got the reallocation in September. Approximately six months.
Q. Okay. Approximately -- approximately six months. And so you don't have any philosophical objection or any objection if this Commission orders you to go back and seek the same kind of treatment for GMO that -- that Empire got, do you?
A. No. We would go back, if so ordered by the Commission, and we would include the Staff in that process.
Q. Okay. And you understand that -- that it -it would make a difference for the ratepayers of GMO?
A. Yes. However, I believe we have to follow what -- what the IRS does either yes or no in this subsequent reallocation in order to avoid a normalization violation. In other words, if the IRS says yes, then we get to reallocate. If they say no, then we don't get to reallocate.
Q. Do you think my feelings would be hurt if an arbitrator award was followed by the IRS but my Commission order wasn't?
A. I can't speculate what the IRS would do. However, we believe at this time it may not go according to the way the Commission would like it to go or the Staff.
Q. We11, and can you understand that if it does not go that way, then this commissioner might be inclined to go ahead and just disgorge all of the credits? Can you understand that sentiment?
A. Yes. I definitely understand the sentiment. However, the harm that that would cause the ratepayers is substantial, and the Company.
Q. Well, it wouldn't necessarily have to harm the ratepayers, would it?
A. Not necessarily. However, it's going to impact the financial condition and -- especially if we have to pay back the cash. And I mean, I understand the -- the commissioner sentiment -- your sentiment on how it seems
unfair and we are working towards resolving that and we would be a part of that process.
Q. And it seems to me that you had a -- a joint business venture, you had a -- some people would argue a fiduciary duty to include your partners, they were certainly included in all the costs, but apparently one of the benefits was left out and, you know, now you're basically here in front of the Commission saying, well, you know, sorry it's too late and we don't know what the IRS is going to do.

You know, it's not my problem, but, you know, if you decide against the Company, then everyone will be harmed, when this is a problem that really KCP\&L appears to have created. I mean, and do you see something wrong with that analysis?
A. I understand your concerns.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No further questions, Judge.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there any further cross-examination based on the commissioner's question?

Staff?
MS. OTT: I have one question. And this is just a follow up with Commissioners Davis. RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. OTT:
Q. After you didn't include GMO in the initial arbitration because you didn't think that it had a strong case of winning in the arbitration panel, is that what I understood you saying?
A. We -- we believed KCPL had the stronger case than the other parties. And so we -- we believed that ultimately we would be successful, so we didn't ultimately have GMO join the arbitration.
Q. So when KCPL was not successful with Empire, KCPL didn't make a decision for GMO, then, to subsequently follow a second -- an additional arbitration, then, to seek a similar order. Correct?
A. Not at that time.

MS. OTT: No further questions.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there
redirect?
MR. ZOBRIST: Yes.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Ms. Hardesty, is this a partnership between the co-owners in Iatan 2?
A. No.
Q. As the commissioner said, is it a joint business venture?
A. No.

MR. ZOBRIST: And if I could, I'd like to
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mark excerpts from the Iatan Unit 2 and Common Facilities Ownership Agreement. I guess that would be, Judge -- if you could give me a number, please.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Just one moment. This would be a KCPL number. And I believe you're on KCPL Exhibit 105. And is -- is this a confidential document? No. okay. Thank you.
(wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit No. KCPL 105 was marked for identification.) BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. And Ms. Hardesty, I've marked as Exhibit 105 a portion of the Iatan Unit 2 and Common Facilities Ownership Agreement; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. Now, on the second page of this exhibit in the second paragraph from the bottom, what does it say with regard to how the owners are treated? Are they joint owners or are they tenants in common?
A. It says they are tenants in common.
Q. okay.
A. Each with an undivided ownership interest.
Q. Okay. Now, if you would turn to Article 9, which is marked in this Exhibit as Page 37. I think it's just four pages back. what does Article 9 deal with?
A. The taxes and the election out of
partnership treatment.
Q. Okay. what did the co-owners do with regard to partnership treatment?
A. They elected out of partnership treatment in this operating agreement and filed that with the IRS.
Q. Okay. And if you would look eight lines down on the 37 th page of the agreement -- and again, we're in Section 9.1. Do you see where it says, In this regard?
A. Yeah. Yes.
Q. And would you please read that into the record?
A. In this regard, the owners do not intend to create any joint venture, partnership, association, taxable as a corporation or other entity for the conduct of any business for profit. The owners authorize KCPL to prepare and file a return satisfying the requirements of the United States Treasury regulations $1.761-2(b)(2)$ and on which the election for the arrangements to be excluded from the provisions of Subchapter $K$ is set forth.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, what does Subsection B of Section 9.1 state as far as what each of the owners are to do with regard to filing tax returns?
A. It says to the extent possible, KCPL and a11 the owners shal1 treat separately -- shal1 each separately report and pay for all real property, franchise, business,
or other taxes and fees.
MR. ZOBRIST: Okay. Judge, I moved the admission of Exhibit 105.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Would there be any objection to Exhibit KCPL 105?

Seeing none then, I will admit Exhibit 105.
(Wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit No. KCPL 105 was received into evidence.) BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. And Ms. Hardesty, do you have a copy of KCPL 297? That's the exhibit that Ms. Ott handed you that had a number of letters attached to it?
A. I believe so. The Empire documents?
Q. Right. If you would turn to what is marked as joint Exhibit 9, which is a letter from Mr. Downey at KCPL to Mr. Gibson at Empire District Electric Company, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, does this generally recite the basis upon which KCPL initially rejected the Empire claims?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And on Page 2, at the top of the first full agreement, does it say the central tax principal of the agreement is that arrangement is not a partnership?
A. It does.
Q. Okay. And later on in the next to the last paragraph does it also cite Section 9.1 with regard to the co-owners opting out of the partnership agreement?
A. It does.

MR. zOBRIST: Judge I'd like to have marked the private letter ruling that was referred to by Ms. Hardesty on cross-examination.

JUDGE DIPPELL: That will be marked KCPL 106. Does that have a number or some official identifier?

MR. ZOBRIST: Yes.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Number 200945006, re1ease date 11/06/2009.
(Wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit No. KCPL 106 was marked for identification.)

MR. ZOBRIST: That's correct. And the letter itself as I understand, was issued to the taxpayer in July 2009, but was not publicly released until November 6th, 2009.

JUDGE DIPPELL: And this is also a public document?

MR. ZOBRIST: Yes. And sorry, Judge, could you give me the exhibit number again?

JUDGE DIPPELL: 106. KCPL 106.
MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you.
BY MR. ZOBRIST:

3935
Q. Ms. Hardesty, can you identify Exhibit 106?
A. I've seen this before, yes.
Q. And what is this document?
A. This is a private letter ruling issued by the Internal Revenue Service regarding some investment tax credits of one company and whether or not those tax credits could be either paid or reallocated to another company.
Q. okay. And what -- what were the tax -- what was the taxpayer in this case? was it a regulated public utility.
A. It was.
Q. Okay. And I know that the Commission, as we11 as the judge, can -- can read all this, but -- but generally what was the issue of -- in this private letter ruling that was sought by the utility?
A. One utility was selling assets to a second utility and the -- there was some investment tax credits remaining on the books of the original utility that would be written off and the Commission wanted to be able to transfer the benefits of those investment tax credits to the buying utility. And the IRS essentially said in this case that it could not reallocate the credits nor could it pay cash because that would be an indirect violation.
Q. okay. okay. And so the -- the IRS's conclusion in this case was what would happen if the

Commission either directed a reallocation or if a cash payment were directed and that had occurred?
A. That would be a normalization violation.
Q. And what would be the consequence of such a normalization violation?
A. The penalty provisions of the Internal Revenue Code associated with that would be applied and they would have to repay any outstanding credits that were on the books of the selling utility.
Q. Okay. And what about the buying utility? What would be the consequences to the buying utility?
A. I believe it would also be a normalization violation. However, $I$ don't recall what the penalty was there.
Q. Now, Ms. Ott asked you some questions about consolidated returns. Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do -- wel1, who owned the tax credits in this case? was it -- well, who owned them?
A. Kansas City Power and Light Company was allocated the credits originally.
Q. And what ability does a holding company have to take the cracks -- tax credits that is one subsidiary has and reallocate them to another?
A. The consolidated tax return rules don't
allow us to reallocate credits from one entity that it's generated them to another entity.
Q. Okay.
A. Even if they're within the same consolidated group.
Q. Okay. And why is that? What's -- what's the reason for that, that you can't just shuffle around tax credits between subsidiaries?

MS. OTT: I'm going to object. That's beyond the scope of cross-examination. The question was just whether or not they file consolidated tax return. It didn't go into the methodology behind consolidated tax returns.

MR. ZOBRIST: Well, I think this is fair -fairly probing an issue that she opened, Judge.

MS. OTT: I believe you just opened. It that was beyond the scope of cross-examination.

JUDGE DIPPELL: I'm going to overrule. I believe that he's getting to the explanation for the reason for her answer to your question.

BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. And I believe my question is, why are subsidiaries not permitted to either share or reallocate or shuffle back and forth investment tax credits?
A. I'm not sure I can answer to why the IRS has
set those rules. However, you are required -- there has to be a regulation or Internal Revenue Code section that allows you to do that and there are no sections within the consolidated return regs.
Q. Does Great Plains Energy own Iatan 2?
A. It -- through its subsidiaries, it owns a portion. However, Great Plains Energy itself does not own Iatan 2?
A. Okay.
Q. Now, are -- Ms. Ott asked you about the 2007 Department of Energy application, the successful application. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And -- and I believe you told her that you were involved in that application?
A. I was.

MR. ZOBRIST: Okay. Judge, I'd like to ask Ms. Hardesty to look at a portion of that application if I could bother you for another number.

JUDGE DIPPELL: That would be KCPL 107.
(Wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit No. KCPL 107 was
marked for identification.)
BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Okay. Ms. Hardesty, I've handed you excerpts from the October 30, 2007 application for section

48A, advanced coal credits. Do you recognize that document?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Is this the application that was submitted by KCP\&L in October 2007?
A. Portions of it, yes.
Q. Yeah. Right. These -- these are excepts of that; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And -- and you recognize this document even though it doesn't have the signatures of either Mr. Easley or Mr. Cline on the first page?
A. It appears to be the same document, yes.
Q. And I would ask you to turn, if you would, page to -- Page 4 that is entitled Section 5 Application For Certification. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And who has made the application in this case?
A. Kansas City Power and Light Company.
Q. And is it -- is its taxpayer identification number set forth there?
A. It is.
Q. Okay. And this -- this application was made for $\$ 125$ miliion in tax credits related to Section 48A?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, would you turn to Page 11 of Exhibit 107?
A. I'm there.
Q. Okay. Under financing and ownership structure, what does the application set forth?
A. Do you want me to read it or do you want me to just --
Q. Just generally what does it inform the IRS and the Department of Energy?
A. It -- it -- if identifies all of the owners and identifies that they are tenants in common with undivided ownership interest.
Q. And on the next page, Page 12 were the representative ownership shares of each of the co-owners set forth?
A. They are.
Q. okay. And on the next to the last page, which was Page 30 of the application at the bottom, did it indicate that the owners had entered into the Iatan Unit 2 and Common Facilities Ownership Agreement?
A. It does.
Q. Okay. And at the top of the next page, the final page of Exhibit 107 , did it set forth again the percentage ownership interests of each of the co-owners?
A. It does.
Q. okay. And so that information became available to both the Department of Energy and the Internal Revenue Service back in the fall of 2007?
A. Yes. It was also in the original application, but yes, it was in the 2007 application as we11.
Q. And when -- pardon. When was the original application filed?
A. It was filed in 2006.

MR. ZOBRIST: Okay. Judge, I offer Exhibit 107.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there any objection to Exhibit 107?

Hearing none, I wi11 admit KCPL 107.
(wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit No. KCPL 107 was received into evidence.)

MR. ZOBRIST: And I believe I neglected to offer Exhibit 106, the private letter ruling, and I do so at this time.

JUDGE DIPPELL: And is there any objection to Exhibit 106?

Hearing none, $I$ wil1 admit Exhibit 106.
(Wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit No. 106 was received into evidence.)

MR. ZOBRIST: I think I'm just about done, Judge, but I want to look at my notes here real quick. BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. With regard to private letter rulings, of what use are they to taxpayers?
A. Although they cannot recite it as precedent it gives us an idea of how the IRS has -- will treat a similar situation for another taxpayer.
Q. Now, were you involved in the practice of public accounting before going to work for KCP\&L?
A. At one -- my early career $I$ was at a private accounting firm before I went to Sprint and then ultimately KCPL.
Q. And -- and did you, as a private practitioner in public accounting, did you rely upon private letter rulings in giving clients advice?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, I think that's all I have.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. I believe then that that is all for Ms. Hardesty on this issue, unless Commission, did you have another question?

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No. Can -- Judge, can I inquire of Mr. Zobrist for a moment?

JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Zobrist, when the original tax credit application and I guess succeeding tax credit applications were filed, did KCP\&L ever notify Empire or Aquila that they were making it a tax credit application for $\$ 125$ million?

MR. ZOBRIST: Judge, I think -- I think the witness can answer that. I'd be glad to -- do you want to -- I'd be glad to answer it too, but you may have sworn testimony that you can get on the record.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay.
THE WITNESS: I do not believe with the first application, since I wasn't there, I'm not aware of any conversations with the other owners. And subsequent with the second application, I'm not aware of any conversations with the subsequent owners other than in a simple conversation with the GMO tax director or Aquila tax director saying that that we were filing an application. Then we shortly thereafter acquired them so it became sort of --

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Moot point?
THE WITNESS: -- moot point. Yeah.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. Now, I'm going to go ahead and -- well, let me go ahead -- can I go back and ask Mr. Zobrist some more questions?
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JUDGE DIPPELL: Yes.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Maybe I -- I might need to inquire of Mr. Conrad here too. Okay. Mister -Mr. Zobrist can you refresh my recollection? It's been a while since $I$ went to the law school. What are tenants in common?

MR. ZOBRIST: We11, tenancy in common, I guess the easiest way is to contrast it with joint ownership. It is where you own a portion of an asset where as in joint owners own jointly. So that they each own 100 percent of the asset. And here you have tenants in common who own certain percentages and no more, no less.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right. But it's -you'd agree that here in this case it's an undivided percentage?

MR. ZOBRIST: Correct. That's what the ownership agreement states.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right. And the ownership agreement states that KCP\&L Aquila, Empire Electric share all of the $0 \& M$ costs of Iatan 2 ?

MR. ZOBRIST: In a proportional --
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Proportionately.
MR. ZOBRIST: Correct.
COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Correct. And when
Iatan 2 doesn't generate at ful1 capacity, the tenants in
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1
2 of the power; is that correct?
MR. ZOBRIST: I believe that's correct.
(REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, a portion
5 of the transcript is confidential and can be found in
Volume 37, Page 3947.)
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MR. ZOBRIST: We11, Judge, that was supposed to be highly confidential -- Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Oh, okay. All right.
No further questions, Judge. Thank you.
MR. ZOBRIST: I would also say it was an arbitration pane1. It was, you know, three arbitrators.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Right. Three -- I
thought I read that in Missouri Lawyers Weekly, Mr. Zobrist. Did I not read it in Missouri Lawyers weekly?

MR. ZOBRIST: You shouldn't have.
MR. CONRAD: I hear a bell unringing.
MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Let me ask then if there's any additional recross based on Commissioner's last question of Ms. Hardesty?

A11 right then. Any additional redirect?
MR. ZOBRIST: Can we go back and, you know, to Mr. Conrad's point about unringing the bell, can we just -- even though it's out in the EFIS sphere, can we just take that Q and A and make it HC?

JUDGE DIPPELL: We can make that particular question and answer highly confidential and mark it so. I'11 ask the court reporter to do so in the transcript.

MR. ZOBRIST: Thank you, Judge.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right then. I believe
that that is all for you, Ms. Hardesty for -- on this issue and you may step down.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
(Witness excused.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: okay. It's quarter to 6:00. How much -- how long do we expect Staff's two witnesses to take? Can we wrap them up in an hour's time?

MR. ZOBRIST: Oh, yes. Yes.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right. Let's take a quick ten-minute break and come back with Staff's two witnesses and we'11 finish off. Let's go off the record. (A recess was taken.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: Let's go back on the record then.

MS. OTT: Staff calls Paul Harrison. (Witness sworn.)

JUDGE DIPPELL: Go ahead, Ms. Ott when you're ready.

PAUL HARRISON testifies as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. OTT:
Q. Please state your name for the record.
A. Paul R. Harrison.
Q. Whom are you employed and what capacity?
A. I'm employed by the Missouri Public Service

Commission as a regulatory auditor.
Q. And are you the same Paul Harrison that has previously caused to be filed prepared sections of the cost of service report, rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony, which has been previously marked for identification as KCPL 222 HC , which would be your rebuttal in the KCPL case?
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad 223$ HC, proprietary and NP as surrebuttal?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in the GMO case, surrebuttal marked 222 HC and proprietary and NP?
A. Yes.
Q. With respect to your pre-filed testimony, was that prepared by you or under your direct supervision or under direct supervision?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any correction to make to your testimony at this time?
A. No.
Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions today, would your answers be the same?
A. Yes.
Q. Would they be true, accurate to your best information knowledge and belief?
A. Yes

MS. OTT: with that I'd like to offer KCPL 222 HC, KCPL 223 HC proprietary and NP, and then GMO 222 HC into the record.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right. Would there be any objection to KCPL 222 and 223 with all of its confidential and non-confidential and proprietary versions and GMO 222 HC?

MR. ZOBRIST: No objection.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Seeing no objection, then $I$ will admit those documents.
(Wherein; Staff Exhibit Nos. KCPL 222 HC, KCPL 223 HC, KCPL 223 NP, and GMO 222 HC were received into evidence.)

MS. OTT: And with that, I'11 tender Mr. Harrison for cross-examination.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Al1 right. I don't believe we have too many options. Is there cross-examination from GMO?

MR. ZOBRIST: Yes, Judge.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Good evening, Mr. Harrison.
A. Good evening.
Q. Now, I understand you've been with the Public Service Commission since January 2000?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And what was your position prior to

```
that?
```

A. Prior to going to work here at the
Q. Yes, sir.
A. I was a manager for tool warehouse outlet.
Q. And were you engaged in the practice of public accounting at tool warehouse?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Are you a certified public accountant?
A. No.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Mr. Harrison, can I get you to you talk into the microphone? Thank you. BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Have you ever been employed in any capacity by a public accounting firm?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been employed in any capacity by a law firm that provided tax or business advice?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Have you ever worked for a public utility as an accountant or an auditor?
A. No.
Q. Have you worked in any corporations;
accounting, finance, controller or related type of
A. No.
Q. Now, I understand you were in the Air Force for 23 years, sir?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you work in an accounting position during those years of service?
A. I worked with budgets, put together budgets, maintained budgets for the squadron and the wing.
Q. And that was for, obviously, United States Air Force, a governmental entity. Correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Now, in this case, Mr. Harrison, are you familiar with the Iatan Unit 2 and Common Facilities Ownership Agreement?
A. Yes, I am. I have -- I've review it.
Q. And I'm just going to call that the ownership agreement, if that's all right with you.
A. Okay.
Q. Am I correct that the owners who are parties to that agreement are tenants in common with each having an undivided ownership interest?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. And am I correct that the ownership shares, those specific percentages of each of the co-owners
is set forth in that agreement?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, in your surrebuttal there are certain references to partners. Do you recall that, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in that context, you were not referring to them as partners for tax purposes, were you?
A. I was referring to them as -- as owners as far as the agreement, the owner agreement.
Q. Well, they actually are not partners in the agreement, isn't that true?
A. It's called a joint ownership agreement.
Q. Okay. Do you have before you Exhibit 105 that I marked while Ms. Hardesty was on the stand?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. If I could ask you, sir, to turn to the next to the last page of Exhibit 105. It's actually Page 37 of the agreement.
A. Okay. I'm there.
Q. Okay. And am I correct that Section 9.1(a), paren, little a, close paren -- states that the owner -owners agree that they intend that the arrangements provided for in this agreement and other ancillary agreements entered into in connection herewith -- and then it says -- paren -- (collectively the arrangements) --
closed paren -- be excluded from the application of
Subchapter K of Chapter 1 of Subtitle A of the Internal
Revenue Code of 1986 as amended -- paren -- (the code) -close paren, period.

Did I read that correctly?
A. You did.
Q. Okay. What is Subchapter K?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Okay. Do you know whether that is the subchapter that deals with partnerships and partners?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. If you would skip down to about the eighth line of that section. And off to the right margin it starts, In this regard. Do you see that sir?
A. I see it.
Q. okay. Let me just read that into the record. It states, quote, "In this regard, the owners do not intend to create any joint venture, partnership association, taxable as a corporation or other entity for the conduct of any business for profit, close quote. Did I read that correctly?
A. You did.
Q. Does it appear from this sentence that the owners who were a party to the Iatan 2 ownership agreement did not intend to create a partnership?
A. It says that they do not intend to create any joint venture or partnership.
Q. Thank you. So do you believe in reading this now that it's clear that they were not partners?
A. It's my understanding that they were -- they had a joint ownership agreement and they were partners in the Iatan 2.
Q. Okay. Do you -- can you quote me any section of the ownership agreement where it defines the owners as partners?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And if you would turn to Page 1 of the agreement -- I'm sorry, Page 2 of Exhibit 105, this -these excerpts from the agreement. Am I correct that in the second paragraph from the bottom it states that the owners are tenants in common each with an undivided ownership interest therein as herein provided?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, have you ever seen a partnership agreement?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And do you know what the characteristics of a partnership are versus a corporation?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And you're not a lawyer, are you, sir?
A. No.
Q. okay. In -- in your preparation for the case, did you review the application that Kansas City Power and Light Company made to the Department of Energy and the Internal Revenue Service?
A. I did.
Q. Okay.

MR. ZOBRIST: And if -- if the court
reporter could hand the witness Exhibit 106, I'd appreciate it.

BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Mr. Harrison, does Exhibit 106 appear to be excerpts -- I'm sorry, I apologize. I asked the court reporter to hand the witness Exhibit 107.
A. I have 107.
Q. Okay. Does -- does that appear to be excerpts from the application that KCPL submitted to the Department of Energy and --
A. Yes, it does.
Q. okay. And am I correct that if you turn to the last page of Exhibit 107, which is actually Page 31 to the full application, that the respective ownership interests of KCPL --
A. Where are you reading now?
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Q. At the top of Page 31, sir, in the boxes?
A. okay.
Q. Am I correct that at the top of Page 31 the ownership shares of each of the owners is set forth there?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. And that has KCPL owning 54.71
percent?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And then Aquila 18 percent?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then Empire at 12 percent; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Now, the final arbitration award, which is attached as Schedule 1 to your surrebuttal testimony, are you familiar with that?
A. I am.
Q. Okay. And am I correct that in its first full paragraph it did state that Aquila did own 18 percent of the project?
A. Yes. They owned 18 percent of the project.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, in your surrebuttal at Page 2 you stated that KCPL did not advise either the IRS or the DOE or the arbitration panel that GMO or its predecessor, Aquila, was an 18 percent owner of Iatan 2 . It's clear --
A. Could you tell me where you're reading from?
Q. Yeah. It was Page 2 of your surrebuttal, Lines 22 through 24.
A. Okay. I'm there.
Q. Okay. And so if we look at the first page of the arbitration award, the panel did know that Aquila owned 18 percent of the project, didn't it?
A. It was included in the arbitration agreement.
Q. Okay. And as we just went through the excerpts of the application to the Department of Energy, Aquila's 18 percent ownership -- 18 percent ownership share was also communicated to the Department of Energy. Correct? And that's Exhibit 107.
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Okay. And if you go back a couple of pages in Exhibit 107 to Page 12, the ownership percentages are set forth there toward the bottom of that page as well, are they not?
A. They are.
Q. Okay. Now, sir, did you have occasion to serve a data request upon Staff requesting that the Company advise you with regard to the private letter rulings that Ms. Hardesty talked about in her rebuttal testimony?
A. I did.
Q. okay.

JUDGE DIPPELL: I think I need one more, Mr. Zobrist.

MR. ZOBRIST: Okay.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Now that you've gotten al1 the way back to your seat. Thank you.
(wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit No. KCPL 108 was marked for identification.) BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Mr. Harrison, is Exhibit 108 the response of the Company to your -- it says interrogatories set MPSC 2010/12/29, and specifically Question Number 0124.4?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And am I correct that this set forth
a list of private letter rulings abbreviated PLR in response to your data request?
A. Yes.
Q. okay.

MR. ZOBRIST: I move for the admission of
Exhibit 108, Judge.
JUDGE DIPPELL: And that's KCPL 108. Would there be any objection to KCPL 108?

Seeing none, $I$ will admit it.
(wherein; KCP\&L Exhibit No. KCPL 108 was received into evidence.)

1 BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Mr. Harrison, did you review any of the private letter rulings that were listed here by the Company?
A. I reviewed all of them. I went through them.
Q. Okay. And am I correct that there were a group where the IRS said there would not be a violation of a normalization rule?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. And there were about a half a dozen instances where the IRS said that there would be a violation of the normalization rules?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And would you agree that the taxpayers who filed those requests for private letter rulings were interested in the opinion of the Internal Revenue Service?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. And would you agree that violations of the normalization principles do have financial consequences to the parties that they affect?
A. They possibly could, yes.
Q. Okay. And one of the effects could be the disallowance of the use of tax credits?
A. Yes.
Q. And one of the other consequences could be the repayment of tax credits that have been previously taken by the taxpayer?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And would you agree that private 1etter rulings are considered by taxpayers and tax experts as instructive tools to decide what to with regard to their tax matters?
A. They are a matter of information, yes.
Q. Okay. And are they regularly relied upon by professionals in rendering opinions in providing guidance to taxpayers?
A. I don't know.
Q. okay. And did you read specifically a private letter ruling 2009/45006, the one that was admitted into evidence when Ms. Hardesty was on the stand?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. And what does that private letter ruling hold?
A. what does it what?
Q. what does it state? what advice did the IRS impart to the taxpayer in that case?
A. Well, that private letter ruling that $I$ looked at did not -- I don't believe it was on point for
this case here because it was for a transfer of the ITC as part of the sale of the -- the gas utility to another -another regulated utility.

So it -- and these were dealing with accumulated deferred income taxes not a current investment tax credit like what's going on right now with KCPL.
Q. Okay. The private letter ruling did say that if this utility buyer and this utility seller reallocated those tax credits pursuant to the stipulation that was filed with the regulatory utility Commission in that case, that that would result in a normalization violation though, did it not?
A. It did say that it would result in a normalization violation, yes.
Q. Okay. And it essentially said that neither party would be able to take advantage of any of the those investment tax credits if there were a normalization violation. Correct?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. And so it would affect both the buyer as well as the seller. Correct?
A. Yes.
Q. okay. And it also stated that if the parties had gone ahead and either reallocated or exchanged cash representing the value of those investment tax
credits, that all tax -- all credits for tax years that were open under the statute of limitation would be recaptured?
A. Do you have a copy of that document?
Q. It's Exhibit 107. And specifically I'm referring to Page 7.

MS. OTT: Mr. Zobrist, do you mean Exhibit
106. Because I have Exhibit 107 as --

BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. I'm sorry. I meant 106.
A. 106 .
Q. I meant 106.
A. And 105.
Q. I meant 106, the one that has the Internal Revenue Service at the top.
A. And could you refer -- refer me to where you're reading from?
Q. It's the third paragraph from the bottom, the thick paragraph.
A. of which page?
Q. Page 7. And this is in the section that begins the previous page. It says, Issue for sanctions for normalization violation. In the middle of that paragraph -- and I'11 just read it -- it says, Section 211B of the act provides that if a taxpayer fails to see meet
the normalization requirements for the ITC with respect to any public utility property in any year ending after December 31, 1985, all credits for tax years open under the statute of limitations at the time a final determination is rendered inconsistent with normalization requirements are recaptured. Do you see that, sir?
A. I do.
Q. What does recapture mean?
A. That it will have to be repaid to the IRS.
Q. Okay. Now, in this case if the Commission were to reallocate the advanced coal tax credits and the IRS were to find a normalization violation, is it true that KCPL would have to repay the tax credits that it has already claimed?
A. Could you repeat the question, please?
Q. Yeah. If -- if the Commission orders a reallocation and KCPL follows the Commission's order and the IRS says that's a normalization violation, KCPL would have to repay the tax credits that it has already claimed; isn't that true?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And that would be approximately $\$ 52.3$
million?
A. I believe in a -- in Melissa's testimony she stated it was like $\$ 29$ million that had already used;
something like $\$ 77$ million, unused, uncommitted.
Q. Let me just ask you this: Did you disagree with the figures Ms. Hardesty cited in her testimony?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And so whatever those figures are, if a normalization violation were found, would you agree that KCPL would either lose the tax credits still on the books, whether it was advanced coal or other ITCs, and then they'd have to repay whatever they had claimed?
A. I believe that's the re -- recapture rules.
Q. Okay. And do you also agree in terms of losing what is on the books that if there is a violation of the normalization rules, you would lose the investment tax credits that are on your books?
A. And I don't believe the Staff disputes that.
Q. Okay. Okay. Now, Staff has not made any offer to stipulate that KCPL should allow to -- should be allowed to recover in its cost of service any of these tax credits that it would lose or have to repay if there were a normalization violation; isn't that true?
A. Could you repeat that question, please?
Q. Staff is not willing and you haven't
stipulated or agreed in your testimony that if these losses occurred either having to pay back taxes or having to lose tax credits on the books, that it would be able to recover
those losses in the cost of service?
A. No, we have not.
Q. And Mr. Harrison, are you aware of any rule that would allow subsidiaries of the holding company to share or allocate tax credits among each other?
A. Not that I'm aware of.

MR. ZOBRIST: Okay. Judge, I don't have anything further. Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Is there any redirect?

MS. OTT: Yes.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. OTT:
Q. Mr. Harrison, Mr. Zobrist was discussing with you partnership -- the partnership of -- of the joint owners of the Iatan project. Were -- are you referencing partnership in like the legal entity ref--
A. No.
Q. As a legal entity?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I'd also like you to go back to

Exhibit 106?
A. Okay.
Q. I think you were looking at Page 7?
A. Okay.
Q. Can I get you to read the last two
paragraphs on Page 7?
A. where it starts with "except"?
Q. Yes.
A. Except as specifically determined above, no opinion is expressed or implied concerning the federal income tax consequence of the matter described above. This ruling is directed only to the taxpayer who requested it. Section $6110(k)(3)$ of the code provides it may not be used or cited as precedent in accordance with the power of attorney on file with this office. A copy of this letter is being sent to you -- or sent to your --
Q. Can you finish --
A. Sent to your authorized representative. We are also sending a copy of this letter ruling to the director.
Q. Okay. Now, of these private letter rulings which you received, were any directly on point with the issue before the Commission today?
A. They were not.
Q. Did any of the private letter rulings relate to a finding by a regulatory agency that a holding company failed to allocate tax credits equal -- equally between the two affiliates?
A. No.
Q. Now, Mr. Zobrist was talking about
normalization issues. Is Staff asking KCPL to commit a normalization violation?
A. No.
Q. Can you ask explain that to -- to me?
A. If the taxpayers cost of service is reduced more rapidly than what's the depreciable life of the asset, it would be -- in Staff's opinion that would be a normalization violation.
Q. So what is -- is Staff asking here?
A. Staff is just asking to allocate this cost between KCPL and GMO. They paid for all of the cost, 18 percent of the all of the construction costs, all the 0\&m, all the payroll benefits, but yet they don't get any credits to offset it.
Q. Okay. And is Staff requesting that K-- KCPL allocate the credits prior to going to the IRS for a ruling?
A. The Staff's primary recommendation is to allocate the cost, but alternatively we've got on Page 23 of my surrebuttal to get a private letter ruling or to set up an arbitration panel like -- like what was done with Empire Electric.
Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Zobrist asked about stipulations and then somehow got rephrased whether or not Staff was willing to stipulate a fact in your testimony.

Was the answer in reference to settlement negotiations amongst the parties?
A. Could you repeat that question, please?
Q. Now, when Mr. Zobrist was asking about stipulations and whether or not Staff would be willing to stipulate to a fact?
A. Right.
Q. Do you know -- remember what he was talking about?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. Now, was your answer in reference to a settlement negotiation amongst parties?
A. No.

MS. OTT: I have nothing further. Thank you.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Mr. Harrison, I believe that is all and you may step down.

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Another Staff witness still?
Yes.
THE WITNESS: There you go, ma'am. Thank
you.
(Witness excused.)
(Witness sworn.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Thank you. Ms. Ott,
whenever you are ready.
KEITH A. MAJORS testifies as follows:
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. OTT:
Q. Could you please state your name for the record?
A. Keith A. Majors.
Q. And whom are you employed and in what capacity?
A. I'm employed by the Missouri Public Service Commission as a utility regulatory auditor.
Q. And are you the same Keith Majors that has caused to be filed prepared portions of the cost of service report in both the KCPL and GMO case?
A. I am.
Q. And also KCPL Exhibit 230 HC , which is your rebuttal testimony?
A. I am.
Q. Surrebutta1 KCPL 231 HC?
A. I am.
Q. Rebuttal GMO 229 HC?
A. I am.
Q. And then GMO surrebuttal 230?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you have any corrections to that testimony today?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Okay. And if I were to ask you the same questions today, would they be the same?
A. Yes, they would.
Q. And they'd be true and accurate to your best knowledge, information and belief?
A. They would.

