

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
STATE OF MISSOURI

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Evidentiary Hearing

June 15, 2015

Jefferson City, Missouri

Volume 9

In The Matter of Kansas City)
Power & Light Company's Request) File No. ER-2014-0370
for Authority To Implement a)
General Rate Increase for)
Electric Service)

MICHAEL BUSHMANN, Presiding
SENIOR REGULATORY LAW JUDGE

ROBERT S. KENNEY, Chairman,
STEPHEN M. STOLL,
WILLIAM P. KENNEY,
DANIEL Y. HALL,
SCOTT T. RUPP,
COMMISSIONERS

REPORTED BY:
Angie D. Threlkeld, CRR No. 1382
TIGER COURT REPORTING, LLC

A P P E A R A N C E S

1
2 ROBERT J. HACK, Attorney at Law
3 ROGER W. STEINER, Attorney at Law
4 Kansas City Power & Light Company
5 1200 Main, 16th Floor
6 Kansas City, Missouri 64105
7 816.556.2791

8 FOR: Kansas City Power & Light Company

9
10 KARL ZOBRIST, Attorney at Law
11 Dentons
12 4520 Main Street, Suite 1100
13 Kansas City, Missouri 64111
14 816.460.2545

15 FOR: Kansas City Power & Light Company

16
17 JAMES M. FISCHER, Attorney at Law
18 Fischer & Dority, PC
19 101 Madison, Suite 400
20 Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
21 573.636.6758

22 FOR: Kansas City Power & Light Company

23
24 MARK W. COMLEY, Attorney at Law
25 601 Monroe Street, Suite 301
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
FOR: City of Kansas City, Missouri

CAROLE L. ILES, Attorney at Law
EDWARD F. DOWNEY, Attorney at Law
Bryan Cave
221 Bolivar Street, Suite 101
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
573.556.6622

FOR: Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers

DAVID WOODSMALL, Attorney at Law
308 E. High Street, Suite 204
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
573.636.6006

FOR: Midwest Energy Consumers Group

JOHN COFFMAN, Attorney at Law
871 Tuxedo Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63119
573.424.6779

FOR: Consumers Council of Missouri

1 ALEXANDER ANTAL, Associate General Counsel
2 301 West High Street
3 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
4 573.522.3304
5 FOR: Missouri Division of Energy
6 SEAN TSHIKORORO, Attorney at Law
7 1000 Independence Avenue Southwest
8 Washington, DC 20585
9 202.586.6918
10 FOR: Us Department of Energy
11 ANDY ZELLERS, General Counsel
12 Brightergy
13 1712 Main Street, Floor 6
14 Kansas City, Missouri 64108
15 816.897.1049
16 JAMES B. LOWERY, Attorney at Law
17 Smith Lewis, LLP
18 111 South 9th Street
19 Columbia, Missouri 65201
20 573.443.3141
21 FOR: Ameren Missouri
22 HENRY B. ROBERTSON, Attorney at Law
23 319 N. 4th Street, Suite 800
24 St. Louis, Missouri 63102
25 314.231.4181
FOR: Sierra Club
SUNIL BECTOR, Attorney at Law
85 Second Street, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, California 64105
415.977.5759
FOR: Sierra Club
THOMAS CMAR, Attorney at Law
Earthjustice
1101 Lake Street, Suite 403B
Oak Park, Illinois 60301
312.257.9338
FOR: Sierra Club
LISA PERFETTO, Attorney at Law
Earthjustice
48 Wall Street, 19th Floor
New York, New York 10005
212.845.7388

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

MARC D. POSTON, Deputy Public Counsel
TIMOTHY OPITZ, Assistant Public Counsel
PO Box 2230
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102
573.751.5558

FOR: Office of the Public Counsel

KEVIN A. THOMPSON, Chief Staff Counsel
NATHAN WILLIAMS, Deputy Counsel
CYDNEY D. MAYFIELD, Senior Staff Counsel
WHITNEY PAYNE, Assistant Staff Counsel
MARCELLA MUETH, Assistant Staff Counsel
COLLEEN E. DALE, Senior Counsel
200 Madison Street, Suite 800
PO Box 360
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102-0360
573.751.4140

FOR: Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Good morning. Today is June 15,
2 2015. The Commission has set this time for an evidentiary
3 hearing in the Matter of Kansas City Power & Light Company's
4 Request for Authority to Implement a General Rate Increase For
5 Electric Service, File Number ER-2014-0370. My name's Michael
6 Bushmann. I'm the Regulatory Law Judge that will be handling
7 this proceeding.

8 Some parties have requested to be excused from
9 portions of the hearing. Those requests from Sierra Club,
10 Brightergy, and Ameren Missouri have been granted. I was
11 notified that the attorney for the Department of Energy Federal
12 Executive Agencies has been delayed due to travel problems, and
13 so we'll probably push his opening to one of the mini openings
14 that occurs a little bit later.

15 Let's have the counsel for the remaining parties
16 make their entry of appearance.

17 For Kansas City Power & Light Company?

18 MR. HACK: Thank you, Judge. On behalf of Kansas
19 City Power & Light Company, let the record reflect the
20 appearance of Robert J. Hack, Roger W. Steiner, Karl Zobrist,
21 and James M. Fischer. Our contact information is on the
22 written entry form.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

24 For Commission Staff.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. Kevin Thompson,

1 Nathan Williams, Cully Dale, Cydney Mayfield, Jeff Keevil,
2 Marcie Mueth, Whitney Payne, Nicole Mers, and Hampton Williams
3 for the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,
4 Post Office Box 360, Jefferson City, Missouri.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

6 Office of Public Counsel.

7 MR. POSTON: Good morning. Marc Poston and Tim
8 Opitz, appearing for the Office of the Public Counsel and the
9 public.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Division of Energy.

11 MR. ANTAL: For the Missouri Division of Energy,
12 Alex Antal.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Midwest Energy Consumers Group.

14 MR. WOODSMALL: Good morning, Your Honor. David
15 Woodsmall appearing on behalf of MECG.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Industrial Energy
17 Consumers.

18 MR. DOWNEY: Good morning, Judge. Edward Downey,
19 Carole Hles, Diane Vuylsteke on behalf of the MIEC, 221 Bolivar
20 Street, Jefferson City, Missouri.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: City of Kansas City.

22 MR. COMLEY: Good morning, Judge Bushmann. Mark
23 W. Comley, Newman, Comley & Ruth, 601 Monroe, Post Office Box
24 20106, Jefferson City, Missouri, on behalf of the City of
25 Kansas City.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: IBEW Local Unions 412, 1464, and
2 1613.

3 Consumers Council of Missouri.

4 MR. COFFMAN: John B. Coffman, appearing on behalf
5 of the Consumers Council of Missouri.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And Missouri Gas Energy.

7 MR. ZELLERS: Good morning, Your Honor. Rick
8 ZELLERS here on behalf of Laclède Gas Company doing business as
9 Missouri Gas Energy, 700 Market Street, St. Louis, Missouri
10 63101. And at this point we would ask for Missouri Gas Energy
11 to be excused from the remainder of the hearing.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That request is granted. Thank
13 you.

14 I'd like you to -- ask that people in the audience
15 please silence your cell phones during the hearing today.

16 I'm sorry. Go ahead, from Brightergy.

17 MR. ZELLERS: Judge, Andy Zellers for Brightergy,
18 LLC.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Zellers. I
20 didn't see you back there. Didn't expect to see you.

21 All right. There's a preliminary matter we have
22 to deal with, a couple of pending motions. There was a motion
23 of Staff to late file its position statement. That motion is
24 granted.

25 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: There was a motion, MIEC and the
2 Office of the Public Counsel, filed on June 10th, a motion to
3 strike pleadings, reject tariff sheets, and strike testimony
4 relating to whether KCP&L is foreclosed from applying for and
5 receiving a fuel adjustment clause as a result of the terms of
6 a stipulation and agreement the Company entered into in 2005.

7 This has been a live issue in the case for months
8 and appears in the list of disputed issues identified by the
9 parties. Rather than ruling on the motion at this late date, I
10 will defer a ruling now and take the motion with the case.
11 Interested parties should question relevant -- relevant
12 witnesses and discuss the issue in their briefs.

13 As far as the order of witnesses today, my
14 understanding is we're going to try and stick to the order that
15 the parties have provided on the hearing schedule. With doing
16 mini openings in addition to the general openings today, it's
17 -- my hope would be that we would easily have the four
18 witnesses today testify; and if we're running ahead of time, it
19 would be nice if we could do a few of tomorrow's witnesses
20 since that's quite a lengthy list for tomorrow. We'll just
21 have to see how that goes.

22 Also, I think before we do openings, it would be a
23 good time for parties, if they have not already done so, to
24 have their prefiled exhibits marked so we can get that out of
25 the way. So if you would like to take a few minutes to do

1 that, why don't we do that now.

2 MR. HACK: Judge, if I may with one item?

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes, Mr. Hack.

4 MR. HACK: On the witness list for the policy
5 issues that are to start week two, KCP&L inadvertently omitted
6 Mr. Tim Rush, and we would ask that he go up after Mr. Overcast
7 on that -- that first day of week two.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That would be granted.

9 MR. HACK: Thank you, sir.

10 MR. FISCHER: Judge, we've -- we've given the
11 parties the exhibit list with the numbers. Do you want the
12 testimony brought forward with the numbers on it? Is that what
13 you had in mind or --

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That's what I had -- that's what
15 I was thinking we should do, if you haven't already done so.

16 MR. WOODSMALL: Your Honor, similar to KCP&L's
17 request, I just noted that Mr. Brubaker had filed testimony on
18 jurisdictional allocations but was left off the witness list
19 for July 1st. So his name should be listed there.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That was jurisdictional cost
21 allocations?

22 MR. WOODSMALL: Correct. Issue number 21.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And what was the witness name
24 again?

25 MR. WOODSMALL: Maurice Brubaker.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And he would appear after
2 Mr. Featherstone?

3 MR. WOODSMALL: That would be fine.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Request is granted.

5 MR. WOODSMALL: Finally, Your Honor, to the extent
6 it's necessary, I may come and go throughout this hearing, and
7 I would ask if I'm not here that I'll be excused?

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You are.

9 MR. WOODSMALL: Thank you.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And that would go for any other
11 attorneys. No need to make a formal request if you need to be
12 absent during a part that doesn't affect your client.

13 (Off the record.)

14 (Company Exhibits 100 through 138 marked for
15 identification.)

16 (Staff Exhibits 200 through 242 marked for
17 identification.)

18 (OPC Exhibits 300 through 312 marked for
19 identification.)

20 (MO-DOE Exhibits 350 through 355 marked for
21 identification.)

22 (Sierra Club Exhibits 400 through 403 marked for
23 identification.)

24 (Brightergy Exhibit 450 marked for
25 identification.)

1 (MECG Exhibits 500 through 504 marked for
2 identification.)

3 (MIEC Exhibits 550 through 559 marked for
4 identification.)

5 (DOE/FEA Exhibits 700 through 704 marked for
6 identification.)

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. I think we're done
8 with that. Why don't we go ahead and move on now into opening
9 statements.

10 First opening statement will be by Kansas City
11 Power & Light Company.

12 MR. FISCHER: May it please the Commission. Good
13 morning. This case is a request for authority to implement a
14 general rate increase of \$120.9 million, or 15.75 percent, for
15 Kansas City Power & Light's Missouri service area.

16 While the Commission approved a rate increase for
17 KCPL back in December -- or, excuse me, back on January 26th of
18 2013 in our last case, which was ER-2012-0174, since that time
19 the Company has been unable to earn its authorized rate of
20 return for the reasons that I'm going to discuss in just a few
21 minutes.

22 In this case KCPL seeks to increase rates to
23 recover significant capital expenditures since its last rate
24 case, including specifically the environmental retrofit of the
25 LaCygne plant and significant improvements at the Wolf Creek

1 nuclear power plant, and also reset the cost of service based
2 upon more current information and experience.

3 Now, the primary drivers of the rate increase,
4 from the Company's perspective are these: LaCygne represents
5 about \$47 million of the \$120.9 million increase, or about
6 39 percent of the case; the Wolf Creek investments represent
7 \$28.8 million of the rate increase, or about a quarter of the
8 Company's case; transmission costs represent \$16.6 million, or
9 14 percent of the Company's overall case; the other
10 infrastructure investments represent 17.1 million, or
11 14 percent; and property taxes represent 10.4 percent -- or,
12 I'm sorry, 10.4 million, or 9 percent of the increase.

13 And this chart up here that I put on the slide
14 kind of shows you in a graphic form what the major things are.
15 The blue is LaCygne, green is Wolf Creek, the orange is the
16 other infrastructure, and the transmission costs are in gray.
17 So you can kind of get a feel for what's really driving this
18 case.

19 The LaCygne plant has met its in-service criteria
20 agreed to by the Company and the Staff experts. The in-service
21 reports themselves were filed last week in EFIS. And as of
22 March 24th of this year, LaCygne Unit 2 and the common
23 equipment were in service. As of April 30th of 2015 LaCygne
24 Unit 1 was in service, subject of course to the Commission's
25 approval.

1 I'm very happy to say that the environmental
2 retrofit of the LaCygne plant has come in, it's been completed
3 ahead of schedule; and when all the costs are finalized, it's
4 expected to come in under its original budget. KCPL currently
5 expects the overall cost of the plant to come in at
6 \$1.15 billion, which is about \$75 million less than the
7 definitive estimate of 1.23 billion.

8 Now, I found in the Iatan cases that we've tried
9 here, it's difficult to really explain in words the magnitude
10 of these projects. So what we've decided to do is give you a
11 before and after picture of the project. And I put -- I put
12 exhibits on your -- on your desk so you can put them side by
13 side. But this is a before, the preconstruction picture. You
14 can see all the area out in front that is open. It's not --
15 there's nothing there. Well, the after picture shows you just
16 how much additional equipment was added at that site. So
17 before and after (indicating). Substantial amount. That's
18 what -- that's what the \$1.15 billion has purchased for
19 consumers of the Company. Before and after (indicating).

20 No party, with the exception of the Sierra Club,
21 has raised any questions at all regarding the LaCygne plant
22 upgrades. The Sierra Club is raising similar issues, though,
23 to those that were raised at the predetermination hearing in
24 Kansas. In that proceeding the Kansas Corporation Commission
25 rejected outright the Sierra Club's arguments and determined

1 that it was reasonable and prudent for KCPL to retrofit the
2 LaCygne plant. I think I'm going to leave, though, for the
3 mini openings more detailed discussion of the specific issues
4 that the Sierra Club's raising in this case.

5 Turning to cost of capital. In this proceeding
6 the Company is recommending a 10.3 percent return on equity,
7 utilizing the capital structure of Great Plains Energy, the
8 parent of the regulated utility. The Company's updated range
9 is from 10.0 to 10.6 ROE. Staff is recommending an ROE in the
10 range of 9.0 to 9.5, with a midpoint of 9.25, utilizing the
11 capital structure of 50.31 percent equity.

12 Now, in Surrebuttal Staff suggested that KCPL's
13 ROE should not be significantly different from the ROE
14 authorized in the recent Ameren rate case. We're going to have
15 some testimony, and we'll show you that we believe the recent
16 market changes justify a higher ROE than authorized in that
17 case.

18 Staff's recommendation is -- is not based upon its
19 underlying analysis of the Company's overall cost of equity.
20 Rather than relying on Staff's assessment of the actual cost of
21 equity, which I believe Mr. Marevangepo indicates he believes
22 is in the range of 7.18 to 7.96, which we find very low, rather
23 than relying on that analysis, he -- he arrives at his
24 recommendation by erroneously arguing that the cost of equity
25 has substantially declined since the Commission authorized the

1 9.7 ROE for KCPL in the last rate case.

2 However, we think the competent substantial
3 evidence will show that since January 2013 there's been no
4 discernible downward trend in the level of authorized rate of
5 returns for vertically-integrated electric utilities across the
6 country. In addition, interest rates are not materially
7 different from the interest rates prevailing from the -- at the
8 time of the last Company's case.

9 If we go to the intervenors, Mr. Gorman, on behalf
10 of the Industrial Intervenors, is recommending a 9.1 percent
11 ROE, within the range of 8.8 to 9.4. Mr. Gorman's low end of
12 the range is so low, though, that it's never been authorized by
13 any state commission, according to the reports of the
14 Regulatory Research Associates. As to Gorman's high end, the
15 9.4, only twice in history has a vertically-integrated electric
16 utility return -- received a return that low.

17 Ms. Reno, on behalf of the U.S. Department of
18 Energy and the Federal Executive Agencies, she's recommending
19 something even lower, the 9.0.

20 As you know, under Hope and Bluefield, the Company
21 is entitled to an ROE commensurate with the ROEs of other
22 companies of commensurate risk. Staff's witness acknowledges
23 that the recent ROEs for other companies have been in the 10
24 percent range. In fact, as noted in the Staff's Cost of
25 Service Report itself, the average ROE for electric utility

1 companies for the first three quarters of 2014 was
2 9.92 percent. That's what the average was for those first
3 three quarters.

4 Besides the revenue requirement issues themselves,
5 there's another very important aspect to this case. KCPL is
6 seeking to establish a fuel adjustment clause that recovers
7 fuel, purchased power, and transmission costs, and trackers for
8 the Critical Infrastructure Protection, which I sometimes refer
9 to as CIPs, the CIPs cyber costs, property taxes, and
10 vegetation management costs. These mechanisms are necessary to
11 provide the Company with a reasonable opportunity to earn its
12 authorized rate of return. Without them the Company will have
13 no realistic opportunity to earn the Commission-authorized
14 return.

15 Now I'd like to show you a very important slide
16 here. This shows you the earned ROE compared to the authorized
17 ROE. The red line up above is the authorized ROE over the last
18 seven years since 2007, and the blue lines show you the actual
19 earned amounts that the Company has earned. Now, the gap
20 between those two lines in the bar graphs, the gap there
21 between the earned returns and the authorized returns from 2007
22 through 2013 on that slide has resulted in an aggregate earning
23 shortfall for KCPL's shareholders over that period of
24 \$220 million, or about \$32 million on average per year.

25 The updated earnings results for 2014 show that

1 KCPL Missouri only earned 5.69 percent on equity, down from
2 last year's previous -- the previous year results of
3 6.5 percent return on equity. Of course, during that period
4 our authorized return was 9.7. So last year, although we had
5 an authorized of 9.7, we only earned 5.69. And the previous
6 year we only earned 6.5. And then this -- this gap is just
7 continuing to exist.

8 Now, some parties to this case will tell you that
9 the solution is for the Company to file more rate cases to
10 address the shortfall in earned ROEs. This chart covers a
11 seven-year period, from 2007 to 2013, and it reflects the
12 results from five general rate increases that were filed during
13 that period. So filing more rate cases is just not the answer.

14 A significant factor contributing to the earnings
15 shortfall for KCPL is that the Company is experiencing little
16 or no growth in its Missouri sales due to stagnation in the
17 population in the Missouri service territory, energy efficiency
18 initiatives, which we've been proposing, and solar
19 installations, conservation measures, and other factors.

20 Now, historically, KCPL, like -- like other
21 regional companies, have experienced low growth in the range of
22 2 to 3 percent annually. And in the past that increased kWh
23 usage on the Company's system has provided additional revenues
24 that exceeded the revenues that were established in the last
25 rate case. Utilities like KCPL were able to utilize the

1 increased revenues to offset the increasing costs that occurred
2 in the year after the rates were set.

3 However, today the Company is experiencing flat to
4 declining kWh usage in its Missouri territory; and this lack of
5 load growth, coupled with the fact that we have significant
6 cost increases largely driven by the need to meet government
7 mandates for SPP transmission costs, property taxes, and the
8 CIP cybersecurity compliance, those costs are -- largely
9 explain the reason why the historical regulatory model has not
10 worked since KCPL's last rate order and why KCPL continues to
11 have such a large shortfall in its earnings.

12 KCPL has not earned its last authorized ROE
13 because the costs have been higher and the costs that were --
14 that were included in the last rate case, while the revenues
15 have been flat. And I'd like to show you more specifically
16 what the costs were that went up.

17 The retail revenues first were down nearly
18 \$14.5 million, and the wholesale sales were down \$7.9 million.
19 But if you look on the cost side, the fuel and the purchased
20 power costs were up 13.7 million, transmission costs were up
21 6.9 million, and nonfuel operations and maintenance expenses
22 were up \$6 million. And there's a few other things.
23 Depreciation expenses were up 3.3 million, and property taxes
24 were up 3.9 million, while rate base was increasing
25 78.2 million.

1 I'd like to show you, though, the GMO performance
2 and contrast that. By contrast, KCPL Greater Missouri
3 Operations Company, which of course is KCPL's sister company,
4 they had their rates set at the same time that KCPL did in the
5 last case, and those rates became effective on the same date,
6 and they were authorized the same 9.7 percent ROE. That was
7 true for both of their divisions, the MPS division and the L&P
8 division where St. Joe is located.

9 Now, for that period the MPS division earned a
10 return of 9.76 percent, or very close to its authorized return,
11 L&P earned return on equity of 11.31 percent for 2013, and at
12 the same time KCPL Missouri was earning -- only earning
13 6.5 percent on equity. And if you look at the update, as I had
14 already mentioned, in 2014 that number has dropped to
15 5.69 percent.

16 Okay. So what are the reasons for the
17 differences? Well, there are really two. The differences
18 between GMO and KCPL are these: GMO had a fuel adjustment
19 clause in place in 2013, while KCPL Missouri did not; and in
20 2013 GMO experienced growth in billing determinates -- or what
21 I mean by that are customer numbers and kilowatt hour sales --
22 relative to the levels that were put in the rate case, while
23 KCPL Missouri did not.

24 KCPL's earnings in Kansas where it has a fuel
25 adjustment clause and the property tax tracker, were also

1 considerably better than in the Missouri jurisdiction.

2 For KCPL to have a realistic opportunity to earn
3 its Commission-authorized return, the Missouri Commission must
4 recognize that there's a disconnect between the change in
5 environment faced by KCPL and the historical regulatory
6 construct in the state. It's essential that the Commission
7 recognize this by either granting the authority for the modest
8 regulatory mechanisms that KCPL's requesting in this case or by
9 including forecasted amounts in the cost of service for SPP
10 transmission fees, property taxes, and cybersecurity costs.
11 Absent such actions by the Commission, KCPL's earnings
12 shortfalls that I showed you on that chart will continue to
13 persist, and it will have no realistic opportunity to achieve
14 its authorized rate of return.

15 In 2005 in the KCPL regulatory plan case, Case
16 E0-2005-0329, the Company entered into a stipulation and
17 agreement with a number of the parties to that case. That
18 stipulation and agreement included a provision that the Company
19 would not seek to utilize a fuel adjustment clause or a
20 single-issue ratemaking mechanism prior to June 1st, 2015. And
21 the Judge has already mentioned that there's a motion pending
22 on this topic. But in this case the Company is seeking to
23 utilize a fuel adjustment clause effective with the new
24 Commission-authorized rates, which will be well after June 1st,
25 2015. I think we're expecting the new rates to go into effect

1 at the end of September.

2 Now, some parties are arguing that the language of
3 that comprehensive energy plan stipulation precludes the
4 Company from asking for a fuel adjustment clause in this case.
5 We've addressed those arguments in testimony, we'll address
6 them in briefs, and we'll also address them in the opening.
7 But needless to say, we're not asking to utilize a fuel
8 adjustment clause until the new rates go into effect at the end
9 of September. Needless to say, KCPL is the only Missouri
10 electric company that doesn't have a fuel adjustment clause and
11 practically the only -- only integrated electric company in a
12 nonrestructured state across the country that doesn't have a
13 fuel clause. There might be one or two exceptions to that.
14 This needs to change.

15 I do want to address one aspect of the fuel
16 adjustment clause, however. The Company is requesting that
17 transmission costs associated with charges and revenues for the
18 Southwest Power Pool billings and transmission costs to buy and
19 sell energy be recovered through the FAC mechanism. In the
20 recent KCPL case, File Number EU-2014-0077, the Commission
21 denied KCPL's application for accounting authority order to
22 cover transmission costs.

23 While the Commission denied KCPL's request for an
24 AAO in that case, it indicated that the Commission -- excuse me
25 -- it indicated that the Company could include transmission

1 costs in the fuel clause in the Company's next rate case. And
2 I put paragraph 12 of that order on the board. The order
3 stated, The transmission expenses for which companies seek an
4 AAO are the type of expenses which may be collected through a
5 Commission-approved fuel adjustment clause authorized during a
6 general rate case proceeding.

7 Now, based on this Unanimous Order, KCPL believed
8 that this was the Commission's preferred approach to recovery
9 and tracking of transmission costs. KCPL certainly believes
10 it's appropriate to recover its transmission costs through an
11 FAC approved in this proceeding. Transmission costs are
12 directly linked to the Company's fuel and purchased power
13 requirements, particularly because of the new SPP-integrated
14 marketplace, which is also sometimes referred to as the Day
15 Ahead Market. Prior -- prior to the Commission's decision in
16 the Ameren rate case, KCPL understood that the Commission
17 considered it appropriate to include transmission costs in the
18 FAC, as it stated in that particular order.

19 KCPL respectfully requests in this proceeding that
20 the Commission allow KCPL to recover SPP transmission costs
21 through the FAC. However, if the Commission decides not to
22 include SPP transmission costs in the FAC, then KCPL would
23 respectfully request that the Commission approve a transmission
24 tracker in this proceeding. This is appropriate because basing
25 the rate allowance for SPP transmission fees on historical

1 levels with no ability to account for changes, which we all
2 know are going to be coming in that area, will lead to a
3 mismatch of costs and revenues with a significant detrimental
4 impact on the Company's earnings in the year after the new
5 rates go into effect.

6 But if the Commission decides it doesn't want to
7 authorize an FAC with the transmission costs included or if it
8 decides that it doesn't want to do a transmission tracker, then
9 there is a third alternative that we'd ask you to consider.
10 That alternative would be to include KCPL's forecast of SPP
11 transmission costs in base rates, subject to refund. This is
12 similar to the way the Commission treated fuel cost back in the
13 1980s when the fuel cost was held to be unlawful. In those
14 days the Commission included forecasted fuel in the revenue
15 requirement and then had a subsequent true-up proceeding to
16 review the actual increase or decrease in fuel costs. If the
17 fuel costs were higher than the actual costs, the difference
18 was refunded or credited with interest to consumers.

19 Property taxes are also outside the Company's
20 control and are a significant contributor to earnings erosion.
21 The adoption of a property tax tracker would be a tool that
22 could be used to reduce the frequency of rate cases. Property
23 taxes, as you can see from the slide, have been escalating over
24 the last five years. In 2009 they were 67.2 million, and in
25 2013 they have grown to 83 million. Based on this history of

1 property tax increases in each of the last five years, KCPL is
2 projecting additional property tax increases in the next few
3 years.

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Judge, can I interrupt here?

5 MR. FISCHER: I can take a question.

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Excuse me. I just want to
7 interrupt. Could you get me the numbers going back to 2005?
8 Because I know most properties I saw the county, a lot of them
9 dropped, dropped, dropped, and then they've been increasing
10 lately.

11 MR. FISCHER: Property taxes back to --

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I just want two thou -- just
13 so I can see a reference.

14 MR. FISCHER: Sure. We can --

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Does that make sense?

16 MR. FISCHER: We can --

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: All right. Thank you.

18 MR. FISCHER: We'll get that to you, Judge.

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Sorry for interrupting.

20 MR. FISCHER: No problem at all.

21 But, anyway, that's where -- that's what it shows
22 from 2009 to 2013, and we'll get you a broader view of that.

23 Now under -- under these circumstances, we believe
24 it's appropriate for the Commission to authorize a tracker for
25 property taxes that would both protect the customers and the

1 shareholders for increases or decreases. Again, that's an
2 alternative that would be to include forecasted property taxes,
3 subject to refund pending a true-up in the Company's next rate
4 case.

5 Another critical area is a Critical Infrastructure
6 Protection, which we call CIPs, and -- which relates to
7 cybersecurity costs. The Company is committed to and required
8 to comply with the NERC standards set out in the CIPs version 5
9 and subsequent versions of the CIPs standards. The cost to
10 comply will be substantial. And the Company is already
11 committed significant resources towards compliance. Going
12 forward those efforts and resources will be increasing. In
13 this case, the Company is requesting that the Commission
14 authorize it to establish a tracker for those costs. The
15 amounts above the costs will be included in base rates -- or
16 the amounts above costs that are in the base rates would be
17 tracked for recovery consideration in the next general rate
18 case.

19 Now, there's been a substantial amount of
20 testimony devoted to the FAC and the trackers that KCPL
21 requested. And the sheer volume of all that testimony, it's
22 easy to get lost in the details, and it's hard to plow through
23 it. I find myself getting lost in those details. But that
24 being said, I want to ask you to make one mental note, and that
25 is about what is not being said about SPP transmission costs,

1 property taxes, or the cybersecurity costs.

2 Not a single witness in this case, among all those
3 that are testifying in opposition to the Company's request, has
4 claimed in any way whatsoever that these costs are not
5 reasonable and that they're not necessary costs for providing
6 electric service, nor has any witness claimed that the
7 transmission fees, property taxes, or cybersecurity costs
8 should not be included in the Company's revenue requirement.
9 But the treatment that they propose will preclude the Company
10 from having the ability to recover all of those costs.

11 This is disallowance by process, from our
12 perspective. In other words, the process itself is what's
13 causing the disallowance. And if it's adopted by the
14 Commission, it will simply perpetuate the Company's consistent
15 poor earnings performance after the new rates are in effect.

16 I'd like to give you one big picture look, and
17 I -- that is a little hard to read, so let me pass out an
18 exhibit so you can look at it.

19 Judge, this gives you a big-picture look at where
20 the Company and the Staff cases stand at this point. So I
21 mentioned earlier, the Company's original request was for
22 \$120.9 million. With the estimate of the true-up impact
23 included, our current case now supports a \$128.1 million
24 increase. However, that doesn't reflect a settlement of
25 depreciation issues, which has been reached in principle, which

1 will lower that amount.

2 Now, according to the reconciliation, the Staff's
3 updated revenue requirement is 21.2 million, but that's before
4 the true-up proceeding where all the LaCyne costs will be
5 coming in. In its original filing, Staff has included an
6 estimate of \$65 million for the impact of that true-up
7 proceeding and their increase, when you included that, was
8 82.3 million to 91.3 million.

9 So, in summary, this case is important not only to
10 review the Company's revenue requirement, but it's also
11 critical to consider regulatory policies that will be used to
12 protect both customers and shareholders under the circumstances
13 that exist today.

14 Given the lack of meaningful growth in customer
15 count and usage and the expected increases in transmission
16 costs, property taxes, and cybersecurity costs, which no one
17 seriously disputes, this case is also largely about putting in
18 place regulatory mechanisms that will give the Company a
19 realistic opportunity to earn the authorized rate of return or
20 at least something close to what the Commission determines is a
21 reasonable rate of return.

22 Now, if the Commission believes that the
23 regulatory process should give utilities a reasonable
24 opportunity to earn its authorized rate of return -- and I
25 think that's something the law requires -- then it should not

1 adopt the views advanced by Staff, Public Counsel, and MECC,
2 among other parties, that will undoubtedly perpetuate a
3 regulatory system that will result in disallowance by process,
4 when there's clearly a better way that will protect the
5 Company's customers and its shareholders.

6 I appreciate very much your attention today. I'd
7 be happy to answer your questions. We have a lot of witnesses
8 coming up that will be able to answer the technical questions,
9 as well.

10 Thank you very much.

11 Judge, I don't know if I need to mark those as
12 illustrative exhibits or not, but I'd like to do that --

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Not unless you're going to offer
14 them.

15 MR. FISCHER: I was not going to offer them.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Then I don't think you need to.

17 MR. FISCHER: Thank you very much.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions?

19 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Yeah, just a couple.

20 Good morning. Thank you.

21 MR. FISCHER: Good morning.

22 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Let me start backwards with your
23 primary revenue requirement issues. You said that the
24 \$128.1 million revenue requirement doesn't reflect the impact
25 of the settlement in principle regarding depreciation?

1 MR. FISCHER: Yes.

2 CHAIR R. KENNEY: How much -- by how much would it
3 be reduced, approximately?

4 MR. FISCHER: Well, it depends on if you look at
5 it right now or at the time of the true-up. I understand that
6 it's about 7 to \$10 million. At true-up it will be 10 million.
7 Right now it's probably 7, depending on what part of the case
8 you look at.

9 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Okay. Let me -- let me turn to
10 the stipulation and agreement in E0-2005-0329.

11 MR. FISCHER: Yes, sir.

12 CHAIR R. KENNEY: The operative sentence is in 3B,
13 yeah, 3B, 1C.

14 MR. FISCHER: Yes.

15 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Single issue rate mechanisms.
16 And it indicates, and I'm paraphrasing or I'm abbreviating it,
17 KCP&L will not seek to utilize any mechanism prior to June 1,
18 2015.

19 MR. FISCHER: Yes.

20 CHAIR R. KENNEY: So the discrepancy is whether
21 filing the rate case prior to June 1, 2015 constitutes seeking
22 to utilize on the one hand versus actually not having the
23 mechanism in place until after June 1st, 2015.

24 MR. FISCHER: That's my understanding. I think
25 it's -- the record reflects I think it's June 15th, and we're

1 not utilizing -- we don't want to utilize it until
2 September 30. Our perspective is that that language does not
3 seek (sic) us from filing a case. It just seeks (sic) us from
4 utilizing it, which we're not -- we don't want to do that. We
5 know -- we've always said we didn't want to add the fuel clause
6 until the end of this case, and that would be September 30.

7 CHAIR R. KENNEY: And Staff's argument is that you
8 couldn't even file the rate case asking -- your rate case
9 shouldn't have even requested it?

10 MR. FISCHER: I guess that's their argument, yes,
11 and we'll be -- we've addressed that in testimony too.

12 CHAIR R. KENNEY: And so who's going to -- who's
13 going to speak to that?

14 MR. FISCHER: I think that testimony is in Darrin
15 Ives and in Tim Rush, I believe.

16 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Okay.

17 MR. FISCHER: And we'll have it in briefs as well.

18 CHAIR R. KENNEY: But it's a -- it --

19 MR. FISCHER: It's a legal question.

20 CHAIR R. KENNEY: It's a legal question; right?

21 MR. FISCHER: And we'll be briefing it, but we
22 want to give you the opportunity to ask questions if you have
23 any.

24 CHAIR R. KENNEY: And I will. But let me just ask
25 a few now. I mean, you -- you were a signatory it. You were

1 one of the lawyers on the case when it was --

2 MR. FISCHER: I certainly was, yes.

3 CHAIR R. KENNEY: -- negotiated. And Mr. Coffman
4 was Public Counsel at the time, and it looks like Dan Joyce and
5 Steve Dottheim represented Staff, but I'm guessing Mr. Williams
6 and Mr. Thompson may have been around at the time that that was
7 negotiated also.

8 If it's purely a legal question and there's an
9 ambiguity as to the meaning of the language, do we construe it
10 against the drafter? Who do we construe the ambiguous language
11 against?

12 MR. FISCHER: I don't think it's ambiguous, Judge.
13 But I think we all drafted it together, to be honest. Nobody's
14 drafted that. We spent -- we spent months and months in the
15 downstairs conference room working that document out. So I
16 don't think anybody could be considered the drafter.

17 CHAIR R. KENNEY: So you're all equal drafters,
18 and you all spent months and months and months, and you're all
19 good lawyers. This issue never came up in the course of these
20 discussions.

21 MR. FISCHER: Well, that was in 2004 or '5 when we
22 were first talking about that. It seemed clear to us that we
23 couldn't have one until -- we couldn't have a fuel adjustment
24 clause until after June 1st, 2015. We couldn't seek to utilize
25 one, we're not seeking to utilize one until September 30th.

1 CHAIR R. KENNEY: So this is all really going to
2 come down to the intent of the parties?

3 MR. FISCHER: I think it's going to come down to
4 how you interpret the language. But our intent was certainly
5 not to have one until after June 1st, 2015. As I stand here
6 today, we don't have one.

7 CHAIR R. KENNEY: All right. Okay. Let me just
8 ask a couple of quick questions about regulatory lag and
9 KCP&L's inability to earn its authorized ROE.

10 MR. FISCHER: Certainly.

11 CHAIR R. KENNEY: At one point you mentioned
12 declining load growth --

13 MR. FISCHER: Yes.

14 CHAIR R. KENNEY: -- declining to -- you know,
15 flat to declining load growth. Then you mentioned the NERC CIP
16 standards.

17 MR. FISCHER: Yes.

18 CHAIR R. KENNEY: But you also threw in there
19 solar installations and energy efficiency.

20 MR. FISCHER: I did that --

21 CHAIR R. KENNEY: You didn't put in -- it's not in
22 your -- you said it's -- verbally.

23 MR. FISCHER: I did, that's right.

24 CHAIR R. KENNEY: It's not in any of the
25 documentation. Are you able to attribute of how much of

1 your -- of KCP&L's inability to earn its ROE would be
2 attributable to energy efficiency and to solar installations?

3 MR. FISCHER: We might ask the technical experts.
4 I don't have a number that would do that, for sure.

5 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Who would be the witness to
6 direct that question to?

7 MR. FISCHER: Probably -- Tim Rush and Darri n
8 lves, again, would probably be the two that might be able to
9 get that information to you. We've got -- we've had, of
10 course, a lot of solar installations. And to the extent
11 that -- or Burton Crawford might be another opportunity. He
12 might have some information about how that's affected the
13 forecast.

14 CHAIR R. KENNEY: As a general proposition,
15 though, the bigger items are the lack of an FAC, property
16 taxes, NERC CIP standards, and vegetation management?

17 MR. FISCHER: Yeah, certainly the cybersecurity,
18 the CIPs, is the newest issue; and it's right around the
19 corner. We see that as a substantial increase, and we believe
20 that will have a significant impact on it. But transmission,
21 of course, is the big -- the big-dollar item.

22 CHAIR R. KENNEY: So the energy efficiency and the
23 solar installations would be a much less significant component?

24 MR. FISCHER: I think those have affected the load
25 growth, along with lack of population growth, and just the area

1 itself has not had load growth, and that's -- because there's
2 no load growth, there's no revenue growth. But yet we do have
3 cost increases that are just around the corner, right after a
4 rate case gets established -- the new rates get established.

5 CHAIR R. KENNEY: And GMO was able to earn its ROE
6 in both the MPS district and the Light & Power district?

7 MR. FISCHER: And KCPL was able to earn it in
8 Kansas where they had a fuel clause and property tax tracker.

9 CHAIR R. KENNEY: So would you say, then, that the
10 most significant component would be the presence or absence of
11 an FAC and the presence or absence of a property tax tracker?

12 MR. FISCHER: Along with the fact that there
13 wasn't load growth. But, yes, those -- from a regulatory
14 standpoint, those are the things that are absent.

15 CHAIR R. KENNEY: All right. That's all I have.
16 Thank you very much.

17 MR. FISCHER: Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: I have no questions. Thank
19 you.

20 MR. FISCHER: Thank you.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Mr. Fischer.

22 Opening statement by Staff.

23 MR. THOMPSON: May it please the Commission. You
24 will hear issue-specific opening statements prior to every
25 issue in this case, and so I will not detain you very long at

1 all at this point. There's a lot of witnesses to get through;
2 and the sooner we start, the better.

3 In this case KCPL seeks an increase in its retail
4 rates of 120.9 million. I was -- I was excited to learn just a
5 minute ago that it's actually 128.1 million. It's expanding as
6 time goes by.

7 The original increase, 120.9, is an increase of
8 15.75 percent. 15.75 percent. KCPL has 519,000 retail
9 customers, more or less, and about 275,000 of them, more or
10 less, are in Missouri. KCPL also operates in Kansas.
11 Currently, KCPL collects about \$770 million a year from its
12 Missouri customers. This case is KCPL's sixth general rate
13 case in Missouri since 2006. In 2006 KCPL got a rate increase
14 of 10.46 percent; in 2007, an increase of 8.4 percent; in 2009,
15 an increase of 16.1 percent; in 2010, an increase of
16 5.23 percent; and in 2012, an increase of 9.64 percent. Those
17 numbers add up to 49.83 percent. 49.83 percent. If you add in
18 the requested increase here, you get up to over 65 percent.
19 Over 65 percent for the increase of electricity, a basic
20 necessity of life. Maybe the fact that kWh sales are dropping
21 are because people can't afford them. Maybe that's what that
22 reflects.

23 But we're told that KCPL's load growth is not only
24 flat, it's declining. So it's selling less electricity, and
25 outside of any energy efficiency considerations. But KCPL

1 wants more money for less electricity. 88 percent of KCPL's
2 customers are residential customers. They will bear the brunt
3 of any rate increase that's granted.

4 So how are these residential customers doing? I
5 think that's a fair question. In the counties that compose
6 KCPL's service area, they continue to experience challenges in
7 the wake of the Great Recession, 2008 and following. Real
8 gross domestic product growth has been smaller in Missouri than
9 in the United States as a whole since the recession ended. In
10 fact, GDP growth was negative in Missouri in the year 2011.
11 Annual unemployment levels in Missouri are still higher than
12 the prerecession unemployment levels. The unemployment rates
13 for 2014 show that Missouri unemployment is leveling off near
14 6 percent. Nationally, however, there's a downward trajectory
15 that's continuing. So, in other words, Missouri is not
16 resolving unemployment as well as the nation as a whole. We
17 lag.

18 The number of jobs in KCPL's service territory
19 peaked in 2008, and it's still below 2004 levels. The current
20 economic outlook suggests that unemployment -- or, excuse me,
21 that employment, household income, and GDP will improve over
22 the short term. So there's some good news. There's some good
23 news.

24 From 2007 to 2013 the counties in the KCPL service
25 area collectively experienced an 11.47 increase in average

1 weekly wages, but this was somewhat lower than the overall
2 Missouri compounded increase in average weekly wages of
3 11.56 percent, and it's also about 9.1 percent below the
4 increase in the Consumer Price Index. So, in other words,
5 whatever wage growth has occurred has been less than the
6 increase in the cost of living. Life got harder between 2007
7 and 2013. Life got harder for people in Kansas City. That's
8 what that tells us.

9 During that same time electric rates for
10 residential customers increased 57.69 percent. Those rate
11 increase numbers we went through earlier, that was overall for
12 the Company as a whole. The impact of rate increases on the
13 residential class was higher. Was higher.

14 KCPL has also experienced inflationary pressure --
15 we understand that -- illustrated by a 17.84 percent increase
16 in the Producer Price Index for industrial commodities between
17 2007 and 2013. So prices are going up for Kansas City Power &
18 Light as well.

19 KCPL is requesting \$128 million on an annual basis
20 in additional revenue requirement. From 2007 to 2013 the
21 increase in average weekly wages for the counties in the KCPL
22 service area was less than one-fifth of the increase in
23 electric rates for those same folks. The increase in wages was
24 less than a fifth of the increase in electric rates.

25 If KCPL gets the 15.75 percent increase they asked

1 for -- and I guess it's actually slightly more now that the
2 numbers are higher -- average weekly wages will be less than
3 one-seventh. The increase in wages will be less than
4 one-seventh of the increase in electric rates. So maybe it
5 ain't so great living in Kansas City.

6 Mr. Ives, testifying for KCPL, had a lot to say
7 about regulatory lag. The Company, despite its best efforts,
8 cannot earn its authorized rate of return. Well, the cure for
9 what ails KCPL clearly is an FAC. No question about that. And
10 KCPL has looked across the state at Ameren Missouri, which
11 consistently earns over its authorized rate of return, and has
12 seen how an FAC has cured the regulatory lag problem there. I
13 mean, we used to have Warner Baxter in here with charts exactly
14 like the one that Mr. Ives showed us weeping, weeping into his
15 beer over their failure to earn their authorized rate of
16 return. Well, that's not a problem anymore. In the last
17 Ameren case, we didn't hear any of that. Mr. Baxter didn't
18 make an appearance.

19 So KCPL is asking for alternative regulatory
20 mechanisms, and Staff's response to that really falls into two
21 different categories. On the part of the FAC, our position is,
22 yes, that will solve your problem, yes, all the other kids have
23 one, but you made a deal. You made a deal; you could not seek
24 to utilize an FAC before June 15, 2015. Staff's interpretation
25 of that admittedly not so clear language is that they could not

1 ask for an FAC before the target date. Not only can they not
2 have one, they can't ask for one. That's our reading of the
3 language. You guys are going to have to decide what that
4 language means, what the parties meant by it.

5 They also want some other alternative regulatory
6 mechanisms. Trackers. They want trackers. They mentioned to
7 you a property tax tracker, cybersecurity tracker, they want
8 some help with the SPP transmission costs. Staff is opposed to
9 trackers, except in very specific, limited circumstances.
10 There are times when a tracker is the right regulatory tool to
11 use. Absolutely.

12 Let me give you a good example: When the
13 Commission imposed new and more onerous vegetation management
14 and infrastructure inspection obligations on these companies.
15 The Commission did that by rule. The Commission understood at
16 the time that this was going to cost the Company significant
17 money that they had not budgeted, significant amounts of money
18 that were not built into existing rates. And so the Commission
19 gave them trackers. Let's see how much this costs, and let's
20 make sure you recover that money in the next rate case. It was
21 fair and it worked, and it illustrates the right circumstances
22 in which to use a tracker. Staff says these are the wrong
23 circumstances. We're opposed to the trackers that KCPL is
24 asking for in this case.

25 Mr. Hevert is here. We're happy to see him. He's

1 sponsoring return on equity, as Mr. Fischer told you, of
2 10.3 percent. Recently you gave Ameren an ROE of 9.53 percent,
3 and we don't see any reason why you should treat KCPL any
4 better. That was the right way to go, and we urge you to go
5 that way with this Company as well.

6 Also notable in this case, Staff is taking a new
7 position with respect to rate case expense. Staff believes
8 that rate case expense should be shared on a 50/50 basis
9 between the ratepayers and the shareholders.

10 In closing, I will just say that Kansas City is a
11 beautiful place, the City of Fountains. Staff urges you to
12 make life just a little bit easier for the people that live
13 there. Staff suggests that KCPL should get a rate increase,
14 but no more than \$21.2 million on an annual basis. That's just
15 under 3 percent.

16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Just a couple, Mr. Thompson.
18 Thank you. I appreciate Staff's evolution.

19 MR. THOMPSON: We're always changing and growing,
20 sir.

21 CHAIR R. KENNEY: That's excellent. Let me ask
22 you a question about the seek to utilize language.

23 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

24 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Why not just say -- if the
25 intent was that KCPL wouldn't try to get it, just say they

1 would n't seek it?

2 MR. THOMPSON: There were a lot of lawyers
3 involved in those negotiations. And, frankly, they all get a
4 D. They get a D. We learned in law school that if you're
5 going to write a contract, make it clear, make it unambiguous.
6 Otherwise, all you're doing is building a landmine into the
7 path that you're going to travel across. Well, they didn't pay
8 any attention to that. They built a landmine into that path.

9 I was not part of those negotiations. I was
10 upstairs. I was -- I was an RLJ in those days. I'm not saying
11 I would have done any better if I had. Let me be quick to say
12 that. I'm just giving you the historical fact that I was not
13 part of that.

14 CHAIR R. KENNEY: So --

15 MR. THOMPSON: So I can't tell you what I think it
16 means --

17 CHAIR R. KENNEY: All right.

18 MR. THOMPSON: -- from experience.

19 CHAIR R. KENNEY: So seek to utilize versus simply
20 seeking would --

21 MR. THOMPSON: If they just used one of those
22 words, either seek or utilize, it would have been clear.

23 CHAIR R. KENNEY: All right. And then how do
24 we -- how does the finder of fact in law discern the meaning of
25 the language in an ambiguous contract? What --

1 MR. THOMPSON: Plain language.

2 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Plain language first. But if
3 it's ambiguous, then what do we look to?

4 MR. THOMPSON: Well, you try to determine the
5 intent -- intent of the parties.

6 CHAIR R. KENNEY: And what's the evidence we look
7 to to determine the intent of the parties?

8 MR. THOMPSON: The four corners of the document.

9 CHAIR R. KENNEY: That's if it's -- that's if it's
10 unambiguous. So, I mean, looking outside of the four corners
11 of the document, what extrinsic evidence can we look -- can we
12 properly look to to discern the intent of the parties?

13 MR. THOMPSON: I guess you could ask the lawyers
14 who were involved.

15 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Are you all going to put any of
16 those lawyers on?

17 MR. THOMPSON: We're not putting any on.

18 CHAIR R. KENNEY: All right. Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. THOMPSON: Sir, nice to see you.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Nice to see you. Have you
21 ever lived in Kansas City?

22 MR. THOMPSON: No, sir, but my son did. It's a
23 beautiful place.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Well, you just made
25 reference that things aren't good in Kansas City.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Well, that --

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I take issue on that,
3 because I've lived there for 30 years. The Royals went to the
4 World Series first time in 30 years.

5 MR. THOMPSON: I personally --

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Kansas City Chiefs --

7 MR. THOMPSON: -- was very proud.

8 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: -- playoffs again.

9 MR. THOMPSON: I was very proud. And you know I'm
10 a huge Chiefs fan.

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Oh, but, hey, we got some --
12 we have some great barbecue, don't we, Mr. Chairman?

13 CHAIR R. KENNEY: You do, indeed. And I've
14 sampled much of it, yes.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Yes, I know. I do take
16 issue with that.

17 MR. THOMPSON: I apologize.

18 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Things are good in Kansas
19 City.

20 MR. THOMPSON: They could be better.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: They could be better. I
22 just have one question.

23 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: You mentioned that since
25 2006 that KCP&L has had rate increases of about

1 49-point-something percent. If this would be included, it
2 would be over 60 percent. Is that an anomaly compared to our
3 other two utilities, electrical utilities, in this state or is
4 that pretty close to what they are doing?

5 MR. THOMPSON: It's close, but somewhat higher
6 than the same figures for Ameren Missouri. Is it --

7 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Are you saying it's higher
8 if they would get what they're asking or it's higher as from it
9 2006 till before this rate case? Because I think Ameren is
10 about 50-something percent. And if I remember, we just had --
11 Empire was about the same. So --

12 MR. THOMPSON: It's a little bit higher than -- as
13 we're poised here today considering a new rate increase,
14 looking back over what's already happened, the amount of the
15 increase for KCPL is higher than the amount of the increase was
16 for Ameren at the same point in that case.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Ameren, as I recall, was
19 47 percent.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. And then they're 49.

21 MR. THOMPSON: So it's close.

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Pretty close.

23 MR. THOMPSON: It's close.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: So it's not -- it's not that
25 unusual.

1 MR. THOMPSON: No, sir.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: We're finding that trait
3 around -- and I'm just reminded of a clip I saw, our president
4 of the United States 2007 campaign. Under his administration
5 he said electrical prices will most likely double. So, I mean,
6 and it's -- it's going that way; correct?

7 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

8 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Okay. That's all I wanted.
9 Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Good morning.

11 MR. THOMPSON: Good morning, sir.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: Just a few questions. Going
13 back to the 2005 stipulation, is it Staff's position that it
14 would not be a violation of the stipulation had KCP&L filed its
15 rate case June 1?

16 MR. THOMPSON: If that was the target date, then
17 yes, that would not be a violation.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: I don't understand what you
19 mean by target date.

20 MR. THOMPSON: Was it the 1st or the 15th? 1st?
21 Oh, yeah. 1st, that's not a violation.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. What if KCP&L's CEO or
23 some high-ranking officer stood up the day before June 1st and
24 said we intend to seek an FAC?

25 MR. THOMPSON: No violation.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Well, why is that?

2 MR. THOMPSON: Because it's not a formal filing in
3 front of the Commission.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: So where -- so by seek to
5 utilize you would say that it's implicit that that is before
6 this Commission?

7 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Going back to the -- to
9 the question that the chairman asked you. If we were to
10 determine that -- that looking at the four corners of the
11 document, the specific words in this provision and the entire
12 contract, and we were to determine that it's -- that it's
13 ambiguous and we have to go to extraneous sources and you're
14 not going to put on any of the lawyers who were involved in
15 negotiations, what extraneous sources should we rely on?

16 MR. THOMPSON: If the Commission were to request
17 that Staff put the lawyers who were involved in negotiating
18 that agreement on the stand for questions, we would be happy to
19 do that. In the case that we have currently planned based on
20 our prefiled testimony, we don't have those lawyers planned as
21 witnesses. But if the Commission requests, we will make them
22 available, to the extent they're still here.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Do -- do you believe the
24 language is ambiguous?

25 MR. THOMPSON: I believe it is, yes.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: And so in order to convince
2 us -- to convince the Commission as to the meaning of that
3 ambiguous language, what evidence do you plan to present?

4 MR. THOMPSON: Argument.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Argument based upon what?

6 MR. THOMPSON: Based upon the plain meaning of the
7 language. I think our argument is that the word seek -- the
8 appearance of the word seek in the sentence shows that it
9 applied to the act of asking for the FAC.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. I was -- I was
11 listening to your discussion of economic indicators in
12 Missouri, and I was a little confused -- well, in Missouri
13 compared to the rest of the country. Isn't Missouri's
14 unemployment below the national unemployment, and hasn't it
15 been so for the last five years?

16 MR. THOMPSON: That could be. The testimony that
17 I read was speaking of trends; and it said that Missouri had
18 leveled, while nationally it's continuing to drop. It didn't
19 actually say what the national figure was.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: Oh. I believe that's
21 relevant, don't you?

22 MR. THOMPSON: I do too.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: All right. Thank you.

24 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, sir.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Opening by Office of Public

1 Counsel .

2 MR. POSTON: May it please the Commission. I'm
3 Marc Poston, and I'm here on behalf of the Office of the Public
4 Counsel representing the roughly 274,000 customers served by
5 KCP&L. I won't address every issue this morning, but I would
6 like to discuss several issues.

7 You've heard the Company's perspective, which
8 reflects the perspective of the Company's shareholders, and
9 you've heard from the Staff. Now it's time to hear from the
10 customers that will pay for every dime of any increase that you
11 authorize.

12 And who are KCPL's customers? It's safe to say
13 that many, if not most, of KCPL's customers are Chiefs fans.
14 And so we can safely say there's thousands, if not tens of
15 thousands, of KCPL customers in this picture.

16 This slide gives you an idea of who will be
17 impacted by this -- the decisions made in this case. There's
18 241,947 residential customers. These include large families,
19 small families, retirees on fixed incomes, single mothers, the
20 poor, the wealthy, senior citizens, apartment dwellers, and
21 those living in single-family homes. But there really are many
22 more customers than 241,000, because one home may have a family
23 of two or a family of five or more. The population of the
24 counties where KCPL serves is roughly 1.3 million. So this
25 case impacts a very large number of people.

1 There's over 25,000 small businesses. These
2 include your mom-and-pop, family-owned businesses. There's
3 over 6,000 medium and large businesses. 81 large power users.
4 And combined, these are the customers that will impact -- will
5 be impacted by this case.

6 This table comes from Dr. Marke's testimony that
7 OPC sponsored. This table shows the hardships that a large
8 portion of the KCPL's customers are experiencing today. A
9 significant portion of these customers are in poverty;
10 20 percent in some counties, and close to 20 percent in many
11 counties. That's one out of five living in poverty. And the
12 struggles of KCPL's customers are also reflected in the high
13 number of past due balances, which is also around 20 percent,
14 one in five customers. And these same customers have been told
15 time and time again every year or every other year since 2007
16 to pay considerably more for their electric service through
17 constant rate increases.

18 KCPL's customers have endured five major rate
19 increases in the last eight years, and these were not small
20 increases. In 2007, 10.46 percent. The next year, 6.5. In
21 2009, 16 percent. Two years later, 5.25. And two years after
22 that, 9.6. And now here we are just two years after that
23 latest increase. And the result of these combined increases,
24 as you heard from Mr. Thompson, is the customers are paying
25 57 percent more than they were paying just eight years ago for

1 the same service. And that's an enormous increase. And now
2 KCPL wants to add another 15 percent. The result, if approved,
3 would be customers paying over 82 percent more than they were
4 paying in 2007.

5 It's hard to comprehend how someone in poverty or
6 living on a low fixed income can withstand another increase.
7 And if you consider the timing of these issues -- or these
8 increases, which began in 2007, this was when the country fell
9 into a recession. As KCPL's residential and business customers
10 struggled with the impact of recession, they were repeatedly
11 hit year after year with another rate increase. And today,
12 eight years after the start of the recession, the Kansas City
13 region has not recovered.

14 This is also from Dr. Marke's testimony, and it
15 shows jobs have only recovered 2 out the 13 counties where
16 KCP&L serves, unemployment rates have not recovered in any of
17 the counties, GDP only 2 out of 13, and home prices have only
18 recovered 1 out of the 13 counties.

19 And with each rate increase forced upon customers,
20 there are a number of customers that just can't keep up, the
21 straw on the camel's back. They're forced to go off the system
22 or forced to go deeper into debt. The public hearing comments
23 and the comments filed in EFIS attest to the struggles of KCPL
24 customers, the struggles they've endured since 2007, and their
25 frustrations with what have essentially been continuous rate

1 increases. And I hope you'll spend the time necessary to read
2 through every one of these comments.

3 So as the recession hit and people were losing
4 jobs, losing their homes, as businesses were closing their
5 doors, KCPL was increasing revenues year after year.

6 This slide, also from Dr. Marke's testimony,
7 compares the KCPL increases, the 57 percent they've received
8 since 2007, to increases in average weekly wages, which has
9 only increased 11.4 percent during that same time period. And
10 then the last column on this slide shows the increase that it
11 would be if you approve their increase here, 82 percent.

12 So despite this Commission granting KCPL a rate
13 increase every time they've asked for one since 2007, or maybe
14 because of it, here they are again. The impacts on the most
15 vulnerable of KCPL's customers -- customer base needs to be
16 considered with every issue brought to you in this case.

17 Unnecessary risk shifting from the Company to
18 customers, as KCPL seeks with several of its requests in this
19 case, demands thorough scrutiny by this Commission. And one
20 such attempt to shift risk on customers would occur if the
21 Commission approves KCPL's request to increase the residential
22 customer charge by 177 percent from the current \$9 customer
23 charge to a \$25 monthly rate and, therefore, shift risk to
24 customers that use the lowest amounts of energy. Most
25 low-income customers are low-usage customers and, therefore,

1 raising the customer charge would require low-income customers
2 to pay a disproportionate share of any increase authorized.

3 The testimony of OPC's witness, Dr. David
4 Dismukes, explains how KCPL's high customer charge proposal is
5 contrary to cost causation principles. In fact, KCPL's own
6 cost study is inconsistent with how it now claims those costs
7 should be recovered from ratepayers. And one major flaw in the
8 KCPL's customer charge proposal is that it wrongly assumes that
9 all residential customers have the same level of demand. This
10 is simply not true. The electricity demand from a widowed
11 senior citizen living alone in an efficient apartment with few
12 appliances is only a small fraction of the electricity demand
13 from a family of five living in a 5,000-square-foot home.

14 The current rate structure with a \$9 customer
15 charge and most revenue recovery through a rate based on energy
16 usage recognize these differences. KCPL's proposal would hit
17 hardest on those trying to cut back on their usage and those
18 low-income customers that are forced to use as little
19 electricity as possible because they simply can't afford it.

20 KCPL wants you to approve a customer charge unlike
21 any other customer charge in the country. And the evidence
22 presented in this case will show you that KCPL's customer
23 charge is already in line with customers charges of other
24 electric utilities in the region and in the country. And
25 here's a sampling of these. This is also from Dr. Marke's

1 testimony.

2 And, as you know, the same issue came up in the
3 Ameren rate case, and there the issue was in regard to a much
4 smaller increase, from \$8 to 8.50. In response to this 50 cent
5 request, the Commission made it clear that an increase in the
6 customer charge is not in the public interest. And this is a
7 quote from the Commission's order. And that order became
8 effective just one month ago. Nothing has changed to make
9 these findings any less applicable here than to KCPL. And the
10 mere fact that KCPL is seeking a higher charge than Ameren
11 sought should not impact these findings since they're not
12 influenced by how much the utility wants to charge.

13 As you will see, each factual reason KCPL witness
14 Mr. Tim Rush gives for a \$25 customer charge is clearly refuted
15 by the facts as presented in the testimony of the OPC witnesses
16 Dr. Dismukes and Dr. Marke. Maintaining a \$9 customer charge
17 will continue allowing customers to have greater control over
18 their bills for economic and conservation purposes, as the
19 Commission found in Ameren, and it's clearly in the public
20 interest.

21 Another issue that raises public interest concerns
22 is KCPL's electric vehicle charging station proposal, which I
23 don't believe they even raised in their opening. What KCPL
24 asks in this case will set in stone a regulatory approach to
25 the issue from now on. While the Commission doesn't make legal

1 precedent in these opinions, the practical impact will be just
2 as consequential as a court decision. How and whether this
3 Commission regulates electric vehicle charging stations is at
4 issue in this case. And the consequences of that choice, if
5 this Commission decides the issue is ripe, will be substantial,
6 maybe not immediately but in the years and decades to come.

7 Is it in the best interest of the public to allow
8 a regulated monopoly to extend its monopoly into a new area of
9 service? Is that area of service, that market, competitive
10 already? If so, why allow one market participant the
11 substantial advantages associated with having its captive
12 ratepayers ensure its investments in infrastructure deployment.

13 We have convenience store operators and others in
14 this state who strongly believe in fuel choice, and I suspect
15 they would object to the State through this Commission
16 sanctioning a competitive advantage like that. If the market
17 is not competitive now, because we defined it not competitive
18 based on fuel but on the type of vehicle, do we want to
19 establish a situation in which that market will never be
20 competitive in KCPL's service territory? Is that the best way
21 to protect customers in the future?

22 OPC does not believe this issue, with so many
23 substantial policy implications, is best decided in this rate
24 case. This issue should be addressed in a separate case,
25 perhaps a working docket, one not complicated by a pending rate

1 case, wherein these questions and a long list of unanswered
2 questions regarding program design, goals, scope, risk
3 shifting, cost benefit analysis, subsidies, and other
4 policy-related issues can be examined appropriately. None of
5 these issues have been addressed by KCPL's very late and
6 unstudied addition of this issue into the case.

7 Even if we step down a bit from these substantial
8 questions of public policy and get back into the realm of more
9 familiar -- more familiar to a rate case, the proposal to
10 recover expenses in rates remains horribly ill-advised.
11 Requiring ratepayers, especially the low-income ratepayers, to
12 pay for a service that is available only to the wealthiest of
13 KCPL's customers is plain wrong and would only increase the
14 heavy burden that these ratepayers have -- have had to endure
15 since 2007.

16 KCPL's proposing this initiative for one reason
17 only, to increase profits for their shareholders while
18 increasing load and growing the rate base upon which it
19 calculates its ROE. Instead of shouldering any of the risk of
20 this very speculative endeavor, KCPL wants its customers to
21 carry all the risk.

22 And as you know, KCPL's surprising intervenors in
23 this case with this last-minute proposal, offered four months
24 after the Company filed its initial case, and we've all done
25 our best to develop responses to the proposal. The main thing

1 I'd like you to think about with regard to that is the number
2 of unanswered questions and how this request is very premature
3 in that regard. And so we ask that you keep any costs related
4 to KCPL's electric vehicle charging station out of rates and
5 open a working docket to work through the many substantial
6 policy issues regarding that proposal.

7 In the end it may be in the customer's best
8 interest for the electric vehicle charging stations to be
9 deployed by regulated utilities with tariffed rates and all the
10 benefits and burdens that come from the Commission process, or
11 it may be in the customers' best interests for Missouri to
12 choose not to expand the scope of the Commission's regulatory
13 regime, which is itself a drastic exception of free market
14 principles. It may be best for customers here to let the free
15 market develop on its own and let the market choose the winners
16 and losers, without ratepayers ensuring one privileged actor
17 over all the others. And we need our policymakers in this
18 building, and perhaps in the capitol, to take the time to make
19 this weighty and consequential determination correctly, and
20 it's not best made in this rate case.

21 Another request that's not in the public interest
22 is KCPL's request for a fuel adjustment clause. MIEC and OPC
23 filed a motion last week to strike KCPL's pleadings, tariff
24 sheets, and testimony regarding the FAC. It's our position
25 that KCPL's request for an FAC violates the agreement KCPL

1 entered into and that the Commission ordered KCPL to follow
2 where they agreed prior to June 1st, 2015 they would not seek
3 to utilize an FAC. And KCPL's October rate case filing does
4 just that; it seeks to utilize an FAC. And KCPL would rather
5 the Commission ignore the words seek to -- I've got the
6 language here on the slide -- and read the passage as if it
7 says prior to June 1st, 2015, KCPL will not utilize an FAC.
8 And here I've modified the language as KCPL would have you read
9 it.

10 That's not what it says. The words seek to have
11 meaning. There isn't any other way to interpret this language.
12 I do not think it's ambiguous at all. To interpret it as KCPL
13 proposes would be to remove these two words. The purpose of
14 this language with the seek to included is to keep an FAC
15 proposal out of any rate case filed before June 1st. Yet here
16 we are fighting over an issue we should not be spending
17 resources on.

18 Because of this agreement, KCPL's testimony,
19 pleadings, and tariff sheets that seek an FAC should be
20 stricken. This would eliminate 21 FAC issues to be decided by
21 the Commission in this case. It would eliminate one-fourth of
22 the overall issues in this case. And since KCPL's pattern of
23 filing rate cases is every year or every other year, it won't
24 be long after this case before they'll file their next rate
25 case, and they can request an FAC at that time and not be in

1 violation of the agreement or the Commission's order. But if
2 the Commission allows this issue to be heard, the FAC request
3 should be denied because KCPL has not met its burden that an
4 FAC is necessary.

5 Public Counsel witness, Ms. Lena Mantle, will be
6 able to answer your questions over this issue. Her testimony
7 explains the criteria to be considered with an FAC request and
8 how KCPL has not satisfied that criteria. Her testimony
9 explains how KCPL has not provided sufficient descriptions of
10 the costs and revenues it would include in an FAC. These are
11 not minor details that should be left to the Company. Each
12 cost and revenue should be known and approved. This is, after
13 all, single-issue ratemaking, and it deserves the greatest
14 scrutiny possible.

15 Ms. Mantle's testimony also shows how KCPL's fuel
16 and purchased power costs have been constant recently with
17 little variation. She also shows how the Company's management
18 has substantial control over the contracts it enters into for
19 fuel and purchased power. She also explains how an FAC would
20 shift an unreasonable amount of risk to the customers. The
21 Company essentially wants this Commission to agree that it
22 would be unreasonable for the Company to face any risks
23 associated with changes in fuel and purchased power, and in
24 that same order conclude that it would be reasonable for KCPL's
25 customers to instead bear that risk.

1 And given what the Company's customers have
2 endured in terms of continuous rate increases, adding another
3 rate to a customer's bill that changes between KCPL's already
4 constant stream of rate increases is too much to ask,
5 especially at this time.

6 And given the fact that an FAC greatly reduces the
7 Company's incentive to control fuel and purchased power costs,
8 it's simply not in the public interest to grant an FAC to
9 KCP&L. This Commission rejected Ameren's first FAC request,
10 and it should do the same here for KCPL, and for the same
11 reasons; it's not necessary and would, therefore, unnecessarily
12 shift risks to customers.

13 KCPL also requests a number of trackers. Public
14 Counsel's witness, Ted Robertson's Surrebuttal Testimony
15 provides the Commission with a good overview of trackers and
16 tracker policy. They request multiple trackers for property
17 tax, vegetation management, cybersecurity, and transmission
18 fees. Mr. Addo, Public Counsel witness, explains multiple
19 reasons why a tracker should be rejected. And while the
20 reasons to deny each request vary slightly, they all have a
21 number of reasons in common -- common for denial: The expenses
22 are predictable, and including annualized amounts in base rates
23 allows recovery of a normal ongoing expense; trackers provide a
24 disincentive to the utility to control costs; the claims of
25 increased costs are speculative; trackers violate the matching

1 principle; and they constitute single-issue making --
2 ratemaking, because they allow cost recovery without
3 considering all relevant factors during the period the costs
4 were incurred.

5 So denying these tracker requests would also be
6 consistent with the Commission's findings and conclusions in
7 the recent Ameren case where the Commission rejected Ameren's
8 unnecessary tracker requests.

9 I'd like to move on to rate case expense.
10 Regarding rate case expense, we propose that customers not be
11 required to pay all of KCPL's rate case expenses, for the same
12 reasons explained in Commissioner Hall's concurrence filed last
13 week in the Ameren case. And I've just included bullet points,
14 and I hope I paraphrased -- paraphrased these correctly. And
15 Public Counsel's witness, William Addo, includes a breakdown in
16 his testimony of KCPL's rate case expenses, expenses incurred
17 to date. He proposes prudence disallowances for excessively
18 hour -- excessive hourly rates for the high-priced attorneys
19 retained by KCPL and for consultants that cover topics already
20 covered in testimony by KCPL employees. After removing the
21 imprudent costs, he recommends an equal sharing of the
22 remaining rate case expenses. He explains how a 50/50 sharing
23 is reasonable because shareholders benefit from a rate case by
24 way of an approved -- approved return on their investments, and
25 customers benefit by improvements in service.

1 The Commission Staff also recommends an equal
2 sharing. They say 50/50 is appropriate, as Staff puts it,
3 because it creates an incentive and eliminates a disincentive
4 on the utility's part to control rate case expenses to
5 reasonable levels. And it's also appropriate because consumers
6 already pay all the rate case expenses incurred by the
7 Commission, all the rate case expenses incurred by the
8 Commission Staff, and all the rate case expenses incurred by
9 Public Counsel. Customers should not have to also pay all the
10 rate case expenses incurred by KCPL, while KCPL's investors,
11 who benefit most from a rate case, pay nothing. A 50/50 split
12 introduces a level of fairness into these expenses.

13 The last thing I'll say about rate case expenses
14 that -- I believe it was Chairman Kenney in the Ameren case,
15 questioned whether a rule was the best place to consider a
16 50/50 sharing of rate case expense. But a Commission order
17 requiring a sharing need not be done by rulemaking, as long as
18 the record supports sharing and supports the amount of sharing.
19 The evidence presented in this case by the Public Counsel and
20 the Commission Staff supports a 50/50 sharing, and such sharing
21 can be ordered for KCPL and applied specifically to KCPL.

22 The last issue I will address is return on equity.
23 This slide shows the four ROE proposals. The three proposals
24 on the left obviously are more consistent with each other, and
25 then there's KCPL's proposal on the right. And if you'll

1 notice, this chart begins at 8 percent and shows only proposed
2 ROE percentage above 8 percent. This is because 8 percent is
3 what the Commission Staff included was the high end of the true
4 cost of equity. And that makes sense, too, because an electric
5 company like KCPL is a safe investment. Electric utilities
6 provide a service that we all need to light our homes, to cool
7 our homes, to power our TVs, computers, phones, washing
8 machines, that is, for those of us that can afford those
9 things.

10 It's also a safe investment because the Company
11 itself estimates that it's going to continue gaining customers
12 through at least 2019. And this is a graph from Dr. Marke's
13 testimony, and it shows over a ten-year period the Company has
14 been growing. The Company also predicts the average customer
15 usage will also continue to rise. Those numbers are also in
16 Dr. Marke's testimony.

17 KCPL is a good investment. They provide a service
18 we all use for our homes and businesses, a service we will
19 continue using and using more of, and they have a complete
20 monopoly on the market. So they have no competition, no
21 alternatives for their captive customer base. And unlike any
22 other industry, if things go poorly for the Company, they can
23 and do come here and request a rate increase. And if they get
24 it, and they usually do, there's little a customer can do but
25 pay or try to cut back on their usage, which is difficult to

1 do, or they can drop off the system.

2 And even if things aren't going poorly for KCPL,
3 they can still come here and ask for more. And given the fact
4 that they have more attorneys and consultants and consultants
5 on top of consultants and attorneys on top of attorneys, KCPL
6 can throw more resources into every rate increase than every
7 other party in the case, and this gives the Company an
8 excellent chance of walking away with some reward for their
9 efforts each and every time.

10 It's a safe investment, and it makes sense that
11 the 8 percent set by Staff is the high end of what -- the
12 costs. Mr. Gorman, in his testimony on ROE, concludes that,
13 The market continues to embrace the regulated utility industry
14 as a safe haven investment and views utility equity and debt
15 investments as low risk securities.

16 So we urge the Commission on behalf of KCPL's
17 customers to grant KCPL no more than 9 percent, which is within
18 the range recommended by three different expert witnesses.
19 Mr. Gorman's range was 8.8 percent to 9.4, Staff's range was
20 9.0 to 9.5, and 9 percent is right at the range recommended by
21 the U.S. Department of Energy.

22 Mr. Gorman states it best when he says that his
23 ROE recommendation will mitigate the claimed revenue deficiency
24 in this proceeding by providing KCPL fair compensation with the
25 lowest cost to customers. And that's really the goal here, to

1 authorize an ROE that is fair for the Company and lowest cost
2 for customers. A win-win.

3 And it's important to keep in mind that these
4 recommendations are not based upon KCPL having an FAC or any
5 other risk-shifting tracker mechanism proposed by KCPL that, if
6 approved, would pass on more risk to customers. So if you
7 grant any one of these tracking mechanisms, including the FAC,
8 this shift of risk to KCPL's customers would certainly justify
9 an ROE of 9 percent or even less, because customers will be
10 shouldering more substantially more risk than they do
11 currently.

12 These are the issues we wanted to raise in this
13 general opening, and we'll provide more comments in the
14 openings before each issue.

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Mr. Poston, thank you. Does the
17 Office of Public Counsel offer or has it ever offered a rate
18 mechanism applicable to low-income customers that would cap the
19 amount that they pay as a percentage of their income or some
20 other type of alternative proposal for low-income customers?

21 MR. POSTON: I'm not aware of any at the moment.
22 I can try to find -- I can dig and get an answer to that.

23 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Does Office of Public Counsel
24 have any opinion on whether such a rate would lower the number
25 of customers that have arrearages and/or the amount of bad debt

1 that the Company writes off?

2 MR. POSTON: I mean, that would be the hope, that
3 any mechanism would do those things. I would encourage you to
4 ask those questions of Dr. Marke or Dr. Dismukes that will be
5 up here tomorrow.

6 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Thank you. The language from
7 the stipulation, seek to utilize versus utilize, you said it's
8 not ambiguous. Let's -- let's take me at my word that it is
9 ambiguous.

10 MR. POSTON: Okay.

11 CHAIR R. KENNEY: What do we look to for evidence
12 of the intent of the parties?

13 MR. POSTON: Well, I agree with what Mr. Thompson
14 said, you look within the document itself, and then you -- then
15 you look outside the document, if the document itself doesn't
16 provide you with the guidance.

17 CHAIR R. KENNEY: What things outside of the
18 document do you propose that we look to?

19 MR. POSTON: I believe there are Staff witnesses
20 or Staff employees that were involved in that process that
21 perhaps be called.

22 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Any OPC witnesses to whom I
23 should direct questions about it?

24 MR. POSTON: I don't think there was anyone in our
25 office that was involved in that that are still here. Perhaps

1 Mr. Robinson, but I don't know to what extent he may have been
2 involved in it.

3 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Do you have any -- do you intend
4 to put any witnesses on regarding -- that would offer extrinsic
5 evidence to the meaning of the language?

6 MR. POSTON: We have not intended to do that to
7 this point. We'll certainly be talking about that --

8 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Think about that.

9 MR. POSTON: -- when I go back to the office, yes.

10 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Okay. Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: Just a few. Thank you.

13 Mornin g.

14 MR. POSTON: Mornin g.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Starting with the clean charge
16 network.

17 MR. POSTON: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand OPC's position to
19 be that that -- that that issue is not appropriate for
20 determination in this proceeding and we should take that up
21 either in the working docket or some further -- some case down
22 the line where we can accumulate more information and evidence;
23 is that --

24 MR. POSTON: That's correct.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, let me ask you about

1 whether or not OPC has a legal analysis or a legal position on
2 whether or not it would be legal for the Commission to put that
3 item into rates.

4 MR. POSTON: We have not done analysis of that.
5 We do intend to hit that in our brief. When that issue comes
6 up, if you'd like, I can perhaps do a -- explain a little more
7 at that time. We have not done that analysis at this point in
8 time.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Turning to the 2005
10 agreement, I think -- I think you make a fairly persuasive
11 argument that KCP&L's position on this provision reads out a
12 couple words in the provision, but I think you can also take it
13 the other way. Aren't you -- doesn't your interpretation,
14 doesn't your -- and doesn't the interpretation of Staff and
15 some of the other parties to this case take out the words to
16 utilize? So your analysis is it will not seek any mechanism
17 authorized in current legislation?

18 MR. POSTON: No, I don't -- I don't think so. I
19 think -- well, you can't really remove the words utilize, and
20 there has to be some type of a word there to explain what it is
21 the Company can't seek to do.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, it seems to me that your
23 position is that KCP&L agreed not to seek a mechanism, not to
24 seek an FAC prior to June 1.

25 MR. POSTON: Right.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, it seems to me that that
2 interpretation reads out of the provision to utilize.

3 MR. POSTON: I disagree. I think -- I mean, I
4 disagree. I think that you needed to have something in there
5 explaining what it was that they weren't allowed to seek, and
6 so they can't allowed (sic) to seek to use one of those --

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I think --

8 MR. POSTON: -- mechanisms.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: -- you can go right to the
10 noun, but that's okay.

11 Let me ask you this: The second sentence of that
12 paragraph explains what -- what KCP&L is receiving, what
13 KCP&L's consideration was for making the promise not to seek an
14 FAC. And I'm wondering if OPC has any legal argument as to the
15 lack of parallel language between those two provisions? In
16 the -- in the second sentence it makes it clear that the key
17 is -- the key date -- the key action is filing a rate case
18 before June 1, is what -- is what the second provision allows
19 for. That is not contained in the first sentence. I'm
20 wondering if you have any position as to why that might be?

21 MR. POSTON: I don't at this -- at this time. I
22 don't have it in front of me, but I will study that and provide
23 you with analysis of that.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. I have no further
25 questions. Thank you.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't we take a short break.
2 We'll be in recess until 10:30.

3 (Off the record.)

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's go back on the record.
5 Before we get to the next opening statement, Mr. Poston, I
6 think you said you had a brief clarification to state.

7 MR. POSTON: Yes, thank you, Judge.

8 When I was asked the question about whether we had
9 a witness we were putting up that was there at the time this
10 was drafted and I said no, I was thinking of Public Counsel
11 employees at the time. But Rita Mantle has testified on FAC.
12 She was there at the time. She is our witness in this case
13 now. And to the extent the Commission thinks there was some
14 ambiguous language there, she can help clarify that.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. Thank you.

16 Next opening would be Missouri Division of Energy.

17 MR. ANTAL: May it please the Commission. My name
18 is Alex Antal, and I will be giving the opening for the
19 Missouri Division of Energy.

20 Division of Energy has filed testimony on six
21 issues in this case. These issues include the residential
22 customer charge, time-of-use rates, KCPL's clean charge network
23 pilot program proposal, economic development riders, standby
24 tariff rates, and low income weatherization cost recovery.

25 I'll take this time to state Division of Energy's

1 positions on these issues and briefly explain why these are our
2 positions, and we'll save more detailed comments for the issue
3 openings.

4 Division of Energy's first issue is the
5 residential customer charge. DE recommends that the
6 residential customer charge not be increased and, to the extent
7 that any revenue increase is approved, that that increase
8 should be applied to the residential energy charges.

9 Division of Energy contends that the Company's
10 proposal to increase residential customer charges in this rate
11 case should be rejected because the proposal is inconsistent
12 with energy efficiency goals noted by this Commission in its
13 report and order in both the -- both KCPL's last general rate
14 case and in the recent Ameren Missouri rate case, as well as
15 the proposal's inconsistency with the policy goals of the
16 Missouri Energy Efficiency Investment Act. KCPL's proposal
17 also fails to adequately address potential impacts on
18 low-income customers.

