

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

In The Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Company's Missouri Service Area.

Case No. ER-2008-0318

DEPOSITION OF JEREMY HAGEMEYER

NOVEMBER 14, 2008

NATIONWIDE SCHEDULING

Offices Missouri - Illinois - Kansas

HEADQUARTERS: 711 NORTH ELEVENTH STREET, St. Louis, Missouri 63101
800.280.3376
www.midwestlitigation.com

JEREMY HAGEMEYER 11/14/2008

1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI In The Matter of Union) Electric Company d/b/a) AmerenUE for Authority) Case No. to File Tariffs Increasing) ER-2008-0318 Rates for Electric Service) Provided to Customers in) the Company's Missouri) Service Area.)	6	Page 3 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI In The Matter of Union) Electric Company d/b/a) AmerenUE for Authority) Case No. to File Tariffs Increasing) ER-2008-0318 Rates for Electric Service) Provided to Customers in) the Company's Missouri) Service Area.)
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	DEPOSITION OF JEREMY HAGEMEYER TAKEN ON BEHALF OF UNION ELECTRIC COMPANY NOVEMBER 14, 2008	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	DEPOSITION OF WITNESS, JEREMY HAGEMEYER, produced, sworn and examined on the 14th day of November, 2008, between the hours of eight o'clock in the forenoon and six o'clock in the afternoon of that day, at the offices of the Missouri Public Service Commission, 9900 Page Avenue, Suite 130, Overland, Missouri, before Tara Schwake, a Certified Realtime Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Illinois, in a certain cause now pending Before the Public Service Commission of the State of Missouri, Case No. ER-2008-0318.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I N D E X WITNESSES All Witnesses: Page Jeremy Hagemeyer Examination by Mr. Fischer 6	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 4 APPEARANCES FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION: Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 (573) 751-6726 by: Mr. Steven Dottheim Ms. Sarah L. Kliethermes gencounsel@psc.mo.gov sarah.kliethermes@psc.mo.gov FOR AMERENUE: FISCHER & DORITY, PC 101 Madison Street, Suite 400 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 (573) 636-6758 By: Mr. James Fischer jfischer@aol.com
23 24 25		23 24 25	

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

JEREMY HAGEMEYER 11/14/2008

Г		T	
,		Page 5	Page 1 Q Did you? Okay. So you're familiar
1	ALSO PRESENT:		2 with the process?
2	MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES		3 A To an extent.
3	711 North 11th Street	i.	
4	St. Louis, Missouri 63101	Į	4 Q It's fairly straightforward. I'll
5	(314) 644-2191	- 1	5 have some questions for you. And if you don't
6	1-800-280-DEPO		6 understand any of the questions, just ask me to
7	by: Ms. Tara Schwake, CRR, RPR	- 1	7 clarify them and I'll try to do that. And if
8			8 your counsel has objections, I'm sure she'll
9	Mr. John Cassidy		9 voice them. But it's my understanding you'll be
10			10 expected to answer, unless there's something we
11			need to have the RLJ resolve. Or we can take up
12			12 the objections later, too.
13			13 If you do need a break today, a
14		1	health break or a coffee break, just let me know
15			and I'll try to accommodate that, too, and
16			hopefully we can get this done and get on to our
17			17 weekend.
18			18 You understand that you're under
19		- 1	19 oath?
20			20 A Yes.
21	· · ·		Q Do you have any questions about the
22	1	i	22 process at this point?
23			23 A No.
24			Q Okay.
25		2	25 MR. FISCHER: Sarah, is there
	р	age 6	Page 8
1	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED	- 1	1 anything you'd like to add?
2	by and between Counsel for the Plaintiff and		2 MS. KLIETHERMES: (Nonverbal
3	Counsel for the Defendant that this deposition		3 response.)
4	may be taken by Tara Schwake, Notary Public and		4 Q (BY MR. FISCHER) Okay. Let's begin
5	Certified Realtime Reporter, thereafter		5 with the beginning then, your background and
6	transcribed into typewriting, with the signature		6 education. I believe the Staff report on cost of
7	of the witness being expressly reserved.		7 service has an Appendix A which includes a
8	JEREMY HAGEMEYER,		8 summary of your background, education and
9	of lawful age, having been produced, sworn, and] !	9 credentials; is that correct?
10	examined on the part of Union Electric Company,	1	0 A Yes.
11	testified as follows:	1	1 Q As I understand it, you received
12	EXAMINATION	1	2 your undergraduate degree from Southwest Missouri
13	QUESTIONS BY MR. FISCHER:	1	3 State University in accounting and German in May
14	Q Good morning, Mr. Hagemeyer. My	1	4 of 2001; is that right?
15	name's Jim Fischer and I'm representing Amere	nUE 1	5 A Yes. Yes.
16	in this proceeding, which I believe is the	1	6 Q And you've been employed as a
17	AmerenUE rate case, No. ER-2008-0318. And fo	r 1	7 utility regulatory auditor at the Commission
18	the record, I'm with the law firm of Fischer and	1	8 since January 16, 2002; is that right?
19	Dority, PC. And our mailing address is 101	1	9 A Yes.
20	Madison Street, Suite 400, Jefferson City, 65101	. 2	0 Q Is it also correct that this is
21	And my phone number is area code 573-636-67	58. 2	1 your first job after graduation from Southwest
22	Okay. Mr. Hagemeyer, have you ever	2:	2 Missouri State University?
23	had your deposition taken in any other case?	2:	3 A No.
24	A Yes, in the last AmerenUE rate	24	4 Q No? Okay. What was your previous
25	case.	2.	5 job before this one?
		I	

		_	<u> </u>
	Page 9	,]	Page 11
1	A Manager in training, Goodrich	1	two Laclede rate cases, or just one?
2	Quality Theaters in Jefferson City, Missouri, the	2	A Two.
3	Capital 8, I believe.	3	Q Okay. Were there any other cases
4	Q That's where we generally go,	4	that I missed in that list that you worked on?
5	unless we go to the Rag Tag.	5	A Small water, sewer company cases,
6	Let's see, you've also included a	6	but otherwise, yes, that would
7	summary of cases that you've worked on here at	7	Q Have you previously testified
8	the Commission in your Appendix A to the Staff	8	regarding the issues of vegetation management,
9	report; is that right?	9	inspection reliability programs, the MISO MISO
10	A Yes.	10	RSG resettlement expenses, and Callaway
11	Q And it appears that this is your	11	allocation factors in any of those cases?
12	second AmerenUE rate case; is that correct?	12	A I have not.
13	A Yes.	13	Q So, this would be the first case
14	Q In that previous AmerenUE rate	14	that you have addressed those issues?
15	case, did you address the issues of incentive	15	A Yes.
16	compensation?	16	Q It appears that you may have
17	· A No.	17	prefiled testimony on the incentive comp issue in
18	Q Vegetation management or inspection	18	the Atmos energy rate case; is that right?
19	reliability programs?	19	A Yes.
20	A No.	20	Q Is it correct that the incentive
21	Q MISO, RSG resettlement expenses or	21	compensation issue was not a litigated issue
22	gross receipt taxes?	22	between Staff and Atmos in GR-2006-0387?
23	A Gross receipt taxes, I did.	23	A That's correct.
24	Q What about the Callaway allocation	24	Q In that case the company and the
25	factors?	25	Staff agreed that there would be a zero revenue
		-	
ļ	Page 10		Page 12
1	A No.	1	requirement increase and there were no revenue
2	Q Is it correct that you've not	2	requirement issues litigated between Staff and
3	participated in any other electric rate cases	3	company; is that your memory?
4	with the exception of that Ameren rate case that	4	A That's my understanding, yes.
5	you just mentioned?	5	Q Is it also correct that you did not
6	A That is correct.	6	take the witness Staff in the Atmos case to
7	Q And that was ER-2007-0002?	7	defend your position on incentive compensation
8	A Yes.	8	issues?
9	Q Is it also correct that you	9	A That's correct.
10	participated in two Missouri American Water rate	10	Q So, that issue wasn't litigated
11	cases?	11	among any of the parties to that case?
12	• 1/	12	A Not that I'm aware of, no.
1	A Yes.		
13	Q And you participated it looks like	13	Q Okay. So, is it correct that this
13 14	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos,	14	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you
13 14 15	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion	14 15	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your
13 14 15 16	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right?	14 15 16	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues,
13 14 15 16 17	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's	14 15 16 17	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime?
13 14 15 16 17 18	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's not represented on here that I did not file	14 15 16 17 18	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime? A I have taken the stand in it
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's not represented on here that I did not file testimony in, but I did prepare work papers and	14 15 16 17 18 19	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime? A I have taken the stand in it was
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's not represented on here that I did not file testimony in, but I did prepare work papers and assist.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime? A I have taken the stand in it Was Q I'm referring to just the incentive
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's not represented on here that I did not file testimony in, but I did prepare work papers and assist. Q Okay. What was that one? Was that	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime? A I have taken the stand in it Was Q I'm referring to just the incentive comp issue.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's not represented on here that I did not file testimony in, but I did prepare work papers and assist. Q Okay. What was that one? Was that a rate case?	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime? A I have taken the stand in it was Q I'm referring to just the incentive comp issue. A I understand.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's not represented on here that I did not file testimony in, but I did prepare work papers and assist. Q Okay. What was that one? Was that a rate case? A Yes, it was a rate case. I don't	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime? A I have taken the stand in it Was Q I'm referring to just the incentive comp issue. A I understand. Q Okay.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's not represented on here that I did not file testimony in, but I did prepare work papers and assist. Q Okay. What was that one? Was that a rate case? A Yes, it was a rate case. I don't recall, I'm sorry.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime? A I have taken the stand in it Was Q I'm referring to just the incentive comp issue. A I understand. Q Okay. A I believe it was the 2003 Missouri
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q And you participated it looks like in three natural gas cases, one involving Atmos, one involving Laclede, and then a companion AmerenUE gas case; is that right? A There was one Laclede case that's not represented on here that I did not file testimony in, but I did prepare work papers and assist. Q Okay. What was that one? Was that a rate case? A Yes, it was a rate case. I don't	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	AmerenUE case will be the first case in which you will be taking the witness stand to defend your position on incentive compensation issues, assuming it doesn't settle in the meantime? A I have taken the stand in it Was Q I'm referring to just the incentive comp issue. A I understand. Q Okay.

1			
1	Page 13		Page 15
1	service bonus which was part of the incentive.	1	goals?
2	Q Okay. So there's a customer	2	A I'd have to refer to one of my work
3	service bonus issue in that 2003 water case?	3	papers. Is that
4	A Correct.	4	Q Okay. That'd be great.
5	Q Okay. If we go to pages 46 through	5	A Could you repeat your question,
6	49 in the Staff report on cost of service	6	please?
7	A Just a moment, please.	7	Q Sure. Is it your understanding
8	Q Okay, sure. Begins on page 46,	8	that the I'm referring here to the executive
9	that's where the incentive compensation issue	9	incentive plan for officers, that 100 percent of
10	begins, I believe; is that correct?	10	the incentive plan funding comes from earnings
11	A Yes.	11	per share goals?
12	Q Did you draft that section of the	12	A My understanding was that 50
13	Staff report, section 5, on incentive	13	percent was related to earnings per share and 50
14	compensation issues?	14	percent was individual goals.
15	A Yes.	15	Q Now, this is for the officers?
16	Q Did any other Staff auditors revise	16	-
17	your sections of that report on incentive comp	17	Q Do you happen to have Krista
18	before you filed it?	18	-
19	A They offered suggestions.	19	A I'm not sure.
20	Q Okay. Who would have been involved	20	Q I can give you a copy here.
21	with that process?	21	A Please.
22	A That would have been Steve Rackers.	22	Q I'd like to refer you to page 5 of
23	I can't remember which attorney, I believe Sarah	23	her rebuttal testimony. At the top of the page
24	did, but I'm not sure.	24	there's a table that lists the various plans and
25	Q But Steve Rackers would be the	25	the method of funding. Do you see that?
	•		
	Page 14		Page 16
1	auditor?	1	A Yes, I do.
2	A Yes.	2	Q Would this indicate to you that for
3	Q Did you determine the position the	3	
4		1	the executive incentive plan for officers, which
	Staff would be taking on the incentive	4	the executive incentive plan for officers, which is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings
1 5	Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue on this case?	4 5	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings
5	compensation issue on this case?		is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used
6	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please?	5	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings
6 7	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the	5 6	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes.
6 7 8	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the	5 6 7	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff
6 7 8 9	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case?	5 6 7	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the
6 7 8	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the	5 6 7 8 9	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff
6 7 8 9 10	A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes.	5 6 7 8 9	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes. Q Is it your understanding that	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the executive plan for officers that is not being
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes. Q Is it your understanding that AmerenUE is not requesting recovery of costs	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes. Q Is it your understanding that AmerenUE is not requesting recovery of costs associated with earnings per share goals in the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the executive plan for officers that is not being requested to be included in the test year? A Give me a moment.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes. Q Is it your understanding that AmerenUE is not requesting recovery of costs associated with earnings per share goals in the short term executive incentive plan for officers?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the executive plan for officers that is not being requested to be included in the test year? A Give me a moment. Q Sure.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes. Q Is it your understanding that AmerenUE is not requesting recovery of costs associated with earnings per share goals in the short term executive incentive plan for officers? A That is my understanding.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the executive plan for officers that is not being requested to be included in the test year? A Give me a moment. Q Sure.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes. Q Is it your understanding that AmerenUE is not requesting recovery of costs associated with earnings per share goals in the short term executive incentive plan for officers? A That is my understanding. Q Is it your understanding that all	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the executive plan for officers that is not being requested to be included in the test year? A Give me a moment. Q Sure. A My understanding is \$1,923,427 is tied to the EIP for officers. Executive
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes. Q Is it your understanding that AmerenUE is not requesting recovery of costs associated with earnings per share goals in the short term executive incentive plan for officers? A That is my understanding. Q Is it your understanding that all the short term executive incentive plan for	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the executive plan for officers that is not being requested to be included in the test year? A Give me a moment. Q Sure. A My understanding is \$1,923,427 is
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	compensation issue on this case? A Would you repeat that, please? Q Did you personally determine the position that the Staff would be taking on the incentive compensation issue in this case? A Yes. Q On page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, which is earnings per share, be disallowed from the cost of service; is that correct? A Yes. Q Is it your understanding that AmerenUE is not requesting recovery of costs associated with earnings per share goals in the short term executive incentive plan for officers? A That is my understanding. Q Is it your understanding that all	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	is shorthanded EIP-O, that 100 percent earnings per share is the funding mechanism or metric used by Ameren for that? A Yes. Q Okay. Now, on page 47 of the Staff report on cost of service, it indicates that the Staff recommends that all incentive compensation directly tied with meeting EPS, or earnings pershare, be disallowed from the cost of service. Was that your decision, or was that made at a supervisory level? A That was my decision. Q Okay. Do you know how much short term incentive compensation is included in the executive plan for officers that is not being requested to be included in the test year? A Give me a moment. Q Sure. A My understanding is \$1,923,427 is tied to the EIP for officers. Executive incentive plan, excuse me.

	,	. [
1	Page 17 talk about the short term incentive plan for	1	Page 19
2	managers and directors, is it correct that the	2	A Could you repeat the question,
3	Staff is disallowed other costs with regard to	3	please?
4	the short term incentive plan for managers and	4	Q Is it correct to conclude that some
5	directors because they included an EPS share	5	of Staff's objections to these incentive
6	metric?	6	compensation plans is the fact that AmerenUE ties
7	A Repeat, please.	7	some of its incentive compensation to earnings
8	Q Yes. Is it correct that Staff is	8	per share goals?
9	disallowed other incentive compensation costs	9	A Yes, that would be correct.
10	associated with the short term incentive plan for	10	Q Staff is not opposed to any form of
11	managers and directors, not talking about the	11	incentive compensation; is that correct?
12	officers now but the managers and directors of	12	A Could you be more specific? I'm
13	the incentive plan, because they did include a	13	sorry.
14	earnings per share component?	14	Q Is Staff opposed to every kind of
15	A Yes.	15	incentive compensation?
16	Q Do you know how much short term	16	A No.
17	incentive compensation was disallowed by Staff	17	Q So, Staff's not opposed to just the
18	for managers and directors because it was related	18	fact that there is incentive compensation, it's
19	to earnings per share?	19	for specific reasons like it is tied to earnings
20	A Twenty-five percent in the funding,	20	per share.
21	but there were also I believe KPIs that might	21	A Yes.
22	have addressed the earnings per share.	22	Q In fact, would Staff believe that
23	Q Okay. So there was	23	public utilities should be incented to provide
24	A I'm sorry, key performance	24	good quality of service to their customers?
25	indicators, which is another 75 percent of that	25 ,	A The basis for Staff's position on
-		1-	
	Page 18	l .	Page 20
1	plan, some of which relate to earnings per share.	1	earnings per share is Commission orders. And
2	Q Do you have a, an estimate of how	2	turning to the Commission order in EC-87114,
3	much of that, of the disallowances related to	3	which is an AmerenUE complaint case
4	earnings per share for the managers and directors	4	Q Okay, yeah, I understand that
5	plan?	5	that's what your position is on earnings per
6	A Offhand, no, I don't.	6	share. But I was just asking that Staff works, Staff be opposed to incenting public utilities to
7 8	Q Okay. And are there other incentive compensation program costs that have	7	provide good quality of her advice to their
9	been disallowed by the Staff because they were	8	customers?
10	based on earnings per share goals?	10	A It would depend on the metrics
11	A There were some key performance	11	used.
12	indicators that were disallowed based on earnings	12	Q If the goals for the incentive
13	per share.	13	compensation were tied to excellent customer
14	Q And other plans, for example, the	14	service, would Staff be willing to support those
15	Ameren management incentive plan for the	15	kinds of metrics?
16	marketing and trading commodities plan?	16	A We'd be willing to look at it, and
17	A I believe so, yes.	17	if the metrics met our, met the qualifications or
18	Q Do you have an estimate of how much	18	I hesitate to the use the word guidelines.
19	of those were related to earnings per share that	19	But what was laid out in 87114, if they met
20	you disallowed?	20	those, that criteria, we would allow.
21	A Offhand, no.	21	Q Would you generally agree that
22	Q Would it be correct for me to	22	improving the level of customer service would
23	conclude that one of Staff's objections to these	23	benefit consumers?
24	incentive plans are the fact that Ameren ties	24	A Yes.
25	some of its incentive compensation to earnings	25	Q If the goals for the incentive

