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DEPOSITION
of Amr A. Ibrahim, taken before me, Julieanna Hennebert, a Notary Public in and for the state of Ohio, at the offices of Ohio Consumers' Counsel, Ten West Broad Street, Suite 1800, Columbus, Ohio, on Friday, January 30, 2009, at 1:30 p.m.

|  |  | Page 2 |  |  | Page 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | APPEARANCES: |  | 1 | AMR A, IERAHIM |  |
| 2 | Faruk, Ireland \& Cox, P.L.L. |  | , | being by me first duly sworn, as herelnafter |  |
| 3 | By Mr, Charies J. Farukl SOO Courthouse Plaza, SW |  | 3 | certified, deposes and says as follows: |  |
|  | 10 North Ludlow Street |  | 4 | EXAMINATION |  |
| 4 | Dayton, Ohlo 45402 |  | 5 | BY MR. FARUKI: |  |
| 6 | On behalf of the Applicant. |  | 6 | Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Ibrahim, |  |
| 6 | Janine L. Migden-Ostrander, Ohio Consumers' Counsel |  | 7 | A. Good afternoon, Mr. Faruki. |  |
| 7 | By Ms. dacqueline L. |  | 8 | Q. Tell us your full name and where you work |  |
|  | Mr. Rick Reese |  | 9 | please. |  |
| 8 | 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 |  | 10 | A. My name is Amr A. Ibrahim. And I work |  |
| 9 | Columbus, Ohlo 43215 |  | 11 | for OCC in the analytics department. |  |
|  | On behalf of the Residential Consumers of |  | 12 | Q. Who leads the analytics department? |  |
| 10 | The Dayton Power and Light. |  | 13 | A. Dr. Adams, Aster Adams. |  |
| 11 |  |  | 14 | Q. Is he your boss? |  |
| 12 | $\cdots$ |  | 15 | A. Indeed he is. |  |
| 14 |  |  | 16 | Q. The year that you joined OCC was what7 |  |
| 15 |  |  | 17 | A. 2008. |  |
| 16 |  |  | 18 | Q. When in 2008 did you join? |  |
| 17 18 |  |  | 19 | A. 23 rd of October 2008. Probably 24. |  |
| 19 |  |  | 20 | Around that few days. |  |
| 20 |  |  | 21 | Q. Did you work in the analytics department |  |
| 21 |  |  | 22 | ever since you joined OCC? |  |
| 22 23 |  |  | 23 | A. This is correct. |  |
| 24 |  |  | 24 | Q. Let me show you what I had the reporter |  |
| 25 |  |  | 25 | mark as exhibits, and these are copies of documents |  |
|  |  | Page 3 |  |  | Page 6 |
| 1 | Friday Afternoon Session, |  | 1 | that you, or your counsel rather, gave me this |  |
| 2 | January 30, 2009. |  | 2 | morning. |  |
| 3 | - - |  | 3 | MR. FARUKI: Jackie, I don't know if |  |
| 4 | STIPULATIONS |  | 4 | you've seen these. |  |
| 5 | It is stipulated by and among counsel for the |  | 5 | MS. ROBERTS: I have coples. |  |
| 6 | respective parties that the deposition of Amr $\mathrm{A}^{\text {. }}$ |  | 6 | Q. I'm going to give you a copy of what has |  |
| 7 | Ibrahim, a witness called by the Respondents under |  | 7 | been marked as DP\&L Exhibit 54. That is a four-page |  |
| 8 | the applicable Rules of Civil Procedure, may be |  | 8 | document. Simply ask you to tell me what it is. |  |
| 9 | reduced to writing in stenotypy by the Notary, whose |  | 9 | A. This is my resume. |  |
| 10 | notes thereafter may be transcribed out of the |  | 10 | Q. And it's accurate and complete as far as |  |
| 11 | presence of the witness; and that proof of the |  | 11 | you know? |  |
| 12 | officlal character and qualification of the Notary is |  | 12 | A. Accurate and complete in October 2008. |  |
| 13 | waived. |  | 13 | Q. Exhibit 55 is a copy of an article from |  |
| 14 |  |  | 14 | April 2006 Public Utilities Fortnightly. |  |
| 15 | -- |  | 15 | A. Yes. |  |
| 16 |  |  | 16 | Q. That apparently you were one of the |  |
| 17 |  |  | 17 | authors of; is that correct? |  |
| 18 |  |  | 18 | A. Yes, this is correct. |  |
| 19 |  |  | 19 | Q. And can you tell me what pertinence or |  |
| 20 |  |  | 20 | relevance, if any, to this matter that that article |  |
| 21 |  |  | 21 | has? |  |
| 22 |  |  | 22 | A. Basically it shows that I have been |  |
| 23 |  |  | 23 | involved in rate design issues in the years of my |  |
| 24 |  |  | 24 | career, And this is one of the areas that we have |  |
| 25 |  |  | 25 | exchanged ideas and experiences, particularly when we |  |
|  |  | Page 4 |  |  | Page 7 |
| 1 | INDEX |  | 1 | wanted to link between the wholesale and the retail |  |
| 2 | - |  | 2 | markets in service territory IS of New England, |  |
| 3 | DP\&L EXHIBITS IDENTIFJED |  | 3 | Independent System Operator of New England. |  |
| 4 | 53 - Testimony of Mr, Ibration 9 |  | 4 | Q. Do the views that are expressed in that |  |
| 5 | 54 - Mr. Ibrahim's Resume 6 |  | 5 | article from 2006 still represent your views today? |  |
| 6 | 55 - Public Utilities Fortnightly 6 |  | 6 | A. That was a joint product and I would like |  |
| 7 | 56-2004 Power-Gen Article 7 |  | 7 | to break it down again in two parts in order to see |  |
| 8 | 57-2007 Power-Gen Article 8 |  | 8 | exactiy what I did contribute to it and whether I |  |
| 9 | 58 - Ohio Revised Code 4905.31 39 |  | 9 | still agres with it or not. |  |
| 10 | - - - |  | 10 | Q. Exhibit 56 is a copy of an articde tited |  |
| 11 |  |  | 11 | "Temporary substitution to Independent Regulation in |  |
| 12 |  |  | 12 | the Electricity Sector - Application of International |  |
| 13 |  |  | 13 | Practices." |  |
| 14 |  |  | 14 | A. Yes. |  |
| 15 |  |  | 15 | Q. It's dated in 2004. |  |
| 16 |  |  | 16 | A. Correct. |  |
| 17 |  |  | 17 | Q. Is that one that you authored, sir? |  |
| 18 |  |  | 18 | A. Yes, it is. |  |
| 19 |  |  | 19 | Q. Was that published? |  |
| 20 |  |  | 20 | A. That was published in the proceedings of |  |
| 21 |  |  | 21 | this particular conference, which is the Power |  |
| 22 |  |  | 22 | Generation Conference of the Middle East for 2004. |  |
| 23 |  |  |  | Q. Same question as I asked you before, what |  |
| 24 |  |  | 24 | If any pertinence does this articie have to this |  |
| 25 |  |  | 25 | matter? |  |