19 Division of Energy's second issue is in regards to
20 time-of-use rates. KCPL has proposed to freeze several of its
21 time-of-use rates so that no new customers can subscribe to
22 these rates going forward. KCPL -- KCPL's rationale for this
23 is that not enough ratepayers currently subscribe to these
24 rates. KCPL -- KCPL has made this proposal without filing new
25 time-of-use rates or a clear timeline for when new time-of-use

1 rates will be filed.

2 DE recommends that the Commission reject the
3 Company's time-of-use rate proposal and, instead, require that
4 the Company refile modified and improved time-of-use rates in
5 its next rate case. This proposal will maintain the
6 availability of these rate schedules for new customers
7 interested in realizing energy efficiency gains based on
8 detailed energy price signals, while simultaneously giving the
9 Company a path to improving its time-of-use rates.

10 Division of Energy's next issue is regards to the
11 clean charge network. Division of Energy recommends
12 conditional approval of KCPL's clean charge network in this
13 case because a clean charge network is a public utility service
14 under the Commission's jurisdiction and because it would
15 provide numerous benefits to the Company's service territory in
16 the Kansas City metropolitan area. Commission has jurisdiction
17 of the clean charge network under Section 386.250, Subsection
18 1, because KCPL is selling and distributing electricity to
19 electric vehicle charging stations at host sites and ultimately
20 to electric vehicles.

21 The clean charge network also includes significant
22 benefits. These benefits include the potential for spreading
23 the Company's fixed cost recovery across more kilowatt hours
24 sold, increasing economic development in the Kansas City
25 metropolitan area, and reducing total air pollution emissions

1 from the transportation and electric power sectors as end-use
2 customers charge their vehicles with electricity generated from
3 cleaner energy sources.

4 Additionally, a clean charge network is not
5 covered by the Commission's promotional practice rules since
6 the Company plans to own the individual charging stations and
7 the electricity provided by these charging stations will be
8 paid by parties other than the Company at standard tariffed
9 rates during the pilot phase of this program.

10 Division of Energy's next issue is in regards to
11 Economic Development and Urban Core Development Riders.
12 Division of Energy recommends the Commission approve its
13 proposal to link MEEIA participation to receipts of EDR or UCD
14 incentives. Economic development riders create incentives that
15 have not yet been aligned with the State and Commission policy
16 to encourage energy efficiency. DE's recommendation provides
17 the Commission with the opportunity to establish disalignments.

18 KCP&L's MEEIA portfolio includes energy efficiency
19 programs applicable to commercial and industrial customers who
20 are the same customers targeted for the EDR and UCD rates.
21 KCPL's EDR and UCD tariff sheets should be modified to include
22 participation in applicable and cost-effective business energy
23 efficiency programs as an eligibility requirement for taking
24 service under these special rates.

25 Division of Energy's next issue is standby service

1 tariff review. Division of Energy recommends that KCPL be
2 required to establish a working group to review their standby
3 service tariff to ensure that its rates are cost based and
4 reflect best practices. Properly designed standby rates can
5 allow customers to deploy distributed generation, including
6 combined heat and power technology that can produce 60 percent
7 to 80 percent higher efficiency. Additionally, parties have
8 agreed to review standby rates in the most recent Ameren
9 Missouri and Empire District Electric Company rate cases.
10 Concurrent review of standby rates may result in a better end
11 product and consistency in rate design.

12 Division of Energy's last issue is in regards to
13 low income weatherization cost recovery. Division of Energy
14 recommends that KCP&L's low income weatherization costs be
15 collected in base rates at the conclusion of the Company's
16 current MEEIA cycle. Having program costs included in KCPL's
17 rate -- or rate base rates assures ongoing funding on an annual
18 basis, regardless of whether KCPL has a Commission-approved
19 MEEIA portfolio.

20 KCPL should be allowed to recover any outstanding
21 program costs throughput disincentive and incentive components
22 for the period that the program was under MEEIA through its
23 DSIM. Additionally, the Commission should authorize KCP&L to
24 recover customer contributions to annual low income
25 weatherization service program expenses in base rates. This

1 will align with the Commission's funding approval for
2 weatherization services provided by all other
3 Missouri-regulated investor-owned electric and natural gas
4 utilities, with the exception of KCPL and GMO.

5 And those are all my prepared remarks. If there
6 are any questions?

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions?

8 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No, thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Nothing.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions. Thank you.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

12 Missouri Industrial Energy Consumers.

13 MR. DOWNEY: Good morning. May it please the
14 Commission. My name's Ed Downey. I represent the Missouri
15 Industrial Energy Consumers. The role we have in this case is
16 much smaller than the role we typically have in an Ameren rate
17 case.

18 And, Judge, I took your order from Thursday
19 seriously, and I've got a pretty short opening statement. And
20 we're going to present more detailed openings when we address
21 the specific issues.

22 The MIEC did include prefilled testimony on a
23 number of issues, probably the most significant of which is
24 return on equity. Our witness is Mike Gorman, and he is a
25 joint witness with the MECG. He filed Direct, Rebuttal, and

1 Surrebuttal, and the attorney that will be handling the ROE
2 issue is Carole Hles.

3 We also presented evidence on class cost of
4 service and rate design. That witness is Maurice Brubaker.
5 Again, we filed his testimony jointly with the MECG.
6 Mr. Brubaker filed Direct, Rebuttal, and Surrebuttal, and I'll
7 be handling that issue and also Mr. Brubaker. And I would note
8 that there was a Nonunanimous Stipulation just filed this
9 morning on this issue.

10 Fuel adjustment clause, our witness is Jim
11 Dauphinais. You're familiar with him from the Ameren case. He
12 is a joint witness between the MIEC and the OPC. He filed
13 Rebuttal and Surrebuttal Testimony, and I will be the attorney
14 handling that issue.

15 Again, on the transmission revenues issue, which
16 was an issue you had in the Ameren case, the witness is Jim
17 Dauphinais. He filed Rebuttal, and I'll be the attorney
18 handling that issue. He's also the witness and I am the
19 attorney on the Swissvale/Stillwell and West Gardner issue.

20 We have one last witness, and that was Greg Meyer.
21 He filed Rebuttal Testimony, and his Rebuttal Testimony is on
22 behalf of only the MIEC. I'm the attorney on that issue with
23 Greg -- handling that issue with Greg. But I think that issue
24 is not likely to be heard by the Commission because of some
25 proposals that have been made to open up a separate docket to

1 deal with the whole decoupling issue.

2 All the parties have agreed to waive cross of
3 Mr. Meyer, and they've agreed that we can introduce his
4 testimony without his appearance. And so unless the
5 commissioners will have questions for him, it would be our
6 intention to not have him appear.

7 The MIEC has also taken positions outside of its
8 prefiled testimony. Probably the most significant there is
9 that we do not believe that an FAC should be allowed in this
10 case. And in support of that position, we jointly filed the
11 motion to strike with the OPC. In that motion we did not ask
12 for an immediate ruling; we asked the Judge to take that issue
13 with the case. But we thought it would be good to open that
14 issue up for discussion so that the commissioners know to ask
15 questions of witnesses and the lawyers.

16 We oppose all trackers as single-issue ratemaking.
17 We support Staff's position on amortizations that ended before
18 the close of the true-up period. We support -- it says accept;
19 should say support. We support Staff's position on spent
20 nuclear fuel fees, on bad debt expense. And we also support
21 the testimony and the position of the MECG and their witness,
22 Mike Brosch, on accumulated deferred income taxes.

23 And I forget which party proposed this. I think
24 it may have been MECG. We support their position to identify
25 on the customer's bills who the service provider is. We oppose

1 the proposal by one of the parties that in order to obtain an
2 economic development rider -- or in order to receive service
3 under the rider that a customer should be required first to
4 implement all MEEIA programs.

5 The last issue is one that I don't think there's
6 much disagreement on, but we support Kansas City Power & Light
7 conducting a study to develop a standby rate.

8 And, in sum, I would say that, based on our review
9 of the evidence in this case and the testimony of our
10 witnesses, we believe that the requested rate increase of
11 Kansas City Power & Light is significantly overstated.

12 I'd be happy to entertain any questions.

13 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No questions. Thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions. Thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Good morning.

16 MR. DOWNEY: Morning.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: What MIEC members do you have
18 in the KCP&L service area?

19 MR. DOWNEY: Ford Motor Company, Enbridge
20 Pipeline, and Bayer. I'm not quite sure of the full correct
21 name of that corporation.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm sorry, Ford?

23 MR. DOWNEY: Ford Motor Company.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: And the second one was?

25 MR. DOWNEY: Enbridge Pipeline Company, and then

1 Bayer.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: I noticed a moment ago that
3 you indicated that MIEC opposes all trackers as single-issue
4 ratemaking. Do you believe that all trackers are illegal as
5 single-issue ratemaking?

6 MR. DOWNEY: The Company line on that is yes.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: The Company -- okay. Well --

8 MR. DOWNEY: We've lit -- as you know,
9 Commissioner, we've litigated this issue and haven't had much
10 success in the Court of Appeals. So if you're asking me is the
11 law supporting our position, I'm not sure I can say that.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: You're hoping for a further
13 evolution of the law?

14 MR. DOWNEY: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Let's -- let's assume for a
16 moment that all -- that some trackers are legal. What -- what
17 standard would you recommend that we employ to determine
18 whether or not it's good public policy to institute a tracker?

19 MR. DOWNEY: I believe you've artic -- articulated
20 in a number of cases -- and it may have even been the first
21 Ameren rate case where you adopted an FAC -- the standard, you
22 know, are the costs outside the control of the utility, are the
23 costs volatile, are they material?

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: And so that's the standard
25 that you would recommend that we continue to employ?

1 MR. DOWNEY: Yeah, I don't think we have an
2 objection to the standard, if -- if they are allowed.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. DOWNEY: We do believe they're single-issue
5 ratemaking, because you don't focus on other expenses that
6 might be going down at the same time these expenses are going
7 up.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand your position.
9 Okay.

10 MR. DOWNEY: Thank you.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

12 Midwest Energy Consumers Group.

13 MR. WOODSMALL: Good morning, Your Honor,
14 Commissioners. My name is David Woodsmall. I'm here on behalf
15 of MECG. My opening statement is going to go slightly longer
16 because I rolled my return on equity opening statement into
17 this, so I won't have a mini opening statement later. But this
18 will go a little bit longer because of that.

19 As the Commission is obviously aware, I was deeply
20 involved in both the recent Ameren and Empire rate cases. As
21 the Commission is also aware, those cases were tried in a civil
22 way. Differences were inevitable. Disagreements unavoidable.
23 That said, in the Ameren and Empire cases those differences
24 were presented to the Commission without any personal attacks.

25 As I was preparing this weekend, I spent a lot of

1 time reading testimony. What immediately struck me was the
2 lack of civility in the testimony. Civility in the Empire and
3 Ameren cases has been inexplicably replaced by personal attacks
4 in KCP&L's testimony.

5 Here's a classic example from Mr. Ives'
6 surrebuttal. He says, Staff is burying its head in the sand.
7 He accuses particular Staff members, Featherstone and Hyneman,
8 of, quote, Taking an approach I would refer to as throwing
9 spaghetti at the wall to see what sticks in an effort to muddy
10 the record for the Commission. He then says, Staff is
11 one-sided, misapplied, not relevant. Again, he says, Staff
12 throws things against the wall and takes a number of leaps of
13 faith to inaccurately portray certain information.

14 I was with the Commission Staff. I know what a
15 difficult job they have. As a single entity expected to
16 provide a completely objective view, they are inevitably in a
17 position of pleasing neither the utility nor the consumer
18 parties. I also understand that because of this unique
19 position, Staff must rise above and maintain its objectivity.
20 Therefore, it is often difficult for Staff to defend itself
21 against these type of attacks.

22 I, on the other hand, I'm not so constrained.
23 Therefore, I'm going to take this opportunity to defend Staff
24 against these attacks and show that while -- that rational
25 minds can disagree with KCP&L, without being considered to have

1 buried their heads in the sand.

2 In demonstrating how reasonable parties can
3 disagree with KCP&L, I'm going to address five specific issues.
4 First I will address KCP&L's broad-brush request for
5 implementation of tracker mechanisms. KCP&L seeks trackers in
6 this case for vegetation management, property taxes,
7 cybersecurity costs, and transmission costs.

8 Second, I will address KCP&L's request for a fuel
9 adjustment clause. Of great importance, I will address the
10 regulatory plan, the provision in it, and its effect on KCP&L's
11 request.

12 Third, I will address KCP&L's request for an
13 inflated return on equity. Relying upon the same witness used
14 by Ameren, KCP&L now asks for a 10.3 return on equity. As was
15 demonstrated, KCP&L's witness relied upon a flawed methodology
16 in that Ameren case. He relied on a similar flawed methodology
17 in this case.

18 Fourth, I will address KCP&L's claims that because
19 of the regulatory paradigm in Missouri, it can't possibly earn
20 its authorized return on equity. I will show that KCP&L's
21 return on equity is deflated by a number of factors within its
22 control.

23 Fifth, I will demonstrate that KCP&L's pessimistic
24 view of Missouri regulation is not shared by objective
25 analysts, specifically debt rating services and other services

1 believe that Missouri is in the mainstream of utility
2 regulation.

3 Finally, I will address KCP&L's recent rate case
4 history and the impact on customers. Specifically I will show
5 that with this rate increase, KCP&L's rates will have gone up
6 82 percent since January 1st of 2007.

7 As mentioned, KCP&L has asked that the Commission
8 implement deferral accounting in the context of four separate
9 trackers. Relying on consultants that have been paid hundreds
10 of thousands of dollars, KCP&L claims that such mechanisms are
11 necessary for it to earn its authorized return. Interestingly,
12 numerous other parties and witnesses, including Staff members
13 assigned to be objective, disagree with KCP&L. Those
14 individuals demonstrate that the implementation of these
15 trackers destroy the incentives inherent in Missouri regulation
16 to minimize costs. No longer faced with these incentives,
17 these witnesses assert that KCP&L's rates will increase. And
18 there's a great example of that.

19 EEI publishes a book that includes the rates that
20 different utilities are charging. And as you can see, the
21 average Missouri rate is 8.56 cents. Kansas, on the other
22 hand, has a number of trackers; transmission tracker, property
23 tax tracker, energy efficiency tracker, fuel adjustment clause.
24 Kansas average -- average retail rate is almost 17 percent
25 higher. Better example, KCP&L itself has operations in both

1 Missouri and Kansas. Its average rate in Missouri is 8.89
2 cents. In Kansas, where it has all these trackers and is no
3 longer subjected to the incentives inherent in regulation,
4 their rates are higher. Again, 17 percent higher in Kansas.

5 Whether KCP&L wants to admit it or not, trackers
6 will lead to higher rates and higher profits for KCP&L. After
7 all, if they didn't, why would KCP&L be asking for them?

8 So despite the negative effect on rates, MECG has
9 recognized that there are times when a tracker may be
10 appropriate, getting to your question from earlier. Given
11 that, the question becomes how should you assess a request to
12 implement deferral accounting? It is important to remember
13 that, unlike fuel adjustment clauses, there is no specific
14 statutory authority for trackers. There's statutory authority
15 for a fuel adjustment clause, but nothing for trackers. So
16 where do you turn for guidance on when to implement a tracker?
17 The answer is case law.

18 In 1992 the Commission considered a request for
19 deferral accounting. There the Commission held the use of
20 deferral accounting, quote, Should be allowed only on a limited
21 basis, end quote. Specifically relying on guidance contained
22 in the instructions in the uniform system of accounts, the
23 Commission held that, quote, This limited basis is when events
24 occur during a period which are extraordinary, unusual and
25 unique and nonrecurring.

1 That decision by the Commission was appealed, and
2 the Western District agreed with the Commission. There the
3 court held, Because rates are set to recover continuing
4 operating expenses, plus a reasonable return on investment,
5 only an extraordinary event should be permitted to adjust the
6 balance to permit costs to be deferred for consideration in a
7 later period.

8 So what we have here is we have guidance from the
9 Court of Appeals saying deferral accounting is only allowed
10 where there is extraordinary costs. That doesn't apply to the
11 FAC, because FAC has separate statutory authority.

12 In the 22 years since that appellate decision, the
13 Commission has consistently relied upon the requirement that
14 deferred costs be extraordinary. Recently, this Commission,
15 these five commissioners, decided KCP&L's request for deferral
16 accounting as it applies to transmission costs. Relying on the
17 decision from the Court of Appeals, the Commission rejected
18 KCP&L's request and found that transmission costs are not
19 extraordinary. Specifically, the Commission found that the
20 transmission costs were not extraordinary, unusual, or
21 infrequent.

22 In previous cases it appears that the Commission
23 has also sought to utilize other standards for trackers, in
24 addition to the extraordinary standard. Consistent with proper
25 ratemaking, MECG's witness, Brosch, with over 40 years of

1 regulatory experience, including a number of years with the
2 Missouri Commission, has developed five additional criteria
3 that he says should be applied to trackers in addition to the
4 extraordinary standard. And he sets these out here. And the
5 Commission has used these in previous cases, and Mr. Downey
6 talked about them.

7 The costs should be substantial. After all, while
8 you may want to give deferral accounting for a large ice storm,
9 you don't want to give deferral accounting when a single limb
10 falls off. The cost should be substantial.

11 The costs should also be outside the control of
12 the utility. Do you really want to use deferral accounting to
13 pick up certain costs if they were caused by the utility's
14 decision to reduce preventative maintenance? So the costs
15 should be beyond the control of the utility.

16 Third, the costs should be volatile. And the
17 Commission has said volatile is not simply just increasing,
18 volatility means up and down. If costs are simply increasing,
19 those are easy to pick up in a rate case. We can predict
20 those. We can see those. We can -- the Company can time its
21 rate cases to pick those up.

22 Property taxes is a great example. You know the
23 property tax bill is coming in at the end of the year. File a
24 rate case 11 months before that; you'll get your property
25 taxes. So the Commission has required in the past trackers

1 only where the costs are volatile, swinging up and down.

2 Four, the deferral accounting mechanism should be
3 straightforward and simple to administer. A great example of
4 this is the Company's request on cybersecurity. The Company
5 wants to include labor costs associated with cybersecurity.
6 Well, the question then becomes how do you separate labor costs
7 from typical IT projects with labor costs for cybersecurity?
8 It's very difficult, if not impossible, to separate those
9 label -- labor costs. So a tracker mechanism in that case
10 would not be straightforward and simple to administer.

11 Finally, the deferral request should be balanced.
12 That is to say, the attendant benefits should offset any costs.
13 And, again, another great example is vegetation management.
14 The Company wants to have deferral accounting for all the costs
15 associated with vegetation management, but it doesn't recognize
16 the attendant benefits.

17 You do vegetation management, your maintenance is
18 going to go down, your outages are going to go down, your sales
19 are going to go up. How do you pick up those benefits to apply
20 them against the costs. And that's what Mr. Brosch says, the
21 deferral mechanism must be balanced.

22 So Mr. Brosch goes through in his testimony, and
23 he's applied these standards to each of KCP&L's tracker
24 requests. First, as you can see here, he looked at property
25 taxes; and he applied the criteria, and he concludes deferral

1 accounting for property taxes is inappropriate. First, these
2 costs are not extraordinary. You've been paying property taxes
3 ever since you've been in business. These costs are not really
4 material or volatile. As you can see, the incremental increase
5 in property taxes is not really significant. The incremental
6 amount imposed would not really affect KCP&L's finances. So
7 the request for a property tax tracker does not meet the
8 Commission's criteria or the Court's criteria for
9 extraordinary.

10 Vegetation management. Again, he went in and
11 applied the same criteria for vegetation management. You can
12 see this is at pages 23 through 29 of his Direct Testimony.
13 And he concludes vegetation management costs are not
14 extraordinary, nor are they material. As you can see, the
15 costs went up; they're coming back down. They're fairly
16 stable. We don't need deferral accounting for these type of
17 costs. They're easy to pick up in a rate case. Furthermore,
18 the incremental changes in these costs year over year is not
19 material. These costs, in total, represent less than 1 percent
20 of KCP&L's revenues.

21 Finally, it should be noted that utilities in
22 Missouri have been operating under the Commission's vegetation
23 management rule for six years. They have experience with it.
24 They know what the costs are going to be. In a recent Ameren
25 case, the Commission rejected Ameren's request to continue the

1 vegetation management tracker. Empire, in a stipulation,
2 voluntarily revoked theirs. We don't need another tracker for
3 this for KCP&L.

4 Finally, Mr. Brosch applied the criteria to
5 KCP&L's cybersecurity tracker costs. Again, these costs are
6 not material in that they are less than 1 percent of KCP&L's
7 revenues. As this chart shows, the costs are not volatile
8 either. You can see, in actuality, the costs -- projected
9 costs are decreasing, 24 million in 2015, decreasing down just
10 slightly below 18 million in 2017. So the costs aren't
11 volatile, they're not material, and they are largely within the
12 control of management.

13 I should point out that Public Counsel's witness,
14 Marke, says in his testimony he is aware of no commissions that
15 have granted a cybersecurity tracker. In fact, just a couple
16 weeks ago the West Virginia Commission rejected American
17 Electric Power's request for a cybersecurity tracker.

18 So, the conclusion, contrary to KCP&L's claims
19 that the parties have, quote, buried their heads in the sand,
20 you can see the parties have thoughtfully and rationally
21 applied standards for considering KCP&L's tracker request.
22 Consistent with the Court of Appeals' dictates, none of these
23 costs are considered extraordinary. Furthermore, none of these
24 costs are material. As such, the Commission should reject each
25 of KCP&L's requested trackers.

1 Let's turn to fuel adjustment clause. This is
2 another example of deferral accounting that the Company wants
3 to implement. As I mentioned earlier, the Commission does not
4 have to apply the extraordinary standard to a fuel adjustment
5 clause. You have separate statutory authority for that. The
6 only standards you have to apply are the ones you create
7 yourself. And you set those out in previous cases, and I'll go
8 through those. Largely, it's some of the same standards as
9 Mr. Brosch wants to apply to trackers; materiality, volatility,
10 beyond the control of the Commission, easy to administer. As
11 such, the extraordinary standard does not apply.

12 In this case, the Commission is faced with two
13 overarching fuel adjustment clause questions. First, does
14 KCP&L's request for a fuel adjustment clause violate its
15 commitments in its regulatory plan. And as I'll show, we
16 believe it does violate that. Second, does KCP&L's request
17 meet the criteria the Commission has set forth? And we believe
18 they have not met those criteria, and Staff and Public Counsel
19 agree.

20 If you answer yes to both of these questions, then
21 you have 16 other questions that you have to answer regarding
22 how to implement a fuel adjustment clause. Let me repeat that.
23 You only have to answer those questions if you find KCP&L has
24 not violated its regulatory plan and has met the criteria for a
25 fuel adjustment clause.

1 So let's talk about the first issue. In 2005
2 KCP&L and several parties, including the Commission Staff and
3 Public Counsel, executed a stipulation to provide the
4 regulatory support for KCP&L to build Iatan 2. Through the
5 stipulation KCP&L received over \$185 million in rates that it
6 was otherwise not entitled to through normal ratemaking to
7 support it and its credit rating while Iatan-2 was being built.

8 One of the primary benefits that ratepayers
9 received was a commitment from KCP&L not to seek to utilize a
10 fuel adjustment clause prior to June 1st, 2015. And I'll use
11 this opportunity -- here's the language out of the regulatory
12 plan. And the commissioners have been asking questions about
13 this, and I don't believe that this -- I was not around for it.
14 I was an advisor to Commissioner Gaw at the time, so I was not
15 involved in the drafting of this. But I do not believe that
16 this language is ambiguous. I think if you read the first
17 sentence with the second sentence in the same paragraph, you
18 get some clarification.

19 The second sentence looks at June 1st, 2015 and
20 talks about general rate case filings. If you read this in a
21 manner KCP&L wants you to, you have an overlap. You have an
22 IEC going through June 1st, 2015, but then you have an FAC
23 going back in time before that and continuing. You have an
24 overlap of time. Whereas, if you read it like the other
25 parties, you have one ending, the other one neatly picking up.

1 So I think the second sentence helps to clarify what is meant
2 by the first sentence, and I believe Staff witnesses will tell
3 you that.

4 Staff Witness Featherstone was around for the
5 drafting of this document. Staff witness -- well then-Staff
6 Employee Mantle was around for this. And she's now testifying
7 on behalf of OPC. Staff -- he's not a witness in this case,
8 but Staff Employee Shallenberg was instrumental in this whole
9 dialogue. So those people can appear before the Commission and
10 give you guidance on what they thought it meant. So, in our
11 mind, KCP&L cannot even seek a fuel adjustment clause prior to
12 June 1st, 2015.

13 In the event that the Commission finds that KCP&L
14 is not violating the regulatory plan, the Commission then needs
15 to apply its criteria. Now as I said, most of this criteria
16 comes from a previous Commission order. In this case MEGG has
17 retained the services of Michael Brosch. He is widely
18 considered to be an expert in the field of fuel adjustment
19 clauses, with over 40 years of regulatory experiences.

20 Here's the kicker. In its first case considering
21 a fuel adjustments clause, the Commission found Mr. Brosch to
22 be an expert and expressly adopted the criteria considered by
23 Mr. Brosch. You see this from an Ameren case. Mr. Brosch was
24 the one that developed these criteria. The Commission adopted
25 them. Who's better to tell you whether KCP&L has met these

1 criteria than the man that drafted the criteria himself. So we
2 retained Mr. Brosch, and he'll be testifying that KCP&L has not
3 met these criteria.

4 Commission has memorialized these criteria in the
5 context of its fuel adjustment clause rule. And one of the key
6 things here, it provides the criteria, but it also states that
7 you apply the criteria -- this is going dead -- on a cost
8 component basis. You don't look at fuel costs in general. You
9 look at each component, and you apply the criteria according to
10 the rule to each separate component. So Mr. Brosch did that.

11 Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor, this is highly
12 confidential. The next four slides, I believe, have highly
13 confidential information.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. Then we'll go
15 in-camera for that.

16 MR. WOODSMALL: Or you just don't show it, and I
17 won't talk about it. I'll just -- if you --

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And you're just going --

19 MR. WOODSMALL: -- just don't show it. Show me or
20 something.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And you're not going to talk
22 about it?

23 MR. WOODSMALL: I will avoid the highly
24 confidential information.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. Okay. Proceed.

1 MR. WOODSMALL: Oh, okay. So given that you are
2 required, according to the rule, to apply the criteria to each
3 different cost component, Mr. Brosch looked at KCP&L's coal
4 prices. KCP&L uses a lot of coal. According to its SEC
5 statement, about 78 percent of its generation is coal produced.
6 That said, KCP&L has locked in coal supplies through contracts.
7 And as you can see, coal prices are very stable. They're
8 not -- there's no -- not a bit of volatility contained there.
9 Coal prices are stable. And because KCP&L has locked up this
10 coal, it has very little exposure to any volatility.

11 As they say in their SEC statement and contained
12 in Mr. Brosch's testimony, a 10 percent increase in coal prices
13 only represents a 0.15 percent increase in KCP&L's total
14 expenses. So very little volatility, very little materiality.
15 Mr. Brosch says you shouldn't have coal in a fuel adjustment
16 clause.

17 Similarly, nuclear. KCP&L nuclear costs are very
18 stable, as you can see here. In fact, KCP&L's nuclear costs
19 over the last couple of years has actually declined. Nuclear
20 costs are not material, they're not volatile. You don't need a
21 fuel adjustment clause for these costs.

22 Next, he looks at gas costs. As KCP&L points out
23 in its SEC statement, only about 1 percent of its generation is
24 actually fired by gas or fuel oil. So any volatility in the
25 gas market is not very material to KCP&L. They don't use it.

1 So why is that a consideration here? That said, there is a
2 slight amount of volatility -- whoops, you can see here the
3 prices have ranged over the last couple of years. But since
4 they don't rely upon it, it's not a big concern for KCP&L.

5 Off-system sales, however. KCP&L has demonstrated
6 some volatility in the off-system sales market. And these
7 off-system sales are material. Mr. Brosch, at pages 36 through
8 42 of his testimony, states that if you are to implement a fuel
9 adjustment clause, it needs to go no further than one single
10 component, off-system sales. This is the only component that
11 is material, demonstrates volatility, beyond the control of
12 management, and meets the other standards. So if you do a fuel
13 adjustment clause, it should be very limited. And so you could
14 see that here. Here's his conclusion: Limit the application
15 of fuel adjustment clause, if you find that one is necessary
16 and doesn't violate the regulatory plan.

17 The next issue I wanted to address was KCP&L's
18 request for an inflated return on equity. This should be a
19 fairly easy decision for the Commission to address. I'm done
20 with the confidential. This should be fairly easy for the
21 Commission to address. KCP&L asked for a 10.30 percent return
22 on equity and relies upon the same witness that Ameren just
23 used. In that case Ameren asked for a 10.4 percent return on
24 equity and received a 9.53 percent.

25 It is important to recognize that KCP&L's witness,

1 Mr. Hevert, considers KCP&L and Ameren to be comparable
2 companies in the proxy group. They're comparable companies.
3 Therefore, if Ameren received a 9.53 ROE, why would its
4 comparable company receive an ROE of 10.3? As such, the
5 Commission's findings in the Ameren case should largely drive
6 the Commission's decision here. As you can see on this case,
7 Mr. Hevert's recommendation is clearly the recommendation
8 that's outside the mainstream.

9 Commission in the past has criticized Mr. Hevert's
10 return on equity recommendation and rejected his conclusions.
11 2011 Ameren rate case they found out -- found his
12 recommendation was too high because he overestimates future
13 long-term growth rates. 2012 case Commission said the same
14 thing; his recommendation's too high; his growth rate's too
15 high. Recently in their decision, April 29th, Commission found
16 the same thing; growth rates too high; recommendation too high.
17 So what happens? He files his testimony, same inflated growth
18 rates. He's learned nothing from your criticisms. Same
19 inflated growth rates, an ROE of 10.3, that is well outside the
20 mainstream.

21 Mr. Hevert, in reaching his recommendation, relies
22 upon inflated growth rates. In fact, as Mr. Gorman points out,
23 his growth rates exceed the projected growth in the GDP.
24 What's interesting, though, is historically, as you can see
25 from the red line, electricity use has always lagged the growth

1 in the GDP. It doesn't make sense to think that electricity
2 will grow faster than the economy. Electricity has always
3 lagged. Given that, how can you use growth rates that exceed
4 the growth in the GDP? It just doesn't make sense.

5 Missouri's not the only Commission to find that
6 Mr. Hevert's recommendations are, quote, too high. I showed
7 this to you in the Ameren case. Since then there's been a
8 couple of other reported cases. But since January 1st, 2013,
9 there's been 23 reported cases in which Mr. Hevert provided
10 recommendations. In those cases he recommended about a 10.5
11 ROE. Commission's decision averaged 9.7. Difference was
12 79 basis points.

13 So let's look at what the Commission says about
14 Mr. Gorman. The Commission has repeatedly found Mr. Gorman to
15 be credible: The witness for MIEC does the best job of
16 presenting the balanced analysis that the Commission seeks.
17 Again, in an Aquila case from 2007: Michael Gorman, the
18 witness for SIEUA, did the best job of presenting the balanced
19 analysis that the Commission seeks. The Illinois Commission
20 said the same thing: Mr. Gorman's analyses are largely free of
21 any significant errors.

22 Mr. Gorman's recommendation in this case is below
23 his recommendation in the Ameren case, but there's a reason for
24 that. There's a time difference. Testimony was prepared three
25 months later, and capital costs have continued to decline. So

1 the 9.53 ROE that was applicable to Ameren, this is later; it's
2 not so applicable anymore.

3 So let's look at the recommendations. Mr. Gorman,
4 9.10; Staff, 9.25; DOE, 9.00; Ameren, 9.53; and you have
5 Mr. Hevert, 10.30. But take away the 79 basis points of
6 historical inflation that he uses, 9.51. Clearly, Mr. Hevert,
7 you take away his inflater, you get him back to the mainstream.

8 Next I wanted to address KCP&L's earned -- the
9 return on equity that it actually earns. You heard a lot about
10 this from KCP&L. KCP&L complains that it cannot possibly earn
11 its authorized return in Missouri, that Missouri regulation is
12 just so backwards that it can't possibly do it. I say that's
13 nonsense. There are a lot of reasons KCP&L didn't earn its
14 authorized return. I set these out here. I'll go through them
15 one by one.

16 First off, KCP&L's return on equity is deflated
17 because it incurs excessive costs. In its testimony Staff
18 started asking data requests about over \$140,000 of various
19 officer expense reports. These expense reports included costs
20 for travel, meals, baby showers. Staff started looking into
21 that, and KCP&L didn't want to answer. KCP&L simply punted it
22 and said, we'll take those costs out of the case. But they
23 include them in their calculation for return on equity. If
24 those costs aren't proper for inclusion in rates, why are they
25 in KCP&L's ROE calculation?

1 In addition to these officer expense reports,
2 KCP&L also incurs inflated A&G costs. A&G costs include
3 officer salaries, benefits, rents, outside consulting services,
4 like four attorneys in the room here today, and other
5 overheads. In an analysis undertaken by Staff, as well as
6 MEG's witnesses, KCP&L has shown to have the highest A&G costs
7 of any regional utility. In fact, as compared to Ameren,
8 KCP&L's A&G costs are 48 percent higher.

9 KCP&L wants to know how it can earn its authorized
10 return? Get its A&G costs under control. There's no reason
11 A&G costs need to be 50 percent higher than Ameren's. In fact,
12 if KCP&L just reduces A&G costs to the level of Westar, the
13 next highest, it would save \$14 million. They can make their
14 authorized return; get their costs under control.

15 There's another reason their ROE is deflated.
16 KCP&L uses improper allocations. Now this is important; you'll
17 hear this in Mr. Collins' testimony. KCP&L acts as a service
18 company for all the Great Plains companies. Any services,
19 anything that's needed by the Great Plains companies are
20 provided by KCP&L. Similarly, all the costs that come in go to
21 KCP&L. Costs come in to KCP&L, and the only way they get out
22 is if they're directly assigned or generally allocated. But if
23 they're not, they're retained by KCP&L. Any residual stays at
24 KCP&L. And for that reason, you start seeing these type of
25 differences.

1 GMO has A&G costs of \$225. KCP&L, \$309. Why is
2 it that? Because KCP&L isn't properly allocating these costs.
3 KCP&L sees that if we keep these costs here, we can get -- we
4 can deflate our ROE, we can get recovery for those costs.
5 Meanwhile, the unregulated operations show inflated profits.

6 Biggest concern is the allocation of costs to
7 KCP&L's parent company. Ameren -- Ameren allocates about
8 6.9 percent of its indirect costs to its parent company.
9 6.9 percent. Southern Company allocates 3.8 percent of its
10 costs to its parent company. KCP&L, 0.49 percent. KCP&L
11 doesn't allocate costs. They need these costs to stay here so
12 they can get recovery and show you a lower ROE. So one of the
13 recommendations we make in our case is that KCP&L implement a
14 minimum allocation to its parent of 5 percent of costs.
15 Mr. Kollen testify on that issue.

16 Another reason that KCP&L's return on equity is
17 deflated, they don't normalize for weather. Commission faced
18 this issue in the recent Ameren complaint case. Commission
19 said surveillance reports are useless if you don't normalize
20 costs. And one of the -- a good example of this quote is the
21 weather: Weather is only -- is only one of the many items that
22 must be adjusted or normalized when setting rates. So KCP&L's
23 deflated ROE that they show you, it's not normalized. It's
24 suspect from the very beginning.

25 Another reason KCP&L's return on equity is

1 deflated is KCP&L has forfeited revenue opportunities to its
2 unregulated affiliates. 2009 KCP&L received a notice to
3 construct two transmission projects from SPP. Those projects,
4 once built, would have brought revenues in to KCP&L. They were
5 in KCP&L's service area. KCP&L didn't build them. KCP&L
6 assigned this opportunity to its unregulated affiliate,
7 Transource. So Transource now has this revenue stream. KCP&L
8 doesn't. Well, it's easy to see, you give away your revenue
9 opportunities, your ROE is going to go down fast. And that's
10 what happened here.

11 Finally, Staff points out in its Surrebuttal
12 Testimony that KCP&L has manipulated its reported return on
13 equity. In 2014 KCP&L reported its return on equity. But,
14 strangely, KCP&L used a 2013 demand allocator to get there.
15 That 2013 allocator, while dated, provided the opportunity to
16 allocate more costs to the Missouri jurisdiction. So Missouri
17 return on equity was lower. The Kansas return on equity was
18 higher. That's convenient. KCP&L used the wrong allocator,
19 and it provides a lower ROE. So as you can see, tons of
20 reasons that KCP&L's deflated ROE exists. All of these within
21 its control.

22 Finally, on this issue, KCP&L's single-minded
23 focus on ROE is misleading. They come to you, they talk about
24 return on equity. They go to their shareholders, they talk
25 about something called total shareholder return. That's not

1 focused on return on equity. Total shareholder return focus
2 on -- focuses on dividends and the increase in stock price.
3 When you look at total shareholder return, you see KCP&L is in
4 the top tier of all electric utilities. So KCP&L, when they're
5 talking to their shareholders, things are dandy. No problems.
6 When they come in here, it's a completely different story.

7 KCP&L gives the Commission a very misleading view
8 of the regulatory environment here, too. You can see numerous
9 quotes here. Staff's just-say-no approach to KCP&L's efforts
10 to rebalance the historical ratemaking model in Missouri. It
11 talks all kinds of problems with the regulatory paradigm in
12 Missouri. But as I'll show, this is very subjective. KCP&L's
13 woe-is-me view of Missouri regulation is not shared by
14 objective analysts. Moody's, responsible for rating KCP&L's
15 debt, says, The stable outlook for each company incorporates
16 our expectation that ongoing regulatory support of cost
17 recovery and environmental capex will continue in Missouri. It
18 doesn't say you have to implement anything more. It just says
19 continue with what you're doing. Moody's says that's enough to
20 get KCP&L an upgrade.

21 Regulatory Research Associates says something
22 similar. They rate each of the state utility commissions.
23 They rate Missouri an A2, right in the middle. 19
24 jurisdictions higher. 20 below. The rest even with Missouri.
25 Missouri's average, right in the mainstream. Here's what they

1 say: Missouri's regulation is relatively balanced from an
2 investor perspective. Rate case decisions over the past couple
3 of years have generally been neutral. I don't read that to say
4 there's anything wrong with Missouri regulation.

5 So let's look at who truly has been hurt over the
6 last ten years, because it hasn't been KCP&L. KCP&L's rates
7 have gone up 57.7 percent. That's compounded. That explains a
8 difference between my calculation and Mr. Thompson's
9 calculation. You compound it 57.69 percent since 2007. You
10 add the rate increase here today, you're up to 82-and-a-half
11 percent increase in rates. I'll tell you who's suffering.
12 It's the ratepayers.

13 Here's a slide that was provided earlier. You can
14 see how much wages have gone up, 11 percent. Consumer Price
15 Index, 12 percent. KCP&L's rates, 84 percent. Ratepayers are
16 the ones suffering. So how does this show up? National
17 average rates have increased by 30.4 percent over this time
18 period. KCP&L's average rates almost double that amount. And
19 you can see that here, the blue line being KCP&L, with the
20 projected amount if they get their rate increase here. KCP&L's
21 rates are growing much faster than others.

22 This goes to a question you asked, Commissioner
23 Kenney, about how KCP&L's rates and their increases compare to
24 others. Mr. Featherstone has a table at the back of his
25 Surrebuttal Testimony, and it shows KCP&L's rates, Ameren's

1 rates, other utilities' rates; and KCP&L's rates are growing
2 much faster than everyone's except for L&P. So KCP&L's rate
3 and their rate growth is not typical, it's not average. It's
4 well above.

5 Finally, those that have been affected are my
6 clients. My clients have seen industrial rates increase
7 57.3 percent. National average industrial rate over that time,
8 less than half. KCP&L's industrial rate in 2006 before we
9 started these rate cases, 6.4 percent below the regional
10 average. Now it's almost 4 percent above. If you're concerned
11 about industrial activity in Missouri, if you're concerned
12 about economic development, this is where you look. Missouri
13 industrial rates, KCP&L industrial rates aren't competitive.
14 You can see that here. KCP&L's rates in the very dark purple,
15 much higher than the other regional rates that they're in,
16 much, much higher than Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana.
17 Industrial customers will eventually move. You keep pricing
18 industrial rates as they are now, they'll eventually move. And
19 I hear that constantly from my clients. You know, they bury me
20 with these things. So industrial rates are a concern. KCP&L's
21 rates in general are a big concern.

22 That's all I have. If you have any questions.

23 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No questions. Thank you.

24 MR. WOODSMALL: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions.

2 MR. WOODSMALL: Thanks.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

4 Opening by Brightergy.

5 MR. ZELLERS: Thank you, Your Honor. May it
6 please the Commission. We'll be brief. We've taken a position
7 on only one issue in this case, and that's the Kansas City
8 Power & Light's ask for recovery in the clean charge network.
9 We've taken this position because we believe it's an
10 opportunity for the Commission to encourage utilities to be
11 forward thinking and to come up with innovative solutions.
12 Anybody who's attended a MARC conference or a NARUC meeting or
13 keeps up with the trade press knows the types of issues that
14 utilities are facing. Those issues were brought to light by
15 Mr. Fischer, KCPL's counsel, in his opening. Generally
16 increasing costs and flat lining revenues. If this were any
17 other business, the business would do what it could to cut down
18 on those costs, come up with new sources of revenue. Utilities
19 are not traditionally equipped to do that. They are
20 constrained by the regulatory environment.

21 However, with innovations like the clean charge
22 network, utilities across the country have been and are trying
23 to make these types of innovations to deal with the problems
24 they're facing. The Commission should encourage this by
25 embracing the pilot program concept.

1 In terms of standards, in terms of what you can
2 look at, is this a good decision for the Commission to make,
3 look at is the program aimed at addressing an aspect of the
4 change in utility industry? If it is, we should take a look at
5 it. Does the program act to stabilize the Company's long-term
6 earnings? This is another positive aspect for all ratepayers.
7 Does the program have a reasonable chance of long-term
8 stability; that is, is it forward thinking? If we can meet
9 these three standards, the Commission should give serious
10 consideration to whether it's justified in a recovery, whether
11 it's in rate base or whether it's through another mechanism.

12 KCP&L has asked for another docket to look at
13 these issues. We support that. We support a docket not just
14 to look at the clean charge network for KCP&L, but what all
15 utilities can do to deal with the changing environment.
16 However, that doesn't stop the Commission from using this
17 opportunity in this case to allow recovery -- to take a chance
18 and allow the utility to make some innovations.

19 We'll go into a little more depth in the mini
20 opening on Wednesday morning, but if you have any questions
21 now, I'm happy to take them.

22 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No questions. Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions.

25 MR. ZELLERS: Thank you.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

2 City of Kansas City.

3 MR. COMLEY: Your Honor, the City of Fountains,
4 the home of highly-acclaimed award-winning sports teams and the
5 home of record-setting quarterbacks -- I understand that in
6 Oklahoma people often saying that it's up-to-date in Kansas
7 City -- I have no opening statement. We do not anticipate any
8 cross-examination. And with your lead, I'd like to be excused
9 for the remainder of the hearing.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Request is granted. Thank you.
11 Consumers Council of Missouri.

12 MR. COFFMAN: Good morning. May it please the
13 Commission. I'm John Coffman, here today on behalf of the
14 Consumers Council Missouri.

15 I just want to touch on four issues that are dear
16 to my client and that they have a perspective on. But first I
17 want to address the theme that KCPL started off with this
18 morning, which was concern about their load growth. And I
19 would remind you that maintaining a particular load growth is
20 not part of the Public Service Commission's charge. The Public
21 Service Commission here is to set just and reasonable rates,
22 essentially rates that are balanced, that are fair to both
23 consumers and to shareholders. But it really isn't a concern
24 of the law or the regulation to make sure that load growth is
25 going at a particular level, just that there's a reasonable

1 opportunity to earn a fair return.

2 And I might also ask you, if you're considering
3 that issue, that a weak load growth might be an indication that
4 things are not necessarily going gangbusters for consumers at
5 the time either. And consumers have, as you've seen in the
6 recent slides this morning, suffered more than a 50 percent
7 rate increase in base rates since 2006. These are dramatic
8 rate increases that most people have had to bear and had to
9 figure into their budgets during a time of recession. And
10 unemployment and wage growth has not quite recovered. And so
11 the fact there's a weak load growth, I think it shouldn't be
12 the responsibility of these customers to somehow boost or to
13 boost earnings or extra earnings.

14 I guess I'll first address the request for a fuel
15 adjustment clause. As a preliminary matter, I guess I was in
16 that hot and sweaty room on the second floor where the
17 stipulation that was adopted in the 2005 case was drafted. My
18 recollection is that that -- in that particular paragraph the
19 importance was distinguishing between what could be requested
20 before June 2015 and what couldn't and that what could be
21 requested is an interim energy charge, an interim energy
22 mechanism, but not a fuel adjustment clause. And from the
23 perspective of the Office of Public Counsel at that time, this
24 was one of the most important benefits that we got out of
25 the -- out of the deal, and that is no fuel adjustment clause

1 and none of the hassles and problems that those present for the
2 entire length of the -- of the plan.

3 And, in return, what was given consideration for
4 that was KCP&L was granted the opportunity to charge
5 significant additional amortizations, many of which have been
6 added to the rates over the last few years. The benefit of
7 these additional amortizations were essentially the benefit of
8 construction work in progress, which they would not have the
9 legal right to have.

10 So that was -- from our perspective -- or from the
11 consumer perspective that I recall, that was the trade-off; no
12 fuel adjustment clause or assurance of no mechanisms that were
13 in that Senate Bill 179, in return for something that had many
14 of the qualities of construction work in progress. Those were
15 the two big things. So it is important to us.

16 But, beyond that, I think it's important not to
17 focus so much on the interpretation of that paragraph, but on
18 whether a fuel adjustment clause is really justified. And we
19 don't believe that KCP&L needs a fuel adjustment clause to
20 receive a fair return. We don't believe that the evidence in
21 this case supports one. We would be -- you know, if you are
22 interested in providing some mechanism that gives special
23 treatment to fuel and purchased power costs, we would like the
24 Commission to look at something like an interim energy charge.

25 I think in the limited experience that we had back

1 when with it, it was much more fair, and it provided more of
2 the incentive to control costs, but did allow some assurance to
3 the utility that if things went above the range that they would
4 be compensated. Or if you are looking at something more like a
5 fuel adjustment clause, we would ask that you consider
6 something that was more symmetrical and shared 50/50 between
7 the consumers and not something that is akin to what Ameren
8 Missouri has been using with the 95.5 percent.

9 And we are not eager to see the same problems that
10 we've seen on the eastern side of the state be adopted for the
11 western side of the state. We think that it does not control
12 costs and does not provide the proper incentives that cost of
13 service ratemaking provides, and does not -- we think that it
14 creates just endless problems with creative methods of trying
15 to slip in other costs that are not fuel and purchased power
16 costs. And we don't like that kind of a piecemeal process; but
17 we do think that there are better ways to do it, if you are
18 interested in that.

19 Another issue that the Consumers Council really
20 cares about, and that is the fixed customer charge. We like to
21 see the fixed part of the bill kept low. We think the evidence
22 in this case shows that a \$9 customer charge is more than
23 sufficient to cover the costs that are customer specific and
24 that the rest of the costs, to the extent that rates are
25 increased, should be applied to the volumetric or energy

1 charges.

2 As the PSC has noted, high customer charges do
3 negatively impact low users, many of whom are low income or
4 senior citizens, and that keeping the customer charge low is
5 consistent with encouraging conservation and energy efficiency.

6 We also believe that keeping the customer charge
7 from increasing beyond \$9 is also consistent with much of the
8 testimony that was received in the local public hearings in
9 this case. And that goes to customer acceptability, which is
10 an important element of rate design.

11 The word that the Commission used in its most
12 recent Ameren rate order and that you hear customers use over
13 and again is control. Keeping more of the costs in the
14 volumetric part of the bill lets consumers retain more control
15 over their monthly bill. Raising that customer charge takes
16 away that control.

17 A couple of comments on the electrical vehicle
18 charging station, because this is kind of a new issue, an issue
19 of first impression. It is not our opinion that this is a
20 utility service. We believe it's a competitive service. We
21 believe that it should not be treated like a monopoly service
22 and should not be funded or subsidized by captive ratepayers.
23 We worry that allowing KCPL as a regulated monopoly to get into
24 this business could have a detrimental impact in discouraging
25 new entrants that might want to get into the charging business.

1 And we are also concerned that most of the ratepayers who would
2 be funding this would not have the ability to afford a fancy
3 new electric car. So to the extent that there is this service
4 being provided by KCPL, we think it should be treated as
5 unregulated, we think that captive ratepayers should be
6 shielded from having to fund it, and that the charges should be
7 paid for by the users.

8 And when you do get into these issues, whether
9 it's here or in a separate docket, I would ask that you also
10 look at the question of when the charging is going to occur.
11 In other states that have addressed this issue, the main focus
12 has been does this fit within the load growth? Is it going to
13 be in the middle of the night? Is it going to be during the
14 peak time? And that, I think, is maybe the most important
15 issue for cost and for environmental concerns as well. So be
16 sure to ask about exactly when these -- the charging of these
17 particular stations would be.

18 We are opposed to all of the trackers in this
19 case, for the reasons I stated earlier, by the Office of Public
20 Counsel and Industrial Intervenors. Trackers, I think, have a
21 very limited use. I think in exceptional cases there can be a
22 use. But we've gotten so far away from the original intent,
23 which is that that such mech -- such piecemeal mechanisms need
24 to be extraordinary and nonrecurring, and that is the cost
25 related should be not necessarily big costs or dramatically

1 increasing costs, but extraordinary, unusual, and nonrecurring.
2 Not just infrequent, but nonrecurring. Once -- a very unusual
3 situation. And we do support 9 percent return on equity.

4 And we may have other comments as we get into each
5 of the issues.

6 That's all I have. Questions?

7 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Mr. Coffman. Thank you.

8 MR. COFFMAN: Yes.

9 CHAIR R. KENNEY: And thanks for sharing your
10 insight on the stipulation. Let me just ask a question about
11 the paragraph that contains the language regarding the FAC in
12 Senate Bill 179. The second sentence reads, In exchange for
13 this commitment, the signatory parties agree that if KCP&L
14 proposes an interim energy charge in a general rate case filed
15 before June 1st, 2015, et cetera, et cetera. Was it the intent
16 of the parties that the interim energy charge could be sought
17 instead of an FAC?

18 MR. COFFMAN: Yes. That is my recollection. And
19 we had had -- at that time we had a comparatively more positive
20 experience with the interim energy charge. We felt like that
21 was a compromise under certain circumstances we could live
22 with. And most of the discussion at the time, as I recall, in
23 that room was about regarding the terms that followed there and
24 what type of an interim energy charge we might, you know, find
25 appropriate --

1 CHAIR R. KENNEY: And there's like six points
2 under there, and one of them -- or a couple of them talk about
3 an interim energy charge that would include fuel and purchased
4 power costs.

5 MR. COFFMAN: Correct.

6 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Which would be the same as what
7 an FAC contemplates.

8 MR. COFFMAN: Well, with some significant
9 differences. It's for a limited period of time, and there's a
10 band -- sort of a -- you might call it a dead band or a period
11 of costs, you know, that they can go up to; and if they went
12 over it, then there would be some recovery --

13 CHAIR R. KENNEY: But you wouldn't --

14 MR. COFFMAN: -- after the fact.

15 CHAIR R. KENNEY: But if you read this all -- if
16 you read both of these provisions together, it couldn't be that
17 the parties contemplated that you would be able to request both
18 an FAC and an interim energy charge?

19 MR. COFFMAN: No. No. Our -- and I think that --
20 that if you -- I don't believe it's ambiguous. But if you
21 believe that it is ambiguous, I think that you can rely on the
22 rules of construction that would ask that you look at that
23 entire paragraph in context, in pari materia, and -- and I
24 think you -- I think you can read that most clearly as you can
25 ask for this before June 15, but you can't ask for this before

1 June 15 --

2 CHAIR R. KENNEY: All right.

3 MR. COFFMAN: -- 2015.

4 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions. Thank you.

7 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Thank you, Mr. Coffman.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

9 That concludes all the general opening statements.
10 Parties have any feeling about starting with the mini openings
11 at this point or go ahead and just break for lunch? I'm
12 tending to want to break for lunch so that the attorney for
13 Department of Energy has more time to get here, since he was
14 going to be providing an opening for that.

15 MR. FISCHER: We're going to change counsel, too,
16 on the issues. So it would be helpful to take a break.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't we take a lunch break
18 now. We'll resume at 1:00.

19 We'll be in recess until 1:00.

20 MR. STEINER: Could I raise one issue, Your Honor?

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes.

22 MR. STEINER: This deals with the LaCygne
23 Environmental Project issue that's going to be heard on
24 Wednesday. And we've heard from the Sierra Club, which is the
25 party that filed testimony against the Company, and they have

1 no cross-examination questions for Witness Archibald, Witness
2 Bell, and Witness Ling. And so I was wondering if the
3 Commission has questions for those witnesses and, if not, we'd
4 like to excuse them.

5 CHAIR R. KENNEY: I don't know, but I don't think
6 so.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: There might be other parties also
8 that have questions for them. So...

9 MR. STEINER: Do any of the other parties have
10 questions?

11 MR. THOMPSON: We don't have all of Staff's
12 lawyers here, so I can't answer that question.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. Why don't we --

14 MR. STEINER: How about getting back to me, Kevin?

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't you get back to me
16 before then, and let me know if there's any -- if you have no
17 objections and no parties have an objection, you want to waive
18 cross, then we can excuse the witnesses.

19 MR. STEINER: Thanks, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right.

21 MR. DOWNEY: Judge, along the same lines, have you
22 heard from the commissioners yet whether they have any
23 questions for Mr. Meyer, because he's due tomorrow?

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'll check with them over the
25 lunch hour --

1 MR. DOWNEY: Thank you.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: -- and try and let you know at
3 1:00.

4 MR. DOWNEY: Thank you.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Anything further?

6 All right. We're in recess.

7 (Off the record.)

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's go back on the record and
9 get start with the next phase.

10 The topic for this afternoon is cost of capital,
11 and as mention in a previous order, what I'd like to do is to
12 have parties make -- if you would like to, make brief opening
13 statements about just limited to that topic.

14 So for -- I'm going to use the list of openings
15 and just go down for the parties.

16 Kansas City Power & Light will be the first one to
17 make an opening statement about cost of capital.

18 MR. ZOBRI ST: Thanks, Judge. May it please the
19 Commi ssi on. Karl Zobrist on behal f of Kansas Ci ty Power &
20 Li ght Company. The gui ding pri nci ples wi th regard to cost of
21 equi ty have been set down by the Uni ted States Supreme Court
22 for many years in the Hope and the Bluefi eld cases. They
23 provide that public uti li ti es are enti tled to earn a rate of
24 return that is comparab le to compa ni es in si mi lar li nes of
25 busi ness in si mi lar parts of the coun try. There is an empha si s

1 on the need for financial integrity and financial security, and
2 there is to be an equitable balance between stakeholders and
3 ratepayers.

4 Now what should the Commission look to in order to
5 set the proper return on equity in this case? These guiding
6 principles tell us to look at the economy and see what's going
7 on.

8 I'm going to show you just a couple of headlines
9 here of things that have been going on this spring. Businesses
10 are lending -- or businesses are being lent money by U.S. banks
11 for the first time in quite a while. As a number of the
12 witnesses have advised the Commission, interest rates have been
13 at record lows in order to stimulate the economy, and recently
14 we are now seeing strong gains in hiring that are putting eyes
15 on the fed, and eyes on the fed means that the fed is beginning
16 to think about raising interest rates.

17 This spring housing starts have surged to a
18 seven-year high, as we finally struggled to get out of the
19 winter. And we're seeing strong job growth which is easing
20 concern about the first quarter where the winter really dealt a
21 blow to the economy. In fact, there were some initial
22 projections that thought the economy was shrinking at that
23 time.

24 And with the improvement in the economy, we have
25 seen some volatility in the bond markets, which Mr. Hevert

1 discusses I believe in his Rebuttal and I know in his
2 Surrebuttal. And we have seen that the brighter economic news
3 is speeding flight from government bonds, which is causing
4 interest rates to go up.

5 Let me try to put some details on these particular
6 economic trends. As Mr. Hevert stated, I believe in his
7 Rebuttal, treasury bond yields are hitting new highs. Since
8 the end of the first quarter, the end of March, the 30-year
9 treasury yield has increased over 35 basis points, from
10 2.74 percent to 3.1 percent. And the ten-year treasury yield
11 has hit an eight-month high, nearing 2.5 percent, almost
12 2.5 percent the past couple of weeks, the highest since
13 October 2014. What is also happened is that the utility bond
14 index is also increasing. It increased by about 36 points.

15 And as a number of the other counsel in this case
16 indicated, unemployment rates are coming down. The exact
17 statistics are that the U.S. now is at 5.5 percent as of May of
18 this year, down from 8 percent in January 2013 when the
19 Commission issued its last report and order in a Kansas City
20 Power & Light rate case. For Missouri we weren't hit quite as
21 hard as the nation, and by January 2013 we were at 6.6 percent.
22 In April Missouri was at 5.5 percent. It went up a little bit,
23 ticked up a little bit in May at 5.7 percent because people
24 were actually looking for jobs for a change. And I would
25 expect that that number is probably going to go up.

1 We have seen strong job growth in May. Nonfarm
2 payroll increased by about 280,000. And housing starts in
3 April increased to the highest rate since 2007. It was an over
4 20.2 percent increase to 1.14 million in annualized rates as
5 far as housing starts. Building permits have increased, the
6 most since June of 2008. These statistics come from the Census
7 Bureau of the Commerce Department and from the Housing & Urban
8 Development Department. And the trade deficit declined by 10.2
9 percent, the sharpest in over six years.

10 So what are the three points that we gain from
11 this? First of all, the economy is growing. We didn't think
12 that was happening even two months ago. The economy is
13 growing. In May twenty -- I'm sorry, in the first quarter of
14 2015 where we thought it had shrunk by seven-tenths of a
15 percent, it looks like the economy was actually flat, which is
16 good news. It's flat according to the latest revisions. And
17 now in the second quarter it appears that it's growing by about
18 3 percent. Unemployment rate has fallen, as I indicated. And
19 by May of this year, earnings for this year have increased
20 2.3 percent, the highest in nearly two years. And so with
21 unemployment falling and with the economy approaching full
22 strength, the Federal Reserve Board has strongly indicated that
23 it will likely raise rates sometime this fall, perhaps as early
24 as September. And as a result, we are seeing long-term bond
25 yields increasing, as I said, to 2.4 percent from just

1 1.85 percent two months ago in April.

2 So if you're a Democrat, you get to hum Happy Days
3 Are Here Again, and if you're Republican -- I don't think that
4 Republicans really have a theme song, but I'm going to go back
5 to the Battle Hymn of the Republic. That's probably a safe
6 one.

7 So what does that mean here? What it means is
8 that the conditions of economic expansion are going to require
9 higher returns on equity. And, interestingly enough, in this
10 case there are only two witnesses that have talked about
11 economic growth, the recent economic growth; and that's
12 Mr. Hevert, and then there are allusions to it by the Staff
13 witness. Mr. Gorman and Ms. Reno did not talk about that.
14 Mr. Hevert in particular talked about these trends in, I
15 believe, the next-to-the-last page of his Surrebuttal.

16 This is kind of a busy slide, but it -- it is a
17 summary -- let me try to -- I'm going to cut off the first
18 column there, but I'll tell you what those are. This is
19 essentially the cost of equity estimates in this case, and it
20 is based upon the three models that the three experts -- pardon
21 me, the four experts rely upon.

22 The first are the discounted cash flow. And as
23 you can see, Ms. Reno from the Department of Energy does three
24 studies of the discounted cash flow, Mr. Gorman does three.
25 Mr. Marevangepo does two, and Mr. Hevert does two. They are

1 relatively low for Staff, they are low for DOE and the
2 Industrials. And Mr. Hevert's have been portrayed as high; but
3 as I will explain, given the recent economic conditions that
4 we've seen simply in the last two months, his are more
5 reasonable than the other experts.

6 Each of these experts does a Capital Asset Pricing
7 Model, which is the middle line there, and then the risk
8 premium again.

9 And then the bottom line is really the most
10 important, so let me focus in on that. These are the three
11 recommendations that you have from each of the experts in
12 ascending order. Ms. Reno recommends 9.0 percent. We have
13 evidence in this case that the average, the average for this
14 quarter return on equity in this country is 9.83 percent. So
15 Ms. Reno is 85 -- 83 basis points between the average return on
16 equity given by public service utility commissions this year.

17 Mr. Gorman comes in in a range of 8.8 to
18 9.4 percent, settling with a recommendation of 9.1 percent. He
19 is 43 basis points below the average ROEs for this quarter,
20 which is 9.83 percent.

21 Staff comes in at a range of 9.0 to 9.5, with a
22 recommendation of 9.25. That is 33 basis points below the 9.83
23 average.

24 And Mr. Hevert comes in at 10.3 percent, his range
25 being 10.0 to 10.6. His lowest range is the closest to the

1 average, which is 9.83 percent. He is at 17 basis points off.

2 Now, what accounts for these differences? As I
3 think Mr. Woodsmall mentioned, growth rates tend to be the area
4 that we focus on in explaining why someone is low, someone is
5 high where they have come to their recommendation.

6 These are just the growth rates that the experts
7 used in the DCF approach. And you can see that there are stark
8 differences among these four witnesses. Staff, the
9 Industrials, and Department of Energy tend to be somewhat
10 bunched way toward the bottom. And Mr. Hevert is at
11 5.65 percent. His estimate is based upon real gross domestic
12 product growth over a long period of time, from 1929 to 2013,
13 3.27 percent, which is what my footnote says there. Staff's
14 stage 1 is between 5.57 and 5.74 percent, the Industrials'
15 stage 1 at is 4.89 percent, and the Department of Energy's is
16 4.6 to 4.61 percent. So the question is what is the
17 difference? And it has to do with how you look at economic
18 data, whether you rely purely on historical forecasts or you
19 look at forward-looking forecasts and the exercise of judgment,
20 as well as in the context of what is going on with the economy
21 and what other public utilities are doing throughout the United
22 States.

23 The evidence in this case is going to be that,
24 given the economic trends that we are seeing and given what
25 utility commissions are doing across the Company -- across the

1 country, that Mr. Hevert's recommendation is the more
2 reasonable of the other three that you are presented with.

3 Now we have two small cost of capital structure
4 issues that I want to make certain that you're aware of, and
5 then go back once more to the summary of ROEs that I talked
6 about.

7 The Company has proposed, as it has in a number of
8 its past cases, that the capital structure of its parent, Great
9 Plains Energy, Incorporated, be adopted in this case. Staff
10 agrees and the Industrials do not oppose. This was the capital
11 structure that was used for KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations
12 Company, the sister Company of KCP&L. However, Ms. Reno from
13 the Department of Energy opposes this. She proposes to use
14 KCPL's Company structure. This is at odds with the prior
15 rulings of this Commission, and it's at odds with the capital
16 structure that's been set for both companies by the Kansas --
17 or by -- for KCP&L by the Kansas Commission.

18 This slide is a little busy, but the bottom line
19 is that Ms. Reno from Department of Energy is the only expert
20 that recommends that you use short-term debt. Now, the Company
21 has proposed again, as it has for most of its rate cases, to
22 have its capital structure composed of long-term debt,
23 preferred stock, and common stock. Again, Staff concurs. The
24 figures that they presented you were as of December 31st, 2014.
25 The Company's were as projected to May 31st of this year, and

1 they'll be updated when we get to the true-up stage. And the
2 Industrials do not oppose capital structure. What the.

3 Department of Energy proposes is to insert
4 short-term debt. You see the figures there. It reduces the
5 long-term debt and inserts short term, and it reduces equity.
6 This is also at odds with prior Commission rulings.

7 Now, Mr. Hevert in his Rebuttal indicated that if
8 the Commission were to use KCP&L's debt structure, there should
9 be certain adjustments. And Ms. Reno in her Rebuttal has
10 agreed that those corrections should be made. So I don't think
11 there's any dispute on that issue.

12 This is an updated version of Schedule 17 to
13 Mr. Hevert's Rebuttal where he summarized the recent ROEs. And
14 it's the top line that's partially cut off that relates to
15 vertically-integrated electric utilities. And what this shows
16 is that -- let me try to get that focused again. I'll read
17 those top numbers, because the numbers went up and then they
18 came down in 2014.

19 For the first quarter of 2014, the average
20 authorized returns on equity in the country were 9.86 percent.
21 Then it rose to 10.10. Then it declined to 9.90, and then went
22 up a little to 9.94. And then in the first quarter it took a
23 hit down to 9.64 percent, again likely based upon review of
24 economic data projections as well as historical. And then in
25 the first quarter of 2015 -- pardon me, the second quarter of

1 2015, this quarter to date, the average has risen to
2 9.83 percent. And it is at that level, including the
3 Commission's decision in the Ameren case.

4 And, again, when you look at that average,
5 9.83 percent, Mr. Hevert's bottom range is only 17 points away
6 from that, Staff is 33 points below from its top range of 9.5,
7 Mr. Gorman is 43 points below, and Ms. Reno at 9.0 is 83 points
8 below.

9 So what I would say in closing is ask in
10 particular Mr. Hevert about these economic trends and why --
11 why his recommendations are what they are, because things have
12 changed since the evidence in the Ameren case, things have
13 changed since the Commission had its deliberation two months
14 ago. Changes in the off -- in the economy is different now
15 than it even was a couple months ago, and that is what
16 justifies a return on equity closer to the Company's
17 recommendation in this case.

18 Thank you very much.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions?

20 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No questions. Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. Thank you.

23 Opening by Staff.

24 MR. THOMPSON: I have a little visual aid myself.

25 Only one.

1 May it please the Commission. Return on equity is
2 a troublesome area, often the largest area in terms of money in
3 a given rate case. It's certainly the area where you have the
4 most discretion. It's amazing how scientific it all sounds
5 when you hear a flurry of figures and data from the financial
6 markets and matrices showing what other commissions have done
7 and what the results of various tests are. But don't be
8 fooled. This is very much a subjective exercise. ROE is very
9 much a matter of expert opinion and expert judgment.

10 If you look at the chart that I've put up there,
11 of the four experts who are going to testify this afternoon,
12 three of them are in close agreement as to what the return on
13 equity should be that is set by this Commission for this
14 Company. Also in close agreement is the return on equity that
15 this Commission authorized for Ameren Missouri not very long
16 ago, 9.53 percent. An outlier is the recommendation made by
17 Mr. Hevert, 10.3 percent. He made a very similar
18 recommendation in the Ameren Missouri case. The Commission was
19 evidently not persuaded by it, and I urge you to not be
20 persuaded today by the recommendation that he has made in this
21 case.

22 It's interesting in all the talk that we heard
23 from Mr. Zobrist about how things have changed -- and I guess
24 that was the theme of his opening, things have changed, and
25 what you did with Ameren, well, that's not right now, that

1 wouldn't be correct, things have changed -- he didn't say a
2 word about whether investors require a higher return today than
3 they required two months ago. And the only purpose, the only
4 purpose of an ROE expert's analysis is to determine the return
5 that an investor requires. What is the return that is required
6 for that security? We didn't hear about that. We heard that
7 bonds have changed and interest has changed and maybe the feds
8 are getting skittish, but we didn't hear about investors. We
9 didn't hear about the returns they require.

10 I suggest to you that the evidence in front of you
11 supports a return on equity at 9.53 percent or below, just as
12 you did in the case of Ameren Missouri.

13 Thank you very much.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions?

15 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No questions. Thank you,
16 Mr. Thompson.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: OPC.

18 MR. OPITZ: May it please the Commission. Good
19 afternoon. The Commission's guiding purpose in setting rates
20 is to protect the public against -- to protect the public and
21 the consumers against a natural monopoly of the public utility.
22 And to fulfill this duty, the Commission is charged with
23 setting just and reasonable rates. And here, as in nearly
24 every case, a significant component of just and reasonable is
25 the return -- rate of return on equity.

1 Once again, return on equity is a large-dollar
2 issue. Based on the reconciliation filed by Staff, the
3 difference between the Company's requested 10.3 percent ROE and
4 the lowest recommendation, the U.S. DOE's recommended 9 percent
5 ROE is approximately \$23.2 million. However, I will point out
6 that because of the in-service dates of the LaCygne
7 environmental upgrade, the Company's plant balance is expected
8 to increase, likely making this issue worth significantly more.

9 Public Counsel has not sponsored a witness on this
10 issue, but the Commission will have before it the expert
11 testimony of four experts. Ms. Reno recommends 9 percent,
12 Mr. Gorman recommends 9.1 percent, Mr. Marevangepo recommends
13 9.25 percent, and at a cost to ratepayers of more than the
14 lowest recommendation of 23 -- approximately \$23.2 million
15 more, Mr. Hevert recommends 10.3 percent. That's a
16 recommendation that is an increase from the Company's current
17 authorized ROE.

18 You heard briefly in the opening offered by the
19 Company that a reasonable return on equity, as developed by the
20 United States Supreme Court decisions in Bluefield and Hope
21 cases, is, first, that the return on equity be adequate to
22 attract capital at reasonable terms, thereby enabling the
23 utility to provide safe and reliable electric service for the
24 public; two, that it be sufficient to ensure the Company's
25 financial integrity; and, three, that the return on equity be

1 sufficient to ensure the Company's -- ensure that the Company
2 gets returns on investments commensurate with enterprises with
3 corresponding risks.

4 Bearing all that in mind, a just and reasonable
5 rate is one that is fair to the utility and fair to its
6 ratepayers. Each of these experts has presented in prefiled
7 testimony what they believe to be a range of reasonable ROE
8 recommendations.

9 Mr. Gorman has offered testimony that there's been
10 a significant decline in capital market costs. He's testified
11 that the industry authorized return on equity has been
12 declining over the last several years. And Staff's expert
13 offered similar testimony. This Commission is aware of that
14 decline, as it recently recognized that the cost of capital has
15 declined when it ordered a 9.53 percent ROE for Ameren
16 Missouri, which was a reduction from the Company's previous
17 rate case. As the utility's capital market changes, ratepayers
18 should share in the benefit of these lower capital market
19 costs.

20 Notably a part of determining a reasonable rate of
21 return or reasonable rate is to make rates as affordable as
22 possible without causing a detriment to the utility. In
23 determining the return on equity, the Commission has some level
24 of discretion, as mentioned by Mr. Thompson. Public Counsel
25 urges this Commission to authorize a return on equity in a

1 manner that recognizes the economic challenges faced by
2 households in KCPL's service territory.

3 You've heard the testimony at the local public
4 hearings. You may have read the comments filed in EFIS.
5 Customers have expressed their frustration about the increasing
6 burden of additional rate increases. Even now many customers
7 are struggling to pay their bills. Staff's witness, Michael
8 Stahlman, offered prefiled testimony that the general economic
9 conditions, specifically of the counties that compose the
10 service area of KCPL, continues to experience challenges in the
11 wake of the Great Recession.

12 Annual unemployment levels are still above
13 prerecession levels in KCPL's service area. Further, Dr. Marke
14 of Public Counsel has prefiled testimony that KCPL's
15 residential ratepayers' wages are not keeping up with the KCPL
16 rate increases. This fact is especially troubling, considering
17 the existing portion of past due balances among residential
18 rate pays for KCPL. As of October 1st, 2014 more than 20
19 percent of residential KCPL accounts have past due balances.

20 Customers can't afford the current rates, and any
21 additional increase furthers the financial strain for the
22 ratepayers. Public Counsel asks that the Commission focus on
23 ensuring rate affordability and fairness for customers. There
24 is no question that the lower the ROE, the more affordable
25 rates will be for customers.

1 Despite a decrease in the capital market costs and
2 a declining trend in authorized ROEs, KCPL's witness presents
3 an ROE recommendation that would significantly and unreasonably
4 increase the authorized ROE. Certainly the Company has a right
5 to an ROE that is sufficient to keep its public utility plants
6 in proper repair for effective public service and an amount
7 that will ensure that investors can receive reasonable return
8 on funds invested; however, if the cost of equity and the cost
9 to attract capital decrease, it is only appropriate that the
10 Commission lower the authorized ROE, not increase it as the
11 Company has requested.

12 Mr. Gorman has presented a range with an ROE with
13 a range as low as 8.8 percent, made utilizing traditional tools
14 to determine an appropriate return on equity. Ms. Reno has
15 also recommended an ROE, hers being 9 percent, with a range of
16 8.2 to 9.6 percent. As I mentioned to you earlier, the
17 difference between an ROE of 10.3 percent and 9 percent is
18 approximately \$23.2 million, as of Staff's most recent
19 reconciliation. This extra money, to the extent that it is not
20 required to keep the plant in repair or attract capital for the
21 Company, does not benefit the ratepayers in any way.

22 The Commission is charged with protecting the
23 public and their money, and I would urge that you not transfer
24 any more -- not \$1 more than what you believe is necessary and
25 sufficient to attract capital and provide fair compensation at

1 the lowest cost to customers.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIR R. KENNEY: I have no questions. Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: No questions.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

6 Missouri Division of Energy.

7 MR. ANTAL: Your Honor, we haven't filed any
8 testimony on this issue and won't make any opening statement.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That's fine.

10 U.S. Department of Energy.

11 And, sir, could you make your entry of appearance
12 on the record?

13 MR. TSHIKORORO: Yes, I'd like to make an entry of
14 appearance. My name is Sean Tshikoraro, attorney representing
15 the United States Department of Energy and the Federal
16 Executive Agencies.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you very much.

18 MR. TSHIKORORO: May it please the Commission.
19 The U.S. Department of Energy and the Federal Executive
20 Agencies adhere to the principle that utilities should have an
21 opportunity to earn a reasonable return for their investors.
22 In this case DOE takes the position that an ROE of 9.0, based
23 on a range of reasonableness of 8.2 to 9.6, will provide the
24 Company with an opportunity to earn a reasonable rate of
25 return. It's important to remember that the range of

1 reasonableness recommended by Ms. Reno, DOE's witness, does
2 have an upper bound of 9.6, a number that does encapsulate this
3 Commission's most recent decision in the Ameren Missouri case
4 where the Commission approved an ROE of 9.53.

5 And also, as we can see from the chart that's
6 still up there, Ms. Reno is in line with the majority of expert
7 opinion in this case, both that of Staff and the Industrial
8 customers. The only outlier is the Company witness, who
9 recommends an ROE of 10.3, with a range of reasonableness of
10 10.0 to 10.6.

11 The return requested by the Company, recommended
12 by their expert, Mr. Hevert, is explained by Mr. Hevert's
13 unwillingness to actually adopt the -- his own DCF
14 calculations, the lower bounds of his own DCF calculations.

15 The Discounted Cash Flow Model, as you know,
16 Commissioners, is a well-established model that is universally
17 used by experts and commissions around the country in
18 calculating return on equity. Mr. Hevert's own DCF
19 calculations resulted in a lower bound ROE of 8.35. However,
20 Mr. Hevert arbitrarily ignores these lower results. This
21 Commission and others have used the DCF methodology for
22 decades, and the DCF Model should not be discarded in this
23 situation at this point in time just because we're currently
24 experiencing record historically low costs of capital. DCF
25 Models accurately reflect these low costs, and they should not

1 be ignored for that fact alone.

2 Mr. Hevert emphasizes a need to rely instead on a
3 Capital Asset Pricing Model, as was a model also utilized by
4 DOE Witness Reno, and a Bond Yield Plus Risk Premium Model.
5 It's important to note that, despite Mr. Hevert's substantial
6 criticism of Ms. Reno's use of DCF Models, even Mr. Hevert's
7 Capital Asset Pricing Model utilizes a DCF Model to calculate
8 the return required by the market.

9 At the center of the DCF debate in this case, as
10 mentioned by other attorneys that have come before you today,
11 is the issue of the appropriate growth rate. Mr. Hevert would
12 have us believe that the sophisticated investors only focus on
13 a single indicator when making their investment decisions.
14 That indicator being projected earnings growth. Ms. Reno, on
15 the other hand, has run a series of different DCF Models to
16 reflect that prudent investors look to a number of factors when
17 making investment decisions, including dividends, book values,
18 earnings, and sustainable growth rates. Ms. Reno's use of the
19 variety of DCF Models reflects the reality that prudent
20 investors base their investment decisions on all available
21 information.

22 Mr. Hevert's prefiled testimony emphasized the
23 importance of recent economic indicators, as did the Company's
24 opening statement just now. The allegation is that these
25 economic indicators show unsustainable utility stock prices and

1 the potential for increasing interest rates.

2 In Mr. Hevert's Rebuttal Testimony, he focuses his
3 analysis primarily on a relatively short time period though, a
4 time period during which utility stock prices started to
5 decrease. This is an attempt by Mr. Hevert to establish that
6 investors are perceiving increased risk in the utility
7 industry. However, as the testimony of Ms. Reno, as well as
8 that of Mr. Gorman and Mr. Marevangepo show, this is simply not
9 the case. Utility stocks have seen a slight decrease since the
10 beginning of this year, but that decrease must be viewed in the
11 context of how high they have been; and, as such, this decrease
12 should be seen more as a market correction and not something
13 that is going to cause investors to perceive more risk.

14 Furthermore, DCF Models account for stock prices
15 and the stock price that investors are willing to pay. And
16 they assume that investors are sophisticated and look at all
17 relevant economic trends when making their investment
18 decisions. And as I mentioned at the beginning of my
19 statement, this Commission's most recent decision in the Ameren
20 case found an ROE of 9.53, which, again, is well within the
21 range of Ms. Reno's reasonable calculations. And for this
22 reason, the DOE takes the position that the Company's proposed
23 ROE of 10.3 is well outside the range of what should be
24 considered a fair and reasonable return on equity.

25 Thank you.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions?

2 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No questions. Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: I have just a few. The
4 Department of Energy is a KCP&L customer?

5 MR. TSHIKORORO: Correct. Not just the Department
6 of Energy, we also represent the other Federal Executive
7 Agencies. So we have a variety of customers within -- or a
8 variety of facilities within the KCP&L --

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: But you're --

10 MR. TSHIKORORO: -- service territory.

11 MR. STEINER: -- intervening as a customer, not
12 with a particular policy agenda?

13 MR. TSHIKORORO: That's correct, sir.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: No -- okay. How common is it
15 for DOE to intervene in state ratemaking proceedings?

16 MR. TSHIKORORO: It is fairly common. We have a
17 program established for that purpose. We actually get our
18 delegation from the General Services Administration, which has
19 the authority from Congress to represent the federal
20 government's consumer interests before state public utility
21 commissions. GSA delegated that authority to the Department of
22 Energy. They've also delegated it to several other agencies.

23 And so in those service territories for utilities
24 around the country where DOE has the federal government's
25 largest load, we do intervene on behalf of those facilities and

1 their consumer interests.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: And is that -- is that
3 delegation statutory? By rule? By MOU?

4 MR. TSHIKORORO: It's statutory. So the authority
5 is statutorily given to GSA; and then GSA delegated it to us by
6 order, the administrator of the GSA.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

9 Statement by MIEC.

10 (Off the record.)

11 MS. ILES: May it please the Commission. My name
12 is Carole Iles. I'm here on behalf of the MIEC.

13 Is there some reason it's not on that screen?

14 (Off the record.)