MS. OTT: Okay. With that, I'd like to
offer KCPL 230 HC, KCPL 231 HC, GMO 229 HC and GMO 230. JUDGE DIPPELL: would there be any objection to KCPL 230 and 231 and GMO 239, 229, and 230

MR. STEINER: Is -- just let me inquire. Is that the cost of service report? MS. OTT: No. JUDGE DIPPELL: No.

MR. STEINER: That's just his testimony in GMO?

MS. OTT: It's his rebuttal and surrebuttal in both KCPL and GMO.

MR. ZOBRIST: We don't have any objection. JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Then, $I$ wil1 admit those four documents. (Wherein; Staff Exhibit Nos. KCPL 230 HC, KCPL 231 HC, GMO 229 HC, and GMO 230 were received into evidence.)

MS. OTT: And with that, I'11 tender
Mr. Majors for cross-examination.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Is there cross-examination by the Company?

MR. ZOBRIST: Okay. Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. Mr. Majors, I understand your testimony is just addressed to the fees and expenses that were incurred in the arbitration proceedings and the subsequent appeals?
A. Well, the -- the costs really to the arbitration proceedings were imbedded into the test year. And those -- those -- the other fees related to appea1 have not been updated, but they are identified in my surrebuttal testimony.
Q. And were you aware that in the arbitration Kansas City Power and Light Company was the respondent or the defendant?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. And if KCP\&L had not defended itself, it would have lost the claims that were brought by MJMEUC and KEPCo?

MS. OTT: Let me object to the question, calls for a legal conclusion or judge's ruling and adds speculation.

MR. ZOBRIST: Well, I think this is -- I'm
not trying to elicit a legal conclusion. I mean if KCPL hadn't defend it itself, if it hadn't shown up and defended the arbitration, isn't fair to assume KEPCo and MJMEUC would have won their claims?

JUDGE DIPPELL: He's asking -- I'm going to overrule the objection. He's asking -- his question was what the witness's understanding is. I will let him answer as to what his understanding is.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MR. ZOBRIST:
Q. we11, did KCPL defend itself against the MJMEUC and KEPCo claims in the arbitration?
A. I believe it entered into arbitration proceedings, yes, with -- with the parties being KEPCo MJMEUC and Empire.
Q. So you don't even know whether KCPL was a respondent or a defendant in the arbitration?
A. It participated at the arbitration.
Q. Are you not aware of the notices to arbitrate that were filed by KEPCo and MJMEUC in this case -- pardon me, in the arbitration?
A. I'm aware of those notices, yes.
Q. Okay. KCPL didn't sent out a notice to arbitrate, did it?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. And is it true that if the MJMEUC and KEPCO claims had been successfully sustained in the arbitration process, that that would have been a greater share over 15 percent than the Empire share of 12 percent of the tax credits?
A. I'm sorry. Could you -- could you repeat that?
Q. Are you familiar with the ownership shares of MJMEUC and KEPCo?
A. Yeah. Generally, yes.
Q. Have you read the arbitration order?
A. I have. It was attached to my surrebuttal testimony.
Q. Okay. We11, you understand that MJMEUC and KEPCo wanted either the tax credits or if they couldn't get tax credits they wanted the monetary equivalent of their ownership percentages of the tax credits?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Okay. So they wanted KCP\&L either to write them a check or they wanted the arbitration pane1 to order KCPL to order they write them a check?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. And KCPL hired lawyers and hired experts and spent money to defend against those claims?
A. They did.
Q. Okay. And am I correct that KCPL was successful in defeating those claims?
A. Part of the arbitration award was to refund KEPCo and MJMEUC their portion of the fees related to the research of the tax credit. So whether or not it was a clear black and white, whoever -- I -- I guess was -- was the victor of arbitration.

Part of the fees were refunded to KEPCo and MJMEUC, as well as if you -- doing the math, if you divide the portion that was awarded to Empire, it is more than their -- than their share of the ownership of -- of Iatan 2.

It's a prorata rounded -- prorata share of the KEPCo and mJmeuc tax credits.
Q. We11, I'm speaking of -- I think you were referring to the charges that KCP\&L made to the owners before the arbitration to do the investigation that preceded the Department of Energy application. Isn't that what you were referring to just now?
A. I was.
Q. okay. Well, what I'm saying is, is that the legal fees and the expenses that you seek an adjustment for now, those fees and expenses have incurred in defending both the Empire claims as well as the MJMEUC and the KEPCo claims. Correct?
A. That would be correct, yes.
Q. okay. And to the extent that KCPL was able to prevail on the KEPCo and the MJMEUC claims, those benefits were preserved for the KCP\&L ratepayers?
A. They were.

MR. ZOBRIST: That's all I have, Judge.
JUDGE DIPPELL: A11 right. Then is there
any redirect?
MS. OTT: No. Thank you.
JUDGE DIPPELL: okay. I believe that ends
your testimony this evening, Mr. Majors. You may step down.
(Witness excused.)
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. I think that concludes, then, the advanced coal credit and arbitration fees issue.

Let me just ask again about the KCPL earning tax situation. what was the situation on that issue?

MS. OTT: It's no longer an issue.
MR. STEINER: It's not going to be tried tomorrow.

JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. Does that mean there -- has that one been part of a written stipulation at this point?

MR. STEINER: No. I think we were just
going to read into the record what we agreed to.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
MR. STEINER: But I don't --
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay.
MR. STEINER: There has not been a
settlement document filed.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Okay. So sometime before the end of the week, we'11 need to get that agreement on the record.

MR. STEINER: Okay.
JUDGE DIPPELL: Is that -- okay. And then we'11 start with cost of debt in the morning?

MR. FISCHER: Correct. Yeah. With Mr. Cline.

JUDGE DIPPELL: And I promised Mr. Lum7ey that we would get to his witness tomorrow, I believe, in the other issue. So we will forge ahead with the schedule as it is until we get through.

There was one -- it had also been brought up in the beginning about excusing witnesses or waiving cross on witnesses. I did not have any questions from any of the commissioners for any of those witnesses, so if you all need to take those things up among yourself or if that finishes Ms. Hardesty's testimony then --

I'11 just put that out there so that you
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Any other scheduling issues or any other items that need to be taken up before we go off the record?

A11 right. Then, let's go off the record. We're adjourned for the evening. Be back at 8:30 tomorrow.
(The hearing was adjourned unti1 8:30 a.m. on February 15, 2011.)

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Lisa M. Banks, CCR within and for the State of Missouri, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing hearing was duly sworn; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that $I$ am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken, and further, that $I$ am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the of the action.

Lisa M. Banks, CCR

I N D E X
PAGE

THE COMPANY'S
TIM RUSH
Direct Examination by Mr. Fischer 3799
Questions by Commissioner Davis 3801
Cross-Examination by Mr. Mills 3811
Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams 3812
Redirect Examination by Mr. Fischer 3816
BURTON CRAWFORD
Direct Examination by Mr. Fischer 3823
Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams 3824
Redirect Examination by Mr. Fischer 3828
CURTIS BLANC
Direct Examination by Mr. Fischer
3831
Cross-Examination by Mr. Conrad
3833
Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams 3835
Questions by Commissioner Davis 3835
Recross-Examination by Mr. Woodsmal1 3838
Redirect Examination by Mr. Fischer 3839
MELISSA HARDESTY
Direct Examination by Mr. Zobrist
3907
Cross-Examination by Ms. Ott 3908
Questions by Commissioner Davis 3924
Recross-Examination by Ms. Ott 3930
Redirect Examination by Mr. Zobrist 3931

STAFF'S EVIDENCE
LENA MANTLE
Direct Examination by Mr. Thompson 3842
Cross-Examination by Mr. Fischer 3843
Questions by Commissioner Davis 3861
Recross-Examination by Mr. Conrad 3876
Recross-Examination by Mr. Fischer 3880
Further Questions by Commissioner Davis 3883
Redirect Examination by Mr. Williams 3885

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011

1
2 Direct Examination by Ms. Ott 3949
Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist 3951 Redirect Examination by Ms. Ott 3967

KEITH MAJORS
Direct Examination by Ms. Ott 3971
Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist

3982
TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC 573.886.8942 www.tigercr.com E X H I B I T I N D E X

KANSAS CITY POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY:
Exhibit No. GMO 45
Primary Revenue Requirements
3791
Exhibit No. GMO 32 HC
3822
Direct testimony of Tim Rush
Exhibit No. GMO 32 NP
Direct testimony of Tim Rush
Exhibit No. GMO 33
Rebuttal testimony of Tim Rush
Exhibit No. GMO 35
Surrebuttal testimony of Tim Rush
Exhibit No. GMO 10
Direct testimony of Burton Crawford
3824
Exhibit No. GMO 11
Rebuttal testimony of Burton Crawford
3824
Exhibit No. GMO 12 NP
Surrebuttal testimony of Burton Crawford 3823
3824
Exhibit No. GMO 12 HC
Surrebuttal testimony of Burton Crawford 3823
3824
Exhibit No. GMO 4
Direct testimony of Curtis Blanc
3831
3833
Exhibit No. GMO 5
Rebuttal testimony of Curtis Blanc
3831
3833
Exhibit No. GMO 6
Surrebuttal testimony of Curtis Blanc
3831
3833
Exhibit No. KCPL 105
3932
3934
Ownership agreement
Exhibit No. KCPL 106
3935
3942
IRS Number 200945006

E X H I B I T I N D E X (Continued)
Marked Rcv'd

KANSAS CITY POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY: (Continued)
Exhibit No. KCPL 1073939 Application

Exhibit No. KCPL 108
3960
3960
Data Request 0124.4 and response
Exhibit No. KCPL 303908
Rebuttal testimony of Melissa Hardesty
Exhibit No. KCPL 31
3908
3908
Surrebuttal testimony of Melissa Hardesty
Exhibit No. GMO 183908
3908
Rebuttal testimony of Melissa Hardesty
Exhibit No. GMO 19
3908
3908
Surrebuttal testimony of Melissa Hardesty

EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY:
Exhibit No. KCPL 801
3771
3774
Report and Order 12/21/2006
Exhibit No. KCPL 802
3771
3774
Report and Order 08/09/2008
Exhibit No. KCPL 803
3771
3774
Missouri Court of Appeals Opinion

OFFICE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL:
Exhibit No. KCP\&L 4043771
3773
Rebuttal testimony of Barbara Meisenheimer

STAFF OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION:
Exhibit No. GMO 249
3824
3828

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011 (Continued)

Exhibit No. GMO 2503824
Electric Annual Report 12/31/2008
Exhibit No. GMO 210 HC 3843
Staff cos Report 11/10/2010
Exhibit No. GMO 232
Rebuttal testimony of Lena Mantle
Exhibit No. GMO 233
3843
Surrebuttal testimony of Lena Mantle
Exhibit No. KCPL 295 HC 3915
Notice to Arbitrate
Exhibit No. KCPL 230 HC 3972
Rebuttal testimony of Keith Majors
Exhibit No. KCPL 231 нC
3972
Surrebuttal testimony of Keith Majors
Exhibit No. GMO 229 нC 3972
Rebuttal testimony of Keith Majors
Exhibit No. GMO 230
3972
Surrebuttal testimony of Keith Majors
Exhibit No. KCPL 296 нС 3917
Notice to Arbitrate
Exhibit No. KCPL 297 нС
3918
Notice of Controversy
Exhibit No. KCPL 222 HC
Testimony of Paul Harrison
Exhibit No. KCPL 223 HC
3951
Surrebuttal testimony of Paul Harrison
Exhibit No. KCPL 223 NP
3951
Surrebuttal testimony of Paul Harrison
Exhibit No. GMO 222 нC
3951

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011

| \$ | \$77 3966:1 | 3796:4 | 2 3959:14,17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$107 3894:23 | \$78 3790:6 | 3802:15 | 3964:5,8 |
| \$125 3894:20 | \$800,000 | $3807: 3$ $3808: 22$ | 3984 |
| 3896:8 | $3792: 16$ | 3808:22 | 108 |
| 3903:15,25 |  | 3844:10 | 3960:7,10, 20 |
| 3904:21 | 0 | 3851:6 | ,21,22,24 |
| 3940:25 | $\frac{0}{0124.4}$ | 3853:9,17 | 3984:5 |
| 3944:6 | 0124.4 | 3867:24 ${ }^{\text {385 }}$ | 10-minute |
| \$13 3785:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 3960: 12 \\ & 3984: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 3870:5,9 | 3841:12 |
| \$135 3899:10 | 0355 3907:17 | 387 | 11 3800:9 |
| \$14.3 3789:14 | 0356 3907:25 | 3883:9 |  |
| 3792:15 | 08/09/2008 | 3884:10,11 | 3831:13 ${ }^{\text {38, }}$ |
| \$15 3868:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 8 / 09 / 2008 \\ & 3984: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 3888:5 | 3844:8 |
| \$17.7 |  | 3945:10 | 3859:19 |
| 3914:4,5,13 | 1 | 100-megawatt | 3860:2 |
| \$20 3782:21 | 1 | 3806:12 | 3983:13 |
| 3783:1 | 3780:14,15,1 | 3813:10 | 11/06/2009 |
|  | 8,20,25 | 3866:7,21 | 113935:12 |
| 3811:4 | 3781:2 | 3867:19 | 11/10/2010 |
| 3820:5,8 | 3809:24 | 388 | 3985:6 |
| 3853:24 | 3810:3 | 100-megawatts 3869:14 | 1100 3760:2 |
| 3871:21 | 3813:3,6 | 3869:14 |  |
| 3877:13 | 3814:17 | 101 3759:16 | 111 3760:16 |
| \$20.2 3792:10 | 3824:18,20 | 3855:13 | 112 3781:14 |
| \$20.3 3791:16 | 3825:5,21,24 | 102 3783:10 | 3795:7 |
| \$22 3782:23 | 3833:24 | 3853:7 | 3818:19,21 |
| 3820:9 | 3847:6 | 103 3842:7 | 3883:5,6 |
| \$22.1 | 3850:16,20 | 38 | 112/41 |
| 3797:13,16 | 3851:17 71719 | 105 | 3859:10 |
| 3854:24 | 3852:2,17,19 | 3932:6,8,11 | 119 3760:7 |
| \$24.3 3791:14 | 3867:7,10,16 | 3954:13,17 | 12 3768:12 |
| \$26.5 | 3871:9,13 | 3956:13 | 3769:2,9 |
| 3905:12,17 | 3874:5 | 3964:13 | 3808:13,14 |
| \$29 3965:25 | 3886:2,9 | 3983:22 | 3809:6 |
| \$360 3780:9 | 3887:6, | 105-megawatt | 3817:25 |
| \$40 3820:4 | 3955:2 |  | 3823:9,24,25 |
|  | 3956:12 | 106 | 3824:5,8 |
| \$4925:11 | 39 | 3935:9,13,23 | 3829:1,10,11 |
| \$450,000 | 3933:17 | 3942:19,22,2 | 3851:17 |
| 3905:19 | 10 3800:8 | 3,24 | 3860:14 |
| \$5 3871:25 | 3823:9 | 3957:10,13 | 3870:18 |
| \$500 3895:23 | 3824:2,4,5,7 | ,12,14 | 3880:19 |
| \$52 3790:5 | 3831:12 | 3967:21 | 3896:25 |
| \$52.3 3965:22 | 3850:22 | 3983:23 | 3909:6,7,8 |
|  | 3891:16 | 107 | 3941:14 |
| \$60 3820:11 | 3983:11 | 3939:20,21 | 3958:11 |
| \$71.4 3792:7 | 100 3782:5 | 3941:3,24 | 3959:17 |
| \$75.8 3779:10 | 10083:6,14 | $\begin{aligned} & 3942: 12,14,1 \\ & 5,16 \end{aligned}$ | 3983:14,16 |
|  | 3795:25 | 3957:15,16,2 |  |

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011

| 12.8 3827:16 | 3923:16,18 | 3862:4,24 | 3951:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12/21/2006 | 3958:9,19,21 | 3863:6 | 2005 3788:16 |
| 3984:15 | , 25959:7,12 | 3864:12 | 3789:3.16 |
| 12/31/2008 | 3969:11 | 3868:21 | 3895:6,7 |
| 3984:24 | 3984:10 | 3870:9,10,14 | 2006 3770:17 |
| 3985:4 | 180,000 | 3874:20 | 3895:19,22 |
| 1200 3823:5 | 3812:12 | 3875:17 | 3896:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3831: 8 \\ & 3907: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 19 | 3877:8 3882 2, 8, 13 | 3910:2,5 |
| 3907:12 | 3908:6,8,11, | 3887:16 | 3911:24 |
| 125 3904.917 | 15 3984:11 | 3889:5,20,24 | 3912:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3904: 9,17,23 \\ & 3910: 15.18 \end{aligned}$ | 1985 3965:3 | 3892:3 | 3942:10 |
| 3911:1, 2, 10, | 1986 3955:3 | 3893:19 | 2007 3786:18 |
| 16 | 1's 3824:25 | 3895:12, 25 | 3895:22 |
| 13.87 3779:12 |  | 3896:3,4 | 3911:25 |
| 130 3759:7 | 2 | 3903:15,18,1 | 3939:10,25 |
| 134 3899:10 | 2 3779:25 | 3904:1, 6, 8 | 3940:5 3942 4, |
| 14 3758:6 | 3780:7,10,25 | 3905:2 ${ }^{\text {390, }}$ | 3942:4,6 |
| 143858:18 | 3781:6,10,14 | 3909:1 | $\begin{gathered} 2008 \quad 3770: 20 \\ 3824: 19.20 \end{gathered}$ |
| 14.43 3779:10 | 3782:1, 3, 5,6 | 3922:5 | 3825:2 |
| 1464 3765:2 | 3783:2,6,14 | 3923:11 | 3826:14 |
| 15 3800:9 | 3790:2 | 3931:20 | 3827:1 |
| 3854:5,8 | 3791:20 | 3932:1,12 | 3896:7,9 |
| 3858:21 | 3792:12 | 3939:5,8 | 3903:16 |
| 3868:21 | 3793:25 | 3941:20 | 3910:17 |
| 3877:15 | 3794:19 | 3945:20,25 | 2009 3894:14 |
| 3896:24 | 3795:1, 3, 6,1 | 3953:14, | 3911:7,13 |
| 3975:4 | 4,22 | 3955:24 | 3935:17,18 |
| 3979:7 | 3796:2,5,7,1 | 3956:7,13 |  |
| 15,000 | 6,17,18,21 | 3958:23,25 | 3962:16 |
| 3925:11 | $3797: 20$ $3802: 2$ | 3959:2 |  |
| 150 3884:2 | 3803:2 | 3976:12 | 200945006 |
| 153 3780:7 | 3807:17 | 2,166,099 | 3933:11 |
| 3795:7,8 | 3814:7 | 3827:3 |  |
| 3796:3,4 | 3815:5, 9,15 | 2.4 3853:3 | 2010 |
| 3844:10 | 3816:4,9 | 20 3820:8,9 | $\begin{aligned} & 3922: 16,18 \\ & 3928: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 159 3837:11 | 3818:11 | 3856:11 |  |
| 16 3768:13 | 3829:9 | 3864:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 010 / 12 / 29 \\ & 3960: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3769:2 | 3836:17 | 3865:2 |  |
| 3845:17 | 3840:13 | 3868:14,15 | 2011 3758:6 |
| 3850:22 | 3844:11 | 3872:1 | 3781:21,25 |
| 3889:11 | 3845:2 | 3877:11,13,1 | 3859:11,12 |
| 1613 3765:2 | 3847:6,11 | 7387 | 38679:7,22 |
| 17 3845:18 | 3850:24 | 200 3759:7 |  |
| 17 3845:18 | 3851:2,5,17, | 3760:16 | 2012 3813:25 |
| 18 | 22 | 3761:6,10 | 3819:12 |
| 3780:6,14,18 | 3852:2,17,19 | 2000 3783:22 | 2014 3854:20 |
| 3802:2 | 3853:2,15,17 | 3794:2,11 | 3868:4,5 |
| 3816:4 | 3854:4,16 | 3838:23 |  |
| 3853:24 | 3855:5 | 3844:23 |  |
| 3867:16 | 3856:1 | 3857:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 3787: 1,3 \\ & 3819: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3908:6,8,11, | 3858:9,23 | 3860:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 3819: 18 \\ & 21 \quad 3856 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$ |
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| 3857:4 | 0,21 3826:14 | 3908:6,11,15 | 3823 3981:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 210 3842:9,21 | 3828:7,11,12 | 3957:22 | 3983:15,16 |
| 3843:2,8,14, | 3833:16 | 3958:1, 3 | 3824 3981:9 |
| 15 3985:5 | 3834:16 | 3965:3 | 3983:12,1 |
| 211B 3964:24 | 3984:24 | 398 | 5,16 3984:24 |
| 215 3766:15 | 250 | 312 3760:11 | 3985:4 |
| 215s 3766:17 | 3824:14,16,1 | 312.371 .2673 | 3828 3981:10 |
|  | 3826:3 | 3760: | 3984:24 |
| $\begin{gathered} 223855: 11 \\ 3959: 3 \end{gathered}$ | 3827:14 | 314.725 .8788 $3759: 8$ | 3985 3831 |
| 22.1 3779:12 | 3833:16 | 32 3799:25 | 3983:18,19, 2 |
| 222 3950:5,10 | 3834:16 | 3800:19 | 1 |
| 3951:1,4,6,1 | 3985:4 | 3822:15,16 | 3833 3981:12 |
| 0,11 | 28.3 3827:12 | 3983:5,7 | 3983:18,19, 2 |
| 3985:20,24 | 295 3915:2,3 | 32459 3760:7 | 1 |
| 223 3950:7 | 3916:17,18,2 | 33 3799:25 | 3835 3981:13 |
| 3951:1,4,11 | 4 3917:3 | 3800:20 | 3838 3981:14 |
| 3985:21,23 | 3985:10 | 3822:15,16 | 3839 3981:14 |
| 2230 3761:11 | 296 | 3983:8 |  |
| 3762:25 | 3917:20,22 | 3420 3759:11 | 3842 3981:22 |
| $229 \quad 3971: 20$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3918: 5,11,15 \\ & 3985: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 35 3799:25 | $\begin{gathered} 3843 \text { 3981:22 } \\ 3985: 5,7,8 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3972: 9,11,24 \\ & 3985: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 297 | $\begin{aligned} & 3800: 20 \\ & 3822: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $3985: 5,7,8$ 3861 3981:23 |
| 23 3953:4 | 3918:18,19 | 3983:10 | 3876 3981:23 |
| 3969:19 | 3919:18,10 | 35.1 3827:10 | 3880 3981:24 |
| 230 | 3934:11 | 355 3768:13 | 883 |
| 3971:15,22 | 3985:18 |  |  |
| 3972:9,11,23 | 2's 3816:6 | $363758: 8$ 36.7 3827.7 | 3885 3981:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 3985: 11,1 \end{aligned}$ | 2153816.6 | 36.7 3827:7 | 3907 3981:16 |
| 231 3971:18 | 3 | 360 3763:12 | 3908 3981:17 |
| 3972:9,11, 24 | 3 3768:12 | 37 3932:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 3984: 7,8,10, \\ & 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3985:12 | 3769:2,6 | 3954:17 |  |
| 232 | 3781:2 |  |  |
| 3842:11,21 | 3851:18 |  | $\begin{gathered} 3917 \\ 3985: 10,17 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3843:4,14,16 | 3852:2,17,19 | $8,21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3985: 10,17 \\ & 3918 \end{aligned}$ |
| $3985: 7$ 233 | 3858:23 | 3773 3984:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 3918 \\ & 3985: 17,18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3842:13,22 | 3909:16 | 3774 | 3920 3985:18 |
| 3843:4,14,16 | 3.5 3909:11 | 3984:15,16,1 |  |
| 3985:8 | 30 3871:24 | 8 | 3924 3981:17 |
| 239 3972:11 | 3878:7,18 | 3791 3983:4 | 3930 3981:18 |
| 24 3857:4 | 3879:4 | 3799 3981:5 | 3931 3981:18 |
| 3959:3 | 3907:24 | 37th 3933:7 | 3932 3983:22 |
| 24/7 | 3908:5,11,14 | 3801 3981:5 | 3934 3983:22 |
| 3812:16,20 | 3925:10 | 3811 3981:6 | 3935 3983:23 |
| 240 3782:6 | 3941:19 |  | 39393984 |
| 3853:2 | 3984:7 | 3812 3981:6 | 39393984 |
| 249 | 300 3759:3 | 3816 3981:7 | $\begin{gathered} 9423983 \\ 3984 \cdot 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3824:14,15,1 | 309 3761:6 |  | 3947 3946:6 |
| 3825:11,18, 2 | 31 3907:24 | 398:5, ${ }^{\text {a }}$, 1 | 3949 3982:2 |

