Page 92 STATE OF MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS Evidentiary Hearing February 18, 2014 Jefferson City, Missouri Volume VIII (Start time of hearing: 8:30 a.m.)

Page 93 1 STATE OF MISSOURI 2 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 3 4 5 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 6 7 Evidentiary Hearing 8 February 18, 2014 9 Jefferson City, Missouri Volume VIII 10 11 12 In the Matter of Lake) Region Water & Sewer) 13 Company's Application To) Case No. WR-2013-0461 Implement A General Rate) 14 Increase In Water And) Sewer Service) 15 16 17 MICHAEL BUSHMANN, Presiding, Regulatory LAW JUDGE. 18 19 ROBERT S. KENNEY, Chairman STEPHEN M. STOLL, 20 WILLIAM KENNEY, DANIEL Y. HALL, 21 COMMISSIONERS. 22 23 REPORTED BY: 24 PAMELA S. GENTRY, CCR NO. 426 MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES 25

```
1
                        APPEARANCES:
 2
    MARK W. COMLEY, Attorney at Law
            Newman, Comley & Ruth
 3
            601 Monroe, Suite 301
            P.O. Box 537
            Jefferson City, MO 65102
 4
            (573)634-2266
 5
            comleym@ncrpc.com
 6
                  FOR: Lake Region Water and Sewer
     Company.
 7
     CHRISTINA BAKER, Assistant Public Counsel
            Office of the Public Counsel
 8
            P.O. Box 2230
            200 Madison Street, Suite 650
 9
            Jefferson City, MO 65102-2230
10
            (573)751-4857
                  FOR: Office of the Public Counsel
11
                            and the Public.
12
     KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel
13
    AMY MOORE, Deputy Counsel/Water Sewer
     TIM OPITZ, Legal Counsel
14
            Missouri Public Service Commission
            P.O. Box 360
15
            200 Madison Street
            Jefferson City, MO 65102
            (573)751-3234
16
17
                  FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public
                            Service Commission.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
2.5
```

Page 95 1 (Start time of hearing: 8:30 a.m.) 2 PROCEEDINGS 3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's bring the proceedings to order. Can we bring the proceedings 4 5 to order, please. We're on the record. 6 Good morning. Today is February 18th, 7 2014. The Commission has set this time for an Evidentiary Hearing and In The Matter Of Lake 8 9 Region Water And Sewer Company's Application To 10 Implement A General Rate Increase In Water And Sewer Service, Filing No. WR-2013-0461. 11 12 My name's Michael Bushmann. I'm the 13 Regulatory Law Judge that's to be presiding over 14 this hearing. 15 Let's begin with counsel making their entries of appearance. For Lake Region Water and 16 17 Sewer Company? 18 MR. COMLEY: Thank you, Judge Bushmann. Let the record reflect the entry of 19 appearance of Mark W. Comley of Newman, Comley & 20 21 Ruth, P.C., 601 Monroe Street, Jefferson City, Missouri, on behalf of Lake Water and Sewer. 22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And for Staff of the 23 Public Service Commission? 24 25 MS. MOORE: Thank you, Judge.

Page 96 Appearing on behalf of the Staff of the Public 1 2 Service Commission, Amy Moore, Tim Opitz, and Kevin 3 Thompson, P.O. Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri, 65102. 4 5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And Office of Public 6 Counsel. 7 MS. BAKER: Thank you. Christina Baker, P.O. Box 2230, Jefferson City, Missouri, 8 9 65102, appearing on behalf of the Office of Public Counsel and the Ratepayers. 10 11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you. 12 Just a couple of initial remarks. I 13 would like to advise anybody in the audience to please silence any cell phones or other electronic 14 15 devices that you have right now. 16 Also, for Counsel, please remember to 17 push the button for your microphone when you talk 18 so that people who are listening on the webcast can understand what you're saying. 19 20 I don't believe there are any pending 21 motions at this time unless Counsel would tell me 22 otherwise. 23 I would like to take official notice 24 of some things. The parties have filed two joint stipulations of non-disputed material facts, and I 25

1	would like to commend the parties for all their
2	hard work in preparing these stipulations and the
3	partial settlement in this case which will all
4	result in a reduction in both hearing times and
5	cost to the ratepayers. Those stipulations are
6	fact, and their attached appendices are received
7	into the record.
8	Also, as requested by the parties, the
9	Commission takes official notice of the following:
10	1, All Commission orders issued in
11	Lake Region's 2010 rate case SR-2010-0110 and
12	WR-2010-0111;
13	2, All admitted exhibits and hearing
14	transcript pages referred to in the stipulations;
15	And, 3, the following exhibits or
16	other filings that were made in the 2010 rate case:
17	Exhibits 43 through 48; Lake Region's reply to
18	Staff's response to request from agenda on April
19	7th, 2010; and Lake Region's response to May 19th,
20	2010, order of the Commission.
21	As far as witnesses today, we'll
22	follow the order that was filed by the parties in
23	their amended joint list of issues and witnesses.
24	Since many of the witnesses are going to be
25	testifying multiple times, I think it would be

Page 98 appropriate to wait until they offer -- to offer 1 2 their prefiled testimony into the record until the 3 final time that they're on the stand. And I know that we've done some 4 5 premarking of exhibits. Does anybody need to mark 6 any additional exhibits at this time before we 7 proceed? 8 MS. BAKER: I do have a copy of the timeline that was attached to Mr. Robertson's 9 testimony. I believe it was his Surrebuttal 10 11 Testimony. 12 If the Commission would find that 13 useful, I will enter that in as an exhibit, not something that I would admit, just something for 14 15 handy reference. 16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Since it was already 17 listed as a schedule -- is that correct? MS. BAKER: That's correct. 18 19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: -- that's attached to his testimony? That would either come in or not 20 21 with the testimony. So, why don't we just see later how that goes; and, if you want to offer that 22 23 at that time, you can. 24 MS. BAKER: That sounds fine. 25 MS. MOORE: I don't have anything else

		Page 99
1	right now, except I do need to make a correction to	
2	the Staff's exhibit list.	
3	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay.	
4	MS. MOORE: For the Staff's accounting	
5	schedules. We have it listed as 2A, B, and C; and	
6	when we printed it, we printed it all together, all	
7	the accounting schedules together. For purposes of	
8	efficiency, I let the Court Reporter we're just	
9	going to mark it as 2.	
10	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. And that would	
11	encompass all you listed here in 2A, B, and C?	
12	MS. MOORE: Correct.	
13	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. Anything	
14	further we need to do about exhibits? I think, Mr.	
15	Comley, you already marked all yours, didn't you?	
16	MR. COMLEY: Yes, I did, Judge.	
17	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. In that case,	
18	I don't think there are any more preliminary	
19	matters that need to be taken care of. We can now	
20	start with opening statements. The first opening	
21	statement will be by Lake Region.	
22	OPENING STATEMENT BY LAKE REGION	
23	MR. COMLEY: May it please the	
24	Commission. On August 18th, 2010, the Commission	
25	entered a report and order in Case Nos.	

SR-2010-0110 and WR-2010-0111. The Commission will 1 2 recognize those case numbers as the 2010 rate case 3 for Lake Region. 4 In that report and order, the 5 Commission ordered Lake Region to file a new 6 general rate increase no later than three years 7 following the effective date of that order. 8 In timely obedience to that order, on 9 July 16th, 2013, Lake Region submitted tariff 10 sheets designed to implement a general rate increase for water and sewer service provided to 11 12 its Missouri customer base. The tariff sheets were designed to produce an aggregate annual water and 13 sewer revenue increase of approximately \$218,762, 14 15 exclusive of applicable gross receipts, sales or 16 franchise fees. The tariff sheets had effective 17 dates of August 15, 2013. On July 31st, 2013, the Commission 18 entered its order suspending those tariffs for 120 19 days plus six months, so that they would become 20 21 effective or have an operation of law date of June 13th, 2014. As Judge Bushmann has noted, the 22 parties have stipulated at length to certain facts 23 that are detailed in our February filings. Several 24 facts, I will highlight. 25

1	First, Lake Region provides water
2	service to approximately 658 customers and sewer
3	service to approximately 635 customers in its
4	Shawnee Bend service area. It provides sewer
5	service to approximately 245 customers in its
6	Horseshoe Bend service area. Lake Region's water
7	system is comprised of two deep wells, each with a
8	pumping capacity of 360,000 gallons per day; a
9	200,000 gallon elevated storage tank; and a total
10	of approximately 96,847 feet of water mains. Lake
11	Region's sewer system is comprised of seven sewage
12	treatment plants and a total of approximately 8,924
13	feet of collecting sewers.
14	The Staff engaged in a comprehensive
15	audit of the books and accounts of the Company and
16	its cost of service report was filed on November
17	15th, 2013. There were a variety of issues
18	separating the parties; but, as noted by Judge
19	Bushmann
20	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Keep going.
21	Don't mind me. My apologies.
22	MR. COMLEY: as Judge Bushmann
23	noted, there are there was a partial stipulation
24	filed, and I think the issues were narrowed as of
25	February 11th. There are principally three issues

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

		Page 102
1	that are dividing the parties at this hour, and not	
2	necessarily in the order of importance. Those	
3	issues involve legal fees incurred by the Company	
4	in an appeal that was favorable an appeal of a	
5	favorable Camden Count Circuit Court judgment. The	
6	Company's capital structure-return on equity and	
7	the issue of availability fees which the Company	
8	has repeatedly contended in this case is actually a	
9	non-issue.	
10	Now, before reaching my remarks about	
11	the availability fees, I would like to address the	
12	Company's position on the other issues; legal fees,	
13	capital structure, and return on equity.	
14	With respect to the legal fees issues,	
15	this issue involved a lawsuit filed by Shawnee Bend	
16	Development Company in 2009. Shawnee Bend	
17	Development claimed a breach of a 1998 contract and	
18	sought damages for alleged nonpayment of payments	
19	due for road crossings, a sewer trunk extension	
20	line, and a water well that Shawnee Bend	
21	Development constructed for The Villages, which is	
22	a very popular development at the Lake of the	
23	Ozarks.	
24	The Company believed payment was due	
25	in some form or the other. But based upon contract	

1	terms, the Company disagreed with the developer's
2	demand. Shawnee Bend Development contended that it
3	was due approximately \$200,000 more than what the
4	Company asserted was owed. The matter was tried
5	before Judge Kenneth Hayden at Camden County, and
6	Judge Hayden agreed with Lake Region's
7	interpretation of the 1998 contract as well as two
8	others that the parties had entered about the
9	development there.
10	The issue turned, essentially, on the
11	application of the Company's main extension rule,
12	Rule 14. The trial court rendered a judgment
13	consistent with the Company's understanding of Rule
14	14's provisions and consistent with the series of
15	contracts entered between the parties in accordance
16	with Rule 14's requirements. The judgment, as
17	entered, favored the Company. Shawnee Bend did not
18	accept the trial court's conclusions and filed an
19	appeal with the Southern District.
20	The Company, at that point, had before
21	it a judgment that was entirely in its favor with
22	the risk that, if it were overturned at any rate,
23	there would be an excess of amount of money due on
24	the judgment. The Company was justified in
25	challenging that on appeal to protect and preserve

www.midwestlitigation.com

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

		Page 104
1	that favorable judgment so to avoid any increased	
2	costs or liability. The legal fees for pursuing	
3	that appeal were reasonably incurred by the Company	
4	and should be allowed in this case.	
5	Mr. Keith Foster, a witness for the	
6	Staff, has proposed a means of amortizing the legal	
7	fee expense over a period of five years with a	
8	tracking mechanism so as to avoid over-recovery.	
9	This is acceptable to the Company. I understand	
10	that Office of Public Counsel does oppose this	
11	method.	
12	With respect to the capital structure	
13	and return on equity, since the last rate case in	
14	2010, Lake Region applied to the Commission and	
15	received approval to enter a long-term debt	
16	arrangement for debt not to exceed \$2 million.	
17	Proceedings on that application were in File No.	
18	WR-2013-0118. Before this financing application	
19	was approved and before Lake Region drew down on	
20	the note that was approved in that case, Lake	
21	Region had no debt recorded on its books.	
22	Judged by the Company's actual debt	
23	and equity that's reflected on its books now, the	
24	Company, as testified to by Mr. John Summers, is	
25	proposing a ratio of 60 percent debt to 40 percent	

1	equity to support its rate-based development. The
2	Staff has recommended a theoretical capital
3	structure consisting of 75 percent debt and 25
4	percent common stock.
5	The Staff's proposal includes in its
6	analysis a loan which was first entered by the
7	Company shareholders to acquire their respective
8	shares in the Company along with some other
9	property. Staff then stacks that loan on top of
10	the one recently approved at the Company level to
11	arrive what it considers the total debt of the
12	Company. The Company is not a party to that
13	shareholder loan. That loan is independent and
14	disconnected from Company's operations, and it
15	should not be a consideration in its debt or
16	capital structure.
17	Additionally, although the idea of a
18	hypothetical structure for the Company might be
19	reasonable, the Staff's approach in setting that
20	structure is not. Mr. Michael Gorman will testify
21	on behalf of the Company concerning Staff's
22	hypothetical structure. He'll also confirm
23	Mr. John Summers' proposal that there be a 60
24	percent debt to 40 percent equity capital structure
25	to support the Company's rate development.

1	Mr. Gorman is also concerned by which
2	the way the shareholder loan has been included in
3	this analysis. Mr. Gorman also applies Standard
4	and Poor's criteria to Lake Region's proxy bond
5	rating in connection with the financial risk
6	profile and business risk profile for the Company.
7	He concludes that Staff's proposed capital
8	structure departs significantly from the one most
9	appropriate to Lake Region using these standards.
10	S&P's criteria would equate to a total
11	debt ratio of approximately 60 percent. This is
12	the same as Lake Region's proposed capital
13	structure. Another observation is that S&P metric
14	guidelines do not support a finding that a capital
15	structure with a 75 percent debt ratio is
16	reasonable. The Commission should adopt the
17	Company's capital structure and its return on
18	equity should be set at 13.89 percent as supported
19	by Lake Region's testimony.
20	With respect to the availability fees,
21	at the outset, I must repeat the Company's
22	objection that this topic, a topic regarding fees
23	that are authorized in the deed restrictions on
24	properties located in Lake Region's service
25	territory is not relevant or material to any issues

1	in this matter simply because a developer's charge
2	and collection of availability fees for water and
3	sewer system infrastructure, or the developer's
4	sale or assignment of those fees or part of those
5	fees, are issues beyond the regulatory jurisdiction
6	of this Commission, and it has so ruled in the
7	past.
8	The Company has filed a motion to
9	strike certain testimony of Staff and the Office of
10	Public Counsel, and a motion in limine, and the
11	reasons for the Company's positions on this issue
12	and its objection are set out in detail in those
13	motions and any suggestions filed in support. And
14	I can see you're relieved that I'm not going to
15	repeat all those things in those motions.
16	The Company's testimony addressing
17	this issue is offered conditionally. It is on the
18	condition that, at some point, you overrule those
19	objections and you go ahead and hear this evidence.
20	I mentioned earlier the report and
21	order of Lake Region's 2010 rate case. In that
22	case and, eventually, in that same report and
23	order, the Commission, over these same objections
24	that I've noted moments ago, deliberated upon an
25	extensive record on the availability fees that are

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	charged against property owners in Lake Region's
2	service territory, and it rendered a decision on
3	the subject which, for the first time, had been
4	raised in the context of a contested case.
5	You will notice that the record in
6	this case will closely resemble the one the
7	Commission deliberate upon before regarding
8	availability fees.
9	Some things have not changed. As they
10	did in the 2010 case, Staff and Office of Public
11	Counsel submitted data requests to the Company
12	about the availability fees. The Company objected
13	to them on the jurisdictional ground that I
14	mentioned and, also, on the additional fact that
15	the information was actually in the hands of
16	nonparties.
17	As they did in 2010, Staff and Office
18	of Public Counsel have sponsored written testimony
19	in which they complain that the Company refused to
20	give needed information or that these parties lack
21	information because the Company refused to supply
22	it. Even so, I want the Commission to know that
23	the record in this case will confirm that the
24	Company has complied with all its discovery orders
25	and none are outstanding. The Company should not

1	be faulted for validly objecting to improper data
2	requests in this proceeding.
3	Staff and OPC still propose to use the
4	availability fee revenue charged to the undeveloped
5	lot owners as an offset to cost of service or as an
6	offset to rate base which, in either case, means a
7	marked reduction in the Company's revenue
8	requirement. The parties filed a Joint Stipulation
9	of Undisputed Material Facts on January 31st, 2014,
10	which, in largest parts, paralyzed parallel,
11	excuse me the findings of fact made by the
12	Commission on the availability fee issue in the
13	2010 report and order.
14	The facts have not changed. The
15	essential facts on this issue are the same as they
16	were in 2010. Four Seasons Lakesites, a developer
17	in the Lake of the Ozarks, installed the water and
18	wastewater connections for each lot in its real
19	estate development. The lots in the development
20	are subject to recorded covenants and restrictions
21	which impose upon owners of undeveloped lots the
22	obligation to pay monthly fees in exchange for
23	available water and sewer connections. Four
24	Seasons imposed those fees and the covenants to
25	recover the costs it occurred in installing the

1	water and sewer infrastructure.
2	If lot owners failed to pay the
3	availability fee, the obligation becomes a lien on
4	the lot and it is enforceable by foreclosure or
5	other remedies set out by the covenants. The
6	owners of the lots in the Four Seasons Lakesite
7	development may vote to end the obligation to pay
8	availability fees. By a series of sales,
9	transfers, and assignments originating with the
10	developer of Four Seasons, the rights to collect
11	the availability fees are now owned in part by a
12	shareholder in Lake Region, a non-shareholder, a
13	former shareholder in Lake Region, and the
14	developer itself.
15	I'll mention this. In 2010, both
16	shareholders of Lake Region owned the rights to the
17	fees. Sally Stump, who was a shareholder at that
18	time, still owns the rights to the availability
19	fees, but her shares have been transferred to
20	Vernon Stump. Mr. Stump, Vernon Stump, has no
21	rights to the availability fees. The ownership of
22	the availability fees was disputed.
23	A court proceeding was initiated by
24	the developer and, pursuant to a confidential
25	settlement agreement which the Commission has at

		Pag
1	its disposal, the developer retained the right to	
2	receive a portion of those availability fees. The	
3	developer's also taken security interest in those	
4	fees. Lake Region shareholders registered Lake	
5	Utility Availability 1 as a fictitious name, as a	
6	business name, to facilitate collection of those	
7	fees. Lake Region does not own or control the	
8	collection, distribution, enforcement or the	
9	termination of the availability fees.	
10	It does not charge availability fees	
11	by tariff. It does not collect availability fees.	
12	Its customers do not pay availability fees. It was	
13	in view of these facts and others that were related	
14	that the Commission decided in 2010 that it could	
15	not assert jurisdiction over these availability	
16	fees; that to satisfy the standards of due process	
17	and avoid unpredictability with such a significant	
18	issue involved with the determining a Company's	
19	operational revenues, the Commission would open a	
20	workshop to lead to a rulemaking. The Commission	
21	decreed that it would delineate the definitive	
22	policy for the prospective treatment of	
23	availability fees for that rulemaking.	
24	In its later orders, Commission did	
25	not order this directive. The workshop was opened,	

		Page 112
1	proceedings ensued, but no rule has been	
2	recommended, proposed, or adopted regarding the	
3	perspective treatment of availability fees, as far	
4	as the issue itself.	
5	Availability fees are not included in	
6	the Company's filing. To repeat, the Company	
7	derives no income or revenue of availability fees.	
8	It has no right to availability fees. The	
9	availability fees affecting lots in the Company's	
10	shawnee Bend area paid to persons entitled to those	
11	fees pursuant to the deed restrictions memorialized	
12	in the document titled Amendment to the Third	
13	Amendmended and Restated Declaration of Restrictive	
14	Covenants Relating to Water and Sewer Systems.	
15	These restrictions have been further amended, and	
16	they are noted in the joint stipulation the parties	
17	have filed.	
18	The Company's customers do not pay	
19	availability fees to Lake Region. They take	
20	service under and they pay only the rights and	
21	rates and charges in the Company's tariffs as	
22	approved by this Commission. If any Company	
23	ratepayer happens to be paying an availability fee,	
24	it is entirely because that ratepayer made an	
25	independent decision to purchase an undeveloped lot	

1	subject to the deed restrictions assessing the fee.
2	The Company has no power to enforce
3	the payment of the availability fee against the lot
4	owner, even if the lot owner is a company
5	ratepayer. The owner of the undeveloped lot is the
6	sole decision maker whether to take regulated water
7	and/or sewer service at the property or to continue
8	to pay the availability fee.
9	The legal rights to the availability
10	fees on Shawnee Bend have been assigned by the
11	developer of that area to RPS Properties and Sally
12	Stump. They are still the owners, or partial
13	owners, of the rights of those fees. RPS is a
14	shareholder; Mrs. Stump is not. Mrs. Stump's
15	husband has acquired those shares, as I mentioned.
16	Staff and Office of Public Counsel
17	have somewhat similar proposals on how the
18	Commission should treat the availability fee
19	revenue. Even though Lake Region has no legal
20	right to the availability fee revenue, Staff
21	proposes that part of the revenue collected during
22	the test year should be used as an offset to the
23	Company's overall cost of service for its water and
24	sewer operations. Even though Lake Region has no
25	legal right to the availability fee revenue, OPC

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

estimate of the total amount revenue, not an accurately at revenue, something t 17 years or more should be ke Region's rate base, a approved by this Commission ses. ties approach were adopted, he Commission may order es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots Lake of the Ozarks would pay
at revenue, something t 17 years or more should be ke Region's rate base, a approved by this Commission ses. ties approach were adopted, he Commission may order es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
t 17 years or more should be ke Region's rate base, a approved by this Commission ses. ties approach were adopted, he Commission may order es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
ke Region's rate base, a approved by this Commission ses. ties approach were adopted, he Commission may order es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
approved by this Commission ses. ties approach were adopted, he Commission may order es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
ses. ties approach were adopted, he Commission may order es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
ties approach were adopted, he Commission may order es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
he Commission may order es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
es it regulates to rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
rsonal assets for cost of would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
would mean an alteration or e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
e lawful agreements. The able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
able powers to do so. ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
ach would also mean that nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
nee Bend who take no utility ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
ny would be paying part, and ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
ts involved in providing property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
property owners who do take he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
he Company. This is an o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
o non-customers of the asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
asonable. As it stands now, the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
the use of the availability owners of undeveloped lots
owners of undeveloped lots
-
Lake of the Ozarks would pay

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	more for availability fees than the Company's
2	customers would pay in monthly rates for delivery
3	of water service to the premises.
4	If the Staff's proposal or the Office
5	of Public Counsel's proposals accepted, reduction
6	of the Company's rates for service would be
7	astonishing. They will return to levels below
8	those that were approved by this Commission in
9	1997. This is certainly the wrong regulatory
10	message to send to customers, investors, and
11	generally members of the public in a time of
12	stricter and costlier environmental regulation, and
13	higher costs and expenses related to utility
14	service.
15	Availability fees may be related to
16	utility infrastructure construction. They may have
17	been mentioned in applicable deed restrictions as
18	payable to the Company and governed by an approved
19	tariff, it may be that the Staff and Office of
20	Public Counsel believe they are unreasonable and
21	should not be used, that their transfer, if they
22	were ever done, is imprudent and they should not be
23	used. All of these things still beg the question
24	whether the Commission's jurisdiction goes so far
25	as to ignore legal assignments of those revenues

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	from the developer to someone else, to modify those
2	agreements, or to review deed restrictions and
3	decide subdivision by subdivision whether the
4	availability fee charged by the developer and
5	collected by the developer is reasonable.
6	The use of availability fees to help
7	finance the original investment in infrastructure
8	of a water and sewer utility does not give the
9	customers of that utility a property interest in
10	availability fees going forward or in perpetuity.
11	As a public utility, Lake Region is legally
12	entitled to earn a reasonable return on
13	development, whatever its source, and the recovery
14	in rates of its reasonable operating expenses,
15	including debt services.
16	The availability fees at issue in this
17	case have clearly become a distinct matter of
18	contractual rights between and among the assignees,
19	one of which is the original developer, only one of
20	which is a shareholder in Lake Region. Those fees
21	have no ongoing relevance to Lake Region. They are
22	a matter of private contractual rights between the
23	developer and lot owners.
24	The developer had the ability to share
25	or sell those rights to whomever it wanted to. The

1	Lake Region shareholder, RPS, who has the right to
2	availability fees, could sell its shares in Lake
3	Region at any time without giving its right its
4	contractual right to those availability fees.
5	I'm going to digress just a moment
6	before concluding. As the Commission hears the
7	evidence today, you will observe that Staff is
8	proposing to set the Company capital structure
9	based in principal part on a loan taken out by the
10	Company shareholders that was not approved by the
11	Commission, nor subject to Commission approval in
12	which Lake Region is not a party to that loan, its
13	assets are not at risk in that loan, and Lake
14	Region has no control over that loan or its
15	payment. Staff and OPS is both proposing to reduce
16	the Company's revenue requirement by imputing
17	income to the Company or reducing rate base in an
18	amount reflecting revenue the Company does not own,
19	has no rights to collect, does not collect, over
20	which it has no control.
21	On availability fees, the Company's
22	position is that they are beyond the Commission's
23	jurisdiction. They should not be considered in
24	this case. If the Staff's proposal or Office of
25	Public Counsel's proposal is accepted, it will be a

www.midwestlitigation.com

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

Page 118 violation of the Company's rights of due process as 1 2 guaranteed by the 14th Amendment to the United 3 States Constitution and the corresponding due process of Article 10, Section -- Article 1, 4 5 Section 10. 6 The result will be a taking without 7 compensation of an investor's right of a reasonable 8 return on investment made in the Company, a violation of the 5th Amendment to the United States 9 Constitution as guaranteed to the states through 10 the 14th Amendment. For these reasons, the 11 12 proposals on the treatment of availability fees 13 advocating by the Office of Public Counsel and Staff should be rejected by the Commission. 14 15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Mr. 16 Comley. 17 Next opening statement will be by 18 Staff. 19 OPENING STATEMENT BY STAFF 20 MS. MOORE: Good morning. May it 21 please the Commission. As you know, as it has become fairly obvious here, the largest issue 22 23 presented for your determination in this case, both 24 in time spent on it and in financial impact, is the issue of availability fees. However, there are a 25

1	few other decisions to be made, and I would like to
2	mention those first this morning.
3	The other issues left for your
4	consideration are related to capital structure,
5	return equity, and also to certain legal fees the
6	Company incurred during the test year as Mr. Comley
7	discussed.
8	First, as to capital structure, it is
9	Staff's position that Lake Region is currently
10	financed to 100 percent debt. This is based on
11	Staff's conclusion that there are two loans to
12	consider in determining Lake Region's capital
13	structure, which added together equal more than the
14	value of the utility. First, there's what can be
15	described as the acquisition loan which is issued
16	to Lake Region's shareholders; and, second, there's
17	a loan issued directly to Lake Region. The main
18	point of contention on this issue is with the
19	acquisition loan.
20	Staff includes this loan on its
21	calculation of Lake Region's capital structure
22	because the loan creates a security interest in
23	Lake Region's assets. In other words, the
24	practical effect of default on that loan is that
25	the lender, the bank, take possession of Lake

1	Region. The evidence shows that, up until this
2	case, the Company considered this acquisition loan
3	to be a responsibility of Lake Region and agreed
4	with Staff that the loan was appropriately
5	classified as Lake Region debt. Staff believes
6	that's still the case and believes the Company's
7	historical perspective of the loan shows us that it
8	also believes the loan was used to finance Lake
9	Region.
10	Now, although Staff's calculations
11	shows a hundred percent debt, Staff has proposed
12	that the Commission apply a hypothetical capital
13	structure to the Company as 75 percent debt and 25
14	percent equity. As Staff's expert Shana Atkinson
15	testified and will testify, it is increasingly
16	difficult to accurately estimate the cost of equity
17	for companies with extreme amounts of leverage in
18	their capital structure, and Staff's approach to
19	address this, the 75 percent/25 percent, fits with
20	past practices of Staff and with industry standards
21	or guidelines.
22	Related to this, Staff has recommended
23	a return on equity for Lake Region of 13.89 percent
24	based on its standard methodology of calculating
25	that. This is a fair and reasonable return as long

www.midwestlitigation.com MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	as the Company's capital structure is set at 75
2	percent debt and 25 percent equity, Staff's
3	proposed hypothetical structure. However, if the
4	Commission were to accept the Company's proposed
5	capital structure, Staff would recommend a lower
6	return on equity at 11.93 percent, which is also
7	calculated using Staff's standard methodology, just
8	with the new capital structure numbers.
9	The last issue you will hear in this
10	case is regarding whether Lake Region's costs
11	incurred to defend a court case should be included
12	in the rates. Mr. Comley gave a bit of a history
13	of that case; so, briefly, Staff finds these costs
14	were incurred reasonably. The case involved a
15	contract interpretation issue between Lake Region
16	and a developer. The trial court found in favor of
17	Lake Region. The developer appealed, and the costs
18	in discussion were incurred in defending the
19	appeal. Ultimately, the appellate court found in
20	favor of the developer, but this does not negate
21	the reasonableness of the cost itself.
22	Because the cost was reasonable and
23	occurred within the test year, Staff is in favor of
24	including the cost in rates. However, because this
25	is a nonrecurring cost and shouldn't be normalized

Phone: 1.800.280.3376

Fax: 314.644.1334

1	like you would office supplies or chemicals
2	expenses that happen on a regular basis, Staff has
3	proposed that this cost be amortized over five
4	years with a tracker in order to prevent
5	over-recovery. As you heard, the Company agrees
6	with the Staff's proposed treatment of this
7	expense.
8	And, so, for the main issue,
9	availability fees, much has already been said and
10	Motions, Discovery Conferences, more Motions, and,
11	as Mr. Comley said, I won't go into all of the
12	arguments. But the issue comes down to this:
13	Staff and Public Counsel believe availability fees
14	should be considered in the calculation of rates
15	for the Company; the Company disagrees. In fact,
16	Lake Region has argued that any information
17	regarding the availability fees charged to lot
18	owners in its service area is irrelevant to the
19	Commission's duty to set just and reasonable rates
20	for Lake Region and its customers. That was in the
21	objections, Motions to Strike, Motion in Limine, et
22	cetera.
23	These Company arguments are largely
24	variations on a theme of keeping the Commission
25	from evaluating the availability fees at issue

1	here, removing them from your consideration in this
2	hearing. These are diversions distracting from the
3	simple facts. The fact is that Lake Region
4	imprudently assigned away a stream of revenue that
5	can only be appropriately charged by a utility, a
6	stream of revenue that the utility and the
7	customers benefited from in the past and should
8	continue benefitting from.
9	As I've discussed before, this
10	Commission in the past, the role of Staff has
11	recommended to the Commission positions that
12	balance the needs of the utility and the customers.
13	In this case, there doesn't even have to be a
14	nuanced balancing act. The interest of the company
15	and the customers should be aligned in that the
16	availability fees revenue benefits them both if the
17	revenue remains with the Company as it was. The
18	only interest that is not served by keeping the
19	revenue with the Company is the interest of
20	shareholders that now receive that revenue directly
21	as personal gain.
22	Staff cannot be concerned with
23	shareholders' personal gain. What is of concern to
24	Staff is that Lake Region's cost of service fully
25	reflect all of the revenues and costs that belong

1	in that cost and service, and that is why Staff
2	must, again, recommend that the Commission include
3	availability fees in its calculation of rates for
4	the Company.
5	So, Staff urges the Commission to not
6	be waylaid about the Company's attempts to divert
7	us from examining availability fees, but instead to
8	hear all the evidence and facts about what these
9	fees are, what they were meant for, and what these
10	types of fees have been and are used for by other
11	regulated utilities in Missouri.
12	Despite conclusions to the contrary,
13	in the Commission's previous order, Staff proposed
14	treatment of availability fees of revenue is not
15	radical. It's not a departure from Commission's
16	policy or practice. The departure from Commission
17	practice would be to allow a regulated utility to
18	assign away a part of its revenue to an unregulated
19	entity. In Staff's knowledge, that has never been
20	done except by Lake Region's shareholders, not
21	other companies' availability fees and not with any
22	other revenue stream of a utility. And to the best
23	of Staff's knowledge, such a maneuver has never
24	been approved by the Commission, not even in a
25	previous Lake Region order in which the Commission

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	stated it should assert jurisdiction over these
2	availability fees. Allowing the Company to proceed
3	as if doing this was fine, that would be the
4	radical decision.
5	Finally, Staff is asking the
6	Commission to impute availability fees revenue to
7	the Company, for all the reasons laid out in
8	testimony, and as you'll here today, but only
9	insofar as future effect. Staff is not asking the
10	Commission to go back to the last rate case and
11	compute from there. Staff isn't asking that the
12	admitting back to the date which Lake Region
13	imprudently assigned away this revenue stream.
14	Staff is only asking that the Commission determine
15	from this case forward how this revenue should be
16	treated for purposes of Lake Region's rates.
17	Staff believes the most just and
18	reasonable treatment of availability fees revenue,
19	the treatment that balances the needs of the
20	Company and the customers, is to impute this
21	revenue to Lake Region, the entity the fees were
22	originally designed for and the only entity that
23	provides a service in exchange for the fees.
24	However, whether the Commission ultimately agrees
25	with Staff's proposed treatment of availability

Page 126 fees or not, Staff urges this Commission to decide 1 2 this issue within this case. I think we could all 3 agree the needs of the customers and of the Company would be best met by having this issue laid to 4 5 rest. Thank you. CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Ms. Moore? 6 7 MS. MOORE: Yes, your Honor. 8 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Thank you for your 9 opening statement. I have a question. Can you hear me okay? 10 11 MS. MOORE: Yes, I can. 12 EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN KENNEY: 13 Q. You referred -- you said that the 14 acquisition loan places the Company's assets, 15 there's a security interest in the Company's assets, and Mr. Comley said exactly the opposite, 16 17 that the Company's assets were not at risk. So, I take it that you guys are diametrically opposed in 18 19 that assertion? 20 Α. Right. 21 Is there a security agreement, some Q. document that we will be able to look at to 22 determine that issue? It seems like that should be 23 a pretty easy determination, whether the assets are 24 25 at risk or not.

1	A. I'm going to have to refer you to our
2	expert witness, Shana Atkinson, about any other
3	documents that are included the specifics of the
4	documents included and the loan. However, my
5	understanding in general of the question and the
6	answer to your question is that, if the
7	shareholders were to default on that loan, the bank
8	would then take possession of their shares, and
9	because they would then have possession of their
10	shares, they would then have the assets of the
11	utility.
12	We had a similar situation in the past that
13	you might remember where a loan was defaulted upon
14	and the small water and sewer company and the bank
15	ended up having the utility in their hands and they
16	had to go out and find a sever to run it, and then
17	it came to us and we had to determine how do we
18	handle a situation where the bank is, essentially,
19	the owner of a utility. That case was unique in
20	its resolution, but it was definitely a sticky
21	issue.
22	Q. So, the security is in the
23	shareholders' securities. I mean, their shares of
24	the company?
25	A. That's my understanding.
Page 128 1 ο. Not any specific asset that's used to 2 provide service? 3 Α. Correct. So, if they default on the loan, the 4 Q. 5 shares become anew to the bank and the bank owns the utility? 6 7 Yes. Correct. Α. 8 Q. All right. Thank you. 9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any other questions. 10 (No response.) 11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Ms. Moore. 12 Opening statement by Office of Public 13 Counsel. 14 OPENING STATEMENT BY PUBLIC COUNSEL 15 MS. BAKER: May it please the Commission. Most of the issues in this case have 16 17 been agreed upon by the parties. However, the issues of availability fees, cap structure, return 18 on equity, and legal fees remain for Commission 19 determination. Public Counsel would ask that the 20 21 Commission keep in mind that the courts have determined that the Commission's principal purpose 22 is to serve and protect the ratepayers. 23 24 On the issue of availability fees, in Lake Region's previous cases, the Commission's 25

1	report and order specifically stated, because the
2	utility had at different intervals direct use of or
3	access to this revenue stream, and because the fees
4	can be defined as a commodity falling under the
5	definition of utility service, the Commission
6	concludes that it should assert jurisdiction over
7	availability fees.
8	This is completely opposite to what
9	Mr. Comley stated in his opening statement claiming
10	that the Commission determined that it should not
11	take jurisdiction. This particular quote shows the
12	Commission did take jurisdiction over the
13	availability fees. And the evidence will show that
14	it is just and reasonable for availability fees to
15	be applied against rate base as contributions in
16	aid of construction, is estimated as of the end of
17	the calendar year 2013 approximately \$6.6 million
18	of availability fees has been billed and collected,
19	and using a 40 percent water/60 percent sewer split
20	based on the monthly charges of \$10 for water and
21	\$15 for sewer, approximately 2.6 million of water
22	related and 4 million of sewer related availability
23	fees has been collected.
24	As agreed to by Lake Region, the
25	collection of availability fees from undeveloped

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

1	lots by the terms and time of the original
2	agreements began prior to construction or
3	completion of the water and sewer systems and were
4	collected to make construction of the systems fees,
5	I believe. The purpose for establishing the
6	availability fees was to recover the development in
7	the water and sewer systems, not to maintain or
8	repair the existing operations of the system once
9	they were constructed.
10	However, the evidence will show that
11	the availability fees were intended to be collected
12	far beyond merely the recovery of the original
13	construction. Estimates show that the amount of
14	availability fees presumed collected far exceeds
15	the cost of the original development in the water
16	and sewer systems. For the Shawnee Bend Water
17	System, it is estimated that approximately \$331,000
18	has be collected through availability fees above
19	and beyond the original cost to develop that
20	system. Similarly, it is estimated for the Shawnee
21	Bend Sewer System approximately \$706,000, at the
22	very least, has been collected through availability
23	fees above and beyond the original cost of that
24	system.
25	So, the evidence will show that there

www.midwestlitigation.com

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	is no specific time between the original
2	development costs and the amount of availability
3	fees that will be collected. There is no provision
4	that states that once this certain amount of money
5	is collected the availability fees will go away.
6	In fact, the way the declaration is written that
7	contains the requirement for undeveloped lots to
8	pay availability fees is that the default is that
9	the availability fees will never go away.
10	The declaration is binding until
11	January 15, 2015, after which it is automatically
12	renewed unless the owners of 90 percent of the lots
13	vote to terminate the declaration. Owners of
14	undeveloped lots have no specific timeline to
15	connect to utility service. And you would agree
16	that 90 percent agreement is a huge hurdle to meet
17	even in the best circumstances. Therefore,
18	availability fees could continue for the
19	foreseeable future just as they were intended.
20	But in a way that does make some sense, an
21	undeveloped lot may sit there for years until the
22	owner decides to connect to the utility. All the
23	while things are changing at the utility, plant is
24	getting older, and new regulations become
25	applicable.

Development is needed to make the 1 2 utility state-of-the-art for its customers. When 3 the owner of an undeveloped lot decides to take service in, say, 2014, they're not connecting to 4 5 the utility as it was originally developed. They are connecting to a state-of-the-art utility that 6 7 is in 2014. So, the place holder of paying 8 availability fees to recover the development in the 9 water and sewer systems helps guaranty that whenever the lot becomes developed there will be a 10 11 state-of-the-art system there ready to serve it. 12 Availability fees ensure that all those who use the system help pay for it rather 13 that current customers footing the entire bill. 14 Because the contributed plant associated with the 15 availability fees lowers rate base and lowers 16 17 utility rates for customers, it's important that the Commission ensure that Lake Region's customers 18 receive the full benefit from the availability 19 fees. 20 21 As the Commission found in the 22 previous case, there is a nexus between the availability fees, rate base, and rates. Customers 23 24 of Lake Region have benefitted from the construction of the original Shawnee Bend plant. 25

1	However, as stated before, the evidence will show
2	that the will show that for the Shawnee Bend
3	Water System is estimated at approximately \$331,000
4	has been collected through availability fees above
5	and beyond the original cost; and, similarly, for
6	the sewer system, approximately \$706,000 has been
7	collected above and beyond.
8	It's just and reasonable that the
9	availability fees be applied against rate base as
10	contributions in aid of construction. The result
11	of this would be to lower rate base and less rates
12	for customers. However, the evidence will show
13	that, for the Shawnee Bend Sewer System, the
14	calculated amount of availability fees collected so
15	far exceeds the amount of rate base development.
16	In fact, the adjustment to rate base would actually
17	bring rate base to a negative number. Therefore,
18	it is just and reasonable to set the rate base for
19	Shawnee Bend Sewer System at zero.
20	Admittedly, the numbers of Public
21	Counsel that Public Counsel will present are
22	estimations based on documentation that is
23	available. Only Lake Region and/or its
24	shareholders have access to the information on the
25	actual amount that has been collected. But Lake

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	Region and its shareholders refused to provide
2	specific values for the amount of availability fees
3	that have been collected over the years.
4	Lake Region and its shareholders know
5	perfectly well that in it's last rate case the
6	Commission found a nexus between availability fees,
7	rate base, and utility rates. So, estimates are
8	what we have to present to the Commission. But the
9	evidence will show that these estimates are a
10	reasonable approximation of the availability fees
11	billed and/or collected, and the comparisons with
12	the developer donated development result in
13	reasonable approximations of the access money
14	collected over and above the cost of the original
15	developer donated investments. Lake Region is
16	certainly free to provide to provide evidence as
17	to the reasonableness of a different actual amount.
18	On the issue of cap structure, the
19	evidence will show that it is just and reasonable
20	for the cap structure for Lake Region to be based
21	on the Company's actual cap structure of 68.9
22	percent debt and 31.1 percent equity. The evidence
23	will also show that Staff's position that a
24	hypothetical cap structure of 75 percent debt and
25	25 percent equity should be imposed has no basis in

1 reality of the utility. 2 Staff's broad-based -- broad-brushed 3 position that all small water and sewer systems should be treated as having 25 percent equity may 4 5 help to prop up a troubled system that has no equity and is in need of a cash flow, but there is 6 7 no evidence that this position is just and reasonable for all small systems or for this 8 9 particular system where it can be shown that there is more than 25 percent equity. There is also no 10 evidence that Staff's position is a fair balance of 11 12 the needs of the utility versus the needs of the customer. Therefore, it is just and reasonable 13 that Lake Region's actual cap structure be utilized 14 in this case. 15 And another part of a just and 16 17 reasonable rate is an authorized return on equity that is needed excessive nor confiscatory. A 18 reasonable return on equity as developed by the 19 20 United States Supreme Court decisions in the 21 Bluefield and Hope cases is one adequate to attract 22 cap at reasonable terms thereby enabling the utility to provide safe and reliable service; 2, 23 24 sufficient to ensure the Company's financial

25 integrity; and, 3, commensurate with returns on

1 development on enterprise having corresponding 2 risks.

3 The evidence will show that Lake Region's current commission-authorized return on 4 5 equity of 8.5 percent continues to be just and reasonable in this case. The evidence will show 6 7 that the Company's equity ratio has increased significantly since the prior case, and the Company 8 9 is likely to be subject to less risk than it was in the last case. The economy is still suffering and 10 reasonable returns are lower as a result. Since 11 12 Lake Region's last rate case, the overall return in 13 equity the seen -- has seen in its variate rate cases has decreased, not increased. 14

15 The only risk that Lake Region has incurred lately revolves around the shareholder 16 17 decision to remove equity from the Lake Region Water and Sewer System to fund a cash payout to the 18 shareholders. That decision was purely shareholder 19 driven, and any risk and result in lowering of 20 21 return should not be placed on Lake Region but, instead, should be borne by the shareholders 22 themselves. Shareholders also specifically removed 23 24 the payment of availability fees from Lake Region as a separate cash flow and, as a result, 25

1 eliminated a good deal of risk on behalf of the 2 shareholder. 3 Customers have no say in shareholder 4 actions and are at the mercy of Commission decision 5 on how much return is reflected in rates. There is 6 no evidence that Staff's recommended 13.89 or 11.93 7 percent, depending on Commission's decisions, or

8 that the Company's original 11.07 return on equity 9 recommendation are reflections of just and 10 reasonable shareholder risk. Therefore, Lake 11 Region's current authorized return on equity of 8.5 12 percent continues to be just and reasonable in this 13 case.

14 The last issue is that of legal fees. As stated before, the issue before the Commission 15 is whether the legal fees incurred during the test 16 17 year for Shawnee Bend Development Company, LLC, and Lake Region Water and Sewer should be included in 18 the calculation of rates for Lake Region. As the 19 Commission has already heard, the developer won 20 21 this case, and the customers received no benefit from the costs of this legal action. Utilization 22 23 of the test year concept assumes that reasonable 24 and prudent expenses included in the development of rates should be representative of costs which will 25

		Page
1	be incurred each year during the period that the	
2	new rates are in effect.	
3	The evidence will show that a judgment	
4	was entered on July 10th, 2013, indicating the case	
5	was resolved at that time. There are no similar	
6	legal actions currently outstanding and none are	
7	foreseen in the near future. Therefore, legal fees	
8	are a nonrecurring expense and should not be	
9	included in the calculation of the rates for Lake	
10	Region. Thank you.	
11	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Ms. Baker.	
12	We're now ready to start with witness	
13	testimony. As I mentioned before, we're going to	
14	do that by issue; and the first issue to be	
15	discussed is capital structure, and the first	
16	witness will be Lake Region's witness, John	
17	Summers.	
18	CAPITAL STRUCTURE	
19	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Summers, could	
20	you come forward, please.	
21	(Whereupon, the witness, John Summers,	
22	was administered the oath by Judge Bushmann.)	
23	JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may be seated.	
24	MR. COMLEY: Judge Bushmann, so I'll	
25	be clear, we're going to wait to make formal offers	

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

	Page
1 of the to	estimony until each witness testifies fully
2 on the i	ssues in which their testimony addresses?
3	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes. Since they'll
4 be comin	g up and down several times, I think it
5 will be 1	best to offer it the last time they're up.
6	MR. COMLEY: Very well. I do have a
7 series o	f questions for Mr. Summers in connection
8 with all	of that, kind of preparatory things, and
9 I'll def	er the offer until after he's been
10 cross-ex	amined.
11	JUDGE BUSHMANN: That's fine.
12 DIRECT E	XAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY:
13 Q	. Mr. Summers, would you state your full
14 name for	the record, please?
15 A	. John R. Summers.
16 Q	. And what is your position with Lake
17 Region?	
18 A	. I'm the General Manager.
19 Q	. Mr. Summers, did you cause to be
20 prepared	for filing in this case a three
21 separate	pieces of written testimony?
22 A	. Yes, I did.
23 Q	. And they have been marked by the
24 Reporter	, I think, as Lake Region's Exhibits 1, 2,
25 and 3, as	nd they are direct, rebuttal, and

139

1 surrebuttal testimony respectively; is that 2 correct? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. Mr. Summers, do you have any 5 corrections or additions to your testimony in any 6 one of those exhibits? 7 I would correct the exhibit, I believe Α. it's in my rebuttal testimony, where I added the 8 actual case numbers to the exhibit stating how 9 availability fees had been historically treated. 10 MR. COMLEY: With the permission from 11 12 the Judge, I would like to show this to Mr. Bush --Judge Bushmann, I would like to show this to 13 Mr. Summers for identification, please. 14 15 (Whereupon, Mr. Comley handed a document to the Witness.) 16 17 Ο. (By Mr. Comley) Mr. Summers, I'm handing you what has been marked at the bottom as 18 19 JRS Exhibit No. 1. Is this the resized JRS Exhibit 20 No. 1 to the rebuttal testimony you have just 21 mentioned? 22 Yes it is. Α. 23 Q. It is your decision this should be 24 replaced for the exhibit that is on the current set 25 of rebuttal testimony?

Page 141 1 A. Yes. 2 Q. Are there any other additions or 3 corrections to your direct, rebuttal, or surrebuttal testimony as it's been submitted to the 4 5 Commission? 6 A. No. 7 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I'll defer the offer of the testimony and submit Mr. Summers 8 for cross-examination. 9 10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. 11 MR. COMLEY: I will hand out this. 12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes. Thank you. Just to be clear, Mr. Comley, what you 13 just handed the Staff, is that the revision to the 14 15 testimony that you referred to? 16 MR. COMLEY: On the rebuttal 17 testimony, it's the exhibit that was attached to 18 his testimony on rebuttal. 19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And this is the only thing that's changed? 20 21 MR. COMLEY: Yes. My understanding. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. Thank you. 22 All right. Cross-examination by Staff. 23 MR. OPITZ: Your Honor, Staff has no 24 cross at this time. 25

Page 142 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Public Counsel. 1 2 MS. BAKER: No questions. Thank you. 3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Are there any questions from the bench? 4 5 (No response.) 6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions, 7 Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN KENNEY: I'm sorry. I 8 couldn't hit the mute button. No. Thank you. 9 10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any other questions? 11 A. No questions. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Since there's no 12 13 cross and no questions from the bench, we don't need to have re-cross or redirect, so you may step 14 down at this time. 15 16 (Whereupon, the Witness left the 17 witness stand.) MR. COMLEY: Lake Region would call 18 19 Mr. Michael Gorman. 20 (Whereupon, the witness, Michael 21 Gorman, was administered the oath by Judge Bushmann.) 22 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY: 24 25 Mr. Gorman, state your full name for Q.

Page 143 1 the Commission, please. 2 Α. Michael Gorman. 3 Q. How are you professionally employed, 4 sir? 5 Α. Managing Principal of Brubaker and 6 Associates. 7 Mr. Gorman, as part of the testimony Q. 8 in this case, did you cause to be prepared a set of 9 written testimony which has been marked as Exhibit 5, your rebuttal testimony in this case? 10 Yes. 11 Α. 12 Q. Are there any changes or corrections 13 to your testimony? 14 Α. No. 15 And if I were to ask the same Q. 16 questions that are propounded in your testimony, 17 would your answers today be the same? Α. 18 They would. 19 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I offer Mr. Gorman at this time; and he is also testifying 20 21 on only one issue, and given the procedures you announced, I will go ahead and offer his testimony 22 into evidence at this time. 23 24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'm sorry. am I 25 incorrect that he won't be testifying about return

on equity? 1 2 MR. COMLEY: Oh, I'm presuming that 3 maybe we will handle both of those at the same time. But if we can't --4 5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Are we doing those 6 together combined? 7 MR. OPITZ: Yes. MR. COMLEY: I'm sorry. I was 8 9 presuming maybe the issues were so closely 10 connected that you were going to cross Mr. Summers on that same issue when he was up there. 11 12 MR. OPITZ: Yes. 13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Can we do both at the 14 same time? 15 MR. OPITZ: I have no cross on that 16 issue from Mr. Summers. JUDGE BUSHMANN: And does Public 17 18 Counsel have any? 19 MS. BAKER: I did not. So, putting them together was fine. 20 21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Moving things along with the agreement of the parties, why don't we 22 23 combine these two issues of capital structure and 24 return on equity, and cross-examination could cover 25 both issues.

Page 145 And, so, Mr. Comley, you're going to 1 2 offer your exhibit? 3 MR. COMLEY: I would offer Exhibit No. 5 into evidence. That's Mr. Gorman's rebuttal 4 5 testimony. 6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections to the 7 receipt of that exhibit? 8 MR. OPITZ: None from Staff, your 9 Honor. 10 MS. BAKER: No objection. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Hearing none, then 11 12 Lake Region Exhibit 5 will be received into record. MR. COMLEY: I tender Mr. Gorman for 13 14 cross-examination. JUDGE BUSHMANN: And cross-examination 15 by Staff. 16 17 MR. OPITZ: No cross at this time, 18 your Honor. 19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any cross-examination by Office of Public Counsel? 20 21 MS. BAKER: Yes, your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER: 22 23 Q. Starting first with the issue of cap 24 structure. Were you able to calculate the actual 25 cap structure for Lake Region?

1	A. Mr. Summers calculated that cap
2	structure, but it was approximately 60 percent debt
3	and 40 percent. I did verify his calculation of
4	the numbers, but he sponsored the Company's actual
5	cap structure.
6	Q. All right. You're aware that Staff
7	says it has a rule of thumb to apply a 25 percent
8	debt or a 75 percent debt/25 percent equity cap
9	structure to any small water and sewer system?
10	A. That's highly leveraged. Yes, that's
11	my understanding of the Staff's position.
12	Q. All right. In your experience, is it
13	reasonable to apply a rule of thumb hypothetical
14	structure to every small water and sewer system
15	without making a determination that it balances the
16	need of the utility and the customers?
17	A. I think that is not a reasonable
18	position.
19	Q. Did you yourself calculate a
20	reasonable range of return of equity for Lake
21	Region?
22	A. I reviewed Staff's methodology, and as
23	far as they recommend using risk preliminary
24	methodology, based on their assessment of target
25	bond rating, Lake Region doesn't have a bond

rating. So, the imputed a bonding rate based on 1 2 its financial characteristics, that imputed bond 3 rating was around B plus. Based on that bond rating and yield spreads 4 5 of Treasury securities relative to corporate bonds, they developed their return on equity estimate. 6 Ι 7 found that a proxy bond rating of B plus based on the Company's actual cap structure was reasonable 8 9 and yield spreads provided a reasonable estimate of a preliminary to current Treasury bond yields to 10 11 produce a fair return on equity for below 12 development grade company in this marketplace. You're aware that Lake Region has no 13 0. 14 bonds, is not a publicly-traded company, correct? 15 Α. There are no bonds, but it does have a loan, but it has no bond rating. 16 17 ο. And it's not publicly-traded, correct? Α. The equity shares are privately-owned, 18 19 that's correct. 20 And, in your testimony, you mentioned Q. 21 a 10-percent return on equity for Missouri Ameren 22 in its last rate case; is that correct? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Were you aware that the last Missouri Ο. 25 Ameren rate case involved a global settlement were

1 return on equity for the company was not stated? 2 Α. Was not stated, but it was used for 3 ISRIS, Infrastructure System Replacement Surcharge, pricing that followed the global settlement in that 4 5 case. 6 And is ISRS, or Infrastructure System Q. 7 Replacement, is just one portion of Missouri 8 Ameren, is not their entire company, correct? It is one rate mechanism for the 9 Α. Company. It's not all the rate mechanisms, that's 10 correct. 11 12 0. You're aware that Lake Region agreed 13 to 8.5 percent return of equity in their last rate 14 case? 15 A. I'd have to verify that, but that is -- I believe that is correct. 16 17 Q. Are you aware of any significant increased risk faced by Lake Region since its last 18 19 rate case? A. Well, I didn't review the methodology 20 21 to establish 8.5 percent, in the last case. I did review the methodology to establish a return on 22 23 equity based on the risk characteristics of the 24 Company in this case. 25 So, the answer is no, you did not Q.

	Page 149
1	review any increased risks since the last rate
2	case, whether there were any increased risks?
3	A. Well, not specifically for the return
4	on equity. I did review the change in the
5	financing structure of the Company in this case
6	relative to what it was in the last case, and in
7	this case, there is a direct Company loan.
8	Q. Okay. And you would agree that the
9	Company or shareholder actions specifically with
10	the loan that you just mentioned affect the amount
11	of risk faced by the utility?
12	A. I'm sorry. Can you repeat that
13	please.
14	Q. You would agree that Company or
15	shareholder actions affect the amount of risk
16	that's faced by the utility?
17	A. I would agree that Company management
18	actions can impact the development risk of the
19	Company. I'm not confident that shareholder
20	actions can have a direct impact on the development
21	risk of the Company.
22	MS. BAKER: No further questions.
23	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from
24	the bench.
25	CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Yes.

Page 150 1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Chairman. 2 EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN KENNEY: 3 Q. Can you hear me okay? Α. I can. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. 4 5 Q. Thank for being here. I just have a 6 couple of questions about the business loan 7 agreement and how you analyze it in arriving at 8 your cap structure versus Staff's recommendation, 9 and I just want to make sure I understand your 10 testimony. You don't take issue with Staff's 11 12 methodology. Is it essentially your opinion that 13 Staff's cap structure is inconsistent with S&P's 14 financial and business risk profiles for a strong 15 rating because they impute them? My position is that Staff's 16 Α. 17 methodology didn't necessarily attempt to identify what a reasonable cap structure is using the S&P 18 methodology. The methodology Staff uses, I think, 19 is reasonable. The reason I think it's reasonable 20 21 is because it's transparent, it's verifiable. And in the issue I have with Staff is that 22 they didn't test the reasonableness of the 23 24 Company's actual capital structure, first to see whether or not it is consistent with the business 25

1	risk and the financial risk included in that
2	Standard & Poor's methodology that they are
3	advocating to use in this case.
4	In employing that methodology to test
5	whether or not the Company's actual capital
6	structure is reasonable shows that it is. Sixty
7	percent debt ratio is consistent with a
8	highly-leveraged company. It is consistent with
9	the business risk profile score based on Staff's
10	finding as well as my finding.
11	The disconnect I have with Staff is when
12	they moved away from the Company's actual capital
13	structure to impute a capital structure with
14	significantly more debt than the Company's actual
15	capital structure. I don't think Standard & Poor's
16	methodology supports Staff's decision to do that.
17	I don't think the ultimate finding is necessarily
18	inconsistent with the highly-leveraged company but,
19	nevertheless, I don't think that Staff's
20	methodology demonstrates that the Company's actual
21	capital structure is not reasonable. In fact, I
22	think it's quite the opposite, that that
23	methodology shows that the actual capital structure
24	is reasonable.
25	Q. Doesn't the determination of what is

1 the actual capital structure turn on whether that 2 loan is imputed to the Company or not? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. So, are you taking exception with the 5 imputation of the loan, the acquisition to the 6 Company in the first place? 7 Α. Yeah. I don't think that's a complete 8 or an accurate analysis to determine how the 9 Company funded its equity ownership of the shares in Lake Region. Normally, when Staff and others 10 review the financing structure between the parent 11 12 company and the utility subsidiary, one looks at 13 the total capital mix of the parent company. You don't select specific loans of the parent company 14 15 and attribute those to the funding source the parent company used to procure the equity shares. 16 17 But, rather, you recognize the equity shares as an asset of the parent company on the essence side of 18 the balance sheet, then you go to the liability 19 side of the balance sheet and make an assessment of 20 21 how they funded all of their assets. Staff didn't 22 do that. So I don't think their analysis is complete in identifying how the Company funded 23 those equity shares. 24 25 So, what you're saying is they imputed Q.