15 MS. ILES: So MIEC's witness for the ROE issue is
16 Mr. Michael Gorman; and his recommendation in this case, as
17 you've heard from the other attorneys, is an ROE of
18 9.1 percent, which is the midpoint of his recommended range of
19 8.8 to 9.4 percent.

20 Mr. Gorman summarizes -- you've heard a lot about
21 where we are in the economy, where we are in the capital
22 markets. And I think Mr. Gorman provides a nice summary on
23 page 23 of his Rebuttal Testimony when he says that, A fair
24 analysis of utility securities shows that the market generally
25 regards utility securities as low risk investment instruments

1 and supports the finding that utilities' cost of capital is
2 very low in today's marketplace. So we're simply asking that
3 ratepayers get the benefit of today's very low cost of capital.

4 As you've also heard from the other attorneys, the
5 witnesses in this case use the same market-based analyses as
6 all of the witnesses -- expert witnesses on this issue used the
7 same market-based analyses, but they get different results
8 because of different inputs.

9 As Mr. Gorman points out in his testimony, if you
10 make some corrections to Mr. Hevert's testimony, all of the
11 return on equity witnesses in this case, including
12 Mr. Hevert's, when corrected, prove that KCPL's current market
13 cost of equity is 9.5 percent or less. Mr. Hevert's analyses
14 and recommendations are simply based on inflated data and
15 artificially-adjusted models. His results are not reliable.

16 In particular I'd point out that the GDP growth
17 rate that Mr. Hevert relies on in making his analyses, he uses
18 a 5.65 percent. As Mr. Zobrist pointed out, he used a GDP
19 growth rate that's based on historical numbers rather than
20 forward-looking analyst projections, as Mr. Gorman does.
21 Mr. Gorman's GDP growth rate is 4.6 percent. That's a
22 significant difference, and it leads to a significant
23 difference in the outcomes of their analyses.

24 The only other thing I'd point out that -- about
25 Mr. Hevert's testimony, besides his inflated growth rates and

1 his various adjustments that need to be made to his analyses,
2 is that he also places undue emphasis on average returns on
3 equity authorized by other regulatory commissions around the
4 country. We do agree that average authorized returns
5 provide -- and I'm aware that this Commission often looks to
6 this and that this does provide some measure of reasonableness
7 when setting return on equity in this case. Mr. Gorman's
8 recommendation reflects the continuation of the downward trend
9 awarded -- of awarded returns on equity for utility companies.
10 On the other hand, Mr. Hevert's recommendation would be an
11 increase for KCPL.

12 As Mr. Gorman notes in his testimony, regulatory
13 commissions authorized returns on equity have declined over
14 time, albeit at a much slower pace than the decline in actual
15 capital market costs. And we think more weight should be given
16 to what's actually going on in the capital markets because
17 there is that lag, because as capital prices go down, you don't
18 see -- commissions do take a more conservative approach,
19 perhaps with the thought that -- the concern that the costs are
20 going to go back up. But they haven't gone back up.
21 Notwithstanding the testimony today, we are in a very low cost
22 of capital market right now.

23 The other thing I would point out, and this is
24 information that Mr. Gorman also provided in the Ameren case,
25 when he looks at authorized ROEs, he doesn't just look at

1 what's going on with vertically-integrated companies and what
2 the average is, which is the number that Mr. Zobrist mentioned
3 when he was up here a minute ago. That 9.94 percent is the
4 average for 2014 if you look only at vertically-integrated
5 companies, which of course KCP&L is. But there are other
6 electric utility companies that have similar investment risk,
7 notwithstanding the fact that they're distribution companies;
8 and we know that because they have similar bond ratings. The
9 bond ratings tell us what the investment risk is, and we need
10 to be looking at companies with similar investment risk. If
11 you look at all electric utilities for 2014, not just the
12 vertically integrated, the number comes down to 9.76 percent.

13 The other issue that Mr. Gorman thinks is
14 important to look at is how were the cases decided, how was
15 that issued decided in the cases where an ROE was set by a
16 public utility Commission. If you look at the cases where the
17 issue was actually litigated and you also increase your number
18 of data points to include all the cases involving companies
19 with similar investment risk, that average for 2014 comes down
20 to 9.63 percent. Mr. Gorman updated this information through
21 the first quarter of 2015. And you can see these numbers are
22 very close to what they were for 2014, but they're actually
23 slightly lower. So his testimony reflects that decline.

24 Mr. Hevert's does not.

25 In this case the clear and persistent trend of

1 very low capital market costs for utility companies justifies a
2 continued decline in the authorized return on equity. That's
3 from Mr. Gorman's testimony. An authorized return of
4 9.1 percent, in summary, balances the interests of KCP&L and
5 its ratepayers by allowing the rates to reflect today's very
6 low capital costs.

7 Thank you.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions.

9 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No, thank you.

10 MS. ILES: Thank you.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any opening by Brightergy?

12 MR. ZELLERS: No opening on this topic, Your
13 Honor.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Consumers Council?

15 MR. HOFFMAN: No opening, Your Honor.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That concludes all the opening
17 statements for cost of capital.

18 Our first witness is Mr. Hevert.

19 MR. ZOBRI ST: Company calls Mr. Robert Hevert to
20 the stand.

21 ROBERT HEVERT, testifies as follows:

22 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

23 **Q Please state your name.**

24 A My name is Robert Hevert. Last name is spelled
25 H-E-V, as in victor, E-R-T.

1 **Q And by whom are you employed?**

2 A I am managing partner of Sussex, S-U-S-S-E-X,
3 Economic Advisors of Framingham, Massachusetts.

4 **Q And, Mr. Hevert, did you prepare in this case**
5 **Direct Testimony marked Exhibit 115, Rebuttal Testimony marked**
6 **116, and Surrebuttal Testimony marked Exhibit Number 117 with**
7 **accompanying schedules?**

8 A Yes, I did.

9 **Q Do you have any corrections to any of those three**
10 **exhibits?**

11 A I have two minor corrections. The first is on my
12 Direct Testimony. And, I apologize, I can't remember what
13 exhibit number that is.

14 **Q Exhibit 115.**

15 A 115. And that is on page 53. There's a table
16 there, Table 9, which says Summary of DCF Results. That is
17 mislabelled. The table title should be Overall Rate of Return.

18 And then the second is in my Surrebuttal
19 Testimony, which I supposed is 117?

20 **Q Correct.**

21 A And that is on page 41. Line 23 at the left-hand
22 margin where it reads, Objectives of debt in -- or, excuse me,
23 equity investors, it ought to read objectives of debt
24 investors.

25 **Q Any other corrections?**

1 A Not that I'm aware of, no.

2 MR. ZOBRI ST: Judge, I presume that you'll want
3 the witness to undergo cross-examination and redirect prior to
4 my offering the exhibit?

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Is he going to testify at a later
6 time also?

7 MR. ZOBRI ST: No, this will be the only occasion.
8 So I would --

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't you go ahead and offer,
10 and we'll see if there will be any objections.

11 MR. ZOBRI ST: Your Honor, then I offer Exhibits
12 115, 116, and 117 at this time, and tender the witnesses for
13 cross-examination.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections to those exhibits?
15 Hearing none, they'll be received into the record.
16 (Exhibits 115, 116, and 117 received into
17 evidence.)

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross-examination would be
19 Brightergy.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZELLERS:

21 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Hevert.

22 A Good afternoon.

23 Q Mr. Gorman's Surrebuttal, do you have that in
24 front of you?

25 A One second, please. Yes, I have that.

1 Q **Could you refer to page 4? I was struck that he**
2 **stated in that testimony that you concocted weights to show how**
3 **Mr. Gorman arrived at his 9.1 percent recommended ROE. Can you**
4 **explain a little bit about what you did in your Rebuttal**
5 **Testimony and whether or not that's an accurate statement?**

6 A I can. I'd be happy to. I think if we were to go
7 to Mr. Gorman's Direct Testimony at page 39 -- I just want to
8 be sure I have that correct -- he discusses how he went ahead
9 and arrived at his estimate. And at page 39 Mr. Gorman says
10 that his recommended return is the midpoint of his range of 8.8
11 to 9.4 percent; the 9.4 percent being the upper bound, being
12 his risk premium result, and the 9.1 percent being the average
13 of that 8.8. The 8.8 percent is the average of his Capital
14 Asset Pricing Model and Discounted Cash Flow methods. He says
15 the low end is based on the average of those two. So when you
16 take the average of those two and then apply that as an average
17 with another, it's effectively giving each 25 percent weight.
18 And that's what I did on Table 5. In my view what I did was
19 put numbers to what it seemed to me Mr. Gorman said he had
20 done. His recommendation is the midpoint of two numbers. One
21 number is given as 9.4. The other number is given as the
22 average of two. The average of those two then have weights of
23 25 percent each.

24 So I have to say I too was a little surprised at
25 Mr. Gorman's choice of words. I didn't think it was

1 contrivance at all on my part or concoction. I thought all I
2 had done was to put in numbers what he said he had done in his
3 testimony.

4 MR. ZELLERS: Thank you, Mr. Hevert.

5 No other questions at this time, Your Honor.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Division of Energy.

7 MR. ANTAL: No questions.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Consumers Council?

9 MR. HOFFMAN: No questions.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: U.S. Department of Energy?

11 MR. TSHIKORORO: No questions.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

13 MS. ILES: No questions.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MECG.

15 MR. WOODSMALL: Yes, very briefly, Your Honor.

16 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WOODSMALL:

17 **Q Good afternoon, Mr. Hevert.**

18 **A** Good afternoon.

19 **Q Do you recall answering a data request in this**
20 **case, 16-11, which you were asked for your ROE recommendations**
21 **for the past three years?**

22 **A** Yes, this is the one where you said it would
23 require an update. And we don't always keep those, but I think
24 it's a fair question, so I go ahead and pull the numbers
25 together, as you asked.

1 **Q Thank you. Hand you a document. Can you identify**
2 **that as the response to Data Request 16-11?**

3 A Yes, I can.

4 MR. WOODSMALL: And I believe this is my
5 exhibit...

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I see you have exhibits up till
7 504. So the next number will be 505.

8 (MIEC Exhibit 505 marked for identification.)

9 MR. WOODSMALL: Your Honor, I'd move for the
10 admission of Exhibit 504.

11 THE WITNESS: I thought it was 505.

12 MR. WOODSMALL: Oh, I'm sorry.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: 505 is the next open.

14 MR. WOODSMALL: I'm sorry. 505.

15 MR. ZOBRI ST: No objection.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any other objections to the
17 receipt of that? Hearing none, Exhibit 505 will be received
18 into the record.

19 (Exhibit 505 received into evidence.)

20 BY MR. WOODSMALL:

21 **Q Mr. Hevert, would you agree that this is a list of**
22 **the cases that you've provided testimony since January 1st of**
23 **2013?**

24 A Yes, I would agree with that.

25 **Q And in this data request response you provide your**

1 **recommended ROE as well as the ROE that was ordered by the**
2 **Commission; is that correct?**

3 A Yes. And I also provide the recommended ROE
4 range.

5 Q **Thank you. Would you agree that your recommended**
6 **ROE in this averaged 10.49 --**

7 A I --

8 Q **-- for the reported cases?**

9 A I've not done that calculation. I couldn't tell
10 you offhand.

11 Q **Would you accept that, or do you want to do the**
12 **calculation?**

13 A I would accept it, subject to check.

14 Q **Okay. Would you agree that the Commission's**
15 **ordered ROE in the cases that have decisions was 9.70?**

16 A Just one second, please. I would agree with that.
17 And I would also point out that some of these cases were
18 natural gas cases, some electric cases, some vertically
19 integrated, some distribution only. So there's a wide range of
20 cases in this -- in this summary.

21 Q **Thank you, Your Honor -- or thank you, sir.**

22 A I got a promotion.

23 Q **I'm trying to promote you already.**

24 MR. WOODSMALL: Your Honor, I have a couple of
25 questions that I believe I need to go in-camera for.

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

JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right.

(REPORTER'S NOTE: At this point, an in-camera was held, Volume 10, pages 160 to 162.)

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

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

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay. We're back in public
2 sessi on.

3 CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WOODSMALL:

4 Q Back to data request 16-1, would you agree that
5 your budgeted amount for this case is \$99,660?

6 A Not for the entirety of the case. I believe that
7 budget excluded costs associated with Surrebuttal Testimony.

8 Q Okay. So your costs will likely be above that
9 \$99,000 figure then?

10 A It may. I'm not entirely sure what the final
11 number will be.

12 Q Okay. Would you agree that, turning to data
13 request 16-13, in your last five cases in which ROE was
14 litigated, your total cost was 163 -- one hundred --

15 MR. ZOBRI ST: Let me object before the figure
16 comes out then. I don't understand why what he is charging
17 other public utilities is relevant to the what he is charging
18 the public utility that's before the Commission.

19 MR. WOODSMALL: Because at this point in time his
20 actual numbers aren't in, his invoices aren't done, he's still
21 providing services. So I want to give the Commission some idea
22 of a ballpark of what ROE services will cost from him for a
23 fully-litigated case, including all services.

24 MR. ZOBRI ST: Well, it lacks foundation. I
25 understand that -- the nature of the question. But unless the

1 foundation is lain for those other rate cases, I again fail to
2 perceive its relevance to what he's going to charge this
3 Company in this case.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Overruled.

5 BY MR. WOODSMALL:

6 **Q In the last five cases in which you -- in which**
7 **return on equity was fully litigated, would you agree that you**
8 **charged in one \$167,000; in another \$111,000, case 3, 92,000;**
9 **case 4, 165,000; and case 5, \$176,000?**

10 A Yes. I'd like to -- I think there's a couple
11 pieces of that response that you didn't mention. I think in
12 our response we noted that the cost of every case depends upon
13 the scope of the issues, the number of intervening witness, the
14 level of discovery, the nature of the hearings.

15 I would also say, going back to our budget in this
16 case, that with respect to what we have budgeted, we've -- our
17 costs have run over, and we have written down about \$24,000.
18 So we will stick to our budget in this case. It is costing us
19 to do that. But that's what we're going to do.

20 **Q So you're planning on sticking to the \$99,000**
21 **budget?**

22 A That \$99,000 budget excludes Surrebuttal
23 Testimony. So far we're slightly below that \$99,000 budget,
24 but it does include costs that we have written off.

25 **Q Okay. So when you say you're going to be sticking**

1 **to the budget, what is the budget that you anticipate sticking**
2 **to?**

3 A No, I said we have stuck -- excuse me. If I
4 didn't say we have stuck to the budget, that's what we have
5 done. So far up through hearings, I believe, including
6 discovery, Direct Testimony, Rebuttal Testimony, the budget was
7 approximately, as you say, \$99,000. I believe we're within now
8 about a thousand dollars of that amount, in terms of what we've
9 billed so far. Those amounts do not include costs associated
10 with Surrebuttal Testimony. I cannot tell you right now what
11 those costs are.

12 MR. WOODSMALL: Okay. I have no further
13 questions. Thank you.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: OPC?

15 MR. OPITZ: No questions, Your Honor.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Staff?

17 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

18 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:

19 Q **Good afternoon, Mr. Hevert.**

20 A Good afternoon, Mr. Thompson.

21 Q **It's nice to see you again. I hope you're**
22 **gratified that I finally learned how to pronounce your name**
23 **correctly?**

24 A Hevert is the correct pronunciation.

25 Q **Oh, you're kidding me. I thought you told me it**

1 **wasn't the last -- whatever you say.**

2 MR. WOODSMALL: Now I owe you an apology. I'm
3 sorry.

4 THE WITNESS: It is Hevert. I just...

5 MR. WOODSMALL: Oh.

6 THE WITNESS: You're too easy, Kevin.

7 BY MR. THOMPSON:

8 **Q So often I've been told that.**

9 **Mr. Hevert, would you agree with me that the**
10 **purpose of your engagement is to determine the market-required**
11 **return for this Company?**

12 A The purpose of my engagement is to determine the
13 market, the investor required return on equity, yes.

14 **Q Okay. And now in this data request response that**
15 **Mr. Woodsmall thoughtfully provided to us all, in those cases**
16 **are there any instances where you are representing a consumer**
17 **organization?**

18 A No, they -- they are not.

19 **Q Would you agree with me that you typically**
20 **represent utilities?**

21 A I -- what I will say is that my testimony
22 represents my view of the cost of equity, and to the extent
23 that the parties that engage me understand my view and they
24 find my view consistent with theirs that they'll retain me.

25 I've not been asked by people's counsel, attorneys

1 general to provide cost of equity testimony.

2 **Q Okay. I appreciate that. And you would agree**
3 **with me that as a result, you have generally represented**
4 **companies; is that correct?**

5 A Well, I think we need to -- if we're talking about
6 return on equity, that's one thing. If we're talking beyond
7 that, our firm certainly has represented utility commissions
8 and agencies.

9 **Q Thank you. It's true, isn't it, that all of the**
10 **experts in this case have used more or less similar models in**
11 **determining their recommendations?**

12 A More or less, I would agree.

13 **Q But the inputs have differed; isn't that true?**

14 A Well, I think there are a couple of things that
15 differ. I think the inputs differ. I think the interpretation
16 of the results differ. And I think looking at results in the
17 context of other observable quantifiable measures, that differs
18 as well.

19 **Q Would you agree with me that this engagement**
20 **requires professional experience and judgment?**

21 A I would agree with that, yes.

22 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. No further questions.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions based -- or, excuse me.
24 Questions from the bench?

25 Mr. Chairman?

1 QUESTIONS BY CHAIR R. KENNEY:

2 Q Mr. Hevert; right?

3 A For you, that's correct, sir.

4 Q Thanks. Just a few additional ones to expand upon
5 some of the questions that Mr. Thompson was just asking you.

6 Attachment A to your Direct Testimony is a list of
7 cases in which you've testified in various jurisdictions; is
8 that correct?

9 A Yes, sir, that's correct.

10 Q And I looked at the list pretty carefully. There
11 are no consumer groups that appear on that Attachment A;
12 correct?

13 A That's right. And, again, it's not to say that I
14 would not represent a consumer group. I --

15 Q You just never have?

16 A I've never been asked.

17 Q And, as a result, you never have?

18 A Correct.

19 Q Okay. In a hundred percent of the companies on --
20 the applicants on there and the entities on which you've test
21 -- on whose behalf you've testified are all power and light
22 companies, gas companies?

23 A For -- on rate of return issue's, that's correct.

24 Q There's some other ones on here, Market Power
25 Study, some divestitures, a handful of other types of cases on

1 **this list as well?**

2 A Yes, sir.

3 **Q That's not exclusively ROE testimony?**

4 A That's correct.

5 **Q And just to expand on some of the other questions**
6 **that were asked about the engagement, what's your hourly rate?**

7 A My hourly rate is \$350. If we look at the average
8 hourly rate for our firm under this engagement, I believe our
9 budgeted estimate is about \$250.

10 **Q So there are other folks from your firm that have**
11 **worked on this engagement?**

12 A Oh, yes, sir. We -- we leverage down as best we
13 can to use the lower-cost people as much as we can.

14 **Q Do you charge the same amount to appear here to**
15 **testify as you do prepare your testimony?**

16 A I do. I do not charge a premium for appearing
17 live.

18 **Q Now let me just ask a couple of other questions**
19 **not related to the financial terms of your engagement, the**
20 **substance of it now. There were some comparisons made to**
21 **Ameren, in your testimony in Ameren; and I believe Mr. Zobrist**
22 **or somebody else made the note in one of the opening statements**
23 **that recent market changes justify an ROE that's different from**
24 **Ameren?**

25 A Yes, sir.

1 **Q Things have changed in the two months subsequent?**

2 A Yes, sir.

3 **Q Has the relative or comparative risk between KCP&L**
4 **and Ameren changed?**

5 A I would not say that the relative risk between
6 those two companies have changed. What I would say is that if
7 we were to look at the utility sector generally, when you're at
8 a point at which they were priced at historically high levels,
9 that in and of itself engenders risk, and I think that's the
10 risk that we saw happening over the past two months, the sort
11 of coming off of those historically high valuation levels.

12 **Q But the business and financial risk comparatively**
13 **of the two utilities is the same?**

14 A I would agree with that.

15 **Q What was your cost of capital recommendation in**
16 **the Ameren case, if you recall? Would you please remind us?**

17 A I believe it was a range of 10.2 to 10.6 percent
18 with a point estimate of 10.4 percent.

19 **Q 10.2 to 10.6?**

20 A Yes, I believe that's correct.

21 **Q And what's your cost of capital estimate in this**
22 **case?**

23 A 10.0 to 10.6 with a point estimate of 10.3.

24 **Q So they're virtually the same. But you're saying**
25 **that there are market differences that would justify difference**

1 **in the ROE recommendations, but we don't see a difference in**
2 **your ROE recommendations; is that correct?**

3 A It's a -- it's a really good question. That's
4 right. And the -- the --

5 **Q Your Counsel probably ask you more questions to**
6 **follow up. But my statement's correct?**

7 A Your statement is correct.

8 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Okay. That's all the questions
9 I have. Thank you.

10 THE WITNESS: Always a pleasure.

11 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Thanks for your time. Thanks.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commissioner Kenney.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: I would make a comment that
14 the chairman is leaving us and asking about all these rates,
15 I'm wondering if he's going into the business, but I don't know
16 that.

17 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Not this. I'm not qualified to
18 render cost of capital.

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: There's always college,
20 Counsel. I have no questions.

21 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER HALL:

22 **Q Good afternoon.**

23 A Good afternoon.

24 **Q So you provided testimony in the Ameren rate case,**
25 **which we resolved in late April; correct?**

1 A That's right.

2 Q And your -- your recommendation in that case was
3 10.2 to 10.6?

4 A Correct.

5 Q So sitting here today do you believe that the
6 Commission's determination on that issue was reasonable or
7 unreasonable? And I will not take offense.

8 A I -- well, I appreciate that. I feel that the
9 Commission's determination, quite frankly, was low. I think if
10 we look at the capital market conditions at the time and I
11 think if we look at the change in capital market conditions
12 over time, and especially now when we look at the way the debt
13 markets are reacting, the equity market are reacting to the end
14 of federal intervention, there's lot more uncertainty in the
15 market.

16 So in my view, if you were to have an average
17 authorized return -- and there are lots of numbers floating
18 around -- but let's call it between 9.8 and 9.9 percent. You
19 know, in my view the 9.53 was a bit low.

20 Q But 9.8 would be reasonable?

21 A I think -- 9.8 is 20 basis points below the lower
22 end of my range. But 9.8 also is, depending upon how
23 calculated, within the range of average authorized returns that
24 we're seeing elsewhere. And I think some people would look at
25 that as a -- as a reasonable benchmark.

1 **Q You test -- did you testify in the 2012 Ameren**
2 **case?**

3 A I did.

4 **Q I don't see that on here.**

5 A Oh, I'm -- I think that -- are you talking about
6 Mr. Woodsmall's --

7 **Q Yes, I am.**

8 A I think it's just a matter of timing on that one.
9 I think it's the -- his request was as of January 1st, 2013.

10 **Q You provided testimony in the 2012 case after**
11 **2013?**

12 A No, I thought you said it was -- I'm sorry, you
13 said it was not in here?

14 **Q Yeah, I don't -- well, I mean -- I mean, I'm**
15 **reading Staff's Rebuttal Testimony on this issue, and**
16 **there's -- and there's reference to your estimate in Ameren**
17 **Missouri's 2012 rate case, and then I'm looking at this**
18 **response to the data request where you don't mention**
19 **2012 Ameren rate case. So I'm confused.**

20 A And I think the reason we didn't is the way we
21 interpret the question, because it asked for testimony offered
22 or filed since January 1st, 2013.

23 **Q Oh, I understand. Okay. Fair enough. All right.**
24 **So in the 2012 rate case, the Ameren rate case, your**
25 **recommendation was 10.5; is that correct?**

1 A Yes, that's correct.

2 **Q And in the -- in the Ameren rate case recently**
3 **completed, it was 10.4. And you in this case are recommending**
4 **10.3; is that correct?**

5 A That's right.

6 **Q I see a trend there. I see a trend of your**
7 **recommendations going down over time. Is there -- is that a**
8 **false interpretation of the positions you've taken in those**
9 **three cases?**

10 A No, I think -- I think that's -- that's correct.
11 If you look at the point estimates, there has been a 10 basis
12 point change each time. I think if we were to look at the
13 testimony in this case, I believe early on I referred to 10.3
14 as a conservative estimate.

15 Because the data itself, in this case in
16 particular, I think is very noisy, it's very variable. And I
17 think in this case, because of the way the markets have
18 reacted, it's -- there's a larger breadth of model results. I
19 recognized that the lower end of those results had expanded,
20 and I just thought it reasonable to reflect that. And that's
21 why I thought 10.3 was the proper number, although I did think
22 it was a conservative estimate.

23 But that said, I think my ranges, at least to some
24 extent, overlapped each other among the three cases.

25 **Q Well, it still looks to me like there's a downward**

1 trend in the recommendation that you -- that you're making.
2 And it appears to me, based on what I've seen in this case and
3 elsewhere, that that downward trend is -- is indicative of
4 what's happening -- what's happening nationally --

5 A Well --

6 Q -- is that true?

7 A I think I have a disagreement with some people
8 about this national trend. I think if you were to look at the
9 trend, if you were to look at each rate case decision on the
10 date it was rendered and you were to look at that over time,
11 there's literally not a statistically-significant trend. If
12 you aggregate data into quarters, sometimes you may be able to
13 discern a trend. But if you look at the actual returns over
14 time and you stick a trend line through it, that trend line is
15 essentially flat.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Well, that's not my
17 understanding of the -- of the data, but I'll leave it to
18 experts to hash that out and present -- and present arguments
19 to us.

20 Thank you.

21 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on commissioner
23 questions?

24 Brightergy?

25 MR. ZELLERS: Nothing further, Your Honor.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Division of Energy?

2 MR. ANTAL: No questions.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Consumers Council?

4 MR. HOFFMAN: No questions.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: U.S. Department of Energy?

6 MR. TSHIKORORO: No questions.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

8 MS. ILES: No questions.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MECG?

10 MR. WOODSMALL: None. Thank you.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Office of Public Counsel.

12 MR. OPITZ: Just a few, Your Honor.

13 RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. OPITZ:

14 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Hevert.

15 A Good afternoon.

16 Q In response to a question from the chairman, you
17 mentioned that others in your office have billed hours for this
18 case. How many other people in your office have worked on this
19 case?

20 A I would say -- well, we -- we like to use interns
21 as best we can, because they are, of course, a fairly low-cost
22 resource for us. Interns come and go. And so over time, with
23 all of the people involved -- and I think there was a discovery
24 request to this effect -- there were probably 10 or 12
25 individuals.

1 **Q And what functions did those individuals perform?**

2 A It ranges. A lot of it is research. As you can
3 imagine, this is a data-intensive exercise. So gathering the
4 data, putting the data in a format that's needed are things
5 that we try to have people who are sort of the lower-cost
6 people do that type of work. We then have people in the firm
7 that are a bit more experienced and will help draft the
8 testimony, help establish positions with respect to Rebuttal
9 and Surrebuttal Testimony and, to some extent, work on
10 analyses. I'll tell you that I myself spent a fair amount of
11 time working on the analyses. But to get back to one of the
12 Mr. Woodsmall's questions, I rarely bill for much of that time.

13 **Q And can you tell me what the hourly rate for those**
14 **other people who have worked on the case are -- is?**

15 A Well, I can tell you that it ranges from \$50 an
16 hour to, I believe, \$295 an hour. But I think, in aggregate,
17 again, we're probably in the 240 to \$250 per hour range, when
18 you sort of take the weighted average of all the people working
19 on it.

20 MR. OPITZ: That's all I have. Thank you.

21 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Staff?

23 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

24 RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:

25 **Q I thought I heard you say earlier that in**

1 **developing your budget for this engagement that you estimated**
2 **250 hours; is that correct?**

3 A No. I think what I said was that the weighted
4 average billing rate would be about \$250 per hour.

5 Q **Well, I heard that too. But did you not give a**
6 **figure for the number of hours you anticipated?**

7 A Not sitting here, I don't believe I did.

8 Q **Okay. Well, are you able to give such an**
9 **estimate?**

10 A I think our proposal had an estimate in there.

11 Q **And what do you think it was?**

12 A Well, I couldn't tell you offhand, but I'm pretty
13 sure it's in there.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. No further questions. Thank
15 you.

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect?

17 MR. ZOBRI ST: Thank you, Judge.

18 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

19 Q **Mr. Hevert, Chairman Kenney asked you a question**
20 **about market differences that have occurred, and you said they**
21 **were there. But would you go ahead and explain what the market**
22 **difference are -- market differences are that you have seen in**
23 **the capital markets in the past couple of months?**

24 A Yes, I would.

25 And I didn't mean to speak over you. I apologize

1 for that.

2 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No, don't apologize. No
3 worries.

4 THE WITNESS: What we've seen over the past couple
5 of months really is a couple of things. If we start on the
6 debt side and, in particular, on the treasury side of the
7 market, we've seen, of course, a run-up in interest rates that
8 was talked about in the testimony; but we've also seen a
9 historically high level of volatility in interest rates.
10 You'll see fairly large movements from day to day in treasury
11 yields. And what that tells you is that for what is perceived
12 to be among the most risky -- excuse me, among the most safe of
13 assets, that itself has become somewhat risky, that itself has
14 exhibited a degree of variation that is highly unusual.

15 We've also seen, for example, increases in the
16 yields on Company bonds. I know that there's a bond issue that
17 Staff referred to in their Rebuttal Testimony. And if you were
18 to look at the yield on that bond now, it's a couple basis
19 points above where it was in 2012, but it has increased by
20 about 40 basis points only over the past couple of months. So
21 we have seen interest rates move up. We have seen interest
22 rates become more volatile.

23 We've also seen companies that are in somewhat
24 defensive sectors like utilities lose a lot of value. There
25 was a great article in the Wall Street Journal a week or so ago

1 about sectors that were considered safe are now risky because
2 they had become priced at such a high level. So just within
3 the past couple of months we've seen interest rates move
4 around, interest rates come up, interest rates sect -- excuse
5 me, sensitive sectors lose a fair amount of value. Much of
6 this I think is in connection with the Federal Reserve
7 statement that they intend to begin normalizing interest rate
8 policy somewhere between now and the end of the year. And
9 we've seen that, of course, in the probabilities of a rate
10 increase suggested by the federal funds futures.

11 So a lot of market-based data is telling us that
12 interest rates have gone up, yet the market has become more
13 volatile, and the market perceives that there's a high
14 likelihood of increases in interest rates over the coming
15 months.

16 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

17 **Q Now, what is the effect of those changes in the**
18 **capital markets upon a utility like Kansas City Power & Light**
19 **and its investors?**

20 **A** Well, for -- for companies that are capital
21 intensive, they tend to be very sensitive to changes in
22 interest rates in terms of their valuation in the cost of
23 equity. So as interest rates go up, the cost of equity goes
24 up. It does not necessarily move in lockstep. It's not a
25 basis-point-for-basis-point change, but they are directionally

1 related.

2 **Q Now, with respect to the questions that**
3 **Commissioner Hall asked with regard to trends, did you update**
4 **Schedule 17 to your Surrebuttal to reflect trends in returns on**
5 **equity authorized by commissions through -- or, I should say,**
6 **through the second quarter to date?**

7 A Well, we -- we have in Schedule 23 -- excuse me.
8 Yes, we've -- I've updated -- excuse me, no, Schedule 17,
9 you're correct. Schedule 17 is updated through April 29th,
10 2015.

11 **Q And my question is today have you prepared a graph**
12 **that updates it through the second quarter? Which I'll mark as**
13 **Exhibit 139.**

14 A Yes. Thank you.
15 (Company Exhibit 139 marked for identification.)

16 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

17 **Q Do you have before you what I've marked as**
18 **Exhibit 139?**

19 A Yes, I do.

20 **Q Okay. And does that reflect the summary of**
21 **authorized returns on equity from the first quarter of 2014**
22 **through the second quarter to date of 2015?**

23 A Yes, it does.

24 MR. ZOBRI ST: Your Honor, I offer this into
25 evidence, Exhibit 139.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections? Hearing none
2 Exhibit 139 received into the record.

3 (Company Exhibit 139 received into evidence.)

4 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

5 Q Now let me hand you one other exhibit -- well, let
6 me as you this: What was the source of the documents -- of the
7 numbers that appear in 139?

8 A Noted at the bottom it is Regulatory Research
9 Associates, which is the same source that people typically use
10 when they're reviewing authorized returns in jurisdictions.

11 (Company Exhibit 140 marked for identification.)

12 MR. THOMPSON: What number is this one, Karl?

13 MR. ZOBRI ST: 140.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

15 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

16 Q Mr. Hevert, can you identify Exhibit 140?

17 A Yes. This is the fundamental data from which
18 Exhibit 139 was developed.

19 MR. ZOBRI ST: Okay. Judge, I move the admission
20 of Exhibit 140.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

22 Hearing none, it will be received into the record.

23 (Company Exhibit 140 received into evidence.)

24 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

25 Q Okay. Now, Mr. Hevert now in response to

1 **Commissioner Hall's question about trends, what is your**
2 **response to the Commissioner's question about the downward**
3 **trend that he observed and that you did not -- let's just say**
4 **you didn't entirely agree with him?**

5 A Well, I think if you were to look on a quarterly
6 basis here, you see beginning at 9.86 in the first quarter of
7 2014, ending at 9.83 in the second quarter of 2015 -- and it
8 certainty bumped around a bit between there -- but I think,
9 again, when looked at on a quarterly basis during this period,
10 you see movement around, but the beginning and the endpoint are
11 fairly consistent with each other.

12 **Q Okay. And what is the average to date for the**
13 **second quarter of 2015?**

14 A 9.83 percent for vertically-integrated companies.

15 **Q And let me just ask you one more explanatory**
16 **question. With regard to distribution companies and**
17 **transmission companies in the electric sector, why do those**
18 **ROEs tend to be lower than those for vertically-integrated**
19 **utilities?**

20 A They tend to be lower, and I think they're
21 consistently lower because transmission distribution companies
22 do not have the operating, the regulatory, the financial risks
23 associated with the ownership and operation of electric
24 generation assets.

25 MR. ZOBRI ST: Okay. Thank you. Nothing further.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, sir. You may step --

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: I have a follow-up question.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Go ahead.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: I apologize.

5 FURTHER QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER HALL:

6 Q So 10.37 for all electric in the first quarter of
7 2015, which includes the Virginia decisions; correct?

8 A Yes, that would include the Virginia riders.

9 Q Okay. Well, and my understanding from looking at
10 the regulatory focus of the Regulatory Research Associates is
11 they thought there was some reason to exclude the Virginia
12 decisions from -- from their overall analysis of any possible
13 trend; would you agree with that?

14 A I agree with that, and that's why we're focused
15 on that top line, vertically integrated, which does not include
16 the Virginia rate -- excuse me, the Virginia rate riders.

17 Q So the -- so the trend -- so characterize again
18 for me what your -- what your view is of a trend, if there is a
19 trend.

20 A I think that the trend, if there is one, has
21 been -- has been negligible. In my testimony and -- I tell
22 you, I can't recall if it's in my Rebuttal or Surrebuttal
23 Testimony, but what we did was actually looked at all of the
24 authorized returns between 2013 and 2015 and put that trend
25 line through it and found that statistically it was essentially

1 a flat line. Perhaps it was a little bit downward sloping.
2 But if you were to go ahead and use that relationship and apply
3 it to June 2015, I believe the number would have been
4 9.88 percent, as opposed to the overall average of 9.92 percent
5 at the time.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'll offer another opportunity
8 for recross based on Commissioner Hall's questions.

9 Brightergy?

10 MR. ZELLERS: None, Your Honor.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Missouri Division of Energy?

12 MR. ANTAL: No questions.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Consumers Council?

14 MR. HOFFMAN: No, thank you.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: U.S. Department of Energy?

16 MR. TSHIKORORO: None, Your Honor.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

18 MS. ILES: Sorry, I have one question about
19 Exhibit 140. Or is that responsive here, following up on
20 Commissioner Hall --

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Yes.

22 MS. ILES: -- and the trend?

23 RECROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. ILES:

24 **Q Could you tell us, do you know anything about**
25 **the -- oh, the Wisconsin Electric Power, the 10.2 that's on**

1 **this Exhibit 140?**

2 A What's -- what's your question?

3 **Q What kind of case was that one?**

4 A These were -- I know the Wisconsin cases. I
5 believe this may have been one of the cases where the
6 Commission essentially adopted the preexisting -- excuse me,
7 the existing rate of run of 10.2 percent.

8 **Q Were any rates changed in that case?**

9 A I could not tell you offhand. One of the points,
10 of course, of using multiple cases is that, while each case has
11 its own aspects to it, when you look at multiple cases over
12 time, you're able to essentially average them out, mitigate the
13 effect of the -- of any particular aspect of any particular
14 case.

15 **Q But isn't it true that there were only three after**
16 **the first quarter, so that one would have a pretty big impact**
17 **when we're looking at this -- this number that we're looking**
18 **for for the second quarter of 2015?**

19 A Sure. And that's why I mentioned a minute ago, if
20 you were to look at this data over time on a case-by-case
21 basis, you find that the trend is insignificant; and if you
22 were to assume a June date, you would probably be a little bit
23 higher than 9.83 percent.

24 **Q And wouldn't you get a more accurate picture of**
25 **what's going on if you had more data points?**

1 A That's what I just said.

2 Q Okay.

3 A We just had more data points --

4 Q Then we -- you would agree --

5 A -- announced. Those --

6 Q -- with me on that?

7 A Excuse me, let me finish, please. Those more data
8 points, that greater number of data points tell us that there
9 is no significant trend over that time.

10 MS. ILES: Okay. Thank you.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by MECG?

12 MR. WOODSMALL: No questions. Thank you.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Office of Public Counsel?

14 MR. OPITZ: No questions. Thank you.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Commission Staff?

16 MR. THOMPSON: No, thank you, Judge.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect again?

18 MR. ZOBRI ST: No further questions.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Mr. Hevert.

20 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may step down now.

22 (Witness excused.)

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thinking it might be a good time
24 for a break. Why don't we take about a 15-minute break.

25 We'll be in recess until about 10 till 3:00.

1 (Off the record.)

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's go back on the record. I
3 think we're ready for Staff witness.

4 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge. Staff calls
5 Zephani a Marevangepo.

6 ZEPHANI A MAREVANGEPO, testifies as follows:

7 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:

8 Q State your name, please.

9 A Zephani a Marevangepo.

10 Q I wonder if you could spell it for the court
11 reporter.

12 A Z-E-P-H-A-N-I-A. My last name,
13 M-A-R-E-V-A-N-G-E-P-O.

14 Q Thank you. And how are you employed?

15 A Utility regulatory auditor with the Public Service
16 Commission.

17 Q Okay. And did you prepare or cause to be prepared
18 a contribution to the Staff Revenue Requirement Report, Exhibit
19 200 HC and NP having to do with the cost of capital?

20 A Yes, I did.

21 Q And also Appendix Number 2 to that report?

22 A Yes, I did.

23 Q Which contains the schedules; is that correct?

24 A That's correct.

25 Q And Rebuttal Testimony that's been marked

1 **Exhibit 227?**

2 A Yes, I did.

3 **Q And Surrebuttal Testimony marked Exhibit 228?**

4 A Yes, I did.

5 **Q And do you have any changes or corrections to**
6 **those pieces of testimony?**

7 A No, I do not.

8 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. It's our practice not to
9 offer the report until after the last contributor has
10 testified. I will go ahead and offer the Rebuttal and
11 Surrebuttal, Staff Exhibits 227 and 228.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections to those exhibits?
13 Hearing none, those two exhibits, 227 and 228, will be received
14 into the record.

15 (Staff Exhibits 227 and 228 received into
16 evidence.)

17 MR. THOMPSON: I will tender the witness for
18 cross-examination. Thank you, Judge.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Cross-examination by Office of
20 Public Counsel.

21 MR. OPITZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. OPITZ:

23 **Q Good afternoon, Mr. Marevangepo.**

24 A Afternoon.

25 **Q On page 10 of your Surrebuttal you state that your**

1 recommended ROE is 9.25 percent and that's based on Staff's
2 conservative estimate of an approximate 25 to 75 basis points
3 decline in the cost of equity since 2012; is that correct?

4 A That is correct.

5 Q When you say conservative estimate, do you mean
6 that your analysis shows that the cost of equity has declined
7 more than your recommendation?

8 A Yes. It could have been higher, up to 1,900 basis
9 points.

10 Q And that would have reduced the return on equity?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Would a return on equity of 9 percent allow the
13 Company to attract capital?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Do you agree that the industry authorized return
16 on equity has been steadily declining over the last several
17 years?

18 A Yes, I agree.

19 MR. OPITZ: Thank you. No further questions.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

21 MS. ILES: No questions.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MECG?

23 MR. WOODSMALL: No questions. Thank you.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: U.S. Department of Energy?

25 MR. TSHIKORORO: No questions, Your Honor. Thank

1 you.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Brightergy?

3 Missouri Division of Energy?

4 MR. ANTAL: No questions.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Consumers Council?

6 Kansas City Power & Light?

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

8 Q Good afternoon.

9 A Afternoon.

10 Q You began your portion of the Staff report by
11 quoting the Supreme Court cases in Bluefield and Hope; isn't
12 that correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Okay. And on page 20 you stated that a public
15 utility is entitled to such rates that produce return on the
16 value of property employed for the convenience of the public
17 equal to that generally being made at the same time and in the
18 same general part of the country on investments and other
19 businesses with corresponding risks and uncertainties; is that
20 correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q Okay. And the Supreme Court used the word
23 entitled, meaning that this is an entitlement that a public
24 utility deserves from a utility Commission that is determining
25 what ROE should be set; is that a fair statement?

1 A I guess I don't have an opinion as to the legal
2 language. But I guess I'll leave that up to the attorneys.

3 Q **Okay. But the Supreme Court -- and you quoted it**
4 **by saying the word entitlement; correct?**

5 A Yes.

6 Q **And apart from a legal definition, this is**
7 **something that a public utility is entitled to from the**
8 **Commission when it sets a return on equity; correct?**

9 A That's correct.

10 Q **And is it fair to say that financial soundness is**
11 **an essential element of fixing the return on equity?**

12 A Yeah, that's the Company -- yes, that's part of
13 it.

14 Q **Okay. Okay. Now, on page 20 you also quoted the**
15 **Supreme Court in the Hope case, and you state there that**
16 **financial integrity is a legitimate concern of the investor;**
17 **correct?**

18 A That's correct.

19 Q **Okay. And you state that it's not -- or you**
20 **quoted the Supreme Court of saying it's not simply sufficient**
21 **to have revenue for operating expenses; correct?**

22 A That's correct.

23 Q **Okay. So that's one factor. You -- you -- it's**
24 **not simply sufficient to just have revenue to pay for operating**
25 **expenses; correct?**

1 A That's correct.

2 Q Okay. And then the Supreme Court says that there
3 must be revenue for the capital costs of the utility, including
4 service on the debt and the dividends on the stock; correct?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q Okay. So we have capital costs that must be
7 reflected in a return on equity, as well as the service on the
8 debt, the debt cost; correct?

9 A Yes, that's correct.

10 Q Okay. Okay. And then the third factor that you
11 site there -- or there a third part of the opinion that you
12 site says that the return should be sufficient to assure
13 confidence in the financial integrity of the enterprise so as
14 to maintain its credit and to attract capital; correct?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q Okay. So those three factors, having more
17 revenue -- more than just the bare amount of revenue for
18 operating expense, revenue for the capital costs, and
19 sufficient to ensure confidence in the Company's financial
20 integrity, those are three factors that the Commission has to
21 consider in setting ROE in this case --

22 A That's correct.

23 Q -- do you agree?

24 A Yes, I do.

25 Q Okay. Okay. Now, on page 57 of the Staff

1 report -- if you could turn there, please. Are you there, sir?

2 A Yes, I am.

3 Q Okay. Toward the bottom of page 57, you say that
4 fairness to ratepayers means rates that are not one penny more
5 than necessary to be fair to the shareholders. That's what you
6 state there; correct?

7 A What line is that?

8 Q It's line 25.

9 A Okay. Yes.

10 Q Okay. And those are your words; those aren't the
11 words from the Supreme Court, correct?

12 A That's correct.

13 Q Okay. And they're not the words of any state
14 court or of any state utility Commission, are they?

15 A No, they are not.

16 Q Okay. Now, given the balance that Hope and
17 Bluefield required, would you agree that fairness to
18 shareholders would mean rates charged to customers must not be
19 one penny less than what would be fair to shareholders?

20 A According to the statement, yes.

21 Q Okay. Now, the second sentence on page 57 begins
22 with the word fairness. You state, Fairness to shareholders
23 means rates that will produce revenue sufficient to cover
24 KCPL's prudent costs of service, which includes an allowed ROR,
25 which means rate of return; correct?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q Okay. And the rate of return has to be consistent
3 with all these factors that we've talked about in the Hope case
4 and in the Bluefield case; correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. And to achieve those revenues, we look to
7 what revenues are being produced and what returns on equities
8 have been granted to other companies in this business in this
9 general part of the country that are having these corresponding
10 risks; correct?

11 A That's correct.

12 Q Okay. Now, to achieve the consistency with these
13 other companies, would you agree that regulatory mechanisms
14 that have been granted to other public utility commissions in
15 Missouri and in this general part of the country should be
16 seriously considered by the Commission?

17 A I would say they should be considered based on the
18 merits presented before the Commission.

19 Q Okay. Okay. And are you aware of any authority
20 that says that if this Commission grants Kansas City Power &
21 Light certain regulatory mechanisms, such as a fuel adjustment
22 clause, that it is required to lower the return on equity that
23 it would otherwise grant to the Company, based upon the
24 financial standards that we've talked about?

25 A I guess let me get the question straight. Are you

1 asking me if that's my opinion?

2 **Q No, I'm asking you if you're aware of any**
3 **authority that requires the ROE to be decreased by virtue of**
4 **having those regulatory mechanisms that other public utilities**
5 **have that bear similar risks and uncertainties?**

6 A No, I'm not aware of any decisions.

7 **Q Okay. And would that also be true through the use**
8 **of an accounting mechanism known as trackers, that simply**
9 **because a tracker or a group of trackers are authorized, that**
10 **doesn't necessarily require the return on equity to be**
11 **decreased; isn't that true?**

12 A That wouldn't be my opinion.

13 **Q Okay.**

14 A Maybe some other people's opinions, but that
15 wouldn't be my opinion.

16 **Q Well, in -- in the case of this Company, when**
17 **trackers were granted for -- and when trackers were granted for**
18 **other post-retirement benefits, did the Commission lower the**
19 **Company's return on equity?**

20 A I don't recall the Commission lowering the ROE.

21 **Q Okay. Now, I believe that you've presented**
22 **reports in your Rebuttal that indicate your recognition that**
23 **the investment community favors what we call generically**
24 **regulatory mechanisms; is that true?**

25 A I guess -- I guess I have to go back to my

1 Rebuttal Testimony. Maybe take me to the page.

2 Q Why don't you start with your Rebuttal Testimony
3 around page 15, sir.

4 A Yes, I'm there.

5 Q Okay. Now, you quote a report from Wolfe,
6 W-O-L-F-E, Research that states that Great Plains Energy has
7 historically under earned its allowed ROE by over 150 basis
8 points, primarily due to the structural regulatory lag in
9 Missouri; correct?

10 A Yes, that's what they reported.

11 Q Okay. And the report noted that while the lag has
12 been reduced, it, quote, is expected to widen, closed quote,
13 for several reasons, including, and I'm quoting again here,
14 rising transmission costs and property taxes; correct?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q Okay. And, again, this is a report that you quote
17 in the Rebuttal that you have presented as Staff's expert
18 witness; correct?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Okay. Now, in your Rebuttal on page 14, line 14,
21 you state, The investment community recognizes that the lack of
22 cost recovery options, combined with modest load growth, will
23 create a continued drag on their earnings trajectory over time;
24 correct?

25 A That is correct.

1 **Q Okay. And when you used the phrase their**
2 **earnings, you were referring to KCP&L?**

3 A The Company, yes.

4 **Q Okay. And then on page 16, beginning on line 21,**
5 **you state, Staff acknowledges that the investment community**
6 **does cite to the lack of various regulatory mechanisms in**
7 **Missouri when assessing the quality of an investment in GPE's**
8 **stock; correct?**

9 A Yes.

10 **Q And so all things being equal, sir, if you're an**
11 **equity investor, you'd prefer to own stock in a public utility**
12 **with an FAC in trackers then a public utility that was not**
13 **authorized to use those regulatory mechanisms; correct?**

14 A I don't think I would make a decision just based
15 on that one criteria. I would look at the cash flows and -- I
16 guess most of those mechanisms that are not present today, I
17 guess orders -- I guess are companies that are affecting the
18 stock price. So it depends on what I'm paying for the Company.

19 **Q Well, all things being equal, if there's an equity**
20 **investor out there who wants to invest in the public utility**
21 **sector, he or she would be more likely to want to invest in a**
22 **public utility that has these regulatory mechanisms, a fuel**
23 **adjustment clause and trackers, than one that does not have**
24 **them; isn't that true?**

25 A It depends.

1 **Q Well, but isn't that what the investment reports**
2 **that you cite essentially say --**

3 A Yes --

4 **Q -- that all things being equal, if we've got a**
5 **Company that's got a fuel adjustments clause and trackers and**
6 **we have one over here does not, I'd rather put my money over**
7 **there; isn't that true?**

8 A In this case not everything is equal. In this
9 case those analysts they cited that the GPE stock price is
10 selling at a discounted price --

11 **Q Well, that --**

12 A -- because of those issues.

13 **Q Pardon me. But one of the GPE companies has a**
14 **fuel adjustment clause; right?**

15 A Yes.

16 **Q And one of them does not; correct?**

17 A That's correct.

18 **Q And the one in this rate case does not have one;**
19 **correct?**

20 A That is correct.

21 **Q Okay. Okay. Now, you talked -- you talked on**
22 **page 14 of your Rebuttal about the regulatory mechanisms that**
23 **KCPL did have during what we call the comprehensive energy**
24 **plan; correct?**

25 A What -- what line are we?

1 **Q It's sort of generally on page 14. You talked**
2 **about the temporary credit support mechanisms that ended in**
3 **2011. This is on page 7. And then you talked about that again**
4 **on line 13. Do you see that, sir?**

5 A Page 14?

6 **Q Page 14 of your Rebuttal.**

7 A Yes, I see that.

8 **Q Okay. So the regulatory mechanisms that came out**
9 **of the stipulation and agreement entered into back in I think**
10 **it's 2005, all those ended in 2011; correct?**

11 A That's not my position. That's what Mr. Ives
12 said. I was just citing what Mr. Ives stated in his testimony.
13 But as to the benefits of what it was agreed upon at the time,
14 that's something that will be addressed by other expert
15 witnesses. But --

16 **Q I understand that. I'm just trying to get the**
17 **timeline down. Those regulatory mechanisms ended in 2011,**
18 **correct, or don't you know?**

19 A I guess that's something that is subject to
20 verification. I was just citing what Mr. Ives said.

21 **Q Okay. But do you have any basis to disagree with**
22 **what Mr. Ives said, that they all stopped in 2011?**

23 A No. No, I don't.

24 **Q You don't. Okay. Okay. And then you went on**
25 **later in your Rebuttal, around pages 23 and 25, to -- pardon**

1 me, I think I've got the wrong page here. Well, do you
2 remember speaking with (sic) management's ability to manage its
3 costs and that there were some in the investment community that
4 stated that KCPL might have done a better job in managing its
5 costs? Do you recall that?

6 A No, I guess maybe you have to take me to the page.

7 Q Okay. Let me -- this may be in your Surrebuttal.
8 Well, let me just ask this general question: Do you have any
9 opinion that leads to your conclusion that KCPL has not managed
10 its costs properly?

11 A No, I don't have an opinion.

12 Q Okay. Okay. And are you aware of the fact that
13 as the regulatory plan was concluding, that the Commission,
14 when it reviewed the costs with regard to Iatan 2 and the
15 improvements to Iatan 1, that there were very few disallowances
16 that occurred in that rate case?

17 A I remember there were disallowances. I don't know
18 if there were a few or not. But I know --

19 Q Well, there were no major disallowances in that
20 case; correct?

21 A I guess I will take your word for it.

22 Q Okay. Well, do you remember -- have you read that
23 report and order recently that came out in -- it was case
24 number ER-2010-0355?

25 A For the Ameren?

1 Q No, no, for Kansas City Power & Light at the end
2 of the -- at the end of the regulatory plan.

3 A I don't recall the details, but --

4 Q Well, the Commission was relatively complimentary
5 of the cost containment and the cost management job that the
6 KCP&L did with the Iatan 2 and the Iatan 1 projects; isn't that
7 true?

8 A I don't recall.

9 Q Well, do you recall that the -- the disallowances
10 that were recommended by Staff and by the Missouri Retailers
11 Association were denied?

12 A I don't recall that.

13 Q Okay. And do you remember that Commissioner
14 Jarrett when he was a member of the Commission, indicated that
15 the job that the Company did with regard to putting on Iatan 1
16 and Iatan 2 into operation was, quote, an achievement worth
17 noting, closed quote? Do you recall that?

18 A I don't remember that quote.

19 Q Okay. Now, in the Staff report on pages 34 and
20 36, you cite Moody's and the Standard & Poor's ratings; is that
21 correct?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Okay. And you state there -- I believe it begins
24 on line 9 on page 35 -- While Staff is estimating cost of
25 equity for KCPL, it is important to understand current credit

1 profiles for KCPL, Great Plains, and GMO, as their ratings
2 collectively influence the investors' views of the risks
3 associated with investing in KCPL; correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q Okay. Are you familiar with a report -- do you
6 follow the Moody's reports as they come out on the utility
7 sector and on the companies doing business in Missouri?

8 A I follow some of them.

9 Q Okay.

10 (Company Exhibit 141 marked for identification.)

11 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

12 Q Sir, I've handed you what I've marked -- pardon
13 me.

14 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. Is this 141?

15 MR. ZOBRI ST: 141.

16 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

17 Q Are you familiar with Exhibit 141, which is a
18 Moody's Investor Service Report, prepared March 10, 2015,
19 called A Sector In-Depth Analysis of U.S. Regulated Utilities?

20 A Yes, I remember reading this report.

21 Q Okay. Okay. And is it fair to say that you read
22 that report, along with many others, in the course of preparing
23 your testimony in this case?

24 A Yes.

25 MR. ZOBRI ST: Okay. Judge, I move the admission

1 of Exhibit 141.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

3 Hearing none, 141 will be received into the
4 record.

5 (Company Exhibit 141 received into evidence.)

6 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

7 Q Now, this report has a headline that says **Lower**
8 **Authorized Equity Returns Will Not Hurt Near-Term Credit**
9 **Profiles; is that correct?**

10 A That is correct.

11 Q Okay. And is it fair to say that the opinions in
12 this report are based on what the authors talk about as
13 persistently low interest rates and a comprehensive suite of
14 cost recovery mechanisms?

15 A Yes, that was pretty much the summary of the
16 report.

17 Q Okay. And in those two factors, the persistently
18 low interest rates and the comprehensive suite of cost recovery
19 mechanisms, was what Moody's was stating should be reasons why
20 the public -- the investing public, particularly, or the people
21 that are investing in the debt should not be concerned about as
22 far as low ROEs; is that true?

23 A That is correct.

24 Q Okay. So if the trends show that interest rates
25 are rising, would that indicate to you, sir, that lower

1 **authorized equity returns might hurt near-term credit profiles?**

2 A I guess it depends. When you say rising, they are
3 rising from what point or -- I guess you have to focus on the,
4 I guess, basis points they say they are rising by, how many
5 basis points; and you have to have a benchmark to see, you
6 know, they are rising from which point.

7 I guess in our case like we're talking about a
8 relative change from 2012, even though the interest rates are
9 rising, they are not -- they're not as high as they were like
10 in 2012, and we are talking about the interest rates that
11 actually -- I guess the yields that actually are borne by the
12 ratepayers, and we're talking about the debt -- utility debt
13 costs, not just interest rates in general. But we are talking
14 about interest rates on utility bonds. Those ones, they have
15 gone up; but the question is by how much. And --

16 Q So --

17 A -- they haven't exceeded the 2012 levels.

18 Q **So it's a matter of degree; the greater the rise**
19 **in interest rates, the more problematic low ROEs become, as a**
20 **general proposition; correct?**

21 A That is correct.

22 Q **Okay. And, similarly, if a utility does not have**
23 **this comprehensive suite of cost recovery mechanisms, again by**
24 **degrees, that can be make lower ROEs a problem that needs to be**
25 **addressed; correct?**

1 A To some extent.

2 Q Now, the report, if you turn to page 2, in the
3 second paragraph, Moody's says across the U.S. we continue to
4 see regulators approving reg -- pardon me, let me start again.
5 Paragraph 2 states, Across the U.S. we continue to see
6 regulators approving mechanisms that allow for more timely
7 recovery of costs, a material credit positive. Did I read that
8 correctly?

9 A Yes, you did.

10 Q Okay. And so these mechanisms that are discussed
11 in that second paragraph deal with a variety of structures that
12 can be granted to a utility that, in the opinion of Moody's,
13 make low ROEs relatively acceptable; is that correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Okay. Now, let's go through those in the second
16 sentence. It says, These mechanisms, which keep utility's
17 business risk profile low compared to most industrial sectors,
18 include -- and the first one is formulaic rate structures. Did
19 you see that?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. Now, KCPL does not have a formulaic rate
22 structure; is that correct?

23 A That is correct.

24 Q And as far as I know in Missouri, formulaic rate
25 structures have not been authorized; true?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q Okay. And the second member of the robust suite
3 here is called special purpose trackers or riders; correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q Okay. And currently Kansas City Power & Light
6 only has trackers for pension costs and for other
7 post-retirement benefits; is that correct?

8 A I believe so.

9 Q Okay. And they're seeking some additional
10 trackers here, but they only have the pension tracker and the
11 OPED tracker; correct?

12 A That should be correct.

13 Q Okay. Now, the third mechanism that Moody's talks
14 about is a decoupling program which -- it says which delink
15 volumes from revenues. KCPL doesn't have one of those, does
16 it?

17 A They do not.

18 Q Okay. Then the second one says the use of future
19 test years or other preapproval arrangements. And those are
20 either prohibited by law or have not been granted to any public
21 utility in this state by this Commission; true?

22 A I guess I wouldn't be able to speak to that. I'm
23 not sure about the prearranged -- preapproved arrangements.
24 I'm not sure about that. For future test years I know for sure
25 that, I guess so --

1 Q Well, are you familiar with the preapproval
2 process that Kansas entertained with regard to the retrofits at
3 LaCygne.

4 A Yes, I do (sic).

5 Q Okay. Okay. And we don't have a -- I mean, I
6 know you're not a lawyer, but we don't have a statute or
7 regulation or even a practice that permits that type of
8 preapproval arrangement; correct?

9 A I don't believe we do.

10 Q Okay. Okay. Okay. And Moody's then goes on to
11 say in the next paragraph, A supportive regulatory environment
12 translates into a more transparent and stable financial
13 profile, which in turn results in reasonably unfettered access
14 to capital markets for both debt and equity; correct?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q Okay. And so is it fair to say that the opposite
17 is true, that without the robust suite of regulatory mechanisms
18 and without those -- any of those five structures that we
19 talked about, Moody's views a utility's financial profile as
20 being less stable, less secure?

21 A I guess according to this, I guess, report, that's
22 correct.

23 Q Okay. And this is report that was issued just a
24 couple of months ago on March 10, 2015; correct?

25 A Yes, that's correct.

1 **Q Okay. Okay. Now, if you would please turn to**
2 **page 3.**

3 MR. THOMPSON: Page 3 of what?

4 THE WITNESS: Page 3 of the --

5 MR. ZOBRI ST: Page 3 of 141. Sorry.

6 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

7 **Q Now, the final paragraph before the bar chart**
8 **there that begins, Despite the reduction, Moody's is saying**
9 **here, Despite ROE reduction in authorized ROEs, U.S. utilities**
10 **are thankful to their regulators for the robust suite of timely**
11 **cost recovery mechanisms which allow them to recoup**
12 **prudently-incurred operating costs; is that correct?**

13 A That's correct.

14 **Q And that would be such costs as for fuel; correct?**

15 A That's correct.

16 **Q And, again, KCPL doesn't have a fuel adjustment**
17 **clause; true?**

18 A True.

19 **Q Okay. And then it says it would also be good to**
20 **have regulatory mechanisms that allow them to recoup**
21 **prudently-incurred operating costs such as some investment**
22 **expenses; correct?**

23 A Yes.

24 **Q Okay. And KCPL in this case has asked for**
25 **regulatory mechanisms with regard to Critical Infrastructure**

1 **Protection Systems that are mandated by the North American**
2 **Electric Reliability Corporation; isn't that true?**

3 A That's true.

4 Q Okay. And at the present time it does not have
5 either a tracker or the ability through a fuel adjustment
6 clause to recover any of those expenses; correct?

7 A That's my understanding.

8 Q Okay. Now, if you would turn again on page --
9 Exhibit 141 -- I'm sorry -- yeah, Exhibit 141 to page 5, below
10 the bar chart, the paragraph begins, Earned ROEs have been
11 relatively flat over the past few years. Do you see that, sir?

12 A Below the graph? Yes.

13 Q Yeah. The whole sentence says, Earned ROEs, as
14 reported by utilities and adjusted by Moody's, have been
15 relatively flat over the past few years, despite the decline in
16 authorized ROEs; correct?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Okay. And you're aware that the position of KCPL
19 in this case is that its earned ROEs are substantially below
20 its authorized ROEs; correct?

21 A I'm not sure about the word substantially, because
22 that's an issue that is still subject to debate, and I think we
23 have our expert witnesses to address that. But --

24 Q Right. But it's the position of the Company that
25 it is substantially under earning its authorized return on

1 equity; correct?

2 A Yes, that's the position of the Company.

3 Q Okay. And you're not sponsoring any evidence that
4 disputes that; other -- other Staff witnesses are addressing
5 that, correct?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q Okay. Now Moody's, in the second sentence of that
8 paragraph that I was quoting, says that this means -- and I
9 think what they're saying is, you know, if the earned -- the
10 earned ROEs having been relatively flat, despite the decline in
11 authorized ROEs -- this means utilities are earning closer to
12 their authorized equity returns, which is positive from an
13 equity market valuation perspective; correct?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Okay. And so if -- if the evidence in this
16 case -- the substantial -- the competent evidence in this case
17 shows that it is not able to substantially earn close to its
18 authorized ROEs, that would be a negative from an equity market
19 valuation perspective, wouldn't it?

20 A If the Company can present that case, then that
21 would be correct.

22 Q Okay. Now, on the final page of this exhibit --
23 pardon me, not the final page, but it's page 7, and it's
24 actually entitled Appendix Exhibit 7, regarding utilities with
25 the highest earned ROEs ranked by a seven-year average. Do you

1 see that, sir?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Okay. Now, am I correct that Great Plains Energy,
4 Incorporated is not among the companies that is listed on that
5 page?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q Okay. Now, sir, if you would turn, please, to
8 your Surrebuttal at page 5, looking at lines 3 and 4, you
9 acknowledge there that there have been recent P/E, price to
10 earnings contractions since January 2015; correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay. So you acknowledge that there have been
13 capital losses in the utility sector; is that true? That's
14 what --

15 A I guess I wouldn't just say they are capital
16 losses based on this. But I guess it's the contraction in the
17 other P/E valuations.

18 Q Okay. What do you mean when you say contraction,
19 recent P/E contraction?

20 A I'm talking about the relative valua -- I guess
21 whenever investors look at companies, these valuation based on
22 the DCF Models and KPM Models. And then there's another simple
23 valuation based on the P/E ratios, and that's a relative
24 valuation of the utilities. So that's -- so they just look at
25 the price of the Company divided by the earnings. So whenever

1 that number is contracting -- I guess in this case, this number
2 was contracting because the price of the stock was coming down.

3 Q Right, the price is declining. Correct. And as
4 the price of the stock is declined, we are beginning to see
5 just in the last six to four weeks increases in the bond yields
6 for both treasury bonds as well as corporate bonds; correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Okay. And we are seeing a degree of bond market
9 volatility that we hadn't seen three, four, five months ago;
10 correct?

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay. In reading the financial news, it seems
13 that predictions are relatively unanimous that the Federal
14 Reserve Board is going to raise interest rates in September.
15 Is that your opinion?

16 A I don't think that's my opinion.

17 Q Okay. When do you think they're going to raise
18 rates?

19 A Nobody knows.

20 Q I understand that. But, you know, we have indices
21 that project, you know, what is going to happen with interest
22 rates, you know, with the stock market, with other things. I
23 mean, isn't it a fair statement to say that all the
24 projections are -- in fact, Janet Yellen herself, the chair the
25 Federal Reserve Board, has said we're going to -- we're going

1 **to seriously consider raising rates in the -- in the fall?**

2 A I don't remember seeing that specific statement.
3 What I remember hearing from Janet Yellen was that, I guess,
4 the future at this point is unknown. But I guess the key
5 point, I guess, is using whatever tools they can to contain the
6 situation.

7 Q Okay. Have you read Mr. Hevert's Surrebuttal in
8 this case?

9 A Yes, I did.

10 Q Okay. Do you have a copy in front of you?

11 A No, I do not.

12 Q Okay. I'm just going to hand you, and I think all
13 counsel have this page, 46 of his Surrebuttal where he has
14 about six or seven bullet points about macroeconomic changes.
15 And I just want to ask you if you agree or disagree with these.

16 MR. THOMPSON: What page did you say?

17 MR. ZOBRI ST: 47.

18 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

19 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

20 Q Now, sir, the first bullet point on line 3 of
21 Mr. Hevert's page 47 of his Surrebuttal states that the 30-year
22 treasury yield increased by 35 basis points, from 2.74 percent
23 to approximately 3.10 percent. Do you agree with that?

24 A What time frame are we talking about here?

25 Q Footnote 93 says as of June 3rd, 2015, and the

1 source is Yahoo Finance that was accessed on that same date.

2 A As of June the 3th, yes.

3 Q Pardon me?

4 A As of June the 3rd, yes, I guess I would accept
5 that.

6 Q Okay. And that the Moody's BAA utility index
7 increased by 36 basis points, again based on the source of
8 Bloomberg, dated June 2, 2015. Do you agree with that?

9 A As of June 2nd, yes, I do agree.

10 Q And on the third bullet point, line 6, it states,
11 Federal Reserve Chair Janet Yellen stated that, quote, It will
12 be appropriate at some point this year to take the initial step
13 to raise the federal funds rate target and begin the process of
14 normalizing monetary policy. And the source apparently is the
15 CME Group, which I think is the Chicago Mercantile Exchange
16 Group out of Chicago. Do you agree with that quote, that
17 that's what you've been reading or you've heard that said or do
18 you disagree with that?

19 A That is consistent with some of the statements she
20 has been making, yes.

21 Q Okay. And then on line 9, it states, The implied
22 probability of at least a 25 basis point increase in the
23 federal funds rate by October 2015 was over 85 percent. And
24 the citation there -- whoops, I think I got it wrong. That was
25 the -- that's the CME Group that was accessed on June 3rd. Do

1 **you agree with that statement on line 9 regarding the**
2 **implied prob --**

3 A Whether it's over 85 percent, I don't agree,
4 because so many sources are saying different things. So I
5 guess you decide to rely on one thing, I guess I would say
6 that's what they said. But other sources are saying something
7 different.

8 Q Okay. And on line 11 he stated, The reported U.S.
9 trade deficit decreased by 19.20 percent, the sharpest decline
10 in over six years. And that quotes a Wall Street Journal
11 article. Do you have any basis to disagree with that?

12 A No, I do not.

13 Q Okay. And the bullet point at line 13, The
14 reported seasonally adjusted annual rate of privately-owned
15 housing starts increased by 20.40 percent over the prior month,
16 quoting a release from the U.S. Census Bureau. Do you have any
17 basis to disagree with that?

18 A I do not have any basis to disagree with the
19 number. But I guess that's the same message that I've been
20 reading.

21 Q Okay. And on line 15 he states, The Institute of
22 to Supply Management noted that manufacturing activity
23 continued to expand for May for the 29th consecutive month. Do
24 you have any basis to disagree with that?

25 A No, I do not.

1 **Q** **Okay. And, finally, on line 17 he states, The**
2 **XLU -- in all caps -- a utility exchange traded fund, decreased**
3 **by over 3 percent, quoting a source at -- the source of Yahoo**
4 **Finance accessed on June 4. Do you have any basis to disagree**
5 **with that?**

6 A Again, as of June 4th I agree.

7 **Q** **Okay. Okay. So all of those trends that**
8 **Mr. Hevert cited, and I believe that you agreed these are**
9 **accurate statements, indicate that the economy is improving and**
10 **that growth in the economy is occurring; is that a fair**
11 **statement?**

12 A I don't agree that the economy is improving,
13 because if you read -- look at the news today, it will tell you
14 the reason why the ten-year treasuries have come down is
15 because of the weak economy. So these numbers are just moving
16 up and down everyday. So based on what I read today, the
17 economy is not improving.

18 **Q** **The economy is not improving?**

19 A It's not improving.

20 **Q** **Really? Where did you read that?**

21 A I guess Yahoo Finance.

22 **Q** **Yahoo Finance?**

23 A Yea. The reason why it gives, the ten-year
24 treasuries dropped from 2.37 to 2.3. They are focusing on the
25 improved -- to say, I guess, they keep on revising the -- I

1 guess the growth expectations.

2 **Q But the overall trend in treasury yields has**
3 **undoubtedly been up over the last few months; correct?**

4 A Up and down.

5 **Q Well, and last -- last week it hit 2.47; correct?**

6 A Yes, that's correct.

7 **Q Okay. Okay. Let me move on to your constant**
8 **growth DCF, if I might. If you look at your Staff report on**
9 **page 44, you have recommended a growth range of 3.5 percent to**
10 **4.5 percent, which led to your ROE recommendation in the**
11 **constant growth DCF of 7 to 8 percent; is that -- is that**
12 **correct?**

13 A I did not make a recommendation based on constant
14 stage DCF.

15 **Q Well, I'm looking at line 15 where you say using**
16 **the growth range -- pardon me, Using the growth rate range**
17 **Staff established for the constant growth DCF results in a cost**
18 **of equity estimate of 7 to 8 percent; correct?**

19 A Yes, that's correct.

20 **Q Now, I understand that's not your recommendation,**
21 **but that's what your -- your model produced?**

22 A Yes, that's correct.

23 **Q And you're presenting this to the Commission, I**
24 **assume, for them to consider, at least to some extent?**

25 A Not to consider, but to provide the information.

1 **Q All right. All right. So essentially you did**
2 **this calculation, and you rejected it because you found it to**
3 **be too low?**

4 A No, I did not reject it because it's too low.
5 It's because, if you look back at our testimony, for all
6 electric utility companies our recommendations are based on
7 multi stage DCF. But we have been providing information from
8 constant DCF.

9 **Q Okay. But the 7 to 8 percent is too low; correct?**
10 **You wouldn't have relied upon this if this was the only model**
11 **that you would have prepared?**

12 MR. THOMPSON: I'm going to object. That's asked
13 and answered. He earlier said he did not reject it because it
14 was too low.

15 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

16 **Q So you think it's appropriate?**

17 A 7 to 8 is appropriate.

18 MR. POSTON: Judge, I'm going to object as well.
19 He's actually asked two questions -- there's been three
20 questions in there. I'm not sure which one he's answering.

21 MR. ZOBRI ST: I'd be glad to start again, Judge.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Why don't you back up and ask the
23 question again.

24 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

25 **Q Okay. You've stated that you used a growth rate**

1 range of 3.5 to 4.5 percent, which produced a cost of equity
2 estimate, an ROE of 7 to 8 percent; correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Okay. But you're not recommending that to the
5 Commission; correct?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q Okay. Okay. And I guess you and I have a
8 disagreement. You say it's just provided for information, and
9 I'm saying you wouldn't have recommended because it's too low.
10 Is that our disagreement?

11 A That's part of the disagreement, yes.

12 Q Now, are you aware that in KCPL's 2013 rate case
13 the Staff recommendation was based on a growth rate of 5.0 to
14 5.5 percent growth rate?

15 A I believe that's correct.

16 Q Okay. And isn't it true that that was rejected by
17 the Commission in its report and order that it issued in
18 January 2013?

19 A I believe that's correct.

20 Q Okay. Okay. Now, on page 44, line 2, you speak a
21 little bit about the growth rate of 5.74 percent to 5.57. I
22 would have reversed it, but do you see where I'm talking about?

23 A Page 44?

24 Q It's page 44, line 2.

25 MR. THOMPSON: No, that can't be right.

1 THE WITNESS: No.

2 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

3 Q Well, let me ask you this: You -- you made some
4 observations with regard to growth rates estimated by analysts
5 of being too high; correct?

6 A In what context? I don't remember what you're --

7 Q Well --

8 A -- talking about.

9 Q There was an estimate of analyst growth rates of
10 5.57 to 5.74 percent that -- I believe it's on page 43 at the
11 top, around line 4, that you rejected; is that a fair
12 statement? And you rejected those at the top of page 44
13 because you said they were highly suspect. So you have to look
14 two places, at the top of page 43 and the top of page 44.

15 A Okay. Oh, for purposes of using a perpetual
16 growth rate, yes, they were higher than the economy. I --

17 Q And so -- I'm sorry, did I interrupt you?

18 A I was saying for purposes of the -- I guess
19 calculating constant DCF results based on here, when a
20 perpetual growth rate of 5.78 it wasn't reasonable because that
21 would mean you'd expect the companies to grow at a rate higher
22 than the economy.

23 Q Well, essentially you rejected that growth rate,
24 and you said that Staff is relying upon its common sense
25 judgment to come up with what eventually was its range of 9.0

1 to 9.5 percent; is that a fair statement there? You talk in
2 line 5 about common sense restraints, which Staff has applied
3 in this case.

4 A Yes, common sense restraints, I guess meaning the
5 fundamentals of the Company against what is actually real.

6 Q Okay. So you moved on to the multistage DCF; is
7 that a fair statement?

8 A At which point now? Right now we're still talking
9 about constant --

10 Q Right. Right. And you are not presenting that
11 except for information purposes --

12 A Yes.

13 Q -- because you say I'm going to provide the
14 Commission with my multistage DCF analysis; is that correct?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q Okay. And so for that you developed a long-term
17 perpetual growth rate based on the years 1968 to 1999; is that
18 correct?

19 A That is correct.

20 Q Okay. And you completely ignore, however, the
21 last 15 years. You stop at 1999, and you don't consider
22 anything from the year 2000 up to the present; correct?

23 A That is correct.

24 Q Okay. And so you ignore everything before 1968,
25 and then you ignore everything after 1999; is that true?

1 A I guess for that first part, yes, that's true.

2 Q Now, when Mr. Hevert was developing his long-term
3 growth percentage, he used the period from 1929 to 2013; is
4 that correct?

5 A That is correct.

6 Q Okay. And you found that not to be adequate, not
7 to be proper, in your opinion; is that a fair statement?

8 A If you are talking about perpetual growth rate,
9 Mr. Hevert wasn't relying on that time period. He was going
10 backwards --

11 Q Right.

12 A -- to --

13 Q He went backwards and he went forwards; correct?

14 A For your -- for your GDP he just went backwards.

15 Q Well, but he went from 1929 to 2013; isn't that
16 true?

17 A Well, that is -- I think -- I believe that is
18 true.

19 Q Okay. Okay. Now, if you were to calculate the
20 average ten-year annual growth rates from 1929 to 2014, isn't
21 it true that the growth rate that you came up with, which was
22 4.40 percent, we would have only -- we would have seen growth
23 rates exceeding that in 68 of the 76 ten-year periods; isn't
24 that true?

25 A No, I guess if I decide to update my study to

1 2013, the growth rates would be lower. If we are basing them
2 on the fundamentals of the Company, the actual growth rates
3 that are being experienced by companies, they will be lower. I
4 think I do have work papers that proceed that information for.
5 I guess up to 1990 and up to 2013, I have work papers that show
6 a lower growth rate.

7 **Q Well, essentially all of the models that you ran**
8 **in this case, the DCFs, the Capital Asset Pricing Model, you**
9 **were not satisfied with the results that you got, and so you**
10 **applied a rule of thumb and then a risk premium to come up with**
11 **Staff's recommendations in this case; isn't that true?**

12 A That is not true. That's not the process.

13 **Q Well, you didn't -- your recommendation of 9.0 to**
14 **9.50 with a midpoint of 9.25 does not reflect any of your DCF**
15 **studies, does it?**

16 A That's -- that's correct.

17 **Q Okay. And so you made a judgment to come before**
18 **the Commission and say my models are either not reliable or I**
19 **just don't think that they're appropriate, so you need to**
20 **follow my rule of thumb, based upon all these other factors**
21 **that I'm considering, and that's where I come up with my**
22 **recommendation of 9.25; isn't that a fair statement?**

23 A No, that's not correct.

24 **Q Okay. Let me just ask you a couple of final**
25 **questions. In your Surrebuttal there is a chart at the**

1 beginning of the testimony, which is on page 3, where you
2 summarize the ROE recommendations by the witnesses in the case.
3 Do you see that, sir, page 3 of your Surrebuttal?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Now, you include the ROE recommendation by a
6 witness who is not testifying in this case, Dr. Randall
7 Woolridge; is that correct?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q Okay. And his recommendation is 8.55 percent;
10 correct?

11 A That's correct.

12 Q Were you aware that he testified in front of this
13 Commission in KCP&L's 2006 rate case?

14 A No, I'm not.

15 Q Okay. In that case the Commission set a zone of
16 reasonableness of 200 points, from to 9.37 to 11.37 percent.
17 Dr. Woolridge, who represented the Department of Energy,
18 recommended a 9.0 percent. Were you aware of that?

19 A No.

20 Q Were you aware that the Commission said that it
21 will discard it, meaning his recommendation, and find it merits
22 no further discussion because it fell outside the zone of
23 reasonableness?

24 A No.

25 MR. ZOBRI ST: Okay. That's all I have. Thank

1 you.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions from commissioners?
3 Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Mr. Marevangepo, thank you for
5 being here. I have no questions.

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: No questions.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I have just a few.

8 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER HALL:

9 Q Good afternoon.

10 A Good afternoon.

11 Q In response to questions from Mr. Zobrist, I
12 believe you said that there was nothing that required or
13 mandated a lower ROE if we were to institute trackers and FAC
14 in this case. And I think the keyword was there was nothing
15 that required it. Is that correct? Did I understand that?

16 A The question is correct, but I just don't recall
17 that decision being made or that requirement. I guess I don't
18 even know if we have that requirement.

19 Q Okay. Well, then let me -- let me ask it this
20 way: Do you believe that if the Commission were to institute
21 an FAC and some of the additional trackers sought by KCP&L in
22 this case that it would be appropriate for the Commission to
23 establish a lower ROE?

24 A If we look at Moody's report that the Company just
25 presented today, it would be appropriate.

1 **Q Can you explain why it would be appropriate?**

2 A According to this report, the way they present it
3 is that if the Company do not have these mechanisms, then they
4 carry more risk and that risk should be compensated somehow.
5 And in this case it would be giving higher ROE. So now if
6 these mechanisms are in place, then the opposition take place;
7 ROE should be reduced whatever basis points that party might
8 agree on.

9 **Q Well, I guess I understand Moody's report, and I'm**
10 **trying to understand what Staff's position is. Are you saying**
11 **that Staff agrees with the Moody's analysis as contained in**
12 **that report on the issue?**

13 A On that issue it was Staff's position that we were
14 not recommending any reduction in ROE if these mechanisms are
15 granted.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions based on commissioner
18 questions?