3988
TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC 573.886.8942 www.tigercr.com

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011

| 3951 3982:2 | 3983:4 | 3759:4 | 3967:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3985:20,21,2 | 4520 3760:2 | 573.635.7166 | 3968:1 |
| 3,24 | 46.38827 .1 | 3760:12 | 70 3884:15 |
| 3960 3984:5 |  | 573.636.6758 | 70s 3806:19 |
| 3967 3982:3 | $483813: 1$ | 3759:17 | 71988 3770:22 |
| 3971 3982:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 8(a) \\ & 3895: 5,10 \end{aligned}$ | 573.751 .6514 | 73 3782:10 |
| 3972 | 3896:4 | 3761:7 | 3858:14 |
| 3985:11,12,1 | 48A 3940:1,25 | 59 | 3859:2 |
| 4,15 | 49 3813:1 | 3808:16,17,2 | 75 3802:14 |
| 3973 3982:5 | 49 3813:1 | 4 3811:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 3819: 12 \\ & 3867: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 | 5 | 59.1 3891:15 | 75-megawatt |
| 4 3818:1,7,13 | 5 3784:19 |  | 3806:13 |
| 3829:1,10,11 | 3785:14,20 | 6 | 3813:20 |
| 3831:19,25 | 3831:19,25 | 6 3831:19 | 794,126 |
| 3832:13,20,2 | 3832:13,20,2 | 3832:1,13,20 | 3827:2 |
| $438333: 5,8$ $3846: 2$ | 4 3833:5,8,2 | 3443833:6,9 |  |
| 3851:10,21 | 3851:22 |  | 8 |
| 3852:11,13,2 | 3850:15 | . 5 3909:22 | 8 3780:23 |
| $23858: 24$ | 3983:19 | 6:00 3949:5 | 3832:18 |
| 3859:9 | 5.3 3909:16 | 60 3781:21 | 8,760 3891:11 |
| $3871: 25$ $3880: 19$ | 5.3 $5: 00$ $38909: 17$ | 3808:8 3820.12 , | 8:30 3979:5,6 |
| 3940:15 |  | 3859:11,13 | 801 3770:16 |
| 3983:17 | $\begin{gathered} 503812: 24,25 \\ 3867 \cdot 7 \end{gathered}$ | 60,000 | 3771:4 |
| 40 3773:15 | 3864:18 | 3812:11 | 3773:20 |
| 3820:10,12,1 | 3871:24 | 600 3876:25 | $3774: 4,7$ $3984: 15$ |
| 4 3871:24 | 3878:1,7,18 |  |  |
| 3878:7,18,21 | 3879:4,20,21 | 61 3781:22 | 802 3770:19 |
| 3879:4 |  | 3807:19 | 3771:4 |
| 3884:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O-some } \\ & 3820: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 3808:9 | 3773:20 |
| 400 3759:16 | 50-year | $6110(k)(3$ | 3984 |
| 404 3767:4,11 | 525 3837:11 |  | 3771:4 |
| 3768:12 | 533782.7 | 63105 3759:8 | 3773:20 |
| 3771:6 | 53 3782:7 | 64111 3759:12 | 3774:4,7 |
| 3773:16,17 | 3796:3 | 3760:3 | 3984:18 |
| 3984:21 | 3820:15 | 64141-9679 | 816.360.5976 |
| 41 3781:13 | 3844:13 | 3759:21 | 3759:12 |
| 3795:8 | 3851:6 | 65101 |  |
| 3807:19 | 3870:5,10 | 3759:4,16 | $3760: 3$ |
| 3818:18 | 3883:9 | 65102 3760:12 | 816.556 .2314 |
| 3820:16 |  | 3761:7,11 | 3759:22 |
| 3856:1 | 54.71 3958:6 | 3763:1,12 |  |
| 3883:6 | 55 3812:24 | 65201 3760:17 | 9 |
| 3884:9,10 | 3909:1 | 6th 3935:18 | 9 3832:18,19 |
| 412 3765:2 | 57 3782:11 |  | 3844:8 |
| 418679 | 3858:15 | 7 | 3932:22,24 |
| 3759:21 | 3859:5 | 73832.18 | 3934:15 |
| 428 3759:3 | 573.443.3141 | 7 3858:25 | 9.1 3933:8,21 |
| 45 3791:8,10 | 3760:17 | 3859:10 | 3935:2 |
| 45 3791.8,10 | 573.635.2700 | 3964:6,21 |  |
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| 9.1(a 3954:20 | 3839:16 | 3814:17 | 3853:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90 3842:7 | 3840:13 | 3860:12 | 3854:15 |
| 3843:2 | 3866:6 | 3896:10 | 3875:21 |
| 94 3844:6 | accordance | 3944:19 | additional |
| 95 3785:18,19 | 3968:9 | acquiring | 3788:17 |
| 3845:17 | according | 3787:6 | 3792:25 |
| 3853:14 | 3787:16 | acquisition | 3799:8,12 |
| 3859:19 | 3824:2 | 3788:3 | 3815:1 |
| 3860:2 | 3837:6 | 3802:2 3813 l | 3854:21 |
| 3886:1 | 3870:8 3929:11 | 3838:14,17,1 | 3868:14,15 |
| 95/5 3784:20 | 3946:1 | 8,19,22, | 3873:12 |
| 98 3850:22 | accordingly | 3839:3 | 3881:20 |
| 3856:10 | 3900:17 | act 3884:21 | 3884:18 |
| 857:4 | account | 3895:6 | 3886:6 |
| 3889:11 | account $3783: 2$ | 3898:21 | 3897:9 |
| 99 3851:14 | 3810:15 | 3902:2 | 3903:18 |
| 9th 3922:18 | 3819:14 | 3964:2 | 3905:22 |
|  | 3829:2 | acted | 3931:11 |
| A | 3830:3,12,15 | 3897:23,24 | 3948:14,16 |
| a.m 3979:6 | 3854:7,18 | 3904:4 | additionally |
| AARP 3763:18 | accountant 3952:10,22 | action 3980: 9,13 | 3802:21 |
| abandoned | counti | actions | 3919:16 |
| 3784:25 | 3943:10, 12, 1 | 3863:8 | additions |
| abbreviated | 5 | 3905:9 | 3780:6 |
| 3960:15 | 3952:7,16,25 | actual | 3853:16 |
| ability | 3953:6 | 3886:17 | add-on |
| 3790:6 | accumulated | 3896:8 | 3769:16 |
| 3937:22 | 3963:5 | actually | address |
| 3980:7 | accurate | 3766:5 | 3762:25 |
| able 3811:12 | 3772:25 | 3768:9 | 3763:11 |
| 3863:5 | 3773:4 | 3798:20 | 3823:3 |
| 3915:19 | 3800:16 | 3804:23 | 3831:5,8 |
| 3924:10 | 3823:16 | 3808:6 | 3907:12 |
| 3936:19 | 3832:9 | 3813:8,17 | addressed |
| 3963:16 | 3950:22 | 3817:23 | 3924:14 |
| 3966:25 | 3972:5 | 3818:1,22 | 3973:8 |
| 3977:2 | accurately | 3821:1 |  |
| Absolutely | 3775:6 | 3822:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { ddresses } \\ 3764: 24 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3811:24 | 3919:24 | 3859:7 |  |
| accept 3765:7 | achieve | 3870:12 | $3767: 23$ |
| 3899:15 | 3840:2 | 3896:4,24 | 3769:7 |
| acceptable | acknow1edges | 3899:14 | 3811:10 |
| 3884:15,17 | 3783:5 | 3954:10,17 | adds 3973:23 |
| accepted | acqu 3838:21 | 3957:22 | adjourned |
| 3901:19 | acquiesced | add 3787:18 | 3979:5,6 |
| access 3786:5 | 3793:8 | added 3791:19 | adjustment |
| accidentally | acquire | 75:4 | 3772:17,19 |
| 3925:13,15 | 3863:8 | 3914:14 | 3782:16 |
| accommodate | acquired |  | $3784: 15$ $3785: 2$ |
| 3778:14 | 3783:21,24 | adis3:1,14 | 3797:8 |
| accomplish | 3789:6 | 3820:6 | 3809:13,19 |
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| 3810:10,12 | 3881:19 | afternoon | 3896:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3820:19,22 | advanced | 3777:22,23 | 3897:24 |
| 3821:9 | adis9:20,22 | 3824:22 | 3904:7 |
| 3898:12 | 3790:1,9,17 | 3833:15 | 3909:1,14,15 |
| 3900:17 | 3841:15 | 3835:4,5,24, | 3913:7,13 |
| 3905:21 | 3892:13 | 25 | 3922:6,10,13 |
| 3976:22 | 3893:19 | 3843:24,25 | 3923:4 |
| adjustments | 3894:7 | 3861:24,25 | 3932:2,13 |
| 3784:18 | 3896:2 | 3876:18 | 3933:5,7 |
| admission | 3903:14,17,2 | after-the- | 3935:3 |
| 3832:13 | 5905:1,10,12 | after-the- fact 3886:23 | 3941:21 |
| 3833:2 | 3905:1,10,12 |  | 3945:17,19 |
| 3934:3 | 3910:2,12,16 | Ag 3764:18 | 3953:15,18,2 |
| 3960:19 | 3911:10 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | against |  |
| admit 3774:5 | 3918:3 | 3872:1 | 3954:1, 9,11, |
| 3776:13 | 3919:2 | 3896:21 | 12,18,23 |
| 3824:6 | 3921:14 | 3897:16,23 | 3955:24 |
| 3828:10 | 3922:7 | 3926:23 | 3956:6,9,13, |
| 3843:7,14 | 3940:1 | 3927:9,15 | 14,20 3959:9 |
| 3908:12 | 3965:11 | 3930:12 | 3978:8 |
| 3917:1 | 3966:8 | 3974:11 | 3983:22 |
| 3918:14 | 3977:15 | 3975:24 | agreements |
| 3920:6 | advantage | agencies | 3819:3 |
| 3934:6 | avantage | 376 | 3923:2 |
| 3942:15,23 |  | 3764:10,12 | 3954:24 |
| 3951:9 | advantageous | 3786:7 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| 3960:23 | 3808:1 | 3798:7 | $3813: 24$ |
| 3972:22 | adverse |  |  |
| admits | 3782:14 | agency $3968: 21$ | ahead <br> 3768:15,25 |
| 3770:14 | 3783:3 |  | 3768:15,25 |
| admitted | 3786:2 | agents 3786:7 | 3777:5 |
| 3770:16 | advice | agnostic | 3799:14,18 |
| 3773:16 | 3943:16 | 3902:21,24 | 3811:18, |
| 3776:18 | 3952:19 | ago 3765:21 | 3822:25 |
| 3800:20,22,2 | 3962:22 | 3783:24 | 3841:17,25 |
| 4 3801:3 | advise | 3836:12 | 3868:10 |
| 3822:7,15 | 3958:23 | 3845:3,5 | 3885:5 |
| 3824:3 | 3959:23 | 3928:12 | 3893:11,13,1 |
| 3833:2, | advocate | AGP/SIEUA | 6 3907:1 |
| 3920:14 | 3902:13 | MEUA 3759:5 | 3927:5 |
| 3962:16 | affect | agreed 3767:7 | 3944:24 |
| admitting | 3782:14 | 3772:7,16 | 3949:17 |
| 3766:19 | 3885:9 | 3785:2 | 3963:24 |
|  | 3892:4,5 | 3897:4 | 3978:17 |
| adopted <br> 3791.25 | 3961:22 | 3966:23 | Air 3760:6 |
| 3817:12 | 3963:20 | 3978:1 | 3764:13 |
| 3820:23 | affiliate | agreement | 3953:3,11 |
| 3840:12 | 3786:25 | 3788:19 | a1 3876:10 |
| 3855:7 | 3904:19 | 3789:4 |  |
| adoption | affiliates | $\begin{aligned} & 3803: 10 \\ & 3806: 21 \end{aligned}$ | Allegations 3769:22 |
| 3785:12 | 3923:3 | 3813:11,13,2 |  |
| 3855:5 | 3968:23 | $13818: 25$, | al1ocate |
| adopts 3786:1 | affix 3766:1 | 3863:10 | 3789:22 |
| 3853:22 | afford 3807:3 | 3866:21 | 3790:8 |
|  | afford 3807.3 | 3894:20 | 3802:24 |
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| 3803:16 | 3871:1 | 3913:19, 25 | 9,21 3973:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3805:3 | allocation | 3938:1 | 3976:1 |
| 3809:15 | 3781:9,18,20 | 3966:17 | 3980:8,10 |
| 3817:18 | 3782:1,14 | 3967:4 | amend 3914:3 |
| 3840:12 | 3783:2,6,17 | allowed | amended |
| 3853:1 | 3784:1 | 3876:10 | 3896:4 |
| 3856:1 | 3792:12 | 3911:19 | 3955:3 |
| 3869:8,9 | 3793:25 | 3966:18 | amendment |
| 3871:14,16 | 3797:20 |  | 3905:15 |
| 3881:15,24 | 3799:9,11 | allowing 3902:17 | 3913:18,24 |
| 3885:15 |  | 3902:17 | Ameren |
| 3888:20 | 3803:7,19,21 | allows 3939:3 | Ameren <br> 3760:18 |
| 3890:16 | 3805:10 | alluding | 3763:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3911: 16,19 \\ & 3927: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 3809:14,15 | 3855:10 | 3785:21 |
| 3967:5 | 3811:4 20 | alone 3784:3 | 3798:19,20 |
| 3968:22 | 3817:16,20 | alone $3790: 4$ | 3801:5 |
| 3969:10,16,1 | 3821:9, | 3807:2 | 3803:9 |
| 9 | 3829:1 | 3849:13 | AmerenUE |
| allocated | 3830:2,11,14 | 3851:19,24 | 3890:11 |
| 3781:13 | 3839:15 | 3852:2,3,7,1 | American |
| 3782:3,7 | 3840:6 | 4,20.22, 4 | 3872:15 |
| 3795:3,7 | 3845:1 | 3874:22,24 | among 3894:11 |
| 3796:3 | 3850:23 | already | am95:1 |
| 3802:3,8 | 3851:2,6,7 | 3778:20 | 3923:2 |
| 3817:25 | 3855:5 | 3785:16 | 3967:5 |
| 3819:24 | 3858:8 | 3820:16 | 3978:23 |
| 3836:17 | 3859:10,17 | 3824:2 | 3978.23 |
| 3844:11 | 3861:10 | 3831:22 | amongst |
| 3849:15,17 | 3866:2 | 3843:9 | 3816:1 |
| 3851:22 | 3870:19,21 | 3898:9 | 3970:2,12 |
| 3864:11 | 3871:4,6,10 | 3965:14,19,2 | amount |
| 3866:12,23 | 3872:3 | 5 | 3779:9,11 |
| 3867:4 | 3880:14 | alternative | 3780:5 |
| 3869:8,9 | 3881:11 | 3787:23 | 3782:16 |
| 3870:22 | 3882:12 | 3788:5 | 3796:11 |
| 3871:8 | 3886:24,25 | 3789:11 | 3807:12 |
| 3876:10 | 3889:6,12,24 |  | 3810:5 |
| 3881:5,6 | 3892:12 | alternatively | 3817:13 |
| 3886:22 | 3899:9 | 3969:19 | 3865:13 |
| 3887:2,4,18, | 3903:8 | a7ternatives | 3866:8 |
|  | 3923:2,4 | 3787:7 | 3889:23 |
| 3888:4,5,8,9 | 3926:16 |  | 3903:15 |
| 3889:2,20 | allocations | am 3823:12 | 3905:21 |
| 3894:20 | 3779:17 | 3824:10 | 3910:20 |
| 3911:15,18 | 3806:2 | 3825:5 | 3921:17,25 |
| 3925:19,18 | 3818:21 | 3833:10 | 3925:3,4,5,6 |
| 3937:21 | 3870:20 | 3865:19 | ,8,20,22,23 |
| allocat | 3880:20,24 | 3872:18 | amounts |
| a 3794:13 | 3881:1 | 3953:16,20,2 | 3925:18 |
| 3795:19 |  | 4956.14 | analogous |
| 3807:20 | a110w 3771:22 | 3957:21 | 3865:11 |
| 3829:3,8 | 3805:9,15 | 3958:3,17,18 | analysis |
| 3840:1 | 3840:25 | 3960:14 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3785:10 |
| 3851:2 | 3864:7 | 3961:7 | 3787:1,2,5,2 |
| 3861:13 | 3905:16 | 3971:14,17,1 | $23802: 18$ |
| 3870:25 | 3905.16 | 3971.14,17,1 | 3803:15 |
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| 3805:3 | 3902:3 | 3957:13,17 | 3896:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3807:25 | anymore | appearance | 3905:15 |
| 3817:23 | 3807:9 | 3762:14,16 | 3910:5 |
| 3818:13,14,1 | anyone | 3764:21 | 3911:1 |
| 3925:10 | 3763:14 | appearing | 3913:18,23 |
| 3927:19 | 3765:3 | 3763:5,6,21 |  |
| 3930:15 | 3793:18 | 3764:7 | apportioned <br> 3875:1 |
| analyze | 3798:17 | appears | apportionment |
| 3783:25 |  | 3825:21 | 3925:1 |
| 3784:7 | anything | 3918:24,25 | preciate |
| ancil1ary | 3772:13 | 3930:13 | 3792:17 |
| 3954:23 | 3776:12 | 3940:13 | 3876:18 |
| and/or 3923:7 | 3809:10 | 3980:5 | 3957:10 |
| Annette | 3834:1,2 | applicable | appreciated |
| 3761:4 | 3835:16 | 3795:4 | 3778:22 |
| 3763:8,10 | 3837:11 | application | approach |
| announce | 3865:24 | 3758:10,14 | 3786:9 |
| 3910:22 | 3869:13 | 3859:22 | 3788:6 |
| annual | 3880:7 | 3895:20,25 | 3825:7 |
| 3834:17 | 3881:25 | 3897:15 | 3846:7 |
| 3984:24 | 3886:17 | 3902:1,3 | appropriate |
| 3985:4 | 3901:15 | 3910:7,12 | 3769:21 |
| answer 3768:8 | 3902:2,6 | 3911:23,24,2 | 3772:3 |
| 3769:8 | 3967:8 |  | 3782:16 |
| 3792:18 | anything's | 3912:1, ${ }^{\text {a }}$,6,1 | 3788:6,11 |
| 3814:21 | 3810:4 | 3914:2 | 3790:8 |
| 3816:16 | anyway 3818:4 | 3921:14 | 3818:17 |
| 3817:9 | 3873:18 | 3939:11,12,1 | 3836:19,20 |
| 3819:23 | 3920:8 | 5,18,25,12,1 | 3839:15,20 |
| 3821:12 | apart 3835:17 | 3940:4,15,18 | 3848:1,7 |
| 3829:23 |  | , 24 | 3851:23 |
| 3834:4 | apologize | 3941:6,19 | 3852:3 |
| 3835:19 | 3763:11 | 3942:6,9 | 3852.3 |
| 3840:20 | 3957:14 | 3944:3,6,13, | approva1 |
| 3880:12 | apparent7y | 15,18 3955:1 | 3758:11,15 |
| 3888:1 | 3776:6 | 3957:4,18,23 | 3790:11 |
| 3913:9 | 3785:6 | 3959:11 |  |
| 3914:11 | 3789:2 | 3976:18 | 3797:15 |
| 3924:10 | 3919:8,15 | 3984:4 | 3804:5 |
| 3938:20,25 | 3930:6 |  | 3922:20 |
| 3944:8,9 | 3930.6 | applications | 3922.20 |
| 3948:22 | appeal | 3895:22 | approved |
| 3970:1,11 | 3905:22 | 3913:4 | 3785:18,19 |
| 3974:7 | 3973:12 | 3925:18 | 3803:24 |
| answered | appealed | 3944:4 | 3804:5,6,11 |
| 3814:25 | 3897:3 | applied | 3894:21 |
| 3877:16 | appeals | 3881:11,12 | 38972:11 |
| 3914:14 | 3770:21 | 3893:20 | 3912:18 |
| answers | 3973:9 | 3896:5,12 |  |
| 3800:14 | 3984:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 3910: 2,2 \\ & 3911: 5 \end{aligned}$ | approximate |
| 3832:4 | appear | 3937:7 |  |
| 3950:20 | 3826:1,8,24 |  | approximately |
| anybody | 3827:19 | apply $3893: 23$ | 3782:21 |
| 3793:13 | 3955:23 | 3895:19 | 3789:13 |
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| 3791:18 | 3896:15,19,2 | 3849:3,4,13, | 3945:9,11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3792:14,16 |  | 22 3850:1 | 3969:6 |
| 3812:10,12,1 | 3897:2,3,20 | 3855:4 | assets |
| 4 3820:5 | 3898:13,23 | 3859:21 | 3794:12 |
| 3853:2,24 | 3900:3 | 3887:19 | 3795:18 |
| 3894:23 | 3901:9,14,20 | 3890:7 | 3804:12 |
| 3909:3,5 | ,21 3903:2,4 | areas | 3936:16 |
| 3923:17 | 3904:3,4,12, | 3779:7,16 |  |
| 3925:12 | 13,18 | 3781:19,24 | assign |
| 3928:16,17 | 3905:14 | 3783:4 | 3794:17 |
| 3965:22 | 3906:15,17 | 3784:9 | assigned |
| Apri1 3896:7 | $3913: 11,15,1$ | 3790:19 | 3762:7 |
| 3910:17 | 3914:6,12 | 3791:24 3794 14, | 3780:15 |
| AQCS 3780:14 | 3916:14 | 3794:14,21 | 3794:16 |
| Aquila | 3918:3 | 3830:11 | 3796:15 |
| 3779:7,8 | 3919:1,2, 9,1 | 3845:24 | 3813:16,21 |
| 3783:21,24 | 3,14,2 | 3857:25 | 3818:9 |
| 3786:18,24 | 3920:21,24 | 3888:17 | 3819:8 |
| 3788:3,21 | 3921:1,10,20 | argue 3787:25 | 3886:14 |
| 3793:7,10 | 3922:2,3,6,1 | 3930:4 | assigning |
| 3803:24 | 4 3925:25 | arguing | 3795:13 |
| 3804:6 | 3926:4,6,21 | 3785:4 | 3805:15 |
| 3813:18 | 3927:7,12 | 3787:17 | assignment |
| 3814:10 | 3928:2 | 3788:21 | 3796:5 |
| 3838:15,20 | 3931:2,3,8,1 | 3793:1 | 3820:16 |
| 3839:4 | 1 3948:6 | argument | 3900:14 |
| 3844:22 | 3958:15,24 | 3805:21 | assignments |
| 3845:21,23 | 3959:6,8 | 3836:10 | 3886:16 |
| 3849:2,20 | 3973:9,11,15 | arguments | associated |
| 3860:5,8,12 | 3974:3,12,13 | 3927:11,16 | 3765:24 |
| 3862:17 | ,17,18,21 | arose 3895:1 | 3909:21 |
| 3881:21 | 3975:3,11,20 |  | 3921:14 |
| 3882:10 | 3976:3,7,17 | arrangement | 3937:7 |
| 3893:23 | 3977:15 | 3934:24 | association |
| 3896:10,12,1 | arbitrator | arrangements | 3764:15 |
| 8 3897:15,16 | 3929:8 | 3776:2 | 3933:13 |
| 3901:25 |  | 3933:18 | 3955:19 |
| 3903:16 | arbitrators 3948:6 | 3954:22,25 | assume |
| 3926:16 |  | art 3905:3 | 3769:18 |
| 3944:5,17 | $\begin{gathered} \text { arbitrator's } \\ \text { 3905:22 } \end{gathered}$ | Article | 3799:9 |
| 3958:9,19, 25 |  | 3932:22,24 | 3855:10 |
| 3959:6 | area | ascertain | 3919:10 |
| Aquila's | 3780:13,15,1 | 3818:17 | 3974:3 |
| 3959:1 | 6 3781:14,15 | aside 3838:5 | assuming $3840: 22$ |
| arbitrate | 3782:4,8,15, | 3887:16 |  |
| 3905:19 | 3791:13, 21 | aspect | $3784: 2$ |
| 3916:12 | 3792:7,13 | 3818:17 |  |
| 3918:1 3920 18 | 3794:6,8 | aspects | 3899:8, |
| 3920:18 | 3795:7,8 | 3819:21 | 889 |
| 3974:20,24 | 3818:11 | 3922:10 | attached |
|  | 3835:8 | asset 3818:8 | 3766:5,8 |
| arbitration $3790: 15,21,2$ | 3840:19 | 3874:20,25 | 3846:2 |
| 2 3894:13,18 | 3848:16,18 | 3877:24 | 3857:20 |
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| 3900:25 | 5 3778:4 | 3802:16 | 3836:9,11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3901:2 | 3787:7 | 3803:20 | 3837:16,20,2 |
| 3934:12 | 3789:16 | 3806:1 | 4 3845:2 |
| 3958:15 | 3792:19 | 3816:18 | 3847:9,12 |
| 3975:12 | 3818:12 | 3819:19 | 3856:8 |
| attacking | 3856:13 | 3852:10 | 3857:6,12 |
| 3769:16 | 3857:13,23 | 3857:21 | 3858:2 |
|  | 3870:3 | balanced | 3863:7 |
| attempt | 3874:13 | $3786: 8$ | 3864:1 |
| 3768:7 | 3895:23 |  | 3867:11 |
| 3818:15 | 3903:19 | balances | 3869:7 |
| 3839:24 | 3904:5 | 3808:7 | 3870:7 |
| 3905:25 | 3905:4 | balancing | 3872:3 |
| attempted | 3942:3 | 3781:15 | 3873:14 |
| 3857:13,24 | Avenu | 3811:1 | 3876:20 |
| attempting | 3760:11 | 3818:17 | 3877:12 |
| 3775:10 | average | 3819:21 | 3885:20 |
| attendanc | 3809:24 | 3884:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 3886: 19,21,2 \\ & 3 \\ & 3889: 15,23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3799:2 | 3829:15 | ba11park | 3901:22 |
| attending | 3871:14 | 3877:20 | 3903:25 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ttending } \\ & 3798: 23 \end{aligned}$ | avoid 3790:12 | Banks 3758:23 | 3904:9 |
| attention | 3871:22 | 3980:3,16 | 3905:10 |
| 3774:20 | 3926:8 | Barb | 3923:7 |
| 3777:19 | 3929:3 | 3767:3,22 | 3948:14 |
| 3792:17 | award 3897:3 | 37 |  |
| 3886:2 | 3898:23 | Barbara | baseload |
| ttorney | 3901:20,21,2 | 3773:14 | 3781:16,17,2 |
| 3759:2,6,10, | 3,24 3914:6 | 3984:21 | 3782:10,11,1 |
| 11, 14, 15,19, | 3958:15 | Barclays |  |
|  | 3959:6 | 3785:24 | 3796:1, 9,14 |
| 3760:1,6,10, | 3976:3 | bargaining | 3806:17 |
| 14,15 3846:3 | awarded | 3883:20 | 3808:10 |
| 3968:10 | awarded |  | 3812:15 |
| 3980:11 | 3893:20 | bars 3902:6 | 3821:3 |
| attorneys | 3904:8 | base 3764:13 | 3828:1, 3 |
| 3799:6 | 3910 | 3784:13,16,1 | 3858:10,15 |
| 3925:2 | 3911:10 | 7,19,24 | 3859:2,6,13 |
|  | 3976.10:7 | 3785:1,7,9,1 | 3862:17 |
| 3906:14 | aware 3778:7 | 4 3787:11 | 3863:2,10,13 |
|  |  | 3798:15 |  |
| auditor | 3797:19 | 3818:8 | 3866:8 |
| 3949:25 | 3910:13 | 3857:2 | 3869:22,23 |
| 3952:22 | 3944:13,15 | 3863:1,2 | 3870:12,13,1 |
| 3971:10 | 3967:3,6 | based 3781:15 | 4 3875:8,10 |
| authority | 3973:15 | $3784: 1,7$ | 3884:3,18 |
| 3901:16 | 3974:19,22 | 3785:10 | 3886:10 |
| authorize | away 3850:3 | 3786:10 | 3887:3,4 |
| 3933:15 |  | 3787:14 | bases 3844:17 |
| authorized | B | 3796:3,4 | $3845: 8$ |
| 3968:13 | background | 3811:15 | asic 3891: |
| availability | 3797:20 | 3814:9 |  |
| 3777:21 | 3895.1 | 3815:13,16,2 | 3806:17 |
| available | bad 3904:5 | 4 3817:18 | 3821:2,15 |
| 3774:21 | balance | 3818:6 | 3871:23 ${ }^{\text {38 }}$ |
| 3777:22,23,2 | 3784:5 | 3829:14, |  |
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| 3930:8 | 3899:3 | 3898:14,18 | beneficial |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| basing | 3950:23 | 3906:11 | 3852:15 |
| 3845:12 | 3972:6 | 3909:7,20,25 | benefit |
| basis 3769:2 | believe | 3912:6,18 | 3783:19 |
| 3794:13 | 3765:6 | 3914:14 | 3887:5,8 |
| 3795:18 | $3766: 22$ $3770: 10$ | 3915:2 | 3898:14,18 |
| 3819:20 | 3785:22 | 3916:12 | 3905:10 |
| 3827:24 | 3788:4 | 3918:1 | 3906:2 |
| 3836:23 | 3791:7,24 | 3919:23 | benefited |
| 3883:23 | 3797:14,24 | 3921:2 | benefited |
| 3886:23 | 3799:15, | 3922:3,9,10 | 3899:7 |
| 3903:1 | 3800:19 | 3923:14,23 | 3906:1 |
| 3934:20 | 3807:2 | 3924:2, 3925 : 10,14 | benefiting <br> 3813:2 |
| Bassham | 3812:10,11, 2 | 3928:14 |  |
| 3913:3 | 4,25 | 3929:1,11 | benefits $3790: 21$ |
| Beach 3760:7 | 3813:12,15,2 | 3932:5 | 3796:18 |
| bear 3892:3 | 5 3814:8,25 | 3937:12 | 3821:11 |
| bearing | 3816:18 ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ | 3938:16,19,2 | 3847:22,23 |
| 3811:12 | 3817:8 | 2 3939:14 | 3874:17 |
| beat 3900:5 | 3819:12,18,2 | 3943:21 | 3886:10 |
| became 3942:2 | 4821:12 | 3944:12 | 3898:17 |
| 3944:19 | 3822:19 | 3946:3 | 3909:18,21 |
| become | 3824:13 | 3948:25 | 3923: |
| 3779:18 | 3829:22 | 3951:15 | $3930 \cdot 7$ |
| begin 3762:1 | 3830:19 | 3956:3 | 3936:20 |
| 3765:5 | 3831:14,22 | 3962:25 | 3969:13 |
| 3778:18,25 | 3832:13 | 3963:19 | 3977:4 |
| 3797:12' | 3839:11 | 3965:24 | besides |
| 3799:10,14 | 3840:20,22 | 3966:10,15 | 3840:1 |
| beginning | 3841:14,21 | 3970:17, | 3908:21 |
| 3769:9 | 3842:7 | 3974:13,25 | best 3800:16 |
| 3793:22 | 3843:10 | 3975:18,22 | 3805:16 |
| 3798:25 | 3844:8 | 3977:10 | 3823:16 |
| 3927:1 | 3847:18, 22 | 3978:16 | 3832:10 |
| 3978:20 | 3848:1 | believed | 3871:19 |
|  | 3849:6,9,25 | 3912:21 | 3899:14 |
| 3964:22 | 3852:6,11 | 3914:7 | 3926:17 |
|  | 3855:6 | 3926:19 | 3950:22 |
| begun 3822:10 | 3856:6 | 3927:4,6,25 | 3972:5 |
| behalf | 3857:16 | 3931:5,6 | 3980:6 |
| 3762:18,23 | 3858:22,24 | believes | better |
| 3763:6,21,25 | 3859:17 | 3787:10,19 | 3796:20 |
| 3764:7,12,20 | 3866:10 | 3790:8,22 | 3812:1 |
| 3774:16,17 | 3870:14 | 3796:14 | 3819:17 |
| 3775:1,2,3 | 3876:4,6 | 3862:9 | 3840:7 |
| 3898:21 | 3877:6 |  | 3883:13 |
| 3911:5,6 | 3878:19,24 | 3948:11 | 3884:15 |
| behind | 3884:17 |  | beyond |
| 3892:16 | 3886:19 | be longed $3895: 15$ | 3840:16 |
| 3938:12 | 3887:11 | 3895:15 | 3938:10,17 |
| belief | 3891:5,15 | Bemiston |  |
| 3800:17 | 3892:8 | 3759:7 | $3787: 13$ |
| 3832:10 | 3893:3 | bench 3876:20 |  |
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| 3885:7 | bottom | 3768:18 | calculation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| billed | 3834:20 | 3802:2 | 3826:17,23 |
| 3834:20 | 3932:16 | 3865:4 | 3827:5,9,22 |
| billing | 3941:19 | built 3787:20 | calculator |
| 3816:21 | 3959:18 | 3788:21 | 3824:23,24 |
| bil1ion | 3964:18 | 3794:15 | 3825:12 |
| 3872:3 | bound 3897:14 | 3806:22 | 3830:25 |
| 3878:8 | Box 3759:21 | 3863:9 | calendar |
| bit 3766:4 | 3761:6,11 | 3882:9 | $3824: 19,20$ |
| 3779:18 | 3762:25 | 3888:16 |  |
| 3833:20 | 3763:12 | bul1et | callaway |
| 3854:12 | boxes 3958:1 | 3868:12 |  |
| 3867:11 | breach 3770:2 | burden | 3781:16,22 |
| 3875:15 | 3876:24 | 381 | 3,25.16, |
| 3876:12 | break 3834:12 | burning | 3782:10,12,1 |
| 3892:15 | $3841: 12$ | $3896: 3$ | 8 3787:9 |
| 3894:25 | 3949:10 | Burton | 3789:5,8,9 |
| 3895:2 |  | 3789:15 | 3796:1,10,11 |
| bite 3868:12 | $3915: 25$ | 3823:1,5,7 | 3808:13 |
| black 3976:6 | briefly | 3858:6 | 3809:16 |
| B1anc 3830:22 | 3774:13 | 3981:8 | 3815:13 |
| 3831:2,3,7,9 | 3784:11 | 3983:12,13,1 | 3828:1,3 |
| 3832:18 | 3816:14 | 5,16 | 3836:21,22 |
| 3833:15 | 3828:19 | business | 3854:11,22 |
| 3835:4,24 | 3839:9 | business | 3856:1,18 |
| 3837:22 | 3915:7 | 3783:22,25 | 3857:5,14,21 |
| 3838:2 | briefs | 3812:10 | 3859858:15 |
| 3839:11 | 3915:17 | 3821:16 | 3863:1,10,13 |
| 3865:22 | bring 3766:24 | 3831:7 | 3866:13,23 |
| 3981:11 | 3774:20,23 | 3837:13 | 3867:12 |
| 3983:18,19,2 | 3777:18 | 3872:17 | 3868:18 |
| 1 | 3803:23 | 3878:17 | 3869:22 |
| blow 3901:17 | 3824:22 | 3907:11 | 3871:22 |
|  | 3835:16 | 3930:4 | 3875:5,12,21 |
| Blunk 3789:15 | 3836:15,24 | 3931:23 | ,23 3884:18 |
| boggling | 3839:4 | 3933:15,25 | 3945:25 |
| 3865:21 | Broadway | 3955:20 | 3949:23 |
| boiled 3892:2 | 3759:11 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3952: 15 \\ & 3971: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| book | brought | 3807:3,7,8 |  |
| 3787:6,12 | 3894:14 |  | 3785:24 |
| 3788:1 | 3973:20 | $3963: 8,20$ | 3786:1,6 |
| 3808:1 | 3978:19 |  | 3802:9 |
| books 3790:3 | Brydon 3760:11 | buying $3936: 21$ | 3854:1,8 |
| 3867:25 |  | 3937:10,11 | 3866:13 |
| 3875:22 | bucket | 3937.10,11 | 3868:15 |
| 3894:8,9 | 3784:16 |  |  |
| 3936:18 | 3821:20,21 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3877: 7,14 \\ & 3884: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3937: 9 \\ & 3966: 7,12,14 \end{aligned}$ | budgets | $\begin{gathered} \text { ca1cu1ate } \\ 3826: 11 \end{gathered}$ | 3884:20 <br> Capitol |
| ,25 | 3953:8,9 |  | Capitol |
| bother | build 3785:13 | $3827: 18$ | 3760:11 |
| 3939:19 | building | 3834:6 | $\begin{gathered} \text { CAPT } 3760: 6 \\ 3764: 11: \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 3798:8 \& 3818:9,21 \& 3893:3,4,11 \& certification <br>
\hline Captain \& 3820:15,25 \& caught \& $$
3910: 18
$$ <br>
\hline 3764:11 \& 3823:8 \& 3877:24 \& 3940:16 <br>
\hline care 3765:6 \& 3831:10,11 \& cause 3783:8 \& certified <br>
\hline career \& 3835:14 \& 3838:3 \& 3952:9 <br>
\hline 3943:11 \& 3837:5 \& 3853:10 \& certify <br>
\hline \& 3839:19 \& 3878:13 \& 3980:4 <br>
\hline $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { careless } \\
3886: 20
\end{gathered}
$$ \& 3842:6,13 \& 3894:5 \& cetera <br>
\hline \& 3845:1 \& 3928.5 \& 3803:18 <br>
\hline $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Car1 3759:6 } \\
3764: 7
\end{gathered}
$$ \& $3851: 8,12$
$3860: 23$ \& 3928:5 \& CFO 3913:3 <br>
\hline 3775:9 \& 3862:12 \& caused \& chance 3768:9 <br>
\hline carry 3806:25 \& 3863:22 \& 3799:23 \& change <br>
\hline carryover \& 3864 \& 3823:7 \& 3786:13 <br>
\hline 3762:11 \& 14868:7 \& 3831:9 \& 3791:23 <br>
\hline Carter \& 3869:12 \& 3971:12 \& 3800:12, <br>
\hline 3760:10 \& 3872:9,16 \& \& 3815:13,16 <br>
\hline 3764:4,5 \& 3877:4 \& 3980:3,16 \& 3816:2,5,7 <br>
\hline 3768:11,14,1 \& 3881:19 \& cent 3809:24 \& 3821:23 <br>
\hline 8,25 3769:1 \& 3888:1,7 ${ }^{\text {3888 }}$ \& cent 3809:24
3810:3 \& 3829:18,25 <br>
\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& 3773: 19,21 \\
& 3774: 2
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 3893:18 \& $$
3810: 3
$$ \& 3830:14 <br>
\hline \& 3894:24 \& Center
$$
3780: 24
$$ \& 3854:9,14 <br>
\hline case

7 \& 3896:17 \& \& 3881:1 <br>
\hline 3768:15 \& 3897:7 \& 3934:23 \& changed <br>
\hline 3769:4,19 \& 3908:18, \& \& 3784:4 <br>
\hline 3770:10,12,1 \& 3917:1 \& cents $3810: 1$ \& 3912:17 <br>
\hline 7,20 \& 3923:13 \& \& changes <br>
\hline 3772:15,18,2 \& 3926:20,23 \& century \& changes $3758: 12,16$ <br>
\hline 0 3773:8,24 \& 3931:3,5 \& 3862:7 \& 3762:5,16 <br>
\hline 3774:20 \& 3936:9,22,25 \& certain \& 3785:2 <br>
\hline 3779:3,13,19 \& 3937:19 \& 3758:12,16 \& 3786:2 <br>
\hline ,21,22 \& 3940:19 \& 3788:2,7 \& 3823:13 <br>
\hline 3780:4,5,12, \& 3950.5 \& 3798:21 \& 3830:8 <br>
\hline 21,22 \& 3953:13 \& 3902:20 \& 3842:19,23 <br>
\hline 3781:3,9 \& 3957:4 \& 3915:21 \& 3861:15 <br>
\hline 3782:14,25 \& 3962:23 \& 3945:12 \& 3881:3 <br>
\hline 3784:12,22,2 \& 3963:1,11 \& 3954:4 \& changing <br>
\hline 5 \& 3965:10 \&  \& 3794:2 <br>
\hline 3785:3,4,5,6 \& 3971:13 \& certainly \& 3830:3 <br>
\hline ,17,21,22 \& 3974:21 \& 3770:11 \& 3859:20 <br>
\hline 3786:17 \& \& 3771:21 \& <br>