|  |  | Page 8 |  |  | Page 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | A. It relates to my experience in the area |  | 1 | or since you have been in the analytics department |  |
| 2 | of regulation in general, including its applicability |  | 2 | within OCC, have you specialized in any areas? |  |
| 3 | in other systems outside North America. |  | 3 | A. I specialized in areas related to |  |
| 4 | Q. I think we have one more to mark. |  | 4 | aggregation and regarding the section of economic |  |
| 5 | (Exhibit marked.) |  | 5 | development. Because of my degree and my experience, |  |
| 6 | Q. The final one I have to hand you is an |  | 6 | I became responsible for this particular section in |  |
| 7 | article titled "Beyond the Single Buyer Model - |  | 7 | DP\&L. |  |
| 8 | Towards a Functioning Competitive Electricity |  | 8 | Q. But I take it while you've been in the |  |
| 9 | Market." |  | 9 | analytics department with Consumers' Counsel you've |  |
| 10 | Is that another that you authored? |  | 10 | specialized in aggregation. Anything else? |  |
| 11 | A. This is correct, sir. |  | 11 | A. I worked in aggregation in one case, I |  |
| 12 | Q. And I'm sorry, what is the date of that |  | 12 | am also expected to work in the near future in areas |  |
| 13 | one? |  | 13 | that are related to rate design and cost of service. |  |
| 14 | A. 2006, February 2006. |  | 14 | Q. If you look at page 2 of your testimony? |  |
| 15 | Q. Was that published in connection with a |  | 15 | A. Yes. |  |
| 16 | conference? |  | 16 | Q. And I'm looking at the answer that ends |  |
| 17 | A. This is indeed Power-Gen Conference for |  | 17 | on lines 8 and with the phrase "economic development |  |
| 18 | 2006. |  | 18 | initiatives." |  |
| 19 | Q. What pertinence does that one have to |  | 19 | A. Yes. |  |
| 20 | this matter? |  | 20 | Q. Can you tell me what your prior |  |
| 21 | A. Very similar to the previous article. |  | 21 | experience has been with those? |  |
| 22 | Q. Do the views you express in that remain |  | 22 | A. In approximately 1992، '93, '94, and the |  |
| 23 | the same as those views you have today? |  | 23 | early part of "95, B.C. Hydro was keen to assist the |  |
| 24 | A. Generally, ves. There are other areas in |  | 24 | province of British Columbia, the state of British |  |
| 25 | which maybe I would change my opinion in it. |  | 25 | Columbia, to see if we can extend the economic |  |
|  |  | Page 9 |  |  | Page 12 |
| 1 | Q. And I didn't think I asked you that |  | 1 | development Initiatives to the Industrial base in |  |
| 2 | question about Exhibit 56. Are the views that you |  | 2 | British Columbia. |  |
| 3 | expressed in that ones that you hold today? |  | 3 | And the initiatives that I reference here |  |
| 4 | A. I would like to repeat the same answer |  | 4 | were related to the work I have done during that |  |
| 5 | again if I may, and generally speaking, yes, although |  | 5 | particular period. |  |
| 6 | there could be some areas where my experience I have |  | 6 | Q. So that was with the B.C. Hydro that you |  |
| 7 | acquired since 2004, which is the date of this |  | 7 | reference on page 1 of your line 20? |  |
| 8 | particular publication, has caused me to change my |  | 8 | A. This is one of the functions that I have |  |
| 9 | opinion. |  | 9 | done when I was in British Columbia. |  |
| 10 | Q. Thank you. |  | 10 | Q. And were there particular economic |  |
| 11 | A. My pleasure. |  | 11 | development initiatives that you worked on or |  |
| 12 | Q. Do you have a copy of your own testimony |  | 12 | developed yourself? |  |
| 13 | handy to look at? |  | 13 | A. Yes, there were initiatives that were |  |
| 14 | A. Yes, 1 do. |  | 14 | contemplated and initiatives that were studied during |  |
| 15 | Q. On page 1, couple of questions about your |  | 15 | that particular period. |  |
| 16 | background. When you say on line 15 you "worked as |  | 16 | Q. Were these for residential consumers, |  |
| 17 | an independent consultant with several entities," can |  | 17 | non-residential consumers? |  |
| 18 | you tell me what those were? |  | 18 | A. For non-residential consumers. |  |
| 19 | A. Yes. In United States I worked with |  | 19 | Q. Did any of those inltiatives take root, |  |
| 20 | Bearing Point, I worked with London Economics in |  | 20 | in other words, actually get implemented? |  |
| 21 | Boston, and with IPA Energy which is a Scoltish firm |  | 21 | A. No. |  |
| 22 | in Scotland. |  | 22 | Q. Was your work on any of those Initiatives |  |
| 23 | Q. You said that you were -- this is line |  | 23 | one that involved issues of cost recovery? |  |
| 24 | 19, that you were with Enron Corporation from 1997 to |  | 24 | A. All of them involved addressing the Issue |  |
| 25 | 2001. |  | 25 | of cost recovery. |  |
|  |  | Page 10 |  |  | Page 13 |
| 1 | A. Yes. |  | 1 | Q. And did you make or develop yourself |  |
| 2 | Q. What were your duties there? |  | 2 | proposals for cost recovery in connection with any of |  |
| 3 | A. I was a manager, then a director in |  | 3 | those initiatives? |  |
| 4 | Enron. My manager is divided broadly into two |  | 4 | A. Yes. |  |
| 5 | categories. I was part of Enron International and |  | 5 | Q. And what did you propose in the way of |  |
| 6 | then I became part of Enron Corp., and my duties are |  | 6 | cost recovery? |  |
| 7 | outlined very succinctly in the document that's an |  | 7 | A. Basically the designs that were proposed |  |
| 8 | exhibit here. |  | 8 | at that particular time were aiming at asking the |  |
| 9 | Q. Your resume? |  | 9 | receiver of this particular benefit to pay the cost |  |
| 10 | A. Correct. I did not number but if you go |  | 10 | of it, i.e., if customer A recelves a specific |  |
| 11 | to page 2, if you go to director. |  | 11 | benefit towards the end of providing this particular |  |
| 12 | Q. 1 see. |  | 12 | benefit, this customer would pay its cost. |  |
| 13 | A. It lists very succinctly the functions |  | 13 | Q. Is there anything else you can tell me |  |
| 14 | that I have done. |  | 14 | about the economic development initiatives that you |  |
| 15 | Q. Was it the same functions when you were |  | 15 | refer to on lines 8 and 9? |  |
| 16 | director as when you were a manager? 1 ask that |  | 16 | A. Can you be more specific, please? |  |
| 17 | because Exhibit 2 -- I'm sorry, Exhibit 54 on page 2 |  | 17 | Q. Yes. I noticed this was quite a while |  |
| 18 | has the heading "Director, Regulatory Affalrs." |  | 18 | ago. If you have other details, fine. If those are |  |
| 19 | A. Yes. |  | 19 | lost to memory -- |  |
| 20 | Q. And your testimony refers you to being a |  | 20 | A. I do have other details in mind. |  |
| 21 | manager. |  | 21 | Q. Okay. Let me give you a better question |  |
| 22 | A. By and large, yes, when I became a |  | 22 | then. |  |
| 23 | director I became responsible for a group of |  | 23 | Can you describe for me what the economic |  |
| 24 | colleagues in a team to do a specific function. |  | 24 | development initiatives were that you worked on? |  |
| 25 | Q. When you are in the analytics department |  | 25 | A. Two specific Intiatives come to mind. |  |

## Page 14

The first initiative was trying to tink the rate at a given point of time that the customer is paying is linked to the international price of the commodity that this particular customer is producing.

An example, an aluminum smelter, there is an international price for the ingot they produced. It is cyclical and, therefore, the price that they would pay is going to be cyclical following the price on the border, and towards the end of the period is going to be a trueing up mechanism and the customer would pay at the end of the period the full cost of the commodity that this particular producer used.
Q. Simply for the other economic development initiative, can you describe that?
A. What do you mean, you want another example?
Q. Yes, I thought you said in your last answer there were two
A. Yes, yes, there are two.
Q. And you gave me a good general description of the first one,
A. The other is that this tries to follow the acid conversion cycle of a producer loosely defined here, require to confer cash to cash. As an example, you have cash, you buy

```
commodities, you manufacture, you assemble it, you
market it, you sell it, and then you collect.
    This can take a period. If you are, for
instance, a slip builder, this could be a three-vear
process.
    Accordingly, the price of the commodity
would start at the low level and then go at the high
would start at the low level and then go at the high
or vise-versa as the case may be, so that to take
into consideration the cash flow of that activity in
question.
    At the end of the cash conversion cycle,
i.e., when this particufar producer gets the cash
i.e., when this particufar producer gets the cash
and this particular customer is going to pay the cost
of what he has received
    Q. Did either of those initiatives that
you've just described involve some plan or component
of recovery by the utility of its costs for the
initiative?
    A. It was one of the objectives that the
A. It was one of the objectives that the
these particular plans.
    And, therefore, the initiatives was
trying to be, for lack of better terms, designed or
```
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engineered so that -- to ensure that.
It is important to highlight --
Q. I'm sorry, I wasn't sure you were
finished. You paused, go ahead.
A. It is important to highlight B.C. Hydro
is a Crown corporation, is being owned by the Province of British Columbia.

And, therefore, being paid by B.C. Hydro
or paid by the Province, these are the shareholders and these particular shareholders, namely the
Province, are representative of the users.
Q. On page 2 still, line 12 , you refer to an
affidavit being provided in the FERC docket.
A. Yes.
Q. When we were off the record you started
to describe something about that affidavit to me, Is that affidavit available publicly?
A. Yes, sir. If you go to -- yes, sir. And
if you go to the library or what we used to call FERC in the old days under the number, you should --
Q. Do you have a copy of it?
A. At the moment, no, sir.
Q. I don't mean with you in this room, but do you have a copy accessible to you?
A. Yes.
have been looked into in this particular case are
issues related to cost recovery of economic
development initiatives. When I was referencing cases related to that.
Q. Did you make a study of the economy in

Ohic insofar as it was pertinent to economic development initiatives in the first half of the 19905 compared to today?
A. I did not make a study. I tried to get a reasonable sample of the Commission opinions and orders regarding that.
Q. Do you know who proposed those economic development programs?
A. It is indicated by the case and the name case studies in each case in question.
Q. Do you know as you sit here?
A. As you can see from line No, 13 and page

No. 3, Cincinnati Gas \& Electric, Cleveland Electrlc, and Toleda Edison.
Q. Are you saying those utilities were the
ones that proposed the programs?
A. They proposed the programs.
Q. So it was proposed by the utility as opposed to being mandated by state law?

A, I wouldn't characterize it that way.

They are in relation to a specific setup that made
them fight for it. Put it in their application.
Q. I'm not sure what you mean when you say that. I'm trying to simply ask you a question were the programs that were involved in the cases you're citing proposed by the utllity, the electric distribution utility, or were they required by state law?
A. I don't think that this is what I looked into. I was looking specifically into how did they recover the cost.
Q. So you don't know.
A. I looked exactly on how did they recover a specific program that they have put forward.
Q. But you don't know the answer to my question; is that right?

I just want my record to be clear that you do not know whether or not the programs that were at issue in those cases were proposed by the electric utility or required by state law.
A. I'm speculating here, and I don't think
that they came out of the one accord.
Q. But you're guessing.
A. The fact is that there have been requests
for splitting revenue.

Page 17
Q. Readily accessible?
A. Yes.

