1	
2	
3	
4	
5	AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION
6	MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
7	IN RE: THE PETITION OF EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC
8	COMPANY, ET AL.
9	CASE NOS. EO-2022-0040 & EO-2022-0193
10	JUNE 16, 2022
11	VOLUME 7
12	
13	
14	
15	(Due to the quality of the recorded media, portions
16	were unable to be transcribed and include inaudible
17	portions. The transcript may also include
18	misinterpreted words and/or unidentified speakers.
19	The transcriber was not present at the time of the
20	recording; therefore, this transcript should not be
21	considered verbatim.)
22	
23	
24	TRANSCRIBED BY: MELISSA LANE
25	

1	JASON HOLSMAN: Commissioner Holsman is on.
2	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Good morning,
3 commissio	oner.
4	JASON HOLSMAN: Good morning. And Judge,
5 how many	witnesses do we have left?
6	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Five. We're going to
7 start too	day with David Murray.
8	JASON HOLSMAN: Thank you very much.
9	JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. So it's 8:30,
10 so let's	come to order. Okay. And we're ready for
11 day four	of this hearing on EO-2022-0040 and
12 E0-2022-0	0193. I believe we're going to start today
13 with Dave	id Murray for public counsel. All right.
14 Take the	stand. Raise your right hand. Do you
15 solemnly	swear or affirm the testimony you're about to
16 give in t	this matter is the truth, the whole truth and
17 nothing b	out the truth?
18	THE WITNESS: I do.
19	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. Inquire.
20	EXAMINATION
21 BY NATHAN	N WILLIAMS:
22 Q	. Good morning, Mr. Murray.
23 A.	. Good morning.
24 Q	. Would you please state and spell your name?
25 A	. It's David Murray, D-A-V-I-D, M-U-R-R-A-Y.

1	Q. Mr. Murray, did you prepare and cause to be
2	pre-filed rebuttal testimony that has been marked as
3	Exhibit 206, and then subsequently add an additional
4	schedule to that testimony that's been pre was also
5	pre-filed, and that has been marked as Exhibit 207?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Would those exhibits be your testimony here
8	today or would you have any changes since then they
9	were pre-filed?
10	A. I'd like to an update and potential
11	clarification regarding short-term debt. On page 8,
12	lines 1 through 4, I explain the average monthly
13	short-term debt interest rate for the period of
14	February through June, and I want to make sure it's
15	very clear that that that isn't an average monthly
16	analyzed short-term interest rate. So in order to do
17	so, I would insert on line 2, I would insert annual
18	between monthly and short term which goes to the next
19	line, and then to make sure it is absolutely clear
20	what that month what that would convert to as a
21	monthly interest rate, I would like to at the end of
22	the sentence on line 4, indicate, quote, this converts
23	to monthly rates of .03 percent, .03 percent,
24	.02 percent, .02 percent, and .02 percent, comma,
25	respectively.

1 0. With those revisions, are Exhibits 206 and 2 207 your testimony here today? 3 Α. Yes. 4 NATHAN WILLIAMS: I offer exhibits 206 and 207 as modified by -- or with the addition -- well, I 5 6 just offer the exhibits. 7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Exhibits 206 and 207 being 8 offered, any objections to their receipt? Hearing 9 none, they will be received. NATHAN WILLIAMS: I tender the witness for 10 examination by others. 11 12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. And for cross, 13 we begin with staff. 14 CURT STOKES: Thank you, Judge. 15 EXAMINATION BY CURT STOKES: 16 17 Mr. Murray, can you turn to page 9 of your 0. rebuttal testimony? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 That's where you talk about the net present 0. 21 value discount rate? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Then on page -- there's a portion of your 0. 24 rebuttal, you mention the all in cost? 25 A. Yes.

1	Q. Can you clarify what you mean by all in?
2	A. What I meant by all in was determining what
3	the net proceeds were to the company subtracting the
4	issuance expense. So more or less that's the same
5	thing as commonly as understood as an embedded cost
6	of of debt because the company will have to pay,
7	you know, the issuance expense, that is factored in
8	by in determining an all-in rate.
9	Q. Okay. And you mentioned embedded cost of
10	debt. Can you define that?
11	A. Embedded cost means it's once it's
12	issued in the net proceeds and the interest expenses
13	apply on a present value, future value basis, that
14	determines the the cost as of that time of
15	issuance.
16	Q. Thank you. Now, on on page 12, at line
17	2, it appears you use the 2.47 percent rate as the
18	discount rate to calculate the net present value
19	estimate?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Did you apply that to both the net present
22	value of traditional financing and securitization
23	financing?
24	A. No.
25	Q. Okay. What did you use the 2.47 percent to

1	discount?
2	A. Just for securitization financing.
3	Q. Okay. What what percentage rate did you
4	use for traditional financing?
5	A. I think I used a variety of discount rates
6	for to test what the net present value estimates
7	would be and and the main rate I used was a and
8	it's highly confidential, so I won't indicate what the
9	exact rate is but was a weighted average cost of
10	capital determined by LUCO (phonetic) for purposes of
11	assessing the fair value of its assets for goodwill
12	impairment.
13	Q. Okay. So you used for the traditional
14	method of finance, you used a discount rate,
15	approximately the weighted average cost of capital?
16	A. Based on current cost. The problem I have
17	with the if you don't mind, if I don't explain, the
18	problem I have with the historical rate of return is
19	that based on a rate of return an estimated cost of
20	capital back in 2019. I wanted to look at how the
21	company was estimating the present value of its
22	anticipated cash flows going forward as recently as
23	possible.
24	Q. Okay. And then the you also mentioned
25	earlier, though, that the 2.47 percent rate you don't

1 believe indicates like a currently accurate estimated 2 securitization rate? 3 I think -- if you don't mind, if I explain, Α. the easiest way to -- to make my position clear is --4 is the securitization rate at the time of issuance 5 which will be determined, you know, after this -- you 6 7 know, whenever getting ready to go to market, that is 8 the appropriate discount rate to apply to -- to 9 payments under the securitization of -- of the whatever cost end up being, because it's just like 10

11 issuing -- it's issuing a bond. And, so the -- the 12 rate charged on -- on the securitized bond is the risk 13 of those cash flows. And, so that -- it should be 14 whatever that is at the time.

Q. Okay. Now, you agree that the interest rate that will be applied to -- that would be applied to securitization in the future, we don't know exactly what that is; right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Ο. The best we can do is estimate it right 21 now? 2.2 Α. Yes. 23 And it -- based on current estimates, do Ο. 24 you believe it would be 2.47 percent? 25 Α. No.

```
1
            Q.
                 Do you believe it would be higher?
 2
            Α.
                 Yes.
 3
                 Okay. Now, assuming that securitization
            Q.
 4
     bonds are going to have a lower interest rate than a
 5
     company's approximate weighted average cost of
 6
     capital, are you -- is that a safe assumption?
 7
            Α.
                 Yes.
 8
                 So using a weighted average cost of capital
            0.
 9
     as a discount rate for traditional financing and a
     securitization interest rate as the discount rate for
10
11
     securitization financing, would that calculation ever
12
     yield a net present value benefit for customers from
13
     securitization?
14
            Α.
                 It depends on what you use a weighted
15
     average cost of capital, so I don't -- I don't know
16
     the answer. That's -- there's too many hypotheticals,
17
     I'm sorry.
18
                 CURT STOKES: No further cross.
19
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. For Renew Missouri?
20
                 ALICIA GREENWALD: No questions, Your
21
     Honor, thank you.
2.2
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: For Liberty.
23
                 DEAN COOPER: Yes, Your Honor.
24
                           EXAMINATION
25
    BY DEAN COOPER:
```

1	Q. Mr. Murray, I think you say in your
2	testimony and maybe this is linked to Mr. Stokes'
3	question, but but then, again, maybe I didn't
4	follow his question similar to you, but in your
5	testimony on page 2, you indicate that if the
6	commission used traditional and customary methods of
7	financing to allow a rate of return, inclusive of an
8	ROE securitization will be less costly to ratepayers;
9	correct? And I'm referring to what the commission
10	authorized with the rate of return.
11	A. So, yes. I mean, it's not updated. So,
12	yeah, I'm following along with some of these
13	assumptions used by other parties, specifically your
14	witness in direct testimony.
15	Q. Right. And how about this statement, would
16	you agree with this, this is from Ms. Niehaus'
17	surrebuttal, while the pricing of triple A bonds will
18	increase with general market volatility, pricing of
19	traditional methods of financing will as well, meaning
20	if if we see the price of the triple A bonds going
21	up, other types of financing will likely follow; would
22	you agree with that?
23	A. By the same issuer. I mean, that's a very
24	broad but typically, by the same issuer with the
25	same terms, and you know, tenors and what-have-you,

1 there's a lot of assumptions there, but generally, 2 yes. 3 Generally, yes; correct? Q. 4 Α. Yes. 5 Now, I understand you recommend no carrying Q. 6 costs for -- for Asbury; correct? 7 Α. Yes. And as I read your testimony, that's based 8 0. 9 on OPC's position in the 2021 rate case; correct? Yes. 10 Α. 11 0. And not based upon any particular reading of the securitization statute itself. You're not 12 13 making an argument that the security -- that the 14 securitization statute will not allow carrying costs; 15 correct? 16 Α. I'm not interpreting the statute. 17 Yeah. You're making no -- no 0. 18 representation as to the statute at all; correct? 19 Α. I would say that I put in quotations customary and traditional, and I notice there's 20 21 discrepancies in the statute, and I noticed they're 22 not defined in the statute, so I -- and from that 23 laymen's perspective, I consider that definition to be 24 up in the air. 25 But that's all you were focused on was --Q.

1 was just those terms; correct? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. Customary and traditional? 4 Α. And not -- I -- I do not know that statute 5 backwards and towards. I looked at the first three, four pages which really, you know, get to the crux of 6 7 estimating a securitization amount. 8 DEAN COOPER: That's all the questions I 9 have, Your Honor. 10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We'll come up 11 for questions from the bench. Are there any questions from the commissioners on line? 12 13 RYAN SILVEY: Judge, this is Commissioner 14 Silvey. I have no questions at this time. 15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. 16 JASON HOLSMAN: Judge, this is Commissioner 17 Holsman. I also have no questions at this time. 18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. I have some 19 questions. First of all, what's the timeframe for 20 which your 4.65 percent WACC, weighted average cost of 21 capital was calculated? 22 THE WITNESS: Sorry, I don't think I 23 calculated a 4.65 percent. I think that might be 2.4 the -- the staff's recommended cost of long-term debt. 25 JUDGE WOODRUFF: What was your weighted

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

Page 510

1 average cost of capital? 2 THE WITNESS: I used -- we would probably 3 need to go into -- because I used an internal 4 document --5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. 6 THE WITNESS: -- for purposes of goodwill 7 analysis. 8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You don't need -- it's in 9 your rebuttal testimony. 10 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is. 11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You don't need to repeat 12 it here then. And what timeframe was that? 13 THE WITNESS: It is 2020 is the latest 14 update I've received. They've updated since then, but 15 I do not have a copy of that. 16 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. 17 THE WITNESS: The company has. 18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: In your calculations 19 submitted on June 9th, you included financing cost for 20 the traditional financing scenario. Please explain 21 why you did this, given that other parties did not 22 include financing costs for the traditional financing 23 scenario. 24 THE WITNESS: Sorry, I'm confused by that 25 question. I'm not -- I'm not following.

1	JUDGE WOODRUFF: I'll repeat it. You
2	included financing costs for the traditional financing
3	scenario; is that correct?
4	THE WITNESS: I included financing costs
5	for the carrying cost, so I did not include anything
6	other than for for the carrying cost.
7	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Why did you do
8	that?
9	THE WITNESS: I did that because, you know,
10	Storm Uri is a much bigger issue because. It's from
11	February 2021 through estimated time of issuance of
12	the bonds, which may be December 2022, and and I
13	provided the cost of short-term debt because that's
14	how they funded, and actually, that is, in my opinion,
15	customary to how you would fund a working capital
16	need, so that's why I included the the cost of
17	short-term debt which was, you know, very low until
18	recently. And, so that's why those rates seem very
19	low and may have been assumed by some to be a mistake,
20	but it the cost of short-term debt on an annual
21	basis was 4.25 percent. And, so I used that to to
22	provide information to the commission as to similar to
23	AFUDC that since I did not include that in my
24	capital structure in the generate case, that that
25	should be captured somewhere in the ratemaking that's

1 considered by -- you know, Empire's rate charged to 2 ratepayers. 3 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And in your NPV 4 comparison calculations, you use difference discount 5 rates for the securitization and traditional financing 6 in NPV calculations. Can you explain why? 7 This is a situation that THE WITNESS: 8 I'm -- that I feel -- don't feel -- just don't feel 9 strong about, but I think it's a very fundamental 10 concept of finance, that just like when you issue --11 if I bought a bond today at four and a half percent, I 12 am going to receive four and a half percent to coupon 13 payments. And, so the appropriate discount rate is 14 the expected cost of -- of financing, because I am 15 going to receive an annuity, and the whole purpose of 16 securitization is to, you know, achieve the highest 17 credit rating possible and fund this by all debt and 18 provide the proceeds to the company, and then you have 19 this true-up process where it's a separate line item. 20 The assurance of payment to the company are -- is --21 when I say the company, the special purpose entity 22 is -- you know, to make sure that there's very little 23 to no risk on this -- on this issuance through this 24 process, so the -- the risk -- using a rate of return 25 assumes an overall corporate cash flow. And, so

 that's why a weighted average you would hope would be synony return would make sense in that 	ymous with a rate of
3 return would make sense in that	at situation, but with
4 securitization, the whole purp	pose is to make these
5 payments literally almost, you	a know, no risk. And, so
6 that's why it's just like w	when I say it's just like
7 buying a bond today, the princ	cipal amount would be the
8 present value, because your	- your expected interest
9 rate is what you're buying you	ur bond for today.
10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: (Okay. That's all the
11 questions I have. Are there a	any questions based on
12 the questions from the bench of	or any recross from
13 staff?	
14 CURT STOKES: No,	Your Honor.
15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: H	Renew Missouri?
16 ALICIA GREENWALD:	No, Your Honor.
17 DEAN COOPER: No o	questions, Your Honor.
18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: 7	Then redirect.
19 NATHAN WILLIAMS:	Thank you. I think just
20 a few.	
21 EXAMINAT	FION
22 BY NATHAN WILLIAMS:	
23 Q. Do you recall when	n staff was asking you
24 about the this is Nathan W	illiams, by the way
25 asking you about the discount	rates, the NPV versus

1 securitization and traditional ratemaking? 2 Α. Yes. 3 And you indicated that you looked at Q. 4 goodwill impairment and you based on a confidential 5 company document? 6 Α. Yes. 7 And you also mentioned LUCO in your 0. 8 response. Would you explain why you were looking at 9 LUCO? LUCO is the main holding company for all 10 Α. 11 the U.S. regulated utility assets. When I say holding 12 company, it's -- it's -- it's an indirect holding 13 company. There -- they have a -- Liberty Utility 14 Central is -- is the immediate holding company, but 15 LUCO is, you know, handles all their corporate -- when 16 I say LUCO, the company holds all the corporate 17 financing activities that through a financing subsidiary named Liberty Utility Finance Company, I 18 19 believe. And, so -- but they are responsible for all 20 of the, you know, accounting and financial performance 21 and, you know, I guess reporting of -- of how their 22 regulated utility assets in the United States are --23 are doing. 24 Q. Then in response to a question from staff 25 counsel, you indicated that you believe that by the

1 time of issuance, the securitization rate will be 2 greater than 2.47. Would you explain why you believe 3 that? 4 Α. That's based on the current interest rates. 5 I'm not -- I'm not going to plan to be a market procrastinator. Current interest rates are, in my 6 opinion, are the best predictor of future interest 7 8 rates. That's what's embedded in the current market. 9 And you know, obviously, we have a lot of things going on in the market right now with concern about 10 inflation and the feds just increasing the fed rate by 11 12 75 basis points yesterday. 13 NATHAN WILLIAMS: No further questions. 14 Thank you. 15 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 16 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Mr. Murray, you can step 17 down. 18 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 19 NATHAN WILLIAMS: May he be excused? 20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yes. 21 NATHAN WILLIAMS: Thank you. 2.2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I believe the next witness 23 is Fred Graves for Liberty. Please raise your right 2.4 hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give in this matter is the 25

1	truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
2	THE WITNESS: I do.
3	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. You may
4	inquire.
5	DIANE CARTER: Thank you.
6	EXAMINATION
7	BY DIANE CARTER:
8	Q. If you'll please state your full name.
9	A. Yes. Frank, middle initial C, last name
10	Graves, G-R-A-V-E-S.
11	Q. How are you employed and in what capacity?
12	A. I am a what we call a principal which is
13	essentially a partner in in a consulting firm
14	called the Brattle Group, B-R-A-T-T-L-E with
15	headquarters in Boston, Massachusetts.
16	Q. And did you have cause to prepare excuse
17	me. Did you prepare and have cause to be pre-filed in
18	this case testimony on behalf of the Empire District
19	Electric Company?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. And that was both direct testimony and
22	surrebuttal testimony?
23	A. That is correct.
24	Q. And have those documents been marked as
25	exhibits 16 and 17?

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

Subject to check, I believe that's right. 1 Α. 2 Do you have any changes for that pre-filed Q. 3 testimony? 4 Α. T do not. 5 If I asked you those same questions today, Q. 6 would your answers be substantially the same? 7 Α. Yes, they would. 8 And are those answers -- answers true and 0. 9 correct to the best of your information, knowledge, and belief? 10 11 Α. Certainly. 12 DIANE CARTER: I would move for the admission of Exhibit 16 and 17 and tender Mr. Graves 13 14 for cross examination. JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. 16 and 17 have 15 16 been offered. Any objection to their receipt? 17 Hearing none, they will be received. For cross 18 examination, we begin with Renew Missouri. 19 ALICIA GREENWALD: No questions, Your 20 Honor. Thank you. 21 JUDGE WOODRUFF: For staff. 22 CURT STOKES: Thank you, Your Honor. Curt 23 Stokes on behalf of staff. 24 EXAMINATION 25 BY CURT STOKES:

1 Ο. Mr. Graves, how much are you being paid to 2 testify today? 3 My billing rate is \$725 an hour. Α. 4 0. Thank you. Liberty's asking ratepayers to 5 pay for all of Asbury's remaining costs; correct? 6 Α. It's unrecovered net costs, that's true. 7 Yes. 8 The -- those full unrecovered costs would 0. 9 be the same rates that Liberty ratepayers would pay as 10 if Asbury were in service and providing electricity; 11 correct? 12 Α. I don't think that's guite correct. If the 13 arrangement is that the unrecovered costs will be 14 securitized, it will be paid by customers at a lower rate than it would have, otherwise, been paid and on a 15 different schedule. 16 17 Okay. So -- but other than the timing and 0. interest rate differences, Liberty's seeking full 18 19 recovery of all Asbury costs? 20 Α. That is correct. 21 0. Now, Asbury did not provide electricity to 22 customers during Winter Storm Uri; is that correct? 23 Α. That's my understanding. 24 And Asbury will never again provide Q. 25 electricity to Liberty customers; is that correct?

As far as I know, there's no plan for any 1 Α. future recovery. So yes, I agree with that. 2 3 So Liberty really is not seeking any sort Q. 4 of costs sharing of Asbury's retirement with 5 ratepayers? 6 I'm not sure how that's related to the Α. 7 previous question, but there is an embedded cost 8 sharing by virtue of the fact that Asbury's been 9 providing lots of benefits for which ratepayers didn't 10 have to pay any of the advantages. They just paid the 11 costs. Now, it's not as economical as it used to be, 12 and it's better to replace, but since there was no 13 gain sharing in the past, there should be no loss 14 sharing now. In my view, there's already been the 15 right amount of sharing. 16 Q. You are not suggesting that the commission 17 reject the use and useful standard; correct? I think it can be used, but it's a very 18 Α. 19 blunt instrument that, basically, only tells you if 20 the asset is performing. Pretty much that's it. It 21 doesn't tell you about the economic drivers of its 22 situation, causes, responsibility, what's replacing it 23 and whether that's more valuable or not. So it's a 24 starting point for wondering how much cost recovery should be allowed and in what form, but it's not 25

informative by itself. 1 2 Okay. But the commission should not reject Q. 3 that principal entirely? 4 Α. Only if it's the only principal they're 5 going to use, then would reject it in its entirety. CURT STOKES: No further cross. 6 7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And public counsel. 8 NATHAN WILLIAMS: Nathan Williams. No 9 questions, thank you. JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Come up for 10 questions from the bench then. Commissioners on the 11 line do you have any questions? 12 13 JASON HOLSMAN: No questions, Judge. Commissioner Holsman. 14 15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. And I have no 16 questions. So no recross. Any redirect? 17 DIANE CARTER: No, Judge, thank you. 18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And Mr. Graves, you can 19 step down. 20 THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you much. 21 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I believe the next witness 22 then is Katrina Niehaus. 23 DEAN COOPER: Judge, I'm waiting for a 2.4 document that one of our folks was supposed to bring back from my office. Could you give me about five 25

```
Page 521
```

```
minutes to locate where that is?
 1
 2
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Before this witness
 3
    testifies?
 4
                 DEAN COOPER: Before this witness
    testifies.
 5
 6
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yes, we can do that.
 7
                 DEAN COOPER: Thank you. I apologize, Your
 8
    Honor.
 9
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: We'll take a five-minute
    break. That'll bring us back at -- well, 9:01, so.
10
11
    Thank you.
12
                All right. Let's go ahead and get started.
13
    I don't think I've sworn you in yet.
14
                 THE WITNESS: You have not.
15
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Please raise
16
    your right hand. Do you solemnly swear or affirm that
17
    the testimony you're about to give in this matter is
    the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
18
19
                 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
20
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. You may
21
    inquire.
22
                 DEAN COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
23
                           EXAMINATION
24 BY DEAN COOPER:
25
           Q. Would you please state your name?
```

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

Page 522

Α. Katrina Niehaus. 1 2 By whom are you employed and in what Q. 3 capacity? 4 Α. Goldman Sachs, and I run part of our structured finance there. 5 6 0. Are you appearing today on the Empire 7 District Electric Company which does business as 8 Liberty? 9 Α. Yes. 10 Q. Have you caused to be prepared for the 11 purposes of this proceeding certain direct testimony 12 for both cases, E0-2022-0040 and for E0-2022-0193? 13 Α. Yes. 14 And then you also have prepared surrebuttal Q. 15 testimony that was filed in both cases; correct? 16 Α. Yes. 17 0. Is it your understanding that your -- that those pieces of testimony have been marked as Exhibits 18 19 18, 19, and 20 for identification? 20 Α. Yes. 21 0. Do you have any changes that you would like 22 to make to that testimony? 23 Not at this time. Α. 24 If I ask you the questions which are Q. contained in Exhibits 18, 19, and 20 today, would your 25

1	answers be the same?
2	A. I think the only difference would be,
3	obviously, marketing are continuing to move. And, so
4	rates on the securitization would be in a different
5	place today than they would be in the future.
6	Q. And with that, that caveat, are your
7	answers true and correct to the best of your
8	information, knowledge and belief?
9	A. Yes.
10	DEAN COOPER: Your Honor, at this time I
11	would offer Exhibits 18, 19, and 20 into evidence.
12	JUDGE WOODRUFF: 18, 19, and 20 have been
13	offered. Any objections to their receipt? Hearing
14	none, they will be received. And for cross
15	examination, we begin
16	DEAN COOPER: Judge, I'd like to go ahead
17	and mark the other document that I had referred to
18	previously.
19	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay.
20	DEAN COOPER: If we could do that.
21	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Sure. (Inaudible) 24.
22	DEAN COOPER: 24, yes.
23	(Silence in audio.)
24	Q. (By Dean Cooper:) Do you recognize what
25	has been marked as Exhibit 24?

Α. 1 Yes. 2 And is that a document that was prepared by Q. 3 you or at your direction? 4 Α. Yes. 5 And is that a document that would be of 0. 6 assistance to you in answering questions 1 through 3 7 of the notice of commission questions that was issued 8 on -- let's see. I think June 9th? 9 Α. Yes. 10 DEAN COOPER: Judge, I think we'll leave it there for the time-being, and we would tender 11 Ms. Niehaus for cross examination. 12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Very good. We will begin 13 14 for cross examination with Renew Missouri. 15 ALICIA GREENWALD: No questions, Your 16 Honor. Thank you. 17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: For staff. 18 CURT STOKES: Thank you, Your Honor. Curt 19 Stokes on behalf of staff. 20 EXAMINATION 21 BY CURT STOKES: 2.2 Ms. Niehaus, were you listening to the 0. 23 testimony of Mr. Mocindy (phonetic) yesterday morning? 24 Α. T was not. 25 Oh, okay. Is it your understanding that Q.

1	there is usually an informal process that takes place
2	to review an issuance advice letter where everybody
3	involved goes around and shares that they're all on
4	board with that?
5	A. Yes. We would welcome that input.
6	Q. Okay. What how far in advance of that
7	issuance advice letter does that process usually take
8	place?
9	A. Generally, that would happen in the few
10	weeks leading up to a transaction.
11	Q. Okay.
12	A. Pricing.
13	Q. And does not doing that or along the way
14	create potential for a delay?
15	A. Yes. Our goal would be that everyone has
16	agreed to the contents of the issued advice letter of
17	advance of bringing a transaction to market. We
18	wouldn't want to have any disagreements during the
19	marketing or pricing process.
20	Q. Okay. Now, in your direct testimony that
21	was filed in January of this year; correct?
22	A. Yes, that sounds right.
23	Q. And you referenced a at that time an
24	expected weighted average bond interest rate of
25	2.47 percent?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. I believe you said on direct that, you
3	know, the markets are continuing to change?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. So I hope I'm not putting you on the spot
6	too much. If you refresh that testimony, to reflect
7	an expected weighted average rate based on current
8	market conditions, what would that rate be today?
9	A. So we have in this newest exhibit
10	submitted pricing as of Friday. Obviously, I was
11	traveling yesterday evening. And, so have not updated
12	my pricing as of this morning, and there has been
13	significant market movement with the FOMC announcement
14	yesterday as well as where futures are today and
15	treasure rate movements. As of the pricing of Friday
16	for a blended securitization, it would be around
17	4.28 percent. What I would note is that is, as of
18	Friday, markets are evolving, and we would expect to
19	adjust our pricing and structure thoughts in
20	conjunction with the market to get to the best outcome
21	for the ratepayers of Missouri.
22	Q. Okay. Can you can you state how that
23	the rate as of Friday, the 4.28 percent, can you kind
24	of walk us through how that rate was derived?
25	A. Sure. So there's generally two components

1	to how investors think about the interest rate they
2	should receive on bonds. One is the base rate or the
3	risk free rate. That would be the treasury reference,
4	and then the second would be the risk premium. That
5	would be the spread to treasuries that's outlined in
6	my materials. And, so both of those move in
7	conjunction with market sentiments. Treasury rates is
8	something that is definable and knowable based on
9	spot you know, where you can see treasury rates
10	trading. The credit spread is something that we will
11	discover during a marketing process. This is our best
12	estimate as to where credit spreads are today based on
13	where other comparable transactions are pricing and
14	trading in the secondary market.
15	Q. Okay. You said, you know, based on other
16	transactions. How many securitizations have been
17	issued since January of 2022?
18	A. I would have to get back to you on that.
19	When you talk about utility securitizations which
20	would be the most relevant comparison, there are a
21	handful, though, not all of them look at your
22	transaction, so I think it's probably been four or so,
23	but we can come back with the exact number. And, you
24	know, then as far as transactions, as a whole, it
25	would be a number. Actually, I do have the count

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

1 here. I can count one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. So since January 2022, there have been seven 2 securitizations. 3 4 Q. Okay. And is that? 5 Α. Utility securitizations. 6 Is that from appendix A of what has been Ο. 7 marked as Exhibit 24? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Q. Okay. That's what you were counting? 10 Α. Yeah, yeah. 11 Q. This kind of goes to what has been marked 12 as Exhibit 24. Would the rate be different for Uri 13 and Asbury securitizations, if they were separated? 14 Our current expectation is the rate would Α. 15 be different. When investors assign that risk 16 premium, one of the things that is important to them 17 is liquidity in the securitizations. The Asbury 18 securitization is a bit smaller than the Uri 19 securitization. And, so as such, an investor may 20 require more of a risk premium because there would be 21 less liquidity in those bonds, and it may be more 22 difficult for them to exit out of their investment in 23 the future. 24 Q. Okay. Another putting you on the spot 25 question. How would you expect the interest rate to

1 change between now and the anticipated date of 2 issuance?

3 Α. I wish I knew that. I don't know that I'd 4 be sitting here if I could tell you. I do not have a 5 crystal ball. It is hard for me to say what direction 6 things will move in. There are obviously 7 macroeconomic events that can cause significant 8 changes to the market environment. Sitting in my seat 9 in January, when we filed our original testimony, we're in a very different place. I don't think -- you 10 know, people did not envision the Russia Ukraine 11 12 situation unfolding in the capacity that it did. And, 13 so events like that can create material changes to the 14 market for the positive and for the negative, so I wouldn't feel comfortable projecting what's going to 15 16 happen with rates going forward.

Q. Now, assume that the commission issues a financing order and the issuance of bonds is delayed by an appeal, about 12 months, would you expect -what would you expect the effect on the interest rate change to be if that were to happen, if you know.

A. That is unknowable.

Q. And then I think getting -- getting into -and if you want to refer to Exhibit 24, please do.
Can you summarize the benefits and downsides of

2.2

1 combining the Winter Storm Uri and the Asbury 2 securitizations?