19 OPC?

20 MR. OPITZ: None, Your Honor.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

22 MS. ILES: No questions.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MECG?

24 Department of Energy?

25 MR. TSHIKORORO: No questions, Your Honor.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Brightergy?

2 Division of Energy?

3 Consumers Council?

4 Kansas City Power & Light?

5 MR. ZOBRI ST: No questions.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect?

7 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

8 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:

9 Q I'd like -- I'd like to go back to the question --
10 the conversation you just had with Commissioner Hall.

11 A Yes.

12 Q Okay. And that had to do with whether an ROE
13 adjustment would be appropriate if cost recovery mechanisms
14 were granted. I think -- I think the report talked about a
15 robust suite of cost recovery mechanisms. And KCP&L is, in
16 fact, seeking a robust suite of cost recovery mechanisms in
17 this case; you would agree?

18 A I would agree.

19 Q Okay. If you know, is KCP&L seeking a fuel
20 adjustment clause?

21 A Yes, they are seeking.

22 Q And is KCP&L seeking several different trackers?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Now, would you agree with me that the return
25 required by an investor is a reflection of the risk of the

1 **investment?**

2 A Yes.

3 **Q And would you agree with me that a robust suite of**
4 **cost recovery mechanisms would reduce the risk of KCP&L as an**
5 **investment?**

6 A Yes, it would reduce the risk.

7 **Q So wouldn't it follow that the required return**
8 **would also be reduced?**

9 A It would be reduced in the cost of
10 equity methodologies -- it will be reflected in the cost of --
11 cost of equity methodologies that we use. So if it's reduced,
12 then I guess at this point -- I mentioned earlier that they do
13 not have these mechanisms they're asking for. And that's the
14 main -- that's the reason for the stock, I guess the reason why
15 it's trading at a discount, as noted by other analysts. So
16 their assumption is that if they get these mechanisms, would be
17 reflected in the stock price of the Company, and then the
18 ultimate result would be it would be reflected in the cost of
19 equity methodologies. So that's the reason why we did not make
20 a specific adjustment.

21 **Q Let me see if I understand you. The stock price**
22 **is low because they lack a robust suite of cost recovery**
23 **mechanisms, but if they get such a suite, the stock price would**
24 **go up; is that what you're saying?**

25 A It wouldn't trade at a discount.

1 Q When you say trade at a discount --

2 A That's lower --

3 Q -- you mean low, don't you?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. And so if they get these cost recovery
6 mechanisms, if I understand you correctly, you would expect the
7 stock price to go up --

8 A Yes.

9 Q -- that is, to no longer trade at a discount?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q And that would be reflected in your cost of equity
12 calculations because they are market based?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And so they would capture the change in stock
15 price?

16 A That is correct.

17 Q Okay. But are you going to get an opportunity to
18 submit another analysis to the Commission before it makes its
19 decision in this case?

20 A No.

21 Q So there would not be an opportunity, would there,
22 for you to redo your analysis using new stock prices, would
23 there?

24 A We wouldn't have that opportunity.

25 Q So in the absence of that opportunity, would it be

1 reasonable or not -- what's your opinion, would it be
2 reasonable to suggest to the Commission that if it were to
3 grant a robust suite of cost recovery mechanisms to KCP&L that
4 it should then adjust the ROE downward?

5 A Yes. Sitting today, given the situation you
6 presented to me, yes, it would make it -- it would make sense
7 to make the downward adjustment today.

8 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much. No further
9 questions.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You see may step down.

11 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

12 (Witness excused.)

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Next witness is from the
14 Department of Energy.

15 Can you call your witness, please.

16 MR. TSHIKORORO: Department of Energy calls to the
17 stand Maureen Reno.

18 MAUREEN RENO, testifies as follows:

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You may be seated.

20 You may proceed.

21 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TSHIKORORO:

22 Q Ms. Reno, can you please state your name for the
23 record?

24 A Maureen Lynn Reno.

25 Q And what is your business address?

1 A 19 Hope Hill Road, Derry, New Hampshire.

2 Q Ms. Reno, did you prepare or did someone under
3 your supervision prepare DOE Exhibits 7000 and 701, the Direct
4 Testimony and Rebuttal Test -- Surrebuttal Testimony of Maureen
5 Reno?

6 A Yes, I did.

7 Q Ms. Reno, do you have any corrections to DOE
8 Exhibits 700 or 701?

9 A No, I do not.

10 Q If I were to ask you the same questions today that
11 are found in DOE Exhibits 700 and 701, would you answer those
12 questions the same?

13 A Actually, before we continue with this line of
14 questioning, I would like to make a note to the Commission
15 that, as a result of some corrections or adjustments offered by
16 the utility, I made some alterations to my Rebuttal Testimony.

17 Q So, Ms. Reno, you're not correcting your testimony
18 at all, but you're just highlighting for the Commission that
19 your Surrebuttal Testimony does have adjustments to the figures
20 that were contained in your Direct Testimony; is that correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. TSHIKORORO: Your Honor, we would like to move
24 for admission of DOE Exhibits 700 and 701.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

1 MR. THOMPSON: Well, Judge, I wonder if I could --
2 I don't understand the note she gave about changes to her
3 Surrebuttal Testimony. Was she going to go through those
4 changes and present them to us or is --

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: My under -- correct me if I'm
6 wrong, Counselor, but my understanding was there were no
7 corrections to be made to the testimonies; is that correct?

8 MR. TSHI KORORO: That's correct, Your Honor. She
9 was just clarifying that the figures that are in her Direct
10 Testimony were updated by her Surrebuttal Testimony.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Okay.

12 MR. THOMPSON: I apologize.

13 MR. TSHI KORORO: Sorry for the confusion.

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That's okay. I want to make sure
15 everybody's clear.

16 And I hear no other objections, so I'll receive
17 700 and 701 into the record.

18 (U. S. DOE Exhibits 700 and 701 received into
19 evidence.)

20 MR. TSHI KORORO: Thank you, Your Honor. I now
21 tender Ms. Reno for cross-examination.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be Staff.

23 MR. THOMPSON: Welcome to Missouri, Ms. Reno. I
24 have no questions.

25 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

1 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Public Counsel.

2 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. OPITZ:

3 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Reno. Do you agree that the
4 industry authorized return on equity has declined over the last
5 several years?

6 A Yes, I do.

7 Q Do you agree that capital market costs are lower
8 now than they were in 2012?

9 A Yes, I do.

10 MR. OPITZ: That's all I have. Thank you.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

12 MS. ILES: No questions.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MECG?

14 Brightergy?

15 Division of Energy?

16 Consumers Council?

17 Kansas City Power & Light?

18 MR. ZOBRI ST: Just a moment, Judge. I think I
19 disabled my notebook here. There we go.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

21 Q Good afternoon. Sorry for the pause there. This
22 is the first time that you've testified before the Commission;
23 is that correct?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. And your biography that was presented to

1 the Commission is accurate and contemporaneous; is that
2 correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Now, as I understand it, you have not been awarded
5 a Ph.D. in economics from the University of New Hampshire; is
6 that true?

7 A That's true.

8 Q You've completed your coursework and your
9 examinations, but not the dissertation?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q Okay. So Staff was in error in Mr. Marevangepo's
12 Surrebuttal at page 3 where he listed you as Maureen Reno,
13 Ph.D.; correct?

14 A Yes. That's unfortunate, though.

15 Q All right. All right. Well, it's a great honor.
16 My father was a Ph.D. But I just wanted to clarify. And so
17 you haven't completed your dissertation?

18 A Correct.

19 Q All right. Now let's deal with the capital
20 structure issues before we get into return on equity. You
21 opposed the use of the capital structure of KCP&L's parent
22 Company; is that correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Okay. And all the other witnesses in this case
25 propose to use the parent capital structure, including

1 **Mr. Gorman, Staff, and Mr. Hevert; right?**

2 A That's correct.

3 Q **And we've been using Great Plains Energy's capital**
4 **structure for both Kansas City Power & Light and for its sister**
5 **utility, who we call GMO, for at least since the acquisition of**
6 **GMO's predecessor, which is known as Aquila. You're aware of**
7 **that, are you not?**

8 A Yes, I'm aware of commissioner precedent.

9 Q **Okay. And in 2013, in the case with this Company,**
10 **it adopted the parent Company's structure for use for the**
11 **public utility; correct?**

12 A That's correct.

13 Q **Okay. And you're also aware that the Kansas**
14 **Corporation Commission has utilized the parent Company's**
15 **structure for KCPL in past rate cases; is that correct?**

16 A That's correct.

17 Q **Okay. Now, let's turn just briefly to the**
18 **short-term debt point at all. You propose to include**
19 **short-term debt in the Company's capital structure again; is**
20 **that true?**

21 A That's true.

22 Q **And, again, you're the only witness that proposes**
23 **that; is that correct?**

24 A That's correct.

25 Q **Okay. And all the others simply want to include**

1 long-term debt and the two classes of equity, common stock and
2 preferred stock; correct?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q And, in fact, short-term debt has not been
5 included in the capital structure of this Company for many
6 years; isn't that true?

7 A That's correct.

8 Q Okay. And it is true that if the Commission were
9 inclined to use short-term debt in the capital structure as
10 well as long-term debt, you have agreed to the corrections that
11 Mr. Hevert proposed in his Rebuttal at pages 65 and 66;
12 correct?

13 A Yes, and I incorporated those results in my
14 Surrebuttal.

15 Q Okay. And so just to clarify to the record, as
16 Judge Bushmann was saying when you were introduced to the
17 Commission, it's those corrections and adjustments that are in
18 your Surrebuttal that reflect your recommendation, not the
19 recommendations in your Direct Testimony?

20 A That's correct.

21 Q Okay. All right. Now, in your Direct Testimony
22 you emphasize the importance of macroeconomic trends; is that a
23 fair statement?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. And this was -- this was in your

1 **introduction to your Direct Testimony?**

2 A Yes.

3 Q Okay. Do you have Mr. Hevert's Surrebuttal
4 Testimony before you, by any chance?

5 A Yes, I do.

6 Q Okay. If you would turn to, I think it's page
7 44 -- and I'm going to ask the court reporter to retrieve for
8 me that page that I gave Staff's witness, and I want to go
9 through those economic trends. Staff's witness is a gentleman.
10 So -- do you see page 47 of Mr. Hevert's Surrebuttal?

11 A Yes, I do.

12 Q Okay. Do you agree that the 30-year treasury
13 yield has increased over 35 basis points, from 2.74 to
14 approximately 3.10 percent, in the last couple of months?

15 A Yes, I do.

16 Q Okay. Now, I don't need to repeat these for the
17 commissioners. They heard me go through this in detail with
18 Staff. Are there any of the bullet points here that you
19 disagree with, that you think that they are either miscited or
20 this is a trend that is not occurring?

21 A No, I do not disagree.

22 Q Okay. Well, isn't it fair to say that, contrary
23 to your testimony just a few minutes ago where you said that
24 capital costs are not increasing, at least in the past few
25 months aren't we seeing indications that capital costs are

1 **increasing; that they're not declining, they're increasing?**

2 A Well, what -- what we see here are corrections in
3 the market and corrections from very low interest rates,
4 corrections from an unstable economy. And so we still haven't
5 moved from that low interest rate environment where there are
6 low costs of capital.

7 Q Well, this Commission has got to set the return on
8 equity for this Company sometime in September. And isn't it
9 correct to say that all the trends are that capital costs are
10 beginning to increase?

11 A Well, there are -- there are some short-term
12 movements, but we really haven't seen significant movements in
13 that long-term costs.

14 Q Well, that's right, because we just came out of a
15 bad winter quarter --

16 A Right.

17 Q -- that luckily the economic indications are, it
18 wasn't real good but it wasn't as bad as people thought it was,
19 and things are beginning to pick up in the second quarter;
20 correct?

21 A That's true.

22 Q And Janet Yellen is telling the world that in
23 September, you know, it will be appropriate at some point to
24 take the initial step to raise the federal funds rate target;
25 correct?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q Okay.

3 A But what we're seeing here is the Federal Reserve
4 is stepping away from expansionary policy. These are -- these
5 are changes to short-term rates. And investors also
6 consider -- in addition to what's going on in the short-term
7 rates, they're also looking at what's going on in long-term
8 rates, and they're making their assessments. And so the
9 short-term variations are different than what investors expect
10 in the long run. As you see in our results, that is my results
11 in the CAP-M and the DCF results, which are also in line with
12 other witnesses before you today.

13 Q Well, one of the criticism -- criticisms that you
14 have had of Mr. Hevert is that he relies too heavily on analyst
15 growth rates; correct?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q Okay. And analyst growth rates are trying to look
18 into the future based upon, you know, contemporary data and
19 recent historical data to say where things are going; correct?

20 A Well, let me make a clarification. My critique is
21 he relies on one specific analyst growth rates. That is
22 projected earnings growth. And my critique is that investors
23 incorporate other bits of information as well.

24 Q But what I'm trying to say is that the analyst
25 growth rates that being presented to this Commission, the

1 **projections show that the economy is beginning to take off; and**
2 **you don't dispute that?**

3 A No, I do not.

4 Q Okay. And right now you're not prepared to share
5 a particular statement as to what the growth rate is going to
6 be, say, in September or December; but all the indications are,
7 as Mr. Hevert stated in page 47 of his Surrebuttal, that growth
8 is here and that interest rates are very likely to go up?

9 A Yes, that's true. But what we're looking at is
10 we're looking at short-term changes. And what's key here and
11 as shown in mine and other witnesses' results, particularly the
12 multistage DCF and the Cap-M results, the risk premium results,
13 is that investors are also looking over what's happening or
14 they expect to be happening in the long term.

15 Q Okay. Well, let me ask you a couple of questions
16 about that. If you can turn to page 27 of your Direct
17 Testimony, you summarize at the bottom of the page 27 the
18 estimated returns on equity for three single-stage DCF analyses
19 and four three-stage DCF analyses; correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. So if we look at the single stage, you've
22 got an EPS growth rate of 9.0; you have a dividend per share,
23 earning per share, book value per share of 8.31 percent;
24 correct?

25 A That's correct.

1 Q And a sustainable growth of 8.20 percent; right?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Okay. Now, not one public utility Commission in
4 the whole United States of America has ever granted an ROE to a
5 public utility anywhere near that in recent years; correct?

6 A That's correct.

7 Q Even in the depths of the recession, nothing near
8 that; correct?

9 A That's correct.

10 Q Okay. Now, let's move to the three-stage DCF.
11 Again, we have the EPS and the DPS/EPS/DVPS, those are in the
12 mid 8s; right? The earnings per share is 8.62 percent; the one
13 with the other three per share variations is 8.45 percent,
14 correct?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q Okay. And, again, well below any ROE ever
17 authorized by a Commission in this country; correct?

18 A Yes, that's true.

19 Q Okay.

20 A But may I clarify something?

21 Q Well, we'll let your lawyer do that. So --

22 A Okay.

23 Q -- I'm just trying to set the -- you know, the
24 ballpark here. So the highest one that you have is your
25 earnings per share with 5.5 percent GDP growth rate, and that's

1 **9.18 percent; correct?**

2 A Yes, that's correct.

3 Q Okay. And then if you use the 5.5 growth rate
4 with your dividend per share/earnings per share/book value per
5 share, we go back down to 9.01 percent; correct?

6 A Yes. And those numbers, the three-stage DCF with
7 dividends per share, book value per share, and also
8 incorporating earnings per share, you see a lower result
9 because those other alternative growth rate methods are based
10 on consistent projections of growth where you have --

11 Q Go ahead.

12 A -- where you have dividends and book value being
13 based on management decisions. And here, you know, I started
14 my analysis look -- first incorporating earnings per share
15 growth, as Mr. Hevert does. And so as a result of those
16 optimistic earnings growth projections, you see the higher
17 returns.

18 Q Well, to sort of tie this up in a package, you
19 know, you don't like Mr. Hevert's growth projections; but when
20 we use yours, we end up with ROEs that are entirely out of the
21 mainstream of returns on equity that have been authorized by
22 utility commissions in this country, correct?

23 A Yes, that is correct.

24 Q Okay. Now, let's talk about the analysts'
25 forecasts. You presented testimony in your Surrebuttal at 8

1 and 9 where you say, **These analysts' forecasts and the growth**
2 **rates are too high, they're too optimistic; is that correct?**

3 A Yes, that's correct.

4 Q Okay.

5 A I'm just trying to find where in my Surrebuttal.

6 Q **It's Surrebuttal pages 8 and 9.**

7 A Okay.

8 Q **And, in fact, you've advised the Commission that**
9 **they should be -- they should be -- they should be cautious**
10 **about looking at these kinds of growth rates because the**
11 **analysts could face potential conflicts of interest. You state**
12 **that at page 9, lines 11 through 13; correct?**

13 A Well, I summarize a report issued by the
14 Securities & Exchange Commission, which is a warning to
15 analysts that they need to look beyond just earnings per share
16 growth rates; they need to their own due diligence, look at
17 other financial information.

18 Q Okay. Well, and in that context, you produced as
19 a work paper an article by the folks at McKinsey, the
20 consulting firm; correct?

21 A That's true as well, yeah.

22 Q Okay.

23 A And that report demonstrated that --

24 MR. ZOBRI ST: No pending question, Judge.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: You just need to wait until he

1 asks you a question.

2 THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry.

3 (Company Exhibit 142 marked for identification.)

4 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

5 Q Now, Ms. Reno, I've handed you what the court
6 reporter has marked as Exhibit 142. Is that the article that
7 you relied upon with regard to cautioning the Commission with
8 regard to analyst growth rates?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Now, are you generally familiar with what was
11 known as the Global Settlement of 2003?

12 A You'll have to elaborate.

13 Q Well, there's a footnote in the article that you
14 cite here that talks about the Global Settlement of 2003. It's
15 on Footnote 2. It's the last page of the exhibit, which is
16 marked page 17, in the -- from the magazine that this is cited
17 from. Do you see that? It's about two-thirds of the way down,
18 footnote 2, it says, quote, The Global Settlement of 2003
19 between regulators and ten of the largest U.S. investment firms
20 aim to present conflicts -- prevent conflicts of interest
21 between their analysts and investment businesses. Do you see
22 where I read that?

23 A Yes, I see that.

24 Q Okay. So, you know, in the wake of WorldCom and
25 Enron and all that, the SEC started cracking down on the

1 securities industry, and they had this global settlement that
2 came out in 2003 that began to regulate potential conflicts of
3 interest; correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q Okay. And are you familiar with SEC's Regulation
6 AC?

7 A Yes, I am.

8 Q Okay. And what is Regulation AC?

9 A To what part are you pertaining?

10 Q In terms of how it -- well, what does AC stand
11 for?

12 A I can't recall.

13 Q Okay. Analyst Certification; does that sound
14 correct?

15 A Yes, it does.

16 Q Okay. I'm going to show you not a full copy of an
17 SEC release, because it goes into some other things. I can
18 provide that later on, if anybody wants it. But let me ask you
19 ask you about that.

20 And this will be Exhibit 142?

21 COURT REPORTER: 143.

22 (Company Exhibit 143 marked for identification.)

23 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

24 Q Now, Ms. Reno, I've handed you Exhibit 143, which
25 is the Introduction and Summary of Regulation Analyst

1 Certification that was released by the SEC, effective around
2 April 14th of 2003. Does this generally look familiar to you
3 as relating to that Regulation AC?

4 A Yes, it does.

5 Q Okay. And without going into a whole lot of
6 detail, the Regulation AC that the SEC promulgated tells
7 research analysts that they have to certify that the views that
8 they express in their research part are their own views;
9 correct?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q And that if they're receiving any compensation
12 that relates to something that might influence their report,
13 they have to disclose it; right?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q And then there are also regulations with regard to
16 public appearances, that they have to state will these views
17 are theirs or whether they're being paid by somebody to give a
18 particular opinion; correct?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q And as with all the Securities & Exchange
21 regulations, there are consequences if you violate Regulation
22 AC; correct?

23 A That's correct.

24 Q And that could mean you'd lose your license; might
25 even mean if you engage in fraud, you could go to jail, right?

1 A Right.

2 Q **Now, you didn't find in any of the analyst surveys**
3 **that Mr. Hevert cited, did you, any evidence of conflict of**
4 **interest?**

5 A I -- I don't recall.

6 Q **Okay. It's not in your testimony; is that fair to**
7 **say?**

8 A No, it's not.

9 Q **Okay. Now let's turn back to the McKinsey report**
10 **and the discussion of analyst projections. In Mr. Hevert's**
11 **schedule he used growth rates provided by Zacks and by First**
12 **Call and by Value Line; is that correct?**

13 A That's correct.

14 Q **Okay. And the average range that he used, based**
15 **upon those analysts' growth rates was 5.64 percent; is that**
16 **correct?**

17 A Is that regard to his GDP growth rate?

18 Q **Right.**

19 A I believe he -- yeah, that number rings a bell.

20 Q **Okay. Now, the -- and, again, you think that's**
21 **too high; correct?**

22 A Well, to be conservative, I did use a range of GDP
23 growth rates ranging from 4.8 to 5.5. So, yes, his 5.64 would
24 be a little high.

25 Q **Okay. Well, and in truth, although you had one**

1 high point, the majority -- the vast majority, I mean
2 two-thirds, three-quarters of the growth rates that you used
3 had the ROE either in the 8s or at like 9.01 or 9.18, correct,
4 when we get down to the bottom line of what your ROE
5 recommendations were?

6 A Yeah, but that also includes an upper bound of
7 9.6.

8 Q Right. But you had one figure at 9.6, and then
9 all the others were huddled down as --

10 A And 9.3, my other Cap-M result.

11 Q Yeah. And then all the others were 9.18, 9.01,
12 and the rest were in the 8s; correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Okay. Okay. Now, let me ask you a question about
15 the McKinsey article. I mean, generally speaking, do you --
16 this was produced to you as a work paper -- produced to us as a
17 work paper; correct?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q And you relied upon this in preparing your
20 testimony in this case?

21 A My Surrebuttal.

22 Q In your Surrebuttal? And so you consider it
23 authoritative, as far as the subjects that it discusses?

24 A Yes, it's a report.

25 Q Well, I mean, did you find anything in it that was

1 **inaccurate?**

2 A No, I did not.

3 Q **Did you find anything in it that you disagreed**
4 **with?**

5 A No.

6 Q **Okay. Let me turn your attention, if you would,**
7 **to the last page of Exhibit --**

8 MR. THOMPSON: 142.

9 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

10 Q **-- 142. Thank you. Do you see Footnote 9 there?**

11 A Yes.

12 Q **Okay. And Footnote 9 relates to some statements**
13 **that begin on the previous page as far as earnings growth**
14 **rates; is that generally correct?**

15 A Yes.

16 Q **Okay. And, actually, going back to that previous**
17 **page of Exhibit 142, it's marked 16 at the top, the article**
18 **says, you know, analysts have been persistently over**
19 **optimistic, with estimates ranging from 10 to 12 percent,**
20 **compared with actual earnings growth of 6 percent. Do you see**
21 **that at the bottom of the first column?**

22 A I'm not seeing the 6 percent. I'm seeing 5
23 percent.

24 Q **It's the first column.**

25 A Oh, okay. I was looking at the second column.

1 Q **Right. Yeah, first column. And then in the**
2 **second column they talk about capital markets being less giddy.**
3 **And then at the bottom it says, What's more, an actual forward**
4 **P/E ratio of the S & P 500 as of November 11, 2009 to '14 is**
5 **consistent with long-term earnings growth of 5 percent; is that**
6 **correct?**

7 A Yes.

8 Q **Okay. And then it says, This assessment is more**
9 **reasonable, considering that long-term earnings growth for the**
10 **market as a whole is unlikely to differ significantly --**
11 **significantly from growth in GDP, and then there's Footnote 9;**
12 **correct?**

13 A That's correct.

14 Q **Okay. And Footnote 9 states, Real GDP averaged 3**
15 **to 4 percent over the past seven or eight decades, which would**
16 **indeed be consistent with nominal growth of 5 to 7 percent,**
17 **given current inflation of 2 to 3 percent; correct?**

18 A That's correct.

19 Q **Okay. And that is consistent with Mr. Hevert's**
20 **figures, which were 3.27 percent of real GDP growth and**
21 **inflation of 2.31 percent; correct?**

22 A That's correct.

23 MR. ZOBRI ST: Okay. Nothing further, Judge.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Do you intend to offer 142 and
25 143 into the record.

1 MR. ZOBRI ST: I do, Your Honor. I apologize.
2 Yeah, I offer 142 and 143.

3 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?
4 Hearing none, those will be received into the
5 record.

6 (Company Exhibits 142 and 143 received into
7 evidence.)

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any questions from commissioners?
9 Mr. Chairman?

10 CHAIR R. KENNEY: No, thanks.

11 Ms. Reno, thank you for being here.

12 THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Welcome to Jefferson City.
14 Not an easy place to get here, is it?

15 THE WITNESS: It was a nice drive from the
16 airport.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: Thank you. No questions.

18 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER HALL:

19 Q Good afternoon. It's my understanding that you
20 are recommending an ROE of 9.0 in this case?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q Has any Commission in this country ever granted an
23 ROE at that number that you're aware of?

24 A Not to my knowledge.

25 Q Is it safe to say that utilities must compete with

1 each other for capital?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Isn't it relevant that there's no other utility
4 out there with that ROE? Shouldn't -- shouldn't we take that
5 into account?

6 A Yes, we should. Can I elaborate, though?

7 Q Sure.

8 A Oh, okay. I recommend a 9.0, true. But it's also
9 within a range of reasonableness, which is as high as 9.6. And
10 I -- and that also includes, within that range, a recent ruling
11 from this Commission of 9.5. So it's up to the Commission to
12 decide what's best in terms of balancing the interests of the
13 ratepayers and investors in this case.

14 Q But you're recommending an ROE that's 53 points
15 lower than our recent decision?

16 A That's correct.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: All right. Thank you.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on bench questions?
19 Staff?

20 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Judge.

21 RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:

22 Q Following up on what Commissioner Hall was asking
23 you, does it matter what other commissions have been granting
24 to other companies in other cases?

25 A It does to an extent. It sets up expectations for

1 investors. But what the Commission really needs to keep in
2 mind is what is best for the Company in this case, in the -- in
3 this era of low interest rates, low costs of capital.

4 **Q Would you agree with me that the authorized**
5 **returns on equity, ROEs, granted by commissions trend upward or**
6 **downward more slowly than the cost of equity?**

7 A Yes, I would agree.

8 **Q And is there -- in your opinion, is there any**
9 **danger if commissions look to what other commissions are doing**
10 **in granting ROEs? Is there a danger of circularity, for**
11 **example?**

12 A Yes.

13 **Q Now, with respect to the range that you**
14 **recommended, would an award anywhere within that range be**
15 **acceptable, in your opinion?**

16 A Yes.

17 **Q So 8.8 would be just as good as 9.6, in your**
18 **professional opinion?**

19 A Yes, it would.

20 MR. THOMPSON: No further questions. Thank you.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Public Counsel?

22 MR. OPITZ: No cross, Judge.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: MIEC?

24 MS. ILES: No questions.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Consumers Council?

1 MR. HOFFMAN: No questions.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Kansas City Power & Light?

3 MR. ZOBRI ST: No questions.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect?

5 MR. TSHI KORORO: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. TSHI KORORO:

7 Q Ms. Reno, can I direct you back to page 27 of your
8 Direct Testimony?

9 A Yes, you can.

10 Q There's a chart there on the bottom of the page
11 that counsel for the Company was asking you about. Are these
12 reasonable results based on current data using reasonable
13 models?

14 A Yes, they are in that what I did here is, to be
15 reasonable, I did start with looking at and applying
16 Mr. Hevert's methodology of applying earnings growth forecasts.
17 And as a result, for example, with the single-stage DCF, you
18 have 9.0. That is using just the earnings growth forecast.
19 And then, for example, with the single-stage DCF, as I
20 incorporate alternative growth rates, which I'm aware that the
21 Commission has approved in past orders, those numbers fall,
22 reflecting the low cost of capital environment we have today.

23 And the same holds with my three-stage DCF. I
24 introduce -- again, I start with just using Mr. Hevert's
25 earnings per share forecast, and then I do some more

1 sensitivity runs based on alternative growth rates and find
2 numbers fall.

3 MR. TSHIKORORO: Thank you, Your Honor. That's
4 all I have.

5 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. That concludes your
6 testimony, Ms. Reno. You may step. Thank you.

7 THE WITNESS: You're welcome.

8 (Witness excused.)

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: We have one more witness today,
10 and it may -- I anticipate it might take a little while. Why
11 don't we take a short break before we do Mr. Gorman.

12 We'll be in recess for about ten minutes.

13 (Off the record.)

14 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Let's go back on the record.

15 MICHAEL GORMAN, testifies as follows:

16 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Please be seated.

17 You may proceed.

18 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. ILES:

19 **Q Please state your name for the record.**

20 A Michael Gorman.

21 **Q What is your business address, Mr. Gorman?**

22 A 16630 Swingley Ridge Road, Chesterfield, Missouri.

23 **Q Mr. Gorman, did you prepare Direct, Rebuttal, and**
24 **Surrebuttal Testimony for this case that's been marked as**
25 **Exhibits 550, 551, and 552?**

1 A Yes.

2 Q And I would note for the record that there is an
3 HC and an NP version of your Rebuttal Testimony; is that
4 correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q That's Exhibit 551; correct?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Do you have any changes or corrections to your
9 testimony?

10 A To my Direct Testimony? I have a change to my
11 Rebuttal Testimony.

12 Q And did you prepare an errata sheet that describes
13 your corrections to that?

14 A I did, yes.

15 MS. ILES: Could I please have this marked as an
16 exhibit?

17 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I think your next -- do you need
18 a number?

19 MS. ILES: Yes.

20 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I think your next number is 560.

21 (MIEC Exhibit 560 marked for identification.)

22 BY MS. ILES:

23 Q I've handed you what's been marked as Exhibit 560.
24 Is this the errata sheet you prepared for your Rebuttal
25 Testimony?

1 A It is.

2 Q **Could you explain to us what the correction is?**

3 A The correction was, to accurately describe
4 Mr. Hevert's testimony in this proceeding, I inadvertent the
5 described part of his multigrowth stage DCF Model from the
6 Ameren Missouri proceeding. So these -- these redlined
7 revisions are errata, correct that testimony.

8 Q **Did you have any other corrections to your**
9 **testimony?**

10 A I do not.

11 MS. ILES: Your Honor, I'd like to offer for
12 admission at this time Exhibits 550, 551, 552, and 560.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

14 Hearing none, they will be received into the
15 record.

16 (MIEC Exhibits 550, 551, 552, and 560 received
17 into evidence.)

18 MS. ILES: And also tender the witness for cross.

19 JUDGE BUSHMANN: And just for my clarification, on
20 560 it corrects page 15 of which testimony?

21 MS. ILES: Rebuttal.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you.

23 MS. ILES: Both HC and NP.

24 JUDGE BUSHMANN: First cross would be Public
25 Counsel.

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. OPITZ:

2 Q Mr. Gorman, you recommend a range of 8.8 percent
3 to 9.4 percent for ROE; correct?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Now, even though you recommend a return on equity
6 of 9.1 percent, any number within that range would be a fair
7 and reasonable estimate for the current market cost of capital
8 for KCPL; correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q Would any number in that range allow the Company
11 to attract capital?

12 A In this marketplace, I believe it would, yes.

13 Q Do you agree that capital market costs are lower
14 now than in KCPL's last rate case?

15 A Yes, I believe there's strong evidence of that,
16 yes. It's my belief it is.

17 Q And turning to your Surrebuttal, you offered
18 testimony about regulatory mechanisms that reduce cost recovery
19 risk; correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Do you believe that a fuel adjustment clause
22 reduces risk to a Company?

23 A Well, it certainly shifts risk. The
24 implementation of fuel adjustment clause in terms of whether or
25 not it can lower the risk to the utility, requires a detailed

1 assessment of whether or not the utility could control or
2 manage fuel risk without a fuel adjustment clause in a manner
3 that's consistent with its abilities to fully recover its cost
4 of fuel with a fuel adjustment clause.

5 So, in other words, fuel risk can be managed
6 without a fuel adjustment clause. But what is significant
7 about a fuel adjustment mechanism is that it reduces the
8 utility's incentive to manage fuel risk because it no longer
9 takes fuel risk; it simply passes its few costs on to retail
10 customers, and they in turn assume most of the fuel risk at
11 that point.

12 So I think it's -- it's a little more complicated
13 question to me. But it certainly does shift the risk of
14 recovering fuel costs from investors to customers by
15 implementing a fuel adjustment clause.

16 **Q If the Commission authorized a fuel adjustment**
17 **clause, would your ROE recommendation remain the same?**

18 A In this case I believe a shift in -- or
19 implement -- implementing fuel adjust -- pardon me.
20 Implementing regulatory mechanisms in this case that reduce the
21 Company's risk going forward will result in a different
22 assessment of the Company's risk than what I used in my study.
23 So my return on equity recommendation reflects the Company's
24 risk -- investment risk as it exists right now.

25 If regulatory mechanisms reduce that risk going

1 forward, then an adjustment to my recommended rate of return
2 would be appropriate, because my recommended rate of return
3 reflects the risk that exists today. If the regulatory
4 mechanisms, again, lower those risks, then a reduced return on
5 equity would be appropriate to recognize the risk reduction
6 created by the implementation of new regulatory mechanisms.

7 **Q If the Commission does not authorize the use of**
8 **any alternative regulatory mechanisms, would that change your**
9 **recommendation for the return on equity for the Company?**

10 A If the existing regulatory mechanisms remain in
11 place, then my recommended return on equity and range would be
12 appropriate and provide fair compensation for that level of
13 investment risk.

14 MR. OPITZ: That's all I have. Thank you.

15 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions by Staff?

16 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. THOMPSON:

18 **Q I was listening carefully to the questions and**
19 **answers between you and Mr. Opitz. If a fuel adjustment clause**
20 **is granted in this case as the Company has requested, in your**
21 **opinion would that change the parameters of the analysis that**
22 **you conducted?**

23 A It wouldn't change my analysis, because my
24 analysis was based on publicly-available indicators of
25 investment risk for KCP&L and the proxy group that

1 reasonably -- is reasonably comparable to KCP&L's investment
2 risk. So my return on equity, again, is based on current
3 observable risk indicators and market cost of capital for that
4 level of risk.

5 But to the extent the Commission approves new
6 regulatory mechanisms which change risk going forward, then an
7 external adjustment to my recommended return on equity would be
8 appropriate, because KCP&L's risk would be reduced going
9 forward relative to the time I did my study.

10 **Q Well, would a fuel adjustment clause be a**
11 **regulatory mechanism that would change risk going forward?**

12 A If it's designed to shift fuel cost recovery risks
13 from the Company to customers, then I think it would reduce
14 operating risk, yes.

15 **Q In that case would you have to do a new analysis**
16 **to determine what an appropriate ROE would be?**

17 A I don't think you could reasonably and accurately
18 capture the change in risk created by implementing new
19 regulatory mechanisms until those regulatory mechanisms are in
20 effect for some period of time that allows market participants
21 to understand the regulatory mechanisms and the impact on the
22 utility.

23 So within this rate case I think the best the
24 Commission can do is to use its independent discretion to
25 recognize that risk reduction that will take place and, in

1 effect, with the regulatory mechanism, it likely will shift the
2 risk to customers from the Company and, therefore, require a
3 judgmental determination of where within my recommended range a
4 fair return on equity would be.

5 **Q Let me ask you a hypothetical question. Let's say**
6 **the Commission decided to implement an FAC for KCP&L that is**
7 **identical in all respects to the FAC that Ameren Missouri has.**
8 **Now, you have testified, have you not, in the last several**
9 **Ameren Missouri rate cases?**

10 A I have, yes.

11 **Q And with respect to Ameren Missouri, the change in**
12 **cost recovery before and after the implementation of the FAC is**
13 **observable; it's historical, correct?**

14 A It's part of the risk metrics of the Company, yes,
15 after it's implemented and then the market can see how it
16 actually works, yes.

17 **Q So would -- if the Commission implemented an**
18 **identical FAC for KCP&L, could the historical case of Ameren**
19 **Missouri provide guidance as to how KCPL's risk of not**
20 **recovering all of its costs would thereby be changed?**

21 MR. ZOBRI ST: Objection, I believe it's an
22 incomplete and inaccurate hypothetical question.

23 JUDGE BUSHMANN: In what respect?

24 MR. ZOBRI ST: Well, to the extent that you're
25 basing it on a different Company, holding Company that has got

1 different subsidiaries, different operations, different service
2 territory, different load growth than this Company does. I
3 don't believe you can compare apples and oranges, and so I
4 object that it's an incomplete and inaccurate hypothetical and
5 lacks foundation.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: I'll overrule since the question
7 was whether or not the witness believes he can do that. So
8 I'll overrule the question -- the objection.

9 You want to ask your question again, if you can.

10 MR. THOMPSON: Could you read it back? Or do you
11 remember?

12 THE WITNESS: I think I understand the question.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right.

14 THE WITNESS: Essentially can you use Ameren
15 Missouri as a benchmark to determine what their impact on
16 KCP&L's investment risk would be if you implemented a fuel
17 adjustment clause similar -- similar to Ameren Missouri.

18 BY MR. THOMPSON:

19 Q That's correct.

20 A And I think that's one piece of the puzzle that
21 you can look at. But another important piece is the actual
22 fuel risk difference between Ameren Missouri and KCP&L, whether
23 or not they're nuclear, coal, gas, fuel, how much is the
24 relative weights of each of those fuels, where a
25 contractual obliga -- or contractual procurement for those fuel

1 types, all of that, I think, is necessary to get a sense of
2 just how much fuel risk the utility has and whether or not they
3 can manage that risk without a fuel adjustment mechanism,
4 compared to how much risk they are shedding by implementing a
5 fuel adjustment mechanism.

6 So I think it would be a little more complicated
7 than just implementing regulatory mechanisms that's similar to
8 Ameren Missouri, because that would only be part of the
9 analysis that you would need to in order to get a true
10 understanding what the level of risk is and what the reduction
11 of risk is.

12 **Q Well, then, if the Commission were to implement an**
13 **FAC for KCP&L and in the absence of the sort of complex study**
14 **that you're talking about, would it be appropriate for the**
15 **Commission to move towards the lower end of your proposed**
16 **range?**

17 A I would recommend the Commission stay within my
18 recommended range to ensure that the return on equity is
19 within -- is a reasonable estimate of the current market cost
20 of equity is for KCP&L. So, yes, I think it should be below
21 the midpoint, but the Commission should exercise its discretion
22 on how close to the low end of the range would be appropriate.

23 **Q So that would be a matter of judgment for the**
24 **Commission?**

25 A Yes.

1 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. No further questions.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: U.S. Department of Energy?

3 MR. TSHI KORORO: No questions, Your Honor.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Brightergy?

5 Division of Energy?

6 MR. ANTAL: No questions.

7 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Consumers Council?

8 MR. HOFFMAN: No questions.

9 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Kansas City Power & Light?

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

11 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Gorman.

12 A Good afternoon.

13 Q I think you stated in response to some of the
14 questions on -- from other counsel here in the room that the --
15 that the capital costs are about the same today as they were at
16 the time of KCP&L's last rate case?

17 A No, I think I stated I think capital costs are
18 lower today.

19 Q Are lower today?

20 A Yeah.

21 Q Okay. Now, would you agree that we're beginning
22 to see changes in capital markets in the United States that
23 have begun over the last just four to six, eight weeks?

24 A I think there has been movement in volatility in
25 capital market costs over the last four to six weeks that has

1 been comparable to movements in volatility in capital market
2 costs over the last five years.

3 **Q Well, the Federal Reserve Board was not talking**
4 **about raising interest rates over the last five years; isn't**
5 **that a fair statement?**

6 A They have hinted at changing interest rates as the
7 economy improves for several years now. There has been
8 positive indications that have -- that the Federal Reserve has
9 relied on to suggest that they're hoping that that will occur
10 this year.

11 **Q Okay. And you just filed testimony last week**
12 **before the Illinois Commerce Commission in an Ameren Illinois**
13 **gas case; is that correct?**

14 A Yes.

15 **Q And what was your recommendation for ROE in that**
16 **gas case?**

17 A I'm embarrassed to say I'd have to double-check,
18 but I think --

19 **Q You know, I've got a copy here, and I'll lead you**
20 **through it --**

21 A Thank you.

22 **Q -- to see if you disagree with me. Your ROE**
23 **recommendation in the Ameren Illinois gas case, which is Docket**
24 **Number 15-0412, was 9.25 percent. Does that sound right?**

25 A It does, yes.

1 **Q Okay. And the recommended range in that case was**
2 **9.0 percent from your DCF analysis to 9.5 percent in your CAP-M**
3 **analysis?**

4 A That sounds correct, yes.

5 **Q And you were presenting Direct Testimony on behalf**
6 **of the Illinois Industrial Energy Consumers and the Citizens**
7 **Utility Board?**

8 A Yes.

9 **Q Okay. And I believe that was filed on June 9th,**
10 **2015, last Tuesday?**

11 A That sounds correct.

12 **Q Now, does the fact that your ROE recommendation in**
13 **that case is a little bit higher than in this case and your**
14 **range is a little bit higher in this case reflect the fact that**
15 **the economy is beginning to improve and we're seeing growth in**
16 **the economy?**

17 A Well, no, more specifically I think it reflects
18 the fact that utility bond yields have dropped a little bit.
19 The yields have gone up, and the DCF estimates have gone up a
20 little bit since the time I did my analysis in this case.

21 **Q And is it generally true that returns on equity**
22 **for gas distribution utilities average below those of**
23 **vertically-integrated electric utilities like KCP&L?**

24 A For an industry I think that's true. But for
25 Ameren Illinois, the bond rating and investment risk is not

1 that different than the Ameren Missouri's bond rating.

2 **Q Well, as -- as an overall matter with regard to**
3 **gas distribution companies, is it fair to say that they are**
4 **viewed as less risky and more stable than vertically-integrated**
5 **electric utilities?**

6 A Generally speaking, vertically-integrated electric
7 utility companies have more operating risk than do gas
8 companies, particularly those with gas -- purchased gas
9 adjustment clauses.

10 **Q Okay.**

11 A May I correct that? I think I said in my prior
12 Ameren Missouri. What I meant to say was Kansas City Power &
13 Light. So I wanted to get that correction in.

14 **Q Okay. Now, do you have a copy of Mr. Hevert's**
15 **Surrebuttal Testimony?**

16 A I do.

17 **Q Okay. Would you turn to page 47? That's the list**
18 **of about eight bullet points with regard to changes in the**
19 **economy that I've gone through with the Staff expert and with**
20 **the DOE expert. Have you had a chance to review those, sir?**

21 A I have, yes.

22 **Q Do you generally agree that those are accurate**
23 **statements in terms of some of the economic developments that**
24 **we're seeing at this time?**

25 A I agree that over the referenced time period,

1 which has been up to through January to April of this year,
2 that treasury bond yields did increase in line with what he
3 represented.

4 I'm not confident that his representation of an
5 increase in BAA utility bond yields have increased by 36 basis
6 points. I would have to check that.

7 Federal Reserve Chairman Yellen has stated that
8 and continues to state, as did the previous fed chairman,
9 Bernanke, that they will increase interest rates once the
10 economy gets stronger, that that is Federal Reserve policy, and
11 that the action taken by the fed likely will be reflected in a
12 change in the federal funds rate.

13 **Q How about October 2015, on line 10, the 85 percent**
14 **probability?**

15 A I am not familiar -- I did not verify that --

16 **Q Okay.**

17 A -- that statement.

18 **Q Why don't I go through this. It might be easier**
19 **for the court reporter. The next bullet point is that the U.S.**
20 **trade deficit decreased by 19.20 percent, the sharpest decline**
21 **in over six years?**

22 A I can't confirm the numbers, but it is my
23 understanding that the U.S. trade deficit has decreased.

24 **Q Then the next point, reported seasonally-adjusted**
25 **annual rate of privately-owned housing starts increased by**

1 **20.4 percent over the prior month?**

2 A Yeah, that -- I can't verify the number, but it is
3 my understanding that housing starts have improved.

4 Q **And the next point, that the Institute to Supply**
5 **Management noted that manufacturing activity continued to**
6 **expand in May for the 29th consecutive month?**

7 A I'm not familiar with is that quote, but it is my
8 understanding that industrial production is up.

9 Q **Okay. And then the utility exchange traded fund**
10 **XLU, that it decreased by 3 percent?**

11 A Well, utility prices have come down more recently.
12 I'm not sure what time period he's referencing there.

13 Q **Okay. But they have decreased; correct?**

14 A They have.

15 Q **And that's consistent, for example, with Staff's**
16 **observation that we -- we've seen that price-to-earnings ratios**
17 **in the utility segment are decreasing?**

18 A Well, specifically in the Ameren Illinois
19 testimony we just went over, the reason my recommended return
20 was a little bit higher is largely because of the decline in
21 stock prices, which cause the DCF estimates to be a little
22 higher in that case than they were in this case. Consequently,
23 the low end of my recommended range was a little higher there
24 than it is here.

25 Q **Okay. Let me ask you to turn, if you would,**

1 **please, sir, to your Surrebuttal, and Schedule MPG-SR-1.**

2 A I'm there.

3 Q **Now, you have quoted a series of cases, either all**
4 **cases or litigated cases, with regard to vertically-integrated**
5 **utilities and all electric utilities, as far as rate cases in**
6 **either 2014 or the first quarter of 2015; is that true?**

7 A Yes.

8 Q **Okay. And you haven't provided any statistics on**
9 **the second quarter of 2015, but we have them from the first**
10 **quarter of 2015 and then all the 2014; is that correct?**

11 A Well, the second quarter of 2015 isn't complete
12 yet, so that document's not yet available. But what I -- I
13 presented here was the RRA quarterly reports based on the
14 quarters that have been completed.

15 Q **Okay. Now, let's start with last year's rates,**
16 **which I believe are pages 3 and 4. You indicated that the**
17 **average return on equity for litigated electric utility rate**
18 **cases was 9.63; is that correct?**

19 A Yes.

20 Q **And if we go to vertically-integrated electric**
21 **utility rate cases, the next page, it's higher; is that**
22 **correct?**

23 A It's 9.85 percent, yes. But that's largely
24 because of a Wisconsin decision.

25 Q **Okay. And if we include settled cases from the**

1 **first column, it goes up to 9.94 percent; correct?**

2 A For vertically-integrated utilities, yes.

3 Q Okay. And those two numbers are both indicated on
4 page 4 of Schedule MPG-SR-1; is that correct?

5 A It is.

6 Q Okay. Now let me ask you a question about page 4
7 of your Surrebuttal. You were -- Mr. Hevert, in his Rebuttal,
8 described how you arrived at your 9.1 percent recommended rate.
9 And you stated at line 10 of page 4, your Surrebuttal, that he
10 simply concocted the weights. I mean, isn't it simply the fact
11 that he took what you did in terms of averaging two numbers to
12 come up with one of the final two numbers and then taking the
13 other number and simply making a math -- mathematical
14 calculation; that there was no really concoction involved?

15 A Well, first let me apologize to Mr. Hevert and
16 this Commission for not using more professional language there.
17 But what I intended to say was he did not rely on my testimony
18 in identifying weights I applied to each of my results to
19 produce my 9.1 percent return on equity.

20 I do not apply specific weights to return on
21 equity findings. Mr. Hevert does not provide specific weights
22 in return on equity. In looking at his entire analysis and me
23 looking at my entire analysis and developing what I believe to
24 be a supportive rate of return finding that the Commission can
25 have confidence in that reasonably represents the current

1 market cost of equity to the utility in that case and that will
2 also support the financial integrity of the utility in that
3 case, it is not a simple mathematical formulation of specific
4 return on equity findings to arrive at what I find to be an
5 appropriate return on equity range in my point estimate. I
6 rely on all my studies, I rely on all the market information
7 considered in my study, I look at all the market information
8 provided in credit reports in the utility's filing, and all of
9 that is used to offer an informed recommendation on where the
10 current market cost of equity is that meets the standards
11 outlined in Hope and Bluefield. It is not a simple
12 determination of applying weights to specific return on equity
13 estimates.

14 Well, I should have used more professional
15 language, though. I do apologize.

16 **Q Let me ask you this: If you would turn,**
17 **Mr. Gorman, to your Direct Testimony, on page 33, line 3 -- and**
18 **this is with regard to your risk premium recommendation -- you**
19 **state, I propose to provide 75 percent weight to the high end**
20 **of my risk premium estimates and 25 percent to the low end of**
21 **my risk premium estimates. So isn't it true that you do apply**
22 **a weighting process as you go through your analysis?**

23 **A** As part of the specific information in this risk
24 premium study, it was necessary to take all the risk premium
25 estimates and offer what is a reasonable interpretation of all

1 that data to what the current market cost of equity would be
2 based on a risk premium study.

3 Risk premiums vary with the changes in perceptions
4 of investment risk between equity and debt securities. I went
5 through a detailed review of factors that help me understand
6 what the market believes the relative risk differential is in
7 this market; and based on that assessment and based on some
8 judgment, I gave more weight to the higher -- the risk premium
9 estimate because of the level of market interest rates. The
10 uncertainty about the level of risk to investors that market
11 interest rates will increase, sooner rather than later,
12 informing what I believe to be a balanced interpretation of all
13 that data.

14 **Q Well, when I look at your low end at 9.21 percent**
15 **and your high end of 9.56 percent, what I hear you saying is**
16 **that you applied your judgment, said that 9.21 percent is too**
17 **low; I can only give that 25 percent weight; and my 9.56, I'm**
18 **going to give that 75 percent weight, in order to come up with**
19 **a recommendation that I believe is reasonable?**

20 A That was the end of my analysis, yes.

21 **Q Okay. And, actually, if you took the midpoint of**
22 **the 25 and the 75, what was 9.385 percent, and you rounded that**
23 **up to the get to the 9.40; correct?**

24 A Because these numbers are not precise enough to
25 round them off to the one-hundredth decimal point.

1 **Q** And a few pages later in your direct, on page 38,
2 is it fair to say that you did a similar pro -- that you went
3 through a similar process where you gave the lower end of your
4 CAP-M a 25 percent weight, that was an 8.27; and the higher
5 end, which was 9.30, you gave that a 75 percent weight; is that
6 correct?

7 A Well, it is correct. But, again, that's because
8 of all the information considered as part of this analysis,
9 including a lot of these macroeconomic factors that you've been
10 talking about today, all of those were used to apply weights to
11 my risk premium study to try to gauge what a reasonable outlook
12 would be for capital costs when rates determined in this
13 proceeding are in effect.

14 **Q** Okay. So when you've come before the Commission
15 in prior cases, you've done the same sort of thing of weighting
16 and even disregarding a model result that you think is too low
17 or too high; correct?

18 A I wouldn't -- I disagree that I disregarded it. I
19 have found that it is not appropriate for including within my
20 recommended range, based on the information I examined in
21 preparing my testimony.

22 **Q** Well, in Kansas City Power & Light Company's last
23 rate case, you told the Commission at page 39 of your Direct
24 Testimony -- and I've got excerpts of that, if you need to have
25 them -- that your recommended range was based on your DCF and

1 **your risk premium analyses, and you disregarded your CAP-M;**
2 **isn't that correct?**

3 A In that case that is true. But that's when
4 risk-free rates were -- even forecasted risk-free rates were so
5 low that I just wasn't comfortable including that return within
6 my recommended range.

7 Q Okay. And so in that case, where your DCF showed
8 9.5 percent and your risk premium was 9.0 percent, you based
9 your recommendation on those parameters; correct?

10 A That's true. And that's not different than what
11 I've done here on certain return on equity estimates. There
12 are return on equity estimates that are outside of my
13 recommended range.

14 Q And in the last rate case for KCP&L you
15 disregarded the CAP-M rate because that came in at 8.40
16 percent; correct?

17 A I routinely do that in every study and every
18 testimony I file.

19 Q Now, you and I've been having a discussion about
20 the inverse relationship between interest rates and equity risk
21 premium for at least the last three rate cases. So why is this
22 a problem for you to accept that? Because when we look at
23 Mr. Hevert's -- sorry. I'll rephrase. I'll rephrase. It's
24 getting late in the day here.

25 Look at Mr. Hevert's graph, if you would. It's

1 **page 83, I think, of his Rebuttal. It's chart 13. And my**
2 **question is is why -- why do you not accept the argument, the**
3 **proposition that he and other Company ROE witnesses have said**
4 **that when -- when equity risk premiums -- when interest rates**
5 **go down, equity risk premiums go up?**

6 A Because it's more complicated than that. The
7 academic literature is very clear that the equity risk premium
8 will go up when the investment risk of an equity security
9 increases more than the investment risk of a bond investment.
10 Changes in nominal interest rates are one factor that can help
11 describe that difference in investment risk, but it's not the
12 only factor. Consequently, assuming one factor that describes
13 that relationship can produce an accurate estimate or risk
14 premium estimate is -- is an inadequate and incomplete
15 analysis.

16 Q **So is it fair to say you don't dispute the trend;**
17 **you just -- you have a more complicated analysis and say there**
18 **are more things at work; but you don't dispute the observations**
19 **that Mr. Hevert and other experts have made with regard to the**
20 **relationship of interest rates and equity risk premiums?**

21 A Well, I am disputing that it is always found to be
22 a negative relationship. There are academic studies that found
23 that periods in the '70s where the relationship between
24 interest rates and equity risk premiums were positive, but that
25 was based on the market conditions that existed at that time.

1 But changes in interest rates certainly are a
2 factor that help describe investment risk of equity securities
3 and debt securities. But the complete assessment of gauging an
4 appropriate equity risk premium is based on an assessment of
5 the differences in the total investment risk, not just the
6 changes in interest rates.

7 Q Okay. Mr. Gorman, I'm going to show you a chart
8 with regard to your recommendations on return on equity in the
9 last couple of cases and ask you a couple of questions about
10 them.

11 (Company Exhibit 144 marked for identification.)

12 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

13 Q Mr. Gorman, let me show you what the court
14 reporter has marked as Exhibit 144. Let's go through these and
15 just make sure that you and I agree on what's -- what's
16 depicted here. As far as this case at the bottom, is it your
17 recommendation to the Commission, your midpoint 9.1 percent and
18 Staff's 9.25?

19 A That's my understanding, yes.

20 Q Okay. And in the recent Ameren case, am I correct
21 that your recommendation was 9.3 percent and Staff was at
22 9.25 percent?

23 A I believe that's correct, yes.

24 Q And in the last KCP&L rate case consolidated with
25 the GMO rate case, you were at 9.3 percent and Staff was at

1 **9.0 percent?**

2 A Subject to check, yes.

3 Q **And then going back to Ameren's 2012 rate case,**
4 **you were also at 9.3 percent and Staff was at 9.0 percent; is**
5 **that correct?**

6 A I would have to check, but...

7 Q **Okay. It sounds reasonable?**

8 A I believe I was higher than Staff in those cases,
9 yes.

10 Q **And then in the 2011 Kansas City Power & Light**
11 **Case, you were at 9.65 percent and Staff was at 9.0. Does that**
12 **sound correct?**

13 A I would have to check the numbers, but I believe I
14 was higher than Staff in --

15 Q **Now --**

16 A -- that case.

17 Q **-- Commissioner Hall has asked a number of**
18 **witnesses about trends in here. And we see that Staff has been**
19 **generally consistent going up a little bit in recent cases, and**
20 **you have been declining. What is the reason for the decline**
21 **that we have seen in your ROE testimony in Missouri utility**
22 **cases, at least as depicted here, over the last four years?**

23 A Changes in capital market costs. Bond yields have
24 gone down. Utility stock prices have gone up. Utility
25 dividend yields have come way down with the increase in stock

1 price. Based on that observable market evidence, market cost
2 of equity for Missouri electric utilities is significantly
3 lower today than it was in 2011.

4 **Q Okay. And do you have an explanation why Staff's**
5 **recommendations have increased over the last couple of cases?**

6 A I think Staff is capable of answering that
7 question, but I -- I -- as I sit here, I cannot give you an
8 answer.

9 **Q Okay. Okay.**

10 MR. ZOBRI ST: Judge I move the admission of
11 Exhibit 144.

12 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Any objections?

13 Hearing none, 144 is received.

14 (Company Exhibit 144 received into evidence.)

15 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

16 **Q Now, I just have a couple of questions to ask you**
17 **about fuel adjustment clause in regulatory mechanisms. You**
18 **cited in your Rebuttal, I believe around pages 3 and 4, the**
19 **Standard & Poor's report of May 2nd, 2014; is that correct?**

20 A In my Rebuttal? I'm sorry, what page?

21 **Q 3 and 4 of your Rebuttal.**

22 A Yes.

23 **Q Okay. Okay. Do you happen to have a copy of that**
24 **with you or do you need one?**

25 A I need one, please.

1 (Company Exhibit 145 marked for identification.)

2 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

3 Q Mr. Gorman, does that appear to be the report that
4 you cited in your Rebuttal Testimony?

5 A Yes.

6 MR. ZOBRI ST: Okay. Judge, I move the admission
7 of Exhibit 145.

8 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Objections?

9 Hearing none, it will be received.

10 (Company Exhibit 145 received into evidence.)

11 BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

12 Q Okay. Now, is it fair to say that this report
13 recognizes that capital spending will require timely recovery
14 of costs through various rate mechanisms, including base rates
15 and rate surcharges that should strengthen cash flow?

16 A That's a pretty specific description.

17 Q Yeah.

18 A Do you --

19 Q I'm sorry --

20 A -- have a reference?

21 Q -- Mr. Gorman, it's page 4 at the bottom. Sorry.
22 It's under the section entitled Business Risk, and it's the
23 last sentence.

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. And so it would be true that if the

1 **Commission were to grant Kansas City Power & Light the fuel**
2 **adjustment clause that would allow for the recovery of fuel**
3 **purchased power and other expenses, that would be consistent**
4 **with the views of Standard & Poor's in this report?**

5 A Well, it could result in an upgrade in utility's
6 bond rating, as noted on page 3; that they could raise the
7 ratings if the Company's business profile strengthens, the
8 economic growth in the Company's service territory could
9 strengthen, boost operating cash flows from utility and,
10 thereby, boost business risk profile. It could also raise the
11 ratings if the financial measures strengthen and consistently
12 exceed our base rate fore -- base case forecast, including
13 adjusted FFO to debt, consistent with high-end significant
14 financial risk profile category, and improved financial
15 measures could occur through stronger operating cash flow or
16 greater equity funding in capital investments.

17 So it is recognized by S & P, as I understand it,
18 what regulatory mechanisms are in effect and what the effect
19 could be on the rating if regulatory mechanisms are modified in
20 a way that strengthens cash flows and makes recovery of costs
21 more predictable.

22 Q Okay. And if we go to the next section of that
23 report that says Financial Risk Significant, S & P says, Based
24 on our medial volatility financial ratio benchmarks, our
25 assessments of -- our assessment of KCP&L's financial risk

1 **profile is, quote, significant, closed quote; correct?**

2 A Yes.

3 Q Okay. And the last sentence that begins there and
4 goes over to the next page says, Steady cost recovery through
5 the regulatory process will be required to maintain cash flow
6 measures, including FFO to debt greater than 16 percent on
7 average and CFO to debt in excess of 14 percent, which are both
8 within range for the significant category; is that correct?

9 A Yes.

10 Q And CFO means cash from operations -- cash flow
11 from operations?

12 A Correct.

13 Q Okay. And FFO is funds from operations; correct?

14 A It is.

15 Q Okay. Now, we've been talking about fuel
16 adjustment clauses and trackers. In the fuel adjustment clause
17 there is an after-the-fact prudence review, is there not, of
18 the costs that flow through the fuel adjustment clause?

19 A In the Ameren fuel adjustment clause or the
20 proposed fuel clause here?

21 Q Proposed fuel clause here.

22 A You know, I'm not the witness on the proposed fuel
23 clause here, but it's my understanding there is a prudent
24 review in Ameron's --

25 Q Okay. Well --

1 A -- fuel clause.

2 **Q -- without asking you a legal question, I mean,**
3 **doesn't the statute and the regulations of the Commission**
4 **contemplate a prudence stage after costs flow through the fuel**
5 **adjustment clause?**

6 A I would expect it to, because it's my
7 understanding just about all fuel adjustment clauses for
8 utilities include a prudency review.

9 **Q All right. All right. So when a cost flows**
10 **through, it just isn't ever examined again, in your -- in your**
11 **experience; it is reexamined to determine if it was prudently**
12 **incurred by the utility?**

13 A It can be subject to a prudency test, that's
14 correct. But I guess the question within a fuel adjustment
15 clause is the breadth the Commission and the parties have to
16 make that prudency determination, whether or not all the
17 factors that would normally be looked at in determining the
18 fuel cost to the utility that is done in a rate case would be
19 done within a fuel adjustment proceeding such as production
20 costing, ensuring that the plants are operating consistent with
21 the least-cost generation opportunities for the utility, and an
22 adequate review of the fuel contracting --

23 **Q Well, are you --**

24 A -- obligations.

25 **Q Pardon me. Are you aware of anything that limits**

1 **this Commission in conducting the kind of prudence review that**
2 **you just articulated here, investigating all of those facts?**

3 A Well, for nonutility parties, there can be
4 budgetary constraints that don't allow for the same kind of
5 review of it. But I'm not aware of any legal constraint, but
6 there are practical constraints to it.

7 Q Well, sir, my question was not about the
8 intervenors. My question was about these commissioners and the
9 people that work for them. There is no legal or regulatory or
10 other impediment that you're aware of that limits their ability
11 to conduct an investigation along the lines that you just
12 suggested would be prudent; isn't that true?

13 A Well, there would be a limit, to the extent they
14 rely on intervenors to provide informed opinions on the
15 prudence of the fuel costs and fuel adjustment proceedings. If
16 intervenors are not capable of funding the detailed review in
17 the fuel adjustment clause proceedings like they would normally
18 do in a base rate case, then the Commission would not have the
19 benefit of that informed testimony.

20 Q Well, how many Fortunate 500 companies are within
21 the industrial groups here in Missouri?

22 A They are all relatively large, successful
23 companies. But that doesn't mean that they are willing to fund
24 investigations into fuel adjustment clause proceedings without
25 some limited -- limitations in what they're willing to spend.

1 **Q** Okay. Now, Mr. Thompson I think was asking you
2 some questions about whether the Commission, if it were to
3 grant a fuel adjustment clause and perhaps some of the other
4 regulatory mechanisms, if it should trend -- tend to award an
5 ROE toward the lower end of your recommended range. Do you
6 recall that?

7 A I'm not sure you characterized it correctly, but
8 I -- but as I understood Mr. Thompson's question is, if the
9 Commission were to award the fuel adjustment clause
10 proceeding in -- fuel -- fuel adjustment clause in this
11 proceeding and that fuel adjustment clause would not be
12 reflected in the risk assessment of the Company in this
13 proceeding, would it be appropriate to reward -- adjust a
14 return on equity to reflect that risk reduction. I'm not
15 sure --

16 **Q** Right. And what you said is we can't see what
17 effect it's going to have in the future, so it's really better
18 to way and see what kind of effect it has; correct?

19 A Well, we know it's going to have an effect of
20 changing rates on customers before the next base rate case. So
21 we know there is going to be impacts on customers, immediately
22 upon implementation of that fuel adjustment mechanism. So the
23 question is whether or not an adjustment to the return on
24 equity is balanced, recognizing the benefits to the utility of
25 not assuming the fuel cost recovery risk they otherwise would

1 without the fuel adjustment clause and the burdens of customers
2 by assuming greater price volatility because a fuel adjustment
3 clause is implemented.

4 **Q Now, in the last KCP&L rate case, it was coupled**
5 **with KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company; correct?**

6 A Yes.

7 **Q Okay. And you're aware that KCPL does not have a**
8 **fuel adjustment clause, but GMO does; correct?**

9 A Correct.

10 **Q Okay. And you didn't recommend a lower ROE for**
11 **GMO than you did for KCP&L in that case, did you?**

12 A That's because GMO's risk factors, I felt, were
13 adequately reflected what its operating risks are.

14 **Q And you, frankly, didn't even discuss whether GMO**
15 **should have a lower ROE because it has an FAC; isn't that true?**

16 A And that's consistent with my testimony --

17 **Q No, my question --**

18 A -- here.

19 **Q -- is did you even discuss that issue, whether you**
20 **should lower the ROE because GMO has an FAC and KCPL didn't?**
21 **That's my question.**

22 A And my answer is consistent with this testimony.
23 If it's already in effect, then it's already included in the
24 observable risk factors, so there's no need to give it special
25 attention.

1 **Q And you didn't discuss that in your testimony in**
2 **the last rate case, did you?**

3 A It was not at issue in the last case.

4 **Q But you did not make any comparison between the**
5 **two utilities because GMO had an FAC and KCPL didn't, did you?**

6 A I don't believe I did at that time. KCP&L wasn't
7 seeking a fuel adjustment clause at that time, and GMO already
8 had one in effect.

9 MR. ZOBRI ST: Okay. Thank you. No further
10 questions, Judge.

11 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Questions from commi ssi oners?
12 Mr. Chair man?

13 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Just a couple.

14 QUESTIONS BY CHAIR R. KENNEY:

15 **Q Mr. Gorman, how are you?**

16 A Fi ne. And you?

17 **Q Doing well. Thanks. Good to see you. Just a**
18 **couple of questions. Have you -- do you typically testi fy on**
19 **behalf of industrial consumers?**

20 A General ly, yes.

21 **Q Go ahead.**

22 A I mean, I'm testi fying on behalf of Ci ti zen
23 Utility Board in Illinois, and the Office of Public Counsel has
24 retained me at times.

25 MR. ZOBRI ST: Mr. Chair man, I'm sorry, I can't

1 hear you because you're not --

2 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Sorry.

3 MR. ZOBRI ST: Thank you.

4 CHAIR R. KENNEY: Sorry about that. My question
5 was if he typically testifies on behalf of industrial
6 consumers?

7 THE WITNESS: They are generally the client group
8 I will represent. But I have represented smaller consumer
9 groups and federal executive agencies in various proceedings
10 around the country.

11 BY CHAIR R. KENNEY:

12 Q Have you represented any utilities on rate of
13 return issues?

14 A I have represented one utility in a rate of return
15 proceeding in Wyoming, return on equity in another small
16 water -- wastewater utility on a capital structure issue here
17 in Missouri.

18 Q So 99 percent, though, is on behalf of industrial
19 consumers and --

20 A Or more.

21 Q -- ratepayer advocates? Or more?

22 A Or more, yes.

23 Q What's your hourly rate?

24 A \$235.

25 Q And do you charge a different rate to appear here

1 at the hearing?

2 A I do not.

3 CHAIR R. KENNEY: All right. I don't have any
4 other questions. Thank you.

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

6 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER KENNEY:

7 Q Hello, Mr. Gorman. How are you?

8 A Good. And you?

9 Q Good. I just have a couple minor questions. I
10 know -- I believe last -- on the Ameren case your range was 9.0
11 to 9.6 with a midpoint of 9.3; is that correct?

12 A I believe that's correct, yes.

13 Q Because I was trying to seek a -- I felt Ameren
14 deserved a higher ROE, and I actually quoted you because you
15 had made a statement that -- talking about investors, that they
16 would have -- something about 9.8 percent that an investor
17 would have felt deserved -- felt they deserved an ROE or return
18 on investment about approximately in that rate. But the
19 Commission used a very scientific formula in coming up with a
20 9.53 ROE, so that really doesn't matter anymore.

21 But on this case, I had just a couple of
22 questions. Going back to that fuel adjustment charge, now
23 Ameren and KCP&L -- and I'm just using Ameren because you
24 were -- that's fresh in my mind, they are -- they differ --
25 their fuel costs differ, they have different operations. I

1 know they both have -- you know, Ameren -- KCP&L has some more
2 wind. Ameren has hydro, and they have their gas. And I know
3 KCP&L's about 78 percent coal. I know Ameren is pretty high.
4 In your ROA -- ROE on that was about -- you know, from -- about
5 two -- 20 basis points higher on both ends; right?

6 A Yes, but that was almost entirely because of the
7 difference in the market at the time I did the studies.

8 Q And that's -- when would the study have been done?
9 10 to 12 weeks difference in time?

10 A That was -- I think it was late fall of 2014 when
11 I did the Ameren study. And it was, you know, early 2015,
12 probably March time frame, when I did the study for this case.

13 Q So it might have been four months difference or
14 something. But you -- whatever. So four to six months, three
15 to six months, whatever.

16 A It was. But, importantly -- and we talked about
17 this in the Ameren case -- is the buildup in utility stock
18 prices was pretty significant at the beginning of 2015 relative
19 to 2014 time period. It has since come back down to -- to
20 levels that we saw in 2014.

21 Q Getting back to those fuel costs, because that's
22 really how you determine -- that's part of your determination.
23 And like with the FAC, where if Ameren did not have an FAC,
24 would that have affected your ROE range?

25 A If they didn't have an FAC, then the risk factors

1 I observed would have reflected the risk of Ameren without an
2 FAC.

3 **Q So -- so most -- could I surmise that the range of**
4 **your ROE would have been higher for Ameren?**

5 A Potentially.

6 **Q Potentially?**

7 A Yeah. I can't answer that definitively, because a
8 utility can manage fuel costs without an FAC. And to the
9 extent they can manage it, then it may not change their risk to
10 get an FAC.

11 **Q Okay. So if -- so if KCP&L were granted an FAC**
12 **identical to Ameren's, you can't determine that risk factor on**
13 **how it would affect their -- them right now and how would**
14 **affect your -- how you came up with your ROE range?**

15 A It can only be measured with reasonable judgment.
16 In the rate case that Ameren implemented the fuel adjustment
17 mechanism, Ameren's own witness, Dr. Roger Moren, stated that
18 implementing a fuel adjustment mechanism at that time would
19 have justified a 25-basis-point reduction to the return on
20 equity. I agreed with him on that, because that was
21 approximately the difference in a bond rating. And the bond
22 rating gives an indication of greater cost recovery assurance.

23 **Q So I might assume that if -- if KCP&L were granted**
24 **an FAC identical to Ameren's, we might -- I might say, well, I**
25 **should look at a quarter -- 25 basis points lower and look**

1 at maybe -- yours is now at 9.1, it might be 9.85 -- or 8.85?

2 A As long as you stay within my recommended range, I
3 think that would be appropriate.

4 Q Okay. And then one last question.

5 Mr. Marevangepo and I know Staff counsel when they opened, they
6 said -- I think Mr. Marevangepo said -- I hope I'm not
7 butchering his name too bad -- he said that the Commission
8 would be more than justified in authoring -- authorizing an ROE
9 of 9.53. And Mrs. Reno mentioned that also. But you don't
10 feel that would be appropriate because it's outside of your
11 range?

12 A It's outside of my range, yes. My --

13 Q So it wouldn't be an appropriate ROE?

14 A Based on -- if you want to award a return on
15 equity based on a reasonable estimate of the current market
16 cost of equity for KCP&L in this -- at the time I did my
17 analysis, anything higher than 9.4 would be too -- would be
18 unreasonably high. But 9.53 I think was a reasonable result
19 for Ameren Missouri based on its investment risk. And I --
20 it's above my recommended range, but I think it was a balanced
21 finding in that case.

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEY: All right. Thank you.

23 QUESTIONS BY COMMISSIONER HALL:

24 Q Good afternoon.

25 A Good afternoon.

1 **Q** **On page 5 of your Rebuttal Testimony you make some**
2 **comments about the benefits of regulatory lag. I was wondering**
3 **if you could elaborate on that? You say that it creates**
4 **certain efficiencies and incentives. I'm wondering what those**
5 **certain efficiencies and incentives are.**

6 **A** You know, a utility is like every other business.
7 They have to have strong management to come in and oversee
8 operations to ensure that costs are as low as they possibly
9 can, service quality is as high as it -- and reliable as it
10 possibly can. So creating economic incentives for utility
11 management to make sure that they're finding every opportunity
12 to manage costs creates the best environment where utility is
13 managed -- managing costs more aggressively and effic -- and as
14 efficiently as they possibly can.

15 By eliminating regulatory lag, the management has
16 less incentive to manage costs because they can more quickly
17 adjust prices for changes in costs. That allows the costs not
18 to impact their bottom line, because they simply pass it on to
19 customers.

20 But with regulatory lag, the utility management
21 will have to find a way to mitigate that increase in cost until
22 they are allowed to change prices, because they want to earn
23 their allowed rate of return. So it creates incentives for
24 management to manage costs as aggressively as possible within
25 the limits of how they're able to adjust prices to reflect cost

1 changes.

2 **Q So would you say that -- that regulatory lag is**
3 **less appropriate in situations where there are costs that**
4 **cannot be -- that cannot be contained or managed?**

5 A Yes.

6 **Q They're outside --**

7 A I think that's part of the regulatory balance, and
8 in many instances fuel adjustment mechanisms were awarded
9 because fuel costs are outside of the utility management's
10 control.

11 **Q So if -- so for items that are outside the control**
12 **of management, you -- you would not be opposed to eliminating**
13 **or at least reducing regulatory lag as to -- as to those costs?**

14 A If the regulatory mechanism is shown to benefit
15 both investors and customers, I think it's a balanced
16 mechanism.

17 **Q That wasn't really my question. My question was**
18 **about those costs that are outside of management's control.**
19 **Does it -- does it make sense in those situations to reduce or**
20 **eliminate regulatory lag?**

21 A Yes, but let me offer one restriction. If the
22 cost is significant and can significantly limit or impair the
23 utility's ability to earn its authorized return on equity, then
24 a regulatory mechanism which provides the utility a real
25 opportunity to earn its approved rate of return or authorized

1 return on equity generally, I believe, would be a balanced
2 regulatory mechanism.

3 **Q To what extent should the Commission take into**
4 **account ROEs that have been established by other commissions in**
5 **other states when -- when establishing an ROE in a -- in a**
6 **particular case?**

7 A I think it is a point of information that the
8 commissioners should consider.

9 **Q Why is that?**

10 A Because it does give some information as to what
11 the market generally expects in terms of a balanced regulatory
12 decision. I don't think it can guide the ultimate
13 determination of what is a fair and reasonable return on
14 equity, and I say that because the regulatory policies and
15 procedures have to be symmetrical. The market wants to have
16 assurance that if capital market costs increase that the
17 utility's going to be able to adjust its rates to reflect that
18 increase in capital market costs.

19 If -- if they get the benefit of increasing prices
20 to capture increasing capital market costs, then customers
21 should have the benefit of reduced prices to reflect declines
22 to capital market costs because that's a balanced regulatory
23 proceeding --

24 **Q And then --**

25 A -- mechanism.

1 **Q -- last line of questioning, do you believe that**
2 **ROE's nationally are trending down?**

3 A I think the evidence is indisputable, from my --

4 **Q Is that --**

5 A -- standpoint.

6 **Q -- over the last year, last five years, last ten**
7 **years, or all the above?**

8 A You know, if you look at my Schedule MPG-11, you
9 see a very clear decline since at least 2009. In the 2008,
10 2009 time period, frankly, we're a little precarious because of
11 the finance -- we were in the height of the financial fallout
12 caused by the Lehman Brother and others default. But there is
13 a clear decline in capital market costs over the last ten
14 years, in my judgment, going all the way down to an industry
15 authorized return of 9.76, excluding Virginia utilities, for
16 2014; and that number comes down, you know, to under 9.7, 9.66
17 in the first quarter of 2015. So there is a clear and obvious
18 declining trend in authorized returns on equity.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

20 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

21 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Recross based on Commission
22 questions.

23 Public Counsel?

24 MR. OPITZ: No recross.

25 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Staff?

1 MR. THOMPSON: No questions. Thank you.

2 JUDGE BUSHMANN: U.S. Department of Energy?

3 MR. TSHI KORORO: No questions, Your Honor.

4 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Consumers Council?

5 MR. HOFFMAN: No questions.

6 JUDGE BUSHMANN: KCPL.

7 MR. ZOBRI ST: Just a couple.

8 RE-CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZOBRI ST:

9 Q On Commissioner Hall's last question about trends,
10 do you have Mr. Hevert's Direct Testimony up there?

11 A Yes.

12 Q I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Surrebuttal?

13 A Yes.

14 Q On page 10 he has a chart number 3 that says,
15 Authorized ROEs for vertically-integrated electric utilities
16 for the past three years. At least for the past three years we
17 haven't seen a discernible trend; isn't that true?

18 A Based on Mr. Hevert's testimony, I guess he can
19 give that allusion. But if you look at actual litigated
20 findings by regulatory commissions, which is what I presented
21 in response to Mr. Hevert's testimony and as shown in my
22 Surrebuttal Testimony in this case on MPG-SR-1, where the
23 Commission makes a finding on the current market cost of
24 equity, they have been declining over time.

25 Integrated utilities in particular are impacted by

1 regulatory decisions that don't change the return on equity
2 from what was previously approved. So it gives the -- the
3 sig -- the allusion of the Commission finding that a current
4 market cost of equity, for example, for Wisconsin Electric
5 Power Company in Michigan is 10.2 percent this year where the
6 Commission really didn't adjust rates in a regulatory case --

7 **Q Well, Mr. Gorman --**

8 **A -- in that here.**

9 **Q -- the allusion is you're only referencing**
10 **litigated cases, whereas Mr. Hevert is looking at all cases;**
11 **isn't that a fair point?**

12 **A** If the question is whether or not the utility
13 commissioners are finding the return on equity to be decreasing
14 over time, based on their interpretation of what the market
15 cost of equity is, then there is a clear and defined downward
16 trend in those findings.

17 **Q Maybe I'm -- maybe I missed my point. What I was**
18 **trying to say is you are referencing litigated cases;**
19 **Mr. Hevert is render -- is referencing all cases, whether --**
20 **whether it's settlement, whether it's a partial settlement,**
21 **whether it's fully litigated; correct? You see a trend in the**
22 **litigated cases; he doesn't see a trend in all the cases as**
23 **they're coming out, whether they're settled, litigated, or a**
24 **mixture?**

25 **A** And I think that's a true statement. So the

1 question is is what question are we trying to answer?

2 **Q I simply wanted to point out the difference**
3 **between litigated and non, so -- let me ask you one other**
4 **thing -- one other point. The companies proxy group that you**
5 **used in this case, isn't it true that the vast majority of**
6 **those companies do have fuel adjustment clauses?**

7 A Yes.

8 **Q Okay. And is it also true that if a public**
9 **utility is not earning it's recognized ROT -- let me try again.**
10 **It's getting late. Isn't it true that if a regulated public**
11 **utility is not earning its authorized return on equity,**
12 **regulatory lag is not a good thing; correct?**

13 A Well, it's -- it's not a good result for the
14 utility, but it could mean that utility management needs to
15 work a little harder.

16 MR. ZOBRI ST: Okay. That's all I have, Judge.

17 Thank you.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Redirect?

19 MS. ILES: Yes, Your Honor.

20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. ILES:

21 **Q Mr. Gorman, you stated, I think early in cross,**
22 **that capital costs are lower today than at the time the**
23 **Commission issued its last order for KCP&L. What do you rely**
24 **on in making that statement?**

25 A Changes in utility bond yields and -- including

1 treasuries and forecasted levels of treasury bond yields at the
2 time of my last case and in this case.

3 **Q And Mr. Zobrist listed a number of -- had you**
4 **refer to Mr. Hevert's testimony and a number of factors that he**
5 **listed concerning recent increases in the cost of capital.**

6 A Correct.

7 **Q I believe one of the things he had you note was a**
8 **change in treasury bond yields. Do you recall that line of**
9 **questioning?**

10 A I do.

11 **Q Could you explain to us, given that change, that**
12 **recent change in treasury bond yields, how would that impact --**
13 **how should that impact the determination of ROE in this case?**

14 A Well, I think the change in treasury bond yields
15 were fully reflected in all the rate return witnesses'
16 testimonies. I'm looking at Mr. Hevert's Direct Testimony, his
17 Exhibit RBH-5. At that time the current observable 30-year
18 treasury bond yield was three point -- 3.2 percent. It's now
19 3.1. So it was higher at the time he did his study.