1 that loan to the Company without necessarily 2 looking at what that loan was used to fund? 3 Α. They did not do a complete analysis of identifying how the Company was funding all of its 4 5 assets, including the Lake Region equity shares and all of the other assets owned by the partnership. 6 7 Those are assets on the partnership's balance sheet, the liability describes how they funded all 8 of those assets, and there's equity and debt in the 9 liability side of the balance sheet that should 10 have been evaluated to get a better estimate and 11 12 more accurate estimate of what the funding source was available to the partnership to fund its 13 investments and all of its business including its 14 development in the equity shares of Lake Region. 15 16 Q. Okay. CHAIRMAN KENNEY: That's all I have. 17 18 Thank you very much for your time. 19 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any cross based on 21 questions from the bench. 22 (No response.) 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Does Staff have any 24 questions. 25

Page 154 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. OPITZ: 1 2 Good morning, Mr. Gorman. Q. 3 Α. Good morning. 4 Q. Were you involved with Lake Region and 5 its shareholders at the time that this acquisition loan was established? 6 7 Α. No. 8 Q. And were you involved with Lake Region or its shareholders when the funds from that 9 acquisition loan were originally invested? 10 Α. In 2002? 11 12 Q. I believe so, yes. 13 Α. No. 14 Q. Were you involved with Lake Region or 15 its shareholders when the loan was the subject of a finance case before the Commission? 16 17 Α. I believe the shareholder loan was not the subject of a financing case before the 18 Commission, but there was a separate loan on behalf 19 of Lake Region that was. But I was not involved in 20 21 that proceeding. 22 MR. OPITZ: No further cross, your 23 Honor. 24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross by Public 25 Counsel?

1 MS. BAKER: No questions. Thank you. 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect? 3 MR. COMLEY: May I? Thank you, Judge. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY: 4 5 Mr. Gorman, in response to questions Q. from the Office of Public Counsel and Ms. Baker, 6 7 she was mentioning some matters of the last case 8 and percentages used in the last case for Lake 9 Region. Has there been any market condition or any 10 economic factor since Lake Region's last rate case 11 which affects your opinions in this matter today? 12 Α. Well, what we've been seeing in the capital markets, particularly since the 2008-2009 13 period, is a flight to quality where the market is 14 15 looking for secure and predictable investments to put their capital. And if you are what the market 16 17 perceives as a low-risk investment opportunity, you're in high demand. So, development-grade 18 utility companies' securities are in very high 19 20 demand right now. Their capital cost is very low. 21 Treasury securities are in very high demand right 22 now and cost of Treasury securities are very low. For other companies perceived as not part of 23 24 that quality development grouping of the capital 25 market, capital market costs are not low for those.

1	Staff has made an analysis, and I think it's a good
2	one, that a proxy bond rating for this company is
3	below investment grade. Several notches below
4	development grade bond rating.
5	They found appropriate bond rating proxy for
6	this cost is B plus. I think that's reasonable
7	based on the S&P methodology that they used to try
8	to target a reasonable bond rating.
9	Capital costs for below investment grade
10	companies has not been low and stable since 2008.
11	It's been rather volatile, and I think that's
12	evidence from Ms. Atkinson's work papers where she
13	shows the yield spread for various investment grade
14	bond ratings and below investment grade bond
15	ratings over a relatively short number of months
16	last year. That spread jumps around quite a bit,
17	particularly for the lower grade non-investment
18	grade bonds. But her analysis also shows that this
19	spread for below investment-grade companies
20	relative to Treasury bonds is somewhere between 300
21	or more basis points for a utility below
22	investment-grade bond rating of around B plus.
23	The Lake Region negotiated loan since the
24	last rate case and that loan even with shareholder
25	guarantees on the loans still added minute interest

1	rate of 5 percent. That 5 percent interest rate is
2	in line with the yield spreads of B plus bond
3	rating based on the spread shown in Ms. Atkinson's
4	work papers in this case. All of that was for the
5	example that I used to judge the Staff's return on
6	equity estimate to be reasonable based on that B
7	plus bond rating target which I also found to be
8	reasonable.
9	Q. Commissioner (sic) Kenny asked
10	questions about your position on imputation of
11	shareholder loan acquisition loan be referred
12	evidence. With respect to the Lake Region loan,
13	direct loan approved in the financing case, do you
14	know how the proceeds of the Lake Region loan, the
15	one that was approved in the financing case, were
16	used in respect to the shareholder loan?
17	A. Well, it's my understanding of the
18	proceedings of the Lake Region loan were not
19	retained in the utility but they were distributed
20	up to the parent company to, essentially,
21	restructure the shareholders' original acquisition
22	cap capitalization of the company.
23	Q. Is that a factor in your significance
24	in your case, in your testimony for this case?
25	A. Well, it is, because it's my

1	understanding that Lake Region's management has
2	made an explicit decision to try to develop a
3	transparent and verifiable capital structure mix
4	for Lake Region. And I think that is important for
5	several reasons, particularly if the Staff and the
6	Commission endorse that effort. And the reason I
7	think it's important is because Lake Region can
8	quite literally take the Commission's determination
9	of that capital structure mix being reasonable and
10	be used to set rates to the bank when it applies to
11	extend that existing Lake Region loan. I think
12	it's important because, when they are asking the
13	bank to extend that Lake Region loan, they're going
14	to set an interest rate based on the risk of that
15	loan.
16	Having that regulatory structure supporting
17	the financing mix and the ratemaking mix tied to
18	that loan is important when the Lake Region
19	management interacts with the banking institutions
20	or other capital sources of cap to negotiate actual
21	capital that will be used to support their
22	investment in Lake Region.
23	Q. During the course of your analysis,
24	did you compute the amount of money in Lake
25	Region's rate base for purposes of this case?

Page 159 A. I didn't compute it but I looked at 1 2 the Staff's estimate of it. 3 Q. Have you analyzed the amount of debt that the Staff is imposing on the Company compared 4 5 to the amount of rate base? 6 A. Yes. Staff is imputing debt similar 7 in excess of \$4 million, and the rate base estimate is around \$2.6 million. 8 9 MR. COMLEY: That's all the questions I have. 10 11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, 12 Mr. Gorman. You may step down. (Whereupon, the Witness left the 13 14 witness stand.) 15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Seems to me this would be a good time for a break. Why don't we 16 17 stand in recess until about 10:15. (Whereupon, a recess was taken at 9:55 18 19 a.m.) 20 (Whereupon, the record resumed at 21 10:13 a.m.) 22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: The next witness that we have for the combined issues of cap structure 23 24 and return on equity is Shana Atkinson. 25 MR. OPITZ: Your Honor, Staff calls

Page 160 Shana Atkinson. 1 2 (Whereupon, the witness, Shana 3 Atkinson, was administered the oath by Judge Bushmann.) 4 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. OPITZ: 6 Ms. Atkinson, can you state your name, Q. 7 and spell that, too? 8 Α. Shana Atkinson, S-h-a-n-a A-t-k-i-n-s-o-n. 9 10 And where are you employed and in what Q. 11 capacity? 12 Α. I'm employed by Missouri Public Service Commission as a Utility Regulatory Auditor 13 14 III. 15 Are you the same Shana Atkinson to Q. 16 prepare or caused to be prepared the testimony 17 that's been marked as exhibit -- a portion of Exhibit 1, the Staff's cost of service requirement 18 19 report, and Exhibit 7, Staff's Exhibit 7, the 20 surrebuttal of Shana Atkinson? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. Do you have anything that you wish to 23 correct in that testimony? 24 Α. No. 25 If I ask you those same questions Q.

1 today within that testimony and report, would your 2 answers be the same? 3 Α. Yes. Is the information in each of those 4 Q. 5 exhibits true and correct, to the best of your 6 knowledge and belief? 7 Α. Yes. MR. OPITZ: Your Honor, Staff would 8 like to offer Exhibit 7, the surrebuttal of Shana 9 Atkinson, into evidence; and, as is my 10 understanding, we'll wait to offer Exhibit 1 until 11 12 all of the witnesses have testified in the cost of service report. And, with that, Staff tenders the 13 14 witness for cross. 15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objection to the receipt of Staff Exhibit 7 into the record? 16 17 MR. COMLEY: No objection. MS. BAKER: No. 18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Staff Exhibit 7 will 19 be received into the record. 20 21 And first cross would be Office of 22 Public Counsel. 23 MS. BAKER: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER: 24 25 Q. Good morning, Ms. Atkinson.

Page 162 1 Α. Good morning. 2 Were you able to calculate an actual **Q**. 3 capital structure for Lake Region? 4 Α. I have not computed that since I got 5 an updated rate base yet. 6 But at the moment that you had a Ο. 7 previous rate base number, you were able to 8 calculate an actual capital structure? Α. 9 Yes. 10 And is it Staff's rule of thumb to Q. 11 apply a 75 percent debt/25 percent equity capital 12 structure to any small water and sewer system where 13 Staff believes there's less than 25 percent equity? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Does Staff's rule of thumb Q. 16 hypothetical capital structure make any 17 determination on how it balances the needs of the utility and the needs of the customers? 18 19 Α. We compute a fair and reasonable rate determined by our methodology. 20 21 So, you don't do a specific balance Q. 22 between the utility needs and the customer needs? 23 Α. No. All right. Are you aware that Lake 24 **Q**. 25 Region agreed to an 8.5 percent return on equity in

Page 163 their last rate case? 1 2 A. Could you repeat that? 3 Q. Are you aware that Lake Region agreed to an 8.5 percent return on equity on their last 4 5 rate case? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. Are you aware of any significant 8 increased risk faced by Lake Region since its last 9 rate case? 10 Α. No. 11 And you would agree that Company or Q. 12 shareholder actions do affect the amount of risk 13 that's faced by the utility? 14 Α. Yes. 15 And did you take into account Lake Q. Region or its shareholders' actions, like 16 17 shareholder removal of equity to provide cash payments to shareholders, when you developed your 18 19 position on return on equity? 20 Α. Yes. 21 MS. BAKER: No further questions. 22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Lake Region. 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY: 24 I have a whole lot of stuff, Ms. Q. 25 Atkinson. That's why I'm up here at the podium.
Page 164 Α. 1 Okay. 2 I have a few questions that will start 0. 3 with the cost of service portion. Your cost of service portion. On page 6, lines 19 through 21, I 4 5 think we're talking about the two loans that are a part of your analysis for the case. Would that be 6 7 fair? 8 Α. Yeah. 9 **Q**. What is the acquisition loan? And sometimes I'll refer to that as the shareholder 10 11 loan. Would that be okay with you? 12 Α. Yeah. And the other loan would be the loan 13 Q. 14 that was approved during the financing case, and 15 I'll say I think I've got this right, WF-2013-0118? Α. 16 Yes. 17 0. And if I refer to the financing case, that's what I'm referring to. Now, on the 18 19 acquisition loan or shareholder loan, to make this 20 clear, this is the loan that Altera Bank first 21 issued in October of 2004, would that be correct? No. It was issued by Gold Bank in 22 Α. 23 2004. 24 Gold Bank issued that. And the debt Q. 25 was -- the debt was used for the acquisition of the

Page 165 1 shares; is that correct? 2 Α. Yeah, the pickup of that loan was to acquire Lake Region Water and Sewer Company. 3 Now, was there other property involved 4 Q. 5 in that loan, to your knowledge? 6 Α. No. It said the purpose of the loan 7 was to acquire Lake Region Water and Sewer Company. 8 Q. So, the only purpose that you saw was 9 for the acquisition of the shares? 10 Α. Yes. 11 Now, that loan has been renewed; is 0. 12 that correct? 13 Α. It has been refinanced over the years. 14 Q. And the most recent financing would 15 have been in May of 2011 -- no -- May of 2012? 16 Hold on. Let me see if I have it. Α. 17 Q. Excuse me. I'll say May of 2013. 18 Α. Yes. 19 Okay. Commissioner (sic) Kenny in his Q. 20 remarks earlier talked about the loans, and my 21 understanding is that, in connection with the 22 subpoena issued to RPS Properties, the Staff 23 acquired copies of the commercial loan agreement as 24 well as pledge agreements and the other documents related to the Altera Bank loan; is that correct? 25

Page 166 1 Α. The shareholder loan. 2 Shareholder loan? Q. 3 Α. Yes. MR. COMLEY: I have an exhibit I would 4 5 like for the witness to review. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. 6 7 (Whereupon, a document was handed to 8 the witness.) 9 0. (By Mr. Comley) Ms. Atkinson, I've 10 handed you a document that's covered by a business 11 records affidavit, and I'm going to ask you, is 12 that affidavit and the documents following the 13 response to the subpoena that the Staff received 14 from RPS Properties? 15 Hold on just a second. Α. 16 (Whereupon, the Witness looked at the 17 document.) 18 Α. (By the Witness) Yes. It's the same. 19 Now, is this the loan that you have Q. 20 reviewed in connection with your testimony? 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. And is that a true and correct copy of 23 the loan as it was received by you and reviewed? 24 Α. Yes. 25 MR. COMLEY: I would like to have that

Page 167 marked as Lake Region's next exhibit, I think we're 1 2 on to No. 7. 3 Ο. (By Mr. Comley) And while you were thumbing through Exhibit 7, I noticed you may have 4 5 a copy handy. 6 Α. Yes. 7 Q. With respect to Exhibit 7, this 8 represents the current version of that shareholder loan. Would that be a correct statement? 9 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. And the shareholders have changed 12 since originally -- since the time the first loan 13 was taken out for the shares; is that correct? 14 Α. Yes. It is my understanding that 15 Vernon Stump now has Sally Stump's shares. 16 And the shareholder loan was not Q. 17 approved by the Commission; is that correct? Α. Correct. 18 19 Q. And would it be Staff's position that 20 this kind of loan would not be subject to 21 Commission approval? 22 Within the limitations of Missouri Α. 23 Revised Statutes 39380. 24 Under that, the Commission would Q. necessarily be required to approve --25

Page 168 Α. Not necessarily. It's within the 1 2 statute. 3 Q. Now, the other one in your analysis 4 was one that the Commission approved in the 5 financing case; is that correct? The other loan that you analyzed in your testimony was the one 6 7 that was approved by the Commission in the 8 financing case? 9 Α. The Greechen (ph), yes. 10 And in that loan, Lake Region 0. collateralized that loan with its assets. Would 11 12 that be a correct statement? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. And in the way you imputed the debt of 15 the Company, you have added the shareholder loan, 16 the acquisition loan, to the Lake Region loan, the 17 one that was approved in the financing case, for the total debt. Is that correct? 18 19 The current amount of the acquisition Α. loan, that's 1.3 million, then about 1.4 million at 20 21 the Lake Region level. 22 0. So, how much have you calculated the 23 debt to the Company to be? What is the total debt 24 that you have calculated? 25 The total debt is -- hold on just a Α.

Page 169 second. It's about 2.7 million. Under that. 1 2 You calculate the amount of debt for **Q**. 3 the whole company at 2.7 million? Α. Under that. 4 5 Q. 2.7. Do you know what the rate base 6 is? 7 The counter rate base then is about Α. two-and-a-half million. 8 9 **Q**. I think Mr. Gorman mentioned that your calculation of the the entire debt was around 4 10 million? 11 12 Α. In direct testimony, we didn't have the information. We had to subpoena RPS Properties 13 for the current documentation of the loan to make 14 15 sure that Lake Region disbursed the amount from the finance case to pay down the shareholder loan. 16 17 Q. All right. 18 Α. So, that's why there's a discrepancy 19 there. 20 So, you know that the amount that was Q. 21 borrowed at the Lake Region level, the financing 22 loan, financing case loan, that was used to pay 23 down the shareholder loan? A. Correct. 24 25 And that's why the figures now differ? Q.

		Page 170
1	A. We had to make sure that the	
2	disbursement actually took place. We didn't have	
3	the current RPS loan and Sally Stump loan	
4	documentation to verify that. So, we included the	
5	whole entire amount of 2.8 million in the original	
6	direct testimony and added that to the Lake Region	
7	loan, and that's why that was about 4.3 million.	
8	Q. But right now, given your figure that	
9	you just testified to, you're saying that the total	
10	debt would approximate the amount of the rate base?	
11	A. Correct.	
12	Q. Now, as part of the shareholder loan,	
13	the makers of that note executed a negative pledge	
14	agreement. Remember that?	
15	A. Yes.	
16	Q. And that, basically, provides that the	
17	shareholder would take no action that pled the	
18	assets of Lake Region for collateral for any	
19	indebtedness than what you understand that?	
20	A. Yes.	
21	Q. And that negative pledge agreement is	
22	part of the Exhibit No. 7?	
23	A. Yes.	
24	Q. So, a copy of that is involved in	
25	Exhibit 7?	

1 Α. Yes. 2 Okay. Would it be fair to say that **Q**. 3 the negative pledge agreement terms and provisions were significant to you in determining that the 4 5 shareholder loans should be imputed to Lake 6 Region's debt structure? 7 Α. I would say it helped reinforce our opinion on the debt structure. I wouldn't say it 8 was the main reason. 9 10 Q. It was very important, though, wasn't it? 11 12 Α. Because Altera Bank now has a loan 13 held by -- that Lake Region has a loan by them, the negative pledge agreement doesn't really change any 14 15 interest that they have with the Company. 16 Let's go through this a little bit. Q. 17 You may recall that Lake Region sent requests for admissions to the Staff --18 19 A. Uh-huh. 20 -- that were directed toward the cap Q. 21 structure testimony. Do you remember that? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Q. And would it be fair to say, Ms. 24 Atkinson, that you had some role in answering those 25 requests for admissions?

Α. Yes. 1 2 And the interrogatories that were **Q**. 3 involved with those? 4 Α. Yes. 5 (Whereupon, a certain document was 6 marked for identification by the Court Reporter as Exhibit No. 7, psg, 2/18/14.) 7 MR. COMLEY: I'm going to try to use 8 9 the ELMO a little bit, and I don't know how much it's going to affect the ability for people to hear 10 me, but I'm going to have to be over here a little 11 12 bit and direct the witness to some pleadings over here. I'll try to yell. 13 14 Q. (By Mr. Comley) Ms. Atkinson, I'm 15 going to try to direct your attention to that television over there (indicating). 16 17 Α. Okay. 18 Q. I think that this is going to show up. 19 I'm hoping that people can see it. Some of these 20 things are going to be, maybe, out of scope, but 21 I'm hoping that we can get these things so people 22 can see it. 23 You know this is titled Response to the 24 Missouri Sewers Company Combined First Set of 25 Request for Admissions; is that correct?

Α. Yes. 1 2 And, again, you were part and parcel 0. of preparing these responses? 3 Α. Yes. 4 5 Q. I'm going to direct your attention to No. 13, -- No. 13, Request No. 13. And I'm hoping 6 7 that this will expand enough so you can read it. 8 The request is debts of regulated utility 9 shareholders are not debts of the regulated utility, and your answer is, Staff cannot 10 11 truthfully admit or deny this statement. While it 12 is usually true that personal debt of utility shareholders is not considered a debt of a utility, 13 14 Lake Region's shareholders demonstrate an exception 15 to this standard. 16 Lake Region has only two shareholders, both 17 of whom have specifically signed negative pledge agreements, do not pledge Lake Region assets as 18 19 collateral in any other loans. The intent of the 20 structure of this debt instrument is to prevent the 21 Lake Region; therefore, in this case, the shareholders debt should be considered a debt of 22 23 Lake Region for the purposes of assessing Lake 24 Region's capital structure. 25 Have I read that correctly?

Α. Yes. 1 2 Let's look at Request for Admission **Q**. 3 No. 14. It asks to admit or deny the debts of shareholders even occurred for purposes of 4 5 purchasing shares and regulated utilities are not debts of the utility. And I think the answer you 6 7 give to that is identical to the one for 13? 8 Α. Yes. 9 So, for purposes of these requests for 0. admissions, you end with, therefore, in this case, 10 the shareholders' debt should be considered a debt 11 12 of Lake Region for the purposes of assessing Lake 13 Region's cap structure on the basis of the negative 14 pledge agreement. Is that correct? 15 Α. Yes. MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, at this time, 16 17 I would like to move for the admission of Lake Region Exhibit No. 7. 18 19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections? 20 MS. BAKER: Do we have a copy of that? 21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Did you give that to the Counsel? Have they seen that? 22 23 MR. COMLEY: I think the copy was sent 24 by agreement, the RPS subpoena was sent to 25 everybody. Mr. Opitz was sent that.

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

Page 175 MS. BAKER: This is what is attached 1 2 to --3 MR. COMLEY: This was attached to --4 MR. OPITZ: You're talking about the 5 loan? 6 MR. COMLEY: It was attached to an 7 email sent by Mr. Opitz on Friday, November 22nd. MS. BAKER: Okay. I get a lot of 8 e-mails. 9 10 MR. COMLEY: I don't have another 11 copy. 12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Can Ms. Baker look at the one that's been marked? 13 14 MR. COMLEY: Absolutely. 15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Are you through with 16 the document reader? 17 MR. COMLEY: I've got several more 18 things to use. 19 (Whereupon, Ms. Baker looked at the 20 document.) 21 MS. BAKER: I'm assuming I have the 22 entire document available to me. 23 MR. COMLEY: I hope you do. I'm 24 assuming you do. 25 MS. BAKER: Okay. With that caveat,

Page 176 no objection. 1 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Staff, any objection? 3 MR. OPITZ: No objection, your Honor. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Then, Lake Region 4 5 Exhibit 7 is received into the record. 6 (By Mr. Comley) I've got a few more Q. 7 of the admissions I want to work with you on. 8 Α. Okay. 9 Let's take a look at No. 6, -- excuse 0. me -- No. 4. The Staff has admitted that the 10 11 outstanding shares in or of Lake Region are not 12 classified of assets for Lake Region for accounting 13 purposes. And that's correct, isn't it? 14 Α. Yes. 15 And the Staff is admitted that the Q. 16 outstanding shares in or of Lake Region are not 17 classified as assets of Lake Region for purposes of the Staff report? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 Number 6. RPS Properties, LP, does Q. 21 not own any Lake Region assets. In their response, 22 the Staff has insufficient knowledge to either 23 admit or deny this statement. Lake Region and its owners have not provided information showing RPS 24 25 Properties, LP's real financial and/or personal

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

1 assets. Is that a correct reading of that? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. No. 7, Sally Stump does not own any Lake Region assets, and your answer is the same as 4 5 it was for 6? 6 Α. Yes. 7 Would that be correct? Q. Uh-huh. 8 Α. 9 No. 8, Lake Region assets are not 0. collateral or security for the RPS/Stump loan, and 10 that is denied. Is that correct? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. On December 31st, you said -- 2012 --14 this is No. 9 -- Vernon Stump shared in Lake 15 Region? 16 Α. Yes. 17 Q. But he does not own Lake Region. Your 18 answer there is like the ones you had for 6 and 7? 19 Α. Yes. 20 Let me ask you this: For purposes of Q. 21 the auditor examination to the Lake Region 22 accounts, did you or any member of the Staff 23 discover that assets used by Lake Region for 24 regulatory purposes were owned by any others than 25 Lake Region?

		Page 178
1	A. I don't know if they are or not.	
2	Q. Would that have been something that	
3	you or a Staff member would have done to determine	
4	whether there were assets being used that weren't	
5	owned by Lake Region?	
6	A. Repeat the question, please.	
7	Q. Would you or another Staff person	
8	during the course of the audit confirm that Lake	
9	Region's regulatory office were in Lake Region's	
10	name?	
11	A. I don't know.	
12	Q. With respect to the denial of request	
13	for admission No. 8-S, you answered interrogatories	
14	with respect to that denial, did you not?	
15	A. Yes.	
16	Q. Can you see can you see that on	
17	your television there?	
18	A. Yes.	
19	Q. I have the reasons for denial that	
20	because Lake Region's assets are owned by the	
21	company shareholders and the shareholders have	
22	pledged their shares as collateral, Staff believes	
23	Altera Bank would take ownership of the assets in	
24	the event of default. Is that your answer?	
25	A. They are owned, in effect, that the	

two shareholders own the equity shares and, 1 2 therefore, control the assets. 3 Ο. But here (indicating), you're saying that the shareholders own the assets. So, is that 4 5 correct? 6 Α. That's what that says, yes. 7 I have a few questions about your Q. 8 surrebuttal. One of the parts of your surrebuttal 9 is that, because Mr. Summers agreed with the cap 10 structure that was in the last case, whether he 11 agreed with the proposal the structure of the last 12 case, that it should not be any different for this 13 case. Would that be a fair reading of your 14 testimony? 15 A. Um, he said that including the acquisition loan in the cap structure most 16 17 accurately reflects the cost of cap employ in the company. 18 19 Q. Your testimony would be, because he 20 said it, then it should be the same as it is now; 21 is that correct? Nothing has changed since the last 22 Α. case to not include the acquisition loan. 23 Isn't it true that there's been a 2.4 Q. 25 financing case since that time?

Α. Yes. 1 2 And isn't it true that there's been **Q**. kind of a remarkable change in market conditions 3 since that time? 4 5 Α. What do you mean by remarkable change? 6 ο. We did have a financial reversal 7 starting in 2008 and continuing, we still have 8 conditions in the economic markets that are less 9 than the ultimate; isn't that correct? 10 Α. Yes. 11 I suspect you wouldn't agree that if a Q. 12 Staff witness would say something in a previous 13 case that that should stay the same no matter what? 14 Α. No. 15 Okay. That's what I thought. Would Q. 16 it be fair to say that, until the loan authorized 17 in the financing case, the Staff of the Commission was concerned that the Company's cap structure was 18 not entirely transparent? 19 20 I don't know. Α. 21 Does this loan, through the financing Q. 22 case, give Staff a better view of what is on the 23 Lake Region books as for debt? 24 I wouldn't say a better view, no. Α. 25 So, are you saying that it would --Q.

1 the loan that is in the financing case was 2 unnecessary for the company for its debt structure? 3 Α. Staff views that they have the same amount of debt, whether its at the Lake Region 4 5 level or at the shareholder level. 6 So, if it wanted to, it could go ahead Q. 7 and get debt not approved by the Commission and add 8 to the shareholder loan which the Staff would use 9 for debt structure for the company? 10 Α. No. The shareholder loan was used to 11 acquire Lake Region Water and Sewer Company, and 12 that's why we include that acquisition loan. 13 **Q**. Well, in the absence of an approval of 14 the Commission, let's say, for instance, the 15 shareholders decided to increase the amount of the 16 shareholder loan and collateralize it with not only 17 the shares of the company but other property that they own, would the Staff then use the amount of 18 19 the total loan as the debt structure for the 20 Company? 21 Α. It's been represented to Staff that that acquisition loan used to acquire Lake Region 22 Water and Sewer Company could have been issued at 23 the Lake Region level. They only chose that to do 24 25 for their own reasons.

Page 182 1 0. Even so, would it be your testimony 2 that, if that loan amount is increased, the loan 3 amount is increased to the the point where other 4 property is collateralizing --5 MR. OPITZ: Objection, your Honor. Calls for speculation. 6 7 MR. COMLEY: She's been qualified as 8 an expert. This goes to her opinion and the 9 credibility of her opinions on this. 10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Objection overruled. 11 (By Mr. Comley) The question is, Q. 12 would Staff use the acquisition loan as the total 13 debt of the Company if that loan were increased in 14 value without Commission approval, of course, and 15 there would be other property collateralizing that loan? 16 17 Α. Staff would do discovery to see why that acquisition loan increased. 18 19 Let's go this way. They decided to Q. 20 purchase property for RPS and RPS was going to use 21 that in connection with their public business and 22 say its a billed. And it would be collateralized 23 by the real estate owned by RPS. Would the Staff, in turn, use that entire loan as the debt structure 24 25 for the Company?

	Page 183
1	A. Staff would do discovery to see what
2	amount is attributed to that real estate property.
3	Q. So, the amount attributed to the real
4	estate property would be deducted?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Now, the shareholders guaranteed the
7	Lake Region loan, did they not? The one that's
8	tied to the Company, the one that was approved in
9	the financing.
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Did they need to do so?
12	A. I don't know if it was required,
13	because Altera Bank had said they looked favorably
14	upon issuing more debt to Lake Region in the
15	future.
16	Q. Do you think it would be as favorable
17	if the shareholders weren't willing to guarantee
18	personally the note?
19	A. I don't know.
20	Q. Do you think the owner guarantee had
21	anything to do with the interest rate on the note?
22	A. I don't know.
23	Q. If it were an economic decision to
24	or for the shareholders or the borrowers to
25	guarantee that loan, would you believe it was

Page 184 1 necessary? 2 Α. I'm sorry. Can you repeat the 3 question? 4 Q. If guaranteeing that loan was 5 something necessary for the shareholders to 6 guarantee a lower rate of interest, would you agree 7 it was a good thing to do? Yes. 8 Α. 9 0. If the owners who gave the guarantee to lower the interest rate, it means they gave that 10 11 to lower the interest rate, did the guarantee limit 12 any of their total debt issuance guaranteed 13 capacity? 14 Α. Can you repeat that. 15 See if I can do it right. If the Q. 16 owners gave the guarantee to lower the interest 17 rate on the loan, did the guarantee create a limit 18 on their total debt issuance or guarantee capacity? 19 Α. I don't know. 20 Another question. Did you ever Q. 21 consider that the common equity cap of the 22 shareholder RPS was a component of the cap 23 available to fund the original equity acquisition, the shareholder loan? 24 25 The acquisition loan stated that the Α.

sole purpose of that loan was to purchase acreage 1 2 and water sewer company. 3 Q. So, I take it you did not consider the common equity of RPS? 4 5 Α. No. 6 Does it make economic sense for Lake 0. 7 Region to have much larger amounts of debt than it 8 has in utility rate base investments? 9 Α. I'm sorry. Can you repeat that. 10 Does it make economic sense for Lake **Q**. 11 Region to have larger amounts of debt than it has 12 in utility rate base? It's been represented that the Lake 13 Α. Region assets can support all that debt. 14 15 Q. But does it make economic sense for 16 them to have more debt than they have invested in 17 their rate base? Α. 18 No. 19 We've tended to cover this a little Q. 20 I think it's on page 5 of your surrebuttal. bit. 21 Lines 18 through 22, and through page 6. I think 22 it's there that you say that the negative pledge 23 agreement was not essential for purposes of your 24 analysis, and your decision to impute the 25 shareholder loan for the debt structure of the

Page 186 1 Company. 2 Α. I'm sorry. What lines? 3 Q. I think it was on page 5, I'm looking at lines 18 through 22. 4 5 Α. You said page 5. 6 Of your surrebuttal. Ο. 7 Α. I have on page 5 that question to that answer from 18 through 22, what would have happened 8 if all the debt had been happened to move to Lake 9 Region. 10 11 What people looking at the bottom of Q. 12 page 5, lines 21 through 22, something like the 13 lender could, ultimately, take possession of Lake 14 Region if there was a same -- same effect lender 15 foreclosed on Lake Region assets; is that fair? Is 16 that right? 17 Α. Yes. 18 In the right spot? Q. 19 Α. Yes. 20 On page 60, lines 13 through 15, you Q. 21 say, The release of the negative pledge agreement 22 does not diminish Altera's Bank security interest 23 in the bank of bank operations. Is that the 24 correct reading of your testimony? 25 Α. Yes. (Check)

	Page 187
1	Q. Now, with respect to Lake Region
2	Exhibit 7, is it fair to say that nowhere in the
3	commercial pledge agreements is there a reference
4	to Lake Region assets?
5	A. I don't believe so.
6	Q. And there is no description of Lake
7	Region assets in the note itself; is that correct?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. And the only place, as I recall, from
10	your testimony that the assets may have been
11	involved in this loan was as they were mentioned in
12	the negative pledge agreement. Is that a correct
13	statement?
14	A. Correct.
15	Q. And isn't it true that the negative
16	pledge agreement has be released?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. I have a copy of that somewhere.
19	Excuse me just a minute. I think the Court
20	Reporter will verify that we have already marked
21	premarked the affidavit of Mr. Timothy A. Gervy who
22	is an employee of Altera Bank. And I would like to
23	show you a copy of that exhibit.
24	MR. COMLEY: May I borrow your
25	exhibit. What was that number? No. 6.

Page 188 (Whereupon, Mr. Comley handed the 1 2 Witness a document.) 3 Q. (By Mr. Comley) Let me state for the record I've handed Ms. Atkinson a Lake Region's 4 5 Exhibit No. 6. Can you identify that for the 6 record, please? 7 Α. This is a release of the negative 8 pledge agreement. 9 Q. And it's covered by Mr. Gervy's affidavit; is that correct? 10 11 Α. Yes. 12 Q. And you have seen this release before? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. And doesn't this, in effect, release 15 any obligation of the shareholders in connection with further collateralization of the Lake Region 16 17 assets? Α. 18 Yes. 19 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I would offer into evidence Lake Region Exhibit No. 6. 20 21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections? 22 MR. OPITZ: No objection, your Honor. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Ms. Baker? 23 24 MS. BAKER: No objection. 25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Lake Region Exhibit

No. 6 is received into the record. 1 2 (By Mr. Comley) I'm getting to the Q. 3 end of my examination I think. Now, in connection with the -- your testimony, did you review a 4 5 Reuter's Yield Spreadsheet? The bonds online? 6 Α. 7 I think it was in one of your work Q. 8 papers. 9 Yeah. Α. 10 Q. And do you have a copy of that? Yeah. I found it. 11 Α. 12 And can you tell me, was this used in Q. 13 preparing your testimony and the bond information you had in your testimony? 14 15 Α. Yes. And I know that Mr. Gorman mentioned 16 Q. 17 it during his cross-examination. Do you have a copy that we can mark as an exhibit? 18 19 Α. Yeah. Is this the one you're talking about (indicating)? 20 21 Yes, it is. Yes, it is. Q. And, again, 22 Lake Region 8 was used by you in the preparation of 23 your testimony in the bond yields that you referred to in your testimony; is that correct? 24 25 Α. Yes.

Page 190 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I would offer 1 2 into evidence Lake Region No. 8. 3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections? MR. OPITZ: No objection, your Honor. 4 MS. BAKER: No objection. 5 6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Lake Region Exhibit 8 7 is received into the record. MR. COMLEY: I have no other questions 8 for the witness. 9 10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from the bench. 11 12 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: I did earlier, but I think I've had my questions answered. Thank you 13 14 for your time. 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 16 COMMISSIONER HALL: I have no 17 questions. 18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Staff. 19 MR. OPITZ: Thank you, your Honor. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. OPITZ: 20 21 Ms. Atkinson, Mr. Comley asked you in Q. 22 relation to the request for admissions that you answered on behalf of Staff that there was a 23 24 negative pledge agreement as a determining factor 25 in your decision to include the acquisition loan in

1 the cap structure. Were there other factors that 2 you based your decision to include that acquisition 3 loan in the capital structure? Α. Yes. 4 5 And can you, I guess, explain what Q. those factors are? 6 7 One of the main factors was that it Α. was represented to Staff by the Company that they 8 9 could have issued the acquisition loan at the Lake Region level and they didn't do so because of their 10 own reasons. 11 12 **Q**. Is that the only other consideration 13 that you took into your decision? 14 Also, that they took out the Α. acquisition loan to acquire Lake Region Water and 15 Sewer Company, and because of the equity interest 16 17 that the bank then, in a default, would take over control of the assets. 18 19 Q. On the same topic of the negative 20 pledge agreement that Mr. Comley brought up, why 21 was it important for the bank to have a negative 22 pledge agreement which the loan is under, when the 23 acquisition loan was solely under the shareholders? 2.4 Α. They didn't have the assets as collateral under any other loan, but now they do 25

		Page 192
1	since they took out the Lake Region middle loan.	
2	So, the negative pledge agreement doesn't matter in	
3	regard to their security interest in Lake Region.	
4	Q. Can you explain why it doesn't matter?	
5	A. It's the same bank. Altera Bank has	
6	the acquisition loan and Region loan. Before the	
7	Lake Region loan, they had a negative pledge	
8	agreement to make sure the Company wouldn't use	
9	assets collateral for any of the loan. Because if	
10	they took out the Lake Region level loan, they have	
11	a secured interest in the assets. The assets are	
12	collateral in that loan, so the negative pledge	
13	agreement doesn't matter.	
14	Q. Mr. Comley asked you or mentioned that	
15	in your testimony, surrebuttal testimony, you	
16	discuss John Summers agreeing to the capital	
17	structure as most accurately reflecting the debts	
18	of Lake Region in the last case. Is that is the	
19	fact that he agreed to the capital structure in the	
20	last case the basis of your decision in including	
21	it in the capital structure in this case?	
22	A. No.	
23	MR. COMLEY: I'll object to	
24	mischaracterization of the testimony. It's a bit	
25	late, but I'll object anyway.	

1	Q. (By Mr. Opitz) If that wasn't the
2	basis of mentioning that, if mentioning that was
3	the only excuse me. Since there was an
4	agreement on the capital structure in the last case
5	that most accurately reflected the capital
6	structure of Lake Region and you've said that that
7	wasn't the only reason for including it in the
8	capital structure, can you expound upon some of the
9	other reasons and why that was important to state
10	that it was important?
11	A. It was important to state Mr. Summers
12	testimony in the last rate case in his agreement to
13	include the acquisition loan just to show that the
14	Company viewed that position as a most accurate
15	representation of the cost of capital by including
16	that acquisition loan which happened in the this
17	case, also.
18	Q. Mr. Comley mentioned the financing
19	case in which Lake Region took out a loan on the
20	Lake Region level. What was the practical impact
21	of that loan on the capital structure of Lake
22	Region?
23	A. It simply moved they took out debt
24	to pay down the shareholder loan, so it just simply
25	switched debt from the shareholder level to the

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	Lake Region level.
2	Q. Mr. Comley asked you if Lake Region
3	had needed a personal guarantee to get the Lake
4	Region loan in the finance case. Has the Company
5	ever represented to the Staff that the lender
6	relied primarily on Lake Region or the personal
7	guarantee?
8	A. No. They relied on the Lake Region
9	assets.
10	Q. There was discussion of the total debt
11	of the company, and that seemed to be different
12	than what was mentioned earlier. Can you explain
13	why the total debt has changed?
14	A. Originally, in direct, it was 4.3
15	million, because Staff was using the 2.85 million
16	acquisition loan because they hadn't received the
17	documentation from RPS Properties to clarify what
18	the current amount was as of June 30th, 2013. So,
19	now, Staff is of the understand it's about 2.7
20	million combined with Lake Region level loan and
21	the acquisition loan.
22	Q. Thank you. Working in your
23	department, do you often deal with evaluating the
24	financial effects of loans?
25	A. Yes.

What is the financial effect of a 1 **Q**. 2 default on the acquisition or sometimes called the 3 shareholder loan? Α. It is my understanding that if it was 4 5 defaulted upon that the bank would take control, 6 take control of the assets through acquiring the 7 equity interest in the Company. 8 Q. And on the same page, what is the financial -- what would the financial effect of 9 10 default on the Lake Region loan be? The default on the Lake Region loan, 11 Α. 12 they would take control of the assets since there 13 are personal guarantees. It's my understanding they would also take personal control of the 14 interests. 15 16 Q. So, under both of the levels of loan 17 that are at issue here, is there a difference in the financial effect that a default would have? 18 19 Α. No. 20 A way back, Ms. Baker asked you about Q. 21 the rule of thumb of 75 percent to 25 percent. Is that the initial recommendation that Staff makes 22 23 for all small water and sewer companies? 2.4 Α. No. It's just small water and sewer companies that are above 75 percent debt. We cap 25

Page 196 it at 75 percent debt if they're over it, in 1 2 regards to their capital structure. 3 Q. Okay. MR. OPITZ: That's all I have at this 4 5 time, your Honor. 6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Ms. Atkinson, that 7 concludes your testimony today. Thank you. You 8 may step down now. 9 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 10 (Whereupon, the Witness left the witness stand.) 11 12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Last witness on these two issues is Ted Robertson. 13 14 (Whereupon, the witness, Ted 15 Robertson, was administered the oath by Judge Bushmann.) 16 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER: 18 Please state and spell your name for Q. the Court Reporter? 19 20 Ted Robertson, R-o-b-e-r-t-s-o-n. Α. 21 And by whom are you employed? Q. A. I'm the Chief Accountant for the 22 Missouri Office of the Public Counsel. 23 24 Are you the same Ted Robertson who Q. filed direct, rebuttal, and surrebuttal testimony 25

Page 197 in this case numbered OPC 2, OPC 3, and OPC 4? 1 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. Do you have any changes or corrections to your testimony? 4 5 A. I do not. 6 Do you have any updates to your Q. 7 testimony? I do not. 8 Α. 9 **Q**. Did you have a change in your cap structure from your testimony? 10 Α. 11 No. 12 Q. Okay. Is the testimony true and 13 accurate, to the best of your knowledge and belief? 14 Α. It is. 15 If asked the same questions today, Q. would your answers be essentially the same? 16 17 Α. They would. 18 Q. Okay. MS. BAKER: I will wait to move for 19 the admission of testimony, but I will go ahead and 20 21 tender the witness for cross-examination. 22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Very good. First cross would be by Staff. 23 24 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, for the point of order, I will have objections at this point into 25

Page 198 Mr. Robertson's testimony, but it's not on an issue 1 2 he's testifying at this point. I wanted to make 3 sure I would reserve my chance to make those exceptions later. 4 5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You've preserved it. 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. OPITZ: 7 Good morning, Mr. Robertson. Q. 8 Α. Good morning. 9 In your testimony, have you testified Ο. 10 as to any independent analysis to come up to the 11 8.5 percent return on equity? 12 Α. No. 13 Q. And have you submitted any work papers 14 in calculating your return on equity? 15 Α. No. 16 Q. So, in coming up with the 8.5 percent, 17 was that based on Staff's analysis in the last 18 case? 19 That, and the fact that I thought the Α. risk profiled company had improved since the equity 20 21 percentage had increased since the last case. 22 MR. OPITZ: That's all I have, your 23 Honor. 2.4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Lake Region. 25 MR. COMLEY: No questions.

Page 199 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from 1 2 the bench. CHAIRMAN KENNEY: No. Thank you. 3 Thank you, Mr. Robertson. 4 5 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions. 6 Thank you. 7 THE WITNESS: Thank you. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by OPC? 8 9 MS. BAKER: No, thank you. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Robertson, you 10 11 may step down, sir. 12 (Whereupon, the Witness left the 13 witness stand.) 14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: My schedule shows that the next issue that we're going to be talking 15 about is the issue of availability fees; and, for 16 17 that, the first witness would be Mr. Summers again. AVAILABILITY FEES 18 19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Summers, I'll remind you you're still under oath. 20 THE WITNESS: Yes. 21 22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any further direct, 23 Mr. Comley? 24 MR. COMLEY: No, I have no other 25 direct.
Page 200 1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And, then, cross-2 examination by Staff. 3 MS. MOORE: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MOORE: 4 5 Q. Good morning, Mr. Summers. 6 Α. Good morning. 7 First, do you have a copy of your Q. 8 rebuttal testimony in front of you? No, but I'll be happy to get one. 9 Α. I've got it in my --10 11 Q. If you wouldn't mind. 12 (Whereupon, the Witness got a 13 document.) 14 A. (By the Witness) I apologize. Takes 15 a little while with these bifocals to find things 16 sometimes. Q. 17 That's okay. If you wouldn't mind, 18 could you go to page 5, please? A. This was on the rebuttal? 19 20 Q. Correct. 21 Α. Okay. 22 Would you please read lines 1 through Q. 23 8 on page 5 for us? 24 Yes. Staff has proposed including Α. availability fee revenues to reduce the revenue 25

		Page 201
1	requirement, and OPC has proposed treating	
2	availability fees current and past as additional	
3	contribution in construction CAIC to reduce rate	
4	base. Do you agree with either approach? No. The	
5	Commission made the correct decision there 20 years	
6	ago to record the plant investment in the area with	
7	availability fees as CAIC and not to include the	
8	availability fees in the ratemaking process.	
9	Q. So, is it your testimony that the	
10	Commission decided that in Case No. WR-95-194 that	
11	availability fees would not be included in the	
12	ratemaking process for Lake Region?	
13	A. Yes, that's the way I read that.	
14	Q. Do you happen to have a copy of that	
15	order with you?	
16	A. No, I don't.	
17	Q. First, is it your understanding that	
18	that was a certificate case for the Company?	
19	A. That is my understanding.	
20	Q. Okay.	
21	A. It was the case in which the rates	
22	were first set for Shawnee Bend.	
23	MS. MOORE: Judge, may I approach the	
24	witness?	
25	JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may.	

	Page 202
1	Q. (By Ms. Moore) Mr. Summers, what I
2	have handed you is a copy of the order in Case No.
3	WR-95-164. Can you confirm for us that that's what
4	that appears to be?
5	A. Yes, that's what it appears to be.
6	Q. Okay. Can you read the caption of the
7	order for us, beginning in the matter of?
8	A. Yes. In The Matter Of The Application
9	Of Four Seasons Lakesites Water And Sewer Company
10	For Certificate Of Convenience And Necessity
11	Authorizing It To Construct, Install, Own, Operate,
12	Control, Manage, And Maintain Water And Sewer
13	Utility Companies For The Property Located In An
14	Unincorporated Area, Generally Comprising Either
15	Of The Area Known As Shawnee Bend.
16	Q. And if you could take a moment, would
17	you please review that order quickly? Take what
18	time you need, though.
19	A. Okay. Thanks.
20	(Whereupon, the Witness looked at a
21	document.)
22	A. (By the Witness) Okay.
23	Q. Okay. After reviewing that order,
24	would you agree that there is no ruling stated here
25	specifically regarding the ratemaking treatment of

Page 203 1 availability fees? 2 Α. I would agree there's nothing in this 3 order on it. Would you then agree the first rate 4 Q. 5 case for the Shawnee Bend rate service area was the 2010 rate case just prior to that one? 6 7 Α. No. I wouldn't agree with that, because availability fees were included in the 8 testimony of Greq Meyers in this case, and then 9 they were not included in the rates. 10 11 Q. You're discussing the certificate 12 case? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. And what I asked you was would you 15 agree the first rate case for Shawnee Bend service area Lake Region was the 2010 rate case prior to 16 17 this one? 18 Α. There were rates set in this case. 19 Q. Okay. 20 I have the tariffs with me. Α. 21 That's not the question I asked you, Q. 22 sir. 23 I believe that is a rate case. If Α. rates were set, that is a rate case. 24 25 Your testimony is the rate case and Q.

1 the certificate case is the same thing? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. Did you participate in the certificate 4 case? 5 Α. No, I didn't. 6 Q. So, you have no personal knowledge of 7 what happened in that case, correct? No, I don't. 8 Α. MS. MOORE: Judge, I have this copy of 9 the order in that case. I could either submit it 10 as Staff Exhibit, I believe it would be 13, or ask 11 12 that you take official notice of it, whichever you 13 prefer. 14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Is there any 15 objection from the parties to admitting that into 16 the record? 17 MS. BAKER: No. 18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I would prefer we 19 mark it as Staff Exhibit 13 --20 MS. MOORE: Sure. 21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: -- just to clarify the record. Since there's no objection, I will 22 receive that into the record. 23 24 MS. MOORE: I have extra copies here. 25 Would you like me to pass that out?

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes, please. 2 MS. MOORE: Okay. 3 (Whereupon, a certain document was marked for identification by the Court Reporter as 4 5 Staff Exhibit No. 13, psg, 2/18/14.) 6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may proceed. 7 MS. MOORE: Thank you. 8 Q. Mr. Summers, I just have a few more 9 This will be brief. All right. Would questions. 10 go back to your rebuttal testimony, page 3, this is 11 your testimony about the workshop docket or what 12 you call a rulemaking docket in 2011. Can you read lines 19 through 22? 13 14 What was the outcome of these dockets Α. created to develop the rulemaking. At Staff's 15 request on June 17th, 2011, the dockets were closed 16 17 and availability rulemaking was consolidate into the small utility workshop docket WW-2009-0386. 18 19 MS. MOORE: Judge, may I approach? 20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may. 21 Q. (By Ms. Moore) Mr. Summers, what I've 22 handed you is a copy of the docket sheet in that 23 workshop docket. Can you confirm for us that that is what it appears to be? 24 25 That is what it appears to be, yes. Α.

Page 206 1 **Q**. Okay. First, can you read the style 2 of the case for us there at the top? 3 Α. In The Matter Of Working Docket To Investigate Appropriate Methods For Ratemaking 4 5 Treatment Of Fees Or Other Mechanisms Used For 6 Capital Recovery Of Sewer And Water Infrastructure 7 Investment. 8 Q. Okay. And if you could review the 9 docket real quickly? 10 (Whereupon, the Witness looked at a 11 document.) 12 Α. (By the Witness) Okay. Would you agree there is no Staff 13 Q. 14 request to close the docket showing here? 15 Α. I would agree that's the case. 16 Q. Okay. After reviewing this, would you 17 change your testimony about Staff requesting that this docket be closed? 18 19 Α. No, I wouldn't. 20 But you agree that it does not show Q. 21 that Staff requested this docket be closed? 22 I agree that's what this docket shows, Α. 23 yes. 24 Thank you. Q. 25 MS. MOORE: I would like to also

Page 207 submit this as Staff Exhibit 9 -- no -- 14. 1 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That document has 3 been offered. Are there any objections? MS. BAKER: No objections. 4 5 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Say again. 6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Ms. Moore, could you 7 explain what the document is again? MS. MOORE: The document is a printout 8 of the docket sheet of Case No. SW-2011-0042. 9 There was a water and a sewer docket that were the 10 same, and this is just the sewer side. 11 12 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: 0042 was the sewer, 13 the WW was 2011-0043; is that right. 14 MS. MOORE: I believe so, yes. 15 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Okay. And you're just referencing the SW-2011-0042 docket sheet, 16 that will be Staff Exhibit 14? 17 MS. MOORE: Correct. 18 19 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Okay. Thank you 20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Staff Exhibit 14 will 21 be received into the record. (Whereupon, a certain document was 22 marked for identification by the Court Reporter as 23 Staff Exhibit No. 14, psg, 2/18/14. 24 25 Q. (By Ms. Moore) Okay. If we could go

1 back to rebuttal testimony, page 6. Point out here 2 that the covenants about the availability fees say, 3 These fees are to be paid to the owners of the utility or their assigns and designees. Is that 4 5 correct? 6 Α. That's correct. 7 To what version of the covenants are Q. 8 you referring in your testimony? 9 Α. I am referring to the covenants in 10 2009. 11 Okay. I have here a copy of the Q. 12 covenants as of 1971, one of the first versions. 13 This version was included in the request for 14 official notice in the parties joint stipulation of 15 undisputed facts in this case. Do you have a copy of that with you? 16 17 Α. No. 18 (Whereupon, Ms. Moore handed the 19 Witness a document.) 20 (By Ms. Moore) I know that copy's a Q. 21 little difficult to read, but if you could find 22 page 22 for me. I think I have it tabbed in that 23 copy. 24 Oh, yes, you do. Α. 25 Okay. If you can, can you read Q.

	Page	e 209
1	Section 8 beginning with the title of the section	
2	as far as I have underlined?	
3	A. Central Sewage Disposal System And	
4	Water Work System. The owner of each lot agrees to	
5	pay to the owner or owners of the sewage disposal	
6	system and water work system to be constructed	
7	within the development a minimum monthly	
8	availability charge for water, water service, and	
9	the accommodations afforded the owners of said lots	
10	by said water works system. Commencing upon the	
11	availability of the water and water work system	
12	distribution line provided for the lot and	
13	continuing thereafter, so long as water is	
14	available for use.	
15	Q. Thank you. And I believe the copy	
16	you're referring to are of the covenants of 2009,	
17	the assigns and designees, was right there about	
18	the about who it should be paid to owner, owners	
19	of the utilities, or the assigns and; designees, is	
20	that correct?	
21	A. I believe that's correct.	
22	Q. Okay. So, looking at this in 1971	
23	when these looking at the 1971 version, you	
24	would agree that the language of that assigns and	
25	designees was added sometime later?	

Α. Yes, I would. 1 2 Okay. And if you would flip to the Q. 3 next page, could you continue reading where I've marked? Still within Section 8 on Central Sewage 4 5 Disposal System And Water Work System? 6 Α. The said owner or owners of said water 7 works system and sewage will be a privately-owned public utility authorized by certificate of public 8 9 convenience and necessity issued by the State of 10 Missouri Public Service Commission to operate sewage disposal systems and/or water work systems. 11 12 Aforesaid amounts of said available charges, times, and method payments said owners, and other matters, 13 shall be as provided in schedule or rates and 14 rules, regulations, and conditions of services for 15 water services and for sewer services filed and 16 17 published by said public utility or utilities with said Missouri Public Service Commission. 18 19 Q. Wouldn't you agree, then, that the 20 availability fees for Lake Region were originally 21 intended for the utility to be regulated by the 22 Commission? 23 No, I would not. The subdivisions at Α. 24 issue in this hearing are not included in this document. 25

1 **Q**. That was the original. Can you read 2 the title of the whole document there on the front? 3 Α. Amended Declaration of Restrictive Covenants. 4 5 Q. And the covenants you referred to in 6 2009 was a later version of that document, correct? 7 A. Yes, that's correct. 8 Q. Thank you. 9 MS. MOORE: I don't have any other questions. 10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross-examination by 11 12 Public Counsel. 13 MS. BAKER: Thank you. Just a couple of questions. 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER: 15 16 Q. Did Lake Region provide a total amount 17 of availability fees that would be collected? A. No. 18 19 Q. Did Lake Region provide a comparison 20 of the amount of availability fees collected to the 21 amount of original system costs for the Shawnee Bend Water and Shawnee Bend Sewer Systems? 22 23 A. No. 24 MS. BAKER: No further questions. 25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from

1 the bench. 2 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I have no 3 questions. EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN KENNEY: 4 5 Mr. Summers, good morning. Can you Q. 6 hear me okay? 7 Α. Yes, I can. Thank you. 8 Q. You were asked about Docket No. SW-9 2011-0042. What's your understanding of why that docket was opened? 10 My understanding is contained in the 11 Α. 12 last report and order which essentially said that a rulemaking was necessary before the Commission made 13 such a major change in policy. 14 15 And what's your understanding of what Q. happened with that docket? 16 I don't think anything happened with 17 Α. that docket. 18 19 Q. What's your basis for thinking that? 20 Because the Company was never Α. 21 contacted regarding that docket, and we were the reason for the docket. 22 23 **Q**. So, you never participated in that docket at all? 24 25 No, sir. Α.

Page 213 1 **Q**. Okay. How long have you been with the 2 Company? 3 Α. I've been with the Company since the current shareholders bought it in 2004, October 4 2004. 5 6 What is your understanding of what is Q. 7 done with the availability fees as they are 8 collected? Were do they go? 9 Α. They go into a bank account that is 10 owned by RPS Properties and Sally Stump. 11 Q. And what happens to the money? 12 Α. They disburse it as they see fit, 13 although I believe that they are contractually obligated to pay a portion of that to the 14 15 developer. 16 Q. And when you say "they", who are you 17 referring to, the shareholders of RPS? 18 Α. Of RPS and Sally Stump. 19 Q. Then, what is the purpose of 20 collecting the availability fee just as a general 21 proposition as you understand it? 22 Α. I agree with what the developer testified to in the last case, that he created 23 those fees to collect -- to collect back the monies 24 25 that he invested in the water and sewer system.

Page 214 1 0. So, your understanding is the same as 2 the developer's testimony in the last case? 3 Α. Correct. 4 Q. Okay. Do you have any specific 5 knowledge separate and apart from what the 6 developer testified to in the last case as to what 7 is done with the availability fees? No, sir. 8 Α. 9 0. Okay. 10 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: I don't have any 11 other questions. Thanks for your time. 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any other questions? 14 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. 15 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions. 16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on 17 questions from the bench, starting with Staff. MS. MOORE: Just one. 18 19 RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. MOORE: 20 Mr. Summers, you were asked about what Q. 21 was done with the money that's collected for 22 availability fees, and I believe you testified --23 correct me if I am wrong -- that it's your understanding that these fees are currently paid 24 25 because of an attempt to recoup investment of the

1 developer; is that correct? 2 Α. That's correct. 3 Q. Were RPS Properties or Sally Stump developers of Lakesite, predecessor of Lake Region? 4 5 Α. No. They reached an agreement with 6 them separately. 7 Q. Thank you. MS. MOORE: No further questions. 8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Public Counsel. 9 10 MS. BAKER: No questions. Thank you. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by Lake 11 12 Region. MR. COMLEY: Thank you. 13 14 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY: 15 Mr. Summers, Ms. Moore directed you to Q. the order, and I think in Case No. WA-95-164. Is 16 17 that the correct number? 18 Α. That is the order, yes. 19 Q. With respect to your testimony on the 20 results of that application case, did you review 21 any of the testimony that was filed by the Staff in 22 that case? Yes, I did. 23 Α. 24 Q. Do you remember which testimony you 25 reviewed?