3 So as we think about the benefits to Α. Sure. 4 combining the transactions, I think there are a 5 couple. First is we would expect to the upfront transaction costs for a combined transaction to be 6 7 less than the sum of two separate transactions. There 8 are certain transaction costs that scale based on 9 size, but there are a number of costs that are fixed costs, so by issuing a single transaction as opposed 10 11 to two separate transactions, you would reduce the occurrence of those fixed costs to a single cost. 12 The 13 second is, we would expect that a larger transaction 14 would have more liquidity in it, and as I described would be more desirable to investors, and therefore, 15 should result in a lower interest rate which would 16 17 ultimately be passed forward and through to the 18 ratepayers in Missouri.

19 Okay. Now, as far as downsides or risks of Ο. 20 issuing a single financing order and a single bond 21 issuance, would exposure to interest rate volatility 22 be one of those potential risks? 23 Α. A single transaction, so --24 Q. I guess -- I withdraw that question, Your 25 Honor.

1	So let's preface my question on the idea
2	that if the commission issued one order in one case
3	that was not appealed and an order in a separate case
4	that was appealed and that resulted that allowed
5	Liberty to move forward quickly with one of the
6	securitizations, but not the other compared to a
7	situation where the commission used one financing
8	order and everything is held up by an appeal, would
9	exposure to interest rate volatility for the one that
10	would not have been appealed, would that be a
11	A. It would be a consideration.
12	Q. Okay.
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. And you don't there's probably no way to
15	actually call calculate and quantify that; correct?
16	A. I would be I am not able to project what
17	will happen in the markets.
18	Q. Is it possible that interest rates could
19	reach a level where they would no longer be
20	quantifiable net present value benefit from
21	securitization?
22	A. If you look at historical utility cost of
23	capital as compared to current interest rates, there
24	could theoretically be a point where that, that
25	occurred, but in general, as interest rates increase

1	for the securitization, one would expect that the
2	utilities cost of capital would also increase, given
3	they're both referencing similar investor bases and
4	tied to the same treasury base rate calculation.
5	Q. Okay. You had mentioned spread earlier.
6	Can you explain what that what spread is?
7	A. Yes. So when investors think about
8	deploying their capital, they look at the risk free
9	premium which is the treasury rate, and then a spread
10	which is what they demand in return for the risk of a
11	particular transaction. For example, generally, a
12	triple A rated securitization would have a lower
13	spread than a single A rated securitization because
14	the risk associated with repayment is lower in a
15	triple A securitization than in a double A or
16	single A securitization.
17	Q. And would the triple A securitization be a
18	proxy or comparison point for a utility securitization
19	like Liberty seeking in this case?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And the single A would be a proxy or
22	approximate comparison for, like, traditional
23	financing by utility?
24	A. Not necessarily. I'm just saying, you
25	know, in general, for when investors are looking at

1	
1	securitizations broadly, utility securitizations have
2	historically been rated triple A, but there are many
3	other kinds of securitizations, some which do not have
4	triple A ratings. There would be other appropriate
5	comparisons for the utilities cost of debt in equity.
6	Q. Okay. Do you know the level of the
7	interest rate on securitization would have to hit
8	before there would no longer be a quantifiable net
9	present value benefit?
10	A. Well, the if the securitization cost of
11	capital exceeded the cost of the utilities blended
12	cost of debt in equity, there would not be a
13	perceivable NPV savings unless the utilities cost of
14	debt in equity was reset, then, to the current market
15	rates.
16	Q. Uh-huh. But in that net present value
17	benefit calculation, you also have to take into
18	account financing costs; correct?
19	A. Correct.
20	Q. So it would be not necessarily exceeding
21	the utilities cost of capital, it would be something
22	slightly lower?
23	A. Sure. Yes.
24	Q. Depending on?
25	A. Slightly lower.

1	Q. It would depend on maybe, you know, the
2	size of the security?
3	A. The size of the securitization, the
4	magnitude of the financing cost, and the duration of
5	the securitization.
6	Q. Let's switch gears to the proposed
7	certificate to be filed by Liberty utilities. Liberty
8	does propose the certificate be filed with the
9	commission by the underwriters; is that correct?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And can you tell me what the underwriters
12	do?
13	A. So the the structuring advisor and
14	underwriters do a number of different things. First,
15	we work with the utility to structure a transaction
16	that is desirable to the market. We will help guide
17	the utility through their rating agency process to
18	approve the highest cost highest possible rating
19	which ultimately will result in the lowest cost of
20	capital. We will work with the utility and their
21	lawyers to create appropriate disclosure and marketing
22	materials, and we will work to market the bonds
23	through to through our sales force to a variety
24	of investors and guide the utility and their
25	commission and advisors through the marketing and

```
1
     pricing process.
 2
                 Okay. So there's a lot of coordination, it
            Q.
 3
     sounds like. Is there something called like a
 4
     Sindacat (phonetic) team?
 5
            Α.
                 Yes. Our Sindacat is a group of
 6
     individuals who would be guiding the transaction
 7
     through the ultimate marketing pricing and the
 8
     marketing and pricing of the transaction.
 9
                 Okay. You are also proposing that Liberty
            0.
     itself file a certificate with the commission;
10
11
     correct?
12
            Α.
                 That is my understanding, yes.
13
                 Now, that certificate states that there are
            Q.
14
     quantifiable net present value benefits with the bonds
15
     as structured?
16
            Α.
                Correct.
17
            0.
                 Are -- are there qualifications or
18
     disclaimers on such certificate?
19
            Α.
                 I wouldn't be able to comment on the
20
     details of Liberty's certificate.
21
            0.
                 Okay. Now, what about -- on the
22
     underwriter certificate, are there qualifications or
23
     disclaimers?
24
            Α.
                 Yes. The underwriters' certificate do
     generally have qualifications and disclaimers around
25
```

1	achieving best pricing at the time based on the
2	current then current market environment. And those
3	qualifications are relevantly standard across utility
4	securitizations.
5	Q. Is there a copy of such a certificate
6	attached to the proposed order in this case?
7	A. We have not filed a draft of our
8	certificate yet, I don't believe.
9	Q. I believe your testimony references a a
10	draft issuance advice letter being circulated before
11	the actual issuance advice letter?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Would a draft of those certificates also be
14	circulated?
15	A. Generally, we would circulate that in
16	advance as well.
17	Q. Okay. Now, do the underwriters have any
18	fiduciary responsibility to Liberty utility
19	ratepayers?
20	A. No.
21	Q. Does Liberty have any fiduciary duty to its
22	ratepayers?
23	A. I wouldn't be able to comment on that.
24	Q. What would it cost Liberty to finance Uri
25	costs absent securitization?

1	A. I assume they would be financing them at
2	their blended weighted average cost of capital, so
3	debt and equity.
4	
	Q. Okay. And do you know that what the cost
5	of that is today or recently?
6	A. I I believe it was in the 6 percent
7	area, but I don't know the exact number.
8	Q. Have you read staff rebuttal testimony by
9	Sarah Lange proposing cost allocations to all customer
10	classes based on an energy allocator?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. And would you anticipate that such an
13	allocation would have any adverse impacts on the bond
14	issuance?
15	A. There are a lot of components that go into
16	creating the tightest structure possible. The
17	allocation of costs is something that is more of a
18	political discussion than a ratings discussion, so I
19	wouldn't want to comment on the fairness of her
20	proposal. And, so what we would do is work with
21	once we have a proposal for how costs should be
22	allocated, work to make sure there are appropriate
23	true-up mechanisms between classes, so that in the
24	case of a securitization, there aren't any shortfalls
25	that would result in a shortfall of bond payments, but

1 commenting on the appropriateness of allocations is -is generally not something I would do. 2 3 Okay. Assuming the commission agreed with Q. 4 staff's position that if a customer in one class moved 5 to another class that the kilowatt hours associated 6 with that customer moves with the customer and that 7 the energy allocation kind of takes care of itself 8 without having to over, under recover from different 9 classes, with that understanding, would you believe that that would be a lower risk cost allocation and 10 11 true-up mechanism? 12 We have worked through a number of Α. 13 different allocation mechanisms. I wouldn't 14 necessarily say that one is lower risk or not. It's 15 more assuring that the document appropriately reflects 16 the mathematical accuracy of how the calculation is 17 going to work and that there is never a case where you 18 are not able to true-up for a customer movement. 19 Q. Okay. And, so segueing into that true-up 20 mechanism, does Liberty agree that the mandatory 21 true-up -- at least every six months with an interim 22 optional true-up is that ideal? 23 I can't comment on what Liberty would say, Α. but what I can say is that would be standard for 24 25 utility securitizations and would allow us to comply

1 with rating agency criteria to achieve the triple A rating putting aside any other impairments to the 2 3 structure. 4 Ο. Okay. Now, you had mentioned one benefit 5 of a consolidated offering is avoiding duplicative financing costs; correct? 6 7 Α. Yes. 8 So I'm guessing that to date Liberty has Ο. 9 not incurred any duplicative costs? 10 Α. I do not believe so, but you would have to 11 check with Liberty to confirm that. 12 At least with Goldman Sachs they haven't? Q. 13 They have not. Α. 14 Now, you can agree that it's important for Q. 15 the staff -- for a staff designated representative and 16 financial advisor to be able to provide the commission 17 quidance on the issuance advice letter; correct? 18 Α. Yes. We would welcome your input. 19 Ο. Okay. And to be able to provide that 20 guidance, the -- you agree that the commission would 21 have to proceed input and collaborate in all facets; 22 correct? 23 I think there is specific language around Α. 24 the commission and their advisors' involvement in the 25 transaction. I am not one who is in a position to

1	comment on the appropriateness of that. I I have
2	worked in many different states where there are
3	different involvements from the commission and their
4	financial advisor in the process, and I follow the
5	rules and guidance of the legislation and the
6	commission, and adhere to the policy that's set for
7	me.
8	Q. Okay. How much is Goldman Sachs being paid
9	as part of this securitization case?
10	A. So we would hope eventually to be an
11	underwriter. I think our and we are receiving a
12	structuring fee of what are we getting here?
13	\$255,000, I believe.
14	Q. Okay. And are you being paid as an expert
15	witness?
16	A. No.
17	Q. In this fee? Okay. No further questions,
18	Your Honor.
19	JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Public
20	counsel?
21	NATHAN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Nathan
22	Williams for public counsel.
23	EXAMINATION
24	BY NATHAN WILLIAMS:
25	
20	Q. Good morning.

1 Α. Good morning. I want to start with what Mr. Cooper's 2 Q. 3 probably hoping someone does, on Exhibit 24, there are 4 a number of things in there that are not clear to me 5 as to exactly what they mean. 6 Α. Sure. 7 So my questions are going -- starting off 0. are going to be about clarification. So if you turn 8 9 to Exhibit 24, in the line that talks about liquidity 10 and offering, there's a reference to a minimum size 11 of -- I'm not sure what that symbol, but 250 plus MM. What is that saying -- in English, what does that say? 12 13 Yes. So I would say generally investors Α. 14 when they consider a liquid securitization would look 15 to see a transaction that is around 250 million, so 16 approximately 250 million in size for a minimum 17 transaction size to be viewed as liquid. Below that, investors will view it as a smaller transaction, and 18 19 you may have impacts on pricing and liquidity. 20 Q. So price MM throughout this document with 21 reference to monetary, it means millions? 22 Millions, yes, sir. Α. 23 Ο. Then there's line estimated upfront 24 financing costs, and then there's in parenthetical 25 from Hunton. What is Hunton?

1 Α. Hunton is the law firm who is representing Liberty in this transaction. 2 3 I assume TBD means to be determined? Q. 4 Α. That is correct. 5 Over on the second page where you have a Q. 6 table that are classes and there are some letters? 7 Α. Yes. 8 What is WAL referring to? Ο. 9 It refers to weighted average life. Α. And so, that is the average period of time in which 10 11 principal is repaid for a particular class of bonds, when investors look to reference --12 13 Q. That's good enough. I'm just looking for 14 what the letters mean? 15 Α. Of course. 16 Q. TSY tenor, what does that mean? 17 Α. The treasury tenor that we are reflecting from the pricing perspective. 18 19 And TSY spread? Q. 20 That would be spread to the treasury rate. Α. 21 Q. Spread between what? 22 That would be the risk -- as I mentioned, Α. 23 when an investor prices a bond, they look for the risk 24 free rate, which is the treasury rate plus the risk 25 premium of the spread, so that would be the spread to

1 the treasury rate that gets to your all interest 2 costs. 3 What is prin window mean -- or I assume Q. 4 principle, PRIN, window is principal? 5 Α. It is the period of time in which principal 6 is repaid to investors. So you'll note in the class 7 Al principal is repaid to investors starting on the 8 first payment date which would be slightly after 9 issuance which would be year 0 through year 9. Securitization class A2 principal is returned to 10 investors between years 9 and 13. 11 12 Thank you. EXP final? Ο. 13 Α. That would be the expected final maturity 14 of the bonds. And, so you can see the -- that would be the last date that principal would be expected to 15 16 be repaid to investors. 17 And then following the word Asbury, you 0. have 10 BPS wider, bases points? 18 19 Α. Basis points. So that's a note due to the 20 liquidity. 21 0. And basis points is how much of a percent? 2.2 Α. One basis point is equal to one, one 23 hundredth of a percent. So Asbury would price 24 approximately --25 I think you've answered my question. Q. Are

1	the revenues that bondholders receive from these
2	securitization bonds, if they're issued in this case
3	or the bonds that are the subject of this case, would
4	those be subject to federal or state income tax?
5	A. Yes. These would be taxable bonds.
6	NATHAN WILLIAMS: No further questions.
7	Thank you.
8	JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We'll come up
9	for questions from the bench. Any questions from the
10	commissioners on line?
11	RYAN SILVEY: Thank you, judge. This is
12	Commissioner Silvey. I have a question.
13	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Go ahead.
14	RYAN SILVEY: Thank you.
15	EXAMINATION
16	BY RYAN SILVEY:
17	Q. You were asked a question about duplicative
18	financing cost, if the commission were to issue two
19	orders instead of one. Could you
20	A. Yes.
21	Q provide some sort of ballpark or range
22	on what duplicative costs may be, if the commission
23	decides to issue two orders instead of one?
24	A. Yes. So I think there are a number of
25	costs that we are not a party to negotiating, like the

1	commission's own advisory costs, which I assume would
2	be less in a single transaction than if you were to
3	issue two transactions, but I think we believe that it
4	would save based on what we've submitted for
5	Exhibit 24, somewhere in the order of magnitude around
6	a little over a million dollars. So somewhere between
7	a million and \$1.3 million, if I'm doing the math
8	right on the spot that someone should check that, and
9	we did submit the exhibit that shows the differential.
10	Q. Okay. So your estimate is between 1 and
11	\$1.3 million in duplicative costs, if we were to issue
12	two orders instead of one?
13	A. That is correct.
14	Q. Is that accurate?
15	A. That is my estimate.
16	Q. Okay.
17	A. Based on my knowledge as of today.
18	RYAN SILVEY: Okay. Thank you, Judge. No
19	further questions.
20	JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. And I do have
21	some additional questions, and I'll start out by
22	saying that my initial questions about the combining
23	costs have pretty much been answered with your
24	Exhibit 24, so I won't go into that. But some more
25	general questions. How have interest rates changed

1	from 2018 to current? Have they generally increased
2	or decreased and by how much?
3	THE WITNESS: Generally increased. I would
4	have to go back and look at what treasury rates were
5	in 2018, but there has been a general increase.
6	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And there's more
7	even more volatility in the last few months.
8	THE WITNESS: Yes. Including last night.
9	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Can you please
10	explain your role as financial advisor to Liberty?
11	THE WITNESS: My my goal is to help them
12	appropriately prepare and file for this transaction,
13	get to the points point where we have a serviceable
14	financing order and begin the preparatory work for rate
15	agency process and provide guidance on transactions
16	structure and what might be received by the might
17	be best received by the market.
18	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And I assume
19	Goldman Sachs has experience in this role?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
21	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Does Goldman Sachs also
22	have experience as an underwriter?
23	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
24	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And will Goldman Sachs be
25	the underwriter for this transaction?

1 THE WITNESS: I hope so, but I suspect 2 there will be a selection process that we will be a 3 part of. 4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And that -- is that 5 up to Liberty to decide who is going to be the underwriter? 6 7 THE WITNESS: That is my understanding. JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. If you were to be 8 9 the underwriter, does that create any potential conflicts of interest in performing the two roles as 10 advisor and underwriter? 11 12 THE WITNESS: I do not believe so. It is 13 standard practice for the financial advisor to also be 14 the underwriter and the majority of transactions, the financial advisor is best positioned to be the 15 16 underwriter and able to actually create efficiencies 17 in process by having continuity of advice to the 18 utility. 19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Can you explain the 20 difference between rule 144-A req A bonds versus bonds 21 registered with the SCC? 22 THE WITNESS: Well, I'm not a lawyer, but 23 rule 144-A bonds are a form of private placement that 24 do not require registration with the SCC or as much government regulatory oversight. In general, there 25

1	may be slightly more upfront costs with an SCC
2	registered transaction because you do have to file
3	with the SCC and prepare compliant documentation.
4	That said, SCC registered deals generally are more
5	liquid than rule 144-A deals and perceived by the
6	market in a favorable fashion which would ultimately
7	result in a lower interest cost and savings for
8	ratepayers.
9	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. My understanding
10	that Liberty's planning on issuing bonds registered
11	with the SCC; is that still the plan?
12	THE WITNESS: That is my expectation as
13	well.
14	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Are there any
15	conditions under which Liberty should consider issuing
16	the rule 144-A bonds?
17	THE WITNESS: The majority of the
18	transactions that have been issued within the utility
19	space have been SCC registered, because the goal is to
20	achieve the lowest cost possible to the extent you did
21	not issue SCC registered bonds. I would expect
22	certifications would have qualifications around that
23	point.
24	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Questions about the
25	bond marketing and pricing process

1	THE WITNESS: Sure.
2	JUDGE WOODRUFF: generally. Does the
3	commission's decision to issue a single financing
4	order or two, effect either positively or negatively
5	the ability of Liberty in and the underwriters to
6	successfully market price and issue a combined bond
7	offering?
8	THE WITNESS: We are we would we
9	expect to be able to successfully issue bonds
10	regardless of the free mark for a single offering or
11	two.
12	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. What effect, if
13	any, would the appeal to a court of the commission's
14	financing order have on the underwriters' ability to
15	proceed with the bond issuance process?
16	THE WITNESS: We are not able to proceed
17	with bond issuance until the financing order is final
18	and non-appealable.
19	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Would a single I kind
20	of got into this with staff's questioning, but if the
21	commission were to issue two separate financing orders
22	and and only one of them were appealed, would
23	would that provide any benefits?
24	THE WITNESS: I think what you're asking
25	is maybe I can reframe the question to make sure

1	I'm answering appropriately. A delay caused by the
2	appeal in a financing order would delay the
3	transaction. We do not have the ability to foresee
4	what will happen with markets over time. So by taking
5	risk off the table for a single issuance, let's say
6	one of the orders was not appealed, I think a
7	statement was made earlier, you are taking less market
8	risk through that process, though in return, we expect
9	there may be more upfront financing costs and less
10	efficiency in execution for the second smaller
11	transaction.
12	JUDGE WOODRUFF: What would happen if
13	process of after the commission has issued its
14	financing order, before the bond can be priced, and so
15	forth, what would happen if the market were to change
16	such that there would no longer be a benefit for the
17	financing as you described earlier with
18	THE WITNESS: I presume there would be some
19	pretty serious discussions about whether to proceed
20	with the transaction.
21	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. So the would the
22	commission have any say any more as to whether that
23	transaction would proceed?
24	THE WITNESS: I am not a lawyer, but my
25	understanding is that Liberty in their certification

1	does need to show savings. And, so if they were
2	unable to show savings, I assume there would need to
3	be further discussion about how to proceed.
4	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Now, what's the
5	minimum dollar value of secured property in which a
6	reasonable underwriter would expect sufficient
7	investor interest liquidity and triple A bond rating
8	such that the bond were issued at the lowest available
9	cost for Liberty's customers.
10	THE WITNESS: So as I mentioned 250 million
11	is the rule of thumb, though, we have done
12	securitizations that are much smaller, and our goal is
13	always to get the best execution for the ratepayers
14	based on the framework that we are living within. If
15	we end up moving forward with two separate
16	transactions, we would do our best to get assuming
17	we were the underwriters, we would do our best to get
18	best execution for both transactions based on the
19	facts and circumstances of those particular
20	transactions.
21	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. So if, for example,
22	you had a you had a bond issue of 150 million
23	instead of 250?
24	THE WITNESS: I would expect less focus
25	from investors.

```
JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Would that imply a
 1
 2
    higher interest rate?
 3
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
 4
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And do you know how much?
 5
                 THE WITNESS: In the filings, in
 6
    Exhibit 24, we imply that it would be approximately
 7
     ten basis points, based on our best estimates in
 8
    today's market.
 9
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. So if it was a -- a
     $75 million issuance, it would be something higher
10
11
    interest again?
12
                 THE WITNESS: That level of precision is
13
    challenging to articulate, but, yes.
14
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Question about the
    estimated financing cost proposed in Liberty's
15
16
    petition is fixed versus variable costs.
17
                 THE WITNESS: I don't have that off top of
    my head. There are certain costs that are fixed, like
18
19
     legal fees, trustee fees, et cetera. There are
20
     certain costs that are variable like -- and related to
    transaction size like rating agency fees, underwriting
21
22
    fees, and SCC registration fees. I have not done the
23
    breakout for you, though.
24
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And just looking at
    Exhibit 24, there are -- there's a listing of various
25
```

1	financing costs. Would the TBD, to be determined,
2	would that tend to be the ones that are variable?
3	THE WITNESS: No. I think we just didn't
4	have certain amounts. So, for example, we have the
5	commission's initial advisory fees as to be
6	determined. Those are generally not variable based on
7	transaction size, but we have not been provided with
8	that information.
9	JUDGE WOODRUFF: I see. Thank you. Now,
10	questions about the post-financing order process,
11	should the commission require that a bond advisory
12	body be established consisting of Liberty, the
13	commission, the the commission staff, and any
14	designated staff or consultant advisor to Liberty
15	that basically, with commission staff, basically, a
16	bond advisory team; is that something you would
17	suggest or oppose or
18	THE WITNESS: I follow the rules as they
19	are outlined to me and, so I don't feel that it's
20	appropriate for me to comment on that.
21	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay.
22	THE WITNESS: I'm excited to work with the
23	commission and their team in the capacity as
24	determined that's appropriate.
25	JUDGE WOODRUFF: So you'll work with

1	whatever you're told to work?
2	THE WITNESS: Correct. That's what you pay
3	me for.
4	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. What would be the
5	perimeters of the bonds establishing the terms and
6	conditions of the bonds, including but not limited to
7	repayments schedules, expected interest rates, and
8	financing costs?
9	THE WITNESS: What would be the perimeters?
10	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yes.
11	THE WITNESS: So my understanding is the
12	recovery period for these bonds is 13 years. We are
13	targeting level debt service. And, so those are the
14	two main perimeters. We would then, you know, upfront
15	costs are going to be what they will be, and we will
16	create a structure that is appropriate based on market
17	demand at the time of issuance. But the two main
18	perimeters that I believe you're asking to be set are
19	the final expected final payment date, which I believe
20	is something like 13 years, and the shape of the debt
21	service schedule which my understanding is a level
22	debt service schedule.
23	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Should a procedure be
24	established that allows or requires the staff to audit
25	the ongoing financial costs post issuance of the

```
Page 555
```

```
bonds?
 1
                 THE WITNESS: Generally, in order to
 2
 3
     achieve a triple A rating, review of -- are you
 4
     talking about the true-up mechanism?
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yes.
 5
 6
                 THE WITNESS: The -- the only input that
 7
     can be had on the true-up mechanism by the commission
 8
     is to check the mathematical accuracy of the
 9
     calculation.
10
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: That is established by the
11
     statute?
12
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Do traditional
13
14
     financing methods incur financing costs also?
15
                 THE WITNESS: Traditional being a
16
     investment grade utility offering?
17
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yes.
18
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
19
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And what kind of costs
20
     would those be?
                 THE WITNESS: I do not do investment grade
21
22
    utility bond offerings. It is something I could come
23
     back on, but there would generally be legal fees. If
2.4
     you need an order of magnitude, I cannot comment on
     that, but I would expect the cost to be in similar
25
```

categories including legal expenses, rating agency 1 2 fees, as well as under writing fees. 3 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Why weren't financing 4 costs included in Liberty's traditional financing NPV 5 scenario? If you know. 6 THE WITNESS: I can't comment on that. 7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. You weren't involved in --8 9 THE WITNESS: No. 10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: -- creating that? Based 11 on your bond experience, are these activities part of 12 the process to be undertaken by the utility or to 13 place bonds on marketing -- first of all, selection of 14 the underwriters; is that part of the process? THE WITNESS: Underwriters must be selected 15 16 in order to proceed with a bond offering. The process around selection of the underwriters, it would be a 17 18 conflict for me to comment on given I hope to be an 19 underwriter. 20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. How about preparing 21 for and registering the bonds with the SCC? 22 THE WITNESS: That -- are you asking if 23 that would be --24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Part of the process. 25 THE WITNESS: -- part -- yes. The

Page 557

1	underwriter. Once the underwriters were selected,
2	generally, they would help to prepare offering
3	documents and register the bonds with with the SCC
4	in conjunction with the utility and their counsel.
5	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And preparing for a
6	meeting with rating agencies?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Preparing for and
9	marketing the bonds?
10	THE WITNESS: The underwriters would be
11	involved in preparing and marketing the bonds, yes.
12	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Are there any other
13	activities that are part of the process?
14	THE WITNESS: There's preparation of other
15	ancillary materials, so investor presentations, cash
16	flow analysis, marketing calls, preparation of a model
17	and cash flows for the rating agencies, there is a
18	number of other steps that go into the preparation of
19	these transactions.
20	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Does issuing two
21	financing orders require two separate bond issuances
22	or can one transaction be created from two financing
23	orders? One for Uri and one for Asbury?
24	THE WITNESS: It would be more complicated,
25	but I am sure the the lawyers can figure it out.

LEXITAS LEGAL Phone: 1.800.280.3376

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. It sounds like 2 that's not something you would recommend. 3 THE WITNESS: We have created transactions 4 in multiple -- we have structured transactions based 5 on multiple frameworks including having, you know, two 6 or more utilities each with their own financing order 7 issuing a single bond, so it is possible but 8 simplicity is always helpful. 9 (Silence in audio.) 10 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Going back to my earlier 11 question about the bond advisory body to be 12 established, and you indicated you would work with 13 whatever you --14 THE WITNESS: Yes. 15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: -- we've ordered. 16 Assuming Liberty doesn't have responsibility regarding 17 the structuring marketing and pricing of the bonds, should the commission order and input advice from 18 19 other members of the bond advisory team be required? 20 It is not required. THE WITNESS: 21 Different states do it in different ways. My only 22 guidance I can give is that it is important that 23 whoever be involved in the process be ready to move 24 efficiently and quickly. We are creating a marketing 25 and pricing process that aligns with market

1	expectations as well as the internal processes of
2	investors and to the extent you are not adhering to
3	market standard or you are not complying or creating a
4	process that matches the internal investor hedging and
5	committee processes you may have investors that might
6	opt out of the transaction which would result in a
7	worth outcome for the ratepayers of Missouri.
8	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Can you explain a
9	little bit about what the process expected process
10	would be?
11	THE WITNESS: Action. I would note that
12	the process changes depending on the market
13	environment in more distress markets. Sometimes our
14	process will be extended or if there is a efficiency
15	in the market, we may wish to compress the process to
16	take risk off the table, but generally, once all of
17	our marketing materials have been prepared so that
18	would be the registration statement generally an
19	investor presentation as well as sometimes an investor
20	term sheet. We would begin our marketing process.
21	That process generally lasts three to five days and
22	would comprise of a series of one-on-one calls, a
23	broad group investor call, and providing information
24	to investors through a road show website, and once
25	marketing has commenced, at some point, we would share

1 with investors initial thoughts on pricing. Those are referred to, I think, in some of these documents as 2 3 IPTs or initial price thoughts, that helps to guide 4 investors to expectations around where -- what the 5 relative value of these bonds are. Depending on 6 investor demand, investors at that point would start 7 to place orders on the bonds. Depending on investor 8 demand, we may have the ability to tighten our IPTs in 9 or bring our spread in to result in a lower spread to 10 treasuries. If investor demand is not sufficient, we 11 may need to widen our spreads out in order to garner 12 more support for the transaction and be able to clear 13 all of the bonds in the market. Those decisions are 14 made quickly at checkpoint calls with the commission, 15 if appropriate, as well as the utility, and then once 16 we have figured out the right price through the series 17 of market testings, we will announce to investors that 18 we are going to price the deal. We will notify them 19 of the allocations, how many bonds they're going to 20 get, and we will price the transaction and spot the 21 relevant treasury rate at that point in time. There 22 is then generally a five-day period between pricings 23 and closing where we will finalize transaction 24 documents, and then the utility will receive their 25 funds, five days post pricing in most cases.