Page 23 Page 21 employee safety is a worthwhile goal? compensation were tied to reliability metrics, 2 2 would Staff be opposed to giving incentives for 3 Would you agree that customers may providing reliable service to AmerenUE's benefit from a company that has a lower number of 4 customers? 5 Again, it would depend. If 5 accidents by reducing overall operating costs, Α 6 for example? improvement is involved or is required to receive 6 7 Α Yes. 7 those incentive payments, we would be willing to Customers would also benefit if the 8 Q look at that and, quite possibly, supporting it. 8 9 employees are successful at creating a safer work 9 Q Would you agree that improving service reliability would be expected to benefit 10 environment when they're working on the 10 customers' premises, wouldn't you agree? 11 consumers? 11 12 Α Yes. 12 Α 13 Would you also agree that reducing 13 Is it your understanding that the Q Q the time it takes to respond to natural gas leaks 14 Commission recently adopted rules designed to 14 monitor the level of reliability for electric 15 or electric service outages would be expected to 15 16 benefit consumers? 16 companies? 17 Reducing the time it takes to 17 That is my understanding. Α 18 address these problems? 18 Do you believe it's reasonable for 19 19 the Commission to monitor the level of Q Yes. 20 reliability for electric companies? 20 Yes, that would be worthwhile to 21 customers. 21 Yes. 22 So, Staff isn't opposed to increase 22 Do you believe it would be Q 23 system reliability as such. 23 reasonable for the Commission to give electric 24 Α Right. 24 companies and their employees incentives to 25 And Staff's not opposed to improved improve reliability of service to their Page 22 Page 24 customers? performance by employees generally? 1 2 No. Staff is not opposed to 2 A It would depend on the type of 3 incentives requested. 3 improved performance. 4 Q And Staff's not opposed to a 4 Q Would you generally agree that improving system reliability is a worthwhile company trying to reduce the number of workdays 5 lost to accidents? 6 activity that benefits consumers? 6 7 7 Yes. No, Staff is not opposed to that. Α 8 Mr. Hagemeyer, do you believe it 8 Would you agree with me that a 9 would be reasonable for the Commission to give public utility must be able to attract capital if it is to continue to build new power plants and 10 electric companies and their employees incentives to improve customer satisfaction? 11 improve its distribution infrastructure? 11 12 A I apologize. Could you repeat the 12 Could you rephrase that? 13 Q Sure. I'll try to break it down. 13 question, please? 14 Q Yes. Do you believe it would be Would you agree that a public utility must be 15 reasonable for the Commission to give electric able to attract capital if it's to build new 15 companies and its employees incentives to improve power plants? 16 16 17 customer satisfaction? Attract new capital? 17 18 18 It would depend on the type of Attract capital generally. 19 incentive offered. If it required improvement 19 Attract capital generally, yes. 20 And that would probably be true for 20 over current levels, we would. 21 O Would you agree that improving major improvements to the distribution system as 22 well, the infrastructure? 22 customer satisfaction is a worthwhile goal that 23 would benefit consumers? 23 I would assume so. 24 24 And would you agree with me that Yes. 25 Do you also believe that improving the construction of adequate capacity benefits Q

Page 27 Page 25 earnings, it's possible to fund a portion of the ratepayers? public utilities construction program through the 2 2 Α Yes. 3 use of those retained earnings; isn't that true? 3 Without adequate capacity or the 4 ability to purchase capacity and energy on the wholesale market, electric companies like 5 Q And the utility could use some of 5 its retained earnings to help fund its ongoing 6 AmerenUE would not be able to provide safe and 7 maintenance programs; isn't that correct? 7 adequate service to its customers over the long 8 Yes. 8 run. Wouldn't you agree? 9 And would you agree that it's q Would you mind repeating that? I Α important to ratepayers that a public utility 10 apologize. 10 Sure. Without adequate capacity or 11 adequately maintain its facilities? 11 the ability to purchase capacity or energy from 12 Α Yes. 12 13 Now, on page 2 of your surrebuttal, 13 the wholesale market, an electric company like AmerenUE would not be able to provide safe and 14 at lines 5 through 7, you indicate that the 14 15 Staff, at the time of its August 28, 2008, cost 15 adequate service to its customers over the long of service report filing, had not been provided term. Is that correct? 16 16 17 with adequate information to evaluate the portion 17 Α Yes of incentive compensation related to KPIs and the And if a public utility did not 18 18 19 have any earnings over the long term, do you 19 exceptional performance benefit plan; is that 20 believe it would be able to attract investors to 20 correct? 21 21 fund its construction program? Α 22 Q KPI refers to a key performance 22 Any earnings? Α 23 23 indicator; is that right? Q Yes. 24 24 No. Well, wait. Let me make sure Α Yes. I understood the question. Could you repeat 25 What's your understanding of what Page 28 Page 26 is a key performance indicator in AmerenUE's 1 that? I apologize. incentive compensation plans? Just generally how 2 Yeah. I asked if a public utility did not have any earnings over the long term, do 3 vou understand that. you believe it would be able to attract investors 4 My understanding are, these are 5 performance targets or goals that the company is 5 to fund its construction program? 6 measuring its employees on to ensure that it If they had no earnings over the 6 7 meets the various aspects of performance, 7 long term, they would not be able to. 8 O Would you also agree that public 8 finance, safety, customer service, and utilities may use some of their retained earnings 9 operational. But these are, these are goals that 9 10 they are measured against. 10 to fund construction programs? 11 And they are goals specific to 11 12 different employee groups; is that right? 12 Without any retained earnings, 13 13 would it be necessary for a public utility to finance its construction program using outside 14 Now, on page 2 at lines 8 through 9 14 you say, given this lack of information, the 15 15 sources of capital? Would you agree with that? 16 Staff proposed a disallowance of these incentive 16 Is this also assuming no earnings? packages. Is that right? 17 17 Or is this assuming earnings that could help it 18 18 Yes 19 Then you go on to state, since that 19 I'm assuming here no retained Q time the company has provided summaries of KPIs 20 20 earnings. and made personnel available to explain the 21 Okay. With no retained earnings, I 22 specific measurements and definitions utilized in 22 would assume that in addition to using the funds 23 provided by customers, they would have to seek 23 determining that portion of the company's 24 24 incentive plans; is that right? outside capital. 25 25 Yes. And by having some retained

Page 31 Page 29 Q Could you elaborate on what you compensation plan costs that were included in the mean when you say that the company made available 2 test year by Ameren? personnel to explain those measurements? 3 I don't know offhand. A Yes. I had a meeting with several 4 Q Do you know, okay, do you -- your 5 disallowance, according to the reconciliation members of the company's personnel, Ken Varel, 6 Krista Bauer, there were some other people in the 6 that I had, it was a total disallowance for 7 room whose names I didn't catch but, yes, that's, 7 incentive compensation of \$13,737,755. Is that, they went through the KPIs with me. 8 is that the right number? 9 Q Did they spend several days doing That is the right number for just that? Or -the incentive plans excluding the long term, 10 10 The meeting describing the KPIs was 11 which is the restrictive stock and performance 11 one, one day, but there were discussions over the 12 share unit plan which is below. 12 phone to clarify some of the KPIs later. 13 Q Which is reflected at just a little 13 14 under \$7 million? Q Okay. Did you feel satisfied with 14 15 15 the explanations that were given by the company Α Yes. 16 to explain what these were and how they worked? 16 Q So, it looks like the total would 17 Yes. 17 be a little over \$20 million; that's what the Α 18 Q Based upon the additional 18 disallowance is? information provided by the company, has Staff 19 19 Α Twenty-two. 20 now revised its disallowance for incentive 20 So, I was asking the question, 21 compensation plans? 21 trying to get a handle on what percent of the 22 Based on the meetings and the 22 426,000 allowed compared to \$22 million total 23 23 disallowance, so that would be, what would that information provided, yes, we have. be in terms of rough percentages? 24 How much of the Staff's 24 I'd have to calculate that. 25 25 disallowance has been reduced as a result of that Page 30 Page 32 information being provided? Could you do that for me real 2 quick? 2 Our disallowance is now, I don't --I have the information -- well, I apologize. We 3 3 You're wanting the percent allowed are now proposing an allowance of 426,545. 4 out of the total? That's our allowance. We've reduced our 5 Q Yes. 5 6 That would be roughly two percent. allowance -- we've reduced our disallowance to Α 7 Two percent? Okay. Do you have 7 allow \$426,545. any work papers that summarize the amount of the 8 Q Okay. So that's how much money you 9 have included in your cost of service related to various incentive plans that are being incentive plans, all the incentive plans, is 10 recommended to be included in rates? That two 10 \$426,545; is that right? 11 percent? 11 12 Where that, where the amount comes 12 Α Okay. Can you explain to me why 13 from? Yes, I do. 13 Q Q Okay. Have you provided those to 14 you have included that amount in there which --14 why did you change your position on that? 15 the company? 15 The position was changed to reflect 16 Yes, I have. 16 17 Okay. And do you have similar work that we had more information, and we agreed with 17 papers that summarize the amount of the various 18 some of the measurements that were being used. 19 However, that was tempered by the response to a 19 incentive plans that are being recommended to be 20 excluded from the rates by the Staff? The other 20 question relating to how much incentive payment 21 98 percent? 21 was tied to performance less than targeted for 22 Α 22 those KPIs. 23 23 Q Okay. I'd like to talk to you Q And have those been provided to the about that in a minute. What percentage does 24 company? 24 25 that \$426,545 represent of the total incentive Α Yes.

		1	
	Page 33	1	Page 35
1	Q Now, is it your understanding that AmerenUE has revised its short term incentive	1 2	Q Okay. Well, is it your understanding that the Staff's criticism and the
2	compensation plan from its previous plan that was	3	Commission's criticism of the plan was that it
3		1	7
4	reviewed in the last AmerenUE rate case?	4	was principally driven by earnings per share metrics?
5	A That's my understanding, yes.	5	
6	Q And have you reviewed the rebuttal	6	A From the last case?
7	testimony of Krista Bauer regarding the revisions	1	Q Yes.
8	to the AmerenUE short term incentive plan?	8	A My understanding from reading Lisa
9	A From this case?	9	Hanneken's testimony in that case was that there
10	Q Yes.	10	was an earnings per share trigger that was
11	A Yes.	11	required to be met, similar to what is on some of
12	Q Is it your understanding that	12	these plans currently, but that she didn't have
13	AmerenUE removed the earnings per share as the	13	the information regarding to that. Or regarding
14	primary funding mechanism for all of the plans,	14	the programs offered. The specific criteria
15	but with the single exception being the executive	15	used, similar to the KPIs. But that would have
16	incentive plan for officers?	16	to be subject to check. I'd have to go back and
17	A I believe there were some KPIs that	17	look at that.
18	were tied to earnings per share.	18	Q But in this case the company has
19	Q But none of them had the majority	19	taken steps away from just using earnings per
20	of their earnings per share as a metric; is that	20	share metrics for funding their various plans; is
21	your understanding?	21	that your understanding?
22	A That's my understanding.	22	A There are other metrics used than
23	Q Does Staff consider that to be a	23	earnings per share.
24	step in the right direction?	24	Q And I guess my question was, is
25	A You mean, does Staff believe that	25	that considered a step in the right direction
<u> </u>			
١.	Page 34	١.	Page 36
1	moving away from earnings per share is, as a	1	from Staff's perspective, to get away from the
2	funding mechanism is appropriate?	2	use of earnings per share metrics?
3	Q Yes.	3	A Moving away from earnings per share
4	A We do believe that's a step in the	4	provided that they are service oriented is a good
5	right direction.	5	thing in the Staff's mind.
6	Q Okay. And is it your understanding	6	Q Okay. Let's turn to the, the
7	that AmerenUE worked with external advisors to	7	executive incentive plan for managers, that plan?
8	review and refine their short term incentive	8	A Okay.
9	plans?	_	Q Is it your understanding that 25
10	A That's my understanding, but can I	10	percent of the managers or directors award is
11	go back to the previous question?	11	still based upon earnings per share goals?
12	Q Sure.	12	A The managers 25 percent, yes.
13	A You said a step in the right	13	Q The remainder of the manager
14	direction? It would depend. I mean, I don't	14	director incentives are based upon other goals
15	want to say blanket that just earnings per share	15	such as leadership and contribution achievements
16	is not acceptable. It's when you get into	16	related to specific key performance indicators,
17	financial performance measures similar to	17	or KPIs; is that right?
18	earnings per share; we also disagree with those	18	A Among other things, yes.
19	as well.	19	Q Did Staff disallow all of the costs
20	Q But in the last case, it's my	20	associated with the executive incentive plan for
21	understanding that the plans were all funded by	21	managers?
22	earnings per share metrics; is that right?	22	A Did we disallow all
23	A I'd have to look at the work papers	23	Q Yes.
24	from the last case. I'm sorry, I don't have	24	A No, we did not.
25	those in front of me.	25	Q What amount did you include for the
i			

Page 39 Page 37 Q Yes. Is it your understanding that executive plan for managers? 1 2 100 percent of the incentive awards are based 2 I don't have that specifically 3 upon the achievement of predefined KPIs on that 3 broken out. I'm sorry. 4 plan? Okay. Do you have an estimate at 5 all? 5 Α Yes. 6 0 Did Staff disallow all the costs 6 Α 7 Would that be included in your work 7 associated with the Ameren management incentive Q 8 plan for managers? 8 papers? 9 Did we disallow the entire thing? 9 Α You could derive that from my work papers, but they are not -- that specific 10 Yes. Q 11 calculation is not in there. 11 Α No, we did not. What did you allow? 12 Q Okay. Did you personally make the 12 13 decision on how much of these incentive plan 13 We allowed the KPIs that we thought costs would be included in Staff's cost of 14 were appropriate, and that included safety and service study? 15 operational goals and customer service goals as 15 16 well. But that was also, like I said, prior, 16 Α Could you repeat that? I'm sorry. 17 17 against the prior plan. That was also tempered I was just asking whether you by the idea of the -- that a lot of the payouts 18 personally made the decision on how much of the 18 executive incentive plan for managers, how much 19 were for performance below the targeted amounts 20 of those incentive plan costs that were going to 20 which were stretch goals established by the 21 company. So the amount that was, that failed to 21 be included in the Staff's cost of service, did 22 you make that decision? 22 meet those targets was disallowed. 23 23 A I made the decision to -- or -- I Q Okay. I'd like to talk to you 24 about that a little bit later, too, but --24 was the one that calculated what I thought should be allowed, yes. I'm sorry, I did not answer understand whether you looked at that on an Page 38 Page 40 individual basis or whether you looked at that in 1 your question? 2 big groups of aggregate numbers, but I'll visit Q Okay, let me rephrase it, then. Did you make the final decision on how much would with you about that in a minute. Do you know how much roughly of the be allowed regarding that particular program? 5 Ameren management incentive plan for managers was Yes. And when you say "that 6 6 allowed? particular program" --7 7 I'm talking about here, the A Offhand, like I said for the 8 executive incentive plan for managers. 8 executive incentive plan for managers, I don't 9 Δ Yes. have that calculation specifically but it 10 That one had the 25 percent 10 probably can be derived from my work papers. earnings per share and the 75 percent related to 11 Would it probably be two percent or 11 12 12 KPIs and other metrics? less? 13 I don't know. 13 Yes Α 14 And I don't think you knew off the 14 Did you personally make the 15 decision on this plan on what the level of 15 top of your head or your work papers would show compensation -- incentive compensation cost would 16 how much of that plan was allowed? 17 17 be included in Staff's cost of service? Right. It would not show that, no. 18 18 Q But would it be around the two A I was the one that made the 19 percent, do you think? 19 incentive compensation adjustment, yes. 20 Q Turning next to this Ameren 20 A Potentially. I believe it actually 21 might be less than that. 21 marketing, trading and commodities plan, which I 22 think is an extension of the Ameren management 22 Q Okay. Let's turn to the Ameren 23 management incentive plan for management 23 incentive plan for managers? 24 24 Mm-hmm. employees. 25 25 The AMIP? Is it your understanding that a