MR. FARUKI: I'll make a request for
that. I told Mike this morning I would just send an
e-mall afterwards with whatever.
MS. ROBERTS: Okay, thank you.
MR. FARUKI: with whatever requests there
were.
Q. Page 3, at the part of your answer that
begins on line 12 , "I also reviewed parts. . ."
A. Yes.
Q. Those opinions of the Commission that you
are talking about on lines 12, 13, and 14, were from
rate cases in 1991 and 1995; is that right?
A. This is correct.
Q. You would agree with me that those cases
are rather old and are pre-deregulation, right?
A. I agree that they are pre-deregulation. But I would like to say that they are relevant to our case, and therefore, the term "old" to me is not really clear in my mind what constitutes "old."
Q. You agree with me that there have been a lot of changes to the economy in Ohio since that period of time?
A. Depends upon the change. The issues that
-

|  |  | Page 20 |  |  | Page 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Q. Well, i'll tell you 1 don't want you to |  | 1 | risks that DP\&L may see as customers coming back to |  |
| 2 | guess in this deposition. If you know, that's fine. |  | 2 | their standard service offer. |  |
| 3 | If you don't know, that's fine. Either way, tell me. |  | 3 | Q. Should customers that are taking service |  |
| 4 | But I don't want to ask questions that will cause you |  | 4 | by means of a government aggregation program be |  |
| 5 | to guess or speculate. |  | 5 | treated differently from other customers that shop? |  |
| 6 | Fair enough? |  | 6 | A. Similar customers should be treated |  |
| 7 | A. Fair. Thank you, |  | 7 | similarly. |  |
| 8 | Q. At the bottom of the page "What is the |  | 8 | Q. Are you saying that customers who take |  |
| 9 | purpose of your testimony, " you say on line 22 "I |  | 9 | service from government aggregation are similar to |  |
| 10 | performed an analysls of the economic development |  | 10 | some other group of customers? |  |
| 11 | plan --"' |  | 11 | A. If they are similar to the other group of |  |
| 12 | A. Yes. |  | 12 | CRES taking service from CRES, does the question |  |
| 13 | Q. "-- and the treatment of governmental |  | 13 | include -- can you read me the question again please. |  |
| 14 | aggregation. . ." |  | 14 | (Record read.) |  |
| 15 | A. Yes. |  | 15 | A. Can you be more specific, what do you |  |
| 16 | Q. How did you go about that analysis? |  | 16 | mean "other group of customers"? |  |
| 17 | A. I did understand the application |  | 17 | Q. Yes, I'm trying to figure out what you |  |
| 18 | thoroughly. For the relevant parts of it I tried to |  | 18 | mean when you say "similar customers should be |  |
| 19 | break down the components economic development plan |  | 19 | treated similariy," |  |
| 20 | in it to different components and subcomponents. |  | 20 | How does that relate to my question as to |  |
| 21 | I tried to understand how did they come |  | 21 | why people taking service by means of government |  |
| 22 | up with the cost of the program. I tried to |  | 22 | aggregation should or should not be permitted to |  |
| 23 | understand how do they come up with the recovery |  | 23 | shop? |  |
| 24 | mechanism that they are proposing. And I tried to |  | 24 | A. Government aggregation or a CRES, to me |  |
| 25 | understand to what extent the reasonableness of what |  | 25 | doesn't make any difference in the sense they are |  |
|  |  | Page 21 |  |  | Page 24 |
| 1 | the company has found. |  | 1 | taking service from a third party, alternative party, |  |
| 2 | Q. These were things you were doing or steps |  | 2 | vis-a-vis that DP\&L, whether this party is a |  |
| 3 | you were taking based on your review of the company's |  | 3 | government aggregator or a CRES. |  |
| 4 | filing or parts of the company's filing? |  | 4 | This is exactly my answer. So if those |  |
| 5 | A. Correct. |  | 5 | taking service from aggregation are similar to those |  |
| 6 | Q. On page 4, line 12, you refer to tariff |  | 6 | taking senvice from a CRES, they all should be |  |
| 7 | sheet G23, and your recommendation that it be |  | 7 | treated the same. |  |
| 8 | incorporated into this proceeding. |  | 8 | Q. Still on the same topic can you explain |  |
| 9 | A. This is correct. |  | 9 | to me why customers should be given the option or the |  |
| 10 | Q. Your thought there I take it is that it |  | 10 | choice for fixed or market based rates? |  |
| 11 | would be reviewed by the parties as well as by the |  | 11 | In other words, from an economic |  |
| 12 | PUCO? |  | 12 | perspectlve wouldn't it make sense for customers to |  |
| 13 | A. When you mean -- can you rephrase the |  | 13 | know the terms and conditions at which they will be |  |
| 14 | question, because it means several things in my mind. |  | 14 | returning before they decide to switch to either a |  |
| 15 | Q. Sure. You say on line 12 that one of |  | 15 | CRES provider or take service by means of |  |
| 16 | your recommendations is that this tariff be |  | 16 | aggregation? |  |
| 17 | incorporated Into thls proceeding. What do you mean |  | 17 | It was kind of long question, you want |  |
| 18 | by that? |  | 18 | that read back? |  |
| 19 | A. Il's going to be part of this particular |  | 19 | A. Yeah. |  |
| 20 | proceeding so that it can be reviewed by the |  | 20 | (Record read.) |  |
| 21 | Commission and the relevant parties. As well as with |  | 21 | A. I would like to make my answer specific |  |
| 22 | DP\&L, of course. |  | 22 | to what is in DP\&L at the moment. |  |
| 23 | Q. Can you tell me the basis of your second |  | 23 | Q. That's fine. |  |
| $24$ | recommendation which begins on line 13? |  | 24 | A. A customer at the moment who is taking |  |
| 25 | A. Yes, and this is related to and part of |  | 25 | service from a CRES or an aggregator is paying a |  |
|  |  | Page 22 |  |  | Page 25 |
| 1 | my answer to question 26 on page 21, sir. |  | 1 | specific rider that is a POLR charge. That should |  |
| 2 | Q. Okay. I didn't want you to read that to |  | 2 | give this customer the right to choose whether to go |  |
| 3 | me, 1 just want you to explain to me in your own |  | 3 | back at market rate or government aggregation. |  |
|  | words what the basis is for your second |  | 4 | And since you have asked that question, |  |
| 5 | recommendation about self selecting either the |  | 5 | sir, and since you have assumed that they should know |  |
| 6 | standard service offer or the market based rate. |  | 6 | the terms and conditions in which they can come back |  |
| 7 | MS. ROBERTS: I'll object, I think that |  | 7 | to service, is that part of the question? |  |
| 8 | question's asked and answered. His testimony is his |  | 8 | Q. Yes. I wasn't assuming that, I was |  |
| 9 | answer. |  | 9 | asking whether you thought that it made sense that |  |
| 10 | Q. Fair enough. Go ahead and answer my |  | 10 | they should know that. |  |
| 11 | question. |  | 11 | A. And this is one of the reasons why I'm |  |
| 12 | A. The basis of this particular |  | 12 | asking for tariff sheet G23 to be part of this |  |
| 13 | communication is that if the customer is paying a |  | 13 | particular proceeding, so that the terms and |  |
| 14 | rate stabilization surcharge, that it is actually |  | 14 | conditions with which the customer will know exactly |  |
| 15 | compensating the incumbent utility in this case, |  | 15 | how to take service from a market base rate should be |  |
| 16 | DP\&L, for the cost -- the customer, since this |  | 16 | known before making the decision. |  |
| 17 | customer was paying it, should have the option to |  | 17 | Q. Although -- sorry, were you done? |  |
| 18 | self select when they come out of service with the |  | 18 | A. Yes. Please, go ahead. |  |
| 19 | negative reader or CRES to take service and service |  | 19 | Q. But the tariff sheet for a market based |  |
| 20 | offer or market. |  | 20 | rate, would you expect that that tariff sheet would |  |
| 21 | Q. I think my question is why shoutd they |  | 21 | include price terms? |  |
| 22 | have that choice. |  | 22 |  |  |
| 23 | A. They do have -- I'm recommending this |  | 23 | the price would be determined. But not specifically |  |
| 24 | choice because they are paying the incumbent utility, |  | 24 | in terms of cents per kilowatt hour. |  |
| 25 | DP\&L, a surcharge that will compensate DP\&L. for the |  | 25 | Q. We'll go back to the beginning then. |  |