1	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. So from what I'm
2	hearing, there's there's not going to be any time
3	for somebody to come back and say, hey, commission do
4	you think this is a good idea?
5	THE WITNESS: Generally, the rules of what
6	everyone is comfortable with are determined up front
7	and in the processes that I think result in the best
8	outcome for ratepayers, there is it is everyone
9	working together and pulling in the right direction in
10	the same direction to move efficiently through the
11	process so that we can get as much investor demand as
12	possible which allows us to drive that credit spread
13	in as tightly as possible and get to the best outcome
14	for the ratepayers.
15	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Should the
16	commission require that Liberty, the underwriters, and
17	any independent financial advisor deliver to the
18	commission independent written certifications without
19	material or qualifications confirming what they have
20	done has, in fact, resulted in lowest cost of funds
21	and the lowest recovery charges consistent with market
22	conditions at the time of bond pricing, so we're
23	looking for
24	THE WITNESS: The expectation that the
25	underwriters and and the utility will be providing

such certifications. 1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. I believe that's 2 3 all the questions I have then. Any recross based on 4 questions from the bench beginning with Renew Missouri? 5 6 ALICIA GREENWALD: No. Excuse me. No 7 questions, Your Honor. 8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. For staff. 9 CURT STOKES: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 10 EXAMINATION BY CURT STOKES: 11 12 You mentioned a -- or you were asked about Q. 13 a bond advisory team. Have you worked with 14 commissions that had a bond advisory team previously? 15 Α. Yes. 16 0. And the team has been consisting of members 17 of, like, designated staff that would be able to respond quickly? 18 19 Α. Yes. 20 Ideally. Okay. In your experience, has 0. 21 that been an effective way to alleviate concerns 22 raised by staff or financial advisor and help them 23 provide guidance to the commission on the issuance 24 advise letter once it's finally issued? 25 A. Yes.

1	Q. You were asked about two financing orders
2	authorizing one bond offerance or one one bond
3	offering. Are you familiar with the bond issuance in
4	taxes recently where they my understanding is that
5	they securitize, like, all the utilities
6	A. The cost securitization, yes.
7	Q. Can you explain how that worked?
8	A. That was a very different structure than
9	what we're trying to achieve here, and due to a number
10	of structural considerations, they were actually it
11	did not look like a traditional IOU securitization. I
12	don't know that that is the best comparison, if you
13	are looking to a transaction with multiple utilities
14	or multiple financing orders. I think probably the
15	better comparisons would be either the first energy
16	deal in Ohio that was issued, I want to say, in 2014
17	or NSTAR did a deal in Massachusetts a number of years
18	before.
19	Q. Okay. That's all I was going to ask, if it
20	was a useful comparison or not.
21	A. I I am very aware of it. I don't know
22	that it is the best comparison given Texas has a
23	different legal and regulatory framework than
24	Missouri.
25	Q. Now, you had mentioned that, you know,

1	two if there were two bond offerings that you'd
2	have a ten basis point increase. Assuming the
3	approximately \$145 million associated with Asbury,
4	what does ten basis points equate to for \$145 million?
5	A. I don't have a calculator up here. Or
6	maybe I do actually. Well, it would be ten basis
7	points per year. I guess the duration on the cash
8	flows is probably something, you know, we can come
9	back we can actually come back and do the math for
10	you, but it would be the duration times the ten basis
11	points times the total bond offering size. So, you
12	know, it could be meaningful in the millions of
13	dollars over the life of the transaction.
14	Q. You estimated, though, it would be more
15	than the \$1 million in savings from consolidation?
16	A. Yes. I believe so, but I guess the point
17	is, it would be compounding the savings of
18	consolidation.
19	Q. Yeah. That's where I was getting to.
20	A. Yes. Yes.
21	Q. Yeah.
22	A. Correct.
23	CURT STOKES: Yeah. No further questions,
24	Your Honor.
25	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Public counsel.

1	NATHAN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Nathan
2	Williams again.
3	EXAMINATION
4	BY NATHAN WILLIAMS:
5	Q. In response to bench questions, you
6	indicated that there have been securitizations below
7	the 250 million that you indicated as preferable; do
8	you recall that?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. How low have how much below the 200
11	well, I don't think I want to get it in that way.
12	What amount of securitizations have been that done
13	that were below the 250 million?
14	A. So I submitted as part, I believe of my
15	testimony a list of all of the transactions and
16	relevant transaction sizes. There have been a handful
17	of deals that have been sub 100 million, though most
18	of them a bit older at this point in time, going back
19	to the inaugural period sound securitization in 1997
20	that was \$35 million. And there have been a couple of
21	transactions that have been smaller. The goal is,
22	obviously, to get best execution regardless of the
23	transaction size, and we will be able to successfully
24	execute a smaller transaction. It just may not price
25	as efficiently as the larger transaction.

1	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Redirect.
2	DEAN COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
3	JASON HOLSMAN: Judge, this is Commissioner
4	Holsman. I have a question.
5	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Go ahead.
6	JASON HOLSMAN: Thank you.
7	EXAMINATION
8	BY JASON HOLSMAN:
9	Q. Given the market volatility of late, what
10	specific market conditions would be present that would
11	make you make the bond yield disadvantageous?
12	A. I'm sorry, can you repeat that? The bond
13	yield to what?
14	Q. It would be disadvantageous, that would
15	what conditions would be present that would
16	essentially suggest that it wasn't worth doing?
17	A. I believe the metric that has been set is
18	present value savings relative to the utility's
19	blended cost of capital. And, so to the extent we had
20	continued rate hikes by the fed or market volatility
21	such that investors demanded significantly higher
22	credit spreads to treasuries, you could be in a
23	position where the cost of the securitization exceeded
24	historical costs or historical weighted costs of the
25	utility, but I would note that my guess is that if you

1	updated those costs, like, in the next rate
2	proceeding, the utilities blended cost of capital
3	would also likely increase in line with what is
4	happening in the securitization markets given everyone
5	references the same treasury yields.
6	Q. Given that the fed has already announced
7	that they are going to increase interest rates, is
8	there a sense of urgency to try to get this done, does
9	the timing of this play a factor?
10	A. You know, I don't have the ability to
11	foresee where rates and credit spreads are going.
12	That said, I think taking advantage of markets when
13	they are open is always a good practice and is the
14	advice that we generally would give to our clients.
15	Whether they be utilities or otherwise.
16	JASON HOLSMAN: Okay. Thank you, Judge.
17	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. Any further
18	recross based on those questions from the
19	commissioner? Staff? I see shaking hands. We'll go
20	to redirect.
21	DEAN COOPER: Thank you, Your Honor.
22	EXAMINATION
23	BY DEAN COOPER:
24	Q. Ms. Niehaus, I apologize. I'm sure this is
25	going to be disjointed as I work back through my notes

-	
1	here, but let's start with a recent you had you
2	were asked to comment on an (inaudible) kind of
3	combined, perhaps securitization that was recent, and
4	I think you said you thought if you start talking
5	about a combination of of orders and that sort of
6	thing, that the the more appropriate sort of
7	reference point might be an order from 2014 or another
8	that was older than that; is that correct?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. So you can't think of any that would be
11	similar to that within the last without going back
12	eight years?
13	A. I cannot, no.
14	Q. There were questions about sort of the
15	implications of delay and the securitization process.
16	Is one of the factors that can impact delay, the fact
17	that commonly carrying charges continue to accrue
18	during that that time period?
19	A. That is a factor, yes.
20	Q. Okay. If we assume two separate
21	financings, Uri, Asbury here, is there necessarily
22	some delay for one or the other in terms of trying to
23	move forward with those those two securitizations?
24	I guess what I'm asking is, can they just run forward
25	on a parallel track or necessarily are you going to

1	have to take one first followed by another?
2	A. They could theoretically run together on a
3	parallel track, and you could bring one, and then
4	bring the other when it was appropriate.
5	Q. Say that again, I apologize.
6	A. They could begin progressing in their life
7	cycle on a parallel track, if the decision was made to
8	do two separate securitizations. If one was ready to
9	go and the other was not, you could theoretically
10	bring one to market while the other continued on
11	through its regulatory process.
12	Q. You mentioned a \$255,000 fee. Is that a
13	per transaction?
14	A. I believe we were charging the the
15	structuring advisor fee per transaction, yes.
16	Q. In response to questions from, I believe it
17	was the law judge, you reference that during the
18	I think it was the marketing, and the pricing process
19	that decisions need to be made quickly; is that the
20	word you used?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. When you say quickly, are you talking
23	months, weeks, days or something shorter than that?
24	A. In some cases, it will be minutes. We will
25	get feedback from an account, we will know that we are

1	fully allocated for our transaction, and there will be
2	a decision that needs to be made about whether we are
3	ready to move forward and price the transaction.
4	Delays outside of the normal timing are generally not
5	well received by the investors as they expect a
6	certain cadence to a transaction.
7	(Silence in audio.)
8	Q. Some of the questions I think necessarily
9	went to your your experience in both the utility
10	securitization sort of space as well as your personal
11	experience with transactions. What is your experience
12	with utility securitization efforts?
13	A. I have the first utility securitization
14	I worked on was in 2005 for Jersey Central Power and
15	Light. I've been involved in the structuring and/or
16	underwriting. I believe 18 transactions totaling
17	north of \$17 billion in issuance.
18	Q. Have these been in a variety of states?
19	A. Yes. They are across a number of states.
20	Q. If you if you know or if you have
21	experience, would would you describe the Missouri
22	statute in regard to the participation of the of
23	the advisor to be more or less descriptive in other
24	states you've worked with?
25	A. I would say it's pretty close to down the

1 middle of the fairway.

2	Q. Okay. And I'm going to I'm sure this is
3	where I'm going to finish. You were asked questions
4	about the impact of the markets, you know, how is
5	there a level where suddenly we get to a point that
6	securitization is not there are no quantifiable net
7	present value benefits for the customers, and you may
8	have been in here earlier. I asked Mr. Murray about
9	this statement in your surrebuttal where you say,
10	while the pricing of triple A bonds will increase with
11	general market volatility, pricing and traditional
12	methods of financing will as well; would you expand
13	on on that as it as it relates to this question
14	of what about rising markets?
15	A. Sure. So I would say generally, but not
16	always markets move together especially when you are
17	talking about rising treasury rates or base rates.
18	A investment grade utility, first mortgage bond or
19	other more traditional form of offering will reference
20	the same rates and same base rates as a utility
21	securitization, so as the fed resets rates or rates
22	rise, both in both cases, the utilities senior cost
23	of regular way debt will rise likely in conjunction
24	with the rising of the utility cost of capital.
25	Additionally, these are both high quality bond

1	offerings, so it would not be outside of expectation
2	for market volatility to impact both a utility's
3	regular form of debt offering as well as equity
4	markets in addition to their securitization cost of
5	capital, so I think you know, I think the point you
6	may be getting at is there may be a time disjointment
7	between the comparisons of the utilities cost of debt
8	and equity from their prior rate proceedings as
9	opposed to a current market on the securitization
10	because we would be bringing a market in today's rate.
11	DEAN COOPER: That's all the questions I
12	have, Your Honor. I would offer Exhibit 24 at this
13	time.
14	JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. 24 has been
15	offered. Any objections to its receipt? Hearing
16	none, it will be received. Thank you, Ms. Niehaus. I
17	believe the next witness would be then Mr. Davis. Do
18	we need to take a little break?
19	CURT STOKES: Correct, Your Honor. He'll
20	be appearing remotely, so maybe a five-minute break to
21	make sure we have connectivity.
22	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Let's go ahead and take a
23	10-minute break. We'll come back at 10:20.
24	CURT STOKES: Thank you.
25	JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. Let's go ahead

and resume then. Our next witness is Mark Davis for 1 2 staff. And he is testifying via Webex. I see on my screen he's just taken a seat, so. I -- you may 3 4 inquire. 5 CURT STOKES: Thank you, Your Honor. Curt 6 Stokes on behalf of staff. 7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Let me swear him in first. 8 I almost forgot. Please raise your right hand. Do 9 you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give in this matter is the truth, the whole 10 truth, and nothing but the truth? 11 12 THE WITNESS: I do. 13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. Now you may 14 inquire. CURT STOKES: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 16 EXAMINATION 17 BY CURT STOKES: 18 Ο. Good morning, Mr. Davis. Before we get 19 started, I just wanted to remind you again, we are 20 recording this. We don't have a court reporter 21 present, but a court reporter will be transcribing 22 later from the recording, so to the extent you can 23 talk slowly, unlike I do sometimes, and you know, wait 2.4 so that there's no overlap, that's most helpful for 25 the record.

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

Page 574

1 Α. Understood. 2 Can you please state your full name for the Q. 3 record? 4 Α. Mark S.A. Davis. 5 Thank you. How are you employed and in Q. 6 what capacity? 7 I am a partner of Ducera Partners, Α. 8 Investment Bank. 9 And have you prepared in these proceedings 0. 10 rebuttal testimony marked as Exhibit 107 and a -- a 11 work paper marked as Exhibit 117? Α. 12 Yes. 13 Q. And do you have any corrections to make to 14 these documents? 15 Α. T do. 16 Q. Can you state what those are? 17 Α. Yes. On page 5, paragraph 2, line 2, I'd like to change based on the short term or to say, 18 19 should also be evaluated based on. Separately, on page 14, paragraph 2, line 3, I'd like to change 20 21 exceeds to state is less than --22 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I apologize, 23 Mr. Stokes, can you direct me to Mr. Davis's --24 CURT STOKES: I think just for the parties' 25 clarifications, page 14, is it line number 8?

1	THE WITNESS: Paragraph 2, line I
2 belie	we that is line 8. In the case interest rates,
3 it sh	ould now say is less than the discount rate under
4 secur	itization.
5	Q. (By Curt Stokes:) Okay. Thank you. With
6 those	corrections, if I were to ask you the same
7 quest	ions in those documents, would your answers be
8 the s	ame?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And are those corrected answers true and
11 corre	ect to the best of your knowledge and belief?
12	A. Yes.
13	CURT STOKES: And Your Honor, I don't
14 know	I think Exhibit 117 would be helpful answering
15 some	of the commission questions for would I be
16 able	to lay a quick foundation for that and let the
17 parti	es move?
18	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Please do.
19	Q. (By Curt Stokes:) Mr. Davis, can you
20 brief	ly describe what Exhibit 117 is?
21	A. Yes. This is underlying an update of
22 under	lying work papers that were attached to my
23 testi	mony, updated to explicitly address questions
24 posed	by the commission.
25	Q. Okay. Going going to the second page,

1	for example, can you kind of walk us through for
2	example, where it says consolidated, kind of tell us
3	what that first what the what each of the lines
4	is doing there?
5	A. Yes. So on page 2, on the right-hand side
6	of the page, under under the term consolidated,
7	this looks at a comparison of the net present value
8	savings of a ten-year AAO to a 13-year securitization.
9	It also looks at the implied break even interest rate
10	for there to be positive NPV savings under that
11	scenario.
12	Q. And then to the left, on the Uri, where it
13	says Uri standalone, can you just briefly describe
14	that?
15	A. Yes. So to the left under Uri standalone
16	is a similar analysis looking strictly at the Uri
17	securitization, on a standalone basis, not including
18	the impacts of a consolidated deal with Asbury and the
19	added amounts that would be securitized as well
20	incremental fees that would be associated with an
21	Asbury securitization.
22	Q. Thank you. And then there are two rows
23	indicated with a blue background. Can you can you
24	describe the difference between those two rows?
25	A. Yes. The the first row indicates the

1	implied NPV comparison of the cases based on using the
2	same discount rate for AAO and securitization. The
3	second case uses a discount rate for AAO based on the
4	carrying costs approved by the commission and uses a
5	discount rate for securitization at the utility's
6	weighted average cost of capital.
7	Q. Thank you. Turning to page 3 of that
8	document, there are scenarios 1 through 4 at the top.
9	Can you very briefly describe what you were doing in
10	the four scenarios?
11	A. Yes. So there's four scenarios referenced
12	that serve the basis for a footnote in my testimony,
13	looking at the impacts of different carrying costs and
14	different discount rates on the NPV savings associated
15	with securitization. Scenario 1 uses the weighted
16	average cost of capital as the discount rate and
17	carrying cost for both winter storm Uri and for
18	Asbury. Scenario 2 adjusts those amounts to use
19	the is highlighted with the blue arrows, use the
20	cost of debt for the discount rate associated with
21	Winter Storm Uri AAO as well as adjust the discount
22	rate for securitization to reflect the portion
23	associated with with Winter Storm Uri at that cost
24	of debt, and the portion associated with Asbury at the
25	weighted average cost of capital. Scenario 3 further

1	adjusts those scenarios to look at the carrying costs
2	for Winter Storm Uri at the long-term cost of debt
3	rate, and the consolidated AAO at the weighted average
4	interest rate or carrying cost associated with
5	Winter Storm Uri at the long-term cost of debt rate
6	and Asbury at the weighted average cost of capital.
7	The final scenario, scenario 4, discounts all of those
8	amounts, those carrying cost amounts at the long-term
9	cost of debt rate. So discounts both the AAO or
10	sorry, the Winter Storm Uri cash flows as well as the
11	Asbury cash flows at that long-term cost of debt rate.
12	Q. Thank you. And then can you very briefly
13	describe what pages 4 through 8 what what those
14	documents are?
15	A. Sure. So pages 4 through 8 provide a range
16	of different terms that could be approved in an AAO
17	and terms associated with securitization and also
18	evaluate a securitization of both Asbury and Uri on a
19	standalone basis as well as on a consolidated basis to
20	provide various sensitivities around the the NPV
21	savings associated with the various assumptions that
22	are illustrated. They further provide a look at the
23	potential impacts of a time delay on those NPV
24	savings.
25	Q. Thank you. And then can you briefly

1	describe the page 9 calculations?
2	A. Yes. Page 9 calculates the the AAO
3	or the ADIT adjustments associated with a 10, 13 or
4	15-year securitization adjusting those balances to
5	reflect the NPV of the ADIT amount which serves the
6	basis for the portion of ADIT that's included in the
7	Asbury securitization amount.
8	Q. Thank you. And then, finally, just can
9	you explain what what page ten is?
10	A. Yes. Page ten illustrates the cost
11	assumptions put out by Liberty for Winter Storm Uri
12	and for Asbury, both in terms of upfront costs and
13	ongoing costs and what those would look like on a
14	consolidated basis. They further include a an
15	illustration of the potential maximum savings that
16	could be achieved through through issuing the
17	securitization as a consolidated transaction avoiding
18	potentially duplicative costs to the extent they
19	haven't otherwise been incurred.
20	Q. And and does that document also break
21	out fixed and variable costs?
22	A. It does. So this the starting point in
23	the under the upfront costs and under ongoing
24	costs, there's a total line item for the fixed
25	amounts, and then below those amounts are percentages

1	associated with variable amounts. So there's no
2	savings illustrated associated with those variable
3	amounts such as the underwriting fees, SCC
4	registration fees, and bond rating fees, but potential
5	savings associated with the fixed amounts.
6	Q. Thank you.
7	CURT STOKES: Your Honor, based on that, I
8	would offer Exhibits 107 and 117 into evidence.
9	JUDGE WOODRUFF: 107 and 117 have been
10	offered. Any objections to their receipt?
11	NATHAN WILLIAMS: Judge, I don't have an
12	objection to the exhibits, but I question the the
13	designation of 117 as being highly confidential. I
14	don't see how it falls within the scope of the
15	protective order, and I'm not advocating necessarily
16	that it be made public, but I want to understand why
17	it should not be.
18	JUDGE WOODRUFF: That was going to be my
19	question as well.
20	CURT STOKES: Let me lay a foundation maybe
21	for that designation with Mr. Davis, if I may.
22	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Well, first of all, is it
23	your plan to offer this as a C or HC?
24	CURT STOKES: I believe we would appreciate
25	having it marked as HC; is that correct, Mr. Davis,

that the commission's protective order would apply to 1 2 this document? THE WITNESS: That's correct. 3 4 (By Curt Stokes:) And can you briefly Q. 5 explain the propriety and intellectual property of -of this document? 6 7 Yes. So this represents a propriety Α. 8 financial analysis prepared, you know, by my team or 9 under my direction looking at, you know, various -various scenarios and -- and analyses. 10 11 Q. And in your opinion, does that -- does 12 this -- do these financial calculations derive 13 financial value to you and to Sarah? 14 Α. They do. 15 And if -- if shared with competitors or Ο. 16 people in competition with you, would -- would it be 17 valuable to them? 18 Α. It may be. 19 Based on that, we're just asking that the Q. 20 commission's protective order apply and that, 21 therefore, the nondisclosure agreement document apply 22 to this document? 23 NATHAN WILLIAMS: Judge, if I might. 24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Go ahead. 25 NATHAN WILLIAMS: How would these -- I

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

1	mean, it says on it that they're illustrative,
2	illustrative, I'm sorry, why would they confer
3	potential value to others that would compete with you?
4	THE WITNESS: So the methodology in the way
5	that that, you know, have approached it and put it
6	together as well as, you know, compared the various
7	scenarios, you know, I view to be propriety in nature.
8	And and something that, you know, could be used
9	could be used by competitors to, you know, form the
10	basis of you know, their analysis or, you know,
11	roles in other other you know, similar engagements.
12	CURT STOKES: And Your Honor, maybe some
13	clarification might help.
14	Q. (By Curt Stokes:) So the value from these
15	documents derives from the documents themselves;
16	correct?
17	A. That's correct.
18	Q. So if somebody wanted to just cite, for
19	example, page 3, scenario 3 showing a net present
20	value calculation showing a net NPV benefits of you
21	know, 25.7 million, that would be that there
22	would be no problem with that; right? It would just
23	be, you know, attaching or copying the entire document
24	itself?
25	A. That's exactly right. So the manner that

1 it's prepared, put together and -- and compared as 2 opposed to the illustrative assumptions that are built 3 in there.

Q. Okay. But the -- like, the percentages and
the net present value benefit derived calculations,
those numbers standing alone outside of the document
could be made public; correct?

A. That's correct.

8

9 CURT STOKES: Does that help, Your Honor? JUDGE WOODRUFF: It does. I think -- one 10 more clarification on this. You've asked it to be 11 highly confidential. Is simply a highly confidential 12 13 designation sufficient, that would make it -- it would 14 make it, so it's not viewable by the public or other 15 competitors, but everyone in the case would be able to 16 see it with -- where it's highly confidential means 17 only the attorneys can see it.

18 DEAN COOPER: Your Honor, Dean Cooper for 19 Liberty. I -- I guess that would be the position that 20 I would like to -- I guess ask Mr. Stokes to consider 21 as well, because I think the highly confidential 22 material was more applicable to really a different 23 sort of market than we're talking about here, and I 24 think that this sort of marketing information as to -just kind of normal market situations fits within a 25

1	couple of the categories probably in the regular
2	confidential rule that the commission has.
3	CURT STOKES: Let me ask Mr. Davis. So
4	Mr. Davis on the understanding that it if this
5	document is confidential, it's not available to the
6	public, it would be available to all of the attorneys
7	to the to the to the to the attorneys for the
8	parties to the case and to their high experts. I know
9	there are a lot of outside experts, one from the
10	Brattle Group, one from Utilicast, one from Goldman
11	Sachs. Based on that, are there competitive concerns
12	about anyone from Brattle, Utilicast or Goldman Sachs
13	being able to see this entire document?
14	A. So I think our preference would be for it
15	to be highly confidential, if it would please the
16	commission, you know, sharing it with those parties
17	something, we can take up before.
18	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Sorry, I didn't understand
19	your last statement. You kind of got garbled on the
20	line.
21	THE WITNESS: Sorry. If sharing with
22	those our preference would be for it to be highly
23	confidential. If sharing it with those parties would
24	please the commission, you know, I think we would be
25	okay with that.

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

Page 585

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. So I take that as confidential would be sufficient? You prefer highly 2 confidential? 3 4 CURT STOKES: Yeah. I think that would be the preference, but confidential at least. 5 6 JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We'll accept 7 it as confidential then --8 CURT STOKES: Okay. 9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: -- rather than HC. All 10 right. Does that take care of your concerns, Mr. Williams? 11 12 NATHAN WILLIAMS: Sounds like I've gotten it as public as I'm going to, so I think so. 13 14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Then 107 and 117 will be received. 15 16 CURT STOKES: And I tender the witness for 17 cross. 18 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Cross examination. 19 Then we begin with Renew Missouri. 20 ALICIA GREENWALD: No questions, Your 21 Honor, thank you. 22 JUDGE WOODRUFF: MECG? Counsel? 23 NATHAN WILLIAMS: No questions, thank you. 24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Liberty. 25 DEAN COOPER: No questions.

1	JUDGE WOODRUFF: All right. We'll come up
2	for questions from the bench. Any questions from the
3	commissioners on the line?
4	RYAN SILVEY: Commissioner Silvey has no
5	questions.
6	JASON HOLSMAN: Commissioner Holsman has no
7	questions.
8	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Well, I do have some
9	questions. The first is the basic question, should
10	the commission issue a single financing order
11	addressing Winter Storm Uri and Asbury securitizations
12	or should we do separate financing orders? In your
13	opinion?
14	THE WITNESS: In my opinion, there's value
15	in a single financing order given the potential for
16	both cost savings associated with that up front and
17	ongoing costs as well as the liquidity benefits that,
18	you know, I think have been described to the
19	commission as well around issuing these amounts
20	through a a single financing order.
21	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And I'm going to ask you
22	some of the same questions that I asked Ms. Niehaus.
23	What would be the effective appeal to a court of a
24	commission's financing order on the ability on the
25	underwriter's ability to proceed with a bond issuance

1 process? THE WITNESS: So there's -- there's the 2 3 potential that an appeal could delay the issuance of 4 all or a portion of the bonds. In -- in doing that, 5 the -- the utility would be subject to interest rate 6 risk on, you know, the value of the -- of the amount 7 that's securitized during that time period. 8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Does a single financing 9 order or two separate financing orders provide a benefit or detriment during the bond issuance process 10 11 all else being equal? 12 THE WITNESS: All else being equal a single 13 financing order would (inaudible). 14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Does a single financing order or separate financing orders provide a benefit 15 16 or detriment in the event of only one of the 17 securitization subject matters being appealed? 18 THE WITNESS: There would be uncertainty in terms of interest rate risk, so there's the potential 19 20 for savings associated with the upfront and ongoing 21 costs on one hand and uncertainty around interest rate 22 risks on -- on the other hand. As part of the work 23 papers that we prepared, we looked at a potential 24 increase in interest rates of approximately ten basis points where you know, where words were at, at the 25

1	time and based on those four words, there was still
2	savings associated with a delay of the securitization.
3	There's potential benefits of still issuing the entire
4	financing together given the financial avoided cost in
5	the overall transaction.
6	JUDGE WOODRUFF: What would be the minimum
7	dollar value of securitized property at which a
8	reasonable underwriter would expect sufficient
9	investor interest liquidity in triple A bond rating
10	such that the bond rates are at the lowest cost
11	available for Liberty's customers, so what's the
12	minimum that could be financed possibly?
13	THE WITNESS: I don't know that I can
14	quantify the minimum amount that could be financed.
15	There was reference earlier to an exhibit that's been
16	filed in testimony with the list of the size of each
17	securitization that have been issued back to 1997 only
18	a handful of those have been under, you know, the 60
19	million threshold for, you know, staff's proposal for
20	Asbury, I believe it was six yields are listed in
21	there under \$60 million, so there is a potential to
22	issue smaller amounts all be it, you know, relatively
23	uncommon given the, you know, high cost upfront costs
24	and ongoing costs associated with with
25	securitization, you know, subscale.