I reviewed the testimony of both Greq 1 Α. 2 Meyers and Martin Hummel. 3 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I would like to show the testimony to Mr. Summers. 4 5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Go ahead. 6 (By Mr. Comley) Mr. Summers, I've Q. 7 handed you copies of what purports to be the 8 testimony of Mr. Gregory Meyers and Mr. Martin 9 Hummel in Case No. WA-95-164. Can you identify those documents as the documents you've reviewed in 10 11 connection with your testimony for this case? 12 Α. Yes, they are the same. 13 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, what I would like to do, instead of admitting them as evidence 14 15 or admitting them as exhibits, I think that these are within the Commission's files, and I would ask 16 17 that the Commission take official notice of the testimony that was filed in that case, particularly 18 the testimony of Mr. Hummel and Mr. Meyers. 19 20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Is there any 21 objection of the Commission taking official notice of those documents? 22 23 MS. MOORE: No objection. 2.4 MS. BAKER: No objection. 25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission will take

official notice of the testimony that you 1 2 described. (By Mr. Comley) Subject to the 3 Ο. Commission's check and the parties check, 4 5 Mr. Summers, would you mind referring to the testimony of Mr. Meyers? Under the topic of 6 7 availability fees -- and there is a question and 8 answer there about his recommendations on treatment 9 of availability fees. Can you locate that for the 10 Commission, please? 11 Α. Yes. 12 **Q**. Let me borrow that a minute. Let me 13 point you to the question and answer on page 6. At 14 the top of the page starting at line 3, am I 15 reading this correctly? Question, Please describe 16 the Staff's position regarding availability fees. 17 The answer is, The Staff recommends that availability fees not become part of the Company's 18 tariffs. Instead, the Staff will search the 19 20 development company needs to enter into a written 21 agreement whereby the developer assigns the right 22 of the company to bill and receive availability 23 fees. Is that the correct reading of that 24 testimony? 25 Α. Yes.

Page 218 1 **Q**. Is your understanding in connection 2 with that case that there were no tariffs for 3 availability fees in that case? A. That's correct. 4 5 Q. Public Counsel asked you questions about whether Lake Region provided actual data 6 7 concerning the collection of availability fees. 8 Does Lake Region maintain data concerning the 9 collection of availability fees? 10 A. No, we do not. Office of Public Counsel asked 11 **Q**. 12 questions about whether Lake Region provided a reconciliation of the amounts of availability fees 13 14 collected during the course of collection of 15 availability fees. Does Lake Region prepare reconciliations of that nature? 16 17 A. No, we do not. MR. COMLEY: I have no other 18 19 questions. 20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Summers, that 21 concludes this part of your testimony. THE WITNESS: Thank you. 22 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may step down. (Whereupon, the Witness left the 24 25 witness stand.)

Page 219 1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We're getting close 2 to the lunch hour, and I hesitate to start a new 3 witness, that might have a lengthy examination. So, I'm thinking that since we're ahead of schedule 4 5 we might just now break for lunch, and why don't we come back at, say, 1:00. 6 7 Any objections to that? 8 (No response.) JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. Then, 9 we'll be in recess until 1:00. 10 (Whereupon, a luncheon recess was 11 12 taken at 11:33 a.m.) AFTERNOON SESSION 13 14 (Whereupon, the record resumed at 1:00 15 p.m.) 16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'm going to go back on the record. The next witness we have on 17 availability fee issue is Staff witness Kimberly 18 Bolin. 19 20 (Whereupon, the Witness, Kimberly 21 Bolin, was administered the oath by Judge 22 Bushmann.) 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may proceed. 24 MS. MOORE: Thank you. 25

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. MOORE: 1 2 Q. If you would please state your full 3 name for the record? Α. Kimberly Bolin. 4 5 Could you spell that, please? Q. Α. Bolin is spelled B-o-l-i-n. 6 7 Q. Where are you employed and in what 8 capacity? 9 Α. I am a Regulatory Auditor V with the Missouri Public Service Commission. 10 11 Are you the same Ms. Bolin who Q. 12 prepared or caused to be prepared the testimony 13 that's been marked as Exhibit 2, Staff Accounting 14 Schedules; Exhibit 3, Direct Testimony; Exhibits 15 8A and 8B, as well as portions of Exhibit 1, Cost of Service Report? 16 17 Α. Yes, I am. 18 Do you have anything you wish to Q. 19 correct any of that testimony? On the accounting schedules, on the 20 Α. 21 cover page, currently, the cover page reads Horseshoe Bend Sewer Service Area. It should --22 it's for all three service areas, and it should 23 read Horseshoe Bend Sewer Service Area, Shawnee 24 Bend Sewer Service, and Shawnee Bend Water Service 25

Page 221 1 Area. 2 Q. Okay. Any other corrections? 3 Α. No, there's not. 4 Q. Okay. With those corrections in mind, 5 if I ask you the same questions today, would your 6 answers be the same? 7 A. Yes, they would. 8 Q. And is the information in those 9 documents true and correct, to the best of your knowledge and belief? 10 11 Α. Yes, they are. 12 MS. MOORE: Your Honor, this is Ms. Bolin's last subject for testimony, so I would like 13 to offer now Exhibits 2, 3, 8A, and 8B, and we'll 14 hold that Cost of Service Report for one more 15 witness, and I would tender the witness for cross. 16 17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections to 18 those three exhibits? 19 MR. COMLEY: Remind me which exhibits are being offered? The direct testimony to --20 21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: The Accounting Schedules; 3 is Ms. Bolin's direct; and 8A and B is 22 Ms. Bolin's surrebuttal. 23 24 MR. COMLEY: I have objections to portions of Ms. Bolin's direct testimony or 25

		Page 222
1	surrebuttal, and to the extent and, perhaps, part	
2	of the accounting schedules. And to the extent	
3	that Ms. Bolin's referring to availability fees and	
4	any application they may have in this case, I would	
5	object in her direct testimony page 10, line 13;	
6	page 12, lines 4 through 5; page 13, lines 12	
7	through 16; and her surrebuttal testimony, page 1,	
8	lines 16 through 21; page 2, lines 3 through 22;	
9	page 4, lines 7 through 23; page 5, lines 1 through	
10	2, and then 7 through 23; page 6, lines 1 through	
11	23; page 7, lines 1 through 23; page 8, lines 1	
12	through 22	
13	(Whereupon, Commissioners Stoll and	
14	Hall entered the room.)	
15	MR. COMLEY: and page 9, lines 1	
16	through 11.	
17	I think on page 9, lines 12 through	
18	25, she refers to a pleading in the case in Camden	
19	County. There is no foundation for the attachment	
20	of that exhibit. There has be no authentication	
21	supplied by the Circuit Clerk, so it is	
22	inadmissible. It's not admission against Lake	
23	interest Lake Region's interest and does not	
24	qualify for that even if it was properly	
25	authenticated.	

1	I would note for the record, in a
2	previous case, this filing was rejected. Exhibit
3	52 is referred to in the footnote on her testimony,
4	but Exhibit 5 2 from previous case was not
5	admitted. This matter involving a Circuit Court
6	case, and the pleadings filed in the Circuit Court
7	case has been first raised on surrebuttal; and if,
8	for any reason, the Court the Commission should
9	use this exhibit or if it's admitted for any
10	purpose, Lake Region would seek an additional
11	hearing to address the statements made and what
12	proof there was in the case to support any of the
13	allegations contained in the answer, counterclaim
14	or in the petition.
15	Page 10, we object to lines 1 through
16	23, and page 11, lines 1 through 6, and this is all
17	on grounds of this discussion of availability fees
18	which the topic's been objected to previously, and
19	on the grounds previously asserted, we'd object to
20	this line of testimony. Furthermore, to the extent
21	that her testimony is extended through the
22	accounting schedules, if there are entries made
23	with respect to adjustments to cost of service
24	based upon her testimony and the accounting
25	schedules, particularly any entries that would

Page 223

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

reduce cost of service by the amount that they 1 2 calculate in availability fees, we'd object to 3 those entries. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let me make sure I 4 5 understand the nature of your objection. It 6 sounded to me like there were two objections, most 7 of them to the fact that they discuss availability 8 fees because of your allegation that the Commission 9 does not have jurisdiction over availability fees and are not a proper subject for this hearing. Is 10 that correct? 11 12 MR. COMLEY: Correct. JUDGE BUSHMAN: And the other 13 objection was to attachment KKB2? 14 15 MR. COMLEY: Yes. 16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And I understand your 17 objection there relates to authentication of that document? 18 19 MR. COMLEY: Exactly. And the other -- the other objection we go is unclear for what 20 21 purpose it is being offered. If it's offered as an admission against Lake Region's interest, it is 22 improper use of that exhibit. It cannot constitute 23 24 admission against Lake Region's interest because of the way it's been fashioned. Again, Exhibit 52, 25

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

		Page 225
1	which is referred to in footnote to her testimony,	
2	refers to Exhibit 52 in the 2010 rate case.	
3	Exhibit 52 is not admitted in that rate case and	
4	there is no way for the Commission to take notice	
5	of it.	
6	JUDGE BUSHMANN: As far as the more	
7	general objection to the lines and pages that you	
8	mentioned in the transcript, I'm going to reserve	
9	ruling on that objection. I'm going to take that	
10	with the case, and we won't need to resolve that at	
11	this time.	
12	As far as the exhibit, or Attachment	
13	KKB2, Ms. Moore, do you want to respond to that	
14	objection?	
15	MS. MOORE: Yes. I think that the	
16	purpose of that exhibit is only insofar as Ms.	
17	Bolin testified as an expert about the content of	
18	that. So, her testimony would be based on	
19	documents, evidence, that she gathered as an expert	
20	within the regular course of business as an expert.	
21	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Where does it make	
22	reference in her testimony to that attachment?	
23	This is the surrebuttal; is that correct?	
24	MS. MOORE: I believe that what Mr.	
25	Comley is referring to is on the surrebuttal	

Page 226 testimony, page 9, there's a footnote to which 1 2 corresponds to lines 12 and 13. Ms. Bolin then 3 goes on to guote the -- a portion of the attachment. I believe that's it. 4 5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And I don't understand what you're asserting is the purpose of 6 7 this document or the reason that you're --MS. MOORE: I would say the only 8 purpose of the document is insofar as she testifies 9 10 here. 11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any further response, 12 Mr. Comley? MR. COMLEY: If Ms. Moore cannot 13 identify a purpose for this exhibit, then I think 14 15 it's inadmissible. The other explanation given for use of this exhibit was that it was something that 16 17 an expert in this field would necessarily rely on in making opinions. 18 19 The first, I don't think Ms. Bolin is an expert in determining the valuation of Circuit 20 21 Court pleadings. Second, an expert can't rely on incompetent evidence. And this is incompetent 22 evidence because it lacks proper foundation. 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: This exhibit was a 24 matter of contention in the previous rate case, and 25

1	I would have to say that I agree with the analysis
2	in the previous order that excluded this document
3	from the record. I don't believe it's
4	authenticated, I don't think it can be used as a
5	judicial admission, so I would sustain the
6	objection to Attachment KKB-2. And all the other
7	objections, we will take the with the case.
8	MS. MOORE: Point of clarification.
9	He mentioned some objection to the accounting
10	schedules, and I'm not sure or clear what that is.
11	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Am I correct that is
12	also the general objection, just to the nature of
13	availability fees as being used in the hearing?
14	MR. COMLEY: Yes, and I apologize. I
15	don't have the lines or the entries which would be
16	involved in that, but to the extent Ms. Bolin's
17	testimony has been extended into the accounting
18	schedules and been used to make adjustments to the
19	cost of service, I think, particularly, her entry
20	that would apply or impute availability fees to the
21	revenue requirement, we'd object to it's entry on
22	the accounting schedules.
23	And if it's necessary to make an
24	entry-by-entry analysis later, I ask leave to be
25	able to do that.

Page 228 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'll grant the leave 1 2 to do that for now, because that's just going to be 3 a reserved objection. We can deal with that later. So, in that case, Staff Exhibits 2, 3, 4 5 and 8 will be received into the record subject to Lake Region's objection regarding availability 6 fees. On Exhibit 8, Attachment KKB-2 is not 7 received into the record. 8 9 Any parties need any clarification on 10 that? 11 MS. MOORE: No. Thank you. 12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. In that 13 case, we're ready for cross-examination; and first cross would be by Public Counsel. 14 15 MS. BAKER: Thank you. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER: 16 Q. Good afternoon? 17 A. Good afternoon. 18 19 Q. Staff's position is to include 20 availability fees as revenue on a going-forward 21 basis; is that correct? That is correct. 22 Α. 23 And you are aware that availability Q. 24 fees automatically renew in 2015 unless the owners of -- unless 90 percent of the lots vote to 25

terminate the declaration? 1 2 Α. I believe that's correct. 3 Q. And you would agree that 90 percent agreement is a huge hurdle to meet in the best of 4 5 circumstances? 6 Α. It probably is, yes. 7 So, therefore, you would agree that Q. 8 availability fees will most likely continue in the foreseeable future? 9 10 A. I believe they will continue in the future. 11 12 MS. BAKER: No further questions. 13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross by Lake Region. 14 MR. COMLEY: I'm going to try to do it from here. 15 16 THE WITNESS: That's fine. 17 MR. COMLEY: So, I may get up there. I don't know yet. But, at any rate, we'll try to 18 19 do this from here, and I hope you can hear me all right. 20 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY: 22 Q. First, with respect to the portion of 23 the cost of service report that you participated 24 in, do you have that handy? It would be Exhibit 3. 25 Yes, I have it. Α.

Page 230 1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I believe that's 2 Staff Exhibit 1. 3 Ο. (By Mr. Comley) Excuse me. Staff Exhibit 1. 4 5 Α. I have pages 14 through 16 in front of 6 me of that report. 7 Would you happen to have page 3 of Q. 8 that handy? I do not. I just brought up the 9 Α. availability fee. 10 11 Is it something I could show you? Q. 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. Or do you have another copy from your counsel you could pick up and I'll take it to the 14 15 stand? 16 (Whereupon, the Witness was handed a 17 document.) 18 Α. (By the Witness) Thank you. 19 Q. It's a statement on page 3 at the top 20 of the page, and I don't know whether you were the 21 author of that or not, but I thought another company owned by RPS Properties and Sally Stump is 22 Lake Utility Availability 1? 23 24 A. Yes. That is my statement. 25 Q. That's your statement?

A. Yes. 1 2 But isn't it true that it's not a Q. 3 company? It's a fictitious registered. 4 Α. 5 Q. Right. It's a fictitious name. You 6 don't know that RPS or Sally Stump have 7 incorporated a separate company called Lake --I do not believe it's incorporated, 8 Α. that is correct. 9 10 Strictly a fictitious name Q. registration? 11 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. Your direct testimony, page 13, lines 14 14 through 16, is where I'll start first. 15 Α. I don't have that one, either. 16 Q. Okay. 17 Α. I'm sorry. 18 Q. All right. 19 (Whereupon, the Witness was handed a 20 document.) 21 Α. (By the Witness) Okay. I've got it 22 now. 23 Lines 14 through 16, you're describing Q. the adjustment? 24 25 Which page? Α.

1 Q. Page 13. 2 Α. Okay. 3 Q. It's taking me a minute to get there myself. And I'm looking page 13, lines 14 through 4 5 16. 6 Α. Okay. Got them. 7 Okay. The inclusion of the Q. 8 availability fees in Staff's revenue requirement 9 decreases the revenue requirement for Shawnee Bend 10 Water by \$136,836 and for Shawnee Bend Sewer by \$2,000 -- \$205,254. This adjustment is the largest 11 12 adjustment in Staff's cost of service for this 13 case. 14 And my question is, the numbers have changed 15 slightly since your filing of the direct testimony. 16 Α. You are correct. We received 17 information from RPS during our surrebuttal writing phase that these numbers have changed. 18 19 Q. And those numbers are under 20 confidential seal, I understand? 21 Α. Yes, they are. 22 Q. Is it still the largest adjustment 23 that Staff is proposing in this case? 2.4 A. I believe it is. 25 Let me ask you this. Is it correct to Q.

Page 233 1 say that there is no account on the Company's books 2 or records where this adjustment to the revenue 3 requirement will be entered? Α. The Company does not book availability 4 5 fees into any accounts for Lake Region Water and 6 Sewer. 7 Q. Is it true that the Staff understands 8 that Lake Region does not own this revenue? 9 Α. Lake Region does not collect this revenue, does not book this revenue, it is booked 10 -- it is collected by Lake Utility Availability 11 12 One. 13 Q. Would it be fair to say that the Staff 14 has nothing -- no evidence to the contrary that 15 Lake Region does not own this revenue? 16 A. At one time, Lake Region -- its 17 predecessor did own this revenue, and it has been 18 subsequently assigned elsewhere. 19 Q. Do you recall when it owned that 20 revenue? 21 Α. It was prior to 1999. 22 Q. Do you know what kind of document 23 transferred that revenue? 2.4 Α. It was a document of sell, if I remember right, a contract. 25

Page 234 1 0. Is it true that Lake Region's 2 customers don't pay this revenue? 3 Α. Lot owners who are in Lake Region's service territory pay this revenue. 4 5 Q. But customers of Lake Region do not; is that correct? 6 7 Α. Current customers do not. 8 Q. If there was going to be a customer 9 that paid this revenue, it would be because that 10 customer owned an undeveloped lot as well as being 11 a customer of Lake Region? Would that be a correct 12 statement? 13 Α. Could you repeat that statement? 14 Q. If a customer of Lake Region were to 15 pay availability fee revenue, it was because that 16 person owned an undeveloped lot in the service 17 territory? 18 Α. A person has to have an undeveloped lot to pay availability fees. Once they develop on 19 to the lot, they no longer pay availability fees. 20 21 Do you have a copy of your surrebuttal Q. 22 handy? 23 Yes, I do. Α. That's Exhibit 8. And I will be 24 Q. 25 looking -- I'm going to be looking at your highly-

1	confidential version which, I think, is Staff
2	Exhibit 8B, but I'm going to do my best to avoid
3	any kind of expression of the highly-confidential
4	sections of it. I don't anticipate doing any kind
5	of in-camera examination on this.
6	On page 2, line 11, if I'm reading your
7	answer correctly, I hope that Staff believes that
8	Lake Region is an entity providing a guarantee of
9	water and sewer service availability to the lot
10	owners who are paying the availability fees and
11	also is the entity supporting the utility plant
12	facilities and infrastructure that exists in order
13	to provide that service.
14	Have I read that correctly?
15	A. You've read that correctly.
16	Q. Would it also be true that Lake Region
17	is guaranteeing water and sewer service based upon
18	its tariffs?
19	A. Lake Region holds the certificate of
20	convenience and would provide and would
21	guarantee service to people in their region.
22	Q. And isn't it true that Lake Region is
23	not a party to the covenants or restrictions that
24	establishes the availability fees?
25	A. That is correct.
Page 236 1 **Q**. Your reading of the covenants and 2 restrictions, does it indicate that there is a 3 guarantee for water or sewer service expressed in the covenants? 4 5 Α. I believe there is a -- by having that in the covenants, it is guaranteeing water and 6 7 sewer service. 8 Q. But those covenants do not contain any 9 kind of rules and regulations governing water or 10 sewer service in the subdivision? It does not have any rules or 11 Α. 12 regulations concerning sewer, or water service. Would it be fair to say that the 13 Q. 14 Company's tariffs are also the source of a 15 guarantee of adequate water and sewer service in areas not covered by availability fees in the 16 17 service territory? 18 Α. Could you repeat that question again? 19 Would it also be true that the Q. 20 Company's tariffs are the source of guarantees for 21 adequate service for areas within the service 22 territory of the company that are not covered by availability fees? 23 2.4 A. It's true. 25 Let's go to page 4, line 17 through Q.

1	23. And this is an area where there have been some
2	confidential figures that fall in your testimony,
3	but what I'm going to ask you about is the total
4	availability fee revenue in the test year. And of
5	that total availability fee collection in the test
6	year, you have deducted the amount of fees
7	collected and paid to the developer pursuant to the
8	settlement agreement, is that fair to say?
9	A. That is correct.
10	Q. And my understanding is that
11	Mr. Merciel believes or he would assert that the
12	developer's rights to those fees was a part of an
13	improper or Imprudent service of those fees?
14	A. You would have to address that to
15	Mr. Merciel.
16	Q. Assuming that's the case, can you tell
17	me why the fees to the developer were removed from
18	your calculation?
19	A. Because of the settlement of the court
20	case required that that money be paid to the
21	developer.
22	Q. If it was if the developer is
23	receiving availability fees, you're saying that,
24	simply because of the settlement agreement, those
25	fees should not be used against Lake Region's

1	revenue requirement?
2	A. That is what I believe, yes.
3	Q. So, if RPS Properties, the developer,
4	and Sally Stump were to enter another agreement
5	with the developer in which one or the other may
6	give up their availability fees, would that further
7	reduce the amount that the Staff would impute?
8	A. We'd have to see the circumstances
9	behind that. In this case, it was a settlement,
10	and we believed to get the proper amount that would
11	be going to Lake Region if they owned the
12	availability fees would be that amount.
13	Q. Ms. Stump is not a shareholder in the
14	Company. Why would you impute fees going to her as
15	Company revenue?
16	A. She was not she is not currently a
17	shareholder. She was as of December 31st, 2012.
18	Q. So, I'm assuming that $$
19	A. When she transferred her rights, the
20	Company, to her husband Vernon Stump.
21	Q. So, in future rate cases for this
22	Company, any availability fee revenue paid to Ms.
23	Stump would not be, according to Staff's
24	recommendation, imputable to the Company?
25	A. I do not believe that, no.

1 **Q**. It would be imputable? 2 Α. I believe it could be imputable. 3 Q. And that's why? Α. Because she has been an owner of this 4 5 Company previous years. 6 If the developer were an owner of this Q. 7 company at some point, would the Staff then 8 conclude that the developer's portion, pursuant to 9 a settlement agreement, should be imputed to the 10 Company? 11 MS. MOORE: I have to object. I think 12 this calls for speculation. I know we addressed that earlier in a similar situation, but what Mr. 13 Comley is asking Ms. Bolin about what Staff's 14 position would be in a future. Ms. Bolin, as an 15 16 expert, currently cannot answer that question. 17 MR. COMLEY: Somewhere along the line, 18 principal has been established by the Staff how to 19 impute this revenue. I'm exploring the extent of that principal and how it may be working in future 20 21 cases and in this case. And I think it's a legitimate question, Counsel. 22 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'll overrule the 24 objection. 25 Α. (By the Witness) Could you repeat the

1 question. 2 You know, I'm going to ask the Q. 3 Reporter if she can help us. (Whereupon, the pending question was 4 5 read by the Court Reporter.) 6 Α. (By the Witness) We believe those 7 availability fees belong with Lake Region. They were originally with Lake Region and they should 8 9 have stayed with Lake Region. I was trying to impute an amount that I believed was a fair amount 10 of revenue to include in Lake Region's revenues, 11 12 and I viewed that the developer had -- had filed a 13 suit against Lake Region and the parties had agreed on a settlement of it, and I viewed it reasonable 14 to extract the amount of the settlement of the 15 availability fees that should be paid to the 16 17 developer. 18 Would it be fair to say, then, that if Q. 19 a person receiving these availability fees 20 contractually alters their rights to the 21 availability fees by the court case -- or by the 22 settlement agreement in a court case or any other 23 contractual means, that would affect the way the 24 Staff imputes the way of the availability fees --25 Staff would have to look at the Α.

Page 241 circumstances and facts of that time to determine 1 2 that. 3 Q. Let's presume that RPS is no longer a 4 shareholder with the company, that it sells its 5 shares. Would Staff then impute the revenue from availability fees to the Company? 6 7 Α. Staff would have to look at that 8 circumstance, what, who, what grounds it was sold on. If the availability fees were also sold to the 9 other party, also. 10 11 And if you take a look at it, what I'm Q. 12 gathering is, that the price that the RPS Company 13 or partnership received for the availability fee 14 streams revenue, would that be imputed to the 15 Company? I would have to look at the 16 Α. 17 circumstances in the future on that. I'm kind of jumping around here, Ms. 18 Q. Bolin. Forgive me. Page 3, line 16. You 19 20 mentioned that the distribution system was 21 installed by the developer, Mr. Harold Coplar (ph). 22 Now, I'm not sure about this, but I think 23 Mr. Copler himself was deceased about the time that 24 this infrastructure was installed; but, by that, do 25 you mean the Four Seasons Lakesites that was owned

1 either by Mr. Copler or his successors? 2 Α. Yes. Four Seasons Lakesites. 3 Q. All right. On page 2 -- on page 2, 4 line 14, you have a answer that talks about the 5 purpose of paying the availability fees. You say that the lot owners are paying the fees in order to 6 7 support the utility system which was built for the 8 purpose of providing service to their lines. Is 9 that correct reading --10 To their lots. Α. 11 Q. To their lots, rather? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. You said in several other places -- I 14 wanted to point out, you said in page 4, line 13 15 through 14, you say the owners of unimproved lots 16 are paying a fee for the purpose of having the 17 water and sewer system to connect to in the future. Is that a fair reading of your testimony there? 18 19 Α. That is. 20 And, then, on page 5, lines 12 through Q. 21 21, you talk about the only logical explanation for 22 their payment of these fees. Wasn't it true that 23 in the last case -- and I'm presuming that you have been familiar with the reporting order in that case 24 25 -- isn't it true, in the last case, the Commission

	Page 243
1	on almost identical facts determined that the
2	purpose of the fees was to recover the developer's
3	cost of installing the lines and not for purposes
4	of maintenance?
5	A. I know the Commission referred to what
6	the developer claimed his purpose or his intent of
7	the availability fees were. Staff believes
8	availability fees can be used for any other
9	purposes. I've not found any written documents
10	binding the utility to cap purposes only.
11	Q. Well, again, Lake Region's not a party
12	to the covenants. Is that still the case?
13	A. That is correct. Lake Region is not a
14	party to the covenants.
15	Q. The parties in this case are jointly
16	stipulated in a document that says it's undisputed
17	that the reason the developer initiated the fees
18	was to receive a recoup or recoup the costs of
19	infrastructure?
20	A. Could you point me to where that is in
21	the joint stipulations of facts?
22	Q. I think it's paragraph 42.
23	A. And that is footnoted with being an
24	affidavit of Peter and Brown, the previous
25	developer. Staff takes the position that, while

	Page 244
1	the developer may intended to recover his
2	investment through the availability fees, these
3	availability fees can be used in whatever manner
4	that the utility desires.
5	Q. In terms of your testimony, you have
6	no other testimony besides the developer's
7	affidavit for purposes of determining that the only
8	logical explanation by payment of lot owners is for
9	purposes of maintenance?
10	A. That is correct.
11	Q. And the only evidence we have for the
12	purpose of those fees is the developer's affidavit
13	in the previous case. Wouldn't that be correct?
14	A. That is the only statement he made.
15	Staff does not belief that. Staff has not treated
16	other availability fees in other cases in that
17	manner.
18	Q. Let me put it this way. You're not
19	intending, by your testimony, to refute what are
20	the undisputed facts in the jointly-filed
21	stipulation. Would that be a correct statement?
22	A. That is correct.
23	Q. Could we agree that an owner of a
24	undeveloped lot fails to pay an availability fee,
25	pay the availability fees, that the owner would be

Page 245 1 subject to the enforcement provision in the 2 covenants? 3 Α. That is correct. 4 Q. Would you agree with me that it would 5 be logical for a lot owner to pay that fee to avoid 6 foreclosure on the lot? 7 Α. He would prevent it being placed on 8 the lot if he paid the fine. 9 Q. And it would avoid the lien as well? 10 A. Yes. 11 So, it would be logical for them to do Q. 12 that? Yes, it would. 13 Α. 14 Q. All right. I'm still kind of skipping 15 around. On page 4, line 4, you say, If 16 availability fee revenue did not exist, then a 17 utilities operation might require subsidation -excuse me -- subsidation -- I'll say it in a 18 19 minute, -- subsdidation by the developer for 20 revenue in order to meet operating expenses, 21 particularly in early growing years when most lots 22 are largely unimproved. Did I read that correctly, Ms. Bolin? 23 24 A. Yes, you did. 25 Hasn't the Company operated without Q.

Page 246 1 availability fee revenue for quite some time? 2 Α. They have at a higher rate of tariff 3 rate to the customers, yes. Their tariffs have been set in 2 4 Q. 5 cases, would you agree? 6 I agree that they first established Α. 7 their rates with the CCN case. 8 Q. Okay. That's the WA-95-164 case? Α. 9 Yes. 10 Q. And the rates are 2010? 11 A. Yes. Those are the two, the only rate 12 case has 2010, the other CCN. Commission found rates fair and 13 **Q**. 14 reasonable? 15 A. Yes, they did. 16 Q. Company's been operating by approved 17 tariff rates by this Commission for quite some time? 18 19 A. Yes, they have. 20 The Company did not include Q. 21 availability fee revenue in the cost of service 22 initially and in the last case; isn't that correct? 23 The Company did not include it in the Α. 24 last case. I'm not sure if they included it in the CCN case, the initial case. 25

1 0. All right. Do you know whether the 2 tariffs reflected a --3 Α. The tariffs do not have that, but I don't know if the rates that were developed have 4 5 that in there. 6 Let's move the clock to the present. ο. 7 Let's move it to the present. With respect to 8 subsdization, if the Staff's proposal is adopted, 9 wouldn't the owners of undeveloped lots that do not 10 have water delivered to their premises and do not 11 discharge water into the collection system help pay 12 the costs the Company incurs in serving those who 13 do? 14 They would help pay the cost, and they Α. 15 would also help pay the cost to keep the system available for them when they want to hook up. 16 17 Ο. So, they are paying for the right in the future to connect to a system that they're 18 19 supporting for other people who are getting 20 service? 21 Α. And the current customers are paying to support their availability of these lines. 22 23 **Q**. Now, there are places within Lake 24 Region's service territory where people aren't 25 paying availability fees. Is that correct?

		Page 248
1	A. I believe that is correct.	
2	Q. So, the people on Shawnee Bend paying	
3	availability fees, if Staff's proposal is adopted,	
4	would be helping to pay the cost of service for	
5	areas within Lake Region's service territory that	
6	are not paying availability fees?	
7	A. For in the Shawnee Bend area. Not any	
8	in the Horseshoe Bend area. Those are separate	
9	rates. And I've not applied any availability fees	
10	to the Horseshoe Bend area.	
11	Q. Strictly to the	
12	A. Shawnee Bend water area and the sewer	
13	area.	
14	Q. To the extent that there are areas on	
15	Shawnee Bend who don't pay availability fees, your	
16	proposal would have people paying availability fees	
17	cover cost of service for areas in Shawnee Bend	
18	that aren't paying availability fees?	
19	A. I believe there is some of that, yes.	
20	Q. Ms. Baker asked you about the	
21	difficulty of having 90 percent of the lot owners	
22	on Shawnee Bend or the lot owners affected by the	
23	covenants' termination or changing them. If I were	
24	a customer on Shawnee Bend and my rates were	
25	subsidized by lot owners that are not on, that do	

	Page 249
1	not have a piece of property or rather do not
2	have a residence and are not connected to service,
3	would I be more likely to vote to terminate those
4	fees or would I be more likely to say, Let's keep
5	them going?
6	A. That would be speculation on my part.
7	Q. Is it an economic decision?
8	A. That, I'm not sure. I would have to
9	
10	Q. If my rates are subsidized by somebody
11	else, what should I do?
12	A. And it would be hard to get 90 percent
13	of the vote. That's why availability fees will
14	continue.
15	Q. And some of those lots owners have a
16	vested interest in keeping the lot owners the
17	unimproved lot owners paying those fees?
18	A. Ninety percent would be hard to reach
19	then, yes.
20	Q. Page 5, line 6 through 9. You're
21	talking there, I think, on cost of repair, meaning
22	and intending constructing the distribution water
23	included in the requirement, and you say this
24	includes cost relating to the unimproved lots. It
25	would be the Company's responsibility to maintain

1 the Company's infrastructures regardless of whether 2 the developer imposed availability fees in the area 3 or not; isn't that correct? They would have to maintain them for 4 Α. 5 their customers, that's correct. 6 Wouldn't there be vacant lots that --Ο. 7 or other land parcels that may separate customers 8 one from the other? 9 Α. There may be vacant lots, yes. Wouldn't it be true that for most 10 Q. 11 water, and maybe even sewer companies, there are no 12 customer basis 100 percent contiguous. Would that 13 be a fair statement? For most, they are not; but for most, 14 Α. there are not availability fees also charged to lot 15 owners. 16 17 Ο. Even so, there is an obligation to maintain those lines if they are between customers? 18 19 There is an obligation. Α. 20 On page 6, lines 4 through 23, you're Q. 21 talking about a -- I think a cost of billing and 22 collection service for the availability fees. Just 23 for the record, this was not included in your direct case. 24 25 Α. That is correct. It was not included

1 in my direct case.

2	Q. And it could have been?
3	A. It could have been, but our case was
4	to include the availability fees in our case, and
5	if you include the availability fees, I think the
6	cost of billing and collection should also be
7	included in the cost of service. If it's not if
8	the availability fees are not included in the cost
9	of service, then Lake Utility Availability is
10	getting their billing and collection for free and
11	the customers are subsidizing that.
12	Q. Another observation. This figure was
13	known to you at least for three years, isn't it?
14	A. It has, but our direct case did not
15	reflect the exclusion of availability fees.
16	Q. Let's go to page 8 of your
17	surrebuttal. There are questions there about
18	collection of availability fees. On line 16
19	through 19 is where I'm looking. Your analysis of
20	the annual reports, wouldn't your testimony be
21	somewhat of a guess rather than a comprehensive
22	analysis on this?
23	A. Ours would be estimated. We did not
24	get that information from RPS.
25	Q. And there's no calculations to refute

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

		Page
1	what Mr. Summers has calculated in his rebuttal on	
2	this, isn't that correct? Do you recall that he	
3	had a schedule in the back of his rebuttal	
4	testimony that set out what he considers the	
5	collection of that?	
6	A. There is nothing to give me evidence	
7	to prove it one way or the other, correct or	
8	incorrect.	
9	Q. It's true as well that, according to	
10	the Company's annual reports on file with the on	
11	file with the Commission, that there are no fees	
12	collected in certain years. Would that be a	
13	correct statement?	
14	A. Reported in the annual report to the	
15	Commission, there are years where no availability	
16	fees are reported in that report.	
17	Q. The total amount of availability fees	
18	that were collected and reported during the years	
19	of 1974 through 2004 is not accurate because the	
20	data is missing for some years. Would that be	
21	correct?	
22	A. It was not reported in the annual	
23	report, so I guess you would say it was missing.	
24	Q. Is it also true, in those annual	
25	reports, there is no breakdown of the dollars	

252

1 collected to know whether the fees were connected 2 for water and sewer at Shawnee Bend rather than 3 Horseshoe Bend? Α. I believe that's correct. 4 5 Q. Is it also true that, based on the time of the certification cases and the transfer of 6 7 assets, availability fees collected between the 8 years 1974 and 1992 are comprised primarily, if not 9 totally, from fees collected in relation to 10 Horseshoe Bend Water System, the system that's been sold to Ozark Shores? 11 12 Α. That, I'm not sure. We cannot 13 distinguish between who they were collected for and the annual reports, and we were not provided any 14 information on that. 15 16 Q. Horseshoe Bend availability is not 17 involved in this case, correct? That is correct. Horseshoe Bend Sewer Α. 18 does not have availability fees. Horseshoe Water 19 20 does, but they are owned by Ozark Shores. 21 Also, on pages 8 through 9, you talk Q. 22 about the developer may have recouped some of the 23 money spent to install a water and sewer system 24 through the sales -- sale of lots and development. 25 Basically, Ms. Bolin, there is no proof in this

1 record or in your testimony that Four Seasons 2 Lakesites designed the lot price to recover the 3 costs of water and sewer systems; is that correct? There is no proof, but I would hope 4 Α. 5 that a developer would want to profit from the sale 6 of his lots and would include the costs in the sale of the lots. 7 8 Q. Aside from your own personal belief of 9 what the developer may try to do, there is no evidence in this record of the elements of the 10 11 price per lot contained, either, for infrastructure 12 improvement? That is correct. 13 Α. 14 Q. Would it be fair to say that Lake 15 Region had no control over the way in which the 16 developer sought to sell the lots in the 17 development? 18 Α. That is correct. 19 Q. On page 10 -- I've talked about this a 20 little bit before in the cost of service report --21 you mention on lines 1 through 3 about Lake Utility 22 Availability 1, and you say it's an affiliate of 23 Lake Region. We've confirmed already and will 24 confirm, Lake Region -- I mean Lake Utility 25 Availability 1 is actually a fictitious name used

1 by the shareholders or now used by the people who 2 own the availability fees. Would that be correct? 3 Α. That is correct. And there are no rules affecting 4 Q. 5 affiliated transactions for water and sewer 6 companies for the PSC. Would that be correct? 7 Α. That is correct, but we believe the 8 gas and electric would apply. 9 And you're trying to extend those Ο. rules to the water and sewer companies? 10 That is correct. 11 Α. 12 Q. And you're saying that, because, 13 actually, an alias was the shareholder or people 14 that owned those availability fees constitute an 15 affiliate with which Lake Region has transactions? The Company -- the people who collect 16 Α. 17 the availability fees are employees of Lake Region. They are also common shareholders of Lake Region. 18 So, I believe under the definition they would 19 qualify as an affiliate. 20 21 Well, just to make it clear, there is Q. 22 only one shareholder now that's collecting the 23 availability fees. 2.4 You have two shareholders under Lake Α. Utility Availability that collect the availability 25

Sally Strump and RPS. 1 fees. 2 Sally's no longer a shareholder. Q. 3 Α. As of when in RPS? Or in Lake Utility Availability, she is. But RPS has the common 4 5 ownership of Lake Utility Availability 1 and Lake 6 Region, and Sally Stump was a previous owner in 7 Lake Region until she transferred her stock to her husband Vernon Stump. 8 9 0. I think the record will show that RPS has a 50 percent ownership in the fictitious name 10 and also owns half the shares in Lake Region. 11 12 Α. That's correct, and then bills are 13 billed by the Camden County Public Water Supply 14 District No. 4 and have the same address as Lake 15 Region customer's bills. 16 Q. You're not contending that Public 17 Water Supply District No. 4 is an affiliate of Lake Region? 18 19 It could be, yes. An unincorporated Α. association or political subdivision can be an 20 21 associate, an affiliate, yes. They have common management; they have common employees, yes. 22 23 But that would be under the rules **Q**. 24 governing gas and electric companies? 25 That is under the definition that is Α.

Page 257 included in the gas and electric companies, but we 1 2 believe it could apply in this situation to define 3 what an affiliate is. 4 Q. Thank you. 5 MR. COMLEY: That's all the questions I have. 6 7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Do the Commissioners 8 have any questions? 9 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: No questions. Thank 10 you. 11 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions. 12 Thank you. 13 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions, your Honor. 14 15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. Redirect by 16 staff. 17 MS. MOORE: Thank you. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. MOORE: 18 19 Okay. Ms. Bolin, I believe you were Q. 20 asked in several different ways about the purpose 21 of availability fees. I would like to start, 22 first, you were asked in reference to page 2 of 23 your, I believe it's rebuttal testimony about these 24 fees guaranteeing service from the company? Do you 25 remember that?

Page 258 Page 2, my surrebuttal, yes. 1 Α. 2 Yes. If these fees are not for **Q**. 3 setting aside any monies going to the developer, if these fees are not for guaranteeing service, what 4 5 are they being paid for? 6 Α. I would not know. The only logical 7 explanation for the purpose of these fees is the person, the lot owners is getting expectation to 8 9 pay for a water and sewer system to be hooked to in 10 the future. 11 Q. And setting aside that of what are 12 they actually being paid for, can you elaborate for us on what availability fees in general are paid 13 14 for by regulated utilities in Missouri? 15 Are paid to regulated utilities? Α. 16 Q. Why are they paid? 17 Α. Why are they paid? To help support the system that is in place. 18 19 Q. And I think you were asked about that 20 as well in the form of whether or not these fees 21 can be used to maintain the system. Do you recall 22 that? 23 Yes. Α. 24 Q. I believe you testified in answer to 25 those questions that the fees benefit the current

Page 259 1 customers and that it supports the system. Did I 2 quote you correctly? 3 Α. I believe that's what I said. Could you elaborate on that for us? 4 Q. 5 Α. The fees help maintain the system 6 which would incorporate all the current customers 7 also that are hooked to the system. They help to pay for repairs, maintenance, and any capital costs 8 they would need. 9 10 Q. And, then, how would it benefit 11 someone who is not yet a customer to be paying 12 these fees? 13 Α. They would have a system in place that is more than capable of serving them and would be 14 in good condition. 15 16 Q. What would happen if these lot owners 17 were not holding their place on that lot and paying those fees? Would there be anyone to help support 18 the system for future use? 19 20 Α. No, there would not be. 21 Other than the customers? Ο. Yes. Current customers. But if the 22 Α. lot owned -- if they did not have availability 23 24 fees, the lot owners, these would not be in 25 existence.

1 0. I believe you were asked about the 2 utility's obligation to maintain the system whether 3 or not there were availability fees. Do you remember that? 4 5 Α. Yes. 6 And you agreed that, yes, they do have Q. 7 that obligation to maintain the system? Yes. They have an obligation to 8 Α. 9 maintain a system. 10 Can you describe for us what other Q. 11 regulated utilities use these fees for in relation 12 to maintaining a system? Is that something that 13 has been outlined ever as a reason for regulated 14 utilities in Missouri to charge these fees? 15 MR. COMLEY: I'll object on grounds it's beyond the scope of cross. 16 17 MS. MOORE: I believe Counsel 18 specifically asked Ms. Bolin about whether or not 19 these should be used for maintaining the system. I'm asking her if that is how they have been used 20 21 for other regulated utilities. 22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Objection overruled. 23 (By the Witness) I believe they have Α. been included as revenue for other utilities that 24 have availability fees. And, then, when they're 25

		Page 261
1	included revenue, they could be used for	
2	maintaining or for any type of plant capital	
3	investment needed.	
4	Q. Thank you. You were also asked about	
5	the difference between who is a shareholder for the	
6	Company and who is an owner of the availability	
7	fees through Lake Utilities No. 1. Do you remember	
8	that?	
9	A. Yes.	
10	Q. Can you tell us again, who are the	
11	owners for each entity?	
12	A. The shareholders for Lake Region Water	
13	and Sewer are Vernon Stump and RPS Properties. The	
14	owners of Lake Utility Availability 1 are RPS	
15	Properties and Sally Stump, the wife of Vernon	
16	Stump.	
17	Q. And when did that become the case?	
18	A. As of December 31st, 2012.	
19	Q. When was that in relationship to when	
20	this case was filed?	
21	A. That would have been in the middle of	
22	our test year. It was before this case was filed.	
23	Q. How far before this case was filed?	
24	A. I believe this case was filed in	
25	August, July? It would have been six, seven	

1 months. 2 Q. Six months? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. Thank you. 5 MS. MOORE: That's all the questions 6 that I have right now. Thank you. 7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Ms. Bolin. THE WITNESS: Thank you. 8 (Whereupon, the Witness left the 9 witness stand.) 10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Next witness is James 11 12 Merciel. (Whereupon, the witness, James A. 13 14 Merciel, was administered the oath by Judge Bushman.) 15 16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Please be seated. DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. MOORE: 17 18 Mr. Merciel, could you please state Q. your name for the record? 19 20 James A. Merciel, Jr. Α. 21 And could you spell your last lame for Q. 22 us? 23 Last name is spelled M-e-r-c-i-e-l. Α. 24 Where are you employed and in what Q. 25 capacity?

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

Page 263 Α. I am employed at the Public Service 1 2 Commission. I'm on the Staff in the Water and 3 Sewer Unit. I'm a -- I'm a Supervising Engineer. Are you the same Mr. Merciel who 4 Q. 5 prepared or caused to be prepared the testimony 6 that's be marked as Exhibit No. 11 as well as 7 portions of Exhibit 1? I believe those are the right exhibit 8 Α. 9 numbers. The answer would be yes. 10 Do you have anything you wish to Q. 11 correct or add to that testimony? 12 Α. No, I do not. If I asked the same questions today, 13 Q. would your answers be the same? 14 15 A. Yes. 16 Is the information in those documents Q. 17 true and correct, to the best of your knowledge and 18 belief? 19 Α. Yes. 20 MS. MOORE: Your Honor, this is the 21 only issue for Mr. Merciel, so Staff would offer 22 Exhibit 11 and tender the witness for cross. 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections? 2.4 MR. COMLEY: Yes, your Honor. We have portions to Exhibit 11. 25

		Page 264
1	For the reasons I've stated earlier	
2	about the inadmissibility of evidence on	
3	availability fees, we'd object to page 2, lines 13	
4	through 23; page 3, lines 1 through 23; page 4,	
5	lines 1 through 23; page 5, lines 1 through 23;	
6	page 6, lines 1 through 22; page 7, lines 1 through	
7	23; page 8, lines 1 through 22; page 9, lines 1	
8	through 24; page 10, lines 1 through 2.	
9	And, again, those would be on the	
10	basis of the objections I've raised on the	
11	admissibility of evidence about availability fees	
12	in this case.	
13	JUDGE BUSHMANN: In that case, I'll	
14	treat that objection the same way with Ms. Bolin's	
15	testimony and reserve judgment on that and take it	
16	with the case. And, so let's see. We're not	
17	offering Exhibit 1 yet, are we?	
18	MS. MOORE: Not yet.	
19	JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. Then,	
20	Exhibit Staff Exhibit 11 is received into the	
21	record subject to the objection. And first cross	
22	would be by Office of Public Counsel.	
23	MS. BAKER: Thank you.	
24	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER:	
25	Q. Good afternoon.	

1 Α. Good afternoon. 2 You would agree that the original **Q**. 3 development for Shawnee Bend Water and Sewer had a 4 specific dollar amount? 5 Α. I'm sorry. The original? 6 That the original development, when Q. 7 Shawnee Bend Water and Sewer was put in by the 8 original developer, there was a dollar amount associated with that? 9 10 A. You mean the cost of the system? The cost --11 0. 12 Α. Yes, I would agree. 13 Q. And, so, you would also agree that 14 there is no cap on availability fees to be 15 collected per the declaration? 16 I would. I would agree. Α. 17 Q. And, so, you would agree that the way the availability fees are set up, they would 18 continue even if the original development is paid 19 20 for? 21 Α. They could. They certainly could. 22 0. And you would agree that the 23 availability fees will most likely continue for the foreseeable future? 24 25 Α. It seems likely, yes.

Page 266 1 MS. BAKER: No further questions of 2 the witness. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross-examination by 3 4 Lake Region. 5 MR. COMLEY: Thank you. 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY: 7 Q. Mr. Merciel, you've been a -- I'll 8 call you a subject matter expert on the issue of 9 availability fees in this Commission for a number of cases. Wouldn't that be a fair statement? 10 11 A. Fair enough, yes, sir. 12 Q. You've been an expert on operation and engineering and maintenance of water and sewer 13 14 systems as well? 15 A. Yes, sir. 16 Q. Would it be fair to say that the 17 Commission has, indeed, relied upon your knowledge 18 in this area for making decisions in previous 19 cases? 20 A. On some cases, yes, that would be 21 true. 22 Q. And there have been cases where you told me under cross-examination that an 23 24 availability fee is not a utility service; is that 25 correct?

		Page 267
1	A. I have said that as I think I had a	
2	disclaimer that was stated as a technical from	
3	the technical perspective.	
4	Q. Do you want me to get the testimony	
5	out?	
6	A. It's there. I will concede it is	
7	there. But, as stated, it was said as a technical	
8	as a technical person. There are some legal	
9	ramifications that could paint a different picture	
10	on that matter.	
11	Q. Okay. Aside from the legal part of	
12	this, you have testified in the past that in your	
13	opinion as a subject matter expert that	
14	availability is not a utility service?	
15	A. I testified that it's not a service in	
16	that the customer does not pay the availability	
17	charge this month and directly receive some benefit	
18	that particular month, as, for example, paying a	
19	commodity charge where you get a certain number of	
20	gallons when you pay a dollar amount. It's	
21	different in that respect.	
22	Q. For example, do you remember an	
23	exchange between you and I in a complaint involving	
24	a lady name Cathy Hummel?	
25	A. I do remember.	

1	Q. Well, let me point you, if I can, to a
2	transcript that I have here. Let's start at I'm
3	going to represent to you that this is from
4	WC-2006-20 0082. It's a transcript from Boyd,
5	and 7, part 2, in that case on March the 2nd, 2006.
6	Let's go down to line 22. This is you and me
7	exchanging questions and answers.
8	Now, are availability fees like this charged
9	by other regulated public utilities. Answer, There
10	are two presently that have availability charge
11	well well, there are two that, in some fashion,
12	have an availability charge. Am I reading that
13	correctly?
14	A. I think you are. I couldn't see the
15	lines you were reading before you turned the page
16	there.
17	Q. I'm sorry.
18	A. You had line 22, and that wasn't
19	showing up.
20	Q. Let's go down to line 12. Has the
21	Staff taken any stand on the tariffing of those
22	availability fees? Answer, Not since the
23	certificate case in 1972. Am I clear that that's
24	referring to Lake Region?
25	A. That would be correct. It was Four

		Page 269
1	Seasons Lakesites Water and Sewer at the time.	
2	That was the name of the company.	
3	Q. And question, Would it be safe to say	
4	the Staff has not recommended for that company that	
5	those availability fees be tariffed? And I know	
6	it's 1972, before your time. Answer, Yes or yea,	
7	yeah. Can you ask the question again the way you	
8	asked it. Isn't it true that the Staff has not	
9	recommended that those fees be tariffed by the	
10	company that is charging them. That would be true.	
11	Is that correct?	
12	A. That is correct.	
13	Q. Page 1095. Question, Isn't it true	
14	that availability fees are not necessarily for	
15	republic utility service. Answer, Well, the ones	
16	that I'm familiar with are for the utility service.	
17	The revenue is used to operate the utility. Even	
18	though the revenue is used for the utility, is the	
19	rate charged for a specific utility service. Oh,	
20	well, no. I am reading that correctly?	
21	A. That's correct.	
22	Q. And do you recall that exchange	
23	between you and I?	
24	A. I do.	
25	Q. There is some difference between the	

	Page 270
1	parties about whether the Commission is actually
2	asserted jurisdiction over availability fees. Is
3	it Staff's position through your voice that, in the
4	last rate case, the Commission did assert
5	jurisdiction over availability fees?
6	A. You're talking about the last rate
7	case for Lake Region Water and Sewer?
8	Q. Lake Region Water and Sewer.
9	A. Yeah. And I agree the Commission did
10	not in that particular case.
11	Q. You mentioned cases in your
12	surrebuttal not cases, perhaps but maybe
13	cases involving Peaceful Valley and IH Utilities,
14	Inc. Were those cases, Mr. Merciel, in which the
15	Company consented to having availability fees
16	included in their cost of service?
17	A. Well, I would have to answer yes.
18	There has be no controversy with respect to
19	availability fees until this Company's most recent
20	rate case.
21	Q. And then you kind of put my next
22	question. My understanding is, except in the Lake
23	Region case, there has be no contested case
24	concerning the jurisdiction of the Commission over
25	availability fees.

		Page 271
1	A. To my knowledge, it's never been	
2	contested other than that case. If I may, since	
3	you mentioned Peaceful Valley, I would mention, for	
4	ex parte reasons, that company does have a rate	
5	case filed before the Commission at present. Just	
6	so everybody understands that.	
7	Q. Would it be fair to say that the	
8	Commission has not imputed revenue from	
9	availability fees to any company that did not own	
10	the rights to that revenue?	
11	A. I think the answer would be yes. The	
12	rights might be the question involved there,	
13	though.	
14	Q. Regarding the ownership of the rights	
15	to the availability fees referred to in this case,	
16	when do you believe Lake Region under its present	
17	or former names may have acquired rights to those	
18	fees?	
19	A. My answer is Lake Region had the	
20	rights to the fees by the terms of the subdivision	
21	restrictive covenants. So, I think the answer	
22	would be, from its inception, Lake Region had the	
23	rights to those fees.	
24	Q. So, you're saying the document that	
25	would should the Commission should look at for	
Page 272 1 the termination of when those fees were owned would 2 be the covenants that's where we look for 3 ownership? Α For determination? 4 5 For ownership. For ownership of those Q. 6 fees. 7 Α. Okay. For -- I think you were asking me about originally when did Lake Region, correct? 8 9 **Q**. Right. Right. 10 Α. Okay. 11 Mutual ownership of those fees. Q. 12 Excuse me. Excuse me. Yes. 13 Α. Okay. 14 Q. You're telling the Commission that we 15 should look at the covenants and restrictions to 16 determine when Lake Region initially owned those 17 fees? 18 Α. That's correct. Very simply, that's what the covenants say. They be paid to the owner 19 of the utility systems. That would be Lake Region. 20 21 We've talked about the certification Q. case, WA-95-164. 22 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. Do you know whether the Staff believed 25 the Company owned the rights of those fees then?

		Page 273
1	A. I believe the Staff believed that the	
2	Company did own the rights. I think you'll see	
3	something in Greg Meyer's testimony who is on the	
4	he was one of the Staff auditors at the time	
5	talking about the developer signing rights. And	
6	I'm not sure exactly where that statement comes	
7	from, but, again, going on what the restrictive	
8	documents say, it's payable to the utility.	
9	Q. At least	
10	A. That's what they say.	
11	Q to Mr. Meyers' perspective, as you	
12	understand his testimony, it was unclear to him	
13	whether the Company had the ownership of those	
14	availability fees?	
15	A. It could I don't want to testify	
16	that it wasn't clear to them. That's certainly a	
17	possibility. His testimony was that the developer	
18	should have signed the rights to the utility. I	
19	personally don't think that was necessary, but	
20	that's what he said, and it is what it is.	
21	Q. You mentioned on page 4 of your	
22	testimony, you mention that there was an assignment	
23	in March of 1999, and I was going to ask you, do	
24	you mean there's assignments in our stipulation of	
25	undisputed facts that occurred in 2002, as I	

1	recall? Do you know of another assignment that
2	you're referring to in March of 1999? If you need
3	to find something in your notes to confirm that, by
4	all means look in your notes or your work papers.
5	That seemed to be out of sync with what we
6	understood the case to be.
7	A. Okay. To be honest, I'm not sure what
8	I mean by assignment. In '99, that was about the
9	time that we saw some utility owners I might not
10	say it's the present owners, it was some previous
11	owners Bam (ph) Lake Utility, availability type,
12	either corporate names or fictitious names. There
13	were several of them that were formed. And that
14	was about the time frame that they started showing
15	up. I'm not sure if we know exactly when the
16	assignment was made out of the utility company. It
17	would have been after 1995, and very likely about
18	the time you're talking about there, but I don't
19	know exactly.
20	Q. Did in terms of a document, an
21	actual assignment document, that does not show up
22	until April of 2002? Would that be fair, to your
23	recollection? If you don't know, you don't know.
24	A. Yeah. I may have seen it. We might
25	have talked about that last case. I don't recall

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

it right off --1 2 Accounting for availability fees. Let **Q**. 3 me ask you this. This may be something that's a little bit on the fringe of your area of expertise, 4 5 but is it your recommendation that Lake Region should tariff the availability fee? 6 7 Α. Well, I and the Staff were not making that recommendation. I will point out, again, back 8 9 to the restrictive covenants, those documents say that it would be put in the tariff and approved by 10 the Commission. It's been that way since this 11 12 company first started back in whenever it was, '73. 13 That provision never actually occurred, so the Staff has never -- never tried to actually enforce 14 15 that or promote it. 16 Q. Is it your recommendation that Lake 17 Region should bill and collect this fee? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Would it be booked then as an accounts Q. 20 receivable on Lake Region's books? 21 Α. For that, an accounting term, I suppose it would. It should be revenue. That's 22 receivable by the company. I may not be using the 23 terms properly. I'm not an auditor. 24 25 In your position, do you want to see Q.

1 that on the Lake Region books as an account 2 receivable of some sort? 3 Α. I would. I think it's revenue that belongs to the utility company. Again, that's 4 5 referring back to the subdivision documents. I think that's what lot owners agreed to. 6 7 On page 7 of your surrebuttal, you Q. 8 talk about the workshop docket that was ordered by 9 the Commission in the last case. Now, I would 10 propose to the Commission that that order speaks 11 for itself. But, in general, would you agree that 12 the Staff was directed to deduct that workshop 13 toward a rulemaking addressing availability fees on 14 a perspective basis? 15 Yes. That direction was given. Α. And wasn't the intent to have that 16 Ο. 17 rule in place before we came back for rate relief in this case? 18 19 That was probably the Commission's Α. intent. I don't wish to speak for the Commission, 20 21 but that's probably true. 22 Ο. Well, at the same time, I wanted to 23 get your Staff's analysis, too. 2.4 Α. Okay. 25 But was it your understanding from the Q.

1 Staff's perspective that this should have been done 2 before the next case? 3 Α. Well, my best answer to that to the extent it's possible to arrive at a rule that could 4 5 actually be published and approved, I think that 6 would have been the intent. I think it's Staff's position, ultimately, was it's a lot easier said 7 than done. Like a rule, it's like writing an 8 9 audit, company expenses are more of a case-to-case 10 11 That's why I want -- if your Q. 12 surrebuttal has some more, I have more questions 13 about that. 14 Α. Yeah. 15 Q. Do you know that whether you or other 16 members of the Staff contacted any company, 17 including Lake Region, regarding if rulemaking and availability fees would be considered in that 18 19 rulemaking? 20 Α. I don't have specific knowledge on 21 that issue. I wasn't working directly on it myself. In the workshop docket, there were 22 companies that were participating in various 23 24 aspects. I just don't know about that particular The docket was already existing and this 25 issue.