Page 43 Page 41 small number of management professionals and 1 supervisors are included in that particular 2 2 Q Okay. On page 2 of your rebuttal 3 incentive plan, probably less than a dozen or so? testimony, lines 13 through 14 --4 That's my understanding. If I You mean surrebuttal? remember correctly, it was about ten. 5 Is it surrebuttal? I quess Krista 5 0 6 Q Okay. Is it your understanding 6 had rebuttal, you had surrebuttal. Okay. Page 7 that there are two components to this plan, the 7 2, lines 13 through 14. 8 8 first component is a base plan which is Okay. 9 essentially the same as the Ameren management 9 There you state, the Staff proposes a disallowance of financial KPIs and project incentive plan, but then there's a second 10 11 component that's called a supplemental component based KPIs. Is that correct? 11 12 that provides additional group or position 12 Yes. 13 Would you define there for me what 13 specific metrics that are, that these particular 0 14 gentlemen or women need to address? 14 you mean by the financial KPIs? 15 A I'd need to review. I don't have 15 If you go down to line 14, I define 16 that in front of me. 16 it as, the financial KPIs relate to maintaining a 17 Q Okay. Did Staff disallow all of 17 proximity to the operations and maintenance the costs associated with the Ameren marketing budget or capital budgets or achievement of a 18 18 19 and trading commodities plan? 19 certain earnings per share, EPS, level. 20 A In the test year there were no 20 Okay. And that's what you're 21 costs associated with this plan. 21 referring to there as the financial KPIs? 22 22 So, there are no costs included in Yes Α vour recommendation related to this particular 23 Then you go on to state, these 23 24 plan? 24 measures do not allow the flexibility to address 25 Right. Right. unanticipated operational issues; is that Page 42 Page 44 Q Okay. Let's turn then to the 1 correct? 1 2 2 Ameren incentive plan for union employees. Α Yes. 3 The ATP? 3 Q Mr. Hagemeyer, are you suggesting 4 Yes. Is it your understanding that 4 there that the incentive compensation plan costs 5 this incentive plan applies to union employees? 5 should be disallowed because employees are 6 6 That's my understanding. incented to stay within their operation and 7 7 maintenance or capital budgets? Is it your understanding from Miss 8 Bauer's rebuttal testimony that the AIP is 100 8 Could you repeat that, please? 9 Yeah. Are you suggesting there 9 percent on incentive -- on key performance indicator performance, that's how it's funded, that the incentive compensation plan costs should 10 be disallowed because employees are incented to 11 100 percent? 11 12 stay within their operation and maintenance or 12 Α Yes. 13 Q Did Staff propose to disallow all 13 capital budgets? the costs associated with this plan? 14 I'm suggesting that the budget 14 15 numbers alone are not a sufficient reason to 15 16 How much did you allow? 16 award an incentive payment. Q 17 A Again, I don't have that number 17 Q Well, when you state that these specifically. Or, well, wait. No, I'm sorry. 18 measures do not allow the flexibility to address 18 Let me rephrase that. You said, did we disallow 19 unanticipated operational issues, what do you 19 20 mean by that? 20 that completely? 21 What I mean by that is, if 21 Q Yes. 22 Yes. And that was based on the 22 something operationally occurred, a repair was 23 performance less than target. 23 needed that may not have been anticipated, and 24 Q And did you personally make the 24 they had to fix it and that was not budgeted, 25 decision on how much of that plan you disallowed? that repair was not budgeted and they went

Page 45 Page 47 incentive compensation plan that contained KPIs outside of those budget parameters in the KPI, which incented employees to stay within budget if 2 that they would not receive that payment or would 2 3 there was an exception for circumstances when 3 receive a reduced payment. 4 there were unanticipated operational issues that 4 So, there are times from your 5 perspective where they need to exceed the budget 5 needed to be addressed? 6 Well, when I say unanticipated 6 in order to address unanticipated operational issues; is that right? Is that what you're 7 operational issues, I'm also including 7 8 efficiencies that could be gained that may be 8 saying? 9 utilized that would allow the company to come in 9 Α Yes. way under budget as well. I mean, it's not just 10 Are you suggesting that staying 10 within budget is an inappropriate goal for 11 repairs or unanticipated things that would cause 11 management to seek to achieve for its customers? 12 the increase, an increase. 12 13 Q Well, is staying within budget a 13 No. I am saying that it's 14 inappropriate for a basis for an incentive plan. 14 bad management goal, from your perspective? 15 15 Q Does Staff believe it would be 16 Q Is staying within budget a bad 16 better to send the signal to employees that it's 17 regulatory goal? 17 not important to stay within budget? No. Staff is not saying that. 18 18 Well, I just don't think that it's 19 There -- Staff is saying that it's an 19 an appropriate basis for awarding an incentive 20 inappropriate basis for awarding an incentive 20 payment. There are operational issues either 21 21 that would increase the cost or reduce the cost. 22 And just by basing it on financial alone, you 22 Q Are you suggesting that it would be 23 more appropriate for the company's incentive plan 23 don't take the -- or on budget alone, you do not to build into the incentives incentives for the 24 24 take those into account. employees to do whatever it takes to address the 25 Q If I understand your testimony, and Page 48 Page 46 you're saying it's because there are some times unanticipated operational issues? 1 whenever there are unanticipated operational 2 What I'm saying is, we want to 3 focus more on the things, service oriented, not issues that need to be addressed? necessarily financial, but maintaining a safe and 4 Α Yes adequate service. We also want customer, 5 That's the reason just staying 5 6 within budget's not a good goal; is that right? customer goals to be a part of that as well, 7 7 A I'm saying staying within budget maintaining that the customer service is improved 8 8 doesn't necessarily anticipate either increases 9 Are you suggesting that it would be 9 to costs or decreases to costs that could occur. more appropriate for the company's incentive plan and that therefore it's an inappropriate goal, or 10 inappropriate basis for awarding an incentive to build into them incentives for the employees 11 11 12 payment. 12 to do whatever it takes to address the 13 Q Mr. Hagemeyer, isn't it true that 13 unanticipated operational issues? 14 Α Could you repeat the question, Staff has routinely reviewed in past cases whether a completed power plant was built within 15 please? budget costs? 16 Q Are you suggesting that it would be 16 17 A I don't know that. I'm sorry. 17 more appropriate for the company's incentive 18 compensation plan to build into the plan 18 Okay. Would you agree that staying incentives for employees to do whatever it takes within budget can be an appropriate goal, at 19 20 least in some regulatory contexts? 20 to address unanticipated operational issues? 21 Yes. 21 I wouldn't say whatever it takes. Α 22 On page 2, lines 19 through 21 of 22 I would suggest that it would be appropriate to 23 look at metrics that require improvement on your surrebuttal, you state, Staff opposes the project based KPIs because they do not promote 24 service oriented goals. 25 improvement or performance beyond what should be Q Well, would Staff be opposed to an

Page 49 Page 51 prospective employees and current employees will reasonably expected of an employee; is that correct? 2 take into account when they decide whether to 2 3 3 accept a job at Ameren or stay on their current Α Yes 4 Now, here, what's your definition 4 job, wouldn't you agree? 5 A I would say so. 5 of a project based KPI as you use that term? 6 6 Well, if you turn to the next page If Ameren fails to pay a on the top, I provide an example. And I can read 7 7 competitive compensation package over the long term, AmerenUE will not be able to attract and 8 that for you, if you'd like. 8 9 Q No, that's okay. I read the 9 retain a high quality work force, wouldn't you example. Could you define for me what you mean 10 agree? 10 by project based KPIs, just at a more general Could you repeat the question, 11 Α 11 12 12 please? 13 Sure. If AmerenUE fails to pay a 13 At a general level, it's a KPI that does not call for improvement. It just says, do 14 competitive compensation package over the long 14 15 this and you'll get an incentive payment. A 15 term, AmerenUE will not be able to attract or percentage of the --16 retain a high quality work force, wouldn't you 16 17 agree? 17 Q On a specific kind of project 18 18 oriented, not earnings per share, but more on a I would agree. particular metric or reliability metric or a 19 It's my understanding that the 19 20 customer service metric or something like that? 20 State of Missouri sometimes grants merit pay 21 increases to its employees; is that true? 21 22 22 If so, I've never received one. Okay. Now, you were involved in 23 I'm sorry. 23 the preparation of the Staff cost of service 24 report that was filed in this case; is that 24 Q Okay. 25 right? 25 I don't know. Page 50 Page 52 Q Is it your understanding that merit I was involved in that, yes. 1 2 I'm not as familiar with it as I pay increases are sometimes designed to provide an incentive for employees to continue to serve 3 might, should be, probably, but I didn't find any disallowances by Staff related to the company's 4 the public well? 4 5 A Again, not having reviewed that 5 call centers. Do you know of any? 6 program, I can't say. 6 In the service report? 7 7 Yes. Okay. Let's turn, then, to the 8 exceptional performance bonus program, EPBP. Is 8 Α No. Wait. Are you talking q it your understanding that all non-Ameren 9 incentive only? leadership team personnel, which I think includes 10 No, I'm talking about in, across the company, across the Staff's case. Were there all employees except the officers, managers, and 11 directors, all of the folks other than that group 12 disallowances related to call centers that you 13 know of? 13 are eligible for this exceptional performance 14 bonus program award? 14 I don't know. I'm sorry. Α 15 Okay. Do you know if Staff has 15 I believe that's correct, yes. Has the Staff disallowed all the found any call center problems which warranted a 16 16 17 disallowance? 17 costs of the exceptional performance bonus 18 A I don't know. 18 program? 19 19 Mr. Hagemeyer, would you agree with Α me that AmerenUE needs to be able to compete in 20 Q How much of that, of those costs 20 were disallowed? 21 the employment marketplace to attract employees 21 22 to Ameren to serve its customers over the long 22 \$848,075. 23 term? 23 And nothing was included for that 24 24 program in Staff's cost of service? Over the long term, yes. 25 25 That's correct. And compensation is a factor that

Γ			,
1	Page 53 Q And did you personally make the	1	Page 55 A No.
2	decision to exclude 100 percent of the costs	2	Q And have you ever designed a
3	associated with the exceptional performance bonus	3	incentive compensation program for any employer
4	program?	4	you've worked with?
5	A Yes.	5	A No.
6	Q Mr. Hagemeyer, let's discuss the	6	Q Okay. Let's talk a little bit more
7	Ameren long term incentive plan for just a	7	about these key performance indicators. Did you
8	minute, and we'll go back to the short term here	8	review the key performance indicators used by
9	in a minute, too. Have you reviewed the rebuttal	9	Ameren in its incentive compensation plans?
10	testimony of Krista Bauer at page 19? And I'm	10	A Yes.
11	going to refer to lines 13 through 14.	11	Q Did you review all of them or just
12	A Give me just a moment, please.	12	a handful, sampling?
13	Q Sure. There she testifies that	13	A All of them.
14	long term incentive programs have become a common	14	Q All of them? Okay. So you would
15	component of the executive level total rewards	15	have reviewed, for example, the Missouri customer
16	package. Do you see that?	16	service scorecard that would apply to customer
17	A Yes.	17	service representatives?
18	Q In your audit, did you have any,	18	A Do you have a copy of that?
19	come across evidence that would, or studies to	19	Q I bet I do.
20	dispute her statement that such long term	20	A I want to make sure I have the
21	incentive programs are a common component of	21	right one.
22	executive level total rewards packages?	22	Q Here's the one I was looking at,
23	A Did I come across anything that	23	it's ED Missouri customer service scorecard.
24	would contradict that? O Yes.	24	A Yes. I believe I did review that.
25	Q Yes.	25	Q Okay. One of the KPIs for this
	Page 54		Page 56
1	A No, I haven't.	1	group is to successfully communicate power on
2	Q She refers on line 16 through 19 to	2	project information to AmerenUE customers. Is
3	a survey conducted by Hewitt and Associates that	3	that your understanding?
4	found that 100 percent of Ameren's peer companies	4	A That is my understanding.
5	had utilized one or more long term incentive	5	Q And another one relates to reducing
6	vehicles. In your audit, did you review that	6	the number of gas leak responses solely
7	Hewitt and Associates study on that point?	7	attributable to calls being mishandled in the
8	A No. Not on that point, no.	8	call center. Is that correct?
9	Q Do you have any studies or evidence	9	A If you wouldn't mind giving me just
10	that would indicate or dispute the finding that	10	one moment?
11	Ameren's peer companies have utilized long term	11	Q Oh, sure. I'm sorry. I was
12	incentive vehicles as part of their executive	12	referring to the second one, the number of
13	total compensation plans?	13	delayed gas leak responses solely attributed to
14	A You are asking if I found anything	14	calls being mishandled in the call center.
15	that would say any of those have not used those	15	A If you look at that, there is no
16	plans?	16	money bag next to it, so that's not a KPI upon
17	Q Correct.	17	which incentive payments are tied.
18	A Okay. No, I have not seen anything	18	Q Okay. The next one seems to have a
19	like that.	19	money bag, the management or manage annual
20	Q And in your previous employment or	20	average speed of answer for calls queued to
	your employment here at the Commission, have you	21	agents. Would that be a money bag one that you referred to?
21	and the state of the ball of the state of th		referren TO?
22	ever participated in the hiring process, trying	22	·
22 23	to attract people to come to the Commission or to	23	A Yes.
22 23 24	to attract people to come to the Commission or to your previous employer? Have you been involved	23 24	A Yes. Q Then there, there's also KPIs
22 23	to attract people to come to the Commission or to	23	A Yes.

Г		1	
	Page 57	1	Page 59
1	highly satisfied with new services or upgrades.	1	incentive compensation for call center employees
2	Did you review these KPIs particularly?	2	in your cost of service?
3	A Yes.	3	A They would fall under — would the,
4	Q Would you agree that increasing the	4	do you know what, are they union? Or I'm
5	number of customers that are highly satisfied	5	sorry.
6	would benefit customers?	6	Q You know, I don't know if they all
7	A Yes.	7	are union or not. I was really just asking
8	Q Do you believe that increasing the	8	whether you had included any call center
9	percentage of highly satisfied customers is a	9	employees.
10	reasonable key performance indicator to include	10	A I mean, some of these metrics we
11	in an Ameren incentive plan?	11	did agree
12	A Could you repeat your question?	12	Q None of the union guys got
13	I'm sorry.	13	anything, right? I think they are union.
14	Q Would you believe that increasing	14	A All right. Well, if they are
15	the percent of highly satisfied customers is a	15	union, they did not perform anything for
16	reasonable metric to include in a Ameren	16	performance less than target.
17	incentive compensation plan?	17	Q Okay. Now, would you just
18	A And you're referring specifically	18	generally explain how you personally evaluated
19	to this KPI?	19	the KPIs related to, say, the customer service
20	Q Just generally. Isn't that a	20	scorecard?
21	metric that would be, one of those kinds of	21	A You're specifically wanting this
22	metrics that the Staff would find to be	22	card?
23	attractive?	23	Q Yes. That would be fine just as an
24	A Potentially. I mean, in this	24	example.
25	instance, though, that's not one that's	25	A Just a moment. Sir, I believe,
	Page 58		Page 60
1	Q Has a money bag next to it?	1	looking at this again, I believe there's
2	A Right. Exactly.	2	something I need to clear up. The contract
3	Q But it's one that they're trying to	3	portion was the next scorecard, which is the
4	promote.	4	it only has four KPIs listed. This is the
5	A Right.	5	management piece, as far as I know. The one
6	Q Do you believe it's reasonable to	6	we're referring to where it has the percentage of
7	include a KPI for average speed of answer at the	7	customers highly satisfied.
8	call centers?	8	Q Okay. You say this is the
9	A If it calls for improvement, yes.	9	management, this ED Missouri customer service
10	Q Now, did Staff include any	10	scorecard you believe is management?
11	incentive compensation for call center employees	11	A No, no. Where it's titled 2008
12	I'm sorry?	12	ED Missouri customer service scorecard, and if
13	A I'm sorry. May I I apologize	13	you look over sir, I can show you which one
14	for interrupting, but I think that would also	14	I'm looking at. This is the contract piece. And I don't believe that yeah. That's the
15 16	need to be in context. I mean, if their average	15	
16	speed of answer and then just hang up, I mean,	16 17	contract um, yours doesn't match mine but
17	you would, I mean, obviously find that unattractive.	17	Q Okay.
18	•	18 19	A You know, it's this right here, to
19 20			my understanding is, this relates to
20	performance metric that you could include that	20	management employees.
21	would make sense to try to incent employees to do	21	Q Okay. A So a percentage of this, when I
22	a better job at?	22 23	
23	A So long as the customer was getting their question answered, yes.	23	said that none of them was allowed O Included?
24 25		2 4 25	Q Included? A Yes. That would sort of have to be
23	Q Okay. Did the Staff include any	23	A Tes. That would soft of have to be

JEREMY HAGEMEYER 11/14/2008

	Page 61	1	63
1	clarified.	1 annual average speed of answer per queued calls	
2	MS. KLIETHERMES: Are there any	2 to agents. I also agreed with the calls sent to	
. 3	page numbers we can refer to for the benefit of	3 center index.	
4	the court reporter?	4 Q Okay. And if, if any of the target	
5	THE WITNESS: No.	5 amounts did not, if they didn't reach the targe	
6	MS. KLIETHERMES: Could you give	6 amount then that would not, then you wouldn	
7	the full title of the page?	7 have included anything related to those specif	IC
8	THE WITNESS: Sure. The 2008 Missouri customer service scorecard. And below	8 KPIs; is that right? 9 A Right. Well, let me be a little	
9		,	
10 11	that, it says, YTD June 2008. And the line below	10 bit more clear. I apologize. The, that would 11 have been allowed. But again, when we asked how	
12	that is, forecasted incentive compensation payout for 2008, scorecard equals 110 percent.	12 much of the plan participants for each plan did	
13	Q (BY MR. FISCHER) Mr. Hagemeyer,	13 not not how many, but how much of the payout	
14	would you perhaps just use that particular	14 was tied to performance less than target, the	
15	example as a, and explain to me how you would	15 number allowed would have been reduced for that.	
16	evaluate that particular KPI and those metrics	16 And I just want to make sure I said that right.	
17	that are used in that?	17 Q It would have been eliminated,	
18	A Okay. Looking at this, I thought	18 wouldn't it?	
19	that the financials should not be allowed.	19 A Depending. I mean, for the AIP,	
20	Q That's because they're budget	20 all of it would have been eliminated. But for	
21	oriented?	21 the, for the programs not AIP, that would have	
22	A Budget oriented and, in this case,	22 been reduced.	
23	net write-off, which is more impacted by the	23 Q Okay. Well, I'd like to go through	
24	economy, I would think, than efforts from the	24 that and understand a little bit more.	
25	company. I agreed with the idea of safety/lost	25 A Okay.	
		·	
			- 1
	Page 62	Page	64
1	Page 62 work DLWA cases.	Page 1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related	64
1 2		•	
1	work DLWA cases.	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related	
2	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume	
2 3	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study?	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes.	
2 3 4	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some	
2 3 4 5	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost	
2 3 4 5 6	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates?	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related	
2 3 4 5 6 7	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that?	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance.	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual KPIs?	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Do you think that having KPIs	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual KPIs? A I wouldn't say that it overrides	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Do you think that having KPIs 18 related to lost workdays would also be a	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual KPIs? A I wouldn't say that it overrides it. It complements.	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Do you think that having KPIs 18 related to lost workdays would also be a 19 reasonable metric?	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual KPIs? A I wouldn't say that it overrides it. It complements. Q Okay. It complements it. But if	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Do you think that having KPIs 18 related to lost workdays would also be a 19 reasonable metric? 20 A Yes. And generally those were	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual KPIS? A I wouldn't say that it overrides it. It complements. Q Okay. It complements it. But if they didn't reach the target that y'all got	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Do you think that having KPIs 18 related to lost workdays would also be a 19 reasonable metric? 20 A Yes. And generally those were 21 allowed.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual KPIs? A I wouldn't say that it overrides it. It complements. Q Okay. It complements it. But if they didn't reach the target that y'all got thrown out; is that right?	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Do you think that having KPIs 18 related to lost workdays would also be a 19 reasonable metric? 20 A Yes. And generally those were 21 allowed. 22 Q Did Staff include any short term	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual KPIs? A I wouldn't say that it overrides it. It complements. Q Okay. It complements it. But if they didn't reach the target that y'all got thrown out; is that right? A Yes.	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Do you think that having KPIs 18 related to lost workdays would also be a 19 reasonable metric? 20 A Yes. And generally those were 21 allowed. 22 Q Did Staff include any short term 23 incentive compensation related to the nuclear	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	work DLWA cases. Q So you would have included some related to that in the cost of service study? A When you say cost of service study Q The Staff's rates, proposed rates? A Yes. That would have been included. Q Do you know how much would have been included related to that? A Below it there's a weighting which says 20 percent. But again, that would also flow through the performance less than target disallowance. Q And that, that particular part of your analysis overrides all the other individual KPIs? A I wouldn't say that it overrides it. It complements. Q Okay. It complements it. But if they didn't reach the target that y'all got thrown out; is that right?	1 Q You also reviewed the KPIs related 2 to the nuclear performance scorecards, I assume 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you recall that there were some 5 related to radiation exposure or total lost 6 workdays? 7 A I believe so, yes. 8 Q Would you think having KPIs related 9 to reducing radiation exposure would be a 10 reasonable thing to include in an incentive comp 11 for that section of the employees? 12 A If you're reducing it, yes. 13 Basically looking for improvement, yes. 14 Q It would benefit the general public 15 if we had less radiation exposure? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Do you think that having KPIs 18 related to lost workdays would also be a 19 reasonable metric? 20 A Yes. And generally those were 21 allowed. 22 Q Did Staff include any short term	