1	JUDGE WOODRUFF: The updated financing
2	costs proposed in Liberty's petition is fixed versus
3	variable costs; do you know?
4	THE WITNESS: Sorry, I the it didn't
5	come through clearly. Could you repeat the question?
6	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Sure. How much of the
7	estimated financing costs proposed in Liberty's
8	petition is fixed costs, and how much is variable
9	costs?
10	THE WITNESS: So they use and I'm
11	referencing page 10 of the exhibit that we we spoke
12	through earlier, the the upfront fixed fees are
13	estimated at approximately \$2.5 million for Winter
14	Storm Uri and a similar amount for Asbury. And then
15	ongoing costs are estimated at approximately \$225,000
16	per year fixed ongoing costs for Uri and fixed ongoing
17	costs for for Asbury. There's roughly the
18	percentage of variable costs, I don't show the dollar
19	amount of variable costs on page ten.
20	JUDGE WOODRUFF: In his opening statement
21	staff's counsel stated that you prepared quantitative
22	analysis which compares the cost and benefits of a
23	combined, but delayed securitization with the cost and
24	benefits of separate securitization where one bond
25	issuance is delayed, but the other bond issuance is

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

not delayed. Is that part of the analysis that you 1 include in Exhibit 117? 2 3 THE WITNESS: It is. 4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Do you believe having two financing orders, one for Storm Uri, and a 5 6 second for Asbury will prevent a combined -- prevent a 7 combined financing in the event that no party appeals 8 either financing orders? 9 THE WITNESS: I want to make sure I understood the question. Did you say it would prevent 10 a combined financing order to have --11 12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Could you have two 13 separate -- could you have two financing orders and 14 one bond issuance? THE WITNESS: I -- I don't know if, you 15 16 know, from a legal perspective, it's something that 17 could be -- could be combined, if they're issued or if 18 they're approved under separate financing orders. 19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You don't know if it could 20 be combined? 21 THE WITNESS: I don't. 2.2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. What is your 23 experience with bonds, specifically securitization 24 bonds? 25 THE WITNESS: So I've been -- since the

1	beginning of this, you know, cycle of securitizations,
2	I personally, in my firm, been, you know, highly
3	active within the space advising, you know, regulators
4	on, you know, either commissions or commission staff
5	on utility securitizations, I'm currently involved in
6	securitization transactions in you know, four
7	states with total issuance volume anticipated either
8	through those financing orders or active processes in
9	excess of \$10 billion.
10	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And you said Sarah's
11	involved in this process as an advisor to various
12	commissions, regulators; is that what you said?
13	THE WITNESS: That's correct. I said we
14	don't serve in an underwriting capacity. We we
15	serve in in an advisory role to, you know,
16	commission, so with commission staff.
17	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. In Sarah's roles
18	serving public clients with securitization bonds, what
19	has been your level of involvement in the structuring
20	marketing and pricing phases?
21	THE WITNESS: So as advisor to, you know,
22	the the designated, you know (inaudible) or finance
23	team role, I've been highly involved in, you know,
24	respectively all facets of that process, so involved
25	from the, you know, early days of the the designing

1	what the process ultimately should look like and what
2	the commission staff review process should look like
3	to the underwriter selection process, making sure that
4	use sufficient information is garnered by the
5	commission staff in order to evaluate what the
6	structure marketing and pricing proposals look like
7	from the ultimate underwriter team, and then, you
8	know, building from that to reviewing the structure of
9	the of the proposal being involved in overseeing
10	the marketing process from commission staff's
11	perspective, including evaluating the length of the
12	marketing process, the steps involved, the investors
13	that are targeted as part of that process to
14	ultimately inclusion in the pricing process, so
15	investor calls, the different pricing levels,
16	reviewing what the order book looks like, so the
17	degree of subscription from investors into the order
18	book and ultimately that the decisions of the
19	utility and their underwriters, how to tighten that
20	pricing in order, you know, to achieve the statutory
21	objectives within, you know, the the particular
22	states or financing orders requirements.
23	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And did you did you
24	participate in meetings with rating agencies?
25	THE WITNESS: For the rating agencies, I've

1	received access to recorded calls with the rating
2	agencies and reviewed presentation materials that will
3	be presented to the rating agencies. The discussions
4	directly with the rating agencies have in the
5	incentives I've been involved have taken place
6	directly between the issuer underwriter with the
7	rating agencies, you know, transcripts or notes
8	provided, you know, provided to to, you know, the
9	advisor to the relevant commission staff.
10	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And Mr. Mocindy's
11	surrebuttal testimony said there should not be any
12	additional protocols or procedures added to the
13	finance order that could lead to delays in completing
14	the transaction. What's been your experience with the
15	impact of protocols or procedures to the finance
16	order? Have you seen them cause delays?
17	THE WITNESS: No. I as it relates to
18	the procedures that are put in place, having steps in
19	place that provide for an organized process outlining,
20	you know, what the role of the finance team is, items
21	that, you know, would be, you know, effectively
22	reviewed along the way establishing what that review
23	process looks like, in my mind, have created
24	efficiencies in the process, so you don't end up in a
25	world where there's a you know, draft issuance

1	advice letter in front of, you know, commission staff
2	or a designated representative that could you know,
3	could be problematic and could require, you know,
4	revisiting various steps that had already taking place
5	to having, you know, those steps put in place from the
6	onset of the process. I believe has been helpful in
7	providing for, you know, a smooth issuance process.
8	JUDGE WOODRUFF: In Mr. Mocindy's
9	surrebuttal testimony, again, he states, in my
10	opinion, the marketing and pricing of these bonds is
11	not fundamentally different from traditional debt
12	securities issues by Liberty; do you agree with that
13	statement?
14	THE WITNESS: Not necessarily. So the
15	the traditional securities issued by Liberty aren't,
16	you know, necessarily the the direct or as directly
17	tied to the, you know, ratepayer as the securitization
18	bond which are, you know, a hundred percent paid for
19	by the ratepayer and service and others collected by
20	the utility, but not necessarily, you know, part of
21	the utility balance sheets, so they're a little bit
22	different in that regard. They're also typically
23	marketed to a different universe of investors than you
24	would see in traditional utility finance. So often
25	times you'll market the securitization bonds to a

1	combination of ABS investors and corporate investors
2	which may be different than, you know, a corporate
3	investor that or banks that often times invest in,
4	you know, utility finance, so a bit of different
5	investor union vary as well between the securitization
6	bonds and corporate finance, so I think, you know, a
7	number of differences between between the two.
8	JUDGE WOODRUFF: On page 4 of Mocindy's
9	testimony, he he infers that (inaudible) has
10	implied that Liberty is unsuited to manage the
11	structuring marketing and pricing process. Did you
12	make any such statement, and if so, why? To make such
13	implication?
14	THE WITNESS: So the there are
15	natural there's a lot of natural alignment between
16	the utility and the ratepayers in a securitization
17	transaction. At the same time there's also, you know,
18	areas where the utility and ratepayer may have
19	different different incentives including, you know,
20	items like a servicer fee or administrative fee. So
21	items that are paid directly from the ratepayer to the
22	utility, in a utility securitization transaction. So
23	there are, you know, degrees of of differences
24	between between you know, degrees of differences
25	in the in the alignment of Liberty and the the

1	ratepayers. There's also, you know, degrees of
2	disalignment between the ratepayer, and ultimately the
3	investor that's acquiring these securities that would
4	look for, you know, the highest interest rate that
5	they can achieve on the on the issuance, and the
6	ratepayer that wants to pay, you know, lowest rate
7	effectively on on the securitization, and the
8	underwriters are are in a position without any
9	fiduciary responsibility to the ratepayer. And, so
10	there's value in making sure that the ratepayers, you
11	know, effectively also have a you know, seat at the
12	table in that issuance process.
13	JUDGE WOODRUFF: In Mocindy's surrebuttal
14	testimony, page 7, this time, he says, communication
15	with rating agencies will generally be limited to one
16	person from Liberty, and a representative from the
17	lead underwriter. Is this statement consistent with
18	your experience, and what has your experience been?
19	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I don't I don't
20	disagree with with that statement.
21	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And why would that be
22	appropriate to limit that communication?
23	THE WITNESS: So the communications are
24	typically recorded or there's there's, you know
25	and any communications get posted to data sites that

1	are shared with all of the rating agencies through a
2	17-G5 site. And, so often times the the direct
3	communication is, you know, takes place between issuer
4	and rating agency, but access to that information
5	access to what the rating agencies are asking
6	interested in making sure that the ultimately, the
7	structure of the bonds as proposed include the
8	components necessary to get the highest possible
9	credit rating and the lowest cost are items that are
10	through that 17-G5 site and access to information
11	that's presented to rating agencies in review of what
12	they're asking about, that, you know, commission staff
13	can receive information on, if the structuring is
14	ultimately, you know, appropriate to to achieve the
15	lowest cost from a rating agency perspective.
16	JUDGE WOODRUFF: In your experience with
17	similar securitizations, how have issues or inputs
18	from the commission's representatives been involved
19	with the issuer and the underwriter?
20	THE WITNESS: Often times through direct
21	direct dialog, so meetings established between the
22	utility underwriters, commission staff, and advisors
23	where information is reviewed, feedback is provided
24	either, you know, directly to the group or directly to
25	the issuer, and then, you know you know, taken into

1	account or evaluated to, you know, ultimately
2	determine, you know, on that particular issue, you
3	know, what if anything is necessary to make sure that
4	the process is moving along forward, and there's no
5	issue with what's being proposed ultimately, you know,
6	as a step along the way for what would ultimately be
7	necessary to to approve the issuance advice letter.
8	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And have those
9	conversations caused any undue delays?
10	THE WITNESS: No. The having a process
11	that outlines what's necessary to be reviewed by when
12	and taking advantage of windows when the SCC is
13	reviewing documents and when rating agencies are
14	reviewing documents provide for, you know, substantial
15	time for staff to, you know, review information,
16	provide input as to, you know, make sure that the
17	issuer is able to, you know, go to market, you know,
18	when it's ready. I found, you know, commission staff
19	to recognize the urgency associated with the process
20	to the extent it exists, and I've been very impressed
21	with the ability of, you know, commission staff, you
22	know, work within those timeframes in order to, you
23	know, make sure that the ratepayer interest is
24	ultimately protected.
25	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Do traditional

AUDIO TRANSCRIPTION, VOLUME 7 6/16/2022

1	financing methods incur financing costs?
2	THE WITNESS: Yes.
3	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And what would those costs
4	be?
5	THE WITNESS: So from a from a it
6	you know, high level would be such things as the
7	underwriting fees, legal fees, SCC registration frees
8	associated with those costs, that a quantum of
9	those costs isn't something that that I know
10	offhand.
11	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Did that include those
12	financing costs in your traditional financing NPV
13	scenario?
14	THE WITNESS: So the the I used the
15	carrying costs provided by staff for the traditional
16	ratemaking analysis as well as the discount rate. In
17	some instances, those costs or those rates include,
18	you know, effectively the all in cost of financing
19	including including those amounts, but you know, I
20	haven't verified in this instance if if that's the
21	way that it it works in Missouri.
22	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Based on your bond
23	experience, are there activities are these
24	activities part of the process taking by the utility
25	or issuer to place the bonds to market, first of all,

```
Page 600
```

```
1
     selection of the underwriters; is that part of the
 2
    process?
 3
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
 4
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Preparing for and
 5
     registering the bonds with the SCC?
 6
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
 7
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Preparing for and meeting
 8
     with rating agencies?
 9
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
10
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Preparing for and
11
    marketing the bonds?
12
                 THE WITNESS: Yes.
13
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And are there any other
14
     activities that are part of the process?
15
                 THE WITNESS: So to, you know, broadly
     the -- you know, structuring, marketing and -- and,
16
17
     you know, pricing of the bonds, would -- would all fit
18
     into that category, and there's a lot of subcategories
19
     that, you know, put within there, but I think broadly
20
     that would encompass the -- the process.
21
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Now, turning to
22
    Exhibit 117, could you please explain the 4 percent
23
     used as the assumed carrying costs for the -- the
24
     13-year securitization for Uri standalone?
25
                 THE WITNESS: Yes. So 4 percent was an
```

1	(inaudible) rate to, you know, when evaluating the NPV
2	savings, I noted that the interest rate environment
3	had changed fairly substantially from the time that
4	Liberty had submitted testimony to the point that I
5	was preparing testimony. And, so 4 percent was
6	reflective of an illustrative assumption of interest
7	rates at that point in time informed by movements in
8	the treasury and securitizations that had priced in
9	that you know, I believe since the beginning of
10	2022.
11	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. You analyzed two
12	scenarios, one where using the same discount rate for
13	securitization and the AAO AAO, and another way you
14	were using different discount rates for two options.
15	Can you explain why you tested those scenarios?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes. So the purpose of
17	part of the purpose of this analysis was to
18	demonstrate a need to look at, you know, several
19	scenarios to evaluate NPV savings. The the
20	different discount rates that were utilized in the
21	analysis range from the weighted average cost of
22	capital which is often times used as a you know, a
23	proxy for the customer's cost of capital to the
24	long-term debt rate to the extent using a, you know,
25	long-term debt rate would be, you know, approved or

1	otherwise, you know, the method used in traditional
2	utility finance as looking for a range of effectively
3	the you know, the customer cost of capital.
4	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Under what conditions,
5	what the discount rates would be the same and which
6	under what conditions would they be different?
7	THE WITNESS: So in evaluating the NPV and
8	traditional ratemaking, in in both instances, the
9	analysis on on page 2 uses the same interest rate.
10	That matches the effectively, the carrying cost
11	approved by the commission with the with the
12	discount rate effectively indicating that, you know,
13	in that instance, the commission would be approving,
14	you know, fair value for the, you know, cost of that
15	capital. If there were a difference in that carrying
16	cost and the discount rate, that would imply, you
17	know, someone else, equity holders are bearing the
18	cost of under and over collection based on what the
19	commission had approved. In the case of
20	securitization. There's precedent for use of the
21	weighted average cost of capital as a discount rate to
22	evaluate the NPV of customer savings using that
23	weighted average cost of capital as a proxy for, you
24	know, the ultimately, what the customer pays, the
25	customer cost of capital. So that's an alternative

way of looking at securitization or we look at it 1 2 based off of multiple discount rates. You know, ranging from the long-term debt rate to the weighted 3 4 average cost of capital. 5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Can you comment and provide an opinion on the bond advisory team concept 6 7 as used in the recent Duke Energy securitization in 8 North Carolina or in the recent California case? 9 THE WITNESS: Sure. In -- could you expand a little bit on what would be -- on what would be 10 11 helpful related to -- to those roles? 12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: First of all, it's 13 something that you would recommend in -- it involves 14 the participation of the commission -- the commission staff and their advisors of the bond marketing and 15 16 pricing process? 17 THE WITNESS: Got it. Yes. I -- I would recommend involvement of commission staff in the 18 19 process from, you know, effectively the early days of 20 approval of the financing order through ultimately 21 the -- the pricing of the bonds. I -- in my opinion, 22 it resulted in, you know, savings for customers to help provide comfort that ultimately the 23 24 securitization would achieve the lowest cost as was 25 required by -- by statute.

JUDGE WOODRUFF: And what experience do you 1 2 have with that bond advisory team structure? 3 THE WITNESS: I -- as it relates to the issuances, in California, it's been, you know, 4 5 disclosed that -- that my firm advised on the last, you know, several of those transactions. 6 7 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Do you have any concerns 8 on finding or slowing down a bond issuance from using 9 this advisory team concept? 10 THE WITNESS: No, I -- I don't. 11 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Can you explain how 12 interest rates have changed in recent months? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. There's been a 14 substantial increase in -- in interest rates, both in terms of -- you know, primarily in terms of the 15 16 treasury rate, but also in terms of spreads -- or you 17 know, risk premiums that investors have put on, put on bonds. 18 19 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Is it the treasury rate 20 that was just raised last night? THE WITNESS: The -- the federal funds rate 21 22 was raised last night. So they -- the treasury is --23 you know, are -- aren't directly tied to that, 24 although they reacted to the expectation that federal fund rate was going to increase. 25

```
1
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Do you know if interest
 2
     rates have increased in the last day or two?
 3
                 THE WITNESS: I believe they have.
 4
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Do you have any concerns
 5
     with the concept of Goldman Sachs acting in both as
 6
     the financial advisor and the underwriter roles, if
 7
     that were to happen?
 8
                 THE WITNESS: No. It -- I agree it is
 9
     often times typical for the structure and advisor to
     be involved in an underwriting capacity as well.
10
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Can you please explain
11
12
     what the discount rate is?
                 THE WITNESS: Sorry, could you clarify the
13
14
    question?
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I'm just trying to get a
15
16
    definition of the term discount rate.
17
                 THE WITNESS: I guess a rate used to
18
     determine the present value of a future cash flow
19
     stream.
20
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: And how is that determined
21
    or calculated?
22
                 THE WITNESS: It varies. I don't know that
23
     there's one -- one standard for it.
2.4
                 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Would a discount
25
    rate be the same as securing costs?
```

THE WITNESS: Not necessarily. It could be 1 2 but not necessarily. 3 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Is it appropriate to use a 4 discount rate from 2018 to determine the NPV for this 5 case? 6 THE WITNESS: I don't know. It's possible. 7 It depends how -- how, you know, rates have -- have 8 moved since then. 9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And rates have 10 moved since then, I guess? 11 THE WITNESS: That's right. 12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Given the potential 13 increase in interest rates that could occur in the 14 coming months, how would you expect this to impact the NPV comparison calculation? 15 16 THE WITNESS: So the cost of securitization 17 would go up, you know, relative to, you know, what it's like prior to -- prior to the increase in 18 19 interest rates. Looking at interest rates to use 20 the -- you know, the current weighted average cost of 21 capital that's approved by the commission, you know, 22 prior to any adjustments that have taken place 23 associated with that, with the rise in interest rates 2.4 would show a decline in the -- in the NPV of savings. You know, there's uncertainty of ultimately of what 25

1	happens to that weighted average cost to capital, you
2	know, when it's reset by the commission, so I don't
3	know that, you know, anyone can say with certainty
4	where ultimately, where that that rate is going
5	and and you know, how it will, you know, change
6	when it's, you know, reset by the commission.
7	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Do you agree that if the
8	cost of securitization were to rise because of
9	interest rate changes, that the cost of additional
10	financing would also tend to rise?
11	THE WITNESS: From that from a capital
12	market perspective, yes. The how rates are
13	ultimately set in the regulatory proceeding, you know,
14	would it may take time for rates to ultimately
15	adjust.
16	JUDGE WOODRUFF: It is my understanding
17	that staff's position is that customary ratemaking
18	absent securitization would use an AAO amortized over
19	a ten-year period with carrying cost of Liberty
20	short-term debt rate or carrying cost of Liberty's
21	long-term debt rate. Please explain how the
22	short-term debt rate or the long-term debt rate is
23	reflected in the NPV calculations included in your
24	rebuttal testimony.
25	THE WITNESS: Sure. So and I believe

1	staff's position is currently the long-term debt rate
2	rather than the short-term and long-term debt rate.
3	Page 2 of the exhibit that we walked through it at the
4	beginning of of this testimony provide, you know,
5	that comparison of a ten-year AAO to a 13-year
6	securitization, discount rates both at the, you know,
7	blended cost of debt for for Winter Storm Uri and
8	the weighted average cost of capital for as bury.
9	JUDGE WOODRUFF: What was the reason for
10	staff changing its position?
11	THE WITNESS: I don't know.
12	JUDGE WOODRUFF: It wasn't from your
13	recommendation?
14	THE WITNESS: No.
15	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And and I'm also
16	assuming you don't disagree with it?
17	THE WITNESS: No.
18	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Okay. I believe
19	that's all the questions I have then. So we'll move
20	to recross based on questions from the bench.
21	Beginning with Renew Missouri.
22	ALICIA GREENWALD: No questions, Your
23	Honor, thank you.
24	JUDGE WOODRUFF: MECG? Public counsel?
25	NATHAN WILLIAMS: No, thank you.

LEXITAS LEGAL

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Liberty. 2 DEAN COOPER: Dean Cooper for Liberty. 3 EXAMINATION 4 BY DEAN COOPER: Mr. Davis, just for a bit of context, I --5 Q. 6 I assume you're familiar with the Missouri 7 Securitization Statute; correct? 8 Α. Correct. 9 And particularly, the portions that discuss 0. 10 the participation of the staff advisor? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Would you agree with me that -- that at Ο. 13 least in the statute when it talks about the 14 participation of the advisor that the -- that the --15 this all leads to and the ultimate deliverable is so 16 commission's representative or representatives can 17 provide the commission with an opinion on the 18 reasonableness of the pricing terms and conditions of 19 the securitized utility tariff bonds on an expedited 20 basis? 21 Α. That -- that -- just to clarify, you're 22 asking me, is that what the -- the requirement of the 23 statute is? 24 Is that the ultimate deliverable Q. Correct. 25 for the advisor according to the statute?

Page 610

1 Α. I -- I need to check. 2 CURT STOKES: I would object. Calls for a 3 legal conclusion. 4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I'll overrule the 5 objection. You can answer. THE WITNESS: I would need to check. 6 7 DEAN COOPER: That's all the questions I 8 have, Your Honor. 9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Redirect. 10 CURT STOKES: Thank you, judge. 11 EXAMINATION 12 BY CURT STOKES: 13 Mr. Davis, I believe you had already Q. 14 discussed a little bit about your experiences on bond teams. Can you generally describe the -- the benefits 15 16 from a commission having a bond team? 17 Yes. So the -- the commission having a Α. 18 bond team provides the ability to have someone with a 19 seat at the table looking out for the ratepayer 20 interest along the way and avoiding instances where 21 the only mechanism for the commission to ultimately 22 act to protect the ratepayer interest is, you know, 23 relatively catastrophic event which would be rejection 24 of the issuance advice letter. So having a seat at 25 the -- along the way allows interim steps to, you

1 know, ensure that the statutory requirements and meeting that lowest cost standard are achieved. 2 3 Q. And in your experience, is that bond team 4 also helpful in keeping the commission timely informed 5 about all of the developments in the post-financing 6 order process? 7 Α. It is. 8 I think you were also asked a little bit Ο. 9 about, you know, changing interest rates, you know, 10 changing cost of capital associated with changing 11 interest rates; do you recall those questions? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. It -- is it fair to say that one of the 14 aspects of securitization is that the ratepayers and 15 the utility are locking in a known interest rate once 16 that interest rate is set? 17 Α. Yes. 18 0. And then over the course of that recovery, 19 that interest rate just stays the same? 20 That's correct. Α. 21 But associated with that is a non 0. 22 bypassable aspect to that charge; correct? 23 That's correct. Α. 24 Q. Flipping that over, though, to traditional 25 ratemaking, is it your understanding that rates have

1 returned and interest rates and traditional making can 2 vary over time? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Ο. And is it also your understanding, though, 5 that associated with those variable rates, though, is an associated commission review of the justness and 6 7 reasonableness of those rates? 8 That's my understanding. Α. Yes. 9 And then on the -- you were also asked 0. 10 about staff's change position on the short-term debt 11 rate? 12 Α. Yes. 13 Q. Is it your understanding that staff's 14 position changed based on a misunderstanding of what the annual short-term debt rate was, like -- you know, 15 16 did -- did staff think it might have been .3 per month 17 instead of .3 per year? 18 NATHAN WILLIAMS: Judge, I'm going to 19 object to that as he's already testified that he 20 doesn't know why staff changed its position. I don't 21 see that this question is inconsistent with him 22 saying -- or responding to his question would be 23 inconsistent with what he's already testified to. 24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I -- I see it as a 25 clarification rather than necessarily a change. I'm

going to overrule your objection, and he can answer. 1 2 THE WITNESS: So that -- that does refresh 3 my -- my recollection, and I believe that was part, if 4 not the rationale from staff. 5 CURT STOKES: Thank you. And apologies to the parties and judge, just trying to shorten that 6 7 refresh recollection process. 8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: That's fine. So I believe 9 that was testified to by somebody earlier in the 10 process today. 11 Ο. (By Curt Stokes:) You had mentioned 12 earlier that, you know, a federal -- federal funds 13 rate already being anticipated in the market. Can you 14 tell us a little bit about how the market anticipates 15 future interest rates? 16 Α. Yes. In particular, as it relates to the -- the treasury bonds. Treasury bond rates as 17 expectations around increased, you know, use inflation 18 19 and federal increase in the federal fund rate, bond 20 pricing, reacted in advance of that, so as market data 21 points came out, leading up to the fed decision which 22 informed investor views around, you know, could have 23 been informed investor reviews -- or views around 24 inflation, the treasury bond pricing required yields 25 increased so that there wasn't a full reaction

1	ultimately when the fed decision came out.
2	Q. Thank you. Can you turn to Exhibit 117
3	again? And page 2?
4	A. Yep.
5	Q. Can you go to the bottom right of that
6	chart, and kind of explain what that \$25 million
7	figure represents and just summarize how you get
8	there?
9	A. Sure. So the the \$25 million figure
10	represents the implied NPV benefits of securitization
11	in a consolidated transaction relative to the ten-year
12	AAO. That assumes the carrying costs associated with
13	the AAO or 5.16 percent which is the blended discount
14	rate between Uri and Asbury and assumes the cost of
15	the securitization is 4 percent. For a discount rate,
16	that assumes the discount rate associated with
17	traditional recovery of the AAO recovery is
18	5.16 percent, and it assumes the discount rate
19	associated with securitization is the is the
20	utilities weighted average cost of capital or
21	6.77 percent.
22	Q. Thank you. And the when you mention the
23	5.16 percent blended rate, can you just briefly
24	summarize what that means?
25	A. Sure. So that uses a discount rate for

1	Winter Storm Uri of 4.65 percent and a discount rate
2	for Asbury of the weighted average cost of capital.
3	And, so the two of those amounts combined together,
4	based on their relative size implies a 5.16 percent
5	weighted average rate.
6	Q. And then are the changes elsewhere on page
7	2 made in a similar manner reflecting the numbers in
8	their respective rows and columns?
9	A. They are, yeah.
10	Q. Can then can you turn to page 3?
11	A. Yes.
12	
	Q. So here, can you briefly describe the
13	yellow row? It's the one that begins consolidated
14	securitization versus AAO net present value, and
15	the and NPV savings reflected in that, for
16	scenarios 1 through 3.
17	A. Yes. So this this provides a similar
18	analysis to what was reflected on on page 2,
19	adjusted to use a 13-year AAO, which I believe is
20	is staff's position of an AAO. And calculate the net
21	present value of such amounts based on the carrying
22	rates and discount rates listed directly above it
23	on on that page.
24	Q. Okay. And even though staff's filed
25	position is a ten-year AAO, you think it's still

1	appropriate to use, like, a 13-year AAO just for
2	comparison purposes, so we're getting a a big
3	picture?
4	A. Yeah. This is a apples to apples
5	comparison, and then the pages behind it show
6	individual terms as well to be able to evaluate NPV
7	savings under, you know, if you want to use a
8	different AAO relative to securitization term like a
9	ten-year versus 13-year. You can see the implied NPVs
10	on the following pages and and (inaudible) NPV
11	savings.
12	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Your last or your
13	sentence there kind of faded out. Can you repeat what
14	you just said?
15	THE WITNESS: Yeah. On the the
16	following pages, you can see the implied NPVs
17	associated with a range of terms for the AAO as well
18	as terms for the securitization and mix and match to
19	the extent folks, you know, want to look at a
20	different term AAO or a different term securitization,
21	you can see the implied NPVs based on these
22	assumptions, and you know, do calculations of the
23	of the amount of savings under, you know, all the
24	different scenarios listed on the page.
25	CURT STOKES: I don't believe I have any

Page 617

further questions. 1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Mr. Davis, you can 2 3 step down and go about your business. 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 5 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Redirect? 6 NATHAN WILLIAMS: Yes, please. With regard 7 to Exhibit 117-C. 8 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yes. 9 NATHAN WILLIAMS: Staff attorneys already represented there's information within that exhibit 10 11 that is not confidential. My request is that there be 12 made a public version of that exhibit. 13 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Commission agrees, if you 14 can, while that is ready. Presumably, it won't be before the end of the hearing, but. Use your 15 16 microphone. You're not coming across. 17 CURT STOKES: Sorry about that. I forgot. 18 While we're on cleanup, I think staff still owes Exhibit 116 to the commission. We had circulated a 19 courtesy copy earlier with the judge and the parties, 20 21 but before we actually file it, we wanted to make sure 22 that all the parties agreed that our calculation 23 accurately represented their positions. 24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. 25 CURT STOKES: And, so I think we're there,

1 so that should be happening today or shortly. 2 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And it'll give the 3 other parties a chance to respond in writing. The 4 next witness, then, is Mr. Owen. Do you solemnly 5 swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give in this matter is the truth, the whole truth, and 6 7 nothing but the truth? 8 THE WITNESS: I do. 9 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. You may 10 inquire. 11 ALICIA GREENWALD: Thank you, Judge. Alicia Greenwald for Renew Missouri. 12 13 EXAMINATION 14 BY ALICIA GREENWALD: 15 Mr. Owen, will you please state your full 0. 16 name for the record? 17 My name is James Matthew Owen. Α. 18 Ο. By whom are you employed, and in what 19 capacity? I am the executive director of Renew 20 Α. 21 Missouri Advocates, doing business as Renew Missouri. 22 And did you prepare and cause to be Q. 23 pre-filed surrebuttal testimony and the schedule to 24 that testimony that have been marked as Exhibits 400 25 and 401?

Page 619

Α. 1 Yes. 2 Do you have any changes to make to your Q. 3 testimony at this time? 4 Α. No. 5 If I were to ask you those same questions Ο. 6 today, would your answers be substantially the same? 7 Α. Yes. 8 ο. And are all of those answers true and 9 correct to the best of your information, knowledge, 10 and belief? 11 Α. They are. 12 ALICIA GREENWALD: Your Honor, at this time I offer Exhibits 400 and 401 into evidence and tender 13 14 Mr. Owen as a witness. 15 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Exhibits 400 and 401 have 16 been offered. Any objections to their receipt? 17 Hearing none, they will be received. And for cross 18 examination, we begin with MECG. Liberty? 19 DIANE CARTER: Yes. Just a little. Thank you, Judge. 20 21 EXAMINATION 2.2 BY DIANE CARTER: 23 Mr. Owen, on page -- do you have your 0. 24 testimony with you? A. I do. 25

1	Q. Excellent. On page 6 of your testimony,
2	lines 12 to 13, you state that it is your position
3	that coal plants are destructive to air quality and
4	overall public health; is that your position?
5	
6	and remains my position.
7	Q. And then separately in your testimony,
8	let's see, page 11, lines 6 to 7, you state that the
9	price of coal-powered electricity in the United States
10	would rise by at least 50 percent, if public health
11	costs were taken into account; is that your testimony?
12	A. That that is my testimony and that is
13	based on research I have conducted, yes.
14	Q. Are you familiar with public counsel's
15	testimony in this case, particularly during the the
16	hearing this week that there is an American Lung
17	Association report claiming that the air quality when
18	Asbury was operating in that county was was
19	excellent? Are you familiar with that testimony?
20	From public counsel?
21	A. I do believe Office of Public Counsel
22	witness Lena Mantle did testify to that, yes.
23	Q. How do you reconcile that testimony from
24	public counsel with your positions?
25	A. Well, it's interesting to me just because

1	when I heard that, I went and looked up some
2	information on that. First of all, the American
3	Cancer Society has a report from June 25th of 2021,
4	that indicates as far as their energy policy goes,
5	that they would recommend that all coal-burning plants
6	be shut down immediately, and they transition to clean
7	energy generation. That's a report from that
8	organization I would also note that that the
9	American Lung Association has also looked at air
10	quality for Jasper County and Neosho County, they
11	get that is also from 2021, and they give that
12	county a B which still remains lower than, let's say,
13	Greene County which was at
14	NATHAN WILLIAMS: Judge, I'm objecting to
15	this testimony as hearsay. He's giving results about
16	some study. He's not provided the study. There's no
17	foundation for the study. He's just dumping in
18	information. That's out-of-court statements.
19	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Your response?
20	DIANE CARTER: He's not my witness, but
21	from my perspective, that it is the basis for his
22	opinion, and as an expert offering opinion, he can
23	rely on what went would, otherwise, be hearsay.
24	NATHAN WILLIAMS: While I don't disagree
25	with that, I don't believe that it is the basis of his

1	opinion. He expressed his opinion in his testimony,
2	and then he said he just looked up this information.
3	JUDGE WOODRUFF: I'll overrule the
4	objection. You can answer.
5	THE WITNESS: And, so, to that regard, I
6	believe that, you know, the air quality they're saying
7	Jasper County, even though it was recorded in 2021, as
8	opposed to when the plant closed in March of 2020, I
9	think still shows that there is improvement that needs
10	to be had. Also talk about evidence in our testimony
11	in the surrebuttal testimony that I provided shows
12	health consequences to the population living within a
13	12-mile radius of the Asbury plant. So I would say I
14	would disagree with OPC's position that this is
15	this is a healthy outcome for them to have a
16	coal-burning plant near where they live.
17	Q. (By Diane Carter:) On page 17 of your
18	testimony, you address the public interest standard.
19	Do you believe that the rate charged by Liberty for
20	electricity is the only factor for the commission to
21	consider when it determines whether or not the public
22	interest is being served?
23	A. I do not.
24	Q. What else do you believe should be
25	considered?