20 He also used a projected util -- or treasury bond
21 yield of 3.80 percent. Current yield of 3.1 percent is still
22 70 basis points below the projected yield he used at the time
23 of his analysis. So treasury bond yields may have increased
24 over the last few months, but they're still lower than the
25 treasury bonds used in Mr. Hevert's analysis.

1 In my study, current observable treasury bond
2 yields were about 2.7 percent; but I relied on projected
3 treasury bond yields in my study, which were 3.7 percent. So
4 the change in treasury bond yield was expected, it was
5 reflected in my study, and it's still lower than the treasury
6 bond yields I used to produce my recommended return on equity
7 range.

8 So there's nothing unexpected here. It's all
9 included in everybody's study and fully accounted for. And the
10 increase in treasury bond yields is actually lower than the
11 projected treasury bond yields that many witnesses, including
12 me and Mr. Hevert, used in our studies.

13 **Q Mr. Zobrist also asked you some questions about**
14 **results that you, I believe his words were, disregarded in your**
15 **risk premium and CAP-M analyses. So the question I have for**
16 **you is were the results that you disregarded on the low end of**
17 **your recommendation or, actually, below your recommended range**
18 **would be another way to put that?**

19 A Yes. Like Staff there are -- return on equity
20 findings I think are sound methodologies. But for reasons
21 based on a review of market evidence, I did not include those
22 return on equity estimates in forming my recommended range
23 because the return on equity, consistent with the Hope and
24 Bluefield, needs to be a reasonable estimate of what the
25 current market cost of equity is, but it also needs to ensure

1 the financial integrity of the utility. So those are important
2 parameters that I use, and presumably other witnesses in this
3 case have used also, to interpret the entire analysis to form
4 what their recommended return on equity is.

5 In this case that meant I was not reducing my
6 return on equity down as low as some of my model estimates
7 suggested I could have supported if I would have been
8 comfortable doing that.

9 **Q All right. And then in answer to questions about**
10 **the FAC and whether implementing an FAC in this case would have**
11 **an impact on your recommendation, you mentioned that one of the**
12 **consequences of the implementation of an FAC could be an**
13 **upgrade in KCP&L's bond rating. Do you recall that testimony?**

14 A Yes.

15 **Q And how would that impact the cost of equity for**
16 **KCP&L if their bond rating was upgraded?**

17 A If their bond rating was upgraded, their cost of
18 debt would be reduced, because their default risk and their --
19 would be lower and their cash flows would be stronger in
20 relationships to their financial obligations. In other words,
21 their operating risk would be lower with a fuel adjustment
22 clause than it would be without one. And if that results in
23 improved bond rating, then their cost of capital would also be
24 lower to reflect that reduction in risk.

25 **Q Now, Mr. Zobrist I believe also asked you about**

1 **some testimony that you submitted to the Illinois Commerce**
2 **Commission.**

3 A Yes.

4 Q **And can you tell us, has the Illinois Commerce**
5 **Commission relied on your recommendation in setting ROEs in**
6 **utility cases?**

7 A They have relied on my DCF studies in most of the
8 cases I've been involved in. They have a preference for the
9 Staff's Cap-M methodology in awarding their developed range.
10 So they have given weight in many cases to my DCF studies.

11 Q **One other thing I wanted to touch on with respect**
12 **to when you were talking about average authorized returns on**
13 **equity, and you mentioned -- you made some comments about the**
14 **Wisconsin case and how that had an impact on the two hundred**
15 **and four -- 2014 average for vertically-integrated ROEs. Can**
16 **you explain how -- how that case impacts that average?**

17 A Well, I think it impacted the '14 and '15. In
18 Wisconsin they have a requirement for biannual rate cases, so
19 they have a rate case every two years. But Wisconsin is also
20 limiting the actions they undertake in order to implement new
21 rates every year. So there have been settlements by all the
22 parties, including the Industrial Group in Wisconsin; and those
23 settlements have often resulted in just carrying forward the
24 return on equity that had been previously approved by the
25 Commission as part of the rate settlement.

1 The finding by the Industrial Groups in particular
2 is not that that's a fair reflection of the current market cost
3 of equity for the utility; but, rather, it's an indication that
4 the settlement in its entirety was a reasonable resolution of
5 the issues for that rate case. And that's why I think a
6 settled case, in particular those in Wisconsin, should not be
7 viewed as a finding by the Wisconsin Commission of what the
8 current market cost of equity is for the Wisconsin utilities.

9 **Q And, finally, the chairman asked you about your**
10 **hourly rate, and we also heard testimony earlier today about a**
11 **budget for this case for Mr. Hevert. Do you have a budget for**
12 **this case or an hourly estimate?**

13 A I do. Usually it's about \$30,000.

14 **Q Okay.**

15 A I'm assuming that's what it is. I would have to
16 check.

17 MS. ILES: No further questions.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: Thank you, Mr. Gorman. That
19 completes your testimony, sir. You may be excused.

20 THE WITNESS: Appreciate it.

21 (Witness excused.)

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: That's all the evidence or
23 witnesses that we had scheduled for today. And we'll plan on
24 starting tomorrow at 8:30 a.m. and proceeding with the next set
25 of witnesses.

1 MR. HACK: Before we leave the record, may I ask
2 just a question about the witnesses I talked to you about
3 earlier today? Bob Bell, Forrest Archibald -- Sierra Club is
4 the only party that filed testimony against our witnesses on
5 the LaCygne Project. They have specifically waived cross of
6 Mr. Bell, Mr. Archibald, and Mr. Ling. Staff has waived of
7 those witnesses. I have not heard from anybody else. I know
8 the commissioners may have questions. But if we can avoid
9 bringing folks in, I'd love to be able to do that.

10 JUDGE BUSHMANN: They're scheduled for
11 Wednesday --

12 MR. HACK: For Wednesday.

13 JUDGE BUSHMANN: -- correct? So tomorrow I'll
14 probably ask before we start. Counsel might think about
15 whether or not they're willing to waive cross and objections to
16 testimony for those three witnesses, Archibald --

17 MR. HACK: Bell and Ling.

18 JUDGE BUSHMANN: -- and Ling. So contemplate
19 that. And, Commissioners, we'll see if they have any questions
20 that they would need to ask those three witnesses.

21 MR. HACK: Appreciate it very much.

22 JUDGE BUSHMANN: All right. Anything further?
23 Then we're adjourned for the day.

24 (The hearing was adjourned until 8:30 a.m. on.
25 June 16, 2015.)

1	INDEX	
2	Opening Statement by Mr. Fischer	22
	Opening Statement by Mr. Thompson	45
3	Opening Statement by Mr. Poston	59
	Opening Statement by Mr. Antal	80
4	Opening Statement by Mr. Downey	85
	Opening Statement by Mr. Woodsmall	90
5	Opening Statement by Mr. Zellers	115
	Opening Statement by Mr. Zobrist	117
6	Opening Statement by Mr. Thompson	136
	Opening Statement by Mr. Tshikororo	143
7		
	KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT EVIDENCE	
8		
	ROBERT HEVERT	
9	Direct Examination by Mr. Zobrist	152
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zellers	154
10	Cross-Examination by Mr. Woodsmall	156
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Woodsmall	159
11	In-camera	
	Continued Cross-Examination by Mr. Woodsmall	162
12	Cross-Examination by Mr. Thompson	164
	Questions by Chair R. Kenney	166
13	Questions by Commissioner Hall	170
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Opitz	175
14	Recross-Examination by Mr. Thompson	176
	Redirect Examination by Mr. Zobrist	177
15	Further Questions by Commissioner Hall	182
	Recross-Examination by Ms. Iles	184
16		
	STAFF OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION EVIDENCE	
17		
18	ZEPHANIA MAREVANGÉPO	
19	Direct Examination by Mr. Thompson	186
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Opitz	188
20	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	189
	Questions by Commissioner Hall	224
21	Redirect Examination by Mr. Thompson	226
22	US DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	
23	MAUREEN RENO	
	Direct Examination by Mr. Tshikororo	230
24	Cross-Examination by Mr. Opitz	232
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	233
25	Questions by Commissioner Hall	251

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

INDEX (Continued)

Redirect Examination by Mr. Tshikororo 253

MISSOURI INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS EVIDENCE

MICHAEL GORMAN

Direct Examination by Ms. Iles	255
Cross-Examination by Mr. Opitz	257
Cross-Examination by Mr. Thompson	260
Cross-Examination by Mr. Zobrist	264
Questions by Chair R. Kenney	288
Questions by Commissioner Kenney	289
Questions by Commissioner Hall	293

	EXHIBIT INDEX	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2	KANSAS CITY POWER & LIGHT:		
3	KCPL Exhibit 100-NP	21	
4	Rebuttal Testimony of Forrest Archibald, Nonproprietary		
5	KCPL Exhibit 100-HC	21	
6	Rebuttal Testimony of Forrest Archibald, Highly Confidential		
7	KCPL Exhibit 101	21	
8	Direct Testimony of Albert Bass		
9	KCPL Exhibit 102-NP	21	
10	Direct Testimony of Robert Bell, Nonproprietary		
11	KCPL Exhibit 102-NC	21	
12	Direct Testimony of Robert Bell, Highly Confidential		
13	KCPL Exhibit 103-NP	21	
14	Direct Testimony of William Edward Blunk, Nonproprietary		
15	KCPL Exhibit 103-HC	21	
16	Direct Testimony of William Edward Blunk, Highly Confidential		
17	KCPL Exhibit 104-NP	21	
18	Rebuttal Testimony of William Edward Blunk, Nonproprietary		
19	KCPL Exhibit 104-HC	21	
20	Rebuttal Testimony of William Edward Blunk, Highly Confidential		
21	KCPL Exhibit 105-NP	21	
22	Rebuttal Testimony of Ryan Bresette, Nonproprietary		
23	KCPL Exhibit 105-HC	21	
24	Rebuttal Testimony of Ryan Bresette, Highly Confidential		
25			

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec'd
1			
2			
3	KCPL Exhibit 106 Surrebuttal Testimony of Ryan Bresette	21	
4			
5	KCPL Exhibit 107-NP Rebuttal Testimony of John Carlson, Nonproprietary	21	
6			
7	KCPL Exhibit 107-HC Rebuttal Testimony of John Carlson, Highly Confidential	21	
8			
9	KCPL Exhibit 108-NP Surrebuttal Testimony of John Carlson, Nonproprietary	21	
10			
11	KCPL Exhibit 108-HC Surrebuttal Testimony of John Carlson, Highly Confidential	21	
12			
13	KCPL Exhibit 109-NP Direct Testimony of Burton Crawford, Nonproprietary	21	
14			
15	KCPL Exhibit 109-HC Direct Testimony of Burton Crawford, Highly Confidential	21	
16			
17	KCPL Exhibit 110-NP Rebuttal Testimony of Burton Crawford, Nonproprietary	21	
18			
19	KCPL Exhibit 110-HC Rebuttal Testimony of Burton Crawford, Highly Confidential	21	
20			
21	KCPL Exhibit 111-NP Surrebuttal Testimony of Burton Crawford, Nonproprietary	21	
22			
23	KCPL Exhibit 111-HC Surrebuttal Testimony of Burton Crawford, Highly Confidential	21	
24			
25	KCPL Exhibit 112-NP Rebuttal Testimony of Melissa Hardesty,	21	

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	KCPL Exhibit 112-HC	21	
4	Rebuttal Testimony of Melissa Hardesty, Highly Confidential		
5	KCPL Exhibit 113-NP	21	
6	Surrebuttal Testimony of Melissa Hardesty, Nonproprietary		
7	KCPL Exhibit 113-HC	21	
8	Surrebuttal Testimony of Melissa Hardesty, Highly Confidential		
9	KCPL Exhibit 114	21	
10	Direct Testimony of Scott Heidtbrink		
11	KCPL Exhibit 115	21	154
12	Direct Testimony of Robert Hevert		
13	KCPL Exhibit 116	21	154
14	Rebuttal Testimony of Robert Hevert		
15	KCPL Exhibit 117	21	154
16	Surrebuttal Testimony of Robert Hevert		
17	KCPL Exhibit 118-NP	21	
18	Direct Testimony of Darrin Ives, Nonproprietary		
19	KCPL Exhibit 118-HC	21	
20	Direct Testimony of Darrin Ives, Highly Confidential		
21	KCPL Exhibit 119-NP	21	
22	Supplemental Direct Testimony of Darrin Ives, Nonproprietary		
23	KCPL Exhibit 119-HC	21	
24	Supplemental Direct Testimony of Darrin Ives, Highly Confidential		
25	KCPL Exhibit 120	21	
	Rebuttal Testimony of Darrin Ives		
	KCPL Exhibit 121-NP	21	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of Darrin Ives,		

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	KCPL Exhibit 121-HC	21	
4	Supplemental Testimony of Darrian Ives, Highly Confidential		
5	KCPL Exhibit 122	21	
6	Direct Testimony of James Kiely		
7	KCPL Exhibit 123-NP	21	
8	Surrebuttal Testimony of James Kiely, Nonproprietary		
9	KCPL Exhibit 123-HC	21	
10	Surrebuttal Testimony of James Kiely, Highly Confidential		
11	KCPL Exhibit 124	21	
12	Direct Testimony of Ronald Klote		
13	KCPL Exhibit 125-NP	21	
14	Rebuttal Testimony of Ronald Klote, Nonproprietary		
15	KCPL Exhibit 125-HC	21	
16	Rebuttal Testimony of Ronald Klote, Highly Confidential		
17	KCPL Exhibit 126	21	
18	Surrebuttal Testimony of Ronald Klote		
19	KCPL Exhibit 127	21	
20	Direct Testimony of Paul Ling		
21	KCPL Exhibit 128	21	
22	Rebuttal Testimony of Paul Ling		
23	KCPL Exhibit 129	21	
24	Rebuttal Testimony of H. Edwin Overcast		
25	KCPL Exhibit 130	21	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of H. Edwin Overcast		
	KCPL Exhibit 131	21	
	Direct Testimony of Christopher Rogers		

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	KCPL Exhibit 132-NP	21	
4	Rebuttal Testimony of Joshua Phelps-Roper, Nonproprietary		
5	KCPL Exhibit 132-HC	21	
6	Rebuttal Testimony of Joshua Phelps-Roper, Highly Confidential		
7	KCPL Exhibit 133-NP	21	
8	Surrebuttal Testimony of Joshua Phelps-Roper, Nonproprietary		
9	KCPL Exhibit 133-HC	21	
10	Surrebuttal Testimony of Joshua Phelps-Roper, Highly Confidential		
11	KCPL Exhibit 134-NP	21	
12	Direct Testimony of Tim Rush, Nonproprietary		
13	KCPL Exhibit 134-HC	21	
14	Direct Testimony of Tim Rush, Highly Confidential		
15	KCPL Exhibit 135-NP	21	
16	Rebuttal Testimony of Tim Rush, Nonproprietary		
17	KCPL Exhibit 135-HC	21	
18	Rebuttal Testimony of Tim Rush, Highly Confidential		
19	KCPL Exhibit 136-NP	21	
20	Surrebuttal Testimony of Tim Rush, Nonproprietary		
21	KCPL Exhibit 136-HC	21	
22	Surrebuttal Testimony of Tim Rush, Highly Confidential		
23	KCPL Exhibit 137	21	
24	Direct Testimony of John Spanos		
25	KCPL Exhibit 138	21	
	Rebuttal Testimony of John Spanos		

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
		Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	KCPL Exhibit 139	180	181
4	Summary of Authorized ROEs from		
5	1st Quarter of 2014 through 2nd Quarter		
6	Of 2015		
7	KCPL Exhibit 140	181	181
8	Data from which Exhibit 139 was developed		
9	KCPL Exhibit 141	202	203
10	Moody's Investor Service, dated 3/10/15,		
11	article titled A Sector In-Dept Analysis		
12	Of U.S. Regulated Utilities		
13	KCPL Exhibit 142	244	251
14	Article relied on by Ms. Reno regarding		
15	analyst growth rates		
16	KCPL Exhibit 143	245	251
17	Introduction and summary of Regulation		
18	Analyst Certification released by the SEC		
19	KCPL Exhibit 144	278	280
20	Chart comparing Mr. Gorman's recommendations		
21	On ROEs compared to Staff's		
22	KCPL Exhibit 145	281	281
23	Standard & Poor's Report, dated 5/2/14		
24	STAFF OF THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE		
25	COMMISSION:		
26	Staff Exhibit 200-NP	21	
27	Staff Report Revenue Requirement - Cost		
28	Of Service, with Appendices 1-3,		
29	including Errata filed 4/9/15,		
30	Nonproprietary		
31	Staff Exhibit 200-HC	21	
32	Staff Report Revenue Requirement - Cost		
33	Of Service, with Appendices 1-3,		
34	including Errata filed 4/9/15,		
35	Highly Confidential		
36	Staff Exhibit 201	21	
37	Staff Accounting Schedules		

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	Staff Exhibit 202-NP	21	
4	Staff's Rate Design & Class		
5	Cost-of-Service Report,		
6	filed 4/21/15,		
7	Nonproprietary		
8	Staff Exhibit 202-HC	21	
9	Erratum to Exhibit 202-NP,		
10	Highly Confidential		
11	Staff Exhibit 203	21	
12	Reconciliation filed on 6/10/15		
13	Staff Exhibit 204	21	
14	Rebuttal Testimony of Alan Bax		
15	Staff Exhibit 205	21	
16	Surrebuttal Testimony of Alan Bax		
17	Staff Exhibit 206-NP	21	
18	Rebuttal Testimony of Daniel Beck,		
19	Nonproprietary		
20	Staff Exhibit 206-HC	21	
21	Rebuttal Testimony of Daniel Beck,		
22	Highly Confidential		
23	Staff Exhibit 207	21	
24	Surrebuttal Testimony of Natelle Dietrich		
25	Staff Exhibit 208-NP	21	
26	Rebuttal Testimony of Dana Eaves,		
27	Nonproprietary		
28	Staff Exhibit 208-HC	21	
29	Rebuttal Testimony of Dana Eaves,		
30	Highly Confidential		
31	Staff Exhibit 209-NP	21	
32	Surrebuttal Testimony of Dana Eaves,		
33	Nonproprietary		
34	Staff Exhibit 209-HC	21	
35	Surrebuttal Testimony of Dana Eaves,		
36	Highly Confidential		

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	Staff Exhibit 210	21	
4	Direct Testimony of Cary Featherstone, including Erratum filed 6/11/16		
5	Staff Exhibit 211-NP	21	
6	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary Featherstone, Nonproprietary		
7	Staff Exhibit 211-HC	21	
8	Rebuttal Testimony of Cary Featherstone, Highly Confidential		
9	Staff Exhibit 212	21	
10	Surrebuttal Testimony of Cary Featherstone		
11	Staff Exhibit 213	21	
12	Rebuttal Testimony of Randy Gross		
13	Staff Exhibit 214-NP	21	
14	Surrebuttal Testimony of V. William Harris, Nonproprietary		
15	Staff Exhibit 214-HC	21	
16	Surrebuttal Testimony of V. William Harris, Highly Confidential		
17	Staff Exhibit 215	21	
18	Rebuttal Testimony of Charles Hyneman		
19	Staff Exhibit 216-NP	21	
20	Surrebuttal Testimony of Charles Hyneman, Nonproprietary		
21	Staff Exhibit 216-HC	21	
22	Surrebuttal Testimony of Charles Hyneman, Highly Confidential		
23	Staff Exhibit 217	21	
24	Rebuttal Testimony of Robin Kliethermes		
25	Staff Exhibit 218	21	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of Robin Kliethermes		
	Staff Exhibit 219	21	
	Rebuttal Testimony of Sarah Kliethermes		

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	Staff Exhibit 220 Surrebuttal Testimony of Sarah Kliethermes	21	
4			
5	Staff Exhibit 221-NP Surrebuttal Testimony of Lisa Kremer, Nonproprietary	21	
6			
7	Staff Exhibit 221-HC Surrebuttal Testimony of Lisa Kremer, Highly Confidential	21	
8			
9	Staff Exhibit 222-NP Rebuttal Testimony of Karen Lyons, Nonproprietary	21	
10			
11	Staff Exhibit 222-HC Rebuttal Testimony of Karen Lyons, Highly Confidential	21	
12			
13	Staff Exhibit 223-NP Surrebuttal Testimony of Karen Lyons, Nonproprietary	21	
14			
15	Staff Exhibit 223-HC Surrebuttal Testimony of Karen Lyons, Highly Confidential	21	
16			
17	Staff Exhibit 224-NP Direct Testimony of Keith Majors, filed in Case Number EU-2015-0094, Nonproprietary	21	
18			
19	Staff Exhibit 224-HC Direct Testimony of Keith Majors, filed in Case Number EU-2015-0094, Highly Confidential	21	
20			
21			
22	Staff Exhibit 225-NP Rebuttal Testimony of Keith Majors, Nonproprietary	21	
23			
24	Staff Exhibit 225-HC Rebuttal Testimony of Keith Majors, Highly Confidential	21	
25			

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	Staff Exhibit 226-NP	21	
4	Surrebuttal Testimony of Keith Majors, Nonproprietary		
5	Staff Exhibit 226-HC	21	
6	Surrebuttal Testimony of Keith Majors, Highly Confidential		
7	Staff Exhibit 227	21	188
8	Rebuttal Testimony of Zephania Marevangepo		
9	Staff Exhibit 228	21	188
10	Surrebuttal Testimony of Zephania Marevangepo		
11	Staff Exhibit 229	21	
12	Rebuttal Testimony of Derick Miles		
13	Staff Exhibit 230	21	
14	Surrebuttal Testimony of Derick Miles		
15	Staff Exhibit 231	21	
16	Rebuttal of Joel Molina		
17	Staff Exhibit 232	21	
18	Rebuttal Testimony of Byron Murray		
19	Staff Exhibit 233	21	
20	Surrebuttal Testimony of Byron Murray		
21	Staff Exhibit 234	21	
22	Direct Testimony of Mark Oligschlaeger, filed in Case Number EU-2015-0094		
23	Staff Exhibit 235	21	
24	Rebuttal Testimony of Mark Oligschlaeger, including Errata filed 5/18/15		
25	Staff Exhibit 236-NP	21	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of Mark Oligschlaeger, Nonproprietary		
	Staff Exhibit 236-HC	21	
	Surrebuttal Testimony of Mark		

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	Staff Exhibit 237 Direct Testimony of Michael Scheperle	21	
4			
5	Staff Exhibit 238 Rebuttal Testimony of Michael Scheperle	21	
6	Staff Exhibit 239 Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Scheperle	21	
7			
8	Staff Exhibit 240-NP Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Stahlman, Nonproprietary	21	
9			
10	Staff Exhibit 240-HC Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Stahlman, Highly Confidential	21	
11			
12	Staff Exhibit 241 Rebuttal Testimony of Matthew Young	21	
13	Staff Exhibit 242 Surrebuttal Testimony of Matthew Young	21	
14			
15	OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC COUNSEL EVIDENCE:		
16	OPC Exhibit 300 Direct Testimony of Geoff Marke	21	
17	OPC Exhibit 301 Rebuttal Testimony of Geoff Marke	21	
18			
19	OPC Exhibit 302 Surrebuttal Testimony of Geoff Marke	21	
20	OPC Exhibit 303 Direct Testimony of David Dismukes	21	
21			
22	OPC Exhibit 304 Rebuttal Testimony of David Dismukes, amended	21	
23			
24	OPC Exhibit 305-NP Surrebuttal Testimony of David Dismukes, Nonproprietary	21	
25			

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	OPC Exhibit 305-HC	21	
4	Surrebuttal Testimony of David Dismukes, Highly Confidential		
5	OPC Exhibit 306-NP	21	
6	Direct Testimony of William Addo, Nonproprietary		
7	OPC Exhibit 306-HC	21	
8	Direct Testimony of William Addo, Highly Confidential		
9	OPC Exhibit 307-NP	21	
10	Rebuttal Testimony of William Addo, Nonproprietary		
11	OPC Exhibit 307-HC	21	
12	Rebuttal Testimony of William Addo, Highly Confidential		
13	OPC Exhibit 308-NP	21	
14	Surrebuttal Testimony of William Addo, Nonproprietary		
15	OPC Exhibit 308-HC	21	
16	Surrebuttal Testimony of William Addo, Highly Confidential		
17	OPC Exhibit 309-NP	21	
18	Direct Testimony of Lena Mantle, Nonproprietary		
19	OPC Exhibit 309-HC	21	
20	Direct Testimony of Lena Mantle, Highly Confidential		
21	OPC Exhibit 310-NP	21	
22	Rebuttal Testimony of Lena Mantle, Nonproprietary		
23	OPC Exhibit 310-HC	21	
24	Rebuttal Testimony of Lena Mantle, Highly Confidential		
25	OPC Exhibit 311	21	

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)	Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	OPC Exhibit 312 Surrebuttal of Ted Robertson	21	
4			
5	MISSOURI DIVISION OF ENERGY:		
6	DOE Exhibit 350 Direct Testimony of John Buchanan, Revenue Requirement	21	
7			
8	DOE Exhibit 351 Surrebuttal Testimony of John Buchanan	21	
9	DOE Exhibit 352 Rebuttal Testimony of Martin Hyman	21	
10			
11	DOE Exhibit 353 Surrebuttal Testimony of Martin Hyman	21	
12	DOE Exhibit 354 Direct Testimony of Jane Lohraff, Rate Design	21	
13			
14	DOE Exhibit 355 Surrebuttal Testimony of Jane Lohraff	21	
15			
16	SIERRA CLUB:		
17	Sierra Club Exhibit 400 Direct Testimony of Tim Woolf	21	
18	Sierra Club Exhibit 401 Surrebuttal Testimony of Tim Woolf	21	
19			
20	Sierra Club Exhibit 402-NP Direct Testimony of Rachel Wilson, Nonproprietary	21	
21			
22	Sierra Club Exhibit 402-HC Direct Testimony of Rachel Wilson, Highly Confidential	21	
23			
24	Sierra Club Exhibit 403-NP Surrebuttal Testimony of Rachel Wilson, Nonproprietary	21	
25			

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
		Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	Sierra Club Exhibit 403-HC	21	
4	Surrebuttal Testimony of Rachel Wilson, Highly Confidential		
5	BRIGHTERGY:		
6	Brightergy Exhibit 450	21	
7	Surrebuttal Testimony of Adam Blake		
8	MIDWEST ENERGY CONSUMERS GROUP:		
9	MECG Exhibit Number 500	21	
10	Direct Testimony of Lane Kollen		
11	MECG Exhibit Number 501	21	
12	Surrebuttal Testimony of Lane Kollen		
13	MECG Exhibit Number 502	21	
14	Direct Testimony of Michael Brosch, Revenue Requirement		
15	MECG Exhibit Number 503	21	
16	Direct Testimony of Michael Brosch, Rate Design		
17	MECG Exhibit Number 504	22	
18	Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Brosch		
19	MECG Exhibit Number 505	157	157
20	Data Request 16-11		
21	MISSOURI INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS:		
22	MI EC Exhibit Number 550	22	257
23	Direct Testimony of Michael Gorman, Revenue Requirement		
24	MI EC Exhibit Number 551-NP	22	257
25	Rebuttal Testimony of Michael Gorman, Nonproprietary		
	MI EC Exhibit Number 551-HC	22	257
	Rebuttal Testimony of Michael Gorman, Highly Confidential		

	EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)		
		Marked	Rec' d
1			
2			
3	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 552 Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Gorman	22	257
4			
5	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 553 Direct Testimony of Maurice Brubaker, Revenue Requirement	22	
6			
7	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 554 Direct Testimony of Maurice Brubaker, Rate Design	22	
8			
9	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 555 Rebuttal Testimony of Maurice Brubaker	22	
10	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 556 Surrebuttal Testimony of Maurice Brubaker	22	
11			
12	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 557-NP Rebuttal Testimony of James Dauphinais, Nonproprietary	22	
13			
14	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 557-HC Rebuttal Testimony of James Dauphinais, Highly Confidential	22	
15			
16	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 558 Surrebuttal Testimony of James Dauphinais	22	
17	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 559 Rebuttal Testimony of Greg Meyer	22	
18			
19	MI EC Exhi bi t Number 560 Rebuttal Testimony of Michael Gorman, Errata	256	257
20			
21	US DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY:		
22	USDE Exhi bi t Number 700 Direct Testimony of Maureen Reno, ROR/Capital Structure/ROE	22	232
23			
24	USDE Exhi bi t Number 701 Surrebuttal Testimony of Maureen Reno, ROR/Capital Structure/ROE	22	232
25			

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

EXHIBIT INDEX (continued)

	Marked	Rec' d
USDE Exhibit Number 702 Direct Testimony of Michael Schmidt, Rate Design/Class COS	22	
USDE Exhibit Number 703 Rebuttal Testimony of Michael Schmidt, Rate Design/Class COS	22	
USDE Exhibit Number 704 Surrebuttal Testimony of Michael Schmidt, Rate Design/Class CO	22	

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Angie D. Threlkeld, a Certified Court Reporter, CCR No. 1382, the officer before whom the foregoing hearing was taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing hearing was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken, and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

Angie D. Threlkeld

Angie D. Threlkeld, CCR



<p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>A&G 109:2,2,6 109:8,10,11,12 110:1</p> <p>a.m 305:24 306:24</p> <p>A2 112:23</p> <p>AAO 32:24 33:4</p> <p>abbreviating 40:16</p> <p>abilities 259:3</p> <p>ability 34:1 37:10 122:2 200:2 209:5 285:10 295:23 325:6</p> <p>able 28:25 39:8 43:25 44:8 45:5,7 69:6 124:17 174:12 177:8 185:12 206:22 210:17 294:25 296:17 306:9</p> <p>absence 45:10 45:11 229:25 264:13</p> <p>absent 21:12 31:11 45:14</p> <p>Absolutely 50:11</p> <p>AC 245:6,8,10 246:3,6,22</p> <p>academic 277:7 277:22</p> <p>accept 87:18 158:11,13 214:4 276:22 277:2</p> <p>acceptability 121:9</p> <p>acceptable 205:13 253:15</p> <p>access 207:13</p>	<p>accessed 214:1 214:25 216:4</p> <p>accompanying 153:7</p> <p>account 34:1 146:14 252:5 296:4</p> <p>accounted 302:9</p> <p>accounting 32:21 93:8 94:12,19,20 95:9,16 96:8,9 96:12 97:2,14 98:1,16 100:2 195:8 314:25</p> <p>accounts 94:22 133:2 141:19</p> <p>accumulate 77:22</p> <p>accumulated 87:22</p> <p>accurate 155:5 185:24 216:9 234:1 268:22 277:13</p> <p>accurately 144:25 257:3 261:17</p> <p>accuses 91:7</p> <p>achieve 31:13 194:6,12</p> <p>achievement 201:16</p> <p>acknowledge 211:9,12</p> <p>acknowledges 26:22 197:5</p> <p>acquisition 235:5</p> <p>act 58:9 81:16 116:5</p> <p>action 79:17 269:11 325:8 325:12</p>	<p>actions 31:11 304:20</p> <p>activity 114:11 215:22 270:5</p> <p>actor 67:16</p> <p>acts 109:17</p> <p>actual 25:20 27:18 34:16,17 150:14 162:20 174:13 223:2 249:20 250:3 263:21 298:19</p> <p>actuality 99:8</p> <p>Adam 322:6</p> <p>add 41:5 46:17 46:17 61:2 113:10</p> <p>added 24:16 119:6</p> <p>adding 70:2</p> <p>addition 19:16 26:6 66:6 95:24 96:3 109:1 239:6</p> <p>additional 24:16 28:23 35:2 48:20 96:2 119:5,7 141:6 141:21 167:4 206:9 225:21</p> <p>Additionally 83:4 84:7,23</p> <p>Addo 70:18 71:15 320:5,7 320:9,11,13,15</p> <p>address 28:10 32:5,6,15 59:5 72:22 81:17 85:20 92:3,4,8 92:9,12,18 93:3 105:17,19 105:21 108:8 117:17 118:14 209:23 230:25</p>	<p>255:21</p> <p>addressed 32:5 41:11 65:24 66:5 122:11 199:14 204:25</p> <p>addressing 116:3 210:4</p> <p>adequate 139:21 222:6 284:22</p> <p>adequately 81:17 287:13</p> <p>adhere 143:20</p> <p>adjourned 306:23,24</p> <p>adjust 95:5 230:4 259:19 286:13 294:17 294:25 296:17 299:6</p> <p>adjusted 110:22 209:14 215:14 282:13</p> <p>adjustment 19:5 27:6 30:18,25 31:19,23 32:4 32:8,10,16 33:5 42:23 67:22 86:10 92:9 93:23 94:13,15 100:1 100:4,13,14,22 100:25 101:10 102:11,18 103:5 104:15 104:21 105:9 105:13,15 118:15,22,25 119:12,18,19 120:5 194:21 197:23 198:14 208:16 209:5 227:13,20 228:20 230:7 258:21,24</p>	<p>259:2,4,6,7,15 259:16 260:1 260:19 261:7 261:10 263:17 264:3,5 268:9 280:17 282:2 283:16,16,18 283:19 284:5,7 284:14,19 285:15,17,24 286:3,9,10,11 286:22,23 287:1,2,8 288:7 290:22 292:16,18 295:8 300:6 303:21</p> <p>adjustments 102:21 135:9 150:1 198:5 231:15,19 236:17</p> <p>administer 97:3 97:10 100:10</p> <p>administration 56:4 147:18</p> <p>administrator 148:6</p> <p>admission 157:10 181:19 202:25 231:24 257:12 280:10 281:6</p> <p>admit 94:5</p> <p>admittedly 49:25</p> <p>adopt 39:1 144:13</p> <p>adopted 37:13 89:21 102:22 102:24 118:17 120:10 134:9 185:6 235:10</p> <p>adoption 34:21</p>
---	---	--	--	---

advanced 39:1	aggressively 294:13,24	78:10 137:12 137:14 199:9	84:5 116:17,18 120:2 189:12 205:6 208:11 208:20 258:10 282:2 285:4	55:18 64:3,10 64:19 71:7,13 72:14 81:14 84:8 85:16 86:11,16 89:21 90:20,23 91:3 92:14,16 98:24 102:23 105:22 105:23 106:1,3 106:5,11 107:7 107:23 108:1,4 109:7 110:7,7 110:18 120:7 121:12 136:3 136:12 137:15 137:18,25 138:12 140:15 144:3 146:19 150:24 168:21 168:21,24 169:4,16 170:24 172:1 172:16,19,24 173:2 200:25 257:6 262:7,9 262:11,18 263:14,17,22 264:8 266:12 266:23 267:25 268:1,12 270:18 278:20 283:19 290:10 290:13,23,23 291:1,2,3,11 291:17,23 292:1,4,16 293:19
advantage 65:16	ago 46:5 60:25 64:8 89:2 99:16 130:12 131:1 136:14 136:15 137:16 138:3 151:3 178:25 185:19 207:24 212:9 237:23	agrees 134:10 226:11	allowance 33:25	
advantages 65:11		ahead 18:16 19:18 22:8 24:3 33:15 125:11 154:9 155:8 156:24 177:21 183:3 184:2 188:10 242:11 288:21	allowed 79:5,6 84:20 87:9 90:2 94:20 95:9 193:24 196:7 294:22 294:23	
advised 128:12 243:8			allowing 64:17 121:23 152:5	
advisor 101:14			allows 69:2 70:23 79:18 261:20 294:17	
Advisors 153:3			allusion 298:19 299:3,9	
advocates 289:21	agree 69:21 76:13 100:19 123:13 150:4 157:21,24 158:5,14,16 162:4,12 163:7 165:9,19 166:2 166:12,19,21 169:14 182:4 183:13,14 186:4 189:15 189:18 192:23 193:17 194:13 213:15,23 214:8,9,16 215:1,3 216:6 216:12 226:8 227:17,18,24 228:3 233:3,7 237:12 253:4,7 258:13 265:21 268:22,25 278:15	aid 136:24	allusions 131:12	
affect 21:12 98:6 292:13,14		ails 49:9	alterations 231:16	
affiliate 111:6		aim 244:20	alternative 34:9 34:10 36:2 49:19 50:5 75:20 242:9 254:20 255:1 260:8	
affiliates 111:2		aimed 116:3	alternatives 73:21	
afford 46:21 63:19 73:8 122:2 141:20		ain't 49:5	amazing 137:4	
affordability 141:23		air 82:25	ambiguity 42:9 42:10,12 52:25 53:3 57:13,24 58:3 68:12 76:8,9 80:14 101:16 124:20 124:21	
affordable 140:21 141:24		airport 251:16	ambiguous 290:13,23,23 291:1,2,3,11 291:17,23 292:1,4,16 293:19	
after-the-fact 283:17		akin 120:7	Ameren's 70:9 71:7 98:25 109:11 113:25 279:3 292:12 292:17,24	
afternoon 127:10 137:11 138:19 154:21 154:22 156:17 156:18 164:19 164:20 170:22 170:23 175:14 175:15 188:23 188:24 190:8,9 225:9,10 233:3 233:21 251:19 265:11,12 293:24,25		Alan 315:10,11	amended 319:22	
agencies 16:12 26:18 143:16 143:20 147:7 147:22 166:8 289:9	agreed 23:20 68:2 78:23 84:8 87:2,3 95:2 135:10 199:13 216:8 236:10 292:20	Albert 309:7	Ameren 14:12 16:10 25:14 33:16 49:10,17 51:2 55:6,9,16	
agenda 147:12	agreement 19:6 31:17,18 40:10 57:18 67:25 68:18 69:1	Alex 17:12 80:18		
aggregate 27:22 174:12 176:16		ALEXANDER 14:1		
		align 85:1		
		aligned 83:15		
		allegation 145:24		
		allocate 110:11 111:16		
		allocated 109:22		
		allocates 110:7,9		
		allocating 110:2		
		allocation 110:6 110:14		
		allocations 20:18,21 109:16		
		allocator 111:14 111:15,18		
		allow 33:20 65:7 65:10 71:2		

209:1 Ameron's 283:24 amortizations 87:17 119:5,7 amount 24:17 36:19 38:1 55:14,15 69:20 72:18 75:19,25 98:6 105:2 113:18,20 142:6 162:5 164:8 168:14 176:10 179:5 192:17 amounts 27:19 31:9 36:15,16 50:17 62:24 70:22 164:9 analyses 107:20 149:5,7,13,17 149:23 150:1 176:10,11 240:18,19 276:1 302:15 analysis 25:19 25:23 66:3 78:1,4,7,16 79:23 107:16 107:19 109:5 138:4 146:3 148:24 183:12 189:6 202:19 221:14 226:11 229:18,22 242:14 260:21 260:23,24 261:15 264:9 267:2,3,20 272:22,23 273:22 274:20 275:8 277:15 277:17 293:17 301:23,25	303:3 314:8 analyst 149:20 220:9 239:14 239:17,21,24 244:8 245:13 245:25 247:2 247:10 314:10 314:12 analysts 92:25 112:14 198:9 220:4 228:15 243:11,15 244:21 246:7 249:18 analysts' 242:24 243:1 247:15 and/or 75:25 Andy 14:7 18:17 Angie 12:22 325:3,18 announced 186:5 annual 47:11 48:19 51:14 84:17,24 141:12 215:14 222:20 269:25 annualized 70:22 130:4 annually 28:22 anomaly 55:2 answer 28:13 39:7,8 69:6 75:22 94:17 100:20,21,23 108:21 126:12 231:11 280:8 287:22 292:7 300:1 303:9 answered 218:13 answering 156:19 218:20 280:6	answers 260:19 Antal 14:1 17:11 17:12 80:17,18 143:7 156:7 175:2 184:12 190:4 265:6 307:3 anticipate 117:7 164:1 255:10 anticipated 177:6 anybody 42:16 115:12 245:18 306:7 anymore 49:16 108:2 290:20 anyway 35:21 apart 191:6 apartment 59:20 63:11 apologize 54:17 153:12 177:25 178:2 183:4 232:12 251:1 272:15 273:15 apology 165:2 apparently 214:14 appealed 95:1 Appeals 89:10 95:9,17 Appeals' 99:22 appear 21:1 87:6 102:9 167:11 168:14 181:7 281:3 289:25 appearance 16:16,20 49:18 58:8 87:4 143:11,14 appearances 246:16 appearing 17:8	17:15 18:4 168:16 appears 19:8 95:22 130:17 174:2 appellate 95:12 Appendices 314:19,22 Appendix 187:21 210:24 apples 263:3 appliances 63:12 applicable 64:9 75:18 83:19,22 108:1,2 applicants 167:20 application 32:21 105:14 applied 58:9 72:21 81:8 96:3 97:23,25 98:11 99:4,21 120:25 221:2 223:10 272:18 274:16 applies 95:16 apply 95:10 97:19 100:4,6 100:9,11 102:15 103:7,9 104:2 155:16 184:2 272:20 273:21 275:10 applying 19:4 254:15,16 273:12 appreciate 39:6 51:18 166:2 171:8 305:20 306:21 approach 33:8 64:24 91:8	112:9 133:7 150:18 approaching 130:21 appropriate 33:10,17,24 35:24 72:2,5 77:19 94:10 123:25 142:9 142:14 145:11 214:12 218:16 218:17 223:19 225:22,25 226:1 227:13 238:23 260:2,5 260:12 261:8 261:16 264:14 264:22 273:5 275:19 278:4 286:13 293:3 293:10,13 295:3 appropriately 66:4 approval 23:25 82:12 85:1 approve 33:23 62:11 63:20 83:12 approved 22:16 33:11 61:2 69:12 71:24,24 75:6 81:7 144:4 254:21 295:25 299:2 304:24 approves 62:21 261:5 approving 205:4 205:6 approximate 189:2 approximately 40:3 139:5,14
--	--	---	---	--

142:18 164:7 213:23 237:14 290:18 292:21 April 23:23 106:15 129:22 130:3 131:1 170:25 180:9 246:2 269:1 Aquila 107:17 235:6 arbitrarily 144:20 Archibald 126:1 306:3,6,16 309:3,5 area 22:15 24:14 34:2 36:5 44:25 47:6,25 48:22 65:8,9 82:16,25 88:18 111:5 133:3 137:2,2,3 141:10,13 arguing 25:24 32:2 argument 41:7 41:10 58:4,5,7 78:11 79:14 277:2 arguments 24:25 32:5 174:18 Arkansas 114:16 arrangement 207:8 arrangements 206:19,23 arrearages 75:25 arrive 273:4 arrived 155:3,9 272:8 arrives 25:23	artic 89:19 article 178:25 215:11 243:19 244:6,13 248:15 249:17 314:8,10 articulated 89:19 285:2 artificially-adj... 149:15 ascending 132:12 asked 48:25 57:9 62:13 80:8 87:12 93:7 105:21,23 113:22 116:12 156:20,25 165:25 167:16 168:6 172:21 177:19 180:3 208:24 218:12 218:19 279:17 302:13 303:25 305:9 asking 32:4,7 41:8 49:19 50:24 55:8 58:9 89:10 94:7 101:12 108:18 149:2 167:5 170:14 195:1,2 228:13 252:22 254:11 284:2 286:1 asks 64:24 92:14 141:22 244:1 aspect 27:5 32:15 116:3,6 185:13 aspects 185:11 assert 93:17 assess 94:11 assessing 197:7	assessment 25:20 250:8 259:1,22 274:7 278:3,4 282:25 286:12 assessments 239:8 282:25 Asset 132:6 145:3,7 155:14 223:8 assets 178:13 182:24 assigned 93:13 109:22 111:6 Assistant 15:1,6 15:6 Associate 14:1 associated 32:17 65:11 69:23 97:5,15 162:7 164:9 182:23 202:3 Associates 26:14 112:21 181:9 183:10 Association 201:11 assume 89:15 146:16 185:22 217:24 259:10 292:23 assumes 63:8 assuming 277:12 286:25 287:2 305:15 assumption 228:16 assurance 119:12 120:2 292:22 296:16 assure 192:12 assures 84:17 Attachment 167:6,11	attacks 90:24 91:3,21,24 attempt 62:20 146:5 attendant 97:12 97:16 attended 115:12 attention 39:6 52:8 249:6 287:25 attest 61:23 attorney 13:2,2 13:6,9,13,15 13:16,19,22 14:4,10,13,16 14:19,23 16:11 86:1,13,17,19 86:22 125:12 143:14 325:10 attorneys 21:11 71:18 74:4,5,5 109:4 145:10 148:17 149:4 165:25 191:2 attract 139:22 142:9,20,25 189:13 192:14 258:11 attributable 44:2 attribute 43:25 audience 18:14 auditor 187:15 authoring 293:8 authoritative 248:23 authority 12:13 16:4 22:13 31:7 32:21 94:14,14 95:11 100:5 147:19 147:21 148:4 194:19 195:3 authorize 34:7	35:24 36:14 59:11 75:1 84:23 140:25 260:7 authorized 22:19 25:14,16 25:25 26:4,12 27:12,16,17,21 28:4,5 29:12 30:6,10 31:14 33:5 38:19,24 43:9 49:8,11 49:15 63:2 78:17 92:20 93:11 108:11 108:14 109:9 109:14 135:20 137:15 139:17 140:11 142:2,4 142:10 150:3,4 150:13,25 152:2,3 171:17 171:23 180:5 180:21 181:10 183:24 189:15 195:9 197:13 203:8 204:1 205:25 208:9 209:16,20,25 210:11,12,18 233:4 241:17 242:21 253:4 259:16 295:23 295:25 297:15 297:18 298:15 300:11 304:12 314:3 authorizing 293:8 authors 203:12 availability 82:6 available 57:22 66:12 145:20 271:12
---	---	--	---	--

Avenue 14:4	219:12 224:12	97:21 107:16	214:7 216:16	Baxter 49:13,17
average 26:25	224:18,20	107:18 113:1	217:13 218:6	Bayer 88:20
27:2,24 47:25	235:6,8,13	117:22 274:12	219:13 220:19	89:1
48:2,21 49:2	251:23 254:20	286:24 293:20	221:17 223:20	bear 47:2 69:25
62:8 73:14	284:25 285:5	295:15 296:1	226:17 229:12	118:8 195:5
93:21,24,24	285:10 287:7	296:11,22	239:18 242:9	Bearing 140:4
94:1 112:25		balances 60:13	242:13 247:14	beautiful 51:11
113:17,18	B	141:17,19	252:18 254:12	53:23
114:3,7,10	B 14:10,13 18:4	152:4	255:1 260:24	Beck 315:13,15
132:13,13,15	BAA 214:6	balancing	261:2 271:13	BECTOR 14:16
132:19,23	269:5	252:12	274:2,7,7	beer 49:15
133:1 135:19	baby 108:20	ballpark 162:22	275:20,25	began 61:8
136:1,4 150:2	back 18:20	241:24	276:8 277:25	190:10 245:2
150:4 151:2,4	22:17,17 34:12	band 124:10,10	278:4 280:1	beginning
151:19 155:12	35:7,11 55:14	banks 128:10	282:23 293:14	110:24 128:15
155:13,15,16	56:13 57:8	bar 27:20 208:7	293:15,19	146:10,18
155:16,22,22	61:21 63:17	209:10	297:21 298:18	182:6,10 197:4
168:7 171:16	66:8 73:25	barbecue 54:12	299:14 302:21	212:4 224:1
171:23 176:18	77:9 80:4	bare 192:17	basic 46:19	238:10,19
177:4 182:12	98:15 101:23	base 29:24 34:11	basing 33:24	240:1 265:21
184:4 185:12	108:7 113:24	36:15,16 62:15	223:1 262:25	267:15 291:18
210:25 222:20	119:25 126:14	66:18 70:22	basis 48:19 51:8	begins 73:1
247:14 267:22	126:15 127:8	73:21 84:15,17	51:14 84:18	193:21 201:23
271:17 283:7	131:4 134:5	84:25 116:11	94:21,23 103:8	208:8 209:10
304:12,15,16	150:20,20	118:7 145:20	107:12 108:5	283:3
averaged 107:11	162:1,4 163:15	281:14 282:12	129:9 132:15	begun 265:23
158:6 250:14	176:11 187:2	282:12 285:18	132:19,22	behalf 16:18
averaging	195:25 199:9	286:20	133:1 171:21	17:15,19,24
272:11	218:5,22 227:9	based 23:1	173:11 178:18	18:4,8 26:9,17
avoid 103:23	242:5 247:9	25:18 33:7	178:20 182:6,9	59:3 74:16
306:8	249:16 254:7	34:25 57:19	185:21 189:2,8	86:22 90:14
award 253:14	255:14 263:10	58:5,6 63:15	196:7 199:21	102:7 117:13
286:4,9 293:14	279:3 290:22	65:18 75:4	204:4,5 213:22	127:19 147:25
award-winning	291:19,21	82:7 84:3 88:8	214:7,22	148:12 167:21
117:4	backwards	131:20 133:11	215:11,17,18	267:5 288:19
awarded 150:9,9	39:22 108:12	135:23 139:2	215:24 216:4	288:22 289:5
234:4 295:8	222:10,13,14	143:22 149:14	226:7 237:13	289:18
awarding 304:9	bad 75:25 87:20	149:19 155:15	269:5 291:5	belief 258:16
aware 75:21	238:15,18	166:23 174:2	292:25 301:22	believe 25:15,21
90:19,21 99:14	293:7	174:22 184:8	basis-point-fo...	35:23 41:15
134:4 140:13	balance 95:6	189:1 194:17	179:25	44:19 57:23,25
150:5 154:1	128:2 139:7	194:23 197:14	Bass 309:7	58:20 64:23
194:19 195:2,6	193:16 295:7	203:12 211:16	Battle 131:5	65:14,22 72:14
200:12 209:18	balanced 97:11	211:21,23	Bax 315:10,11	76:19 87:9

88:10 89:4,19 90:4 93:1 100:16,17 101:13,15 102:2 103:12 115:9 119:19 119:20 121:6 121:20,21 124:20,21 129:1,6 131:15 140:7 142:24 145:12 157:4 158:25 162:6 164:5,7 168:8 168:21 169:17 169:20 171:5 173:13 176:16 177:7 184:3 185:5 195:21 201:23 206:8 207:9 216:8 219:15,19 220:10 222:17 225:12,20 247:19 258:12 258:15,21 259:18 262:21 263:3 267:9 271:16 272:23 274:12,19 278:23 279:8 279:13 280:18 288:6 290:10 290:12 296:1 297:1 301:7 302:14 303:25 believed 33:7 believes 25:21 33:9 38:22 51:7 263:7 274:6 bell 126:2 247:19 306:3,6 306:17 309:9	309:11 bench 166:24 252:18 benchmark 171:25 204:5 263:15 benchmarks 282:24 benefit 66:3 71:23,25 72:11 119:6,7 140:18 142:21 149:3 285:19 295:14 296:19,21 benefits 67:10 82:15,22,22 97:12,16,19 101:8 109:3 118:24 195:18 199:13 206:7 286:24 294:2 Bernanke 269:9 best 49:7 65:7 65:20,23 66:25 67:7,11,14,20 72:15 74:22 84:4 107:15,18 168:12 175:21 252:12 253:2 261:23 294:12 325:6 better 31:1 39:4 46:2 51:4 52:11 54:20,21 84:10 93:25 102:25 120:17 200:4 286:17 beyond 96:15 100:10 105:11 119:16 121:7 166:6 243:15 biannual 304:18 big 37:16 44:21 105:4 114:21	119:15 122:25 185:16 big-dollar 44:21 big-picture 37:19 bigger 44:15 Biggest 110:6 bill 70:3 96:23 119:13 120:21 121:14,15 123:12 176:12 billed 164:9 175:17 billing 30:20 177:4 billings 32:18 billion 24:6,7,18 bills 64:18 87:25 141:7 biography 233:25 bit 16:14 51:12 55:12 66:7 90:18 104:8 129:22,23 155:4 171:19 176:7 182:8 184:1 185:22 219:21 267:13 267:14,18,20 270:20 279:19 bits 239:23 Blake 322:6 Bloomberg 214:8 blow 128:21 blue 23:15 27:18 113:19 Bluefield 26:20 127:22 139:20 190:11 193:17 194:4 273:11 302:24 Blunk 309:13,15	309:17,19 board 33:2 130:22 212:14 212:25 266:3 267:7 288:23 Bob 306:3 Bolivar 13:17 17:19 bond 128:25 129:7,13 130:24 145:4 151:8,9 178:16 178:18 212:5,8 267:18,25 268:1 269:2,5 277:9 279:23 282:6 292:21 292:21 300:25 301:1,8,12,14 301:18,20,23 302:1,3,4,6,10 302:11 303:13 303:16,17,23 bonds 129:3 138:7 178:16 204:14 212:6,6 301:25 book 93:19 145:17 240:23 242:7,12 boost 118:12,13 282:9,10 borne 204:11 bottom 132:9 133:10 134:18 136:5 181:8 193:3 240:17 248:4 249:21 250:3 254:10 278:16 281:21 294:18 Boulevard 13:23 bound 144:2,19 155:11 248:6	bounds 144:14 Box 15:2,8 17:4 17:23 breadth 173:18 284:15 break 80:1 125:11,12,16 125:17 186:24 186:24 255:11 breakdown 71:15 Bresette 309:21 309:23 310:3 brief 78:5 80:6 115:6 127:12 briefing 41:21 briefly 81:1 139:18 156:15 235:17 briefs 19:12 32:6 41:17 brighter 129:2 Brightergy 14:7 16:10 18:16,17 21:24 115:4 152:11 154:19 174:24 184:9 190:2 227:1 233:14 265:4 322:5,6 bringing 306:9 broad-brush 92:4 broader 35:22 Brosch 87:22 95:25 97:20,22 99:4 100:9 102:17,21,23 102:23 103:2 103:10 104:3 104:15 105:7 322:12,14,16 Brosch's 104:12 Brother 297:12
--	---	--	---	--

brought 20:12 62:16 111:4 115:14	310:13,15,17 310:19,21,23	186:23 187:2 188:12,19 189:20,22,24 190:2,5 203:2 218:22 225:2 226:17,21,23 227:1,6 230:10 230:13,19 231:25 232:5 232:11,14,22 233:1,11,13 236:16 243:25 250:24 251:3,8 252:18 253:21 253:23,25 254:2,4 255:5 255:9,14,16 256:17,20 257:13,19,22 257:24 260:15 262:23 263:6 263:13 265:2,4 265:7,9 280:12 281:8 288:11 297:21,25 298:2,4,6 300:18 305:18 305:22 306:10 306:13,18,22	134:18 butchering 293:7 buy 32:18 Byron 318:16,17	capital 22:23 25:5,7,11 107:25 127:10 127:17 132:6 134:3,8,10,15 134:22 135:2 139:22 140:10 140:14,17,18 142:1,9,20,25 144:24 145:3,7 148:21 149:1,3 150:15,16,17 150:22 152:1,6 152:17 155:13 169:15,21 170:18 171:10 171:11 177:23 179:18,20 187:19 189:13 192:3,6,14,18 207:14 211:13 211:15 223:8 233:7 234:19 234:21,25 235:3,19 236:5 236:9 237:24 237:25 238:6,9 250:2 252:1 253:3 254:22 258:7,11,13 261:3 265:15 265:17,22,25 266:1 275:12 279:23 281:13 282:16 289:16 296:16,18,20 296:22 297:13 300:22 301:5 303:23
Brubaker 20:17 20:25 86:4,6,7 323:5,7,9,10	bury 114:19 burying 91:6 Bushmann 12:16 16:1,6 16:23 17:5,10 17:13,16,21,22 18:1,6,12,19 19:1 20:3,8,14 20:20,23 21:1 21:4,8,10 22:7 39:13,16,18 45:21 58:25 80:1,4,15 85:7 85:11 90:11 103:14,18,21 103:25 115:3 117:1,10 125:8 125:17,21 126:7,13,15,20 126:24 127:2,5 127:8 136:19 136:22 138:14 138:17 143:5,9 143:17 147:1 148:8 152:8,11 152:14,16 154:5,9,14,18 156:6,8,10,12 156:14 157:6 157:13,16 159:1 162:1 163:4 164:14 164:16 166:23 170:12 174:22 175:1,3,5,7,9 175:11 176:22 177:16 181:1 181:21 183:1,3 184:7,11,13,15 184:17,21 186:11,13,15 186:17,19,21	business 18:8 61:9 83:22 98:3 115:17,17 121:24,25 127:25 169:12 170:15 194:8 202:7 205:17 230:25 255:21 281:22 282:7 282:10 294:6 businesses 60:1 60:2,3 62:4 73:18 128:9,10 190:19 244:21 busy 131:16	C C 13:1 calculate 145:7 222:19 calculated 171:23 calculates 66:19 calculating 144:18 220:19 calculation 108:23,25 113:8,9 158:9 158:12 218:2 272:14 calculations 144:14,14,19 146:21 229:12 California 14:17 call 36:6 124:10 171:18 195:23 198:23 230:15 235:5 247:12 called 76:21 111:25 202:19 206:3 calls 152:19 187:4 230:16 camel's 61:21 campaign 56:4 cap 75:18 Cap-M 239:11 240:12 248:10 267:2 275:4 276:1,15 302:15 304:9 capable 280:6 285:16 capex 112:17	capitol 67:18 caps 216:2 captive 65:11 73:21 121:22 122:5
brunt 47:2				
Bryan 13:16				
Buchanan 321:6 321:8				
budget 24:4 162:7 163:15 163:18,21,22 163:23 164:1,1 164:4,6 177:1 305:11,11				
budgetary 285:4				
budgeted 50:17 162:5 163:16 168:9				
budgets 118:9				
build 101:4 111:5				
building 52:6 67:18 130:5				
buildup 291:17				
built 50:18 52:8 101:7 111:4				
bullet 71:13 213:14,20 214:10 215:13 237:18 268:18 269:19				
bumped 182:8				
bunched 133:10				
burden 66:14 69:3 141:6				
burdens 67:10 287:1				
Bureau 130:7 215:16				
buried 92:1 99:19				
Burton 44:11				

capture 229:14 261:18 296:20	72:11,13,14,16 72:19 74:7	172:24 173:2,3 173:13,15,17	303:10 304:14 304:16,19	category 282:14 283:8
car 122:3	77:21 78:15	174:2,9 175:18	305:5,6,11,12 317:17,20	causation 63:5
carefully 167:10 260:18	79:17 80:12,21 81:11,14,14	175:19 176:14 185:3,8,10,14	318:19	cause 146:13 187:17 270:21
cares 120:20	82:5,13 85:15	191:15 192:21	case-by-case 185:20	caused 96:13 297:12
Carlson 310:5,7 310:9,11	85:17 86:11,16 87:10,13 88:9	194:3,4 195:16 198:8,9,18	cases 24:8 28:9 28:13 34:22	causing 37:13 129:3 140:22
Carole 13:15 17:19 86:2 148:12	89:21 92:6,16 92:17 93:3	200:16,20,23 202:23 204:7	37:20 68:23 84:9 89:20	cautioning 244:7
carry 66:21 226:4	94:17 96:19,24 97:9 98:17,25	208:24 209:19 210:16,16,20	90:20,21,23 91:3 95:22	cautious 243:9
carrying 304:23	100:12 101:20 102:7,16,20,23	212:1 213:8 219:12 221:3	96:5,21 100:7 107:8,9,10	Cave 13:16
Cary 316:3,5,7,9	105:23 106:5,6 106:11,13	223:8,11 224:2 224:6,13,15	114:9 122:21 127:22 134:8	CCR 325:4,18
case 19:7,10 22:13,18,22,24 23:6,8,9,18 25:4,14,17 26:1,8 27:5 28:8,25 29:14 30:5,22 31:8 31:15,15,17,22 32:4,20,24 33:1,6,16 36:4 36:13,18 37:2 37:23 38:9,17 40:7,21 41:3,6 41:8,8 42:1 45:4,25 46:3 46:12,13 49:17 50:20,24 51:6 51:7,8 55:9,16 56:15 57:19 59:17,25 60:5 62:16,19 63:22 64:3,24 65:4 65:24,24 66:1 66:6,9,23,24 67:20 68:3,15 68:21,22,24,25 71:7,9,10,11 71:13,16,22,23 72:4,6,7,8,10	107:7,17,22,23 108:22 110:13 110:18 113:2 115:7 116:17 118:17 119:21 120:22 121:9 122:19 123:14 128:5 129:15 129:20 131:10 131:19 132:13 133:23 134:9 136:3,12,17 137:3,18,21 138:12,24 140:17 143:22 144:3,7 145:9 146:9,20 148:16 149:5 149:11 150:7 150:24 151:25 153:4 156:20 162:5,6,23 163:3,8,9,9,12 163:16,18 166:10 169:16 169:22 170:24 171:2 172:2,10 172:17,19,24	225:14,22 226:5 227:17 229:19 234:24 235:9 248:20 251:20 252:13 253:2 255:24 258:14 259:18 259:20 260:20 261:15,23 262:18 265:16 266:13,16,23 267:1,13,13,14 267:20 270:22 270:22 273:1,3 275:23 276:3,7 276:14 278:16 278:20,24,25 279:3,11,16 282:12 284:18 285:18 286:20 287:4,11 288:2 288:3 290:10 290:21 291:12 291:17 292:16 293:21 296:6 298:22 299:6 300:5 301:2,2 301:13 303:3,5	151:14,15,16 151:18 157:22 158:8,15,17,18 158:18,20 162:13 163:1,6 165:15 167:7 167:25 173:9 173:24 185:4,5 185:10,11 190:11 235:15 252:24 262:9 271:3,4,4,5,18 271:21,25 275:15 276:21 278:9 279:8,19 279:22 280:5 299:10,10,18 299:19,22,22 304:6,8,10,18	cell 18:15 Census 130:6 215:16 cent 64:4 center 145:9 cents 93:21 94:2 CEO 56:22 certain 91:13 96:13 123:21 134:4 135:9 194:21 276:11 294:4,5 certainly 33:9 42:2 43:4,10 44:17 75:8 77:7 137:3 142:4 258:23 259:13 278:1 certainty 166:7 182:8 CERTIFICATE 325:1 Certification 245:13 246:1 314:12 Certified 325:3 certify 246:7 325:5 cetera 123:15,15 CFO 283:7,10

chair 39:19,22 40:2,9,12,15 40:20 41:7,12 41:16,18,20,24 42:3,17 43:1,7 43:11,14,18,21 43:24 44:5,14 44:22 45:5,9 45:15 51:17,21 51:24 52:14,17 52:19,23 53:2 53:6,9,15,18 54:13 75:16,23 76:6,11,17,22 77:3,8,10 85:8 88:13 114:23 116:22 123:7,9 124:1,6,13,15 125:2,4,7 126:5 136:20 138:15 143:3 147:2 152:9 167:1 170:8,11 170:17 178:2 212:24 214:11 225:4 251:10 288:13,14 289:2,4,11 290:3 307:12 308:7	32:14 116:4 125:15 129:24 171:11 173:12 179:25 204:8 229:14 256:10 260:8,21,23 261:6,11,18 262:11 269:12 292:9 294:22 299:1 301:8,11 301:12,14 302:4	82:12,13,17,21 83:2,4 115:8 115:21 116:14 117:20 118:21 119:4,24 120:20,22 121:4,6,15 123:14,16,20 123:24 124:3 124:18 163:2 168:14,16 289:25 290:22	Chief 15:4 Chiefs 54:6,10 59:13 choice 65:4,14 155:25 choose 67:12,15 Christopher 312:24 CIP 29:8 43:15 44:16 CIPs 27:9,9 36:6 36:8,9 44:18 circularity 253:10 circumstances 35:23 38:12 50:9,21,23 123:21 citation 214:24 cite 197:6 198:2 201:20 244:14 cited 198:9 216:8 244:16 247:3 280:18 281:4 citing 199:12,20 citizen 63:11 288:22 citizens 59:20 121:4 267:6 City 12:7,12 13:3,4,5,7,8,11 13:12,14,14,14 13:17,20 14:2 14:8 15:2,8 16:3,17,19 17:4,20,21,21 17:24,24,25 22:10,15 48:7 48:17 49:5 51:10,11 53:21 53:25 54:6,19 61:12 82:16,24 88:6,11 115:7	117:2,2,3,7 127:16,19 129:19 179:18 190:6 194:20 201:1 206:5 227:4 233:17 235:4 251:13 254:2 265:9 268:12 275:22 279:10 282:1 307:7 309:2 civil 90:21 civility 91:2,2 claimed 37:4,6 74:23 claims 63:6 70:24 92:18 93:10 99:18 clarification 80:6 101:18 239:20 257:19 clarify 80:14 102:1 234:16 236:15 241:20 clarifying 232:9 class 48:13 86:3 315:3 classes 236:1 classic 91:5 clause 19:5 27:6 30:19,25 31:19 31:23 32:4,8 32:10,13,16 33:1,5 41:5 42:24 45:8 67:22 86:10 92:9 93:23 94:15 100:1,5 100:13,14,22 100:25 101:10 102:11,21 103:5 104:16 104:21 105:9 105:13,15
changed 64:8 136:12,13 137:23,24 138:1,7,7 169:1,4,6 185:8 262:20	changes 25:16 34:1 69:23 70:3 98:18 136:14 140:17 168:23 179:17 179:21 188:5 213:14 232:2,4 239:5 240:10 256:8 265:22 268:18 274:3 277:10 278:1,6 279:23 294:17 295:1 300:25	charged 138:22 142:22 163:8 193:18 charges 32:17 63:23 81:8,10 121:1,2 122:6 charging 64:22 65:3 67:4,8 82:19 83:6,7 93:20 121:18 121:25 122:10 122:16 162:16 162:17	Charles 316:16 316:18,20 chart 23:13 28:10 31:12 73:1 99:7 137:10 144:5 208:7 209:10 223:25 254:10 277:1 278:7 298:14 314:14	charts 49:13 check 126:24 158:13 269:6 279:2,6,13 305:16 Chesterfield 255:22 Chicago 214:15 214:16
chairman 12:17 54:12 57:9 72:14 166:25 170:14 175:16 177:19 225:3 251:9 269:7,8 288:12,25 305:9	changing 51:19 116:15 266:6 286:20	Charles 316:16 316:18,20	chart 23:13 28:10 31:12 73:1 99:7 137:10 144:5 208:7 209:10 223:25 254:10 277:1 278:7 298:14 314:14	charts 49:13 check 126:24 158:13 269:6 279:2,6,13 305:16 Chesterfield 255:22 Chicago 214:15 214:16
challenges 47:6 141:1,10 chance 74:8 116:7,17 237:4 268:20 change 31:4	characterize 183:17 characterized 286:7 charge 62:22,23 63:1,4,8,15,20 63:21,23 64:6 64:10,12,14,16 77:15 80:22,22 81:5,6 82:11	charging 64:22 65:3 67:4,8 82:19 83:6,7 93:20 121:18 121:25 122:10 122:16 162:16 162:17	Charles 316:16 316:18,20 chart 23:13 28:10 31:12 73:1 99:7 137:10 144:5 208:7 209:10 223:25 254:10 277:1 278:7 298:14 314:14	charts 49:13 check 126:24 158:13 269:6 279:2,6,13 305:16 Chesterfield 255:22 Chicago 214:15 214:16

118:15,22,25 119:12,18,19 120:5 194:22 197:23 198:5 198:14 208:17 209:6 227:20 258:21,24 259:2,4,6,15 259:17 260:19 261:10 263:17 280:17 282:2 283:16,18,19 283:20,21,23 284:1,5,15 285:17,24 286:3,9,10,11 287:1,3,8 288:7 303:22 clauses 94:13 102:19 268:9 283:16 284:7 300:6 clean 77:15 80:22 82:11,12 82:13,17,21 83:4 115:8,21 116:14 cleaner 83:3 clear 42:22 49:25 52:5,22 64:5 79:16 81:25 151:25 232:15 277:7 297:9,13,17 299:15 clearly 39:4 49:9 64:14,19 106:7 108:6 124:24 client 21:12 117:16 289:7 clients 114:6,6 114:19 clip 56:3 close 30:10	38:20 55:4,5 55:21,22,23 60:10 87:18 137:12,14 151:22 210:17 264:22 closed 196:12 201:17 283:1 closer 136:16 210:11 closest 132:25 closing 51:10 62:4 136:9 Club 14:15,18 14:22 16:9 21:22 24:20,22 125:24 306:3 321:15,16,18 321:19,21,23 322:3 Club's 24:25 25:4 CMAR 14:19 CME 214:15,25 coal 104:3,4,5,6 104:7,9,10,12 104:15 263:23 291:3 Coffman 13:22 18:4,4 42:3 117:12,13 123:7,8,18 124:5,8,14,19 125:3,7 collected 33:4 84:15 collectively 47:25 202:2 collects 46:11 COLLEEN 15:7 college 170:19 Collins' 109:17 Columbia 14:11 column 62:10	131:18 249:21 249:24,25 250:1,2 272:1 combined 60:4 60:23 84:6 196:22 come 21:6 24:2 24:4,5 43:2,3 65:6 67:10 73:23 74:3 109:20,21 111:23 112:6 115:11,18 130:6 133:5 145:10 175:22 179:4 202:6 220:25 223:10 223:17,21 270:11 272:12 274:18 275:14 279:25 291:19 294:7 comes 60:6 78:5 102:16 132:17 132:21,24 151:12,19 162:16 297:16 comfortable 276:5 303:8 coming 34:2 38:5 39:8 96:23 98:15 129:16 169:11 179:14 212:2 290:19 299:23 Comley 13:13 17:22,23,23 117:3 commensurate 26:21,22 140:2 comment 170:13 comments 61:22 61:23 62:2 75:13 81:2	121:17 123:4 141:4 294:2 304:13 Commerce 130:7 266:12 304:1,4 commercial 83:19 commission 12:1 15:9 16:2,24 17:3 22:12,16 24:24 25:25 26:13 31:3,6 31:11 32:20,23 32:24 33:16,20 33:21,23 34:6 34:12,14 35:24 36:13 37:14 38:20,22 45:23 50:13,15,15,18 57:3,6,16,21 58:2 59:2 62:12,19,21 64:5,19,25 65:3,5,15 67:10 68:1,5 68:21 69:2,21 70:9,15 71:7 72:1,7,8,16,20 73:3 74:16 78:2 80:13,17 81:12 82:2,16 83:12,15,17 84:23 85:14 86:24 90:19,21 90:24 91:10,14 93:7 94:18,19 94:23 95:1,2 95:13,14,17,19 95:22 96:2,5 96:17,25 98:25 99:16,24 100:3 100:10,12,17 101:2 102:9,13	102:14,16,21 102:24 103:4 105:19,21 106:9,13,15 107:5,13,14,16 107:19,19 110:17,18 112:7 115:6,10 115:24 116:2,9 116:16 117:13 117:21 119:24 121:11 126:3 127:19 128:4 128:12 129:19 134:15,17 135:6,8 136:13 137:1,13,15,18 138:18,22 139:10 140:13 140:23,25 141:22 142:10 142:22 143:18 144:4,21 148:11 150:5 151:16 158:2 162:18,21 185:6 186:15 187:16 190:24 191:8 192:20 193:14 194:16 194:18,20 195:18,20 200:13 201:4 201:14 206:21 217:23 219:5 219:17 221:14 223:18 224:13 224:15,20 225:20,22 229:18 230:2 231:14,18 233:22 234:1 235:14 236:8 236:17 238:7
--	---	---	--	--

239:25 241:3 241:17 243:8 243:14 244:7 251:22 252:11 252:11 253:1 254:21 259:16 260:7 261:5,24 262:6,17 264:12,15,17 264:21,24 266:12 272:16 272:24 275:14 275:23 278:17 282:1 284:3,15 285:1,18 286:2 286:9 290:19 293:7 296:3 297:21 298:23 299:3,6 300:23 304:2,5,25 305:7 307:17 314:17 Commission's 23:24 33:8,15 64:7 67:12 69:1 71:6 82:14 83:5 85:1 98:8,22 106:5,6 107:11 117:20 136:3 138:19 144:3 146:19 158:14 171:6,9 Commission-a... 33:5 84:18 Commission-a... 27:13 31:3,24 commissioner 35:4,6,12,15 35:17,19 45:18 53:20,24 54:2 54:6,8,11,15 54:18,21,24 55:7,17,20,22	55:24 56:2,8 56:10,12,18,22 57:1,4,8,23 58:1,5,10,20 58:23 71:12 77:11,12,15,18 77:25 78:9,22 79:1,7,9,24 85:9,10 88:14 88:15,17,22,24 89:2,7,9,12,15 89:24 90:3,8 101:14 113:22 114:25 115:1 116:23,24 125:5,6 136:21 143:4 147:3,9 147:14 148:2,7 170:12,13,19 170:21 174:16 174:22 180:3 182:1 183:2,4 183:5 184:6,8 184:20 201:13 225:6,7,8 226:16,17 227:10 235:8 251:13,17,18 252:17,22 279:17 290:6 293:22,23 297:19 298:9 307:13,15,20 307:25 308:7,8 Commissioner's 182:2 commissioners 12:20 87:5,14 90:14 95:15 101:12 126:22 144:16 225:2 237:17 251:8 285:8 288:11 296:8 299:13	306:8,19 commissions 99:14 112:22 132:16 133:25 137:6 144:17 147:21 150:3 150:13,18 166:7 180:5 194:14 242:22 252:23 253:5,9 253:9 296:4 298:20 commitment 101:9 123:13 commitments 100:15 committed 36:7 36:11 commodities 48:16 common 23:22 70:21,21 134:23 147:14 147:16 220:24 221:2,4 236:1 community 195:23 196:21 197:5 200:3 companies 26:22,23 27:1 28:21 33:3 50:14 106:2,2 109:18,19 127:24 134:16 150:9 151:1,5 151:6,7,10,18 152:1 166:4 167:19,22,22 169:6 178:23 179:20 182:14 182:16,17,21 194:8,13 197:17 198:13 202:7 211:4,21	218:6 220:21 223:3 252:24 268:3,7,8 285:20,23 300:4,6 company 13:3,5 13:8,12 16:17 16:19 18:8 19:6 21:14 22:11,19 23:20 24:19 25:6 26:20 27:11,12 27:19 28:9,15 29:3 30:3,3 31:16,18,22 32:4,10,11,16 32:25 36:7,10 36:13 37:9,20 38:18 48:12 49:7 50:16 51:5 62:17 66:24 69:11,21 69:22 73:5,10 73:13,14,22 74:7 75:1 76:1 78:21 82:4,9 83:6,8 84:9 88:19,23,25 89:6,7 96:20 97:4,14 100:2 106:4 109:18 110:7,8,9,10 112:15 125:25 127:20 133:25 134:7,12,12,14 134:20 137:14 139:19 140:1 142:4,11,21 143:24 144:8 144:11 152:19 163:3 165:11 178:16 180:15 181:3,11,23 189:13 191:12	194:23 195:16 197:3,18 198:5 201:15 202:10 203:5 209:24 210:2,20 211:25 221:5 223:2 225:24 226:3 228:17 234:22 235:9 236:5 238:8 244:3 245:22 251:6 253:2 254:11 258:10 258:22 260:9 260:20 261:13 262:2,14,25,25 263:2 277:3 278:11 280:14 281:1,10 286:12 287:5 299:5 Company's 12:12 16:3 23:4,8,9 25:8 25:19 26:8 28:23 33:1,12 34:4,19 36:3 37:3,8,14,21 38:10 39:5 59:7,8 69:17 70:1,7 81:9 82:3,15,23 84:15 97:4 116:5 134:25 136:16 139:3,7 139:16,24 140:1,16 145:23 146:22 192:19 195:19 235:10,14,19 259:21,22,23 275:22 282:7,8 comparable 106:1,2,4
--	---	--	---	---

127:24 261:1 266:1 comparative 169:3 comparatively 123:19 169:12 compare 113:23 263:3 compared 27:16 55:2 58:13 109:7 205:17 249:20 264:4 314:14 compares 62:7 comparing 314:14 comparison 288:4 comparisons 168:20 compensated 120:4 226:4 compensation 74:24 142:25 246:11 260:12 compete 251:25 competent 26:2 210:16 competition 73:20 competitive 65:9 65:16,17,17,20 114:13 121:20 complains 108:10 complaint 110:18 complete 73:19 271:11 278:3 completed 24:2 173:3 234:8,17 271:14 completely 91:16 112:6	221:20 completes 305:19 complex 264:13 compliance 29:8 36:11 complicated 65:25 259:12 264:6 277:6,17 complimentary 201:4 comply 36:8,10 component 44:23 45:10 103:8,9,10 104:3 105:10 105:10 138:24 components 84:21 compose 47:5 141:9 composed 134:22 compound 113:9 compounded 48:2 113:7 comprehend 61:5 comprehensive 32:3 198:23 203:13,18 204:23 compromise 123:21 computers 73:7 concept 115:25 concern 105:4 110:6 114:20 114:21 117:18 117:23 128:20 150:19 191:16 concerned 114:10,11	122:1 203:21 concerning 301:5 concerns 64:21 122:15 conclude 69:24 concludes 74:12 97:25 98:13 125:9 152:16 255:5 concluding 200:13 conclusion 84:15 99:18 105:14 200:9 conclusions 71:6 106:10 concocted 155:2 272:10 concoction 156:1 272:14 concurrence 71:12 Concurrent 84:10 concurr 134:23 conditional 82:12 conditions 131:8 132:3 141:9 171:10,11 277:25 conduct 285:11 conducted 260:22 conducting 88:7 285:1 conference 42:15 115:12 confidence 192:13,19 272:25 confident 269:4 confidential	103:12,13,24 105:20 309:6 309:11,15,19 309:23 310:7 310:11,15,19 310:23 311:4,8 311:18,22 312:4,9,15 313:6,10,14,18 313:22 314:23 315:7,15,21,25 316:8,15,20 317:7,11,15,20 317:24 318:6 319:10 320:4,8 320:12,16,20 320:24 321:22 322:4,24 323:14 confirm 269:22 conflict 247:3 conflicts 243:11 244:20,20 245:2 confused 58:12 172:19 confusion 232:13 Congress 147:19 connection 179:6 consecutive 215:23 270:6 consequences 65:4 246:21 303:12 consequential 65:2 67:19 Consequently 270:22 277:12 conservation 28:19 64:18 121:5 conservative	150:18 173:14 173:22 189:2,5 247:22 consider 34:9 38:11 61:7 72:15 120:5 192:21 213:1 217:24,25 221:21 239:6 248:22 296:8 considerably 31:1 60:16 consideration 36:17 79:13 95:6 105:1 116:10 119:3 considerations 46:25 considered 33:17 42:16 62:16 69:7 91:25 94:18 99:23 102:18 102:22 146:24 179:1 194:16 194:17 273:7 275:8 considering 55:13 71:3 99:21 102:20 118:2 141:16 223:21 250:9 considers 106:1 consistency 84:11 194:12 consistent 37:14 71:6 72:24 95:24 99:22 121:5,7 165:24 182:11 194:2 214:19 242:10 250:5,16,19 259:3 270:15 279:19 282:3
--	--	---	--	--