-				ſ
		Page 65		Page 67
1	Q	I don't know.	1	
2	Ā	Okay. If you'll give me a moment.	2	A Okay.
3	Do you	have a specific scorecard you're referring	3	Q The KPI would include a completed
4	to?		4	project which completed projects, which are
5	Q	Oh, I'll probably find one here.	5	
6	Let's se		6	four or more outages by 100 percent. Would that
7	A	Oh, wait. I believe I found it.	1 7	be a KPI that would seem reasonable to you to
8	Q	I have a third quarter nuclear	8	include in an incentive plan?
9	-	nance scorecard I could show you.	9	A Reduce the number of outages?
10	A	Okay.	10	
11	$\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$	Can you tell if you included	11	•
12	-	ng related to the nuclear group?	12	
1	A	Yes. We allowed 80 percent of the	13	,
13		•	14	four or more outages. Wouldn't you agree?
14		t then that got filtered through the	15	A Yes.
15	•	ance less than target.		
16	Q	So none was included?	16	Q Are you also familiar with some of
17	A	That's not true.	17	the reliability measures like SAIFI?
18	Q	That's not true?	18	A Yes.
19	Α	Right. For the contract piece	19	Q Does it seem reasonable to incent
20	Q	Explain what you mean when you	20	employees to improve reliability indexes such as
21	got filte	ered through.	21	SAIFI?
22	Α	I apologize for the imprecision	22	A Yes.
23	•	it what I mean is if the scorecard was	23	Q Mr. Hagemeyer, is it your
24		o AMIP AMIP, eight percent was	24	understanding that AmerenUE has reviewed its
25	allowed	of the total, and that would depend on	25	short term incentive plan to try to meet the
		Page 66		Page 68
1		card itself from there on out as to	1	criteria the Staff and the Commission included in
2		or not those were goals allowed. And in	2	their last rate case, to come closer to what they
3		80 percent of the management piece was	3	understood the Commission's concerns were?
4		f that. And then the contract piece,	4	A Could you repeat your question?
5	none of it	was allowed because they fell under	5	Q Is it your understanding that
6	the AIP.	That was completely the AIP did not	6	AmerenUE has revised its short term incentive
7	_	et completely.	7	plan to try to meet the criteria the Staff and
8	Q	But some of the management KPIs did	8	Commission that was announced in the last rate
9	meet the	target, so you included those?	9	case?
10	Α	Yes.	10	A Is there a specific mention of this
11	Q	Okay. Did you also, I saw one	11	in the testimony? In Krista Bauer's?
12	scorecar	d called Twin Rivers division. Would	12	Q Yes. Krista Bauer talks about it
13	that be a	scorecard that you would have looked	13	at
14	at? It in		14	A Page 9.
15	Α	Do you have the title?	15	Q Page 9, line 13. "Why did AmerenUE
16		Yeah.	16	revise its short term compensation plans." Down
17	•	Is it the ED distribution services	17	at line 20 she says, "As a part of the review
18	Twin Rive		18	process, we considered prior feedback from the
19		The one I was looking at, it was	19	Commission, and as a result, removed earnings per
20	_	has scorecard under LaBoube?	20	share as the primary funding mechanism for all
21		u-b-e? Something like that?	21	but the AIPO plan." Is that your understanding?
22			22	A That it says that there, yes.
F		Give me just a moment.	23	
23	-	Sure. Mine has Twin Rivers		The state of the s
24	aivision	scorecard in parentheses at the top.	24	that were made to the incentive plan since the
25	Dar I.	we can short circuit and I can just ask	25	last case are improvements to the plan? From

Page 71 Page 69 related incentive compensation allowed by the your perspective as an auditor? amount that the company paid for performance that 2 My understanding of, again, I did 2 3 did not fully meet the targets; is that correct? 3 not see the KPIs that were used in the last case. 4 But we do agree with a lot of the KPIs that are 5 used and, you know, as to whether it's an 5 0 Did you review the performance of each individual employee to determine if he or 6 6 improvement over the last case, I'd be --7 she fully met the KPI target? 7 Q Okay, well, you've looked at this plan and obviously you've disallowed 98 percent 8 Α Nο. 8 9 Did you just review the aggregate 9 of the costs. How would you suggest that Ameren Q data regarding larger groups of employees to improve its incentive compensation plan in the 10 determine if that larger group met the target? 11 future? 11 12 12 I would suggest they reduce the Α 13 Q If all call center employees, for 13 emphasis on financial and project based KPIs. 14 Q Okay. And by financial you mean 14 example, with the exception of a single employee 15 fully met the KPI target, how would Staff have 15 the staying within budget type goals? treated the costs associated with that incentive 16 A Among, yeah, that and the earnings 16 compensation? 17 17 per share KPIs and --18 Could you repeat your question? Q Which they did for the, for all but Α 18 19 the 25 percent? 19 I'm sorry. 20 A There are still KPIs with those 20 Yeah. For example, I'm just 21 asking, I'm trying to understand how you did 21 requirements in there. 22 this. If all the call center employees with the 22 Q Okay. And you'd suggest reducing exception of just one person met, fully met the 23 those further? 23 24 target of the KPI, but because the one employee 24 Α Yes. 25 Anything else? didn't meet that target, and as a result the Q Page 72 Page 70 group as a whole didn't meet the target, would Just so long as it would stay 1 2 within the ideas laid out in the Commission's 2 you have disallowed all of those costs? EC-87114 case, and so that -- and the service 3 I mean, it would depend. If the 3 4 oriented type goals, stuff like that. 4 group itself got, I mean, if the --5 Q If the group was 99 percent of the 5 Q If Ameren made those kinds of 6 target, it would have been disallowed; is that improvements, would you expect it to be less 6 7 right? 7 objectionable from the Staff's perspective? 8 It would, again, it would depend on 8 If they failed to meet the target, 9 9 that percentage which they didn't meet the target the goals that they use. Q If they eliminated the earnings per 10 would be disallowed, yes. 10 Q And if you had ten employees that share and the staying within budget type goals, 11 11 fully met the target, or nine employees that 12 would that be less objectionable to the Staff? 12 13 I believe so. 13 fully met the target but one employee that did Be more likely to be found to be an 14 not, that would mean that the total of ten didn't 14 Q 15 fully meet it. Correct? 15 includable cost in a rate case? 16 Α One out of ten doesn't make the 16 A Well, we didn't want to include performance measures that don't require 17 17 target. improvement. So, so long as improvement can be 18 The result would be that the whole 18 group would be disallowed because they didn't 19 shown, we would consider them. It would depend 20 have the whole group meeting the target. 20 on the specific measures used. 21 I'm sorry, I'd have to go back and 21 Okay. On page 3 of your rebuttal 22 22 review the plan documents for that. I mean, in 23 Give me just a minute. 23 my understanding was, this was a, um, when we Q Sure. At lines 10 through 12, you 24 asked the question, we asked what percentage of 24

Fax: 314.644.1334

payouts were related to performance less than

state, the Staff reduced the amount of KPI

25

Page 75 Page 73 target. And if the group didn't meet the target, already compensated at market rates through the then that would have been within that percentage. 2 employees' base pay and represents performance 2 3 that should currently be expected of the 3 And it would have been disallowed. 4 4 employees. Is that right? 5 So, it's hypothetically possible 5 A That's in there, ves. Q 6 Q Is that your personal belief here, 6 that all but one of the employees of a particular 7 that's what you're reflecting? 7 group could have fully met the target, but 8 because one person didn't, the group as a whole Α Yes. 8 9 Would you describe for me what you 9 didn't meet the target. Wouldn't that be true? Q 10 10 mean there by the stretch goal term? Potentially. 11 And in that set of circumstances, 11 The stretch goal term I believe is used in Krista Bauer's rebuttal testimony on page 12 the whole group would have been disallowed 12 13 10, line 13, she defines that. A goal that because they didn't fully meet the target. 13 14 14 AmerenUE employees are striving to achieve. 15 Q Okay. Now, as we discussed a 15 If the group didn't receive a 16 minute ago, if everyone in the employee group met 16 payout based on that one person, yes, you're 17 the stretch goal but one employee only met 95 correct. 17 18 percent of that stretch goal, so everybody except 18 And even if they did, but it wasn't one had got there, but one only got 95 percent of 19 at the targeted level, that's where the Staff 19 20 made the disallowance; isn't that true? 20 the way, would Staff have disallowed all of the 21 costs associated with that group because the 21 22 group as a whole didn't get to that stretch goal? 22 So, in that circumstance, if they 23 23 had made the first level as a whole group but Α Yes. 24 Or let's say that if all the 24 then they didn't get to the full target level 0 25 because one person didn't meet it, the whole 25 employees came within 99 percent of achieving the Page 74 Page 76 group would have not been included in the Staff's stretch goal but they didn't get there as a 1 group, would Staff have disallowed all the costs 2 rates. Right? 3 Performance less than target was 3 associated with that particular KPI? 4 not in Staff's rates. Yes. 4 5 5 Okay. Now, on page 16 you state, Mr. Hagemeyer, have you done any 6 studies to determine if AmerenUE's base pay 6 the Staff believes that performance that falls 7 short of the, quote, stretch goals, unquote -levels are comparable to other public utilities if there's no incentive compensation included in 8 Excuse me, sir, which --8 9 I'm sorry. Page 16. 9 employees' paychecks? Q 10 I don't have a page 16. 10 If their base pay is? Well, I had You don't have a page 16. Okay. 11 a meeting with Ameren personnel where I did 11 Let me find it, then. Sorry. review salary surveys with this individual and 12 13 Unless I'm missing something. 13 their base pay was solidly within the middle, is 14 I'm sure you're right. Do you know 14 what I was told. Within the market range. Q Okay. When you state that Staff where you address stretch goals in your 15 15 testimony? 16 believes that performance that falls short of 16 17 I believe it's page 3. 17 these stretch goals is already compensated at 18 Okay. 18 market rates through the employees' base rates, 19 Lines 12 and 13. Or I'm sorry --19 what is that based on? What is that opinion 20 based on? 20 okay, the Staff believes that performance that

Fax: 314.644.1334

Well, the response based on the

That actually means they have to go beyond normal

fact that the stretch goals require improvement.

performance. Normal performance is included in

21

22

23

24

25

their market pay.

falls short of --

Q Yeah. I was trying to quote line

that falls short of these stretch goals is

16, not page 16. Okay. Here on page 3 at line

16 you say, the Staff believes that performance

21

22

23

24

	Page 77		Page 79
,1	Q Okay. So it's your perspective or	1	the work papers dealing with these initiatives?
2	opinion that the base rate is for normal	2	A Yes.
3	activities or normal performance, and that that	3	Q And if has Staff now determined
4	is that anything above that is would be	4	the appropriateness of an adjustment for these
5	let me withdraw that. That's not a good	5	programs from test year levels?
6	question.	6	A I believe the, that we're on the
7	Have you ever performed a study to	7	verge of making that determination, yes.
8	compare compensation rates with existing market	8	Q Okay. And you'll let the company
9	rates yourself?	9	know what your thoughts are?
10	A Myself? Have I collected data from	10	A Yes.
11	multitudes of utility companies to compare	11	Q Have you supported anything in the
12	salaries?	12	case up until now related to that adjustment?
13	Q Compare salary levels or wage	13	A I'm sorry, can you
14	levels?	14	Q Have you included anything in
15	A No. I have not. And let me be	15	addition to
16	clear, you're asking if I, like Hewitt and	16	A Test year levels?
17	Associates, did the study?	17	Q Yes.
18	Q Right.	18	A No.
19	A No, I did not.	19	Q Okay. Will you do that at true up
20	Q And you didn't look at the Hewitt	20	or when will that happen?
21	and Associates study?	21	A Yes, that would be part of true up,
22	A I don't remember which study it	22	if it's deemed that those are adjustments that
23	was, but I believe that was one of the ones that	23	are necessary and appropriate.
24	AmerenUE relies upon.	24	MR. FISCHER: Okay. I appreciate
25	Q But you haven't done anything	25	your time and effort on a Friday. That's all I
<u> </u>			
	Page 78	1	Page 80
1	for example, state Personnel Advisory Board does	1	have.
2	those kinds of things.	2	THE REPORTER: What would you like
3	A I don't, no.	3	to do about signature?
4	Q Do you know how you would go about	4	MR. DOTTHEIM: Yes.
5	structuring that kind of a study?	5	THE REPORTER: He'll read and sign?
6	A No.	6	MR. DOTTHEIM: Yes.
7	Q Or how you would go about gathering	7	MR. FISCHER: And I, we've got a
8	the data for that?	8	hearing coming up beginning next week. Is it
9	A No.	9	possible to get this expedited a bit?
10	Q Just a couple other quick issues to	10	THE REPORTER: Yes.
11	tie up here at the end of your testimony. In	11	MR. FISCHER: Can you send it
1		12	electronically, and I'd take a hard copy, too.
12	your surrebuttal at page 6, line 13 through 16,		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	you're discussing the vegetation management	13	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take
12 13 14	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs.	13 14	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single
12 13 14 15	you're discussing the vegetation management	13 14 15	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script.
12 13 14 15 16	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16?	13 14 15 16	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four
12 13 14 15	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say	13 14 15 16 17	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say there, to date, the Staff has not received an	13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy. (Wherein, the taking of the instant
12 13 14 15 16 17	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say there, to date, the Staff has not received an update of work papers dealing with these	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy. (Wherein, the taking of the instant deposition ceased.)
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say there, to date, the Staff has not received an update of work papers dealing with these initiatives. Once these updates are received,	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy. (Wherein, the taking of the instant deposition ceased.) (Deposition to be read and signed
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say there, to date, the Staff has not received an update of work papers dealing with these initiatives. Once these updates are received, the Staff will determine the necessity and	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy. (Wherein, the taking of the instant deposition ceased.)
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say there, to date, the Staff has not received an update of work papers dealing with these initiatives. Once these updates are received, the Staff will determine the necessity and appropriateness of an adjustment from test year	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy. (Wherein, the taking of the instant deposition ceased.) (Deposition to be read and signed
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say there, to date, the Staff has not received an update of work papers dealing with these initiatives. Once these updates are received, the Staff will determine the necessity and appropriateness of an adjustment from test year expense levels; is that right?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy. (Wherein, the taking of the instant deposition ceased.) (Deposition to be read and signed
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say there, to date, the Staff has not received an update of work papers dealing with these initiatives. Once these updates are received, the Staff will determine the necessity and appropriateness of an adjustment from test year expense levels; is that right? A Yes.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy. (Wherein, the taking of the instant deposition ceased.) (Deposition to be read and signed
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you're discussing the vegetation management infrastructure and reliability programs. A I'm sorry, which lines? 13 through 16? Q 13 through 16, I believe. You say there, to date, the Staff has not received an update of work papers dealing with these initiatives. Once these updates are received, the Staff will determine the necessity and appropriateness of an adjustment from test year expense levels; is that right?	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DOTTHEIM: And we'll take everything. Electronically and, you know, single page and the script. MR. FISCHER: Yeah, I like the four pages, too. That's really handy. (Wherein, the taking of the instant deposition ceased.) (Deposition to be read and signed