-	
1	A. I believe that there I think there's
2	nothing that, you know, is precluding this in the
3	securitization statute language that there there
4	can be noneconomic benefits, social costs that can be
5	factored into weighing the value of how we how we
6	discard these energy transmission costs and seeing
7	what kind of value that it had to the public as well.
8	Q. On page 20 of your testimony, there is a
9	reference to the Rocky Mountain Institute.
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. What is that?
12	A. It is also a nonprofit that's based
13	that's based in Denver, Colorado, that works on clean
14	energy and renewable energy issues around the world.
15	Q. What was the Rocky Mountain Institute's
16	involvement with assessing the prudence of retiring
17	Asbury or in putting together your testimony?
18	A. At our request, the Rocky Mountain
19	Institute did put together a you know, an analysis
20	that they put online. That was able to look at OPC's
21	numbers that was specifically from John Robinett's
22	testimony that he filed and found that there would be
23	a savings of roughly \$25 million for ratepayers as a
24	result of this proposal from the company.
25	DIANE CARTER: Thank you. That's all my

1	questions.
2	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Any cross for staff?
3	CURT STOKES: I put you on the spot here, I
4	apologize.
5	THE WITNESS: It's what I'm here for.
6	CURT STOKES: But you're the last witness
7	and maybe the last person who can answer this
8	question.
9	EXAMINATION
10	BY CURT STOKES:
11	Q. Were you here earlier today when there was
12	some bench questions asking about, are there costs
13	associated with traditional financing for a utility?
14	A. I think I was in the room for that.
15	Q. Okay. You've previously served as as
16	the public counsel for the state of Missouri; correct?
17	A. Yeah, from February of '16 to February of
18	'17, yes, that's right.
19	Q. So you have experience with ratemaking and
20	utility regulation?
21	A. That was my that was my first bout of
22	it, and I have been involved with it somewhat, with
23	Renew Missouri as well, yes.
24	Q. So in in that experience, is it your
25	understanding that the financing costs associated with

1	traditional ratemaking are already embedded in all
2	utility's rates in a in a full blown rate case?
3	A. I would say traditional, yes.
4	Q. Okay. So to the extent that Liberty has
5	financing costs associated with its traditional bond
6	offerings, those might already be reflected in rates?
7	A. They might be. It would depend on the
8	case.
9	Q. Right. Okay. No further
10	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Public counsel.
11	NATHAN WILLIAMS: Thank you.
12	EXAMINATION
13	BY NATHAN WILLIAMS:
14	Q. Mr. Owen, when you were public counsel, was
15	the was there a case in front of the commission
16	regarding Asbury?
17	A. I can't recall. There might have been. I
18	know the only thing I remember before before the
19	public counsel at the time was a merger case involving
20	empire and Algonquin. That's the only thing I
21	remember from that time period.
22	Q. So you don't recall a rate case involving
23	Empire where Asbury would have been first or gone
24	into rates for the improvements made in 2015?
25	A. My time here was in 2016. That would have

Page 626

1 been before my time. 2 Q. Well, the investment went --3 Α. Oh. 4 Q. -- was part of a rate case? 5 That's right. I don't remember if Α. Yeah. 6 that was during my time or not. I would have had a 7 lawyer working on that case. 8 Well, did your office have a policy Ο. 9 regarding as public counsel a policy that's similar to 10 your public interest policy now about taking in social 11 and other costs of things like power plant, coal power 12 plants? 13 I don't think we have a formal position. Α. 14 You formulated that after you left public Q. 15 counsel? 16 Α. I'm saying we didn't -- I don't think we 17 had a formal policy when I was at public counsel. 18 0. Who accepted the policy as public counsel? 19 Well, I was public counsel. I don't think Α. 20 there were any formal policies that we had in place 21 there. We didn't have, like, a book of -- of 22 positions that we took in every case. Maybe that's 23 the case now, but we didn't at the time that I was 24 there. 25 Do you at Renew Missouri now? Q.

Page 627

1 Α. I am. 2 Q. No. Do you have such a policy? Oh, no. We don't have formal -- we don't 3 Α. 4 have a formalized, like, list of policies, no. 5 So you're just expressing your opinion? Q. 6 Α. I'm expressing an opinion based on the 7 facts and the law that's applicable to each case. I 8 think you've got to do those things by a case-by-case 9 I wouldn't want to have any generalizations of basis. 10 any one particular area or one particular issue. Ι 11 think things are more complicated and more nuance than 12 that. Or they should be anyway. 13 NATHAN WILLIAMS: No further questions. 14 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Questions from the bench? 15 And any commissioners on the line have questions for 16 Mr. Owen? 17 GREG KOLKMEYER: This is Commissioner 18 Kolkmeyer, and I don't have any questions at this 19 time, Judge. Thank you. 20 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Thank you. I do have one 21 question. Where is the Asbury plant in relation to 22 the city of Joplin? 23 THE WITNESS: I believe it's the -- I 24 believe it's in Jasper County, so -- is that right? Ι 25 think that would have to be north of Joplin.

Page 628

1 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I know it's in Kansas. 2 THE WITNESS: It is in Kansas? Then I am 3 completely off, then it would be west of there. 4 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. Pardon? Different 5 plant? I express my --6 THE WITNESS: Asbury Missouri? 7 DIANE CARTER: Yes. 8 THE WITNESS: If I had a map. 9 NATHAN WILLIAMS: Judge, I think you can 10 take notice of the geography or the commission can 11 take notice of the geography of the state. 12 JUDGE WOODRUFF: I can look at a map of Missouri and find Asbury. Okay. 13 14 NATHAN WILLIAMS: There is a municipality 15 called Asbury, and the plant is relatively close to 16 it, I believe. 17 JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. I'm not sure the 18 value of that as evidence, but I'm not sure how 19 important it is either. It's just something that 20 occurred to me this morning as I was in the shower. 21 Okay. That's all the questions I had then. Any 22 recross based on that question? Redirect? 23 ALICIA GREENWALD: No, Judge, thank you. 24 JUDGE WOODRUFF: You can step down. 25 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.

1	JUDGE WOODRUFF: And that completes the
2	list of witnesses. I'm just going through the list of
3	testimony to see if there's anything we missed. It
4	looks like everything came in for the company. For
5	staff's exhibits, I show 110 well, one let's,
6	first of all, deal with 112 which was Ms. McMillan's
7	Uri calculations. I show that I deferred ruling on
8	that, I think, to allow public counsel to look at it.
9	Did we was there a problem? Okay. I'll go ahead
10	and admit 112 at this point. And then 116 we
11	discussed. I also show exhibits 110 which is a NERC
12	standard, 114 which is public counsel's response to
13	staff's recommendation and 115 which is a joint motion
14	regarding substitute tariff sheet. Those were all
15	pre-filed or identified by staff, but there's been no
16	mention of them. Are they
17	CURT STOKES: I won't need them.
18	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. It looks like I see
19	everything come in from public counsel. I see MECG
20	and Renew Missouri have been offered and received. I
21	believe Liberty indicated they will be filing a
22	revised draft order. Do you know when you'll be doing
23	that?
24	DIANE CARTER: Judge, would the commission
25	find that helpful to have a proposed consolidated

1	financing order?
2	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Yes. At some point. Is
3	that something you filed as your initial briefs or
4	DIANE CARTER: That was my intention.
5	JUDGE WOODRUFF: Okay. And I believe
6	initial briefs are due on July 13th? And with reply
7	briefs on the 20th one week later. And as far as the
8	transcripts, we've been sending them onto the court
9	reporter to be transcribed as we've been sending
10	the recordings as they've been produced. We've
11	requested, I think, they be done with within five
12	business days which means that the transcripts should
13	be arriving day to day next week, and we should have
14	them for you as soon as possible. Anything else
15	anyone needs to bring up while we're still on the
16	record? Thank you all very much. And with that, we
17	are adjourned.
18	RYAN SILVEY: Thank you, Judge.
19	JASON HOLSMAN: Thank you, Judge.
20	GREG KOLKMEYER: Thank you, Judge.
21	(Silence in audio.)
22	(Audio ended.)
23	
24	
25	

-	
1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	
3	
4	I, Melissa J. Lane, Certified Court
5	Reporter of Missouri, Certified Shorthand Reporter of
6	Illinois and Registered Professional Reporter, do
7	hereby certify that I was asked to prepare a
8	transcript of proceedings had in the above-mentioned
9	case, which proceedings were held with no court
10	reporter present utilizing an open microphone system
11	of preserving the record.
12	I further certify that the foregoing pages
13	constitute a true and accurate reproduction of the
14	proceedings as transcribed by me to the best of my
15	ability and may include inaudible sections or
16	misidentified speakers of said open microphon
17	recording.
18	melisse J. Lane - 200
19	
20	Melissa J. Lane, CCR, CSR, RPR
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Α	514:20	577:21 607:15	553:5,11,16	513:16 517:19
A1 543:7	accrue 568:17	adjusted 615:19	558:11,19	524:15 562:6
A2 543:10	accuracy	adjusting 579:4	562:13,14	585:20
AAO 576:8	538:16 555:8	adjustments	591:15 603:6	608:22 618:11
577:2,3,21	accurate 505:1	579:3 606:22	604:2,9	618:12,14
578:3,9,16	545:14 631:13	adjusts 577:18	Advocates	619:12 628:23
579:2 601:13	accurately	578:1	618:21	alignment
601:13 607:18	617:23	administrative	advocating	595:15,25
608:5 614:12	achieve 512:16	595:20	580:15	aligns 558:25
614:13,17	539:1 548:20	admission	affirm 500:15	all-in 503:8
615:14,19,20	555:3 563:9	517:13	515:24 521:16	alleviate 562:21
615:25 616:1,8	592:20 596:5	admit 629:10	573:9 618:5	allocated
616:17,20	597:14	advance 525:6	AFUDC 511:23	537:22 570:1
ability 549:5,14	603:24	525:17 536:16	agencies 557:6	allocation
550:3 560:8	achieved	613:20	557:17	537:13,17
567:10	579:16 611:2	advantage	592:24,25	538:7,10,13
586:24,25	achieving 536:1	567:12 598:12	593:2,3,4,7	allocations
598:21 610:18	acquiring 596:3	advantages	596:15 597:1	537:9 538:1
631:15	act 610:22	519:10	597:5,11	560:19
able 531:16	acting 605:5	adverse 537:13	598:13 600:8	allocator 537:10
535:19	Action 559:11	advice 525:2,7	agency 534:17	allow 507:7
536:23	active 591:3,8	525:16 536:10	539:1 546:15	508:14
538:18 539:16	activities 514:17	536:11 539:17	552:21 556:1	538:25 629:8
539:19 547:16	556:11 557:13	547:17 558:18	597:4,15	allowed 519:25
549:9,16	599:23,24	567:14 594:1	agree 505:15	531:4
560:12 562:17	600:14	598:7 610:24	507:16,22	allows 554:24
565:23	actual 536:11	advise 562:24	519:2 538:20	561:12 610:25
575:16 583:15	add 501:3	advised 604:5	539:14,20	alternative
584:13 598:17	added 576:19	advising 591:3	594:12 605:8	602:25
616:6 623:20	593:12	advisor 534:13	607:7 609:12	American
above-mentio	addition 502:5	539:16 540:4	agreed 525:16	620:16 621:2
631:8	572:4	546:10 547:11	538:3 617:22	621:9
ABS 595:1	additional	547:13,15	agreement	amortized
absent 536:25	501:3 545:21	553:14 561:17	581:21	607:18
607:18	593:12 607:9	562:22	agrees 617:13	amount 509:7
absolutely	Additionally	569:15	ahead 521:12	513:7 519:15
501:19	571:25	570:23 591:11	523:16 544:13	565:12 579:5
accept 585:6	address 575:23	591:21 593:9	566:5 572:22	579:7 587:6
accepted	622:18	605:6,9	572:25	588:14 589:14
626:18	addressing	609:10,14,25	581:24 629:9	589:19 616:23
access 593:1	586:11	advisors	air 508:24	amounts 553:4
597:4,5,10	adhere 540:6	534:25	620:3,17	576:19 577:18
account 533:18	adhering 559:2	597:22	621:9 622:6	578:8,8
569:25 598:1	ADIT 579:3,5,6	603:15	AL 499:8	579:25,25
620:11	adjourned	advisors'	Algonquin	580:1,3,5
accounting	630:17	539:24	625:20	586:19
accounting	adjust 526:19	advisory 545:1	Alicia 506:20	588:22

599:19 615:3	apologize 521:7	598:7	asked 517:5	568:20 609:6
615:21	567:24 569:5	approved 577:4	544:17 562:12	assumed 511:19
analyses 581:10	574:22 624:4	578:16 590:18	563:1 568:2	600:23
analysis 510:7	appeal 529:19	601:25 602:11	571:3,8 583:11	assumes
557:16 576:16	531:8 549:13	602:19 606:21	586:22 611:8	512:25 614:12
581:8 582:10	550:2 586:23	approving	612:9 631:7	614:14,16,18
589:22 590:1	587:3	602:13	asking 513:23	assuming
599:16 601:17	appealed 531:3	approximate	513:25 518:4	506:3 538:3
601:21 602:9	531:4,10	506:5 532:22	549:24	551:16 558:16
615:18 623:19	549:22 550:6	approximately	554:18	564:2 608:16
analyzed 501:16	587:17	504:15 541:16	556:22	assumption
601:11	appeals 590:7	543:24 552:6	568:24 581:19	506:6 601:6
ancillary 557:15	appearing	564:3 587:24	597:5,12	assumptions
and/or 499:18	522:6 572:20	589:13,15	609:22	507:13 508:1
570:15	appears 503:17	area 537:7	624:12	578:21 579:11
announce	appendix	627:10	aspect 611:22	583:2 616:22
560:17	528:6	areas 595:18	aspects 611:14	assurance
announced	apples 616:4,4	argument	assessing	512:20
567:6	applicable	508:13	504:11 623:16	assuring 538:15
announcement	583:22 627:7	arrangement	asset 519:20	attached 536:6
526:13	applied 505:16	518:13	assets 504:11	575:22
annual 501:17	505:16	arriving 630:13	514:11,22	attaching
511:20 612:15	apply 503:13,21	arrows 577:19	assign 528:15	582:23
annuity 512:15	505:8 581:1	articulate	assistance	attorneys
answer 506:16	581:20,21	552:13	524:6	583:17 584:6
610:5 613:1	appreciate	Asbury 508:6	associated	584:7 617:9
622:4 624:7	580:24	518:10,19,21	532:14 538:5	audio 499:5
answered	approached	518:24 528:13	564:3 576:20	523:23 558:9
543:25	582:5	528:17 530:1	577:14,20,23	570:7 630:21
545:23	appropriate	543:17,23	577:24 578:4	630:22
answering	505:8 512:13	557:23 564:3	578:17,21	audit 554:24
524:6 550:1	533:4 534:21	568:21 576:18	579:3 580:1,2	authorized
575:14	537:22	576:21 577:18	580:5 586:16	507:10
answers 517:6	553:20,24	577:24 578:6	587:20 588:2	authorizing
517:8,8 523:1	554:16 560:15	578:11,18	588:24	563:2
523:7 575:7	568:6 569:4	579:7,12	598:19 599:8	available 551:8
575:10 619:6	596:22	586:11 588:20	606:23 611:10	584:5,6
619:8	597:14 606:3	589:14,17	611:21 612:5,6	588:11
anticipate	616:1	590:6 614:14	614:12,16,19	average 501:12
537:12	appropriately	615:2 620:18	616:17 624:13	501:15 504:9
anticipated	538:15 546:12	622:13 623:17	624:25 625:5	504:15 506:5
504:22 529:1	550:1	625:16,23	Association	506:8,15
591:7 613:13	appropriaten	627:21 628:6	620:17 621:9	509:20 510:1
anticipates	538:1 540:1	628:13,15	assume 529:17	513:1 525:24
613:14	approval	Asbury's 518:5	537:1 542:3	526:7 537:2
anyway 627:12	603:20	519:4,8	543:3 545:1	542:9,10
apologies 613:5	approve 534:18	aside 539:2	546:18 551:2	577:6,16,25

		1	1	1
578:3,6	545:17 551:14	514:25 515:2	523:7 526:20	558:7,11,19
601:21 602:21	551:18 552:7	515:22 517:1	527:11 536:1	561:22 562:13
602:23 603:4	553:6 554:16	520:21 526:2	546:17 547:15	562:14 563:2
606:20 607:1	556:10 558:4	536:8,9 537:6	551:13,16,17,18	563:2,3 564:1
608:8 614:20	562:3 567:18	538:9 539:10	552:7 561:7	564:11 566:11
615:2,5	574:18,19	540:13 545:3	561:13 563:12	566:12 571:18
avoided 588:4	577:1,3 580:7	547:12 554:18	563:22	571:25 580:4
avoiding 539:5	581:19 584:11	554:19 562:2	565:22 575:11	586:25
579:17 610:20	588:1 599:22	564:16 565:14	619:9 631:14	587:10 588:9
aware 563:21	602:18 603:2	566:17 569:14	better 519:12	588:10
	608:20 612:14	569:16 570:16	563:15	589:24,25
B	615:4,21	572:17 575:2	big 616:2	590:14 594:18
B 621:12	616:21 620:13	580:24	bigger 511:10	599:22 603:6
B-R-A-T-T-L-E	623:12,13	588:20 590:4	billing 518:3	603:15 604:2
516:14	627:6 628:22	594:6 601:9	billion 570:17	604:8 610:14
back 504:20	bases 532:3	605:3 607:25	591:9	610:16,18
520:25 521:10	543:18	608:18 610:13	bit 528:18	611:3 613:17,19
527:18,23	basic 586:9	613:3,8 615:19	559:9 565:18	613:24 625:5
546:4 555:23	basically 519:19	616:25 620:21	594:21 595:4	bondholders
558:10 561:3	553:15,15	621:25 622:6	603:10 609:5	544:1
564:9,9	basis 503:13	622:19,24	610:14 611:8	bonds 506:4
565:18	511:21 515:12	623:1 627:23	613:14	507:17,20
567:25 568:11	543:19,21,22	627:24	blended 526:16	511:12 527:2
572:23	552:7 564:2,4	628:16 629:21	533:11 537:2	528:21 529:18
588:17	564:6,10	630:5	566:19 567:2	534:22
background	576:17 577:12	bench 509:11	608:7 614:13	535:14 542:11
576:23	578:19,19	513:12 520:11	614:23	543:14 544:2
backwards	579:6,14	544:9 562:4	blown 625:2	544:3,5
509:5	582:10	565:5 586:2	blue 576:23	547:20,20,23
balance 594:21	587:24	608:20	577:19	548:10,16,21
balances 579:4	609:20 621:21	624:12 627:14	blunt 519:19	549:9 554:5
ball 529:5	621:25 627:9	benefit 506:12	board 525:4	554:6,12
ballpark 544:21	bearing 602:17	531:20 533:9	body 553:12	555:1556:13
Bank 574:8	beginning	533:17 539:4	558:11	556:21 557:3
banks 595:3	562:4 591:1	550:16 583:5	bond 505:11,12	557:9,11
base 527:2	601:9 608:4	587:10,15	512:11 513:7,9	558:17 560:5
532:4 571:17	608:21	benefits 519:9	525:24	560:7,13,19
571:20	begins 615:13	529:25 530:3	530:20	571:10 587:4
based 504:16	behalf 516:18	535:14	537:13,25	590:23,24
504:19	517:23 524:19	549:23 571:7	542:23	590.23,24
505:23 508:8	573:6	582:20	542.25 548:25 549:6	594:25 595:6
508:11 513:11	belief 517:10	586:17 588:3	549:15,17	597:7 599:25
514:4 515:4	523:8 575:11	589:22,24	550:14 551:7	600:5,11,17
526:7 527:8	619:10	610:15 614:10		603:21 604:18
527:12,15			551:8,22 553:11 16	
530:8 536:1	believe 500:12	623:4	553:11,16	609:19 613:17 book 592:16,18
537:10 545:4	505:1,24	best 505:20	555:22 556:11	I DOOK 392.10.18
	506:1 514:19	515:7 517:9	556:16 557:21	626:21

Г

Boston 516:15	calculates	607:11 608:8	578:11 605:18	612:10,25
bottom 614:5	579:2	611:10 614:20	catastrophic	changed
bought 512:11	calculation	615:2	610:23	545:25 601:3
bout 624:21	506:11 532:4	captured 511:25	categories	604:12 612:14
BPS 543:18	533:17 538:16	care 538:7	556:1 584:1	612:20
Brattle 516:14	555:9 582:20	585:10	category	changes 501:8
584:10,12	606:15 617:22	Carolina 603:8	600:18	517:2 522:21
break 521:10	calculations	carrying 508:5	cause 501:1	529:8,13
572:18,20,23	510:18 512:4,6	508:14 511:5,6	516:16,17	559:12 607:9
576:9 579:20	579:1 581:12	568:17 577:4	529:7 593:16	615:6 619:2
breakout	583:5 607:23	577:13,17	618:22	changing
552:23	616:22 629:7	578:1,4,8	caused 522:10	608:10 611:9
briefly 575:20	calculator	599:15	550:1 598:9	611:10,10
576:13 577:9	564:5	600:23	causes 519:22	charge 611:22
578:12,25	California	602:10,15	caveat 523:6	charged 505:12
581:4 614:23	603:8 604:4	607:19,20	CCR 631:20	512:1 622:19
615:12	call 516:12	614:12 615:21	Central 514:14	charges 561:21
briefs 630:3,6,7	531:15 559:23	Carter 516:5,7	570:14	568:17
bring 520:24	called 516:14	517:12 520:17	certain 522:11	charging
521:10 560:9	535:3 628:15	619:19,22	530:8 552:18	569:14
569:3,4,10	calls 557:16	621:20 622:17	552:20 553:4	chart 614:6
630:15	559:22	623:25 628:7	570:6	check 517:1
bringing 525:17	560:14 592:15	629:24 630:4	Certainly 517:11	539:11 545:8
572:10	593:1 610:2	case 499:9	certainty 607:3	555:8 610:1,6
broad 507:24	Cancer 621:3	508:9 511:24	certificate	checkpoint
559:23	capacity 516:11	516:18 531:2,3	534:7,8	560:14
broadly 533:1	522:3 529:12	532:19 536:6	535:10,13,18	circulate 536:15
600:15,19	553:23 574:6	537:24 538:17	535:20,22,24	circulated
building 592:8	591:14 605:10	540:9 544:2,3	536:5,8 631:1	536:10,14
built 583:2	618:19	575:2 577:3	certificates	617:19
bury 608:8	capital 504:10	583:15 584:8	536:13	circumstances
business 522:7	504:15,20	602:19 603:8	certification	551:19
617:3 618:21	506:6,8,15	606:5 620:15	550:25	cite 582:18
630:12	509:21 510:1	625:2,8,15,19	certifications	city 627:22
buying 513:7,9	511:15,24 513:1	625:22 626:4	548:22 561:18	claiming 620:17
bypassable	531:23 532:2	626:7,22,23	562:1	clarification
611:22	532:8 533:11	627:7 631:9	Certified 631:4	501:11 541:8
	533:21	case-by-case	631:5	582:13 583:11
C	534:20 537:2	627:8	certify 631:7,12	612:25
C 516:9 580:23	566:19 567:2	cases 522:12,15	cetera 552:19	clarifications
cadence 570:6	571:24 572:5	560:25	challenging	574:25
calculate	577:6,16,25	569:24	552:13	clarify 503:1
503:18 531:15		571:22 577:1	chance 618:3	605:13 609:21
	578:6 601:22			
615:20	601:23 602:3	cash 504:22	change 526:3	class 538:4,5
615:20 calculated				
615:20	601:23 602:3	cash 504:22	change 526:3	class 538:4,5

537:23 538:9	589:5 629:19	602:11,13,19	company's	comprise
542:6	comfort 603:23	603:14,14,18	506:5	559:22
clean 621:6	comfortable	606:21 607:2	comparable	concept 512:10
623:13	529:15 561:6	607:6 609:17	527:13	603:6 604:9
cleanup 617:18	coming 606:14	610:16,17,21	compared	605:5
clear 501:15,19	617:16	611:4 612:6	531:6,23	concern 515:10
505:4 541:4	comma 501:24	617:13,19	582:6 583:1	concerns
560:12	commenced	622:20	compares	562:21 584:11
clearly 589:5	559:25	625:15 628:10	589:22	585:10 604:7
clients 567:14	comment	629:24	comparison	605:4
591:18	535:19	commission's	512:4 527:20	conclusion
close 570:25	536:23	545:1 549:3	532:18,22	610:3
628:15	537:19	549:13 553:5	563:12,20,22	conditions
closed 622:8	538:23 540:1	581:1,20	576:7 577:1	526:8 548:15
closing 560:23	553:20	586:24	606:15 608:5	554:6 561:22
coal 620:3	555:24 556:6	597:18 609:16	616:2,5	566:10,15
626:11	556:18 568:2	commissioner	comparisons	602:4,6
coal-burning	603:5	500:1,3	533:5 563:15	609:18
621:5 622:16		509:13,16	572:7	conducted
	commenting 538:1	520:14 544:12	compete 582:3	620:13
coal-powered 620:9	commission	566:3 567:19	•	confer 582:2
	499:6 507:6		competition 581:16	confidential
collaborate		586:4,6 627:17	· -	
539:21	507:9 511:22		competitive 584:11	504:8 514:4
collected	519:16 520:2	commissioners		580:13 583:12
594:19	524:7 529:17	509:12 520:11	competitors	583:12,16,21
collection	531:2,7 534:9	544:10 586:3	581:15 582:9	584:2,5,15,23
602:18	534:25	627:15	583:15	585:2,3,5,7
Colorado	535:10 538:3	commissions	completely	617:11
623:13	539:16,20,24	562:14 591:4	628:3	confirm 539:11
columns 615:8	540:3,6	591:12	completes	confirming
combination	544:18,22	committee	629:1	561:19
568:5 595:1	549:21 550:13	559:5	completing	conflict 556:18
combined	550:22 553:11	commonly	593:13	conflicts 547:10
530:6 549:6	553:13,13,15	503:5 568:17	compliant	confused
568:3 589:23	553:23 555:7	communication	548:3	510:24
590:6,7,11,17	558:18 560:14	596:14,22	complicated	conjunction
590:20 615:3	561:3,16,18	597:3	557:24 627:11	526:20 527:7
combining	562:23	communicati	comply 538:25	557:4 571:23
530:1,4	575:15,24	596:23,25	complying	connectivity
545:22	577:4 584:2	company 499:8	559:3	572:21
come 500:10	584:16,24	503:3,6	components	consequences
509:10	586:10,19	504:21 510:17	526:25	622:12
520:10	591:4,16,16	512:18,20,21	537:15 597:8	consider
527:23 544:8	592:2,5,10	514:5,10,12,13	compounding	508:23 541:14
555:22 561:3	593:9 594:1	514:14,16,18	564:17	548:15
564:8,9	597:12,22	516:19 522:7	compress	583:20
572:23 586:1	598:18,21	623:24 629:4	559:15	622:21
	•	•	•	•

www.lexitaslegal.com

consideration	523:10,16,20	504:9,15,16,19	518:5,6,8,13	620:14 629:12
531:11	523:22,24	505:10 506:5	518:19 519:4,11	count 527:25
considerations	524:10 566:2	506:8,15	530:6,8,9,10	528:1
563:10	567:21,23	509:20,24	530:12 533:18	counting 528:9
considered	572:11 583:18	510:1,19 511:5	536:25	county 620:18
499:21 512:1	583:18	511:6,13,16,20	537:17,21	621:10,10,12
622:25	585:25 609:2	512:14 513:1	539:6,9	621:13 622:7
consistent	609:2,4 610:7	519:7,24	541:24 543:2	627:24
561:21 596:17	Cooper's 541:2	530:12 531:22	544:22.25	couple 530:5
consisting	coordination	532:2 533:5	545:1,11,23	565:20 584:1
553:12 562:16	535:2	533:10,11,12,13	548:1 550:9	coupon 512:12
consolidated	copy 510:15	533:21 534:4	552:16,18,20	course 542:15
539:5 576:2,6	536:5 617:20	534:18,19	553:1554:8	611:18
576:18 578:3	copying 582:23	536:24 537:2	554:15,25	court 549:13
578:19 579:14	corporate	537:4.9	555:14,19	573:20,21
579:17 614:11	512:25 514:15	538:10 544:18	556:4 566:24	586:23 630:8
615:13 629:25	514:16 595:1,2	548:7.20	566:24 567:1	631:4,9
consolidation	595:6	551:9 552:15	577:4,13 578:1	courtesy 617:20
564:15,18	correct 507:9	555:25	579:12,13,18	create 525:14
constitute	508:3,6,9,15	561:20 563:6	579:21,23,24	529:13 534:21
631:13	508:18 509:1	566:19,23	586:17 587:21	547:9,16
consultant	511:3 516:20	567:2 571:22	588:23,24	554:16
553:14	516:23 517:9	571:24 572:4	589:2,3,7,8,9	created 557:22
consulting	518:5,11,12,20	572:7 577:6	589:15,16,17	558:3 593:23
516:13	518:22,25	577:16,17,20	589:18,19	creating 537:16
contained	519:17 522:15	577:23,25	599:1,3,8,9,12	556:10
522:25	523:7 525:21	578:2,4,5,6,8	599:15,17	558:24 559:3
contents	531:15 533:18	578:9,11	600:23	credit 512:17
525:16	533:19 534:9	579:10 586:16	605:25 614:12	527:10,12
context 609:5	535:19 534.9	588:4,10,23	620:11 623:4	561:12 566:22
continue 568:17	539:6,17,22	589:22,23	623:6 624:12	567:11 597:9
continued	542:4 545:13	597:9,15	624:25 625:5	criteria 539:1
566:20	554:2 564:22	599:18 601:21	626:11	cross 502:12
569:10	568:8 572:19	601:23 602:3	counsel 500:13	506:18 517:14
	575:11 580:25	602:10,14,16	514:25 520:7	517:17 520:6
continuing 523:3 526:3		602:10,14,18		
	581:3 582:16		540:20,22 557:4 564:25	523:14 524:12
continuity 547:17	582:17 583:7	602:25 603:4		524:14 585:17
	583:8 591:13	603:24	585:22	585:18 619:17
conversations	609:7,8,24	606:16,20	589:21	624:2
598:9	611:20,22,23	607:1,8,9,19	608:24	crux 509:6
convert 501:20	619:9 624:16	607:20 608:7	620:20,21,24	crystal 529:5
converts	corrected	608:8 611:2,10	624:16 625:10	CSR 631:20
501:22	575:10	614:14,20	625:14,19	current 504:16
Cooper 506:23	corrections	615:2	626:9,15,17,18	505:23 515:4
506:25 509:8	574:13 575:6	costly 507:8	626:19 629:8	515:6,8 526:7
			1 1-10110	
513:17 520:23 521:4,7,22,24	cost 502:24 503:5,9,11,14	costs 508:6,14 510:22 511:2,4	629:19 counsel's	528:14 531:23 533:14 536:2