Page 278 issue got rolled in at some later time. 1 2 But the Staff did not promulgate a **Q**. 3 rule specifically for availability fees? Α. There was no rule promulgated by 4 5 Staff. 6 I mean -- I'm sorry. There's no rule Q. 7 recommended by Staff for formal ruling? There was no rule drafted and 8 Α. recommended by the Staff, nor by any company or any 9 10 industry organization, correct. 11 Q. And right now there is no rule adopted 12 by the Commission on the subject matter? There is nothing down that I know of 13 Α. right now. 14 15 Q. Were you involved in preparing the Staff report on the history of a workshop docket, 16 17 it's initial creation, and it's rollover into the other cases? 18 19 No, I was not. I don't think I even Α. reviewed it. I didn't prepare it. I'm not sure I 20 21 even saw it before it was filed. 22 0. Did you prepare -- did you give any 23 guidance to people on what issues were actually 24 identified in the workshop dockets and the rollover docket? I'll call it the rollover docket. 25

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

		Page 279
1	A. Okay. Well, not to a great extent. I	
2	may have I may have provided some background	
3	information, more like answering somebody's	
4	question. I didn't review documents, or I didn't	
5	have a highly active role in that in that in	
6	that docket.	
7	Q. Do you know if a decision was made to	
8	drop the rulemaking from the docket for	
9	availability fees? Was a decision made to drop the	
10	rulemaking for availability fees from consideration	
11	of the docket?	
12	A. By the?	
13	Q. By the Staff?	
14	A. By the Staff? Not to my knowledge.	
15	Q. Do you know why it was not considered	
16	in the docket? And I'm presuming it wasn't	
17	considered in the docket because of the report that	
18	was issued by the Staff in identifying the issues	
19	addressed.	
20	A. Yeah. Well, again, I don't I don't	
21	have a lot of firsthand knowledge about it. I do	
22	remember we, as the Staff, took the position that	
23	availability fees were largely case-by-case. We	
24	had the opinion that trying to do a rulemaking was	
25	a lot more cumbersome than was practical. How that	

Page 280 fell out into any Staff recommendation, I'm not 1 2 really sure. I wasn't -- I wasn't involved with 3 those decisions. Do you know if your analysis that you 4 Q. 5 just described was put into written form and given 6 to General Counsel or a member of the higher level 7 management of the Staff? I do not. I don't know. I would have 8 Α. to review it to see. 9 10 Q. Did you attend meeting where the issue 11 of treating availability fees on a case-by-case 12 basis were held? I don't think I did. I don't think I 13 Α. attended any meetings on it. Doesn't mean some 14 15 didn't happen, but I don't believe I attend -didn't attend any. 16 17 Ο. Was treating availability cases fee on case-by-case basis you and other members of the 18 Sewer Staff made? 19 20 The Water and Sewer Staff would be Α. 21 involved in it. Yes. 22 Q. Do you know who approved the decision 23 to treat availability fees on a case-by-case basis? A. I could guess, but I don't know for 24 25 sure.

Page 281 1 0. Did you participate in the workshop 2 docket directly? 3 Α. No. 4 Q. Did you provide advice to Staff 5 members that were working in that docket? 6 Α. Only possibly in the form of maybe 7 answering questions from time to time. Mostly in the context, like, maybe somebody coming in and 8 9 asking a guestion or talking about it out in the 10 hall, that sort of thing. 11 All right. Refer to the rollover 0. 12 docket, I'm thinking that would be the SW-2011-0042 13 and WW-2011-0043. Does that make sense to you? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Q. And the WW-2009 -- no, that's not 16 right. No. That was -- that was the case that was 17 combined with the other two dockets I mentioned. Okay. Maybe to help out there. There 18 Α. was a -- there was an existing workshop docket --19 well, two. I think one for water, one for sewer. 20 21 And, as I recall -- could be wrong -- but, as I recall, there was a spin-off docket from this 22 23 Company's last rate case. And I think that's the combination you're speaking of. 24 25 Q. All right.

1	A. That case was I don't know if the
2	cases were consolidated or the issue just went into
3	workshop docket. I don't know exactly how it was
4	handled procedurally.
5	MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I'm going to
6	ask the Commission to take official notice of all
7	the docket sheets in the cases. I think we've
8	taken it we've filed an exhibit of the docket
9	sheet for one of these cases, but I think it would
10	be appropriate to have all the docket sheets and,
11	perhaps, even take official notice of the orders of
12	the Commission in each of the dockets that we
13	referred to, and that would be the workshop docket
14	that was spun off of the 2010 Lake Region rate case
15	and the cases in which that workshop docket was
16	eventually consolidated. And I don't I think I
17	have the case numbers here.
18	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Make sure that I'm
19	the ones you're referring to, would that be
20	WW-2011-0043, SW-2011-0042, and WW-2009-0386?
21	MR. COMLEY: Yes.
22	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Those the three
23	you're referring to?
24	MR. COMLEY: Yes, your Honor.
25	JUDG BUSHMANN: You're asking the

		Page 283
1	Commission take official notice of Commission	
2	orders entered in those cases and filed in those	
3	cases, and also the job docket sheet identifying	
4	the different filings?	
5	MR. COMLEY: Yes. And I think, if	
6	conceivably, the filing would be important, too. I	
7	think they've been referred to in the evidence. At	
8	any rate, the filing of the parties in those cases	
9	I think would be important to the Commission	
10	decision in that.	
11	JUDGE BUSHMANN: You're asking for	
12	official notice on all documents filed in those	
13	three cases?	
14	MR. COMLEY: Yes.	
15	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objection from	
16	any party to do that?	
17	MS. MOORE: I have no objection. I	
18	think it may be cumbersome. Perhaps the docket	
19	sheets and orders, but, otherwise, I really have no	
20	objection to all of it.	
21	MS. BAKER: And I have no objection,	
22	but I'm not sure that there's everything in	
23	there is relevant.	
24	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Well, considering	
25	that the Commission can take official notice of its	

1	own files, and all the filings in those docket
2	numbers would constitute files of the Commission, I
3	will go ahead and take official notice of those
4	three docket numbers and the associated filings
5	that were made in them.
6	MR. COMLEY: Thank you very much. I
7	was hoping that official notice would relieve some
8	of the cumbersome nature of paper exhibits. So, in
9	my own defense, thank you.
10	Q. (By Mr. Comley) Mr. Merciel, on page
11	3 of your surrebuttal, lines 11 and 12, you refer
12	to language in subdivision covenants and
13	restrictions applicable to most lot owners in the
14	Company's service fees which prevent the
15	availability fees. Do you know which covenants you
16	were referring to?
17	A. Oh, well
18	Q. We have several, of course.
19	A. Yes. There are a lot of them. I
20	can't off the top of my head say specifically.
21	There was a there was an amendment to the third
22	amend. And there was a fourth amendment, and some
23	of them refer back to previous documents. And I
24	can't tell you off the top of my head exactly which
25	one it is. I think it's actually in it's in

Page 285 I might have some pages in my testimony in this 1 2 case. 3 Q. You do have one --Α. It was previous to this case. 4 5 I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt Q. 6 you. 7 Α. Yeah. I say the documents are there. I can't tell you off the top of my head what 8 9 documents they were there. 10 I was going to ask you if you knew Q. which subdivisions you're referring to. 11 12 Α. There's a long list of subdivisions in those documents on both Shawnee Bend and Horseshoe 13 14 Bend. 15 Q. Your schedule GAM-2, I think the pages 1 through 3 are only to the availability fees 16 17 charged for water and sewer -- rather for water on Horseshoe Bend. Did you understand that the 18 19 various declarations and amendments may have had 20 different applications to subdivisions? 21 Α. Yes. There are some different applications. 22 23 0. And they were graduated? 2.4 Α. Yeah. And I think where you're talking there's -- if I recall correctly, there 25

	Page 2	286
1	were different paragraphs for Horseshoe Bend and	
2	Shawnee Bend. I might be on the wrong document,	
3	but I recall seeing that. Certainly for sewer. No	
4	question sewer is handled completely different on	
5	Horseshoe Bend and Shawnee bend.	
6	Q. Basically, the Commission would need	
7	to look at each of the documents, look at their	
8	entirety, to see what subdivision is involved in	
9	each of them; is that correct?	
10	A. Well, yes. And, yeah, at that time, I	
11	would say in the last case, it was in either my	
12	surrebuttal testimony or rebuttal testimony. We	
13	had the documents in there entirety. Many many	
14	voluminous pages, just so I would be in context.	
15	Q. I think they are part of the record	
16	here; and if they aren't, we can get them.	
17	A. Right.	
18	Q. So, I think we do have stipulation	
19	A. The information is out there, yes.	
20	Q. All right. Would it be your memory	
21	that water and sewer availability fees first appear	
22	in the restrictive covenants for Shawnee Bend in	
23	about 2009?	
24	A. No. I don't no. We looked at them	
25	in the well, we were aware Staff was aware of	

it in the certificate case in 1995, and I believe 1 2 -- I believe they existed back then. 3 Q. For Shawnee Bend? Α. For Shawnee Bend, yes. 4 5 Would that have been for sewer only? Q. Α. I don't think so. I could be -- could 6 7 be wrong about that. 8 Q. So, it would be for water? 9 Α. I just recall that we were talking about availability charges in that certificate 10 11 case. 12 Was it for both or just for one? Q. Well, I thought both, but I could be 13 Α. wrong on that. I'm not a hundred percent sure. 14 You and Mr. Summers had debated about 15 Q. 16 the regulation of these fees in your testimony. I 17 was going to ask you, in the initial case in 1973 when the Company was formed, in that same case, 18 were these fees involved to pay for plant and 19 20 service? Do you know? 21 Α. From what I can gather, the fees were at least initially, if not beyond that, they were 22 -- they were there to support operation of the 23 utility system, and I'm basing that statement 24 largely on the engineering report in that case 25

1	where where the engineers said that
2	approximately well, in the first first one to
3	six years, 20 to 30 percent of the revenue would
4	actually be from fees for getting service. In
5	other words, the commodity and customer charge like
6	you typically see. And the remainder of the
7	revenue would be availability fees.
8	And I read that to mean that this was a new
9	system. The system was getting built, very few
10	customers, but yet, you know, as we've discussed in
11	other cases, when you build a utility system, you
12	have to start it when your first customer connects.
13	You might have revenue from one customer, maybe two
14	or three customers, but you have to operate the
15	entire system. So, to the extent you have other
16	lots that are sold but not connected, this
17	availability fee revenue is available to the
18	utility to do the operations.
19	Q. The availability fee revenue was not
20	tariffed, though; is that correct?
21	A. It was not, even though it's in the
22	restrictions that it would be. But it, in fact,
23	was not. Never was with this company.
24	Q. With
25	A. With other companies, it has been, but

```
1
     not with this company.
 2
                  The extent to which availability fees
            Q.
 3
     have been collected for the life of the company, is
     it correct that those fees have paid for plant and
 4
 5
     service?
 6
            Α.
                  I wish I could answer that question.
 7
     I have not done that analysis, so we'd have to sit
     down with a cost of the system and look at revenue
 8
 9
     that's been checked over the years. Maybe other
     expenses such as billing expenses should come out
10
     of the the revenue, and certainly some maintenance
11
12
     expenses. I think somebody would have to sit down
13
     and do an analysis to be able to answer that
     question, and I have not done that.
14
15
                  Let's go to 1997, 1998. My
            Q.
16
     understanding is that the Company did book
17
     availability and revenue in its annual reports. Do
     you have an understanding of that history or not?
18
19
            Α.
                  I believe that's true. I don't recall
20
     specifically what's in the annual reports.
21
            Q.
                  Do you remember at all how much it
22
     was?
23
                  Well, no, I don't remember that. But
            Α.
24
     it was my understanding -- let's see, the time
     frame you're talking about --
25
```

1 **Q**. That would have been after the 2 WA-95-164 case. 3 Α. Right. And for this company, that would have been after the Ozark Shores sale. I 4 5 should say the sale of water system assets to Ozark Shores, which did have availability as revenue, as 6 7 far as I know, it was going in the annual report at the time. It was being included in the rate 8 9 calculations. But this company, I can't testify here right off what was included in the annual 10 11 reports. 12 If it wasn't, I would say it should have 13 been, because I believe it was utility revenue. And had we done a rate case at that time, I believe 14 Staff would have included that as revenue on the 15 rate calculation. 16 17 Ο. Do you know who prepared the rate design for the WA-95-164 case? 18 19 Α. Probably me. 20 If it was Martin Hummel, would you be Q. 21 surprised? Could have been Martin Hummel who was 22 Α. working under my supervision at the time. He 23 24 probably did it, and might have been with my help. 25 MR. COMLEY: Judge Bushmann, I would

Page 291 like to show the witness a piece of testimony. 1 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. 3 (Whereupon, a document was handed to the Witness.) 4 5 Q. (By Mr. Comley) Mr. Merciel, I'm going to represent to you that I'm handing you a 6 7 copy of testimony of Mr. Martin Hummel from Case 8 No. WA-95-164. Α. 9 Yes. 10 I'm going to ask you if you can take Q. 11 just a moment to review that and look at the rate 12 design that Mr. Hummel has in that testimony. 13 Α. Okay. I will look through it. 14 Q. All right. 15 I can tell you you're not going to Α. find availability revenue that Staff built into 16 17 this case. 18 I was going to ask you, Mr. Merciel, Q. 19 if after looking at that testimony whether you saw 20 if Staff built in any availability fee revenue in 21 the rate design. 22 And we do not. I do remember at the Α. time of that case we talked about it, but at the 23 24 time there were -- there might have been some lots sold, but this system was very new. Probably no 25

1	actual customers and could have been some lots
2	sold. I don't I could be wrong. I don't think
3	the system was built yet. The punch line is there
4	wasn't enough revenue for us to really really
5	include. We just wanted to try to design some
6	rates that would be realistic rates that this
7	company could live with, and we chose to ignore
8	availability revenue at the time. Doesn't mean
9	ignore it for good, but for purposes of doing the
10	calculations for this case, we did not include
11	availability revenue.
12	Q. Now, you mentioned that the system had
13	not been built. Do you recall when the system was
14	fully constructed?
15	A. I don't. We probably have that in the
16	files. I don't remember off the top of my head.
17	Q. Do you recall when the developer
18	contributed the plant to the company?
19	A. No. I'm sorry, I don't.
20	Q. Do you we have
21	A. This testimony this testimony might
22	even say what was in service at the time, if it
23	was. I don't know. The information would be out
24	there. I just don't know offhand.
25	Q. Let me ask you this. Just reviewing

Page 293 1 Mr. Hummel's testimony in that case, did it refresh 2 your recollection if availability rate design was 3 there for the company in the case? Again, it was not in the rate design 4 Α. 5 in this case, but primarily through Mr. Meyers' testimony, we recognized that availability revenue 6 7 was there and would be there and that the Staff would consider it in the future, in future rate 8 reviews. That was really all we did in this case. 9 10 MR. COMLEY: For the sake of 11 everyone's benefit, I can supply copies of the 12 testimony of Mr. Meyers and Mr. Hummel in those 13 cases. 14 I would ask the Commission take 15 official notice of the testimony that was filed in that record. I think we did that with Mr. Meyers' 16 17 testimony. I don't think we -- I don't think we marked that as an exhibit. 18 19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I don't think we did, either. And what was the exact testimony? 20 21 MR. COMLEY: It would be the testimony of Martin Hummel. His rebuttal testimony, as I 22 23 remember. 2.4 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct. 25 MR. COMLEY: Case No. WA-95-164.

Page 294 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That name sounds 1 2 familiar. Was that one of the testimonies that we 3 took initial notice of earlier? MR. COMLEY: You know, I can't 4 5 remember if we did take initial notice of both. If 6 we did, I'll sit down and be quiet. 7 THE WITNESS: Mr. Hummel's name was mentioned but I don't think you talked about his 8 9 testimony. 10 MR. COMLEY: That was my thoughts 11 initially. 12 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. Any objection to taking official notice of that testimony in that 14 15 case? 16 MS. MOORE: None. 17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: In that case, we'll take official notice of Mr. Hummel's rebuttal 18 19 testimony in that case. 20 (By Mr. Comley) As parts of the Q. 21 recommendations in Case No. WA-95-164, Mr. Meyers 22 suggested -- Mr. Meyer, rather, suggested that 23 there be reviews of the Company and the 24 availability fees. Has the Staff ever reviewed 25 that except in the context of the 2010 rate case?

		Page 295
1	A. To my knowledge, not on the Shawnee	
2	Bend side. At least not in the context of any	
3	case. I don't know if it was looked at informally.	
4	It could have been. I don't remember whether it	
5	was or not. Sometimes we do that. The Company did	
6	have a rate case on its sewer rates on the	
7	Horseshoe Bend side but, as Ms. Bolin stated	
8	before, those are stand-alone rates and we may not	
9	have looked at the availability issue for Shawnee	
10	Bend at all in that particular case.	
11	Q. Do you recall that Mr. Meyers wanted	
12	to have a quarterly review of the availability	
13	fees?	
14	A. I don't remember that. If it says	
15	it may say that. If it does, it does.	
16	Q. All right.	
17	A. I'm not sure if we did it. Possibly	
18	Mr. Meyer, another auditor could have done some	
19	reviews.	
20	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Hello, Commissioner.	
21	COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Hello. Thank	
22	you.	
23	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Proceed.	
24	Q. (By Mr. Comley) Reviewing Staff's	
25	proposal in this case, would it be fair to say that	

1 you're looking back 17 years or so and trying to 2 change the rate structure for the Company for the 3 future? Is that a correct statement? Α. Well, I think it's a correct 4 5 statement. That's what -- that's what happens in rate cases. 6 7 And why wouldn't going back that Q. 8 distance consider -- be considered retroactive 9 ratemaking? 10 Oh, well, rate may have been in effect Α. for all that time, but with rate cases and revising 11 12 rates, that's from a point going forward. So, we 13 may be changing rate at a minimum effect for that long, but I don't know that it's retroactive. 14 15 We're not trying to force the Company to refund monies that were collected or make adjustments in 16 17 that nature. It's only on a going-forward basis. You're proposing to impute the 18 Q. 19 availability of revenue to the Company but still 20 treat the plant as contributed. Is that correct? 21 Α. Yes. I don't know that all the plant is contributed. Some would be; perhaps a 22 significant amount. 23 24 Q. I would say the plant that's been 25 covered or the plant that's involved with the

Page 297 1 payment of availability fees? 2 Α. Well, I don't think you can tie 3 availability fees to specific plant. Would it be the plant that's installed 4 Q. 5 in the subdivisions where availability fees are enforced? 6 7 That would be true. Α. 8 Q. Would it be fair to say that this 9 approach is exactly opposite from the way the 10 Company was financially approved by the Commission in its certificate case? 11 12 Α. If I understand your question, I don't 13 think that's true. 14 Q. So, what you're doing here is the same as was done in the certificate case? 15 Yes, with the exception that, at the 16 Α. 17 time, we did ignore availability fees because of -hesitate to say lack of data -- but being a new 18 company, there just wasn't any cost. Certificate 19 cases done pro forma basis routinely, if you have a 20 21 new system, it's got an estimate cost and estimated revenues, and that's what we did in that 22 certificate case. 23 24 If the availability fee revenue would **Q**. have been tariffed and included in the revenues 25

Page 298 1 given to the Company in the 1997 case and the plant 2 continued on the books as contributed, would have 3 been the rates been reduced in that 1997 case? I'm sorry. Which '97 case is that? 4 Α. 5 That would be the WA-95 -- I say '97 Q. 6 7 Α. Okay. The '95 case? 8 Q. The '97 comes from the effective date. 9 Α. Oh, okay. 10 I will ask the question again. Q. 11 Α. Yes, if you would, please. 12 If the availability fees were tariffed Q. 13 and included in the revenue treatment of the 14 Company and the plant contributed on the books 15 state contributed the rates for the Company and, as 16 a consequence of the certificate case, would have 17 been reduced, wouldn't that have been correct? Α. That could have happened. I'm not --18 don't know that that's for sure. It could have 19 been in effect. 20 21 Q. This seems to be a simple question, 22 and maybe you can can tell me. There's never been 23 a real estate developer come before the Commission 24 and ask to have an availability fee approved. Isn't that correct? 25

Well, we've had some requests that --1 Α. 2 or seem to be similar to that. Maybe informal --3 well, developers do like to collect whatever revenue they can get, whether availability fees, 4 5 connection charges. We do see requests like that 6 from time to time. 7 And the Staff gets those requests, but Q. 8 do you know of any formal applications filed with 9 the Commission in which a real estate developer 10 said, I'm going to have an availability fee for a 11 subdivision lots and I want to have it approved? 12 Α. No. I can't think of one where they requested the rate be approved. The -- certainly, 13 some of the companies we've been talking about, 14 15 including this Company and Peaceful Valley and Indian Hills Utility, have included the 16 17 availability revenue as part of their feasibility analysis. So, to that extent, they've come to the 18 19 Commission with the revenue on the table so to 20 speak. 21 Q. But these are the companies. These 22 are utility companies? 23 Α. Yes. Peaceful Valley started --24 actually, the developer was the utility, the same 25 entity at that time.

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

1 **Q**. But it became a public utility? 2 Α. Yes, with a transfer of assets case. And, by agreement, the availability 3 Q. fee revenue was included in there? 4 5 Α. I would say it was by agreement. 6 There was no controversy. That was part of the 7 feasibility. It was all -- it was intended as the utility revenue, and that's the way it was treated. 8 9 **Q**. Would you agree with me that Lake 10 Region does not own the availability fee revenue? I think I would agree that they don't 11 Α. 12 own it. That's not to say that they shouldn't own 13 it. 14 All right. Have you compared the Q. 15 rates for service that the Staff is proposing in this case to the rates that were approved in 1997, 16 17 and that's with the certificate case? A. I have not. I've not done a rate 18 analysis. I'm not the one on the Staff who would 19 necessarily do that. I'm not sure that's been done 20 21 at all yet. 22 0. Did you review Mr. Summers' schedule 23 in which it was revised, the revised schedule with case numbers that talk about how the revenue was 24 25 included and how plant services was treated

1 accordingly? 2 Α. I've seen a schedule. I think -- I 3 think a schedule. I don't --Do you disagree with it? 4 Q. 5 Α. Well, I don't really disagree with it 6 as such, but I think it goes on the premise that 7 the availability revenue is for capital recovery or pipeline infrastructure that's in service, and I 8 don't think that's a valid premise. 9 10 Q. But, at the same time, that represents 11 the way the Commission treated the availability fee 12 revenue in those cases? I -- no. I don't agree with that. 13 Α. 14 Q. Okay. 15 That might be from the perspective of Α. Lake Region and Ozark Shores, there might be some 16 17 validity when you include IH Utilities and Peaceful Valley. I don't think it's -- I don't think it's 18 19 representative. 20 I have some questions about the Q. 21 Company company service. Basically, would you 22 agree that the Company has provided safe and 23 adequate service ever since it started service 24 about 40 years ago? 25 I would say this Company's provided Α.

Page 302 good service to its customers. We have problem 1 2 water and sewer companies. This is not one of 3 them. 4 Q. It's been doing that regularly, and it 5 provides very good service? 6 It's been a good company for as long Α. 7 as I've be working here. 8 Q. On page 4, line 15, of your testimony, 9 you say that it was imprudent for the Company to transfer availability fee. Would you agree that 10 this is a new contention from the Staff? 11 12 Α. Well, it was -- it was -- no, it's not 13 new now. It was new in the last case, back in 14 2010. 15 Q. I think in that case you mentioned 16 that it was unreasonable. You didn't say it was 17 imprudent. 18 Α. Perhaps that's true. 19 Q. All right. 20 Α. But my point was going to be that was 21 the first time this has been brought up as a controversial issue. First time it's had to be 22 addressed by the Staff. 23 24 Q. Let me ask you this. There has be no 25 complaint filed by the Staff in connection with the

1 assignment of the availability fee revenue that's 2 referred to in our statement of undisputed facts? 3 Α. That's correct. There's been no complaint. 4 5 Q. The rates were approved in the 2010 rate case despite the fact that Staff did contend 6 7 that it was unreasonable for the availability of 8 revenue to be assigned? 9 Α. That's true. That did happen. 10 Do you know if the assignment of this Q. 11 revenue was at all a topic in the workshop docket 12 or the rollover dockets? I don't know. If it was discussed, I 13 Α. 14 wasn't involved with the discussions. 15 Did you attend the Company public Q. hearing held in December of 2013? Were you there? 16 17 Α. No. I was not there. That was the local hearing, I think you're referring to? 18 19 Q. That's right. 20 Α. Okay. No. I was not there. 21 Did you ever learn that there was no Q. 22 complaint from members of the public or any Lake 23 Region customers at that hearing? 24 Α. That's what I recall hearing, that there were no complaints. Again, this is not a 25

problem company. They take care of their 1 2 customers. 3 Ο. On page 9 of surrebuttal, you state, 4 Availability fee revenues of the utilities would 5 actually be an enhancement to utility viability. Is that a correct reading of your testimony? 6 7 Α. Yes. 8 Q. That is basically the core issue here, isn't it? 9 10 Well, yes. Also, considering this Α. company having grown to the size that it has, it is 11 12 past the point of having viability problems like we often see with small utilities. So, short of that 13 14 ___ 15 Q. The Company's operated without 16 availability fee revenues for quite some time and 17 it's still financially viable? 18 Α. It has, yes. 19 Q. Now, if Staff's proposals are 20 accepted, Lake Region's viability would depend upon 21 the transfer of that availability fee revenue to 22 the Company. Would you agree? 23 Α. Yes. 24 Q. Do you think that Lake Region can 25 compel the owners of that availability fee revenue

1 to relinquish it?

A. Well, I can't answer that. I'm only recommending to the Commission that the revenue belongs with the utility, and I'm recommending the Commission take that into consideration. Whether -- whether that can -- can happen again now is -is a question I can't answer.

8 Q. Let's presume this. If Lake Region 9 cannot acquire rights to the availability fee 10 revenue and cannot collect it for itself, and 11 Staff's proposals are accepted, are the rates 12 designed in Staff's proposals sufficient to 13 generate and cover Lake Region's cost of service? I can't really give you a definitive 14 Α. answer. I think the answer you're looking for is 15 to say without the availability revenue, if that's 16 17 taken out, the rates may not be sufficient. But, again, Staff takes the position that, you know, 18 this money's being collected, it's being billed, 19 it's out there, it's getting paid to somebody, and 20 21 it's Staff's position is it belongs with the 22 utility. How we get there after these actions, that's what I can't give you a good answer to. 23 24 Q. If the proposal goes into place and 25 Lake Region cannot collect this revenue for itself,

1 doesn't that place the Company's economic viability 2 in peril? 3 Α. I guess that depends on what the owners of the Company do. Some of the owners have 4 5 control over the availability revenue, and I think it's fixable. 6 7 It depends on the owners? Q. 8 Α. It depends on the owners. 9 MR. COMLEY: Thank you, Mr. Merciel. I have no other questions. 10 11 THE WITNESS: Okay. Yes, sir. 12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from 13 the Commissioners. 14 (No response.) 15 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Mr. Merciel, no. Sir, thank you for your time. 16 17 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER STOLL: 19 20 I'm not sure if you're the right Q. 21 person to ask this, but as I was sitting here 22 listening, how is the amount of the availability fee determined? Is it standard based on each lot, 23 \$25 a month or --24 25 Well, it is in the subdivision Α.

Page 307 restrictive covenants. I may not use the right 1 2 name. 3 Q. Okay. Α. It's in there. I might have it 4 5 backwards. I believe it's \$10 for water per month and \$15 for sewer. 6 7 Okay. Do you know if Lake Regional Q. 8 (sic) has a customer charge or a minimum charge on their water bill? 9 10 On their rates, yes, they do. Α. Water and sewer? 11 Q. 12 Α. Yes. Well, water. 13 Q. Yeah. 14 Yeah. The water, there is. Sewer, I Α. 15 can't remember. Might be a flat rate on sewer. 16 Q. Yeah. How about tap on fees? Do you 17 recall if they have a --There's -- I don't think there's a 18 Α. tap-on fee. There might. I'd have to look at the 19 tariff. Might be an inspection fees, like there's 20 21 not a large cap offset on, you know -- on making a 22 connection. 23 Q. Okay. 24 COMMISSIONER STOLL: That's all I have. 25 Thank you.
EXAMINATION BY COMMISSIONER HALL: 1 2 Good afternoon. Q. 3 Α. Good afternoon. It sounds like from your testimony so 4 Q. 5 far that it's not uncommon for water and sewer utilities to charge availability fees? 6 7 Α. Well, it's -- I wouldn't really quite 8 say that. Most of the companies don't have the 9 availability fees. We have this one and Ozark Shores, the predecessor, and the two other 10 companies we've talked about. I don't know of any 11 12 other companies that we regulate that do have. 13 There could have been some in the distant past, but I'm only aware of these four companies, out of the, 14 15 oh, I don't know, 60 or 70 water companies and same amount of sewer companies we regulate at the 16 17 present time. 18 And of those four companies, of those Q. 19 four companies, are there any examples of that 20 revenue being treated as revenue for rate 21 calculation? Yes, sir. In my testimony in Indian 22 Α. Hills which no longer charges the availability fee. 23 24 It's gone away with that company, but there was a small company rate case in -- I don't remember the 25

1	year now, it was in the '80s and in the Staff
2	work paper, it clearly assigned the availability
3	revenue to maintenance and some depreciation.
4	Might have been some return on the utility plant.
5	It was included as revenue.
6	Peaceful Valley, I haven't yet found a rate
7	case where it actually makes the assignment. But
8	in the last case and, again, that's the company
9	that has the case before the Commission right now,
10	so I don't want to do any ex parte but in the
11	last case, there was an across-the-board change in
12	all the tariff rates which included the
13	availability charge. To my knowledge, that was
14	included in the revenue with that company as well
15	in past cases.
16	Ozark Shores does not have it in the tariff,
17	but the revenue over the years, I think there's
18	been some different treatments, you know, a little
19	bit of variation, but, basically, it's been
20	included in revenue in the rate calculation.
21	Q. Okay.
22	COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.
23	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
24	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross after
25	Commission questions. Public Counsel?

Page 310 1 MS. BAKER: No questions. Thank you. 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Lake Region? 3 MR. COMLEY: No questions. JUDGE BUSHMANN: And redirect by 4 5 Staff. MS. MOORE: Thank you. 6 7 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. MOORE: 8 Q. Mr. Merciel, towards the beginning of 9 your discussion with Mr. Comley, I believe you were 10 asked about your previous statements regarding 11 whether availability fees can be considered utility 12 service. Yes. 13 Α. 14 Can you elaborate for us on how Q. 15 availability fees can be considered part of a utility service? 16 17 Α. Well, they could be a part of service. And, again, might back up, my statement was the 18 context of customer paying for something this month 19 20 that he's getting this month. In that sense, it 21 may not be a service but it could be considered a service in that, first of all, just the fact that 22 they're paying a required fee to the utility 23 company. But my opinion, in paying this fee and 24 providing revenue to support the utility, they're 25

		Page 311
1	participating in the upkeep of this utility for the	
2	present and for the future when they may want to	
3	connect to it. So, in essence, they are	
4	maintaining a system that's there for their	
5	benefit. And it could be considered service in	
6	that respect.	
7	Q. Okay. And I think this has be	
8	covered, but just to be sure, there was discussion	
9	about whether or not availability fees are	
10	tariffed. Are they always tariffed for the	
11	companies that we're aware of?	
12	A. No, they're not. Again, I think I	
13	mentioned they are in the tariff of Peaceful Valley	
14	presently. They were in the tariff of Indian	
15	Hills, IH Utilities, Indian Hills subdivision.	
16	They no longer are because that company's not	
17	charging it. They weren't in the tariff from the	
18	inception. The availability revenue existed, and	
19	at some point, those companies choose to put it in	
20	the tariff.	
21	And, then, Ozark Shores and this company,	
22	Lake Region, the availability is there but it's not	
23	in the tariff.	
24	Q. What is Ozark Shores' relationship to	
25	Lake Region?	

		Page 312
1	A. Ozark Shores acquired the water system	
2	assets on Horseshoe Bend. Lake Region was	
3	originally the owner; at the time, the Four Seasons	
4	Lakesite Water and Sewer Company. They have	
5	they had the water sewer utility Horseshoe Bend.	
6	That company sold the water assets to Ozark Shores.	
7	Coincidentally, that company sold to largely the	
8	present owners of Lake Region, the other owners of	
9	Lake Region at the time. But they sold to Ozark	
10	Shores. The owners of Ozark Shores are largely the	
11	same people that, ultimately, bought Four Seasons,	
12	now called Lake Region.	
13	Q. Okay. I think you were also asked	
14	whether the Commission had ever imputed	
15	availability fees revenue to a utility that does	
16	not have the rights to the availability fees	
17	revenue. Do you remember that question?	
18	A. I do remember. I think I answered	
19	that, to my knowledge, that was never never done	
20	before with the Commission's approval.	
21	Q. To your knowledge, have there ever	
22	been any companies that have given up the rights to	
23	a stream of revenue in order for the Commission to	
24	have to impute it?	
25	A. To my knowledge, that's never	

Page 313 happened. The companies that I'm aware of that 1 2 have it, they always had it and never -- never did 3 or never tried to give it up. 4 Q. Okay. You were also asked about the 5 workshop in regards to availability fees. There 6 was first --7 Α. Yes. 8 Q. -- the original workshop as a result 9 of Lake Region, and then the rollover docket, I 10 think, is what are we calling it? 11 Α. Right. 12 You mentioned in your response to that Q. 13 there was some difficulty in making a rule without 14 availability fees. Can you elaborate on that? 15 My position -- I think I'm safe to say Α. would be the Staff's position -- that to make a 16 17 rule on availability fees would either have to be very complex in order to try to capture all 18 19 situations that could be out there. These fees can 20 be set up by the developer; they can be set up by 21 the utility. They, in fact, can be transferred around; they can be called different things. I 22 think it's hard to capture exactly -- exactly how 23 to handle it in a rule. 24 25 Or the rule would be just so simple, for

1	example, rule that just says, if a utility company
2	ever has availability revenue, it can't transfer it
3	out without Commission approval. That's probably
4	overly simplified, but I like to compare, writing a
5	rule for that, it's like writing a rule on what
6	gets included with a ratemaking in an audit. It's
7	inherently case-by-case. That's why we have to
8	have auditors go in and look at it and make
9	decisions on every line item they see. Every line
10	item they see. You know, is this reasonable, is
11	not reasonable, should a portion be included,
12	should it be allocated. You can't write a rule,
13	you couldn't write a computer program and just plug
14	in numbers and expect it to spit out rates.
15	It's just more, more, more complicated and
16	more convoluted than trying to trying to write
17	some rule that captures everything. So, the bottom
18	line is we thought availability revenue should be
19	handled on a case-by-case basis. That's what it
20	really comes down to.
21	Q. You mentioned that engineering report
22	in response to a question about the certificate
23	case. Can you elaborate more on what that is and
24	what it has to do with availability fees?
25	A. Yes. When utilities file before the

1	Commission with a certificate of convenience and
2	necessity, and not always, but a lot of times that
3	will be somebody coming in, it's a new service
4	area, maybe new subdivision as was the case here on
5	Horseshoe Bend. They come in, it's pro forma, they
6	use estimated expenses, estimated revenue based on
7	a growth forecast. It's what we call a feasibility
8	study.
9	The utilities are required to file a
10	feasibility study. That's what the Staff uses to
11	evaluate their business plan and evaluate expenses,
12	and set rates initially. And this was a report
13	that Four Seasons Lakesites had filed in this case
14	back in '73, and that's the engineering report I
15	was talking about. It had some estimated plan
16	expenses, estimated operating expenses, basically
17	described how the company was going to operate its
18	business, and it mentioned availability fees.
19	Q. What did it say about availability
20	fees?
21	A. It said that this water system is
22	unusual in that it's don't remember if we used
23	the term recreational area but unlike a
24	subdivision in the city, this is a recreational
25	area where people might buy lots, they may or may

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	not build a house on it. Some people may build on
2	a lot, live somewhere else on the lake, but buy a
3	lot, have access to the boat dock or swimming pool.
4	They buy a lot without actually building a lot
5	(sic) on that, and that was anticipated with this
6	company.
7	So, that was the unusual nature of it. What
8	the engineer forecasted was that, in the first six
9	years, between 20 and 30 percent of the Company's
10	revenue would be from people actually taking water
11	service and the remainder would be availability
12	revenue. And that's what I read as that was the
13	well, that was part of the feasibility in starting
14	this system. They were depending on the
15	availability of revenue to support the utility
16	system operation.
17	Q. In relation to the certificate case,
18	you also mentioned that Staff had made the decision
19	to bypass a recommendation on availability fees
20	until later? Was that correct?
21	A. Correct. That was in the '95 case.
22	Q. Would that be normal as a decision to
23	make in a certificate case?
24	A. Oh, I guess you could call it normal.
25	That's the only one we've ever done that on, but

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

it's -- I've never, you know -- availability 1 2 revenue is rare enough. That's the only one I've 3 ever worked on, you know, from its inception. Perhaps the better question is what is 4 Q. 5 the difference in Staff's review for a certificate case versus a ratemaking case? 6 7 Α. The difference is a certificate case 8 is done on pro forma data. You're forecasting 9 what's going to happen. On a normal rate case with an existing company, you use a test year or some 10 method to go back and look at actual expenses and 11 12 actual revenue. 13 **Q**. Okay. I believe Commissioner Stoll 14 asked you about availability fees, and I believe it 15 was about revenue. How is it -- and without saying 16 any amounts, because some of those amounts are 17 confidential -- but how does this availability fee for Lake Utility Availability 1 in the amount that 18 19 is charged compare to other availability fees that 20 you're familiar with? 21 Α. Well, I could say amounts of other companies if it's for comparison. I think it's all 22 public record. 23 The other companies, yes, that would 24 Q. 25 be fine.

		Page 318
1	A. Well, the other companies this only	
2	applies to water. This is the only one where we	
3	have a sewer availability. But on this company,	
4	water availability is \$10. With Peaceful Valley,	
5	the current rate it's in the tariff, and I don't	
6	have the exact amount I think it's like \$8.51,	
7	or some amount like that. A little bit lower.	
8	Q. Uh-huh.	
9	A. IH Utilities, it was \$2 per month,	
10	which was set back in the mid '60s when that	
11	company first came in.	
12	q. And I think Commissioner Hall asked	
13	you about availability fees being treated as	
14	revenue; and, to your knowledge, has there ever	
15	been any company that has availability fees	
16	regulated by Missouri that does not treat it as	
17	revenue?	
18	A. To my knowledge, all the availability	
19	fee revenue we deal with has been dealt with as	
20	utility revenue except for what's been happening	
21	with this company in the last case and this case.	
22	Q. Thank you.	
23	MS. MOORE: No further questions.	
24	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you,	
25	Mr. Merciel. You may step down now.	

Page 319 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. Thank you. 1 2 (Whereupon, the Witness left the 3 witness stand.) JUDGE BUSHMANN: Seems to be a good 4 5 time for a break. Why don't we go into recess until about 3:25. 6 7 (Whereupon, a recess was taken at 3:12 8 p.m.) 9 (Whereupon, the record resumed at 3:25 10 p.m.) JUDGE BUSHMANN: Back on the record. 11 12 Our last witness today dealing with the issue of availability fees is Mr. Robertson. 13 14 Mr. Robertson, you're already under 15 oath; and for cross-examination, first party would 16 be Staff. 17 MS. BAKER: Beforehand, since this is his last issue, I will go ahead and tender his 18 19 testimony OPC 2, OPC 3 and OPC 4 for admission. 20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Are there any 21 objections to the receipt of those exhibits? 22 MR. COMLEY: Yes, your Honor. With 23 respect to Mr. Robertson's direct testimony which I believe has been marked as OPC 2, on the basis of 24 the objections that Lake Region has raised to 25

1	testimony about availability fees in this case, we
2	have the following objections to pages and lines in
3	his direct line as follows: Page 2, lines 18
4	through 21; page 3, lines 2 through 23; page 4,
5	lines 1 through 26; page 5, lines 1 through 31;
6	page 6, lines through 1 through 5; page 7, lines 9
7	through 22; page 8, lines 1 through 2.
8	With respect to OPC Exhibit 3,
9	Mr. Robertson's rebuttal testimony, we have these
10	objections based upon the same grounds that I have
11	raised before with respect to availability
12	testimony. These objections apply to his rebuttal
13	of page 1, lines 18 through 21; page 2, lines 1
14	through 23; page 3, lines 1 through 22; page 4,
15	lines 1 through 16.
16	And with respect to Mr. Robertson's
17	surrebuttal testimony which is Exhibit OPC Exhibit
18	4, we have these objections based upon those
19	grounds I have voiced about availability fees
20	already. These objections apply to page 1, lines
21	14 through 26; page 2, lines 1 through 22; page 3,
22	lines 1 through 23; page 4, lines 1 through 23;
23	page 5, lines 1 through 23; page 6, lines 1 through
24	23; page 7, lines 1 through 21. Also, the
25	objections would be posed to Schedules TJR 1, 2.1,

Page 321 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2, and so much of TJR Schedule 4 1 2 that refers to the availability fees. 3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And those are all based on those same grounds as in prior 4 5 availability fee witnesses? 6 MR. COMLEY: Yes, your Honor. 7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: In that case, I'll reserve judgment as before, will take that with the 8 case, and receive Office of Public Counsel Exhibits 9 2, 3, and 4 into the record subject to the 10 objections as noted. 11 12 All right. Now, cross. Staff? 13 MS. MOORE: No questions. Thank you. 14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Lake 15 Region. MR. COMLEY: Thank you. 16 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY: 18 Turning to your direct testimony, Q. Mr. Robertson, on page 6. 19 20 Α. Okay. 21 On page 6, lines 2 through 4, you Q. mentioned that the Commission did not address in 22 the previous case, I think, Public Counsel's 23 24 primary concern the collection of the funds 25 represent contributions in aid of construction and

	Page 322
1	all such contributions have not be properly
2	identified and included in the utilities cost of
3	service. Did I read your testimony correctly
4	there? Would it be fair to say that there is
5	nothing in Commission's 2010 order that rules that
6	the availability fees collected on Shawnee Bend
7	should somehow be reflected in rate base?
8	A. Are you asking if the order says they
9	should be reflected in rate base as in an offset?
10	Q. I'm saying would you agree that there
11	is nothing in the order that directs or agrees with
12	the idea that availability fees collected on
13	Shawnee Bend should somehow be reflected in rate
14	base?
15	A. I agree that the order does not use
16	the availability fees as an offset in rate base in
17	that order.
18	Q. On page 3, lines 21 through 23, of the
19	direct, there is some mention of your research on
20	availability fees.
21	A. Excuse me. Excuse me. Again, what
22	page?
23	Q. Page 3, lines I'm kind of skipping
24	around.
25	A. Yes, I know.

		Page 323
1	Q. It's at the bottom of the page at page	
2	3. You say your research indicates that	
3	availability fees are usually utilized by various	
4	governmental entities and ongoing through there.	
5	Let me direct your attention to that answer. Do	
6	you recall, through Ms. Baker's office or directed	
7	to you, that you received data requests from Lake	
8	Region?	
9	A. I did.	
10	Q. Through your research?	
11	A. Yes.	
12	Q. And my understanding you had offered	
13	in response to Internet links about availability	
14	fees, and one was a link to revenue of availability	
15	fees in the State of Virginia?	
16	A. Yes, that's correct.	
17	Q. And another link, I think, was also to	
18	a site involving a county in Virginia?	
19	A. That's right. Could you hold on just	
20	one moment. I actually have the response to that	
21	DR. Thank you. That's correct.	
22	Q. And I take it, Mr. Robertson, that you	
23	did not do any specific research with respect to	
24	how availability fees are treated in Missouri?	
25	A. No, that's not true. I was involved	

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

Page 324 in the last case, so I was aware of how 1 2 availability fees have been treated in Missouri. 3 Oh, okay. So, your research, the Q. 4 research you're talking about, though, is it 5 strictly in other counties in other states? 6 Α. As I told you in response, that 7 response on it said I included reviewing various 8 testimony and exhibits in the prior case and I also did some additional NS search. 9 10 Let's turn to your surrebuttal. Let's Q. 11 go to page 2, line 3. 12 Α. Okay. 13 Q. You mention there that Company's --14 you say, However, Company's refusal to provide the 15 actual data has not prevented OPC from preparing an 16 analysis for the Commission that shows the 17 estimated amounts for availability fees collected win the Shawnee Bend Water and Sewer District 18 19 operations in comparison to the companies in the 20 PMSC Staff by developers. Did I say that 21 correctly? 22 Α. You read that correctly. 23 Q. All right. I wanted to confirm with 24 you that, in more than one place, you had mentioned 25 that the Company has refused to supply information

1	to your office. But do you quarrel with the idea
2	at this time do you recall with the the fact at
3	this time that the actual data was not in Lake
4	Region's possession and control?
5	A. Really depends on what data you're
6	referring to. In several data requests, I saw that
7	plan investment contributions wee made by the
8	developer, year by year coming forward for each
9	operation. I think that's probably within the
10	Company's control. So, yes, that is within the
11	Company's control.
12	As far as the availability fees, which I
13	think is what your question is, Lake Region, at
14	least for the least several years since the last
15	owners have owned it, I guess they shifted it off
16	into a different fund, so that
17	Q. Actual data about availability fees is
18	not kept by Lake Region in its records?
19	A. Well, you know, that may or may not be
20	accurate. We've got some response a response
21	from the Company that said some of that information
22	is kept on Lake Region's computers. So, it's on a
23	utility computer; I think the utility does have
24	access to it.
25	Q. And the Commission did handle that,

Page 326 1 didn't they, in a discovery order? 2 Α. As far as I can tell. I didn't get 3 the information. You didn't get the discovery order? 4 Q. 5 Α. I didn't get the availability fees, the information I requested. 6 7 You did see the discovery order, Q. 8 though? 9 Α. I have read the orders, yes. 10 All right. Is it pretty true, fairly Q. true -- I'll withdraw that. 11 12 Isn't it true that your position about availability fees is the same as it was in the 2010 13 14 case? 15 A. It is -- it's extremely similar. If you look back in my testimony in the the 2010 case, 16 17 I think what we initially said was that, to treat the money collected from the fees as owing to the 18 benefit of the company to the extent that's 19 satisfied, it should be treated, and it actually 20 21 should be treated as SEAC (ph). In this case, we're recommending after further analysis that all 22 excess be treated as additional SEAC. 23 24 So, it's some of the extension of your Q. 25 position, then, in this case or are you saying it's

1 the same? 2 Α. I think you've got to look at the 3 entire picture of what these two -- these were for. As Mr. Merciel testified, these companies, when 4 5 they first started for a CNN, they estimate, try to forecast on pro forma basis what it's going to take 6 7 to operate them. 8 Q. That was in the feasibility report he 9 was talking about? 10 I think that was part of it, yes, in Α. the '95 case. 11 12 And I think it was CD -- maybe he was 0. 13 talking about the 17 -- 754 case. The original 14 case, I think, is what the feasibility studies --You've had discussed on both 15 Α. occasions. I'm referring specifically only to the 16 17 Shawnee Bend which is, I believe, the W-95 case. 18 Q. All right. 19 Since you don't know what it's going Α. to take to operate those companies, I think in 20 21 those instances the fees were believed to be utilized to help develop the Company, help maintain 22 the Company, open it properly until such time they 23 24 got enough ratepayers to support the system. So, in that system, it would be treated as OM 25

```
maintenance costs.
 1
 2
                  Moving back to the question that I did
            Q.
 3
     ask, and I know you tried to answer it. I know you
 4
     have. But your position in this case is nearly
 5
     identical to the position that Office of Public
     Counsel took in the 2010 case?
 6
 7
            Α.
                  Yes. Nearly identical. That's true.
 8
            Q.
                  Is it also fair to say that you're
 9
     relying on estimates for purposes of your position,
     estimates of availability fees?
10
                  Well, if you look at the schedule
11
            Α.
12
     where I define those costs that you're talking
     about, some of the costs are estimates, some of
13
     them were obtained from affidavits, from Brian
14
15
     Swearengen, and some of them were obtained from the
     annual reports. So, not all of the costs are
16
17
     estimates. Some are; some aren't.
            Q.
                  Let me see. You have -- looking at
18
     your schedule TJR 1, would that be where those
19
20
     estimates are recorded?
21
            Α.
                  That's -- exactly.
22
            0.
                  1995 to '97, these were pro forma
23
     financials, so they had be estimates; is that
24
     correct?
25
                  They would be estimates. And, then,
            Α.
```

		Page 329
1	below that, or after that, we have costs that	
2	related identified by the POA in the prior case,	
3	and then we also had costs that are identified,	
4	fees that were identified by Staff in the report	
5	they put together for the Commission and, to some	
6	degree, was supported by the Company and they	
7	updated it from Mr. Swearengen.	
8	So, to answer your questions, some of the	
9	costs are estimates based on available information	
10	that we do have, and I believe some of the costs to	
11	be from what the Company provides us to be actual.	
12	Q. Would you agree with me that the	
13	verifiable data would be in the annual report	
14	analysis done in 2006, 7, and 8, and 9?	
15	A. I would tell you that I asked the	
16	Company for this information so we could have the	
17	actual information to provide the Commission. They	
18	would not provide it, so based on available	
19	information which we did have, access to that is	
20	what we developed here.	
21	Q. So, even the Staff annual report	
22	analysis you would consider to be inaccurate?	
23	A. I would consider it to be very close	
24	because, if I recall correctly from	
25	Mr. Swearengen's affidavit, the sum of the numbers	

		Page 330
1	or the amounts between the years 2005 and 2010,	
2	what Staff put together and what Mr. Swearengen	
3	said the Company collected in his affidavit was	
4	very close. He was only different by a few	
5	thousand dollars.	
6	Q. Aren't their annual report estimates	
7	for the years '95 through '98 available?	
8	A. For the years again?	
9	Q. '95 through '98?	
10	A. I don't recall that they are for	
11	the early years, '95, '96, and '97. As far as the	
12	annual reports after that, I'm not sure that	
13	they're broken out between between the	
14	utilities.	
15	I will tell you also that the annual report	
16	information, for what it's worth, even in this	
17	analysis as I stated in my testimony, is probably	
18	not completely accurate. I really wish the Company	
19	had provided the information so that we could give	
20	the Commission, you know, the actual data. They	
21	didn't. So, based on what we did have access to,	
22	this is what we put together, and we believe it's	
23	at least a reasonable representation of the fees	
24	that the Companies and the shareholders or its	
25	owners have collected over the years.	

1	Q. Regarding Schedule TJR 1, would it be
2	fair to say that you have not considered cost of
3	capital in determining the figures you are trying
4	to determine?
5	A. Would you further explain the
6	question? I don't completely understand.
7	Q. Would cost of capital be a factor in
8	the analysis you're working on here?
9	A. Well, from what we're looking at here
10	is we're looking at the comparison of the fees
11	they've collected in the comparison to the plant
12	they contributed to the company, to see if they
13	recovered the developer, they recovered the cost
14	they incurred to build out the system.
15	Q. And wouldn't cost of capital be a cost
16	for the developer that we should consider in
17	turning what would be contributions in aid of
18	construction?
19	A. That's a possibility. That is a
20	possibility. What their cost of capital would be.
21	Q. And that's not included in your
22	analysis?
23	A. And neither did the Company provide
24	information that cost of capital was required or
25	needed by them.

1 **Q**. You would assume that there would be 2 cost of capital for the investment? 3 Α. I would not assume it. I would tell you that there is a possibility. 4 5 Q. If a developer invests that much money in an infrastructure, there's going to be cost of 6 7 capital, wouldn't you agree? Well, if they donated the Company a 8 Α. 9 hundred thousand dollars, they want to recover that hundred thousand dollars back, would they earn a 10 return on it at the same time they're getting the 11 12 hundred thousand dollars back. There are many instances in ratemaking where the Commission allows 13 utility to recover costs incurred but no return on 14 15 it. 16 Q. Would you agree with me the Company 17 ratepayer's not paying availability fees? Yes, I agree. 18 Α. 19 Q. Would you agree with me that, since 20 the owners of the undeveloped lots are not 21 customers of the Company, they are not subject to 22 the Company's tariffs? Since they're not a customer, they're 23 Α. 24 not subject to their tariffs while they're not a 25 customer.

1	Q. Would I be correct in assuming that if
2	the Commission accepts your position on this that,
3	if the Company should come back in for rate relief
4	in a few years, you would again try to compute the
5	amount of availability fees paid by the non-
6	customers of the Company and again make that an
7	offset to rate base?
8	A. If the if the fees continue to be
9	collected, yes.
10	Q. At some point, assuming availability
11	fees paid by the non-customers reduce the rate base
12	of the Company additionally, non-customers of the
13	Company would fund all capital purchases of the
14	company, all they make toward the regulatory
15	assets. Is that conceivable?
16	A. If you look at the reconciliation in
17	this case, we believe that's already occurred for
18	Shawnee Bend Sewer. Of the Counsel's
19	recommendation as far as reconciliation rate base,
20	Shawnee Bend Sewer be set at zero because we
21	believe the Company's over collected or collected
22	an amount of availability fees far greater than
23	what they actually contributed to the utility.
24	Q. So, in essence, it's possible that the
25	non-customers would be paying through availability
1	

1 fees all the capital assets the Company might need 2 in the future for service? 3 Α. It's also possible that, if the Commission takes control of these fees, they can 4 5 seize them, also. They can end them, stop it, so that doesn't -- no longer collected. 6 7 Q. So, the answer to the question I asked 8 you is yes? 9 Α. As I've told you earlier, yes, it could happen. It has happened in our view already. 10 11 Would you agree with me that the Q. 12 Company's rate base has been reviewed and 13 determined in two previous rate cases? 14 You're referring to the CNN case and Α. 15 the 2010 case. I will tell you the CNN case were estimates pro forma numbers, and I will tell you 16 17 that the 2010 case, which was the last case, we do not agree with the outcome of it. 18 19 Q. You don't agree with it, but the rate 20 base was approved by the Commission, don't you --21 Α. They issued an order, yes. 22 Q. Would it be fair to say that your 23 proposal needs to be restructure the rate base of 24 the Company as far back as, I'll say, 19 years? 25 I will tell you that my testimony is Α.

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

		Page 335
1	trying to show the Commission that the developers	
2	contributed a certain amount of money to the	
3	operations, and since that time they've collected	
4	these fees, and the amount of fees they collected	
5	far exceed the amount of money that they	
6	contributed. So, in essence, they're collecting	
7	these fees with no cost behind it and no future	
8	costs at any time behind it.	
9	MR. COMLEY: That's all the questions	
10	I have, JudgeBushmann.	
11	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Do the Commissioners	
12	have any questions?	
13	CHAIRMAN KENNEY: I do.	
14	EXAMINATION BY CHAIRMAN KENNEY:	
15	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Robertson. Can	
16	you hear me okay?	
17	A. I can. Thank you.	
18	Q. I just want to ask you a few questions	
19	about the workshop dockets that we were discussing,	
20	SW-2011-0042 and WW-2011-0043?	
21	A. Maybe.	
22	Q. WW-2	
23	A. I hate to interrupt you, but it may	
24	slow you down a little bit here. I wasn't involved	
25	in those workshops.	

Page 336 1 Ο. That was my question. Was OPC 2 involved at all? 3 A. I don't have an answer to that. I can say I wasn't, but I'm sure Christina Baker, one of 4 5 our attorneys in our office, probably was. 6 Q. Who is actually in the hearing room 7 right now right? 8 Α. Yes, sir, she is. 9 And I can't question her because she's 0. 10 not a witness. Okay. All right. CHAIRMAN KENNEY: Well, no questions 11 12 then. Thank you. 13 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir. 14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Do you have any 15 questions? 16 COMMISSIONER STOLL: I have no 17 questions. Thank you for your testimony, though. 18 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross after 20 Commission questions. Any questions by Staff? 21 MS. MOORE: No. Thank you. 22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Lake Region? 23 MR. COMLEY: None. Thank you. 2.4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect by OPC. 25 MS. BAKER: Just a couple of

Page 337 1 questions. 2 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER: 3 You were asked by Mr. Comley about Q. whether the rate base had been reviewed in previous 4 5 cases, the certificate case and the previous rate case for Lake Region. Do you remember that? 6 7 Α. I do. 8 Q. Okay. And was it made very clear in 9 front of the Commission in that case that 10 information was not being provided regarding 11 availability fees? 12 Α. We had the same problems in the 2010 13 case that we've had in this case getting information from the Company so we can provide the 14 15 Commission with accurate information so they can base their decision on that information. We didn't 16 17 get it done, and we didn't get it here, either. And, so, your understanding that the 18 Q. Commission issued that order on the rate base and 19 20 on everything in the case with the information that 21 they had in front of it? That's correct. 22 Α. 23 Also, going to the question of the Q. 24 rate base amounts for Shawnee Bend Sewer, I believe 25 it was -- your estimations that put it at rate

1 base, that would be a negative, so it was your 2 position to set it at zero? 3 Α. That is correct. We believe they collected more fees than the developers actually 4 5 contributed in billing out the operation. But we believe that, if you try to create a negative rate 6 7 base, you would get into problems with ratemaking, 8 and, so, we just decided to recommend that the rate base for Shawnee Bend Sewer be set at zero. 9 10 And there were also some questions Q. 11 about future offsets. Would you feel that those 12 would still be appropriate in the future? I think, if the fees continue to be 13 Α. collected, the more that's collected, the greater 14 15 the excess over what the developers contribute to the utilities is going to grow. Eventually, the 16 17 only other utility would be Shawnee Bend Water that still has a rate base, in our opinion, would 18 eventually -- would actually go negative. But, in 19 20 that case for the same reason we're dealing with 21 the Shawnee Bend Sewer, we'd recommend a zero rate base there, also, if that occurred. 22 23 Q. And the amount that is collected right now would set at 10 and 25, I believe, per month 24 25 per lot?