JEREMY HAGEMEYER 11/14/2008

	Page 81			Page 83
1	•	1	STATE OF)	1 age 05
		2	COUNTY OF)	
2			,	
3		3	I, JEREMY HAGEMEYER, do hereby certify:	
4	•	4	That I have read the foregoing deposition;	
5	and for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify	5	That I have made such changes in form	
6	that the witness whose testimony appears in the	6	and/or substance to the within deposition as	
7	foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that	7	might be necessary to render the same true and	
8	the testimony of said witness was taken by me to	8	correct;	
9	the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to	9	That having made such changes thereon, I	
10		10	hereby subscribe my name to the deposition.	
1		11	I declare under penalty of perjury that	
11		12	the foregoing is true and correct.	
12	•	1		
13	•	13	Executed this day of	_/
14		14	2008, at	
15		15		
16	or otherwise interested in the outcome of the	16		
17	action.	17	Notary Public	
18		18	My commission expires:	
19		19		
20		20		
21	Notary Public in and for	21	JEREMY HAGEMEYER	
1	·	22	JEKENT HAGENETEK	
22	The State of Illinois		TDC/JEDENAY HACENEYED 44/44/00	
23		23	TRS/JEREMY HAGEMEYER, 11/14/08	
24	My commission expires June 7, 2009	24	In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318	
25		25		
		<u> </u>		
1				
	Page 82			Page 84
1	Midwest Litigation Services	1	WITNESS ERRATA SHEET	Page 84
	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street	1 2	WITNESS ERRATA SHEET Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER	Page 84
1 2 3	Midwest Litigation Services			Page 84
2 3 4	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334	2	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318	Page 84
2 3 4 5	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008	2 3 4	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER	Page 84
2 3 4 5 6	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel	2 3 4 5	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08	Page 84
2 3 4 5 6	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission	2 3 4 5 6	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line #	Page 84
2 3 4 5 6	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel	2 3 4 5 6 7	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read:	Page 84
2 3 4 5 6 7	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line #	Page 84
2 3 4 5 6	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	Page 84
2 3 4 5 6 7	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line #	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Page # Line # Should read: Should read:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Page # Line # Should read: Should read:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Should read: Eason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Should read: Eason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Should read: Reason for change: Should read: Should read: Should read: Should read: Should read: Should read:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Should read: Eason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections desired on the errata sheets, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Page # Line # Should read: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections desired on the errata sheets, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Page # Line # Should read: Should read: Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections desired on the errata sheets, and sign the signature page before a notary public. Please return the errata sheets and notarized signature page to Mr. James Fischer for filing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Page # Line # Should read: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections desired on the errata sheets, and sign the signature page before a notary public. Please return the errata sheets and notarized signature page to Mr. James Fischer for filing prior to trial date.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections desired on the errata sheets, and sign the signature page before a notary public. Please return the errata sheets and notarized signature page to Mr. James Fischer for filing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections desired on the errata sheets, and sign the signature page before a notary public. Please return the errata sheets and notarized signature page to Mr. James Fischer for filing prior to trial date. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Sincerely,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections desired on the errata sheets, and sign the signature page before a notary public. Please return the errata sheets and notarized signature page to Mr. James Fischer for filing prior to trial date. Thank you for your attention to this matter.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Midwest Litigation Services 711 North 11th Street St. Louis, Missouri 63101 Phone (314) 644-2191 * Fax (314) 644-1334 November 17, 2008 Staff of the Commission Office of the General Counsel Missouri Public Service Commission Governor Office Building 200 Madison Street, Suite 100 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 Attn: Mr. Steven Dottheim In Re: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Dear Mr. Dottheim: Please find enclosed your copy of the deposition of JEREMY HAGEMEYER, taken on November 14, 2008, in the above-referenced case. Also enclosed is the original signature page and errata sheets. Please have the witness read your copy of the transcript, indicate any changes and/or corrections desired on the errata sheets, and sign the signature page before a notary public. Please return the errata sheets and notarized signature page to Mr. James Fischer for filling prior to trial date. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Sincerely, Tara Schwake, CRR, RPR, CSR	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Witness Name: JEREMY HAGEMEYER Case Name: Union Electric ER-2008-0318 Date Taken: 11/14/08 Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change: Page # Line # Should read: Reason for change:	

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

				T .
A	again 21:5 42:17	12:25	77:17,21	48:11
ability 25:4,12 81:9	52:5 60:1 62:12	AMIP 38:25 65:24	assume 24:23 26:22	Bauer 29:6 33:7
able 24:9.15 25:6.14	63:11 69:2 70:8	65:24	64:2	53:10 68:12
25:20 26:4,7	against 28:10 39:17	among 12:11 36:18	assuming 12:17	Bauer's 15:18 42:8
50:20 51:8,15	age 6:9	69:16	26:16,17,19	68:11 75:12
about 7:21 9:24	agents 56:21 63:2	amount 30:14 32:8	Atmos 10:14 11:18	become 53:14
17:1,11 30:24	aggregate 40:2 71:9	32:12,18 36:25	11:22 12:6	before 1:1 3:1,16,19
38:7 39:24 40:3	ago 75:16	39:21 63:6 70:25	attention 82:19	8:25 13:18 82:16
41:5 50:10 55:7	agree 20:21 21:9	71:2	Attn 82:9	begin 8:4
67:1 68:12 78:4,7	22:4,21 23:3,11	amounts 39:19 63:5	attorney 13:23	beginning 8:5 80:8
80:3	23:13 24:8,14,24	analysis 62:16	81:14	begins 13:8,10
above 77:4	25:8 26:8,15 27:9	and/or 82:15 83:6	attract 24:9,15,17	BEHALF 1:16
above-referenced	48:18 50:19 51:4	announced 68:8	24:18,19 25:20	being 6:7 16:18
82:13	51:10,17,18 57:4	annual 56:19 63:1	26:4 50:21 51:8	30:1,18 32:9,19
accept 51:3	59:11 67:14 69:4	another 17:25 56:5	51:15 54:23	33:15 56:7,14
acceptable 34:16	agreed 6:1 11:25	answer 7:10 37:25	attractive 57:23	belief 75:6
accidents 23:5 24:6	30:17 61:25 62:25	56:20 58:7,16	attributable 56:7	believe 6:16 8:6 9:3
accommodate 7:15	63:2	63:1	attributed 56:13	12:24 13:10,23
according 31:5	AIP 42:3,8 63:19,21	answered 58:24	audit 53:18 54:6	17:21 18:17 19:22
account 47:24 51:2	66:6,6	anticipate 48:8	auditor 8:17 14:1	21:18,22 22:8,14
1 accounting 0.15	AIPO 68:21	anticipated 44:23	69:1	22:25 25:20 26:4
achieve 45:12 75:14	allocation 9:24	anything 8:1 53:23	auditors 13:16	33:17,25 34:4
achievement 39:3	11:11	54:14,18 59:13,15	August 27:15	38:20 45:15 52:15
43:18	allow 20:20 30:7	63:7 65:12 69:25	Authority 1:5 3:5	55:24 57:8,14
achievements 36:15	39:12 42:16 43:24	77:4,25 79:11,14	available 28:21	58:6 59:25 60:1
achieving 75:25	44:18 47:9	apologize 22:12	29:2	60:10,15 64:7
uci 055 50.10,11	allowance 30:4,5,6	25:10 26:1 30:3	Avenue 3:16	65:7 70:13 74:17
53:19,23	allowed 31:22 32:3	58:13 63:10 65:22	average 56:20 58:7	75:11 77:23 78:17
action 81:12,17	37:25 38:4,16	APPEARANCES	58:15 63:1	79:6
activities 77:3	39:13 40:6 60:23	4:1	award 36:10 44:16	believes 74:6,20,24
activity 22:6	61:19 63:11,15	appears 9:11 11:16	52:14	76:16
actually 38:20	64:21 65:13,25	81:6	awarding 45:20	below 31:12 39:19
66:20 76:23	66:2,4,5 71:1	Appendix 8:7 9:8	47:19 48:11	61:9,10 62:11
auu 0.1	alone 44:15 47:22	applies 42:5	awards 39:2	benefit 20:23 21:10
addition 26:22	47:23	apply 55:16	aware 12:12	22:23 23:4,8,16
17.13	already 75:1 76:17	appreciate 79:24	away 34:1 35:19	27:19 57:6 61:3
additional 27.10	Ameren 10:4 16:6	appropriate 34:2	36:1,3	64:14
41:12	18:15,24 31:2	39:14 45:23 46:10	В	benefits 22:6 24:25
address 6:19 9:15	38:22 39:7 40:5	46:17,22 47:19	back 34:11 35:16	best 81:9
23:18 41:14 43:24	40:20,22 41:9,18	48:19 79:23		bet 55:19
44:18 45:6,25	42:2 50:22 51:3,6	appropriateness	53:8 72:21	better 45:16 58:22
46:12,20 74:15	53:7 55:9 57:11	78:22 79:4	background 8:5,8 bad 47:14,16	between 3:12 6:2
addressed 11:14	57:16 69:9 70:5	area 1:7 3:7 6:21		11:22 12:2
17:22 47:5 48:3	76:11 AmerenUE 1:5 3:5	around 38:18 asked 26:2 63:11	bag 56:16,19,21 58:1	beyond 48:25 76:23
auequate 24.23		72:24,24	base 41:8 75:2 76:6	big 40:2 bit 39:24 55:6 63:10
25:3,7,11,15	4:16 6:15,17,24	*	76:10,13,18 77:2	63:24 80:9
27:17 46:5	9:12,14 10:16 12:14 14:19 19:6	asking 20:6 31:20	based 18:10,12	blanket 34:15
adequately 27:11	20:3 25:6,14 33:2	37:17 54:14 59:7 71:21 77:16	29:18,22 36:11,14	Board 78:1
adjustment 40:19	-		39:2 42:22 43:11	bonus 13:1,3 52:8
78:22 79:4,12	33:4,8,13 34:7 50:20 51:8,13,15	aspects 28:7 assist 10:20	48:24 49:5,11	52:14,17 53:3
adjustments 79:22	56:2 67:24 68:6	associated 14:20	69:13 73:16 76:19	break 7:13,14,14
adopted 21:14	68:15 75:14 77:24	17:10 36:20 39:7	76:20,21	24:13
advice 20:8	AmerenUE's 21:3	41:18,21 42:14	Basically 64:13	broken 37:3
auvisors 54.7	28:1 76:6	53:3 71:16 75:21	basing 47:22	budget 43:18 44:14
Advisory 78:1	Ameren's 54:4,11	76:3	basis 19:25 40:1	45:1,5,11,17 47:2
arter 0.21	American 10:10	Associates 54:3,7	45:14,20 47:19	47:10,13,16,23
afternoon 3:14	ramerican 10.10	ASSULIALES J4.J, /	73.17,40 71.17	+1.10,1J,10,4J

		T		T age 0
48:7,16,19 61:20	centers 50:5,12 58:8	71:2 79:8	contradict 53:24	19:24 20:9 21:4
61:22 69:15 70:11	certain 3:19 43:19	company's 1:7 3:7	contribution 36:15	22:1 23:3,8,11,21
budgeted 44:24,25	CERTIFICATE	28:23 29:5 45:23	copy 15:20 55:18	25:7,15 26:23
budgets 43:18 44:7	81:1	46:10,17 50:4	80:12 82:12,15	45:12 50:22 56:2
44:13	Certified 3:17 6:5	comparable 76:7	correct 8:9,20 9:12	56:25 57:5,6,9,15
budget's 48:6	certify 81:5 83:3	compare 77:8,11,13	10:2,6,9 11:20,23	60:7 67:5,13
build 24:10,15	change 16:25 30:15	compared 31:22	12:5,9,13 13:4,10	
45:24 46:11,18	84:8,12,16,20,24	compensated 75:1	14:16 15:16 17:2	D
Building 4:7 82:7	changed 30:16	76:17	17:8 18:22 19:4,9	D 2:1
built 48:15	changes 82:15 83:5	compensation 9:16	19:11 25:16 27:7	data 71:10 77:10
	83:9	11:21 12:7,16	27:20 43:11 44:1	78:8
C	check 35:16	13:9,14 14:5,9,13	49:2 52:15,25	date 78:18 82:18
calculate 31:25	circuit 66:25	16:10,17 17:9,17	54:17 56:8 71:3	84:4
calculated 37:24	circumstance 73:22	18:8,25 19:6,7,11	72:15 73:14,17	day 3:12,14 29:12
calculation 37:11	circumstances 47:3	19:15,18 20:13	83:8,12	83:13
40:9	73:11	21:1 27:18 28:2	corrections 82:16	days 29:9
call 49:14 50:5,12	City 4:9,19 6:20 9:2	29:21 31:1,7 33:3	correctly 41:5	dealing 78:19 79:1
50:16 56:8,14	82:8	40:16,16,19 44:4	cost 8:6 13:6 14:12	Dear 82:11
58:8,11 59:1,8	clarified 61:1	44:10 46:18 47:1	14:15 16:9,12	decide 51:2
71:13,22	clarify 7:7 29:13	50:25 51:7,14	27:15 30:9 37:14	decision 16:13,15
Callaway 9:24	clear 60:2 63:10	54:13 55:3,9	37:21 40:16,17	37:13,18,22,23
11:10	77:16	57:17 58:11 59:1	47:21,21 49:23	38:3 40:15 42:25
called 41:11 66:12	closer 68:2	61:11 64:23 68:16	52:24 59:2 62:3,4	53:2
calls 56:7,14,20	code 6:21	69:10 71:1,17	70:15	declare 83:11
58:9 63:1,2	coffee 7:14	76:8 77:8	costs 14:19 17:3,9	decreases 48:9
came 75:25	collected 77:10	compete 50:20	18:8 23:5 31:1	deemed 79:22
capacity 24:25 25:3	come 47:9 53:19,23	competitive 51:7,14	36:19 37:14,20	defend 12:7,15 Defendant 6:3
25:4,11,12	54:23 68:2	complaint 20:3	39:6 41:18,21,22	define 43:13,15
capital 9:3 24:9,15 24:17,18,19 26:15	comes 15:10 32:12	complements 62:19 62:20	42:14 44:4,10 48:9,9,16 52:17	49:10
26:24 43:18 44:7	coming 80:8 commission 1:1 3:1	completed 48:15	52:20 53:2 69:9	defines 75:13
44:13	3:15,20 4:3,4,6	67:3,4	71:16 72:2 75:21	definition 49:4
card 59:22	8:17 9:8 20:1,2	completely 42:20	76:2	definitions 28:22
case 1:5 3:5,21 6:17	21:14,19,23 22:9	66:6,7	counsel 4:5 6:2,3	degree 8:12
6:23,25 9:12,15	22:15 54:21,23	component 17:14	7:8 81:11,14 82:6	delayed 56:13
10:4,16,17,22,23	68:1,8,19 81:24	41:8,11,11 53:15	COUNTY 83:2	depend 20:10 21:5
11:13,18,24 12:6	82:6,7 83:18	53:21	couple 67:1 78:10	22:2,18 34:14
12:11,14,14 13:3	Commission's 35:3	components 41:7	court 61:4	65:25 70:8,19
14:5,9 20:3 33:4,9	68:3 70:2	concerns 68:3	creating 23:9	72:3
34:20,24 35:6,9	commodities 18:16	conclude 18:23 19:4	credentials 8:9	Depending 63:19
35:18 49:24 50:11	40:21 41:19	conducted 54:3	criteria 20:20 35:14	deposition 1:15
61:22 66:3 68:2,9	common 53:14,21	consider 33:23	68:1,7	3:10 6:3,23 80:19
68:25 69:3,6 70:3	communicate 56:1	70:19	criticism 35:2,3	80:20 81:7,13
70:15 79:12 82:13	comp 11:17 12:21	considered 35:25	CRR 5:7 82:22	82:12 83:4,6,10
84:3	13:17 64:10	68:18	CSR 82:22	derive 37:9
cases 9:7 10:3,11,14	companies 21:16,20	construction 24:25	current 22:20 51:1	derived 40:10
11:1,3,5,11 48:14	21:24 22:10,16	25:21 26:5,10,14	51:3	describe 75:9
62:1	25:5 54:4,11	27:2	currently 35:12	describing 29:11
Cassidy 5:9	77:11	consumers 20:23	75:3	designed 21:14 52:2
catch 29:7	companion 10:15	21:11 22:6,23	customer 12:25	55:2
cause 3:19 47:11	company 1:4,16 3:4	23:16	13:2 20:13,22	desired 82:16
Cc 82:24	6:10 11:5,24 12:3	contained 47:1	22:11,17,22 28:8	determination 79:7
ceased 80:19	12:25 23:4 24:5	context 58:15	39:15 46:5,6,7	determine 14:3,7
center 50:16 56:8	25:13 28:5,20	contexts 48:20	49:20 55:15,16,23	71:6,11 76:6
56:14 58:11 59:1	29:2,15,19 32:15	continue 24:10 52:3	58:23 59:19 60:9	78:21
59:8 63:3 71:13	32:24 35:18 39:21	contract 60:2,14,16	60:12 61:9	determined 79:3
71:22	47:9 50:11 61:25	64:25 65:19 66:4	customers 1:6 3:6	determining 28:23