536:2 546:1	data 596:25	571:23 572:3	609:15,24	destructive
572:9 606:20	613:20	572:7 577:20	demand 532:10	620:3
currently 505:1	date 529:1	577:24 578:2	554:17 560:6	details 535:20
591:5 608:1	539:8 543:8	578:5,9,11	560:8,10	determine
Curt 502:14,16	543:15 554:19	594:11 601:24	561:11	598:2 605:18
506:18 513:14	David 500:7,13	601:25 603:3	demanded	606:4
517:22,22,25	500:25	607:20,21,22	566:21	determined
520:6 524:18	Davis 572:17	607:22 608:1	demonstrate	504:10 505:6
524:18,21	573:1,18 574:4	608:2,7	601:18	542:3 553:1,6
562:9,11	575:19 580:21	612:10,15	Denver 623:13	553:24 561:6
564:23	580:25 584:3	December	depend 534:1	605:20
572:19,24	584:4 609:5	511:12	625:7	determines
573:5,5,15,17	610:13 617:2	decide 547:5	depending	503:14 622:21
574:24 575:5	Davis's 574:23	decides 544:23	533:24	determining
575:13,19	day 500:11	decision 549:3	559:12 560:5	503:2,8
580:7,20,24	605:2 630:13	569:7 570:2	560:7	detriment
581:4 582:12	630:13	613:21 614:1	depends	587:10,16
582:14 583:9	days 559:21	decisions	506:14 606:7	developments
584:3 585:4,8	560:25	560:13 569:19	deploying	611:5
585:16 610:2	569:23	592:18	532:8	dialog 597:21
610:10,12	591:25 603:19	decline 606:24	derive 581:12	Diane 516:5,7
613:5,11	630:12	decreased	derived 526:24	517:12 520:17
616:25 617:17	deal 560:18	546:2	583:5	619:19,22
617:25 624:3	563:16,17	deferred 629:7	derives 582:15	621:20 622:17
624:6,10	576:18 629:6	definable 527:8	describe	623:25 628:7
629:17	deals 548:4,5	define 503:10	570:21	629:24 630:4
customary	565:17	defined 508:22	575:20	difference
507:6 508:20	Dean 506:23	definition	576:13,24	512:4 523:2
509:3 511:15	506:25 509:8	508:23	577:9 578:13	547:20
607:17	513:17 520:23	605:16	579:1 610:15	576:24
customer 537:9	521:4,7,22,24	degree 592:17	615:12	602:15
538:4,6,6,18	523:10,16,20	degrees	described	differences
602:3,22,24	523:22,24	595:23,24	530:14 550:17	518:18 595:7
602:25	524:10 566:2	596:1	586:18	595:23,24
customer's	567:21,23	delay 525:14	descriptive	different 518:16
601:23	572:11 583:18	550:1,2	570:23	523:4 528:12
customers	583:18	568:15,16,22	designated	528:15 529:10
506:12 518:14	585:25 609:2	578:23 587:3	539:15 553:14	534:14 538:8
518:22,25	609:2,4 610:7	588:2	562:17 591:22	538:13 540:2
551:9 571:7	debt 501:11,13	delayed 529:18	594:2	540:3 558:21
588:11 603:22	503:6,10	589:23,25	designation	558:21 563:8
cycle 569:7	509:24 511:13	590:1	580:13,21	563:23 577:13
591:1	511:17,20	delays 570:4	583:13	577:14 578:16
D	512:17 533:5	593:13,16	designing	583:22
D-A-V-I-D	533:12,14	598:9	591:25	592:15 594:11
500:25	537:3 554:13	deliver 561:17	desirable	594:22,23
500.25	554:20,22	deliverable	530:15 534:16	595:2,4,19,19
I contract of the second se	•	•	•	•

601:14,20	577:20,21	582:15 598:13	early 591:25	574:5 618:18
602:6 616:8	599:16 601:12	598:14	603:19	encompass
616:20,20,24	601:14,20	doing 514:23	easiest 505:4	600:20
628:4	602:5,12,16,21	525:13 545:7	economic	ended 630:22
differential	603:2 605:12	566:16 576:4	519:21	energy 537:10
545:9	605:16,24	577:9 587:4	economical	538:7 563:15
difficult 528:22	606:4 608:6	618:21 629:22	519:11	603:7 621:4,7
direct 507:14	614:13,15,16,18	dollar 551:5	effect 529:20	623:6,14,14
516:21 522:11	614:25 615:1	588:7 589:18	549:4,12	engagements
525:20 526:2	615:22	dollars 545:6	effective	582:11
574:23	discounts	564:13	562:21	English 541:12
594:16 597:2	578:7,9	double 532:15	586:23	ensure 611:1
597:20,21	discover 527:11	downsides	effectively	entire 582:23
direction 524:3	discrepancies	529:25	593:21 596:7	584:13 588:3
529:5 561:9	508:21	530:19	596:11 599:18	entirely 520:3
561:10 581:9	discuss 609:9	draft 536:7,10	602:2,10,12	entirety 520.5
directly 593:4,6	discussed	536:13	603:19	entity 512:21
594:16 595:21	610:14 629:11	593:25	efficiencies	environment
597:24,24	discussion	629:22	547:16	529:8 536:2
604:23		drive 561:12	593:24	559:13 601:2
615:22	537:18,18 551:3			
		drivers 519:21	efficiency 550:10 559:14	envision 529:11
director 618:20	discussions	Ducera 574:7		EO-2022-0040
disadvantage	550:19 593:3	due 499:15	efficiently	499:9 500:11
566:11,14	disjointed	543:19 563:9	558:24 561:10	EO-2022-0193
disagree	567:25	630:6	565:25	499:9 522:12
596:20	disjointment	Duke 603:7	efforts 570:12	equal 543:22
608:16 621:24	572:6	dumping 621:17	eight 568:12	587:11,12
622:14	distress 559:13	duplicative	either 549:4	equate 564:4
disagreements	District 499:7	539:5,9	563:15 590:8	equity 533:5,12
525:18	516:18 522:7	544:17,22	591:4,7	533:14 537:3
disalignment	document	545:11 579:18	597:24	572:3,8
596:2	510:4 514:5	duration 534:4	628:19	602:17
discard 623:6	520:24	564:7,10	Electric 499:7	especially
disclaimers	523:17 524:2	duty 536:21	516:19 522:7	571:16
535:18,23,25	524:5 538:15	E	electricity	essentially
disclosed	541:20 577:8		518:10,21,25	516:13 566:16
604:5	579:20 581:2	E0-2022-0040	620:9 622:20	established
disclosure	581:6,21,22	522:12	embedded	553:12
534:21	582:23 583:6	E0-2022-0193	503:5,9,11	554:24
discount	584:5,13	500:12	515:8 519:7	555:10 558:12
502:21 503:18	documentation	earlier 504:25	625:1	597:21
504:1,5,14	548:3	532:5 550:7	empire 499:7	establishing
505:8 506:9	documents	550:17 558:10	516:18 522:6	554:5 593:22
506:10 512:4	516:24 557:3	571:8 588:15	625:20,23	estimate
512:13 513:25	560:2,24	589:12 613:9	Empire's 512:1	503:19
575:3 577:2,3	574:14 575:7	613:12 617:20	employed	505:20
577:5,14,16	578:14 582:15	624:11	516:11 522:2	527:12 545:10
1	I	I	I	I

LEXITAS LEGAL Phone: 1.800.280.3376

545:15	565:3 566:7	522:25 523:11	624:24	facts 551:19
estimated	567:22	580:8,12	experiences	627:7
504:19 505:1	573:16 585:18	618:24 619:13	610:14	faded 616:13
511:11 541:23	609:3 610:11	619:15 629:5	expert 540:14	fair 504:11
552:15 564:14	618:13 619:18	629:11	621:22	602:14 611:13
589:7,13,15	619:21 624:9	exists 598:20	experts 584:8,9	fairly 601:3
estimates	625:12	exit 528:22	explain 501:12	fairness 537:19
504:6 505:23	example 532:11	EXP 543:12	504:17 505:3	fairway 571:1
552:7	551:21 553:4	expand 571:12	510:20 512:6	falls 580:14
estimating	576:1,2	603:9	514:8 515:2	familiar 563:3
504:21 509:7	582:19	expect 526:18	532:6 546:10	609:6 620:14
et 499:8 552:19	exceeded	528:25	547:19 559:8	620:19
evaluate 578:18	533:11 566:23	529:19,20	563:7 579:9	far 519:1 525:6
592:5 601:19	exceeding	530:5,13	581:5 600:22	527:24
602:22 616:6	533:20	532:1 548:21	601:15 604:11	530:19 621:4
evaluated	exceeds 574:21	549:9 550:8	605:11 607:21	630:7
574:19 598:1	excellent 620:1	551:6,24	614:6	fashion 548:6
evaluating	620:19	555:25 570:5	explicitly	favorable
592:11 601:1	excess 591:9	588:8 606:14	575:23	548:6
602:7	excited 553:22	expectation	exposure	February 501:14
evening 526:11	excuse 516:16	528:14 548:12	530:21 531:9	511:11 624:17
event 587:16	562:6	561:24 572:1	express 628:5	624:17
590:7 610:23	excused 515:19	604:24	expressed	fed 515:11
events 529:7,13	execute 565:24	expectations	622:1	566:20 567:6
eventually	execution	559:1 560:4	expressing	571:21 613:21
540:10	550:10 551:13	613:18	627:5,6	614:1
everybody	551:18 565:22	expected	extended	federal 544:4
525:2	executive	512:14 513:8	559:14	604:21,24
evidence	618:20	525:24 526:7	extent 548:20	613:12,12,19,19
523:11 580:8	exhibit 501:3,5	543:13,15	559:2 566:19	feds 515:11
619:13 622:10	517:13 523:25	554:7,19	573:22	fee 540:12,17
628:18	526:9 528:7	559:9	579:18	569:12,15
evolving 526:18	528:12	expedited	598:20	595:20,20
exact 504:9	529:24 541:3	609:19	601:24 616:19	feedback
527:23 537:7	541:9 545:5,9	expense 503:4	625:4	569:25
exactly 505:17	545:24 552:6	503:7		597:23
541:5 582:25	552:25	expenses	F	feel 512:8,8,8
examination	572:12 574:10	503:12 556:1	facets 539:21	529:15 553:19
500:20	574:11 575:14	experience	591:24	fees 552:19,19
502:11,15	575:20	546:19,22	fact 519:8	552:21,22,22
506:24 513:21	588:15 589:11	556:11 562:20	561:20 568:16	553:5 555:23
516:6 517:14	590:2 600:22	570:9,11,11,21	factor 567:9	556:2,2
517:18,24	608:3 614:2	590:23	568:19	576:20 580:3
521:23 523:15	617:7,10,12,19	593:14 596:18	622:20	580:4,4
524:12,14,20	exhibits 501:7	596:18 597:16	factored 503:7	589:12 599:7
540:23	502:1,4,6,7	599:23 604:1	623:5	599:7
544:15 562:10	516:25 522:18	611:3 624:19	factors 568:16	fiduciary 536:18

536:21 596:9	530:20 531:7	603:12 621:2	547:23 571:19	512:17 604:25
figure 557:25	532:23	624:21	572:3 582:9	613:19
614:7,9	533:18 534:4	625:23 629:6	formal 626:13	fundamental
figured 560:16	537:1 539:6	fit 600:17	626:17,20	512:9
file 535:10	541:24 544:18	fits 583:25	627:3	
				fundamentally
546:12 548:2	546:14 549:3	five 500:6	formalized	594:11
617:21	549:14,17,21	520:25 528:1	627:4	funded 511:14
filed 522:15	550:2,9,14,17	559:21	formulated	funds 560:25
525:21 529:9	552:15 553:1	560:25 630:11	626:14	561:20 604:21
534:7,8 536:7	554:8 555:14	five-day	forth 550:15	613:12
588:16 615:24	555:14 556:3	560:22	forward 504:22	further 506:18
623:22 630:3	556:4 557:21	five-minute	529:16 530:17	515:13 520:6
filing 629:21	557:22 558:6	521:9 572:20	531:5 551:15	540:17 544:6
filings 552:5	563:1,14	fixed 530:9,12	568:23,24	545:19 551:3
final 543:12,13	571:12 586:10	552:16,18	570:3 598:4	564:23
549:17 554:19	586:12,15,20	579:21,24	found 598:18	567:17 577:25
554:19 578:7	586:24 587:8	580:5 589:2	623:22	578:22
finalize 560:23	587:9,13,14,15	589:8,12,16,16	foundation	579:14 617:1
finally 562:24	588:4 589:1,7	Flipping 611:24	575:16	625:9 627:13
579:8	590:5,7,8,11	flow 512:25	580:20 621:17	631:12
finance 504:14	590:13,18	557:16 605:18	four 500:11	future 503:13
512:10 514:18	591:8 592:22	flows 504:22	509:6 512:11	505:17 515:7
522:5 536:24	599:1,1,12,12	505:13 557:17	512:12 527:22	519:2 523:5
591:22 593:13	599:18	564:8 578:10	528:1 577:10	528:23
593:15,20	603:20	578:11	577:11 588:1	605:18 613:15
594:24 595:4	607:10 624:13	focus 551:24	591:6	futures 526:14
595:6 602:2	624:25 625:5	focused	framework	
financed	630:1	508:25	551:14 563:23	G
	financings	folks 520:24	frameworks	G-R-A-V-E-S
financial 514:20	568:21	616:19	558:5	516:10
	find 628:13	follow 507:4,21	Frank 516:9	gain 519:13
546:10 547:13	629:25	540:4 553:18	Fred 515:23	garbled 584:19
	finding 604:8	followed 569:1	free 527:3	garner 560:11
	fine 613:8	following	532:8 542:24	garnered 592:4
	finish 571:3	507:12 510:25	549:10	gears 534:6
	firm 516:13	543:17 616:10	frees 599:7	general 507:18
588:4 605:6	542:1 591:2	616:16	Friday 526:10	531:25
financing	604:5	FOMC 526:13	526:15,18,23	532:25
-	first 509:5,19	footnote 577:12	front 561:6	545:25 546:5
504:2,4	530:5 534:14	force 534:23	586:16 594:1	547:25 571:11
506:9,11	543:8 556:13	foregoing	625:15	generalizations
507:7,19,21	543.8 550.13	631:12	full 516:8 518:8	627:9
510:19,20,22	570:13 571:18	foresee 550:3	518:18 574:2	generally 508:1
510:19,20,22	570.15 571.18	567:11	613:25 618:15	508:3 525:9
510.22 511.2,2	575.7 570.5			
	576.25	forgat 572.0		1 5/6 ⁻ /5 53/11
	576:25	forgot 573:8	625:2	526:25 532:11 535:25
514:17,17 529:18	576:25 580:22 586:9 599:25	forgot 573:8 617:17 form 519:25	625:2 fully 570:1 fund 511:15	535:25 536:15 538:25

Г

541:13 546:1,3	621:4	562:6 585:20	585:9	hikes 566:20
548:4 549:2	going 500:6,12	608:22 618:11	He'll 572:19	historical
553:6 555:2	504:22 506:4	618:12,14	head 552:18	504:18 531:22
555:23 557:2	507:20 512:12	619:12 628:23	headquarters	566:24,24
559:16,18,21	512:15 515:5,9	GREG 627:17	516:15	historically
560:22 561:5	520:5 529:15	630:20	health 620:4,10	533:2
567:14 570:4	529:16 538:17	group 516:14	622:12	hit 533:7
571:15 596:15	541:7,8 547:5	535:5 559:23	healthy 622:15	holders 602:17
610:15	554:15 558:10	584:10	heard 621:1	holding 514:10
generate 511:24	560:18,19	597:24	hearing 500:11	514:11,12,14
generation	561:2 563:19	guess 514:21	502:8 517:17	holds 514:16
621:7	565:18 567:7	530:24 564:7	523:13 561:2	Holsman 500:1
geography	567:11,25	564:16	572:15 617:15	500:1,4,8
628:10,11	568:11,25	566:25	619:17 620:16	509:16,17
getting 505:7	571:2,3	568:24	hearsay 621:15	520:13,14
529:23,23	575:25,25	583:19,20	621:23	566:3,4,6,8
540:12 564:19	580:18 585:13	605:17 606:10	hedging 559:4	567:16 586:6
572:6 616:2	586:21	guessing 539:8	held 531:8	586:6 630:19
give 500:16	604:25 607:4	guidance	631:9	Honor 506:21
515:25	612:18 613:1	539:17,20	help 534:16	506:23 509:9
520:25 521:17	629:2	540:5 546:15	546:11 557:2	513:14,16,17
558:22	Goldman 522:4	558:22	562:22	517:20,22
567:14 573:10	539:12 540:8	562:23	582:13 583:9	521:8,22
618:2,6 621:11	546:19,21,24	guide 534:16	603:23	523:10 524:16
given 510:21	584:10,12	534:24 560:3	helpful 558:8	524:18
532:2 556:18	605:5	guiding 535:6	573:24 575:14	530:25
563:22 566:9	good 500:2,4	Н	594:6 603:11	540:18 562:7
567:4,6	500:22,23		611:4 629:25	562:9 564:24
586:15 588:4	524:13	half 512:11,12 hand 500:14	helps 560:3	566:2 567:21
588:23	540:25 541:1		hey 561:3	572:12,19
606:12	542:13 561:4	515:24 521:16	high 571:25	573:5,15
giving 621:15	567:13 573:18	573:8 587:21	584:8 588:23	575:13 580:7
go 505:7 510:3	goodwill 504:11	587:22	599:6	582:12 583:9
521:12 523:16	510:6 514:4	handful 527:21	higher 506:1	583:18 585:21
537:15 544:13	gotten 585:12	565:16 588:18	552:2,10	608:23 610:8
545:24 546:4	government	handles 514:15	566:21	619:12 628:25
557:18 566:5	547:25	hands 567:19	highest 512:16	hope 513:2
567:19 569:9	grade 555:16,21	happen 525:9	534:18,18	526:5 540:10
572:22,25	571:18	529:16,21	596:4 597:8	547:1 556:18
581:24 598:17	Graves 515:23	531:17 550:4	highlighted	hoping 541:3
606:17 614:5	516:10 517:13	550:12,15	577:19	hour 518:3
617:3 629:9	518:1 520:18	605:7	highly 504:8	hours 538:5
goal 525:15	greater 515:2	happening	580:13 583:12	hundred 594:18
546:11 548:19	Greene 621:13	567:4 618:1	583:12,16,21	hundredth
551:12 565:21	Greenwald	happens 607:1	584:15,22	543:23
goes 501:18	506:20 513:16	hard 529:5	585:2 591:2	Hunton 541:25
525:3 528:11	517:19 524:15	HC 580:23,25	591:23	541:25 542:1
				0 1 20 0 12.1

	1	1	1	1
hypotheticals	528:16 539:14	613:19	613:23	578:4 587:5
506:16	558:22	increased 546:1	initial 516:9	587:19,21,24
	628:19	546:3 605:2	545:22 553:5	588:9 596:4
I	impressed	613:18,25	560:1,3 630:3	598:23 601:2
idea 531:1 561:4	598:20	increasing	630:6	601:6 602:9
ideal 538:22	improvement	515:11	input 525:5	604:12,14
Ideally 562:20	622:9	incremental	539:18,21	605:1 606:13
identification	improvements	576:20	555:6 558:18	606:19,19,23
522:19	625:24	incur 555:14	598:16	607:9 610:20
identified	inaudible	599:1	inputs 597:17	610:22 611:9
629:15	499:16 523:21	incurred 539:9	inquire 500:19	611:11,15,16,19
Illinois 631:6	568:2 587:13	579:19	516:4 521:21	612:1 613:15
illustrated				
578:22 580:2	591:22 595:9	independent	573:4,14	622:18,22
illustrates	601:1 616:10	561:17,18	618:10	626:10
579:10	631:15	indicate 501:22	insert 501:17,17	interested
	inaugural	504:8 507:5	instance	597:6
illustration	565:19	indicated 514:3	599:20	interesting
579:15	incentives	514:25 558:12	602:13	620:25
illustrative	593:5 595:19	565:6,7	instances	interim 538:21
582:1,2 583:2	include 499:16	576:23	599:17 602:8	610:25
601:6	499:17 510:22	629:21	610:20	internal 510:3
immediate	511:5,23	indicates 505:1	Institute 623:9	559:1,4
514:14	579:14 590:2	576:25 621:4	623:19	interpreting
immediately	597:7 599:11	indicating	Institute's	508:16
621:6	599:17 631:15	602:12	623:15	invest 595:3
impact 568:16	included 510:19	indirect 514:12	instrument	investment
571:4 572:2	511:2,4,16	individual 616:6	519:19	528:22
593:15 606:14	556:4 579:6	individuals	intellectual	555:16,21
impacts 537:13	607:23	535:6	581:5	571:18 574:8
541:19 576:18	including 546:8	infers 595:9	intention 630:4	626:2
577:13 578:23	554:6 556:1	inflation 515:11	interest 501:13	investor 528:19
impairment	558:5 576:17	613:18,24	501:16,21	532:3 542:23
504:12 514:4	592:11 595:19	informal 525:1	503:12 505:15	551:7 557:15
impairments	599:19,19	information	506:4,10	559:4,19,19
539:2	inclusion	511:22 517:9	513:8 515:4,6	559:23 560:6
implication	592:14	523:8 553:8	515:7 518:18	560:7,10
595:13	inclusive 507:7	559:23	525:24 527:1	561:11 588:9
implications	income 544:4	583:24 592:4	528:25	592:15 595:3
568:15	inconsistent	597:4,10,13	529:20	595:5 596:3
implied 576:9	612:21,23	597:23	530:16,21	613:22,23
577:1 595:10	increase 507:18	598:15 617:10	531:9,18,23	investors 527:1
614:10 616:9	531:25 532:2		531:25 533:7	528:15 530:15
616:16,21		619:9 621:2,18		
implies 615:4	546:5 564:2	622:2	543:1 545:25	532:7,25
implies 015.4	567:3,7 571:10	informative	547:10 548:7	534:24 541:13
602:16	587:24	520:1	551:7 552:2,11	541:18 542:12
	604:14,25	informed 601:7	554:7 567:7	543:6,7,11,16
important	606:13,18	611:4 613:22	575:2 576:9	551:25 559:2
	1	1	1	1

559:5,24	issuances	500:8 509:16	556:7,10,20	619:15,20
560:1,4,6,17	557:21 604:4	520:13 566:3	556:24 557:5	621:14,19
566:21 570:5	issue 511:10	566:6,8	557:8,12,20	622:3 624:2
592:12,17	512:10 544:18	567:16 586:6	558:1,10,15	625:10 627:14
594:23 595:1	544:23 545:3	630:19	559:8 561:1,15	627:19,20
595:1 604:17	545:11 548:21	Jasper 621:10	562:2,8	628:1,4,9,12
involved 525:3	549:3,6,9,21	622:7 627:24	564:25 566:1	628:17,23,24
556:8 557:11	551:22 586:10	Jersey 570:14	566:3,5	629:1,18,24
558:23	588:22 598:2	John 623:21	567:16,17	630:2,5,18,19
570:15 591:5	598:5 627:10	joint 629:13	569:17 572:14	630:20
591:11,23,24	issued 503:12	Joplin 627:22	572:22,25	July 630:6
592:9,12	524:7 525:16	627:25	573:7,13	June 499:10
593:5 597:18	527:17 531:2	judge 500:2,4	575:18 580:9	501:14 510:19
605:10	544:2 548:18	500:6,9,19	580:11,18,22	524:8 621:3
624:22	550:13 551:8	502:7,12,14	581:23,24	justness 612:6
involvement	562:24	506:19,22	583:10 584:18	
539:24 591:19	563:16 588:17	509:10,13,15	585:1,6,9,14	K
603:18 623:16	590:17 594:15	509:16,18,25	585:18,22,24	Kansas 628:1,2
involvements	issuer 507:23	510:5,8,11,16	586:1,8,21	Katrina 520:22
540:3	507:24 593:6	510:18 511:1,7	587:8,14	522:1
involves 603:13	597:3,19,25	512:3 513:10	588:6 589:1,6	keeping 611:4
involving	598:17	513:15,18	589:20 590:4	kilowatt 538:5
625:19,22	599:25	515:16,20,22	590:12,19,22	kind 526:23
IOU 563:11	issues 529:17	516:3 517:15	591:10,17	528:11 538:7
IPTs 560:3,8	594:12 597:17	517:21 520:7	592:23	549:19 555:19
issuance 503:4	623:14	520:10,13,15	593:10 594:8	568:2 576:1,2
503:7,15	issuing 505:11	520:17,18,21	595:8 596:13	583:25
505:5 511:11	505:11 530:10	520:23 521:2	596:21 597:16	584:19 614:6
512:23 515:1	530:20	521:6,9,15,20	598:8,25	616:13 623:7
525:2,7	548:10,15	523:12,16,19	599:3,11,22	kinds 533:3
529:2,18	557:20 558:7	523:21 524:10	600:4,7,10,13	knew 529:3
530:21 536:10	579:16 586:19	524:13,17	600:21 601:11	know 503:7
536:11 537:14	588:3	540:19 544:8	602:4 603:5	505:6,7,17
539:17 543:9	it'll 618:2	544:11,13	603:12 604:1	506:15
549:15,17	item 512:19	545:18,20	604:7,11,19	507:25 509:4
550:5 552:10	579:24	546:6,9,18,21	605:1,4,11,15	509:6 511:9,17
554:17,25	items 593:20	546:24 547:4	605:20,24	512:1,16,22
562:23 563:3	595:20,21	547:8,19	606:3,9,12	513:5 514:15
570:17	597:9	548:9,14,24	607:7,16	514:20,21
586:25 587:3		549:2,12,19	608:9,12,15,18	515:9 519:1
587:10		550:12,21	608:24 609:1	526:3 527:9
589:25,25	J 631:4,20	551:4,21 552:1	610:4,9,10	527:15,24
590:14 591:7	James 618:17	552:4,9,14,24	612:18,24	529:3,11,21
593:25 594:7	January 525:21	553:9,21,25	613:6,8 616:12	532:25 533:6
596:5,12	527:17 528:2	554:4,10,23	617:2,5,8,13	534:1537:4,7
598:7 604:8	529:9	555:5,10,13,17	617:20,24	552:4 554:14
610:24	JASON 500:1,4	555:19 556:3	618:2,9,11	556:5 558:5
	•	· ·		•