|  |  | Page 26 |  |  | Page 29 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Page 4. |  | 1 | A. I remember him saying that, yes. |  |
| 2 | A. On page 4. |  | 2 | Q. On page 5 , line 14, are you offering any |  |
| 3 | Q. Line 17, your third recommendation that |  | 3 | particular opinions in this case with regard to |  |
| 4 | "the Commission order DP\&L to allow future |  | 4 | unique arrangements? I'm using that phrase because |  |
| 5 | residential customers to self select. . . " |  | 5 | it's in line 14. |  |
| 6 | A. Yes. |  | 6 | A. No. |  |
| 7 | Q. "...if they prefer to take service from |  | 7 | Q. The first sentence on line 6 which |  |
| 8 | government aggregators," |  | 8 | recites an assumption -- |  |
| 9 | And tell me the basis for that |  | 9 | A. You mean in page 6 ? |  |
| 10 | recommendation. |  | 10 | Q. Yes, if 1 misspoke, page 6 , line 1. |  |
| 11 | A. Basically if a customer that is now a |  | 11 | A. Yes. |  |
| 12 | DP\&L customer is considering to take service from an |  | 12 | Q. Reciting the assumption that the economic |  |
| 13 | alternative supply should be given the option to pay |  | 13 | development plan would begin on April 1 with cost |  |
| 14 | or not to pay the RSS, the surcharge. |  | 14 | recovery beginning that day. |  |
| 15 | If they decide to pay, then you should be |  | 15 | A. Yes. |  |
| 16 | allowed to self select when they decide to come back |  | 16 | Q. Do you have any criticism of the notion |  |
| 17 | whether they go back to a standard service offer or a |  | 17 | that cost recovery would begin on the day that the |  |
| 18 | market rate. |  | 18 | plan went into affect? |  |
| 19 | Those customers who do not pay the RSS or |  | 19 | A. My recommendation states clearly that |  |
| 20 | choose not to pay the RSS and therefore not keeping, |  | 20 | DP\&L should start charging for a rider when the |  |
| 21 | not paying for the POLR charge, DP\&L should allow |  | 21 | Commission approves a specific plan with a specific |  |
| 22 | them to go back to take service for them only on the |  | 22 | cost. |  |
| 23 | market base rate. |  | 23 | Q. On the next sentence on page 6 when you |  |
| 24 | Q. Some questions about economic development |  | 24 | are talking about the rider that's described later, |  |
| 25 | then. |  | 25 | let me ask you sort of a high level question, I take |  |
|  |  | Page 27 |  |  | Page 30 |
| 1 | A. Sure, |  | 1 | it from your testimony and your last answer that you |  |
| 2 | Q. Sort of start from the general and move |  | 2 | do not object to cost recovery by means of a rider |  |
| 3 | toward the specific. |  | 3 | for economic development costs; is that accurate? |  |
| 4 | Did you or did OCC do any work with its |  | 4 | A. A rider is an acceptable way to recoup |  |
| 5 | customers, residential customers, to determine what |  | 5 | the costs permitted and approved by the Commission. |  |
| 6 | customers want or would pay for commercial |  | 6 | Q. Go over to page 15 for a minute. |  |
| 7 | development? |  | 7 | A. Sure. |  |
| 8 | A. To my knowledge, no. |  | 8 | Q. Lines 16 and 17. |  |
| 9 | Q. Do you know -- let me give you a section, |  | 9 | A. Yes. |  |
| 10 | if customers -- again, I'm just asking about |  | 10 | Q. The sentence that begins "Furthermore, a |  |
| 11 | residential customers. |  | 11 | stable and more predictable rider. . ." |  |
| 12 | If the residential customers that OCC |  | 12 | A. Yes. |  |
| 13 | represents were asked if they were willing to pay an |  | 13 | Q. I take it you use these words to indicate |  |
| 14 | additional 22 cents a month on their monthly bill for |  | 14 | that that's a goal that you think we should have that |  |
| 15 | creation of jobs in the Dayton area, do you know |  | 15 | the rider be stable and predictable? |  |
| 16 | whether they'd support that? |  | 16 | A. As much as technically possible, yes. |  |
| 17 | A. I'm not aware of a specific study that |  | 17 | Q. Then if you go back to page 6 , line 9 , |  |
| 18 | asks for particular customers from a potential |  | 18 | you suggest that "The cost recovery rider shall be |  |
| 19 | customer list. |  | 19 | revised twice a year. . ." |  |
| 20 | Q. I'll ask it a little more broadly, since |  | 20 | That seems to be cutting against or |  |
| 21 | my question said 22 cents and you said specific |  | 21 | working against the notion of a stable predictable |  |
| 22 | study. |  | 22 | rider. Why are you suggesting twice a year? |  |
| 23 | Regardless of whether it had 22 cents in |  | 23 | A. This is a complex question and it has a |  |
| 24 | it do you know of a survey or study that was done to |  | 24 | lot of assumptions that I may or may not agree with. |  |
| 25 | determine customer attitude about that? |  | 25 | Can you please restate? |  |
|  |  | Page 28 |  |  | Page 31 |
| , | A. To the best of my knowledge, no, I don't |  | 1 | Q. I'm not sure I'll make it any easier but |  |
| 2 | know. |  | 2 | I'll be glad to restate it. |  |
| 3 | Q. On page 5 , in lines $9,10,11,12$ you |  | 3 | A. Please. |  |
| 4 | are reciting the different categories of customers, |  | 4 |  |  |
| 5 | new customer, customers being retained and so on. |  | 5 | cost recovery rider shall be revised twice a year. |  |
| 6 | Do you see that? |  | 6 | A. Yes. |  |
| 7 | A. Yes, I do. |  | 7 | Q. What is the reason for that? |  |
| 8 | Q. You didn't disagree with those as |  | 8 | A. So that to recover the true costs |  |
| 9 | analytical categories I take it; is that right? |  | 9 | associated with. . |  |
| 10 | A. I am describing exactly as succinctly as |  | 10 | Q. Is there any reason why you wouldn't have |  |
| 11 | possible what is in the economic development plan of |  | 11 | an annual reconciliation? |  |
| 12 | DP\&L. |  | 12 | A. It think that perhaps twice a year is more |  |
| 13 | Q. And I'm asking you do you disagree with |  | 13 | reasonable in this particular context. |  |
| 14 | using those categories of customers to talk about |  | 14 | Q. You're aware that Senate Bill 221 already |  |
| 15 | economic development? |  | 15 | specifies there should be a semi annual review as |  |
| 16 | A. I'm not disagreeing. |  | 16 | part of a program? |  |
| 17 | Q. You were - as I recall you attended |  | 17 | A. Yes. |  |
| 18 | Mr. Wagner's deposition when he was asked about |  | 18 | Q. So if there's already a semi annual |  |
| 19 | economic development. |  | 19 | review, revising the cost recovery twice in one year |  |
| 20 | A. I had the pleasure of attending it, yes. |  | 20 | adds what? |  |
| 21 | Q. And you understood from either your |  | 21 | A. The review process has something to do |  |
| 22 | reading or his deposition or both, that DP\&L's |  | 22 | with the cost. It also has something to do with the |  |
| 23 | position with regard to economic development is that |  | 23 | performance of those who are recelving the benefit, |  |
| 24 | it's going to be guided by and comply with the final |  | 24 | and therefore, it puts a regiment into the process |  |
| 25 | Commission rules? |  | 25 | but from the perspective of the rate design it makes |  |

```
It as true as possible and as close as possible to
the actual cost of what's being incurred,
    Q. Since the economic development rider is
designed to recover the delta revenues from all
customers, wouldn't revising the rate once a year be
sufficient unless there are some large changes in
costs experienced by DP&L?
    A. I think that revising it twice a year
would result in more accurate reflection of the true
cost of the program.
    And also might be more effective in
reflecting changes in the program if a new customer
comes in, particulariy if it is a relatively large
size customer that requires a large size
arrangements.
    Q. Later on page 6 in you're answer to
No. 10, maybe I'll start at line 19, you say "DP&L
suggesting the following incentives:" which you list
on the next page.
    A. Yes.
    Q. Again, you were at Mr. Wagner's
deposition where he said these are not DP&L.'s
suggestions because DP&L intend's to follow what the
Commission puts out in its final rules. And he just
had examples. Remember that?
```

Page 33
A. I remember that.
Q. Do you accept that this isn't a DP\&L proposal, that this was something, as he explained, that was simply done for illustrative purposes?
A. And also used in order to come up with the detta revenue and also to come up with the suggested rider.

And accordingly [ heard Mr. Wagner's testimony and I heard that he said that these are just examples. He used the -- just these examples to come up with a cost and he was asking the different rate payors to pay according to the examples.

Accordingly I think it's fair to -- these are the figures I have at the moment although in reality they could be different. But when they are different, they will be different
Q. You did hear the explanation that he didn't have anything else to work with until the rules come out but DP\&L intends to conform what it has proposed to the rules when they do issue.
A. I heard that, yes,
Q. Take a look at page 8 , please.
A. Sure.
Q. When you say on line 14 'There are no customers currently benefiting from the incentives,"
Page 32
that he was in several contexts in the industry
including meetings with customers, that there were
entities who expressed interest in the economic
development, and I also remember Mr. Wagner saying
that he's not sure these customers are in the service
territory of DP\&L.
Q. Do you expect there to be interest or
demand for these programs when they are first
offered?
A. I would like to say that I hope that
there's going to be interest and demand. At the end
of the day, f live and work in Ohio.
Q. As do I.
You have an answer running from page 8
onto page 9 which results in line 5 at a calculation
of about approximately $\$ 2,7$ million for 2009.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have criticism of how that number
was calculated?
A. This particular number is based on the
assumptions that has been highlighted in the
testimony related to a suggested number of customers
and the level of the discounts.
Q. Yes. I was asking more about the
methodology. I'm not asking you the question would
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1 that he was in several contexts in the industry
entities who expressed interest in the economic
development, and I also remember Mr. Wagner saying territory of DP\&L.
Q. Do you expect there to be interest or demand for these programs when they are first offered?
A. I would like to say that I hope that
Q. As do I.