282:13 284:20 287:16,22 302:23 consistently 49:11 95:13 182:21 282:11 consolidated 278:24 constant 60:17 69:16 70:4 217:7,11,13,17 218:8 220:19 221:9 constantly 114:19 constitute 71:1 constitutes 40:21 constrained 91:22 115:20 constraint 285:5 constraints 285:4,6 construct 31:6 111:3 construction 119:8,14 124:22 construe 42:9,10 consultants 71:19 74:4,4,5 93:9 consulting 109:3 243:20 consumer 48:4 91:17 113:14 119:11 147:20 148:1 165:16 167:11,14 289:8 consumers 13:18,21,24 17:13,17 18:3 18:5 24:19	34:18 72:5 85:12,15 90:12 117:11,14,23 118:4,5 120:7 120:19 121:14 138:21 152:14 156:8 175:3 184:13 190:5 227:3 233:16 253:25 265:7 267:6 288:19 289:6,19 298:4 308:3 322:7,18 contact 16:21 contain 213:5 contained 79:19 94:21 104:8,11 226:11 231:20 295:4 containment 201:5 contains 123:11 187:23 contemplate 284:4 306:18 contemplated 124:17 contemplates 124:7 contemporane... 234:1 contemporary 239:18 contends 81:9 context 93:8 103:5 124:23 133:20 146:11 166:17 220:6 243:18 continuation 150:8 continue 31:12 47:6 64:17 73:11,15,19	89:25 98:25 112:17,19 205:3,5 231:13 continued 107:25 152:2 162:3 196:23 215:23 270:5 307:11 308:1 310:1 311:1 312:1 313:1 314:1 315:1 316:1 317:1 318:1 319:1 320:1 321:1 322:1 323:1 324:1 continues 29:10 74:13 141:10 269:8 continuing 28:7 47:15 58:18 95:3 101:23 continuous 61:25 70:2 contract 52:5,25 57:12 contracting 212:1,2 284:22 contraction 211:16,18,19 contractions 211:10 contracts 69:18 104:6 contractual 263:25,25 contrary 63:5 99:18 237:22 contrast 30:2,2 contributing 28:14 contribution 187:18 contributions	84:24 contributor 34:20 188:9 contrivance 156:1 control 34:20 64:17 69:18 70:7,24 72:4 89:22 92:22 96:11,15 99:12 100:10 105:11 109:10,14 111:21 120:2 120:11 121:13 121:14,16 259:1 295:10 295:11,18 convenience 65:13 190:16 convenient 111:18 conversation 227:10 convince 58:1,2 cool 73:6 copy 213:10 245:16 266:19 268:14 280:23 Core 83:11 corner 44:19 45:3 corners 53:8,10 57:10 corporate 212:6 corporation 24:24 88:21 209:2 235:14 correct 20:22 56:6 77:24 88:20 124:5 138:1 147:5,13 153:20 155:8 158:2 164:24 166:4 167:3,8	167:9,12,18,23 168:4 169:20 170:2,6,7,25 171:4 172:25 173:1,4,10 177:2 180:9 183:7 187:23 187:24 189:3,4 190:12,13,20 190:21 191:4,8 191:9,17,18,21 191:22,25 192:1,4,5,8,9 192:14,15,22 193:6,11,12,25 194:1,4,10,11 196:9,14,15,18 196:24,25 197:8,13 198:16,17,19 198:20,24 199:10,18 200:20 201:21 202:3,4 203:9 203:10,23 204:20,21,25 205:13,22,23 206:1,3,4,7,11 206:12 207:8 207:14,15,22 207:24,25 208:12,13,14 208:15,22 209:6,16,20 210:1,5,6,13 210:21 211:3,6 211:10 212:3,6 212:10 217:3,5 217:6,12,18,19 217:22 218:9 219:2,5,6,15 219:19 220:5 221:14,15,18 221:19,22,23
--	--	--	--	---

222:4,5,13	280:19 283:1,8	104:3 112:16	costing 163:18	120:2,12,15,16
223:16,23	283:12,13	120:12 122:15	284:20	120:23,24
224:7,8,10,11	284:14 286:18	122:24 127:10	costs 23:8,16	121:13 122:25
225:15,16	287:5,8,9	127:17,20	24:3 27:7,9,10	123:1 124:4,11
229:10,16	290:11,12	131:19 134:3	29:1,7,8,13,13	140:10,19
231:20,21	299:21 300:12	139:13 140:14	29:16,20,20	142:1 144:24
232:5,7,8	301:6 306:13	142:8,8 143:1	31:10 32:17,18	144:25 150:15
233:23 234:2	corrected	149:1,3,13	32:22 33:1,9	150:19 152:1,6
234:10,13,18	149:12	150:21 152:17	33:10,11,17,20	162:7,8 163:17
234:22 235:2	correcting	162:14,22	33:22 34:3,7	163:24 164:9
235:11,12,15	231:17	163:12 165:22	34:11,16,17,17	164:11 192:3,6
235:16,23,24	correction	166:1 169:15	36:7,14,15,16	192:18 193:24
236:2,3,7,12	146:12 257:2,3	169:21 170:18	36:25 37:1,4,5	196:14 200:3,5
236:20 238:9	268:13	179:22,23	37:7,10 38:4	200:10,14
238:20,25	corrections	187:19 189:3,6	38:16,16 50:8	204:13 205:7
239:1,15,16,19	135:10 149:10	192:8 196:22	50:19 63:6	206:6 208:12
240:19,24,25	153:9,11,25	201:5,5,24	67:3 69:10,16	208:14,21
241:5,6,8,9,14	188:5 231:7,15	203:14,18	70:7,24,25	233:7 237:24
241:15,17	232:7 236:10	204:23 208:11	71:3,21 74:12	237:25 238:6,9
242:1,2,5,22	236:17 238:2,3	217:17 219:1	84:14,16,21	238:13 253:3
242:23 243:2,3	238:4 256:8,13	227:13,15,16	89:22,23 92:7	258:13 259:9
243:12,20	257:8	228:4,9,10,11	92:7 93:16	259:14 262:20
245:3,4,14	correctly 67:19	228:18,22	95:6,10,14,16	265:15,17,25
246:9,10,14,18	71:14 164:23	229:5,11 230:3	95:18,20 96:7	266:2 275:12
246:19,22,23	205:8 229:6	253:6 254:22	96:11,13,14,16	279:23 281:14
247:12,13,16	286:7	258:7,18 259:3	96:18 97:1,5,6	282:20 283:18
247:21 248:3	corrects 257:20	261:3,12	97:7,9,12,14	284:4 285:15
248:12,13,17	corresponding	262:12 264:19	97:20 98:2,3	290:25 291:21
248:18 249:14	140:3 190:19	273:1,10 274:1	98:13,15,17,18	292:8 294:8,12
250:6,12,13,17	194:9	280:1 283:4	98:19,24 99:5	294:13,16,17
250:18,21,22	COS 324:4,6	284:9,18	99:5,7,8,9,10	294:17,24
251:21 252:16	cost 20:20 23:1	286:25 292:22	99:23,24 103:8	295:3,9,13,18
256:4,6 257:7	24:5 25:5,19	293:16 294:21	104:17,18,20	296:16,18,20
258:3,8,19	25:20,24 26:24	294:25 295:22	104:21,22	296:22 297:13
262:13 263:19	29:6,19 31:9	298:23 299:4	107:25 108:17	300:22
266:13 267:4	34:12,13 36:9	299:15 301:5	108:19,22,24	Council 13:24
267:11 268:11	45:3 48:6	302:25 303:15	109:2,2,6,8,10	18:3,5 117:11
270:13 271:10	50:16 63:5,6	303:17,23	109:11,12,14	117:14 120:19
271:18,22	66:3 69:12	305:2,8 314:19	109:20,21	152:14 156:8
272:1,4 274:23	71:2 73:4	314:22	110:1,2,3,4,6,8	175:3 184:13
275:6,7,17	74:25 75:1	cost-effective	110:10,11,11	190:5 227:3
276:2,9,16	80:24 82:23	83:22	110:14,20	233:16 253:25
278:20,23	84:3,13 86:3	Cost-of-Service	111:16 115:16	265:7 298:4
279:5,12	96:10 103:7	315:4	115:18 119:23	counsel 14:1,7

15:1,1,3,4,5,5 15:6,6,7 16:15 17:6,8 19:2 39:1 42:4 59:1 59:4 69:5 70:18 72:9,19 75:17,23 80:10 100:18 101:3 115:15 118:23 122:20 125:15 129:15 139:9 140:24 141:14 141:22 165:25 170:5,20 175:11 186:13 188:20 213:13 233:1 253:21 254:11 257:25 265:14 288:23 293:5 297:23 306:14 319:14 325:7,10 Counsel's 70:14 71:15 99:13 Counselor 232:6 count 38:15 counties 47:5,24 48:21 59:24 60:10,11 61:15 61:17,18 141:9 country 26:6 32:12 58:13 61:8 63:21,24 115:22 127:25 132:14 134:1 135:20 144:17 147:24 150:4 190:18 194:9 194:15 241:17 242:22 251:22 289:10 county 35:8 couple 18:22 39:19 43:8	51:17 78:12 99:15 104:19 105:3 107:8 113:2 121:17 124:2 128:8 129:12 136:15 158:24 163:10 166:14 168:18 177:23 178:4,5 178:18,20 179:3 207:24 223:24 237:14 240:15 278:9,9 280:5,16 288:13,18 290:9,21 298:7 coupled 29:5 287:4 course 23:24 28:3 30:3 42:19 44:10,21 151:5 175:21 178:7 179:9 185:10 202:22 coursework 234:8 court 12:22 65:2 89:10 95:3,9 95:17 99:22 127:21 139:20 187:10 190:11 190:22 191:3 191:15,20 192:2 193:11 193:14 237:7 244:5 245:21 269:19 278:13 325:3 Court's 98:8 cover 32:22 71:19 120:23 193:23 covered 71:20 83:5	covers 28:10 cracking 244:25 Crawford 44:11 310:13,15,17 310:19,21,23 create 83:14 100:6 196:23 created 260:6 261:18 creates 72:3 120:14 294:3 294:12,23 creating 294:10 creative 120:14 credible 107:15 credit 101:7 192:14 199:2 201:25 203:8 204:1 205:7 273:8 credited 34:18 Creek 22:25 23:6,15 criteria 23:19 69:7,8 96:2 97:25 98:8,8 98:11 99:4 100:17,18,24 102:15,15,22 102:24 103:1,1 103:3,4,6,7,9 104:2 197:15 critical 27:8 36:5,5 38:11 208:25 criticism 145:6 239:13 criticisms 106:18 239:13 criticized 106:9 critique 239:20 239:22 cross 87:2 126:18 232:22	253:22 257:18 257:24 300:21 306:5,15 cross-examina... 117:8 126:1 154:3,13,18,20 156:16 162:3 164:18 188:18 188:19,22 190:7 232:21 233:2,20 258:1 260:17 265:10 307:9,10,10,11 307:12,13,19 307:20,24,24 308:5,6,6 CRR 12:22 Cully 17:1 cure 49:8 cured 49:12 current 23:2 37:23 47:19 62:22 63:14 78:17 84:16 139:16 141:20 149:12 201:25 250:17 254:12 258:7 261:2 264:19 272:25 273:10 274:1 293:15 298:23 299:3 301:17 301:21 302:1 302:25 305:2,8 currently 24:4 46:11 57:19 75:11 81:23 144:23 206:5 customer 30:21 38:14 62:15,22 62:22 63:1,4,8 63:14,20,21,22 64:6,14,16 73:14,21,24	80:22 81:5,6 81:10 84:24 88:3 120:20,22 120:23 121:2,4 121:6,9,15 147:4,11 customer's 67:7 70:3 87:25 customers 35:25 38:12 39:5 46:9,12 47:2,2 47:4 48:10 59:4,10,12,13 59:15,18,22 60:4,8,9,12,14 60:14,18,24 61:3,9,19,20 61:24 62:15,18 62:20,24,25,25 63:1,9,18,23 64:17 65:21 66:13,20 67:14 69:20,25 70:1 70:12 71:10,25 72:9 73:11 74:17,25 75:2 75:6,8,9,18,20 75:25 81:18,21 82:6 83:2,19 83:20 84:5 93:4 114:17 118:12 121:12 141:5,6,20,23 141:25 143:1 144:8 147:7 193:18 259:10 259:14 261:13 262:2 286:20 286:21 287:1 294:19 295:15 296:20 customers' 67:11 cut 63:17 73:25
---	---	--	--	--

115:17 131:17 135:14 cyber 27:9 cybersecurity 29:8 31:10 36:7 37:1,7 38:16 44:17 50:7 70:17 92:7 97:4,5,7 99:5,15,17 cycle 84:16 Cydney 15:5 17:1	274:1,13 314:6 322:17 data-intensive 176:3 date 19:9 30:5 50:1 56:16,19 71:17 79:17 136:1 174:10 180:6,22 182:12 185:22 214:1 dated 111:15 214:8 314:7,16 dates 139:6 Dauphinais 86:11,17 323:12,14,16 David 13:19 17:14 63:3 90:14 319:20 319:22,24 320:3 day 20:7 33:14 56:23 178:10 178:10 276:24 306:23 days 34:14 52:10 131:2 DC 14:5 DCF 133:7 144:13,14,18 144:21,22,24 145:6,7,9,15 145:19 146:14 153:16 211:22 217:8,11,14,17 218:7,8 220:19 221:6,14 223:14 239:11 240:12,18,19 241:10 242:6 254:17,19,23 257:5 267:2,19 270:21 275:25	276:7 304:7,10 DCFs 223:8 DE 81:5 82:2 DE's 83:16 dead 103:7 124:10 deal 18:22 49:23 49:23 87:1 115:23 116:15 118:25 205:11 234:19 deals 125:22 dealt 128:20 dear 117:15 debate 145:9 209:22 debt 61:22 74:14 75:25 87:20 92:25 112:15 134:20,22 135:4,5,8 153:22,23 171:12 178:6 192:4,8,8 203:21 204:12 204:12 207:14 235:18,19 236:1,4,9,10 274:4 278:3 282:13 283:6,7 303:18 decades 65:6 144:22 250:15 December 22:17 134:24 240:6 decide 50:3 215:5 222:25 252:12 decided 24:10 65:23 68:20 95:15 151:14 151:15 262:6 decides 33:21 34:6,8 65:5	decimal 274:25 decision 33:15 65:2 95:1,12 95:17 96:14 105:19 106:6 106:15 107:11 116:2 136:3 144:3 146:19 174:9 197:14 225:17 229:19 252:15 271:24 296:12 decisions 59:17 113:2 139:20 145:13,17,20 146:18 158:15 183:7,12 195:6 242:13 299:1 decline 107:25 140:10,14 150:14 151:23 152:2 189:3 209:15 210:10 215:9 269:20 270:20 279:20 297:9,13 declined 25:25 104:19 130:8 135:21 140:15 150:13 189:6 212:4 233:4 declines 296:21 declining 29:4 43:12,14,15 46:24 140:12 142:2 189:16 212:3 238:1 279:20 297:18 298:24 decoupling 87:1 206:14 decrease 34:16 142:1,9 146:5 146:9,10,11	decreased 195:3 195:11 215:9 216:2 269:20 269:23 270:10 270:13 decreases 36:1 decreasing 99:9 99:9 270:17 299:13 deeper 61:22 deeply 90:19 default 297:12 303:18 defend 91:20,23 defensive 178:24 defer 19:10 deferral 93:8 94:12,19,20 95:9,15 96:8,9 96:12 97:2,11 97:14,21,25 98:16 100:2 deferred 87:22 95:6,14 deficiency 74:23 deficit 130:8 215:9 269:20 269:23 defined 65:17 299:15 definition 191:6 definitive 24:7 definitively 292:7 deflate 110:4 deflated 92:21 108:16 109:15 110:17,23 111:1,20 degree 178:14 204:18 212:8 degrees 204:24 delayed 16:12 delegated
---	---	---	--	---

147:21,22 148:5 delegation 147:18 148:3 deliberation 136:13 delink 206:14 demand 63:9,10 63:12 111:14 demands 62:19 Democrat 131:2 demonstrate 92:23 93:14 demonstrated 92:15 105:5 243:23 demonstrates 105:11 demonstrating 92:2 denial 70:21 denied 32:21,23 69:3 201:11 Dentons 13:6 deny 70:20 denying 71:5 Department 14:6 16:11 26:17 74:21 125:13 130:7,8 131:23 133:9 133:15 134:13 134:19 135:3 143:10,15,19 147:4,5,21 156:10 175:5 184:15 189:24 224:17 226:24 230:14,16 265:2 298:2 307:22 323:20 depending 40:7 171:22 depends 40:4	163:12 197:18 197:25 204:2 depicted 278:16 279:22 deploy 84:5 deployed 67:9 deployment 65:12 depreciation 29:23 37:25 39:25 depth 116:19 depths 241:7 Deputy 15:1,5 Derick 318:11 318:13 Derry 231:1 describe 257:3 277:11 278:2 described 257:5 272:8 describes 256:12 277:12 description 281:16 descriptions 69:9 deserved 290:14 290:17,17 deserves 69:13 190:24 design 66:2 84:11 86:4 121:10 315:3 321:13 322:14 323:7 Design/Class 324:4,6,8 designed 84:4 261:12 desk 24:12 despite 49:7 62:12 94:8 142:1 145:5	208:8,9 209:15 210:10 destroy 93:15 detail 237:17 246:6 detailed 25:3 81:2 82:8 85:20 258:25 274:5 285:16 details 36:22,23 69:11 129:5 201:3 detain 45:25 determinates 30:20 determination 67:19 77:20 171:6,9 262:3 273:12 284:16 291:22 296:13 301:13 determine 53:4 53:7 57:10,12 89:17 138:4 142:14 165:10 165:12 261:16 263:15 284:11 291:22 292:12 determined 24:25 275:12 determines 38:20 determining 140:20,23 166:11 190:24 284:17 detriment 140:22 detrimental 34:3 121:24 develop 66:25 67:15 88:7 developed 96:2 102:24 139:19	181:18 221:16 304:9 314:6 developing 177:1 222:2 272:23 development 80:23 82:24 83:11,11,14 88:2 114:12 130:8 developments 268:23 devoted 36:20 dialogue 102:9 Diane 17:19 dictates 99:22 Dietrich 315:17 differ 166:15,15 166:16 250:10 290:24,25 differed 166:13 difference 34:17 107:11,24 113:8 133:17 139:3 142:17 149:22,23 169:25 170:1 177:22 263:22 277:11 291:7,9 291:13 292:21 300:2 differences 30:17,17 63:16 90:22,23 109:25 124:9 133:2,8 169:25 177:20,22 278:5 different 25:13 26:7 49:21 74:18 93:20 104:3 112:6 136:14 145:15 149:7,8 168:23	215:4,7 227:22 239:9 259:21 262:25 263:1,1 263:1,2 268:1 276:10 289:25 290:25 differential 274:6 differs 166:17 difficult 24:9 73:25 91:15,20 97:8 dig 75:22 diligence 243:16 dime 59:10 direct 44:6 76:23 85:25 86:6 98:12 152:22 153:5 153:12 155:7 164:6 167:6 187:7 230:21 231:3,20 232:9 236:19,21 237:1 240:16 254:7,8 255:18 255:23 256:10 267:5 273:17 275:1,23 298:10 301:16 307:9,19,23 308:5 309:7,9 309:11,13,15 310:13,15 311:9,11,15,17 311:19,21 312:5,11,18,24 313:11,13,23 316:3 317:17 317:19 318:19 319:3,16,20 320:5,7,17,19 321:6,12,17,20 321:22 322:9
---	---	---	---	--

323:5,7,22 324:3 direction 325:7 directionally 179:25 directly 33:12 109:22 disabled 233:19 disagree 79:3,4 91:25 92:3 93:13 199:21 213:15 214:18 215:11,17,18 215:24 216:4 237:19,21 266:22 275:18 disagreed 249:3 disagreement 88:6 174:7 219:8,10,11 Disagreements 90:22 disalignments 83:17 disallowance 37:11,13 39:3 disallowances 71:17 200:15 200:17,19 201:9 discard 224:21 discarded 144:22 discern 52:24 53:12 174:13 discernible 26:4 298:17 disclose 246:13 disconnect 31:4 discount 228:15 228:25 229:1,9 discounted 131:22,24 144:15 155:14	198:10 discouraging 121:24 discovery 163:14 164:6 175:23 discrepancy 40:20 discretion 137:4 140:24 261:24 264:21 discuss 19:12 22:20 59:6 287:14,19 288:1 discussed 205:10 discusses 129:1 155:8 248:23 discussion 25:3 58:11 87:14 123:22 224:22 247:10 276:19 discussions 42:20 disincentive 70:24 72:3 84:21 Dismukes 63:4 64:16 76:4 319:20,22,24 320:3 disproportion... 63:2 dispute 135:11 240:2 277:16 277:18 disputed 19:8 disputes 38:17 210:4 disputing 277:21 disregarded 275:18 276:1	276:15 302:14 302:16 disregarding 275:16 dissertation 234:9,17 distinguishing 118:19 distributed 84:5 distributing 82:18 distribution 151:7 158:19 182:16,21 267:22 268:3 district 45:6,6 84:9 95:2 divestitures 167:25 divided 211:25 dividend 240:22 242:4 279:25 dividends 112:2 145:17 192:4 242:7,12 division 14:3 17:10,11 30:7 30:8,9 80:16 80:19,20,25 81:4,9,19 82:10,11 83:10 83:12,25 84:1 84:12,13 143:6 156:6 175:1 184:11 190:3 227:2 233:15 265:5 321:4 divisions 30:7 docket 65:25 67:5 77:21 86:25 116:12 116:13 122:9 266:23 document 42:15	53:8,11 57:11 76:14,15,15,18 102:5 157:1 document's 271:12 documentation 43:25 documents 181:6 DOE 108:4 132:1 143:22 145:4 146:22 147:15,24 231:3,7,11,24 232:18 268:20 321:5,7,9,10 321:12,14 DOE's 139:4 144:1 DOE/FEA 22:5 doing 18:8 19:15 47:4 52:6 55:4 112:19 133:21 133:25 202:7 253:9 288:17 303:8 dollars 93:10 164:8 domestic 47:8 133:11 doors 62:5 Dority 13:10 Dottheim 42:5 double 56:5 113:18 double-check 266:17 Downey 13:16 17:18,18 85:13 85:14 88:16,19 88:23,25 89:6 89:8,14,19 90:1,4,10 96:5 126:21 127:1,4	307:4 downstairs 42:15 downward 26:4 47:14 150:8 173:25 174:3 182:2 184:1 230:4,7 253:6 299:15 DPS/EPS/DVPS 241:11 Dr 60:6 61:14 62:6 63:3,25 64:16,16 73:12 73:16 76:4,4 141:13 224:6 224:17 292:17 draft 176:7 drafted 42:13,14 80:10 103:1 118:17 drafter 42:10,16 drafters 42:17 drafting 101:15 102:5 drag 196:23 dramatic 118:7 dramatically 122:25 drastic 67:13 drive 106:5 251:15 driven 29:6 drivers 23:3 driving 23:17 drop 58:18 74:1 dropped 30:14 35:9,9,9 216:24 267:18 dropping 46:20 DSIM 84:23 due 16:12 28:16 60:13 126:23 141:17,19
--	---	---	--	--

196:8 243:16	34:4,20 37:15	128:6,13,21,22	efficient 63:11	56:5 121:17
duty 138:22	116:6 118:13	128:24 130:11	efficiently	electricity 46:19
dwellers 59:20	118:13 130:19	130:12,15,21	294:14	46:24 47:1
E	145:14,18	133:20 136:14	effort 91:9	63:10,12,19
E 13:1,1,20 15:7	196:23 197:2	148:21 216:9	efforts 36:12	82:18 83:2,7
E-R-T 152:25	211:10,25	216:10,12,15	49:7 74:9	106:25 107:1,2
eager 120:9	239:22 241:12	216:17,18	112:9	element 121:10
earlier 37:21	241:25 242:8	220:16,22	EFIS 23:21	191:11
48:11 94:10	242:14,16	238:4 240:1	61:23 141:4	eligibility 83:23
100:3 113:13	243:15 249:13	266:7 267:15	eight 60:19,25	eliminate 68:20
122:19 142:16	249:20 250:5,9	267:16 268:19	61:12 250:15	68:21 295:20
176:25 218:13	254:16,18,25	269:10	265:23 268:18	eliminates 72:3
228:12 305:10	earns 49:11	Ed 85:14	eight-month	eliminating
306:3	108:9	EDR 83:13,20	129:11	294:15 295:12
early 130:23	Earthjustice	83:21	either 31:7	embarrassed
173:13 291:11	14:20,23	Edward 13:16	52:22 77:21	266:17
300:21	easier 51:12	17:18 309:13	99:8 118:5	embrace 74:13
earn 22:19 27:11	269:18	309:15,17,19	206:20 209:5	embracing
27:13 31:2	easily 19:17	Edwin 312:21	223:18 237:19	115:25
38:19,24 43:9	easing 128:19	312:22	248:3 271:3,6	emissions 82:25
44:1 45:5,7	eastern 120:10	EEI 93:19	elaborate 244:12	emphasis 127:25
49:8,15 92:19	easy 36:22 96:19	effect 31:25 32:8	252:6 294:3	150:2
93:11 108:10	98:17 100:10	34:5 37:15	electric 12:14	emphasize
108:13 109:9	105:19,20	92:10 94:8	16:5 26:5,15	236:22
118:1 127:23	111:8 165:6	175:24 179:17	26:25 32:10,11	emphasized
143:21,24	251:14	185:13 261:20	37:6 48:9,23	145:22
210:17 294:22	Eaves 315:18,20	262:1 275:13	48:24 49:4	emphasizes
295:23,25	315:22,24	282:18,18	60:16 63:24	145:2
earned 27:16,19	economic 47:20	286:17,18,19	64:22 65:3	Empire 55:11
27:19,21 28:1	58:11 64:18	287:23 288:8	67:4,8 73:4,5	84:9 90:20,23
28:5,6,10	80:23 82:24	effective 30:5	82:19,20 83:1	91:2 99:1
29:12 30:9,11	83:11,14 88:2	31:23 64:8	84:9 85:3	employ 89:17,25
108:8 196:7	114:12 129:2,6	142:6 246:1	99:17 112:4	employed 153:1
209:10,13,19	131:8,11,11	effectively	122:3 135:15	187:14 190:16
210:9,10,25	132:3 133:17	155:17	139:23 151:6	325:8,10
earning 27:22	133:24 135:24	effic 294:13	151:11 158:18	employee 102:6
30:12,12	136:10 141:1,8	efficiencies	182:17,23	102:8 325:10
209:25 210:11	145:23,25	294:4,5	183:6 184:25	employees 71:20
240:23 300:9	146:17 153:3	efficiency 28:17	209:2 218:6	76:20 80:11
300:11	237:9 238:17	43:19 44:2,22	267:23 268:5,6	employment
earnings 27:25	268:23 282:8	46:25 81:12,16	271:5,17,20	47:21
28:14 29:11	294:10	82:7 83:16,18	280:2 298:15	enabling 139:22
30:24 31:11	economics 234:5	83:23 84:7	299:4	Enbridge 88:19
	economy 107:2	93:23 121:5	electrical 55:3	88:25

encapsulate 144:2	156:6,10 175:1 175:5 184:11	207:2	equity 25:6,11 25:19,21,24	229:11 233:4 234:20 236:1
encourage 76:3 83:16 115:10 115:24	184:15 189:24 190:3 196:6 198:23 211:3	entire 57:11 119:2 124:23 272:22,23 303:3	28:1,3 30:11 30:13 51:1 72:22 73:4 74:14 85:24	238:8 240:18 242:21 253:5,6 258:5 259:23 260:5,9,11
encouraging 121:5	224:17 226:24 227:2 230:14 230:16 233:15	entirely 162:10 182:4 242:20 291:6	90:16 92:13,14 92:20,21 105:18,22,24	261:2,7 262:4 264:18,20 267:21 271:17
end-use 83:1	265:2,5 267:6 298:2 307:22 308:3 321:4	entirety 162:6 305:4	106:10 108:9 108:16,23 110:16,25	272:19,21,22 273:1,4,5,10 273:12 274:1,4
endeavor 66:20	322:7,18 323:20	entities 167:20	111:13,13,17 111:17,24 112:1 123:3	276:11,12,20 277:4,5,7,8,20 277:24 278:2,4
ended 47:9 87:17 199:2,10 199:17	Energy's 80:25 81:4,19 82:10 83:10,25 84:12	entitled 26:21 101:6 127:23 190:15,23	127:21 128:5 131:9,19 132:14,16	278:8 280:2 282:16 286:14 286:24 289:15
endless 120:14	133:15 235:3	entitlement 190:23 191:4	135:5,20 136:16 137:1 137:13,14	292:20 293:15 293:16 295:23 296:1,14
endpoint 182:10	engage 165:23 246:25	entity 91:15	138:11,25 139:1,19,21,25 140:11,23,25	297:18 298:24 299:1,4,13,15 300:11 302:6
ends 291:5	engagement 165:10,12 166:19 168:6,8	entrants 121:25	142:8,14 144:18 146:24 149:11,13	302:19,22,23 302:25 303:4,6 303:15 304:13
endure 66:14	168:11,19 177:1	entry 16:16,22 143:11,13	150:3,7,9,13 152:2 153:23 163:7 165:13	304:24 305:3,8
endured 60:18 61:24 70:2	engenders 169:9	environment 31:5 112:8 115:20 116:15	165:22 166:1,6 171:13 179:23 179:23 180:5	ER-2010-0355 200:24
energy 13:18,21 14:3,6 16:11 17:10,11,13,16	enormous 61:1	environmental 22:24 24:1 112:17 122:15	180:21 189:3,6 189:10,12,16 191:8,11 192:7	ER-2012-0174 22:18
18:6,9,10 25:7 26:18 28:17 32:3,19 43:19	Enron 244:25	EO-2005-0329 31:16 40:10	194:22 195:10 195:19 197:11 197:19 201:25	ER-2014-0370 12:12 16:5
44:2,22 46:25 62:24 63:15 74:21 80:16,19	ensure 65:12 84:3 139:24 140:1,1 142:7	EPS 240:22 241:11	203:8 204:1 207:14 210:1 210:12,13,18	16:5 era 253:3 erosion 34:20 errata 256:12,24
80:20 81:8,9 81:12,16 82:7 82:8,11 83:3 83:12,16,18,22	192:19 264:18 294:8 302:25	equal 42:17 71:21 72:1 190:17 197:10	217:18 219:1 228:10,11,19	257:7 314:20 314:23 318:21 323:19
84:1,13 85:12 85:15 90:12 93:23 118:21	ensuring 67:16 141:23 284:20	equitable 128:2		Erratum 315:6 316:4
118:21 119:24 120:25 121:5 123:14,16,20	entered 19:6 31:16 68:1 199:9	equities 194:7		erroneously 25:24
123:24 124:3 124:18 125:13 131:23 133:9 134:9,13,19 135:3 143:6,10 143:15,19 147:4,6,22	enterprise 192:13			
	enterprises 140:2			
	enters 69:18			
	entertain 88:12			
	entertained			

error 234:11	249:19 267:19	16:2	exchange 123:12	202:10,17
errors 107:21	270:21 273:13	evidently 137:19	214:15 216:2	203:1,5 209:9
escalating 34:23	273:20,21,25	evolution 51:18	243:14 246:20	209:9 210:22
especially 66:11	276:11,12	89:13	270:9	210:24 244:3,6
70:5 141:16	302:22 303:6	exact 129:16	excited 46:4	244:15 245:20
171:12	estimating	exactly 49:13	exclude 183:11	245:22,24
essential 31:6	201:24	122:16	excluded 162:7	249:7,17 256:6
191:11	et 123:15,15	Examination	excludes 163:22	256:16,21,23
essentially 61:25	EU-2014-0077	152:22 177:18	excluding	278:11,14
69:21 117:22	32:20	187:7 227:8	297:15	280:11,14
119:7 131:19	EU-2015-0094	230:21 254:6	exclusively	281:1,7,10
174:15 183:25	317:17,20	255:18 300:20	168:3	301:17 309:1,3
185:6,12 198:2	318:19	307:9,14,19,21	excuse 22:17	309:5,7,8,10
218:1 220:23	event 95:5	307:23 308:2,5	32:24 35:6	309:12,14,16
223:7 263:14	102:13	examinations	47:20 126:4,18	309:18,20,22
establish 27:6	events 94:23	234:9	153:22 164:3	310:1,3,4,6,8
36:14 65:19	eventually	examined 66:4	166:23 178:12	310:10,12,14
83:17 84:2	114:17,18	275:20 284:10	179:4 180:7,8	310:16,18,20
146:5 176:8	220:25	example 50:12	183:16 185:6	310:22,24
225:23	everybody's	91:5 93:18,25	186:7	311:1,3,5,7,9
established	232:15 302:9	96:22 97:3,13	excused 16:8	311:10,12,13
28:24 45:4,4	everyday 216:16	100:2 110:20	18:11 21:7	311:15,17,19
147:17 217:17	everyone's 114:2	178:15 253:11	117:8 186:22	311:21,23,24
296:4	evidence 26:3	254:17,19	230:12 255:8	312:1,3,5,6,8
establishing	53:6,11 58:3	270:15 299:4	305:19,21	312:10,12,14
296:5	63:21 72:19	exceed 106:23	executed 101:3	312:16,17,19
estimate 24:7	76:11 77:5,22	107:3 282:12	executive 16:12	312:20,22,23
37:22 38:6	86:3 88:9	exceeded 28:24	26:18 143:16	313:1,3,5,7,9
133:11 155:9	119:20 120:21	204:17	143:19 147:6	313:11,13,15
168:9 169:18	132:13 133:23	exceeding	289:9	313:17,19,21
169:21,23	136:12 138:10	222:23	exercise 133:19	313:23,24
172:16 173:14	154:17 157:19	excellent 51:21	137:8 176:3	314:1,3,5,6,7,9
173:22 177:9	180:25 181:3	74:8	264:21	314:11,13,15
177:10 189:2,5	181:23 188:16	exception 24:20	exhibit 20:11	314:18,21,24
217:18 219:2	203:5 210:3,15	67:13 85:4	21:24 37:18	315:1,3,6,6,8,9
220:9 258:7	210:16 232:19	exceptional	153:5,6,13,14	315:11,12,14
264:19 273:5	247:3 251:7	122:21	154:4 157:5,8	315:16,18,20
274:9 277:13	257:17 258:15	exceptions 32:13	157:10,17,19	315:22,24
277:14 293:15	280:1,14	excerpt 275:24	180:13,15,18	316:1,3,5,7,9
302:24 305:12	281:10 297:3	excess 283:7	180:25 181:2,3	316:10,12,14
estimated 177:1	302:21 305:22	excessive 71:18	181:5,11,16,18	316:16,17,19
220:4 240:18	307:7,17 308:3	108:17	181:20,23	316:21,23,24
estimates 73:11	319:14	excessively	184:19 185:1	317:1,3,4,6,8
131:19 173:11	evidentiary 12:5	71:17	187:18 188:1,3	317:10,12,14

317:16,19,21 317:23 318:1,3 318:5,7,9,11 318:12,14,15 318:17,18,20 318:22,24 319:1,3,4,6,7,9 319:11,13,15 319:17,18,20 319:21,23 320:1,3,5,7,9 320:11,13,15 320:17,19,21 320:23,25 321:1,3,5,7,9 321:10,12,14 321:16,18,19 321:21,23 322:1,3,6,8,10 322:11,13,15 322:17,19,21 322:23 323:1,3 323:4,6,8,10 323:11,13,15 323:17,18,21 323:23 324:1,3 324:5,7 exhibited 178:14 exhibits 19:24 21:14,16,18,20 21:22 22:1,3,5 24:12 39:12 153:10 154:11 154:14,16 157:6 188:11 188:12,13,15 231:3,8,11,24 232:18 251:6 255:25 257:12 257:16 exist 28:7 38:13 existed 277:25 existing 50:18 141:17 185:7	260:10 exists 111:20 259:24 260:3 expand 67:12 167:4 168:5 215:23 270:6 expanded 173:19 expanding 46:5 expansion 131:8 expansionary 239:4 expect 18:20 129:25 220:21 229:6 239:9 240:14 284:6 expectation 112:16 expectations 217:1 252:25 expected 24:4 38:15 91:15 139:7 196:12 302:4 expecting 31:25 expects 24:5 296:11 expenditures 22:23 expense 51:7,8 70:23 71:9,10 72:16 87:20 108:19,19 109:1 192:18 expenses 29:21 29:23 33:3,4 66:10 70:21 71:11,16,16,22 72:4,6,7,8,10 72:12,13 84:25 90:5,6 95:4 104:14 191:21 191:25 208:22 209:6 282:3	experience 23:2 47:6 52:18 96:1 98:23 119:25 123:20 141:10 166:20 284:11 experienced 28:21 30:20 47:25 48:14 176:7 223:3 experiences 102:19 experiencing 28:15 29:3 60:8 144:24 expert 74:18 102:18,22 134:19 137:9,9 139:10 140:12 144:6,12 149:6 196:17 199:14 209:23 268:19 268:20 expert's 138:4 experts 23:20 44:3 131:20,21 132:5,6,11 133:6 137:11 139:11 140:6 144:17 166:10 174:18 277:19 explain 24:9 29:9 78:6,20 81:1 132:3 155:4 177:21 226:1 257:2 301:11 304:16 explained 71:12 144:12 explaining 79:5 133:4 explains 63:4 69:7,9,19 70:18 71:22	79:12 113:7 explanation 280:4 explanatory 182:15 exposure 104:10 express 246:8 expressed 141:5 expressly 102:22 extend 65:8 extent 21:5 44:10 57:22 77:1 80:13 81:6 120:24 122:3 142:19 165:22 173:24 176:9 205:1 217:24 252:25 261:5 262:24 285:13 292:9 296:3 external 261:7 extra 118:13 142:19 extraneous 57:13,15 extraordinary 94:24 95:5,10 95:14,19,20,24 96:4 98:2,9,14 99:23 100:4,11 122:24 123:1 extrinsic 53:11 77:4 eyes 128:14,15	58:9 67:24,25 68:3,4,7,14,19 68:20,25 69:2 69:4,7,10,19 70:6,8,9 75:4,7 78:24 79:14 80:11 87:9 89:21 95:11,11 101:22 123:11 123:17 124:7 124:18 197:12 225:13,21 262:6,7,12,18 264:13 287:15 287:20 288:5 291:23,23,25 292:2,8,10,11 292:24 303:10 303:10,12 face 69:22 243:11 faced 31:5 93:16 100:12 110:17 141:1 facilities 147:8 147:25 facing 115:14,24 fact 26:24 29:5 45:12 46:20 47:10 52:12,24 63:5 64:10 70:6 74:3 99:15 104:18 106:22 109:7 109:11 118:11 124:14 128:21 141:16 145:1 151:7 200:12 212:24 227:16 236:4 243:8 267:12,14,18 272:10 factor 28:14 191:23 192:10
--	--	---	--	--

277:10,12,12	fairness 72:12	26:18 130:22	80:20 82:1	282:23,24,25
278:2 292:12	141:23 193:4	143:15,19	85:25 86:5,6,8	297:11 303:1
factors 28:19	193:17,22,22	147:6,19,24	86:12,17,21	303:20
71:3 92:21	faith 91:13	171:14 179:6	87:10 123:14	financially
145:16 192:16	fall 130:23 213:1	179:10 212:13	125:25 139:2	325:11
192:20 194:3	254:21 255:2	212:25 214:11	141:4 143:7	find 25:22 36:23
203:17 223:20	291:10	214:13,23	172:22 266:11	75:22 100:23
274:5 275:9	fallen 130:18	238:24 239:3	267:9 306:4	105:15 107:5
284:17 287:12	falling 130:21	266:3,8 269:7	314:20,23	123:24 165:24
287:24 291:25	fallout 297:11	269:10,12	315:4,8 316:4	185:21 224:21
301:4	falls 49:20 96:10	289:9	317:17,20	243:5 247:2
facts 64:15	false 173:8	feds 138:7	318:19,21	248:25 249:3
285:2	familiar 66:9,9	feel 23:17 171:8	files 106:17	255:1 273:4
factual 64:13	86:11 202:5,17	293:10	filing 28:13 38:5	294:21
fail 163:1	207:1 244:10	feeling 125:10	40:21 41:3	finder 52:24
fails 81:17	245:5 246:2	fees 31:10 33:25	57:2 68:3,23	finding 56:2
failure 49:15	269:15 270:7	37:7 70:18	79:17 81:24	149:1 272:24
fair 47:5 50:21	families 59:18	87:20	273:8	293:21 294:11
74:24 75:1	59:19	fell 61:8 224:22	filings 101:20	298:23 299:3
117:22 118:1	family 59:22,23	felt 123:20	final 162:10	299:13 305:1,7
119:20 120:1	63:13	287:12 290:13	208:7 210:22	findings 64:9,11
140:5,5 142:25	family-owned	290:17,17	210:23 223:24	71:6 106:5
146:24 148:23	60:2	FFO 282:13	272:12	272:21 273:4
156:24 172:23	fan 54:10	283:6,13	finalized 24:3	298:20 299:16
176:10 179:5	fancy 122:2	field 102:18	finally 21:5 93:3	302:20
190:25 191:10	fans 59:13	fifth 48:24 92:23	97:11 98:21	finds 102:13
193:5,19	far 19:13 122:22	fighting 68:16	99:4 111:11,22	fine 21:3 143:9
202:21 203:11	130:5 163:23	figure 58:19	114:5 128:18	288:16
207:16 212:23	164:5,9 203:22	118:9 162:9,15	164:22 216:1	finish 186:7
216:10 220:11	205:24 248:23	177:6 248:8	305:9	fired 104:24
221:1,7 222:7	249:13 271:5	figures 55:6	finance 214:1	firm 166:7 168:8
223:22 236:23	278:16	134:24 135:4	216:4,21,22	168:10 176:6
237:22 247:6	fast 111:9	137:5 231:19	297:11	243:20
258:6 260:12	faster 107:2	232:9 250:20	finances 98:6	firms 244:19
262:4 266:5	113:21 114:2	file 12:12 16:5	financial 128:1,1	first 20:7 22:10
268:3 275:2	father 234:16	18:23 28:9	137:5 139:25	27:1,2 29:17
277:16 281:12	favors 195:23	32:20 41:8	141:21 168:19	42:22 53:2
296:13 299:11	Featherstone	68:24 96:23	169:12 182:22	54:4 70:9
305:2	21:2 91:7	276:18	191:10,16	79:19 81:4
fairly 78:10	102:4 113:24	filed 19:2 20:17	192:13,19	88:3 89:20
98:15 105:19	316:3,5,7,9	23:21 28:12	194:24 207:12	92:4 97:24
105:20 147:16	fed 128:15,15,15	56:14 61:23	207:19 212:12	98:1 100:13
175:21 178:10	269:8,11	66:24 67:23	243:17 273:2	101:1,16 102:2
182:11	federal 16:11	68:15 71:12	282:11,14,14	102:20 108:16

117:16 118:14	297:6	follow-up 183:2	309:3,5	153:3
121:19 127:16	fixed 59:19 61:6	followed 123:23	forth 100:17	Francisco 14:17
128:11,20	82:23 120:20	following 47:7	Fortunate	frankly 52:3
129:8 130:11	120:21	184:19 252:22	285:20	171:9 287:14
130:13 131:17	fixing 191:11	follows 152:21	forward 20:12	297:10
131:22 135:19	flat 29:3,15	187:6 230:18	36:12 81:22	fraud 246:25
135:22,25	43:15 46:24	255:15	115:11 116:8	free 67:13,14
139:21 151:21	115:16 130:15	fooled 137:8	250:3 259:21	107:20
152:18 153:11	130:16 174:15	footnote 133:13	260:1 261:6,9	freeze 81:20
154:18 180:21	184:1 209:11	213:25 244:13	261:11 304:23	frequency 34:22
182:6 183:6	209:15 210:10	244:15,18	forward-looking	fresh 290:24
185:16 205:18	flaw 63:7	249:10,12	133:19 149:20	front 24:14 57:3
213:20 222:1	flawed 92:15,16	250:11,14	forwards 222:13	79:22 138:10
232:22 233:22	flight 129:3	forced 61:19,21	found 24:8	154:24 213:10
242:14 247:11	floating 171:17	61:22 63:18	64:19 95:18,19	224:12
249:21,24	floor 13:3 14:8	Ford 88:19,22	102:21 106:11	frustration
250:1 257:24	14:17,24	88:23	106:11,15	141:5
271:6,9 272:1	118:16	fore 282:12	107:14 146:20	frustrations
272:15 297:17	flow 131:22,24	forecast 34:10	183:25 218:2	61:25
Fischer 13:9,10	144:15 155:14	44:13 254:18	222:6 231:11	fuel 19:5 27:6,7
16:21 20:10	281:15 282:15	254:25 282:12	275:19 277:21	29:19 30:18,24
22:12 35:5,11	283:5,10,18	forecasted 31:9	277:22	31:19,23 32:4
35:14,16,18,20	284:4	34:14 36:2	foundation	32:7,10,13,15
39:15,17,21	flows 197:15	276:4 301:1	162:24 163:1	33:1,5,12
40:1,4,11,14	282:9,20 284:9	forecasts 133:18	263:5	34:12,13,14,16
40:19,24 41:10	303:19	133:19 242:25	Fountains 51:11	34:17 41:5
41:14,17,19,21	flurry 137:5	243:1 254:16	117:3	42:23 45:8
42:2,12,21	focus 90:5	foreclosed 19:4	four 19:17 53:8	65:14,18 67:22
43:3,10,13,17	111:23 112:1	foregoing 325:4	53:10 57:10	69:15,19,23
43:20,23 44:3	119:17 122:11	325:5	66:23 72:23	70:7 86:10
44:7,17,24	132:10 133:4	forfeited 111:1	93:8 97:2	87:20 92:8
45:7,12,17,20	141:22 145:12	forget 87:23	103:12 109:4	93:23 94:13,15
45:21 51:1	183:10 204:3	form 16:22	117:15 131:21	100:1,4,13,14
115:15 125:15	focused 112:1	23:14 303:3	133:8 137:11	100:22,25
307:2	135:16 183:14	formal 21:11	139:11 212:5,9	101:10 102:11
fit 122:12	focuses 112:2	57:2	240:19 265:23	102:18,21
five 28:12 34:24	146:2	format 176:4	265:25 279:22	103:5,8 104:15
35:1 58:15	focusing 216:24	forming 302:22	291:13,14	104:21,24
59:23 60:11,14	folks 48:23	formula 290:19	304:15	105:8,12,15
60:18 63:13	168:10 243:19	formulaic	Fourth 92:18	118:14,22,25
92:3 95:15	306:9	205:18,21,24	fraction 63:12	119:12,18,19
96:2 162:13	follow 68:1	formulation	frame 213:24	119:23 120:5
163:6 207:18	170:6 202:6,8	273:3	291:12	120:15 124:3
212:9 266:2,4	223:20 228:7	Forrest 306:3	Framingham	194:21 197:22

198:5,14 208:14,16 209:5 227:19 258:21,24 259:2,2,4,4,5,6 259:7,8,9,10 259:14,15,16 259:19 260:19 261:10,12 263:16,22,23 263:25 264:2,3 264:5 280:17 282:1,2 283:15 283:16,18,19 283:20,21,22 284:1,4,7,14 284:18,19,22 285:15,15,17 285:24 286:3,9 286:10,10,11 286:22,25 287:1,2,8 288:7 290:22 290:25 291:21 292:8,16,18 295:8,9 300:6 303:21 fuels 263:24 fulfill 138:22 full 88:20 130:21 245:16 fully 163:7 259:3 299:21 301:15 302:9 fully-litigated 162:23 functions 176:1 fund 122:6 216:2 270:9 285:23 fundamental 181:17 fundamentals 221:5 223:2	funded 121:22 funding 84:17 85:1 122:2 282:16 285:16 funds 142:8 179:10 214:13 214:23 238:24 269:12 283:13 further 77:21 79:24 89:12 105:9 127:5 141:13 164:12 166:22 174:25 177:14 182:25 183:5 186:18 189:19 224:22 230:8 250:23 253:20 265:1 288:9 305:17 306:22 307:15 325:9 Furthermore 98:17 99:23 146:14 further 141:21 future 65:21 106:12 206:18 206:24 213:4 239:18 286:17 futures 179:10	167:22 263:23 266:13,16,23 267:22 268:3,7 268:8,8 291:2 gathering 176:3 gauge 275:11 gauging 278:3 Gaw 101:14 GDP 47:10,21 61:17 106:23 107:1,4 149:16 149:18,21 222:14 241:25 247:17,22 250:11,14,20 general 12:13 14:1,7 16:4 19:16 22:14 28:12 33:6 36:17 44:14 46:12 75:13 81:13 101:20 103:8 114:21 123:14 125:9 141:8 147:18 166:1 190:18 194:9,15 200:8 204:13,20 generally 109:22 113:3 115:15 148:24 166:3 169:7 190:17 199:1 244:10 246:2 248:15 249:14 267:21 268:6,22 279:19 288:20 289:7 296:1,11 generated 83:2 generation 84:5 104:5,23 182:24 284:21 generically 195:23	gentleman 237:9 Geoff 319:16,17 319:19 getting 36:23 94:10 126:14 138:8 276:24 291:21 300:10 giddy 250:2 give 24:10 37:16 38:18,23 41:22 50:12 96:8,9 102:10 111:8 116:9 162:21 177:5,8 246:17 274:17,18 280:7 287:24 296:10 298:19 given 20:10 38:14 70:1,6 74:3 94:10 104:1 107:3 119:3 132:3,16 133:24,24 137:3 148:5 150:15 155:21 155:21 193:16 230:5 250:17 301:11 304:10 gives 37:19 59:16 64:14 74:7 112:7 119:22 216:23 292:22 299:2 giving 52:12 80:18 82:8 155:17 226:5 glad 218:21 global 244:11,14 244:18 245:1 GMO 30:1,18 30:18,20 45:5 85:4 110:1 202:1 235:5 278:25 287:8	287:11,14,20 288:5,7 GMO's 235:6 287:12 go 18:16 20:6 21:6,10 22:8 26:9 31:25 32:8 34:5 51:4 51:4 57:13 61:21,22 73:22 77:9 79:9 80:4 90:15,18 97:18 97:18,19 100:7 103:14 105:9 108:14 109:20 111:9,24 116:19 124:11 125:11 127:8 127:15 129:4 129:25 131:4 134:5 150:17 150:20 154:9 155:6 156:24 158:25 175:22 177:21 179:23 183:3 184:2 187:2 188:10 195:25 205:15 227:9 228:24 229:7 232:3 233:19 237:8 237:17 240:8 242:5,11 246:25 255:14 269:18 271:20 273:22 277:5,5 277:8 278:14 282:22 288:21 goal 74:25 goals 66:2 81:12 81:15 goes 19:21 46:6 97:22 113:22 121:9 179:23
--	--	--	--	--

207:10 245:17 272:1 283:4 going 19:14 22:20 25:2,14 34:2 35:7 36:11 39:13,15 41:12,13 43:1 43:3 48:17 50:3,16 52:5,7 53:15 56:6,12 57:8,14 73:11 74:2 81:22 85:20 90:6,6 90:15 91:23 92:3 97:18,18 97:19 98:24 101:22,23 103:7,18,21 111:9 117:25 118:4 122:10 122:12,13 125:14,15,23 127:14 128:6,8 128:9 129:25 131:4,8,17 133:20,23 137:11 146:13 150:16,20 151:1 154:5 163:2,15,19,25 170:15 173:7 185:25 212:14 212:17,21,25 212:25 213:12 218:12,18 221:13 222:9 229:17 232:3 237:7 239:6,7 239:19 240:5 245:16 246:5 249:16 259:21 259:25 261:6,8 261:11 274:18 278:7 279:3,19	286:17,19,21 290:22 296:17 297:14 good 16:1 17:7 17:14,18,22 18:7 19:23 22:12 39:20,21 42:19 47:22,22 50:12 53:25 54:18 56:10,11 70:15 73:17 85:13 87:13 88:15 89:18 90:13 110:20 116:2 117:12 130:16 138:18 154:21,22 156:17,18 164:19,20 170:3,22,23 175:14,15 186:23 188:23 190:8 208:19 225:9,10 233:3 233:21 238:18 251:19 253:17 265:11,12 288:17 290:8,9 293:24,25 300:12,13 Gorman 26:9 74:12,22 85:24 106:22 107:14 107:14,17 108:3 131:13 131:24 132:17 136:7 139:12 140:9 142:12 146:8 148:16 148:20,22 149:9,20 150:12,24 151:13,20 155:3,9,19	235:1 255:11 255:15,20,21 255:23 258:2 265:11 273:17 278:7,13 281:3 281:21 288:15 290:7 299:7 300:21 305:18 308:4 322:20 322:22,24 323:3,19 Gorman's 26:11 26:14 74:19 107:20,22 149:21 150:7 152:3 154:23 155:7,25 314:14 gotten 122:22 government 29:6 129:3 government's 147:20,24 GPE 198:9,13 GPE's 197:7 grant 70:8 74:17 75:7 194:23 230:3 282:1 286:3 granted 16:10 18:12,24 20:8 21:4 47:3 99:15 117:10 119:4 194:8,14 195:17,17 205:12 206:20 226:15 227:14 241:4 251:22 253:5 260:20 292:11,23 granting 31:7 62:12 252:23 253:10 grants 194:20	graph 73:12 180:11 209:12 276:25 graphic 23:14 graphs 27:20 gratified 164:22 gray 23:16 great 25:7 47:7 49:5 54:12 92:9 93:18 96:22 97:3,13 109:18,19 134:8 141:11 178:25 196:6 202:1 211:3 234:15 235:3 greater 30:2 64:17 134:11 186:8 204:18 282:16 283:6 287:2,5 292:22 greatest 69:13 greatly 70:6 green 23:15 Greg 86:20,23 86:23 323:17 gross 47:8 133:11 316:11 group 13:21 17:13 84:2 90:12 106:2 167:14 195:9 214:15,16,25 260:25 289:7 300:4 304:22 322:7 groups 167:11 285:21 289:9 305:1 grow 107:2 220:21 growing 51:19 66:18 73:14 113:21 114:1	130:11,13,17 grown 34:25 growth 28:16,21 29:5 30:20 38:14 43:12,15 44:25,25 45:1 45:2,2,13 46:23 47:8,10 48:5 106:13,14 106:16,17,19 106:22,23,23 106:25 107:3,4 114:3 117:18 117:19,24 118:3,10,11 122:12 128:19 130:1 131:11 131:11 133:3,6 133:12 145:11 145:14,18 149:16,19,21 149:25 196:22 216:10 217:1,8 217:9,11,16,16 217:17 218:25 219:13,14,21 220:4,9,16,20 220:23 221:17 222:3,8,20,21 222:22 223:1,2 223:6 239:15 239:17,21,22 239:25 240:5,7 240:22 241:1 241:25 242:3,9 242:10,15,16 242:19 243:1 243:10,16 244:8 247:11 247:15,17,23 248:2 249:13 249:20 250:5,9 250:11,16,20 254:16,18,20
---	---	--	---	--

255:1 263:2 267:15 282:8 314:10 GSA 147:21 148:5,5,6 guess 41:10 49:1 53:13 118:14 118:15 137:23 191:1,2 194:25 195:25,25 197:16,17,17 199:19 200:6 200:21 204:2,3 204:4,7,11 206:22,25 207:21,21 211:15,16,20 212:1 213:3,4 213:5 214:4 215:5,5,19 216:21,25 217:1 219:7 220:18 221:4 222:1,25 223:5 225:17 226:9 228:12,14 284:14 298:18 guessing 42:5 guidance 76:16 94:16,21 95:8 102:10 262:19 guide 296:12 guiding 127:20 128:5 138:19 guys 50:3	Hall 12:19 45:18 56:10,12,18,22 57:1,4,8,23 58:1,5,10,20 58:23 77:12,15 77:18,25 78:9 78:22 79:1,7,9 79:24 85:10 88:15,17,22,24 89:2,7,12,15 89:24 90:3,8 115:1 116:24 125:6 136:21 143:4 147:3,9 147:14 148:2,7 170:21 174:16 180:3 183:2,4 183:5 184:6,20 225:7,8 226:16 227:10 251:18 252:17,22 279:17 293:23 297:19 307:13 307:15,20,25 308:8 Hall's 71:12 182:1 184:8 298:9 Hampshire 231:1 234:5 Hampton 17:2 hand 40:22 91:22 93:22 145:15 150:10 157:1 181:5 213:12 handed 202:12 244:5 245:24 256:23 handful 167:25 handling 16:6 86:1,7,14,18 86:23 happen 212:21	280:23 happened 55:14 111:10 129:13 happening 130:12 169:10 174:4,4 240:13 240:14 happens 106:17 happy 24:1 39:7 50:25 57:18 88:12 116:21 131:2 155:6 hard 36:22 37:17 61:5 129:21 harder 48:6,7 300:15 hardest 63:17 Hardesty 310:25 311:3,5,7 hardships 60:7 Harris 316:12 316:14 hash 174:18 hassles 119:1 haven 74:14 HC 187:19 256:3 257:23 he'll 103:2 head 91:6 headline 203:7 headlines 128:8 heads 92:1 99:19 hear 45:24 49:17 59:9 109:17 114:19 121:12 137:5 138:6,8 138:9 232:16 274:15 289:1 heard 59:7,9 60:24 69:2 86:24 108:9 125:23,24	126:22 137:22 138:6 139:18 141:3 148:17 148:20 149:4 176:25 177:5 214:17 237:17 305:10 306:7 hearing 12:5 16:3,9 18:11 18:15 19:15 21:6 24:23 61:22 117:9 154:15 157:17 181:1,22 188:13 203:3 213:3 251:4 257:14 280:13 281:9 290:1 306:24 325:4,5 325:9 hearings 121:8 141:4 163:14 164:5 heat 84:6 heavily 239:14 heavy 66:14 Heidtbrink 311:9 height 297:11 held 34:13 94:19 94:23 95:3 159:3 Hello 290:7 help 50:8 80:14 176:7,8 274:5 277:10 278:2 helpful 125:16 helps 102:1 HENRY 14:13 Hevert 50:25 106:1,21 107:9 108:5,6 128:25 129:6 131:12 131:14,25	132:24 133:10 135:7 136:10 137:17 139:15 144:12,20 145:2,11 146:5 149:17 152:18 152:19,21,24 153:4 154:21 156:4,17 157:21 164:19 164:24 165:4,9 167:2 175:14 177:19 181:16 181:25 186:19 216:8 222:2,9 235:1 236:11 239:14 240:7 242:15 247:3 272:7,15,21 277:19 299:10 299:19 302:12 305:11 307:8 311:11,12,14 Hevert's 106:7,9 107:6 132:2 134:1 135:13 136:5 144:12 144:18 145:5,6 145:22 146:2 149:10,12,13 149:25 150:10 151:24 213:7 213:21 237:3 237:10 242:19 247:10 250:19 254:16,24 257:4 268:14 276:23,25 298:10,18,21 301:4,16,25 hey 54:11 high 13:20 14:1 26:14 60:12 63:4 73:3
---	---	---	---	---

74:11 106:12 106:14,15,16 106:16 107:6 121:2 128:18 129:11 132:2 133:5 146:11 169:8,11 178:9 179:2,13 204:9 220:5 243:2 247:21,24 248:1 252:9 273:19 274:15 275:17 291:3 293:18 294:9 high-end 282:13 high-priced 71:18 high-ranking 56:23 higher 25:16 29:13 34:17 47:11 48:13,13 49:2 55:5,7,8 55:12,15 64:10 84:7 93:25 94:4,4,6,6 109:8,11 111:18 112:24 114:15,16 131:9 138:2 185:23 189:8 220:16,21 226:5 242:16 267:13,14 270:20,22,23 271:21 274:8 275:4 279:8,14 290:14 291:5 292:4 293:17 301:19 highest 109:6,13 129:12 130:3 130:20 210:25 241:24	highlighting 231:18 highly 103:11,12 103:23 178:14 220:13 309:6 309:11,15,19 309:23 310:7 310:11,15,19 310:23 311:4,8 311:18,22 312:4,9,15 313:6,10,14,18 313:22 314:23 315:7,15,21,25 316:8,15,20 317:7,11,15,20 317:24 318:6 319:10 320:4,8 320:12,16,20 320:24 321:22 322:4,24 323:14 highly-acclai... 117:4 highs 129:7 Hill 231:1 hinted 266:6 hiring 128:14 historical 29:9 31:5 33:25 52:12 108:6 112:10 133:18 135:24 149:19 239:19 262:13 262:18 historically 28:20 106:24 144:24 169:8 169:11 178:9 196:7 history 26:15 34:25 93:4 hit 61:11 62:3 63:16 78:5	129:11,20 135:23 217:5 hitting 129:7 HOFFMAN 152:15 156:9 175:4 184:14 254:1 265:8 298:5 holding 262:25 holds 254:23 home 59:22 61:17 63:13 117:4,5 homes 59:21 62:4 73:6,7,18 honest 42:13 honor 17:14 18:7 20:16 21:5 90:13 103:11 115:5 117:3 125:20 126:19 143:7 152:13,15 154:11 156:5 156:15 157:9 158:21,24 164:15 174:25 175:12 180:24 184:10,16 188:21 189:25 226:20,25 231:23 232:8 232:20 234:15 251:1 254:5 255:3 257:11 265:3 298:3 300:19 hope 19:17 26:20 62:1 71:14 76:2 127:22 139:20 164:21 190:11 191:15 193:16 194:3 231:1	273:11 293:6 302:23 hoping 89:12 266:9 horribly 66:10 host 82:19 hot 118:16 hour 30:21 71:18 126:25 176:16,16,17 177:4 hourly 71:18 168:6,7,8 176:13 289:23 305:10,12 hours 82:23 175:17 177:2,6 household 47:21 households 141:2 housing 128:17 130:2,5,7 215:15 269:25 270:3 huddled 248:9 huge 54:10 hum 131:2 hundred 162:14 167:19 304:14 hundreds 93:9 hurt 113:5 203:8 204:1 hydro 291:2 Hyman 321:9,11 Hymn 131:5 Hyneman 91:7 316:16,18,20 hypothetical 262:5,22 263:4	Iatan-2 101:7 IBEW 18:1 ice 96:8 idea 59:16 162:21 identical 262:7 262:18 292:12 292:24 identification 21:15,17,19,21 21:23,25 22:2 22:4,6 157:8 180:15 181:11 202:10 244:3 245:22 256:21 278:11 281:1 identified 19:8 identify 87:24 157:1 181:16 identifying 272:18 IEC 101:22 ignore 68:5 221:20,24,25 ignored 145:1 ignores 144:20 Iles 13:15 17:19 86:2 148:11,12 148:15 152:10 156:13 175:8 184:18,22,23 186:10 189:21 226:22 233:12 253:24 255:18 256:15,19,22 257:11,18,21 257:23 300:19 300:20 305:17 307:15 308:5 ill-advised 66:10 illegal 89:4 Illinois 14:21 107:19 266:12 266:12,23
---	--	--	--	---

267:6,25	258:24 260:6	128:24	60:2 69:10	121:3
270:18 288:23	262:12 286:22	improvements	80:21 82:22	incomes 59:19
304:1,4	303:12	22:25 71:25	83:21 85:22	incomplete
illustrated 48:15	implemented	200:15	97:5 108:23	262:22 263:4
illustrates 50:21	262:15,17	improves 266:7	109:2 124:3	277:14
illustrative	263:16 287:3	improving 82:9	151:18 163:24	inconsistency
39:12	292:16	216:9,12,17,18	164:9 183:8,15	81:15
imagine 176:3	implementing	216:19	205:18 224:5	inconsistent
immediate	259:15,19,20	imprudent	235:18,25	63:6 81:11
87:12	261:18 264:4,7	71:21	271:25 284:8	incorporate
immediately	292:18 303:10	in-camera	302:21	239:23 254:20
65:6 91:1	implications	103:15 158:25	included 29:14	incorporated
286:21	65:23	159:2 307:11	31:18 34:7,14	134:9 211:4
impact 34:4	implicit 57:5	In-Dept 314:8	36:15 37:8,23	236:13
37:22 38:6	implied 214:21	In-Depth 202:19	38:5,7 55:1	incorporates
39:24 44:20	215:2	in-service 23:19	68:14 71:13	112:15
48:12 60:4	importance 92:9	23:20 139:6	73:3 84:16	incorporating
61:10 64:11	118:19 145:23	inability 43:9	108:19 236:5	242:8,14
65:1 93:4	236:22	44:1	287:23 302:9	increase 12:13
121:3,24	important 27:5	inaccurate	includes 71:15	16:4 22:14,16
185:16 261:21	27:15 38:9	249:1 262:22	82:21 83:18	22:22 23:3,5,7
263:15 294:18	75:3 94:12	263:4	93:19 183:7	23:12 34:16
301:12,13	105:25 109:16	inaccurately	193:24 248:6	37:24 38:7
303:11,15	118:24 119:15	91:13	252:10	44:19 46:3,7,7
304:14	119:16 121:10	inadequate	including 22:24	46:13,14,15,15
impacted 59:17	122:14 132:10	277:14	31:9 70:22	46:16,18,19
60:5 298:25	143:25 145:5	inadvertent	75:7 84:5	47:3,25 48:2,4
304:17	151:14 201:25	257:4	93:12 96:1	48:6,11,15,21
impacts 59:25	263:21 303:1	inadvertently	101:2 136:2	48:22,23,24,25
62:14 81:17	importantly	20:5	145:17 149:11	49:3,4 51:13
286:21 304:16	291:16	inappropriate	162:23 164:5	55:13,15,15
impair 295:22	imposed 50:13	98:1	192:3 196:13	59:10 60:23
impediment	98:6	incentive 70:7	234:25 275:9	61:1,6,11,19
285:10	impossible 97:8	72:3 84:21	275:19 276:5	62:10,11,13,21
implement	impression	120:2 259:8	281:14 282:12	63:2 64:4,5
12:13 16:4	121:19	294:16	283:6 300:25	66:13,17 73:23
22:13 88:4	improper	incentives 83:14	302:11 304:22	74:6 81:7,7,10
93:8 94:12,16	109:16	83:14 93:15,16	314:20,23	88:10 93:5,17
100:3,22 105:8	improve 47:21	94:3 120:12	316:4 318:21	98:4 104:12,13
110:13 112:18	267:15	294:4,5,10,23	inclusion 108:24	112:2 113:10
259:19 262:6	improved 82:4	inclined 236:9	income 47:21	113:11,20
264:12 304:20	216:25 270:3	include 32:25	61:6 75:19	114:6 118:7
implementation	282:14 303:23	33:17,22 34:10	80:24 84:13,14	130:4 139:8,16
92:5 93:14	improvement	36:2 59:18	84:24 87:22	141:21 142:4

142:10 150:11 151:17 179:10 214:22 238:10 269:2,5,9 274:11 279:25 294:21 296:16 296:18 302:10 increased 28:22 29:1 48:10 62:9 70:25 81:6 113:17 120:25 129:9 129:14 130:2,3 130:5,19 146:6 178:19 213:22 214:7 215:15 237:13 269:5 269:25 280:5 301:23 increases 28:12 29:6 35:1,2 36:1 38:15 45:3 48:12 54:25 60:17,19 60:20,23 61:8 62:1,7,8 70:2,4 113:23 118:8 141:6,16 178:15 179:14 212:5 277:9 301:5 increasing 29:1 29:24 35:9 36:12 62:5 66:18 82:24 96:17,18 115:16 121:7 123:1 129:14 130:25 141:5 146:1 237:24 238:1,1 296:19 296:20 incremental 98:4,5,18	incurred 71:4,16 72:6,7,8,10 284:12 incurs 108:17 109:2 Independence 14:4 independent 261:24 index 48:4,16 113:15 129:14 214:6 307:1 308:1 309:1 310:1 311:1 312:1 313:1 314:1 315:1 316:1 317:1 318:1 319:1 320:1 321:1 322:1 323:1 324:1 indicate 195:22 203:25 216:9 indicated 32:24 32:25 89:3 129:16 130:18 130:22 135:7 201:14 271:16 272:3 indicates 25:21 40:16 indicating 24:17 24:19 indication 118:3 292:22 305:3 indications 237:25 238:17 240:6 266:8 indicative 174:3 indicator 145:13 145:14 indicators 58:11 145:23,25 260:24 261:3	indices 212:20 indirect 110:8 indisputable 297:3 individual 83:6 individuals 93:14 175:25 176:1 industrial 13:18 17:16 26:10 48:16 83:19 85:12,15 114:6 114:7,8,11,13 114:13,17,18 114:20 122:20 144:7 205:17 267:6 270:8 285:21 288:19 289:5,18 304:22 305:1 308:3 322:18 Industrials 132:2 133:9 134:10 135:2 Industrials' 133:14 industry 73:22 74:13 116:4 140:11 146:7 189:15 233:4 245:1 267:24 297:14 inevitable 90:22 inevitably 91:16 inexplicably 91:3 inflated 92:13 105:18 106:17 106:19,22 109:2 110:5 149:14,25 inflater 108:7 inflation 108:6 250:17,21	inflationary 48:14 influence 202:2 246:12 influenced 64:12 information 16:21 23:2 44:9,12 77:22 91:13 103:13 103:24 145:21 150:24 151:20 217:25 218:7 219:8 221:11 223:4 239:23 243:17 273:6,7 273:23 275:8 275:20 296:7 296:10 informed 273:9 285:14,19 informing 274:12 infrastructure 23:10,16 27:8 36:5 50:14 65:12 208:25 infrequent 95:21 123:2 inherent 93:15 94:3 initial 66:24 128:21 214:12 238:24 initiative 66:16 initiatives 28:18 innovations 115:21,23 116:18 innovative 115:11 inputs 149:8 166:13,15 insert 135:3 inserts 135:5	insight 123:10 insignificant 185:21 inspection 50:14 installations 28:19 43:19 44:2,10,23 instances 165:16 295:8 institute 89:18 215:21 225:13 225:20 270:4 instructions 94:22 instrumental 102:8 instruments 148:25 integrated 32:11 151:12 158:19 183:15 298:25 integrity 128:1 139:25 191:16 192:13,20 273:2 303:1 intend 56:24 77:3 78:5 179:7 250:24 intended 77:6 272:17 intensive 179:21 intent 43:2,4 51:25 53:5,5,7 53:12 76:12 122:22 123:15 intention 87:6 interest 26:6,7 34:18 64:6,20 64:21 65:7 67:8,21 70:8 128:12,16 129:4 138:7 146:1 178:7,9 178:21,21
---	--	--	--	---

179:3,4,4,7,12 179:14,22,23 203:13,18,24 204:8,10,13,14 204:19 212:14 212:21 238:3,5 240:8 243:11 244:20 245:3 247:4 253:3 266:4,6 269:9 274:9,11 276:20 277:4 277:10,20,24 278:1,6 interested 19:11 82:7 119:22 120:18 325:11 interesting 106:24 137:22 interestingly 93:11 131:9 interests 67:11 147:20 148:1 152:4 252:12 interim 118:21 118:21 119:24 123:14,16,20 123:24 124:3 124:18 interns 175:20 175:22 interpret 43:4 68:11,12 172:21 303:3 interpretation 49:24 78:13,14 79:2 119:17 166:15 173:8 273:25 274:12 299:14 interrupt 35:4,7 220:17 interrupting 35:19	intervene 147:15,25 intervening 147:11 163:13 intervenors 26:9 26:10 66:22 122:20 285:8 285:14,16 intervention 171:14 introduce 87:3 254:24 introduced 236:16 introduces 72:12 introduction 237:1 245:25 314:12 inverse 276:20 invest 197:20,21 invested 142:8 investigating 285:2 investigation 285:11 investigations 285:24 investing 202:3 203:20,21 investment 73:5 73:10,17 74:10 74:14 81:16 95:4 145:13,17 145:20 146:17 148:25 151:6,9 151:10,19 195:23 196:21 197:5,7 198:1 200:3 208:21 228:1,5 244:19 244:21 259:24 260:13,25 261:1 263:16	267:25 274:4 277:8,9,9,11 278:2,5 290:18 293:19 investments 23:6,10 65:12 71:24 74:15 140:2 190:18 282:16 investor 113:2 138:5 165:13 191:16 197:11 197:20 202:18 227:25 290:16 314:7 investor-owned 85:3 investors 72:10 138:2,8 142:7 143:21 145:12 145:16,20 146:6,13,15,16 153:23,24 179:19 211:21 239:5,9,22 240:13 252:13 253:1 259:14 274:10 290:15 295:15 investors' 202:2 invoices 162:20 involved 52:3 53:14 57:14,17 76:20,25 77:2 90:20 101:15 175:23 272:14 304:8 involving 151:18 issue 19:7,12 20:22 40:15 42:19 44:18 45:25 54:2,16 59:5 62:16 64:2,3,21,25	65:4,5,22,24 66:6 68:16 69:2,6 72:22 75:14 77:19 78:5 81:2,4,19 82:10 83:10,25 84:12 86:2,7,9 86:14,15,16,18 86:19,22,23,23 87:1,12,14 88:5 89:9 101:1 105:17 110:15,18 111:22 115:7 118:3 120:19 121:18,18 122:11,15 125:20,23 135:11 139:2,8 139:10 143:8 145:11 148:15 149:6 151:13 151:17 171:6 172:15 178:16 209:22 226:12 226:13 287:19 288:3 289:16 issue's 167:23 issue-specific 45:24 issued 129:19 151:15 207:23 219:17 243:13 300:23 issues 19:8 20:5 24:22 25:3 27:4 37:25 39:23 59:6 61:7 66:4,5 67:6 68:20,22 75:12 80:21,21 81:1 85:21,23 92:3 115:13,14 116:13 117:15	122:8 123:5 125:16 134:4 163:13 198:12 234:20 289:13 305:5 item 20:2 44:21 78:3 items 44:15 110:21 295:11 Ives 41:15 44:8 49:6,14 199:11 199:12,20,22 311:15,17,20 311:22,23,25 312:3 Ives' 91:5 <hr/> J J 13:2 16:20 jail 246:25 James 13:9 14:10 16:21 312:5,7,9 323:12,14,16 Jane 321:12,14 Janet 212:24 213:3 214:11 238:22 January 22:17 26:3 93:6 107:8 129:18 129:21 157:22 172:9,22 211:10 219:18 269:1 Jarrett 201:14 Jeff 17:1 Jefferson 12:7 13:11,14,17,20 14:2 15:2,8 17:4,20,24 251:13 Jim 86:10,16 job 91:15 107:15
---	--	---	--	--

107:18 128:19	136:19,22	256:17,20	jurisdictions	Karl 13:6 16:20
130:1 200:4	138:14,17	257:13,19,22	112:24 167:7	127:19 181:12
201:5,15	143:5,9,17	257:24 260:15	181:10	KCP&L 19:4
jobs 47:18 61:15	147:1 148:8	262:23 263:6	just-say-no	20:5 40:17
62:4 129:24	152:8,11,14,16	263:13 265:2,4	112:9	54:25 56:14
Joe 30:8	154:2,5,9,14	265:7,9 280:10	justified 116:10	59:5 61:16
Joel 318:14	154:18 156:6,8	280:12 281:6,8	119:18 292:19	70:9 78:23
John 13:22 18:4	156:10,12,14	288:10,11	293:8	79:12 84:23
117:13 310:5,7	157:6,13,16	297:21,25	justifies 136:16	88:18 91:25
310:9,11	159:1 162:1	298:2,4,6	152:1	92:3,5,14 93:7
313:23,25	163:4 164:14	300:16,18	justify 25:16	93:10,13,25
321:6,8	164:16,17	305:18,22	75:8 168:23	94:5,6,7 99:3
joint 85:25	166:23 170:12	306:10,13,18	169:25	100:23 101:2,4
86:12	174:22 175:1,3	306:22		101:5,9,21
jointly 86:5	175:5,7,9,11	judgment	K	102:11,13,25
87:10	176:22,23	133:19 137:9	Kansas 12:12	103:2 104:4,6
Joshua 313:3,5	177:16,17	166:20 220:25	13:3,4,5,7,8,12	104:9,17,22,25
313:7,9	181:1,19,21	223:17 264:23	13:14 14:8	105:4,5,21
Journal 178:25	183:1,3 184:7	274:8,16	16:3,17,18	106:1 108:10
215:10	184:11,13,15	292:15 297:14	17:21,25 22:10	108:10,13,21
Joyce 42:4	184:17,21	judgmental	22:15 24:24,24	108:21 109:2,6
Judge 12:16	186:11,13,15	262:3	30:24 45:8	109:9,12,16,17
16:1,6,18,23	186:16,17,19	July 20:19	46:10 48:7,17	109:20,21,21
16:25 17:5,10	186:21,23	June 12:6 16:1	49:5 51:10	109:23,24
17:13,16,18,21	187:2,4 188:12	19:2 31:20,24	53:21,25 54:6	110:1,2,3,10
17:22 18:1,6	188:18,19	40:17,21,23,25	54:18 61:12	110:10,13
18:12,17,19,25	189:20,22,24	42:24 43:5	82:16,24 88:6	111:1,2,4,5,5,7
19:1 20:2,3,8	190:2,5 202:25	49:24 56:15,23	88:11 93:21,24	111:12,13,14
20:10,14,20,23	203:2 218:18	68:2,7,15	94:1,2,4	111:18 112:3,4
21:1,4,8,10	218:21,22	78:24 79:18	111:17 115:7	112:7,20 113:6
22:7 31:21	225:2 226:17	101:10,19,22	117:2,6 127:16	113:19 114:13
35:4,18 37:19	226:21,23	102:12 118:20	127:19 129:19	116:12,14
39:11,13,16,18	227:1,6,7	123:15 124:25	134:16,17	119:4,19
42:12 45:21	230:10,13,19	125:1 130:6	179:18 190:6	123:13 134:11
58:25 80:1,4,7	231:25 232:1,5	184:3 185:22	194:20 201:1	134:12,17
80:15 85:7,11	232:11,14,22	213:25 214:2,4	206:5 207:2	147:4,8 151:5
85:18 87:12	233:1,11,13,18	214:8,9,25	227:4 233:17	152:4 169:3
90:11 103:14	236:16 243:24	216:4,6 267:9	235:4,13 254:2	197:2 201:6
103:18,21,25	243:25 250:23	306:25	265:9 268:12	225:21 227:15
115:3 117:1,10	250:24 251:3,8	jurisdiction 31:1	275:22 279:10	227:19,22
125:8,17,21	252:18,20	82:14,16	282:1 307:7	228:4 230:3
126:7,13,15,20	253:21,22,23	111:16	309:2	260:25 262:6
126:21,24	253:25 254:2,4	jurisdictional	Karen 317:9,11	262:18 263:22
127:2,5,8,18	255:5,9,14,16	20:18,20	317:13,15	264:13,20