\hline 3787:12,15 \& cases 3779:15 \& 3792:19 \& $$
3955: 2
$$ <br>

\hline 3788:14 \& 3785:20 \& 3797:18 \& <br>
\hline 3789:13,19,2 \& 3793:10,11 \& 3814:22 \& characteristi <br>
\hline 0 3791:13 \& 3817:10 \& 3834:10 \& CS 3850:4 <br>
\hline 3792:5,7 \& 3835:18 \& 3836:17 \& 3857:8 <br>
\hline 3795:1,2,5 \& 3914:22 \& 3837:16 \& 3863:25 <br>
\hline 3797:7,12 \& cash 3929:24 \& 3915:8 \& 3890:18 <br>
\hline 3798:22 \& 3936:23 \& 3930:6 \& 3891:9,12 <br>
\hline 3799:24 \& 3937:1 \& crtainty \& 3956:23 <br>
\hline 3800:2,21 \& 3963:25 \& 3807:14 \& haracterizat <br>
\hline 3802:20 \& Cat 3872:17 \& 3871:24 \& ion 3874:18 <br>
\hline $3803: 19$
$3804: 25$ \& \& CERTIFICA \& charge <br>
\hline 3804:25 \& caucus \& 3980:1 \& 3809:25 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}
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| 3921:13 | 3891:3 | 3976:6 | 3784:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3926:18 | 3903:13,21 | clients | collectively |
| charged | 3907:12,14 | 3943:16 | $3954: 25$ |
| 3921:18, 22 | 3940:20 | Cline 3892:24 | Columbia |
| 3925:13,16 | 3957:4 | 3893:1,3 | 3760:17 |
| charges | 3973:16 | 3940:12 | column |
| 3758:12 | 3983:3 | 3978:14 | 3833:21, 22,2 |
| 3868:18 | 3984:3 | clock 3812:20 |  |
| 3871: | claim 3897:16 | close 3812:25 | 3834:1,11,21 |
| 3976:16 | 3910:18 | 3851:7 | combination |
| charging | claimed | 3954:21 | 3870:6 |
| 3821:6,10 | 3898:10 | 3955:4,20 | combined |
| Cheap 3862:23 | 3965:14,19 | closed 3955:1 | 3846:18 |
| cheaper | claims | closely $3852: 12$ | 3847:20 |
| 3810:8 | 3897:22 |  | combustion |
| 3884:19 | 3898:16 | closer 3866:1 | 3786:23 |
| cheapest | 3900:8,13 | closest | 3787:20 |
| 3863:14 | 3934:20 | 3850:3 | 3788:17,22 |
| 3869:17,18 | 3973:20 3974 l | coal | 3789:3 |
| 3870:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 3974: 4,12 \\ & 3975: 2,24 \end{aligned}$ | 3789:20,22 | comes 3862:11 |
| check 3859:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 3975: 2,24 \\ & 3976: 2,24,25 \end{aligned}$ | 3790:1,9,17 | 3875:16 |
| 3927:12,13,1 | 3977:3 | 3841:15 | coming |
| $\begin{aligned} & 63928: 4 \\ & 3975: 20,21 \end{aligned}$ | clarification | 3878:3,24 | 3773:23 |
| Chief | 3839:7 | 3892:13 | 3847:14 |
| $3761: 1,2$ | clarify | 3893:19 | comment |
| choices | $3822: 14$ $3840: 24$ | 3895:11 | $3767: 5$ $3814: 15$ |
| 3883:17 | 3840 | 3896:2,3 | 3862:11 |
| choose 3862:2 | $\begin{gathered} \text { clarity } \\ 3914: 16 \end{gathered}$ | 3903:14,17,2 | commercial |
| circumstances |  | 3905:1,10,12 | 3826:13,18 |
| 3901:7 | $3827: 24$ | ,20 | 3827:9,16,18 |
| 3924:14 |  | 3910:3,12,16 | 3878:14 |
| cite 3935:2 | $3772: 18,20$ | 3911:10 | commission |
| cited 3966:3 | 3782:16 | 3918:3 | 3758:1 |
| 3968:9 | 3784:15 | 3919:2 | 3761:5,8 |
| City | 3785:2 | 3921:14 | 3763:7 |
| 3758:7,11 | 3786:12 | 3922:7 | 3769:17,24 |
| 3759:4,12,16 | 3797:8 | 3940:1 | 3770:4,5,13 |
| ,18,20,21,23 | 3820:19,22 | 3965:11 | 3771:1,15,20 |
| 3760:3,4,12 | Clayton | 3966:8 | 3772:6,16 |
| 3761:7,11 | 3759:8 | 3977:15 | 3773:9 |
| 3762:3,19,25 | clean 3895:11 | code 3895:5 | 3774:20,22 |
| 3763:12,14,1 | 3905:4 | 3937:7 | 3779:2,23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5,16 \text { 3764:23 } \\ & 3779: 21 \end{aligned}$ | clear 3765:15 | 3939:2 | 3784:5,7,9 |
| 3798:11 | 3767:14 | 3955:3 | 3785:19 |
| 3803:12,14 | 3770:4 | 3968:8 | 3786:1,11 |
| 3805:24, | 3901:14 | coincident | 3787:24 |
| 3814:8 | 3903:5 | 3829:11 | 3788:24 |
| 3815:11 | 3911:8 | collect | 3789:22 |
| 3817:15 | 3916:22 | 3865:1 | 3790:8,11 |
| 3823:5 | 3956:4 | collected | 3791:25 |
| 3831:8,10 | 3958:25 | collected | 3793:4,12,20 |
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| 3797:15,19 | 3901:8,18 | communicated | , 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3803:24 | 3902:5,11,14 | 3959:13 | 3816:4,18,20 |
| 3806:2 | ,23 | community | 3818:10 |
| 3817:12,19 | 3903:3,10 | 3873:9 | 3819:13 |
| 3840:12 | 3906:3, 5, 13, |  | 3825:1 |
| 3855:3,7,18 | 16,20:5, 9,14, | companies $3762: 4,9$ | 3830:9 |
| 3880:23 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 23 3916:2,6' | 3797:12 | 3836:13,19 |
| 3881:13,18 | 3924:21,24 | 3815:21 | 3838:3,4,9,2 |
| 3883:17 | 3929:14,25 | 3817:16 | 2,25 |
| 3890:8,13 | 3930:17 | 3837:8 | 3840:3,8,11, |
| 3893:17,22 | 3931:22 | 3852:7 | 17 3843:21 |
| 3894:1,15 | 3943:24 | 3860:25 | 3845:22 |
| 3898:2 | 3944:2,11,21 | 3890:22,23,2 | 3846:16 |
| 3899:9 | , 23 | 4 3898:8 | 3848:3,4,5,9 |
| 3900:15 | 3945:2,13,18 | 3899:12 | ,19 3849:14 |
| 3902:9 | ,22,24 | 3900:21 | 3855:3,14,19 |
| 3903:6,7,12 | 3948:2,3,7 | companion | 3861:16 |
| 3905:13 | 3981:5,13,17 | 3762:19 | 3863:18 |
| 3915:20 | ,23,24 | 3831:10 | 3882:11 |
| 3928:19,23 | commissioners |  | 3888:3,7,23 |
| $3929: 8,12$ | 3978:22 | company | $\begin{aligned} & 3890: 15 \\ & 3891: 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3936:12,19 | commissioner' | 3759:13,18,2 | 3896:11 |
| 3937:1 | s 3877:17 | 0,23 | 3898:16,22 |
| 3943:23 | 3885:20 | 3760:4,13 | 3902:19 |
| 3949:25 | 3930:20 | 3762:4,10,14 | 3903:24 |
| 3951:23 | Commissioners | 3793:21,23 | 3906:1 |
| 3952:3 | 3758:20 | 3763:21,23 $3764: 3,5$ | 3907:14 |
| 3963:10 | 3930:24 | 3764:3,5 | 3916:13 |
| 3965:10,16 | Commissioner' | 3779:4,15,21 | 3919:5,9 |
| 3968:18 | $\text { s } 3816: 17$ | 3780:9,17, | 3920:23 |
| 3971:10 | 3819:23 | 3781:13 | 3923:8 |
| 3985:2 | 3821:13 | 3782:4,23 | 3926:18 |
| commissioner | 3837:24 | 3783:23 | 3929:19 |
| 3792:20,22 | 3840:21 | 3784:2,3,12, | 3930:12 |
| 3793:13' |  | 3785:5,13,15 | 3934:16 |
| 3797:1,3,23, | Commission's <br> 3965:17 | 3786:6,10,15 | 3936:6,7 |
|  |  | ,19,25 | 3940:20,22 |
| 3801:18,20,2 | commit 3969:1 | 3787:10,20,2 | 3957:5 |
| 1 3811:13,16 | committed | 1 3788:4 | 3959:22 |
| 3820:18, | 3794:2 | 3790:22 | 3960:11 |
| 3835:22,23 | 3804:20 | 3791:24 | 3961:4 |
| 3837:21, | 3859:20 | 3793:7 3794.2 , 1 | 3967:4 |
| 3839:18 | common | 0,20,25 ${ }^{\text {3, }}$ | 3968:21 |
| 3861:20,22,2 | 3779:25 | 3795:6,12,16 | 3973:4,16 |
| 3 3876:17 | 3780:3 | ,21,24 | 3983:3 |
| 3877:11 | 3792:4 | 3796:23 | 3984:3,14 |
| 3878:13 | 3838:13 | 3797:11 | company's |
| 3880:13 | 3852:23 | 3803:15 | 3780:13,19 |
| 3882:20,22 | 3932:1,12,18 | 3806:18 | 3781:1,3,20 |
| 3883:1 | , 19 | 3810:16,22 | 3782:1,7,15, |
| 3885:17 | 3941:12,21 | 3811:8,22 | 22 3783:25 |
| 3891:7 | 3945:6,7,11 | 3812:1 | 3784:21,23 |
| 3899:22,24 | 3946:1 | 3814:3, 6, 8,1 | 3785:16,18 |
| 3900:2,5,9,1 | 3953:14,21 |  | 3787:5,19 |
| 2,24 | 3956:16 | 3815:6,10,11 | 3790:7 |
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| 3791:13 | 3804:7,14,20 | 3778:8 | considering |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3792:7 | 3895:6 | confused | 3782:24 |
| 3794:18 | con 3888:20 | 3832:17 | 3852:3 |
| 3796:16 | once | 3836:8 | consistent |
| 3811:2 | 3898:3 | confusing | 3772:20 |
| 3813:3 | concern | 3832:23 |  |
| 3827:20 | 3803:12 | Congress | consists |
| 3830:2 | 3806:11,17 | 3896:4 | 3842:7 |
| 3838:10 | 3811:10 |  | consolidate |
| 3840:5 | 3820:21 | connection $3954: 24$ | 3838:15,25 |
| 3844:18 | 3821:8 | Conrad | consolidated |
| 3845:9 | 1 3873:7,8 | 3759:2, 3 | 3839:2 |
| 3853:3,25 | 3880:2,12 | 3764:20,21,2 | 3922:24 |
| 3854:23 | concerned | 2 3798:2 | 3922:24 |
| 3855:16 | concerned $3855: 8,9$ | 3801:11 | 3938:4,11,12 |
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| 7 3890:4 | 3792:25 | 3876:21,22,2 | 3836:2 |
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| 3919:4 | concerns | 3945:3 | 3888:14 |
| 3981:3 | 3855:2,18 | 3948:11 |  |
| compare $3812: 22$ | 3880:15 393016 | 3981:12,23 | $3905: 6$ |
| 3840:5 | conclude | 3948:18 | constructed |
| compared | 3844:25 | consequence | 3815:9,15 |
| 3837:11 | 3852:25 | 3937:4 | construction $3795: 22$ |
|  | concludes |  | 3864:23 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { comparing } \\ 3837: 14 \end{gathered}$ | 3977:15 | consequences $3937: 11$ | $3910: 1$ $3923: 12,20$ |
| competent | conclusion | 3961:22 | 3969:12, |
| 3873:14,17 | 3973:23 | 3962:2 |  |
| competitive | 3974:1 | conservative1 | $3925: 9$ |
| $3787: 8$ complete | $\begin{gathered} \text { condition } \\ 3929: 23 \end{gathered}$ | y 3788:9 3796:2 | Consumer |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { complete } \\ 3770: 15,23 \\ 3923: 13 \end{gathered}$ | conditions <br> 3783:13 | $\begin{gathered} \text { consider } \\ 3891: 8 \\ 3896: 2 \end{gathered}$ | consumers <br> 3872:13 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { completed } \\ 3779: 24 \end{gathered}$ | conduct <br> 3933:14 | considerable <br> 3781:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { contain } \\ & 3919: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| completely $3871: 3$ | 3955:20 | consideration | contained |
| completion | 3787:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 3781: 18 \\ & 3851: 18,23 \end{aligned}$ | $3784: 21$ $3785: 9$ |
| 3892:11 | conducting | 3852:20, | 3791:15 |
| compliance | 3879:7,10 | 3875:20 | 3792:9 |
| $3913: 6$ | confidential | 3927:22 | 3800:13 |
| complicate | 3823:10 | consideration | 3832:4 |
| 3884:23 | 3842:17 | s 3786:10 | 3892:8 |
| complicated | 3932:6,9 | considered |  |
| 3864:19 | 3946:5 | $3792: 5$ | us7y 3868:6 |
| complied | 3948:2,22 | 3889:12 | content |
| 3825:19 | 3951:5 | 3962:7 | 3917:17 |
| comprehensive | conflict | 3962.7 | 3919:11 |
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| context | 3894:16 | 3846:21 | 3908:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3809:13 | 3918:2 | 3849:15 | 3971:24 |
| 3846:24 | co-owners | 3850:25 | correctly |
| 3954:6 | 3894:11 | 3851:9 | 3796:7 |
| continue | 3895:2 | 3852:7,8,25 | 3887:2 |
| 3758:12 | 3910:7 | 3853:21 | 3955:5,21 |
| 3785:22 | 3911:17,20 | 3856:16,23 | COS 3985:6 |
| 3787:11 | 3913:13 | 3857:1,10,11 |  |
| 3878:16 | 3921:18,22 | 3857:1, 13 10,11 | cost 3779:6 |
| 3892:18,19 | 3931:20 | 3860:13,16 | 3782:24 $3783: 7,10,15$ |
| 3917:12 | 3933:2 | 3860:13,16 | $3783: 7,10,15$ $3784: 13$ |
| Continued | 3935:3 | 3869:19 | 3785:14 |
| 3984:1, 3 | 3953:25 | 3879:5,18 | 3786:1,5 |
| 3985:3 | 3953:25 | 3892:6 | 3787:3,4,5,8 |
| continues | copies | 3898:14 | 3788:14 |
| 3769:11 | 3901:1,3 | 3900:18 | 3789:10 |
| continuing | 3908:17 | 3909:2 | 3795:6 |
| 3889:5 | 3924:3 | 3910:16,19 | 3796:2,7 |
| contr | copy 3768:21 | 3911:10,11,1 | 3798:4 |
|  | 3774:9 |  | 3802:9 |
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| 3806:12,13 | 3964:4 | 3922:25 | 3819:25 |
| 3848:24 | 3968:10,14 | 3926:13 | 3821:2,11 |
| 3849:6,18 |  | 3931:12 | 3835:15,17 |
| 3854:18,19 | Corp 3813:19 | 3932:13 | 3840:5 |
| 3862:18 | corporate | 3935:15 | 3842:8 |
| 3866:7 | 3784:4 | 3939:12 | 3844:2 |
| 3867:19 | 3921:5 | 3940:8,9 | 3849:1 |
| 3875:5 |  | 3945:16,23,2 | 3850:21 |
| 3884:2,11 | corporation 3795:1 | 4 3946:2,3 | 3851:14 |
| 3888:17,19 | 3817:3,7 | 3951:24 | 3853:7 |
| contracts | 3933:14 | 3953:5,11,12 | 3854:1, 2, 4, 8 |
| 3802:13 | 3955:19 | ,20,24 | 3856:5,11 |
| 3819:14 | 3956:23 | 3954:20 | 3859:24 |
| contrast | corporations | 3956:14 | 3866:12,13,1 |
| 3945:8 | 3952:24 | 3958:3,8,12, | 48867:16,25 |
| control | correct | 13,18 | 3869:24 |
| 3905:5 | 3766:7 | 3959:14 | 3870:10 |
|  | 3768:3 | 3960:14 | 3871:14,16,1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ontroller } \\ & 3952: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 3773:25 | 3961:7 | 7,21 3873:9 |
|  | 3775:3 | 3963:18,19,2 | 3877:8,14,15 |
| controversy | 3804:19 | 1 3976:1,25 | 3878:20,25 |
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| 3759:11 | 3834:8,22 | 3800:3 | 3899:12 |
| 3763:20 | 3837:17,20 | 3823:13 | 3904:24 |
| 3819:11 | 3841:16, | 3832:7 | 3905:6, 9,11 |
| Cooperative | 3844:25 | 3907:20 | 3909:25 |
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| 7 3795:2,19 | 3854:2 | 3918:3 | 3814:3 <br> 3874:2 |
| 3796:6,18,19 | 3855:8 | 3919:2 | 3874:2 |
| 3805:21 | court 3758:23 | 3921:24 | crippled |
| 3809:18 | 3766:6,9 | 3923:7 | 3814:19 |
| 3810:17 | 3770:21 | 3944:3,4,5 | criticism |
| 3849:16,17 | 3823:20 | 3963:6 | 3880:12,16 |
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| 3855:22 | 3948:23 | 397 | 3899:4 |
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| 3875:1 | 3818:1,6,7,1 | 3895:23 | 3908:21 |
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| 3963:5 | 3886:10 | , 22.24 | 3920:25 |
| currently | 3888:4,8 | 3981:5,13,17 | 3927:19 |
| 3785:15 | 3889:18,19,2 | ,23,24 | 3931:10 |
| 3876:6 | 2,23,25 |  | decision- |
| 3905:3 | 3890:4,17 | day $3834: 2,12$ <br> 3839:13 | maki |
| Curtis 3759:7 | 3899:6 | 3885:5 | 3911:22 |
| 3831:3,7,9 | 3904:25 |  | decisions |
| 3981:11 | 3923:12,18 | deal 3762:12 | 3769:17 |
| 3983:18,19, 2 | Cygne 3803:17 | $3801: 23$ $3862: 23$ | 3872:14 |
| 1 |  | 3878:22 | declassified |
| customer | D | 3882:23 | 3920:4 |
| 3794:3 | d/b/a 3759:13 | 3932:24 |  |
| 3811:10 |  |  | 3899:1 |
| 3827:24 | Darrin $3789: 15$ | $3963: 4$ |  |
| 3857:2 |  | 3963.4 | deems 3770:13 |
| 3872:19 | data 3959:22 | deals 3955:10 | defeated |
| 3879:3 | 3960:16 | dealt 3804:11 | 3898:16 |
| 3887:13 | 3984:6 | $3895: 9$ | 3900:8 |
| 3890:5 |  |  |  |
| customers | $3935: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dean } 3759: 11 \\ & 3763: 20 \end{aligned}$ | defeating 3976:2 |
| 3782:15 |  |  |  |
| 3783:3, 9, 10, | $3764: 21$ | Dearmont 3761:4 | $3974: 2,11$ |
| 3784:6,8 | Davis 3758:20 | 3763:5 | 3975:24 |
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| defendant | 3889:19 | determined | 3795:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3973:17 | depreciable | 3888:11 | difficult |
| 3974:17 | 3969:6 | 3911:14 | $3790: 25$ |
| defended | depreciated |  | 3928:1 |
| 3973:19 | $3787: 12$ | determining | dilemma |
|  | depreciation | 3795:19 | 3898:22 |
| 3898:15 | 3878: | 3811:7 |  |
| 3976:23 | deprived | 3912:9 | diligence |
| deferred | 3905:9 | 391 |  |
| 3963:5 | Deputy 3761:1 | detriment | ippe11 |
| define | derived | 3875:10 | 3762:1,6,21 |
| 3816:25 | 3818:18 | 3899:6 | 3763:2,8,13 |
| defines | describe |  | 23 $3764: 2,6,9,1$ |
| 3818:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 3817: 19 \\ & 3920: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $3785: 25$ | $3764: 2,6,9,1$ |
| 3956:9 | described | developed | 3765:1,13,18 |
| definitely $3810: 8$ | described $3879: 25$ | 3820:23 | 3760: |
| 3929:17 | 3919:24 | developing | , 21 |
| delayed | 3968:6 | 3818:21 | 3767:10,13,1 |
| 3892:15 | deserved |  | 6,19,25 |
| deliberately | 3836:24 | Diana 3760:10 $3764: 5$ | 3768:4,7,14, |
| 3839:21 | design | differed | 3773:11,19,2 |
| de7ta 3809:1 | 3797:9 | 3794:6 |  |
| 3811:5 | 3800:2 | difference | 3774:1, 3, 8, 2 |
| 3820:5,14 | 3821:16 | 3781:8 | 3775:19, 21, 2 |
| demand | 3872:14,16 | 3792:11 | 3775:19, 21, |
| $3781: 21$ |  | 3808:16,17,2 | 3776:14,19,2 |
| 3829:12 | 3918:10 | 4 3810:20 | 4 |
| demands | designated | 3847:8 | 3777:2,7,13, |
| $3817: 23$ | 3866:8 | 3850:80 | 17,20, |
| denied | 3918:9 | 3877:13 | $3778: 2,5,9,1$ |
| 3903:17 | designation | 3883:12 | 4,1791:1,4,7 |
| 3912:19 | designation | 3884:8,13 | $3791: 1,4,7$ $3792: 20$ |
| 3914:3,4 | 3917:13 | 3928:25 | 3793:17 |
| Denton 3760:2 | desirable | differences | 3796:25 |
| deny 3905:25 | 3860:25 | 3829:3 | 3797:4,22,25 |
| 3914:11 | despite | different | 3798:6,9,17, |
| Department | 3783:18 | 3768:1 | 24 3799:18 |
| 3763:17 |  | 3779:14 | 3800:23 |
| 3777:6 | destination | 3782:19 | 3801:2,10,12 |
| 3893:20 |  | 3793:14 | 3811:15,18 |
| 3895:21 | detailed | 3805:19 | 3811:15,18 |
| 3910:8 | 3803:25 | 3817:24 | 3812:54 |
| 3939:11 | determination | 3834:5 | 3816:12 |
| 3941:10 | 3965:4 | 3837:8 | 3816:12 11,14 |
| 3942:3 |  | 3850:23 | 1882:11, 21,14 |
| 3957:5,19 | determine | 3857:25 | 3823.22 |
| 3959:11,13 | 3777:2,3 | 3881:4 | 3824:1,9,17 |
| 3976:18' | 3787:1 | 3887:1 | 3824:1,9,17 |
| dependent | 3802:4 3803 20 | 3888:23 | 3825:8, $3828: 8,10,15$ |
| 3869:24 | 3857:13,24 | 3890:19 | ,18 3829:22 |
| depending |  | differing | 3830:18,22,2 |

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011

| 4 3831:2 | 1 3973:3 | disagrees | 3966:15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3832:14,16,2 | 3974:5 | 3787:21,24 | distinction |
| 2,25 | 3977:7,10,14 | 3806:10 | 3846:19 |
| 3833:3,10 | 3978:2, 4, 7, 1 | disal1owance | distracted |
| 3835:21 | 1,15 | 3961:25 | 3775:4 |
| 3837:23 | direct | disallowing | district |
| 3839:8 | 3765:10 | 3786:15 | 3760:13 |
| 3840:25 | 3766:15 | disclosure | 3764:2,5 |
| 3841:8,11,17 | 3767:24 | 3788:7 | 3770:6,21 |
| 3843:5,13,19 | 3799:20,24 | discounted | 3771:3 |
| 3846:9,13,19 | 3814:20 | 3872:5,6 | 3781:10,11 |
| 3861:19 | 3823:2,10 | discuss | 3785:8,10 |
| 3876:19,22 | 3831:2,4,11, | 3893:7 | 3795:25 |
| 3880:6 | 19,23 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | discussed | 3800:10,11 |
| 3882:20,25 | 3842:1, 3 | 3774:18 | 3815:10,22,2 |
| 3885:19 | 3856:9 | 3857:6 | 5 3819:6 |
| 3892:8,11,21 | 3861:15 | 3873:2 | 3862:18 |
| , 25 | 3907:9 | 3912:23 | 3903:24 |
| 3893:6,10,16 | 3949:20 | 3923:25 | 3906:1 |
| 3899:20,23 | 3950:13,14 | discussing | 3934:16 |
| 3903:11 | 3971:3 | 3967:13 | 3984:14 |
| 3906:3,24 | 16,22 | discussions | districts |
| 3907:5 | 3982:2,5 | 3775:16 | 3815:20 |
| 3908:10,20 | 3983:6,7,12, | 3793:6 | divide 3827:4 |
| 3914:18,23 | 18 , | disgorge | $\begin{aligned} & 3881: 10 \\ & 3976: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3916:17,19, 2 | directed | 3929:15 |  |
|  | 3886:1,2 | dispatch | divided |
| 3917:1, 5,10, | 3889:10 | 3802:22 |  |
| 15,21 | 3894:18 | 3803:9 | division |
| 3918:6,8,13 | 3901:13,21 | 3846:23 | 3802:5,14,15 |
| 3919:19 | 3937:1,2 | 3847:4,5,6,8 | 3803:6 |
| 3920:1, 5,15 | 3968:7 | ,19 3848:2 | 3805:7,25 |
| 3924:21 | directing | 3886:13,19 | 3806:13,14 |
| 3930:19 | 3898:23 | dispatched | 3807:1 |
| 3931:15 | 3902:6 | dispatched $3845: 19,23$ | 3808:22 |
| 3932:4 | direction | 3847:11,13 | 3809:5,20 |
| 3934:4 119 | 3837:4 | 3849:16, | 1,25:3813:1 |
| ,23 3938:18 | 3980:8 | 3867:5 | 3816:8,22,23 |
| 3939:20 | directly | dispatchers | 3819:7,8 |
| 3942:13,21 | 3968:17 | 3846:25 | 3821:5 |
| 3943:21 | director | 3886:20 | 3953:1 |
| 3944:1 | director $3785: 23$ | dispatches | divisions |
| 3945:1 | 3893:24 | 3794:20 | 3802:24 |
| 3948:13,21,2 | 3907:16 |  | 3803:21 |
| 5 | 3912:7,11 | dispatching | 3806:6 |
| 3949:5, 9,13, | 3944:17,18 | 3846:17 | 3807:18 |
| 17 | 3968:15, | 3849:20 | 3816:21 |
| 3951:3,8,15 |  | disproportion | 3817:1 |
| 3952:12 | disagree | ately 3841:4 | 3818:12,18 |
| 3960:2,5,21 | 3858:11,16 |  | 3828:23 |
| 3967:9 | 3859:15 | 3838:16 | 3829:3 |
| 3970:16,19, 2 | 3966:2 | 3894:11 |  |
| 5972:10,15, 2 | di sagreed 3772:3,5 | disputes | $\begin{gathered} \text { document } \\ 3825: 6 \\ 3827: 1 \end{gathered}$ |
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| 3916:11 | 3827:21 | ECorp 3805:6 | 3966:7,24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3917:17 | Downey | 3807:18 | 3975:15,19 |
| 3918:14,23 | 3934:15 | 3864:7 | elaborate |
| 3924:11 | dozen 3961:11 | 3869:10 | 3814:22 |
| 3935:20 | driven 3780:6 | Ed 3789:15 | elected |
| 3936:3 | driver | Edison | 3933:4 |
| $3940: 2,11,13$ $3964: 4$ | 3780:12 | E8890:10 | election 3932.25 |
| 3978:6 | drivers | 3895:14 | 3933:18 |
| documentation | 3782:24 | effect | electric |
| 3922:19 | due 3789:19 | 3769:10 $3781: 19$ | 3758:12,16 |
| documents | 3849:25 | 3781:19 | 3760:13 |
| 3773:3 | 3897:23 | 3781:5 $3791: 23$ | 3762:5 |
| 3788:3,7 | du7y 3980:5 | 3792:5 | 3763:23,25 |
| 3803:23 | during | 3795:9 | 3764:2,5 |
| 3804:16 | 3814:17 | 3802:13 | 3815:10, 17 |
| 3918:24 | 3817:10 | 3926:1 | 3837:14,17 |
| 3951:9 | 3893:10 | effecting | 3890:2,18,24 |
| 3972:22 | 3905:19 | 3780:13 | 3894:15,16 |
| DOE 3958:24 | 3921:10, 20,2 | effective | 3895:13,14 |
| Dogwood | $13922: 3$ | 3769:7 | 3903:24 |
| 3759:9 | 3953:7 | effectively | 3934:16 |
| 3764:6,8 | duty 3930:5 | 3784:14 | 3945:20 |
| 3798:12,13 |  | 3891:24 | 3969:22 |
| 3801:8 | E | effectiveness | 3984:14,24 |
| dol1ars | earlier | 3769:15 | 3985:4 |
| 3780:9 | 3805:1 | effects | electricity |
| 3792:15 | 3814:16 | 3961:24 | 3784:8 |
| 3811:12 | 3833:2 | efficiency | 3850:5 |
| 3872:3 | 3846:4 | 3875:15 | 3890:25 |
| done 3814:7 | 3894:21 | 3917:19 | 3891:2 |
| $3827: 22$ $3829: 9$ | ear1y 3895:19 | efficient | 3909:20 |
| 3835:16 |  | 3867:1 | Electric's |
| 3839:21 | earning | effort 3912:7 | 3837:18 |
| 3847:24 | 3977:17 | EFIS 3948:19 | electrons |
| 3865:24 | easiest | eight 3933:6 | 3850:11 |
| 3873:2,25 | 3945:8 | eight 3933:6 |  |
| 3878:11 | Eas7ey 3913:2 | eighth | elicit 3974:1 |
| 3881:17 | 3940:12 | 3955:13 | else 3765:3 |
| 3890:8,14 | easy 3783:15 | either 3788:6 | 3777:3 |
| 3891:8 | 3853:18 | 3834:19 | 3793:18 |
| 3897:6 | 3888:13 | 3868:21 | 3798:18 |
| 3899:5,15 |  | 3869:15 | 3809:10 |
| 3943:1 | economic $3783: 13$ | 3899:12 | 3882:21 |
| 3969:21 | 3853:16 | 3907:21 | e-mai 1 |
|  |  | 3925:10 | 3775:11 |
| $3759: 15$ | economically | 3929:2 | 3777:5 |
|  | 3846:17 | 3936:7 | emissions |
| DOTT | $\begin{aligned} & 3847: 9,19 \\ & 3891: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 3938:23 | 3905:4,5 |
| doubt | conomics | 3940:12 | emphasize |
| 3826:2,9 | 3847:12 | 3958:23 | 3790:10 |
| 3826.2,9 | 3886:21 | 3963:24 | 3896:14 |
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| Empire | 3919:12 | 3976:18 | 3938:1,2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3760:13 | employed | Energy's | 3953:11 |
| 3764:2,5 | 3907:13 | 3921:5 | 3955:19 |
| 3766:23 | 3912:8 | engage 3898:2 | 3967:16,18 |
| 3768:11 | 3949:23,24 | 3899:16 | entries $3762: 13$ |
| 3769:16 | 3971:7,9 | engaged |  |
| 3770:2,14 | 3980:9,11 | 3952:6 | entry 3765:4 |
| 3772:3,10,12 | employee | England | environmental |
| ,17,19,22 | 3980:11 | 3760:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 3780: 20,2 \\ & 3781: 2,6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $3774: 6$ $3785: 21$ | employees | enlightened 3876:2 | equa1 3905:17 |
| 3804:6 |  |  | 3968:22 |
| 3814:9 | employment 3910:4 | ensure 3866:6 <br> 3914:8 | equalization |
| 3815:10,22 |  | 3926:9 | 3840:14,22,2 |
| 3837:14,17,1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Energies } \\ 3904: 19 \end{gathered}$ | ensuring | $33841: 3$ |
| 3894:14,17,1 | energy | 3926:19 | equalize |
|  | 3759:9,13 | entered | 3837:2 |
| 3896:13,17,2 | 3763:19,22 | 3790:20 | equalized |
| 3897:4, 9, 2 | 3764:6,8,18 | 24 | 3890:12 |
| 3898:24 | 3780:24 | 3813:17 | equalizing |
| 3900:3,7 | 3796:13 | 3819:6 | 3889:16 |
| 3901:10,20 | 3802:18 | 3822:5 |  |
| 3903:24 | 3803:3,24 | 3862:17 | 3968:22 |
| 3904:2,8 | 3804:8,14,17 | 3863:10 |  |
| 3906:18 | ,21 3808:10 | 3941:20 | qua |
| 3909:6 | 3809:21 | 3954:24 | 3780:7 |
| 3911:5 | 3810:1, 3, 5,6 | 3974:13 | equipment |
| 3913:18,19,2 | '3812.15 | entire | 3780:14, 20 |
| 3,25 | 3821:5,6 | 3771:21 | 3905:5 |
| 3914:4,5,11, | 3830:8,9 | $3802: 9$ $3803: 13$ | equivalent |
| 13919:1, 4,5 | 3838:20 | 3856:18 | 3975:16 |
| 3919:1,4,5,9 | 3846:18 | 3857:2 | ER-2006-0315 |
| ,20 3925:25 | 3847:20 | 3860:20 | 3770:18 |
| 3926:7,11 | 3849:1,9 | 3910:20 | ER-2008-0093 |
| 3927:13,18 | 3854:3 | 3921:17 | 3770:20 |
| 3928:2,3,8,1 | 3862:6 | entirely | ER-2010-0355 |
| 1,21 3931:9 | 3863:14,16 | 3771:17 | 3758:12 |
| 3934:13,16,2 | 3869:23, | 3772:20,25 | 3762:3 |
| 0 3944:5 | 3870:2 | 3919:6,10 | ER-2010-0356 |
| 3945:19 | 3884:19 | entirety | 3758:15 |
| 3958:11 | 3886:17 | 3888:7 | 3762:2 |
| 3974:15 | 3887:3,4,21 | entities | Eric 3761:4 |
| 3975:4 | $\begin{aligned} & 3893: 21 \\ & 3895: 6,21 \end{aligned}$ | 3871:8 | 3763:5 |
| 3976:10,24 | 3896:10 | entitled | error 3921:19 |
| 3984:14 | 3897:18 | 3904:15 |  |
| Empire's | 3910:8 | 3922:5 | 3927:23 |
| 3769:9,11, 22 | 3912:13 | 3940:15 | 3929:23 |
| 3770:11,17,2 | 3939:5,7,11 | entity |  |
| 0,24 3772:7 | 3941:10 | 3807:9,10,24 | essence |
| 3773:2 | 3942:3 | 3904:14 ${ }^{\text {30,24 }}$ | 3837:2 |
| 3896:25 | 3957:5,19 | 3911:18 | 3885:6 |
| 3904:2 | 3959:11,13 | 3933:14 | essentially |