You have an answer running from page 8 onto page 9 which results in line 5 at a calculation of about approximately $\$ 2,7$ million for 2009.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have criticism of how that number
A. This particular number is based on the assumptions that has been highlighted in the and the level of the discounts.
Q. Yes. I was asking more about the methodology. I'm not asking you the question would
you tell me this is exactly the right number, but I'm asking about the methodology.
A. As far as the level of incentive I don't
have a critcism and I'm not criticizing, I'm just describing.
Q. You find the methodology acceptable?
A. I have the methodology accepting the benefits as being a percentage of the discount but applied by the number of customers.
Q. And that's an acceptable methodology in your view; Is that right?
A. As defined by what the delta revenue is, yes.
Q. And again, to go to a higher level of generality for a minute, you agree with me that OCC supports economic development efforts, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you agree that residential --
A. Can you repeat that again? Please
forgive me, can you repeat again.
Q. The last question?
A. Yes, the statement.
Q. Yes, I asked if you agree that OCC
supports economic development efforts. And you said correct. You want to change that?
you understand that that's because the rules aren't definitive yet, right?
A. This could be part of the explanation,
yes.
Q. Maybe saying a little more simply, are you criticizing DP\&L in line 14 for having no customers benefiting vet? Or are you just reciting the rules aren't done yet?
A. I am stating a fact at the time of writing this particular testimony is that at the moment there are no customers benefiting.
Q. And by stating that fact are you trying to criticize DP\&L for not doing something? Or are you just saying that's the fact at the moment?
A. I think that the term "criticize" is not accurate. I'm just stating a fact that at the moment there are no customers taking service.
Q. Did you happen to be present at the Commission rule -- Commission meeting where the draft rules were discussed?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Did you learn that at that meeting there were customers expressing interest in the program and even asking if they could sign up at that meeting?
A. I am aware from Mr. Wagner's testimony
A. It supports economic development efforts if it benefits Ohio and the rate users and if the cost is shared correctly.
Q. Okay. And you agree that residential customers would benefit from successful economic development efforts that create jobs in this state?
A. Indirectly, yes. After all the
residential customer class are not ineligible class
to benefit from the economic development,
Q. I'm sorry, say that again, they're not
what?
A. Ineligible.
Q. They are ineligible.
A. They cannot, a residential customer
cannot apply.
Q. Now you're explaining why you said
"indirectly." Is that what you mean?
A. Indirectly because they are going to be either working in the entities benefiting it if they complied, or be second or third level economic externalities out of it if they live in the area or
they become owners of places that benefit from that,
Q. As a matter of economics do you agree that if the utility is not granted authority to recover a hundred percent of deita revenue from
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```
economic development contracts then it's not going to
be very encouraged to enter into economic development
arrangements?
    A. That term "delta revenue" is a composite
term. It is the cost of the difference in rates plus
the cost of other administrative costs plus an offset
of any benefits.
    And if there is an offset that is a take
of the benefits that will accrue to the utility as a
result of economic development, this subtracted for
delta revenue and therefore delta revenue is
inclusive of the offset, then the utility is entitled
to recover that delta revenue as defined with the
offset.
    (Record read.)
    Q. You're aware that the Senate Gill 221
includes an amendment to Ohio law that allows
recovery of revenue foregone as a result of any
program?
    A. Can you give me the code number so I know
if 1 can?
    Q, 4905.31(E). I may have one with me.
        But does that ring a bell with you?
    A. The number started to -- there was a lot
in the 4928 and the 05 that maybe I'm confused. If I
```
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to have her read it back.
A. Please.
(Record read.)
Q. They aren't in existence today.
A. There are no figures in existence today I
think that the utility could have estimated averages
for the possible benefits.
Q. How would you do that?
A. Give you an example. In my exhibit, for instance, No. AA[-2, and in my Exhibit in AAI-3, as well as in my Exhibit AAI-1, the company has provided estimates of the number of customers that are going to be ineligible.

They could have, for example, estimated what -- from their experience what savings would accrue from an average customer of this particular, and It's the estimate possible savings and try to come up with a general estimate that would be subject to trueing up when the case comes.
Q. How can that estimate be generated or created?
A. That requires knowledge of our DP\&L service territory in order to taking characteristics of the system where the customers are going to be, where is likely going to be the industrial growth or

Page 41

Page 42
the new customers are going to be ineligible and where exactly are they going to be in the system, vis-a-vis, the characteristics of the substances available and et cetera to come up with that. But assuming that this particular
knowledge, and 1 'm sure that it is there because this is where the growth is expected, general estimates could be produced.
Q. Can you be any more specific as to how to produce an estimate of it based on current information?
A. That would require me to go into a program by program and ask a host of questions that would require if I complied them probably can get that very broad and general average.
Q. Take a look at page 10, the question that begins on line 11 and the answer that follows، are you familiar with the new state mandated line extension policy?
A. No.
Q. Do you know whether there's a policy in effect in Ohio that requires DP\&L to pay a certain portion of the cost to add a new customer to the systern?

MS. ROBERTS: I would object. Asked and
foregone that it's anything less than a hundred percent of lost revenue?

MS. ROBERTS: And I would object to the
question is assuming facts not in evidence.
Q. Go ahead.
A. Subject and caveated to the observation
and the fact that I'm not a lawyer, I would be
speculating by saying that 1 don't see it.
Q. Now, on page 9 , lines 17 and 18 you say
"...DP\&L did not include a component to reflect any
savings. . ."
A. Yes.
Q. Are you suggesting that it should have
calculated some dollar figure for that?
A. If it was possible, yes.
Q. Do you think it's possible today?
A. On a case-by-case basis it is possible to
come up with estimates of possible savings.
Q. But those figures to do those estimates aren't in existence today, are they?
A. It is safe to say that the Commission is also aware of the complexity of arriving at thase particular cost savings and this is why the
Commission historically has taken a $50 / 50 \mathrm{split}$.
Q, You didn't answer my question. I'm going
could have a look at it perhaps. May I have a second to see it please?
Q. Yes. Let me direct your attention. You
can look at anything you want, of course, but I'm looking at Exhibit 58 is a copy of 4905.31, and I'm interested in directing your attention to subsection $E$. And in particular to the fourth line.

See the language "including recovery of
revenue foregone as a resutt of any such program"?
Tell me when you've had a chance to read
A. Sure.

Yes, I remember reading this particular
clause before.
Q. Do you see any description of recovery of revenue foregone as indicating anything less than a undred percent of the lost revenue?
A. I am not a lawyer and it requires a very
close reading, again. Again, I'm not a lawyer, sir.
Q. Do you want my question again?
A. No, sir, 1 would like also to have a look
Q. Well, stick with my question first.

Do you see anything in , 31(E) that
indicates in the description of recovery of revenue