267:23 276:14	45:7 46:3,8,10	312:14,16,17	Keith 317:17,19	307:12 308:7,7
278:24 287:4,5	46:11,13,25	312:19,20,22	317:22,24	kept 120:21
287:11 288:6	47:24 48:14,19	312:23 313:3,5	318:3,5	Kevin 15:4
290:23 291:1	48:21,25 49:6	313:7,9,11,13	Kenney 12:17	16:25 126:14
292:11,23	49:9,10,19	313:15,17,19	12:18 35:4,6	165:6
293:16 300:23	50:23 51:3,13	313:21,23,24	35:12,15,17,19	key 79:16,17,17
303:16	51:25 55:15	314:3,5,7,9,11	39:19,22 40:2	103:5 213:4
KCP&L's 20:16	59:15,24 61:2	314:13,15	40:9,12,15,20	240:10
43:9 44:1	61:23 62:5,7	KCPL's 25:12	41:7,12,16,18	keyword 225:14
56:22 78:11	62:12,18 63:20	27:23 29:10	41:20,24 42:3	kicker 102:20
79:13 83:18	64:9,10,13,23	30:3,24 31:8	42:17 43:1,7	kidding 164:25
84:14 91:4	66:20 67:25	31:11 32:21,23	43:11,14,18,21	kids 49:22
92:4,8,10,12	68:1,4,7,8,12	34:10 46:12,23	43:24 44:5,14	Kiely 312:5,7,9
92:15,18,20,23	69:3,8,9 70:10	47:1,6,18	44:22 45:5,9	kilowatt 30:21
93:3,5,17	70:13 71:19,20	59:12,13 60:8	45:15 51:17,21	82:23
95:15,18 97:23	72:10,21,21	60:12,18 61:9	51:24 52:14,17	kind 23:14,17
98:6,20 99:5,6	73:5,17 74:2,5	62:15,21 63:4	52:19,23 53:2	120:16 121:18
99:18,21,25	74:17,24 75:4	63:5,8,16,22	53:6,9,15,18	131:16 185:3
100:14,16	75:5 81:20,22	64:22 65:20	53:20,24 54:2	285:1,4 286:18
104:3,13,18	81:24,24 82:18	66:5,13,16,22	54:6,8,11,13	kinds 112:11
105:17,25	84:1,18,20	67:4,22,23,25	54:15,18,21,24	243:10
108:8,16,25	85:4 117:17	68:3,18,22	55:7,17,20,22	Kliethermes
109:8 110:7,16	121:23 122:4	69:15,24 70:3	55:24 56:2,8	316:22,23,25
110:22,25	141:10,15,18	71:11,16 72:10	72:14 75:16,23	317:3
111:5,20,22	141:19 150:11	72:25 74:16	76:6,11,17,22	Klote 312:11,12
112:9,12,14	198:23 200:4,9	75:8 80:22	77:3,8,10,11	312:14,16
113:6,15,18,20	201:25 202:1,3	81:13,16,22	85:8,9 88:13	know 26:20 34:2
113:23,25	205:21 206:15	82:12 83:21	88:14 113:23	35:8 39:11
114:1,2,8,14	208:16,24	84:16 115:15	114:23,25	41:5 43:14
114:20 135:8	209:18 235:15	134:14 141:2	116:22,23	54:9,15 64:2
224:13 234:21	258:8 287:7,20	141:13,14	123:7,9 124:1	66:22 77:1
261:1,8 263:16	288:5 298:6	142:2 149:12	124:6,13,15	87:14 89:8,22
265:16 282:25	309:3,5,7,8,10	193:24 219:12	125:2,4,5,7	91:14 96:22
291:3 303:13	309:12,14,16	258:14 262:19	126:5 136:20	98:24 109:9
KCPL 22:17,22	309:18,20,22	keep 61:20 67:3	138:15 143:3	114:19 119:21
24:4 25:1 26:1	310:3,4,6,8,10	68:14 75:3	147:2 152:9	123:24 124:11
27:5 28:1,15	310:12,14,16	110:3 114:17	167:1 170:8,11	126:5,16 127:2
28:20,25 29:10	310:18,20,22	142:5,20	170:12,13,17	129:1 144:15
29:12 30:2,4	310:24 311:3,5	156:23 205:16	170:19 177:19	151:8 170:15
30:12,18,19,23	311:7,9,10,12	216:25 253:1	178:2 225:4,6	171:19 178:16
31:2,5,15 32:9	311:13,15,17	keeping 121:4,6	251:10,13,17	184:24 185:4
32:20 33:7,9	311:19,21,23	121:13 141:15	288:13,14	199:18 200:17
33:16,19,20,22	311:24 312:3,5	keeps 115:13	289:2,4,11	200:18 204:6
35:1 36:20	312:6,8,10,12	Keevil 17:1	290:3,6 293:22	205:24 206:24

207:6 210:9 212:20,21,22 225:18 227:19 238:23 239:18 241:23 242:13 242:19 244:24 249:18 266:19 283:22 286:19 286:21 290:10 291:1,1,2,3,4 291:11 293:5 294:6 297:8,16 306:7 knowledge 251:24 known 69:12 195:8 235:6 244:11 knows 115:13 212:19 Kollen 110:15 322:9,10 KPM 211:22 Kremer 317:5,7 kWh 28:22 29:4 46:20	139:6 207:3 306:5 LaCyne 38:4 lag 43:8 47:17 49:7,12 150:17 196:8,11 294:2 294:15,20 295:2,13,20 300:12 lagged 106:25 107:3 lain 163:1 Lake 14:20 landmine 52:6,8 Lane 322:9,10 language 32:2 41:2 42:9,10 43:4 49:25 50:3,4 51:22 52:25 53:1,2 57:24 58:3,7 68:6,8,11,14 76:6 77:5 79:15 80:14 101:11,16 123:11 191:2 272:16 273:15 large 29:11 59:18,25 60:3 60:3,7 96:8 178:10 285:22 large-dollar 139:1 largely 29:6,8 38:17 99:11 100:8 106:5 107:20 270:20 271:23 larger 173:18 largest 137:2 147:25 244:19 last-minute 66:23 late 18:23 19:9	66:5 170:25 276:24 291:10 300:10 lately 35:10 latest 60:23 130:16 law 12:16 13:2,2 13:6,9,13,15 13:16,19,22 14:4,10,13,16 14:19,23 16:6 38:25 52:4,24 89:11,13 94:17 117:24 206:20 lawyer 207:6 241:21 lawyers 42:1,19 52:2 53:13,16 57:14,17,20 87:15 126:12 lead 34:2 94:6 117:8 266:19 leads 149:22 200:9 leaps 91:12 learn 46:4 learned 52:4 106:18 164:22 least-cost 284:21 leave 25:2 174:17 191:2 306:1 leaving 170:14 led 217:10 left 20:18 69:11 72:24 left-hand 153:21 legal 41:19,20 42:8 64:25 78:1,1,2 79:14 89:16 119:9 191:1,6 284:2 285:5,9 legislation 78:17	legitimate 191:16 Lehman 297:12 Lena 69:5 320:17,19,21 320:23 lending 128:10 length 119:2 lengthy 19:20 lent 128:10 let's 16:15 50:19 50:19 76:8,8 80:4 89:15,15 100:1 101:1 107:13 108:3 113:5 127:8 171:18 182:3 187:2 205:15 234:19 235:17 241:10 242:24 247:9 255:14 262:5 271:15 278:14 level 26:4 63:9 72:12 109:12 117:25 136:2 140:23 163:14 178:9 179:2 260:12 261:4 264:10 274:9 274:10 leveled 58:18 leveling 47:13 levels 30:22 34:1 47:11,12,19 72:5 141:12,13 169:8,11 204:17 291:20 301:1 leverage 168:12 Lewis 14:10 license 246:24 life 46:20 48:6,7 51:12	light 12:12 13:3 13:5,8,12 16:3 16:17,19 22:11 45:6 48:18 73:6 88:6,11 115:14 127:16 127:20 129:20 167:21 179:18 190:6 194:21 201:1 206:5 227:4 233:17 235:4 254:2 265:9 268:13 275:22 279:10 282:1 307:7 309:2 Light's 22:15 115:8 likelihood 179:14 limb 96:9 limit 105:14 285:13 295:22 limitations 285:25 limited 50:9 94:20,23 105:13 119:25 122:21 124:9 127:13 285:25 limiting 304:20 limits 284:25 285:10 294:25 line 27:17 63:23 77:22 89:6 106:25 113:19 132:7,9 134:18 135:14 144:6 153:21 174:14 174:14 183:15 183:25 184:1 193:7,8 196:20 197:4 198:25 199:4 201:24
L				
L 13:15 L&P 30:7,11 114:2 label 97:9 labor 97:5,6,7,9 lack 29:4 38:14 44:15,25 79:15 91:2 196:21 197:6 228:22 lacks 162:24 263:5 Laclede 18:8 LaCygne 22:25 23:4,15,19,22 23:23 24:2,21 25:2 125:22				

213:20 214:10 214:21 215:1,8 215:13,21 216:1 217:15 219:20,24 220:11 221:2 231:13 239:11 247:12 248:4 269:2,13 272:9 273:17 294:18 297:1 301:8 lines 27:18,20 126:21 127:24 211:8 243:12 285:11 Ling 126:2 306:6,17,18 312:18,19 lining 115:16 link 83:13 linked 33:12 Lisa 14:23 317:5 317:7 list 19:8,20 20:4 20:11,18 66:1 127:14 157:21 167:6,10 168:1 268:17 listed 20:19 211:4 234:12 301:3,5 listening 58:11 260:18 lit 89:8 literally 174:11 literature 277:7 litigated 89:9 151:17 162:14 163:7 271:4,17 298:19 299:10 299:18,21,22 299:23 300:3 little 16:14 28:15 37:17 51:12	55:12 58:12 63:18 69:17 73:24 78:6 90:18 104:10 104:14,14 116:19 129:22 129:23 134:18 135:22 136:24 155:4,24 184:1 185:22 219:21 247:24 255:10 259:12 264:6 267:13,14,18 267:20 270:20 270:21,23 279:19 297:10 300:15 live 19:7 51:12 123:21 168:17 lived 53:21 54:3 living 48:6 49:5 59:21 60:11 61:6 63:11,13 LLC 12:22 18:18 LLP 14:10 load 29:5 43:12 43:15 44:24 45:1,2,13 46:23 66:18 117:18,19,24 118:3,11 122:12 147:25 196:22 263:2 local 18:1 121:8 141:3 located 30:8 locked 104:6,9 lockstep 179:24 Lohraff 321:12 321:14 long 45:25 66:1 68:24 72:17 133:12 137:15	239:10 240:14 293:2 long-term 106:13 116:5,7 130:24 134:22 135:5 221:16 222:2 236:1,10 238:13 239:7 250:5,9 longer 90:15,18 93:16 94:3 229:9 259:8 look 29:19 30:13 37:16,18,19 40:4,8 53:3,6 53:11,12 76:11 76:14,15,18 103:8,9 107:13 108:3 112:3 113:5 114:12 116:2,3,4,12 116:14 119:24 122:10 124:22 128:4,6 133:17 133:19 136:4 137:10 145:16 146:16 150:25 151:4,11,14,16 168:7 169:7 171:10,11,12 171:24 173:11 173:12 174:8,9 174:10,13 178:18 182:5 185:11,20 194:6 197:15 211:21,24 216:13 217:8 218:5 220:13 225:24 239:17 240:21 242:14 243:15,16 246:2 253:9 263:21 273:7	274:14 276:22 276:25 292:25 292:25 297:8 298:19 looked 49:10 97:24 104:3 167:10 182:9 183:23 284:17 looking 53:10 55:14 57:10 108:20 120:4 129:24 151:10 166:16 172:17 183:9 185:17 185:17 211:8 217:15 239:7 240:9,10,13 243:10 249:25 254:15 272:22 272:23 299:10 301:16 looks 42:4 101:19 104:22 130:15 150:5 150:25 173:25 lose 178:24 179:5 246:24 losers 67:16 losing 62:3,4 losses 211:13,16 lost 36:22,23 lot 35:8 39:7 44:10 46:1 49:6 52:2 90:25 104:4 108:9,13 148:20 171:14 176:2 178:24 179:11 246:5 275:9 lots 171:17 Louis 13:23 14:14 18:9 Louisiana	114:16 love 306:9 low 25:22 26:11 26:12,16 28:21 61:6 74:15 80:24 84:13,14 84:24 120:21 121:3,3,4 132:1,1 133:4 142:13 144:24 144:25 148:25 149:2,3 150:21 152:1,6 155:15 171:9,19 203:13,18,22 204:19 205:13 205:17 218:3,4 218:9,14 219:9 228:22 229:3 238:3,5,6 253:3,3 254:22 264:22 270:23 273:20 274:14 274:17 275:16 276:5 294:8 302:16 303:6 low-cost 175:21 low-income 62:25 63:1,18 66:11 75:18,20 81:18 low-usage 62:25 lower 26:19 38:1 48:1 75:24 110:12 111:17 111:19 140:18 141:24 142:10 144:14,19,20 151:23 171:21 173:19 182:18 182:20,21 194:22 195:18 203:7,25 204:24 223:1,3
---	--	---	---	--

223:6 225:13 225:23 229:2 233:7 242:8 252:15 258:13 258:25 260:4 264:15 265:18 265:19 275:3 280:3 286:5 287:10,15,20 292:25 300:22 301:24 302:5 302:10 303:19 303:21,24 lower-cost 168:13 176:5 lowering 195:20 LOWERY 14:10 lowest 62:24 74:25 75:1 132:25 139:4 139:14 143:1 lows 128:13 luckily 238:17 lunch 125:11,12 125:17 126:25 Lynn 230:24 Lyons 317:9,11 317:13,15	main 13:3,7 14:8 66:25 122:11 228:14 mainstream 93:1 106:8,20 108:7 112:25 242:21 maintain 82:5 91:19 192:14 283:5 maintaining 64:16 117:19 maintenance 29:21 96:14 97:17 major 23:14 60:18 63:7 200:19 majority 144:6 248:1,1 300:5 Majors 317:17 317:19,22,24 318:3,5 making 71:1 79:13 139:8 145:13,17 146:17 149:17 174:1 214:20 239:8 272:13 300:24 man 103:1 manage 200:2 259:2,8 264:3 292:8,9 294:12 294:16,24 managed 200:9 259:5 294:13 295:4 management 27:10 44:16 50:13 69:17 70:17 92:6 97:13,15,17 98:10,11,13,23	99:1,12 105:12 201:5 215:22 242:13 270:5 294:7,11,15,20 294:24 295:12 300:14 management's 200:2 295:9,18 managing 153:2 200:4 294:13 mandated 209:1 225:13 mandates 29:7 manipulated 111:12 manner 101:21 141:1 259:2 Mantle 69:5 80:11 102:6 320:17,19,21 320:23 Mantle's 69:15 manufacturing 215:22 270:5 Marc 15:1 17:7 59:3 115:12 MARCELLA 15:6 March 23:22 129:8 202:18 207:24 291:12 Marcie 17:2 Marevango 25:21 131:25 139:12 146:8 187:5,6,9 188:23 225:4 293:5,6 307:18 318:8,10 Marevango's 234:11 margin 153:22 mark 13:13 17:22 39:11	180:12 318:19 318:21,23,25 Marke 64:16 76:4 99:14 141:13 319:16 319:17,19 Marke's 60:6 61:14 62:6 63:25 73:12,16 marked 19:24 21:14,16,18,20 21:22,24 22:1 22:3,5 153:5,5 153:6 157:8 180:15,17 181:11 187:25 188:3 202:10 202:12 244:3,6 244:16 245:22 249:17 255:24 256:15,21,23 278:11,14 281:1 309:1 310:2 311:2 312:2 313:2 314:2 315:2 316:2 317:2 318:2 319:2 320:2 321:2 322:2 323:2 324:2 market 18:9 25:16 33:15 65:9,10,16,19 67:13,15,15 73:20 74:13 104:25 105:6 140:10,17,18 142:1 145:8 146:12 148:24 149:12 150:15 150:22 152:1 165:13 167:24 168:23 169:25	171:10,11,13 171:15 177:20 177:21,22 178:7 179:12 179:13 210:13 210:18 212:8 212:22 229:12 233:7 238:3 250:10 258:7 258:13 261:3 261:20 262:15 264:19 265:25 266:1 273:1,6 273:7,10 274:1 274:6,7,9,10 277:25 279:23 280:1,1 291:7 293:15 296:11 296:15,16,18 296:20,22 297:13 298:23 299:4,14 302:21,25 305:2,8 market-based 149:5,7 179:11 market-require... 165:10 marketplace 33:14 149:2 258:12 markets 128:25 137:6 148:22 150:16 171:13 173:17 177:23 179:18 207:14 250:2 265:22 Martin 321:9,11 Massachusetts 153:3 matching 70:25 materia 124:23 material 89:23 98:4,14,19
M				
M 12:18 13:9 16:21 M-A-R-E-V-... 187:13 machines 73:8 macroeconomic 213:14 236:22 275:9 Madison 13:10 15:7 magazine 244:16 magnitude 24:9				

99:6,11,24 104:20,25 105:7,11 205:7	272:10 284:2 285:23 288:22 300:14	118:22 119:22 195:8 206:13 259:7 261:11	meets 105:12 273:10	metropolitan 82:16,25
materiality 100:9 104:14	meaning 42:9 52:24 58:2,6	262:1 264:3,5 286:22 292:17	Melissa 310:25 311:3,5,7	Meyer 86:20 87:3 126:23
materially 26:6	68:11 77:5 190:23 221:4	292:18 295:14 295:16,24	member 201:14 206:2	323:17
math 272:13	224:21	296:2,25	members 88:17 91:7 93:12	Michael 12:16 16:5 102:17
mathematical 272:13 273:3	meaningful 38:14	mechanisms 27:10 31:8	memorialized 103:4	107:17 141:7 148:16 255:15
matrices 137:6	means 50:4 52:16 96:18	38:18 40:15 49:20 50:6	mental 36:24	255:20 308:4 319:3,5,6,8,10
matter 12:12 16:3 18:21	128:15 131:7 193:4,23,25	75:7 79:8 92:5 93:10 119:12	mention 127:11 163:11 172:18	322:12,14,16 322:20,22,24
118:15 137:9	210:8,11 283:10	122:23 194:13 194:21 195:4	mentioned 30:14 31:21	323:3,19 324:3 324:5,7
172:8 204:18	meant 50:4 102:1,10	195:24 197:6 197:13,16,22	37:21 43:11,15 50:6 54:24	Michigan 299:5
252:23 264:23	268:12 303:5	198:22 199:2,8 199:17 203:14	93:7 100:3 133:3 140:24	mid 241:12
268:2 290:20	measure 150:6 measured 292:15	203:19 204:23 205:6,10,16	142:16 145:10 146:18 151:2	middle 112:23 122:13 132:7
Matthew 319:12 319:13	measures 28:19 166:17 282:11	207:17 208:11 208:20,25	175:17 185:19 228:12 293:9	midpoint 25:10 148:18 155:10
Maureen 230:17 230:18,24	282:15 283:6 MECG 17:15	226:3,6,14 227:13,15,16	303:11 304:13	155:20 223:14 264:21 274:21
231:4 234:12	22:1 39:1 85:25 86:5	228:4,13,16,23 229:6 230:3	Mercantile 214:15	278:17 290:11
307:23 323:22	87:21,24 90:15 94:8 102:16	258:18 259:20 259:25 260:4,6	134:16 140:24 142:16 145:10	Midwest 13:21 17:13 90:12
323:24	156:14 175:9 186:11 189:22	260:8,10 261:6 261:19,19,21	146:18 151:2 175:17 185:19	322:7
Maurice 20:25 86:4 323:5,7,9	226:23 233:13 322:8,10,11,13	264:7 280:17 281:14 282:18	228:12 293:9 303:11 304:13	MIEC 17:19 19:1 22:3
323:10	322:15,17 MECG's 95:25	282:19 286:4 295:8	Mere 64:10	67:22 85:22 86:12,22 87:7
Mayfield 15:5 17:1	109:6 mech 122:23	medial 282:24 medium 60:3	merits 194:18 224:21	88:17 89:3 107:15 148:9
McKinsey 243:19 247:9	mechanism 31:20 32:19	MEEIA 83:13 83:18 84:16,19	Mers 17:2	148:12 156:12 157:8 175:7
248:15	40:17,23 75:5 75:18 76:3	84:22 88:4 meet 29:6 98:7	message 215:19 met 23:19 69:3	184:17 189:20 226:21 233:11
meals 108:20	78:16,23 97:2 97:9,21 116:11	meeting 115:12	100:18,24 102:25 103:3	253:23 256:21 257:16 322:19
mean 30:21 41:25 49:13			methodologies 228:10,11,19	322:21,23 323:3,4,6,8,10
53:10 56:5,19			302:20	323:11,13,15 323:17,18
76:2 79:3			methodology 92:15,16	MIEC's 148:15
131:7 172:14			144:21 254:16	
172:14 177:25			304:9	
189:5 193:18			methods 120:14 155:14 242:9	
207:5 211:18			metrics 262:14	
212:23 220:21				
229:3 246:24				
246:25 248:1				
248:15,25				

Mike 85:24 87:22	111:23 112:7	205:24 232:23	moment 75:21 89:2,16 233:18	Moren 292:17
Miles 318:11,13	mismatch 34:3	255:22 257:6	monetary 214:14	morning 16:1 17:7,14,18,22 18:7 22:13 39:20,21 56:10 56:11 59:5 77:13,14 85:13 86:9 88:15,16 90:13 116:20 117:12,18 118:6
million 22:14 23:5,5,7,8,10 23:12 24:6 27:24,24 29:18 29:18,20,21,22 29:23,24,25 34:24,25 37:22 37:23 38:3,6,8 38:8 39:24 40:6,6 46:4,5 46:11 48:19 51:14 59:24 99:9,10 101:5 109:13 130:4 139:5,14 142:18	missed 299:17	262:7,9,11,19 263:15,17,22 264:8 268:12 279:21 280:2 285:21 287:5 289:17 293:19 307:17 308:3 314:17 321:4 322:18	money 47:1 50:17,17,20 128:10 137:2 142:19,23 198:6	mothers 59:19
mind 20:13 75:3 102:11 140:4 253:2 290:24	Missouri 12:2,7 13:4,7,11,14 13:14,17,18,20 13:23,24 14:2 14:3,8,11,12 14:14 15:2,8,9 16:10 17:3,4 17:10,11,16,20 17:24 18:3,5,6 18:9,9,10 22:15 28:1,16 28:17 29:4 30:2,12,19,23 31:1,3 32:9 46:10,12,13 47:8,10,11,13 47:15 48:2 49:10 55:6 58:12,12,17 67:11 80:16,19 81:14,16 84:9 85:12,14 92:19 92:24 93:1,15 93:21 94:1,1 96:2 98:22 108:11,11 111:16,16 112:10,12,13 112:17,23,24 113:4 114:11 114:12 117:11 117:14 120:8 129:20,22 134:11 137:15 137:18 138:12 140:16 143:6 144:3 156:6 175:1 184:11 190:3 194:15 196:9 197:7 201:10 202:7	Missouri's 58:13 107:5 112:25 113:1 172:17 268:1	monopoly 65:8,8 73:20 121:21 121:23 138:21	motion 18:22,23 19:1,2,9,10 31:21 67:23 87:11,11
minds 91:25	mitigate 74:23 185:12 294:21	Missouri-regu... 85:3	month 64:8 215:15,23 270:1,6	motions 18:22
mine 240:11	mixture 299:24	mitigate 74:23 185:12 294:21	monthly 62:23 121:15	Motor 88:19,23
mini 16:13 19:16 25:3 90:17 116:19 125:10	MO-DOE 21:20	MO-DOE 21:20	months 19:7 42:14,14,18,18 42:18 66:23 96:24 107:25 130:12 131:1 132:4 136:13 136:15 138:3 169:1,10 177:23 178:5 178:20 179:3 179:15 207:24 212:9 217:3 237:14,25 291:13,14,15 301:24	MOU 148:3
minimize 93:16	model 29:9 112:10 132:7 144:15,16,22 145:3,3,4,7,7 155:14 173:18 217:21 218:10 223:8 257:5 275:16 303:6	model 29:9 112:10 132:7 144:15,16,22 145:3,3,4,7,7 155:14 173:18 217:21 218:10 223:8 257:5 275:16 303:6	move 22:8 71:9 114:17,18 157:9 178:21 179:3,24 181:19 202:25 217:7 231:23 241:10 264:15 280:10 281:6	move 22:8 71:9 114:17,18 157:9 178:21 179:3,24 181:19 202:25 217:7 231:23 241:10 264:15 280:10 281:6
minimum 110:14	models 131:20 144:25 145:6 145:15,19 146:14 149:15 166:10 211:22 211:22 223:7 223:18 254:13	models 131:20 144:25 145:6 145:15,19 146:14 149:15 166:10 211:22 211:22 223:7 223:18 254:13	movement 182:10 265:24	moved 221:6 238:5
minor 69:11 153:11 290:9	modified 68:8 82:4 83:21 282:19	modified 68:8 82:4 83:21 282:19	movements 178:10 238:12 238:12 266:1	moving 216:15
minute 46:5 151:3 185:19	Molina 318:14	Molina 318:14	MPG-11 297:8	MPG-SR-1 271:1 272:4 298:22
minutes 19:25 22:21 237:23 255:12	mom-and-pop 60:2	mom-and-pop 60:2	MPS 30:7,9 45:6	muddy 91:9
misapplied 91:11			Mueth 15:6 17:2	multigrowth 257:5
miscited 237:19				
mislabeled 153:17				
misleading				

multiple 70:16 70:18 185:10 185:11	neatly 101:25	42:7	Nobody's 42:13	North 209:1
multistage 218:7 221:6,14 240:12	necessarily 118:4 122:25 179:24 195:10	negotiating 57:17	noisy 173:16	notable 51:6
Murray 318:16 318:17	necessary 21:6 27:10 37:5 62:1 69:4 70:11 93:11 105:15 142:24 193:5 264:1 273:24	negotiations 52:3,9 57:15	nominal 250:16 277:10	Notably 140:20
N	need 21:11,11 29:6 39:11,16 67:17 72:17 73:6 98:16 99:2 104:20 109:11 110:11 122:23 128:1 145:2 150:1 151:9 158:25 166:5 223:19 237:16 243:15 243:16,25 256:17 264:9 275:24 280:24 280:25 287:24 306:20	neither 91:17 325:7	non 300:3	note 36:24 86:7 145:5 159:2 168:22 231:14 232:2 256:2 301:7
N 13:1 14:14	needless 32:7,9	NERC 36:8 43:15 44:16	Nonfarm 130:1	notebook 233:19
name 20:19,23 80:17 88:21 90:14 143:14 148:11 152:23 152:24,24 164:22 187:8 187:12 230:22 255:19 293:7	needs 32:14 62:15 102:14 105:9 119:19 204:24 253:1 300:14 302:24 302:25	network 77:16 80:22 82:11,12 82:13,17,21 83:4 115:8,22 116:14	nonfuel 29:21	noted 20:17 26:24 81:12 98:21 121:2 163:12 181:8 196:11 215:22 228:15 270:5 282:6
name's 16:5 85:14	negative 47:10 94:8 210:18 277:22	neutral 113:3	Nonproprietary 309:4,9,13,17 309:21 310:5,9 310:13,17,21 311:6,16,20 312:7,13 313:4 313:8,12,16,20 314:20 315:5 315:13,19,23 316:6,13,18 317:5,9,13,18 317:22 318:4 318:23 319:8 319:24 320:6 320:10,14,18 320:22 321:20 321:24 322:22 323:12	notes 150:12
NARUC 115:12	negatively 121:3	never 26:12 42:19 65:19 167:15,16,17	noticed 89:2	notice 73:1 111:2
Natelle 315:17	negligible 183:21	new 14:24,24 31:23,25 32:8 33:13 34:4 37:15 45:4 50:13 51:6 55:13 65:8 81:21,24,25 82:6 115:18 121:18,25 122:3 129:7 229:22 231:1 234:5 260:6 261:5,15,18 304:20	notified 16:11	noting 201:17
Nathan 15:5 17:1	negotiated 42:3	newest 44:18	notwithstanding... 150:21 151:7	notwithstandi... 150:21 151:7
nation 47:16 129:21		Newman 17:23	noun 79:10	November 250:4
national 58:14 58:19 113:16 114:7 174:8		news 47:22,23 129:2 130:16 212:12 216:13	NP 187:19 256:3 257:23	NP 187:19 256:3 257:23
nationally 47:14 58:18 174:4 297:2		next-to-the-last 131:15	nuclear 23:1 87:20 104:17 104:17,18,19 263:23	nuclear 23:1 87:20 104:17 104:17,18,19 263:23
natural 85:3 138:21 158:18		nice 19:19 53:19 53:20 148:22 164:21 251:15	number 16:5 20:22 30:14 31:17 32:20 44:4 47:18 59:25 60:13 61:20 67:1 70:13,21 75:24 85:23 89:20 91:12 92:21 93:22 96:1 128:11 129:15 129:25 134:7	number 16:5 20:22 30:14 31:17 32:20 44:4 47:18 59:25 60:13 61:20 67:1 70:13,21 75:24 85:23 89:20 91:12 92:21 93:22 96:1 128:11 129:15 129:25 134:7
nature 162:25 163:14		Nicole 17:2	nonrecurring 94:25 122:24 123:1,2	nonrestructur... 32:12
near 47:13 241:5 241:7		night 122:13	nonrestructur... 32:12	nonsense 108:13
near-term 203:8 204:1			Nonunanimous 86:8	normalize 110:17,19
nearing 129:11			nonutility 285:3	normalized 110:22,23
nearly 29:17 130:20 138:23			normal 70:23 101:6	normalizing 179:7 214:14

144:2 145:16 151:2,12,17 153:6,13 155:21,21 157:7 162:11 163:13 173:21 177:6 181:12 184:3 185:17 186:8 187:21 200:24 212:1,1 215:19 247:19 251:23 256:18 256:20 258:6 258:10 266:24 270:2 272:13 279:17 297:16 298:14 301:3,4 317:17,20 318:19 322:8 322:10,11,13 322:15,17,19 322:21,23 323:3,4,6,8,10 323:11,13,15 323:17,18,21 323:23 324:3,5 324:7 numbers 20:11 20:12 30:21 35:7 46:17 48:11 49:2 73:15 135:17 135:17 149:19 151:21 155:19 155:20 156:2 156:24 162:20 171:17 181:7 216:15 242:6 254:21 255:2 269:22 272:3 272:11,12 274:24 279:13 numerous 82:15 93:12 112:8	O	Oak 14:21 object 65:15 162:15 218:12 218:18 263:4 objection 90:2 126:17 157:15 262:21 263:8 objections 126:17 154:10 154:14 157:16 181:1,21 188:12 203:2 231:25 232:16 251:3 257:13 280:12 281:8 306:15 objective 91:16 92:24 93:13 112:14 objectives 153:22,23 objectivity 91:19 obliga 263:25 obligations 50:14 284:24 303:20 observable 166:17 261:3 262:13 280:1 287:24 301:17 302:1 observation 270:16 observations 220:4 277:18 observed 182:3 292:1 obtain 88:1 obvious 297:17 obviously 72:24 90:19 occasion 154:7	occur 62:20 94:24 122:10 266:9 282:15 occurred 29:1 48:5 177:20 200:16 occurring 216:10 237:20 occurs 16:14 October 68:3 129:13 141:18 214:23 269:13 odds 134:14,15 135:6 off-system 105:5 105:6,7,10 offense 171:7 offer 39:13,15 75:17 77:4 154:9,11 180:24 184:7 188:9,10 250:24 251:2 257:11 273:9 273:25 295:21 offered 66:23 75:17 139:18 140:9,13 141:8 172:21 231:15 258:17 offering 154:4 offhand 158:10 177:12 185:9 office 15:3 17:4 17:6,8,23 19:2 58:25 59:3 75:17,23 76:25 77:9 118:23 122:19 175:11 175:17,18 186:13 188:19 288:23 319:14 officer 56:23 108:19 109:1,3	325:4 offset 29:1 97:12 oh 54:11 56:21 58:20 103:11 104:1 157:12 164:25 165:5 168:12 172:5 172:23 184:25 220:15 244:2 249:25 252:8 oil 104:24 okay 18:19 30:16 40:9 41:16 43:7 53:18 55:17,20 56:8,22 57:1,8 58:10 76:10 77:10 78:9 79:10,24 80:15 89:7 90:3,9 103:25 104:1 136:22 147:14 148:7 158:14 162:1,8,12 163:25 164:12 165:14 166:2 167:19 170:8 172:23 174:16 177:8,14 180:20 181:19 181:25 182:12 182:25 183:9 184:6 186:2,10 187:17 188:8 190:14,22 191:3,14,14,19 191:23 192:2,6 192:10,10,16 192:25,25 193:3,9,10,13 193:16,21 194:2,6,12,19 194:19 195:7 195:13,21	196:5,11,16,20 197:1,4 198:21 198:21 199:8 199:21,24,24 200:7,12,12,22 201:13,19,23 202:5,9,21,21 202:25 203:11 203:17,24 204:22 205:10 205:15,21 206:2,5,9,13 206:18 207:5,5 207:10,10,10 207:16,23 208:1,1,19,24 209:4,8,18 210:3,7,15,22 211:3,7,12,18 212:8,12,17 213:7,10,12 214:6,21 215:8 215:13,21 216:1,7,7 217:7,7 218:9 218:25 219:4,7 219:7,16,20,20 220:15 221:6 221:16,20,24 222:6,19,19 223:17,24 224:9,15,25 225:19 226:16 227:12,19 229:5,17 231:22 232:11 232:14 233:25 234:11,24 235:9,13,17,25 236:8,15,21,25 237:3,6,12,16 237:22 239:2 239:17 240:4 240:15,21
--	----------	---	--	--	--

241:3,10,16,19 241:22 242:3 242:24 243:4,7 243:18,22 244:24 245:5,8 245:13,16 246:5 247:6,9 247:14,20,25 248:14,14 249:6,12,16,25 250:8,14,19,23 252:8 265:21 266:11 267:1,9 268:10,14,17 269:16 270:9 270:13,25 271:8,15,25 272:3,6 274:21 275:14 276:7 278:7,20 279:7 280:4,9,9,23 280:23 281:6 281:12,25 282:22 283:3 283:13,15,25 286:1 287:7,10 288:9 292:11 293:4 300:8,16 305:14	one-sided 91:11 onerous 50:13 ones 100:6 113:16 167:4 167:24 204:14 ongoing 70:23 84:17 112:16 OPC 21:18 60:7 64:15 65:22 67:22 76:22 78:1 79:14 86:12 87:11 102:7 138:17 164:14 226:19 319:15,17,18 319:20,21,23 320:3,5,7,9,11 320:13,15,17 320:19,21,23 320:25 321:3 OPC's 63:3 77:18 OPED 206:11 open 24:14 67:5 86:25 87:13 157:13 opened 293:5 opening 16:13 22:8,10 32:6 45:22,24 58:25 64:23 75:13 80:5,16,18 85:19 90:15,16 90:17 115:4,15 116:20 117:7 125:9,14 127:12,17 136:23 137:24 139:18 143:8 145:24 152:11 152:12,15,16 168:22 307:2,2 307:3,3,4,4,5,5 307:6,6	openings 16:13 19:16,16,22 25:3 75:14 81:3 85:20 125:10 127:14 operates 46:10 operating 95:4 98:22 182:22 191:21,24 192:18 208:12 208:21 261:14 268:7 282:9,15 284:20 287:13 303:21 operation 182:23 201:16 operations 29:21 30:3 93:25 110:5 134:11 263:1 283:10,11,13 287:5 290:25 294:8 operative 40:12 operators 65:13 opinion 75:24 121:19 137:9 144:7 191:1 192:11 195:1 195:12,15 200:9,11 205:12 212:15 212:16 222:7 230:1 246:18 253:8,15,18 260:21 opinions 65:1 195:14 203:11 285:14 Opitz 15:1 17:8 138:18 164:15 175:12,13 176:20 186:14 188:21,22	189:19 226:20 233:2,10 253:22 258:1 260:14,19 297:24 307:13 307:19,24 308:5 opportunities 111:1,9 284:21 opportunity 27:11,13 31:2 31:13 38:19,24 41:22 44:11 83:17 91:23 101:11 111:6 111:15 115:10 116:17 118:1 119:4 143:21 143:24 184:7 229:17,21,24 229:25 294:11 295:25 oppose 87:16,25 134:10 135:2 opposed 50:8,23 122:18 184:4 234:21 295:12 opposes 89:3 134:13 opposite 207:16 opposition 37:3 226:6 optimistic 242:16 243:2 249:19 options 196:22 orange 23:15 oranges 263:3 order 19:13,14 29:10 32:21 33:2,2,7,18 58:1 64:7,7 69:1,24 72:16 81:13 85:18	88:1,2 102:16 121:12 127:11 128:4,13 129:19 132:12 148:6 200:23 219:17 264:9 274:18 300:23 304:20 ordered 68:1 72:21 140:15 158:1,15 orders 197:17 254:21 organization 165:17 original 24:4 37:21 38:5 46:7 122:22 ought 153:23 outages 97:18 outcome 325:12 outcomes 149:23 outlier 137:16 144:8 outlined 273:11 outlook 47:20 112:15 275:11 outright 24:25 outside 34:19 46:25 53:10 76:15,17 87:7 89:22 96:11 106:8,19 109:3 146:23 224:22 276:12 293:10 293:12 295:6,9 295:11,18 outstanding 84:20 overall 23:9 24:5 25:19 48:1,11 68:22 153:17 183:12 184:4
---	---	--	--	--

217:2 268:2 overarching 100:13 Overcast 20:6 312:21,22 overestimates 106:12 overheads 109:5 overlap 101:21 101:24 overlapped 173:24 overrule 263:6,8 Overruled 163:4 oversee 294:7 overstated 88:11 overview 70:15 owe 165:2 ownership 182:23	211:5,8 213:13 213:16,21 217:9 219:20 219:23,24 220:10,12,14 220:14 224:1,3 234:12 237:6,8 237:10 240:7 240:16,17 243:12 244:15 244:16 249:7 249:13,17 254:7,10 257:20 268:17 271:21 272:4,6 272:9 273:17 275:1,23 277:1 280:20 281:21 282:6 283:4 294:1 298:14 pages 98:12 105:7 159:3 199:25 201:19 236:11 243:6 271:16 275:1 280:18 paid 83:8 93:9 122:7 246:17 paper 243:19 248:16,17 papers 223:4,5 paradigm 92:19 112:11 paragraph 33:2 79:12 101:17 118:18 119:17 123:11 124:23 205:3,5,11 207:11 208:7 209:10 210:8 parallel 79:15 parameters 260:21 276:9 303:2	paraphrased 71:14,14 paraphrasing 40:16 pardon 131:20 135:25 198:13 199:25 202:12 205:4 210:23 214:3 217:16 259:19 284:25 parent 25:8 110:7,8,10,14 134:8 234:21 234:25 235:10 235:14 pari 124:23 Park 14:21 part 21:12 40:7 49:21 52:9,13 72:4 117:20 120:21 121:14 140:20 156:1 190:18 191:12 192:11 194:9 194:15 219:11 222:1 245:9 246:8 257:5 262:14 264:8 273:23 275:8 291:22 295:7 304:25 partial 299:20 partially 135:14 participant 65:10 participants 261:20 participation 83:13,22 particular 33:18 91:7 117:19,25 118:18 122:17 129:5 131:14 136:10 147:12	149:16 173:16 178:6 185:13 185:13 240:5 246:18 296:6 298:25 305:1,6 particularly 33:13 203:20 240:11 268:8 parties 16:8,15 19:9,11,15,23 20:11 28:8 31:17 32:2 39:2 43:2 50:4 53:5,7,12 76:12 78:15 83:8 84:7 87:2 88:1 91:18 92:2 93:12 99:19,20 101:2 101:25 123:13 123:16 124:17 125:10 126:7,9 126:17 127:12 127:15 165:23 284:15 285:3 304:22 325:8 325:11 partner 153:2 parts 127:25 party 24:20 74:7 87:23 125:25 226:7 306:4 pass 37:17 75:6 294:18 passage 68:6 passes 259:9 path 52:7,8 82:9 pattern 68:22 Paul 312:18,19 pause 233:21 pay 52:7 59:10 60:16 63:2 66:12 71:11 72:6,9,11	73:25 75:19 141:7 146:15 191:24 paying 60:24,25 61:3,4 98:2 197:18 Payne 15:6 17:2 payroll 130:2 pays 141:18 PC 13:10 peak 122:14 peaked 47:19 pending 18:22 31:21 36:3 65:25 243:24 penny 193:4,19 pension 206:6 206:10 people 18:14 46:21 48:7 51:12 59:25 62:3 102:9 117:6 118:8 129:23 168:13 171:24 174:7 175:18,23 176:5,6,6,14 176:18 181:9 203:20 238:18 285:9 people's 165:25 195:14 perceive 146:13 163:2 perceived 178:11 perceives 179:13 perceiving 146:6 percent 22:14 23:6,9,11,11 23:12 25:6,11 26:10,24 27:2 28:1,3,22 30:6 30:10,11,13,15
<hr/> P <hr/> P 12:18 13:1,1 250:4 282:17 282:23 P/E 211:9,17,19 211:23 250:4 pace 150:14 package 242:18 page 131:15 148:23 153:15 153:21 155:1,7 155:9 188:25 190:14 191:14 192:25 193:3 193:21 196:1,3 196:20 197:4 198:22 199:1,3 199:5,6 200:1 200:6 201:24 205:2 208:2,3 208:4,5 209:8 209:9 210:22 210:23,23				

46:8,8,14,14	151:3,12,20	percentage 73:2	117:16 118:23	Plains 25:7
46:15,16,16,17	152:4 155:3,11	75:19 222:3	119:10,11	109:18,19
46:17,18,19	155:11,12,13	perceptions	210:13,19	134:9 196:6
47:1,14 48:3,3	155:17,23	274:3	persuaded	202:1 211:3
48:10,15,25	167:19 169:17	PERFETTO	137:19,20	235:3
51:2,2,15 55:1	169:18 171:18	14:23	persuasive 78:10	plan 31:15 32:3
55:2,10,19	182:14 184:4,4	perform 176:1	pertaining 245:9	58:3 92:10
60:10,10,13,20	185:7,23 189:1	performance	pessimistic	100:15,24
60:21,25 61:2	189:12 213:22	30:1 37:15	92:23	101:12 102:14
61:3 62:7,9,11	213:23 214:23	period 27:23	Ph.D 234:5,13	105:16 119:2
62:22 73:1,2,2	215:3,9,15	28:3,11,13	234:16	198:24 200:13
74:11,17,19,20	216:3 217:9,10	30:9 62:9 71:3	phase 83:9	201:2 305:23
75:9 84:6,7	217:11,18	73:13 84:22	127:9	planned 57:19
93:6,24 94:4	218:9 219:1,2	87:18 94:24	Phelps-Roper	57:20
98:19 99:6	219:14,21	95:7 113:18	313:3,5,8,10	planning 163:20
104:5,12,13,23	220:10 221:1	124:9,10	phones 18:15	plans 83:6
105:21,23,24	222:22 224:9	133:12 146:3,4	73:7	plant 22:25 23:1
109:8,11 110:8	224:16,18	182:9 222:3,9	phrase 197:1	23:19 24:2,5
110:9,9,10,14	237:14 240:23	261:20 268:25	pick 96:13,19,21	24:21 25:2
113:7,9,11,14	241:1,12,13,25	270:12 291:19	97:19 98:17	139:7 142:20
113:15,15,17	242:1,5 247:15	297:10	238:19	plants 142:5
114:7,9,10	249:19,20,22	periods 222:23	picking 101:25	284:20
118:6 120:8	249:23 250:5	277:23	picture 24:11,13	playoffs 54:8
123:3 129:10	250:15,16,17	permit 95:6	24:15 37:16	pleadings 19:3
129:10,11,12	250:20,21	permits 130:5	59:15 185:24	67:23 68:19
129:17,18,21	258:2,3,6	207:7	piece 263:20,21	please 18:15
129:22,23	266:24 267:2,2	permitted 95:5	piecemeal	22:12 45:23
130:4,9,15,18	269:13,20	perpetual	120:16 122:23	59:2 80:17
130:20,25	270:1,10	220:15,20	pieces 163:11	85:13 115:6
131:1 132:12	271:23 272:1,8	221:17 222:8	188:6	117:12 127:18
132:14,18,18	272:19 273:19	perpetuate	pilot 80:23 83:9	137:1 138:18
132:20,24	273:20 274:14	37:14 39:2	115:25	143:18 148:11
133:1,11,13,14	274:15,16,17	persist 31:13	Pipeline 88:20	152:23 154:25
133:15,16	274:18,22	persistent	88:25	158:16 169:16
135:20,23	275:4,5 276:8	151:25	place 30:19	186:7 187:8
136:2,5 137:16	276:8,16	persistently	38:18 40:23	193:1 208:1
137:17 138:11	278:17,21,22	203:13,17	51:11 53:23	211:7 230:15
139:3,4,11,12	278:25 279:1,4	249:18	72:15 226:6,6	230:22 255:16
139:13,15	279:4,11 283:6	personal 90:24	251:14 260:11	255:19 256:15
140:15 141:19	283:7 289:18	91:3	261:25	271:1 280:25
142:13,15,16	290:16 291:3	personally 54:5	places 150:2	pleasing 91:17
142:17,17	299:5 301:18	perspective 23:4	220:14	pleasure 170:10
148:18,19	301:21,21	37:12 41:2	plain 53:1,2 58:6	plow 36:22
149:13,18,21	302:2,3	59:7,8 113:2	66:13	plus 95:4 145:4

<p>PO 15:2,8 point 18:10 37:20 43:11 46:1 55:16 77:7 78:7 99:13 125:11 139:5 144:23 149:16,24 150:23 158:17 159:2 162:19 169:8,18,23 173:11,12 204:3,6 213:4 213:5,20 214:10,12,22 215:13 221:8 228:12 235:18 238:23 248:1 259:11 269:19 269:24 270:4 273:5 274:25 296:7 299:11 299:17 300:2,4 301:18 pointed 149:18 points 71:13 104:22 106:22 107:12 108:5 111:11 124:1 129:9,14 130:10 132:15 132:19,22 133:1 136:5,6 136:7,7 149:9 151:18 171:21 178:19,20 185:9,25 186:3 186:8,8 189:2 189:9 196:8 204:4,5 213:14 213:22 214:7 224:16 226:7 237:13,18 252:14 268:18</p>	<p>269:6 291:5 292:25 301:22 poised 55:13 policies 38:11 296:14 policy 20:4 65:23 66:8 67:6 70:16 81:15 83:15 89:18 147:12 179:8 214:14 239:4 269:10 policy-related 66:4 policymakers 67:17 pollution 82:25 Pool 32:18 poor 37:15 59:20 Poor's 201:20 280:19 282:4 314:16 poorly 73:22 74:2 population 28:17 44:25 59:23 portfolio 83:18 84:19 portion 60:8,9 141:17 190:10 portions 16:9 portray 91:13 portrayed 132:2 position 18:23 49:21 51:7 56:13 67:24 77:18 78:1,11 78:23 79:20 87:10,17,19,21 87:24 89:11 90:8 91:17,19 115:6,9 143:22</p>	<p>146:22 199:11 209:18,24 210:2 226:10 226:13 positions 81:1,2 87:7 173:8 176:8 positive 116:6 123:19 205:7 210:12 266:8 277:24 possible 63:19 69:14 140:22 183:12 294:24 possibly 92:19 108:10,12 294:8,10,14 Post 17:4,23 post-retirement 195:18 206:7 Poston 15:1 17:7 17:7 59:2,3 75:16,21 76:2 76:10,13,19,24 77:6,9,14,17 77:24 78:4,18 78:25 79:3,8 79:21 80:5,7 218:18 307:3 potential 81:17 82:22 146:1 243:11 245:2 Potentially 292:5,6 poverty 60:9,11 61:5 power 12:12 13:3,5,8,12 16:3,17,19 22:11,15 23:1 27:7 29:20 32:18 33:12 45:6 48:17 60:3 69:16,19</p>	<p>69:23 70:7 73:7 83:1 84:6 88:6,11 115:8 119:23 120:15 124:4 127:16 127:19 129:20 167:21,24 179:18 184:25 190:6 194:20 201:1 206:5 227:4 233:17 235:4 254:2 265:9 268:12 275:22 279:10 282:1,3 299:5 307:7 309:2 Power's 99:17 practical 65:1 285:6 practically 32:11 practice 83:5 188:8 207:7 practices 84:4 prearranged 206:23 preapproval 206:19 207:1,8 preapproved 206:23 precarious 297:10 precedent 65:1 235:8 precise 274:24 preclude 37:9 precludes 32:3 preconstruction 24:13 predecessor 235:6 predeterminat... 24:23 predict 96:19</p>	<p>predictable 70:22 282:21 predictions 212:13 predicts 73:14 preexisting 185:6 prefer 197:11 preference 304:8 preferred 33:8 134:23 236:2 prefiled 19:24 57:20 85:22 87:8 140:6 141:8,14 145:22 preliminary 18:21 118:15 premature 67:2 premium 132:8 145:4 155:12 168:16 223:10 240:12 273:18 273:20,21,24 273:24 274:2,8 275:11 276:1,8 276:21 277:7 277:14 278:4 302:15 premiums 274:3 277:4,5,20,24 prepare 153:4 168:15 187:17 231:2,3 255:23 256:12 prepared 85:5 107:24 180:11 187:17 202:18 218:11 240:4 256:24 preparing 90:25 202:22 248:19 275:21</p>
---	---	--	---	---

prerecession 47:12 141:13	96:5 100:7 102:16 127:11	33:15,15 40:17 40:21 45:24	284:19 286:10 286:11,13	115:25 116:3,5 116:7 147:17
presence 45:10 45:11	140:16 249:13 249:16 269:8	68:2,7 78:24 101:10 102:11	289:15 296:23 305:24	206:14 programs 83:19
present 58:3 85:20 119:1 174:18,18 197:16 209:4 210:20 221:22 226:2 232:4 244:20	previously 299:2 304:24 price 48:4,16 82:8 112:2 113:14 146:15 197:18 198:9 198:10 211:9 211:25 212:2,3 212:4 228:17 228:21,23 229:7,15 280:1 287:2	134:14 135:6 154:3 215:15 268:11 270:1 275:15 privately-owned 215:14 269:25 privileged 67:16 pro 275:2 prob 215:2 probabilities 179:9 probability 214:22 269:14 probably 16:13 40:7 44:7,8 85:23 87:8 129:25 131:5 170:5 175:24 176:17 185:22 291:12 306:14 problem 35:20 49:12,16,22 204:24 276:22 problematic 204:19 problems 16:12 112:5,11 115:23 119:1 120:9,14	proceedings 12:4 147:15 285:15,17,24 289:9 process 37:11,12 38:23 39:3 67:10 76:20 120:16 207:2 214:13 223:12 273:22 275:3 283:5 procurement 263:25 produce 84:6 190:15 193:23 272:19 277:13 302:6 produced 104:5 194:7 217:21 219:1 243:18 248:16,16 Producer 48:16 product 47:8 84:11 133:12 production 270:8 284:19 professional 166:20 253:18 272:16 273:14 profile 205:17 207:13,19 282:7,10,14 283:1 profiles 202:1 203:9 204:1 profits 66:17 94:6 110:5 program 66:2 80:23 83:9 84:16,21,22,25	programs 83:19 83:23 88:4 progress 119:8 119:14 prohibited 206:20 project 24:11 125:23 212:21 306:5 projected 99:8 106:23 113:20 134:25 145:14 239:22 301:20 301:22 302:2 302:11 projecting 35:2 projections 128:22 135:24 149:20 212:24 240:1 242:10 242:16,19 247:10 projects 24:10 97:7 111:3,3 201:6 promise 79:13 promote 158:23 promotion 158:22 promotional 83:5 promulgated 246:6 pronounce 164:22 pronunciation 164:24 proper 95:24 108:24 120:12 128:5 142:6 173:21 222:7
presented 63:22 64:15 72:19 86:3 90:24 134:2,24 140:6 142:12 194:18 195:21 196:17 225:25 230:6 233:25 239:25 242:25 271:13 298:20	price-to-earni... 270:16 priced 169:8 179:2 prices 48:17 56:5 61:17 104:4,7,9,12 105:3 145:25 146:4,14 150:17 229:22 270:11,21 279:24 291:18 294:17,22,25 296:19,21	privately-owned 215:14 269:25 privileged 67:16 pro 275:2 prob 215:2 probabilities 179:9 probability 214:22 269:14 probably 16:13 40:7 44:7,8 85:23 87:8 129:25 131:5 170:5 175:24 176:17 185:22 291:12 306:14 problem 35:20 49:12,16,22 204:24 276:22 problematic 204:19 problems 16:12 112:5,11 115:23 119:1 120:9,14	procurement 263:25 produce 84:6 190:15 193:23 272:19 277:13 302:6 produced 104:5 194:7 217:21 219:1 243:18 248:16,16 Producer 48:16 product 47:8 84:11 133:12 production 270:8 284:19 professional 166:20 253:18 272:16 273:14 profile 205:17 207:13,19 282:7,10,14 283:1 profiles 202:1 203:9 204:1 profits 66:17 94:6 110:5 program 66:2 80:23 83:9 84:16,21,22,25	projected 99:8 106:23 113:20 134:25 145:14 239:22 301:20 301:22 302:2 302:11 projecting 35:2 projections 128:22 135:24 149:20 212:24 240:1 242:10 242:16,19 247:10 projects 24:10 97:7 111:3,3 201:6 promise 79:13 promote 158:23 promotion 158:22 promotional 83:5 promulgated 246:6 pronounce 164:22 pronunciation 164:24 proper 95:24 108:24 120:12 128:5 142:6 173:21 222:7
presenting 107:16,18 217:23 221:10 267:5	pricing 114:17 132:6 145:3,7 155:14 223:8 primarily 146:3 196:8 primary 23:3 39:23 101:8 principle 37:25 39:25 71:1 143:20 principles 63:5 67:14 127:20 128:6 prior 31:20	procedures 296:15 proceed 103:25 223:4 230:20 255:17 proceeding 16:7 24:24 25:5 33:6,11,19,24 34:15 38:4,7 74:24 77:20 257:4,6 275:13	procurement 263:25 produce 84:6 190:15 193:23 272:19 277:13 302:6 produced 104:5 194:7 217:21 219:1 243:18 248:16,16 Producer 48:16 product 47:8 84:11 133:12 production 270:8 284:19 professional 166:20 253:18 272:16 273:14 profile 205:17 207:13,19 282:7,10,14 283:1 profiles 202:1 203:9 204:1 profits 66:17 94:6 110:5 program 66:2 80:23 83:9 84:16,21,22,25	presenting 107:16,18 217:23 221:10 267:5 presents 142:2 president 56:3 Presiding 12:16 press 115:13 pressure 48:14 presumably 303:2 presume 154:2 pretty 55:4,22 85:19 167:10 177:12 185:16 203:15 281:16 291:3,18 prevailing 26:7 prevent 244:20 preventative 96:14 previous 28:2,2 28:5 95:22

properly 53:12 84:4 110:2 200:10	66:16 proposition 44:14 204:20 277:3	providing 37:5 74:24 119:22 125:14 162:21 218:7	138:20,21 139:9,24 140:24 141:3 141:14,22 142:5,6,23 147:20 151:16 162:1,17,18 175:11 186:13 187:15 188:20 190:14,16,23 191:7 194:14 195:4 197:11 197:12,20,22 203:20,20 206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	put 23:13 24:11 24:11,12 30:22 33:2 43:21 53:15 57:14,17 77:4 78:2 129:5 137:10 155:19 156:2 183:24 198:6 302:18
properties 35:8	protect 35:25 38:12 39:4 65:21 138:20 138:20	provision 31:18 57:11 78:11,12 79:2,18 92:10	187:15 188:20 190:14,16,23 191:7 194:14 195:4 197:11 197:12,20,22 203:20,20 206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	puts 72:2
property 23:11 27:9 29:7,23 30:25 31:10 34:19,21,22 35:1,2,11,25 36:2 37:1,7 38:16 44:15 45:8,11 50:7 70:16 92:6 93:22 96:22,23 96:24 97:24 98:1,2,5,7 190:16 196:14	protecting 142:22	provisions 79:15 124:16	195:4 197:11 197:12,20,22 203:20,20 206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	putting 38:17 53:17 80:9 128:14 176:4 201:15
proposal 63:4,8 63:16 64:22 66:9,23,25 67:6 68:15 72:25 75:20 80:23 81:10,11 81:16,24 82:3 82:5 83:13 88:1 177:10	Protection 27:8 36:6 209:1	prudence 71:17 283:17 284:4 285:1,15	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	puzzle 263:20
proposal's 81:15	proud 54:7,9	prudency 284:8 284:13,16	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	<hr/> Q <hr/>
proposals 72:23 72:23 86:25	prove 149:12	prudent 25:1 145:16,19 193:24 283:23 285:12	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	qualified 170:17
propose 37:9 71:10 76:18 234:25 235:18 273:19	provide 27:11 70:23 73:6,17 75:13 76:16 79:22 82:15 91:16 101:3 120:12 127:23 139:23 142:25 143:23 150:5,6 157:25 158:3 166:1 217:25 221:13 245:18 260:12 262:19 272:21 273:19 285:14	prudently 284:11	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	qualities 119:14
proposed 73:1 75:5 81:20 87:23 134:7,21 146:22 236:11 264:15 283:20 283:21,22	provided 19:15 28:23 69:9 83:7 85:2 107:9 109:20 111:15 113:13 120:1 122:4 150:24 157:22 165:15 170:24 172:10 219:8 247:11 271:8 273:8	prudently-inc... 208:12,21	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	quality 197:7 294:9
proposes 68:13 71:17 123:14 134:13 135:3 235:22	provider 87:25	public 12:1 15:1 15:1,3,9 17:3,6 17:8,9 19:2 39:1 42:4 58:25 59:3 61:22 64:6,19 64:21 65:7 66:8 67:21 69:5 70:8,13 70:18 71:15 72:9,19 75:17 75:23 80:10 82:13 89:18 99:13 100:18 101:3 117:20 117:20 118:23 121:8 122:19 127:23 132:16 133:21 138:20	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	quantifiable 166:17
proposing 28:18	provides 70:15 83:16 103:6 111:19 120:13 148:22 295:24	PSC 121:2	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	quarter 23:7 128:20 129:8 130:13,17 132:14,19 135:19,22,25 135:25 136:1 151:21 180:6 180:12,21,22 182:6,7,13 183:6 185:16 185:18 238:15 238:19 271:6,9 271:10,11 292:25 297:17 314:4,4
		publicly-available... 260:24	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	quarterbacks 117:5
		publishes 93:19	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	quarterly 182:5 182:9 271:13
		pull 156:24	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	quarters 27:1,3 174:12 271:14
		punted 108:21	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	
		purchased 24:18 27:7 29:19 33:12 69:16,19 69:23 70:7 119:23 120:15 124:3 268:8 282:3	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	
		purely 42:8 133:18	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	
		purple 114:14	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	
		purpose 68:13 138:3,4,19 147:17 165:10 165:12 206:3	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	
		purposes 64:18 220:15,18 221:11	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	
		push 16:13	206:20 233:1 235:11 241:3,5 246:16 253:21 257:24 288:23 297:23 300:8 300:10 307:17 314:17 319:14	

<p>question 19:11 35:5 41:19,20 42:8 44:6 47:5 49:9 51:22 54:22 57:9 80:8 94:10,11 97:6 113:22 122:10 123:10 126:12 133:16 141:24 156:24 162:25 170:3 172:21 175:16 177:19 180:11 182:1,2,16 183:2 184:18 185:2 194:25 200:8 204:15 218:23 225:16 227:9 243:24 244:1 248:14 259:13 262:5 262:22 263:6,8 263:9,12 272:6 277:2 280:7 284:2,14 285:7 285:8 286:8,23 287:17,21 289:4 293:4 295:17,17 298:9 299:12 300:1,1 302:15 306:2 questioned 72:15 questioning 231:14 297:1 301:9 questions 24:21 39:7,8,18 41:22 43:8 45:18 56:12 57:18 66:1,2,8 67:2 69:6 76:4 76:23 77:11</p>	<p>79:25 85:6,7 85:10 87:5,15 88:12,13,14 100:13,20,21 100:23 101:12 114:22,23,25 115:1 116:20 116:22,23,24 123:6 125:5,6 126:1,3,8,10 126:23 136:19 136:20,21 138:14,15 143:3,4 147:1 147:2 152:8 156:5,7,9,11 156:13 158:25 164:13,15 166:22,23,24 167:1,5 168:5 168:18 170:5,8 170:20,21 174:23 175:2,4 175:6,8 176:12 176:22 177:14 180:2 183:5 184:8,12 186:11,12,14 186:18 189:19 189:21,23,25 190:4 218:19 218:20 223:25 225:2,5,6,8,11 226:17,18,22 226:25 227:5 230:9 231:10 231:12 232:24 233:12 240:15 251:8,17,18 252:18 253:20 253:21,24 254:1,3 260:15 260:18 265:1,3 265:6,8,14</p>	<p>278:9 280:16 286:2 288:10 288:11,14,18 290:4,6,9,22 293:23 297:22 298:1,3,5 302:13 303:9 305:17 306:8 306:19 307:12 307:13,15,20 307:25 308:7,7 308:8 quick 43:8 52:11 quickly 294:16 quite 19:20 88:20 118:10 128:11 129:20 171:9 quote 64:7 91:8 94:20,21,23 99:19 107:6 110:20 196:5 196:12,12,16 201:16,17,18 214:11,16 244:18 270:7 283:1,1 quoted 191:3,14 191:20 271:3 290:14 quotes 112:9 215:10 quoting 190:11 196:13 210:8 215:16 216:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <hr/> <p>R 13:1 39:19,22 40:2,9,12,15 40:20 41:7,12 41:16,18,20,24 42:3,17 43:1,7 43:11,14,18,21 43:24 44:5,14</p>	<p>44:22 45:5,9 45:15 51:17,21 51:24 52:14,17 52:19,23 53:2 53:6,9,15,18 54:13 75:16,23 76:6,11,17,22 77:3,8,10 85:8 88:13 114:23 116:22 123:7,9 124:1,6,13,15 125:2,4,7 126:5 136:20 138:15 143:3 147:2 152:9 167:1 170:8,11 170:17 178:2 225:4 251:10 288:13,14 289:2,4,11 290:3 307:12 308:7 Rachel 321:20 321:22,24 322:3 raise 75:12 125:20 130:23 212:14,17 214:13 238:24 282:6,10 raised 24:21,23 64:23 raises 64:21 raising 24:22 25:4 63:1 121:15 128:16 213:1 266:4 ran 223:7 Randall 224:6 Randy 316:11 range 25:8,10,22 26:11,12,24 28:21 74:18,19 74:19,20 120:3</p>	<p>132:17,21,24 132:25 136:5,6 140:7 142:12 142:13,15 143:23,25 144:9 146:21 146:23 148:18 155:10 158:4 158:19 169:17 171:22,23 176:17 217:9 217:16,16 219:1 220:25 247:14,22 252:9,10 253:13,14 258:2,6,10 260:11 262:3 264:16,18,22 267:1,14 270:23 273:5 275:20,25 276:6,13 283:8 286:5 290:10 291:24 292:3 292:14 293:2 293:11,12,20 302:7,17,22 304:9 ranged 105:3 ranges 173:23 176:2,15 ranging 247:23 249:19 ranked 210:25 rarely 176:12 rate 12:13 16:4 22:14,16,19,23 23:3,7 25:14 26:1,4 27:12 28:9,12,13,25 29:10,14,24 30:22 31:14 33:1,6,16,25</p>
--	---	---	---	---

34:22 36:3,17 38:19,21,24 40:15,21 41:8 41:8 45:4 46:12,13 47:3 48:10,12 49:8 49:11,15 50:20 51:7,8,13 54:25 55:9,13 56:15 60:17,18 61:11,19,25 62:12,23 63:14 63:15 64:3 65:23,25 66:9 66:18 67:20 68:3,15,23,24 70:2,3,4 71:9 71:10,11,16,22 71:23 72:4,6,7 72:8,10,11,13 72:16 73:23 74:6 75:17,24 79:17 81:10,13 81:14 82:3,5,6 84:9,11,17,17 85:16 86:4 88:7,10 89:21 90:20 93:3,5 93:21,24 94:1 96:19,21,24 98:17 101:20 106:11 112:22 112:23 113:2 113:10,20 114:2,3,7,8,9 116:11 118:7,8 121:10,12 123:14 127:23 129:20 130:3 130:18 134:21 137:3 138:25 140:5,17,20,21 141:6,16,18,23 143:24 145:11	149:17,19,21 153:17 163:1 167:23 168:6,7 168:8 170:24 172:17,19,24 172:24 173:2 174:9 176:13 177:4 179:7,9 183:16,16 185:7 193:25 194:2 198:18 200:16 205:18 205:21,24 214:13,23 215:14 217:16 218:25 219:12 219:13,14,21 220:16,20,21 220:23 221:17 222:8,21 223:6 224:13 235:15 238:5,24 240:5 240:22 241:25 242:3,9 247:17 258:14 260:1,2 261:23 262:9 265:16 269:12 269:25 271:5 271:17,21 272:8,24 275:23 276:14 276:15,21 278:24,25 279:3 281:14 281:15 282:12 284:18 285:18 286:20 287:4 288:2 289:12 289:14,23,25 290:18 292:16 294:23 295:25 301:15 304:18 304:19,25 305:5,10 315:3	321:13 322:14 323:7 324:4,6 324:8 rate's 106:14 ratemaking 31:20 69:13 71:2 87:16 89:4,5 90:5 95:25 101:6 112:10 120:13 147:15 ratepayer 289:21 ratepayers 51:9 63:7 65:12 66:11,11,14 67:16 81:23 101:8 113:12 113:15 116:6 121:22 122:1,5 128:3 139:13 140:6,17 141:22 142:21 149:3 152:5 193:4 204:12 252:13 ratepayers' 141:15 rates 22:22 26:6 26:7 29:2 30:4 30:5 31:24,25 32:8 34:5,11 36:15,16 37:15 45:4 46:4 47:12 48:9,23 48:24 49:4 50:18 61:16 66:10 67:4,9 70:22 71:18 78:3 80:22,24 81:20,21,22,24 81:25 82:1,4,9 83:9,20,24 84:3,4,8,10,15	84:17,25 93:5 93:17,19 94:4 94:6,8 95:3 101:5 106:13 106:16,18,19 106:22,23 107:3 108:24 110:22 113:6 113:11,15,17 113:18,21,23 113:25 114:1,1 114:1,6,13,13 114:14,15,18 114:20,21 117:21,22 118:7 119:6 120:24 128:12 128:16 129:4 129:16 130:4 130:23 133:3,6 138:19,23 140:21 141:20 141:25 145:18 146:1 149:25 152:5 170:14 178:7,9,21,22 179:3,4,4,12 179:14,22,23 185:8 190:15 193:4,18,23 203:13,18,24 204:8,10,13,14 204:19 212:14 212:18,22 213:1 220:4,9 222:20,23 223:1,2 238:3 239:5,7,8,15 239:17,21,25 240:8 243:2,10 243:16 244:8 247:11,15,23 248:2 249:14 253:3 254:20	255:1 266:4,6 269:9 271:15 274:9,11 275:12 276:4,4 276:20 277:4 277:10,20,24 278:1,6 281:14 286:20 296:17 299:6 304:21 314:10 rating 92:25 101:7 112:14 267:25 268:1 282:6,19 292:21,22 303:13,16,17 303:23 ratings 151:8,9 201:20 202:1 282:7,11 ratio 250:4 282:24 rational 91:24 rationale 81:22 rationaly 99:20 ratios 211:23 270:16 RBH-5 301:17 reached 37:25 reaching 106:21 reacted 173:18 reacting 171:13 171:13 read 37:17 58:17 62:1 68:6,8 101:16,20,24 113:3 124:15 124:16,24 135:16 141:4 153:23 200:22 202:21 205:7 213:7 216:13 216:16,20 244:22 263:10
---	---	---	---	---

218:6 223:11 224:2 236:19 248:5 278:8 280:5 314:14 recommended 74:18,20 107:10 139:4 142:15 144:1 144:11 148:18 155:3,10 158:1 158:3,5 189:1 201:10 217:9 219:9 224:18 253:14 260:1,2 260:11 261:7 262:3 264:18 267:1 270:19 270:23 272:8 275:20,25 276:6,13 286:5 293:2,20 302:6 302:17,22 303:4 recommending 25:6,9 26:10 26:18 173:3 219:4 226:14 251:20 252:14 recommends 71:21 72:1 81:5 82:2,11 83:12 84:1,14 132:12 134:20 139:11,12,12 139:15 144:9 reconciliation 38:2 139:2 142:19 315:8 record 16:19 21:13 40:25 72:18 80:3,4 91:10 127:7,8 128:13 143:12 144:24 148:10	148:14 154:15 157:18 181:2 181:22 187:1,2 188:14 203:4 230:23 232:17 236:15 250:25 251:5 255:13 255:14,19 256:2 257:15 306:1 record-setting 117:5 recoup 208:11 208:20 recover 22:23 33:10,20 37:10 50:20 66:10 84:20,24 95:3 209:6 259:3 recovered 32:19 61:13,15,16,18 63:7 118:10 recovering 259:14 262:20 recovers 27:6 recovery 33:8 36:17 63:15 70:23 71:2 80:24 82:23 84:13 110:4,12 112:17 115:8 116:10,17 124:12 196:22 203:14,18 204:23 205:7 208:11 227:13 227:15,16 228:4,22 229:5 230:3 258:18 261:12 262:12 281:13 282:2 282:20 283:4 286:25 292:22 recross 174:22	184:8 252:18 297:21,24 Recross-Exam... 175:13 176:24 184:23 252:21 298:8 307:14 307:15 red 27:17 106:25 redirect 154:3 177:16,18 186:17 227:6,8 254:4,6 300:18 300:20 307:14 307:21 308:2 redlined 257:6 redo 229:22 reduce 34:22 96:14 228:4,6 258:18 259:20 259:25 261:13 295:19 reduced 40:3 189:10 196:12 226:7 228:8,9 228:11 260:4 261:8 296:21 303:18 325:6 reduces 70:6 109:12 135:4,5 258:22 259:7 reducing 82:25 295:13 303:5 reduction 140:16 208:8,9 226:14 260:5 261:25 264:10 286:14 292:19 303:24 reexamined 284:11 refer 27:8 91:8 155:1 301:4 reference 35:13 53:25 172:16	281:20 referenced 268:25 referencing 270:12 299:9 299:18,19 referred 33:14 173:13 178:17 referring 197:2 refile 82:4 reflect 16:19 37:24 39:24 84:4 144:25 145:16 152:5 173:20 180:4 180:20 223:14 236:18 267:14 286:14 294:25 296:17,21 303:24 reflected 60:12 192:7 228:10 228:17,18 229:11 269:11 286:12 287:13 292:1 301:15 302:5 reflecting 254:22 reflection 227:25 305:2 reflects 28:11 40:25 46:22 59:8 145:19 150:8 151:23 259:23 260:3 267:17 refund 34:11 36:3 refunded 34:18 refuted 64:14 reg 205:4 regard 64:3 67:1 67:3 127:20	180:3 182:16 200:14 201:15 207:2 208:25 220:4 244:7,8 246:15 247:17 268:2,18 271:4 273:18 277:19 278:8 regarding 24:21 39:25 66:2 67:6,24 71:10 77:4 100:21 123:11,23 210:24 215:1 314:10 regardless 84:18 regards 81:19 82:10 83:10 84:12 148:25 regime 67:13 region 61:13 63:24 regional 28:21 109:7 114:9,15 regulate 245:2 regulated 25:8 65:8 67:9 74:13 121:23 202:19 300:10 314:8 regulates 65:3 regulation 92:24 93:2,15 94:3 108:11 112:13 113:1,4 117:24 207:7 245:5,8 245:25 246:3,6 246:21 314:12 regulations 246:15,21 284:3 regulators 205:4 205:6 208:10 244:19
--	---	---	---	---

regulatory 12:16 16:6 26:14 29:9 31:5,8,15 38:11,18,23 39:3 43:8 45:13 49:7,12 49:19 50:5,10 64:24 67:12 92:10,19 96:1 100:15,24 101:4,11 102:14,19 105:16 112:8 112:11,16,21 115:20 150:3 150:12 181:8 182:22 183:10 183:10 187:15 194:13,21 195:4,24 196:8 197:6,13,22 198:22 199:8 199:17 200:13 201:2 207:11 207:17 208:20 208:25 258:18 259:20,25 260:3,6,8,10 261:6,11,19,19 261:21 262:1 264:7 280:17 282:18,19 283:5 285:9 286:4 294:2,15 294:20 295:2,7 295:13,14,20 295:24 296:2 296:11,14,22 298:20 299:1,6 300:12 reject 19:3 82:2 99:24 218:4,13 rejected 24:25 70:9,19 71:7	81:11 95:17 98:25 99:16 106:10 218:2 219:16 220:11 220:12,23 related 67:3 122:25 168:19 180:1 325:8 relates 36:6 135:14 246:12 249:12 relating 19:4 246:3 relationship 184:2 276:20 277:13,20,22 277:23 relationships 303:20 relative 30:22 169:3,5 204:8 211:20,23 261:9 263:24 274:6 291:18 325:10 relatively 113:1 132:1 146:3 201:4 205:13 209:11,15 210:10 212:13 285:22 release 215:16 245:17 released 246:1 314:12 relevance 163:2 relevant 19:11 58:21 71:3 91:11 146:17 162:17 252:3 Reliability 209:2 reliable 139:23 149:15 223:18 294:9	relied 92:15,16 95:13 218:10 244:7 248:19 266:9 302:2 304:5,7 314:10 relies 105:22 106:21 149:17 239:14,21 rely 57:15 105:4 124:21 131:21 133:18 145:2 215:5 272:17 273:6,6 285:14 300:23 relying 25:20,23 92:13 93:9 94:21 95:16 220:24 222:9 remain 259:17 260:10 remainder 18:11 117:9 remaining 16:15 71:22 remains 66:10 remarks 85:5 remember 55:10 94:12 143:25 153:12 200:2 200:17,22 201:13,18 202:20 213:2,3 220:6 263:11 remind 117:19 169:16 reminded 56:3 remove 68:13 78:19 removing 71:20 render 170:18 299:19 rendered 174:10 Reno 26:17 131:13,23	132:12,15 134:12,19 135:9 136:7 139:11 142:14 144:1,6 145:4 145:14 146:7 230:17,18,22 230:24 231:2,5 231:7,17 232:21,23 233:3 234:12 244:5 245:24 251:11 254:7 255:6 293:9 307:23 314:10 323:22,24 Reno's 145:6,18 146:21 rents 109:3 repair 142:6,20 repeat 100:22 237:16 repeatedly 61:10 107:14 rephrase 276:23 276:23 replaced 91:3 report 26:25 81:13 129:19 187:18,21 188:9 190:10 193:1 196:5,11 196:16 200:23 201:19 202:5 202:18,20,22 203:7,12,16 205:2 207:21 207:23 217:8 219:17 225:24 226:2,9,12 227:14 243:13 243:23 246:12 247:9 248:24 280:19 281:3	281:12 282:4 282:23 314:16 314:19,22 315:4 reported 12:21 107:8,9 111:12 111:13 158:8 196:10 209:14 215:8,14 269:24 reporter 187:11 237:7 244:6 245:21 269:19 278:14 325:1,3 REPORTER'S 159:2 REPORTING 12:22 reports 23:21 26:13 108:19 108:19 109:1 110:19 195:22 198:1 202:6 271:13 273:8 represent 23:6,8 23:10,11 85:14 98:19 147:6,19 165:20 167:14 289:8 representation 269:4 represented 42:5 166:3,7 224:17 269:3 289:8,12,14 representing 59:4 143:14 165:16 represents 23:4 104:13 165:22 272:25 Republic 131:5 Republican 131:3
---	---	--	---	--

Republicans 131:4	required 36:7 71:11 84:2	resolution 305:4	275:16 282:5	95:4 105:18,21
request 12:12 16:4 18:12	88:3 96:25	resolved 170:25	293:18 300:13	105:23 106:10
20:17 21:4,11	104:2 138:3,5	resolving 47:16	resulted 27:22	108:9,11,14,16
22:13 32:23	142:20 145:8	resource 175:22	144:19 304:23	108:23 109:10
33:23 37:3,21	165:13 193:17	resources 36:11	results 27:25	109:14 110:16
57:16 62:21	194:22 225:12	36:12 68:17	28:2,12 137:7	110:25 111:12
64:5 67:2,21	225:15 227:25	74:6	144:20 149:7	111:13,17,17
67:22,25 68:25	228:7 283:5	respect 51:7	149:15 153:16	111:24,25
69:2,7 70:9,16	requirement	163:16 176:8	166:16,16	112:1,1,3
70:20 73:23	27:4 34:15	180:2 253:13	173:18,19	118:1 119:3,13
92:4,8,11,12	37:8 38:3,10	262:11,23	207:13 217:17	119:20 123:3
94:11,18 95:15	39:23,24 48:20	304:11	220:19 223:9	127:24 128:5
95:18 97:4,11	83:23 95:13	respectfully	236:13 239:10	132:14,15
98:7,25 99:17	187:18 225:17	33:19,23	239:10,11	136:16 137:1
99:21 100:14	225:18 304:18	respects 262:7	240:11,12,12	137:12,14
100:16 105:18	314:19,22	response 49:20	254:12 272:18	138:2,4,5,11
117:10 118:14	321:6 322:12	64:4 157:2,25	302:14,16	138:25,25
124:17 156:19	322:20 323:5	163:11,12	303:22	139:1,19,21,25
157:2,25 162:4	requirements	165:14 172:18	resume 125:18	140:11,21,23
162:13 165:14	33:13	175:16 181:25	retail 29:17 46:3	140:25 142:7
172:9,18	requires 38:25	182:2 225:11	46:8 93:24	142:14 143:21
175:24 322:17	138:5 166:20	265:13 298:21	259:9	143:25 144:11
requested 16:8	195:3 258:25	responses 66:25	Retailers 201:10	144:18 145:8
36:21 41:9	requiring 66:11	responsibility	retain 121:14	146:24 149:11
46:18 88:10	72:17	118:12	165:24	150:7 152:2,3
99:25 118:19	research 26:14	responsible	retained 71:19	153:17 155:10
118:21 139:3	112:21 176:2	112:14	102:17 103:2	163:7 165:11
142:11 144:11	181:8 183:10	responsive	109:23 288:24	165:13 166:6
260:20	196:6 246:7,8	184:19	retirees 59:19	167:23 171:17
requesting 31:8	Reserve 130:22	rest 58:13	retrieve 237:7	189:10,12,15
32:16 36:13	179:6 212:14	112:24 120:24	retrofit 22:24	190:15 191:8
48:19	212:25 214:11	248:12	24:2 25:1	191:11 192:7
requests 16:9	239:3 266:3,8	restraints 221:2	retrofits 207:2	192:12 193:25
33:19 57:21	269:7,10	221:4	return 22:20	194:2,22
62:18 70:13	reset 23:1	restriction	25:6 26:16,16	195:10,19
71:5,8 97:24	residential 47:2	295:21	27:12,14 28:3	209:25 227:24
108:18	47:4 48:10,13	result 19:5 39:3	28:4 30:10,10	228:7 233:4
require 63:1	59:18 61:9	60:23 61:2	30:11 31:3,14	234:20 238:7
82:3 131:8	62:21 63:9	84:10 130:24	38:19,21,24	258:5 259:23
138:2,9 156:23	80:21 81:5,6,8	155:12 166:3	49:8,11,16	260:1,2,4,9,11
195:10 262:2	81:10 141:15	167:17 228:18	51:1 71:24	261:2,7 262:4
281:13	141:17,19	231:15 242:8	72:22 85:24	264:18 270:19
	residual 109:23	242:15 248:10	90:16 92:13,14	271:17 272:19
		254:17 259:21	92:20,21 93:11	272:20,22,24