563:12,21,25	605:22 606:6	lead 593:13	542:2 546:10	586:17 588:9
564:8,12	606:7,17,17,20	596:17	547:5 548:15	list 565:15
567:10	606:21,25	leading 525:10	549:5 550:25	588:16 627:4
569:25	607:2,3,3,5,5	613:21	553:12,14	629:2,2
570:20 571:4	607:6,13	leads 609:15	558:16 561:16	listed 588:20
572:5 573:23	608:4,6,11	leave 524:10	579:11 583:19	615:22 616:24
575:14 581:8	610:22 611:1,9	left 500:5	585:24	listening
581:9 582:5,6	611:9 612:15	576:12,15	594:12,15	524:22
582:7,8,9,10	612:20 613:12	626:14	595:10,25	listing 552:25
582:10,11,21	613:18,22	legal 552:19	596:16 601:4	literally 513:5
582:23 584:8	616:7,19,22	555:23 556:1	607:19 609:1	little 512:22
584:16,24	616:23 622:6	563:23	609:2 619:18	545:6 559:9
586:18 587:6	623:2,19	590:16 599:7	622:19 625:4	572:18 594:21
587:25	625:18 628:1	610:3	629:21	603:10 610:14
· -				
588:13,18,19	629:22	legislation	Liberty's 518:4	611:8 613:14
588:22,23,25	knowable	540:5	518:18 535:20	619:19
589:3 590:15	527:8	Lena 620:22	548:10 551:9	live 622:16
590:16,19	knowledge	length 592:11	552:15 556:4	living 551:14
591:1,2,3,4,6	517:9 523:8	let's 500:10	588:11 589:2	622:12
591:15,21,22	545:17 575:11	521:12 524:8	589:7 607:20	locate 521:1
591:23,25	619:9	531:1 534:6	life 542:9	locking 611:15
592:8,20,21	known 611:15	550:5 568:1	564:13 569:6	long-term
593:7,8,8,20	Kolkmeyer	572:22,25	Light 570:15	509:24 578:2
593:21,21,25	627:17,18	620:8 621:12	limit 596:22	578:5,8,11
594:1,2,3,5,7	630:20	629:5	limited 554:6	601:24,25
594:16,17,18		letter 525:2,7	596:15	603:3 607:21
594:20 595:2	L	525:16 536:10	line 501:17,19	607:22 608:1
595:4,6,17,19	Lane 499:24	536:11 539:17	501:22 503:16	608:2
595:23,24	631:4,20	562:24 594:1	509:12 512:19	longer 531:19
596:1,4,6,11,11	Lange 537:9	598:7 610:24	520:12 541:9	533:8 550:16
596:24 597:3	language	letters 542:6,14	541:23 544:10	look 504:20
597:12,14,24	539:23 623:3	level 531:19	567:3 574:17	527:21 531:22
597:25,25	larger 530:13	533:6 552:12	574:20,25	532:8 541:14
598:1,2,3,5,14	565:25	554:13,21	575:1,2	542:12,23
598:15,16,17	lasts 559:21	571:5 591:19	579:24	546:4 563:11
598:17,18,21	late 566:9	599:6	584:20 586:3	578:1,22
598:22,23	latest 510:13	levels 592:15	627:15	579:13 592:1
599:6,9,18,19	law 542:1	Liberty 506:22	lines 501:12	592:2,6
600:15,16,17	569:17 627:7	514:13,18	576:3 620:2	596:4 601:18
600:19,10,17	lawyer 547:22	515:23 518:9	620:8	603:1 616:19
	550:24 626:7		linked 507:2	623:20
601:18,22,24	lawyers 534:21	518:25 519:3		628:12 629:8
601:25 602:1	557:25	522:8 531:5	liquid 541:14,17	
602:3,12,14,14	lay 575:16	532:19 534:7	548:5	looked 509:5
602:17,24	580:20	534:7 535:9	liquidity 528:17	514:3 587:23
603:2,19,22	laymen's	536:18,21,24	528:21 530:14	621:1,9 622:2
604:4,6,15,17	508:23	538:20,23	541:9,19	looking 514:8
604:23 605:1	000.20	539:8,11	543:20 551:7	532:25

	1	1	1	
542:13	514:10 554:14	594:25	matters 587:17	539:4 542:22
552:24	554:17	598:17	Matthew 618:17	551:10 562:12
561:23 563:13	majority 547:14	599:25	maturity 543:13	563:25
576:16 577:13	548:17	607:12 613:13	maximum	569:12 613:11
581:9 602:2	making 508:13	613:14,20	579:15	merger 625:19
603:1 606:19	508:17 592:3	marketed	McMillan's	method 504:14
610:19	596:10 597:6	594:23	629:6	602:1
looks 576:7,9	612:1	marketing	mean 503:1	methodology
592:16	MALE 574:22	523:3 525:19	507:11,23	582:4
593:23 629:4	manage 595:10	527:11 534:21	541:5 542:14	methods 507:6
629:18	mandatory	534:25 535:7	542:16 543:3	507:19 555:14
loss 519:13	538:20	535:8 548:25	582:1	571:12 599:1
lot 508:1 515:9	manner 582:25	556:13 557:9	meaning	metric 566:17
535:2 537:15	615:7	557:11,16	507:19	microphone
584:9 595:15	Mantle 620:22	558:17,24	meaningful	617:16 631:10
600:18	map 628:8,12	559:17,20,25	564:12	631:16
lots 519:9	March 622:8	569:18	means 503:11	middle 516:9
low 511:17,19	mark 523:17	583:24	541:21 542:3	571:1
565:10	549:10 573:1	591:20 592:6	583:16 614:24	million 541:15,16
lower 506:4	574:4	592:10,12	630:12	545:6,7,7,11
518:14 530:16	marked 501:2,5	594:10 595:11	meant 503:2	551:10,22
532:12,14	516:24 522:18	600:11,16	MECG 585:22	552:10 564:3
533:22,25	523:25 528:7	603:15	608:24 619:18	564:4,15
538:10,14	528:11 574:10	markets 526:3	629:19	565:7,13,17
548:7 560:9	574:11 580:25	526:18 531:17	mechanism	565:20
621:12	618:24	550:4 559:13	538:11,20	582:21 588:19
lowest 534:19	market 505:7	567:4,12 571:4	555:4,7	588:21 589:13
548:20 551:8	507:18 515:5	571:14,16	610:21	614:6,9
561:20,21	515:8,10	572:4	mechanisms	623:23
588:10 596:6	525:17 526:8	Massachusetts	537:23	millions 541:21
597:9,15	526:13,20	516:15 563:17	538:13	541:22 564:12
603:24 611:2	527:7,14	match 616:18	media 499:15	mind 504:17
LUCO 504:10	529:8,14	matches 559:4	meeting 557:6	505:3 593:23
514:7,9,10,15	533:14 534:16	602:10	600:7 611:2	minimum 541:10
514:16	534:22 536:2	material 529:13	meetings	541:16 551:5
Lung 620:16	546:17 548:6	561:19 583:22	592:24	588:6,12,14
621:9	549:6 550:7	materials 527:6	597:21	minutes 521:1
021.9	550:15 552:8	534:22	Melissa 499:24	569:24
M				misidentified
M-U-R-R-A-Y	554:16	557:15 559:17	631:4,20	
500:25	558:25 559:3	593:2	members	631:16
macroecono	559:12,15	math 545:7	558:19 562:16	misinterpreted
529:7	560:13,17	564:9	mention	499:18
magnitude	561:21 566:9	mathematical	502:24	missed 629:3
534:4 545:5	566:10,20	538:16 555:8	614:22 629:16	Missouri 499:6
555:24	569:10 571:11	matter 500:16	mentioned	506:19 513:15
main 504:7	572:2,9,10	515:25 521:17	503:9 504:24	517:18 524:14
	583:23,25	573:10 618:6	514:7 532:5	526:21 530:18
1				

559:7 562:5	529:6 531:5	595:15	572:16	NSTAR 563:17
563:24	558:23 561:10	nature 582:7	586:22	nuance 627:11
570:21 585:19	568:23 570:3	near 622:16	Niehaus'	number 527:23
599:21 608:21	571:16 575:17	necessarily	507:16	527:25 530:9
609:6 618:12	608:19	532:24	night 546:8	534:14 537:7
618:21,21	moved 538:4	533:20	604:20,22	538:12 541:4
624:16,23	606:8,10	538:14 568:21	non 611:21	544:24
626:25 628:6	movement	568:25 570:8	non-appealab	557:18 563:9
628:13	526:13 538:18	580:15 594:14	549:18	563:17 570:19
629:20 631:5	movements	594:16,20	nondisclosure	574:25 595:7
mistake 511:19	526:15 601:7	606:1,2	581:21	numbers 583:6
misunderstan	moves 538:6	612:25	noneconomic	615:7 623:21
612:14	moving 551:15	necessary	623:4	
mix 616:18	598:4	597:8 598:3,7	nonprofit	0
MM 541:11,20	multiple 558:4	598:11	623:12	object 610:2
Mocindy	558:5 563:13	need 510:3,8,11	normal 570:4	612:19
524:23	563:14 603:2	511:16 551:1,2	583:25	objecting
Mocindy's	municipality	555:24 560:11	north 570:17	621:14
593:10 594:8	628:14	569:19 572:18	603:8 627:25	objection
595:8 596:13	Murray 500:7	601:18 610:1,6	NOS 499:9	517:16 580:12
model 557:16	500:13,22,25	629:17	note 526:17	610:5 613:1
modified 502:5	501:1 502:17	needs 570:2	543:6,19	622:4
monetary	507:1 515:16	622:9 630:15	559:11 566:25	objections
541:21	571:8	negative	621:8	502:8 523:13
month 501:20		529:14	noted 601:2	572:15 580:10
612:16	N	negatively	notes 567:25	619:16
monthly 501:12	name 500:24	549:4	593:7	objectives
501:15,18,21	516:8,9	negotiating	notice 508:20	592:21
501:23	521:25 574:2	544:25	524:7 628:10	obviously 515:9
months 529:19	618:16,17	Neosho 621:10	628:11	523:3 526:10
538:21 546:7	named 514:18	NERC 629:11	noticed 508:21	529:6 565:22
569:23	Nathan 500:21	net 502:20	notify 560:18	occur 606:13
604:12 606:14	502:4,10	503:3,12,18,21	NPV 512:3,6	occurred
morning 500:2	513:19,22,24	504:6 506:12	513:25 533:13	531:25
500:4,22,23	515:13,19,21	518:6 531:20	556:4 576:10	628:20
524:23	520:8,8	533:8,16	577:1,14	occurrence
526:12	540:21,21,24	535:14 571:6	578:20,23	530:12
540:25 541:1	544:6 565:1,1	576:7 582:19	579:5 582:20	offer 502:4,6
573:18	565:4 580:11	582:20 583:5	599:12 601:1	523:11 572:12
628:20	581:23,25	615:14,20	601:19 602:7	580:8,23
mortgage	585:12,23	never 518:24	602:22 606:4	619:13
571:18	608:25 612:18	538:17	606:15,24	offerance
motion 629:13	617:6,9 621:14	newest 526:9	607:23 614:10	563:2
Mountain 623:9	621:24 625:11	Niehaus	615:15 616:6	offered 502:8
623:15,18	625:13 627:13	520:22 522:1	616:10	517:16 523:13
move 517:12	628:9,14	524:12,22	NPVs 616:9,16	572:15 580:10
523:3 527:6	natural 595:15	567:24	616:21	619:16 629:20

offering 539:5	557:12,20	operating	568:5 586:12	582:19 589:11
541:10 549:7	558:1 559:8	620:18	587:9,15	589:19 595:8
549:10 555:16	561:1,15 562:2	opinion 511:14	590:5,8,13,18	596:14 602:9
556:16 557:2	562:20	515:7 581:11	591:8 592:22	608:3 614:3
563:3 564:11	563:19 567:16	586:13,14	organization	615:6,10,18,23
571:19 572:3	568:20 571:2	594:10 603:6	621:8	616:24 619:23
621:22	575:5,25	603:21 609:17	organized	620:1,8
offerings	583:4 584:25	621:22,22	593:19	622:17 623:8
555:22 564:1	585:1,8,14,18	622:1,1 627:5	original 529:9	pages 509:6
572:1 625:6	590:4,22	627:6	out-of-court	578:13,15
offhand 599:10	591:17 598:25	oppose 553:17	621:18	616:5,10,16
office 520:25	600:21 601:11	opposed	outcome	631:12
620:21 626:8	605:24 606:9	530:10 572:9	526:20 559:7	paid 518:1,14,15
Oh 524:25	608:18,18	583:2 622:8	561:8,13	519:10 540:8
626:3 627:3	615:24 617:2	opt 559:6	622:15	540:14 594:18
Ohio 563:16	617:24 618:2	optional	outlined 527:5	595:21
okay 500:10	624:15 625:4	538:22	553:19	paper 574:11
503:9,25	625:9 628:4	options 601:14	outlines 598:11	papers 575:22
504:3,13,24	628:13,17,21	order 500:10	outlining	587:23
505:15 506:3	629:9,18	501:16 529:18	593:19	
506:19 510:5	630:5	530:20 531:2	outside 570:4	paragraph 574:17,20
510:16 511:7	older 565:18			575:1
		531:3,8 536:6	572:1 583:6	
512:3 513:10	568:8	545:5 546:14	584:9	parallel 568:25
518:17 520:2	once 503:11	549:4,14,17	overall 512:25	569:3,7
520:7 523:19	537:21 557:1	550:2,14	588:5 620:4	Pardon 628:4
524:25 525:6	559:16,24	553:10 555:2	overlap 573:24	parenthetical
525:11,20	560:15	555:24	overrule 610:4	541:24
526:22	562:24 611:15	556:16 558:6	613:1 622:3	part 522:4
527:15 528:4	one-on-one	558:18 560:11	overseeing	540:9 547:3
528:9,24	559:22	568:7 580:15	592:9	556:11,14,24
530:19 531:12	ones 553:2	581:1,20	oversight	556:25
532:5 533:6	ongoing	586:10,15,20	547:25	557:13 565:14
535:2,9,21	554:25	586:24 587:9	Owen 618:4,15	587:22 590:1
536:17 537:4	579:13,23	587:13,15	618:17 619:14	592:13
538:3,19	586:17	590:11 592:5	619:23 625:14	594:20
539:4,19	587:20	592:16,17,20	627:16	599:24 600:1
540:8,14,17	588:24	593:13,16	owes 617:18	600:14 601:17
545:10,16,18	589:15,16,16	598:22		613:3 626:4
546:6,9,18	online 623:20	603:20 611:6	P	participate
547:4,8,19	onset 594:6	629:22 630:1	page 501:11	592:24
548:9,14,24	OPC's 508:9	ordered 558:15	502:17,23	participation
549:12 550:21	622:14	orders 544:19	503:16 507:5	570:22
551:4,21 552:1	623:20	544:23	542:5 574:17	603:14 609:10
552:9,14,24	open 567:13	545:12 549:21	574:20,25	609:14
553:21 554:4	631:10,16	550:6 557:21	575:25 576:5	particular
555:13 556:7	opening	557:23 560:7	576:6 577:7	508:11 532:11
556:20 557:5	589:20	563:1,14	579:1,2,9,10	542:11 551:19

	1	1	1	
592:21 598:2	601:5 614:13	599:25	627:4	553:10 611:5
613:16 627:10	614:15,18,21	606:22	policy 540:6	posted 596:25
627:10	614:23 615:1,4	626:20	621:4 626:8,9	potential 501:10
particularly	620:10	placement	626:10,17,18	525:14
609:9 620:15	percentage	547:23	627:2	530:22 547:9
parties 507:13	504:3 589:18	plan 515:5 519:1	political 537:18	578:23
510:21 575:17	percentages	548:11 580:23	population	579:15 580:4
584:8,16,23	579:25 583:4	planning	622:12	582:3 586:15
613:6 617:20	performance	548:10	portion 502:23	587:3,19,23
617:22 618:3	514:20	plant 622:8,13	577:22,24	588:3,21
parties' 574:24	performing	622:16 626:11	579:6 587:4	606:12
partner 516:13	519:20 547:10	627:21 628:5	portions 499:15	potentially
574:7	perimeters	628:15	499:17 609:9	579:18
Partners 574:7	554:5,9,14,18	plants 620:3	posed 575:24	power 570:14
party 544:25	period 501:13	621:5 626:12	position 505:4	626:11,11
590:7	542:10 543:5	play 567:9	508:9 538:4	practice 547:13
passed 530:17	554:12	please 500:24	539:25	567:13
pay 503:6	560:22	510:20 515:23	566:23	pre 501:4
518:5,9 519:10	565:19 568:18	516:8 521:15	583:19 596:8	pre-filed 501:2
554:2 596:6	587:7 607:19	521:25	607:17 608:1	501:5,9 516:17
payment	625:21	529:24 546:9	608:10 612:10	517:2 618:23
512:20 543:8	person 596:16	573:8 574:2	612:14,20	629:15
554:19	624:7	575:18 584:15	615:20,25	precedent
payments	personal	584:24	620:2,4,5,6	602:20
505:9 512:13	570:10	600:22	622:14 626:13	precision
513:5 537:25	personally	605:11 607:21	positioned	552:12
pays 602:24	591:2	617:6 618:15	547:15	precluding
people 529:11	perspective	plus 541:11	positions	623:2
581:16	508:23	542:24	617:23	predictor 515:7
perceivable	542:18 590:16	point 519:24	620:24	preface 531:1
533:13	592:11 597:15	531:24 532:18	626:22	prefer 585:2
perceived	607:12 621:21	543:22	positive 529:14	preferable
548:5	petition 499:7	546:13	576:10	565:7
percent 501:23	552:16 589:2	548:23	positively	preference
501:23,24,24	589:8	559:25 560:6	549:4	584:14,22
501:24 503:17	phases 591:20	560:21 564:2	possible	585:5
503:25	•	564:16 565:18	504:23 512:17	
503.25	phonetic 504:10	568:7 571:5	531:18 534:18	premium 527:4 528:16,20
				532:9 542:25
505:24	524:23 535:4	572:5 579:22 601:4,7	537:16 548:20 558:7	
509:20,23 511:21 512:11	picture 616:3	629:10 630:2		premiums 604:17
512:12 525:25	pieces 522:18 place 523:5	points 515:12	561:12,13 597:8 606:6	
	525:1,8		630:14	preparation
526:17,23	529:10 556:13	543:18,19,21 546:13 552:7		557:14,16,18
537:6 543:21			possibly 588:12	preparatory 546:14
543:23	560:7 593:5	564:4,7,11	post 554:25	
594:18	593:18,19	587:25 613:21	560:25	prepare 501:1 516:16,17
600:22,25	594:4,5 597:3	policies 626:20	post-financing	510.10,17

546:12 548:3	523:18 562:14	problem 504:16	595:11 596:12	512:18 518:21
557:2 618:22	624:15	504:18	598:4,10,19	518:24 539:16
631:7	price 507:20	582:22 629:9	599:24 600:2	539:19 544:21
prepared	541:20	problematic	600:14,20	546:15
522:10,14	543:23 549:6	594:3	603:16,19	549:23
524:2 559:17	560:3,16,18	procedure	611:6 613:7,10	562:23
574:9 581:8	560:20	554:23	processes	578:15,20,22
583:1 587:23	565:24 570:3	procedures	559:1,5 561:7	587:9,15
589:21	620:9	593:12,15,18	591:8	593:19 598:14
preparing	priced 550:14	proceed 539:21	procrastinator	598:16 603:6
556:20 557:5	601:8	549:15,16	515:6	603:23 608:4
557:8,11	prices 542:23	550:19,23	produced	609:17
600:4,7,10	pricing 507:17	551:3 556:16	630:10	provided 511:13
601:5	507:18 525:12	586:25	Professional	553:7 593:8,8
present 499:19	525:19 526:10	proceeding	631:6	597:23
502:20	526:12,15,19	522:11 567:2	progressing	599:15 621:16
503:13,18,21	527:13 535:1,7	607:13	569:6	622:11
504:6,21	535:8 536:1	proceedings	project 531:16	provides 610:18
506:12 513:8	541:19 542:18	572:8 574:9	projecting	615:17
531:20 533:9	548:25	631:8,9,14	529:15	providing
533:16 535:14	558:17,25	proceeds	property 551:5	518:10 519:9
566:10,15,18	560:1,25	503:3,12	581:5 588:7	559:23
571:7 573:21	561:22 569:18	512:18	proposal	561:25 594:7
576:7 582:19	571:10,11	process 512:19	537:20,21	proxy 532:18,21
583:5 605:18	591:20 592:6	512:24 525:1	588:19 592:9	601:23
615:14,21	592:14,15,20	525:7,19	623:24	602:23
631:10	594:10 595:11	527:11 534:17	proposals	prudence
presentation	600:17 603:16	535:1 540:4	592:6	623:16
559:19 593:2	603:21 609:18	546:15 547:2	propose 534:8	public 499:6
presentations	613:20,24	547:17 548:25	proposed	500:13 520:7
557:15	pricings 560:22	549:15 550:8	534:6 536:6	540:19,22
presented	primarily	550:13 553:10	552:15 589:2	564:25
593:3 597:11	604:15	556:12,14,16	589:7 597:7	580:16 583:7
preserving	prin 543:3,4	556:24	598:5 629:25	583:14 584:6
631:11	principal 513:7	557:13	proposing	585:13 591:18
Presumably	516:12 520:3	558:23,25	535:9 537:9	608:24 617:12
617:14	520:4 542:11	559:4,9,9,12	propriety 581:5	620:4,10,14
presume	543:4,5,7,10	559:14,15,20	581:7 582:7	620:20,21,24
550:18	543:15	559:21 561:11	protect 610:22	622:18,21
pretty 519:20	principle 543:4	568:15 569:11	protected	623:7 624:16
545:23	prior 572:8	569:18 587:1	598:24	625:10,14,19
550:19	606:18,18,22	587:10 591:11	protective	626:9,10,14,17
570:25	private 547:23	591:24 592:1	580:15 581:1	626:18,19
prevent 590:6	probably 510:2	592:2,3,10,12	581:20	629:8,12,19
590:6,10	527:22 531:14	592:13,14	protocols	pulling 561:9
previous 519:7	541:3 563:14	593:19,23,24	593:12,15	purpose 512:15
previously	564:8 584:1	594:6,7	provide 511:22	512:21 513:4
[00,/		

601:16,17	628:22	515:23 521:15	605:25 606:4	571:17,17,20
purposes	questioning	573:8	607:4,9,20,21	571:20,21,21
504:10 510:6	549:20	raised 562:22	607:22,22	575:2 577:14
522:11 616:2	questions	604:20,22	608:1,2 611:15	587:24
put 508:19	506:20 509:8	range 544:21	611:16,19	588:10 599:17
579:11 582:5	509:11,11,14,17	578:15 601:21	612:11,15	601:7,14,20
583:1 593:18	509:19 513:11	602:2 616:17	613:13,19	602:5 603:2
594:5 600:19	513:11,12,17	ranging 603:3	614:14,15,16,18	604:12,14
604:17,17	515:13 517:5	rate 501:13,16	614:23,25	605:2 606:7
623:19,20	517:19 520:9	501:21 502:21	615:1,5 622:19	606:9,13,19,19
624:3	520:11,12,13,16	503:8,17,18	625:2,22	606:23
putting 526:5	522:24 524:6	504:3,7,9,14	626:4	607:12,14
528:24 539:2	524:7,15	504:18,19,25	rated 532:12,13	608:6 611:9,11
623:17	540:17 541:7	505:2,5,8,12	533:2	611:25 612:1,5
023.17	544:6,9,9	505:16 506:4	ratemaking	612:7 613:15
Q	545:19,21,22	506:9,10,10	511:25 514:1	613:17 615:22
qualifications	545:25	507:7,10	599:16 602:8	615:22 625:2
535:17,22,25	548:24	508:9 512:1,13	607:17 611:25	625:6,24
536:3 548:22		512:24 513:2		
561:19	553:10 562:3		624:19 625:1	rating 512:17
quality 499:15	562:4,7	513:9 515:1,11	ratepayer	534:17,18
571:25 620:3	564:23 565:5	518:3,15,18	594:17,19	539:1,2 551:7
	567:18 568:14	525:24 526:7	595:18,21	552:21 555:3
620:17 621:10	569:16 570:8	526:8,15,23	596:2,6,9	556:1557:6
622:6	571:3 572:11	526:24 527:1	598:23 610:19	557:17 580:4
quantifiable	575:7,15,23	527:2,3	610:22	588:9 592:24
531:20 533:8	585:20,23,25	528:12,14,25	ratepayers	592:25 593:1
535:14 571:6	586:2,2,5,7,9	529:20	507:8 512:2	593:3,4,7
quantify 531:15	586:22	530:16,21	518:4,9 519:5	596:15 597:1
588:14	608:19,20,22	531:9 532:4,9	519:9 526:21	597:4,5,9,11
quantitative	610:7 611:11	533:7 542:20	530:18 536:19	597:15 598:13
589:21	617:1 619:5	542:24,24	536:22 548:8	600:8
quantum 599:8	624:1,12	543:1 546:14	551:13 559:7	ratings 533:4
question 507:3	627:13,14,15	552:2 560:21	561:8,14	537:18
507:4 510:25	627:18 628:21	566:20 567:1	595:16 596:1	rationale 613:4
514:24 519:7	quick 575:16	572:8,10	596:10 611:14	reach 531:19
528:25	quickly 531:5	575:3 576:9	623:23	reacted 604:24
530:24 531:1	558:24	577:2,3,5,16	rates 501:23	613:20
543:25	560:14 562:18	577:20,22	504:5 511:18	reaction 613:25
544:12,17	569:19,22	578:3,4,5,9,11	512:5 513:25	read 508:8
549:25	quite 518:12	587:5,19,21	515:4,6,8	537:8
552:14 558:11	quotations	596:4,6	518:9 523:4	reading 508:11
566:4 571:13	508:19	599:16 601:1,2	527:7,9	ready 500:10
580:12,19	quote 501:22	601:12,24,25	529:16 531:18	505:7 558:23
586:9 589:5		602:9,12,16,21	531:23,25	569:8 570:3
590:10 605:14	R	603:3 604:16	533:15	598:18 617:14
612:21,22	radius 622:13	604:19,21,25	545:25 546:4	really 509:6
624:8 627:21	raise 500:14	605:12,16,17	554:7 567:7,11	519:3 583:22
		000.12,10,17		

reason 608:9	630:16 631:11	607:23 615:15	610:23	repeat 510:11
reasonable	recorded	615:18 625:6	related 519:6	511:1 566:12
551:6 588:8	499:15 593:1	reflecting	552:20 603:11	589:5 616:13
reasonablene	596:24 622:7	542:17 615:7	relates 571:13	replace 519:12
609:18 612:7	recording	reflective 601:6	593:17 604:3	replacing
rebuttal 501:2	499:20	reflects 538:15	613:16	519:22
502:18,24	573:20,22	reframe 549:25	relation 627:21	reply 630:6
510:9 537:8	631:17	refresh 526:6	relative 560:5	report 620:17
574:10	recordings	613:2,7	566:18 606:17	621:3,7
607:24	630:10	reg 547:20	614:11 615:4	reporter 573:20
recall 513:23	recover 538:8	regard 570:22	616:8	573:21 630:9
565:8 611:11	recovery 518:19	594:22 617:6	relatively	631:1,5,5,6,10
625:17,22	519:2,24	622:5	588:22	reporting
receipt 502:8	554:12 561:21	regarding	610:23 628:15	514:21
517:16 523:13	611:18 614:17	501:11 558:16	relevant	representation
572:15 580:10	614:17	625:16 626:9	527:20	508:18
619:16	recross 513:12	629:14	560:21 565:16	representative
receive 512:12	520:16 562:3	regardless	593:9	539:15 594:2
512:15 527:2	567:18	549:10	relevantly	596:16 609:16
544:1 560:24	608:20	565:22	536:3	representativ
597:13	628:22	register 557:3	rely 621:23	597:18 609:16
received 502:9	redirect 513:18	registered	remaining	represented
510:14 517:17	520:16 566:1	547:21 548:2	518:5	617:10,23
523:14 546:16	567:20 610:9	548:4,10,19,21	remains 620:6	representing
546:17 570:5	617:5 628:22	631:6	621:12	542:1
572:16 585:15	reduce 530:11	registering	remember	represents
593:1 619:17	refer 529:24	556:21 600:5	625:18,21	581:7 614:7,10
629:20	reference	registration	626:5	reproduction
receiving	527:3 541:10	547:24	remind 573:19	631:13
540:11	541:21 542:12	552:22	remotely	request 617:11
recognize	568:7 569:17	559:18 580:4	572:20	623:18
523:24	571:19 588:15	599:7	Renew 506:19	requested
598:19	623:9	regular 571:23	513:15 517:18	630:11
recollection	referenced	572:3 584:1	524:14 562:4	require 528:20
613:3,7	525:23 577:11	regulated 514:11	585:19 608:21	547:24 553:11
recommend	references	514:22	618:12,20,21	557:21 561:16
508:5 558:2	536:9 567:5	regulation	624:23	594:3
603:13,18	referencing	624:20	626:25	required 558:19
621:5	532:3 589:11	regulators	629:20	558:20
recommenda	referred 523:17	591:3,12	renewable	603:25
608:13 629:13	560:2	regulatory	623:14	613:24
recommended	referring 507:9	547:25	repaid 542:11	requirement
509:24	542:8	563:23 569:11	543:6,7,16	609:22
reconcile	refers 542:9	607:13	repayment	requirements
620:23	reflect 526:6	reject 519:17	532:14	592:22 611:1
record 573:25	577:22 579:5	520:2,5		requires
574:3 618:16	reflected	rejection	repayments 554:7	554:24
01.010 0.77.0	renected		557.7	JJ7.24