4008
TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011

| 3811:11 | 3908:15 | exceed | 1 3771:3,6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3812:16,20 | 3917:4 | 3796:18 | 3773:15,16,1 |
| 3814:19 | 3918:16 | except | 7 3774:6 |
| 3821:10,16 | 3920:11 | excher 2,4 | 3790:24 |
| 3936:21 | 3934:8 | 3968.2,4 | 3791:4,6,8,1 |
| 3963:15 | 3942:17,25 | exception | 0 3822:16 |
| established | 3951:12 | 3838:11 | 3823:24 |
| 3879:2 | 3960:25 | excepts | 3824:7,15 |
|  | 3962:17 | 3940:7 | 3825:24 |
| establishes 3784:17 | 3972:25 | excerpts | 3826:6,24 |
| et 3803:17 |  | 3932:1 | 3828:12 |
| evaluate | 3758:5 | 3939:25 | 3831:12, 25 |
| 3802:18 |  | 3957:14,18 | 3833:8 ${ }^{3842}$, 113 |
| 3803:19 | exact $3813: 14$ | 3959:11,18 | 3842:9,11, 13 |
| 3926:7,17 | 3856:14 | excess 3790:5 | 3908:5,11,14 |
| evening | 3884:6 | 3869:22 | 3915:3 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 3892:18,20 | 3922: 4 |  | 3916:20 |
| 3893:8 | 3925:6,7 | exchange $3767: 16$ | 3917:3,19, 22 |
| 3951:20,21 | exactly | 3878:6 | 3918:5,15,19 |
| 3977:11 | 3807:17 | 3878:6 | 3920:6,10 |
| 3979:5 | 3808:10 | exchanged | 3932:5, 8,11, |
| events 3880:1 | 3853:6 | 9 | 16,23 |
| 3909:23 | 3883:18,24,2 | excluded | 3934:3,5,6,7 |
| eventually | 5 3900:18 | 3933:18 | ,11,15 |
| 3861:16 | 3902:17 | 3955:1 | 3935:13,22 |
| 3881:13 | 3909:5 | excuse | 3936:1 |
| everybody | 3917:9 | 3785:19 | 3941:31 |
|  | examination | 3822:1 | 3942:11,14,1 |
| 3897:25 | 3799:20 | 3840:11 | 6,19,22,23,2 |
| 3901:17 | 3816:15 | 3844:17 | 4, 3951:10 |
| everyone | 3823:2 | 3848:11 | 3954:13,17 |
| 3779:23 | 3828:20 | 3852:17 | 3956:13, |
| 3865:23 | 3831:4 | 3917:5 | 3957:10,13,1 |
| 3930:12 | 3839:10 | excused | 5,22 |
| everything | 3842:3 | 3798:22 | 3959:14,17 |
| 3771:20 | 3843:18 | 3799:2 | 3960:7,10,20 |
| 3809:25 | 3885:20,24 | 3822:20 | ,24 |
| 3810:1 | 3907:9 | 3830:21 | 3964:5,7,8 |
| 3821:8 | 3908:17 | 3841:10 | 3967:21 |
| 3889:4 | 3931:18 | 3949:4 | 3971:15 |
| 3914:8 | 3949:20 | 3970:23 | 3972:23 |
| 3926:8 | 3967:12 | 3977:13 | 3983:4,5,7,8 |
|  | 3971:3 9 9 1 |  | ,10,11,13,14 |
| 3810:7 | 0,12,14,16,1 | excus8:20 | ,16,17,19,20 |
| evidence | 8,22,25 | Executive | 3'984:4,5,7,8 |
| 3770:16 | 3982:2,3,5 | 3760:8 | ,10,11,15,16 |
| 3773:18 | examined | 3764:9,12 | ,18,21,24 |
| 3774:7 | 3850:23 | 3798:7 | 3985:4,5,7,8 |
| 3822:17 |  |  | ,10,11,12,14 |
| 3823:21 | example <br> 3766:15 | $3904: 13$ | ,15,17,18,20 |
| 3824:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 3766: 15 \\ & 3794: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 3904:13 | ,'21,23,24 |
| 3828:13 | 3794:14 | exhibit | exhibits |
| 3833:9 | 3803:13 | $3766: 5,8,11$ | exhibits |
| 3843:16 | 3805:11, | $3767: 4$ | 3772:13 |
| 3873:12,14,1 | 3816:3,25 | 3768:12 3770 , 16 | $3773: 20$ $3774: 5$ |
| 7.22 3905:24 | 3887:2 | 3770:16,19,2 | 3774:5 |
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| 3791:2 | 3818:24 | 3785:15 | fair 3856:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3800:4 | 3819:13 | 3786:2,9,12 | 3874:18 |
| 3822:3,15 | 3854:17,19 | 3791:23 | 3913:11 |
| 3823:16 | expire 3796:1 | 3792:1 | 3920:17 |
| 3824:13 | 3813:11,13,2 | face 3865:20 | 3938:14 |
| 3833:5,16 | 2,24 3854:20 | faced 3872:13 | 3974:3 |
| 3843:6, | 3867:19 | facilities | fairly $3879: 13$ |
| 3907:24 | expired | 3895:11 | 3938:15 |
| 3908:8 | 3796:10 | 3932:1,12 |  |
| 3914:17,19 | expires | 3941:21 | faith 3904:5 |
| 3915:6 | 3819:8,12 | 3953:14 | fa11 3870:6 |
| exist 3807:9 | expiring | facility |  |
| existed | 3806:12,13 | 3788:8 | familiar |
| 3845:3,13 | 3819:3 | 3905:3 | 3824:25 |
| existence | explain | facing | 3825:6 |
| 3784:3 | 3782:13 | 3865:21 | 3838:517,21 |
| existing |  | fact 3766:8 | 3885:1 |
| 3785:18,19 | 3820:21 | 3768:5 | 3909:13,19 |
| 3789:1 |  | 3797:11 | 3924:7 |
| 3792:1 | 3839:18 | 3807:8 | 3953:14 |
| exists 3884:7 | 3869:2 | 3854:10 | 3958:16 |
| expect | 3894:1 | 3866:20 | 3975:8 |
| 3829:18,24 | 3969:4 | 3898:15 | family |
| 3949:6 | explanation | 3969:25 | 3778:11 |
| expedited | 3938:19 | 3970:6 | $3863: 17$ $3897: 18$ |
| 3915:25 | explore | factor | fancy 3830:25 |
| expense | 3915:24 | 3812:21 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3798: 15 \\ & 3868: 15 \end{aligned}$ | expressed | 3829:7 | $\begin{gathered} \text { fashion } \\ 3767: 6 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 3968:5 | 3861:6,7 |  |
| expenses $3898: 12,15,1$ | expressing | 3864:1 | 3880:25 |
| $83973: 8$ | expressing | 3870:21 | favor |
| 3976:22,23 | expression | 3891:14 | 3771:1,2 |
| expensive | 3886:5 | factors | 3896:20,21 |
| 3772:24 | express7y | 3812:22 |  |
| 3862:14 | 3888:16 | 3818:6 | fax 3894:2 |
| 3866:24 |  | 3881:11 | feasible |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3867: 3,11 \\ & 3869: 18 \end{aligned}$ | extended $3830: 7$ | factor's | 3891:4 |
| 3870:13 |  | 3891:16 | Featherstone |
| experience | $3933: 23$ | facts 3795:20 | 3765:8,10,11 |
| 3813:5 | 3977:2 | 3807:6 | Featherstone' |
| expert 3878:3 | extra 3887:24 | 3899:15 | 3 |
| 3890:22 | extremely | 3924:14 | February |
| 3922:9 | 3814:18 | failed | 3758:6 |
| expertise | extremes | 3893:23 | 3979:7 |
| 3913:9 | 3868:25 | 3905:25 | federal |
| experts |  | 3913:13 | 3760:8 12 |
| 3962:7 |  | 3927:9 | 3798:6, |
| 3975:23 | FAC | 3968:22 | 3894:2 |
| expiration | 3784:18,21 | fails 3964:25 | 3898:10 |
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| 3903:14 | 3882:1 | 3883:14 | 3830:1,17,23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3904:20 | 3911:22 | finish | 3831:4,16,18 |
| 3905:12 | 3913:7 | 3949:11 | 3832:2,12,15 |
| 3968:5 | 3933:5 | 3968:12 | ,17,21,24 |
| fee1 3866:5 | 3942:9,10 | finished | 3833:1 |
| 3883:13 | 3944:4 | 3892:12 | $3839: 9,10$ $3840: 20$ |
| feelings | 3961:16 | finishes | 3841:6 |
| 3929:7 | 3963:10 | 3978:24 | 3843:21,22,2 |
| fees | 3971:12 |  | 3 3846:7,10 |
| 3790:15,22 | 3974:20 | Finnegan | 3861:18 |
| 3898:12,15 | 3978:6 | 3759:32 | 3880:9,10 |
| 3905:19,22,2 | files 3922:24 |  | 3882:18 |
| 5 3906:14 | filing | firm 3764:22 | 3883:3 |
| 3925:2 | filing | 3925:9 | 3885:25 |
| 3934:1 | 38 | 3943:12 | 3886:12 |
| 3973:8,12 | 3859:21 | 3952:16,19 | 3889:10 |
| 3976:4,8,22, | 3910:11 | first 3771:11 | 3892:19,23 |
| 23 3977:16 | 3933:22 | 3772:15 | 3893:1 |
| fellow 3799:6 | 3944:18 | 3781:11 | 3981:5,7,9,1 |
| felt 3897:21 | final 3770:4 | 3791:12 | 0,12,14,22,2 |
| 3902:1 | 3772:23 | 3793:24 | 4 |
| 3913:16 | 3797:16 | 3799:9,15 | Fischer's |
| FERC 3815:23 | 3941:24 | 3806:23 | 3808:18 |
| 3824:19,25 | 3958:14 | 3820:14 | 3877:2 |
| 3825:5,21,24 | 3965:4 | 3847:6 | fits 3810:11 |
| 3826:5,11 | finalized | 3867:8 |  |
| 3833:24 | 3896:9 | 3869:24,25 | five 3788:22 |
| fewer 3889:25 | finally | 3870:15 | 3793:1 |
| fiduciary | 3772:12,23 | 3887:23 | 3841:18 |
| 3930:5 | 3790:24 | 3890:9 | 3850:23 |
| figure | 3876 | 3895:17 | 3893:7 |
| 3810:19 | 3894 | 3907:2 | fixed |
| 3827:6 | finance | 3912:18 | 3809:18,23 |
| 3882:7,14 | 3952:25 | 3914:24 | 3815:21 |
| figured | financial | 3928:14 | 3817:13 |
| 3911:14 | 3788:2,7 | 3934:23 | 3821:10 |
|  | 3804:10 | 3940:12 | 3865:13 |
| figures $3966: 3,5$ | 3814:18 | 3944:13 | 3866:15 |
| 3966:3,5 file | 3863:7 | 3958:18 | 3880:14 |
| file | 3925:10 | 3959.5 | fixes 3830:13 |
| 3758:12,15 | 3929:23 | Fischer | 3862:14 |
| 3772:11 | 3961:21 | 3759:14,15 | FL 3760:7 |
| 3773:5 | financially | 3762:15,18 |  |
| 3904:20 | 3811:11 | 3778:25 | f1at 3829:15 |
| 3933:16 | 3980:12 | 3779:1 | fled 3768:18 |
| 3938:11 | financing | 2 3792:24, | fleet 3787:19 |
| filed 3765:14 | 3941:5 | 3793:9,15,16 | flexibility |
| 3772:1,4 | finding | ,17799.16 18, | 3784:5 |
| 3779:22 | 3865:18 | 3799:16,18,2 |  |
| 3797:12 | 3968:21 | 0 3800:19,25 | 3880:17 |
| 3799:24 | findings | 3811:4, 15 |  |
| 3800:1 | 3770:5 | $3821: 25$ | fipped <br> 3875:22 |
| $3823: 8$ $3831: 10$ | fine 3766:3 | 3823:2,19,23 | float 3864:7 |
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| 3869:11 | 3938:24 | 3887:10 | 3945:25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| flow 3872:6 | 3940:22 | fu11 3772:6 | generated |
| flowed | 3954:1,16,24 | 3886:5 | 3850:1,11 |
| 3790:17,18 | 3958:4 | 3925:20 | 3854:3 |
| 3869:23 | 3959:18 | 3934:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 3887: 21 \\ & 2020: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| fluctuate | 3960:14 | 3957:23 |  |
| 3868:22 | forward | 3958:19 | generating $3787: 19$ |
| focused | $3784: 9$ $3788: 23$ | funeral | 3788:13 |
| 3830:9 | 3788:23 | 3778:12 | 3794:20 |
| Food 3872:17 | f805 | future | 3795:12 |
| Force 3760:6 | fourth 3874:7,9 | 3784:18 | 3815:5,13 |
| 3764:13 | franchise | 3785:6 | 3847:9 |
| 3953:3,11 | franchise 3933:25 | $3790: 7$ $3806: 22$ | 3849:7 |
| forced 3904:2 |  | 3815:17 | 3887:17 |
| forecast | $\begin{gathered} \text { frank1y } \\ 3775: 16 \end{gathered}$ | 3829:18 | 3888:2 |
| 3816:24 |  | 3839:13 | 3891:2 |
| forecasting | $\begin{gathered} \text { Frisky's } \\ \text { 3872:17 } \end{gathered}$ | 3840:9 |  |
| 3857:17 | front 3768:5 | 3882:3,4 | generation 3806:17 |
| forecasts | 3864:25 |  | 3807:13 |
| 3830:10 | 3868:13 | G | 3845:23 |
| foregoing | 3871:21 | gain 3810:21 | 3846:23 |
| 3980:5 | 3872:6 | 9821:13.21 | 3847:19 |
| forge 3978:17 | 3916:11 | gap 3795:10 | 3857:7,15 |
| forgive 3803:22 | fue1 3769:8 <br> 3772:17,19 | Garrett 3759:7 | $3865: 13$ $3871: 23$ |
| form 3810:18 | 3782:15,17,1 | Gary 3785:23 | 3874:12 |
| 3824:18,19,2 | 9 | Gary 3785.23 | 3885:7 |
|  | 3784:11,13,1 | gas 3759:13 | 3886:23 |
| 3825:5,21,24 | 4,15,17,18,1 | 3763:19,22 | 3887:1 |
| 3826:5,11 | 9,24, 2 ,18,1 | 3866:24 | 3913:1 |
| 3833:24 | 3785:1,2,5,7 | 3963:2 | generations |
| formally | , 9,11,12,14, | gas-fired | 3845:18 |
| 3903:16 | 16 | 3869:17,18,1 | generator |
| 3920:7 | 3786:16,21 | 9 | 3881:20 |
| former | $3791: 22$ $3792: 1$ | general | generic |
| 3788:21 | 3796:19 | 3770:9 | 3800:7 |
| 3794:3 | 3797:8 | 3778:18,20 |  |
| 3844:22 | 3802:21,23 | 3798:3 | $3805: 16$ |
| $3860: 5$ | 3809:12,19 | 3799:8 3828.4 | gentleman |
| 3870:17 | 3810:9,12 | 3828:4,5 | gentleman 3849:7 |
| formerly | 3815:7 | 3890:1 |  |
| 3779:7 | 3820:19, 22 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { gets 3778:12 } \\ 3809: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3780:16 | 3821:9 | generally | 3809:20 |
| 3793:7 | 3854:2,4,7 | 3825:5 | 3811:8,25 |
| formula | 3856:4 | 3829:14 | 3818:8 |
| 3810:15 | 3864:10,13,1 | $3838: 24$ $3860: 25$ | 3864:14 |
| forth 3796:22 | 3867:4 | 3934:19 | 3901:10 |
| 3864:7,16 | 3868:18,22 | 3936:14 |  |
| 3866:11,16 | 3871:16,17,2 | 3941:9 | 3840:15,18 |
| 3867:7 | 2,25 3875:1 | 3975:10 | 3863:13,18 |
| 3869:11 | 3877:8 | generate | 3873:23 |
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| 3884:2 | 3822:6,10,16 | 3920:17,25 | 3953:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3904:21 | , 17 | 3921:6,8,13 | GPE 3788:2 |
| 3926:16 | 3823:9,24,25 | 3922:5 | GPE39:3 |
| 3938:19 | 3824:5,7,8,1 | 3923:12,18 | 3922:24 |
| Giboney | 3,14,15,18 | 3926:4,5,7,1 | 3923:3 |
| 3760:14 | 3825:10,11,1 | 1,12,14,20,2 | granted |
| 3763:24 | 3826:3,14 | 3928:1,4,20, | granted |
| 3798:20 | 3827:14 ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ | 25 | 3903:20 |
| Gibson | 3828:7,11,12 | 3931:1, 8,10 | 3904:12 |
| 3934:16 | 3831:12,13,2 | 3944:17 | grants |
| gist |  | 3950:9 | 3855:3,18 |
| 3866:9,10 | 3832:1,20,24 | 3951:1,6,11, |  |
| given 3772:21 | 3833:5,8,9 | $\begin{aligned} & 173958: 24 \\ & 3969: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { gratuitous } \\ \text { 3769:16 } \end{gathered}$ |
| 3778:20 | 3842:9,11,13 | 3971:13,20,2 | great 3814:11 |
| 3836:23 | ,21 | 2 | grea |
| 3856:8 | 3843:2,4,15, | 3972:9,11,17 | 3860:11 |
| 3864:12 | 16 3844:19 | ,19,24 | 3893:14 |
| 3873:7 | 3845:9 | 3983:4,5,7,8 | 3896:10 |
| 3892:15 | 3846:15,16 | ,10,11,13,14 | 3897:17 |
| 3912:20 | 3847:18 | ,16,17,19,20 | 3904:19 |
| gives 3807 | 3851:11,18 | 3984:10,11,2 | 3912:12 |
| 3884:18 | 3854:21 | 3985:4,5,7,8 |  |
| 3943:7 | 3856:17,21 | ,14,15 | 3939.5,7 |
| giving | 3857:8 | GMO-on1y | 3758:15 |
| 3821:11 | 3859:20 | 3762:11 | 3759:17,22 |
| 3943:16 | 3860:15,20 | GMO's 3780:7 | 3760:4 |
| g1ad 3944:8,9 | 3864:14,24 | 3783:3 | 3762:4,18 |
| glove 3810:11 | 3870:23 | 3839:12 | 3779 3794 |
| GMO 3766:15 | 3871:16 | 3844:10 | 9,25 |
| 3768:1 | 3877:14 | 3856:13 | 3795:5,11,16 |
| 3774:17 | 3881:16,22 | 3857:9 | 3796:15,23 |
| 3775:2,3,24 | 3882:11,16 | 3884:2 | 3797:15 |
| 3776:4,13 | 3885:12,16 | 3905:11 | 3814:2,5 |
| 3779:5,25 | 3887:17 | 3907:2 | 3815:6,10 |
| 3780:6,14,21 | 3893:22 | 3920:20,23 | 3816:3 |
| ,23 3781:3,8 | 3894:8 | 3921:11 | 3818:10 |
| 3782:13 | 3896:18 | 3926:2 | 3825:1 |
| 3784:12,22,2 | 3897:9,10,14 | goal 3794:23 | 3827:20 |
| 5 3785:20 | ,16,17,19 | 3835:7,9 | 3835:6,12, |
| 3787:1 | 3898:21 | 3839:12,16 | 3855:16 |
| 3788:16 | 3899:2,7 | 3840:18 | 3888:3,6 |
| 3789:6,23 | 3900:13,16 | 3860:15,18 | 3896:24 |
| 3790:3,9 | 3901:11,24,2 | 3861:2 | 3975:3 |
| 3791:3, 4, 7,1 | 5993:16 ${ }^{\text {39,19 }}$ | 3865:22 | Green 3863:17 |
| $03792: 5$ | 3904:15,21,2 |  |  |
| 3799:25 |  | gone 3801:6 | $3775: 1$ |
| 3800:19 | 3905:8, 9,15, | $3897: 8$ 3899 |  |
| 3802:3 | 16 3906:9,12 | 3899:4 | grid 3878:1 |
| 3804:11 | 3907:24 | 3963:24 | gross 3810:21 |
| 3807:9,11 | 3908:6,8,11, | gotten 3960:5 | , |
| 3816:21 | 15 3909:4 | government | 3852:23 |
| 3817:21 | 3916:18 | 3898:10 | group 3764 |
| 3821:16 | 3916.18 | governmental | 3802:18 |
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| 3807:13 | 3936:25 | Harrison | hear 3762:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3826:19 | happened | 3949:15,19,2 | 3768:7,19 |
| 3912:7 | happened | 2 3950:1 | 3778:23 |
| 3938:5 | 3775:14 | 3951:14,20 | 3781:12 |
| 3961:8 | 3836:12 | 3952:12 | 3793:24 |
| groups | 3875:3 | 3953:13 | 3862:12 |
| 3848:11,12 | 3876:5 | 3957:13 | 3881:25 |
| 3887:1 | app | 3960:10 | 3948:11 |
| growing | 3806:5 | 3961:2, | heard 3776:11 |
| 3881:2 | happy 3792:18 | 3970:16 | 3876:9 |
| grows 3880:24 | hard 3926:25 | 3982:1 | hearing |
| growth | Hardesty | $3985: 20,22$ 3,25 | 3752:2,7, |
| 3805:11 | 3774:16 | hate 3883:1 | 3766:4 |
| guaranteed | 3775:2 | hate 388 | 3767:1,2 |
| 3871:23 | 3777:11,15 | haven't | 3778:23 |
| guess 3762:19 | 3893:24 | 3876:9 | 3779:5 |
| 3793:2 | 3898:4 | 3917:8 | 3942:15,23 |
| 3807:11 | 3902:15 3907 , 8 , 11 | 3966:22 | 3979:6 |
| 3836:8 | 3916:10 ${ }^{\text {39,11 }}$ |  | 3980:5,10 |
| 3863:20 | 3917:25 |  | hearings |
| 3865:7,18 | 3918:22 | 3794:23 | h779:24 |
| 38687 | 3920:13 | 3796:21 | 3793:22 |
| 3932:2 | 3931:19 | 3835:7 | 3798:23 |
| 3944:3 | 3932:11 | 3860:15,18 | 3799:1 |
| 3945:8 | 3934:10 | 3861:2 |  |
| 3976:6 | 3935:7 | 3868:20 | Heather |
| guidance | 3939:18,24 | 3891 | 3762:16 |
| 3962:12 | 3943:22, | 3919:5 | heaven |
| guys 3906:7 | 3948:15 | 3953:21 | 3879:21 |
|  | 3949:1 | 3966:24 | heavily |
| H | 3954:14 | HC 3823:25 | 3809:17 |
| half 3862:7 | 3962:17 | 3824:8 | 3821:3 |
| 3872:2 | 3966:3 | 3831:13 | heavy 3821:3 |
| 3878:8 | 3981:15 | 3842:21 | Heinz 3759:7 |
| 3961:11 | 3984:7, 9,10, | 3843:15 | he'11 3814.23 |
| hand 3810:11 | 12 , | 3915:3 3917 , ${ }^{\text {, }}$ | he'11 3814:23 |
| 3836:10 | Hardesty's | $\begin{aligned} & 391 \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | he1p 3865:18 |
| 3957:10,15 | 3900:20,25 | 3918:7, 9, 11, | 3869:5 |
| handed | 3978:24 | 15,19 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3871:22 |
| 3934:11 | harm 3928:5 | 3919:18 | 3883:19 |
| 3939:24 | 3929:18,20 | 3920:10 | he1pfu1 |
| handing | harmed | 3948:20 | 3779:13 |
| 3825:10 | 3930:13 | 3950:5,7,10 | hereby 3980:4 |
| 3915:6 |  | 3951:1,6,10 | herein |
| handled | 3787:21 | 3971:15,18,2 | 3956:17 |
| 3776:5 | 3788:17,23,2 | 0 | herewith |
| 3874:2 | 5 3792:25 | 3972:9,23,24 | 3954:24 |
| handles | 3794:15 | 3983:5,16 |  |
| 3873:1 | 3867:1 | 3985:5,10,11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ERNANDEZ } \\ & 3761: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| happen | $\begin{aligned} & 3875: 4 \\ & 3876: 14 \end{aligned}$ | , 12, 14,21,24,18 |  |
| 3805:12 | 3888:16 |  | $3777: 22$ |
| 3926:25 | 3888.16 | heads 3799:11 | 3778:3 |
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| 3831:14 | 3884:24 | 4,22 | 3932:1,12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3869:10 | Hospital | 3796:2,5,7,8 | 3939:5,8 |
| 3872:13 | 3764:17 | ,16,17,18,21 | 3941:20 |
| 3873:25 | 3798:9 | 3797:20 | 3945:20,25 |
| 3938:19 | 3798.9 | 3799:9,11 | 3953:14 |
| 3974:5,6 | hour 3809:23 | 3802:2 | 3955:24 |
| high 3859:7 | 3847:14 | 3803:2,14 | 3956:7 |
| 3875:15 | $3867: 3$ $3870: 8$ | 3806:18 | 3958:25 |
| higher | 3891:23,24,2 | 3813:3,6 | 3976:11 |
| 3812:19, 21 | 5 | 3814:7,17 |  |
| 3861:13 | hourly | 3815:5,9,15 | IBEW 3765:2 |
| 3891:16 | 3891:11,12 | 3816:4,6,9 | I'd 3775:16 |
| highest | hours 3821:1 | 3818:11 | 3783:6 |
| 3866:25 | $3826: 12,22,2$ | 3819:25 | 3789:14 |
| 3887:24 |  | 3829:9 | 3790:24 |
| highlight | 3834:3,8,11 | 3836:17 | 3792:18 |
| 3797:10 | 3841:12 | 3840:13 | 3823:19 |
| highlighted | 3849:1,8 | 3845:2 | 3828:6 |
| 3846:11 | 3864 | 3847:6,11 | 3831:24 |
| highly 3823:9 | hour's 3949:7 | 3850:9,16,20 | 3844:6 |
| 3842:17 | Hours 3833:22 | , 24 | 3894:25 |
| 3920:3,8 | HP 3825:14 | 3851:2,22 | 3916:15 |
| 3948:2,22 | HP 3825:14 | 3853:2,17 | 3918:4,17 |
| hindsight | Humphrey | 3855:5, | 3919:17 |
| 3926:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 3759: 19 \\ & 3762: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 3856:1 | 3931:25 |
| hired 3925:9 |  | 3858:9 | 3935:5 |
| 3975:23 | Hundred | 3861:14 | 3939:17 |
| historical |  | 3862:4,24 | 3944:8,9 |
| 3867:5 | hundreds | 3863:6,8,9,2 | 3957:10 |
| 3899:15 | 3890:25 | 4867:6,7,9,1 | 3967:20 |
| history | urt 3929:7 | 0,16 3868:21 | 3972:8 |
| 3788:25 | hypothetical | 3870:9,10,14 | idea 3943:7 |
| 3875:2 | 3788:18 | 3871:9,12 |  |
| 3897:15 | 3789:4,8 | 3874:5,20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { identica1 } \\ 3779: 30 \end{gathered}$ |
| hold 3962:20 | hypothetical 1 | 3875:17 | 3781:25 |
| holding |  | 3878:11 | identificatio |
| 3863:18 |  | 3882:2, 8, 12 | n 3765:24 |
| 3937:22 | I | 3886:9 | 3771:5,7 |
| 3967:4 | Ia 3781:5 | 3887:6,16 | 3791:11 |
| 3968:21 | 3889:23 | 3889:5,20,24 | 3823:25 |
| honest | Iatan 3779:25 | 3892:3,12 | 3824:16 |
| 3902:15 | 3780:7,10,14 | 3893:18 | 3832:1 |
| Honor 3764:25 | ,15,18,20 | 3894:11 25 | 3842:9,11,12 |
| 3767:9 | 3781:10,14,2 | 3895:12,25 | 3908:6 |
| 3774:13 |  | 3896:3,4 | 3915:4 |
| 3777:14 | 3782:1,3,5,6 | 3903:14,18,1 | 3917:23 |
| 3798:2 | 3783:2,6,14 | 9,23:1,6,8 | 3918:20 |
| 3801:11 | 3784:1 | 3905:2, | 3935:14 |
| 3917:18 | 3791:20 | 3909:1 | 3939:22 |
| hope 3803:18 | 3792:12 | 3910:20 | 3940:21 |
| 3879:21 | 3793:25 | 3922:5 | 3950:4 |
| hopefully | 3794:19 | 3923:11 | 3960:8 |
| 3882:22 | 3795:1, 3, 6,1 | 3931:20 | identified |
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| 3833:22 | 3829:20 | 3809:22 | 3786:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3843:11 | 3831:16 | imbedded | 3838:20 |
| 3901:2 | 3833:1 | 1mbedar | 3844:22 |
| 3973:13 | 3834:4,8 | 3973.11 | 3845:21 |
| identifier | 3836:8 | immediately $3914: 5$ | 3860:5,12 |
| 3935:9 | $3838: 6,12,17$ $3841: 12$ |  | incentives |
| identifies | 3845:7 | 3783:3,14,18 | 3895:9 |
| 3941:11,12 | 3846:11, 22 | 3837:6,12,18 | inclined |
| identify | 3852:18 | 3853:16 | 3929:14 |
| 3916:10 | 3853:8 | 3854:6,15 | include |
| 3917:25 | 3855:8,12,17 | 3855:9 | 3910:6 |
| 3918:22 | 3858:25 | 3856:2 | 3913:13 |
| 3921:3 | 3859:7,24 | 3875:18,19 | 3926:4 |
| 3936:1 | 3865:7,10,18 | 3884:20, | 3928:23 |
| IEC 3767:24 | 3867:18 | 3889:18,22 | 3930:5 |
| 3769:11,19,2 | 3869:7 | 3904:24 | 3931:1 |
| 1,23 3770:24 | 3872:8 | 3929:23 | included |
| 3772:15 | 3877:22 | impacts | 3765:16 |
| 3773:7 | 3878:2 | 3781:18 | 3779:20 |
| IECs | 3880:7 | 3862 | 3780:21,22 |
| 3769:7,10,15 | 3882:2,22,23 | impart | 3787:11,14 |
| 3770:9,11 | 3884:16,23,2 | 3962:23 | 3788:15 |
| 3771:21 | 4 3890:22 | implement | 3790:23 |
| I'11 3777:5 | 3891:11 | 3882:16 | 3825:24 |
| 3801:25 | 3892:16 |  | 3826:5 |
| 3809:7 | 3899:23 | Implementatio <br> n 3758:13 | 3918:25 |
| 3824:3 | 3910:13 |  | 3926:24 |
| 3828:6,10 | 3913:9 | implications | 3930:6 |
| 3829:23 | 3914:25 | 3898:5 | 3959:8 |
| 3843:17 | 3915:1 | implied | includes |
| 3914:24 | 3916:6, 8, 21 | 3968:5 | 3784:18 |
| 3948:23 | 3919:6 | importance |  |
| 3964:24 | 3920:6 | 3786:8 | ncluding |
| 3973:1 | 3922:4,9 | important | 3779:25 |
| 3978:25 | 3924:11 | 3802:4 | 3787:3 |
| i17ustrative | 3927:5 | 3862:11 | 3794:24 |
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| 3911:13 | 3973:23 | 6,20 3969:20 | ,15 3878:6 |
| 3930:9 | 3974:1 | 1etters | 3881:5 |
| 1ate-filed | 3976:22 | 3919:15,22 | 3883:7, 9, 25 |
| 3765:8 | 1egally | 3934:12 | 3884:1 |
| 1ater 3797:9 | 3769:3 | 1eve1 3796:7 | 3886:9,21,22 |
| 3807:18 | Lena | 3816:8 | 3887:10,25 |
| 3935:1 | 3842:2,5,6 | 3877:4 | 3888:9,12,14 |
| 1aw 3758:19 | 3843:3 | Lewis 3760:16 | ,18 |
| 3759:2,6,10, | 3981:21 | 3761:9 | 3889:2,3,25 |
| 11,14,15,19, | 3985:7,9 | 3762:24 | 3890:10 |
|  | 1ess 3787:6,8 | 1iability | 3891:13,19 |
| 3760:1,6,10, | 3792:12 | 17abi3:6,9 | 3903:13,20,2 |
| 14,15 3762:7 | 3803:25 |  | 1 3907:14 |
| 3764:22 | 3841:5 | 1ife 3969:6 | 3937:20 |
| 3895:7 | 3854:2 | Light 3758:11 | 3940:20 |
| 3912:17 | 3856:2 | 3759:18,20,2 | 3957:5 |
| 3945:5 | 3864:9 | 3 3760:4 | 3973:16 |
| 3952:19 | 3874:13 | 3762:3,20 | 3983:3 |
| 1aws 3849:25 | 3889:3 | 3779:21 | 3984:3 |
|  | 3914:4 | 3780:17 | Light's |
| awyer | 3945:12 | 3783:23 | 3817:16 |
| 3873:13 | 1et's 3762:14 | 3784:2 | 3867:25 |
| 3956:25 | 3765:5 | 3794:1,3 | 1ikely |
| 1awyers | 3776:24,25 | 3795:20,23 | 3789:23 |
| 3948:8,9 | 3799:14 | 3803:12,15 | 3862:7 |
| 3975:23 | 3809:22 | 3805:24 |  |
| 1ayman's | 3826:20 | 3806:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { limine } \\ & 3771: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3801:23 | 3841:17 | 3807:8,14 |  |
| 1ays 3844:9 | 3856:10 | 3813:3,8 | limitation |
| 1ead 3872:21 | 3876:12 | 3815:11 |  |
| 1east 3779:13 | 3881:9 | 3819:7 | 1imitations |
| 3793:5 | 3885:4 | 3825:22 |  |
| 3820:4 | 3893:6,13 | 3827:1 | 1imited |
| 3862:7 | 3907:1, 3 , 11 , | 3831:11 | 3857:22 |
| 3864:21 | 3979:9,11,13 | 3836:4 | 17ne 3769:9 |
| 3918:9 | 3979:4 | 3838:22 | 3784:17 |
| 3919:16 | 1etter 3766:1 | 3844:18,19,2 | 3800:8,9 |
| 1eaves | 3900:19,24 | 1 | 3836:9, |
| 3821:20 | 3901:4 | 3845:2,4,9,1 | 3845:17 |
| 1eaving | 3910:22 | 0,22 3846:16 | 3851:17,21 |
| 3858:15 | 3919:5 | 3847:1,23 | 3853:8,15 |
| 1ed 3817:9 | 3923:25 | ,20,21,16,18 | 3859:19 |
| Lee's 3763:14 | 3924:1, 8, 12, | 3849:2,13,21 | 3860:2,14 |
| 1eftover |  | 3852:12,14 | 3955.13 |
| leftover | 3934:15 | 3854:2,10,14 | 1ines 3768:12 |
|  | 3936:4,14 | 3857:17,21 | 3769:2 |
| 1egal | 3942:19 | 3860:6 | 3844:8 |
| 3761:2,3,4,5 | 3943:4,16 | 3862:21 | 3844:8 |
| 3873:18 | 3959:23 | 3863:3 | 3850:22 |
| 3874:1 | 3960:15 | 3864:8,11 | 3856:11 |
| 3876:15 | 3961:3,16 | 3866:7,22 | 3857:4 |
| 3905:19,22,2 |  | 3872:25 | 3858:23,24 |
| 5 3911:18 | ,24 3963:7 | 3874:21 | 3859:9, |
| 3922:10 | ,24 3963:7 | 3875:3 | 3865:5,9 |
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| 3886:2 | 3816:24 | 3795:24 | 3887:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3889:11 | 3818:14 | 3796:17 | low-income |
| 3890:24 | 3829:15,16 | 3835:7,9 | 3775:24 |
| 3933:6 | 3830:8 | 3840:18 | 3776:4,10 |
| 3959:3 | 3837:17,20 | 3860:15 | LPS 3847:20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Lisa 3758:23 } \\ 3980: 3,16 \end{gathered}$ |  | 3865:22 | Lum7ey 3759:6 |
| 1ist 3847:3 | 3847:1,2,13, | 3871:19 | 3764:7 |
| 3960:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 143850: 3 \\ & 3857: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 10oming | 3775:11 |
| 1isted | 3858:3, 9,14 |  | 3798:13 |
| 3777:16 | 3863:25 | 1ose 3790:6 | 3801:9 |
| 3792:3 | 3864:1,5 | 3874:16 | 3978:15 |
| 3961:3 | 3867:5,9 | 3894:6,9 | uxury 3789:7 |
| 1istening | 3869:25 | 3966:10 13,19 | luxury 3789.7 |
| 3768:17 | 3870:7, ${ }^{\text {3874 }}$ | ,24 | M |
| 3775:8 | 3881:2 | 1oses 3874:18 | ma'am 3798:8 |
| 3906:6 | 3888:17,20,2 | loses 3874:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { na }{ }^{\prime} \text { am } 3798: 81 \\ & \text { 3970:21 } \end{aligned}$ |
| listing | 1 $3891 \cdot 89$, 11 | 10sing 3884:1 $3966: 12$ |  |
| 3834:7 | 3891:8, 9,11, |  | Madison <br> 3759:16 |
| 1iterally | 14,16,17,25 | 10ss 3899:10 | 3761:6,10 |
| 3872:15 | 1oads 3808:11 | 10sses | main 3760:2 |
| 1itigation | 3829:14 | 3966:23 $3967: 1$ | 3764:23 |
| 3769:23 | 3848.20 | 3967:1 | 3806:11 |
| 3770:25 | Locals 3765:2 | 1ost 3894:17 | 3823:5 |
| 3772:24 | located | 3900:7 | 3831:8 |
| 3773:1, 3 | 3786:24 | 3926:22 | 3907:12 |
| 3901:9 | 3848:17 | 3973:20 |  |
| 3906:18 | 3849:4,23 | 1ot 3805:17 | $3786: 8$ |
| 1ittle 3766:4 | 1ocation | 3807:3,7,8 |  |
| 3779:18 | 3880:1 | 3836:10 | maintain 3786:11 |
| 3783:25 | 1ong 3783:20 | 3874:11 | 3836:3 |
| 3797:18 | 3796:20 | 3883:23 | 3905:7 |
| $3833: 20$ $3836: 8$ | 3805:17 | 3887:3,13 | maintai |
| 3867:11 | 3811:21 | 3891:17,21 | 3792:2 |
| 3875:15 | 3814:19 | 3910:24 | 3953:9 |
| 3876:12 | 3819:22 | 3911:12 |  |
| 3894:25 | 3839:21 | 1ow 3862:22 | $3814: 9$ |
| 3895:2 | 3855:22,24 |  |  |
| 3896:24 | 3862:15,22 | 3886:10 | maintenance |
| 3909:9 | 3863:14 | 3886:10 | 3796:6 |
| 3954:21 | 3875:6 | 1ower 3785:9 | 3923:19 |
| 1ive 3783:3 | 3878:3 | 3788:1 | major |
| living 3890:6 | 3886:9 3888 | $3796: 19$ $3810: 17$ | 3781:5,8 |
| LLC 3758:23 | 3928:13 | 3852:11 | 3792:4 |
| 3759:9 | 3949:6 | 3854:4 |  |
| 3764:8 | longer | 3864:13 | majority |
| LLP 3760:2 | 3805:17 | 38878:10,12 | 3781:19 |
| LMN 3846:2 | 3854:12 | Lower | Majors |
| 1oad 3794:21 | 3977:19 | 3760:15 | 3971:2, 6, 11 |
| 3805:11 | 1ong-term | 3763:24 | 3973:2,7 |
| 3810: 6 | $3785: 25$ | lowest 3787:3 | 3977:11 |
| 3812:21,22 | 3786:20 | 3789:10 | 3982:4 |
| 3815:24 | 3794:23 | 3815:5 | 3985:11,13,1 |
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| 4,16 | 3831:12 | may 3768:8 | 3872:12,15,2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| management | 3832:1 | 3776:22 | 0,22 |
| management | 3842:9,10,12 | 3779:1 | 3873:12,18,2 |
| 3789:6 | ,20 3907:23 | 3783:19 | 3 3874:15 |
| 3862:16 | 3908:6,8 | 3793:20 | 3880:14 |
| 3876:2,6,16 | 3914:17 | 3797:18 | 3883:13,15,2 |
| 3912:8,11,12 | 3915:4 | 3799:2 | 3 3884:4,15 |
| ,25 3921:2 | 3917:7,19,23 | 3800:20 | 3885:8 |
|  | 3918:17,20 | 3802:12 | 3889:2 |
| manager | 3932:9,11,23 | 3805:12 | 3891:20 |
| 3952:5 | 3934:14 | 3807:15 | 3893:3 |
| managing | 3935:5,8,14 | 3811:9 | 3900:13 |
| 3785:23 | 3939:22 | 3813:15 | 3901:9 |
|  | 3950:4,9 | 3814:1,13 | 3902:2,18 |
| mandate <br> 3786:12 | 3954:14 | 3822:6,25 | 3906:5 |
|  | 3960:8 | 3824:3 | 3915:14,16,2 |
| Mantle | 3983:2 | 3825:7 | 3 3916:2 |
| 3806:7,10 | 3984:2 | 3846:7 | 3929:24 |
| 3807:25 | 3985:2 | 3864:9,11 | 3930:14 |
| 3810:16 | market 3787:7 | 3867:21,22 | 3964:7 |
| 3841:23 | m849:10 | 3873:23 | 3965:8 |
| 3842:2,5 | 3869:15 | 3874:5 | 3974:1 |
| 3843:4,20,24 | 3885:1,6,8 | 3892:9 | 3977:22 |
| 3861:21,24 | Marvin | 3903:12 |  |
| 3865:19 | Marvin ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3924:10 | 3810:5 |
| 3876:17 | 3774:17 | 3929:11 |  |
| 3877:1 | 3775:2 | 3944:9 | means 3768:4 |
| 3880:11 | 3789:16 | 3949:2 | 3780:8 |
| 3882:24 | mass | 3968:8 | 3854:4 |
| 3883:2 | 3885:17,18 | 3970:17 | 3874:13 |
| 3885:25 | matches | 3977:11 | 3891:17 |
| 3892:9 | matches $3796: 7$ |  | meant |
| 3981:21 | 3796:7 | $3877: 17$ | 3964:10,12,1 |
| 3985:7,9 | material | 3883:18 |  |
| Mantle's | $\begin{aligned} & 3769: 4 \\ & 3770: 10,14 \end{aligned}$ | 3915:18,24 | measure |
| 3807:11 | 3770:10,14 | 3945:2 | 3829:12 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { March } 3786: 18 \\ 3922: 16 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { materials } \\ 3842: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MCCLOWERY } \\ 3761: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { measured } \\ 3847: 2 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3928:15 | math 3976:9 | McNeil1 | measurements |
| margin 3865:4 | matter | 3760:6 | $3847: 3$ |
| 3955:13 | 3758:10,14 | $3764: 11$ |  |
| mark 3766:13 | 3769:25 | 3798:8 | 3782:16 |
| 3916:19 | 3776:16 | MDNR 3798:10 | 3784:20 |
| 3917:11 | 3810:22 | mean 3777:22 | 3785:20 |
| 3932:1 | 3863:23 | 3785:13.22 | 3786:13 |
| 3948:22 | 3907:17 | 3793:2,4,6 | 3792:2 |
| marked | 3962:10 | 3801:23 | Medical |
| 3766:17 | 3968:6 | 3810:15,19 | 3879:7 |
| 3770:16,19, 2 |  | 3821:14 |  |
| 0 3771:4,7 | matters $3962: 9$ | 3827:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { meet 3796:13 } \\ & 3846: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3790:24 3791 10 | $3962: 9$ maximize | 3836:1,6,23 | 3847:13,20 |
| $3791: 10$ $3799: 25$ | maximize | 3837:10 | 3852:12, |
| 3823:9,20,25 | 3808:4,5 | 3846:23 | 3888:17,18,1 |
| 3824:16 | 3811:22 | 3864:20,21 | 9 3964:25 |
| 3825:10,11,1 |  | 3865:5,12,16 | megawa 3820:8 |
| 7,18 3826:3 | $3810: 16,17$ | 3866:4, 9,20 | megawatt |
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| 3821:1 | memorandum | 3830:3,7,11, | 3903:15,25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3826:11,25 | 3894:19 | 13 3840:23 | 3904:9,17,22 |
| 3827:2,3 | 3896:8 | 3859:18 | , 23 |
| 3833:22 | 3897:5 | 3863:23 | 3905:12,17 |
| 3834:2,7,11 | 3905:16 | 3938:12 | 3910:15,19 |
| megawatts | 3913:19,24 | methods | 3911:1,10,17 |
| 3780:7 | 3914:3 | 3829:13 | 3914:4,5,13 |
| 3781:13,15 | 3928:10 | 3840:1 | 3940:25 |
| 3782:5,7 | mental 3806:9 | 3861:15 | 3944:6 |
| 3783:6,14 | mention | Meyer 3774:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 3965: 23,25 \\ & 3966: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3795:7,9 | 3767:23 | 3775:1 | Mi11s 3761:9 |
| 3802:14,15 | 3804:16 | 3777:11 | M762:23,24 |
| 3807:3 | mentioned | MGE 3801:7 | 3766:25 |
| 3808:4,5,13, | 3782:22 | microphone | 3767:11,15,1 |
| 14,16,17,20, | 3787:21 | 3768:15 | 8,21 |
| 24 3811:5 | 3788:13 | 3952:13 | 3768:3,6,10, |
| 3818:19 | 3844:4 |  | 21 3771:8,10 |
| 3819:12 | 3854:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mid-50s } \\ & 3812: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 3774:8 |
| 3844:10,13 | merge 3864:17 3871:11 | mid-afternoon | 3801:13 |
| 3851:6 |  | 3778:1 | 3811:19, 20 |
| 3853:9,17 | merged $3794: 1$ $3844: 19$ | midd1e 3808:7 | 3812:4 |
| 3856:1 | 3845:10 | 3852:16 | 3822:9,12 |
| 3862:19 | 3846:15 | 3891:1 | 3873:23 |
| 3867:24 | 3847:25 | 3964:23 | 3981:6 |
| 3870:9,10 | 3849:3 |  | mind 3837:5 |
| 3884:3,11 | 3849:3 | Mike 3765:12 | 3839:20 |
| MEGHAN 3761:5 | 3862:16 | miles 3890:25 | 3865:20 |
| Meisenheimer | 3875:7 | million | 3920:23 |
| 3767:4,22 | 3887:7 | 3779:10,12 | mindfu1 |
| 3768:1 | 3890:10 | 3780:9 | 3872:18 |
| 3769:6,20 | merger | 3782:22,23 | mini 3778:19 |
| 3771:24 | $3794: 4,11$ | 3783:1 | 3797:7 |
| 3772:21 | 3795:18 | 3785:8 | 3893:14 |
| 3773:14 | 3839:24 | 3789:14 | 3899:21 |
| 3984:21 | 3844:21 | 3790:5,6 | 389.21 |
| Meisenheimer' | 3845:6,14,21 | 3791:14,16,1 | minimu |
| s 3770:7 | 3848:8,15 |  | 3891:25 |
| 3772:8 | 3849:12,20 | 3792:7,10,15 | minor 3785:1 |
| Melissa | 3859:22 | 3809:3,5 | 8 : |
| 3774:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 3860: 5,9,10 \\ & 3861: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 3811:5 | minute 3792:6 |
| 3775:2 | 3882:16 | 3820:4,6,8,9 | 3884:25 |
| 3893:24 | 3882:16 | ,10,11 | 3893:4 |
| 3907:3,8,11 | met | 3837:11 | minutes |
| 3981:15 | 3781:22,23 | 3853:24 | 3893:7 |
| 3984:7, 9,10, | 3782:10,11 | 3854:5,8,24 | 3896:3 |
| 12 | 3858:10,15 | 3855:11,14 |  |
| Melissa's | $3859: 2,6,11$, 13 3875:12 | 3868:14,15,1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { misleading } \\ 3769: 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3965:24 | method | 8,22.3871:21 | 3770:2,7 |
| member | method | 3877:11,13,1 | 3791:17 |
| 3837:16,18 | 3818:1 | 5,17 | i smatche |
| 3864:24 | 3821:9 | 3894:20,23 | 3866:18 |
| 3912:22 | 3870:17 | 3895:23 | MISO 3885:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { members } \\ & 3912: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { methodology } \\ 3829: 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3896: 8 \\ & 3899: 11 \end{aligned}$ | misremembered |
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 3877:18 \& 3945:3 \& 3777:25 \& 3837:7,9 <br>
\hline missed 3765:4 \& mi sunderstood \& 3893:13 \& 3838:13 <br>
\hline 3767:14 \& 3888:1 \& 3978:12 \& 3839:1 <br>
\hline missing \& Mitten \& mostly \& 3844:13 <br>
\hline 3865:19 \& 3760:15 \& 3840:13 \& 3846:18 <br>
\hline Mississippi \& 3764:4 \& motion \& 3847:1,12,21 <br>
\hline 3786:24 \& MJMEUC \& 3765:7,22 \& , 22 3848:7 <br>
\hline Missouri \& 3894:14,17 \& 3771:13 \& 3849:1,9,22 <br>
\hline M
3758:2,