		- ₁		r age o
different 28:12	17:22 18:1,4,10	employment 50:21	15:8 16:3,18,23	finding 54:10
direction 33:24	18:12,19,25 19:7	54:20,21	33:15 36:7,20	fine 59:23
34:5,14 35:25	19:19 20:1,5	enclosed 82:12,13	37:1,19 38:8 40:8	firm 6:18
81:10	25:19,22 26:3,6,9	Enclosures 82:23	53:15,22 54:12	first 8:21 11:13
directly 14:14 16:11	26:12,16,17,20,21	end 78:11	existing 77:8	12:14 41:8 73:23
director 36:14	27:1,3,6 33:13,18	energy 11:18 25:4	expect 70:6	Fischer 2:4 4:17,21
directors 17:2,5,11	33:20 34:1,15,18	25:12	expected 7:10 21:10	6:13,15,18 7:25
17:12,18 18:4	34:22 35:4,10,19	ensure 28:6	23:15 49:1 67:5	8:4 61:13 79:24
36:10 52:12	35:23 36:2,3,11	entire 39:9	75:3	80:7,11,16 82:18
disagree 34:18	38:11 43:19 49:18	environment 23:10	expedited 80:9	82:24
disallow 36:19,22	68:19 69:16 70:10	EPBP 52:8	expense 78:23	fix 44:24
39:6,9 41:17	economy 61:24	EPS 14:14 16:11	expenses 9:21 11:10	flexibility 43:24
42:13,19	EC-87114 20:2 70:3	17:5 43:19	expires 81:24 83:18	44:18
disallowance 28:16	ED 55:23 60:9,12	equals 61:12	explain 28:21 29:3	flow 62:12
29:20,25 30:2,6	66:17	errata 82:14,16,17	29:16 30:13 59:18	focus 46:3
31:5,6,18,23	education 8:6,8	84:1	61:15 65:20	folks 52:12
43:10 50:17 62:14	efficiencies 47:8	ER-2007-0002 10:7	explanations 29:15	follows 6:11
73:20	effort 79:25	ER-2008-0318 1:5	exposure 64:5,9,15	force 51:9,16
disallowances 18:3	efforts 61:24	3:5,21 6:17 82:10	expressly 6:7	forecasted 61:11
50:4,12	eight 3:13 65:24	83:24 84:3	extension 40:22	foregoing 81:7 83:4
disallowed 14:15	EIP 16:23	essentially 41:9	extent 7:3	83:12
16:12 17:3,9,17	EIP-O 16:4	established 39:20	external 34:7	forenoon 3:13
18:9,12,20 39:22	either 47:20 48:8	estimate 18:2,18		form 19:10 83:5
42:25 44:5,11	elaborate 29:1	37:4	F	found 50:16 54:4,14
52:16,21 69:8	electric 1:4,6,16 3:4	evaluate 27:17	facilities 27:11	65:7 70:14
72:2,6,10,19 73:3	3:6 6:10 10:3	61:16	fact 18:24 19:6,18	four 60:4 67:6,14
73:12 75:20 76:2	21:15,20,23 22:10	evaluated 59:18	19:22 76:22	80:16
discuss 53:6	22:15 23:15 25:5	even 73:18	factor 50:25	Friday 79:25
discussed 75:15	25:13 82:10 83:24	ever 6:22 54:22	factors 9:25 11:11	from 8:12,21 14:15
discussing 78:13	84:3	55:2 77:7	failed 39:21 72:8	15:10 16:12 23:4
discussions 29:12	electronically 80:12	every 19:14	fails 51:6,13	25:12 32:13,20
dispute 53:20 54:10	80:14	everybody 75:18	fairly 7:4	33:3,9 34:1,24
distribution 24:11	eligible 52:13	everyone 75:16	fall 59:3	35:6,8,19 36:1,1,3
24:21 66:17	eliminated 63:17,20	everything 80:14	falls 74:6,21,25	37:9 40:10 42:7
division 66:12,24	70:10	evidence 53:19 54:9	76:16	45:4 47:14 61:24
DLWA 62:1	emphasis 69:13	Exactly 58:2	familiar 7:1 50:2	66:1 68:18,25
documents 72:22	employed 8:16	Examination 2:4	67:16	70:7 77:10 78:22
doing 29:9	81:11,15	6:12	far 60:5	79:5
done 7:16 76:5	employee 23:1	examined 3:11 6:10	Fax 82:3	front 34:25 41:16
77:25	28:12 49:1 71:6	example 18:14 23:6	feedback 68:18	full 61:7 73:24
Dority 4:17 6:19	71:14,24 72:13	49:7,10 55:15	feel 29:14	fully 71:3,7,15,23
Dottheim 4:11 80:4	75:16,17 81:14	59:24 61:15 71:14	fell 66:5	72:12,13,15 73:7
80:6,13 82:9,11	employees 21:24	71:20 78:1	file 1:5 3:5 10:18	73:13
down 24:13 43:15	22:10,16 23:9	exceed 45:5	filed 13:18 49:24	fund 25:21 26:5,10
68:16	24:1 28:6 38:24	excellent 20:13	filing 27:16 82:18	27:1,6
dozen 41:3	42:2,5 44:5,11	except 52:11 75:18	filtered 65:14,21	funded 34:21 42:10
draft 13:12	45:16,25 46:11,19	exception 10:4	final 38:3	funding 15:10,25
driven 35:4	47:2 50:21 51:1,1	33:15 47:3 71:14	finance 26:14 28:8	16:5 17:20 33:14 34:2 35:20 68:20
duly 81:7	51:21 52:3,11	71:23	financial 34:17	
d/b/a 1:4 3:4	58:11,21 59:1,9	exceptional 27:19	43:10,14,16,21	funds 26:22
	60:20 64:11,25	52:8,13,17 53:3	46:4 47:22 69:13	further 69:23 81:13
	67:13,20 71:10,13	exclude 53:2	69:14	future 69:11
E 2:1	71:22 72:11,12	excluded 32:20	financially 81:15 financials 61:19	G
each 63:12 71:6	73:6 75:2,4,14,25	excluding 31:10	find 50:3 57:22	gained 47:8
earnings 14:14,20	76:9,18	excuse 16:24 74:8	58:17 65:5 74:12	O
14:25 15:10,13	employer 54:24	Executed 83:13	82:12	gas 10:14,16 23:14 56:6,13
16:4,11 17:14,19	55:3	executive 14:21,24	02.12	20.0,12

r 	Γ.	<u> </u>		
gathering 78:7	11:22	76:22	62:2,8,10 63:7	82:24
gears 16:25	guess 35:24 43:5	improvements	65:11,16 66:9,14	January 8:18
gencounsel@psc	guidelines 20:18	24:21 68:25 70:6	68:1 74:1 76:8,24	Jefferson 4:9,19
4:13	guys 59:12	improving 20:22	79:14	6:20 9:2 82:8
general 4:5 49:11		21:9 22:5,21,25	includes 8:7 52:10	Jeremy 1:15 2:4
49:13 64:14 82:6	H	inappropriate	including 47:7	3:10 6:8 82:13
generally 9:4 20:21	Hagemeyer 1:15	45:11,14,20 48:10	increase 12:1 23:22	83:3,21 84:2
22:4 24:1,18,19	2:4 3:11 6:8,14,22	48:11	47:12,12,21	jfischer@aol.com
28:2 57:20 59:18	22:8 44:3 48:13	incent 58:21 67:12	increases 48:8	4:22
64:20	50:19 53:6 61:13	67:19	51:21 52:2	Jim 6:15
gentlemen 41:14	67:23 76:5 82:13	incented 19:23 44:6	increasing 1:5 3:5	job 8:21,25 51:3,4
German 8:13	83:3,21,23 84:2	44:11 47:2	57:4,8,14	58:22
getting 58:23	handful 55:12	incenting 20:7	index 63:3	John 5:9
give 15:20 16:20	handle 31:21	incenting 20.7	indexes 67:20	June 61:10 81:24
21:23 22:9,15	handy 80:17	11:17,20 12:7,16	indicate 16:2 27:14	just 7:6,14 10:5
53:12 61:6 65:2	hang 58:16	12:20 13:1,9,13	54:10 82:15	11:1 12:20 13:7
66:22 70:23	Hanneken's 35:9	13:17 14:4,9,13	indicates 14:12 16:9	19:17 20:6 28:2
I .				31:9,13 34:15
given 28:15 29:15	happen 15:17 79:20	14:21,24 15:9,10	indicator 27:23 28:1 42:10 57:10	35:19 37:17 47:10
giving 21:2 56:9	hard 80:12	16:3,10,17,24	l .	
go 9:4,5 13:5 28:19	having 6:9 26:25	17:1,4,9,10,13,17	indicators 17:25	47:18,22 48:5
34:11 35:16 43:15	52:5 64:8,17 83:9	18:8,15,24,25	18:12 36:16 55:7	49:11,14 53:7,12
43:23 53:8 63:23	head 38:15	19:5,7,11,15,18	55:8	55:11 56:9 57:20
72:21 76:23 78:4	health 7:14	20:12,25 21:7	individual 15:14	58:16 59:7,17,23
78:7	hearing 80:8	22:19 27:18 28:2	40:1 62:16 71:6	59:25 61:14 63:16
goal 22:22 23:1	help 26:17 27:6	28:16,24 29:20	76:12	66:22,25 70:1,23
45:11 47:14,17	her 15:23 20:8	30:10,10,20,25	information 27:17	71:9,20,23 78:10
48:6,10,19 75:10	53:20	31:7,10 32:9,19	28:15 29:19,23	<u>K</u>
75:11,13,17,18,22	hesitate 20:18	33:2,8,16 34:8	30:1,3,17 35:13	
76:1	Hewitt 54:3,7 77:16	36:7,20 37:13,19	56:2	Ken 29:5
goals 14:20 15:1,11	77:20	37:20 38:8,23	infrastructure	key 17:24 18:11
15:14 18:10 19:1	He'll 80:5	39:2,7 40:5,8,16	24:11,22 78:14	27:22 28:1 36:16
19:8 20:12,25	high 51:9,16	40:19,23 41:3,10	initiatives 78:20	42:9 55:7,8 57:10
28:5,9,11 36:11	highly 57:1,5,9,15	42:2,5,9 44:4,10	79:1	kind 19:14 49:17
36:14 39:15,15,20	60:7	44:16 45:14,20,23	inspection 9:18	58:19 78:5
46:6,24 66:2	hiring 54:22	46:10,17 47:1,19	11:9	kinds 20:15 57:21
69:15 70:4,9,11	hopefully 7:16	48:11 49:15 50:9	instance 57:25	70:5 78:2
74:7,15,25 76:17	hours 3:12	52:3 53:7,14,21	instant 80:18	Kliethermes 4:12
76:22	human 54:25	54:5,12 55:3,9	interested 81:16	8:2 61:2,6
going 37:20 53:11	hypothetically 73:5	56:17 57:11,17	interrupting 58:14	knew 38:14
good 6:14 19:24		58:11 59:1 61:11	interviews 54:25	know 7:14 16:16
20:8 36:4 48:6	I	64:10,23 67:8,25	investors 25:20	17:16 31:3,4 40:4
77:5	idea 39:18 61:25	68:6,24 69:10	26:4	40:13 48:17 50:5
Goodrich 9:1	ideas 70:2	71:1,16 76:8	involved 10:25	50:13,14,15,18
Governor 4:7 82:7	Illinois 3:19 81:5,22	incentives 21:2,24	13:20 21:6 49:22	51:25 59:4,6,6
graduation 8:21	impacted 61:23	22:3,10,16 36:14	50:1 54:24	60:5,18 62:9 65:1
grants 51:20	important 27:10	45:24,24 46:11,19	involving 10:14,15	69:5 74:14 78:4
great 15:4	45:17	includable 70:15	issue 11:17,21,21	79:9 80:14
gross 9:22,23	imprecision 65:22	include 17:13 36:25	12:10,21 13:3,9	KPI 27:22 45:1
group 41:12 52:12	improve 21:25	57:10,16 58:7,10	14:5,9	49:5,13 56:16
56:1 64:24 65:12	22:11,16 24:11	58:20,25 64:10,22	issues 9:15 11:8,14	57:19 58:7 61:16
71:11 72:1,4,5,19	67:20 69:10	67:3,8 70:16	12:2,8,16 13:14	67:3,7 70:25 71:7
72:20 73:1,7,8,12	improved 23:25	included 9:6 16:17	43:25 44:19 45:7	71:15,24 76:3
73:15,23 74:1	24:3 46:7	16:19 17:5 30:9	46:1,13,20 47:4,7	KPIs 17:21 27:18
75:16,21,22 76:2	improvement 21:6	30:14 31:1 32:10	47:20 48:3 78:10	28:20 29:8,11,13
groups 28:12 40:2	22:19 46:23 48:25	37:7,14,21 39:14		30:22 33:17 35:15
71:10	49:14 58:9 64:13	40:17 41:2,22	J	36:17 38:12 39:3
GR-2006-0387	69:6 70:18,18	52:23 59:8 60:24	James 4:21 82:18	39:13 43:10,11,14
	<u> </u>			

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
43:16,21 47:1	77:16 80:2,16	make 25:24 37:12	72:20 76:11	70:14
48:24 49:11 55:25	likely 70:14	37:22 38:3 40:14	meetings 29:22	morning 6:14
56:24 57:2 59:19	line 43:15 54:2	42:24 53:1 55:20	meets 28:7	moving 34:1 36:3
60:4 62:17 63:8	61:10 68:15,17	58:21 63:16 72:16	members 29:5	much 16:16 17:16
64:1,8,17 65:14	74:22,23 75:13	making 79:7	memory 12:3	18:3,18 29:24
66:8 69:3,4,13,17	78:12 84:6,10,14	manage 56:19	mention 68:10	30:8,20 37:13,18
69:20	84:18,22	62:25	mentioned 10:5	37:19 38:3,16
Krista 15:17 29:6	lines 27:14 28:14	management 9:18	merit 51:20 52:1	40:4 42:16,25
33:7 43:5 53:10	43:3,7 48:22	11:8 18:15 38:23	met 20:17,17,19	52:20 62:9 63:12
68:11,12 75:12	53:11 70:24 74:19	38:23 39:7 40:5	35:11 71:7,11,15	63:13
	78:15	40:22 41:1,9	71:23,23 72:12,13	multitudes 77:11
L	Lisa 35:8	45:12 47:14 56:19	73:7 75:16,17	must 24:9,14
L 4:12	list 11:4	60:5,9,10,20 66:3	method 15:25	Myself 77:10
LaBoube 66:20	listed 60:4	66:8 78:13	metric 16:5 17:6	
lack 28:15	lists 15:24	manager 9:1 36:13	33:20 49:19,19,20	N
Laclede 10:15,17	litigated 11:21 12:2	managers 17:2,4,11	57:16,21 58:20	N 2:1
11:1	12:10	17:12,18 18:4	64:19	name 83:10 84:2,3
laid 20:19 70:2	Litigation 5:2 82:1	36:7,10,12,21	metrics 20:10,15,17	names 29:7
larger 71:10,11	little 31:13,17 39:24	37:1,19 38:8 39:8	21:1 34:22 35:5	name's 6:15
last 6:24 33:4 34:20	55:6 63:9,24	40:5,8,23 52:11	35:20,22 36:2	natural 10:14 23:14
34:24 35:6 68:2,8	long 25:7,15,19	many 63:13	38:12 41:13 46:23	necessarily 46:4
68:25 69:3,6	26:3,7 31:10	market 25:5,13	57:22 59:10 61:16	48:8
later 7:12 29:13	50:22,24 51:7,14	75:1 76:14,18,25	67:1	necessary 26:13
39:24	53:7,14,20 54:5	77:8	middle 76:13	79:23 83:7
law 6:18	54:11 58:23 70:1	marketing 18:16	Midwest 5:2 82:1	necessity 78:21
lawful 6:9	70:18	40:21 41:18	might 17:21 38:21	need 7:11,13 41:14
leadership 36:15	look 20:16 21:8	marketplace 50:21	50:3 83:7	41:15 45:5 48:3
52:10	34:23 35:17 46:23	match 60:16	million 31:14,17,22	58:15 60:2
leak 56:6,13	56:15 60:13 77:20	matter 1:4 3:4	mind 25:9 36:5 56:9	needed 44:23 47:5
leaks 23:14	looked 39:25 40:1	82:19	mine 60:16 66:23	needs 50:20
least 48:20	66:13 69:7	may 6:4 8:13 11:16	minute 30:24 40:3	neither 81:10
less 30:21 38:21	looking 55:22 60:1	23:3 26:9 44:23	53:8,9 70:23	net 61:23
40:12 41:3 42:23	60:14 61:18 64:13	47:8 58:13	75:16	never 51:22
59:16 62:13 63:14	66:19	mean 29:2 33:25	mishandled 56:7,14	new 24:10,15,17
64:15 65:15 70:6	looks 10:13 31:16	34:14 43:4,14	MISO 9:21 11:9,9	57:1
70:12 72:25 74:3	lost 24:6 64:5,18	44:20,21 47:10	Miss 42:7	next 40:20 49:6
let 7:14 25:24 38:2	lot 39:18 69:4	49:10 57:24 58:15	missed 11:4	56:16,18 58:1
42:19 63:9 74:12	Louis 5:4 82:2	58:16,17 59:10	missing 74:13	60:3 80:8
77:5,15 79:8	lower 23:4	63:19 65:20,23	Missouri 1:2,7 3:2,7	nine 72:12
let's 8:4 9:6 36:6	L-a-B-o-u-b-e	69:14 72:3,4,14	3:15,16,21 4:6,9	none 33:19 59:12
38:22 42:1 52:7	66:21	72:22 75:10	4:19 5:4 8:12,22	60:23 65:16 66:5
53:6 55:6 65:6		means 76:23	9:2 10:10 12:24	Nonverbal 8:2
75:24	M	measured 28:10	51:20 55:15,23	non-Ameren 52:9
level 16:14 20:22	made 16:13 28:21	measurements	60:9,12 61:9 82:2	normal 76:23,24
21:15,19 40:15	29:2 37:18,23	28:22 29:3 30:18	82:7,8	77:2,3
43:19 49:12,13	40:18 68:24 70:5	measures 34:17	Mm-hmm 40:24	North 5:3 82:1
53:15,22 73:19,23	73:20,23 83:5,9	43:24 44:18 67:17	moment 13:7 16:20	notarized 82:17
73:24	Madison 4:8,18	70:17,20	53:12 56:10 59:25	notary 3:18 6:4
levels 22:20 76:7	6:20 82:8	measuring 28:6	65:2 66:22	81:4,21 82:16
77:13,14 78:23	mailing 6:19	mechanism 16:5	money 30:8 56:16	83:17
79:5,16	maintain 27:11	33:14 34:2 68:20	56:19,21 58:1	nothing 52:23
like 8:1 10:13 15:22	maintaining 43:16	meet 39:22 66:7,9	monitor 21:15,19	November 1:17
19:19 25:5,13	46:4,7	67:25 68:7 71:3	more 19:12 30:17	3:12 82:5,13
30:23 31:16 39:16	maintenance 27:7	71:25 72:1,8,9,15	45:23 46:3,10,17	nuclear 64:2,23
39:23 40:7 49:8	43:17 44:7,12	73:1,9,13,25	49:11,18 54:5	65:8,12
49:20 54:19 63:23	major 24:21	meeting 14:14	55:6 61:23 63:10	number 6:21 23:4
66:21 67:17 70:4	majority 33:19	16:11 29:4,11	63:24 67:6,14	24:5 31:8,9 41:1
			<u> </u>	