```
answered.
    Q. Do you know?
    A. No.
    Q. Do you know whether or not or do you
know -- let me ask you a different question.
            Based on length of time, do you know how
    many years it would take for DP&L to recover the
    Incremental costs of adding customers to Its system?
    Have you done any study of it?
            A. No.
            Q. At the bottom of page 10, you talk about
    direct and indirect affects on the business. Can you
    give me examples of direct and indlrect affects that
you're talking about?
            A. You are referring to line 22 on page 10;
am I right?
            Q. Yes, sir.
            A. This partccular statement is in
relationship to a sentence that started on line 20,
and it is referring to the benefits that will accrue
to participating and mon-particlpating customers of
the economic development plan, and the plan is going
to benefit directly and indirectiy.
            Directly means that those who are
participating are going to receive a discount that
```

|  |  | Page 44 |  |  | Page 47 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | they are going to use in order to improve the |  | 1 | a component of the benefits that accrues to the |  |
| 2 | performance of their business or employ a certain |  | 2 | utility should be fitted back to the department that |  |
| 3 | amount of people. |  | 3 | revenues, |  |
| 4 | And Indirectly means that as they employ |  | 4 | Q. What do you mean "the difference"? |  |
| 5 | more people, there's going to be more in demand of |  | 5 | A. You were a customer consuming a certain |  |
| 6 | what they produce directiv or indirectly. As an |  | 6 | level of consumption, hundred megawatt hours, hundred |  |
| 7 | example. |  | 7 | kilowatt hours, and now because of the plan, the |  |
| 8 | MR. FARUKI: Read that back please. |  | 8 | economic development plan, you are consuming 101 or |  |
| 9 | (Record read.) |  | 9 | you were supposed to leave the state and come back -- |  |
| 10 | Q. I don't understand that last sentence she |  | 10 | and not come back but have decided to stay. |  |
| 11 | just read. What do you mean "they will be more in |  | 11 | Q. Yes. |  |
| 12 | demand of what they produce"? |  | 12 | A. There is a delta increase in revenues |  |
| 13 | A. Economists call that supply creates |  | 13 | that would not have taken place had the plan did not |  |
| 14 | demand. That means as they Indulge into the process |  | 14 | take place. The net effect after taking the cost of |  |
| 15 | of production, they pay salaries and when they pay |  | 15 | this particular increase in revenues should be |  |
| 16 | salaries they who pays salaries and turn around and |  | 16 | credited back to the delta revenue. |  |
| 17 | buy back in the market what they produce directly or |  | 17 | Q. So just so I understand your proposal, |  |
| 18 | indirectly. |  | 18 | what you're saying is that you -- that DPQL should |  |
| 19 | Q. Okay, you go on to talk about in the |  | 19 | not only glve an economic development discount to the |  |
| 20 | sentence that runs from page 10 onto page 11-- |  | 20 | customer, but it should also pass on that customer's |  |
| 21 | A. And if I may add also, non-participating |  | 21. | distribution revenue to all other customers; is that |  |
| 22 | indirect as there are more people employed in |  | 22 | right? |  |
| 23 | section A in the industry there that were not there, |  | 23 | A. No, I'm not saying that, sir. What I'm |  |
| 24 | they're going to buy more housing, they are going to |  | 24 | saying is very clear in what I have written. I'm |  |
| 25 | consume and increase the demand in the areas. |  | 25 | saying there are going to be benefits accruing to |  |
|  |  | Page 45 |  |  | Page 48 |
| 1 | And I hope that would make my point |  | 1 | DP\&L as a result of the plan. And these particular |  |
| 2 | clearer to you as well. |  | 2 | benefits if quant\|fied properly should be netted out. |  |
| 3 | Yes, sir. |  | 3 | Q. You agree with me that the distribution |  |
| 4 | Q. The sentence that runs from page 10 onto |  | 4 | revenue from the retained customer is supposed to |  |
| 5 | page 11, you talk about increased sales and |  | 5 | cover the cost of the distribution facilities in |  |
| 6 | additional revenues. Those are really the same |  | 6 | place as relevant as the cost of providing |  |
| 7 | thing, aren't they? Aren't you talking about |  | 7 | distribution service to that customer; is that right? |  |
| 8 | additional revenues that come from increased sales? |  | 8 | A. This is not what I intend. What I intend |  |
| 9 | A. Yes. |  | 9 | is there is going to be an Incremental difference in |  |
| 10 | Q. And when you talk about improving the |  | 10 | the revenues. And the incremental impact should be |  |
| 11 | utilization of the different systems and assets in |  | 11 | netted. In your question you are implying that the |  |
| 12 | place on lines 1 and 2, is that something you're |  | 12 | total revenues. This is not what I'm saylng. |  |
| 13 | suggesting should be quantified? Or are you just |  | 13 | Q. Let me ask -- |  |
| 14 | describing that as sort of an economic fact? |  | 14 | A. I'm speaking in terms of increments |  |
| 15 | A. It can be quantified. |  | 15 | change the deltas. If I may. |  |
| 16 | Q. How do you do that? |  | 16 | Q. So you agree with me that if the revenues |  |
| 17 | A. This is an engineering study and it is |  | 17 | were not kept by the utility to cover its cost but |  |
| 18 | related to better utilization of assets as there are |  | 18 | instead would be passed on to all customers by |  |
| 19 | more customers. |  | 19 | netting them against delta revenues, that ultirnately |  |
| 20 | Q. On page 11 you have beginning on line 5 |  | 20 | distribution rates would go up because the utility |  |
| 21 | and ending on line 20, a quotation, and I take it |  | 21 | would have to get recovery of those costs from |  |
| 22 | this is a quotation from Mr. Gonzalez's testimony? |  | 22 | someone to stay in business. |  |
| 23 | A. This is correct, sir. |  | 23 | (Record read.) |  |
| 24 | Q. And why are you quoting the testimony of |  | 24 | A. This is not what I'm saying at all, I'm |  |
| 25 | another witness from a Cleveland Electric case in |  | 25 | saying is that there's going to be incremental |  |
|  |  | Page 46 |  |  | Page 49 |
| 1 | 2008? |  | 1 | changes. And the incremental changes will produce |  |
| 2 | A. I am just trving to give an example of |  | 2 | benefits and costs. |  |
| 3 | what other benefits can accrue and I found that the |  | 3 | If DP\&L, sees the benefits, it should be |  |
| 4 | language that my colleague said is useful and |  | 4 | incremental change that should be accounted in the |  |
| 5 | succinct. |  | 5 | delta. |  |
| 6 | Q. So you're adopting points A through D as |  | 5 | Q. Take a look at page 11, line 10, item |  |
| 7 | your own, right? |  | 7 | "b." |  |
| 8 | A. I am agreeing with points from A to D. |  | B | A. Yes. |  |
| 9 | Q. And not only are you agreeing with them, |  | 9 | Q. You understand that DP\&L as the load |  |
| 10 | but you're sponsoring them in this case. Correct? |  | 10 | serving entity would pay PJM for transmission based |  |
| 11 | A. Can you explain what "sponsoring" means |  | 11 | on the actual load? |  |
| 12 | please? |  | 12 | A. I believe that this is the case, |  |
| 13 | Q. Yes -- I'll ask it differently. |  | 13 | Q. DP\&L would be paying PJM for the |  |
| 14 | Not only are you agreeing with the |  | 14 | transmission service for this customer, in other |  |
| 15 | points, you're incorporating them as part of your |  | 15 | words, right? |  |
| 16 | testimony in this case. |  | 16 | A. This is my understanding. |  |
| 17 | A. Yes. As is clear on page 11. |  | 17 | Q. If DP\&L credits the transmission revenue |  |
| 18 | Q. Well, then let's look at point No. A on |  | 18 | to the delta revenue recovery, then it will not be |  |
| 19 | line 6. You are suggesting that the EDU will receive |  | 19 | receiving any compensation for providing that |  |
| 20 | some distribution revenue from the retained customer, |  | 20 | transmission service to the customer. True? |  |
| 21 | right? |  | 21 | A. This particular statement is related to |  |
| 22 | A. Correct. |  | 22 | the extent where DP\&L. is responsible for the assets |  |
| 23 | Q. Are you suggesting that this revenue be |  | 23 | that have contributed towards the delivery of the |  |
| 24 | credited against the delta revenues? |  | 24 | service. This is not a general statement. |  |
| 25 | A, I'm suggesting the difference as if it is |  | 25 | So if DP\&L does not own transmission and |  |