3759,15 \& 3895:15 \& 3773:9 \& 3850:18 <br>
\hline 3759:13,17,2 \& 3896:12,17,2 \& motions \& 3851:6, 22 <br>
\hline 2 3760:4,18 \& 1,23 3897:22 \& 3774:11 \& 3852:1,13,15 <br>
\hline 3761:8 \& 3898:16 \& move 3800:21 \& 3856:7,13,14 <br>
\hline 3762:4,18,25 \& 3900:8,9 ${ }^{\text {3904:12,14 }}$ \& 3832:12 \& 3856:19,21,13,14 <br>
\hline 3763:12,17,1 \& 3904:12,14 \& 3833:2 \& 3857:5,8,14, <br>
\hline 8,19,22 \& 3916:11 \& 3860:21 \& 17,2i ${ }^{\text {, }}$ <br>
\hline 3764:1,14 \& 3919:16 \& 3865:24 \& 3858:10,15 <br>
\hline 3779:3 \& 3973:20 \& 3885:5 \& 3859:12, <br>
\hline 3794:10,18,1 \& 3974:3,12,15 \& 3892:13 \& 3868:2,21 <br>
\hline 9,25 \& ,20:3,12,15 \& 3960:19 \& 3869:24 <br>
\hline 3795:5,11,16 \& 3975:1, 9, 14 \& moved 3864:14 \& 3870:4,10 <br>
\hline 3796:16,23 \& 3976:4,9,14, \& 3934:2 \& 3871:9,12 <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& 3803: 16 \\
& 3804: 18
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 24 3977:3 \& moving \& 3872:25 <br>

\hline 3805:25 \& MNS 3850:18 \& 3784:14 \& $$
\begin{gathered}
3874: 7,10,13 \\
17
\end{gathered}
$$ <br>

\hline 3814:3,5 \& \& MPS 3779:7,9 \& 3875:3,4,6,7 <br>
\hline 3815:6,11 \& 3759:4,8,12, \& 3781:10,15,1 \& ,9,11,17,20, <br>
\hline 3816:3 \& 16,21 \& 7 3782:8 \& 24 3876:11 <br>
\hline 3817:17 \& 3760:3,12,17 \& 3783:9 \& 3881:6,14 <br>
\hline 3818:7,10 \& 3761:7,11 \& 3785:7 \& 3883:6,10,25 <br>
\hline 3825:1 \& mode1 3865:6 \& 3791:23 \& 3885:15,16 <br>
\hline 3827:20 \& modification \& 3793:25 \& 3886:14,20,2 <br>
\hline 3829:9 \& 3894:19 \& 3794:8,14,16 \& 3887:5,18, 20 <br>
\hline 3831:8 \& \& , 21 \& ,23 <br>
\hline 3835:6,12 \& modify 3897:5 \& 3795:7,10,14 \& 3888:4,5,8,1 <br>
\hline 3836:4,5 \& mogu1s \& , 19 \& 1,14 <br>
\hline 3837:3 \& 3863:16 \& 3796:3,14,16 \& 3889:4,16,19 <br>
\hline 3838:3,4,9 \& moment 3932:4 \& 3800:9 \& ,23 <br>
\hline 3865:14 \& 3943:25 \& 3802:12,14,2 \& 3891:9,16,17 <br>
\hline 3866:19 \& \& 4 3803:6 \& ,19 <br>
\hline 3870:25 \& monetary \& 3805:4,7,12, \& <br>
\hline 3871:20 \& 3975:16 \& 15 3806:14 \& MPSC 3960:11 <br>
\hline 3876:1 \& money 3810:23 \& 3807:7,18,24 \& MPS's 3781:22 <br>
\hline 3880:3,25 \& 3865:1 \& 3808:2,4,21, \& 3782:11 <br>
\hline 3881:7,8 \& 3926:10 \& 22 3810:3,23 \& 3837:11 <br>
\hline 3888:3,6 \& 3975:24 \& 3811:8 \& 3841:5 <br>
\hline 3890:10 \& \& 3812:9,11,21 \& 3845:5 <br>
\hline 3891:4 \& month 3813:14 \& 3813:1,21 \& 3846:17 <br>
\hline 3894:15 \& 3834:12 \& 3816:22,25 \& 3851:24 <br>
\hline 3907:12 \& months \& 3817:3 \& 3852:12 <br>
\hline 3948:8,9 \& 3928:12,16,1 \& 3818:12,18,1 \& 3859:5 <br>
\hline 3949:24 \& 8 \& \& 3866:23,24 <br>
\hline 3971:9 \& \& 3821:2,5,6,1 \& 3868:3 <br>
\hline 3980:4 \& 3944:21,22 \& 1,19 3824:20 \& 3870:8 <br>
\hline 3984:18,23 \& \& 3827:14,17 \& 3888:19 <br>
\hline 3985:2 \& MoPub 3877:5 \& 3828:22 \& u7tiple <br>

\hline Mister 3891:7 \& morning \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 3829: 10 \\
& 3836: 27,23
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 3770:8 <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}
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| 3919:22 | 3963:15 | 3929:3 | 3910:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| multiplicatio | 3980:8 | 3937:3, 5,12 | 3944:4 |
| n 3872:6 | net 3787:6,12 | 3961:9,13,21 | November |
| Municipal | 3788:1 | 3963:11,14,1 | 3894:14 |
| 3894:15 | 3854:4 | 3965:1,5,12, | 3935:17 |
| Murray | Networks | 18 | NP 3823:10,24 |
| 3777:21 | 3779:7,8 | 3966:6,13,20 | 3824:8 |
| 3893:3 | news 3780:1 | 3969:1,2,8 | 3831:13 |
| myse7f | Ninth 3760:16 | North 3885:5 | 3950:7,10 |
| 3762:17 | nobody's | Nos 3771:3 | 3983:7,14 |
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| 3829:4 | $3786: 4$ $3797: 10$ | 3894:10 | 3818:25 |
| 3840:2 | 3797:10 | 3907:15 | 3819:2,5,7 |
| 3849:16,20,2 | policies | 3951:25 | 3825:22 |
| 3 3850:2 | 3786:12 | 3953:6 | 3827:1 |
| 3871:7 | Policy 3895:6 | positions | 3829:4,10 |
| 3878:3,24 | Polish | 3855:7 | 3831:11 |
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| 3836:3,4 | 3864:8,11 | 3957:3 | 3857:6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3838:22 | practice | prepare | 3874:20 |
| 3839:16,19 | 3943:9 | 3907:18,25 | 3912:8 |
| 3840:2, 3844 18,19, | 3952:6 | 3933:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 3950: 2,4 \\ & 3962: 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | practitioner | prepared | price |
| 3845:9,10,22 | 3943:15 | 3818:16 | prin87:7,13 |
| 3846:16 | pre-2000 | 3950:2,13 | 3812:1,13 |
| 3847:1,23 | 3795:18 | 3971:12 | priced |
| 3848:9,16,18 | 3836:12 | present | priced $3811: 23$ |
| 3849:3,14,21 | preceded | 3798:18 | 3870:9,10 |
| ,23 | 3976:18 | 3819.19 | prices 3809:6 |
| 3850:1,2,6,1 | precedence | presented | pricing |
| 3,15,17,19 | 3924:13 | 3804:14 | pricing $3860: 16,19,2$ |
| 3854:3,10,15 | precedent | 3807:25 | 4 3864:21 |
| ,18 | 3795:17 | 3818:23 | 3881:14 |
| 3857:18, 22 | 3943:6 | 3820:25 | 3890:2,20 |
| 3860:6 | 3968:9 | 3898:22 | Pridgin |
| 3862:17,18,2 | precluded | presenting | 3799:1 |
| 1 3863:3,10 | 3772:19 | 3805:1 | primarily |
| 3866:6,21,22 | predecessor | preserve | 3844:17 |
| 3872:25 | 3893:22 | 3897:3 | 3845:2,8,12, |
| 3874:21 | 3958:24 | preserved | 15 |
| 3875:1,3 |  | 3898:17 | primary |
| 3876:1,11,12 | prefer 3890:1 | 3977:4 | 3861:3,7,9 |
| ,15 3877:25 | preferable | preserving | 3866:4 |
| 3878:3,6 | 3890:20 | 3927:20 | 3969:18 |
| 3881:2,5 3883 7,9,25 | preferred | presumably | 3983:4 |
| 3884:1, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3787:1 | 3921:10 | principa1 3934:23 |
| 3885:14,16 | prefile | presume |  |
| 3886:9,21,22 | $3842: 6$ | $3923: 22$ | principles 3961:21 |
| 3887:10,25 | prefiled | presumed |  |
| 3888:9,10,12 | 3765:16 | 3839:4 | printout |
| 3889:3,25 | 3800:13 | pretty 3793:8 |  |
| 3890:10 | pre-filed | 3801:17 |  |
| 3891:1,14,19 | pre-filed 3950:12 | 3864:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 3769: 9,15,16 \\ & 3770: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3894:16 | $3950: 12$ | 3872:14,21 | 3790:19 |
| 3903:13,20,2 | prejudicial | 3890:23 | 3804:25 |
| 1 3905:7 | 3769:5 | prevai 1 | 3813:17 |
| 3907:14 | 3770:1 | 3977:3 | 3835:18 |
| 3918:2 | 3771:25 | prevailed | 3838:14,17 |
| 39370:20 | preliminary | 3853:25 | 3910:4 |
| 3946:2 | 3765:6 | previous | 3951:25 |
| 3957:4 | premarked | previous | 3952:2 |
| 3968:9 | 3765:24 | 3766:4 | 3969:16 |
| 3973:16 | premature | 3785:20,21 | priority |
| 3983:3 | 3797:18 | 3799:1 | 3869:25 |
| 3984:3 |  | 3800:20 | private |
| Power's | premerger 3794:12 | 3861:11 | 3900:19, 24 |
| 3845:3,4 |  | 3964:22 | 3901:4,21 |
| 3848:20,21 | premise | previously | 3903:6 |
| 3852:12 | 3864:22 | 3800:24 | 3923:25 |
| 3854:11 | preparation | 3801:3 | 3924:1,7,11, |
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| 15,16 3935:6 | 3803:7 | 3811:25 | 3796:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3936:4,14 | 3804:24 | properly | 3802:20 |
| 3942:19 | 3805:14 | proper 3784 | 3807:4,16 |
| 3943:4,11,14 | 3817:20 | 3811:23 | 3830:2 |
| ,16 3959:23 | 3911:22 | 3897:24 | 3859:10 |
| 3960:15 | 3912:24 |  | 3863:18 |
| 3961:3,16 | 3921:20,21 | properties | 3905:20 |
| 3962:6,16,19 | 3922:4 | 3802:3 | proposes |
| ,24 3963:7 | 3926:6 | 3807:22 | p782:5 |
| 3968:16,20 | 3927:2,8,12 | property | 3795:6 |
| 3969:20 | 3928:23 | 3923:20 |  |
| pro 3848:23 | 3930:2 | $3933: 25$ $3965: 2$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { proposing } \\ 3794: 25 \end{gathered}$ |
| prob 3814:1 | Processing |  | 3796:2 |
| probably | $3764: 18$ | proportion 3812:19 | 3888:22 |
| $3775: 15$ $3779: 12$ | produced | proportional | proprietary |
| 3805:12 | 3810:1 | 3945:21 | $\text { 3951:1, } 5$ |
| 3809:5 | production | proportionate | prorata |
| 3847:5,6 | 3886:17 | 3909:18 | 3946:1 |
| 3854:12 | professionals | Proportionate | 3976:13 |
| 3887:22 | 3962 | 1y 3945:22 | prove 3772:13 |
| probing | profit 3865:4 | proposal | 3773 |
| 3938:15 | 3955:20 | 3782:1, 8,9,2 | provide |
| problem |  | 3785:6,12 | 3862:6 |
| 3766:4 | 3811:22 | 3786:14,19 | 3915:20 |
| 3774:23 |  | 3795:9,16 |  |
| 3807:1 | prohibits 3793:3 | 3796:21,22 | provided |
| 3882:8 | 3793:3 | 3817:13 | 3764:24 |
| 3900:15 | project | 3818:21 | 3765:21 |
| 3930:11,13 | 3893:19 | 3819:14 | 3901:319 |
| problems | 3894:7 | 3820:23 | 3954:23 |
| 3789:19 | 3903:15,22 | 3837:1 | 3956:17 |
| 3882:12 | 3904:6, 3 | 3840:12 |  |
| 3902:17 | 3909:18,24 | 3855:25 | provides |
| procedura1 | 3910:1,21 | 3856:3,6 | 3811:23 |
| 3772:2 | 3911:9 | 3858:14 | 3964:25 |
| procedurally |  |  |  |
| 3772:10 |  | 3866: | providing |
| O | 3967:15 | 3869:5 | 3787:8 |
| 3767:9 | pro | 3871:21 | 3821:4 |
|  | 3781:21,23 | 3874:14 | 3825:12 |
| proceeded | 3859:11,12 | 3878:5,13 | 3962:12 |
| proceeding | projects | 7 3881:19 | provisions |
| $3769: 25$ | 3905:2 | 3928:15 | 3895:12 |
| 3921:10 | promised | proposals | 3933:19 |
| proceedings | 3892:23 | 3786:20 | 3937:6 |
| 3758:4 | 3893:1 | proposed | prudence |
| 3904:18 | 3978:15 | 3779:9 | 3780:1 |
| 3973:9,11 | proper 3773:5 | 3781:20 | prudent |
| 3974:14 | 3784:1 | 3782:7 | 3787:18 |
| process | 3796:7 | 3783:2,5,17 |  |
| 3786:5,25 | 3803:19 | 3786:2, | 3785:17 |
| 3787:14 | 3805:10 | 3791:20 | 3786:16 |