	1	1	1	1
42:17 56:6,12	29:12 37:24 38:10	overrides 62:16,18	pending 3:19	perspective 36:1
57:5 63:15 67:5,9	40:18 51:22 54:5	o'clock 3:13,13	people 29:6 54:23	45:5 47:14 69:1
67:13	55:21,22,25 56:5		per 14:15,20,25	70:7 77:1
numbers 40:2 44:15	56:10,12,18,21	P	15:11,13 16:5,11	phone 6:21 29:13
61:3	57:21,25 58:3	package 51:7,14	17:14,19,22 18:1	82:3
	60:5,13 65:5	53:16	18:4,10,13,19	piece 60:5,14 65:19
0	66:11,19 71:23,24	packages 28:17	19:1,8,20 20:1,5	66:3,4
oath 7:19	72:13,16 73:6,8	53:22	33:13,18,20 34:1	Plaintiff 6:2
objectionable 70:7	73:16,25 75:17,19	page 2:3 3:15 13:8	34:15,18,22 35:4	plan 14:21,24 15:9
70:12	75:19 77:23	14:11 15:22,23	35:10,19,23 36:2	15:10 16:3,18,24
objections 7:8,12	ones 77:23	16:8 27:13 28:14	36:3,11 38:11	17:1,4,10,13 18:1
18:23 19:5	ongoing 27:6	43:2,6 48:22 49:6	43:19 49:18 63:1	18:5,15,16 27:19
objective 58:19	only 50:9 60:4	53:10 61:3,7	68:19 69:17 70:10	31:1,12 33:3,3,8
obviously 58:17	75:17,19	68:14,15 70:21	percent 15:9,13,14	33:16 35:3 36:7,7
69:8	operating 23:5	74:5,9,10,11,17	16:4 17:20,25	36:20 37:1,13,19
occur 48:9	operation 44:6,12	74:23,23 75:12	31:21 32:3,6,7,11	37:20 38:8,16,23
occurred 44:22	operational 28:9	78:12 80:15 82:14	32:21 36:10,12	39:4,8,17 40:5,8
off 38:14	39:15 43:25 44:19	82:16,18 84:6,10	38:10,11,19 39:2	40:15,21,23 41:3
offered 13:19 22:19	45:6 46:1,13,20	84:14,18,22	40:11 42:9,11	41:7,8,10,19,21
35:14	47:4,7,20 48:2	pages 13:5 80:17	53:2 54:4 56:25	41:24 42:2,5,14
offhand 18:6,21	operationally 44:22	paid 71:2	57:15 61:12 62:12	42:25 44:4,10
31:3 40:7	operations 43:17	papers 10:19 15:3	65:13,24 66:3	45:14,23 46:10,18
Office 4:5,7 82:6,7	opinion 76:19 77:2	32:8,18 34:23	67:6 69:8,19 72:5	46:18 47:1 53:7
officers 14:21,25	opposed 19:10,14	37:8,10 38:15	75:18,19,25	57:11,17 63:12,12
15:9,15 16:3,18	19:17 20:7 21:2	40:10 78:19 79:1	percentage 30:24	67:8,25 68:7,21
16:23 17:12 33:16	23:22,25 24:2,4,7	parameters 45:1	49:16 57:9 60:6	68:24,25 69:8,10
52:11	46:25	parentheses 66:24	60:22 72:9,24	72:22
offices 3:14	opposes 48:23	part 6:10 13:1 46:6	73:2	plans 15:24 18:14
Oh 56:11 65:5,7	order 20:2 45:6	54:12 62:15 68:17	percentages 31:24	18:24 19:6 28:2
okay 6:22 7:1,24	orders 20:1	79:21	perform 59:15	28:24 29:21 30:10
8:4,24 10:21,25	oriented 36:4 46:3	participants 63:12	performance 17:24	30:10 31:10 32:9
11:3 12:13,23	46:24 49:18 61:21	participated 10:3	18:11 24:1,3	32:19 33:14 34:9
13:2,5,8,20 15:4	61:22 70:4	10:10,13 54:22	27:19,22 28:1,5,7	34:21 35:12,20
16:8,16,25 17:23	original 82:14 other 6:23 10:3	particular 38:4,6	30:21 31:11 34:17 36:16 39:19 42:9	54:13,16 55:9 68:16
18:7 20:4 26:21		41:2,13,23 49:19 61:14,16 62:15	42:10,23 48:25	plant 48:15
29:14 30:8,13,23	11:3 13:16 17:3,9 18:7,14 29:6	73:6 76:3	*	plants 24:10,16
31:4 32:7,14,17 34:6 35:1 36:6,8	32:20 35:22 36:14	particularly 57:2	52:8,13,17 53:3 55:7,8 57:10	please 13:7 14:6
37:4,12 38:2,22	36:18 38:12 52:12	parties 12:11 81:12	58:20 59:16 62:13	15:6,21 17:7 19:3
39:23 41:6,17	62:16 76:7 78:10	81:15	63:14 64:2 65:9	22:13 44:8 46:15
42:1 43:2,6,8,20	otherwise 11:6	past 48:14	65:15 70:17 71:2	51:12 53:12 82:12
48:18 49:9,22	81:16	pay 51:6,13,20 52:2	71:5 72:25 74:3,6	82:15,17
50:15 51:24 52:7	out 20:19 32:4 37:3	75:2 76:6,10,13	74:20,24 75:2	point 7:22 54:7,8
54:18 55:6,14,25	62:22 66:1 70:2	76:25	76:16,24,24 77:3	point 7.22 34.7,8 portion 27:1,17
56:18 58:25 59:17	72:16	paychecks 76:9	performed 77:7	28:23 60:3
60:8,17,21 61:18	outages 23:15 67:6	payment 30:20	perhaps 61:14	position 12:7,16
62:20,24 63:4,23	67:9,14	44:16 45:2,3,21	66:25	14:3,8 19:25 20:5
63:25 65:2,10	outcome 81:16	47:20 48:12 49:15	perjury 83:11	30:15,16 41:12
66:11 67:2 69:7	outside 26:14,24	payments 21:7	person 71:23 73:8	possible 27:1 73:5
69:14,22 70:21	45:1	56:17	73:16,25	80:9
74:5,11,18,20,23	over 22:20 25:7,15	payout 61:11 63:13	personal 75:6	possibly 21:8
75:15 76:15 77:1	25:19 26:3,6	73:16	personally 14:7	Potentially 38:20
79:8,19,24	29:12 31:17 50:22	payouts 39:18	37:12,18 40:14	57:24 73:10
Once 78:20	50:24 51:7,14	72:25	42:24 53:1 59:18	power 24:10,16
one 8:25 10:14,15	60:13 69:6	PC 4:17 6:19	personnel 28:21	48:15 56:1
10:17,21 11:1	overall 23:5	peer 54:4,11	29:3,5 52:10	predefined 39:3
15:2 18:23 29:12	Overland 3:16	penalty 83:11	76:11 78:1	prefiled 11:17
				<u>*</u>
1-1-1-1				

preparation 49:23 prepare 10:19 PRESENT 5:1 previous 8:24 9:14 33:3 34:11 54:20 54:24 previously 11:7 primary 33:14 68:20 principally 35:4 prior 39:16,17 68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 81:4,21 82:7,16 83:17 purchase 25:4,12 Q qualifications 20:17 quality 9:2 19:24 20:8 51:9,16 quarter 65:8 question 15:5 19:2 22:13 25:25 30:20 31:20 34:11 35:24 38:1 46:14 51:11 57:12 58:24 68:4 71:18 72:24 77:6		1
PRESENT 5:1 previous 8:24 9:14 33:3 34:11 54:20 54:24 previously 11:7 primary 33:14 68:20 principally 35:4 prior 39:16,17 68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 proceeding 6:16 proceeding 6:16 proceeding 6:16 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 proposes 43:9 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 provides	premises 23:11	
PRESENT 5:1 previous 8:24 9:14	1 ~ ~	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
previous 8:24 9:14		
33:3 34:11 54:20 54:24 previously 11:7 primary 33:14 68:20 principally 35:4 prior 39:16,17 68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 proceess 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposed 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 91:3 provides 41:12 provides 41:12 provides 41:12 provides 41:12 provides 41:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 provides 41:12 provides 41:12 provides 41:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 provides 41:1		purchase 25:4,12
54:24 previously 11:7 primary 33:14 68:20 principally 35:4 prior 39:16,17 68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 proceeding 6:16 proceeding 6:16 proceeding 8:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,34,4,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 74:25:18 26:2 75:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
previously 11:7 primary 33:14 68:20 principally 35:4 prior 39:16,17 68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 propose 42:13 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 p		
primary 33:14 68:20 principally 35:4 prior 39:16,17 68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 procees 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 professional 81:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 20:8 51:9,16 quarter 65:8 question 15:5 19:2 22:13 25:25 30:20 31:20 34:11 35:24 38:1 46:14 51:11 57:12 58:24 68:4 71:18 72:24 77:6 queued 56:20 63:1 quice 32:2 78:10 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 Rackers 13:22,25 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19	1	
G8:20		
principally 35:4 prior 39:16,17 68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 professional 81:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 propose 42:13 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 3:20 43:11 35:24 38:1 46:14 51:11 57:12 58:24 68:4 71:18 72:24 77:6 questions 6:13 7:5,6 7:21 67:1 queued 56:20 63:1 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 Rackers 13:22,25 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 68:18 22:13 25:25 30:20 31:20 34:11 35:24 71:18 72:24 77:6 questions 6:13 7:5,6 7:21 67:1 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 ratepayers 25:1 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 72:24 77:6 questions 6:13 7:5,6 7:21 67:1 quick 32:2 78:10 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 ratepayers 25:1 readiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:22 71:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:22 77:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:22 77:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:22 77:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:19 readiation 64:5,9,15 read		I .
prior 39:16,17 68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 42:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2		
68:18 82:18 probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 42:13 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 31:20 34:11 35:24 38:1 46:14 51:11 57:12 58:24 68:4 71:18 72:24 77:6 queued 56:20 63:1 quick 32:2 78:10 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 Rackers 13:22,25 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasons 19:19		
probably 24:20 40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 42:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2	prior 39:16,17	
40:10,11 41:3 50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professional 81:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 49:7,9 80:5,20 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 75:12 58:24 68:4 71:18 72:24 77:6 questions 6:13 7:5,6 7:21 67:1 queued 56:20 63:1 quick 32:2 78:10 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 Rackers 13:22,25 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:22 9:10 rate 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 43:10 90ic 74:7,22 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:22 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 72:24 77:6 questions 6:13 7:5,6 7:21 67:1 queued 56:20 63:1 quick 32:2 78:10 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:2 72:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:2 77:10 72:10		
50:3 65:5 problems 23:18 50:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professional 81:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 71:18 72:24 77:6 questions 6:13 7:5,6 7:21 67:1 quened 56:20 63:1 quick 32:2 78:10 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 Rackers 13:22,25 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:9,6 7:21 67:1 quened 56:20 63:1 quick 32:2 78:10 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:9,6 Rackers 13:22,25 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 Reliation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 Reliation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 Reliation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 set 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 set 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 3:2.4 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 68:	probably 24:20	38:1 46:14 51:11
problems 23:18	40:10,11 41:3	57:12 58:24 68:4
50:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22	50:3 65:5	71:18 72:24 77:6
50:16 proceeding 6:16 process 7:2,22 13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professional 81:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 propose 42:13 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 7:21 67:1 queued 56:20 63:1 quick 32:2 78:10 quite 21:8 quote 74:7,22 Rackers 13:22,25 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19	problems 23:18	questions 6:13 7:5,6
process 7:2,22		7:21 67:1
process 7:2,22	proceeding 6:16	
13:21 54:22 68:18 produced 3:11 6:9 Professional 81:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		1 ^
produced 3:11 6:9 Professional 81:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
Professional 81:4 professionals 41:1 program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2	1	
Professionals 41:1 Program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 Programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 Project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 Promote 48:24 58:4 Promote 48:24 58:4 Promosed 28:16 62:6 Proposes 43:9 Proposed 28:16 62:6 Proposes 43:9 Provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 Provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 Provides 41:12 Providing 21:3 Proximity 43:17 Public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 Preasonably 49:1 Preasonably 49:1 Preasons 19:19	1 2	
program 18:8 25:21 26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 Rackers 13:22,25 radiation 64:5,9,15 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasons 19:19	į.	R
26:5,14 27:2 38:4 38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2	1 ^	Rackers 13:22.25
38:6 52:6,8,14,18 52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 Rag 9:5 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
52:24 53:4 55:3 programs 9:19 11:9 26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 range 76:14 rate 6:17,24 9:12,14 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19	1	
programs 9:19 11:9		
26:10 27:7 35:14 53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 10:3,4,10,22,23 11:1,18 33:4 68:2 68:8 70:15 77:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
53:14,21 63:21 78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2		
78:14 79:5 project 43:10 48:24 49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 ratepayers 25:1 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
project 43:10 48:24	1	1
49:5,11,17 56:2 67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 27:10 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		1
67:4 69:13 projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 rates 1:6 3:6 32:10 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
projects 67:4 promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 32:20 62:6,6 74:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
promote 48:24 58:4 propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 74:4 75:1 76:18 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
propose 42:13 proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 76:18 77:8,9 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
proposed 28:16 62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 Re 82:10 83:24 reach 62:21 63:5 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 82:15 83:4 84:7 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		1
62:6 proposes 43:9 proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2	propose 42.13	-
proposes 43:9 read 49:7,9 80:5,20 proposing 30:4 82:15 83:4 84:7 prospective 51:1 84:11,15,19,23 provide 19:23 20:8 reading 35:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 reading 35:8 provided 1:6 3:6 really 59:7 80:17 26:23 27:16 28:20 Realtime 3:17 6:5 29:19,23 30:1 Realtime 3:17 6:5 32:14,23 36:4 84:8,12,16,20,24 provides 41:12 reasonable 21:18 providing 21:3 57:10,16 58:6 problic 1:1 3:1,15,18 64:10,19 67:7,12 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 67:19 19:23 20:7 24:9 reasonably 49:1 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19		
proposing 30:4 prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2		1
prospective 51:1 provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 84:11,15,19,23 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 7:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
provide 19:23 20:8 25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 reading 35:8 real 32:1 really 59:7 80:17 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
25:6,14 49:7 52:2 provided 1:6 3:6 26:23 27:16 28:20 29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 real 32:1		
provided 1:6 3:6 really 59:7 80:17 26:23 27:16 28:20 Realtime 3:17 6:5 29:19,23 30:1 reason 44:15 48:5 32:14,23 36:4 84:8,12,16,20,24 provides 41:12 reasonable 21:18 providing 21:3 21:23 22:9,15 proximity 43:17 57:10,16 58:6 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 64:10,19 67:7,12 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 67:19 19:23 20:7 24:9 reasonably 49:1 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19	1 -	
26:23 27:16 28:20 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 21:23 22:9,15 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 Realtime 3:17 6:5 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
29:19,23 30:1 32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 reason 44:15 48:5 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
32:14,23 36:4 provides 41:12 providing 21:3 proximity 43:17 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 84:8,12,16,20,24 reasonable 21:18 21:23 22:9,15 57:10,16 58:6 64:10,19 67:7,12 67:19 reasonably 49:1 reasons 19:19		
provides 41:12 reasonable 21:18 providing 21:3 21:23 22:9,15 proximity 43:17 57:10,16 58:6 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 64:10,19 67:7,12 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 67:19 19:23 20:7 24:9 reasonably 49:1 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
providing 21:3 21:23 22:9,15 proximity 43:17 57:10,16 58:6 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 64:10,19 67:7,12 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 67:19 19:23 20:7 24:9 reasonably 49:1 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19		
proximity 43:17 57:10,16 58:6 public 1:1 3:1,15,18 64:10,19 67:7,12 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 67:19 19:23 20:7 24:9 reasonably 49:1 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19		
public 1:1 3:1,15,18 64:10,19 67:7,12 3:20 4:3,6 6:4 67:19 19:23 20:7 24:9 reasonably 49:1 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19		
3:20 4:3,6 6:4 19:23 20:7 24:9 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19		
19:23 20:7 24:9 reasonably 49:1 24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19		
24:14 25:18 26:2 reasons 19:19	3:20 4:3,6 6:4	
	19:23 20:7 24:9	reasonably 49:1
26:8,13 27:2,10 rebuttal 15:23 33:6	24:14 25:18 26:2	reasons 19:19
	26:8,13 27:2,10	rebuttal 15:23 33:6