```
therefore this particular statement is not applicable
on DP&L In this particular case because DP&L does not
own the transmission facilities. Therefore, what J'm
saying would not be applicable.
    It is also possible in fully deregulated
markets that DP&L could be doing absolutely nothing
but just providing the distribution wires, and then
there's going to be only what I'm saying applicable
on its share of responsibility providing the service.
    Q. So you are not suggesting that in this
circumstance where DP&L has to pay PJM for the
transmission service that the transmission revenue
needs to get credited to the delta revenue recovery.
    A. I am saying that in a case of a utility
that owns the transmission line and the economic
development plan incrementally improves the economics
of that recovery of the rates in the transmission
system, it should be taken Into consideration in
delta revenue.
    Q. Well, again, I want clarity. Let's deal
with this situation where DP&L. has to pay PJM for
transmisslon costs -- let my finish my question.
    A. Please go ahead, sir.
    Q. DP&L has to pay for this transmission
service. Do you agree that in that circumstance it
```

should not have to credit the transmission revenue to
the detta revenue recovery?
A. In the case that DP\&L does not own
transmission facilities and therefore it is a
complete pass through, it is going to be a complete
pass through.
Q. So the answer to my question is yes, you
agree?
A. Again, if I may say, if the DP\&L does not
own the transmission facillties and it is owned by a
third entity that is not part of this particular
fling, what 1 arn saying would not be applicable.
Q. Take a look at point " $c$ " on this page,
page 11 .
A. Yes.
Q. I'm not sure if you're saying this, Your
testimony seems to suggest that payments which DP\&L
receives for the customers for line extension should
be credited back to the delta revenue recovery
mechanism.
Is that your position?
$A_{1}$ If I may listen to the question again.
(Record read.).
A. No, this is not my position.
Q. Okay.

Page 51
mechat development delta revenue recov
mechanism, then DP\&L is not adequately being
sales.
A. No, this is not what I'm saying, sir.
Q. Wait a minute $m y$ question though is do Q. Wait a minuke, my que
you agree with that statement?
A. No, I don't,
Q. Because?
Q. Because? I'm trying to make it clear, and I'm more than happy to say it in a way that would make it clearer, is that when we are speaking about incremental impact of that when we are speaking about incremental impact
the economic development plan, that would result in incremental benefits to the beneficiaries, the participating and non-participating customers, as well as to DP\&L, and we would like to suggest and well as to DP\&L, and we would like to suggest
we'd recommend the Commission to split this partlcular cost between those who benefit; simply means the participating customers, the non-participating customers, and DP\&L, Q. Are you saying that you would split the economic -- the additional revenues between the company and someone else?
Q. If revenue from the new sales is credited to the economic development delta revenue recovery mechanism, then DP\&L. is not adequately being
compensated for the cost of providing those new compensated for the cost of proviaing those
sales.
Q. I'll subtract that term, If that helps.

I didn't mean to make my question unclear.
A. All my answers and the questions before
the question talks in terms of increments impact. So the increment of the change because of the plan will have benefits to the users as well as to DP\&L.

These particular benefits has to be
shared. And the cost has to be shared. And all of the what I have sald so far leads to this particular simple observation that if there are increments changes because of the plan that was going to have increment benefits and increment costs; it is shared by both the shareholders and the rate payors
Q. But you realize that additional sales create additional costs incurred by the utilities, right? True?
A. Additional sales accrue additional costs.
Q. That was an easy question.
A. Yes,
Q. All my questions are easy.
A. Yes. For a change,
Q. And revenues from the new sales are
designed to recover the costs of providing those new
sales. You agree with that?
A. Yes.
A. My position I'm speaking in terms of increments. If there are increment improvements, it has to be shared.
Q. So you agree that or you recognize that

DP\&L incurs costs of extending facilities to serve a new customer.
A. Like any other utility with good utility
practices, yes.
Q. And those facility extension costs are to be recovered by customer payments for line extension?
A. It depends upon the regulatory treatment in question and state in question, territory in question. Service territory in question.
Q. Do you know what the situation is with regard to DP\&L?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Go on to item "d" then.
A. Okay,
Q. If economic development initiatives lead to more overall sales, are you saying that increases in those sales should be somehow credited to the economic development delta revenue recovery mechanism?
A. The term "somehow" makes it extremely general.

## "additional revenues"?

A. Can you be specific what do you mean
Q. I'm talking about the same situation when there are additional sales that result from an economic development effort, would you split the additional revenue from those sales?
A. The additional revenues of those additional sales is going to improve efficiency within DP\&L. This particular -- as I explained above in the language, for instance, better utilization of their systems, as I mentioned above in the language. This particular benefit should be
subtracted, quantified if possible, and subtracted from the cost of the program.
Q. And you're saying that should be done regardless of the cost to the company of the additional service, the cost to provide the new service?
A. I'm finding it difficult to follow your line of repeated questions and I wonder if you would be kind to repeat the question again because I feel that I have said that several times.
Q. Okay. If the company has additiona! sales, you have agreed with me that It's going to incur additional costs.
additional sales should be shared with the customers?
A. What I have stated before is that there's going to be increased sales that is going to result in increased benefits to those who are benefiting from it directly and indirectly, and that includes DP\&L, and the benefits and the costs should be shared.
Q. Take a look at page 12.
A. Yes.
Q. Question 11, you are asked about some
past PUCO cases, right?
A. Question 11 on page 7, sir?
Q. I'm sorry, question 17, on page 12.

You're asking about some PUCO cases, right?
A. Right.
Q. The case numbers are 1991 and 1995 and 1994.
A. Yes.
Q. And then you are asked to provide a
synopsis of the Commission's orders, right?
A. Correct.
Q. But you told me you're not a lawyer and

| Page 56 | they are ten, 15 vears ago, they are still relevant today. Because at the end of the day, it is a recovery of a cost of a specific practice. <br> Q. So does that mean that what you did in your, to use your word, synopsis of Commission orders -- <br> A. There are two synopsis; is it question 18 or question 19? <br> Q. It's still question 18. <br> What you did is to ignore the more recent <br> 4905.31 that I gave you in Exhibit 58. <br> A. I'm not ignoring, and although that this is a strictly legal opinion, my understanding is what I have quoted you are relevant because it's a recovery of delta revenue. <br> Q. So you are calling this strictly a legal opinion? <br> A. In reference to the applicability of the exhibit that you gave me, of course I would consider it a legal opinion. <br> Q. Do you consider what you have in your symopsis in answer 18 on page 13 legal material? <br> A. It is based on my understanding and reading of the Opinion and Orders cited in the testimony, and I have shared my opinion with the | Page 59 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Page 57 | colleagues that they are better than me in the legal matter. Lawyers. <br> Q. Oh, lawyers, okay. In other words, you have bounced your opinion off the lawyers, is that what you're saying? <br> A. I have shared my opinion and my testimony with the legal profession and OCC for an opinion. <br> Q. Are you saying that this comes from them? <br> A. No, I'm not saying that this comes from them. I'm saying that this is my testimony and this is my opinion. <br> Q. And then you go on page 14 to the prepared testimony from 1995 of D. Howard on the Commission staff? <br> A. Correct. <br> Q. Do you think there have been any significant changes in the economy in DP\&L's service teritory since this time? <br> MS. ROBERTS: I would object, it's asked and answered at the beginning of the deposition. <br> Q. Go ahead. <br> A. To the extent that it affects what I am recommending at this particular testimony, which is how to charge for the cost of the economic development plan, and the split of the delta revenue |  |
| Page 58 | between the shareholders and the rate payors, the changes that have taken place over a period of time may not have been significant. <br> Q. Let's talk about some of those, You're aware that two of DP\&L's major customers have recently made announcements that they are shulting down facilities where tens of thousands of workers work? <br> A. I am not familiar with these specific two customers. But I'm familiar with the economic delta in the area particularly recently, and by "recently" I mean the last year or so. <br> Q. Do you know about the General Motors plant closings in Dayton's service territory? <br> A. I am not aware of a specific plant by General Motors but I am aware that plants from in the motor vehicle industry and ancillary services, the backward linkages, and I think that the name of one the companies that I recognize escapes me, Delphi? <br> Q. In Davton sevice terrltory. <br> A. Yes. Is also contemplating leaving or contemplating reduction in operation. I am not sure about leaving to be exact but I am aware of the reduction in operation. <br> Q. You're also aware that up until recently | Page 61 |


|  |  | Page 62 |  |  | Page 65 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | a large proportion of the manufacturing base in |  | 1 | Q. Start on page 18. |  |
| 2 | DP\&L's service territory has been related to the |  | 2 | A. Yes. |  |
| 3 | automotive industry? |  | 3 | Q. Line $\mathbf{1 0}$ you start out by saying "DP\&L's |  |
| 4 | MS. RDPERTS: I don't want you to |  | 4 | rationale for the proposed changes is related to the |  |
| 5 | speculate. I object on that brsis. |  | 5 | financial risks the company sees when large groups of |  |
| 6 | You can answer if you know. |  | 6 | customers leave the standard service offer and then |  |
| 7 | A. I cannot answer for DP\&L's service |  | 7 | return to it." |  |
| 8 | territory but I can answer in reference to the |  | 8 | A. Yes. |  |
| 9 | industrial base around the city of Dayton. |  | 9 | Q. Do you agree that there are such |  |
| 10 | Q. Go ahead. |  | 10 | financial rlsks? |  |
| 11 | A. There is a motor vehicle industry base |  | 11 | $A_{1}$ As stated in the testimony from line 13 |  |
| 12 | among others available in there. |  | 12 | and 20, I agree with it. |  |
| 13 | Q. Maybe I can make this easier. |  | 13 | Q. So just for clarity of my record, the |  |
| 14 | Do you think that the DP\&L service |  | 14 | sentence that begins on line 13 and ends on line 16 , |  |
| 15 | territory could use same economic development |  | 15 | do you agree with that? |  |
| 16 | incentives? |  | 16 | A. Yes. |  |
| 17 | A. Almost any service territory in United |  | 17 | Q. Same question, sir, with regard to line |  |
| 18 | States of America today would work on such efforts to |  | 18 | 16, the sentence that begins "Further" and ends down |  |
| 19 | economic development, whether related to DP\&L plan or |  | 19 | on line 20, do you agree with that? |  |
| 20 | not. |  | 20 | A. I agree with it. I just want to caveat |  |
| 21 | Q. I'm not asking about others. I asked you |  | 21 | my answer is that the term "significant financial |  |