4034
TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

EVIDENTIARY HEARING VOL. 36 ER-2010-0355 \& 0356 02-14-2011

| public 3758:1 | 3875:1 | 3792:23 | 3837:22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3761:5,8,10, | 3926:16 | 3809:8 | 3840:16 |
| 12 | purchases | 3814:25 | 3844:2 |
| 3762:22,24 | 3849:10 | 3816:1 | 3861:20,23 |
| 3763:6 |  | 3829:23 | 3865:20,21 |
| 3766:23 | purchasing | 3837:24 | 3876:20 |
| 3771:2 | 3865:2 | 3838:6,25 | 3877:2 |
| 3773:1 | 3869:15 | 3839:12 | 3883:1 |
| 3795:25 | purpose | 3840:21,25 | 3885:20 |
| 3797:4 | 3795:13 | 3865:14 | 3886:13 |
| 3800:10,11 | 3865:25 | 3874:1 | 3892:7 |
| 3801:12 | 3866:4 | 3877:17,21 | 3901:5 |
| 3804:18 | 3886:24 | 3878:12 | 3906:4,21 |
| 3819:5 |  | 3881:21 | 3917:16 |
| 3836:4,5 | purposes | 3882:24 | 3924:24 |
| 3837:3 | 3788:7,13 | 3888:2 | 3925:25 |
| 3862:1,11,18 | 3789:2 12 | 3889:21 | 3930:17 |
| 3865:15 | 3842:10,12 | 3891: 6 | 3931:14 |
| 3876:1 | 3886:18 | 3897:18 | 3937:15 |
| 3895:17 | 3887:18 | 3898:1,20,24 | 3944:25 |
| 3902:2 | 3954:7 | 3913:10 | 3948:4 |
| 3935:19 | pursuant | 3914:11 | 3950:19 |
| 3936:9 | 3908:25 | 3924:22 | 3972:3 |
| 3943:10,15 | 3963:9 | 3927:21 | 3978:21 |
| 3949:24 |  | 3930:21,23 | 3981:5,13,17 |
| 3951:23 | $3900: 13$ | 3938:10,20,2 | , 23,24 |
| 3952:7, 9,16, | pursuing | 2 3943:23 | quick 3943:2 |
| 21-3965:2 | pursuing | 3948:15,22 | 3949:10 |
| 3971:9 | 3919:13 | 3960:12 |  |
| 3984:20,23 | push 3874:12 | 3965:15 | quickly $3846: 8$ |
| 3985:2 | puts 3892: | 3966:21 |  |
| publicized | putting | $\begin{aligned} & 3970: 3 \\ & 3973: 22 \end{aligned}$ | quite 3770:4 |
| 3895:13 | putting $3805: 6,9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3973: 22 \\ & 3974: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3788: 24 \\ & 3863: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { publicly } \\ 3935: 17 \end{gathered}$ |  | questioning 3925:1 | quote 3783:7 <br> 3955:17,20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { published } \\ 3895: 19 \end{gathered}$ | Quaker 3879:9 | questions | 3956:8, |
| pump 3877:25 | qualified | 3774:21,22 |  |
| purchase | 3912:18,21 | 3776:6,7,23 | R |
| 3769:8 | 3921:23, | 3777:10 |  |
| 3782:17 | qua1 | 3789:14,17 | raised |
| 3788:18 | qualif | 3792:18,21 | 38 |
| 3789:4 | 3896:5 | 3797:1,23 | range 3820:4 |
| 3795:24 | 3912:10 | 3800:13 11 | rapidly |
| 3796:9 | quantify | 3801:9,11,13 | $3969: 6$ |
| 3813:10,12 | quantify 3820:2 | 3811:14,16 |  |
| 3818:25 | 3820:2 | 3811:14,16 | rate $3770: 17,20$ |
| 3819:2 | quarter | 3815:21 | 3779:17, 20, 10 |
| 3849:10 | 3949:5 | 3816:11,17 | ,14,18,10,11 |
| 3866:21 | queries | 3817:8 | 3780:4,5 |
|  | 3777:10 | 3819:24 | 3781:18 |
| purchased | question | 3821:13 | 3783:8,9,14 |
| 3806:18 | 3769:3,15 | 3828:14,15,1 | 3784:12,16,2 |
| 3848:24 | 3770:9 | 7,21,24 | 2 3787:11 |
| 3854:18 | 3775:5 | 3832:3 | 3789:19 |
| 3863:10 | 3790:14 | 3835:20,21,2 | 3791:14,16 |
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| 3793:10 | 6 | 3789:9,10 | 3814:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3795:2 | 3836:15,18,2 | 3933:25 | 3826:2,9 |
| 3797:8 | 4 3837:2,12 | 3943:2 | 3827:21 |
| 3798:15 | 3838:5,11 | reality | 3838:16 |
| 3800:2 | 3839:13 | $3805: 23$ | 3858:11,16 |
| 3813:6 | $3840: 14,18$ $3841: 3$ | realized | 3860:22, |
| 3818:9 | 3856:7 | 3921:22 | 3881:15 |
| 3820:17 | 3859:20 | realizes | 3891:20,21 |
| 3821:16 | 3862:21 | 3783:13 | 3896:14 |
| 3835:14,18 | 3864:17 | 3853:15 | 3897:14 |
| 3837:6 | 3875:18,19 |  | 3901:12 |
| 3839:19 | 3880:2 | reallocate | 3938:7,19 |
| 3840:3 | 3884:20 | 3901:23 | reasonable |
| 3853:10,11,1 | 3887:11,14,1 | 3901:23 | 3851:3,18 |
| 6 3854:25 | 8 3889:16 | 3929:5,6 | 3852:19 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 3860:15,18 | 3890:11 | 3929:52 ${ }^{\text {3920 }}$ | 3852.19 |
| 3861:3,15 | 3904:24 | 3936:22 | reasons |
| 3862:10 | rather 3773:6 | 3938:1,23 | 3814:13 |
| 3863:22 | 3788:9 | 3965:11 | 3862:21 |
| 3868:7 3872 14,16, | 3798:5 | reallocated | 3887:11 |
| $13878: 17{ }^{16,2}$ | 3805:14 3860 16,19 | reallocated | rebase |
| 3882:1,6 | 3861:13,19 | 3897:10 | 3784:13,23, |
| 3890:6,7 |  | 3928:10 | 5 3785:5 |
| 3900:17 | rating 3786:7 3814:11 | 3936:7 |  |
| 3923:13 | 3814:11 | 3963:9,24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ebased } \\ & 3792: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ratemaking } \\ & 3786: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { ratings } \\ 3814: 9 \end{array}$ | reallocation $3894: 1$ | rebasing |
| 3788:13 | Raytown | 3897:10 | 3784:11,14,1 |
| 3789:1 | $3847: 16$ | 3898:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 7,18 \quad 3785: 12 \\ & 3791: 27 \end{aligned}$ |
| ratepayers | Rcv'd 3983:2 | 3899:16 | rebuild |
| 3790:17,21 | 3984:2 | 3914:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rebuifd } \\ & 3792: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3810:17 | 3985:2 | 3928:3, 8,11, |  |
| 3892:2 | re 3966:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 3928: 3,8,11, \\ & 153929: 3 \end{aligned}$ | rebuttal |
| 3898:13,17 | re 3966.10 | 3937:1 | 3767:3,22 |
| 3899:1,2 | reach 3891:3 | 3965:17 | 3772:1 |
| 3906:2 |  | 3965:17 | 3773:13 |
| 3926:11,18 | $3922: 13$ | really 3797:6 | 3799:24 |
| 3928:25 |  | 3808:12 | 3800:1,7 |
| 3929:18,21 | reaches | 3821:23 | 3823:10 |
| 3977:4 | 3891:3 | 3852:7 | 3831:11,19,2 |
| rates 3769:24 | readily | 3855:12,17 | 3 3842:10,21 |
| 3780:11,21 | 3921:19 | 3878:16 | 3843:3 |
| 3781:3,7 | reading | 3882:3 | 3858:19 |
| 3783:8 | 3919:6 | 3890:14 | 3907:18,25 |
| 3784:13,19, 2 | 3956:3 | 3894:22 | 3923:24 |
| 4 | 3957:25 | 3898:22 | 3950:3,5 |
| 3785:1, 7, 9,1 | 3959:1 | 3910:23 | 3959:24 |
| 4 3788:1, | 3964:17 | 3915:12 | 3971:16,20 |
| 3790:16,23 |  | 3930:13 | 3972:18, |
| 3794:3,5,7,1 | reads 3886:8 | 3973:10 | 3983:9,13,19 |
| 3,24 | ready 3892:13 | realm 3829:23 | $3984: 7,10,21$ |
| 3795:4,10,15 | 3907:6 |  | $3985: 7,11,14$ |
| ,19 3802:11 | 3908:23 | reap 3886:10 | recal1 |
| 3819:25 | 3949:18 | reapportionme | 3766:25 |
| 3820:9 | 3971:1 | nt 3927:22 | 3793:6 |
| 3835:13,14,1 | real 3774:13 | reason 3778:5 | 3828:24 |
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| 3878:9,10 | 3779:24 | 3914:16 | refer 3779:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3889:14 | 3922:23 | 3919:25 | 3844:6 |
| 3925:16,23 | recess | 3920:7 | 3908:18 |
| 3937:13,16 | 3841:19 | 3933:11 | 3964:16 |
| 3954:4 | 3893:9 | 3944:10 13 , | reference |
| recap 3896:11 | 3949:12 | 3949:11,13,2 | $3970: 1,11$ |
| recapture | recite 3775:6 | 3955:17 | referenced |
| 3965:8 | 3934:19 | 3971:5 | 3813:20 |
| 3966:10 | 3943:6 | 3978:1,9 | references |
| recaptured | recognize | 3979:3,4 | 3954:4 |
| 3790:4 | 3940:1,10 | recover | referencing |
| 3964:3 | recognized | 3779:6 | 3967:15 |
| 3965:6 | 3921:19 | 3811:12 |  |
| recapturing $3790: 1$ | recollection <br> 3793:8,14 | 3966:18,25 recovered | $\begin{gathered} \text { referred } \\ 3900: 20 \\ 3935: 6 \end{gathered}$ |
| receive | 3838:12 | 3784:20 | referring |
| 3848:8,12 | 3844:23 | 3785:15 | referring |
| 3849:1,8 | 3866:3 | 3790:16,23 | 3891:10,11 |
| 3850:17 | 3945:4 | recovery | 3954:7,8 |
| 3854:24 | recommend | 3769:8 | 3964:6, |
| 3894:13 | 3851:8 | 3881:3 | 3976:16,19 |
| 3923:5 | recommendatio | recross | reflect |
| 3946:1 | n 3790:7 | 3811:15 | 3762:16 |
|  | 3791:15 | 3885:19 | 3791:19 |
| received | 3792:9 | 3948:14 | 3827:19 |
| 3773:18 | 3845:1 | Recross- | 3830:24 |
| 3774:7 | 3853:22 | Examination | 3835:15 |
| 3786:20 | 3861:4 | 3838:1 | 3905:11 |
| 3822:17 | 3969:18 | 3876:23 |  |
| 3824:8 |  | 3880:10 | reflected |
| 3828:13 | recommending | 3930:25 | 3780:10 |
| 3833:9 | 3791:18 | 3981:14,18,2 | 3781:3,77 |
| 3843:16 | 3791:18 | 3,24 | 3785:7,17 |
| 3849:22 | 3844:10 | 3,24 | 3788:1 |
| 3850:13,15,1 | 3851:11 | redirect | 3797:13 |
| 9 3899:8,13 | 3853:1,3 | 3814:23 | 3887:9,13 |
| 3900:16 | recommends | 3816:13,15 | 3899:11 |
| 3908:15 | 3808:22 | 3828:18,20 | reflecting |
| 3910:17 |  | 3839:8,10 | 3788:1,12,14 |
| 3917:4 | reconciliatio | 3885:21,24 |  |
| 3918:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n 3791: } \\ & 3792: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 3931:16,18 | refrained $3767: 2$ |
| 3920:11 | 3792:9 | 3948:16 | 3767:2 |
| 3922:19 | reconsider | 3967:10,12 | refresh |
| 3928:9 | 3775:13 | 3977:8 | 3866:3 |
| 3934:8 | record | 3981:7,10,14 | 3945:4 |
| 3942:17,24 | 3762:16 | ,18,25 | refund 3922:1 |
| 3951:11 | 3770:15,24 | 3982:3 | $3976: 3$ |
| $3960: 25$ $3968: 17$ | 3771:14,16,2 | reduced | refunded |
| 3972:24 | 1 3772:6 | 3969:5 | 3976:8 |
| receives | 3799:21 |  | refused |
| 3923:9 | 3823:4 | reduction 3868:18 | 3904:1 |
| recent | 3830:24 |  | regard |
| 3779:21 | 3831:6 | redundant $3777: 19$ | 3769:4,11 |
| 3780:4 | 3841:18,21 | 3777:19 | 3770:24 |
| recently | 3873:19 | ref 3967:16 | 3792:24 |
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| 3821:19 | 3780:25 | 3794:7 | replacement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3932:17 | 3781:9 | 3796:15 | 3796:9 |
| 3933:2,8,12, | 3786:12 | 3893:8 | report |
| 22 3935:2 | 3788:3 14.15 | remained | 3770:17,19 |
| 3943:4 39514 | 3790:2,14,15 | 3888:14 | 3783:7,11,12 |
| 3959:23,17 | 3892:3 | remaining | 3834:20 |
| 3962:8 | 3903:14,18 | 3781:14 | 3837:6, |
| regarding | 3904:6 | 3790:2 | 3843:2 |
| 3769:15,22 | 3909:23,25 | 389 | 3850:21 |
| 3814:7 | 3940:25 | 39 | 3851:15 |
| 3820:22 | 3973:12 | remember | 3853:8,15 |
| 3828:22,23 | 3973:12 | 3877:21,23 | 3856:11 |
| 3862:12 | 3976:4 | 3885:25 | 3857:6 |
| 3916:13 | 3980:8 | 3886:12 | 3859:25 |
| 3918:3 | relationship | 3896:22 | 3877:7,12 |
| 3919:1,9 | 3909:1 | 3926:3 | 3886:1 |
| 3936:5 | relative | 3970:8 | 3889:11 |
| regardless | 3812:8 | remind | 3933:25 |
| 3847:7,14 | 3826:12 | 3766:19 | 3950:3 |
| 3890:4 | 3828:22 | remove | 3971:13 |
| regards | 3829:2,12 | 3771:13,15,2 | 3984:15, 17, 2 |
| 3811:9 | 3980:10 | 0 3905:21 | 4 3985:4,6, |
| regs | relatively 3806:16 | rendered | reported |
| 3838:13,15 | $\begin{aligned} & 3806: 16 \\ & 3813: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 3965:5 | 3758:22 |
| 3839:2 | 3813:11 | rendering | 3788:2 |
| 3939:4 | 3829:15 | 3962:12 | reporter |
| regularly | 3902:21 | repaid 3965:9 | 3764:24 |
| 3962:11 | 3922:23 | repay 3894:5 | 3766:6,9 |
| regulated | 3925:4,5,22 | repay 39378 | 3823:20 |
| 3936:9 | release | 3965:13,19 | 3831:24 |
| 3963:3 | 3935:11 | 3966:9,19 | 3948:23 |
| regulation 3939:2 | released $3935: 17$ | repayment 3962:3 | 3980:1 |
| regulations | relevant | repeat | REPORTER'S |
| 3894:3 | 3769:4,19,20 | 3778:21 | 46: |
| 3933:17 | ,24 | 3913:21 | REPORTING |
| egulatory | 3770:10,11,1 | 3965:15 | 3758:23 |
| 3758:13,19 | 3 3773:7 | 3966:21 | represent |
| 3762:6 | 3880:20 | 3970:3 | 3921:7 |
| 3786:5 | relied | 3975:6 | representativ |
| 3814:6 | 3795:20 | repeatedly | e 3941:15 |
| 3949:25 | 3962:11 | 3882:10,11,1 | 3968:13 |
| 3963:10 |  | 3 3883:24 | represented |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3968: 21 \\ & 3971: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $3904: 2,13$ | repercussions | $3788: 8$ |
|  | relitigate | 3785:25 | 3807:24 |
| reject 3773:9 | 3780:2 | rephrased | 3872:16 |
| rejected | relitigating | 3969:24 | 3920:20 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3896: 1 \\ & 3934: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $3793: 3$ | replace | 3926:1,14 |
|  | rely 3943:15 | 3866:7 |  |
| 3968:20 | remain | 3884:11 | 3786:21 |
| related | 3769:10 | rep | 3793:22 |
| 3762:8 | remainder | 3875:11 | 3921:5,11 |
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| 3963:25 | 3800:8 | 3950:12 | 3963:11,13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| represents | 3809:4 | 3965:1 | resulted |
| 3809:3 | 3815:24 | respectfully | 3896:20 |
| 3872:12 | 3819:20 | 3786:11 | 3897:12 |
| request | 3847:9,20 | respective | results |
| 3762:5 | 3885:8, | 3781:16 | 3781:21 |
| 3769:22 | 3888:17,19 | 3835:15 | 3859:10,18 |
| 3782:22 | 3891:12, | 3957:23 | 3863:23 |
| 3784:23 | 3933:16 | respectively | 3866:1 |
| 3786:19 | 3965:1, 5 | 3823:11 | 3887:3 |
| 3790:11 | 3983:4 |  | 3899:10 |
| 3820:17 |  | respond | 3922:13 |
| 3821:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { equires } \\ & 3909: 17,22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3767: 6 \\ & 3769: 14 \end{aligned}$ | retai1 3858:9 |
| 3906:8 | requiring | respondent | Retailers |
| 3922:15,18,2 | 3905:15 | 3896:16 | 3764:14 |
| 2 3959:22 | research | 3973:16 | retained |
| 3960:16 | 3921:23 | 3974:17 | 3819:8 |
| 3984:6 | 3976:5 | response | retaining |
| requested | researchers | 3771:9 | 3904:5 |
| 3782:23 | 3786:7 | 3772:11 | return |
| 3784:12 | reserve | 3773:5 | 3841:13,18 |
| 3855:4 | 3798:3 | 3777:10 | 3904:20 |
| 3968:7 | 3799:6 | 3891:6 | 3933:16 |
| requesting | reserved | 3919:4 | 3937:25 |
| 3772:17,19 | 3798:15 | 3960:10,16 | 3939:4 |
| 3779:5 | residential | 3984:6 |  |
| 3782:4 | 3826:12,21,2 | responses | returns |
| 3905:13 | 2,25 | 3771:11 | 3898:10 |
| 3959:22 | 3827:4,15,18 | 3877:2 | 3933:24 |
| 3969:15 | 3828:1,23 | responsible | 3937:16 |
| requests | 3878:14 | 3897:25 | 3938:13 |
| 3786:11 | 3890:5 | 3921:4 |  |
| 3902:25 |  |  | revenue <br> 3767:3,22 |
| 3961:16 | $3930: 1$ | 3769:3 | 3779:13,16 |
| require | resource | 3770:8 | 3782:20,16 |
| 3898:9 | 3787:2 | 3771:11,17 | 3783:15 |
| required | 3804:3 | 3772:11 | 3788:15 |
| 3790:5 | 3856:12 | 3773:5 | 3791:14,19 |
| 3864:6 | 3857:7,9 | rest 3886:8 | 3792:8 |
| 3913:23 | 3858:2 | 3925:12 | 3800:8 |
| 3939:1 | 3862:4 |  | 3809:4 |
| requirement | 3891:21 | restrictions | 3819:20 |
| 3767:3,22 | resources | 3902:20 | 3837:10 |
| 3782:21 | 3763:17 | result | 3853:18,23 |
| 3783:15 | 3777: 6 | 3783:21 | 3893:21 |
| 3788:15 | 3786:19 | 3784:6 | 3895:5,18 |
| 3791:15,19 | 3844:18 | 3787:3 | 3897:4,11 |
| 3792:8 | 3845:3,4,5,9 | 3789:24,25 | 3936:5 |
| 3837:10 | ,13 3857:15 | 3827:9 | 3937:7 |
| 3842:8 | 3858:10 | 3855:4 | 3939:2 |
| 3853:18,23 | 3861:10 | 3858:9 | 3942:4 |
| requirements | respect | 3861:16 | 3957:6 |
| 3779:14,16 | 3772:23 | 3894:1, 4, 10, | 3961:18 |
| 3796:13 | 3818:2 | 12 3903:9 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3964:15 |
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| 3983:4 | rounds | 3814:24 | 3892:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| revenues | 3895:22 | 3816:16 | 3915:25 |
| 3810:16 | 3915:17 | 3822:2,18 | 3958:15 |
|  | RTO 3805:21 | 3866:18 | 3978:17 |
| $3825: 14$ | 3864:21 | 3869:9,20 | scheduled |
| review 3826:4 | RTOs 3865:1 | 3983:6,7,9,1 |  |
| 3917:11 | rule 3798:25 | 0 , | schedules |
| 3953:16 | 3915:15 | Rush's 3869:5 | 3765:8,11 |
| 3957:4 | 3961:9 |  | 3800:16 |
| 3961:2 | 3967:3 | Russ 3764:4 | 3800:16 |
| reviewed | rules $3838: 13,15$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RUSSELL } \\ & 3760: 15 \end{aligned}$ | scheduling 3775:22 |
| $3781: 4$ $3913: 3$ | $3838: 13,15$ $3839: 2$ |  | 3777:8,9 |
| 3961:5 | 3937:25 | S | 3778:18 |
| revised | 3939:1 | sa1e 3963:2 | 9 |
| 3928:9 | 3961:13 | sales 3810:18 | 3979:2, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { RFP 3786:25 } \\ 3787: 13 \end{gathered}$ | ruling | $\begin{aligned} & 3827: 4 \\ & 3849: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Scheper1e } \\ 3765: 12 \end{gathered}$ |
| Rigg 3785:23 | 3923:25 | salvage | school 3945:5 |
| rights | 3924:1, 8, 12, | 3788:9 | scope 3840:16 |
| 3806:23 | 15 3926:6 | sanctions | 3938:10,17 |
| 3807:1 | 3935:6 | 3964:22 | screen 3811:4 |
| 3897:3 | $3936: 4,15$ $3942: 19$ | Sand 3760:7 | screen 3811:4 |
| rise 3901:7 | 3962:16, 20,2 | Santa 3760:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { season } \\ & 3834: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| risk 3873:22 | 4 3963:7 | Sarah 3760:14 | seat 3960:6 |
| road 3805:18 | 3968:7,14 | 3761:3 | seat 3960.6 |
| 3862:13,25 | 3969:17,20 | 3763:24 | SEC 3788:7 |
| 3870:14 | 3973:23 | satisfying | second |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3873: 11 \\ & 3878: 18.21 \end{aligned}$ | rulings $3901: 4$ | $3933: 16$ | 3769:18,23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3878: 18,21 \\ & 3887: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 3901:4 | save 3893:12 | 3847:6 |
| robust 3865:3 | 3924:17 | savings | 3873:1 |
| rode 3876:25 | 3943:4,16 | 3871:25 | 3912:16 |
|  | 3960:15 | 3872:3 | 3924:5,18 |
| $3762: 16$ | 3961:3,17 | scenario | 3932:15,16 |
| rote 3839:3 | 3962:7 | 3,11,22,23,1 | 3936:16 |
|  | 3968:16,20 | 3852:1, 9,11, | 3944:15 |
| Rollison | run 3810:7 | 13,22 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3956:15 |
| 3774:17 | 3812:16 | 3877:14 | section |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3775: 3,12 \\ & 3789: 16 \end{aligned}$ | 3855:24 | scenarios | 3895:5,10 |
| 3789:16 | 3862:15 | 3850:23 | 3909:16,22 |
| room 3767:1 | 3863:14 | 3851:17 | 3933:8,21 |
| Rosa 3760:7 | 3873:22 | 3852:23 | 3935:2 3939 |
| Rose 3778:10 | 3804:15 | 3889:12,15 | 3939:2,25 |
| roughly | Rush | schedule | 3954:20 |
| 3808:13 | R771:12,23 | 3765:7,9 | 3955:13 |
| 3874:7 | 3776:4,7 | 3766:16 | 3956:9 |
| 3899:10 | 3799:15,19,2 | 3772:2 | 3964:21,24 |
| 3905:18 | 2,23 | 3775:24 | 3968:8 |
| 3909:6 | 3801:5,19,22 | 3777:14 | sections |
| rounded | 3811:21 | 3846:1,2 | 3939:3 |
| 3976:13 | 3812:8 | 3860:15,19 | 3950:2 |
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { securitizatio } \\ \text { n } 3804: 12 \end{gathered}$ | sending $3968: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3845: 24 \\ & 3848: 17,21,2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3951: 23 \\ & 3953: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sedalia | Senior | $3849: 4,5,10$, | $\begin{aligned} & 3957: 6 \\ & 3961: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3764:18 | 3758:19 | $3849: 4,5,10$, 13 | $\begin{aligned} & 3961: 18 \\ & 3964: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| seeing | 3907:16 |  | 3966:18 |
| 3799:14 | sense 3783:25 | serves $3805: 7$ $3815: 22$ | 3967:1 |
| 3824:6 | sent 3916:13 | 3815:22 | 3969:5 |
| 3843:7 | 3918:1 | service | 3971:9,12 |
| 3907:1 | 3968:11,13 | 3758:1, 12,16 | 3972:13 |
| 3934:6 | 3974:23 | 3761:5,8 | 3984:23 |
| 3951:8 | sentence | 3763:7 | services |
| 3960:23 | 3844:17 | 3779:6, 9,11, | services $3811: 22$ |
| seek 3894:19 |  | 16 |  |
| 3904:2 | 3955.23 | 3780:13,15,1 | 3846:19, |
| 3922:6 | sentiment | 3781:14, 15,1 | 3846:19, |
| 3928:20 | 3929:16,17,2 | 3781:14,15,1 |  |
| 3931:11 | 5 | 3782:4,8,15, | setting |
| 3976:22 | separate | 17,21 ${ }^{\text {a, }}$, | 3769:24 |
| seeking | 3766:11 | 3783:4,7,10, | 3795:3 18 |
| 3898:12 | 3779:16 | 19 3784:8 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3887:16,18 |
| 3904:5 | 3795:1 | 3787:4 | settled |
| seem 3836:14 | 3817:3 | 3791:13,21,2 | 3793:11 |
| 3859:4 | 3856:12 | 4 3792:6,13 | 3928:11 |
| seemed | 3923:7 | 3794:8,21,24 | settlement |
| 3912:20 | separately | 3804:18 | 3970:1 |
| seems 3836:11 | 3766:13 | 3835:8,15 | 3978:6 |
| 3845:18 | 3847:2 | 3836:5 |  |
| 3865:6,11 | 3856:14,21,2 | 3837:3 | several |
| 3874:15,17 | 4 3857:14 | 3840:19 | 3780:9 |
| 3929:25 | 3933:24 | 3842:8 | 3912:25 |
| 3930:3 | September | 3844:3 | 3913:4 |
| seen 3833:24 | 3922:18 | 3845:24 | 3918:24 |
| 3858:4 | 3928:9,15 | 3848:16,18 | severe |
| 3883:2 |  | $3849: 3,12,22$ 243850 | 3783:18 |
| $3936: 2$ $3956: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { erious } \\ & 3872: 21 \end{aligned}$ | ,24 3850:21 | 3856:2 |
| 3956:19 |  | 3853:8 | share 3780:8 |
| segment | serve 3786:14 $3789: 10$ | 3855:4 | 3782:3 |
| 3893:18 | 3789:10 | 3856:11 | 3794:18 |
| selected | 3795:12 | 3857:25 | 3796:16 |
| 3808:7 | 3805:4,16 | 3859:21,25 | 3858:9 |
| 3826:5 | 3818:5 | 3860:20 | 3879:22 |
| self- | 3835:17 | 3865:15 | 3903:24 |
| contained | 3850:2,3 | 3876:1 | 3904:8,17,21 |
| 3890:23 | 3856:14 | 38889: | 3905:6,8,11, |
| se11er | 3864:4,5 | 3893:21 | 17 3906:1 |
| 3963:8,21 | 3887:1, 25 | 3895:18 | 3909:18 |
| se11ing | 3891:19,24 | 3897:5,11 | 3914:4,12 |
| 3864:22 | 3924:12 | 3899:12 | 3922:7 |
| 3936:16 | 3959:22 | 3904:24 | 3923:8, 9,14 |
| 3937:9 | served | 39056: 5 | 3938:23 |
| send 3777:5 | 3779:7,8 | 3942:4 | 3945:20 |
| 3902:12 | 3794:9 | 3949:24 | 3946:1 |
|  | 3807:13 | 3950:3 | 3959:12 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 3967: 5 \\ & 3975: 4 \\ & 3976: 11,13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3827: 1 \\ \text { shown } 3878: 24 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sing1e } \\ & 3839: 16,19 \\ & 3860: 16,19,2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { sma11er } \\ 3821: 7 \\ 3837: 9 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| shared 3874:25 | shows 3834:1 | 3861:2, 3, 16 | Smith 3760:16 |
| $3874: 25$ shareholders | shuffle | 3881:4,14 | SNR 3760:2 |
| Sharet:21 | 3938:7,24 | 3890 | sold 3826:25 $3827: 2,3$ |
| shares | shy 3909:9 | sir 3834:23 | 3833:22 |
| 3941:15 | Sibley 3847:7 | 3953:4 | 3834:3,8,11 |
| 3953:25 | 3850:6,8,13 | 3954:4,16 | solution |
| 3958:4 | 3871:9,12 | 3955:14 | $3789: 9$ |
| 3975:8 | Sibley's | 3957:1 | somebody |
| sharing $3784: 20$ | 3887:21 | 3959:21 | 3777:3 |
| 3785:20 | signals | 3965:6 | 3873:24 |
| 3786:13 | 3812:1 | sit 3830:25 | somebody's |
| $3791: 23$ $3792: 2$ | signatures | site 3788:23 | 38 |
| $\text { Shayla } 37$ | 3940:11 | 3806:22 | $\begin{gathered} \text { someday } \\ 3839: 23 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3764:11 | signed 3895:7 | situation | somehow |
| sheet 3857:21 | significant | 3924:13 | 3969:24 |
| sheets | 3780:12 | 3943:8 | someone |
| 3826:11 | 3809:13 | 3977:18 | 3902:12 |
| 3830:9 | 3810:5,9,25 | six | sometime |
| Sherwood | 3813:5 | 3928:16,17 | 3911:7 |
| 3879:6 | 3837:12 | size 3874:7 | 3978:7 |
| she's 3767:23 | 3927:16 | sizes 3812:8 | somewhat |
| 3801:6 |  | 3837:8 | 3791:17 |
| 3806:25 | similar | SJLP 3857:8 | somewhere |
| 3908:18 | 3779:20 | SJLP 3857:8 | 3879:22 |
| shift 3805:22 | 3783:111 | $\begin{gathered} \text { skip } \\ 3955: 12 \end{gathered}$ | sorry 3766:12 |
| 3815:23 | 3829:16 |  | 3775:4 |
| 3877:11 | 3904:16 | sky 3878:23 | 3826:18 |
| shifted | 3905:14 | 3879:1 | 3831:16 |
| 3821:1 | 3922:7 | skyrocket | 3838: 6 |
| shock 3872:22 | 3927:13 | 3819:25 | 3846:22 |
| short 3841:12 | 3931:12 | skyrocketing | 3852:18 |
| 3862:13 | simi | 3802:12 | 3867:18 |
| shorten | simila | slack 3761:4 | 3880:7 |
| 3833:19 | 3918:8 | 3763:9,10 | 3882:22 |
| shorter |  | 3776:9,15,21 | 3899:23 |
| 3796:18 | simple | 3777:1,5 | 3916:6,8 |
| shortly | 3834:4 | slides | 3930:9 |
| 3802:14 | 3872:5 |  | 3935:21 |
| 3944:19 | 3944:17 | slightly | 3956:13 |
| short-term | imply 3772:9 | 3785:9 | 3957:14 |
| 3786:20 | 3783:19 | slip 3906:8 | 3964:10 |
| 3788:18 | 3806:5 | sma11 3837:18 | 3970:18 |
| 3878:19 | 3821:17 | 3921:16,17,2 | 3975:6 |
| showed | 3827:3 |  | sort 3804 |
| S787:2,5 | 3839:1 | 3925:3,4,5,1 | 3805:20,21 |
| showing | 3899:15 | 8,22 | 3837:13 |
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| 3864:20,22 | speculates | 3869:22,25 | 3856:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3865:5,6,11 | 3783:19 | 3870:7,14,15 | 3857:5,13 |
| $3906: 6$ | speculation | 3871:10,11,2 | 3860:18 |
|  | 3807:3 | 0 3872:13 | 3862:2, |
| sought | 3829:21 | 3873:9 | 3866:4 |
| 3903:13,16,2 | 3973:24 | 3874:5,7,17 | 3870:9 |
| 4 3904:16 | spent 3780:9 | 3875:7,10,14 | 3875:6 |
| 3936:15 | spent $3975: 24$ | 3876:1 | 3877:7 |
| sound 3909:19 | sphere | 3878:16 | 3881:22 |
| sounded | 3948:19 | 3879:7,10,13 | 3882:10,15 |
| 3906: 6 |  | 3884:10,18 | 3883:16 |
| sounds 3859:5 | split 3865:17 3883:11 | 3887:2,4,24 | 3885:22 |
| 3906:7 | 3884:8 | staff | 3889:8,1 |
|  | spot 3849:10 | 3761:2,8 | 3897:7,18 |
| 3895:18 | SPP | 3763:3,6 | 3898:11 |