	42.9 42.2 6 52.0
	42:8 43:2,6 53:9
	70:21 75:12
	recall 10:24 64:4
	receipt 9:22,23
	receive 21:6 45:2,3
	73:15
Ì	received 8:11 51:22
	78:18,20,25
	recently 21:14
	recommendation
ı	41:23
ı	recommended
Į	32:10,19
ı	recommends 14:13
I	16:10
ĺ	
ı	reconciliation 31:5
	record 6:18
I	recovery 14:19
ļ	reduce 24:5 47:21
I	67:5,9,13 69:12
I	reduced 29:25 30:5
1	
١	30:6 45:3 63:15
ļ	63:22 70:25 81:9
ĺ	reducing 23:5,13,17
l	56:5 64:9,12
l	69:22
l	refer 15:2,22 53:11
ļ	
ı	61:3
l	referred 56:22
l	referring 12:20
l	15:8 43:21 56:12
ļ	57:18 60:6 65:3
ı	refers 27:22 54:2
l	refine 34:8
ļ	reflect 30:16
İ	reflected 31:13
l	reflected 51:15
١	reflecting 75:7
ı	regard 17:3
ı	regarding 11:8
l	12:25 33:7 35:13
ĺ	35:13 38:4 71:10
l	Registered 81:3
l	regulatory 8:17
١	47:17 48:20
	#7.17 40.∠U
	relate 18:1 43:16
	related 15:13 17:18
	18:3,19 27:18
	30:9 36:16 38:11
	41:23 50:4,12
	56:25 59:19 62:3
	62:10 63:7 64:1,5
	64.0 10 00 65 10
	64:8,18,23 65:12
	65:24 71:1 72:25
	79:12 81:11
	relates 56:5 60:19
	relating 30:20
	relative 81:14
	2 22427 0 0 2 . 2 1

	reliability 9:19 11:9
	21:1,10,15,20,25
	22:5 23:23 49:19
ĺ	67:17,20 78:14
	reliable 21:3
i	relies 77:24
	remainder 36:13
	remember 13:23
I	41:5 77:22
İ	removed 33:13
ļ	68:19
ĺ	render 83:7
ļ	repair 44:22,25
ĺ	repairs 47:11
ļ	repeat 14:6 15:5
ĺ	17:7 19:2 22:12
Į	25:25 37:16 44:8
١	46:14 51:11 57:12
Į	68:4 71:18
l	repeating 25:9
ļ	rephrase 24:12 38:2
l	42:19
l	report 8:6 9:9 13:6
l	13:13,17 14:11
l	16:9 27:16 49:24
ĺ	50:6
	reporter 3:17 6:5
l	61:4 80:2,5,10
Į	81:1,4
l	represent 30:25
l	representatives
l	55:17
l	represented 10:18
ı	representing 6:15
l	represents 75:2
	requested 16:19
ŀ	22:3
	requesting 14:19
	require 46:23 70:17
	76:22 required 21:6 22:19
	35:11
	requirement 12:1,2
	requirements 69:21
	reserved 6:7
	resettlement 9:21
	11:10
	resolve 7:11
	resources 54:25
	respond 23:14
	response 8:3 30:19
	76:21
	responses 56:6,13
	restrictive 31:11
	result 29:25 68:19
	71:25 72:18
	retain 51:9,16

retained 26:9,12,19
26:21,25 27:3,6
return 82:17
revenue 11:25 12:1
review 34:8 41:15
54:6 55:8,11,24
57:2 68:17 71:5,9
72:22 76:12
reviewed 33:4,6
48:14 52:5 53:9
55:15 64:1 67:24
revise 13:16 68:16
revised 29:20 33:2
68:6
revisions 33:7 68:23
rewards 53:15,22
right 8:14,18 9:9 10:16 11:18 23:24
27:23 28:12,17,24
30:11 31:8,9
33:24 34:5,13,22
35:25 36:17 38:17 41:25,25 45:7
48:6 49:25 55:21
58:2,5 59:13,14
60:18 62:22 63:8
63:9,16 65:19
72:7 74:2,14 75:4
77:18 78:23
Rivers 66:12,18,23
RLJ 7:11
room 29:7
rough 31:24
roughly 32:6 40:4
routinely 48:14
RPR 5:7 82:22
RSG 9:21 11:10
rules 21:14
run 25:8
\mathbf{S}

safe 25:6,14 46:4
safer 23:9
safety 23:1 28:8
39:14
safety/lost 61:25
SAIFI 67:17,21
salaries 77:12
salary 76:12 77:13
same 41:9 83:7
sampling 55:12
Sarah 4:12 7:25
13:23
sarah.kliethermes
4:14
satisfaction 22:11
*

22:17,22

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			rage 9
satisfied 29:14 57:1	34:1,15,18,22	Southwest 8:12,21	Steve 13:22,25	24:21
57:5,9,15 60:7	35:4,10,20,23	specific 19:12,19	Steven 4:11 82:9	
saw 66:11	36:2,3,11 38:11	28:11,22 35:14	still 36:11 69:20	T
saying 45:8,13,18	43:19 49:18 68:20	36:16 37:10 41:13	STIPULATED 6:1	table 15:24
45:19 46:2 48:1,7	69:17 70:11	49:17 63:7 65:3	stock 31:11	Tag 9:5
says 49:14 61:10	SHEET 84:1	68:10 70:20	straightforward 7:4	take 7:11 12:6
62:12 68:17,22	sheets 82:14,16,17	specifically 37:2	Street 4:8,18 5:3	47:23,24 51:2
Schwake 3:17 5:7	she'll 7:8	40:9 42:18 57:18	6:20 82:1,8	80:12,13
6:4 81:3 82:22	short 14:21,24	59:21	stretch 39:20 74:7	taken 1:16 6:4,23
scorecard 55:16,23	16:16 17:1,4,10	speed 56:20 58:7,16	74:15,25 75:10,11	12:18 35:19 81:8
59:20 60:3,10,12	17:16 33:2,8 34:8	63:1	75:17,18,22 76:1	81:13 82:13 84:4
61:9,12 65:3,9,23	53:8 64:22 66:25	spend 29:9	76:17,22	takes 23:14,17
66:1,12,13,20,24	67:25 68:6,16	St 5:4 82:2	striving 75:14	45:25 46:12,19,21
scorecards 64:2	74:7,21,25 76:16	Staff 4:4 8:6 9:8	structuring 78:5	taking 12:15 14:4,8
script 80:15	shorthanded 16:4	11:22,25 12:2,6	studies 53:19 54:9	80:18
second 9:12 41:10	show 38:15,17	13:6,13,16 14:4,8	76:6	talk 17:1 30:23
56:12	60:13 65:9	14:11,12 16:8,10	study 37:15 54:7	39:23 55:6
section 13:12,13	shown 70:19	17:3,8,17 18:9	62:3,5 77:7,17,21	talking 17:11 38:7
64:11	sign 80:5 82:16	19:10,14,22 20:6	77:22 78:5	50:8,10
sections 13:17	signal 45:16	20:7,14 21:2	stuff 70:4	talks 68:12
see 9:6 15:25 53:16	signature 6:6 80:3	23:22 24:2,7	subject 35:16	Tara 3:17 5:7 6:4
65:6 69:3	82:14,16,18 84:25	27:15 28:16 29:19	subscribe 83:10	81:3 82:22
seek 26:23 45:12	signed 80:20	32:20 33:23,25	substance 83:6	target 42:23 59:16
seem 67:7,19	similar 32:17 34:17	36:19 39:6 41:17	successful 23:9	62:13,21 63:4,5
seems 56:18	35:11,15	42:13 43:9 45:15	successfully 56:1	63:14 65:15 66:7
seen 54:18	since 8:18 28:19	45:18,19 46:25	sufficient 44:15	66:9 71:7,11,15
send 45:16 80:11	68:24	48:14,23 49:23	suggest 46:22 69:9	71:24,25 72:1,6,8
sense 58:21	Sincerely 82:20	50:4,15 52:16	69:12,22	72:9,12,13,17,20
sent 63:2	single 33:15 71:14	57:22 58:10,25	suggesting 44:3,9	73:1,1,7,9,13,24
serve 50:22 52:3	80:14	64:22 68:1,7	44:14 45:10,22	74:3
service 1:1,6,7 3:1,6	sir 59:25 60:13 74:8	70:12,25 71:15	46:9,16	targeted 30:21
3:7,15,20 4:3,6	six 3:13	73:19 74:6,20,24	suggestions 13:19	39:19 73:19
8:7 13:1,3,6 14:12	small 11:5 41:1	75:20 76:2,15	Suite 3:16 4:8,18	targets 28:5 39:22
14:16 16:9,12	solely 56:6,13	78:18,21,25 79:3	6:20 82:8	71:3
19:24 20:14,22	solidly 76:13	82:6	summaries 28:20	Tariffs 1:5 3:5
21:3,10,25 23:15	some 7:5 18:1,11,25	Staff's 18:23 19:5	summarize 32:8,18	taxes 9:22,23
25:7,15 27:16	19:4,7 26:9,25	19:17,25 23:25	summary 8:8 9:7	team 52:10
28:8 30:9 36:4	27:5 29:6,13	24:4 29:24 35:2	supervisors 41:2	tell 65:11
37:15,21 39:15	30:18 33:17 35:11	36:1,5 37:14,21	supervisory 16:14	tempered 30:19
40:17 46:3,5,7,24	48:1,20 59:10	40:17 50:11 52:24	supplemental 41:11	39:17
49:20,23 50:6	62:2 64:4 66:8	62:6 70:7 74:1,4	support 20:14	ten 41:5 72:11,14
52:24 55:16,17,23	67:1,16 68:23	stand 12:15,18	supported 79:11	72:16
59:2,19 60:9,12	something 7:10	state 1:2 3:2,18,20	supporting 21:8	term 14:21,24 16:17
61:9 62:3,4 70:3	44:22 49:20 60:2	8:13,22 28:19	sure 7:8 13:8,24	17:1,4,10,16
82:7	66:21 74:13	43:9,23 44:17	15:7,19 16:21	25:16,19 26:3,7
services 5:2 57:1	sometimes 51:20	48:23 51:20 70:25	24:13 25:11,24	31:10 33:2,8 34:8
66:17 82:1	52:2	74:5 76:15 78:1	34:12 51:13 53:13	49:5 50:23,24
set 73:11	sorry 10:24 17:24	81:5,22 83:1	55:20 56:11 61:8	51:8,15 53:7,8,14
settle 12:17	19:13 34:24 37:3	statement 53:20	63:16 66:23 70:24	53:20 54:5,11
several 29:4,9	37:16,25 42:18	stay 44:6,12 45:17	74:14	64:22 67:25 68:6
sewer 11:5	48:17 50:14 51:23	47:2 51:3 70:1	surrebuttal 27:13	68:16 75:10,11
share 14:15,20,25	56:11 57:13 58:12	staying 45:10 47:13	43:4,5,6 48:23	terms 31:24
15:11,13 16:5,12	58:13 59:5 71:19	47:16 48:5,7,18	78:12	test 16:19 31:2
17:5,14,19,22	72:21 74:9,12,19	69:15 70:11	survey 54:3	41:20 78:22 79:5
18:1,4,10,13,19	78:15 79:13	step 33:24 34:4,13	surveys 76:12	79:16
19:1,8,20 20:1,6	sort 60:25	35:25	sworn 3:11 6:9 81:7	testified 6:11 11:7
31:12 33:13,18,20	sources 26:15	steps 35:19	system 22:5 23:23	testifies 53:13
			<u> </u>	
	···············		•	

				<u>-</u>		
testimony 10:19	53:22 54:13 64:5	33:22 34:6,10,21	wanting 32:3 59:21	works 20:6		
11:17 15:18,23	65:25 72:14	35:2,8,21 36:9	warranted 50:16	worthwhile 22:5,22		
33:7 35:9 42:8	trading 18:16 40:21	39:1 40:25 41:4,6	wasn't 12:10 73:18	23:1,20		
43:3 47:25 53:10	41:19	42:4,6,7 51:19	water 10:10 11:5	wouldn't 23:11 25:8		
68:11 74:16 75:12	training 9:1	52:1,9 56:3,4	12:25 13:3	46:21 51:4,9,16		
78:11 81:6,8	transcribed 6:6	60:19 67:24 68:5	way 47:10 75:20	56:9 62:18 63:6		
Thank 82:19	transcript 82:15	68:21 69:2 72:23	week 80:8	63:18 67:14 73:9		
That'd 15:4	treated 71:16	understood 25:25	weekend 7:17	write-off 61:23		
Theaters 9:2	trial 82:18	68:3	weighting 62:11			
their 19:24 20:8	trigger 35:10	union 1:4,16 3:4	well 24:22 25:24	X		
21:24,25 22:10	TRS/JEREMY	6:10 42:2,5 59:4,7	30:3 34:19 35:1	X 2:1		
26:9 33:20 34:8	83:23	59:12,13,15 82:10	39:16 42:18 44:17	X7		
35:20 44:6,12	true 24:20 27:3	83:24 84:3	46:6,8,25 47:6,10	<u>Y</u>		
51:3 54:12 58:15	48:13 51:21 65:17	unit 31:12	47:13,18 49:6	yeah 20:4 26:2 44:9		
58:24 68:2 76:10	65:18 73:9,20	University 8:13,22	52:4 59:14 63:9	60:15 66:16 69:16		
76:13,25	79:19,21 83:7,12	unless 7:10 9:5	63:23 69:7 70:16	71:20 74:22 80:16		
thereon 83:9	try 7:7,15 24:13	74:13	76:10,21	year 16:19 31:2		
thereto 81:15	58:21 67:12,25	unquote 74:7	went 29:8 44:25	41:20 78:22 79:5		
thing 36:5 39:9	68:7	until 79:12	were 11:3 12:1	79:16		
64:10	trying 24:5 31:21	update 78:19,25	17:21 18:9,11,12	YTD 61:10		
things 36:18 46:3	54:22 58:3 71:21	updates 78:20	18:19 20:13 21:1	y'all 62:21		
47:11 78:2	74:22	upgrades 57:1	29:6,12,15,16			
think 38:14,19	turn 36:6 38:22	use 20:18 26:9 27:3	30:18 31:1 33:17	zero 11:25		
40:22 47:18 52:10	42:1 49:6 52:7	27:5 36:2 49:5	33:18 34:21 37:20	zero 11:25		
58:14 59:13 61:24	turning 20:2 40:20	61:14 70:9	39:14,19,20 41:20	\$		
64:8,17 68:23	Twenty-five 17:20	used 16:5 20:11	47:4 49:22 50:11	\$1,923,427 16:22		
third 65:8	Twenty-two 31:19	30:18 35:15,22	52:21 64:4,20,25	\$13,737,755 31:7		
though 57:25	Twin 66:12,18,23	54:15 55:8 61:17	66:2 68:3,24 69:3 72:25	\$20 31:17		
thought 37:24	two 10:10 11:1,2	69:3,5 70:20 75:12	we'll 53:8 80:13	\$20 31.17 \$22 31:22		
39:13 61:18	32:6,7,10 38:18 40:11 41:7	using 26:14,22	we're 60:6 79:6	\$426,545 30:7,11,25		
thoughts 79:9 three 10:14	type 22:2,18 69:15	35:19	we've 30:5,6 80:7	\$7 31:14		
through 13:5 27:2	70:4,11	utilities 19:23 20:7	whole 72:1,18,20	\$848,075 52:22		
27:14 28:14 29:8	typewriting 6:6	26:9 27:2 76:7	73:8,12,23,25	φο 10,070 32.22		
43:3,7 48:22	81:10	utility 8:17 24:9,14	75:0,12,23,23	1		
53:11 54:2 62:13	01.10	25:18 26:2,13	wholesale 25:5,13	1-800-280-DEPO		
63:23 65:14,21	U	27:5,10 77:11	willing 20:14,16	5:6		
70:24 75:1 76:18	um 60:16 72:23	utilized 28:22 47:9	21:7	10 70:24 75:13		
78:12,15,17	unanticipated	54:5,11	withdraw 77:5	100 4:8 15:9 16:4		
thrown 62:22	43:25 44:19 45:6	5,13,11	witness 3:10 6:7	39:2 42:8,11 53:2		
tie 78:11	46:1,13,20 47:4,6	V	12:6,15 61:5,8	54:4 67:6 82:8		
tied 14:14,25 16:11	47:11 48:2	Varel 29:5	80:21 81:6,8	101 4:18 6:19		
16:23 19:19 20:13	unattractive 58:18	various 15:24 28:7	82:15 84:1,2,25	11th 5:3 82:1		
21:1 30:21 33:18	under 7:18 31:14	32:9,18 35:20	Witnesses 2:2,3	11/14/08 83:23 84:4		
56:17 63:14	47:10 59:3 66:5	vegetation 9:18	women 41:14	110 61:12		
ties 18:24 19:6	66:20 81:10 83:11	11:8 78:13	word 20:18	12 70:24 74:19		
time 23:14,17 27:15	undergraduate	vehicles 54:6,12	work 10:19 15:2	13 43:3,7 53:11		
28:20 79:25	8:12	verge 79:7	23:9 32:8,17	68:15 74:19 75:13		
times 45:4 48:1	understand 7:6,18	visit 40:2	34:23 37:7,9	78:12,15,17		
title 61:7 66:15	8:11 12:22 20:4	voice 7:9	38:15 40:10 51:9	130 3:16		
titled 60:11	28:3 39:25 47:25		51:16 62:1 78:19	14 1:17 43:3,7,15		
today 7:13	63:24 71:21	W	79:1	53:11 82:13		
told 76:14	understanding 7:9	wage 77:13	workdays 24:5 64:6	14th 3:12		
top 15:23 38:15	12:4 14:18,22,23	wait 25:24 42:18	64:18	16 8:18 54:2 74:5,9		
49:7 66:24	15:7,12 16:22	50:8 65:7	worked 9:7 11:4	74:10,11,23,23,24		
total 30:25 31:6,16	21:13,17 27:25	want 34:15 46:2,5	29:16 34:7 55:4	78:12,16,17		
31:22 32:4 53:15	28:4 33:1,5,12,21	55:20 63:16 70:16	working 23:10	17 82:5		

				r agc 34
19 48:22 53:10 54:2	9			
	9 28:14 68:14,15			
2 27.12.29.14.42.2.7	95 75:17,19			
2 27:13 28:14 43:2,7 48:22	98 32:21 69:8			
20 62:12 68:17	99 72:5 75:25			
200 4:8 82:8	9900 3:15			
2001 8:14				
2002 8:18		}		
2003 12:24 13:3				
2008 1:17 3:12				·
27:15 60:11 61:8			1	
61:10,12 82:5,13 83:14				
2009 81:24				
21 48:22			-	
25 36:9,12 38:10				
69:19				
28 27:15				
3				
3 70:21 74:17,23				
314 5:5 82:3,3				
314 3.3 02.3,3				
4				
400 4:18 6:20				
426,000 31:22				
426,545 30:4				
46 13:5,8 47 14:11 16:8				
49 13:6				
5				
5 13:13 15:22 27:14				
50 15:12,13				
573 4:10,20 573-636-6758 6:21				
3/3-030-0/30 0.21		•		
6				
6 2:4 78:12				
63101 5:4 82:2				
636-6758 4:20 644-1334 82:3	,			
644-2191 5:5 82:3				
65101 4:9,19 6:20	j			
82:8				·
7		ļ		
7 27:14 81:24				
711 5:3 82:1 75 17:25 38:11				
751-6726 4:10				
8]	
8 9:3 28:14				
80 65:13 66:3				
87114 20:19				