| 22 | a specific question. I'd like a straight answer to |  | 22 | risks, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ whether they are significant or not |  |
| 23 | it. |  | 23 | significant, these are some things to be determined |  |
| 24 | Do you agree that in the DP\&L. service |  | 24 | on a case-by-case basis. However, conceptually I |  |
| 25 | territory there is a need for economic development |  | 25 | agree. |  |
|  |  | Page 63 |  |  | Page 66 |
|  | incentives? I'm not asking about utilities in some |  | 1 | Q. On page 19, you talk about DP\&L's |  |
| 2 | other part of the world. |  | 2 | treatment of customers returning from governmental |  |
| 3 | A. If and only if the cost of this |  | 3 | aggregators places the risk of market prices squarely |  |
| 4 | particular plan and the benefits and the delta |  | 4 | with the customer that makes a choice to participate |  |
| 5 | revenue including the offsets of the benefits that |  | 5 | in the programs. |  |
| 6 | accrues to DP\&L is accounted into consideration, they |  | 6 | Do you see that reference, the first |  |
| 7 | would. |  | 7 | three lines of page 19? |  |
| 8 | Q, Do you believe that limiting DP\&L's |  | 8 | A. Yes, 1 see the three lines. |  |
| 9 | ability to recover delta revenues will encourage |  | 9 | Q. Do you agree that under basic economic |  |
| 10 | additional economic development arrangements? |  | 10 | principles customers should bear the risk of the |  |
| 11 | MS. ROBERTS: I'm going to object. That |  | 11 | choices they make? |  |
| 12 | was asked and answered, that very question. |  | 12 | A. My recommendation is consistent with this |  |
| 13 | Q. Go ahead. |  | 13 | particular understanding. |  |
| 14 | A. The suggested treatment and the |  | 14 | Q. You agree with that principle though. |  |
| 15 | recommendation on -- the suggested treatment of the |  | 15 | A. A customer who makes a chaice to |  |
| 16 | economic development plan and the recovery of the |  | 16 | participate in such programs should take the risks |  |
| 17 | rider in the recommendations put forward in my |  | 17 | assoclated with It and, thus, with these particular |  |
| 18 | testimony does not affect the ability of DP\&L to |  | 18 | customers pays for the risks that he is undertaking. |  |
| 19 | recover its plan. |  | 19 | Q. On page 20 you have a reference to the |  |
| 20 | Because it's trying to be fair to those |  | 20 | rate stabilization surcharge in line 16. You |  |
|  | who benefit whether they are the participating party |  | 21 | recognize that was approved by the Commission a |  |
| 22 | or non-participating customers or DP\&L. |  | 22 | number of years ago? |  |
| 23 | Q. On page 15, lines 4 and 5, you talk about |  | 23 | A. Correct. |  |
| 24 | ".,.the percentage of revenue recovery being |  | 24 |  |  |
| 25 | determined by the Commission on a case-by-case |  | 25 | Page 22, you talk around lines 11 and 12 |  |
|  |  | Page 64 |  |  | Page 67 |
| 1 | basis. . ." |  | 1 | that -- about your opinion that customers should have |  |
| 2 | A. This is the latest opinlon by the |  | 2 | the optlon not to pay the RSS. |  |
| 3 | Commission that I quoted, yes. |  | 3 | A. Correct. |  |
| 4 | Q. You agree with that position and you |  | 4 | Q. And if so, they would be offered power at |  |
| 5 | think that's appropriate? |  | 5 | market based rates. |  |
| 6 | A. This is the position of the Commission. |  | 6 | A. Correct, |  |
| 7 | Q. Answer my question. I'm asking whether |  | 7 | Q. Is that your recommendation? |  |
| 8 | you think that position is appropriate. |  | 8 | A. Yes. |  |
| 9 | A. The Commission has stated an opinion and |  | 9 | Q. Your testimony talks about, this is |  |
| 10 | it is what it is. |  | 10 | starting on page 23, the RSS being a POLR charge. |  |
| 11 | Q. Yes, but you are entitled to have an |  | 11 | A. Correct. |  |
| 12 | opinion. If you don't have one, again, I want a |  | 12 | Q. Is it $\cdot$ do you have an opinion as to |  |
| 13 | stralght answer. I'm asking if you think it's |  | 13 | whether the RSS should or should not be part of the |  |
| 14 | appropriate. If you have an opinion, tell me. If |  | 14 | fuel calculation? |  |
| 15 | vou don't, tell me that. |  | 15 | A. No. |  |
| 16 | A. I agree with the Commission. However, I |  | 16 | Q. No, you don't have an opinion, or no, it |  |
| 17 | also agree with the Commission's statement that it |  | 17 | should not? |  |
| 18 | has stated that in the past practice they have |  | 18 | A. No, I don't have an opinion. My opinton |  |
| 19 | suggested 50/50. |  | 19 | is stated exactly as what it is, description of the |  |
| 20 | MR. FARUKI: Off the record. |  | 20 | RSS is that it includes the cost of providing the |  |
| 21 | (Off the record.) |  | 21 | POLR service and this is how I base my opinion. |  |
| 22 | MR. FARUKI: Back on the record. |  | 22 | As the customers are paying this |  |
| 23 | Q. Mr, Ibrahim, I'm going to ask you some |  | 23 | particular number possible charge and therefore |  |
| 24 | questions about governmental aggregation. |  | 24 | presumably are keeping the utility whole, they should |  |
| 25 | A. Please go ahead, sir. |  | 25 | exercise the right to choose whether to take standard |  |


|  |  | Page 68 |  |  | Page 71 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | service offer or a market based rate. |  | 1 | A. This would be one of them, yes. |  |
| 2 | Q. On page 23, line 9, you talk about "The |  | 2 | Q. Whose legal opinion or advice are you |  |
| 3 | absence of necessary information embedded in the |  | 3 | relying on, give me a name. |  |
| 4 | market base generation rate. . ." |  | 4 | MS, ROBERTS: I would object as that |  |
| 5 | A. Correct. |  | 5 | being privileged. |  |
| 6 | Q. What is the -- specifically what |  | 6 | MR. FARUKI: Not once he has said that |  |
| 7 | necessary information do you have reference to there? |  | 7 | he's relying on it for his testimony. |  |
| 8 | A. As I highlighted before, it's the terms |  | 8 | MS. ROBERTS: I think he said that a |  |
| 9 | and conditions for which is going to be included in |  | 9 | couple times that he's testifying as an economist and |  |
| 10 | G23. |  | 10 | this is his interpretation as an economist. |  |
| 11 | Q. Okay. On pages 1 guess it starts at the |  | 11 | MR. FARUKI; And then he went on, Jackie, |  |
| 12 | bottom of 24, all of 25, and the answer through line |  | 12 | and said that where necessary he relies on the |  |
| 13 | 12 of 26, you are quoting from an Ohio Revised Code |  | 13 | opinion of other experts. This is one of those |  |
| 14 | section and then from the legislative history; is |  | 14 | situations. I want to know which person. |  |
| 15 | that right? |  | 15 | MS. ROBERTS: Why don't we ask that. I |  |
| 16 | A. I'm actually quoting from the Opinion and |  | 16 | think there might be a language issue here but let's |  |
| 17 | Order of the Commission that itself quoted from the |  | 17 | just clarify it. |  |
| 18 | Ohio Revised Code, If you go to page 24, line 18. |  | 18 | MR. FARUKI: I'm not asking for the |  |
| 19 | Q. Yes. Well, line 18 contains your |  | 19 | advice, I'm asking for the name of the lawyer that |  |
| 20 | conclusion that the recommendations are consistent |  | 20 | he's talking about. |  |
| 21 | with the Commission's recent Opinion and Order In the |  | 21 | A. There is a legal team that was attached |  |
| 22 | Duke case. |  | 22 | to this particular case and specifically I cannot put |  |
| 23 | A. Yes. |  | 23 | a name of the person in this particular case. |  |
| 24 | Q. Then you say the relevant Revised Code |  | 24 | Q. Tell me the names of the group then. |  |
| 25 | Section is as follows. |  | 25 | A. There are several, Ms. J. Roberts, Mr. G. |  |
|  |  | Page 69 |  |  | Page 72 |
| 1 | A. No, sir, that the PUCO relied upon to |  | 1 | Poulos, Mr. Mike Idzkowski, to name three. But whom |  |
| 2 | reach this decision, and they quoted that rule in |  | 2 | exactiy is not clear. |  |
| 3 | their law. |  | 3 | Q. Do you have any alternatives to DP\&L.'s |  |
| 4 | Q. But the quote that appears on page 25, |  | 4 | suggested approach that you have not set out in your |  |
|  | what is that a quote from? |  | 5 | testimony? |  |
| 6 | A. This is from Ohio Revised Code as quoted |  | 6 | A. This is a -- |  |
| 7 | in the Commission order. Would you like to have a |  | 7 | Q. Not clear? |  |
| 8 | look at it? |  | 8 | A. Yes, very. |  |
| 9 | Q. Are you saying on page 25, lines 1 to 15, |  | 9 | Q. That's all right, I'm glad you sald that. |  |
| 10 | those are a quote from the Commission order? |  | 10 | I'll just rephrase it. |  |
| 11 | A. Correct. |  | 11 | I'm trying to find out if you have other |  |
| 12 | Q. And then on page 26 , you have reference |  | 12 | recommendations on the subjects of your testimony |  |
| 13 | to the intent of the legislature regarding the |  | 13 | that are not contained in your testimony, or whether |  |
| 14 | statutory interpretation of standby service, on lines |  | 14 | your testimony has all of it. |  |
| 15 | 3 and 4. |  | 15 | A. My testimony has all of it. However, as |  |
| 16 | A. Yes. |  | 16 | I stated in my testimony, I reserve the right to |  |
| 17 | Q. So you're not a lawyer but you were |  | 17 | incorporate new information as they become available |  |
| 18 | testifying here to the intent of the legislature |  | 18 | to me. |  |
| 19 | regarding a question of statutory interpretation and |  | 19 | Q. I understand. But as of today this Is |  |
| 20 | you're citing in support of that an opinlon of the |  | 20 | complete. Correct? |  |
| 21 | Commission? Is that what you're doing? |  | 21 | A. Yes. |  |
| 22 | A. I am not a lawyer, I have read the |  | 22 | MR. FARUKI: Off the record. |  |
| 23 | Opinion and the Order and I have formed my |  | 23 | (Signature not waived.) |  |
| 24 | understanding of it and I have shared this particular |  | 24 | (Deposition concluded at 3:35 p.m.) |  |
| 25 | opinion with the legal colleagues in OCC, the |  | 25 | -- |  |
|  |  | Page 70 |  |  | Page 73 |
|  | lawyers. |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Q. Okay. |  |  | County of $\qquad$ |  |
| 3 | A. And they advised that my understanding |  | 3 | I, Ami A. Ibrahim, do hereby certify that 1 |  |
| 4 | and my use is correct. |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Q. So you agree with me that what you're |  | 4 | given on Friday, January 30, 200s; that together with the correction page attached hereto noting changes in |  |
| 6 | doing here is rendering a legal opinion about the |  | 5 | form or substance, if any, it is tue and correct. |  |
| 7 | intent of the legislature regarding this statutory |  | 6 |  |  |
| 8 | interpretation of the phrase "standby service." |  | 7 | Ams A. Lbrahim |  |
| 9 | A. No, sir, I'm not rendering a legal |  | 8 | Ams A. Luranim |  |
| 10 | opinion. I have shared my understanding of the law |  | 9 | I do hereby certify that the foregoing |  |
| 11 | and I have put it on as an economist of how I read |  | 10 | transcript of the deposition of Amr A. 1brahim was submitted to the witness for reading and signing: |  |
| 12 | the law and how I understood it. |  | 10 | that after he had stated to the undersigned Notary |  |
| 13 | Q. And then you're saying that you shared |  | 11 |  |  |
| 14 15 | that with counsel who blessed it. <br> A. I did not use the term "blessed it." |  | ${ }_{12}^{12}$ | he signed the same in my presence on the _._ day of 2008. |  |
| 16 | Q. What term do you want to use? |  | 13 |  |  |
| 17 | A. They have agreed that my understanding is |  | 14 | Notary Public |  |
| 18 | correct. |  | 16 | My commission expires _______ |  |
| 19 | Q. Are you relying on them for any part of |  | 17 | --- |  |
| 20 | this? A. This is my testimony based on my |  | 18 19 |  |  |
| 21 | A. This is my testimony based on my |  | 20 |  |  |
| 22 | experience and education, and where there are areas |  | 21 |  |  |
| 23 | that I do like to take opinlon of those who |  | 22 23 |  |  |
| 24 | specialize in a specific field, I take it. |  | 23 24 |  |  |
| 25 | Q. Is this one? |  | 25 |  |  |


| ```M,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: |
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