| sources | 3837:13,16,1 | 3771:13 | 3899:8 |
| 3786:22 | $93869: 16{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3776:6,8 | 3901:4 |
| 3787:8 | 3885:5 | 3777:11 | 3902:16,17 |
| South 3787:21 | spread | 3779:15 | 3903:11 |
| 3788:17,23,2 | 3925:11 | 3781:8 | 3905:13,20 |
| 5 3792:25 |  | 3782:2,5 | 3915:3 |
| 3794:15 | spring 3870:5 | 3783:5,12,13 | 3917:3 22 |
| 3867:1 | Sprint | ,18 3784:22 | 3918:15,19 |
| 3875:4 | 3943:12 | 3785:4,6,13 | 3920:10,19 |
| 3876:14 |  | 3786:14, 19 | 3928:23 |
| 3888:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { quadron } \\ & 3953: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 3787:17,19,2 | 3929:12 |
| Southern |  | 3788:15,20 | 3930:22 |
| 3759:13 | St 3763:16 | 3789:2, | 3949:15 |
| 3763:21 | 3783:4,23 | 3791:18 | 3951:10 |
| sparse | 3784:2' | 3793:1,18,22 | 3959:22 |
| 3803:25 | 3794:1,3,6 | 3794:11 | $3966: 15,16,2$ |
| speak 3919:11 | 3795:8,20,23 | 3795:15,20 | 3969:1, |
| 3927:24 | 3806:18 | 3796:14 | 15,25 |
| speaking | 3813:3 | 3798:15 | 3970:5,19 |
| 3976:15 | 3814:16 | 3801:14 | 3972:23 |
| specific | 3819:7 | 3807:4 | 3984:23 6 |
| 3767:23 | 3821:2,6 | 3808:21 | 3985:2,6 |
| 3807:12 | 3836:3,4,17, | 3809:7 | Staff's |
| 3895:4 | 18 3838:22 | 3811:17 | 377 |
| 3903:21 | 3844:18,19,2 | 3824:11,15 | 3782:8,9,20 |
| 3924:13 |  | 3828:12 | 3783:2 |
| 3953:25 | 3845:2,4,9,1 | 3835:1 | 3785:10 |
|  | 0,22 3846:16 | 3836:2 | 3787:16 |
| specificalty | 3847:15 | 3838:2,8,14, | 3788:5,20 |
| 3762:9 | 3848:8,16,18 | 25 3841:22 | 3791:14,20 |
| 3764:12 | , 21 | 3842:8,20 | 3792:8,12 |
| 3776:12 | 3849:2,11,13 | 3843:2,15 | 3796:5,22 |
| 3921:3 | ,21 3850:1,5 | 3844:17 | 3817:12 |
| 3960:12 | 3860:6 | 3845:8 | 3820:22 |
| 3962:15 | 3862:16,21 | 3850:22 | 3836:11 |
| 3964:5 | 3863:5,12,23 | 3851:7 | 3837:1,6 |
| 3968:4 | 3864:8 | 3853:1,15,21 | 3839:3 |
| speculate | 3866:6,22 | 3854:6 | 3840:12,23 |
| 3929:10 | 3867:8,25 | 3855:2,13,15 | 3841:13 |
|  | 3868:13,21 | ,20,21 | 3844:2,9,25 |
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| 3853:7,9,15 | 3968:2 | station | stockyard |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3855:5,7 | state 3758:2 | 3794:15 | 3879:13 |
| 3856:3,11 | 3783:12 | 3795:22 | stop 3774:3 |
| 3857:6 385814 | 3799:3,21 | status 3920:9 | Street |
| 3859:1 | 3800:9 | 3928:7 | 3759:16 |
| 3860:25 | 3817:24, 25 | statute | 3760:2,16 |
| 3861:3 | 3823:3 ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ | 3896:2 | 3761:6,10 |
| 3862:2 | 3831:5 | 3964:2 | 3831:8 |
| 3863:4 | 3856:12 | 3965:4 | stricken |
| 3865:25 | 3857:5 | statutes | 3771:24 |
| 3866:1 | 3860:14 | 3894:2 | 3772:18 |
| 3870:17 | 3865:22 | stay 3878:25 | strike |
| 3873:15 | 3905:3 | stay 3878.25 | 3771:17 |
| $3877: 14$ $3880: 7$ | 3907:10 | stayed | 3772:9 |
| 3881:19 | 3933:21 | 3862:21 | 3773:6,9 |
| 3886:6 | 3958:19 | steady 3866 | 3906:14 |
| 3888:22 | 3962:22 | Steiner | strong |
| 3890:20 | 3971:4 | 3759:20 | 3927:11 |
| 3949:6,10 | 3980:3 | 3762:17 | 3931:2 |
| 3969:7,18 | stated | 3765:15,19 | stronger |
| 3981:20 | stated | 3776:3,17 | 3926:20 |
| stake 3909:2 | 3770:3,8 | 3841:16,18 | 3931:5 |
| stand 3771:23 | 3794:23 | 3972:12,16 | strongly |
| 3776:4 | 3798:24 | 3977:20,25 | 3897:21 |
| 3784:3 | 3831:15 | 3978:3,5,10 | 3927:4,6 |
| 3807:2 | 3832:16 |  | structure |
| 3829:11 | 3891:8 | $3917: 7$ | 3840:3 |
| 3849:13 | 3914:12 |  | 3861:3 |
| 3851:19,24 | 3958:23 | stemming | 3864:21 |
| 3852:2,3,7,1 | 3963:23 | 3769:23 | 3921:5 |
| 4,20 | 3965:25 | 3770:25 | 3941:6 |
| 3874:22,24 | statement | step 3837:4,5 |  |
| 3908:19 | 3772:24 | 3892:9 | structures |
| 3954:14 | 3778:21 | 3949:2 | 3861:15 |
| 3962:17 | 3787:17 | 3970:17 | struggling |
| stand-alone | 3798:3,21 | 3977:11 | 3872:20 |
| 3796:12 | 3856:17 | Stephen | Stuart 3759:2 |
| standard | 3883:4 | 3913:2 | 3764:21 |
| 3924:16 | 3893:15 | steps 3835:11 | studies |
| start 3762:14 | statements | STEVE 3761 | 3856:12 |
| 3826:20 | $3774: 14$ $3778: 19$ |  | stuff 3873:24 |
| 3833:12 | 3799:12 | stick 3766:7 |  |
| 3892:15 | 3906:25 | stipulate | sub $3896: 3$ $3909: 16,22$ |
| 3902:24 | 3906:25 | 3966:17 |  |
| 3914:24 | states 3760:6 | 3969:25 | subchapter |
| 3978:12 | 3769:9 | 3970:6 | 3933:19 |
| started | 3806:6 | stipulated | 3955:2,7,10 |
| 3774:14 | 3853:9,15 | 3966:23 | subdivision |
| 3802:2 | 3923:4 | stipulation | 3904:14 |
| 3890:9 | 3945:17,19 | $3963: 9$ | subject |
| starting | 3953:10'19 | 3977:23 | 3771:13 |
| 3803:11 | 3954:21 | stipulations | submit |
| starts | 3955:17 | 3969:24 | 3895:20 |
| 3955:14 | 3956:15 | 3970:5 | submitted |
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| 3777:15 | 3826:10 | 3843:11 | 3949:16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3928:14 | 3863:21 | 3851:4 | 3970:24 |
| 3940:5 | Sugar 3760:7 | 3853:8 | 3980:5 |
| 3957:18 | suggesting | 3882:17 | system |
| Subsection | suggesting | 3884:16 | 3802:23 |
| 3933:20 | 3836:16 | 3913:9 | 3827:20 |
| subsequent | 3878:14 | 3914:25 | 3856:19 |
| 3906:17 |  | 3916:1 | systems |
| 3922:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { uggest1on } \\ & 3766: 10,16 \end{aligned}$ | 3919:6 | 3829:12 |
| 3926:6,16 |  | 3920:6 |  |
| 3929:3 |  | 3922:4 | T |
| 3944:14,16 | 3759:3,7,16 | 3924:11 | tags 3850:10 |
| subsequently | sum 3810:21 | 3938:25 | taking 3765:5 |
| 3931:10 | 3821:13,19 | 3955:8 | 3854:7 |
| subsidiaries | summer 3870:5 | surprised | $3862: 9$ $3878: 19$ |
| 3923:5 | 3895:7 | 3859:7 | talk 3775:15 |
| 3938:8,23 | Summit | surrebuttal | $3789: 15$ |
| 3939:6 | 3763:14 | 3765:12 | 3806:2 |
| 3967:4 | sums 3834:19 | 3772:4 | 3876:4 |
| subsidiary | sums 3834.19 | 3799:24 | 3881:23 |
| 3923:8 | superior | 3823:11 | 3882:15 |
| 3937:23 | 3870:18 | 3831:12,20,2 | 3889:12 |
| substantial | supervision | 3 3842:11,22 | 3952:13 |
| 3780:5,24 | 3950:13,14 | 3843:3 | talked |
| 3813:7 | suppliers | 3950:3,7,9 | 3804:23 |
| 3873:14,17 | 3786:21 | 3954:3, | 3807:5 |
| 3928:6 | supp1y | 3958:16,22 | 3813:10 |
| 3929:19 | 3786:19 | 3959:2,22 | 3814:16 |
| substantially |  | 3969:20 | 3880:19 |
| 3782:3 | upport | 3971:18,22 | 3881:22 |
| 3792:12 |  | 3972:18 | 3892:24 |
| 3838:3 | supported | 3973:14 | 3959:24 |
| 3855:3,18 | 3796:8 | 3975:12 | talking |
| Subtitle | 3873:17 | 3983:10,15,1 | 3804:2,7 |
| 3955:2 | supports | 6,21 | 3808:13 |
|  | 3791:13 | 3984:9,12 | 3812:20 |
| succeeding $3944: 3$ | 3792:7 | 3985:9,13,16 | 3816:7, 8, 20 |
|  | supposed | ,22,23,25 | 3817:2 |
| 3773:1 | 3836:3,7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Susan } 3760: 1 \\ & 2767.17 \end{aligned}$ | 3860:4 |
| 3902:9 | 3948:1 |  | 3865:8,10 |
| 3922:17 | sure 3766:7 | stained | 3866:13,14,1 |
| 3931:7,9 | 3776:23 | 39 | 8 3869:21 |
| 3939:11 | 3778:12 | Swearengen | 3872:2 |
| 3976:2 | 3800:21 | 3760:10,11 | 3877:25 |
|  | 3807:23 | 3764:4 | 3881:16 |
| $3975: 2$ | 3808:14 | switch | 3882:2 |
|  | 3813:14 | 3866:16 | 3894:22 |
| sudden | 3814:23 |  | 3895:4 |
| 3875:11,22 | 3816:23 | sworn 3799:17 | 3968:25 |
|  | 3819:20 | 3822:23 | 3970:8 |
| 3878:15 | 3822:7 | 3831:1 | talks 38 |
| sue 3873:24 | 3832:22 | 3892:10 | 3909:20 |
| sufficient | 3836:24 | 3907:4 | tariff |
| sufficient | 3840:4,10 | 3944:9 | 3794:24 |
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| 3835:7,13 | 3954:7 | tenants | 3898:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3838:10 | 3961:25 | 3932:18,19 | testifies |
| 3860:16,19,2 | 3962:3,7,9 | 3941:12 | 3785:24 |
| 4 3861:2,16 | 3963:6,9,17, | 3945:5,11,25 | 3799:19 |
| 3881:14 | 25 3964:1 | 3953:21 | 3823:1 |
| 3890:2,20 | 3965:3,11,13 | 3956:16 | 3831:3 |
| tariffed | , 19 $966: 7,13,18$ | tendency | 3842:2 |
| 3838:5 | 3966:7,13,18 | 3863:13 | 3907:8 |
| tariffs | 3968:6,22 | tender | 3949:19 |
| 3762:5 | 3975:5,15,16 | 3800:25 | 3971:2 |
| 3772:16 | ,17 | 3823:23 | testimonies |
| 3797:12,13 | 3976:5,14 | 3832:15 | 3823:14 |
| 3839:1 | 3977:18 | 3908:16 | testimony |
| 3855:4,19 | taxable | 3951:13 | 3765:8,10,12 |
| 3864:17 | axable $3933: 13$ | 3973:1 | ,17,25,10,12 |
| 3865:23 | 3955:19 | ten-minute | 3766:2,23 |
| 3866:1 | taxes 3897:25 | 3949:10 | 3767:3,20,22 |
| $\operatorname{tax}_{3789.21,23}$ | $3900: 10$ | term 3783:20 | ,24 $768.1,22$ |
| 3789:21,23 | 3907:16 | 3796:18,20 | 3768:1,2,22 |
| 3790:1, 2, 3,1 | 3923:10 | 3805:17, | 3769:2,6,14, |
| 3893:19, 25 | 3927:10 | 3811:21 | 20 |
| 3894:5,6,8,9 | 3932:25 | 3855:22 | 4 |
| ,13,20,23 | 3934:1 | 3862:14 | 3771:11,12, |
| 3895:9,23 | 3963:5 | 3873:18 | 4,16,17,18, 2 |
| 3896:12 | 3966:24 | terminate | 2,23 |
| 3897:9,16 | taxing | 3769:23 | 3772:1,2,4,9 |
| 3898:8,10 | 3901:16 | terminated | ,11,17,21 |
| 3899:1,11 | taxpayer | 3769:12,13 | 3773:4,6,7,8 |
| 3900:21,23 | taxpa:20 | 3770:25, | ,10,12,13 |
| 3901:23 | 3899:2 |  | 3776:13,18,2 |
| 3902:4,21 | 3935:16 | termination 3769:13 | 0 3798:14 |
| 3903:14,17,2 | 3936:9 |  | 3799:25 |
| 5 | 3940:21 | terms 3765:23 | 3800:7,13 |
| 3904:9,13,15 | 3943:8 | 3775:17 | 3807:5 |
| ,17,20,22,23 | 3962:4,23 | 3801:23 | 3818:23 |
| 3905:1,10,12 | 3964:25 | 3808:8 | 3820:25 |
| ,17,20 | 3968:7 | 3812:9 | 3823:8 |
| 3906:1 |  | 3815:6 | 3831:11,15 |
| 3910:3,16,19 | taxpayers | 3829:8 | 3832:18 |
| 3911:10 | 3943:5 | 3835:13 | 3841:9 |
| 3912:3,7,11 | 3961:16 | 3966:11 | 3842:6,10,12 |
| 3913:14,20 | 3962:7,13 |  | ,16,21,22,24 |
| 3921:24 | 3969:5 | 3782:18 | 3843:3 |
| 3922:24 | technology |  | 3857:20 |
| 3923:2,4,6,7 | 3905:4 | territory | 3858:6,17,19 |
| , 9,10 |  | 3779:8 3 3794:22,24 | 3859:23 |
| 3927:20 | 3895:2 | 3794:22,24 | 3883:24 |
| 3933:22 | 3895:2 | 3838:5,11 | 3891:15 |
| 3934:23 | temporally | 3849:24 | 3900:20,25 |
| 3936:5,6,8,1 | 3902:6 | 3860:20 | 3901:2 |
|  |  | Terry 3913:3 | 3902:16 |
| 3937:18,23,2 | $3917: 11$ | test 3772:16 | 3907:18,21,2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 3938: 7,11,12 \end{aligned}$ | ten 3845:3,4 | $\begin{aligned} \text { test } 3772: 16 \\ 3905: 19,21 \end{aligned}$ | 5 3923:24, ${ }^{5}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3938: 7,11,12 \\ & , 243940: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 3854:12 | 3973:11 | 3923:24 |
| 3944:3,5,17 | tenancy | testified | 3950:3,12,17 |
| 3952:19 | 3945:7 | 3858:8 | 3958:16 |
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| 3959:24 | 3917:14 | 3858:22,24 | thereafter |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3965:24 | 3924:19,21 | 3859:17 | 3903:23 |
| 3966:3,23 | 3930:19 | 3860:3,13,22 | 3944:19 |
| 3969:25 | 3931:15 | 3861:18 | 3980:7 |
| 3971:16,25 | 3932:7 | 3864:22 | Therefore |
| 3972:16 | 3933:20 | 3865:5 | 3788:11 |
| 3973:7,14 | 3935:24 | 3867:3,5 | 3790:20 |
| 3975:13 | 3943:21 | 3868:4,16,22 | 3914:8 |
| 3977:11 | 3948:4,12,24 | ,23,25 | therein |
| 3978:24 | 3949:3 | 3869:1,12 | therein |
| 3980:4,6 | 3952:13 | 3870:3 | 3956:17 |
| 3983:6,7,9,1 | 3956:3 | 3872:5 | there's |
| 0,12,13,15,1 | 3958:14 | 3873:6,18 | 3765:9 |
| 6,18,19,21 | 3960:6 | 3874:19 | 3776:15 |
| 3984:7,9,10, | 3967: 8,9 | 3876:9,11 | 3777:3 |
| 12,21 | 3970:14,16,2 | 3879:5 | 3780:24 |
| 3985:7, 9,11, | 1,25 3973:5 | 3880:15 | 3785:24 |
| 13,14,16,20, | 3977:9 | 3881:10,17,2 | 3792:15 |
| 22,23,25 | that's 3768:3 | 1 3882:18 | 3793:3 |
| testimony's | 3772:25 | 3883:14 | 3819:4 |
| 3772:14 | 3773:24 | 3884:4,16, 20 | 3820:15 |
| Texas 3825:15 | 3776:17 | 38879:1,11 | 3840:4 |
|  | 3783:10 | 3891:4, 20, 21 | 3847:22,23 |
| 3762:15,21 | $3791: 9$ $3793: 15$ | 3892:6,8,17, | 3849:9 |
| 3763:2,13 | 3797:19 | 20 3894:22 | 3867:6 |
| 3764:25 | 3799:7,9,15 | 3896:22 | 3872:20 |
| 3765:1 | 3800:11 | 3898:2,14 | 3873:19 |
| 3766:20,21 | 3803:7 | 3899:18 | 3874:10,11,1 |
| 3768:10,24 | 3804:15,19 | 3900:11,18 | 3 3882:6,7 |
| 3774:9 | 3805:12,13 | 3903:8 | 3884:4,13 |
| 3778:16 | 3806:8,12 | 3911:6 | 3887:4 |
| 3779:1 | 3807:10 | 3913:15 | 3889:25 |
| 3793:16,17 | 3809:21,23 | 3914:1,6 | 3891:17 |
| 3796:24,25 | 3810:5 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3915:10 | 3919:8 |
| 3797:21,22 | 3812:4 | 3924:16 | 3948:13 |
| 3812:6 | 3813:11,16,2 | 3926:13 | thereto |
| 3816:12 | 1,23 3814:13 | 3934:11 | thereto |
| 3821:25 | 3816:5,19 | 3935:15 |  |
| 3822:18,24 | 3817:1,11 | 3938:9 | they'd 3966:8 |
| 3824:12 | 3818:18 | 3940:9 | 3972:5 |
| 3830:17,18 | 3819:1 | 3943:19 | they'11 |
| 3833:18 | 3821:23,24,2 | 3945:16 | 3789:16 |
| 3834:23 | 5 3822:19 | 3946:3 | 3906:9 |
| 3835:2 | 3823:8 | 3951:24 | they're |
| 3837:21,23 | 3830:17,19 | 3953:5,18 | they're |
| 3839:7 | 3831:21, | 3958:13 | 3776:23 |
| 3841:7,8,25 | 3834:16,23 | 3959:14 | 3777:3 |
| 3843:22 | 3837:17,20 | 3960:21 | 3809:17 |
| 3861:18,19 | 3839:17,20 | 3963:19 | 3810:7 |
| 3876:18 | 3841:6,9,16 | 3965:18 | 3817:7 |
| 3880:5,6 | 3842:8,10,12 | 3966:10 | 3818:2 |
| 3882:18,20 | ,20 3844:4 | 3972:16 | 3819:5 |
| 3885:23 | 3849:10 | 3977: 6 | 3829:15 |
| 3892:8 | 3850:4,8 |  | 3834:18 |
| 3899:18,20 | 3851:7,20,25 | $3925: 18$ | 3850:11 |
| 3906:2,21,23 | 3853:20 |  | 3864:12 |
| ,24 3907:5,7 | 3854:6,19 | $3810: 23$ | 3865:16 |
| 3916:7 | 3856:16 |  | 3867:5,15 |
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| 3868:5 | 3809:19 | tough 3783:13 | 3873:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3874:23,24 | 3813:4 | 3853:16 | true 3773:2 |
| 3881:11 | 3817:22 | toward | 3805:24 |
| 3886:20 | 3824:23 | 3860:21 | 3807:10 |
| 3888:5 | 3832:4 | 3863:13 | 3834:10,16 |
| 3890:15,17,2 | 3842:24 | 3865:24 | 3849:19, |
| 3 3938:4 | 3892:15,16,1 | 3959:18 | 3856:17 |
| they 've | 7,24 3895:3 |  | 3858:1 |
| 3876:5 | 3898:20 | 3835:12 | 3859:1 |
| 3878:11 | 3899:30 | 3910:24 | 3910:6,9 |
| 3887:6 | 3968:18 | 3911:1 | 3914:2 |
| 3889:2 | 3971:25 | 3930:1 | 3922:12 |
| thick 3964:19 | 3972:3 | transcript | 3954:11 |
| third 3770:1 | Todd 3759:10 | 3758:4 | 3965:12, 20 |
| 3863:24 | 3763:20 | 3767:17 | 3966:20 |
| 3881:9 |  | 3946:5 | 3972:5 |
| 3964:18 | 3774:15 | 3948:23 | 3975:1 |
| third-party | 3776:25 | transfer | Trued-up |
| 3786:21 | 3778:13 | 3936:20 | 3915:10 |
| Thompson | 3893:12 | 396 | True-up |
| 3761:2 | 3977:21 | transferred | 3797:17 |
| 3763:5 | 3978:16 | 3870:13 | 3915:13 |
| 3981:22 | 3979:5 | transmission |  |
| thorny | tool 3952:5,7 | 3787:4 | 3801:25 |
| 3872:14 | tools 3962:8 | 3864:23 | 3805:2 |
| thoughts | top 3820:8 | 3865:8,11 | 3807:23 |
| 3886:6,7 | 3846:14 | 3890:24 | 3816:25 |
| throughout | 3858:21 | trave1 | 3819:19,20 |
| 3779:5 | 3868:14 | 3778:11 | 3838:7 |
| 3794:24 | 3917:7 | 3890:25 | 3839:18 |
| 3835:8 | 3918:9,25 | Treasury | 3882:7 |
| 3838:5,10 | 3934:22 | 3894:3 | trying |
| 3840:3,18 | 3941:23 | 3900:23 | 3805:13 |
| 3849:23 | 3958:1,3 | 3902:25 | 3810:19 |
| 3866:17 | 3964:15 | 3933:17 | 3816:17,23 |
| 3921:8 | topic 3790:14 | treat 3817:9 | 3818:9,16 |
| 3926:5 | tortured | treat 3870:21 | 3839:17 |
| throw 3882:23 | 3788:25 | 3881:20 | 3882:3 |
| thus7y 3900:6 | total 3782:23 | 3933:24 | 3890:14 |
| tied 3807:13 | 3820:10,13 | 3943:7 | 3916:21 |
| TIGER 3758:23 | 3821:18,24 | treated | 3974:1 |
|  | 3826:23 | 3803:14 | turbin |
| Tim | 3827:2,4 | 3890:15 | 3786:23 |
| 3799:19,22,2 | 3834:7,20 | 3932:17 |  |
| 3 3981:4 | 3837:10 | treating | turbines |
| 3983:6, 7, 9,1 | 3854:25 | 3848:3 | 3787:20 |
| 0 | 3855:14 |  | 3788:10,17,2 |
| titles 3895:8 | 3877:15 | treatment | 2,23 |
|  | 3903:15,20 | 3928:20 | 3789:1,3 |
| today 3767:8 | 3911:2,8 | 3933:1,3,4 |  |
| 3781:12 | 3925:16,17,2 | tried 3802:18 | turn 3845:17 |
| 3792:17 | 3 | 3863:8 | 3851:14 |
| 3800:14 |  | 3874:5 | 3853:7 |
| 3803:12,23 | touched | 3977:20 | 3856:10 |
| 3805:19 |  | trouble | 3932:22 |
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| 3934:14 | uncertainty | 3911:12 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3940:14 | 3910:25 | 3931:4 | 3849:4,5,17 |
| 3941:2 | 3911:12 | undertaken | 3866:24 |
| 3954:16 | uncommitted | $3898: 25$ | 3870:23 |
| 3956:12 | 3966:1 | underwriters | 3886:14 |
| $\text { 3957: } 21$ | understand | underwriters $3786: 6$ | 3887:18,22 |
| turnaround 3803:5 | 3787:17 | undivided | ,11,12,15,16 |
| turned | 3788:20 | 3932:21 | 3889:3 |
| 3802:17 | 3803:11 | 3941:13 | universe |
|  | 3808:14 | 3945:14 | 3868:24 |
| turning | 3809:9 | 3953:22 | 3869:1 |
| 3791:12 | 3814:13 | 3956:16 | un1awfu1 |
| 3792:6 | 3838:6 | unfair | 3797:14 |
| 3853:14 | 3845:7 | 3771:24 | unless |
| twice 3853:4 | 3865:12,19 | uniform | 3774:10 |
| 3877:24 | 3868:13,16 | 3794:23 | 3799:5 |
| type | 3869:5 | 3835:7 |  |
| 3827:8,22 | 3873:7,18 | 3838:10 | unneeded |
| 3870:6 | 3878:5 | 3839:12 | 3809:21 |
| 3889:6 | 3895:3 | 3840:2,18 | unreasonable |
| 3952:25 | 3900:13 | unifying | 3859:4 |
| typewriting | 3901:10 | 3835:12 | unringing |
| 3980:7 | 3928:24 | Union 3759:13 | 3948:11,18 |
| typical1y | 3929:13,16,1 | 3763:21,23,2 | unsuccessfu1 |
| 3827:25 | 7,24 3930:16 | 5 | 3773:2 |
| 3890:14 | 3935:16 | unit 3781:5 | unsure |
|  | 3951:22 | 3786:24 | 3910:23 |
| U | 3953 | 3788:13 | unu |
| Uh-huh | 3973:14 | 3803:14 | unused |
| 3802:6,25 | 3975:14 | 3814:17 | updated |
| 3804:22 | understanding | 3815:6 | 3973:13 |
| 3805:5,8 | 3776:9 | 3846:19 | upgrade |
| 3806:15,20,2 | 3777:24 | 3847:10 | 3781:6 |
| 4 3810:24 | 3793:10 | 3866:24 |  |
| 3862:5,8 | 3816:3,10 | 3870:22 | upgrades |
| 3883:8, | 3841:2 | 3886:11 | 3780:25 |
| 3885:13 | 3845:19,20,2 | 3887:25 | 3781:2 |
| 3901:18 | 2 3846:25 | 3911:3,8 | upon 3781:15 |
|  | 3854:23 | 3932:1,12 | 3783:3,18 |
| ultimate | 3855:1,25 | 3941:20 | 3784:1,7 |
| 3927:15 | 3869:20 | 3953:14 | 3785:2 |
| 3927:1 | 3885:11 |  | 3845:2,13 |
| u7timately | 3897:5 | $3794: 1,22$ | 3869:24 |
| 3772:24 | 3905:16 | 3838:23 | 3901:22 |
| 3773:2 | 3906:10 | 3833:16 | 3934:20 |
| 3851:7 | 3913:19,24 | 3953:10 | 3943:15 |
| 3887:13 | 3914:3 | 3953:10 | 3959:22 |
| 3892:1 | 3928:10 | units | 3962:11 |
| 3895:12 | 3956:5 | 3781:1,2 |  |
| 3899:6 | 3974:7,8 | 3794:20 | urge 3773:8 |
| 3912:1,18 |  | 3795:12 | 3784:9 |
| 3926:22 | understood 37679 | 3845:23 | 3789:15 |
| 3927:15 |  | 3846:17,23 | usage 3815:7 |
| 3931:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 3869: 6 \\ & 3877: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 3847:3,19 | 3826:12,22,2 |
| 3943:12 | 3880:11 | 3848:17,21,2 | 3 |
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| ut 3890:4 | 3895:8 | VP 3913:1 | week 3762:10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UtiliCorp 3794:1,22 | various $3781: 19$ |  | 3776:5,11 3793:23,25 |
| 3813:18 | venture | $\frac{\text { Wagner }}{}$ | 3797:9 |
| 3838:23 | 3930:4 | 3764:16 | 3978:8 |
| 3846:15 | 3931:23 |  | Weekly |
| 3860:7 | 3933:13 | wait 3798:16 3882: 6 | 3948:8,9 |
| 3882:10 | 3955:18 |  | weeks 3762:8 |
| utilities 3865:14 | 3956:2 versa 3821:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { waiting } \\ & 3775: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 3779:24 |
| 3874:22 | versions | waive 3775:10 | week's $3778: 23$ |
| 3890:2,11,19 | 3823:10 | waived 3799:5 |  |
| utility | 3832:18 | waiving | weighted $3809: 17$ |
| 3794:9 | 3951:5 | 3774:19 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3796: 12 \\ & 3809: 16,20 \end{aligned}$ | versus | 3978:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { elcome } \\ & 3778: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3821:3 | 3810:16 | warehouse | we'11 3762:12 |
| 3836:13 |  | 3952:5,7 | 3767:9 |
| 3851:19,24 | Vice 3821:5 | Warren | 3798:16 |
| 3852:2,4,21 | vice-versa | 3776:16 | 3833:12 |
| 3865:12 | 3870:18 | Warren's | 3864:25 |
| 3885:7 | 3880:25 | 3776:13,20 | 3903:6 |
| 3894:15 | victor 3976:7 | wasn't | 3949:11 |
| 3895:13 | view 3890:21 | 3766:16 | 3978:8,12 |
| 3936:10,15,1 |  | 3775:8 |  |
| 6,17,18,21 | 3904:7 | 3777:24 | we re 3762:13 $3799: 10$ |
| 3937:9,10,11 |  | 3793:2 | 3808:12 |
| 3952:22 | V101ation $3789: 24,25$ | 3814:5 | 3809:1 |
| 3963:2, 3, 8,1 | 3789:24,25 | 3832:23 | 3811:12 |
| 0 3965:2 | 37904:134 | 3835:16 | 3816:23 |
| 3971:10 | 3894:2,4 | 3875:20 | 3818:9 |
|  | 3897:12 | 3883:22 | 3821:15,24 |
| V | 3898:4,6 | 3910:13 | 3826:15, |
| va11ey | 3899:17 | 3925:19 | 3840:15 |
| 3876:24 | 3903:9, | 3927:22 | 3841:20 |
| valuable | 3913:12 | 3944:13 | 3859:24 |
| 3862:4 | 3914:8 |  | 3866:12,14 |
| valuation | 3926:9 | water 3872:15 | 3870:4 |
| 3788:5,6,11 | 3928:5 | 3 3891:4 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3873:15 |
| value | 3936:23 | ays 3770: | 3877:25 |
| 3787:6,7,12 | 3937:3, 5,13 | 3915:22 | 3881:9 |
| 3788:9,12 | 3961:8,13 | WD 3770 | 3882:13,14 |
| 3819:19 | 3963:12,14,1 | WD 3770: | 3892:13 |
| 3900:16 | 8 3964:23 | weath 3776:4 | 3894:22 |
| 3963:25 | 3965:12,18 | weatherizatio | 3895:4 |
| valued | 3966:6,12,20 | n 3775:24 | 3902:18,21 |
| 3789:13 | 3969:2,8 | 3776:5,10 | 3914:25 |
| variable | violations | we'd 3774:23 | 3979:5 |
| 3803:7 | 3961:20 | 3860:21 |  |
| 3809:18,22,2 | Volume 3758:8 | 3892:19 | west 3891:3 |
| 4 3866:16 | 3946:6 | 3893:1 | Western |
| 3891:17 | voluntarily | 3902:8 | 3770:6,21 |
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| we've 3762:7 | 3816:2 | 3775:23 | 3822:20,21,2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3805:12 | 3818:13 | 3776:1 | 3 3823:23 |
| 3820:9,16 | 3839:12 | 3777:9,24 | 3825:19 |
| 3831:22 | 3840:17,21 | 3778:3,7 | 3829:24 |
| 3841:11 | 3847:15 | 3793:19,21 | 3830:21,22 |
| 3858:4 | 3852:13 | 3797:2 | 3831:1 |
| 3866:15 | 3855:12,17,2 | 3801:15 | 3832:15 |
| 3870:5 | 0 3860:7 | 3811:17 | 3841:2,10,13 |
| 3871:7 | 3886:20 | 3812:5,6,7 | , 24 |
| 3894:10 | 3893:18 | 3814:20 | 3843:12,18 |
| 3900:19 | 3898:25 | 3815:1, 3, 4 | 3880:8 |
| 3901:3,21 | 3904:22 | 3816:11 | 3892:10 |
| 3969:19 | 3912:9 | 3818:24 | 3893:25 |
| whatever | 3921:23 | 3824:12,18,2 | 3907:2,4 |
| 3866:24 | 3936:6 | 1 3825:7,9 | 3908:16 |
| 3868:14 | 3938:11 | 3828:6,14 | 3944:8,12,22 |
| 3869:14 | 3955:9 | 3829:20 | 3949:3,4,16 |
| 3887:23,24 | 3966:8 | 3831:14 | 3957:10,15 |
| 3966:5,9 | 3969:24 | 3835:2,3,20 | 3970:18,19,2 |
|  | 3970:5 | 3836:9 | 1,23,24 |
| whenever | 3974:16 | 3837:25 | 3974:9 |
| 3849:2 | 3976:5 | 3838:1 | 3977:13 |
| 3971:1 | whichever | 3839:6 | 3978:16 |
| whereas | 3809:16 | 3840:15 | 3980:4,6 |
| 3896:24 |  | 3842:1,3 | witnesses |
| Wherein | $3976: 6$ | 3843:1,10,17 | 3774:15,19,2 |
| 3771:3,6 |  | 3885:23,24 | 5 3775:7,17 |
| 3773:17 | Whiteman $3764: 13$ | 3892:7 | 3782:13 |
| 3774:6 |  | 3981:6,9,13, | 3792:19 |
| 3791:10 | whoever | 25 | 3841:22 |
| 3822:16 | 3882:11 |  | 3893:2 |
| 3823:24 | 3976: 6 | wil1ing | 3949:6,11 |
| 3824:7,15 |  | 3775:13 | 3978:20,21,2 |
| 3828:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { hoever's } \\ & 3865: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 3882:15 | 2 |
| 3831:25 | 3865:1 | 3966:22 | witness's |
| 3833:8 | whole 3802:23 | 3969:25 | 3974:7 |
| 3843:15 | 3805:14,21 | 3970:5 |  |
| 3908:5,14 | 3809:13 | win 3874:16 |  |
| 3915:3 | 3834:9 |  | $3814: 3$ $3874: 2$ |
| 3917:3,22 | 3854:15 | wind 3881:20 $3891: 3$ | 3874:2 |
| 3918:15,19 | 3865:3 | 3891:3 | won 3894:17 |
| 3920:10 | 3877:8 | wing 3953:9 | 3899:1 |
| 3932:8 | whom 3907:13 |  | 3926:23 |
| 3934:7 | 3949:23 | inning | 3927:15 |
| 3935:13 | 3971:7 |  | 3974:4 |
| 3939:21 | who's 3778:11 | wins 3853:21 | wondering |
| 3942:16,24 | whose 3902.21 | wipe 3898:7 | 3892:16 |
| 3951:10 3960 7, 24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { whose } 3902: 21 \\ & 3980: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 3900:21 | wonders |
| 3972:23 |  | wish 3767:6 | 3902:12 |
| whether | $\begin{aligned} & \text { wide1y } \\ & 3895: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 3884:6 | Woodsmal 1 |
| 3769:21 | widen 3795: | wished 3767:5 | 3759:2 |
| 3770:24 | widen 379 | witness | 3764:22 |
| 3772:6 | Williams | 3771:12 | 3774:13 |
| 3777:2 | 3761:1 | 3777:16,21 | 3775:1, 6, 9, 2 |
| 3789:21 | 3763:4,10 | 3778:10, | 0 3981:14 |
| 3790:14 | 3765:9,23 | 3799:15,17 | work 3817:20 |
| 3811:5,8 | $3766: 10,14,2$ | 3800:25 | 3829:6 |
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