273:4,5,12	28:24 29:1,14	142:4 150:22	258:19,22,23	Road 231:1
276:5,11,12	29:17 32:17	159:1 164:10	258:25 259:2,5	255:22
278:8 286:14	34:3 62:5	167:2,13 170:4	259:8,9,10,13	Robert 12:17
286:23 289:13	69:10 86:15	171:1 172:23	259:21,22,24	13:2 16:20
289:14,15	98:20 99:7	173:5 198:14	259:24,25	152:19,21,24
290:17 292:19	111:4 115:16	209:24 212:3	260:3,5,13,25	307:8 309:9,11
293:14 294:23	194:6,7 206:15	218:1,1 219:25	261:2,3,4,6,8	311:11,12,14
295:23,25	reversed 219:22	221:8,10,10	261:11,14,18	Robertson 14:13
296:1,13	review 34:16	222:11 234:15	261:25 262:2	321:3
297:15 299:1	38:10 84:1,2,8	234:15,19	262:14,19	Robertson's
299:13 300:11	84:10 88:8	235:1 236:21	263:16,22	70:14
301:15 302:6	135:23 268:20	238:14,16	264:2,3,4,10	Robin 316:22,23
302:19,22,23	274:5 283:17	240:4 241:1,12	264:11 267:25	Robinson 77:1
303:4,6 304:24	283:24 284:8	246:13,25	268:7 273:18	robust 206:2
returns 26:5	284:22 285:1,5	247:1,18 248:8	273:20,21,23	207:17 208:10
27:21,21 131:9	285:16 302:21	250:1 252:17	273:24 274:2,3	227:15,16
135:20 138:9	reviewed 200:14	255:5 259:24	274:4,6,8,10	228:3,22 230:3
140:2 150:2,4	reviewing	263:13 266:24	275:11 276:1,8	ROE 25:9,9,13
150:9,13	181:10	284:9,9 286:16	276:20 277:4,5	25:13,16 26:1
171:23 174:13	revising 216:25	290:3 291:5	277:7,8,9,11	26:11,21,25
180:4,21	revisions 130:16	292:13 293:22	277:13,20,24	27:16,17,17
181:10 183:24	257:7	303:9 306:22	278:2,4,5	29:12 30:6
194:7 203:8	revoked 99:2	rings 247:19	281:22 282:10	43:9 44:1 45:5
204:1 210:12	reward 74:8	ripe 65:5	282:14,23,25	51:2 66:19
240:18 242:17	286:13	rise 73:15 91:19	286:12,14,25	72:23 73:2
242:21 253:5	Rick 18:7	204:18	287:12,24	74:12,23 75:1
267:21 297:18	rider 88:2,3	risen 136:1	291:25 292:1,9	75:9 86:1
304:12	riders 80:23	rising 196:14	292:12 293:19	106:3,4,19
revelant 19:11	83:11,14 183:8	203:25 204:2,3	302:15 303:18	107:11 108:1
revenue 27:4	183:16 206:3	204:4,6,9	303:21,24	108:25 109:15
34:14 37:8	Ridge 255:22	risk 26:22 62:17	risk-free 276:4,4	110:4,12,23
38:3,10 39:23	right 18:21 22:7	62:20,23 66:2	risk-shifting	111:9,19,20,23
39:24 45:2	35:17 40:5,7	66:19,21 69:20	75:5	137:8 138:4
48:20 63:15	41:20 43:7,23	69:25 74:15	risks 69:22	139:3,5,17
69:12 74:23	44:18 45:3,15	75:6,8,10	70:12 140:3	140:7,15
81:7 111:1,7,8	50:10,21 51:4	132:7 145:4	182:22 190:19	141:24 142:3,4
115:18 187:18	52:17,23 53:18	146:6,13	194:10 195:5	142:5,10,12,15
191:21,24	58:23 72:25	148:25 151:6,9	202:2 260:4	142:17 143:22
192:3,17,17,18	74:20 78:25	151:10,19	261:12 287:13	144:4,9,19
193:23 314:19	79:9 103:14,25	155:12 169:3,5	risky 178:12,13	146:20,23
314:22 321:6	112:23,25	169:9,10,12	179:1 268:4	148:15,17
322:12,20	119:9 125:2	205:17 223:10	Rita 80:11	151:15 155:3
323:5	126:13,20	226:4,4 227:25	RLJ 52:10	156:20 158:1,1
revenues 28:23	127:6 137:25	228:4,6 240:12	ROA 291:4	158:3,6,15

162:13,22 168:3,23 170:1 170:2 189:1 190:25 192:21 195:3,20 196:7 208:9 217:10 219:2 224:2,5 225:13,23 226:5,7,14 227:12 230:4 241:4,16 248:3 248:4 251:20 251:23 252:4 252:14 258:3 259:17 261:16 266:15,22 267:12 277:3 279:21 286:5 287:10,15,20 290:14,17,20 291:4,24 292:4 292:14 293:8 293:13 296:5 301:13 ROE's 297:2 ROEs 26:21,23 28:10 132:19 134:5 135:13 142:2 150:25 182:18 203:22 204:19,24 205:13 208:9 209:10,13,16 209:19,20 210:10,11,18 210:25 242:20 253:5,10 296:4 298:15 304:5 304:15 314:3 314:14 Roger 13:2 16:20 292:17 Rogers 312:24 role 85:15,16	rolled 90:16 Ronald 312:11 312:12,14,16 room 42:15 109:4 118:16 123:23 265:14 ROR 193:24 ROR/Capital 323:22,24 rose 135:21 ROT 300:9 roughly 59:4,24 round 274:25 rounded 274:22 routinely 276:17 Royals 54:3 RRA 271:13 rule 50:15 72:15 98:23 103:5,10 104:2 148:3 223:10,20 rulemaking 72:17 rules 83:5 124:22 ruling 19:9,10 87:12 252:10 rulings 134:15 135:6 run 145:15 163:17 185:7 239:10 run-up 178:7 running 19:18 runs 255:1 RUPP 12:19 Rush 20:6 41:15 44:7 64:14 313:11,13,15 313:17,19,21 Ruth 17:23 Ryan 309:21,23 310:3	S	S 12:17 13:1 250:4 282:17 282:23 S-U-S-S-E-X 153:2 safe 59:12 73:5 73:10 74:10,14 131:5 139:23 178:12 179:1 251:25 safely 59:14 salaries 109:3 sales 28:16 29:18 30:21 46:20 97:18 105:5,6,7,10 sampled 54:14 sampling 63:25 San 14:17 sanctioning 65:16 sand 91:6 92:1 99:19 Sarah 316:25 317:3 satisfied 69:8 223:9 save 81:2 109:13 saw 35:8 56:3 169:10 291:20 saying 52:10 55:7 95:9 117:6 169:24 191:4,20 208:8 210:9 215:4,6 219:9 220:18 226:10 228:24 236:16 274:15 says 50:22 68:7 68:10 74:22 87:18 91:6,10 91:11 96:3 97:20 99:14	104:15 107:13 112:15,18,19 112:21 133:13 148:23 153:16 155:9,14 192:2 192:12 194:20 203:7 205:3,16 206:14,18 208:19 209:13 210:8 213:25 244:18 249:18 250:3,8 282:23 282:23 283:4 298:14 schedule 19:15 24:3 135:12 180:4,7,8,9 247:11 271:1 272:4 297:8 scheduled 305:23 306:10 schedules 82:6 153:7 187:23 314:25 Scheperle 319:3 319:5,6 Schmidt 324:3,5 324:7 school 52:4 scientific 137:4 290:19 scope 66:2 67:12 163:13 Scott 12:19 311:9 screen 148:13 scrutiny 62:19 69:14 Sean 14:4 143:14 seasonally 215:14 seasonally-adj... 269:24	seated 230:19 255:16 SEC 104:4,11,23 244:25 245:17 246:1,6 314:12 SEC's 245:5 second 14:17 79:11,16,18 81:19 88:24 92:8 100:16 101:17,19 102:1 118:16 123:12 130:17 135:25 153:18 154:25 158:16 180:6,12,22 182:7,13 185:18 193:21 205:3,11,15 206:2,18 210:7 238:19 249:25 250:2 271:9,11 sect 179:4 section 82:17 281:22 282:22 sector 169:7 182:17 197:21 202:7,19 211:13 314:8 sectors 83:1 178:24 179:1,5 205:17 secure 207:20 securities 74:15 148:24,25 243:14 245:1 246:20 274:4 278:2,3 security 128:1 138:6 277:8 see 18:20,20 19:21 24:14 34:23 35:13 44:19 50:19,25
--	---	----------	--	---	--

51:3 53:19,20 64:13 91:9 93:20 96:20 97:24 98:4,12 98:14 99:8,20 102:23 104:7 104:18 105:2 105:14 106:6 106:24 111:8 111:19 112:3,8 113:14,19 114:14 120:9 120:21 128:6 131:23 133:7 135:4 144:5 150:18 151:21 154:10 157:6 164:21 170:1 172:4 173:6,6 178:10 182:6 182:10 199:4,7 204:5 205:4,5 205:19 209:11 211:1 212:4 219:22 224:3 228:21 230:10 237:10 238:2 239:10 242:8 242:16 244:17 244:21,23 249:10,20 262:15 265:22 266:22 279:18 286:16,18 288:17 297:9 299:21,22 306:19 seeing 109:24 128:14,19 130:24 133:24 171:24 212:8 213:2 237:25 239:3 249:22 249:22 267:15	268:24 seek 31:19 33:3 40:17 41:3 42:24 49:23 51:22 52:1,19 52:22 56:24 57:4 58:7,8 68:2,5,10,14 68:19 76:7 78:16,21,23,24 79:5,6,13 101:9 102:11 290:13 seeking 27:6 31:22 40:21 42:25 52:20 64:10 206:9 227:16,19,21 227:22 288:7 seeks 22:22 41:3 46:3 62:18 68:4 92:5 107:16,19 seen 49:12 114:6 118:5 120:10 128:25 129:2 130:1 132:4 146:9,12 174:2 177:22 178:4,7 178:8,15,21,21 178:23 179:3,9 212:9 222:22 238:12 270:16 279:21 298:17 sees 110:3 segment 270:17 sell 32:19 selling 46:24 82:18 198:10 Senate 119:13 123:12 senior 12:16 15:5,7 59:20 63:11 121:4	sense 35:15 73:4 74:10 107:1,4 220:24 221:2,4 230:6 264:1 295:19 sensitive 179:5 179:21 sensitivity 255:1 sentence 40:12 58:8 79:11,16 79:19 101:17 101:17,19 102:1,2 123:12 193:21 205:16 209:13 210:7 281:23 283:3 separate 65:24 86:25 93:8 95:11 97:6,8 100:5 103:10 122:9 September 32:1 32:9 41:2,6 42:25 130:24 212:14 238:8 238:23 240:6 series 54:4 145:15 271:3 serious 116:9 seriously 38:17 85:19 194:16 213:1 served 59:4 serves 59:24 61:16 service 12:1,14 15:9 16:5 17:3 22:15 23:1,23 23:24 26:25 28:17 31:9 37:6 47:6,18 47:24 48:22 60:16 61:1 65:9,9,20	66:12 71:25 73:6,17,18 82:13,15 83:24 83:25 84:3,25 86:4 87:25 88:2,18 109:17 111:5 117:20 117:21 120:13 121:20,20,21 122:3 132:16 139:23 141:2 141:10,13 142:6 147:10 147:23 187:15 192:4,7 193:24 202:18 263:1 282:8 294:9 307:17 314:7 314:17,19,22 services 85:2 92:25,25 102:17 109:3 109:18 147:18 162:21,22,23 session 162:2 set 16:2 29:2 30:4 36:8 64:24 74:11 95:3 100:7,17 108:14 117:21 127:21 128:5 134:16 137:13 151:15 190:25 224:15 238:7 241:23 305:24 sets 96:4 191:8 252:25 setting 110:22 138:19,23 150:7 192:21 304:5 settled 271:25 299:23 305:6 settlement 37:24	39:25 244:11 244:14,18 245:1 299:20 299:20 304:25 305:4 settlements 304:21,23 settling 132:18 seven 27:18 213:14 250:15 seven-tenths 130:14 seven-year 28:11 128:18 210:25 Shallenberg 102:8 share 63:2 140:18 240:4 240:22,23,23 241:12,13,25 242:5,7,7,8,14 243:15 254:25 share/book 242:4 share/earnings 242:4 shared 51:8 92:24 112:13 120:6 shareholder 111:25 112:1,3 shareholders 27:23 36:1 38:12 39:5 51:9 59:8 66:17 71:23 111:24 112:5 117:23 193:5 193:18,19,22 sharing 71:21,22 72:2,16,17,18 72:18,20,20 123:9
--	---	--	---	--

sharpest 130:9 215:9 269:20	showed 31:12 49:14 107:6 276:7	60:9 82:21 85:23 87:8 98:5 107:21 119:5 124:8 138:24 140:10 149:22,22 186:9 238:12 259:6 282:13 282:23 283:1,8 291:18 295:22	96:9 105:9 145:13 240:21	212:5 213:14 215:10 265:23 265:25 269:21 291:14,15
shear 36:21	showers 108:20		single-family 59:21	
shedding 264:4	showing 137:6		single-issue 31:20 69:13 71:1 87:16 89:3,5 90:4	sixth 46:12
sheet 256:12,24	shown 109:6 240:11 295:14 298:21			skittish 138:8
sheets 19:3 67:24 68:19 83:21	shows 23:14 24:15 27:16 35:21 58:8 60:7 61:15 62:10 69:15,17 72:23 73:1,13 99:7 113:25 120:22 135:15 148:24 189:6 210:17	significantly 25:13 88:11 139:8 142:3 250:10,11 280:2 295:22	single-minded 111:22	slide 23:13 27:15 27:22 34:23 59:16 62:6,10 68:6 72:23 113:13 131:16 134:18
shielded 122:6		silence 18:15	single-stage 240:18 254:17 254:19	slides 103:12 118:6
shift 62:20,23 69:20 70:12 75:8 259:13,18 261:12 262:1		similar 20:16 24:22 34:12 92:16 112:22 127:24,25 137:17 140:13 151:6,8,10,19 166:10 195:5 263:17,17 264:7 275:2,3	sir 20:9 40:11 51:20,23 53:19 53:22 54:23 56:1,7,11 57:7 58:24 143:11 147:13 158:21 167:3,9 168:2 168:12,25 169:2 183:1 193:1 196:3 197:10 199:4 202:12 203:25 209:11 211:1,7 213:20 224:3 268:20 271:1 285:7 305:19	slight 105:2 146:9
shifting 62:17 66:3	shrinking 128:22		sister 30:3 134:12 235:4	slightly 49:1 70:20 90:15 99:10 151:23 163:23
shifts 258:23	shrunk 130:14	similarly 104:17 109:20 204:22		slip 120:15
short 47:22 80:1 85:19 135:5 146:3 255:11	sic 41:3,3 79:6 200:2 207:4	simple 97:3,10 211:22 273:3 273:11		sloping 184:1
short-term 134:20 135:4 235:18,19 236:4,9 238:11 239:5,6,9 240:10	side 24:12,13 29:19 120:10 120:11 178:6,6	simply 37:14 52:19 63:10,19 70:8 96:17,18 108:21 132:4 146:8 149:2,14 191:20,24 195:8 235:25 259:9 272:10 272:10,13 294:18 300:2 82:8		slower 150:14
shortfall 27:23 28:10,15 29:11	Sierra 14:15,18 14:22 16:9 21:22 24:20,22 24:25 25:4 125:24 306:3 321:15,16,18 321:19,21,23 322:3	similarly 104:17 109:20 204:22		slowly 253:6
shortfalls 31:12		simple 97:3,10 211:22 273:3 273:11		small 59:19 60:1 60:19 63:12 134:3 289:15
shouldering 66:19 75:10	side 24:12,13 29:19 120:10 120:11 178:6,6	simply 37:14 52:19 63:10,19 70:8 96:17,18 108:21 132:4 146:8 149:2,14 191:20,24 195:8 235:25 259:9 272:10 272:10,13 294:18 300:2 82:8		smaller 47:8 64:4 85:16 289:8
show 25:15 26:3 27:15,18,25 29:15 30:1 47:13 63:22 91:24 92:20 93:4 100:15 103:16,19,19 110:5,12,23 112:12 113:16 128:8 145:25 146:8 155:2 203:24 223:5 240:1 245:16 278:7,13	SIEUA 107:18	simultaneously 82:8		slip 120:15
	sig 299:3	single 37:2 40:15 59:19 91:15		sloping 184:1
	signals 82:8			slower 150:14
	signatory 41:25 123:13			slowly 253:6
	significant 22:23 22:25 28:14 29:5 34:3,20 36:11 44:20,23 45:10 50:16,17			small 59:19 60:1 60:19 63:12 134:3 289:15
				smaller 47:8 64:4 85:16 289:8
				Smith 14:10
				solar 28:18 43:19 44:2,10 44:23
				sold 82:24
				solution 28:9
				solutions 115:11
				solve 49:22
				somebody 168:22 246:17
				somewhat 48:1 55:5 133:9 178:13,23
				son 53:22

song 131:4	Spanos 313:23	sports 117:4	188:15 190:10	226:10,13
sooner 46:2	313:25	SPP 29:7 31:9	192:25 197:5	237:8,9 270:15
274:11	speak 41:13	33:20,22,25	201:10,19,24	278:18 280:4
sophisticated	177:25 206:22	34:10 36:25	210:4 217:8,17	304:9 314:14
145:12 146:16	219:20	50:8 111:3	219:13 220:24	315:3
sorry 18:16	speaking 58:17	SPP-integrated	221:2 226:11	stage 133:14,15
23:12 35:19	200:2 248:15	33:13	232:22 234:11	135:1 217:14
88:22 103:11	268:6	spreading 82:22	235:1 237:18	240:21 257:5
130:13 157:12	special 83:24	spring 128:9,17	252:19 260:15	284:4
157:14 165:3	119:22 206:3	St 13:23 14:14	268:19 278:21	stagnation 28:16
172:12 184:18	287:24	18:9 30:8	278:25 279:4,8	Stahlman 141:8
208:5 209:9	specific 25:3	stability 116:8	279:11,14,18	319:8,10
220:17 232:13	50:9 57:11	stabilize 116:5	280:6 293:5	stakeholders
233:21 244:2	85:21 92:3	stable 98:16	297:25 302:19	128:2
276:23 280:20	94:13 120:23	104:7,9,18	306:6 307:17	stand 37:20 43:5
281:19,21	213:2 228:20	112:15 207:12	314:17,18,19	57:18 152:20
288:25 289:2,4	239:21 272:20	207:20 268:4	314:21,22,24	230:17 245:10
298:12,12	272:21 273:3	Staff 15:4,5,6,6	314:25 315:3,6	standard 83:8
sort 124:10	273:12,23	15:9 16:24	315:8,9,11,12	89:17,21,24
169:10 176:5	281:16	17:3 18:23	315:14,16,18	90:2 95:24
176:18 199:1	specifically	21:16 23:20	315:20,22,24	96:4 100:4,11
242:18 264:13	22:24 29:15	25:9,12 37:20	316:3,5,7,9,10	201:20 280:19
275:15	72:21 92:25	38:5 39:1 42:5	316:12,14,16	282:4 314:16
sought 64:11	93:4 94:21	45:22 50:8,22	316:17,19,21	standards 36:8,9
95:23 123:16	95:19 141:9	51:6,7,11,13	316:23,24	43:16 44:16
225:21	267:17 270:18	57:17 59:9	317:3,4,6,8,10	95:23 97:23
sound 245:13	306:5	72:1,2,8,20	317:12,14,16	99:21 100:6,8
266:24 279:12	speculative	73:3 74:11	317:19,21,23	105:12 116:1,9
302:20	66:20 70:25	76:19,20 78:14	318:3,5,7,9,11	194:24 273:10
soundness	speeding 129:3	91:6,7,10,11	318:12,14,15	standby 80:23
191:10	spell 187:10	91:14,19,20,23	318:17,18,20	83:25 84:2,4,8
sounds 137:4	spelled 152:24	93:12 100:18	318:22,24	84:10 88:7
267:4,11 279:7	spend 62:1	101:2 102:2,4	319:3,4,6,7,9	standpoint
source 181:6,9	285:25	102:5,7,8	319:11,13	45:14 297:5
214:1,7,14	spending 68:16	108:4,17,20	Staff's 25:18,20	stark 133:7
216:3,3	281:13	109:5 111:11	26:22,24 38:2	start 20:5 39:22
sources 57:13,15	spent 42:14,14	131:12 132:1	41:7 49:20,24	46:2 61:12
83:3 115:18	42:18 87:19	132:21 133:8	51:18 56:13	109:24 127:9
215:4,6	90:25 176:10	134:9,23 136:6	74:19 87:17,19	178:5 196:2
South 14:11	split 72:11	136:23 139:2	112:9 126:11	205:4 218:21
Southern 110:9	sponsored 60:7	144:7 164:16	133:13 140:12	254:15,24
Southwest 14:4	139:9	176:22 178:17	141:7 142:18	271:15 306:14
32:18	sponsoring 51:1	186:15 187:3,4	172:15 189:1	started 108:18
spaghetti 91:9	210:3	187:18 188:11	196:17 223:11	108:20 114:9

117:17 146:4 242:13 244:25 starting 77:15 125:10 305:24 starts 128:17 130:2,5 215:15 269:25 270:3 state 12:2 26:13 31:6 32:12 49:10 55:3 65:14,15 80:6 80:25 83:15 112:22 120:10 120:11 147:15 147:20 152:23 187:8 188:25 191:15,19 193:6,13,14,22 196:21 197:5 201:23 206:21 230:22 243:11 246:16 255:19 269:8 273:19 stated 33:3,18 122:19 129:6 155:2 190:14 199:12 200:4 214:11 215:8 218:25 240:7 265:13,17 269:7 272:9 292:17 300:21 statement 18:23 22:10 45:22 80:5 85:19 90:15,16,17 104:5,11,23 117:7 127:17 143:8 145:24 146:19 148:9 155:5 170:7 179:7 190:25 193:20 212:23 213:2 215:1	216:11 220:12 221:1,7 222:7 223:22 236:23 240:5 266:5 269:17 290:15 299:25 300:24 307:2,2,3,3,4,4 307:5,5,6,6 statement's 170:6 statements 22:9 45:24 125:9 127:13 152:17 168:22 214:19 216:9 249:12 268:23 states 47:9 56:4 74:22 103:6 105:8 122:11 127:21 133:22 139:20 143:15 196:6 205:5 213:21 214:10 214:21 215:21 216:1 241:4 250:14 265:22 296:5 stating 203:19 station 64:22 67:4 121:18 stations 65:3 67:8 82:19 83:6,7 122:17 statistically 183:25 statistically-si... 174:11 statistics 129:17 130:6 271:8 statute 207:6 284:3 statutorily 148:5 statutory 94:14 94:14 95:11	100:5 148:3,4 stay 110:11 264:17 293:2 stays 109:23 steadily 189:16 Steady 283:4 Steiner 13:2 16:20 125:20 125:22 126:9 126:14,19 147:11 step 66:7 183:1 186:21 214:12 230:10 238:24 255:6 STEPHEN 12:18 stepping 239:4 Steve 42:5 stick 19:14 163:18 174:14 sticking 163:20 163:25 164:1 sticks 91:9 stimulate 128:13 stipulation 19:6 31:16,18 32:3 40:10 56:13,14 76:7 86:8 99:1 101:3,5 118:17 123:10 199:9 stock 112:2 134:23,23 145:25 146:4 146:14,15 192:4 197:8,11 197:18 198:9 212:2,4,22 228:14,17,21 228:23 229:7 229:14,22 236:1,2 270:21 279:24,25 291:17	stocks 146:9 STOLL 12:18 stone 64:24 stood 56:23 stop 116:16 221:21 stopped 199:22 store 65:13 storm 96:8 story 112:6 straight 194:25 straightforward 97:3,10 strain 141:21 strangely 111:14 straw 61:21 stream 70:4 111:7 Street 13:7,13 13:17,20 14:1 14:8,11,14,17 14:20,24 15:7 17:20 18:9 178:25 215:10 strength 130:22 strengthen 281:15 282:9 282:11 strengthens 282:7,20 stricken 68:20 strike 19:3,3 67:23 87:11 strong 128:14,19 130:1 258:15 294:7 stronger 269:10 282:15 303:19 strongly 65:14 130:22 struck 91:1 155:1 structural 196:8 structure 25:7	25:11 63:14 134:3,8,11,14 134:16,22 135:2,8 205:22 234:20,21,25 235:4,10,15,19 236:5,9 289:16 Structure/ROE 323:22,24 structures 205:11,18,25 207:18 struggled 61:10 128:18 struggles 60:12 61:23,24 struggling 141:7 stuck 164:3,4 studies 131:24 223:15 273:6 277:22 291:7 302:12 304:7 304:10 study 63:6 79:22 88:7 167:25 222:25 259:22 261:9 264:13 273:7,24 274:2 275:11 276:17 291:8,11,12 301:19 302:1,3 302:5,9 subject 23:24 34:11 36:3 158:13 199:19 209:22 279:2 284:13 subjected 94:3 subjective 112:12 137:8 subjects 248:23 submit 229:18 submitted 304:1 subscribe 81:21
---	--	---	---	--

81:23	13:17,20 14:14	supports 37:23	232:10 234:12	system 28:23
Subsection	14:20 15:7	72:18,18,20	236:14,18	39:3 61:21
82:17	203:13,18	119:21 138:11	237:3,10 240:7	74:1 94:22
subsequent	204:23 206:2	149:1	242:25 243:5,6	Systems 209:1
34:15 36:9	207:17 208:10	supposed 153:19	248:21,22	
169:1	227:15,16	Supreme 127:21	255:24 258:17	<hr/> T <hr/>
subsidiaries	228:3,22,23	139:20 190:11	268:15 271:1	T 12:19
263:1	230:3	190:22 191:3	272:7,9 298:12	table 60:6,7
subsidiaries 66:3	sum 88:8	191:15,20	298:22 310:3,9	113:24 153:15
subsidized	summarize	192:2 193:11	310:11,21,23	153:16,17
121:22	224:2 240:17	surcharges	311:5,7,14,25	155:18
substance	243:13	281:15	312:7,9,16,22	take 19:10,25
168:20	summarized	sure 35:14 44:4	313:7,9,19,21	35:5 54:2,15
substantial	135:13	50:20 88:20	315:11,17,22	67:18 76:8
24:17 26:2	summarizes	89:11 117:24	315:24 316:9	77:20 78:12,15
36:10,19 44:19	148:20	122:16 155:8	316:12,14,18	80:1,25 87:12
65:5,11,23	summary 38:9	162:10 177:13	316:20,23	91:23 108:5,7
66:7 67:5	131:17 134:5	185:19 206:23	317:3,5,7,13	108:22 116:4
69:18 96:7,10	148:22 152:4	206:24,24	317:15 318:3,5	116:17,21
145:5 210:16	153:16 158:20	209:21 218:20	318:9,13,17,23	125:16,17
substantially	180:20 203:15	232:14 252:7	318:25 319:6,8	150:18 155:16
25:25 75:10	245:25 314:3	270:12 278:15	319:10,13,19	171:7 176:18
209:19,21,25	314:12	286:7,15	319:24 320:3	186:24 196:1
210:17	SUNIL 14:16	294:11	320:13,15	200:6,21
success 89:10	supervision	surged 128:17	321:3,8,11,14	214:12 226:6
successful	231:3	surmise 292:3	321:18,24	238:24 240:1
285:22	Supplemental	surprised	322:3,6,10,16	252:4 255:10
suffered 118:6	311:19,21	155:24	323:3,10,16,24	255:11 261:25
suffering 113:11	312:3	surprising 66:22	324:7	273:24 296:3
113:16	supplies 104:6	surrebuttal	surveillance	taken 87:7 115:6
sufficient 69:9	Supply 215:22	25:12 70:14	110:19	115:9 173:8
120:23 139:24	270:4	86:1,6,13 91:6	surveys 247:2	269:11 325:5,5
140:1 142:5,25	support 87:10	111:11 113:25	suspect 65:14	325:9
191:20,24	87:17,18,19,19	129:2 131:15	110:24 220:13	takes 91:12
192:12,19	87:20,24 88:6	153:6,18	Sussex 153:2	121:15 143:22
193:23	101:4,7 112:16	154:23 162:7	sustainable	146:22 259:9
suggest 138:10	116:13,13	163:22 164:10	145:18 241:1	talk 101:1
230:2 266:9	123:3 199:2	176:9 180:4	sweaty 118:16	103:17,21
suggested 25:12	273:2	183:22 188:3	swinging 97:1	111:23,24
179:10 285:12	supported 303:7	188:11,25	Swingley 255:22	124:2 131:13
303:7	supporting	200:7 211:8	Swissvale/Still...	137:22 203:12
suggests 47:20	89:11	213:7,13,21	86:19	221:1 242:24
51:13	supportive	223:25 224:3	symmetrical	250:2
suite 13:7,10,13	207:11 272:24	231:4,19 232:3	120:6 296:15	talked 96:6

131:10,14 134:5 178:8 194:3,24 198:21,21 199:1,3 207:19 227:14 291:16 306:2 talking 42:22 77:7 112:5 166:5,6 172:5 204:7,10,12,13 211:20 213:24 219:22 220:8 221:8 222:8 264:14 266:3 275:10 283:15 290:15 304:12 talks 101:20 112:11 206:13 244:14 target 50:1 56:16,19 214:13 238:24 targeted 83:20 tariff 19:3 67:23 68:19 80:24 83:21 84:1,3 tariffed 67:9 83:8 tax 30:25 34:21 35:1,2 45:8,11 50:7 70:17 93:23 96:23 98:7 taxes 23:11 27:9 29:7,23 31:10 34:19,23 35:11 35:25 36:2 37:1,7 38:16 44:16 87:22 92:6 96:22,25 97:25 98:1,2,5 196:14 teams 117:4	technical 39:8 44:3 technology 84:6 Ted 70:14 321:3 tell 28:8 52:15 102:2,25 113:11 128:6 131:18 151:9 158:9 164:10 176:10,13,15 177:12 183:21 184:24 185:9 186:8 216:13 304:4 telling 179:11 238:22 tells 48:8 178:11 246:6 temporary 199:2 ten 113:6 244:19 255:12 297:6 297:13 ten-year 73:13 129:10 216:14 216:23 222:20 222:23 tend 133:3,9 179:21 182:18 182:20 286:4 tender 154:12 188:17 232:21 257:18 tending 125:12 tens 59:14 term 47:22 135:5 240:14 terms 19:5 70:2 116:1,1 123:23 137:2 139:22 164:8 168:19 179:22 245:10 252:12 258:24 268:23 272:11	296:11 territories 147:23 territory 28:17 29:4 47:18 65:20 82:15 141:2 147:10 263:2 282:8 test 167:20 172:1 206:19 206:24 231:4 284:13 testified 80:11 140:10 167:7 167:21 188:10 224:12 233:22 262:8 testifies 152:21 187:6 230:18 255:15 289:5 testify 19:18 110:15 137:11 154:5 168:15 172:1 288:18 testifying 37:3 49:6 102:6 103:2 224:6 288:22 testimonies 232:7 301:16 testimony 19:3 20:12,17 25:15 32:5 36:20,21 41:11,14 57:20 58:16 60:6 61:14 62:6 63:3 64:1,15 67:24 68:18 69:6,8,15 70:14 71:16,20 73:13,16 74:12 80:20 85:22 86:5,13,21,21 87:4,8,21 88:9	91:1,2,4 97:22 98:12 99:14 104:12 105:8 106:17 107:24 108:17 109:17 111:12 113:25 121:8 125:25 139:11 140:7,9 140:13 141:3,8 141:14 143:8 145:22 146:2,7 148:23 149:9 149:10,25 150:12,21 151:23 152:3 153:5,5,6,12 153:19 155:2,5 155:7 156:3 157:22 162:7 163:23 164:6,6 164:10 165:21 166:1 167:6 168:3,15,21 170:24 172:10 172:15,21 173:13 176:8,9 178:8,17 183:21,23 187:25 188:3,6 196:1,2 199:12 202:23 218:5 224:1 231:4,4 231:16,17,19 231:20 232:3 232:10,10 236:19,21 237:1,4,23 240:17 242:25 247:6 248:20 254:8 255:6,24 256:3,9,10,11 256:25 257:4,7 257:9,20 258:18 266:11	267:5 268:15 270:19 272:17 273:17 275:21 275:24 276:18 279:21 281:4 285:19 287:16 287:22 288:1 294:1 298:10 298:18,21,22 301:4,16 303:13 304:1 305:10,19 306:4,16 309:3 309:5,7,9,11 309:13,15,17 309:19,21,23 310:3,5,7,9,11 310:13,15,17 310:19,21,23 310:25 311:3,5 311:7,9,11,12 311:14,15,17 311:19,21,23 311:25 312:3,5 312:7,9,11,12 312:14,16,18 312:19,21,22 312:24 313:3,5 313:7,9,11,13 313:15,17,19 313:21,23,25 315:10,11,13 315:15,17,18 315:20,22,24 316:3,5,7,9,11 316:12,14,16 316:18,20,22 316:23,25 317:3,5,7,9,11 317:13,15,17 317:19,22,24 318:3,5,7,9,11 318:13,16,17 318:19,21,23
--	---	--	---	---

318:25 319:3,5 319:6,8,10,12 319:13,16,17 319:19,20,22 319:24 320:3,5 320:7,9,11,13 320:15,17,19 320:21,23 321:6,8,9,11 321:12,14,17 321:18,20,22 321:24 322:3,6 322:9,10,12,14 322:16,20,22 322:24 323:3,5 323:7,9,10,12 323:14,16,17 323:19,22,24 324:3,5,7 tests 137:7 Texas 114:16 thank 16:18,23 16:25 17:5 18:12,19,25 20:9 21:9 35:17 39:10,17 39:20 45:16,17 45:18,20,21 51:16,18 53:18 56:9 58:23,24 75:15,16 76:6 77:10,12 79:25 80:7,15 85:8 85:10,11 88:13 88:14 90:3,10 90:11 114:23 114:24 115:3,5 116:22,25 117:1,10 123:7 125:4,6,7,8 127:1,4 136:18 136:20,22 138:13,15 143:2,3,5,17	146:25 147:2 148:7,8 152:7 152:9,10 156:4 157:1 158:5,21 158:21 164:13 164:17 166:9 166:22 170:9 174:20,21 175:10 176:20 176:21,23 177:14,17 180:14 181:14 182:25 183:1 184:6,14 186:10,12,14 186:16,19,20 187:4,14 188:18,21 189:19,23,25 202:14 213:18 224:25 225:4 226:16 227:7 230:8,11 231:22 232:20 232:25 233:10 249:10 251:11 251:17 252:17 252:20 253:20 254:5 255:3,6 257:22 260:14 260:16 265:1 266:21 288:9 289:3 290:4,5 293:22 297:19 297:20 298:1 300:17 305:18 thankful 208:10 thanks 115:2 123:9 126:19 127:18 167:4 170:11,11 251:10 288:17 theirs 99:2 165:24 246:17	theme 117:17 131:4 137:24 then-Staff 102:5 thereto 325:11 thing 66:25 72:13 106:14 106:16 107:20 149:24 150:23 166:6 215:5 275:15 300:4 300:12 304:11 things 23:14 29:22 45:14 53:25 54:18 73:9,22 74:2 76:3,17 91:12 103:6 112:5 114:20 118:4 119:15 120:3 128:9 136:11 136:12 137:23 137:24 138:1 166:14 169:1 176:4 178:5 197:10,19 198:4 212:22 215:4 238:19 239:19 245:17 277:18 301:7 think 19:22 22:7 25:2 26:2 31:25 38:25 39:16 40:24,25 41:14 42:12,13 42:16 43:3 44:24 47:5 52:15 55:9 58:7 67:1 68:12 76:24 77:8 78:10,10 78:12,18,19 79:3,4,7 80:6 86:23 87:23 88:5 90:1	101:16 102:1 107:1 118:11 119:16,25 120:11,13,17 120:21 122:4,5 122:14,20,21 124:19,21,24 124:24 126:5 128:16 130:11 131:3 133:3 135:10 148:22 150:15 155:6 155:25 156:23 163:10,11 166:5,14,15,15 166:16 169:9 171:9,11,21,24 172:5,8,9,20 173:10,10,12 173:16,17,21 173:23 174:7,8 175:23 176:16 177:3,10,11 179:6 182:5,8 182:20 183:20 187:3 197:14 199:9 200:1 209:22 210:9 212:16,17 213:12 214:15 214:24 218:16 222:17 223:4 223:19 225:14 227:14,14 233:18 237:6 237:19 247:20 256:17,20 259:12 261:13 261:17,23 263:12,20 264:1,6,20 265:13,17,17 265:24 266:18 267:17,24	268:11 275:16 277:1 280:6 286:1 291:10 293:3,6,18,20 295:7,15 296:7 296:12 297:3 299:25 300:21 301:14 302:20 304:17 305:5 306:14 thinking 20:15 80:10 115:11 116:8 186:23 thinks 80:13 151:13 third 34:9 92:12 96:16 192:10 192:11 206:13 214:10 THOMAS 14:19 Thompson 15:4 16:25,25 18:25 42:6 45:23 51:17,19,23 52:2,15,18,21 53:1,4,8,13,17 53:19,22 54:1 54:5,7,9,17,20 54:23 55:5,12 55:18,21,23 56:1,7,11,16 56:20,25 57:2 57:7,16,25 58:4,6,16,22 58:24 60:24 76:13 126:11 136:24 138:16 140:24 164:17 164:18,20 165:7 166:22 167:5 176:23 176:24 177:14 181:12,14 186:16 187:4,7
---	---	--	---	--

188:8,17	291:14 298:16	96:20 101:14	172:8	152:12
202:14 208:3	298:16 301:18	101:23,24	TIMOTHY 15:1	topics 71:19
213:16,18	306:16,20	107:24 113:17	title 153:17	total 82:25
218:12 219:25	three-quarters	114:7 118:5,9	titled 314:8	98:19 104:13
227:7,8 230:8	248:2	118:23 122:14	today 16:1 18:15	111:25 112:1,3
232:1,12,23	three-stage	123:19,22	19:13,16,18	162:14 278:5
249:8 252:20	240:19 241:10	124:9 125:13	29:3 38:13	touch 117:15
252:21 253:20	242:6 254:23	128:11,23	39:6 43:6	304:11
260:16,17	Threlkeld 12:22	133:12 144:23	55:13 60:8	tracked 36:17
263:10,18	325:3,18	146:3,4 150:14	61:11 109:4	tracker 30:25
265:1 286:1	threw 43:18	154:6,12 156:5	113:10 117:13	33:24 34:8,21
298:1 307:2,6	throughput	162:19 170:11	137:20 138:2	35:24 36:14
307:12,14,19	84:21	171:10,12	145:10 150:21	45:8,11 50:7,7
307:21 308:6	throw 74:6	173:7,12	171:5 180:11	50:10,22 70:16
Thompson's	throwing 91:8	174:10,14	197:16 216:13	70:19 71:5,8
113:8 286:8	throws 91:12	175:22 176:11	216:16 225:25	75:5 89:18
thorough 62:19	thumb 223:10	176:12 184:5	230:5,7 231:10	92:5 93:22,23
thou 35:12	223:20	185:12,20	239:12 254:22	93:23 94:9,16
thought 87:13	Thursday 85:18	186:9,23	255:9 260:3	97:9,23 98:7
102:10 128:22	ticked 129:23	190:17 196:23	265:15,18,19	99:1,2,5,15,17
130:14 150:19	tie 242:18	199:13 209:4	275:10 280:3	99:21 195:9
156:1 157:11	tier 112:4	213:24 222:9	300:22 305:10	206:10,11
164:25 172:12	TIGER 12:22	233:22 257:12	305:23 306:3	209:5
173:20,21	till 55:9 157:6	261:9,20	today's 149:2,3	trackers 27:7
176:25 183:11	186:25	265:16 267:20	152:5	36:20 50:6,6,9
238:18	Tim 17:7 20:6	268:24,25	told 46:23 51:1	50:19,23 70:13
thoughtfully	41:15 44:7	270:12 277:25	60:14 164:25	70:15,16,23,25
99:20 165:15	64:14 313:11	288:6,7 291:7	165:8 275:23	87:16 89:3,4
thousand 164:8	313:13,15,17	291:9,12,19	tomorrow 19:20	89:16 92:5
thousands 59:14	313:19,21	292:18 293:16	76:5 126:23	93:9,15,22
59:15 93:10	321:17,18	297:10 298:24	305:24 306:13	94:2,5,14,15
three 27:1,3	time 16:2 19:18	299:14 300:22	tomorrow's	95:23 96:3,25
72:23 74:18	19:23 22:18	301:2,17,19,22	19:19	99:25 100:9
107:24 116:9	26:8 30:4,12	time-of-use	tons 111:19	122:18,20
130:10 131:20	40:5 42:4,6	80:22 81:20,21	tool 34:21 50:10	195:8,9,17,17
131:20,23,24	46:6 48:9	81:25,25 82:3	tools 142:13	197:12,23
132:10 134:2	50:16 54:4	82:4,9	213:5	198:5 206:3,6
137:12 139:25	59:9 60:15,15	timeline 81:25	top 74:5,5 112:4	206:10 225:13
153:9 156:21	62:1,9,13	199:17	135:14,17	225:21 227:22
173:9,24	67:18 68:25	timely 205:6	136:6 183:15	283:16
185:15 192:16	70:5 74:9 78:7	208:10 281:13	220:11,12,14	tracking 33:9
192:20 212:9	78:8 79:21	times 50:10 94:9	220:14 249:17	75:7
218:19 240:18	80:9,11,12,25	288:24	topic 31:22	trade 115:13
241:13 276:21	90:6 91:1	timing 61:7	127:10,13	130:8 215:9

228:25 229:1,9 269:20,23 trade-off 119:11 traded 216:2 270:9 trading 228:15 traditional 142:13 traditionally 115:19 trait 56:2 trajectory 47:14 196:23 TRANSCRIPT 12:4 transfer 142:23 translates 207:12 transmission 23:8,16 27:7 29:7,20 31:10 32:17,18,22,25 33:3,9,10,11 33:17,20,22,23 33:25 34:7,8 34:11 36:25 37:7 38:15 44:20 50:8 70:17 86:15 92:7 93:22 95:16,18,20 111:3 182:17 182:21 196:14 Transource 111:7,7 transparent 207:12 transportation 83:1 travel 16:12 52:7 108:20 treasuries 216:14,24 301:1	treasury 129:7,9 129:10 178:6 178:10 212:6 213:22 217:2 237:12 269:2 301:1,8,12,14 301:18,20,23 301:25 302:1,3 302:4,5,10,11 treat 51:3 treated 34:12 121:21 122:4 treatment 37:9 119:23 trend 26:4 142:2 150:8 151:25 173:6,6 174:1 174:3,8,9,11 174:13,14,14 182:3 183:13 183:17,18,19 183:20,24 184:22 185:21 186:9 217:2 237:20 253:5 277:16 286:4 297:18 298:17 299:16,21,22 trending 297:2 trends 58:17 129:6 131:14 133:24 136:10 146:17 180:3,4 182:1 203:24 216:7 236:22 237:9 238:9 279:18 298:9 tried 24:8 90:21 troublesome 137:2 troubling 141:16 true 30:7 63:10 73:3 166:9,13	174:6 185:15 195:7,11,24 197:24 198:7 201:7 203:22 205:25 206:21 207:17 208:17 208:18 209:2,3 211:13 219:16 221:25 222:1 222:16,18,21 222:24 223:11 223:12 234:6,7 235:20,21 236:6,8 238:21 240:9 241:18 243:21 252:8 264:9 267:21 267:24 271:6 273:21 276:3 276:10 281:25 285:12 287:15 298:17 299:25 300:5,8,10 true-up 34:15 36:3 37:22 38:4,6 40:5,6 87:18 135:1 truly 113:5 truth 247:25 try 19:14 51:25 53:4 73:25 75:22 127:2 129:5 131:17 135:16 176:5 275:11 300:9 trying 63:17 115:22 120:14 158:23 199:16 226:10 239:17 239:24 241:23 243:5 290:13 299:18 300:1 Tshikororo 143:14	Tshikororo 14:4 143:13,18 147:5,10,13,16 148:4 156:11 175:6 184:16 189:25 226:25 230:16,21 231:23 232:8 232:13,20 254:5,6 255:3 265:3 298:3 307:6,23 308:2 Tuesday 267:10 turn 40:9 94:16 100:1 193:1 205:2 207:13 208:1 209:8 211:7 235:17 237:6 240:16 247:9 249:6 259:10 268:17 270:25 273:16 turning 25:5 78:9 162:12 258:17 Tuxedo 13:23 TVs 73:7 twenty 130:13 twice 26:15 two 20:5,7 27:20 30:17 32:13 35:12 44:8 49:20 55:3 59:23 60:21,21 60:22 68:13 79:15 100:12 111:3 119:15 130:12,20 131:1,10,25,25 132:4 134:3 136:13 138:3 139:24 153:11 155:15,16,20 155:22,22	169:1,6,10,13 188:13 203:17 218:19 220:14 236:1 272:3,11 272:12 288:5 291:5 304:14 304:19 two-thirds 244:17 248:2 type 33:4 65:18 75:20 78:20 91:21 98:16 109:24 123:24 176:6 207:7 types 115:13,23 167:25 264:1 typewriting 325:7 typical 97:7 114:3 typically 85:16 165:19 181:9 288:18 289:5 <hr/> U <hr/> U.S 26:17 74:21 128:10 129:17 139:4 143:10 143:19 156:10 175:5 184:15 189:24 202:19 205:3,5 208:9 215:8,16 232:18 244:19 265:2 269:19 269:23 298:2 314:8 UCD 83:13,20 83:21 ultimate 228:18 296:12 ultimately 82:19 unable 22:19 unambiguous
---	--	---	---	--

52:5 53:10	39:2 217:3	unusual 55:25	122:22 127:14	305:8 314:8
unanimous 33:7	undue 150:2	94:24 95:20	134:13,20	utilities' 114:1
212:13	unemployment	123:1,2 178:14	135:8 145:6,18	149:1
unanswered	47:11,12,12,13	unwillingness	149:5 168:13	utility 25:8
66:1 67:2	47:16,20 58:14	144:13	175:20 181:9	26:16,25 64:12
unavoidable	58:14 61:16	up-to-date	184:2 195:7	70:24 74:13,14
90:22	118:10 129:16	117:6	197:13 206:18	82:13 89:22
uncertainties	130:18,21	update 30:13	228:11 234:21	91:17 93:1
190:19 195:5	141:12	156:23 180:3	234:25 235:10	96:12,15 109:7
uncertainty	unexpected	222:25	236:9 242:3,20	112:22 116:4
171:14 274:10	302:8	updated 25:8	247:22 260:7	116:18 120:3
undergo 154:3	unfettered	27:25 38:3	261:24 263:14	121:20 129:13
underlying	207:13	135:1,12	303:2	132:16 133:25
25:19	unfortunate	151:20 180:8,9	useless 110:19	138:21 139:23
understand 40:5	234:14	232:10	users 60:3 121:3	140:5,22 142:5
48:15 56:18	uniform 94:22	updates 180:12	122:7	145:25 146:4,6
77:18 90:8	Unions 18:1	upgrade 112:20	uses 104:4 108:6	146:9 147:20
91:18 117:5	unique 91:18	139:7 282:5	109:16 149:17	148:24,25
162:16,25	94:25	303:13	usually 73:24	150:9 151:6,16
165:23 172:23	Unit 23:22,24	upgraded	305:13	152:1 162:18
199:16 201:25	United 47:9 56:4	303:16,17	util 301:20	166:7 169:7
212:20 217:20	127:21 133:21	upgrades 24:22	utilities 26:5	179:18 187:15
225:15 226:9	139:20 143:15	upper 144:2	28:25 38:23	190:15,24,24
226:10 228:21	241:4 265:22	155:11 248:6	55:3,3 63:24	191:7 192:3
229:6 232:2	universally	upstairs 52:10	67:9 73:5 85:4	193:14 194:14
234:4 261:21	144:16	upward 253:5	93:20 98:21	197:11,12,20
263:12 274:5	University 234:5	Urban 83:11	112:4 115:10	197:22 202:6
282:17	unknown 213:4	130:7	115:14,18,22	204:12,14,22
understanding	unlawful 34:13	urge 51:4 74:16	116:15 127:23	205:12 206:21
19:14 40:24	unnecessarily	137:19 142:23	133:21 135:15	211:13 214:6
174:17 183:9	70:11	urges 51:11	143:20 147:23	216:2 218:6
209:7 232:6	unnecessary	140:25	151:11 162:17	231:16 235:5
251:19 264:10	62:17 71:8	usage 28:23 29:4	165:20 169:13	235:11 241:3,5
269:23 270:3,8	unreasonable	38:15 63:16,17	178:24 182:19	242:22 252:3
278:19 283:23	69:20,22 171:7	73:15,25	195:4 202:19	258:25 259:1
284:7	unreasonably	USDE 323:21,23	208:9 209:14	261:22 264:2
understood	142:3 293:18	324:3,5,7	210:11,24	267:7,18 268:7
33:16 50:15	unregulated	use 50:11,22	211:24 251:25	269:5 270:9,11
286:8	110:5 111:2,6	62:24 63:18	267:22,23	270:17 271:17
undertake	122:5	73:18 79:6	268:5 271:5,5	271:21 273:1,2
304:20	unstable 238:4	94:19 96:12	272:2 280:2	279:21,24,24
undertaken	unstudied 66:6	101:10 104:25	284:8 288:5	282:9 284:12
109:5	unsustainable	106:25 107:3	289:12 297:15	284:18,21
undoubtedly	145:25	121:12 122:21	298:15,25	286:24 288:23

291:17 292:8 294:6,10,12,20 295:9,24 299:12 300:9 300:11,14,14 300:25 303:1 304:6 305:3 utility's 72:4 96:13 140:17 205:16 207:19 259:8 273:8 282:5 295:23 296:17 utilize 28:25 31:19,23 32:7 40:17,22 41:1 42:24,25 49:24 51:22 52:19,22 57:5 68:3,4,7 76:7,7 78:16 78:19 79:2 95:23 101:9 utilized 145:3 235:14 utilizes 145:7 utilizing 25:7,10 41:1,4 142:13	178:14 variations 239:9 241:13 variety 145:19 147:7,8 205:11 various 108:18 137:7 150:1 167:7 197:6 281:14 289:9 vary 70:20 274:3 vast 248:1 300:5 vegetation 27:10 44:16 50:13 70:17 92:6 97:13,15,17 98:10,11,13,22 99:1 vehicle 64:22 65:3,18 67:4,8 82:19 121:17 vehicles 82:20 83:2 verbally 43:22 verification 199:20 verify 269:15 270:2 version 36:8 135:12 256:3 versions 36:9 versus 40:22 52:19 76:7 vertically 151:12 158:18 183:15 vertically-inte... 26:5,15 135:15 151:1,4 182:14 182:18 267:23 268:4,6 271:4 271:20 272:2 298:15 304:15 victor 152:25 view 35:22 91:16 92:24	112:7,13 155:18 165:22 165:23,24 171:16,19 183:18 viewed 146:10 268:4 305:7 views 39:1 74:14 202:2 207:19 246:7,8,16 282:4 violate 70:25 100:14,16 105:16 246:21 violated 100:24 violates 67:25 violating 102:14 violation 56:14 56:17,21,25 69:1 Virginia 99:16 183:7,8,11,16 183:16 297:15 virtually 169:24 virtue 195:3 visual 136:24 volatile 89:23 96:16,17 97:1 98:4 99:7,11 104:20 178:22 179:13 volatility 96:18 100:9 104:8,10 104:14,24 105:2,6,11 128:25 178:9 212:9 265:24 266:1 282:24 287:2 volume 12:8 36:21 159:3 volumes 206:15 volumetric 120:25 121:14	voluntarily 99:2 vulnerable 62:15 Vuylsteke 17:19 <hr/> W <hr/> W 13:2,13 16:20 17:23 W-O-L-F-E 196:6 wage 48:5 118:10 wages 48:1,2,21 48:23 49:2,3 62:8 113:14 141:15 wait 243:25 waive 87:2 126:17 306:15 waived 306:5,6 wake 47:7 141:11 244:24 walking 74:8 wall 14:24 91:9 91:12 178:25 215:10 want 20:11 32:15 34:6,8 35:6,12 36:24 41:1,4,5,22 50:5,6,7 65:18 96:8,9,12 108:21 117:15 117:17 121:25 125:12 126:17 134:4 154:2 155:7 158:11 162:21 197:21 213:15 232:14 235:25 237:8 263:9 293:14 294:22 wanted 56:8 75:12 105:17	108:8 234:16 268:13 300:2 304:11 wants 47:1 61:2 63:20 64:12 66:20 69:21 94:5 97:5,14 100:2,9 101:21 109:9 197:20 245:18 296:15 Warner 49:13 warning 243:14 washing 73:7 Washington 14:5 wasn't 45:13 165:1 220:20 222:9 238:18 238:18 276:5 288:6 295:17 wastewater 289:16 water 289:16 way 19:25 34:12 37:4 39:4 51:4 51:5 56:6 65:20 68:11 71:24 78:13 90:22 109:21 133:10 142:21 171:12 172:20 173:17 225:20 226:2 244:17 279:25 282:20 286:18 294:21 297:14 302:18 ways 120:17 we'll 16:13 19:20 25:15 32:5,6 35:18 35:22 41:11,17 41:21 75:13 77:7 80:2 81:2 103:14 108:22
---	---	--	--	--

115:6 116:19 125:18,19 154:10 186:25 241:21 255:12 305:23 306:19 we're 19:14,18 22:7 25:14 31:25 32:7 40:25 41:4 42:25 46:23 50:23,25 51:19 53:17 55:13 56:2 85:20 125:15 127:6 128:19 144:23 149:2 162:1 163:19,23 164:7 166:5,6 171:24 176:17 183:14 185:17 185:17 187:3 204:7,12 212:25,25 221:8 239:3 240:9,10 265:21 267:15 268:24 297:10 306:23 we've 20:10,10 24:8,10 28:18 32:5 41:5,11 44:9,9 66:24 89:8,9 115:6,9 120:10 122:22 125:24 132:4 163:16 164:8 178:4,7,8,15 178:23 179:3,9 180:8 194:3,24 198:4 235:3 270:16 283:15 weak 118:3,11 216:15 wealthiest 66:12	wealthy 59:20 weather 110:17 110:21,21 weatherization 80:24 84:13,14 84:25 85:2 Wednesday 116:20 125:24 306:11,12 week 20:5,7 23:21 67:23 71:13 178:25 217:5 266:11 weekend 90:25 weekly 48:1,2,21 49:2 62:8 weeks 99:16 129:12 212:5 265:23,25 291:9 weeping 49:14 49:14 weight 150:15 155:17 273:19 274:8,17,18 275:4,5 304:10 weighted 176:18 177:3 weighting 273:22 275:15 weights 155:2 155:22 263:24 272:10,18,20 272:21 273:12 275:10 weighty 67:19 welcome 232:23 251:12,13 255:7 well-established 144:16 went 29:16 48:11 54:3 98:10,15 120:3	124:11 129:22 135:17,21 155:8 199:24 222:13,13,14 222:15 270:19 274:4 275:2 weren't 79:5 129:20 West 14:1 86:19 99:16 Westar 109:12 western 95:2 120:11 whatsoever 37:4 Whitney 15:6 17:2 wholesale 29:18 whoops 105:2 214:24 wide 158:19 widely 102:17 widen 196:12 widowed 63:10 William 12:18 71:15 309:13 309:15,17,19 316:12,14 320:5,7,9,11 320:13,15 Williams 15:5 17:1,2 42:5 willing 146:15 285:23,25 306:15 Wilson 321:20 321:22,24 322:3 win-win 75:2 wind 291:2 winner 67:15 winter 128:19 128:20 238:15 Wisconsin 184:25 185:4	271:24 299:4 304:14,18,19 304:22 305:6,7 305:8 withstand 61:6 witness 20:4,18 20:23 26:22 37:2,6 44:5 63:3 64:13 69:5 70:14,18 71:15 80:9,12 85:24,25 86:4 86:10,12,16,18 86:20 87:21 92:13,15 95:25 99:13 102:4,5 102:7 105:22 105:25 107:15 107:18 126:1,1 126:2 131:13 139:9 141:7 142:2 144:1,8 145:4 148:15 152:18 154:3 157:11 163:13 165:4,6 170:10 174:21 176:21 178:4 186:20 186:22 187:3 188:17 196:18 208:4 220:1 224:6 230:11 230:12,13,15 232:25 235:22 237:8,9 244:2 251:12,15 255:7,8,9 257:18 263:7 263:12,14 283:22 289:7 290:5 292:17 297:20 305:20 305:21 witnesses 19:12	19:13,18,19 39:7 46:1 57:21 64:15 74:18 76:19,22 77:4 87:15 88:10 93:12,17 102:2 109:6 126:3,18 128:12 131:10 133:8 149:5,6 149:6,11 154:12 199:15 209:23 210:4 224:2 234:24 239:12 277:3 279:18 302:11 303:2 305:23 305:25 306:2,4 306:7,16,20 witnesses' 240:11 301:15 woe-is-me 112:13 Wolf 22:25 23:6 23:15 Wolfe 196:5 wonder 187:10 232:1 wondering 79:14,20 126:2 170:15 294:2,4 Woodsmall 13:19 17:14,15 20:16,22,25 21:3,5,9 90:13 90:14 103:16 103:19,23 104:1 114:24 115:2 133:3 156:15,16 157:4,9,12,14 157:20 158:24 162:3,19 163:5 164:12 165:2,5
---	--	---	--	---

165:15 175:10 186:12 189:23 307:4,10,10,11 Woodsmall's 172:6 176:12 Woolf 321:17,18 Woolridge 224:7 224:17 word 58:7,8 76:8 78:20 121:11 138:2 190:22 191:4 193:22 200:21 209:21 words 24:9 37:12 47:15 48:4 52:22 57:11 68:5,10 68:13 78:12,15 78:19 155:25 193:10,11,13 259:5 302:14 303:20 work 67:5 119:8 119:14 176:6,9 223:4,5 243:19 248:16,17 277:18 285:9 300:15 worked 29:10 50:21 168:11 175:18 176:14 working 42:15 65:25 67:5 77:21 84:2 176:11,18 works 262:16 world 54:4 238:22 WorldCom 244:24 worries 178:3 worry 121:23 worth 139:8	201:16 wouldn't 51:25 52:1 124:13 138:1 185:24 195:12,15 206:22 210:19 211:15 218:10 219:9 228:7,25 229:24 260:23 275:18 293:13 write 52:5 writes 76:1 written 16:22 163:17,24 wrong 50:22 66:13 111:18 113:4 200:1 214:24 232:6 wrongly 63:8 Wyoming 289:15 <hr/> X <hr/> XLU 216:2 270:10 <hr/> Y <hr/> Y 12:19 Yahoo 214:1 216:3,21,22 Yea 216:23 yeah 39:19 40:13 44:17 56:21 90:1 172:14 191:12 209:9,13 243:21 247:19 248:6,11 250:1 251:2 265:20 270:2 281:17 292:7 year 23:22 27:24 28:2,4,6 29:2 34:4 46:11	47:10 60:15,15 60:20 61:11,11 62:5,5 68:23 68:23 96:23 98:18,18 129:18 130:19 130:19 132:16 134:25 146:10 179:8 214:12 221:22 266:10 269:1 297:6 299:5 304:21 year's 28:2 271:15 years 27:18 34:24 35:1,3 54:3,4 58:15 60:19,21,21,22 60:25 61:12 65:6 95:12,25 96:1 98:23 102:19 104:19 105:3 113:3,6 119:6 127:22 130:9,20 140:12 156:21 189:17 206:19 206:24 209:11 209:15 215:10 221:17,21 233:5 236:6 241:5 266:2,4 266:7 269:21 279:22 297:6,7 297:14 298:16 298:16 304:19 Yellen 212:24 213:3 214:11 238:22 269:7 yield 129:9,10 145:4 178:18 213:22 237:13 301:18,21,21 301:22 302:4	yields 129:7 130:25 178:11 178:16 204:11 212:5 217:2 267:18,19 269:2,5 279:23 279:25 300:25 301:1,8,12,14 301:23 302:2,3 302:6,10,11 York 14:24,24 Young 319:12 319:13 <hr/> Z <hr/> Z-E-P-H-A-N... 187:12 Zacks 247:11 Zellers 14:7 18:7 18:8,17,17,19 115:5 116:25 152:12 154:20 156:4 174:25 184:10 307:5,9 Zephania 187:5 187:6,9 307:18 318:7,9 Zobrist 13:6 16:20 127:18 127:19 137:23 149:18 151:2 152:19,22 154:2,7,11 157:15 162:15 162:24 168:21 177:17,18 179:16 180:16 180:24 181:4 181:13,15,19 181:24 182:25 186:18 190:7 202:11,15,16 202:25 203:6 208:5,6 213:17	213:19 218:15 218:21,24 220:2 224:25 225:11 227:5 233:18,20 243:24 244:4 245:23 249:9 250:23 251:1 254:3 262:21 262:24 265:10 278:12 280:10 280:15 281:2,6 281:11 288:9 288:25 289:3 298:7,8 300:16 301:3 302:13 303:25 307:5,9 307:14,20,24 308:6 zone 224:15,22 <hr/> 0 <hr/> 0.15 104:13 0.49 110:10 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 23:24 40:17,21 56:15 61:18 78:24 79:18 82:18 98:19 99:6 104:23 133:14,15 142:24 200:15 201:6,15 1-3 314:19,22 1,900 189:8 1.14 130:4 1.15 24:6,18 1.23 24:7 1.3 59:24 1.85 131:1 1:00 125:18,19 127:3 10 26:23 40:6,6
--	--	---	--	---

104:12 159:3	102-NC 309:10	154:12,16	136-NP 313:19	49:24 61:2
173:11 175:24	102-NP 309:8	307:5 311:13	137 313:23	124:25 125:1
186:25 188:25	103-HC 309:14	118-HC 311:17	138 21:14	196:3 215:21
202:18 207:24	103-NP 309:12	118-NP 311:15	313:24	217:15 221:21
249:19 269:13	104-HC 309:18	119-HC 311:21	1382 12:22	257:20 304:17
272:9 291:9	104-NP 309:16	119-NP 311:19	325:4	15-0412 266:24
298:14	105-HC 309:22	12 33:2 113:15	139 180:13,15	15-minute
10.0 25:9 132:25	105-NP 309:20	175:24 249:19	180:18,25	186:24
144:10 169:23	106 310:3	291:9	181:2,3,7,18	15.75 22:14 46:8
10.10 135:21	107-HC 310:6	120 311:23	314:3,6	46:8 48:25
10.2 130:8	107-NP 310:4	120.9 22:14 23:5	14 23:9,11	150 196:7
169:17,19	108-HC 310:10	37:22 46:4,7	109:13 196:20	152 307:9
171:3 184:25	108-NP 310:8	1200 13:3	196:20 198:22	154 307:9
185:7 299:5	109-HC 310:14	121-HC 312:3	199:1,5,6	311:10,12,13
10.3 25:6 51:2	109-NP 310:12	121-NP 311:24	250:4 283:7	156 307:10
92:14 106:4,19	10th 19:2	122 312:5	304:17	157 322:17,17
132:24 137:17	11 96:24 113:14	123-HC 312:8	14.5 29:18	159 307:10
139:3,15	215:8 243:12	123-NP 312:6	140 181:11,13	15th 40:25 56:20
142:17 144:9	250:4	124 312:10	181:16,20,23	16 60:21 100:21
146:23 169:23	11.31 30:11	125-HC 312:14	184:19 185:1	197:4 249:17
173:4,13,21	11.37 224:16	125-NP 312:12	314:5	283:6 306:25
10.30 105:21	11.4 62:9	126 312:16	140,000 108:18	16-1 162:4
108:5	11.47 47:25	127 312:17	141 202:10,14	16-11 156:20
10.37 183:6	11.56 48:3	128 48:19	202:15,17	157:2 322:17
10.4 23:11,12	110-HC 310:18	312:19	203:1,3,5	16-13 162:13
105:23 169:18	110-NP 310:16	128.1 37:23	208:5 209:9,9	16.1 46:15
173:3	1100 13:7	39:24 46:5	314:7	16.6 23:8
10.46 46:14	1101 14:20	129 312:20	142 244:3,6	160 159:3
60:20	111 14:11	13 61:15,17,18	245:20 249:8	1613 18:2
10.49 158:6	111-HC 310:22	199:4 215:13	249:10,17	162 159:3
10.5 107:10	111-NP 310:20	243:12 277:1	250:24 251:2,6	307:11
172:25	111,000 163:8	13.7 29:20	314:9	163 162:14
10.6 25:9 132:25	112-HC 311:3	130 312:22	143 245:21,22	164 307:12
144:10 169:17	112-NP 310:24	131 312:23	245:24 250:25	165,000 163:9
169:19,23	113-HC 311:7	132-HC 313:5	251:2,6 307:6	166 307:12
171:3	113-NP 311:5	132-NP 313:3	314:11	16630 255:22
10:30 80:2	114 311:9	133-HC 313:9	144 278:11,14	167,000 163:8
100 21:14	115 153:5,14,15	133-NP 313:7	280:11,13,14	16th 13:3
100-HC 309:5	154:12,16	134-HC 313:13	314:13	17 93:24 94:4
100-NP 309:3	307:5 311:10	134-NP 313:11	145 281:1,7,10	133:1 135:12
1000 14:4	116 153:6	135-HC 313:17	314:15	136:5 180:4,8
10005 14:24	154:12,16	135-NP 313:15	1464 18:1	180:9 216:1
101 13:10,17	311:12	136 307:6	14th 246:2	244:16
309:7	117 153:6,19	136-HC 313:21	15 12:6 16:1	17.1 23:10

17.84 48:15	2	2007 27:18,21	30:14 47:13	20585 14:5
170 307:13	2 23:22 28:22	28:11 46:14	111:13 129:13	206-HC 315:14
1712 14:8	61:15,17 101:4	47:24 48:6,17	134:24 135:18	206-NP 315:12
175 307:13	187:21 200:14	48:20 56:4	135:19 141:18	207 315:16
176 307:14	201:6,16 205:2	60:15,20 61:4	151:4,11,19,22	208-HC 315:20
176,000 163:9	205:5 214:8	61:8,24 62:8	180:21 182:7	208-NP 315:18
177 62:22	219:20,24	62:13 66:15	222:20 271:6	209-HC 315:24
307:14	244:15,18	93:6 107:17	271:10 280:19	209-NP 315:22
179 119:13	250:17	113:9 130:3	291:10,19,20	21 20:22 68:20
123:12	2.3 130:20	2008 47:7,19	297:16 304:15	197:4 309:3,5
18 99:10	216:24	130:6 297:9	314:4	309:7,8,10,12
180 314:3	2.31 250:21	2009 34:24	2015 12:6 16:2	309:14,16,18
181 314:3,5,5	2.37 216:24	35:22 46:14	23:23 31:20,25	309:20,22
182 307:15	2.4 130:25	60:21 111:2	40:18,21,23	310:3,4,6,8,10
184 307:15	2.47 217:5	250:4 297:9,10	42:24 43:5	310:12,14,16
185 101:5	2.5 129:11,12	201 314:24	49:24 68:2,7	310:18,20,22
186 307:19	2.7 302:2	2010 46:15	99:9 101:10,19	310:24 311:3,5
188 307:19	2.74 129:10	20106 17:24	101:22 102:12	311:7,9,10,12
318:7,9	213:22 237:13	2011 47:10	118:20 123:15	311:13,15,17
189 307:20	20 60:10,10,13	106:11 199:3	125:3 130:14	311:19,21,23
19 112:23 231:1	112:24 141:18	199:10,17,22	135:25 136:1	311:24 312:3,5
19.20 215:9	171:21 190:14	279:10 280:3	151:21 180:10	312:6,8,10,12
269:20	191:14 291:5	2012 46:16	180:22 182:7	312:14,16,17
1929 133:12	20.2 130:4	106:13 172:1	182:13 183:7	312:19,20,22
222:3,15,20	20.4 270:1	172:10,17,19	183:24 184:3	312:23 313:3,5
1968 221:17,24	20.40 215:15	172:24 178:19	185:18 202:18	313:7,9,11,13
1980s 34:13	200 15:7 21:16	189:3 204:8,10	207:24 211:10	313:15,17,19
1990 223:5	187:19 224:16	204:17 233:8	213:25 214:8	313:21,23,24
1992 94:18	200-HC 314:21	279:3	214:23 267:10	314:18,21,24
1999 221:17,21	200-NP 314:18	2013 22:18 26:3	269:13 271:6,9	315:3,6,8,9,11
221:25	2000 221:22	27:22 28:11	271:10,11	315:12,14,16
19th 14:24	2003 244:11,14	30:11,19,20	291:11,18	315:18,20,22
1C 40:13	244:18 245:2	34:25 35:22	297:17 306:25	315:24 316:3,5
1st 20:19 31:20	246:2	47:24 48:7,17	314:4	316:7,9,10,12
31:24 40:23	2004 42:21	48:20 107:8	2017 99:10	316:14,16,17
42:24 43:5	47:19	111:14,15	2019 73:12	316:19,21,23
56:20,20,21,23	2005 19:6 31:15	129:18,21	202 314:7	316:24 317:3,4
68:2,7,15 93:6	35:7 56:13	133:12 157:23	202-HC 315:6	317:6,8,10,12
101:10,19,22	78:9 101:1	172:9,11,22	202-NP 315:3,6	317:14,16,19
102:12 107:8	118:17 199:10	183:24 219:12	202.586.6918	317:21,23
123:15 141:18	2006 46:13,13	219:18 222:3	14:5	318:3,5,7,9,11
157:22 172:9	54:25 55:9	222:15 223:1,5	203 314:7 315:8	318:12,14,15
172:22 314:4	114:8 118:7	235:9	204 13:20 315:9	318:17,18,20
	224:13	2014 27:1,25	205 315:11	318:22,24

319:3,4,6,7,9	2230 15:2	241,947 59:18	180:9 215:23	305-HC 320:3
319:11,13,15	224 307:20	242 21:16	270:6	305-NP 319:23
319:17,18,20	224-HC 317:19	319:13	2nd 14:17 214:9	306-HC 320:7
319:21,23	224-NP 317:16	244 314:9	280:19 314:4	306-NP 320:5
320:3,5,7,9,11	225 110:1	245 314:11		307-HC 320:11
320:13,15,17	225-HC 317:23	24th 23:22	3	307-NP 320:9
320:19,21,23	225-NP 317:21	25 62:23 64:14	3 28:22 51:15	308 13:20
320:25 321:3,5	226 307:21	155:17,23	130:18 163:8	308-HC 320:15
321:7,9,10,12	226-HC 318:5	189:2 193:8	208:2,3,4,5	308-NP 320:13
321:14,16,18	226-NP 318:3	199:25 214:22	211:8 213:20	309 110:1
321:19,21,23	227 188:1,11,13	273:20 274:17	216:3 224:1,3	309-HC 320:19
322:3,6,8,10	188:15 318:7	274:22 275:4	234:12 250:14	309-NP 320:17
322:11,13	228 188:3,11,13	292:25	250:17 270:10	30th 23:23 42:25
21.2 38:3 51:14	188:15 318:9	25-basis-point	271:16 273:17	310-HC 320:23
210 316:3	229 318:11	292:19	280:18,21	310-NP 320:21
211-HC 316:7	23 98:12 107:9	25,000 60:1	282:6 298:14	311 320:25
211-NP 316:5	139:14 148:23	250 168:9	3.1 129:10	312 21:18 321:3
212 316:9	153:21 180:7	176:17 177:2,4	301:19,21	312.257.9338
212.845.7388	199:25	251 307:25	3.10 213:23	14:21
14:25	23.2 139:5,14	314:9,11	237:14	314.231.4181
213 316:10	142:18	253 308:2	3.2 301:18	14:15
214-HC 316:14	230 307:23	255 308:5	3.27 133:13	319 14:14
214-NP 316:12	318:12	256 323:18	250:20	31st 134:24,25
215 316:16	231 318:14	257 308:5	3.3 29:23	32 27:24
216-HC 316:19	232 307:24	322:19,21,23	3.5 217:9 219:1	33 132:22 136:6
216-NP 316:17	318:15 323:21	323:3,18	3.7 302:3	273:17
217 316:21	323:23	260 308:6	3.8 110:9	34 201:19
218 316:23	233 307:24	264 308:6	3.80 301:21	35 129:9 201:24
219 316:24	318:17	26th 22:17	3.9 29:24	213:22 237:13
22 95:12 307:2	234 318:18	27 240:16,17	3/10/15 314:7	350 21:20 168:7
322:15,19,21	235 289:24	254:7	3:00 186:25	321:5
322:23 323:3,4	318:20	274,000 59:4	30 41:2,6 54:3,4	351 321:7
323:6,8,10,11	236-HC 318:24	275,000 46:9	30-year 129:8	352 321:9
323:13,15,17	236-NP 318:22	278 314:13	213:21 237:12	353 321:10
323:21,23	237 319:3	28.8 23:7	301:17	354 321:12
324:3,5,7	238 319:4	280 314:13	30,000 305:13	355 21:20
220 27:24 317:3	239 319:6	280,000 130:2	30.4 113:17	321:14
221 13:17 17:19	24 99:9	281 314:15,15	300 21:18	36 105:7 129:14
221-HC 317:6	24,000 163:17	288 308:7	319:15	201:20 214:7
221-NP 317:4	240 176:17	289 308:7	301 13:13 14:1	269:5
222-HC 317:10	240-HC 319:9	29 98:12	319:17	360 15:8 17:4
222-NP 317:8	240-NP 319:7	293 308:8	302 319:18	38 275:1
223-HC 317:14	241 319:11	295 176:16	303 319:20	386.250 82:17
223-NP 317:12	241,000 59:22	29th 106:15	304 319:21	39 23:6 155:7,9

275:23	237:7	50 64:4 109:11	57 60:25 62:7	64105 13:4
3B 40:12,13	45 307:2	118:6 176:15	192:25 193:3	14:17
3rd 213:25	450 21:24 322:6	50-something	193:21	64108 14:8
214:4,25	4520 13:7	55:10	57.3 114:7	64111 13:7
3th 214:2	46 213:13	50.31 25:11	57.69 48:10	65 38:6 46:18,19
	47 23:5 55:19	50/50 51:8 71:22	113:9	236:11
	213:17,21	72:2,11,16,20	57.7 113:7	65101 13:11,17
<hr/> 4 <hr/>	237:10 240:7	120:6	573.424.6779	13:20
4 114:10 155:1	268:17	500 22:1 250:4	13:24	65102 13:14
163:9 211:8	48 14:24 109:8	285:20 322:8	573.443.3141	14:2 15:2
216:4 220:11	49 55:20	501 322:10	14:12	65102-0360 15:8
250:15 271:16	49-point-some...	502 322:11	573.522.3304	65201 14:11
272:4,6,9	55:1	503 322:13	14:2	66 236:11
280:18,21	49.83 46:17,17	504 22:1 157:7	573.556.6622	67.2 34:24
281:21	4th 14:14 216:6	157:10 322:15	13:18	68 222:23
4.40 222:22		505 157:7,8,11	573.636.6006	
4.5 217:10 219:1	<hr/> 5 <hr/>	157:13,14,17	13:21	<hr/> 7 <hr/>
4.6 133:16	5 36:8 42:21	157:19 322:17	573.636.6758	7 40:6,7 199:3
149:21	110:14 155:18	519,000 46:8	13:11	210:23,24
4.61 133:16	163:9 209:9	53 153:15	573.751.4140	217:11,18
4.8 247:23	211:8 221:2	252:14	15:9	218:9,17 219:2
4.89 133:15	249:22 250:5	550 22:3 255:25	573.751.5558	250:16
4/21/15 315:4	250:16 294:1	257:12,16	15:3	7.18 25:22
4/9/15 314:20,23	5,000-square-f...	322:19	59 307:3	7.9 29:18
40 95:25 102:19	63:13	551 255:25		7.96 25:22
178:20	5.0 219:13	256:6 257:12	<hr/> 6 <hr/>	70 301:22
400 13:10 21:22	5.23 46:16	257:16	6 14:8 29:22	700 18:9 22:5
321:16	5.25 60:21	551-HC 322:23	47:14 214:10	231:8,11,24
401 321:18	5.5 129:17,22	551-NP 322:21	249:20,22	232:17,18
402-HC 321:21	219:14 241:25	552 255:25	6,000 60:3	323:21
402-NP 321:19	242:3 247:23	257:12,16	6.4 114:9	7000 231:3
403 21:22	5.57 133:14	323:3	6.5 28:3,6 30:13	701 231:3,8,11
403-HC 322:3	219:21 220:10	553 323:4	60:20	231:24 232:17
403-NP 321:23	5.64 247:15,23	554 323:6	6.6 129:21	232:18 323:23
403B 14:20	5.65 133:11	555 323:8	6.9 29:21 110:8	702 324:3
41 153:21	149:18	556 323:10	110:9	703 324:5
412 18:1	5.69 28:1,5	557-HC 323:13	6/10/15 315:8	704 22:5 324:7
415.977.5759	30:15	557-NP 323:11	6/11/16 316:4	70s 277:23
14:18	5.7 129:23	558 323:15	60 55:2 84:6	75 24:6 189:2
42 105:8	5.74 133:14	559 22:3 323:17	601 13:13 17:23	273:19 274:18
43 132:19 136:7	219:21 220:10	560 256:20,21	60301 14:21	274:22 275:5
220:10,14	5.78 220:20	256:23 257:12	63101 18:10	76 222:23
44 217:9 219:20	5/18/15 318:21	257:16,20	63102 14:14	770 46:11
219:23,24	5/2/14 314:16	323:18	63119 13:23	78 104:5 291:3
220:12,14				

78.2 29:25	82.3 38:8	278:17 293:1	135:23
79 107:12 108:5	83 34:25 132:15 136:7 277:1	9.10 108:4	9.65 279:11
8	84 113:15	9.18 242:1 248:3 248:11	9.66 297:16
8 64:4 73:1,2,2 74:11 129:18 217:11,18 218:9,17 219:2 242:25 243:6	85 14:17 132:15 214:23 215:3 269:13 307:4	9.21 274:14,16	9.7 26:1 28:4,5 30:6 107:11 297:16
8.2 142:16 143:23	871 13:23	9.25 25:10 108:4 132:22 139:13 189:1 223:14 223:22 266:24 278:18,22	9.70 158:15
8.20 241:1	88 47:1	9.3 248:10 278:21,25 279:4 290:11	9.76 30:10 151:12 297:15
8.27 275:4	9	9.30 275:5	9.8 171:18,20,21 171:22 290:16
8.31 240:23	9 12:8 23:12	9.37 224:16	9.83 132:14,20 132:22 133:1 136:2,5 182:7 182:14 185:23
8.35 144:19	62:22 63:14	9.385 274:22	9.85 271:23 293:1
8.4 46:14	64:16 74:17,20	9.4 26:11,15 74:19 132:18 148:19 155:11 155:11,21 258:3 293:17	9.86 135:20 182:6
8.40 276:15	75:9 120:22	9.40 274:23	9.88 184:4
8.45 241:13	121:7 123:3	9.5 25:10 74:20 132:21 136:6 149:13 221:1 252:11 267:2 276:8	9.9 171:18
8.50 64:4	139:4,11	9.50 223:14	9.90 135:21
8.55 224:9	142:15,17	9.51 108:6	9.92 27:2 184:4
8.56 93:21	153:16 189:12	9.53 51:2 105:24 106:3 108:1,4 137:16 138:11 140:15 144:4 146:20 171:19 290:20 293:9 293:18	9.94 135:22 151:3 272:1
8.62 241:12	201:24 214:21	9.56 274:15,17	90 307:4
8.8 26:11 74:19 132:17 142:13 148:19 155:10 155:13,13 253:17 258:2	215:1 243:1,6 243:12 249:10 249:12 250:11 250:14	9.6 60:22 142:16 143:23 144:2 248:7,8 252:9 253:17 290:11	91.3 38:8
8.85 293:1	9.0 25:10 26:19 74:20 132:12	9.63 151:20 271:18	92,000 163:8
8.89 94:1	132:21 136:7	9.64 46:16	93 213:25
8:30 305:24 306:24	143:22 220:25 223:13 224:18 240:22 251:20 252:8 254:18 267:2 276:8 279:1,4,11 290:10		95.5 120:8
80 84:7 307:3	9.00 108:4		99 289:18
800 14:14 15:7	9.01 242:5 248:3 248:11		99,000 162:9 163:20,22,23 164:7
81 60:3	9.1 26:10 48:3 132:18 139:12 148:18 152:4 155:3,12 258:6 272:8,19		99,660 162:5
816.460.2545 13:8			9th 14:11 267:9
816.556.2791 13:4			
816.897.1049 14:9			
82 61:3 62:11 93:6			
82-and-a-half 113:10			