10 and 15. Α. 1 2 10 and 15. I'm sorry. 10 and 15. **Q**. 3 That could be adjusted so that maybe the rate base 4 would not go down guite so fast? 5 Α. I'm sure, if the Commission takes the responsibility for these cost fees and whether they 6 7 should be charged or not, they could be adjusted in an amount or they could be eliminated. It would be 8 9 up to the Commission. 10 Q. And the owners of the availability 11 fees could also adjust the amount that they 12 collect? So, the way it's set up is that the 13 Α. restricted covenants would have to occur through 14 there, it's my understanding. 15 And you were asked about the numbers 16 Q. 17 that you had in to your surrebuttal testimony being estimates or whether they were verifiable 18 19 information. Can you explain a little bit again 20 about the difference that you believe between them 21 not being estimates and them being verifiable? Well, essentially, the information 22 Α. 23 except for what came out of the Brian Swearengen's 24 affidavit were the Company alleges certain amounts were collected, at least they didn't provide any 25

1	support other than what he put in there after date
2	of. We've got no support of what they actually
3	collected from the Company or the owners or the
4	shareholders. We've got his affidavit; we've got
5	affidavits from the homeowners association in the
6	prior case for the number of lots that were out
7	there; we've got the pro forma numbers that were
8	actually in the CCN case.
9	That's not not necessarily the actual
10	information. I mean, the Company has that. Only
11	the Company has that, or the shareholders has that
12	as the case may be. It used to belong to the
13	Company itself but was transferred to shareholders.
14	If it's not been transferred, the Company would
15	have had it. It's not actual information, but
16	based on what we do have and information we have
17	got from, like, Mr. Swearengen's affidavits, we
18	know the amounts are fairly close.
19	I mean, for example, like I said in his
20	affidavit, the amount that the Company collected
21	between the year 2005 and 2010 is, according to
22	what he said, the Company collected is very close
23	to what the Staff put together in the report for
24	the Commission in the last case. If you look at
25	the customer numbers that the POA provides, those

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1	numbers are not that the number of lots that
2	where a house hadn't been built or building hadn't
3	been put on connected to the systems, those
4	numbers, customer numbers are not that far off.
5	There's not that much.
6	So, if you multiply it out 300 per year per
7	customer, dollar difference, not that much. Early
8	years, the dollars are a lot smaller. So, even if
9	they're off a little bit, it's not going to be a
10	material amount. And, then, of course, the later
11	years after 2010, in the analysis I put together, I
12	relied on Mr. Swearengen's affidavit there and the
13	customer numbers that rolled forward.
14	Of course, that could be different, too, but
15	I don't see any information that would show that
16	it's the customer numbers are a lot fewer on
17	than the dollar amount would be.
18	Q. And one last question. You were asked
19	whether the undeveloped lot owners were subject to
20	the tariffs of Lake Region. Have you seen tariffs
21	that do include availability fees for undeveloped
22	lot owners?
23	A. Well, what I can think right now, I
24	don't know of any that do.
25	Q. Okay.

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

Page 342 Mr. Merciel testified on the -- for 1 Α. 2 utilities on the state they occurred with. 3 Q. Do you see any reason why an availability fee for an undeveloped lot owner 4 5 couldn't be put on to a tariff? 6 A. No. Absolutely. If Commission agrees 7 it's within their purview to for the utility, I'm sure it could be. 8 MS. BAKER: I have no further 9 questions. 10 11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, 12 Mr. Robertson. 13 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may step down. 15 (Whereupon, the Witness left the 16 witness stand.) 17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: One more issue to deal with. It's scheduled for tomorrow. Do the 18 19 parties have objection to dealing with it today and 20 trying to wrap it up? 21 (No response.) 22 MR. COMLEY: Call John Summers. 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes. Mr. Summers is our first witness. 24 25 LEGAL FEES

		Page 343
1	JUDGE BUSHMANN: You're already sworn	
2	in, sir, so you can just have a seat.	
3	MR. COMLEY: Just a brief direct, your	
4	Honor, brief direct.	
5	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes.	
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. COMLEY:	
7	Q. In connection with the offering of	
8	Mr. Summers' testimony at this hour and at this	
9	time your appearing, Mr. Summers, if I were to ask	
10	you the questions contained in Exhibits 1, 2, and	
11	3, your redirect, rebuttal, and surrebuttal	
12	testimonies that you filed in this case, subject to	
13	the revision, the modification we testified to	
14	you testified to this morning, would your answers	
15	be the same to the questions propounded in your	
16	testimony?	
17	A. Yes, they would.	
18	MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I offer	
19	Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 Lake Region Exhibits 1, 2,	
20	and 3 into evidence.	
21	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?	
22	(No response.)	
23	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Hearing none, Lake	
24	Region's Exhibits 1, 2, and 3 will be received into	
25	the record.	
Page 344 And for cross-examination, first is 1 2 Staff. 3 MS. MOORE: No questions. Thank you. JUDGE BUSHMANN: Public Counsel. 4 5 MS. BAKER: Just a couple of 6 questions. 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER: 8 Q. This issue is revolving around a case 9 called Shawnee Bend Development Company, LLC, v. Lake Region Water and Sewer; is that correct? 10 Α. That's correct. 11 12 Q. All right. There was a judgment that 13 was entered on this case in July of 2013; is that 14 correct? Yes. 15 Α. 16 Q. And the judgment that was entered was 17 in favor of the developer; is that correct? Α. Yes. 18 19 Q. And there are no similar legal actions 20 currently outstanding for Lake Region, are there? 21 Α. No, there are not. 22 Q. And are there any foreseen similar 23 legal issues in the near future for Lake Region 24 that you hope --25 I certainly hope not. Α.

Page 345 1 MS. BAKER: No further questions. 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions by 3 Commissioners. 4 (No response.) 5 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: No questions. Thank 6 you. 7 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. 8 Thank you. 9 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And redirect by Lake Region. 11 MR. COMLEY: I have no redirect for 12 Mr. Summers. 13 14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Summers, that 15 completes your testimony, sir. 16 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may step down. (Whereupon, the Witness left the 18 19 witness stand.) 20 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I'm 21 wondering, in order for there to be support for our stipulations and the issues that have settled, the 22 23 testimony of the other witnesses should probably be 24 submitted to the record at this point. 25 MS. BAKER: We're not done.

Page 346 1 MR. COMLEY: I'm sorry. Never mind. 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I suggest you save 3 that thought because we'll need to take that up soon. We still have Mr. Foster. Is he available? 4 5 MS. MOORE: Yes, he is. 6 (Whereupon, the witness, Keith Foster, 7 was administered the oath by Judge Bushmann.) JUDGE BUSHMANN: Please be seated. 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. MOORE: 9 10 If you could, would you state your Q. full name for the record? 11 12 Α. Keith Foster. 13 Q. And could you please spell it for us? 14 Α. F-o-s-t-e-r. 15 Where are you employed and in what Q. 16 capacity? 17 Α. I'm with the Missouri Public Service Commission as a Utility Regulatory Auditor IV. 18 19 Q. Are you the same Mr. Foster that 20 prepared or cause to be prepared the testimony 21 that's been marked as Exhibit No. 12 as well as portions of Exhibit No. 1? 22 23 Α. Yes, I am. 24 Q. Do you have anything you wish to 25 correct in those piece of testimony?

Α. No, I do not. 1 2 If I asked the same questions today, **Q**. would your answers be the same? 3 Α. Yes, they would. 4 5 Q. And is the information in those 6 documents true and correct, to the best of your 7 knowledge and belief? 8 Α. Yes, they are. MS. MOORE: Your Honor, Staff offers 9 Staff Exhibit 12; and, at this time, there are no 10 more witnesses, I would also offer Staff Exhibit 1 11 12 and tender the witness for cross. 13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections? 14 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, I have no 15 objection to Mr. Foster's surrebuttal testimony. I do need to register objections to the Staff report 16 17 at this time. I don't think that they have been voiced before. 18 19 The Staff report refers to availability fees on the following pages and line 20 21 numbers: Page -- small case -- 2, lines 7 through 8; page 14, lines 16 through 30; page 15, lines 1 22 through 30; page 16, lines 1 through 2. And I 23 24 object to that part of the Staff report on the grounds that I have raised unavailability fees in 25

Page 347

previous objections. 1 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Very good. SB-4, 3 then, Staff Exhibit 1 will be reserved as before to those records, subject to those objections from 4 5 Lake Region regarding availability fees, and Staff Exhibit 12 will be received into the record. 6 7 MS. MOORE: Thank you. JUDGE BUSHMANN: For cross-8 examination, first is OPC. 9 10 MS. BAKER: No questions. Thank you. 11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions by Lake 12 Region? 13 MR. COMLEY: No, your Honor. 14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Would the 15 Commissioners have any questions? 16 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: No. Thank you. 17 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No. Thank you. 18 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions. 19 Thank you. 20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And any redirect by 21 Staff. 22 MS. MOORE: No. Thank you. 23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Mr. Foster, you're fished, sir. 24 25 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

Page 348

Page 349 1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you. 2 (Whereupon, the Witness left the 3 witness stand.) 4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And our last witness, 5 Kerri Roth. 6 (Whereupon, the witness, Kerri Roth, 7 was administered the oath by Judge Bushmann.) JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may be seated. 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. BAKER: 9 10 Please state and spell your name for Q. the Court Reporter. 11 12 A. Keri Roth, R-o-t-h. 13 Q. And by whom are you employed and in 14 what position? Missouri Office of the Public Counsel 15 Α. as a Public Utility Accountant I. 16 17 Q. Are you the same Keri Roth who filed rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony in this case 18 numbered OPC 5 and OPC 6? 19 A. Yes. 20 21 Do you have any changes or corrections Q. 22 to your testimony? 23 Α. No. 24 Q. Is the testimony true and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief? 25

Page 350 A. Yes. 1 2 Q. If I ask the same questions today, 3 would your answers essentially be the same? 4 Α. Yes. 5 MS. BAKER: And, as this is the last 6 witness of the day, I would move for admission of 7 OPC 5, OPC 6, which is Roth rebuttal and Roth surrebuttal, and tender the witness for 8 cross-examination. 9 10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections to receipt of those exhibits? 11 12 (No response.) 13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Hearing none, OPC 14 Exhibits 5 and 6 are received into the record. 15 And for cross-examination, first is 16 staff. 17 MS. MOORE: No questions. 18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Lake Region. 19 MR. COMLEY: No questions. 20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any Commissioners 21 have any questions for Ms. Roth. 22 CHAIRMAN KENNEY: No. Thank you. 23 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions. 2.4 COMMISSIONER STOLL: No questions. 25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any redirect from

Page 351 1 OPC. 2 MS. BAKER: No. No. Thank you. 3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Ms. Roth. THE WITNESS: Thank you. 4 5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You're finished. 6 (Whereupon, the Witness left the 7 witness stand.) JUDGE BUSHMANN: And now I think would 8 be a good time to address Mr. Comley's suggestion 9 10 regarding exhibits. 11 MR. COMLEY: I'm sorry. 12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Parties have left -or have listed a lot of the other testimony as 13 exhibits to be received into the record; and, Mr. 14 15 Comley, from your comments, I think you think it would be wise to include that to support the 16 17 partial stipulation; is that correct? 18 MR. COMLEY: That would be my 19 proposal. We have one exhibit that we'd offer and that would be Vernon Stump's testimony, and we'd 20 21 propose to put that in on the basis of foundation of his affidavit and ask the witness to appear that 22 23 way. 24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Are there any objections? 25

Page 352 1 MS. MOORE: None. 2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Then Lake Region 3 Exhibit 4, Mr. Stump's surrebuttal will be received into the record. And as far as the remaining Staff 4 5 exhibits? 6 MS. MOORE: Yes. We'd also have the 7 same request. I believe what we have left are Staff Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10. 8 9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That's what I have, also. Any objections to the receipt of those 10 records? 11 MR. COMLEY: With respect to Staff's 12 13 report on rate design, Mr. Russo has, I think, extended the availability fee position of the Staff 14 15 into the rate design; and to the extent it does, it would be objectionable. 16 17 I have not taken the time to look at each entry on the Staff rate design to see what 18 portion would be objectionable and would ask leave 19 of the Commission to, once again, prepare a 20 21 detailed list of entries that we'd find objectionable to that. But, again, it would be on 22 23 the grounds of the objection that I voiced several 24 times today in connection with the jurisdiction of the Commission on availability fees. 25

Page 353 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I would request that 1 2 and grant that request, and also receive Exhibits 4 3 and 5 into the record subject to your objection. In regard to the other exhibits, are 4 5 there any objections to those? 6 (No response.) 7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Hearing none, then those remaining exhibits, 6, 9, and 10, are 8 received into the record. And I think that -- that 9 is all Staff's exhibits. 10 As far as Office of Public Counsel, 11 12 there was one additional exhibit. MS. BAKER: Yes. We have the rebuttal 13 testimony of Mr. Addo, and we'd offer that. 14 15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections? 16 (No response.) 17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Hearing none, OPC Exhibit 1 is received into the record. I believe 18 that's all the exhibits. 19 20 Originally, the transcript was 21 supposed to be available on February 27th, but since we're fishing so quickly, I think it would be 22 preferable if we could speed that up a little bit. 23 So, I would have the transcripts available on 24 February 25th. 25

		Page (
1	I'm also seeing that we have a true-up	
2	testimony due on March 6th, with rebuttal on March	
3	11th, and, if necessary, a true-up hearing on March	
4	18th. i haven't had any indication from the	
5	parties whether you think that's necessary or not.	
6	if you know now, you can tell me; if	
7	not, you can tell me later. If you have not had	
8	time to discuss that, that's fine.	
9	MS. MOORE: We haven't discussed it.	
10	JUDGE BUSHMANN: That's fine.	
11	I also show initial briefs are due on	
12	March 21st. Are there any other matters that need	
13	to be addressed before we adjourn here?	
14	MS. BAKER: I guess there is one	
15	issue. I did see some of the joint stipulations on	
16	agenda for tomorrow.	
17	JUDGE BUSHMANN: That's correct.	
18	MS. BAKER: There was a notice that we	
19	filed with the reconciliation stating that the	
20	attachments to the latest one had some errors in it	
21		
22	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Correct.	
23	MS. BAKER: and would be corrected	
24	later. I just wanted to make sure that was known	
25	and taken into account.	

354

		Page 355
1	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Just so you know	
2	just so you know, that was taken into account in	
3	the order. The order was given a 30-day effective	
4	date, and the parties were given until the full 30	
5	days to file your adjusted accounting schedule	
6	since you said in your somebody said in a	
7	footnote that you were anticipating in doing that	
8	by March 17th anyway, which was the date of the	
9	true-up hearing. So, this would give you enough	
10	time to then file your amended schedules and	
11	appendices before the effective date of the order.	
12	MS. BAKER: Yes.	
13	JUDGE BUSHMANN: So, that should take	
14	care of that problem, I think.	
15	MS. BAKER: That would be fine. Thank	
16	you.	
17	JUDGE BUSHMANN: And any other further	
18	matters?	
19	(No response.)	
20	JUDGE BUSHMANN: Hearing none, we're	
21	adjourned.	
22	MS. MOORE: Thank you.	
23	JUDGE BUSHMANN: We're off the record.	
24	(Whereupon, the record ended at 4:06	
25	p.m.)	

			Page 356
1	INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS		
2	Preliminary Matters	95	
3	Opening Statement by Lake Region	99	
4	Opening Statement by Staff	118	
5	Examination by Chairman Kenney	126	
6	Opening Statement by Public Counsel	128	
7	CAPITAL STRUCTURE		
8	JOHN SUMMERS		
9	Direct Examination by Mr. Comley	139	
10	MICHAEL GORMAN		
11	Direct Examination by Mr. Comley	142	
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	145	
12	Examination by Chairman Kenney	150	
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Opitz	154	
13	Redirect Examination by Mr. Comley	155	
14	SHANA ATKINSON		
15	Direct Examination by Mr. Opitz	160	
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	161	
16	Cross-Examination by Mr. Comley	163	
	Redirect Examination by Mr. Opitz	190	
17			
	TED ROBERTSON		
18			
	Direct Examination by Ms. Baker	196	
19	Cross-Examination by Mr. Opitz	198	
20	AVAILABILITY FEES		
21	JOHN SUMMERS		
22	Cross-Examination by Ms. Moore	200	
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	211	
23	Examination by Chairman Kenney	212	
	Recross-Examination by Ms. Moore	214	
24	Redirect Examination by Mr. Comley	215	
25			

Page 357

1	AFTERNOON SESSION	
2	KIMBERLY BOLIN	
3	Direct Examination by Ms. Moore	220
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	228
4	Cross-Examination by Mr. Comley	229
	Redirect Examination by Ms. Moore	257
5		
	JAMES MERCIEL, JR.	
6		
	Direct Examination by Ms. Moore	262
7	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	264
	Cross Examination by Mr. Comley	266
8	Examination by Commissioner Stoll	306
	Examination by Commissioner Hall	307
9	Redirect Examination by Ms. Moore	310
10	TED ROBERTSON	
11	Cross-Examination by Mr. Comley	321
	Examination by Chairman Kenney	335
12	Redirect Examination by Ms. Baker	337
13	LEGAL FEES	
14	JOHN SUMMERS	
15	Direct Examination by Mr. Comley	343
	Cross-Examination by Ms. Baker	344
16		
	KEITH FOSTER	
17		
	Direct Examination by Ms. Moore	346
18		
	KERI ROTH	
19		
	Direct Examination by Ms. Baker	349
20		
	Index of Proceedings	356
21		
	Index of Exhibits	358
22		
	Certificate of Court Reporter	360
23		
24		
25		

				Page 358
1	INDEX OF EXHI	вітѕ		
2		Offered	Received	
3	OPC Exhibit 1			
	Rebuttal Testimony, William			
4	Addo			
	OPC Exhibit 2	319	321	
5	Direct Tesitmony, Ted Robertson			
	OPC Exhibit 3	319	321	
6	Rebuttal Testimony, Ted			
7	Robertson	210	2.0.1	
/	OPC Exhibit 4 Surrebuttal Testimony, Ted	319	321	
8	Robertson			
0	OPC Exhibit 5	350	350	
9	Rebuttal Testimony, Keri Roth	000	000	
	OPC Exhibit 6	350	350	
10	Surrebuttal Testimony, Keri Roth			
11	Staff Exhibit No. 1	347		
	Staff Report/Revenue Requirement	/		
12	Cost of Service			
	Staff Exhibit No. 2	221	228	
13	Staff Accounting Schedules:			
	Horseshoe Bend Sewer, Shawnee			
14	Bend Sewer, Shawnee Bend Water			
1 -	Staff Exhibit No. 3	221	228	
15	Direct Testimony of Kimberly K.			
16	Bolin Staff Exhibit No. 4	352	353	
ΤO	Staff Report, Rate Design	552	202	
17	Staff Exhibit No. 5	352	353	
± ,	Direct Testimony of Jams M. Russ		000	
18	Staff Exhibit No. 6	352	353	
	Rebuttal Testimony of Arthur W.			
19	Rice, P.E.			
	Staff Exhibit No. 7	161	161	
20	Surrebuttal Testimony of Shana			
	Atkinson			
21	Staff Exhibit No. 8a	221	228	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of			
22	Kimberly K. Bolin, HC	0.0.1		
2.2	Staff Exhibit No. 8b	221	228	
23	Surrebuttal Testimony of			
24	Kimberly K. Bolin, NP Staff Exhibit No. 9	352	353	
24	Surrebuttal Testimony of	JJZ		
25	Erin M. Carle			

				Page 359
1	Staff Exhibit No. 10	352	353	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of			
2	Arthur W. Rice, P.E.			
	Staff Exhibit No. 11	263	264	
3	Surrebuttal Testimony of			
	James A. Merciel, Jr.			
4	Staff Exhibit No. 12	347	348	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of			
5	Keith D. Foster			
	Staff Exhibit No. 13			
6	Order			
	Staff Exhibit No. 14	207	207	
7	Docket Sheet			
8	Lake Region Exhibit No. 1	343	343	
	Direct Testimony, John Summers			
9	Lake Region Exhibit No. 2	343	343	
	Rebuttal Testimony, John			
10	Summers			
	Lake Region Exhibit No. 3	343	343	
11	Surrebuttal Testimony,			
	John Summers			
12	Lake Region Exhibit No. 4	351	352	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of			
13	Vernon Stump			
	Lake Region Exhibit No. 5	145	145	
14	Rebuttal Testimony of			
	Michael Gorman			
15	Lake Region Exhibit No. 6	188	188	
	Affidavit of Timothy Gervy			
16	Lake Region Exhibit No. 7	174	174	
17	Business Record Affidavit			
18	Lake Region Exhibit No. 8	190	190	
19	Reuters Corporate Spreads For Ut	ilities		
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

		Page 360
1	CERTIFICATE	
2	STATE OF MISSOURI)	
3) ss.	
4	COUNTY OF COLE)	
5	I, Pamela S. Gentry, Certified Court	
6	Reporter with the firm of Midwest Litigation	
7	Services, do hereby certify that I was personally	
8	present at the proceedings had in the	
9	above-entitled cause at the time and place set	
10	forth in the caption sheet thereof; that I then and	
11	there took down in Stenotype the proceedings had;	
12	and that the foregoing is a full, true and correct	
13	transcript of such Stenotype notes so made at such	
14	time and place.	
15	Given at my office in the City of	
16	Jefferson, County of Cole, State of Missouri.	
17		
18		
19		
20	PAMELA S. GENTRY, CCR #426	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

A	120:16 179:17	218:6 274:21	296:16	351:22 359:15
ability 116:24	192:17 193:5	292:1 317:11	administered	359:17
172:10	acquire 105:7	317:12 324:15	138:22 142:21	affidavits 328:14
able 126:22	165:3,7 181:11	325:3,17	160:3 196:15	340:5,17
145:24 162:2,7	181:22 191:15	329:11,17	219:21 262:14	affiliate 254:22
227:25 289:13	305:9	330:20 340:9	346:7 349:7	255:15,20
above-entitled	acquired 113:15	340:15	admissibility	256:17,21
360:9	165:23 271:17	add 181:7 263:11	264:11	257:3
absence 181:13	312:1	added 119:13	admission 174:2	affiliated 255:5
Absolutely	acquiring 195:6	140:8 156:25	174:17 178:13	afforded 209:9
175:14 342:6	acquisition	168:15 170:6	197:20 222:22	Aforesaid 210:12
accept 103:18	119:15,19	209:25	224:22,24	afternoon 219:13
121:4	120:2 126:14	additional 98:6	227:5 319:19	228:17,18
	152:5 154:5,10	108:14 201:2	350:6	264:25 265:1
acceptable 104:9 accepted 115:5	157:11,21	223:10 324:9	admissions	308:2,3 335:15
117:25 304:20	164:9,19,25	326:23 353:12	171:18,25	357:1
305:11	165:9 168:16	additionally	172:25 174:10	agenda 97:18
	168:19 179:16	105:17 333:12	176:7 190:22	354:16
accepts 333:2	179:23 181:12	additions 140:5	admit 98:14	aggregate 100:13
access 129:3	181:22 182:12	141:2	173:11 174:3	ago 107:24 201:6
133:24 134:13	182:18 184:23	Addo 353:14	176:23	301:24
316:3 325:24	184:25 190:25	358:4	admitted 97:13	agree 126:3
329:19 330:21	191:2,9,15,23	address 102:11	176:10,15	131:15 149:8
accommodations	191:2,9,13,25	120:19 223:11	223:5,9 225:3	149:14,17
209:9	193:16 194:16	237:14 256:14	Admittedly	163:11 180:11
account 163:15	194:21 195:2	321:22 351:9	133:20	184:6 201:4
213:9 233:1	acreage 185:1	addressed	admitting 125:12	202:24 203:2,4
276:1 354:25	across-the-board	239:12 279:19	204:15 216:14	202:24 203:2,4
355:2	309:11	302:23 354:13	216:15	206:13,15,20
Accountant	act 123:14	addresses 139:2	adopt 106:16	206:22 209:24
196:22 349:16	action 137:22	addressing	adopted 112:2	210:19 213:22
accounting 99:4	170:17	107:16 276:13	114:8,24 247:8	227:1 229:3,7
99:7 176:12	actions 137:4	adequate 135:21	248:3 278:11	244:23 245:4
220:13,20	138:6 149:9,15	236:15,21	advice 281:4	246:5,6 265:2
221:21 222:2	149:18,20	301:23	advise 96:13	265:12,13,16
223:22,24	163:12,16	adjourn 354:13	advocating	265:17,22
227:9,17,22	305:22 344:19	adjourned	118:13 151:3	270:9 276:11
275:2,21 355:5	active 279:5	355:21	affect 149:10,15	300:9,11
358:13	actual 104:22	adjust 339:11	163:12 172:10	301:13,22
accounts 101:15	133:25 134:17	adjusted 339:3,7	240:23	302:10 304:22
177:22 233:5	134:21 135:14	355:5	affidavit 166:11	302:10 304.22
275:19	140:9 145:24	adjustment	166:12 187:21	329:12 332:7
accurate 152:8	146:4 147:8	133:16 231:24	188:10 243:24	332:16,18,19
153:12 193:14	150:24 151:5	232:11,12,22	244:7,12	334:11,18,19
197:13 252:19	150.24 151.5	232:11,12,22	329:25 330:3	agreed 103:6
325:20 330:18	151:23 152:1	adjustments	339:24 340:4	120:3 128:17
337:15 349:24	151.25 152.1	223:23 227:18	340:20 341:12	120.3 128.17 129:24 148:12
accurately 114:2	130.20 102.2,0	223.23 221.10	J+0.20 J+1.12	129.24 140.12
	-	-	-	-

162:25 163:3	Allowing 125:2	335:4,5 338:23	178:24 186:8	appearing 96:1,9
	allows 332:13	· ·	217:8,13,17	343:9
179:9,11		339:8,11 340:20 341:10	, ,	
192:19 240:13	Altera 164:20 165:25 171:12		223:13 235:7	appears 202:4,5
260:6 276:6		341:17	239:16 242:4	205:24,25
agreeing 192:16	178:23 183:13	amounts 120:17	258:24 263:9	appellate 121:19
agreement	187:22 192:5	185:7,11	268:9,22 269:6	appendices 97:6
110:25 126:21	alteration 114:12	210:12 218:13	269:15 270:17	355:11
131:16 144:22	Altera's 186:22	317:16,16,21	271:11,19,21	applicable
150:7 165:23	alters 240:20	324:17 330:1	277:3 289:6,13	100:15 115:17
170:14,21	amend 284:22	337:24 339:24	305:2,7,15,15	131:25 284:13
171:3,14	amended 97:23	340:18	305:23 323:5	application
174:14,24	112:15 211:3	Amy 94:13 96:2	328:3 329:8	93:13 95:9
185:23 186:21	355:10	analysis 105:6	334:7 336:3	103:11 104:17
187:12,16	Amendmended	106:3 152:8,22	answered 178:13	104:18 202:8
188:8 190:24	112:13	153:3 156:1,18	190:13,23	215:20 222:4
191:20,22	amendment	158:23 164:6	312:18	applications
192:2,8,13	112:12 118:2,9	168:3 185:24	answering	285:20,22
193:4,12 215:5	118:11 284:21	198:10,17	171:24 279:3	299:8
217:21 229:4	284:22	227:1,24	281:7	applied 104:14
237:8,24 238:4	amendments	251:19,22	answers 143:17	129:15 133:9
239:9 240:22	285:19	276:23 280:4	161:2 197:16	248:9
300:3,5	Ameren 147:21	289:7,13	221:6 263:14	applies 106:3
agreements	147:25 148:8	299:18 300:19	268:7 343:14	158:10 318:2
114:13 116:2	amortized 122:3	324:16 326:22	347:3 350:3	apply 120:12
130:2 165:24	amortizing 104:6	329:14,22	anticipate 235:4	146:7,13
173:18 187:3	amount 103:23	330:17 331:8	anticipated	162:11 227:20
agrees 122:5	114:1 117:18	331:22 341:11	316:5	255:8 257:2
125:24 209:4	130:13 131:2,4	analyze 150:7	anticipating	320:12,20
322:11 342:6	133:14,15,25	analyzed 159:3	355:7	approach 105:19
ahead 107:19	134:2,17	168:6	anybody 96:13	114:8,15,23
143:22 181:6	149:10,15	and/or 113:7	98:5	120:18 201:4
197:20 216:5	158:24 159:3,5	133:23 134:11	anyway 192:25	201:23 205:19
219:4 284:3	163:12 168:19	176:25 210:11	355:8	297:9
319:18	169:2,15,20	anew 128:5	apart 214:5	appropriate 98:1
aid 129:16	170:5,10 181:4	announced	apologies 101:21	106:9 156:5
133:10 321:25	181:15,18	143:22	apologize 200:14	206:4 282:10
331:17	182:2,3 183:2,3	annual 100:13	227:14	338:12
alias 255:13	194:18 211:16	251:20 252:10	appeal 102:4,4	appropriately
aligned 123:15	211:20,21	252:14,22,24	103:19,25	120:4 123:5
allegation 224:8	224:1 237:6	253:14 289:17	104:3 121:19	approval 104:15
allegations	238:7,10,12	289:20 290:7	appealed 121:17	117:11 167:21
223:13	240:10,10,15	290:10 328:16	appear 286:21	181:13 182:14
alleged 102:18	252:17 265:4,8	329:13,21	351:22	312:20 314:3
alleges 339:24	267:20 296:23	330:6,12,15	appearance	approve 167:25
allocated 314:12	306:22 308:16	answer 127:6	95:16,20	approved 104:19
allow 124:17	317:18 318:6,7	148:25 173:10	APPEARANC	104:20 105:10
allowed 104:4	333:5,22 335:2	174:6 177:4,18	94:1	112:22 114:6
		l	I	I

	•	•	•	•
115:8,18	arrive 105:11	117:13 119:23	238:18 333:1	auditors 273:4
117:10 124:24	277:4	126:14,16,17	333:10	314:8
157:13,15	arriving 150:7	126:24 127:10	astonishing	August 99:24
164:14 167:17	Arthur 358:18	152:21 153:5,6	115:7	100:17 261:25
168:4,7,17	359:2	153:7,9 168:11	Atkinson 120:14	authenticated
181:7 183:8	Article 118:4,4	170:18 173:18	127:2 159:24	222:25 227:4
246:16 275:10	aside 254:8 258:3	176:12,17,21	160:1,3,6,8,15	authentication
277:5 280:22	258:11 267:11	177:1,4,9,23	160:20 161:10	222:20 224:17
297:10 298:24	asked 157:9	178:4,20,23	161:25 163:25	author 230:21
299:11,13	190:21 192:14	179:2,4 185:14	166:9 171:24	authorized
300:16 303:5	194:2 195:20	186:15 187:4,7	172:14 188:4	106:23 135:17
334:20	197:15 203:14	187:10 188:17	190:21 196:6	137:11 180:16
approximate	203:21 212:8	191:18,24	356:14 358:20	210:8
170:10	214:20 218:5	192:9,11,11	Atkinson's	Authorizing
approximately	218:11 248:20	194:9 195:6,12	156:12 157:3	202:11
100:14 101:2,3	257:20,22	253:7 290:5	attached 97:6	automatically
101:5,10,12	258:19 260:1	300:2 312:2,6	98:9,19 141:17	131:11 228:24
103:3 106:11	260:18 261:4	333:15 334:1	175:1,3,6	availability
129:17,21	263:13 269:8	assign 124:18	attachment	102:7,11
130:17,21	310:10 312:13	assigned 113:10	222:19 224:14	106:20 107:2
133:3,6 146:2	313:4 317:14	123:4 125:13	225:12,22	107:25 108:8
288:2	318:12 329:15	233:18 303:8	226:4 227:6	108:12 109:4
approximation	334:7 337:3	309:2	228:7	109:12 110:3,8
134:10	339:16 341:18	assignees 116:18	attachments	110:11,18,21
approximations	347:2	assignment	354:20	110:22 111:2,5
134:13	asking 125:5,9	107:4 273:22	attempt 150:17	111:9,10,11,12
April 97:18	125:11,14	274:1,8,16,21	214:25	111:15,23
274:22	158:12 239:14	303:1,10 309:7	attempts 124:6	112:3,5,7,8,9
area 101:4,6	260:20 272:7	assignments	attend 280:10,15	112:19,23
112:10 113:11	281:9 282:25	110:9 115:25	280:16 303:15	113:3,8,9,18,20
122:18 201:6	283:11 322:8	273:24	attended 280:14	113:25 114:2
202:14,15	asks 174:3	assigns 208:4	attention 172:15	114:23 115:1
203:5,16	aspects 277:24	209:17,19,24	173:5 323:5	115:15 116:4,6
220:22,24	assert 111:15	217:21	Attorney 94:2	116:10,16
221:1 237:1	125:1 129:6	Assistant 94:7	attorneys 336:5	117:2,4,21
248:7,8,10,12	237:11 270:4	associate 256:21	attract 135:21	118:12,25
248:13 250:2	asserted 103:4	associated	attribute 152:15	122:9,13,17,25
266:18 275:4	223:19 270:2	132:15 265:9	attributed 183:2	123:16 124:3,7
315:4,23,25	asserting 226:6	284:4	183:3	124:14,21
areas 220:23	assertion 126:19	Associates 143:6	audience 96:13	125:2,6,18,25
236:16,21	assessing 113:1	association	audit 101:15	128:18,24
248:5,14,17	173:23 174:12	256:20 340:5	178:8 277:9	129:7,13,14,18
argued 122:16	assessment	assume 332:1,3	314:6	129:22,25
arguments	146:24 152:20	assumed 114:9	auditor 160:13	130:6,11,14,18
122:12,23	asset 128:1	assumes 137:23	177:21 220:9	130:22 131:2,5
arrangement	152:18	assuming 175:21	275:24 295:18	131:8,9,18
104:16	assets 114:11	175:24 237:16	346:18	132:8,12,16,19
	1	1	I	I

122.22 122.4.0	260.2.25.261.6	201.0 5 200.0	275.0 12 276.5	125.11 152.10
132:23 133:4,9	260:3,25 261:6	321:2,5 322:6	275:8,12 276:5	135:11 152:19
133:14 134:2,6	261:14 264:3	322:12,16,20	276:17 284:23	152:20 153:7
134:10 136:24	264:11 265:14	323:3,13,14,24	287:2 296:1,7	153:10 162:21
140:10 199:16	265:18,23	324:2,17	302:13 310:18	balances 125:19
199:18 200:25	266:9,24	325:12,17	315:14 317:11	146:15 162:17
201:2,7,8,11	267:14,16	326:5,13	318:10 319:11	balancing 123:14
203:1,8 205:17	268:8,10,12,22	328:10 332:17	326:16 328:2	Bam 274:11
208:2 209:8,11	269:5,14 270:2	333:5,10,22,25	332:10,12	bank 119:25
210:20 211:17	270:5,15,19,25	337:11 339:10	333:3 334:24	127:7,14,18
211:20 213:7	271:9,15	341:21 342:4	background	128:5,5 158:10
213:20 214:7	273:14 274:11	347:20 348:5	279:2	158:13 164:20
214:22 217:7,9	275:2,6 276:13	352:14,25	backwards 307:5	164:22,24
217:16,18,22	277:18 278:3	356:20	Baker 94:7 96:7	165:25 171:12
218:3,7,9,13,15	279:9,10,23	available 109:23	96:8 98:8,18,24	178:23 183:13
219:18 222:3	280:11,17,23	133:23 153:13	128:15 138:11	186:22,23,23
223:17 224:2,7	284:15 285:16	175:22 184:23	142:2 144:19	187:22 191:17
224:9 227:13	286:21 287:10	209:14 210:12	145:10,21,22	191:21 192:5,5
227:20 228:6	288:7,17,19	247:16 288:17	149:22 155:1,6	195:5 213:9
228:20,23	289:2,17 290:6	329:9,18 330:7	161:18,23,24	banking 158:19
229:8 230:10	291:16,20	346:4 353:21	163:21 174:20	base 100:12
230:23 232:8	292:8,11 293:2	353:24	175:1,8,12,19	109:6 114:5,6
233:4,11	293:6 294:24	avoid 104:1,8	175:21,25	117:17 129:15
234:15,19,20	295:9,12	111:17 235:2	188:23,24	132:16,23
235:9,10,24	296:19 297:1,3	245:5,9	190:5 195:20	133:9,11,15,16
236:16,23	297:5,17,24	aware 146:6	196:17 197:19	133:17,18
237:4,5,23	298:12,24	147:13,24	199:9 204:17	134:7 158:25
238:6,12,22	299:4,10,17	148:12,17	207:4 211:13	159:5,7 162:5,7
240:7,16,19,21	300:3,10 301:7	162:24 163:3,7	211:15,24	169:5,7 170:10
240:24 241:6,9	301:11 302:10	228:23 286:25	215:10 216:24	185:8,12,17
241:13 242:5	303:1,7 304:4	286:25 308:14	228:15,16	201:4 322:7,9
243:7,8 244:2,3	304:16,21,25	311:11 313:1	229:12 248:20	322:14,16
244:16,24,25	305:9,16 306:5	324:1	264:23,24	333:7,11,19
245:16 246:1	306:22 308:6,9	A-t-k-i-n-s-o-n	266:1 283:21	334:12,20,23
246:21 247:22	308:23 309:2	160:9	310:1 319:17	337:4,16,19,24
247:25 248:3,6	309:13 310:11	a.m 92:18 95:1	336:4,25 337:2	338:1,7,9,18,22
248:9,15,16,18	310:15 311:9	159:19,21	342:9 344:5,7	339:3
249:13 250:2	311:18,22	219:12	345:1,25	based 102:25
250:15,22	312:15,16		348:10 349:9	117:9 119:10
251:4,5,8,9,15	313:5,14,17	B	350:5 351:2	120:24 129:20
251:18 252:15	314:2,18,24	B 99:5,11 147:3,7	353:13 354:14	133:22 134:20
252:17 253:7	315:18,19	156:6,22 157:2	354:18,23	146:24 147:1,4
253:16,19	316:11,15,19	157:6 221:22	355:12,15	147:7 148:23
254:22,25	317:1,14,17,18	358:1	356:11,15,18	151:9 153:20
255:2,14,17,23	317:19 318:3,4	back 125:10,12	356:22 357:3,7	156:7 157:3,6
255:25,25	318:13,15,18	195:20 205:10	357:12,15,19	158:14 191:2
256:4,5 257:21	319:13 320:1	208:1 213:24	Baker's 323:6	198:17 214:16
258:13 259:23	320:11,19	219:6,16 252:3	balance 123:12	223:24 225:18

235:17 253:5	239:2 240:6	211:22 220:22	307:9	booked 233:10
306:23 315:6	248:1,19 253:4	220:24,25,25	billed 129:18	275:19
320:10,18	255:7,19 257:2	232:9,10 248:2	134:11 182:22	books 101:15
321:4 329:9,18	257:19,23	248:7,8,10,12	256:13 305:19	104:21,23
330:21 340:16	258:24 259:3	248:15,17,22	billing 250:21	180:23 233:1
basically 170:16	260:1,17,23	248:24 253:2,3	251:6,10	275:20 276:1
253:25 286:6	261:24 263:8	253:10,16,18	289:10 338:5	298:2,14
301:21 304:8	271:16 273:1	265:3,7 285:13	bills 256:12,15	borne 136:22
309:19 315:16	280:15 287:1,2	285:14,18	binding 131:10	borrow 187:24
basing 287:24	289:19 290:13	286:1,2,5,5,22	243:10	217:12
basis 122:2	290:14 307:5	287:3,4 295:2,7	bit 121:12 156:16	borrowed 169:21
134:25 156:21	310:9 317:13	295:10 312:2,5	171:16 172:9	borrowers
174:13 192:20	317:14 319:24	315:5 322:6,13	172:12 185:20	183:24
193:2 212:19	327:17 329:10	324:18 327:17	192:24 254:20	bottom 140:18
228:21 250:12	330:22 333:17	333:18,20	275:4 309:19	186:11 314:17
264:10 276:14	333:21 337:24	337:24 338:9	318:7 335:24	323:1
280:12,18,23	338:3,6,24	338:17,21	339:19 341:9	bought 213:4
296:17 297:20	339:20 352:7	344:9 358:13	353:23	312:11
314:19 319:24	353:18	358:14,14	Bluefield 135:21	Box 94:3,8,14
327:6 351:21	believed 102:24	benefit 132:19	boat 316:3	96:3,8
beg 115:23	238:10 240:10	137:21 258:25	Bolin 219:19,21	Boyd 268:4
began 130:2	272:24 273:1	259:10 267:17	220:4,6,11	breach 102:17
beginning 202:7	327:21	293:11 311:5	225:17 226:2	break 159:16
209:1 310:8	believes 120:5,6	326:19	226:19 239:14	219:5 319:5
behalf 95:22 96:1	120:8 125:17	benefited 123:7	239:15 241:19	breakdown
96:9 105:21	162:13 178:22	benefits 123:16	245:23 253:25	252:25
137:1 154:19	235:7 237:11	benefitted	257:19 260:18	Brian 328:14
190:23	243:7	132:24	262:7 295:7	339:23
belief 161:6	belong 123:25	benefitting 123:8	357:2 358:15	brief 205:9 343:3
197:13 221:10	240:7 340:12	best 124:22 126:4	358:22,23	343:4
244:15 254:8	belongs 276:4	131:17 139:5	Bolin's 221:13,22	briefly 121:13
263:18 347:7	305:4,21	161:5 197:13	221:23,25	briefs 354:11
349:25	bench 142:4,13	221:9 229:4	222:3 227:16	bring 95:3,4
believe 96:20	149:24 153:21	235:2 263:17	264:14	133:17
98:10 115:20	190:11 199:2	277:3 347:6	bond 106:4	broad-based
122:13 130:5	212:1 214:17	349:25	146:25,25	135:2
140:7 148:16	bend 101:4,6	better 153:11	147:2,4,7,10,16	broad-brushed
154:12,17	102:15,16,20	180:22,24	156:2,4,5,8,14	135:2
183:25 187:5	103:2,17	317:4	156:14,22	broken 330:13
203:23 204:11	112:10 113:10	beyond 107:5	157:2,7 189:13	brought 191:20
207:14 209:15	114:16,25	117:22 130:12	189:23	230:9 302:21
209:21 213:13	130:16,21	130:19,23	bonding 147:1	Brown 243:24
214:22 225:24	132:25 133:2	133:5,7 260:16	bonds 147:5,14	Brubaker 143:5
226:4 227:3	133:13,19	287:22	147:15 156:18	build 288:11
229:2,10 230:1	137:17 201:22	bifocals 200:15	156:20 189:6	316:1,1 331:14
231:8 232:24	202:15 203:5	bill 132:14	book 233:4,10	building 316:4
236:5 238:2,25	203:15 211:22	217:22 275:17	289:16	341:2
	l		I	I

<u> </u>		_	-	_
built 242:7 288:9	215:9,11 216:5	business 106:6	calls 159:25	196:2 206:6
291:16,20	216:20,25	111:6 150:6,14	182:6 239:12	259:8 261:2
292:3,13 341:2	218:20,23	150:25 151:9	Camden 102:5	301:7 331:3,7
Bush 140:12	219:1,9,16,22	153:14 166:10	103:5 222:18	331:15,20,24
Bushman 224:13	219:23 221:17	182:21 225:20	256:13	332:2,7 333:13
262:15	221:21 224:4	315:11,18	cap 128:18	334:1 356:7
Bushmann 93:17	224:16 225:6	359:17	134:18,20,21	capitalization
95:3,12,19,23	225:21 226:5	button 96:17	134:24 135:14	157:22
96:5,11 98:16	226:11,24	142:9	135:22 145:23	caption 202:6
98:19 99:3,10	227:11 228:1	buy 315:25 316:2	145:25 146:1,5	360:10
99:13,17	228:12 229:13	316:4	146:8 147:8	capture 313:18
100:22 101:19	230:1 239:23	bypass 316:19	150:8,13,18	313:23
101:22 118:15	257:7,15	B-o-l-i-n 220:6	157:22 158:20	captures 314:17
128:9,11	260:22 262:7		159:23 171:20	care 99:19 304:1
138:11,19,22	262:11,16	<u> </u>	174:13 179:9	355:14
138:23,24	263:23 264:13	C 95:2 99:5,11	179:16,17	Carle 358:25
139:3,11	264:19 266:3	356:1 360:1,1	180:18 184:21	case 93:13 97:3
140:13 141:10	282:18,22,25	CAIC 201:3,7	184:22 191:1	97:11,16 99:17
141:12,19,22	283:11,15,24	calculate 145:24	195:25 197:9	99:25 100:2,2
142:1,3,6,10,12	290:25 291:2	146:19 162:2,8	243:10 265:14	102:8 104:4,13
142:22,23	293:19 294:1	169:2 224:2	307:21	104:20 107:21
143:24 144:5	294:13,17	calculated 114:3	capable 259:14	107:22 108:4,6
144:13,17,21	295:20,23	114:4 121:7	capacity 101:8	108:10,23
145:6,11,15,19	306:12 309:24	133:14 146:1	160:11 184:13	109:6 116:17
149:23 150:1	310:2,4 318:24	168:22,24	184:18 220:8	117:24 118:23
153:20,23	319:4,11,20	252:1	262:25 346:16	120:2,6 121:10
154:24 155:2	321:3,7,14	calculating	capital 102:6,13	121:11,13,14
159:11,15,22	335:11 336:14	120:24 198:14	104:12 105:2	123:13 125:10
160:4 161:15	336:19,22,24	calculation	105:16,24	125:15 126:2
161:19 163:22	342:11,14,17	119:21 122:14	106:7,12,14,17	127:19 128:16
166:6 174:19	342:23 343:1,5	124:3 137:19	117:8 119:4,8	132:22 134:5
174:21 175:12	343:21,23	138:9 146:3	119:12,21	135:15 136:6,8
175:15 176:2,4	344:4 345:2,10	169:10 237:18 290:16 308:21	120:12,18	136:10,12
182:10 188:21	345:14,17	309:20	121:1,5,8	137:13,21
188:23,25	346:2,7,8	calculations	138:15,18	138:4 139:20
190:3,6,10,18	347:13 348:2,8	120:10 251:25	144:23 150:24	140:9 143:8,10
196:6,12,16	348:11,14,20	290:9 292:10	151:5,12,13,15	147:22,25
197:22 198:5	348:23 349:1,4	calendar 129:17	151:21,23	148:5,14,19,21
198:24 199:1,8	349:7,8 350:10	call 142:18	152:1,13	148:24 149:2,5
199:10,14,19	350:13,18,20	205:12 266:8	155:13,16,20	149:6,7 151:3
199:22 200:1	350:25 351:3,5	278:25 315:7	155:24,25	154:16,18
201:25 204:14	351:8,12,24	316:24 342:22	156:9 158:3,9	155:7,8,10
204:18,21	352:2,9 353:1,7	called 195:2	158:20,21	156:24 157:4
205:1,6,20	353:15,17	231:7 312:12	162:3,8,11,16	157:13,15,24
207:2,6,20	354:10,17,22	313:22 344:9	173:24 191:3	157:24 158:25
211:11,25 214:13,16	355:1,13,17,20 355:23	calling 313:10	192:16,19,21 193:4,5,8,15,21	163:1,5,9 164:6 164:14,17
214.13,10	555.45	g = 10.10	175.4,5,0,15,21	104.14,17

1				
168:5,8,17	274:6,25 276:9	270:12,13,14	210:8 235:19	147:2 148:23
169:16,22	276:18 277:2	278:18 280:17	268:23 287:1	charge 107:1
173:21 174:10	281:16,23	282:2,7,9,15	287:10 297:11	111:10 209:8
179:10,12,13	282:1,14,17	283:2,3,8,13	297:15,19,23	260:14 267:17
179:23,25	285:2,4 286:11	288:11 293:13	298:16 300:17	267:19 268:10
180:13,17,22	287:1,11,17,18	296:6,11	314:22 315:1	268:12 288:5
181:1 192:18	287:25 290:2	297:20 301:12	316:17,23	307:8,8 308:6
192:20,21	290:14,18	309:15 334:13	317:5,7 337:5	309:13
193:4,12,17,19	291:7,17,23	337:5	357:22	charged 108:1
194:4 197:1	292:10 293:1,3	case-by-case	certification	109:4 116:4
198:18,21	293:5,9,25	279:23 280:11	253:6 272:21	122:17 123:5
201:10,18,21	294:15,17,19	280:18,23	Certified 360:5	250:15 268:8
202:2 203:5,6,9	294:21,25	314:7,19	certify 360:7	269:19 285:17
203:12,15,16	295:3,6,10,25	case-to-case	cetera 122:22	317:19 339:7
203:18,23,24	297:11,15,23	277:9	Chairman 93:19	charges 112:21
203:25 204:1,4	298:1,3,4,7,16	cash 135:6	126:6,8,12	129:20 210:12
204:7,10 206:2	300:2,16,17,24	136:18,25	142:7,8 149:25	287:10 299:5
206:15 207:9	302:13,15	163:17	150:1,2,4	308:23
208:15 213:23	303:6 308:25	Cathy 267:24	153:17 190:12	charging 269:10
214:2,6 215:16	309:7,8,9,11	cause 139:19	199:3 207:5,12	311:17
215:20,22	314:23 315:4	143:8 346:20	207:15,19	check 186:25
216:9,11,18	315:13 316:17	360:9	212:4 214:10	217:4,4
218:2,3 222:4	316:21,23	caused 160:16	257:9 306:15	checked 289:9
222:18 223:2,4	317:6,6,7,9	220:12 263:5	306:18 335:13	chemicals 122:1
223:6,7,12	318:21,21	caveat 175:25	335:14 336:11	Chief 94:12
225:2,3,10	320:1 321:7,9	CCN 246:7,12,25	345:5 348:16	196:22
226:25 227:7	321:23 324:1,8	340:8	350:22 356:5	choose 311:19
228:4,13	326:14,16,21	CCR 93:24	356:12,23	chose 181:24
232:13,23	326:25 327:11	360:20	357:11	292:7
237:16,20	327:13,14,17	CD 327:12	challenging	Christina 94:7
238:9 239:21	328:4,6 329:2	cell 96:14	103:25	96:7 336:4
240:21,22	333:17 334:14	Central 209:3	chance 198:3	Circuit 102:5
242:23,24,25	334:15,15,17	210:4	change 149:4	222:21 223:5,6
243:12,15	334:17 337:5,6	certain 100:23	171:14 180:3,5	226:20
244:13 246:7,8	337:9,13,13,20	107:9 119:5	197:9 206:17	circumstance
246:12,22,24	338:20 340:6,8	131:4 172:5	212:14 296:2	241:8
246:25,25	340:12,24	205:3 207:22	309:11	circumstances
250:24 251:1,3	343:12 344:8	252:12 267:19	changed 108:9	131:17 229:5
251:4,14	344:13 347:21	335:2 339:24	109:14 141:20	238:8 241:1,17
253:17 261:17	349:18	certainly 115:9	167:11 179:22	city 92:9 93:9
261:20,22,23	cases 114:7	134:16 265:21	194:13 232:14	94:4,9,15 95:21
261:24 264:12	128:25 135:21	273:16 286:3	232:18	96:3,8 315:24
264:13,16	136:14 238:21	289:11 299:13	changes 143:12	360:15
268:5,23 270:4	239:21 244:16	344:25	197:3 349:21	claimed 102:17
270:7,10,20,23	246:5 253:6	certificate	changing 131:23	243:6
270:23 271:2,5	266:10,19,20	201:18 202:10	248:23 296:13	claiming 129:9
271:15 272:22	266:22 270:11	203:11 204:1,3	characteristics	clarification
	I	I	I	1

227:8 228:9	collected 113:21	314:20	283:5,14 284:6	121:4 122:24
clarify 194:17	116:5 129:18	coming 139:4	284:10 290:25	123:10,11
204:21	129:23 130:4	198:16 281:8	291:5 293:10	124:2,5,16,24
classified 120:5	130:11,14,18	315:3 325:8	293:21,25	124:25 125:6
176:12,17	130:22 131:3,5	Comley 94:2,2	294:4,10,20	125:10,14,24
clear 138:25	133:4,7,14,25	95:18,20,20	295:24 306:9	126:1 128:16
141:13 164:20	134:3,11,14	99:15,16,23	310:3,9 319:22	128:19,21
227:10 255:21	211:17,20	101:22 118:16	321:6,16,17	129:5,10,12
268:23 273:16	213:8 214:21	119:6 121:12	335:9 336:23	129.5,10,12
337:8	213.8 214.21 218:14 233:11	122:11 126:16	337:3 342:22	134:6,8 137:4
clearly 116:17	237:7 252:12	129:9 138:24	343:3,6,18	137:15,20
309:2	252:18 253:1,7	129.9 138.24	345:12,20	141:5 143:1
Clerk 222:21	252:18 255:1,7	140:11,15,17	346:1 347:14	154:16,19
clock 247:6	265:15 289:3	140.11,13,17	348:13 350:19	158:6 160:13
close 206:14	296:16 305:19	141:21 142:18	351:11,15,18	167:17,21,24
219:1 329:23	322:6,12	142:24 143:19	352:12 356:9	167.17,21,24
330:4 340:18	324:17 326:18	142.24 143.19	356:11,13,16	181:7,14
340:22	330:3,25	144.2,8 145.1,5 145:13 155:3,4	356:24 357:4,7	181.7,14
closed 205:16	331:11 333:9	159:9 161:17	357:11,15	201:10 210:10
206:18,21	333:21,21	163:23 166:4,9	comleym@ncr	210:18,22
closely 108:6	334:6 335:3,4	166:25 167:3	94:5	210:13,22
144:9	338:4,14,14,23	172:8,14	Comley's 351:9	216:21,25
CNN 327:5	339:25 340:3	174:16,23	Commencing	217:10 220:10
334:14,15	340:20,22	175:3,6,10,14	209:10	223:8 224:8
Coincidentally	collecting 101:13	175:17,23	commend 97:1	225:4 242:25
312:7	213:20 255:22	176:6 182:7,11	commensurate	243:5 246:13
Cole 360:4,16	335:6	187:24 188:1,3	135:25	246:17 252:11
collateral 170:18	collection 107:2	188:19 189:2	comments	252:15 263:2
173:19 177:10	111:6,8 129:25	190:1,8,21	351:15	266:9,17 270:1
178:22 191:25	218:7,9,14	191:20 192:14	commercial	270:4,9,24
192:9,12	237:5 247:11	192:23 193:18	165:23 187:3	271:5,8,25
collateralization	250:22 251:6	194:2 197:24	Commission	272:14 275:11
188:16	251:10,18	198:25 199:23	92:2 93:2 94:14	276:9,10,20
collateralize	252:5 321:24	199:24 215:13	94:17 95:7,24	278:12 282:6
181:16	combination	215:14 216:3,6	96:2 97:9,10,20	282:12 283:1,1
collateralized	281:24	216:13 217:3	98:12 99:24,24	283:9,25 284:2
168:11 182:22	combine 144:23	218:18 221:19	100:1,5,18	286:6 293:14
collateralizing	combined 144:6	221:24 222:15	104:14 106:16	297:10 298:23
182:4,15	159:23 172:24	224:12,15,19	107:6,23 108:7	299:9,19
collect 110:10	194:20 281:17	225:25 226:12	108:22 109:12	301:11 305:3,5
111:11 117:19	come 98:20	226:13 227:14	110:25 111:14	309:9,25
117:19 213:24	138:20 198:10	229:14,17,21	111:19,20,24	312:14,23
213:24 233:9	219:6 289:10	230:3 239:14	112:22 113:18	314:3 315:1
255:16,25	298:23 299:18	239:17 257:5	114:6,9,14	321:22 324:16
275:17 299:3	315:5 333:3	260:15 263:24	115:8 117:6,11	325:25 329:5
305:10,25	comes 122:12	266:5,6 282:5	117:11 118:14	329:17 330:20
339:12	273:6 298:8	282:21,24	118:21 120:12	332:13 333:2