			C amely 50140	
research	reviewed 593:2	risks 530:19,22	Sarah's 591:10	554:22
620:13	593:22	587:22	591:17	618:23
reset 533:14	597:23 598:11	road 559:24	save 545:4	schedules
607:2,6	reviewing	Robinett's	savings 533:13	554:7
resets 571:21	592:8,16	623:21	548:7 551:1,2	scope 580:14
respective	598:13,14	Rocky 623:9,15	564:15,17	screen 573:3
615:8	reviews 613:23	623:18	566:18 576:8	seat 529:8
respectively	revised 629:22	ROE 507:8	576:10 577:14	573:3 596:11
501:25 591:24	revisions 502:1	role 546:10,19	578:21,24	610:19,24
respond 562:18	revisiting 594:4	591:15,23	579:15 580:2	second 527:4
618:3	right 500:9,13	593:20	580:5 586:16	530:13 542:5
responding	500:14 505:18	roles 547:10	587:20 588:2	550:10
612:22	505:20	582:11 591:17	601:2,19	575:25 577:3
response 514:8	507:15 509:10	603:11 605:6	602:22	590:6
514:24 565:5	515:10,23	room 624:14	603:22	secondary
569:16 621:19	517:1 519:15	roughly 589:17	606:24 615:15	527:14
629:12	520:10,20	623:23	616:7,11,23	sections 631:15
responsibility	521:12,15,16	row 576:25	623:23	secured 551:5
519:22 536:18	525:22	615:13	saying 532:24	securing
558:16 596:9	540:19 544:8	rows 576:22,24	541:12 545:22	605:25
responsible	545:8,20	615:8	612:22 622:6	securities
514:19	560:16 561:9	RPR 631:20	626:16	594:12,15
result 530:16	562:8 572:14	rule 547:20,23	says 576:2,13	596:3
534:19	572:25 573:8	548:5,16	582:1 596:14	securitization
537:25 548:7	582:22,25	551:11 584:2	scale 530:8	503:22 504:2
559:6 560:9	585:6,10	rules 540:5	SCC 547:21,24	505:2,5,9,17
561:7 623:24	586:1 606:11	553:18 561:5	548:1,3,4,11,19	506:3,10,11,13
resulted 531:4	614:5 624:18	ruling 629:7	548:21	507:8 508:12
561:20	625:9 626:5	run 522:4	552:22	508:14 509:7
603:22	627:24	568:24 569:2	556:21 557:3	512:5,16 513:4
results 621:15	right-hand	Russia 529:11	580:3 598:12	514:1 515:1
resume 573:1	576:5	RYAN 509:13	599:7 600:5	523:4 526:16
retirement	rise 571:22,23	544:11,14,16	scenario	528:18,19
519:4	606:23 607:8	545:18 586:4	510:20,23	531:21 532:1
retiring 623:16	607:10 620:10	630:18	511:3 556:5	532:12,13,15
return 504:18	rising 571:14,17		576:11 577:15	532:16,17,18
504:19 507:7	571:24	S	577:18,25	533:7,10
507:10 512:24	risk 505:12	S.A 574:4	578:7,7	534:3,5
513:3 532:10	512:23,24	Sachs 522:4	582:19 599:13	536:25
550:8	513:5 527:3,4	539:12 540:8	scenarios	537:24 540:9
returned 543:10	528:15,20	546:19,21,24	577:8,10,11	541:14 543:10
612:1	532:8,10,14	584:11,12	578:1 581:10	544:2 563:6
revenues 544:1	538:10,14	605:5	582:7 601:12	563:11 565:19
review 525:2	542:22,23,24	safe 506:6	601:15,19	566:23 567:4
555:3 592:2	550:5,8	sales 534:23	615:16 616:24	568:3,15
593:22 597:11	559:16 587:6	Sarah 537:9	schedule 501:4	570:10,12,13
598:15 612:6	587:19 604:17	581:13	518:16 554:21	571:6,21
				,

572:4,9 575:4	584:13	624:15	629:5,7,11	529:12 531:7
576:8,17,21	594:24 612:21	serves 579:5	shower 628:20	situations
577:2,5,15,22	612:24 616:9	service 499:6	showing 582:19	583:25
578:17,18	616:16,21	518:10 554:13	582:20	six 528:1 538:21
579:4,7,17	620:8 629:3	554:21,22	shows 545:9	588:20
587:17 588:2	629:18,19	594:19	622:9,11	size 530:9
588:17,25	seeing 623:6	serviceable	shut 621:6	534:2,3
589:23,24	seeking 518:18	546:13	side 576:5	541:10,16,17
590:23 591:6	519:3 532:19	servicer	significant	552:21 553:7
591:18 594:17	seen 593:16	595:20	526:13 529:7	564:11 565:23
594:25 595:5	segueing	serving 591:18	significantly	588:16 615:4
595:16,22	538:19	set 540:6	566:21	sizes 565:16
596:7 600:24	selected	554:18 566:17	Silence 523:23	slightly 533:22
601:13 602:20	556:15 557:1	607:13 611:16	558:9 570:7	533:25 543:8
603:1,7,24	selection 547:2	seven 528:2,2	630:21	548:1
606:16 607:8	556:13,17	shaking 567:19	Silvey 509:13,14	slowing 604:8
607:18 608:6	592:3 600:1	shape 554:20	544:11,12,14,16	slowly 573:23
609:7 611:14	sending 630:8	share 559:25	545:18 586:4	smaller 528:18
614:10,15,19	630:9	shared 581:15	586:4 630:18	541:18 550:10
615:14 616:8	senior 571:22	597:1	similar 507:4	551:12 565:21
616:18,20	sense 513:3	shares 525:3	511:22 532:3	565:24
623:3	567:8	sharing 519:4,8	555:25 568:11	588:22
securitizations	sensitivities	519:13,14,15	576:16 582:11	smooth 594:7
527:16,19	578:20	584:16,21,23	589:14 597:17	social 623:4
528:3,5,13,17	sentence	sheet 559:20	615:7,17	626:10
530:2 531:6	501:22 616:13	629:14	626:9	Society 621:3
533:1,1,3	sentiments	sheets 594:21	simplicity 558:8	solemnly
536:4 538:25	527:7	short 501:18	simply 583:12	500:15 515:24
551:12 565:6	separate 512:19	574:18	Sindacat 535:4	521:16 573:9
565:12	530:7,11 531:3	short-term	535:5	618:4
568:23 569:8	549:21 551:15	501:11,13,16	single 530:10	somebody
586:11 591:1,5	557:21	511:13,17,20	530:12,20,20	561:3 582:18
597:17 601:8	568:20 569:8	607:20,22	530:23	613:9
securitize	586:12 587:9	608:2 612:10	532:13,16,21	somewhat
563:5	587:15	612:15	545:2 549:3	624:22
securitized	589:24	shorten 613:6	549:10,19	soon 630:14
505:12 518:14	590:13,18	shorter 569:23	550:5 558:7	sorry 506:17
576:19 587:7	separated	shortfall 537:25	586:10,15,20	509:22
588:7 609:19	528:13	shortfalls	587:8,12,14	510:24 566:12
security 508:13	separately	537:24	sir 521:19	578:10 582:2
534:2	574:19 620:7	Shorthand	541:22	584:18,21
see 507:20	series 559:22	631:5	546:20,23	589:4 605:13
524:8 527:9	560:16	shortly 618:1	site 597:2,10	617:17
541:15 543:14	serious 550:19	show 551:1,2	sites 596:25	sort 519:3
553:9 567:19	serve 577:12	559:24	sitting 529:4,8	544:21 568:5
573:2 580:14	591:14,15	589:18	situation 512:7	568:6,14
583:16,17	served 622:22	606:24 616:5	513:3 519:22	570:10
	I	I	I	I

583:23,24	598:15,18,21	594:13 595:12	616:25 617:17	588:25
sound 565:19	599:15 603:15	596:17,20	617:25 624:3	subscription
sounds 525:22	603:18 608:10	statements	624:6,10	592:17
535:3 558:1	609:10 612:16	621:18	629:17	subsequently
585:12	612:20 613:4	states 514:22	Stokes' 507:2	501:3
space 548:19	617:9,18	535:13 540:2	storm 511:10	subsidiary
570:10 591:3	624:2 629:15	558:21 570:18	518:22 530:1	514:18
speakers	staff's 509:24	570:19,24	577:17,21,23	substantial
499:18 631:16	538:4 549:20	591:7 592:22	578:2,5,10	598:14 604:14
special 512:21	588:19 589:21	594:9 620:9	579:11 586:11	substantially
specific 539:23	592:10 607:17	statute 508:12	589:14 590:5	517:6 601:3
566:10	608:1 612:10	508:14,16,18	608:7 615:1	619:6
specifically	612:13 615:20	508:21,22	stream 605:19	substitute
507:13	615:24 629:5	509:4 555:11	strictly 576:16	629:14
590:23	629:13	570:22	strong 512:9	subtracting
623:21	stand 500:14	603:25 609:7	structural	503:3
spell 500:24	standalone	609:13,23,25	563:10	successfully
spoke 589:11	576:13,15,17	623:3	structure 511:24	549:6,9
spot 526:5	578:19	statutory	526:19 534:15	565:23
527:9 528:24	600:24	592:20 611:1	537:16 539:3	suddenly 571:5
545:8 560:20	standard 519:17	stays 611:19	546:16 554:16	sufficient 551:6
624:3	536:3 538:24	step 515:16	563:8 592:6	560:10 583:13
spread 527:5	547:13 559:3	520:19 598:6	592:8 597:7	585:2 588:8
527:10 532:5	605:23 611:2	617:3 628:24	604:2 605:9	592:4
532:6,9,13	622:18 629:12	steps 557:18	structured	suggest 553:17
542:19,20,21	standing 583:6	592:12 593:18	522:5 535:15	566:16
542:25,25	start 500:7,12	594:4,5	558:4	suggesting
560:9,9	541:2 545:21	610:25	structuring	519:16
561:12	560:6 568:1,4	Stokes 502:14	534:13 540:12	sum 530:7
spreads 527:12	started 521:12	502:16 506:18	558:17 569:15	summarize
560:11 566:22	573:19	513:14 517:22	570:15 591:19	529:25 614:7
567:11 604:16	starting 519:24	517:23,25	595:11 597:13	614:24
staff 502:13	541:7 543:7	520:6 524:18	600:16	support 560:12
513:13,23	579:22	524:19,21	study 621:16,16	supposed
514:24 517:21	state 500:24	562:9,11	621:17	520:24
517:23 524:17	516:8 521:25	564:23	sub 565:17	sure 501:14,19
524:19 537:8	526:22 544:4	572:19,24	subcategories	512:22 519:6
539:15,15	574:2,16,21	573:5,6,15,17	600:18	523:21
553:13,14,15	618:15 620:2	574:23,24	subject 517:1	526:25 530:3
554:24 562:8	620:8 624:16	575:5,13,19	544:3,4 587:5	533:23
562:17,22	628:11	580:7,20,24	587:17	537:22 541:6
567:19 573:2	stated 589:21	581:4 582:12	submit 545:9	541:11 549:1
573:6 591:4	statement	582:14 583:9	submitted	549:25
591:16 592:2	507:15 550:7	583:20 584:3	510:19 526:10	557:25
592:5 593:9	559:18 571:9	585:4,8,16	545:4 565:14	567:24 571:2
594:1 597:12	584:19	610:2,10,12	601:4	571:15 572:21
597:22	589:20	613:5,11	subscale	578:15 589:6
1	•	•	•	•

590:9 592:3	571:17 583:23	616:20,20	testings 560:17	627:8,11
596:10 597:6	talks 541:9	terms 507:25	Texas 563:22	think 504:5
598:3,16,23	609:13	509:1 554:5	thank 500:8,19	505:3 507:1
603:9 607:25	targeted 592:13	568:22	502:12,14	509:22,23
614:9,25	targeting	578:16,17	503:16 506:21	512:9 513:19
617:21 628:17	554:13	579:12 587:19	509:15,18	518:12 519:18
628:18	tariff 609:19	604:15,15,16	513:19 515:14	521:13 523:2
surrebuttal	629:14	609:18 616:6	515:15,18,21	524:8,10
507:17 516:22	tax 544:4	616:17,18	516:3,5 517:15	527:1,22
522:14 571:9	taxable 544:5	test 504:6	517:20,22	529:10,23
593:11 594:9	taxes 563:4	tested 601:15	518:4 520:9	530:3,4 532:7
596:13 618:23	TBD 542:3	testified 612:19	520:15,17,20	539:23 540:11
622:11	553:1	612:23 613:9	521:7,11,20,22	543:25
		testifies 521:3,5		544:24 545:3
suspect 547:1 swear 500:15	team 535:4	testify 518:2	524:16,18	
	553:16,23		540:21 543:12	549:24 550:6
515:24 521:16	558:19 562:13	620:22	544:7,11,14	553:3 560:2
573:7,9 618:5	562:14,16	testifying 573:2	545:18 553:9	561:4,7
switch 534:6	581:8 591:23	testimony	562:9 565:1	563:14 565:11
sworn 521:13	592:7 593:20	500:15 501:2	566:2,6	567:12 568:4
symbol 541:11	603:6 604:2	501:4,7 502:2	567:16,17,21	568:10 569:18
synonymous	604:9 610:16	502:18 507:2	572:16,24	570:8 572:5,5
513:2	610:18 611:3	507:5,14	573:5,13,15	574:24 575:14
system 631:10	teams 610:15	508:8 510:9	574:5 575:5	583:10,21,24
Т	tell 519:21	515:25 516:18	576:22 577:7	584:14,24
table 542:6	529:4 534:11	516:21,22	578:12,25	585:4,13
550:5 559:16	576:2 613:14	517:3 521:17	579:8 580:6	586:18 595:6
596:12 610:19	tells 519:19	522:11,15,18	585:21,23	600:19 611:8
take 500:14	ten 552:7	522:22	608:23,25	612:16 615:25
	564:2,4,6,10	524:23	610:10 613:5	617:18,25
521:9 525:7	579:9,10	525:20 526:6	614:2,22	622:9 623:1
533:17 559:16 569:1 572:18	587:24	529:9 536:9	617:4 618:9,11	624:14 626:13
572:22	589:19	537:8 565:15	619:19 623:25	626:16,19
	ten-year 576:8	573:9 574:10	625:11 627:19	627:8,11,25
584:17 585:1	607:19 608:5	575:23 577:12	627:20	628:9 629:8
585:10 607:14	614:11 615:25	588:16 593:11	628:23,25	630:11
628:10,11	616:9	594:9 595:9	630:16,18,19	thought 568:4
taken 573:3	tend 553:2	596:14 601:4	630:20	thoughts
593:5 597:25	607:10	601:5 607:24	theoretically	526:19 560:1
606:22 620:11	tender 502:10	608:4 618:5	531:24 569:2	560:3
takes 525:1	517:13 524:11	618:23,24	569:9	three 509:5
538:7 597:3	585:16 619:13	619:3,24	thing 503:5	528:1 559:21
talk 502:20	tenor 542:16,17	620:1,7,11,12	568:6 625:18	threshold
527:19	tenors 507:25	620:15,19,23	625:20	588:19
573:23	term 501:18	621:15 622:1	things 515:9	thumb 551:11
622:10	559:20	622:10,11,18	528:16 529:6	tied 532:4
talking 555:4	574:18 576:6	623:8,17,22	534:14 541:4	594:17
568:4 569:22	605:16 616:8	629:3	599:6 626:11	604:23
1	I	I	I	I

tighten 560:8	613:10 618:1	563:13 564:13	560:21 567:5	576:24 587:9
592:19	619:6 624:11	565:16,23,24	571:17 601:8	590:5,12,13
tightest 537:16	today's 552:8	565:25	604:16,19,22	595:7 601:11
tightly 561:13	572:10	569:13,15	613:17,17,24	601:14 605:2
time 499:19	told 554:1	570:1,3,6	triple 507:17,20	615:3
503:14 505:5	top 552:17	579:17 588:5	532:12,15,17	types 507:21
505:14 509:14	577:8	593:14 595:17	533:2,4 539:1	typical 605:9
509:17 511:11	total 564:11	595:22 614:11	551:7 555:3	typically
515:1 522:23	579:24 591:7	transactions	571:10 588:9	507:24
523:10	totaling 570:16	527:13,16,24	true 517:8 518:6	594:22
525:23 536:1	track 568:25	530:4,7,11	523:7 575:10	596:24
542:10 543:5	569:3,7	545:3 546:15	619:8 631:13	
550:4 554:17	trading 527:10	547:14 548:18	true-up 512:19	U
560:21 561:2	527:14	551:16,18,20	537:23 538:11	U.S 514:11
561:22 565:18	traditional	557:19 558:3	538:18,19,21	Uh-huh 533:16
568:18 572:6	503:22 504:4	558:4 565:15	538:22 555:4	Ukraine 529:11
572:13 578:23	504:13 506:9	565:21 570:11	555:7	ultimate 535:7
587:7 588:1	507:6,19	570:16 591:6	trustee 552:19	592:7 609:15
595:17 596:14	508:20 509:3	604:6	truth 500:16,16	609:24
598:15 601:3	510:20,22	transcribed	500:17 516:1,1	ultimately
601:7 607:14	511:2 512:5	499:16,24	516:1 521:18	530:17 534:19
612:2 619:3,12	514:1 532:22	630:9 631:14	521:18,18	548:6 592:1
620:5 625:19	555:13,15	transcriber	573:10,11,11	592:14,18
625:21,25	556:4 563:11	499:19		596:2 597:6
			618:6,6,7	597:14 598:1
626:1,6,23 627:19	571:11,19	transcribing 573:21	try 567:8	598:5,6,24
	594:11,15,24		trying 563:9	602:24
time-being	598:25	transcript	568:22	603:20,23
524:11	599:12,15	499:17,20	605:15 613:6	606:25 607:4
timeframe	602:1,8 611:24	631:8	TSY 542:16,19	607:13,14
509:19 510:12	612:1 614:17	TRANSCRIPTI	turn 502:17	610:21 614:1
timeframes	624:13 625:1	499:5	541:8 614:2	unable 499:16
598:22	625:3,5	transcripts	615:10	551:2
timely 611:4	transaction	593:7 630:8	turning 577:7	
times 564:10,11	525:10,17	630:12	600:21	uncertainty 587:18,21
594:25 595:3	527:22 530:6	transition 621:6	two 526:25	606:25
597:2,20	530:6,8,10,13	transmission	528:1 530:7,11	
601:22 605:9	530:23 532:11	623:6	544:18,23	uncommon
timing 518:17	534:15 535:6	traveling 526:11	545:3,12	588:23
567:9 570:4	535:8 539:25	treasure 526:15	547:10 549:4	underlying
today 500:7,12	541:15,17,18	treasuries	549:11,21	575:21,22
501:8 502:2	542:2 545:2	527:5 560:10	551:15 554:14	understand
512:11 513:7,9	546:12,25	566:22	554:17	508:5 580:16
517:5 518:2	548:2 550:3	treasury 527:3	557:20,21,22	584:18
522:6,25	550:11,20,23	527:7,9 532:4	558:5 563:1	understanding
523:5 526:8	552:21 553:7	532:9 542:17	564:1,1	518:23 522:17
FOC 44 FOT 40	557:22 559:6	542:20,24	568:20,23	524:25
526:14 527:12	557.22 559.0	J4Z.ZU,Z4	506.20,25	535:12 538:9

547:7 548:9	universe	useful 519:17	valuable 519:23	583:14
550:25 554:11	594:23	563:20	581:17	viewed 541:17
554:21 563:4	unknowable	uses 577:3,4,15	value 502:21	views 613:22
584:4 607:16	529:22	602:9 614:25	503:13,13,18	613:23
611:25 612:4,8	unrecovered	usually 525:1,7	503:22 504:6	virtue 519:8
612:13 624:25	518:6,8,13	Utilicast 584:10	504:11,21	volatility 507:18
understood	unsuited	584:12	506:12 513:8	530:21 531:9
503:5 574:1	595:10	utilities 532:2	531:20 533:9	546:7 566:9
590:10	update 501:10	533:5,11,13,21	533:16 535:14	566:20 571:11
undertaken	510:14 575:21	534:7 558:6	551:5 560:5	572:2
556:12	updated 507:11	563:5,13	566:18 571:7	volume 499:11
underwriter	510:14 526:11	567:2,15	576:7 581:13	591:7
535:22 540:11	567:1 575:23	571:22 572:7	582:3,14,20	
546:22,25	589:1	614:20	583:5 586:14	W
547:6,9,11,14	upfront 530:5	utility 514:11,13	587:6 588:7	WACC 509:20
547:16 551:6	541:23 548:1	514:18,22	596:10 602:14	wait 573:23
556:19 557:1	550:9 554:14	527:19 528:5	605:18 615:14	waiting 520:23
588:8 592:3,7	579:12,23	531:22 532:18	615:21 623:5	WAL 542:8
593:6 596:17	587:20	532:23 533:1	623:7 628:18	walk 526:24
597:19 605:6	588:23	534:15,17,20	variable 552:16	576:1
underwriter's	589:12	534:24 536:3	552:20 553:2	walked 608:3
586:25	urgency 567:8	536:18	553:6 579:21	want 501:14
underwriters	598:19	538:25	580:1,2 589:3	525:18
534:9,11,14	Uri 511:10	547:18 548:18	589:8,18,19	529:24
536:17 549:5	518:22 528:12	555:16,22	612:5	537:19 541:2
551:17 556:14	528:18 530:1	556:12 557:4	varies 605:22	563:16 565:11
556:15,17	536:24	560:15,24	variety 504:5	580:16 590:9
557:1,10	557:23	561:25	534:23	616:7,19
561:16,25	568:21 576:12	566:25 570:9	570:18	627:9
592:19 596:8	576:13,15,16	570:12,13	various 552:25	wanted 504:20
597:22 600:1	577:17,21,23	571:18,20,24	578:20,21	573:19 582:18
underwriters'	578:2,5,10,18	587:5 591:5	581:9,10	617:21
535:24	579:11 586:11	592:19	582:6 591:11	wants 596:6
549:14	589:14,16	594:20,21,24	594:4	wasn't 566:16
underwriting	590:5 600:24	595:4,16,18	vary 595:5	608:12 613:25
552:21 570:16	608:7 614:14	595:22,22	612:2	way 505:4
580:3 591:14	615:1 629:7	597:22	verbatim	513:24 525:13
599:7 605:10	use 503:17,25	599:24 602:2	499:21	531:14 562:21
undue 598:9	504:4 506:14	609:19 611:15	verified 599:20	565:11 571:23
unfolding	512:4 519:17	624:13,20	version 617:12	582:4 593:22
529:12	520:5 577:18	utility's 566:18	versus 513:25	598:6 599:21
unidentified	577:19 589:10	572:2 577:5	547:20	601:13 603:1
499:18	592:4 602:20	625:2	552:16 589:2	610:20,25
574:22	606:3,19	utilized 601:20	615:14 616:9	ways 558:21
union 595:5	607:18 613:18	utilizing 631:10	view 519:14	we'll 509:10
United 514:22	615:19 616:1,7	V	541:18 582:7	521:9 524:10 544:8 567:19
620:9	617:15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	viewable	544.0 507.13
1	•	•	•	

572:23 585:6	515:13,19,21	554:2,9,11	WOODRUFF	585:22,24
586:1 608:19	520:8,8	555:2,6,12,15	500:2,6,9,19	586:1.8,21
we're 500:6,10	540:21,22,24	555:18,21	502:7,12	587:8,14
500:12	544:6 565:1,2	556:6,9,15,22	506:19,22	588:6 589:1.6
529:10 561:22	565:4 580:11	556:25 557:7	509:10,15,18	589:20 590:4
563:9 581:19	581:23,25	557:10,14,24	509:25 510:5	590:12,19,22
583:23 616:2	585:11,12,23	558:3,14,20	510:8,11,16,18	591:10,17
617:18,25	608:25 612:18	559:11 561:5	511:1,7 512:3	592:23
630:15	617:6,9 621:14	561:24 572:17	513:10,15,18	593:10 594:8
we've 545:4	621:24 625:11	573:1,12 575:1	515:16,20,22	595:8 596:13
558:15 630:8	625:13 627:13	581:3 582:4	516:3 517:15	596:21 597:16
630:9,10	628:9,14	584:21 585:16	517:21 520:7	598:8,25
Webex 573:2	window 543:3	586:14 587:2	520:10,15,18	599:3,11,22
website 559:24	543:4	587:12,18	520:21 521:2	600:4,7,10,13
week 620:16	windows	588:13 589:4	521:6,9,15,20	600:21 601:11
	598:12			
630:7,13 weeks 525:10	598:12 winter 518:22	589:10 590:3 590:9,15,21	523:12,19,21 524:13,17	602:4 603:5 603:12 604:1
	530:1 577:17			
569:23		590:25 591:13 591:21 592:25	540:19 544:8	604:7,11,19
weighing 623:5	577:21,23	593:17 594:14	544:13 545:20 546:6	605:1,4,11,15 605:20,24
weighted 504:9	578:2,5,10 579:11 586:11			,
504:15 506:5		595:14 596:19	546:9,18,21	606:3,9,12
506:8,14	589:13 608:7	596:23	546:24 547:4	607:7,16
509:20,25	615:1	597:20	547:8,19	608:9,12,15,18
513:1 525:24	wish 529:3	598:10 599:2	548:9,14,24	608:24 609:1
526:7 537:2	559:15	599:5,14	549:2,12,19	610:4,9
542:9 566:24	withdraw	600:3,6,9,12	550:12,21	612:24 613:8
577:6,15,25	530:24	600:15,25	551:4,21 552:1	616:12 617:2,5
578:3,6 601:21 602:21	witness 500:18	601:16 602:7	552:4,9,14,24	617:8,13,24
	502:10 507:14	603:9,17	553:9,21,25	618:2,9 619:15
602:23 603:3	509:22 510:2	604:3,10,13,21	554:4,10,23	621:19 622:3
606:20 607:1	510:6,10,13,17	605:3,8,13,17	555:5,10,13,17	624:2 625:10
608:8 614:20	510:24 511:4,9	605:22 606:1	555:19 556:3	627:14,20
615:2,5	512:7 515:15	606:6,11,16	556:7,10,20	628:1,4,12,17
welcome 525:5	515:18,22	607:11,25	556:24 557:5	628:24 629:1
539:18	516:2 520:20	608:11,14,17	557:8,12,20	629:18 630:2
went 570:9	520:21 521:2	610:6 613:2	558:1,10,15	630:5
621:1,23	521:4,14,19	616:15 617:4	559:8 561:1,15	word 543:17
626:2	540:15 546:3	618:4,8 619:14	562:2,8	569:20
weren't 556:3,7	546:8,11,20	620:22	564:25 566:1	words 499:18
west 628:3	546:23 547:1	621:20 622:5	566:5 567:17	587:25 588:1
what-have-you	547:7,12,22	624:5,6	572:14,22,25	work 534:15,20
507:25	548:12,17	627:23 628:2	573:7,13	534:22
wider 560:11	549:1,8,16,24	628:6,8,25	575:18 580:9	537:20,22
wider 543:18	550:18,24	witnesses	580:18,22	538:17 546:14
Williams 500:21	551:10,24	500:5 629:2	581:24 583:10	553:22,25
502:4,10 512:10 22 24	552:3,5,12,17	wondering	584:18 585:1	554:1 558:12
513:19,22,24	553:3,18,22	519:24	585:6,9,14,18	567:25 574:11

	1	1	1	1
575:22	566:11,13	13-year 576:8	2016 625:25	577:8 578:7
587:22	yields 567:5	600:24 608:5	2018 546:1,5	578:13,15
598:22	588:20	615:19 616:1,9	606:4	595:8 600:22
worked 538:12	613:24	13th 630:6	2019 504:20	600:25 601:5
540:2 562:13		14 574:20,25	2020 510:13	614:15
563:7 570:14	Z	144-A 547:20	622:8	4.25 511:21
570:24		547:23 548:5	2021 508:9	4.28 526:17,23
working 511:15	0	548:16	511:11 621:3,11	4.65 509:20,23
561:9 626:7	0 543:9	145 564:3,4	622:7	615:1
works 599:21	02 501:24,24	15-year 579:4	2022 499:10	400 618:24
623:13	501:24	150 551:22	511:12 527:17	619:13,15
world 593:25	03 501:23,23	16 499:10	528:2 601:10	401 618:25
623:14		516:25 517:13	206 501:3	619:13,15
	11			019.15,15
worth 559:7	1 501:12 524:6	517:15 624:17 17 516:25 517:13	502:1,4,7 207 501:5	5
566:16	545:10 564:15			5 574:17
wouldn't 525:18	577:8,15	517:15 570:17	502:2,5,7	5.16 614:13,18
529:15 535:19	615:16	622:17 624:18	20th 630:7	614:23 615:4
536:23	1.3 545:7,11	17-G5 597:2,10	225,000	50 620:10
537:19 538:13	10 543:18 579:3	18 522:19,25	589:15	50 620.10
627:9	589:11 591:9	523:11,12	24 523:21,22	6
writing 556:2	10-minute	570:16	523:25 528:7	6 537:6 620:1,8
618:3	572:23	19 522:19,25	528:12	6.77 614:21
written 561:18	10:20 572:23	523:11,12	529:24 541:3	60 588:18,21
wrote 620:5	100 565:17	1997 565:19	541:9 545:5	00 300.10,21
	107 574:10	588:17	545:24 552:6	7
X	580:8,9		552:25	7 499:11 596:14
Y	585:14	2	572:12,14	620:8
veah 507:12	11 620:8	2 501:17 503:17	25 614:6,9	725 518:3
	110 629:5,11	507:5 574:17	623:23	75 515:12
508:17 528:10	112 629:6,10	574:17,20	25.7 582:21	552:10
528:10 564:19	112 02 0:0,10 114 629:12	575:1 576:5	250 541:11,15,16	552.10
564:21,23	115 629:12	577:18 602:9	551:10,23	8
585:4 596:19	116 617:19	608:3 614:3	565:7,13	8 501:11 574:25
615:9 616:4,15	629:10	615:7,18	255,000	575:2 578:13
624:17 626:5		2.47 503:17,25	540:13 569:12	578:15
year 525:21	117 574:11	504:25	25th 621:3	8:30 500:9
543:9,9 564:7	575:14,20	505:24 515:2		0.00 000.0
589:16 612:17	580:8,9,13	525:25	3	9
years 543:11	585:14 590:2	2.5 589:13	3 524:6 574:20	9 502:17 543:9
554:12,20	600:22 614:2	20 522:19,25	577:7,25	543:11 579:1,2
563:17 568:12	117-C 617:7	523:11,12	582:19,19	9:01 521:10
yellow 615:13	12 503:16	623:8	612:16,17	9th 510:19
Yep 614:4	529:19 620:2	200 565:10	615:10,16	524:8
yesterday	12-mile 622:13	2005 570:14	35 565:20	
515:12 524:23	13 543:11 554:12	2014 563:16		
526:11,14	554:20 579:3	568:7	4	
yield 506:12	620:2	2015 625:24	4 501:12,22	