336:20 337:9	256:24 257:1	169:3 171:15	315:17 316:6	333:21 334:12
337:15,19	277:23 288:25	172:24 178:21	317:10 318:3	compare 314:4
339:5,9 340:24	299:14,21,22	179:18 181:2,9	318:11,15,21	317:19
342:6 346:18	302:2 308:8,11	181:11,17,20	324:25 325:21	compared 159:4
352:20,25	308:12,14,15	181:23 182:13	326:19 327:22	300:14
Commissioner	308:16,18,19	182:25 183:8	327:23 329:6	comparison
101:20 157:9	311:11,19	185:2 186:1	329:11,16	211:19 317:22
165:19 190:16	312:22 313:1	191:8,16 192:8	330:3,18	324:19 331:10
199:5 212:2	317:22,24	193:14 194:4	331:12,23	331:11
214:14,15	318:1 324:19	194:11 195:7	332:8,16,21	comparisons
257:11,13	327:4,20	198:20 201:18	333:3,6,12,13	134:11
295:20,21	330:24	202:9 212:20	333:14 334:1	compel 304:25
306:19 307:24	company 94:6	213:2,3 217:20	334:24 337:14	compensation
308:1 309:22	95:17 101:15	217:22 230:22	339:24 340:3	118:7
317:13 318:12	102:3,7,16,24	231:3,7 233:4	340:10,11,13	complain 108:19
336:16 345:7	103:1,4,17,20	236:22 238:14	340:14,20,22	complaint
348:17,18	103:24 104:3,9	238:15,20,22	344:9	267:23 302:25
350:23,24	104:24 105:7,8	238:24 239:5,7	company's 93:13	303:4,22
357:8,8	105:10,12,12	239:10 241:4,6	95:9 102:6,12	complaints
Commissioners	105:18,21	241:12,15	103:11,13	303:25
93:21 222:13	106:6 107:8	245:25 246:20	104:22 105:14	complete 152:7
257:7 306:13	108:11,12,19	246:23 247:12	105:25 106:17	152:23 153:3
335:11 345:3	108:21,24,25	255:16 257:24	106:21 107:11	completely 129:8
348:15 350:20	112:6,22 113:2	261:6 269:2,4	107:16 109:7	286:4 330:18
Commission's	113:4 114:17	269:10 270:15	111:18 112:6,9	331:6
115:24 117:22	114:20 115:18	271:4,9 272:25	112:18,21	completes 345:15
122:19 124:13	117:8,10,17,18	273:2,13	113:23 115:1,6	completion 130:3
124:15 128:22	118:8 119:6	274:16 275:12	117:16,21	complex 313:18
128:25 137:7	120:2,13 122:5	275:23 276:4	118:1 120:6	complicated
158:8 216:16	122:15,15,23	277:9,16 278:9	121:1,4 124:6	314:15
217:4 276:19	123:14,17,19	287:18 288:23	126:14,15,17	complied 108:24
312:20 322:5	124:4 125:2,7	289:1,3,16	134:21 135:24	component
commission-au	125:20 126:3	290:3,9 292:7	136:7 137:8	184:22
136:4	127:14,24	292:18 293:3	146:4 147:8	comprehensive
commodity 129:4	136:8 137:17	294:23 295:5	150:24 151:5	101:14 251:21
267:19 288:5	147:12,14	296:2,15,19	151:12,14,20	comprised 101:7
common 105:4	148:1,8,10,24	297:10,19	180:18 217:18	101:11 253:8
184:21 185:4	149:5,7,9,14,17	298:1,14,15	233:1 236:14	Comprising
255:18 256:4	149:19,21	299:15 301:21	236:20 246:16	202:14
256:21,22	151:8,18 152:2	301:21,22	249:25 250:1	compute 125:11
companies	152:6,9,12,13	302:6,9 303:15	252:10 270:19	158:24 159:1
120:17 124:21	152:14,16,18	304:1,11,22	281:23 284:14	162:19 333:4
155:19,23	152:23 153:1,4	306:4 308:24	301:25 304:15	computed 162:4
156:10,19	156:2 157:20	308:25 309:8	306:1 311:16	computer 314:13
195:23,25	157:22 159:4	309:14 310:24	316:9 324:13	325:23
202:13 250:11	163:11 165:3,7	311:21 312:4,6	324:14 325:10	computers
255:6,10	168:15,23	312:7 314:1	325:11 332:22	325:22
			•	1

concede 267:6	connected	consolidated	265:23 333:8	314:16
conceivable	144:10 249:2	282:2,16	338:13	copies 165:23
333:15	253:1 288:16	constitute 224:23	continued 298:2	204:24 216:7
conceivably	341:3	255:14 284:2	continues 136:5	293:11
283:6	connecting 132:4	Constitution	137:12	Coplar 241:21
concept 137:23	132:6	118:3,10	continuing 180:7	Copler 241:23
concern 123:23	connection 106:5	Construct	209:13	242:1
321:24	139:7 165:21	202:11	contract 102:17	copy 98:8 166:22
concerned 106:1	166:20 182:21	constructed	102:25 103:7	167:5 170:24
123:22 180:18	188:15 189:3	102:21 130:9	121:15 233:25	174:20,23
concerning	216:11 218:1	209:6 292:14	contracts 103:15	175:11 187:18
105:21 218:7,8	299:5 302:25	constructing	contractual	187:23 189:10
236:12 270:24	307:22 343:7	249:22	116:18,22	189:18 200:7
conclude 239:8	352:24	construction	117:4 240:23	201:14 202:2
concludes 106:7	connections	115:16 129:16	contractually	204:9 205:22
129:6 196:7	109:18,23	130:2,4,13	213:13 240:20	208:11,15,23
218:21	connects 288:12	132:25 133:10	contrary 124:12	209:15 230:13
concluding 117:6	consented 270:15	201:3 321:25	233:14	234:21 291:7
conclusion	consequence	331:18	contribute	copy's 208:20
119:11	298:16	contacted 212:21	338:15	core 304:8
conclusions	consider 119:12	277:16	contributed	corporate 147:5
103:18 124:12	184:21 185:3	contain 236:8	132:15 292:18	274:12 359:19
condition 107:18	293:8 296:8	contained 212:11	296:20,22	correct 98:17,18
155:9 259:15	329:22,23	223:13 254:11	298:2,14,15	99:12 128:3,7
conditionally	331:16	343:10	331:12 333:23	140:2,7 147:14
107:17	consideration	contains 131:7	335:2,6 338:5	147:17,19,22
conditions 180:3	105:15 119:4	contend 303:6	contribution	148:8,11,16
180:8 210:15	123:1 191:12	contended 102:8	201:3	160:23 161:5
Conferences	279:10 305:5	103:2	contributions	164:21 165:1
122:10	considered	contending	129:15 133:10	165:12,25
confident 149:19	117:23 120:2	256:16	321:25 322:1	166:22 167:9
confidential	122:14 173:13	content 225:17	325:7 331:17	167:13,17,18
110:24 232:20	173:22 174:11	contention	control 111:7	168:5,12,18
235:1 237:2	277:18 279:15	119:18 226:25	117:14,20	169:24 170:11
317:17	279:17 296:8	302:11	179:2 191:18	172:25 174:14
confirm 105:22	310:11,15,21	contested 108:4	195:5,6,12,14	176:13 177:1,7
108:23 178:8	311:5 331:2	270:23 271:2	202:12 254:15	177:11 179:5
202:3 205:23	considering	context 108:4	306:5 325:4,10	179:21 180:9
254:24 274:3	283:24 304:10	281:8 286:14	325:11 334:4	186:24 187:7,8
324:23	considers 105:11	294:25 295:2	controversial	187:12,14
confirmed	252:4	310:19	302:22	188:10 189:24
254:23	consistent 103:13	contiguous	controversy	200:20 201:5
confiscatory	103:14 150:25	250:12	270:18 300:6	204:7 207:18
•	151:7,8	continue 113:7	convenience	208:5,6 209:20
135:18		100 0 101 10	202 10 210 0	200 21 211 67
connect 131:15	consisting 105:3	123:8 131:18	202:10 210:9	209:21 211:6,7
	consisting 105:3 consolidate	123:8 131:18 210:3 229:8,10	202:10 210:9 235:20 315:1	209:21 211:6,7 214:3,23 215:1

017.02 019.4	245:22 259:2	211:21 243:18	218.14 225.20	144.15 145.17
217:23 218:4			218:14 225:20	144:15 145:17
220:19 221:9	268:13 269:20	247:12 254:3,6	284:18 341:10	153:20 154:22
224:11,12	285:25 322:3	259:8 328:1,12	341:14	161:14,21
225:23 227:11	324:21,22	328:13,16	court 99:8 102:5	163:22 197:23
228:21,22	329:24	329:1,3,9,10	103:12 110:23	198:24 200:1
229:2 231:9	corresponding	332:14 335:8	121:11,16,19	221:16 228:14
232:16,25	118:3 136:1	counsel 94:7,8,11	135:20 172:6	229:13 260:16
234:6,11	corresponds	94:12,13 95:15	187:19 196:19	263:22 264:21
235:25 237:9	226:2	96:6,10,16,21	205:4 207:23	321:12 347:12
242:9 243:13	cost 97:5 101:16	104:10 107:10	223:5,6,8	348:8 357:7
244:10,13,21	109:5 113:23	108:11,18	226:21 237:19	crossings 102:19
244:22 245:3	114:11 120:16	113:16 115:20	240:5,21,22	cross-examinat
246:22 247:25	121:21,22,24	118:13 122:13	349:11 357:22	141:9,23
248:1 250:3,5	121:25 122:3	128:13,14,20	360:5	144:24 145:14
250:25 252:2,7	123:24 124:1	133:21,21	courts 128:21	145:15,19,22
252:13,21	130:15,19,23	142:1 144:18	court's 103:18	154:1 161:24
253:4,17,18	133:5 134:14	145:20 154:25	covenants 109:20	163:23 189:17
254:3,13,18	155:20,22	155:6 161:22	109:24 110:5	197:21 198:6
255:2,3,6,7,11	156:6 160:18	174:22 196:23	112:14 208:2,7	200:4 211:11
256:12 263:11	161:12 164:3,3	211:12 215:9	208:9,12	211:15 228:13
263:17 266:25	179:17 193:15	218:5,11	209:16 211:4,5	228:16 229:21
268:25 269:11	220:15 221:15	228:14 230:14	235:23 236:1,4	264:24 266:3,6
269:12,21	223:23 224:1	239:22 260:17	236:6,8 243:12	266:23 319:15
272:8,18	227:19 229:23	264:22 280:6	243:14 245:2	321:17 344:1,7
278:10 286:9	232:12 243:3	309:25 321:9	248:23 271:21	350:9,15
288:20 289:4	246:21 247:14	328:6 344:4	272:2,15,19	356:11,12,15
293:24 296:3,4	247:15 248:4	349:15 353:11	275:9 284:12	356:16,19,22
296:20 298:17	248:17 249:21	356:6	284:15 286:22	356:22 357:3,4
298:25 303:3	249:24 250:21	Counsel's 115:5	307:1 339:14	357:7,11,15
304:6 316:20	251:6,7,8	117:25 321:23	cover 144:24	cross-examined
316:21 323:16	254:20 265:10	333:18	185:19 220:21	139:10
323:21 328:24	265:11 270:16	Counsel/Water	220:21 248:17	cumbersome
333:1 337:22	289:8 297:19	94:13	305:13	279:25 283:18
338:3 344:10	297:21 305:13	Count 102:5	covered 166:10	284:8
344:11,14,17	322:2 331:2,7	counter 169:7	188:9 236:16	current 132:14
346:25 347:6	331:13,15,15	counterclaim	236:22 296:25	136:4 137:11
351:17 354:17	331:20,24	223:13	311:8	140:24 147:10
354:22 360:12	332:2,6 335:7	counties 324:5	create 184:17	167:8 168:19
corrected 354:23	339:6 358:12	county 103:5	338:6	169:14 170:3
correction 99:1	costlier 115:12	222:19 256:13	created 205:15	194:18 201:2
corrections	costs 104:2	323:18 360:4	213:23	213:4 234:7
140:5 141:3	109:25 114:18	360:16	creates 119:22	247:21 258:25
143:12 197:3	114:21 115:13	couple 96:12	creation 278:17	259:6,22 318:5
221:2,4 349:21	121:10,13,17	150:6 211:13	credibility 182:9	currently 119:9
correctly 173:25	123:25 131:2	336:25 344:5	criteria 106:4,10	138:6 214:24
217:15 235:7	137:22,25	course 158:23	cross 141:25	220:21 238:16
235:14,15	155:25 156:9	178:8 182:14	142:13 144:10	239:16 344:20
	l		I	l

www.midwestlitigation.com

customer 100:12	355:11	decide 116:3	195:5	described 119:15
135:13 162:22	dates 100:17	126:1	defend 121:11	217:2 280:5
234:8,10,11,14	day 101:8 350:6	decided 111:14	defending 121:18	315:17
248:24 250:12	days 100:20	181:15 182:19	defense 284:9	describes 153:8
259:11 267:16	355:5	201:10 338:8	defer 139:9 141:7	describing
288:5,12,13	deal 137:1	decides 131:22	define 257:2	231:23
307:8 310:19	194:23 228:3	132:3	328:12	description
332:23,25	318:19 342:18	decision 108:2	defined 129:4	187:6
340:25 341:4,7	dealing 319:12	112:25 113:6	definitely 127:20	design 290:18
341:13,16	338:20 342:19	125:4 136:17	definition 129:5	291:12,21
customers 101:2	dealt 318:19	136:19 137:4	255:19 256:25	292:5 293:2,4
101:3,5 111:12	debated 287:15	140:23 151:16	definitive 111:21	352:13,15,18
112:18 115:2	debt 104:15,16	158:2 183:23	305:14	358:16
115:10 116:9	104:21,22,25	185:24 190:25	degree 329:6	designed 100:10
122:20 123:7	105:3,11,15,24	191:2,13	deliberate 108:7	100:13 125:22
123:12,15	106:11,15	192:20 201:5	deliberated	254:2 305:12
125:20 126:3	116:15 119:10	249:7 279:7,9	107:24	designees 208:4
132:2,14,17,18	120:5,11,13	280:22 283:10	delineate 111:21	209:17,19,25
132:23 133:12	121:2 134:22	316:18,22	delivered 247:10	desires 244:4
137:3,21	134:24 146:2,8	337:16	delivery 115:2	despite 124:12
146:16 162:18	151:7,14 153:9	decisions 119:1	demand 103:2	303:6
234:2,5,7 246:3	159:3,6 164:24	135:20 137:7	155:18,20,21	detail 107:12
247:21 250:5,7	164:25 168:14	266:18 280:3	demonstrate	detailed 100:24
250:18 251:11	168:18,23,23	314:9	173:14	352:21
259:1,6,21,22	168:25 169:2	declaration	demonstrates	determination
288:10,14	169:10 170:10	112:13 131:6	151:20	118:23 126:24
292:1 302:1	171:6,8 173:12	131:10,13	denial 178:12,14	128:20 146:15
303:23 304:2	173:13,20,22	211:3 229:1	178:19	151:25 158:8
332:21 333:6	173:22 174:11	265:15	denied 177:11	162:17 272:4
customer's	174:11 180:23	declarations	deny 173:11	determine
256:15	181:2,4,7,9,19	285:19	174:3 176:23	125:14 126:23
	182:13,24	decreased 136:14	department	127:17 152:8
$\frac{\mathbf{D}}{\mathbf{D} 0 5 0 2 5 5 1 1}$	183:14 184:12	decreases 232:9	194:23	178:3 241:1
D 95:2 356:1,1	184:18 185:7	decreed 111:21	departs 106:8	272:16 331:4
358:1 359:5	185:11,14,16	deduct 276:12	departure	determined
damages 102:18	185:25 186:9	deducted 183:4	124:15,16	128:22 129:10
DANIEL 93:20	193:23,25	237:6	depend 304:20	162:20 243:1
data 108:11	194:10,13	deed 106:23	depending 137:7	306:23 334:13
109:1 218:6,8	195:25 196:1	112:11 113:1	316:14	determining
252:20 297:18	debts 173:8,9	115:17 116:2	depends 306:3,7	111:18 119:12
317:8 323:7	174:3,6 192:17	deep 101:7	306:8 325:5	171:4 190:24
324:15 325:3,5	debt/25 146:8	default 119:24	depreciation	226:20 244:7
325:6,17	162:11	127:7 128:4	309:3	331:3
329:13 330:20 data 100:7 21	deceased 241:23	131:8 178:24	Deputy 94:13	develop 130:19
date 100:7,21	December	191:17 195:2	derives 112:7	158:2 205:15
125:12 298:8	177:13 238:17	195:10,11,18	describe 217:15	234:19 327:22
340:1 355:4,8	261:18 303:16	defaulted 127:13	260:10	developed 132:5
		I	1	

132:10 135:19	149:20 153:15	322:19 323:5	311:8	document 112:12
147:6 163:18	155:24 156:4	343:3,4,6 346:9	discussions	126:22 140:16
247:4 329:20	209:7 217:20	349:9 356:9,11	303:14	166:7,10,17
developer 109:16	253:24 254:17	356:15,18	disposal 111:1	172:5 175:16
110:10,14,24	265:3,6,19	357:3,6,15,17	209:3,5 210:5	175:20,22
111:1 113:11	344:9	357:19 358:5	210:11	188:2 200:13
116:1,4,5,19,23	development-g	358:15,17	disputed 110:22	202:21 205:3
116:24 121:16	155:18	359:8	distance 296:8	206:11 207:2,7
121:17,20	devices 96:15	directed 171:20	distant 308:13	207:8,22
134:12,15	diametrically	215:15 276:12	distinct 116:17	208:19 210:25
137:20 213:15	126:18	323:6	distinguish	211:2,6 224:18
213:22 214:6	differ 169:25	direction 276:15	253:13	226:7,9 227:2
215:1 217:21	difference	directive 111:25	distracting 123:2	230:17 231:20
237:7,17,21,22	195:17 261:5	directly 119:17	distributed	233:22,24
238:3,5 239:6	269:25 317:5,7	123:20 267:17	157:19	243:16 271:24
240:12,17	339:20 341:7	277:21 281:2	distribution	274:20,21
241:21 243:6	different 129:2	directs 322:11	111:8 209:12	286:2 291:3
243:17,25	134:17 179:12	disagree 301:4,5	241:20 249:22	documentation
244:1 245:19	194:11 257:20	disagreed 103:1	District 103:19	133:22 169:14
250:2 253:22	267:9,21 283:4	disagrees 122:15	256:14,17	170:4 194:17
254:5,9,16	285:20,21	disburse 213:12	324:18	documents 127:3
258:3 265:8	286:1,4 309:18	disbursed 169:15	diversions 123:2	127:4 165:24
273:5,17	313:22 325:16	disbursement	divert 124:6	166:12 216:10
292:17 298:23	330:4 341:14	170:2	dividing 102:1	216:10,22
299:9,24	difficult 120:16	discharge 247:11	dock 316:3	221:9 225:19
313:20 325:8	208:21	disclaimer 267:2	docket 205:11,12	243:9 263:16
331:13,16	difficulty 248:21	disconnect	205:18,22,23	273:8 275:9
332:5 344:17	313:13	151:11	206:3,9,14,18	276:5 279:4
developers 215:4	digress 117:5	disconnected	206:21,22	283:12 284:23
299:3 324:20	diminish 186:22	105:14	207:9,10,16	285:7,9,13
335:1 338:4,15	direct 129:2	discover 177:23	212:8,10,16,18	286:7,13 347:6
developer's	139:12,25	discovery 108:24	212:21,22,24	doing 125:3
103:1 107:1,3	141:3 142:24	122:10 182:17	276:8 277:22	144:5 235:4
111:3 214:2	149:7,20	183:1 326:1,4,7	277:25 278:16	292:9 297:14
237:12 239:8	157:13 160:5	discrepancy	278:25,25	302:4 355:7
243:2 244:6,12	169:12 170:6	169:18	279:6,8,11,16	dollar 265:4,8
development	172:12,15	discuss 192:16	279:17 281:2,5	267:20 341:7
102:16,17,21	173:5 194:14	224:7 354:8	281:12,19,22	341:17
102:22 103:2,9	196:17,25	discussed 119:7	282:3,7,8,10,13	dollars 252:25
105:1,25	199:22,25	123:9 138:15	282:15 283:3	330:5 332:9,10
109:19,19	220:1,14	288:10 303:13	283:18 284:1,4	332:12 341:8
110:7 116:13	221:20,22,25	327:15 354:9	303:11 313:9	donated 134:12
130:6,15 131:2	222:5 231:13	discussing	359:7	134:15 332:8
132:1,8 133:15	232:15 250:24	203:11 335:19	dockets 205:14	DR 323:21
134:12 136:1	251:1,14	discussion	205:16 278:24	drafted 278:8
137:17,24	262:17 319:23	121:18 194:10	281:17 282:12	drew 104:19
147:12 149:18	320:3 321:18	223:17 310:9	303:12 335:19	driven 136:20
	I	I	I	I

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		_	-	_	_
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	drop 279:8,9	elaborate 258:12	104:15 217:20	135:19 136:5,7	133:3 251:23
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	—	259:4 310:14	238:4	136:13,17	297:21 315:6,6
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	103:3,23	313:14 314:23	entered 99:25	137:8,11 144:1	315:15,16
	111:16 118:1,3	electric 255:8	100:19 103:8	,	· · · · ·
		256:24 257:1	103:15,17	146:20 147:6	estimates 130:13
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		electronic 96:14	· ·	147:11,18,21	134:7,9 328:9
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		elements 254:10	222:14 233:3	· · ·	· ·
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	E			, ,	· · ·
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	E 95:2,2 356:1,1	eliminated 137:1	344:16	,	
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	356:1 358:1,1	339:8	enterprise 136:1	· · · · ·	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	360:1,1	ELMO 172:9		, ,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	earlier 107:20	email 175:7	148:8 169:10	162:11,13,25	estimations
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	165:20 190:12	employ 179:17			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	194:12 239:13	1 v			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	264:1 294:3	- ·			
early 245:21262:24 263:1112:24 180:19198:11,14,20evaluated 153:11330:11 341:7346:15 349:13entirety 286:8,13Erin 358:25evaluatingaarn 116:12aspont 25:10employeesentitled 112:10essence 152:18event 178:24assiz 77:725:17 256:22116:12311:3 333:24event 178:24event 178:24easier 277:725:17 256:22116:12311:3 333:24event 178:24event 178:24easier 277:725:17 256:22125:21,22essential 109:15338:16,19everybody180:8 183:23endors 158:2125:21,22essential 109:15338:16,19everybody180:8 183:23endors 158:6223:22,25150:12 157:20293:11economy 136:10endors 158:6223:22,25150:12 157:20293:11effect 119:24enforce 13:2224:3 227:15197:16 212:12evidence 107:19125:9 138:2275:14352:21339:22 350:3117:7 120:1178:25 186:14enforceableentry 95:19establishe1 148:21124:8 129:1318:14 195:1,9110:4227:19,21148:22130:10,25195:18 296:10enforced 297:6352:18establishe1 54:6133:1,12 134:9296:13 298:20enforceableentry -by-entry239:18 246:6134:16,19,22efficiency 99:8efficiency 99:8316:8equat 106:10establishing138:3 143:23efficiency 99:8asfi-25equate 106:10establishing138:3 143:23efficiency 99	334:9	·			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	early 245:21		e		
earn 116:12 332:10employee 187:22 employeesentities 323:4 entitled 112:10errors 354:20 essence 152:18122:25 194:23 event 178:24assier 277:7 easier 277:7255:17 256:22 255:17 256:22entitled 112:10311:3 333:24 event 178:24event 178:24 eventuallyassier 277:7 easier 277:7255:17 256:22 255:17 256:22entitled 112:10311:3 333:24 event 178:24eventually eventuallyassier 277:7 easier 277:7255:17 256:22 255:17 256:22entitled 112:10338:16.19 everybodyassier 277:7 easier 277:7255:17 256:22 255:17 256:22entitled 112:10338:16.19 everybody180:81 83:23 economy 136:10 effect 119:24 178:25 186:14 188:14 195:1,9endorse 158:6 25:14223:22,25 25:15103:10 127:18 everyone's178:25 186:14 188:14 195:1,9enforceable enforceableentry 95:19 275:14establish 148:21 277:19,21124:8 129:13 2130:10,25100:16,21 298:13 298:20 effect 194:24enforcead 297:6 engaed 101:14 engineer 263:3 216:1235:24established 154:6 establishing133:1,12 134:9 235:24100:16,21 298:8 355:3,11 effect 194:24266:13 287:25 equat 106:10 equat 106:11 establishing136	330:11 341:7			, ,	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	earn 116:12		•		0
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	332:10				
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	easier 277:7				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	easy 126:24				e e
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	economic 155:10		v		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	180:8 183:23	0	,		<i>,</i>
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	185:6,10,15	-			e e
economy 136:10 effect 119:24 125:9 138:2 125:9 138:2 195:18 296:10 296:13 298:20 effective 100:7 effects 194:24 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 effort 158:6 266:13 287:25 effort 158:6 effort 158:6 266:13 287:25 effort 158:14 effort 16:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 242:1 254:11 243:12:12,18 134:22,25 effort 134:22,25 effort 134:22,25150:12 157:20 150:12 157:20 150:12 157:20 150:12 157:20 243:12:12:16 147:6,9 243:12:12:16 120:14,16,23 	249:7 306:1			e e	
effect 119:24 125:9 138:2enforce 113:2 275:14 $224:3 227:15$ $352:21$ $197:16 212:12$ $339:22 350:3$ evidence 107:19 $117:7 120:1$ 178:25 186:14 188:14 195:1,9enforceable $110:4$ entry 95:19 $227:19,21$ $astablish 148:21$ $148:22$ $124:8 129:13$ $130:10,25$ 195:18 296:10 296:13 298:20enforced 297:6 enforcement enforcement $astablished 154:6$ $227:24$ $133:1,12 134:9$ $239:18 246:6$ effective 100:7 100:16,21 298:8 355:3,11 effects 194:24 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 $266:13 287:25$ $environmental$ $266:13 287:25$ $235:24$ $equate 106:10$ $equate 106:10$ $equate 106:10$ $equate 106:10$ $equate 106:10$ $equate 106:10$ $equate 106:10$ $equate 106:10$ $equate 106:10$ $establishing$ $138:2 143:24$ $188:20 190:2$ $236:13 287:25$ $216:14 225:19$ 109:6 176:22 $242:1 254:11$ $242:1 254:11$ $242:1 254:11$ $242:1 254:11$ $293:20 313:17$ $135:24$ $106:18 119:5$ $121:2,6 128:19$ $134:22,25$ $157:6 159:2,7$ $297:21 327:5$ $264:2,11 283:7$ $343:20$	economy 136:10				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	effect 119:24		· ·		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	125:9 138:2				
188:14 195:1,9 195:18 296:10 296:13 298:20110:4 enforced 297:6 enforcement227:19,21 352:18 entry-by-entry 239:18 246:6130:10,25 133:1,12 134:9effective 100:7 100:16,21 298:8 355:3,11 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effect 158:6 either 98:20 109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 201:4 202:14 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15110:4 entry-by-entry 227:24 environmental environmental 115:12 equal 119:13 equal 119:13 equat 106:10 equitable 114:14 182:23 183:2,4 183:24130:10,25 133:1,12 134:9 133:1,12 134:9 135:7,11 136:3 135:7,11 136:3 135:7,11 136:3 135:24100:16,21 298:8 355:3,11 effects 194:24 efficiency 99:8 either 98:20 109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15110:4 266:13 287:25 314:21 315:14 engineers 288:1 104:13,23148:22 equitable 114:14 182:23 183:2,4 298:23 299:9 216:14 225:19 298:23 299:9109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15engineers 288:1 304:5 ensued 112:1 106:18 119:5 106:18 119:5120:16 147:6,9 153:11,12 252:6 254:10 297:21 327:5 343:20242:1 254:11 293:20 313:17ensued 112:1 135:24120:14,16,23 134:22,25157:6 159:2,7 264:2,11 283:7	178:25 186:14				
195:18 296:10 296:13 298:20enforced 297:6 enforcement352:18 established 154:6established 154:6 239:18 246:6133:1,12 134:9 134:16,19,22effective 100:7 100:16,21 298:8 355:3,11111:8 245:1 engaged 101:14 engineer 263:3 316:8227:24 environmental 115:12 equal 119:13establishes 239:18 246:6133:1,12 134:9 134:16,19,22effects 194:24 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 effort 158:6 266:13 287:25a16:8 equate 106:10 equitable 114:14estate 109:19 estate 109:19138:3 143:23 145:4 156:12effort 158:6 effort 158:6 effort 158:6 201:4 202:14 201:4 202:14a16:8 engineers 288:1 and:5equate 106:10 equitable 114:14 104:13,23estate 109:19 estate 109:19157:12 161:10 157:12 161:10109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17a04:5 ensure 132:12,18 135:24106:18 119:5 121:2,6 128:19 297:21 327:5120:16 147:6,9 233:14 244:11 207:21 327:5 343:20293:20 313:17135:24134:22,25estimated 129:16Evidentiary 92:7	188:14 195:1,9				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	195:18 296:10		-		·
effective 100:7 100:16,21 298:8 355:3,11 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effects 194:24 effect 158:6 effect 158:6 engineering 266:13 287:25 alt:21 315:14 engineers 288:1 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17111:8 245:1 227:24 engineer 263:3 a16:8 engineering equate 106:10 equitable 114:14 equity 102:6,13 105:1,24establishes 235:24 establishing 130:5135:7,11 136:3 136:6 137:6 138:3 143:23 145:4 156:12 157:12 161:10 157:12 161:10 182:23 183:2,4 298:23 299:9 216:14 225:19 226:22,23 216:14 225:19 233:14 244:11 226:22,23 233:14 244:11 226:22,23 233:14 244:11 226:22,23 233:14 244:11 226:22,23 233:14 244:11 226:22,23 242:1 254:11 293:20 313:17111:8 245:1 ensure 132:12,18 135:24227:24 227:24 environmental equate 106:10 equitable 114:14 182:23 183:2,4 297:21 327:5 estimated 129:16135:7,11 136:3 135:7,11 136:3 135:24	296:13 298:20		· -		-
100:16,21 298:8 355:3,11 effects 194:24 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15engaged 101:14 engineer 263:3 316:8 engineering 266:13 287:25 314:21 315:14 engineers 288:1 enancement 304:5environmental 115:12 equal 119:13 equate 106:10 equitable 114:14 equity 102:6,13 105:1,24235:24 establishing 130:5136:6 137:6 138:3 143:23 145:4 156:12 157:12 161:10109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15engineers 288:1 substancement 304:5no4:13,23 105:1,24estimate 114:1 226:22,23136:6 137:6 138:3 143:23 145:4 156:12201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15engineers 288:1 304:5n04:13,23 106:18 119:5estimate 114:1 120:16 147:6,9226:22,23 233:14 244:11 252:6 254:10203:20 313:17ensure 132:12,18 135:24120:14,16,23 134:22,25157:6 159:2,7 297:21 327:5264:2,11 283:7 343:20	effective 100:7				· · ·
298:8 355:3,11 effects 194:24 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11engineer 263:3 316:8 266:13 287:25 314:21 315:14 engineers 288:1 105:1,24115:12 equal 119:13 equate 106:10 equitable 114:14 equity 102:6,13 105:1,24establishing 130:5 estate 109:19138:3 143:23 145:4 156:12 157:12 161:10 182:23 183:2,4 298:23 299:9109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11304:5 ensure 132:12,18 135:24105:1,24 106:18 119:5120:16 147:6,9 153:11,12233:14 244:11 252:6 254:10 297:21 327:5203:20 313:17135:24121:2,6 128:19 134:22,25297:21 327:5 estimated 129:16343:20	100:16,21				,
effects 194:24 efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6 either 98:20316:8 engineering 266:13 287:25 314:21 315:14equal 119:13 equate 106:10 equitable 114:14130:5 estate 109:19145:4 156:12 157:12 161:10109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15314:21 315:14 engineers 288:1equity 102:6,13 105:1,24130:5 estate 109:19145:4 156:12 157:12 161:10204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17add:5 ensure 132:12,18105:1,24 120:14,16,23120:16 147:6,9 153:11,12233:14 244:11 252:6 254:10203:20 313:17135:24120:14,16,23 135:24157:6 159:2,7 297:21 327:5264:2,11 283:7 343:20	298:8 355:3,11	00			
efficiency 99:8 effort 158:6engineering 266:13 287:25equate 106:10 equitable 114:14estate 109:19157:12 161:10either 98:20314:21 315:14equity 102:6,13298:23 299:9216:14 225:19109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14314:21 315:14equity 102:6,13298:23 299:9216:14 225:19201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15enhancement 304:5105:1,24120:16 147:6,9233:14 244:11204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11304:5106:18 119:5153:11,12252:6 254:10274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17ensure 132:12,18121:2,6 128:19297:21 327:5343:20293:20 313:17135:24134:22,25estimated 129:16Evidentiary 92:7	effects 194:24	8		6	
effort 158:6266:13 287:25equitable 114:14182:23 183:2,4188:20 190:2either 98:20314:21 315:14equity 102:6,13298:23 299:9216:14 225:19109:6 176:22angineers 288:1104:13,23estimate 114:1226:22,23201:4 202:14anhancement105:1,24120:16 147:6,9233:14 244:11204:10 231:15304:5106:18 119:5153:11,12252:6 254:10242:1 254:11ansued 112:1120:14,16,23157:6 159:2,7264:2,11 283:7293:20 313:17135:24134:22,25estimated 129:16Evidentiary 92:7	efficiency 99:8		-		
either 98:20314:21 315:14equity 102:6,13298:23 299:9216:14 225:19109:6 176:22engineers 288:1104:13,23estimate 114:1226:22,23201:4 202:14enhancement105:1,24120:16 147:6,9233:14 244:11204:10 231:15304:5106:18 119:5153:11,12252:6 254:10242:1 254:11304:5120:14,16,23157:6 159:2,7264:2,11 283:7274:12 286:11ensure 132:12,18121:2,6 128:19297:21 327:5343:20293:20 313:17135:24134:22,25estimated 129:16Evidentiary 92:7	·	0 0	-		
109:6 176:22 201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15engineers 288:1 enhancement104:13,23 105:1,24estimate 114:1 120:16 147:6,9226:22,23 233:14 244:11204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17304:5 ensure 132:12,18106:18 119:5 120:14,16,23153:11,12 157:6 159:2,7 297:21 327:5226:22,23 233:14 244:11 252:6 254:10293:20 313:17insure 132:12,18 135:24121:2,6 128:19 134:22,25297:21 327:5 estimated 129:16343:20 Evidentiary 92:7	either 98:20		-	,	
201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 293:20 313:17engineers 260:17 105:1,24101:10,25 105:1,24connect 11:17 120:16 147:6,9 153:11,12220:22,25201:4 202:14 204:10 231:15autors 200:17 autors 200:17105:1,24 106:18 119:5120:16 147:6,9 153:11,12233:14 244:11 252:6 254:10242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17autors 200:17 autors 200:17106:18 119:5 120:14,16,23153:11,12 157:6 159:2,7252:6 254:10 264:2,11 283:7293:20 313:17autors 132:12,18 135:24121:2,6 128:19 134:22,25297:21 327:5 estimated 129:16343:20	109:6 176:22		1 v		
204:10 231:15 242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17304:5 ensued 112:1 ensure 132:12,18106:18 119:5 120:14,16,23 121:2,6 128:19153:11,12 157:6 159:2,7 297:21 327:5252:6 254:10 264:2,11 283:7 343:20293:20 313:17135:24106:18 119:5 120:14,16,23 134:22,25153:11,12 157:6 159:2,7 297:21 327:5252:6 254:10 264:2,11 283:7 343:20293:20 313:17135:24134:22,25estimated 129:16Evidentiary 92:7		-	,		· · · · ·
242:1 254:11 274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17ensued 112:1 ensure 132:12,18120:14,16,23 121:2,6 128:19157:6 159:2,7 297:21 327:5264:2,11 283:7 343:20293:20 313:17135:24121:2,6 128:19 134:22,25estimated 129:16Evidentiary 92:7	204:10 231:15			,	
274:12 286:11 293:20 313:17ensure 132:12,18 135:24121:2,6 128:19 134:22,25297:21 327:5 estimated 129:16343:20 Evidentiary 92:7	242:1 254:11			, i	
293:20 313:17 135:24 134:22,25 estimated 129:16 Evidentiary 92:7	274:12 286:11			,	,
133.21 131.22,23 estimated 129.10 Evidential y 92.7			,		
-33774 [enter 98:13] 135:4.6 [0,17]] 130:17.70] 93:7.95:8	337:17	enter 98:13	135:4,6,10,17	130:17,20	93:7 95:8
			10011,0,10,17		

ex 271:4 309:10	125:23 267:23	348:3,6 351:19	146:12	facilities 235:12
exact 293:20	269:22	352:3 353:12		fact 97:6 108:14
			expert 120:14	
318:6	exchanging 268:7	353:18 358:3,4	127:2 182:8	109:11 122:15
exactly 126:16		358:5,7,8,9,11	225:17,19,20	123:3 131:6
224:19 273:6	excluded 227:2	358:12,14,16	226:17,20,21	133:16 151:21
274:15,19	exclusion 251:15	358:17,18,19	239:16 266:8	192:19 198:19
282:3 284:24	exclusive 100:15	358:21,22,24	266:12 267:13	224:7 288:22
297:9 313:23	excuse 109:11	359:1,2,4,5,6,8	expertise 275:4	303:6 310:22
313:23 328:21	165:17 176:9	359:9,10,12,13	explain 191:5	313:21 325:2
examination	187:19 193:3	359:15,16,18	192:4 194:12	factor 155:10
126:12 139:12	230:3 245:18	exhibits 97:13,15	207:7 331:5	157:23 190:24
142:24 150:2	272:12,12	97:17 98:5,6	339:19	331:7
155:4 160:5	322:21,21	99:14 139:24	explanation	factors 191:1,6,7
177:21 189:3	executed 170:13	140:6 161:5	226:15 242:21	facts 96:25
190:20 196:17	exhibit 98:13	216:15 220:14	244:8 258:7	100:23,25
200:2 212:4	99:2 140:7,9,19	221:14,18,19	explicit 158:2	109:9,14,15
215:14 219:3	140:19,24	228:4 284:8	exploring 239:19	111:13 123:3
220:1 235:5	141:17 143:9	319:21 321:9	expound 193:8	124:8 208:15
257:18 262:17	145:2,3,7,12	324:8 343:10	expressed 236:3	241:1 243:1,21
306:19 308:1	160:17,18,19	343:19,19,24	expression 235:3	244:20 273:25
310:7 335:14	160:19 161:9	350:11,14	extend 158:11,13	303:2
337:2 343:6	161:11,16,19	351:10,14	255:9	failed 110:2
346:9 348:9	166:4 167:1,4,7	352:5,8 353:2,4	extended 223:21	fails 244:24
349:9 356:5,9	170:22,25	353:8,10,19	227:17 352:14	fair 120:25
356:11,12,13	172:7 174:18	357:21	extension 102:19	135:11 147:11
356:15,16,18	176:5 187:2,23	exist 245:16	103:11 326:24	162:19 164:7
356:23,24	187:25 188:5	existed 287:2	extensive 107:25	171:2,23
357:3,4,6,7,8,8	188:20,25	311:18	extent 222:1,2	179:13 180:16
357:9,11,12,15	189:18 190:6	existence 259:25	223:20 227:16	186:15 187:2
357:17,19	204:11,19	existing 130:8	239:19 248:14	233:13 236:13
examining 124:7	205:5 207:1,17	158:11 277:25	277:4 279:1	237:8 240:10
example 157:5	207:20,24	281:19 317:10	288:15 289:2	240:18 242:18
267:18,22	220:13,14,15	exists 235:12	299:18 326:19	246:13 250:13
314:1 340:19	222:20 223:2,4	expand 173:7	352:15	254:14 266:10
examples 308:19	223:9 224:23	expect 314:14	extra 204:24	266:11,16
exceed 104:16	224:25 225:2,3	expectation	extract 240:15	271:7 274:22
335:5	225:12,16	258:8	extreme 120:17	295:25 297:8
exceeds 130:14	226:14,16,24	expense 104:7	extremely 326:15	322:4 328:8
133:15	228:7 229:24	122:7 138:8	e-mails 175:9	331:2 334:22
exception 152:4	230:2,4 234:24	expenses 115:13		fairly 118:22
173:14 297:16	235:2 263:6,7,8	116:14 122:2	F	326:10 340:18
exceptions 198:4	263:22,25	137:24 245:20	F 356:1 358:1	fall 237:2
excess 103:23	264:17,20,20	277:9 289:10	360:1	falling 129:4
159:7 326:23	282:8 293:18	289:10,12	faced 148:18	familiar 242:24
338:15	320:8,17,17	315:6,11,16,16	149:11,16	269:16 294:2
excessive 135:18	346:21,22	317:11	163:8,13	317:20
exchange 109:22	347:10,11	experience	facilitate 111:6	far 97:21 112:3
	ĺ		l	I

115.24 120.12	200.10 200.4	129.7 140.10	270.25 271.0	fictitious 111:5
115:24 130:12	299:10 300:4	138:7 140:10	270:25 271:9	
130:14 133:15	300:10 301:11	199:16,18	271:15,18,20	231:4,5,10
146:23 209:2	302:10 303:1	201:2,7,8,11	271:23 272:1,6	254:25 256:10
225:6,12	304:4,16,21,25	203:1,8 206:5	272:11,17,25	274:12
261:23 290:7	305:9 306:23	208:2,3 210:20	273:14 275:2	field 226:17
308:5 325:12	307:19 308:23	211:17,20	276:13 277:18	figure 114:3
326:2 330:11	310:23,24	213:7,24 214:7	278:3 279:9,10	170:8 251:12
333:19,22	317:17 318:19	214:22,24	279:23 280:11	figures 169:25
334:24 335:5	321:5 342:4	217:7,9,16,18	280:23 284:14	237:2 331:3
341:4 352:4	352:14	217:23 218:3,7	284:15 285:16	file 100:5 104:17
353:11	feel 338:11	218:9,13,15	286:21 287:16	252:10,11
fashion 268:11	fees 100:16 102:3	222:3 223:17	287:19,21	314:25 315:9
fashioned 224:25	102:7,11,12,14	224:2,8,9	288:4,7 289:2,4	355:5,10
fast 339:4	104:2 106:20	227:13,20	294:24 295:13	filed 96:24 97:22
faulted 109:1	106:22 107:2,4	228:7,20,24	297:1,3,5,17	101:16,24
favor 103:21	107:5,25 108:8	229:8 232:8	298:12 299:4	102:15 103:18
121:16,20,23	108:12 109:22	233:5 234:19	307:16,20	107:8,13 109:8
344:17	109:24 110:8	234:20 235:10	308:6,9 310:11	112:17 196:25
favorable 102:4	110:11,17,19	235:24 236:16	310:15 311:9	210:16 215:21
102:5 104:1	110:21,22	236:23 237:6	312:15,16	216:18 223:6
183:16	111:2,4,7,9,10	237:12,13,17	313:5,14,17,19	240:12 261:20
favorably 183:13	111:11,12,16	237:23,25	314:24 315:18	261:22,23,24
favored 103:17	111:23 112:3,5	238:6,12,14	315:20 316:19	271:5 278:21
feasibility 299:17	112:7,8,9,11,19	240:7,16,19,21	317:14,19	282:8 283:2,12
300:7 315:7,10	113:10,13	240:24 241:6,9	318:13,15	293:15 299:8
316:13 327:8	114:24 115:1	242:5,6,22	319:13 320:1	302:25 315:13
327:14	115:15 116:6	243:2,7,8,17	320:19 321:2	343:12 349:17
February 92:8	116:10,16,20	244:2,3,12,16	322:6,12,16,20	354:19
93:8 95:6	117:2,4,21	244:25 247:25	323:3,14,15,24	files 216:16
100:24 101:25	118:12,25	248:3,6,9,15,16	324:2,17	284:1,2 292:16
353:21,25	119:5 122:9,13	248:18 249:4	325:12,17	filing 95:11
fee 104:7 109:4 109:12 110:3	122:17,25	249:13,17	326:5,13,18	112:6 139:20 223:2 232:15
	123:16 124:3,7	250:2,15,22	327:21 328:10	
112:23 113:1,3	124:9,10,14,21	251:4,5,8,15,18	329:4 330:23	283:6,8
113:8,18,20,25	125:2,6,18,21	252:11,16,17	331:10 332:17	filings 97:16
114:2 116:4	125:23 126:1	253:1,7,9,19	333:5,8,11,22	100:24 283:4
200:25 213:20	128:18,19,24	255:2,14,17,23	334:1,4 335:4,4	284:1,4
219:18 230:10	129:3,7,13,14	256:1 257:21	335:7 337:11	final 98:3
234:15 237:4,5	129:18,23,25	257:24 258:2,4	338:4,13 339:6	Finally 125:5
238:22 241:13	130:4,6,11,14	258:7,13,20,25	339:11 341:21	finance 116:7
242:16 244:24	130:18,23	259:5,12,18,24	342:25 347:20	120:8 154:16
245:5,16 246:1	131:3,5,8,9,18	260:3,11,14,25	347:25 348:5	169:16 194:4
246:21 266:24	132:8,12,16,20	261:7 264:3,11	352:25 356:20	financed 119:10
275:6,17 280:17 288:17	132:23 133:4,9	265:14,18,23	357:13 foot 101:10 13	financial 106:5 118:24 135:24
	133:14 134:2,6	266:9 268:8,22 260:5 0 14	feet 101:10,13 fell 280:1	
288:19 291:20 297:24 298:24	134:10 136:24 137:14,16	269:5,9,14 270:2,5,15,19	fewer 341:16	147:2 150:14 151:1 176:25
271.24 290.24	137.14,10	210.2,3,13,19	10WCI 341.10	131.1 170.23
	•		-	-

<u> </u>				
180:6 194:24	264:21 275:12	Forgive 241:19	fringe 275:4	G 95:2 356:1
195:1,9,9,18	286:21 288:2,2	form 102:25	front 200:8 211:2	gain 123:21,23
financially	288:12 302:21	258:20 280:5	230:5 337:9,21	gallon 101:9
297:10 304:17	302:22 310:22	281:6	full 132:19	gallons 101:8
financials 328:23	313:6 316:8	forma 297:20	139:13 142:25	267:20
financing 104:18	318:11 319:15	315:5 317:8	220:2 346:11	GAM-2 285:15
149:5 152:11	327:5 342:24	327:6 328:22	355:4 360:12	gas 255:8 256:24
154:18 157:13	344:1 348:9	334:16 340:7	fully 123:24	257:1
157:15 158:17	350:15	formal 138:25	139:1 292:14	gather 287:21
164:14,17	firsthand 279:21	278:7 299:8	fund 136:18	gathered 225:19
165:14 168:5,8	fished 348:24	formed 274:13	153:2,13	gathering 241:12
168:17 169:21	fishing 353:22	287:18	184:23 325:16	general 93:13
169:22 179:25	fit 213:12	former 110:13	333:13	95:10 100:6,10
180:17,21	fits 120:19	271:17	funded 152:9,21	127:5 139:18
181:1 183:9	five 104:7 122:3	forth 360:10	152:23 153:8	213:20 225:7
193:18	fixable 306:6	forward 116:10	funding 152:15	227:12 258:13
find 98:12	flat 307:15	125:15 138:20	153:4,12	276:11 280:6
127:16 200:15	flight 155:14	296:12 325:8	funds 154:9	generally 115:11
208:21 274:3	flip 210:2	341:13	321:24	202:14
291:16 352:21	flow 135:6	Foster 104:5	further 99:14	generate 305:13
finding 106:14	136:25	346:4,6,12,19	112:15 149:22	Gentry 93:24
151:10,10,17	follow 97:22	348:23 357:16	154:22 163:21	360:5,20
findings 109:11	followed 148:4	359:5	188:16 199:22	Gervy 187:21
finds 121:13	following 97:9,15	Foster's 347:15	211:24 215:8	359:15
fine 98:24 125:3	100:7 166:12	found 121:16,19	226:11 229:12	Gervy's 188:9
139:11 144:20	320:2 347:20	132:21 134:6	238:6 266:1	getting 131:24
229:16 245:8	follows 320:3	147:7 156:5	318:23 326:22	189:2 219:1
317:25 354:8	footing 132:14	157:7 189:11	331:5 342:9	247:19 251:10
354:10 355:15	footnote 223:3	243:9 246:13	345:1 355:17	258:8 288:4,9
finished 351:5	225:1 226:1	309:6	Furthermore	305:20 310:20
firm 360:6	355:7	foundation	223:20	332:11 337:13
first 99:20 101:1	footnoted 243:23	222:19 226:23	future 125:9	give 108:20 116:8
105:6 108:3	force 296:15	351:21	131:19 138:7	174:7,21
114:9 119:2,8	forecast 315:7	four 109:16,23	183:15 229:9	180:22 238:6
119:14 138:14	327:6	110:6,10 202:9	229:11 238:21	252:6 278:22
138:15 145:23	forecasted 316:8	241:25 242:2	239:15,20	305:14,23
150:24 152:6	forecasting 317:8	254:1 268:25	239.13,20	313:3 330:19
161:21 164:20	foreclosed	308:14,18,19	247:18 258:10	355:9
167:12 172:24	186:15	312:3,11	259:19 265:24	given 143:21
197:22 199:17	foreclosure	315:13	293:8,8 296:3	170:8 226:15
200:7 201:17	110:4 245:6	fourth 284:22	311:2 334:2	276:15 280:5
200.7 201.17 201:22 203:4	foregoing 360:12	frame 274:14	335:7 338:11	298:1 312:22
201.22 205.4 203:15 206:1	foreseeable	289:25	338:12 344:23	355:3,4 360:15
203:13 200:1	131:19 229:9	franchise 100:16	F-o-s-t-e-r	giving 117:3
226:12 223.7	265:24	free 134:16	346:14	global 147:25
220.19 228.13	foreseen 138:7	251:10	570.17	148:4
246:6 257:22	344:22	Friday 175:7	G	go 107:19 122:11
	577.22	1 1100 173.7		50 107.17 122.11

125:10 127:16	Gold 164:22,24	260:15 320:10	handed 140:15	heard 122:5
131:5,9 143:22	good 95:6 118:20	320:19 321:4	141:14 166:7	137:20
152:19 171:16	137:1 150:4	347:25 352:23	166:10 188:1,4	hearing 92:7,18
181:6 182:19	154:2,3 156:1	grouping 155:24	202:2 205:22	93:7 95:1,8,14
197:20 200:18	159:16 161:25	grow 338:16	208:18 216:7	97:4,13 123:2
205:10 207:25	162:1 184:7	growing 245:21	230:16 231:19	145:11 210:24
213:8,9 216:5	197:22 198:7,8	grown 304:11	291:3	223:11 224:10
219:16 224:20	200:5,6 212:5	growth 315:7	handing 140:18	227:13 303:16
236:25 251:16	228:17,18	guarantee	291:6	303:18,23,24
268:6,20 284:3	259:15 264:25	183:17,20,25	handle 127:18	336:6 343:23
289:15 314:8	265:1 292:9	184:6,9,11,16	144:3 313:24	350:13 353:7
317:11 319:5	302:1,5,6	184:17,18	325:25	353:17 354:3
319:18 324:11	305:23 308:2,3	194:3,7 235:8	handled 282:4	355:9,20
338:19 339:4	319:4 335:15	235:21 236:3	286:4 314:19	hears 117:6
goes 98:22	348:2 351:9	236:15	hands 108:15	held 171:13
115:24 182:8	Gorman 105:20	guaranteed	127:15	280:12 303:16
226:3 301:6	106:1,3 142:19	118:2,10 183:6	handy 98:15	Hello 295:20,21
305:24	142:21,25	184:12	167:5 229:24	help 116:6
going 97:24 99:9	143:2,7,20	guaranteeing	230:8 234:22	132:13 135:5
101:20 107:14	145:13 154:2	184:4 235:17	happen 122:2	240:3 247:11
116:10 117:5	155:5 159:12	236:6 257:24	201:14 230:7	247:14,15
127:1 138:13	169:9 189:16	258:4	259:16 280:15	258:17 259:5,7
138:25 144:10	356:10 359:14	guarantees	303:9 305:6	259:18 281:18
145:1 158:13	Gorman's 145:4	156:25 195:13	317:9 334:10	290:24 327:22
166:11 172:8	governed 115:18	236:20	happened 186:8	327:22
172:10,11,15	governing 236:9	guaranty 132:9	186:9 193:16	helped 171:7
172:18,20	256:24	guess 191:5	204:7 212:16	helping 248:4
173:5 182:20	governmental	251:21 252:23	212:17 298:18	helps 132:9
199:15 219:16	323:4	280:24 306:3	313:1 334:10	hesitate 219:2
225:8,9 228:2	grade 147:12	316:24 325:15	happening	297:18
229:14 234:8	156:3,4,9,13,14	354:14	318:20	He'll 105:22
234:25 235:2	156:17,18	guidance 278:23	happens 112:23	high 155:18,19
237:3 238:11	graduated	guidelines	213:11 296:5	155:21
238:14 240:2	285:23	106:14 120:21	happy 200:9	higher 115:13
249:5 258:3	grant 228:1	guys 126:18	hard 97:2 249:12	246:2 280:6
268:3 273:7,23	353:2	Н	249:18 313:23	highlight 100:25
282:5 285:10	great 279:1		Harold 241:21	highly 146:10
287:17 290:7	greater 333:22	H 358:1	hate 335:23	234:25 279:5
291:6,10,15,18	338:14	half 256:11	Hayden 103:5,6	highly-confide
296:7,12	Greechen 168:9	hall 93:20 190:16	HC 358:22	235:3
299:10 302:20	Greg 203:9 216:1	199:5 214:15 222:14 257:11	head 284:20,24	highly-leveraged
315:17 317:9	273:3		285:8 292:16	151:8,18
327:6,19 332:6	Gregory 216:8	281:10 308:1 309:22 318:12	hear 107:19	Hills 299:16
337:23 338:16	gross 100:15	348:18 350:23	121:9 124:8	308:23 311:15
341:9	ground 108:13	348:18 350:23	126:10 150:3	311:15
going-forward	grounds 223:17	hand 141:11	172:10 212:6	historical 120:7
228:20 296:17	223:19 241:8	nanu 171.11	229:19 335:16	historically
	1	1	1	•

140:10	315:5 358:13	III 160:14	inaccurate	117:17
history 121:12	hour 102:1 219:2	impact 118:24	329:22	incompetent
278:16 289:18	343:8	149:18,20	inadmissibility	226:22,22
hit 142:9	house 316:1	193:20	264:2	inconsistent
hold 165:16	341:2	implement 93:13	inadmissible	150:13 151:18
166:15 168:25	huge 131:16	95:10 100:10	222:22 226:15	incorporate
221:15 323:19	229:4	importance	inception 271:22	259:6
holder 132:7	Hummel 216:2,9	102:2	311:18 317:3	incorporated
holding 259:17	216:19 267:24	important	include 124:2	231:7,8
holds 235:19	290:20,22	132:17 158:4,7	179:23 181:12	incorrect 143:25
homeowners	290:20,22	158:12,18	190:25 191:2	252:8
340:5	293:12,22	171:10 191:21	193:13 201:7	increase 93:14
honest 274:7	Hummel's 293:1	193:9,10,11	228:19 240:11	95:10 100:6,11
Honor 126:7	294:7,18	283:6,9	246:20,23	100:14 181:15
141:7,24	hundred 120:11	impose 109:21	251:4,5 254:6	increased 104:1
143:19 145:9	287:14 332:9	imposed 109:24	292:5,10	136:7,14
145:18,21	332:10,12	134:25 250:2	301:17 341:21	148:18 149:1,2
154:23 159:25	hurdle 131:16	imposing 159:4	351:16	163:8 182:2,3
161:8 174:16	229:4	improper 109:1	included 106:2	182:13,18
176:3 182:5	husband 113:15	224:23 237:13	112:5 121:11	198:21
188:19,22	238:20 256:8	improved 198:20	127:3,4 137:18	increasingly
190:1,4,19	hypothetical	improvement	137:24 138:9	120:15
196:5 197:24	105:18,22	254:12	151:1 170:4	incurred 102:3
198:23 216:3	120:12 121:3	imprudent	201:11 203:8	104:3 119:6
216:13 221:12	134:24 146:13	115:22 237:13	203:10 208:13	121:11,14,18
257:14 263:20	162:16	302:9,17	210:24 246:24	136:16 137:16
263:24 282:5		imprudently	249:23 250:23	138:1 331:14
282:24 319:22	<u> </u>	123:4 125:13	250:25 251:7,8	332:14
321:6 343:4,18	idea 105:17	imputable	257:1 260:24	incurs 247:12
345:20 347:9	322:12 325:1	238:24 239:1,2	261:1 270:16	indebtedness
347:14 348:13	identical 174:7	imputation 152:5	290:8,10,15	170:19
hook 247:16	243:1 328:5,7	157:10	297:25 298:13	independent
hooked 258:9	identification	impute 125:6,20	299:16 300:4	105:13 112:25
259:7	140:14 172:6	150:15 151:13	300:25 309:5	198:10
hope 135:21	205:4 207:23	185:24 227:20	309:12,14,20	Index 357:20,21
175:23 229:19	identified 278:24	238:7,14	314:6,11 322:2	Indian 299:16
235:7 254:4	322:2 329:2,3,4	239:19 240:10	324:7 331:21	308:22 311:14
344:24,25	identify 150:17	241:5 296:18	includes 105:5	311:15
hoping 172:19,21	188:5 216:9	312:24	119:20 249:24	indicate 236:2
173:6 284:7	226:14	imputed 147:1,2	including 116:15	indicates 323:2
Horseshoe 101:6	identifying	152:2,25	121:24 153:5	indicating 138:4
220:22,24	152:23 153:4	168:14 171:5	153:14 179:15	172:16 179:3
248:8,10 253:3	279:18 283:3	239:9 241:14	192:20 193:7	189:20
253:10,16,18	ignore 115:25	271:8 312:14	193:15 200:24	indication 354:4
253:19 285:13	292:7,9 297:17	imputes 240:24	277:17 299:15	industry 120:20
285:18 286:1,5	IH 270:13 301:17	imputing 117:16	inclusion 232:7	278:10
295:7 312:2,5	311:15 318:9	159:6	income 112:7	informal 299:2
	I	Ι	I	1
EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

informally 295:3	241:21,24	investment 116:7	127:21 128:24	95:21 96:3,8
information	297:4	118:8 155:17	134:18 137:14	360:16
108:15,20,21	installing 109:25	156:3,9,13,14	137:15 138:14	job 283:3
122:16 133:24	243:3	158:22 201:6	138:14 143:21	John 104:24
161:4 169:13	instance 181:14	206:7 214:25	144:11,16	105:23 138:16
176:24 189:13	instances 327:21	244:2 261:3	145:23 150:11	138:21 139:15
221:8 232:17	332:13	325:7 332:2	150:22 195:17	192:16 342:22
251:24 253:15	institutions	investments	198:1 199:15	356:8,21
263:16 279:3	158:19	134:15 153:14	199:16 210:24	357:14 359:8,9
286:19 292:23	instrument	155:15 185:8	219:18 263:21	359:11
324:25 325:21	173:20	investment-gra	266:8 277:21	joint 96:24 97:23
326:3,6 329:9	insufficient	156:19,22	277:25 278:1	109:8 112:16
329:16,17,19	176:22	investors 115:10	280:10 282:2	208:14 243:21
330:16,19	integrity 135:25	investor's 118:7	295:9 302:22	354:15
331:24 337:10	intended 130:11	invests 332:5	304:8 319:12	jointly 243:15
337:14,15,16	131:19 210:21	involve 102:3	319:18 342:17	jointly-filed
337:20 339:19	244:1 300:7	involved 102:15	344:8 354:15	244:20
339:22 340:10	intending 244:19	111:18 114:18	issued 97:10	Jr 262:20 357:5
340:15,16	249:22	121:14 147:25	119:15,17	359:3
341:15 347:5	intent 173:19	154:4,8,14,20	164:21,22,24	JRS 140:19,19
infrastructure	243:6 276:16	165:4 170:24	165:22 181:23	JUDG 282:25
107:3 110:1	276:20 277:6	172:3 187:11	191:9 210:9	judge 93:17 95:3
115:16 116:7	interacts 158:19	227:16 253:17	279:18 334:21	95:13,18,23,25
148:3,6 206:6	interest 111:3	271:12 278:15	337:19	96:5,11 98:16
235:12 241:24	116:9 119:22	280:2,21 286:8	issues 97:23	98:19 99:3,10
243:19 254:11	123:14,18,19	287:19 296:25	101:17,24,25	99:13,16,17
301:8 332:6	126:15 156:25	303:14 323:25	102:3,12,14	100:22 101:18
infrastructures	157:1 158:14	335:24 336:2	106:25 107:5	101:22 103:5,6
250:1	171:15 183:21	involving 223:5	119:3 128:16	118:15 128:9
inherently 314:7	184:6,10,11,16	267:23 270:13	128:18 139:2	128:11 138:11
initial 96:12	186:22 191:16	323:18	144:9,23,25	138:19,22,23
195:22 246:25	192:3,11 195:7	in-camera 235:5	159:23 196:13	138:24 139:3
278:17 287:17	222:23,23	irrelevant 122:18	278:23 279:18	139:11 140:12
294:3,5 354:11	224:22,24	ISRIS 148:3	344:23 345:22	140:13 141:10
initially 246:22	249:16	ISRS 148:6	issuing 183:14	141:12,19,22
272:16 287:22	interests 195:15	issuance 184:12	item 314:9,10	142:1,3,6,10,12
294:11 315:12	Internet 323:13	184:18	IV 346:18	142:21,23
326:17	interpretation	issue 102:7,15		143:24 144:5
initiated 110:23	103:7 121:15	103:10 107:11	<u> </u>	144:13,17,21
243:17	interrogatories	107:17 109:12	James 262:11,13	145:6,11,15,19
insofar 125:9	172:2 178:13	109:15 111:18	262:20 357:5	149:23 150:1
225:16 226:9	interrupt 285:5	112:4 116:16	359:3	153:20,23
inspection	335:23	118:22,25	Jams 358:17	154:24 155:2,3
307:20	intervals 129:2	119:18 121:9	January 109:9	157:5 159:11
install 202:11	invested 154:10	121:15 122:8	131:11	159:15,22
253:23	185:16 213:25	122:12,25	Jefferson 92:9	160:3 161:15
installed 109:17	Investigate 206:4	126:2,4,23	93:9 94:4,9,15	161:19 163:22
	-	I		l

EVIDENTIARY HEARING 2/18/2014

166:6 174:19	342:23 343:1,5	keep 101:20	know 98:4	312:21,25
174:21 175:12	343:21,23	128:21 247:15	108:22 118:21	318:14,18
174.21 175.12	344:4 345:2,10	249:4	134:4 157:14	347:7 349:25
175.15 176.2,4 182:10 188:21	345:14,17	keeping 122:24	169:5,20 172:9	known 202:15
182.10 188.21	,	123:18 249:16	172:23 178:1	
,	346:2,7,8			251:13 354:24
190:3,6,10,18	347:13 348:2,8	Keith 104:5	178:11 180:20	L
196:6,12,15	348:11,14,20	346:6,12 357:16 359:5	183:12,19,22	lack 108:20
197:22 198:5	348:23 349:1,4		184:19 189:16	297:18
198:24 199:1,8	349:7,8 350:10	Kenneth 103:5	208:20 229:18	lacks 226:23
199:10,14,19	350:13,18,20	Kenney 93:19,20	230:20 231:6	lady 267:24
199:22 200:1	350:25 351:3,5	101:20 126:6,8	233:22 239:12	laid 125:7 126:4
201:23,25	351:8,12,24	126:12 142:8	240:2 243:5	lake 93:12 94:6
204:9,14,18,21	352:2,9 353:1,7	149:25 150:2	247:1,4 253:1	95:8,16,22
205:1,6,19,20	353:15,17	153:17 190:12	258:6 269:5	97:11,17,19
207:2,6,20	354:10,17,22	199:3 207:5,12	272:24 274:1	99:21,22 100:3
211:11,25	355:1,13,17,20	207:15,19	274:15,19,23	100:5,9 101:1,6
214:13,16	355:23	212:4 214:10	274:23 277:15	101:10 102:22
215:9,11 216:5	JudgeBushmann	257:9 295:21	277:24 278:13	
216:20,25	335:10	306:15 335:13	279:7,15 280:4	103:6 104:14
218:20,23	Judged 104:22	335:14 336:11	280:8,22,24	104:19,20
219:1,9,16,21	judgment 102:5	345:5 348:16	282:1,3 284:15	106:4,9,12,19
219:23 221:17	103:12,16,21	350:22 356:5	287:20 288:10	106:24 107:21
221:21 224:4	103:24 104:1	356:12,23	290:7,17	108:1 109:17
224:13,16	138:3 264:15	357:11	292:23,24	110:12,13,16
225:6,21 226:5	321:8 344:12	Kenny 157:9	294:4 295:3	111:4,4,7
226:11,24	344:16	165:19	296:14,21	112:19 113:19
227:11 228:1	judicial 227:5	kept 325:18,22	298:19 299:8	113:24 114:5
228:12 229:13	July 100:9,18	Keri 349:12,17	303:10,13	114:25 116:11
230:1 239:23	138:4 261:25	357:18 358:9	305:18 307:7	116:20,21
257:7,15	344:13	358:10	307:21 308:11	117:1,2,12,13
260:22 262:7	jumping 241:18	Kerri 349:5,6	308:15 309:18	119:9,12,16,17
262:11,14,16	jumps 156:16	Kevin 94:12 96:2	314:10 317:1,3	119:21,23,25
263:23 264:13	June 100:21	Kimberly 219:18	322:25 325:19	120:3,5,8,23
264:19 266:3	194:18 205:16	219:20 220:4	327:19 328:3,3	121:10,15,17
282:18,22	jurisdiction	357:2 358:15	330:20 340:18	122:16,20
283:11,15,24	107:5 111:15	358:22,23	341:24 354:6	123:3,24
290:25 291:2	115:24 117:23	kind 139:8	355:1,2	124:20,25
293:19 294:1	125:1 129:6,11	167:20 180:3	knowledge	125:12,16,21
294:13,17	129:12 224:9	233:22 235:3,4	124:19,23	128:25 129:24
295:20,23	270:2,5,24	236:9 241:18	161:6 165:5	132:18,24
306:12 309:24	352:24	245:14 270:21	176:22 197:13	133:23,25
310:2,4 318:24	jurisdictional	322:23	204:6 214:5	134:4,15,20
319:4,11,20	108:13	KKB-2 227:6	221:10 263:17	135:14 136:3
321:3,7,14	justified 103:24	228:7	266:17 271:1	136:12,15,17
335:11 336:14		KKB2 224:14	277:20 279:14	136:21,24
336:19,22,24	K	225:13	279:21 295:1	137:10,18,19
342:11,14,17	K 358:15,22,23	knew 285:10	309:13 312:19	138:9,16
	I		l	I

			0.57.10	
,	222:22,23	Lakesite 110:6	357:13	292:3 302:8
	223:10 224:22	215:4 312:4	legally 116:11	314:9,9,18
	224:24 228:6	Lakesites 109:16	legitimate 239:22	320:3 324:11
	229:13 230:23	202:9 241:25	lender 119:25	347:20
· ·	231:7 233:5,8,9	242:2 254:2	186:13,14	lines 164:4
	233:11,15,16	269:1 315:13	194:5	185:21 186:2,4
-	234:1,3,5,11,14	lame 262:21	length 100:23	186:12,20
,	235:8,16,19,22	land 250:7	lengthy 219:3	200:22 205:13
'	237:25 238:11	language 209:24	let's 95:3,15	222:6,6,8,8,9,9
	240:7,8,9,11,13	284:12	171:16 174:2	222:10,11,11
,	243:11,13	large 307:21	176:9 181:14	222:15,17
, , , ,	247:23 248:5	largely 122:23	182:19 236:25	223:15,16
, ,	251:9 254:14	245:22 279:23	241:3 247:6,7	225:7 226:2
,	254:21,23,24	287:25 312:7	249:4 251:16	227:15 231:13
, ,	254:24 255:15	312:10	264:16 268:2,6	231:23 232:4
<i>,</i>	255:17,18,24	larger 185:7,11	268:20 289:15	242:8,20 243:3
	256:3,5,5,7,11	largest 109:10	289:24 305:8	247:22 250:18
	256:14,17	118:22 232:11	324:10,10	250:20 254:21
	261:7,12,14	232:22	level 105:10	264:3,4,5,5,6,6
,	266:4 268:24	late 192:25	168:21 169:21	264:7,7,8
, ,	270:7,8,22	lately 136:16	181:5,5,24	268:15 284:11
, ,	271:16,19,22	latest 354:20	191:10 192:10	320:2,3,4,5,5,6
	272:8,16,20	law 93:17 94:2	193:20,25	320:6,7,13,13
, , , ,	274:11 275:5	95:13 100:21	194:1,20 280:6	320:14,15,20
, ,	275:16,20 276:1 277:17	lawful 114:13	levels 115:7 195:16	320:21,22,22
, , ,		lawsuit 102:15		320:23,23,24 321:21 322:18
, ,	282:14 300:9 301:16 303:22	lead 111:20 learn 303:21	leverage 120:17 leveraged 146:10	321:21 322:18
, , , ,	304:20,24	leave 227:24	liability 104:2	347:22,22,23
	305:8,13,25	228:1 352:19	152:19 153:8	link 323:14,17
· · ·	307:7 310:2	left 119:3 142:16	153:10	links 323:14,17
	311:22,25	159:13 196:10	lien 110:3 245:9	list 97:23 99:2
	312:2,8,9,12	199:12 218:24	life 289:3	285:12 352:21
	313:9 316:2	262:9 319:2	limine 107:10	listed 98:17 99:5
, ,	317:18 319:25	342:15 345:18	122:21	99:11 351:13
	321:14 323:7	349:2 351:6,12	limit 184:11,17	listening 96:18
· · · · · ·	325:3,13,18,22	352:7	limitations	306:22
,	336:22 337:6	legal 94:13 102:3	167:22	literally 158:8
, , , ,	341:20 343:19	102:12,14	line 102:20 157:2	Litigation 93:24
	343:23 344:10	102:12,14	209:12 217:14	360:6
	344:20,23	113:19,25	202:5 223:20	little 171:16
	345:10 348:5	115:25 119:5	235:6 236:25	172:9,11
	348:11 350:18	128:19 137:14	239:17 241:19	185:19 200:15
	352:2 356:3	137:16,22	242:4,14	208:21 254:20
	359:8,9,10,12	137:10,22	245:15 249:20	275:4 309:18
	359:13,15,16	267:11 342:25	251:18 268:6	318:7 335:24
· · · · · ·	359:18	344:19,23	268:18,20	339:19 341:9
		211117,20	200.10,20	

		•	•	
353:23	192:1,6,6,7,9	186:11 209:22	156:10	280:7
live 292:7 316:2	192:10,12	209:23 232:4	lower 121:5	Manager 139:18
LLC 137:17	193:13,16,19	234:25,25	133:11 136:11	Managing 143:5
344:9	193:21,24	251:19 291:19	156:17 184:6	maneuver
loan 105:6,9,13	194:4,16,20,21	296:1 305:15	184:10,11,16	124:23
105:13 106:2	195:3,10,11,16	328:18 331:9	318:7	manner 244:3,17
117:9,12,13,14	loans 119:11	331:10	lowering 136:20	March 268:5
119:15,17,19	152:14 156:25	looks 152:12	lowers 132:16,16	273:23 274:2
119:20,22,24	164:5 165:20	lot 109:5,18	low-risk 155:17	354:2,2,3,12
120:2,4,7,8	171:5 173:19	110:2,4 112:25	LP 176:20	355:8
126:14 127:4,7	194:24	113:3,4,5	LP's 176:25	mark 94:2 95:20
127:13 128:4	local 303:18	116:23 122:17	lunch 219:2,5	98:5 99:9
147:16 149:7	locate 217:9	131:21 132:3	luncheon 219:11	189:18 204:19
149:10 150:6	located 106:24	132:10 163:24		marked 99:15
152:2,5 153:1,2	202:13	175:8 209:4,12	M	109:7 139:23
154:6,10,15,17	logical 242:21	234:3,10,16,19	M 93:19 358:17	140:18 143:9
154:19 156:23	244:8 245:5,11	234:20 235:9	358:25	160:17 167:1
156:24 157:11	258:6	242:6 244:8,24	Madison 94:9,15	172:6 175:13
157:11,12,13	long 120:25	245:5,6,8	main 103:11	187:20 205:4
157:14,16,18	209:13 213:1	248:21,22,25	119:17 122:8	207:23 210:4
158:11,13,15	285:12 296:14	249:16,17	171:9 191:7	220:13 263:6
158:18 164:9	302:6	250:15 254:2	mains 101:10	293:18 319:24
164:11,13,13	longer 234:20	254:11 258:8	maintain 130:7	346:21
164:19,19,20	241:3 256:2	259:16,17,23	202:12 218:8	market 155:9,14
165:2,5,6,11,23	308:23 311:16	259:24 276:6	249:25 250:4	155:16,25,25
165:25 166:1,2	334:6	277:7 279:21	250:18 258:21	180:3
166:19,23	long-term 104:15	279:25 284:13	259:5 260:2,7,9	marketplace
167:9,12,16,20	look 126:22	284:19 306:23	327:22	147:12
168:5,10,11,15	174:2 175:12	315:2 316:2,3,4	maintaining	markets 155:13
168:16,16,20	176:9 240:25	316:4 338:25	260:12,19	180:8
169:14,16,22	241:7,11,16	341:8,16,19,22	261:2 311:4	Martin 216:2,8
169:22,23	271:25 272:2	342:4 351:13	maintenance	290:20,22
170:3,3,7,12	272:15 274:4	lots 109:19,21	243:4 244:9	291:7 293:22
171:12,13	286:7,7 289:8	110:6 112:9	259:8 266:13	material 96:25
175:5 177:10	291:11,13	114:24 130:1	289:11 309:3	106:25 109:9
179:16,23	307:19 314:8	131:7,12,14	328:1	341:10
180:16,21	317:11 326:16	209:9 228:25	major 212:14	matter 93:12
181:1,8,10,12	327:2 328:11	242:10,11,15	maker 113:6	95:8 103:4
181:16,19,22	333:16 340:24	245:21 247:9	makers 170:13	107:1 116:17
182:2,2,12,13	352:17	249:15,24	making 95:15	116:22 155:11
182:16,18,24	looked 159:1	250:6,9 253:24	146:15 226:18	180:13 192:2,4
183:7,25 184:4	166:16 175:19	254:6,7,16	266:18 275:7	192:13 202:7,8
184:17,24,25	183:13 202:20	288:16 291:24	307:21 313:13	206:3 223:5
185:1,25	206:10 286:24	292:1 299:11	Manage 202:12	226:25 266:8
187:11 190:25	295:3,9	315:25 332:20	management	267:10,13
191:3,9,15,22	looking 153:2	340:6 341:1	149:17 158:1	278:12
191:23,25	155:15 186:3	low 155:20,22,25	158:19 256:22	matters 99:19
	I		I	I

155:7 210:13	281:17 292:12	microphone	moment 117:5	264:18 283:17
354:12 355:18	294:8 302:15	96:17	162:6 202:16	294:16 310:6,7
356:2	311:13 313:12	mid 318:10	291:11 323:20	318:23 321:13
mean 114:12,15	314:21 315:18	middle 192:1	moments 107:24	336:21 344:3
127:23 180:5	316:18 321:22	261:21	money 103:23	346:5,9 347:9
241:25 254:24	324:24	Midwest 93:24	131:4 134:13	348:7,22
265:10 273:24	mentioning	360:6	158:24 213:11	350:17 352:1,6
274:8 278:6	155:7 193:2,2	million 104:16	214:21 237:20	354:9 355:22
280:14 285:5	Merciel 237:11	129:17,21,22	253:23 326:18	356:22,23
288:8 292:8	237:15 262:12	159:7,8 168:20	332:5 335:2,5	357:3,4,6,9,17
340:10,19	262:14,18,20	168:20 169:1,3	money's 305:19	morning 95:6
meaning 249:21	263:4,21 266:7	169:8,11 170:5	monies 213:24	118:20 119:2
means 104:6	270:14 284:10	170:7 194:15	258:3 296:16	150:4 154:2,3
109:6 184:10	291:5,18 306:9	194:15,20	Monroe 94:3	161:25 162:1
240:23 274:4	306:15 310:8	mind 101:21	95:21	198:7,8 200:5,6
meant 124:9	318:25 327:4	128:21 200:11	month 267:17,18	212:5 343:14
mechanism	342:1 357:5	200:17 217:5	306:24 307:5	motion 107:8,10
104:8 148:9	359:3	221:4 346:1	310:19,20	122:21
mechanisms	mercy 137:4	minimum 209:7	318:9 338:24	motions 96:21
148:10 206:5	merely 130:12	296:13 307:8	monthly 109:22	107:13,15
meet 131:16	message 115:10	minute 156:25	115:2 129:20	122:10,10,21
229:4 245:20	met 126:4	187:19 217:12	209:7	move 174:17
meeting 280:10	method 104:11	232:3 245:19	months 100:20	186:9 197:19
e				
meetings 280:14	210:13 317:11	mischaracteriz	156:15 262:1,2	247:6,7 350:6
meetings 280:14 member 177:22	210:13 317:11 methodology	mischaracteriz 192:24	156:15 262:1,2 Moore 94:13	247:6,7 350:6 moved 151:12
e				,
member 177:22	methodology	192:24	Moore 94:13	moved 151:12
member 177:22 178:3 280:6	methodology 120:24 121:7	192:24 missing 252:20	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2	moved 151:12 193:23
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12	<pre>moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21</pre>
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11	 moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23	 moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20	 moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8	 moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 N
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 N N 95:2 356:1,1
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 273:11	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 <u>N</u> N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17 138:13 140:21	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 273:11 293:5,12,16	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17 349:15 360:2	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23 219:24 220:1	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 <u>N</u> N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6 139:14 142:25
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17 138:13 140:21 147:20 149:10	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 273:11 293:5,12,16 294:21 295:11	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17 349:15 360:2 360:16	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23 219:24 220:1 221:12 225:13	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 <u>N</u> N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6 139:14 142:25 160:6 178:10
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17 138:13 140:21 147:20 149:10 169:9 187:11	<pre>methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 273:11 293:5,12,16 294:21 295:11 Meyer's 273:3</pre>	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17 349:15 360:2 360:16 mix 152:13 158:3	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23 219:24 220:1 221:12 225:13 225:15,24	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 <u>N</u> N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6 139:14 142:25 160:6 178:10 196:18 220:3
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17 138:13 140:21 147:20 149:10 169:9 187:11 189:16 192:14	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 217:6 273:11 293:5,12,16 294:21 294:21 295:11 Meyer's 273:3 Michael 93:17	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17 349:15 360:2 360:16 mix 152:13 158:3 158:9,17,17	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23 219:24 220:1 221:12 225:13 225:15,24 226:8,13 227:8	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 <u>N</u> N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6 139:14 142:25 160:6 178:10 196:18 220:3 231:5,10
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17 138:13 140:21 147:20 149:10 169:9 187:11 189:16 192:14 193:18 194:12	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 273:11 293:5,12,16 294:21 295:11 Meyer's 273:3 Michael 93:17 95:12 105:20	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17 349:15 360:2 360:16 mix 152:13 158:3 158:9,17,17 MO 94:4,9,15	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23 219:24 220:1 221:12 225:13 225:15,24 226:8,13 227:8 228:11 239:11	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6 139:14 142:25 160:6 178:10 196:18 220:3 231:5,10 254:25 256:10
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17 138:13 140:21 147:20 149:10 169:9 187:11 189:16 192:14 193:18 194:12 225:8 227:9	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 273:11 293:5,12,16 294:21 295:11 Meyer's 273:3 Michael 93:17 95:12 105:20 142:19,20	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17 349:15 360:2 360:16 mix 152:13 158:3 158:9,17,17 MO 94:4,9,15 modification	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23 219:24 220:1 221:12 225:13 225:15,24 226:8,13 227:8 228:11 239:11 257:17,18	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 N N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6 139:14 142:25 160:6 178:10 196:18 220:3 231:5,10 254:25 256:10 262:19,23
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17 138:13 140:21 147:20 149:10 169:9 187:11 189:16 192:14 193:18 194:12 225:8 227:9 241:20 270:11	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 273:11 293:5,12,16 294:21 295:11 Meyer's 273:3 Michael 93:17 95:12 105:20 142:19,20 143:2 356:10	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17 349:15 360:2 360:16 mix 152:13 158:3 158:9,17,17 MO 94:4,9,15 modification 343:13	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23 219:24 220:1 221:12 225:13 225:15,24 226:8,13 227:8 228:11 239:11 257:17,18 260:17 262:5	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 <u>N</u> N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6 139:14 142:25 160:6 178:10 196:18 220:3 231:5,10 254:25 256:10 262:19,23 267:24 269:2
member 177:22 178:3 280:6 members 115:11 277:16 280:18 281:5 303:22 memorialized 112:11 memory 286:20 mention 110:15 119:2 254:21 271:3 273:22 322:19 324:13 mentioned 107:20 108:14 113:15 115:17 138:13 140:21 147:20 149:10 169:9 187:11 189:16 192:14 193:18 194:12 225:8 227:9	methodology 120:24 121:7 146:22,24 148:20,22 150:12,17,19 150:19 151:2,4 151:16,20,23 156:7 162:20 Methods 206:4 metric 106:13 Meyer 294:22 295:18 Meyers 203:9 216:2,8,19 217:6 273:11 293:5,12,16 294:21 295:11 Meyer's 273:3 Michael 93:17 95:12 105:20 142:19,20	192:24 missing 252:20 252:23 Missouri 92:1,9 93:1,9 94:14,17 95:22 96:3,8 100:12 124:11 147:21,24 148:7 160:12 167:22 172:24 196:23 210:10 210:18 220:10 258:14 260:14 318:16 323:24 324:2 346:17 349:15 360:2 360:16 mix 152:13 158:3 158:9,17,17 MO 94:4,9,15 modification	Moore 94:13 95:25 96:2 98:25 99:4,12 118:20 126:6,7 126:11 128:11 200:3,4 201:23 202:1 204:9,20 204:24 205:2,7 205:19,21 206:25 207:6,8 207:14,18,25 208:18,20 211:9 214:18 214:19 215:8 215:15 216:23 219:24 220:1 221:12 225:13 225:15,24 226:8,13 227:8 228:11 239:11 257:17,18	moved 151:12 193:23 Moving 144:21 328:2 multiple 97:25 multiply 341:6 mute 142:9 Mutual 272:11 M-e-r-c-i-e-l 262:23 N N 95:2 356:1,1 358:1 name 111:5,6 139:14 142:25 160:6 178:10 196:18 220:3 231:5,10 254:25 256:10 262:19,23

346:11 349:10	173:17 174:13	non-issue 102:9	263:9 282:17	objections
names 271:17	185:22 186:21	non-shareholder	284:2,4 300:24	107:19,23
274:12,12	187:12,15	110:12	314:14 329:25	122:21 145:6
name's 95:12	188:7 190:24	normal 316:22	334:16 339:16	174:19 188:21
narrowed 101:24	191:19,21	316:24 317:9	340:7,25 341:1	190:3 197:25
nature 218:16	192:2,7,12	normalized	341:4,4,13,16	207:3,4 219:7
224:5 227:12	338:1,6,19	121:25	347:21	221:17,24
284:8 296:17	negotiate 158:20	Normally 152:10		224:6 227:7
316:7	negotiated	Nos 99:25	0	263:23 264:10
near 138:7	156:23	notches 156:3	O 95:2 356:1,1	319:21,25
344:23	neither 331:23	note 104:20	358:1	320:2,10,12,18
nearly 328:4,7	never 124:19,23	170:13 183:18	oath 138:22	320:20,25
necessarily 102:2	131:9 212:20	183:21 187:7	142:21 160:3	321:11 343:21
150:17 151:17	212:23 271:1	223:1	196:15 199:20	347:13,16
153:1 167:25	275:13,14,14	noted 100:22	219:21 262:14	348:1,4 350:10
168:1 226:17	288:23 298:22	101:18,23	319:15 346:7	351:25 352:10
269:14 300:20	312:19,19,25	107:24 112:16	349:7	353:5,15
340:9	313:2,2,3 317:1	321:11	obedience 100:8	obligated 213:14
necessary 184:1	346:1	notes 274:3,4	object 192:23,25	obligation
184:5 212:13	nevertheless	360:13	222:5 223:15	109:22 110:3,7
227:23 273:19	151:19	notice 96:23 97:9	223:19 224:2	188:15 250:17
354:3,5	new 100:5 121:8	108:5 204:12	227:21 239:11	250:19 260:2,7
necessity 202:10	131:24 138:2	208:14 216:17	260:15 264:3	260:8
210:9 315:2	219:2 288:8	216:21 217:1	347:24	observation
need 98:5 99:1	291:25 297:18	225:4 282:6,11	objected 108:12	106:13 251:12
99:14,19 135:6	297:21 302:11	283:1,12,25	223:18	observe 117:7
142:14 146:16	302:13,13	284:3,7 293:15	objecting 109:1	obtained 328:14
183:11 202:18	315:3,4	294:3,5,14,18	objection 106:22	328:15
225:10 228:9	Newman 94:2	354:18	107:12 145:10	obvious 118:22
259:9 274:2	95:20	noticed 167:4	161:15,17	occasions 327:16
286:6 334:1	nexus 132:22	November	176:1,2,3 182:5	occur 339:14
346:3 347:16	134:6	101:16 175:7	182:10 188:22	occurred 109:25
354:12	Ninety 249:18	NP 358:23	188:24 190:4,5	121:23 174:4
needed 108:20	non 333:5	NS 324:9	204:15,22	273:25 275:13
132:1 135:18	nonparties	nuanced 123:14	216:21,23,24	333:17 338:22
194:3 261:3	108:16	number 133:17	224:5,14,17,20	342:2
331:25	nonpayment	156:15 162:7	225:7,9,14	October 164:21
needs 123:12	102:18	176:20 187:25	227:6,9,12	213:4
125:19 126:3	nonrecurring	215:17 266:9	228:3,6 239:24	offer 98:1,1,22
135:12,12	121:25 138:8	267:19 340:6	260:22 264:14	139:5,9 141:8
162:17,18,22	non-customers	341:1	264:21 283:15	143:19,22
162:22 217:20	114:21 333:11	numbered 197:1	283:17,20,21	145:2,3 161:9
334:23	333:12,25	349:19	294:13 342:19	161:11 188:19
negate 121:20	non-disputed	numbers 100:2	347:15 352:23	190:1 221:14
negative 133:17	96:25	121:8 133:20	353:3	263:21 343:18
170:13,21	non-investment	140:9 146:4	objectionable	347:11 351:19
171:3,14	156:17	232:14,18,19	352:16,19,22	353:14
	I	I	I	I

I				
offered 107:17	164:11 165:19	319:19,19,24	154:22 159:25	278:10
207:3 221:20	166:6 171:2	320:8,17	160:5 161:8	original 116:7,19
224:21,21	172:17 175:8	324:15 336:1	174:25 175:4,7	130:1,12,15,19
323:12 358:2	175:25 176:8	336:24 348:9	176:3 182:5	130:23 131:1
offering 264:17	180:15 196:3	349:19,19	188:22 190:4	132:25 133:5
343:7	197:12,18	350:7,7,13	190:19,20	134:14 137:8
offers 138:25	200:17,21	351:1 353:17	193:1 196:4	157:21 170:5
347:9	201:20 202:6	358:3,4,5,7,8,9	198:6,22	184:23 211:1
offhand 292:24	202:19,22,23	open 111:19	356:12,15,16	211:21 265:2,5
office 94:8,11	203:19 205:2	327:23	356:19	265:6,8,19
96:5,9 104:10	206:1,8,12,16	opened 111:25	opportunity	313:8 327:13
107:9 108:10	207:15,19,25	212:10	155:17	originally 125:22
108:17 113:16	208:11,25	opening 99:20,20	oppose 104:10	132:5 154:10
115:4,19	209:22 210:2	99:22 118:17	opposed 126:18	167:12 194:14
117:24 118:13	212:6 213:1	118:19 126:9	opposite 126:16	210:20 240:8
122:1 128:12	214:4,9 221:2,4	128:12,14	129:8 151:22	272:8 312:3
145:20 155:6	231:16,21	129:9 356:3,4,6	297:9	353:20
161:21 178:9	232:2,6,7 246:8	operate 202:11	OPS 117:15	originating 110:9
196:23 218:11	257:15,19	210:10 269:17	order 95:4,5	outcome 205:14
264:22 321:9	267:11 272:7	288:14 315:17	97:20,22 99:25	334:18
323:6 325:1	272:10,13	327:7,20	100:4,7,8,19	outlined 260:13
328:5 336:5	274:7 276:24	operated 245:25	102:2 107:21	outset 106:21
349:15 353:11	279:1 281:18	304:15	107:23 109:13	outstanding
360:15	291:13 294:13	operating 116:14	111:25 114:9	108:25 138:6
official 96:23	298:7,9 301:14	245:20 246:16	122:4 124:13	176:11,16
97:9 204:12	303:20 306:11	315:16	124:25 129:1	344:20
208:14 216:17	306:17 307:3,7	operation 100:21	197:25 201:15	overall 113:23
216:21 217:1	307:23 309:21	245:17 266:12	202:2,7,17,23	136:12
282:6,11 283:1	311:7 312:13	287:23 316:16	202:2,7,17,25	overly 314:4
283:12,25	313:4 317:13	325:9 338:5	212:12 215:16	overrule 107:18
284:3,7 293:15	321:20 324:3	operational	215:18 227:2	239:23
294:14,18	324:12 335:16	111:19	235:12 242:6	overruled 182:10
offset 109:5,6	336:10 337:8	operations	242:24 245:20	260:22
113:22 114:5	341:25	105:14 113:24	276:10 312:23	overturned
307:21 322:9	older 131:24	130:8 186:23	313:18 322:5,8	103:22
322:16 333:7	OM 327:25	288:18 324:19	322:11,15,17	over-recovery
offsets 338:11	once 130:8 131:4	335:3	326:1,4,7	104:8 122:5
oh 144:2 208:24	234:19 352:20	opinion 150:12	334:21 337:19	owed 103:4
269:19 284:17	ones 177:18	171:8 182:8	345:21 355:3,3	owing 326:18
296:10 298:9	269:15 282:19	267:13 279:24	355:11 359:6	owned 110:11,16
308:15 316:24	ongoing 116:21	310:24 338:18	ordered 100:5	153:6 177:24
324:3	323:4	opinions 155:11	276:8	178:5,20,25
okay 99:3,10,13	online 189:6	182:9 226:18	orders 97:10	182:23 213:10
99:17 126:10	OPC 109:3	Opitz 94:13 96:2	108:24 111:24	230:22 233:19
141:10,22	113:25 197:1,1	141:24 144:7	282:11 283:2	234:10,16
149:8 150:3	197:1 199:8	144:12,15	283:19 326:9	238:11 241:25
153:16 164:1	201:1 319:19	145:8,17 154:1	organization	253:20 255:14
100.10101.1	201.1 317.17	1 10.0,17 10 1.1	Samzadon	
L				

259:23 272:1	128:5 256:11	347:23	299:17 300:6	243:14 283:16
272:16,25	Ozark 253:11,20	pages 97:14	310:15,17	319:15
325:15	290:4,5 301:16	225:7 230:5	316:13 327:10	pass 204:25
owner 113:4,4,5	308:9 309:16	253:21 285:1	347:24	pay 109:22 110:2
127:19 131:22	311:21,24	285:15 286:14	parte 271:4	110:7 111:12
132:3 183:20	312:1,6,9,10	320:2 347:20	309:10	112:18,20
209:4,5,18	Ozarks 102:23	paid 112:10	partial 97:3	113:8 114:25
210:6 239:4,6	109:17 114:25	208:3 209:18	101:23 113:12	115:2 131:8
244:23,25		214:24 234:9	351:17	132:13 169:16
245:5 256:6	P	237:7,20	participate 204:3	169:22 193:24
261:6 272:19	P 95:2 356:1	238:22 240:16	281:1	209:5 213:14
312:3 342:4	page 164:4	245:8 258:5,12	participated	234:2,4,15,19
owners 108:1	185:20,21	258:13,15,16	212:23 229:23	234:20 244:24
109:5,21 110:2	186:3,5,7,12,20	258:17 265:19	participating	244:25 245:5
110:6 113:12	195:8 200:18	272:19 289:4	277:23 311:1	247:11,14,15
113:13 114:16	200:23 205:10	305:20 333:5	particular	248:4,15 258:9
114:19,24	208:1,22 210:3	333:11	129:11 135:9	259:8 267:16
116:23 122:18	217:13,14	paint 267:9	267:18 270:10	267:20 287:19
131:12,13	220:21,21	Pamela 93:24	277:24 295:10	payable 115:18
176:24 184:9	222:5,6,6,7,8,9	360:5,20	particularly	273:8
184:16 208:3	222:9,10,11,11	paper 284:8	155:13 156:17	paying 112:23
209:5,9,18	222:15,17	309:2	158:5 216:18	114:17 132:7
210:6,13	223:15,16	papers 156:12	223:25 227:19	235:10 242:5,6
228:24 234:3	226:1 230:7,19	157:4 189:8	245:21	242:16 247:17
235:10 242:6	230:20 231:13	198:13 274:4	parties 96:24	247:21,25
242:15 244:8	231:25 232:1,4	paragraph	97:1,8,22	248:2,6,16,18
247:9 248:21	235:6 236:25	243:22	100:23 101:18	249:17 259:11
248:22,25	241:19 242:3,3	paragraphs	102:1 103:8,15	259:17 267:18
249:15,16,17	242:14,20	286:1	108:20 109:8	310:19,23,24
250:16 258:8	245:15 249:20	parallel 109:10	112:16 114:8	332:17 333:25
259:16,24	250:20 251:16	paralyzed 109:10	128:17 144:22	payment 102:24
261:11,14	254:19 257:22	parcel 173:2	204:15 208:14	113:3 117:15
274:9,10,11	258:1 264:3,4,4	parcels 250:7	217:4 228:9	136:24 242:22
276:6 284:13	264:5,6,6,7,7,8	parent 152:11,13	240:13 243:15	244:8 297:1
304:25 306:4,4	268:15 269:13	152:14,16,18	270:1 283:8	payments 102:18
306:7,8 312:8,8	273:21 276:7	157:20	342:19 351:12	163:18 210:13
312:10 325:15	284:10 302:8	part 107:4	354:5 355:4	payout 136:18
330:25 332:20	304:3 320:3,4,4	110:11 113:21	partnership	Peaceful 270:13
339:10 340:3	320:5,6,6,7,13	114:17 117:9	153:6,13	271:3 299:15
341:19,22	320:13,14,14	124:18 135:16	241:13	299:23 301:17
ownership	320:20,21,21	143:7 155:23	partnership's	309:6 311:13
110:21 152:9	320:22,23,23	164:6 170:12	153:7	318:4
178:23 256:5	320:24 321:19	170:22 173:2	parts 109:10	pending 96:20
256:10 271:14	321:21 322:18	217:18 218:21	179:8 294:20	240:4
272:3,5,5,11	322:22,23	222:1 237:12	party 105:12	people 96:18
273:13	323:1,1 324:11	249:6 267:11	117:12 235:23	172:10,19,21
275.15	347:21,22,22			

				_
247:19,24	116:10	plant 131:23	podium 163:25	352:14
248:2,16 255:1	person 178:7	132:15,25	point 103:20	positions 107:11
255:13,16	234:16,18	201:6 235:11	107:18 119:18	123:11
278:23 312:11	240:19 258:8	261:2 287:19	182:3 197:24	possession
315:25 316:1	267:8 306:21	289:4 292:18	197:25 198:2	119:25 127:8,9
316:10	personal 114:11	296:20,21,24	208:1 217:13	186:13 325:4
perceived 155:23	123:21,23	296:25 297:3,4	227:8 239:7	possibility
perceives 155:17	173:12 176:25	298:1,14	242:14 243:20	273:17 331:19
percent 104:25	194:3,6 195:13	300:25 309:4	268:1 275:8	331:20 332:4
104:25 105:3,4	195:14 204:6	331:11	296:12 302:20	possible 277:4
105:24,24	254:8	plants 101:12	304:12 311:19	333:24 334:3
106:11,15,18	personally	pleading 222:18	333:10 345:24	possibly 281:6
119:10 120:11	183:18 273:19	pleadings 172:12	points 156:21	295:17
120:13,14,19	360:7	223:6 226:21	policy 111:22	power 113:2
120:23 121:2,2	persons 112:10	please 95:5 96:14	124:16 212:14	powers 114:14
121:6 129:19	perspective	96:16 99:23	political 256:20	practical 119:24
129:19 131:12	112:3 120:7	118:21 128:15	pool 316:3	193:20 279:25
131:16 134:22	267:3 273:11	138:20 139:14	Poor's 106:4	practice 124:16
134:22,24,25	276:14 277:1	140:14 143:1	151:2,15	124:17
135:4,10 136:5	301:15	149:13 178:6	popular 102:22	practices 120:20
137:7,12 146:2	Peter 243:24	188:6 196:18	portion 111:2	predecessor
146:3,7,8,8	petition 223:14	200:18,22	148:7 160:17	215:4 233:17
148:13,21	ph 168:9 241:21	202:17 205:1	164:3,4 213:14	308:10
151:7 157:1,1	274:11 326:21	217:10,15	226:3 229:22	predictable
162:11,11,13	phase 232:18	220:2,5 262:16	239:8 314:11	155:15
162:25 163:4	phones 96:14	262:18 298:11	352:19	prefer 204:13,18
195:21,21,25	pick 230:14	346:8,13	portions 220:15	preferable
196:1 198:11	pickup 165:2	349:10	221:25 263:7	353:23
198:16 228:25	picture 267:9	pled 170:17	263:25 346:22	prefiled 98:2
229:3 248:21	327:3	pledge 165:24	posed 320:25	preliminary
249:12,18	piece 249:1 291:1	170:13,21	position 102:12	99:18 146:23
250:12 256:10	346:25	171:3,14	117:22 119:9	147:10 356:2
287:14 288:3	pieces 139:21	173:17,18	134:23 135:3,7	premarked
316:9	pipeline 301:8	174:14 185:22	135:11 139:16	187:21
percentage	place 132:7 152:6	186:21 187:3	146:11,18	premarking 98:5
198:21	170:2 187:9	187:12,16	150:16 157:10	premise 301:6,9
percentages	258:18 259:13	188:8 190:24	163:19 167:19	premises 115:3
155:8	259:17 276:17	191:20,22	193:14 217:16	247:10
percent/25	305:24 306:1	192:2,7,12	228:19 239:15	preparation
120:19	324:24 360:9	pledged 178:22	243:25 270:3	189:22
perfectly 134:5	360:14	plug 314:13	275:25 277:7	preparatory
peril 306:2	placed 136:21	plus 100:20	279:22 305:18	139:8
period 104:7	245:7	147:3,7 156:6	305:21 313:15	prepare 160:16
138:1 155:14	places 126:14	156:22 157:2,7	313:16 326:12	218:15 278:20
permission	242:13 247:23	PMSC 324:20	326:25 328:4,5	278:22 352:20
140:11	plan 315:11,15	POA 329:2	328:9 333:2	prepared 139:20
perpetuity	325:7	340:25	338:2 349:14	143:8 160:16
	I	l	I	I

220:12,12	254:2,11	157:18 357:20	105:23 115:4	301:22,25
263:5,5 290:17	pricing 148:4	360:8,11	117:24,25	330:19 337:10
346:20,20	primarily 194:6	proceeds 157:14	179:11 247:8	provides 101:1,4
preparing 97:2	253:8 293:5	process 111:16	248:3,16	125:23 170:16
173:3 189:13	primary 321:24	118:1,4 201:8	295:25 305:24	302:5 329:11
278:15 324:15	principal 117:9	201:12	334:23 351:19	340:25
present 133:21	128:22 143:5	procure 152:16	proposals 113:17	providing 114:18
134:8 247:6,7	239:18,20	produce 100:13	115:5 118:12	235:8 242:8
271:5,16	principally	147:11	304:19 305:11	310:25
274:10 308:17	101:25	professionally	305:12	provision 131:3
311:2 312:8	printed 99:6,6	143:3	propose 109:3	245:1 275:13
360:8	printout 207:8	profile 106:6,6	276:10 351:21	provisions
presented 118:23	prior 130:2 136:8	151:9	proposed 104:6	103:14 171:3
presently 268:10	203:6,16	profiled 198:20	106:7,12 112:2	proxy 106:4
311:14	233:21 321:4	profiles 150:14	120:11 121:3,4	147:7 156:2,5
preserve 103:25	324:8 329:2	profit 254:5	122:3,6 124:13	prudent 137:24
preserved 198:5	340:6	program 314:13	125:25 200:24	PSC 255:6
presiding 93:17	private 116:22	promote 275:15	201:1	psg 172:7 205:5
95:13	privately-owned	promulgate	proposes 113:21	207:24
presume 241:3	147:18 210:7	278:2	114:1	public 92:2 93:2
305:8	pro 297:20 315:5	promulgated	proposing	94:7,8,11,11,14
presumed 130:14	317:8 327:6	278:4	104:25 117:8	94:17 95:24
presuming 144:2	328:22 334:16	proof 223:12	117:15 232:23	96:1,5,9 104:10
144:9 242:23	340:7	253:25 254:4	296:18 300:15	107:10 108:10
279:16	probably 229:6	prop 135:5	proposition	108:18 113:16
pretty 126:24	276:19,21	proper 224:10	213:21	115:5,11,20
326:10	290:19,24	226:23 238:10	propounded	116:11 117:25
prevent 122:4	291:25 292:15	properly 222:24	143:16 343:15	118:13 122:13
173:20 245:7	314:3 325:9	275:24 322:1	prospective	128:12,14,20
284:14	330:17 336:5	327:23	111:22	133:20,21
prevented	345:23	properties	protect 103:25	142:1 144:17
324:15	problem 302:1	106:24 113:11	128:23	145:20 154:24
previous 114:7	304:1 355:14	165:22 166:14	prove 252:7	155:6 160:12
124:13,25	problems 304:12	169:13 176:20	provide 128:2	161:22 182:21
128:25 132:22	337:12 338:7	176:25 194:17	134:1,16,16	196:23 210:8,8
162:7 180:12	procedurally	213:10 215:3	135:23 163:17	210:10,17,18
223:2,4 226:25	282:4	230:22 238:3	211:16,19	211:12 215:9
227:2 239:5	procedures	261:13,15	235:13,20	218:5,11
243:24 244:13	143:21	property 105:9	281:4 324:14	220:10 228:14
256:6 266:18	proceed 98:7	108:1 113:7	329:17,18	256:13,16
274:10 284:23	125:2 205:6	114:16,19	331:23 337:14	263:1 264:22
285:4 310:10	219:23 295:23	116:9 165:4	339:25	268:9 300:1
321:23 334:13	proceeding 109:2	181:17 182:4	provided 100:11	303:15,22
337:4,5 348:1	110:23 154:21	181:17 182:4	147:9 176:24	309:25 317:23
previously	proceedings 92:6	182:13,20	209:12 210:14	321:9,23 328:5
223:18,19	93:6 95:4,4	249:1	218:6,12	344:4 346:17
price 241:12	104:17 112:1	proposal 105:5	253:14 279:2	349:15,16
PILC 241.12	104.17 112.1	hinhozai 102.2	233.14 219.2	347.13,10

	1	I	1	I
353:11 356:6	351:21	190:13,17	raised 108:4	296:13 299:13
publicly-traded	putting 144:19	197:15 198:25	223:7 264:10	300:18 303:6
147:14,17	P.C 95:21	199:1,5 205:9	319:25 320:11	307:15 308:20
published 210:17	P.E 358:19 359:2	211:10,14,24	347:25	308:25 309:6
277:5	p.m 219:15 319:8	211:25 212:3	ramifications	309:20 317:9
pumping 101:8	319:10 355:25	214:11,13,14	267:9	318:5 322:7,9
punch 292:3	P.O 94:3,8,14	214:15,17	range 146:20	322:13,16
purchase 112:25	96:3,8	215:8,10 218:5	rare 317:2	333:3,7,11,19
182:20 185:1		218:12,19	rate 93:13 95:10	334:12,13,19
purchases	Q	221:5 229:12	97:11,16 100:2	334:23 337:4,5
333:13	qualified 182:7	251:17 257:5,8	100:6,10	337:19,24,25
purchasing	qualify 222:24	257:9,11,13	103:22 104:13	338:6,8,18,21
174:5	255:20	258:25 262:5	105:25 107:21	339:3 352:13
purely 136:19	quality 155:14	263:13 266:1	109:6 114:5,6,7	352:15,18
purports 216:7	155:24	268:7 277:12	117:17 125:10	358:16
purpose 128:22	quarrel 325:1	281:7 301:20	129:15 132:16	ratemaking
130:5 165:6,8	quarterly 295:12	306:10,12	132:23 133:9	158:17 201:8
185:1 213:19	question 115:23	309:25 310:1,3	133:11,15,16	201:12 202:25
223:10 224:21	126:9 127:5,6	318:23 321:13	133:17,18	206:4 296:9
225:16 226:6,9	178:6 182:11	321:14 329:8	134:5,7 135:17	314:6 317:6
226:14 242:5,8	184:3,20 186:7	335:9,12,18	136:12,13	332:13 338:7
242:16 243:2,6	203:21 217:7	336:11,15,17	147:1,22,25	ratepayer 112:23
244:12 257:20	217:13,15	336:20,20	148:9,10,13,19	112:24 113:5
258:7	232:14 236:18	337:1 338:10	149:1 155:10	ratepayers 96:10
purposes 99:7	239:16,22	342:10 343:10	156:24 157:1,1	97:5 128:23
125:16 158:25	240:1,4 269:3,7	343:15 344:3,6	158:14,25	327:24
173:23 174:4,9	269:13 270:22	345:1,2,5,7	159:5,7 162:5,7	ratepayer's
174:12 176:13	271:12 279:4	347:2 348:10	162:19 163:1,5	332:17
176:17 177:20	281:9 286:4	348:11,15,18	163:9 169:5,7	rates 112:21
177:24 185:23	289:6,14	350:2,17,19,21	170:10 183:21	115:2,6 116:14
243:3,9,10	297:12 298:10	350:23,24	184:6,10,11,17	121:12,24
244:7,9 292:9	298:21 305:7	quickly 202:17	185:8,12,17	122:14,19
328:9	312:17 314:22	206:9 353:22	193:12 201:3	124:3 125:16
pursuant 110:24	317:4 325:13	quiet 294:6	203:4,5,6,15,16	132:17,23
112:11 237:7	328:2 331:6	quite 151:22	203:23,24,25	133:11 134:7
239:8	334:7 336:1,9	156:16 158:8	225:2,3 226:25	137:5,19,25
pursuing 104:2	337:23 341:18	246:1,17	229:18 238:21	138:2,9 158:10
purview 342:7	questions 128:9	304:16 308:7	246:2,3,11	201:21 203:10
push 96:17	139:7 142:2,4,6	339:4	269:19 270:4,6	203:18,24
put 155:16	142:10,11,13	quote 129:11	270:20 271:4	210:14 246:7
244:18 265:7	143:16 149:22	226:3 259:2	276:17 281:23	246:10,13,17
270:21 275:10	149:23 150:6	R	282:14 283:8	247:4 248:9,24
280:5 311:19	153:21,24		290:8,14,16,17	249:10 292:6,6
329:5 330:2,22	155:1,5 157:10	R 95:2 139:15	291:11,21	295:6,8 296:12
337:25 340:1	159:9 160:25	356:1 360:1	293:2,4,8	298:3,15
340:23 341:3	163:21 164:2	radical 124:15	294:25 295:6	300:15,16
341:11 342:5	179:7 190:8,10	125:4	296:2,6,10,11	303:5 305:11
	I	I	I	I

www.midwestlitigation.com

	I	I	I	I
305:17 307:10	301:5 305:14	208:1 252:1,3	240:19	223:1 227:3
309:12 314:14	308:7 314:20	257:23 286:12	recess 159:17,18	228:5,8 250:23
315:12	325:5 330:18	293:22 294:18	219:10,11	254:1,10 256:9
rate-based 105:1	reason 150:20	320:9,12	319:5,7	262:19 264:21
rating 106:5	158:6 171:9	343:11 349:18	recognize 100:2	286:15 293:16
146:25 147:1,3	193:7 212:22	350:7 353:13	152:17	317:23 319:9
147:4,7,16	223:8 226:7	354:2 358:3,6,9	recognized 293:6	319:11 321:10
150:15 156:2,4	243:17 260:13	358:18 359:9	recollection	343:25 345:24
156:5,8,22	338:20 342:3	359:14	274:23 293:2	346:11 348:6
157:3,7	reasonable	recall 171:17	recommend	350:14 351:14
ratings 156:14,15	105:19 106:16	187:9 233:19	121:5 124:2	352:4 353:3,9
ratio 104:25	116:5,12,14	252:2 258:21	146:23 338:8	353:18 355:23
106:11,15	118:7 120:25	269:22 274:1	338:21	355:24 359:17
136:7 151:7	121:22 122:19	274:25 281:21	recommendation	recorded 104:21
reach 249:18	125:18 129:14	281:22 285:25	137:9 150:8	109:20 328:20
reached 215:5	133:8,18	286:3 287:9	195:22 238:24	records 166:11
reaching 102:10	134:10,13,19	289:19 292:13	275:5,8,16	233:2 325:18
read 173:7,25	135:8,13,17,19	292:17 295:11	280:1 316:19	348:4 352:11
200:22 201:13	135:22 136:6	303:24 307:17	333:19	recoup 214:25
202:6 205:12	136:11 137:10	323:6 325:2	recommendati	243:18,18
206:1 208:21	137:12,23	329:24 330:10	217:8 294:21	recouped 253:22
208:25 211:1	146:13,17,20	receipt 145:7	recommended	recover 109:25
220:24 235:14	147:8,9 150:18	161:16 319:21	105:2 112:2	130:6 132:8
235:15 240:5	150:20,20	350:11 352:10	120:22 123:11	243:2 244:1
245:22 288:8	151:6,21,24	receipts 100:15	137:6 269:4,9	254:2 332:9,14
316:12 322:3	156:6,8 157:6,8	receivable	278:7,9	recovered 331:13
324:22 326:9	158:9 162:19	275:20,23	recommending	331:13
reader 175:16	240:14 246:14	276:2	305:3,4 326:22	recovery 116:13
reading 177:1	314:10,11	receive 111:2	recommends	130:12 206:6
179:13 186:24	330:23	123:20 132:19	217:17	301:7
210:3 217:15	reasonableness	204:23 217:22	reconciliation	recreational
217:23 235:6	121:21 134:17	243:18 267:17	218:13 333:16	315:23,24
236:1 242:9,18	150:23	321:9 353:2	333:19 354:19	Recross 154:24
268:12,15	reasonably 104:3	received 97:6	reconciliations	214:16 309:24
269:20 304:6	121:14	104:15 137:21	218:16	336:19
reads 220:21	reasons 107:11	145:12 161:20	record 95:5,19	Recross-Exami
ready 132:11	118:11 125:7	166:13,23	97:7 98:2	214:19 356:23
138:12 228:13	158:5 178:19	176:5 189:1	107:25 108:5	redirect 142:14
real 109:18	181:25 191:11	190:7 194:16	108:23 139:14	155:2,4 190:18
176:25 182:23	193:9 264:1	207:21 228:5,8	145:12 159:20	190:20 199:8
183:2,3 206:9	271:4	232:16 241:13	161:16,20	215:11,14
298:23 299:9	rebuttal 139:25	264:20 323:7	176:5 188:4,6	257:15,18
realistic 292:6	140:8,20,25	343:24 348:6	189:1 190:7	310:4,7 336:24
reality 135:1	141:3,16,18	350:14 351:14	201:6 204:16	337:2 343:11
really 171:14	143:10 145:4	352:3 353:9,18	204:22,23	345:10,12
280:2 283:19	196:25 200:8	358:2	207:21 219:14	348:20 350:25
292:4,4 293:9	200:19 205:10	receiving 237:23	219:17 220:3	356:13,16,24
	I	I	I	I

357:4,9,12	192:17	136:15,17,21	218:12,15	136:12 137:11
reduce 117:15	reflections 137:9	136:24 137:18	223:10 229:13	138:16 139:24
200:25 201:3	reflects 179:17	137:19 138:10	233:5,8,9,15,16	155:10 158:1
224:1 238:7	reformation	139:17 142:18	234:5,11,14	158:25 167:1
333:11	114:13	145:12,25	235:8,16,19,21	171:6 173:14
reduced 298:3,17	refresh 293:1	146:21,25	235:22 238:11	173:24 174:13
reducing 117:17	refund 296:15	147:13 148:12	240:7,8,9,13	178:9,9,20
reduction 97:4	refusal 324:14	148:18 152:10	243:13 254:15	188:4 222:23
109:7 115:5	refused 108:19	153:5,15 154:4	254:23,24	224:22,24
refer 127:1	108:21 134:1	154:8,14,20	255:15,17,18	228:6 234:1,3
164:10,17	324:25	155:9 156:23	256:6,7,11,15	237:25 240:11
281:11 284:11	refute 244:19	157:12,14,18	256:18 261:12	243:11 247:24
284:23	251:25	158:4,7,11,13	266:4 268:24	248:5 275:20
reference 98:15	regard 192:3	158:18,22	270:7,8,23	304:20 305:13
187:3 225:22	353:4	162:3,25 163:3	271:16,19,22	325:4,22
257:22	regarding 106:22	163:8,16,22	272:8,16,20	343:24
referencing	108:7 112:2	165:3,7 168:10	275:5,17 276:1	register 347:16
207:16	121:10 122:17	168:16,21	277:17 282:14	registered 111:4
referred 97:14	202:25 212:21	169:15,21	300:10 301:16	231:4
126:13 141:15	217:16 228:6	170:6,18	303:23 304:24	registration
157:11 189:23	271:14 277:17	171:13,17	305:8,25 310:2	231:11
211:5 223:3	310:10 331:1	173:16,18,21	311:22,25	regular 122:2
225:1 243:5	337:10 348:5	173:23 174:12	312:2,8,9,12	225:20
271:15 282:13	351:10	174:18 176:4	313:9 319:25	regularly 302:4
283:7 303:2	regardless 250:1	176:11,12,16	321:15 323:8	regulate 308:12
referring 164:18	regards 196:2	176:17,21,23	325:13,18	308:16
208:8,9 209:16	313:5	177:4,9,15,17	336:22 337:6	regulated 113:6
213:17 217:5	region 93:12 94:6	177:21,23,25	341:20 343:19	124:11,17
222:3 225:25	95:9,16 99:21	178:5 180:23	344:10,20,23	173:8,9 174:5
268:24 274:2	99:22 100:3,5,9	181:4,11,22,24	345:11 348:5	210:21 258:14
276:5 282:19	101:1 104:14	183:7,14 185:7	348:12 350:18	258:15 260:11
282:23 284:16	104:19,21	185:11,14	352:2 356:3	260:13,21
285:11 303:18	106:9 110:12	186:10,14,15	359:8,9,10,12	268:9 318:16
325:6 327:16	110:13,16	187:1,4,7	359:13,15,16	regulates 114:10
334:14	111:4,7 112:19	188:16,20,25	359:18	regulation
refers 222:18	113:19,24	189:22 190:2,6	Regional 307:7	115:12 287:16
225:2 321:2	116:11,20,21	191:10,15	Region's 97:11	regulations
347:19	117:1,3,12,14	192:1,3,6,7,10	97:17,19 101:6	131:24 210:15
refinanced	119:9,17 120:1	192:18 193:6	101:11 103:6	236:9,12
165:13	120:3,5,9,23	193:19,20,22	106:4,12,19,24	regulatory 93:17
reflect 95:19	121:15,17	194:1,2,4,6,8	107:21 108:1	95:13 107:5
123:25 251:15	122:16,20	194:20 195:10	114:5 119:12	115:9 158:16
reflected 104:23	123:3 124:25	195:11 198:24	119:16,21,23	160:13 177:24
137:5 193:5	125:12,21	201:12 203:16	121:10 123:24	178:9 220:9
247:2 322:7,9	129:24 132:24	210:20 211:16	124:20 125:16	333:14 346:18
322:13	133:23 134:1,4	211:19 215:4	128:25 132:18	reinforce 171:7
reflecting 117:18	134:15,20	215:12 218:6,8	135:14 136:4	rejected 118:14

223:2	171:21 215:24	254:20 278:16	requesting	respective 105:7
related 111:13	233:25 257:25	279:17 287:25	206:17	respectively
115:13,15	260:4 261:7	290:7 314:21	requests 108:11	140:1
119:4 120:22	267:22,25	315:12,14	109:2 171:17	respond 225:13
129:22,22	279:22 289:21	327:8 329:4,13	171:25 174:9	response 97:18
165:25 329:2	289:23 291:22	329:21 330:6	299:1,5,7 323:7	97:19 128:10
relates 224:17	292:16 293:23	330:15 340:23	325:6	142:5 153:22
relating 112:14	294:5 295:4,14	347:16,19,24	require 245:17	155:5 166:13
249:24	307:15 308:25	352:13 358:16	required 167:25	172:23 176:21
relation 190:22	312:17,18	reported 93:23	183:12 237:20	219:8 226:11
253:9 260:11	315:22 337:6	252:14,16,18	310:23 315:9	306:14 313:12
316:17	remind 199:20	252:22	331:24	314:22 323:13
relationship	221:19	Reporter 99:8	requirement	323:20 324:6,7
261:19 311:24	removal 163:17	139:24 172:6	109:8 117:16	325:20,20
relative 147:5	remove 136:17	187:20 196:19	131:7 160:18	342:21 343:22
149:6 156:20	removed 136:23	205:4 207:23	201:1 227:21	345:4 350:12
relatively 156:15	237:17	240:3,5 349:11	232:8,9 233:3	353:6,16
release 186:21	removing 123:1	357:22 360:6	238:1 249:23	355:19
188:7,12,14	rendered 103:12	reporting 242:24	358:11	responses 173:3
released 187:16	108:2	reports 251:20	requirements	responsibility
relevance 116:21	renew 228:24	252:10,25	103:16	120:3 249:25
relevant 106:25	renewed 131:12	253:14 289:17	research 322:19	339:6
283:23	165:11	289:20 290:11	323:2,10,23	rest 126:5
reliable 135:23	repair 130:8	328:16 330:12	324:3,4	Restated 112:13
relied 194:6,8	249:21	Report/Revenue	resemble 108:6	restricted 339:14
266:17 341:12	repairs 259:8	358:11	reserve 198:3	restrictions
relief 276:17	repeat 106:21	represent 268:3	225:8 264:15	106:23 109:20
333:3	107:15 112:6	291:6 321:25	321:8	112:11,15
relieve 284:7	149:12 163:2	representation	reserved 228:3	113:1 115:17
relieved 107:14	178:6 184:2,14	193:15 330:23	348:3	116:2 235:23
relinquish	185:9 234:13	representative	residence 249:2	236:2 272:15
114:11 305:1	236:18 239:25	137:25 301:19	resized 140:19	284:13 288:22
rely 226:17,21	repeatedly 102:8	represented	resolution	restrictive
relying 328:9	replaced 140:24	181:21 185:13	127:20	112:13 211:3
remain 128:19	Replacement	191:8 194:5	resolve 225:10	271:21 273:7
remainder 288:6	148:3,7	represents 167:8	resolved 138:5	275:9 286:22
316:11	reply 97:17	301:10	respect 102:14	307:1
remaining 352:4	report 99:25	republic 269:15	104:12 106:20	restructure
353:8	100:4 101:16	request 97:18	157:12,16	157:21 334:23
remains 123:17	107:20,22	172:25 173:6,8	167:7 178:12	result 97:4 118:6
remarkable	109:13 129:1	174:2 178:12	178:14 187:1	133:10 134:12
180:3,5	160:19 161:1	190:22 205:16	215:19 223:23	136:11,20,25
remarks 96:12	161:13 176:18	206:14 208:13	229:22 247:7	313:8
102:10 165:20	212:12 220:16	352:7 353:1,2	267:21 270:18	results 215:20
remedies 110:5	221:15 229:23	requested 97:8	311:6 319:23	resumed 159:20
remember 96:16	230:6 252:14	206:21 299:13	320:8,11,16	219:14 319:9
127:13 170:14	252:16,23	326:6	323:23 352:12	retained 111:1
	I	I	I	I

157:19	260:24 261:1	294:24 334:12	326:10 327:18	rolled 278:1
retroactive 296:8	269:17,18	337:4	336:7,7,10	341:13
296:14	271:8,10	reviewing 202:23	338:23 341:23	rollover 278:17
return 102:13	275:22 276:3	206:16 292:25	344:12	278:24,25
104:13 106:17	288:3,7,13,17	295:24 324:7	rights 110:10,16	281:11 303:12
115:7 116:12	288:19 289:8	reviews 293:9	110:18,21	313:9
118:8 119:5	289:11,17	294:23 295:19	112:20 113:9	room 222:14
120:23,25	290:6,13,15	revised 167:23	112:20 113:9	336:6
120.23,23	290:0,13,13	300:23,23	116:18,22,25	Roth 349:5,6,12
135:17,19	291:10,20	revising 296:11	117:19 118:1	349:17 350:7,7
136:4,12,21	292:4,8,11	revision 141:14	237:12 238:19	350:21 351:3
137:5,8,11	297:24 298:13	343:13	240:20 271:10	357:18 358:9
143:25 144:24	299:4,17,19	revolves 136:16	271:12,14,17	358:10
146:20 147:6	300:4,8,10,24	revolving 344:8	271:20,23	routinely 297:20
147:11,21	301:7,12 303:1	re-cross 142:14	272:25 273:2,5	RPS 113:11,13
148:1,13,22	303:8,11	Rice 358:19	272:23 273:2,5	117:1 165:22
149:3 157:5	304:21,25	359:2	312:16,22	166:14 169:13
159:24 162:25	305:3,10,16,25	right 96:15 99:1	risk 103:22 106:5	170:3 174:24
163:4,19	306:5 308:20	111:1 112:8	106:6 117:13	176:20,24
198:11,14	308:20 309:3,5	113:20,25	126:17,25	182:20,20,23
309:4 332:11	309:14,17,20	117:1,3,4 118:7	136:9,15,20	184:22 185:4
332:14	310:25 311:18	126:20 128:8	137:1,10	194:17 213:10
returns 135:25	312:15,17,23	141:23 146:6	146:23 148:18	213:17,18
136:11	314:2,18 315:6	146:12 155:20	148:23 149:11	215:3 230:22
Reuters 359:19	316:10,12,15	155:21 162:24	149:15,18,21	231:6 232:17
Reuter's 189:5	317:2,12,15	164:15 169:17	150:14 151:1,1	238:3 241:3,12
revenue 100:14	318:14,17,19	170:8 184:15	151:9 158:14	251:24 256:1,3
109:4,7 112:7	318:20 323:14	186:16,18	163:8,12	256:4,9 261:13
113:19,20,21	revenues 111:19	205:9 207:13	198:20	261:14
113:25 114:2,3	115:25 123:25	209:17 217:21	risks 136:2 149:1	RPS/Stump
117:16,18	200:25 240:11	219:9 228:12	149:2	177:10
123:4,6,16,17	297:22,25	229:20 231:5	road 102:19	rule 103:11,12,13
123:19,20	304:4,16	231:18 233:25	ROBERT 93:19	103:16 112:1
124:14,18,22	reversal 180:6	242:3 245:14	Robertson	146:7,13
125:6,13,15,18	review 116:2	247:1,17 262:6	196:13,15,20	162:10,15
125:21 129:3	148:20,22	263:8 264:19	196:24 198:7	195:21 276:17
200:25 227:21	149:1,4 152:11	272:9,9 275:1	199:4,10	277:4,8 278:3,4
228:20 232:8,9	166:5 189:4	278:11,14	319:13,14	278:6,8,11
233:2,8,10,10	202:17 206:8	281:11,16,25	321:19 323:22	313:13,17,24
233:15,17,20	215:20 279:4	286:17,20	335:15 342:12	313:25 314:1,5
233:23 234:2,4	280:9 291:11	290:3,10 291:2	356:17 357:10	314:5,12,17
234:9,15 237:4	295:12 300:22	291:14 295:16	358:5,6,8	ruled 107:6
238:1,15,22	317:5	300:14 302:19	Robertson's 98:9	rulemaking
239:19 240:11	reviewed 146:22	303:19 306:20	198:1 319:23	111:20,23
241:5,14	166:20,23	307:1 309:9	320:9,16	205:12,15,17
245:16,20	215:25 216:1	313:11 321:12	role 123:10	212:13 276:13
246:1,21	216:10 278:20	323:19 324:23	171:24 279:5	277:17,19
	l	l	l	l

279:8,10,24	243:16 295:14	155:21,22	101:18	289:5 292:22
rules 210:15	314:1 322:8	security 111:3	series 103:14	300:15 301:8
236:9,11 255:4	SB-4 348:2	119:22 126:15	110:8 139:7	301:21,23,23
255:10 256:23	schedule 98:17	126:21 127:22	serve 128:23	302:1,5 305:13
322:5	199:14 210:14	177:10 186:22	132:11	310:12,16,17
ruling 202:24	219:4 252:3	192:3	served 123:18	310:21,22
225:9 278:7	285:15 300:22	see 98:21 107:14	service 92:2 93:2	311:5 315:3
run 127:16	300:23 301:2,3	150:24 165:16	93:14 94:14,17	316:11 322:3
Russo 352:13	321:1 328:11	172:19,22	95:11,24 96:2	334:2 346:17
358:17	328:19 331:1	178:16,16	100:11 101:2,3	358:12
Ruth 94:2 95:21	355:5	182:17 183:1	101:4,5,6,16	services 93:24
R-o-b-e-r-t-s-o-n	scheduled 342:18	184:15 213:12	106:24 108:2	114:17,19,20
196:20	schedules 99:5,7	238:8 264:16	109:5 112:20	116:15 210:15
R-o-t-h 349:12	220:14,20	268:14 273:2	113:7,23	210:16.16
K-0-t-II 3+7.12	220:14,20	275:25 280:9	114:12,22	300:25 360:7
S	223:22,25	286:8 288:6	114.12,22	serving 247:12
S 93:19,24 95:2	227:10,18,22	289:24 299:5	122:18 123:24	259:14
356:1 358:1	320:25 355:10	304:13 314:9	122:18 123:24	SESSION 219:13
360:5,20	358:13	314:10 326:7	124.1 123.23	357:1
safe 135:23 269:3	scope 172:20	328:18 331:12	131:15 132:4	set 95:7 106:18
301:22 313:15	260:16	341:15 342:3	135:23 160:13	107:12 110:5
sake 293:10	score 151:9	352:18 354:15	160:18 161:13	117:8 121:1
sale 107:4 253:24	SEAC 326:21,23	seeing 155:12	164:3,4 203:5	122:19 133:18
254:5,6 290:4,5	seal 232:20	286:3 354:1	203:15 209:8	140:24 143:8
sales 100:15	search 217:19	seek 223:10	210:10,18	158:10,14
110:8 253:24	324:9	seen 136:13,13	220:10,16,22	172:24 201:22
Sally 110:17	Seasons 109:16	174:22 188:12	220:23,24,25	203:18,24
113:11 167:15	109:24 110:6	274:24 301:2	220:25,24,25	246:4 252:4
170:3 177:3	110:10 202:9	341:20	223:23 224:1	265:18 313:20
213:10,18	241:25 242:2	seize 334:5	227:19 229:23	313:20 315:12
215:3 230:22	254:1 269:1	select 152:14	232:12 234:4	318:10 333:20
231:6 238:4	312:3,11	sell 116:25 117:2	234:16 235:9	338:2,9,24
256:1,6 261:15	315:13	233:24 254:16	235:13,17,21	339:13 360:9
Sally's 256:2	seat 343:2	sells 241:4	236:3,7,10,12	setting 105:19
satisfied 326:20	seated 138:23	send 115:10	236:15,17,21	258:3,11
satisfy 111:16	142:23 262:16	sense 131:20	236:21 237:13	settled 345:22
save 346:2	346:8 349:8	185:6,10,15	242:8 246:21	settlement 97:3
saw 165:8 274:9	second 119:16	281:13 310:20	242.8 240.21 247:20,24	110:25 147:25
278:21 291:19	166:15 169:1	sent 171:17	247.20,24 248:4,5,17	148:4 237:8,19
325:6	226:21	174:23,24,25	249:2 250:22	237:24 238:9
saying 96:19	section 118:4,5	174.23,24,23	251:7,9 254:20	239:9 240:14
152:25 170:9	209:1,1 210:4	separate 136:25	257:24 258:4	240:15,22
179:3 180:25	sections 235:4	139:21 154:19	263:1 266:24	seven 101:11
237:23 255:12	secure 155:15	214:5 231:7	267:14,15	261:25
271:24 317:15	secured 192:11	248:8 250:7	269:15,16,19	sever 127:16
322:10 326:25	securities 127:23	separately 215:6	270:16 284:14	sewage 101:11
says 146:7 179:6	147:5 155:19	separating	287:20 288:4	209:3,5 210:4,7
	117.5 155.17	Soparating	207.20 200.4	207.5,5 210.7,7

210:11	344:10 358:13	163:18 167:11	327:17 333:18	side 152:18,20
sewer 93:12,14	358:14	173:9,13,14,16	333:20 337:24	153:10 207:11
94:6,13 95:9,11	sewers 101:13	173:22 174:4	338:9,17,21	295:2,7
95:17,22	172:24	174:11 178:21	344:9 358:13	signed 173:17
100:11,14	Shana 120:14	178:21 179:1,4	358:14	273:18
101:2,4,11	127:2 159:24	181:15 183:6	sheet 152:19,20	significance
101.2,4,11 102:19 107:3	160:1,2,8,15,20	181:15 185:0	153:8,10	157:23
102.19 107.3	161:9 356:14	183.17,24 184:5 188:15	205:22 207:9	significant
112:14 113:7	358:20	191:23 213:4	207:16 282:9	111:17 148:17
112:14 113:7	share 116:24	213:17 255:1	283:3 359:7	163:7 171:4
127:14 129:19	shared 177:14	255:18,24	360:10	296:23
129:21,22	shareholder	261:12 330:24	sheets 100:10,12	significantly
129.21,22	105:13 106:2	340:4,11,13	100:16 282:7	106:8 136:8
132:9 133:6,13	110:12,13,17	shares 105:8	282:10 283:19	151:14
133:19 135:3	113:14 116:20	110:19 113:15	shift 114:21	signing 273:5
136:18 137:18	117:1 136:16	117:2 127:8,10	shifted 325:15	silence 96:14
146:9,14	136:19 137:2,3	127:23 128:5	Shores 253:11,20	similar 113:17
162:12 165:3,7	137:10 149:9	147:18 152:9	290:4,6 301:16	127:12 138:5
181:11,23	149:15,19	152:16,17,24	308:10 309:16	159:6 239:13
185:2 191:16	154:17 156:24	152:10,17,24	311:21,24	299:2 326:15
195:23,24	157:11,16	165:9 167:13	312:1,6,10,10	344:19,22
202:9,12 206:6	163:12,17	167:15 174:5	short 156:15	similarly 130:20
207:10,11,12	164:10,19	176:11,16	304:13	133:5
210:16 211:22	166:1,2 167:8	178:22 179:1	show 129:13	simple 123:3
213:25 220:22	167:16 168:15	181:17 241:5	130:10,13,25	298:21 313:25
213.23 220.22	169:16,23	256:11	133:1,2,12	simplified 314:4
232:10 233:6	170:12,17	shawnee 101:4	134:9,19,23	simply 107:1
235:9,17 236:3	171:5 181:5,8	102:15,16,20	136:3,6 138:3	193:23,24
236:7,10,12,15	181:10,16	103:2,17	140:12,13	237:24 272:18
242:17 248:12	184:22,24	112:10 113:10	172:18 187:23	sir 143:4 199:11
250:11 253:2	185:25 193:24	114:16,25	193:13 206:20	203:22 212:25
253:18,23	193:25 195:3	130:16,20	216:4 230:11	214:8 266:11
254:3 255:5,10	238:13,17	132:25 133:2	256:9 274:21	266:15 306:11
258:9 261:13	241:4 255:13	133:13,19	291:1 335:1	306:16 308:22
263:3 265:3,7	255:22 256:2	137:17 201:22	341:15 354:11	309:23 319:1
266:13 269:1	261:5	202:15 203:5	showing 176:24	336:8,13 343:2
270:7,8 280:19	shareholders	203:15 211:21	206:14 268:19	345:15 348:24
280:20 281:20	105:7 110:16	211:22 220:24	274:14	sit 131:21 289:7
285:17 286:3,4	111:4 114:10	220:25 232:9	shown 135:9	289:12 294:6
286:21 287:5	117:10 119:16	232:10 248:2,7	157:3	site 323:18
295:6 302:2	123:20,23	248:12,15,17	shows 120:1,7,11	sitting 306:21
307:6,11,14,15	124:20 127:7	248:22,24	129:11 151:6	situation 127:12
308:5,16 312:4	127:23 133:24	253:2 265:3,7	151:23 156:13	127:18 239:13
312:5 318:3	134:1,4 136:19	285:13 286:2,5	156:18 199:14	257:2
324:18 333:18	136:22,23	286:22 287:3,4	206:22 324:16	situations 313:19
333:20 337:24	154:5,9,15	295:1,9 322:6	sic 157:9 165:19	six 100:20 261:25
338:9,21	157:21 163:16	322:13 324:18	307:8 316:5	262:2 288:3
	I	I	I	I

	•	•	•	
316:8	sources 158:20	stable 156:10	219:18 220:13	117:24 119:9
Sixty 151:6	Southern 103:19	stacks 105:9	228:4 230:2,3	119:11 120:10
size 304:11	speak 276:20	staff 94:12,17	232:23 233:7	120:14,18
skipping 245:14	299:20	95:23 96:1	233:13 235:1,7	121:2,7 122:6
322:23	speaking 281:24	101:14 104:6	238:7 239:7,18	124:19,23
slightly 232:15	speaks 276:10	105:2,9 107:9	240:24,25	125:25 134:23
slow 335:24	specific 128:1	108:10,17	241:5,7 243:7	135:2,11 137:6
small 127:14	131:1,14 134:2	109:3 113:16	243:25 244:15	146:11,22
135:3,8 146:9	152:14 162:21	113:20 115:19	244:15 257:16	150:8,11,13,16
146:14 162:12	214:4 265:4	117:7,15	263:2,21	151:9,16,19
195:23,24	269:19 277:20	118:14,18,19	264:20 268:21	157:5 159:2
205:18 304:13	297:3 323:23	119:20 120:4,5	269:4,8 272:24	160:18,19
308:25 347:21	specifically 129:1	120:11,20,22	273:1,4 275:7	162:10,15
smaller 341:8	136:23 149:3,9	121:5,13,23	275:14 276:12	167:19 198:17
sold 241:8,9	173:17 202:25	122:2,13	277:16 278:2,5	205:15 217:16
253:11 288:16	260:18 278:3	123:10,22,24	278:7,9,16	228:19 232:8
291:25 292:2	284:20 289:20	124:1,5,13	279:13,14,18	232:12 238:23
312:6,7,9	327:16	125:5,9,11,14	279:22 280:1,7	239:14 247:8
sole 113:6 185:1	specifics 127:3	125:17 126:1	280:19,20	248:3 270:3
solely 191:23	speculation	141:14,23,24	281:4 286:25	276:23 277:1,6
somebody	182:6 239:12	145:8,16 146:6	290:15 291:16	295:24 304:19
249:10 281:8	249:6	150:19,22	291:20 293:7	305:11,12,21
289:12 305:20	speed 353:23	151:11 152:10	294:24 299:7	313:16 317:5
315:3 355:6	spell 160:7	152:21 153:23	300:15,19	352:12 353:10
somebody's	196:18 220:5	156:1 158:5	302:11,23,25	stand 98:3
279:3	262:21 346:13	159:4,6,25	303:6 305:18	142:17 159:14
somewhat	349:10	161:8,13,16,19	309:1 310:5	159:17 196:11
113:17 251:21	spelled 220:6	162:13 165:22	315:10 316:18	199:13 218:25
soon 346:4	262:23	166:13 171:18	319:16 321:12	230:15 262:10
sorry 142:8	spent 118:24	173:10 176:2	324:20 329:4	268:21 319:3
143:24 144:8	253:23	176:10,15,18	329:21 330:2	342:16 345:19
149:12 184:2	spin-off 281:22	176:22 177:22	336:20 340:23	349:3 351:7
185:9 186:2	spit 314:14	178:3,7,22	344:2 347:9,10	standard 106:3
231:17 265:5	split 129:19	180:12,17,22	347:11,16,19	120:24 121:7
268:17 278:6	sponsored	181:3,8,18,21	347:24 348:3,5	151:2,15
285:5 292:19	108:18 146:4	182:12,17,23	348:21 350:16	173:15 306:23
298:4 339:2	spot 186:18	183:1 190:18	352:4,8,14,18	standards 106:9
346:1 351:11	spread 156:13,16	190:23 191:8	356:4 358:11	111:16 120:20
sort 276:2 281:10	156:19 157:3	194:5,15,19	358:11,12,13	stands 114:22
sought 102:18	spreads 147:4,9	195:22 197:23	358:14,16,16	stand-alone
254:16	157:2 359:19	200:2,24	358:17,18,19	295:8
sounded 224:6	Spreadsheet	204:11,19	358:21,22,24	start 92:18 95:1
sounds 98:24	189:5	205:5 206:13	359:1,2,4,5,6	99:20 138:12
294:1 308:4	spun 282:14	206:17,21	Staff's 97:18	164:2 219:2
source 116:13	SR-2010-0110	207:1,17,20,24	99:2,4 105:5,19	231:14 257:21
152:15 153:12	97:11 100:1	214:17 215:21	105:21 106:7	268:2 288:12
236:14,20	ss 360:3	217:17,19	114:23 115:4	started 274:14
	1	1	1	1

275:12 299:23	stay 180:13	105:22,24	261:15,16	152:12
301:23 327:5	stayed 240:9	106:8,13,15,17	359:13	subsidized
starting 145:23	Stenotype 360:11	117:8 119:4,8	Stump's 113:14	248:25 249:10
180:7 214:17	360:13	119:13,21	167:15 351:20	subsidizing
217:14 316:13	step 142:14	120:13,18	352:3	251:11
state 92:1 93:1	159:12 196:8	121:1,3,5,8	style 206:1	successors 242:1
139:13 142:25	199:11 218:23	128:18 134:18	subdivision	suffering 136:10
160:6 188:3	318:25 342:14	134:20,21,24	116:3,3 236:10	sufficient 135:24
193:9,11	345:17	135:14 138:15	256:20 271:20	305:12,17
196:18 210:9	STEPHEN 93:19	138:18 144:23	276:5 284:12	suggest 346:2
220:2 262:18	sticky 127:20	145:24,25	286:8 299:11	suggested 294:22
298:15 304:3	stipulated 100:23	146:2,5,9,14	306:25 311:15	294:22
323:15 342:2	243:16	147:8 149:5	315:4,24	suggestion 351:9
346:10 349:10	stipulation	150:8,13,18,24	subdivisions	suggestions
360:2,16	101:23 109:8	151:6,13,13,15	210:23 285:11	107:13
stated 125:1	112:16 208:14	151:21,23	285:12,20	suit 240:13
129:1,9 133:1	244:21 273:24	152:1,11 158:3	297:5	Suite 94:3,9
137:15 148:1,2	286:18 351:17	158:9,16	subject 108:3	sum 329:25
184:25 202:24	stipulations	159:23 162:3,8	109:20 113:1	Summers 104:24
264:1 267:2,7	96:25 97:2,5,14	162:12,16	117:11 136:9	105:23 138:17
295:7 330:17	243:21 345:22	171:6,8,21	154:15,18	138:19,21
statement 99:21	354:15	173:20,24	167:20 217:3	139:7,13,15,19
99:22 118:17	stock 105:4 256:7	174:13 179:10	221:13 224:10	140:4,14,17
118:19 126:9	Stoll 93:19 212:2	179:11,16	228:5 245:1	141:8 144:10
128:12,14	214:14 222:13	180:18 181:2,9	264:21 266:8	144:16 146:1
129:9 167:9	257:13 306:19	181:19 182:24	267:13 278:12	179:9 192:16
168:12 173:11	307:24 317:13	185:25 191:1,3	321:10 332:21	193:11 199:17
176:23 187:13	336:16 345:7	192:17,19,21	332:24 341:19	199:19 200:5
230:19,24,25	348:17 350:24	193:4,6,8,21	343:12 348:4	202:1 205:8,21
234:12,13	357:8	196:2 197:10	353:3	212:5 214:20
244:14,21	stop 334:5	296:2 356:7	submit 141:8	215:15 216:4,6
250:13 252:13	storage 101:9	structure-return	204:10 207:1	217:5 218:20
266:10 273:6	stream 123:4,6	102:6	submitted 100:9	252:1 287:15
287:24 296:3,5	124:22 125:13	Strump 256:1	108:11 141:4	300:22 342:22
303:2 310:18	129:3 312:23	studies 327:14	198:13 345:24	342:23 343:8,9
356:3,4,6	streams 241:14	study 315:8,10	subpoena 165:22	345:13,14
statements 99:20	Street 94:9,15	stuff 163:24	166:13 169:13	356:8,21
223:11 310:10	95:21	Stump 110:17,20	174:24	357:14 359:8
states 118:3,9,10	stricter 115:12	110:20,20	subsdidation	359:10,11
131:4 135:20	strictly 231:10	113:12,14	245:19	Supervising
324:5	248:11 324:5	167:15 170:3	subsdization	263:3
state-of-the-art	strike 107:9	177:3,14	247:8	supervision
132:2,6,11	122:21	213:10,18	subsequently	290:23
stating 140:9	strong 150:14	215:3 230:22	233:18	supplied 222:21
354:19	structure 102:13	231:6 238:4,13	subsidation	supplies 122:1
statute 168:2	104:12 105:3	238:20,23	245:17,18	supply 108:21
Statutes 167:23	105:16,18,20	256:6,8 261:13	subsidiary	256:13,17
	I	I	I	I

293:11 324:25	225:25 232:17	258:9,18,21	282:6,11 283:1	311:20,23
support 105:1,25	234:21 251:17	259:1,5,7,13,19	283:25 284:3	318:5 342:5
106:14 107:13	258:1 270:12	260:2,7,9,12,19	291:10 293:14	tariffed 269:5,9
114:12 158:21	276:7 277:12	265:10 287:24	294:5,18 304:1	288:20 297:25
185:14 223:12	284:11 286:12	288:9,9,11,15	305:5 321:8	298:12 311:10
242:7 247:22	304:3 320:17	289:8 290:5	323:22 327:6	311:10
258:17 259:18	324:10 339:17	291:25 292:3	327:20 346:3	tariffing 268:21
287:23 310:25	343:11 347:15	292:12,13	355:13	tariffs 100:19
316:15 327:24	349:18 350:8	297:21 311:4	taken 99:19	112:21 203:20
340:1,2 345:21	352:3 358:7,10	312:1 315:21	111:3 117:9	217:19 218:2
351:16	358:20,21,23	316:14,16	159:18 167:13	235:18 236:14
supported	358:24 359:1,3	327:24,25	219:12 268:21	236:20 246:4
106:18 329:6	359:4,11,12	331:14	282:8 305:17	247:2,3 332:22
supporting	suspect 180:11	systems 112:14	319:7 352:17	332:24 341:20
158:16 235:11	suspending	130:3,4,7,16	354:25 355:2	341:20
247:19	100:19	132:9 135:3,8	takes 97:9 200:14	technical 267:2,3
supports 151:16	sustain 227:5	210:11,11	243:25 305:18	267:7,8
259:1	SW 212:8	211:22 254:3	334:4 339:5	Ted 196:13,14,20
suppose 275:22	Swearengen	266:14 272:20	talk 96:17 242:21	196:24 356:17
supposed 353:21	328:15 329:7	341:3	253:21 276:8	357:10 358:5,6
Supreme 135:20	330:2	S&P 106:13	300:24	358:7
Surcharge 148:3	Swearengen's	150:18 156:7	talked 165:20	television 172:16
sure 150:9	329:25 339:23	S&P's 106:10	254:19 272:21	178:17
169:15 170:1	340:17 341:12	150:13	274:25 291:23	tell 96:21 189:12
192:8 198:3	swimming 316:3	S-h-a-n-a 160:8	294:8 308:11	237:16 261:10
204:20 224:4	switched 193:25		talking 164:5	284:24 285:8
227:10 241:22	sworn 343:1	$\frac{\mathbf{T}}{\mathbf{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{F} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} A$	175:4 189:19	291:15 298:22
246:24 249:8	SW-2011-0042	T 358:1 360:1,1	199:15 249:21	326:2 329:15
253:12 273:6	207:9,16	tabbed 208:22	250:21 270:6	330:15 332:3
274:7,15	281:12 282:20	table 299:19	273:5 274:18	334:15,16,25
278:20 280:2	335:20	take 96:23	281:9 285:25	354:6,7
280:25 282:18	sync 274:5	112:19 113:6	287:9 289:25	telling 272:14
283:22 287:14	system 101:7,11	114:16,19	299:14 315:15	tended 185:19
295:17 298:19	107:3 130:8,17	119:25 126:18	324:4 327:9,13	tender 145:13
300:20 306:20	130:20,21,24	127:8 129:11	328:12	197:21 221:16
311:8 330:12	132:11,13	129:12 132:3	talks 242:4	263:22 319:18
336:4 339:5	133:3,6,13,19	150:11 158:8	tank 101:9	347:12 350:8
342:8 354:24	135:5,9 136:18	163:15 170:17	tap 307:16	tenders 161:13
surprised 290:21	146:9,14 148:3	176:9 178:23	tap-on 307:19	term 275:21
surrebuttal	148:6 162:12	185:3 186:13	target 146:24	315:23
98:10 140:1	209:3,4,6,6,10	191:17 195:5,6	156:8 157:7	terminate 131:13
141:4 160:20	209:11 210:5,5	195:12,14	tariff 100:9,12,16	229:1 249:3
161:9 179:8,8	210:7 211:21	202:16,17 204:12 216:17	111:11 115:19	termination
185:20 186:6	213:25 241:20	216:25 225:4,9	246:2,17 275:6	111:9 248:23
192:15 196:25	242:7,17	210:25 225:4,9 227:7 230:14	275:10 307:20	272:1
221:23 222:1,7	247:11,15,18	241:11 264:15	309:12,16	terms 103:1
223:7 225:23	253:10,10,23	271.11 204.13	311:13,14,17	130:1 135:22
		•		•

r				
171:3 244:5	169:12 170:6	330:17 334:25	336:12,13,17	239:11,21
271:20 274:20	171:21 179:14	336:17 339:17	336:18,21,23	241:22 243:22
275:24	179:19 182:1	343:8,16	342:11,13	249:21 250:21
territory 106:25	186:24 187:10	345:15,23	344:3 345:5,8,9	251:5 256:9
108:2 234:4,17	189:4,13,14,23	346:20,25	345:16 348:7	258:19 267:1
236:17,22	189:24 192:15	347:15 349:18	348:10,16,17	268:14 271:11
247:24 248:5	192:15,24	349:22,24	348:19,22,25	271:21 272:7
Tesitmony 358:5	193:12 196:7	351:13,20	349:1 350:22	273:2,19 276:3
test 113:22 119:6	196:25 197:4,7	353:14 354:2	351:2,3,4	276:6 277:5,6
121:23 137:16	197:10,12,20	358:3,6,7,9,10	355:15,22	278:19 280:13
137:23 150:23	198:1,9 200:8	358:15,17,18	Thanks 202:19	280:13 281:20
151:4 237:4,5	201:9 203:9,25	358:20,21,23	214:11	281:23 282:7,9
261:22 317:10	205:10,11	358:24 359:1,3	theme 122:24	282:16 283:5,7
testified 104:24	206:17 208:1,8	359:4,8,9,11,12	theoretical 105:2	283:9,18
120:15 161:12	214:2 215:19	359:14	thereof 360:10	284:25 285:15
170:9 198:9	215:21,24	thank 95:18,25	thing 141:20	285:24 286:15
213:23 214:6	216:1,4,8,11,18	96:7,11 118:15	184:7 204:1	286:18 287:6
213:23 211:0	216:19 217:1,6	126:5,8 128:8	281:10	289:12 292:2
258:24 267:12	217:24 218:21	128:11 138:10	things 96:24	293:16,17,17
267:15 327:4	220:12,14,19	138:11 141:12	107:15 108:9	293:19 294:8
342:1 343:13	221:13,20,25	141:22 142:2,9	115:23 131:23	296:4 297:2,13
343:14	222:5,7 223:3	150:5 153:18	139:8 144:21	299:12 300:11
testifies 139:1	223:20,21,24	153:19 155:1,3	172:20,21	301:2,3,6,9,18
226:9	225:1,18,22	159:11 161:23	175:18 200:15	301:18 302:15
testify 105:20	226:1 227:17	190:13,15,19	313:22	303:18 304:24
120:15 273:15	231:13 232:15	194:22 196:7,9	think 97:25	305:15 306:5
290:9	237:2 242:18	199:3,4,6,7,9	99:14,18	307:18 309:17
testifying 97:25	244:5,6,19	200:3 205:7	101:24 126:2	311:7,12
143:20,25	251:20 252:4	206:24 207:19	139:4,24	312:13,18
198:2	254:1 257:23	209:15 211:8	146:17 150:19	313:10,15,23
testimonies	263:5,11	211:13 212:7	150:20 151:15	317:22 318:6
294:2 343:12	264:15 267:4	214:12 215:7	151:17,19,22	318:12 321:23
testimony 98:2	273:3,12,17,22	215:10,13	152:7,22 156:1	323:17 325:9
98:10,11,20,21	285:1 286:12	218:22 219:24	156:6,11 158:4	325:13,23
106:19 107:9	286:12 287:16	228:11,15	158:7,11 164:5	326:17 327:2
107:16 108:18	291:1,7,12,19	230:18 257:4,9	164:15 167:1	327:10,12,14
125:8 138:13	292:21,21	257:12,17	169:9 172:18	327:20 338:13
139:1,2,21	293:1,6,12,15	261:4 262:4,6,7	174:6,23	341:23 347:17
140:1,5,8,20,25	293:17,20,21	262:8 264:23	183:16,20	351:8,15,15
141:4,8,15,17	293:22 294:9	266:5 284:6,9	185:20,21	352:13 353:9
141:18 143:7,9	294:14,19	295:21 306:9	186:3 187:19	353:22 354:5
143:10,13,16	302:8 304:6	306:16,17	189:3,7 190:13	355:14
143:22 145:5	308:4,22	307:25 309:22	208:22 212:17	thinking 212:19
147:20 150:10	319:19,23	310:1,6 318:22	215:16 216:15	219:4 281:12
157:24 160:16	320:1,9,12,17	318:24 319:1	222:17 225:15	third 112:12
160:23 161:1	321:18 322:3	321:13,16	226:14,19	284:21
166:20 168:6	324:8 326:16	323:21 335:17	227:4,19 235:1	Thompson 94:12
		I	I	I

r				
96:3	292:8,22	topic's 223:18	326:20,21,23	313:18 327:5
thought 180:15	296:11 297:17	total 101:9,12	327:25	333:4 338:6
198:19 230:21	299:6,6,25	105:11 106:10	treating 201:1	trying 240:9
287:13 314:18	301:10 302:21	114:1 152:13	280:11,17	255:9 279:24
346:3	302:22 304:16	168:18,23,25	treatment 101:12	296:1,15
thoughts 294:10	306:16 308:17	170:9 181:19	111:22 112:3	314:16,16
thousand 330:5	312:3,9 319:5	182:12 184:12	118:12 122:6	331:3 335:1
332:9,10,12	325:2,3 327:23	184:18 194:10	124:14 125:18	342:20
three 100:6	332:11 335:3,8	194:13 211:16	125:19,25	turn 152:1
101:25 139:20	343:9 347:10	237:3,5 252:17	202:25 206:5	182:24 324:10
220:23 221:18	347:17 351:9	totally 253:9	217:8 298:13	turned 103:10
251:13 282:22	352:17 354:8	tracker 122:4	treatments	268:15
283:13 284:4	355:10 360:9	tracking 104:8	309:18	turning 321:18
288:14	360:14	transactions	trial 103:12,18	331:17
thumb 146:7,13	timeline 98:9	255:5,15	121:16	two 96:24 101:7
162:10,15	131:14	transcript 92:6	tried 103:4	103:7 114:7
195:21	timely 100:8	93:6 97:14	275:14 313:3	119:11 144:23
thumbing 167:4	times 97:4,25	225:8 268:2,4	328:3	164:5 173:16
tie 297:2	139:4 210:12	353:20 360:13	troubled 135:5	179:1 196:13
tied 158:17 183:8	315:2 352:24	transcripts	true 161:5	224:6 246:11
Tim 94:13 96:2	Timothy 187:21	353:24	166:22 173:12	255:24 268:10
time 92:18 95:1,7	359:15	transfer 115:21	179:24 180:2	268:11 281:17
96:21 98:3,6,23	title 209:1 211:2	253:6 300:2	187:15 197:12	281:20 288:13
108:3 110:18	titled 112:12	302:10 304:21	221:9 231:2	308:10 327:3
115:11 117:3	172:23	314:2	233:7 234:1	334:13
118:24 130:1	TJR 320:25	transferred	235:16,22	two-and-a-half
131:1 138:5	321:1 328:19	110:19 233:23	236:19,24	169:8
139:5 141:25	331:1	238:19 256:7	242:22,25	type 261:2
142:15 143:20	today 95:6 97:21	313:21 340:13	250:10 252:9	274:11
143:23 144:4	117:7 125:8	340:14	252:24 253:5	types 124:10
144:14 145:17	143:17 155:11	transfers 110:9	263:17 266:21	typically 288:6
153:18 154:5	161:1 196:7	transparent	269:8,10,13	
159:16 167:12	197:15 221:5	150:21 158:3	276:21 289:19	$\frac{\mathbf{U}}{\mathbf{U}}$
174:16 179:25	263:13 319:12	180:19	297:7,13	Uh-huh 171:19
180:4 190:14	342:19 347:2	Treasury 147:5	302:18 303:9	177:8 318:8
196:5 202:18	350:2 352:24	147:10 155:21	323:25 326:10	ultimate 151:17
214:11 225:11	told 266:23 324:6	155:22 156:20	326:11,12	180:9
233:16 241:1	334:9	treat 113:18	328:7 347:6	ultimately
241:23 246:1	tomorrow	264:14 280:23	349:24 360:12	121:19 125:24
246:18 253:6	342:18 354:16	296:20 318:16	true-up 354:1,3	186:13 277:7
269:1,6 273:4	top 105:9 206:2	326:17	355:9	312:11 Um 170:15
274:9,14,18	217:14 230:19	treated 125:16	trunk 102:19	Um 179:15
276:22 278:1	284:20,24	135:4 140:10	truthfully 173:11	unavailability
281:7,7 286:10	285:8 292:16	244:15 300:8	try 156:7 158:2	347:25
289:24 290:8	topic 106:22,22	300:25 301:11	172:8,13,15	unclear 224:20
290:14,23	191:19 217:6	308:20 318:13	229:14,18	273:12
291:23,24	303:11	323:24 324:2	254:9 292:5	uncommon
	I	I	I	1

308:5	unincorporated	261:7 268:9	305:4,22 309:4	110:20 167:15
underlined 209:2	202:14 256:19	270:13 301:17	310:11,16,23	177:14 238:20
understand	unique 127:19	304:4,13 308:6	310:25 311:1	256:8 261:13
96:19 104:9	Unit 263:3	311:15 314:25	312:5,15	261:15 351:20
150:9 170:19	United 118:2,9	315:9 318:9	313:21 314:1	359:13
194:19 213:21	135:20	322:2 330:14	316:15 317:18	version 167:8
224:5,16 226:6	unnecessary	338:16 342:2	318:20 325:23	208:7,13
232:20 273:12	181:2	359:19	325:23 332:14	209:23 211:6
285:18 297:12	unpredictability	utility 111:5	333:23 338:17	235:1
331:6	111:17	114:16,19,20	342:7 346:18	versions 208:12
understanding	unreasonable	115:13,16	349:16	versus 135:12
103:13 127:5	114:22 115:20	116:8,9,11	utility's 260:2	150:8 317:6
127:25 141:21	302:16 303:7	119:14 123:5,6	Utilization	vested 249:16
146:11 157:17	unregulated	123:12 124:17	137:22	viability 304:5
158:1 161:11	124:18	124:22 127:11	utilized 135:14	304:12,20
165:21 167:14	unusual 315:22	127:15,19	323:3 327:22	306:1
195:4,13	316:7	127:13,19		viable 304:17
201:17,19	unverified 114:1	131:15,22,23	V	view 111:13
212:9,11,15	updated 162:5	132:2,5,6,17	v 220:9 344:9	180:22,24
212:9,11,13	329:7	132:2,5,6,17	vacant 250:6,9	334:10
213:0 214:1,24 218:1 237:10	updates 197:6	135:23 146:16	valid 301:9	viewed 193:14
270:22 276:25	upkeep 311:1	149:11,16	validity 301:17	240:12,14
289:16,18,24	urges 124:5	152:12 155:19	validly 109:1	views 181:3
323:12 337:18	126:1	156:21 157:19	Valley 270:13	VIII 92:9 93:9
339:15	use 109:3 114:23	160:13 162:18	271:3 299:15	Villages 102:21
understands	116:6 129:2	162:22 163:13	299:23 301:18	violation 118:1,9
233:7 271:6	132:13 151:3		309:6 311:13	
understood	172:8 175:18	173:8,10,12,13	318:4	Virginia 323:15 323:18
274:6	172.8 175.18	174:6 185:8,12 202:13 205:18	valuation 226:20	voice 270:3
	,		value 119:14	
undeveloped 109:4,21	182:12,20,24 192:8 209:14	208:4 210:8,17 210:21 230:23	182:14	voiced 320:19 347:18 352:23
/			values 134:2	
112:25 113:5	223:9 224:23	233:11 235:11	variate 136:13	volatile 156:11
114:24 129:25	226:16 259:19	242:7 243:10	variation 309:19	Volume 92:9
131:7,14,21	260:11 307:1	244:4 251:9	variations	93:9
132:3 234:10	315:6 317:10	254:21,24	122:24	voluminous
234:16,18	322:15	255:25 256:3,5	variety 101:17	286:14
244:24 247:9	useful 98:13	261:14 266:24	various 156:13	vote 110:7
332:20 341:19	uses 150:19	267:14 269:15	277:23 285:19	131:13 228:25
341:21 342:4	315:10	269:16,17,18	323:3 324:7	249:3,13
undisputed	usually 173:12	269:19 272:20		W
109:9 208:15	323:3	273:8,18 274:9	verifiable 150:21	$\frac{\mathbf{W}}{\mathbf{W} 94:2\ 95:20}$
243:16 244:20	utilities 114:10	274:11,16	158:3 329:13	
273:25 303:2	124:11 174:5	276:4 287:24	339:18,21	358:18 359:2
unfair 114:21	209:19 210:17	288:11,18	verify 146:3	wait 98:1 138:25
unimproved	245:17 258:14	290:13 299:16	148:15 170:4	161:11 197:19
242:15 245:22	258:15 260:11	299:22,24	187:20	want 98:22
249:17,24	260:14,21,24	300:1,8 304:5	Vernon 110:20	108:22 150:9
	1	I		

176:7 225:13	211:22 213:25	268:4	139:1 140:16	work 97:2
247:16 254:5	220:25 232:10	webcast 96:18	142:16,17,20	156:12 157:4
267:4 273:15	233:5 235:9,17	wee 325:7	153:19 159:13	176:7 189:7
275:25 277:11	236:3,6,9,12,15	wells 101:7	159:14,22	198:13 209:4,6
299:11 309:10	242:17 247:10	went 282:2	160:2 161:14	209:11 210:5
311:2 332:9	247:11 248:12	weren't 178:4	166:5,8,16,18	210:11 274:4
335:18	249:22 250:11	183:17 311:17	172:12 180:12	309:2
wanted 116:25	253:2,10,19,23	we'll 97:21	188:2 190:9,15	worked 317:3
181:6 198:2	254:3 255:5,10	161:11 219:10	196:9,10,11,12	working 194:22
242:14 276:22	256:13,17	221:14 229:18	196:14 197:21	206:3 239:20
292:5 295:11	258:9 261:12	294:17 346:3	199:7,12,13,17	277:21 281:5
324:23 354:24	263:2 265:3,7	we're 95:5 99:8	199:21 200:12	290:23 302:7
wasn't 171:10	266:13 269:1	138:12,13,25	200:14 201:24	331:8
193:1,7 242:22	270:7,8 280:20	164:5 167:1	202:20,22	works 209:10
268:18 273:16	281:20 285:17	199:15 219:1,4	206:10,12	210:7
276:16 277:21	285:17 286:21	228:13 264:16	208:19 214:12	workshop 111:20
279:16 280:2,2	287:8 290:5	296:15 311:11	218:22,24,25	111:25 205:11
290:12 292:4	302:2 307:5,9	326:22 331:9	219:3,17,18,20	205:18,23
297:19 303:14	307:11,12,14	331:10 338:20	221:16,16	276:8,12
335:24 336:4	308:5,15 312:1	345:25 353:22	229:16 230:16	277:22 278:16
wastewater	312:4,5,6	355:20,23	230:18 231:19	278:24 281:1
109:18	315:21 316:10	we've 98:4	231:21 239:25	281:19 282:3
water 93:12,14	318:2,4 324:18	155:12 185:19	240:6 260:23	282:13,15
94:6 95:9,10,16	338:17 344:10	254:23 272:21	262:8,9,10,11	303:11 313:5,8
95:22 100:11	358:14	282:7,8 288:10	262:13 263:22	335:19
100:13 101:1,6	water/60 129:19	299:1,14	266:2 291:1,4	workshops
101:10 102:20	way 106:2 131:6	308:11 316:25	293:24 294:7	335:25
107:2 109:17	131:20 168:14	325:20 337:13	294:12 306:11	worth 330:16
109:23 110:1	182:19 195:20	340:2,4,4,7	306:17 309:23	wouldn't 171:8
112:14 113:6	201:13 224:25	WF-2013-0118	319:1,2,3,12	180:11,24
113:23 115:3	225:4 240:23	164:15	336:10,13,18	192:8 200:11
116:8 127:14	240:24 244:18	whichever	342:13,15,16	200:17 203:7
129:20,21	252:7 254:15	204:12	342:24 345:9	206:19 210:19
130:3,7,15,16	264:14 265:17	wife 261:15	345:16,18,19	244:13 247:9
132:9 133:3	269:7 275:11	William 93:20	346:6 347:12	250:6,10
135:3 136:18	297:9 300:8	358:3	348:25 349:2,3	251:20 266:10
137:18 146:9	301:11 339:13	willing 183:17	349:4,6 350:6,8	296:7 298:17
146:14 162:12	351:23	win 324:18	351:4,6,7,22	308:7 331:15
165:3,7 181:11	waylaid 124:6	wise 351:16	witnesses 97:21	332:7
181:23 185:2	ways 257:20	wish 160:22	97:23,24	wrap 342:20
191:15 195:23	WA-95 298:5	220:18 263:10	161:12 321:5	write 314:12,13
195:24 202:9	WA-95-164	276:20 289:6	345:23 347:11	314:16
202:12 206:6	215:16 216:9	330:18 346:24	won 137:20	writing 232:17
207:10 209:4,6	246:8 272:22	withdraw 326:11	wondering	277:8 314:4,5
209:8,8,10,11	290:2,18 291:8	witness 104:5	345:21	written 108:18
209:11,13	293:25 294:21	127:2 138:12	words 119:23	131:6 139:21
210:5,6,11,16	WC-2006-20	138:16,16,21	288:5	143:9 217:20
	1	1	1	1

243:9 280:5	317:10 325:8,8	\$8.51 318:6	10:13 159:21	15 100:17 131:11
wrong 115:9	340:21 341:6	·	10:15 159:17	186:20 302:8
214:23 281:21	years 100:6	#	100 119:10	339:1,2,2
286:2 287:7,14	104:7 114:4	#426 360:20	250:12	347:22
292:2	122:4 131:21		1095 269:13	15th 101:17
WR-2010-0111	134:3 165:13	0	11 222:16 223:16	150 356:12
97:12 100:1	201:5 239:5	0042 207:12	235:6 263:6,22	154 356:12
WR-2013-0118	245:21 251:13	0082 268:4	263:25 264:20	155 356:13
104:18	252:12,15,18	1	284:11 359:2	16 222:7,8 230:5
WR-2013-0461	252:20 253:8	$\frac{1}{197:10111:5}$	11th 101:25	231:14,23
93:13 95:11	288:3 289:9		354:3	232:5 241:19
WR-95-164	296:1 301:24	118:4 139:24	11.07 137:8	251:18 320:15
202:3	309:17 316:9	140:19,20 160:18 161:11	11.93 121:6	347:22,23
WR-95-194	325:14 330:1,7	200:22 220:15	137:6	16th 100:9
201:10	330:8,11,25		11:33 219:12	160 356:15
WW 207:13	333:4 334:24	222:7,9,10,11 222:11,15	118 356:4	161 356:15
WW-2 335:22	341:8,11	222:11,15 223:15,16	12 222:6,6,17	358:19,19
WW-2009	yell 172:13	230:2,4,23	226:2 242:20	163 356:16
281:15	yield 147:4,9	250.2,4,25	268:20 284:11	17 114:4 236:25
WW-2009-0386	156:13 157:2	256:5 261:7,14	346:21 347:10	296:1 327:13
205:18 282:20	189:5	263:7 264:4,5,5	348:6 359:4	17th 205:16
WW-2011-0043	yields 147:10	264:6,6,7,7,8	120 100:19	355:8
281:13 282:20	189:23	264:17 285:16	126 356:5	174 359:16,16
335:20		317:18 320:5,5	128 356:6	18 92:8 93:8
W-95 327:17	Z	320:6,7,13,13	13 173:6,6,6	185:21 186:4,8
	zero 133:19	320:14,15,20	174:7 186:20	320:3,13
$\frac{\mathbf{X}}{\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}$	333:20 338:2,9	320:21,22,22	204:11,19	18th 95:6 99:24
X 356:1 358:1,1	338:21	320:23,23,24	205:5 222:5,6	354:4
<u> </u>	\$	320:25 328:19	226:2 231:13	188 359:15,15
Y 93:20	\$10 129:20 307:5	331:1 343:10	232:1,4 242:14	19 164:4 205:13
yea 269:6	318:4	343:19,19,24	264:3 359:5	251:19 334:24
yeah 152:7 164:8	\$136,836 232:10	346:22 347:11	13th 100:22	19th 97:19
164:12 165:2	\$15 129:21 307:6	347:22,23	13.89 106:18	190 356:16
189:9,11,19	\$2 104:16 318:9	348:3 353:18	120:23 137:6	359:18,18
269:7 270:9	\$2,000 232:11	358:3,11 359:8	139 356:9	196 356:18 1971 208:12
274:24 277:14	\$2.6 159:8	1.3 168:20	14 103:12 174:3 207:1,17,20,24	209:22,23
279:20 285:7	\$200,000 103:3	1.4 168:20	230:5 231:14	1972 268:23
285:24 286:10	\$205,254 232:11	1:00 219:6,10,14	230:3 231:14 231:23 232:4	269:6
294:12 307:13	\$218,762 100:14	10 118:4,5 222:5	242:4,15	1973 287:17
307:14,16	\$25 306:24	223:15 254:19	320:21 347:22	1973 287.17 1974 252:19
year 113:22	\$331,000 130:17	264:8 338:24	359:6	253:8
119:6 121:23	133:3	339:1,2,2 352:8	14th 118:2,11	198 356:19
129:17 137:17	\$4 159:7	353:8 359:1	14 (n 110.2,11 14 's 103:14,16	1992 253:8
137:23 138:1	\$6.6 129:17	10th 138:4	142 356:11	1995 274:17
156:16 237:4,6	\$706,000 130:21	10-percent	142 356:11 145 356:11	287:1 328:22
261:22 309:1	133:6	147:21	359:13,13	1997 115:9
	l			

289:15 298:1,3	329:14	21st 354:12	221:22 222:8	358:24 359:1
300:16	2008 156:10	211 356:22	228:4 229:24	359:12
1998 102:17	180:7	212 356:23	230:7,19	353 358:16,17,18
103:7 289:15	2008-2009	214 356:23	241:19 254:21	358:24 359:1
1999 233:21	155:13	215 356:24	264:4 284:11	356 357:20
273:23 274:2	2009 102:16	22 185:21 186:4	285:16 319:19	358 357:21
	208:10 209:16	186:8,12	320:4,8,14,21	360 94:14 96:3
2	211:6 286:23	205:13 208:22	321:10 322:18	357:22
2 97:13 99:9	2010 97:11,16,19	222:8,12 264:6	322:23 323:2	360,000 101:8
135:23 139:24	97:20 99:24	264:7 268:6,18	324:11 343:11	39380 167:23
197:1 220:13	100:2 104:14	320:7,14,21	343:19,20,24	
221:14 222:8	107:21 108:10	22nd 175:7	358:5,14	4
222:10 223:4	108:17 109:13	220 357:3	359:10	4 129:22 169:10
228:4 235:6	109:16 110:15	221 358:12,14,21	3.1 321:1	176:10 197:1
242:3,3 246:4	111:14 203:6	358:22	3.2 321:1	222:6,9 236:25
257:22 258:1	203:16 225:2	2230 94:8 96:8	3:12 319:7	242:14 245:15
264:3,8 268:5	246:10,12	228 357:3 358:12	3:25 319:6,9	245:15 250:20
319:19,24	282:14 294:25	358:14,21,22	30 288:3 316:9	256:14,17
320:3,4,7,13,21	302:14 303:5	229 357:4	347:22,23	264:4 273:21
321:10,21	322:5 326:13	23 222:9,10,11,11	355:4	302:8 319:19
324:11 343:10	326:16 328:6	223:16 237:1	30th 194:18	320:4,14,18,22
343:19,19,24	330:1 334:15	250:20 264:4,4	30-day 355:3	321:1,10,21
347:21,23	334:17 337:12	264:5,5,7 320:4	300 156:20 341:6	352:3,8 353:2
358:4,12 359:9	340:21 341:11	320:14,22,22	301 94:3	358:7,16
2A 99:5,11	2011 165:15	320:23,24	306 357:8	359:12
2nd 268:5	205:12,16	322:18	307 357:8	4.3 170:7 194:14
2.1 320:25	2011-0042 212:9	24 264:8	31 320:5	4:06 355:24
2.2 321:1	2011-0043	245 101:5	31st 100:18 109:9	40 104:25 105:24
2.6 129:21	207:13	25 105:3 120:13	177:13 238:17	129:19 146:3
2.7 169:1,3,5	2012 165:15	121:2 134:25	261:18	301:24
194:19	177:13 238:17	135:4,10 146:7	31.1 134:22	42 243:22
2.8 170:5	261:18	162:13 195:21	310 357:9	426 93:24
2.85 194:15	2013 100:9,17,18	222:18 338:24	319 358:4,5,7	43 97:17
2/18/14 172:7	101:17 129:17	25th 353:25	321 357:11 358:4	48 97:17
205:5 207:24	138:4 165:17	257 357:4	358:5,7	
20 201:5 288:3	194:18 303:16	26 320:5,21	335 357:11	5
316:9	344:13	262 357:6	337 357:12	5 143:10 145:4
200 94:9,15	2014 92:8 93:8	263 359:2	343 357:15 359:8	145:12 157:1,1
356:22	95:7 100:22	264 357:7 359:2	359:8,9,9,10,10	185:20 186:3,5
200,000 101:9	109:9 132:4,7	266 357:7	344 357:15	186:7,12
2002 154:11	2015 131:11	27th 353:21	346 357:17	200:18,23
273:25 274:22	228:24		347 358:11 359:4	222:6,9 223:4
2004 164:21,23	207 359:6,6	3	348 359:4	242:20 249:20
213:4,5 252:19	21 164:4 186:12	3 97:15 135:25	349 357:19	264:5 320:5,6
2005 330:1	222:8 242:21	139:25 197:1	350 358:8,8,9,9	320:23 349:19
340:21	320:4,13,24	205:10 217:14	351 359:12	350:7,14 352:8
2006 268:5	322:18	220:14 221:14	352 358:16,17,18	353:3 358:8,17
	I	l		l

359:13	176:5 177:3,18	353:8 358:24	
5th 118:9	187:2 222:9,10	9:55 159:18	
50 256:10	222:11 264:6	90 131:12,16	
52 223:3 224:25	268:5 276:7	228:25 229:3	
225:2,3	320:6,24	248:21 249:12	
537 94:3	329:14 347:21	95 298:7 316:21	
573)634-2266	358:19 359:16	327:11 330:7,9	
94:4	7th 97:19	330:11 356:2	
573)751-3234	70 308:15	96 330:11	
94:16	73 275:12 315:14	96,847 101:10	
573)751-4857	75 105:3 106:15	97 298:4,5,8	
94:10	120:13,19	328:22 330:11	
91.10	120:13,19	98 330:7,9	
6	146:8 162:11	99 274:8 356:3	
6 164:4 176:9,20	195:21,25	<i>>> _</i> 110 <i>33</i> 0.3	
177:5,18	195.21,25		
185:21 187:25	754 327:13		
188:5,20 189:1			
208:1 217:13	8		
222:10 223:16	8 177:9 189:22		
249:20 250:20	190:2,6 200:23		
264:6 320:6,23	209:1 210:4		
321:19,21	222:11 228:5,7		
349:19 350:7	234:24 251:16		
350:14 352:8	253:21 264:7		
353:8 358:9,18	320:7 329:14		
359:15	347:22 359:18		
6th 354:2	8a 220:15 221:14		
60 104:25 105:23	221:22 358:21		
106:11 146:2	8b 220:15 221:14		
186:20 308:15	235:2 358:22		
60s 318:10	8,924 101:12		
601 94:3 95:21	8-S 178:13		
635 101:3	8.5 136:5 137:11		
650 94:9	148:13,21		
65102 94:4,15	162:25 163:4		
96:4,9	198:11,16		
65102-2230 94:9	8:30 92:18 95:1		
658 101:2	80s 309:1		
68.9 134:21			
	9		
7	9 177:14 207:1		
7 160:19,19	222:15,17		
161:9,16,19	226:1 249:20		
167:2,4,7	253:21 264:7		
170:22,25	304:3 320:6		
172:7 174:18	329:14 352:8		