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DECEMBER 22, 2010

## PROCEEDINGS

(The witness was duly sworn by
Kelly L. Wilburn.)
KEVIN HIGGINS,
called as a witness, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MS. SPILLER:
Q. Mr. Higgins, this is Amy Spiller, counsel for Duke Energy Ohio in connection with this matter. Can you hear me okay over the phone?
A. I sure can.
Q. Okay. And we've had a bit of a perhaps technical issue, so if I could just reiterate Mr. Kutik's request that you speak up. I'm hoping that all on the phone can hear your testimony clearly this morning, sir.
A. I will do, I will do my best, thank you.
Q. Thank you. Mr. Higgins, can you identify yourself for purposes of the record, please?
A. Yes. My name is Kevin C. Higgins.
Q. And what is your business address, sir?
A. My business address is 215 South State Street, Suite 200, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.
Q. And what is your occupation?
A. I am an economist and I'm a principal in the firm of Energy Strategies, LLC.
Q. Mr. Higgins, do you have in front of you what has been marked -- or what will be marked as Exhibit 1 to your deposition, which is an Amended Notice of Deposition filed on December 13, 2010?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And Mr. Higgins, have you produced at your deposition this morning any documents responsive to that notice?
A. Well, my understanding is that I needed to bring any exhibits. I mean, let me just double check here. I brought a lot of things so I'll.

Yes.
Q. And what are the documents, sir, that you brought in response to the subpoena? Or I'm sorry, in response to the notice of deposition?
A. I brought my testimony. I brought Duke Energy Ohio's application and filing. I brought a document that I reviewed, which is cited in my testimony. I can give you the exact citation. Give me one moment, please.

It's Duke Energy's Third Quarter Earnings Review and Business Update, issued October 28, 2010.
Q. Okay.
A. I brought a, an Amended Substitute Senate Bill No. 221, the, the act which adopted the market rate offer.
Q. Okay.
A. And I brought a section of the statute that is referenced in my testimony as well. I brought a copy of the ESP settlement that in the last -- I don't want to say the "last." I guess when the current ESP was approved.
Q. And that would be, sir, the ESP for Duke Energy Ohio filed under Case No. 08920?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay, thank you.
A. I, I also brought electronically some -- the work papers that Duke Energy Ohio provided that were used in some of my analysis. Now, I'll point out that because of the volume of material associated with the Company's filing I brought some of this material electronically.

I brought some things hard copy that I thought were more likely to be discussed, and I brought others electronically. So if I do get asked about something I brought electronically, like a work paper, it will take me a moment just to go to my
computer, which I brought, and call it up.
Q. Okay. Other than what you have identified, sir, do you have any other documents, whether hard copy or electronic, that you brought with you to your deposition today?
A. No, that's it.
Q. The items, sir, that you have just identified -- your testimony filed on December 21st, Duke Energy Ohio's application and filing filed on November 15th, Duke Energy Ohio's third quarter business update, the Ohio law, portions of the Amended Senate Bill 221 and portions thereof, as well as a copy of the stipulation and recommendation filed in Duke Energy Ohio Case No. 08920 -- have you reviewed any other documents, sir, for purposes of preparing your testimony in this case?
A. No.
Q. What was it about the ESP stipulation and recommendation in Case No. 08920 that you thought relevant to preparing your testimony in this case?
A. The ESP settlement represents the status quo. And I think as matter of general practice I like to refresh myself with the, with the status quo as I prepare my testimony.
Q. Okay. In preparing your testimony in this
case, Mr. Higgins, did you review the testimony that you submitted on behalf of Kroger in connection with the application filed by the FirstEnergy Distribution Utilities for approval of a market rate offer?
A. I did not specifically re-review that testimony.
Q. Aside from your counsel, did you speak with anyone in preparing your testimony in this case?
A. I have a couple of associates who work -- who report to me at Energy Strategies, and I did work with one of those -- with one of them in preparing my testimony in terms of having her research some documents under my direction.
Q. And what were the documents, sir, that this associate researched under your direction, please?
A. She found some work papers that were prepared by Duke Energy -- Duke, Duke Energy Ohio. And she also found the, the document I referred to earlier, which was the third quarter earnings report.
Q. Okay. And when you referenced the work papers, those are work papers filed by Duke Energy Ohio relative to this case, correct?
A. That's correct. That's correct. And I also spoke to the energy manager at Kroger, just simply to get $a$, an understanding or -- of the -- Kroger's
current situation with respect to its -- the procurement of its electricity supply.
Q. And who is the energy manager at Kroger with whom you spoke?
A. Denis George.
Q. Denis George?
A. Yes.
Q. And the name of your associate, please, who partici -- who assisted in your research?
A. Oliwia Smith. And that's Oliwia with a "w" instead of a "v."
Q. Aside from your testimony, Mr. Higgins, have you prepared any summaries, memoranda, or other documents related to this case?
A. I have not.
Q. With regard to your position at Energy Strategies, are there specific issues on which you provide consulting services?
A. Well, I, I don't know that -- let me back up. Certainly whenever I'm engaged to, to assist a client in a hearing I address specific topics, so I suppose the answer is yes. Are you asking what areas I, I may restrict my practice to?
Q. Do you have areas of specialty? Perhaps a better way to ask the question.
A. I would say I -- my experience in electricity proceedings includes most areas of -- that are addressed with respect to rate determination, policy issues as well. Most topics, with the exception of return on equity.

I typically don't get involved in return on equity issues. But I, I've, over the course of my career I've been involved in most aspects of electricity rate proceedings.
Q. Okay.
A. Or policy proceedings.
Q. And I'm sorry, sir, I didn't mean to talk over you. You broke up a bit on that response, but if I may restate it. You address in proceedings rate determinations, policy issues. Do not focus on return on equity issues?
A. That is correct. And so I suppose it would be fair to say I've addressed most -- I've addressed fairly often revenue requirement issues, rate design, cost of service, as well as policy matters pertaining to the structure of electric markets.
Q. Okay, thank you. And you are testifying on behalf of The Kroger Company in this proceeding, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And the purpose of your testimony, sir, is to address two particular issues within Duke Energy Ohio's filing, correct?
A. That is correct.

MR. YURICK: Objection, I think the testimony speaks for itself.

You may answer.
Q. (By Ms. Spiller) I'm sorry Mr. Higgins, you can go ahead and answer.
A. I, I'd say that fairly characterizes my testim -- my direct testimony.
Q. Okay. Through your testimony, Mr. Higgins, you do not oppose the market rate offer structure, do you?
A. May I ask when you say "structure," could you be a little bit more specific?
Q. Sure. Just the general notion of a market rate offer.
A. No, I do not. My understanding is that that is an option that's available under the law for, for Duke Energy Ohio. And I do not oppose that, that right, you might say, that the Company has to file.
Q. Okay. And Mr. Higgins, you are not disputing that Duke Energy Ohio's proposed competitive bidding process is open, fair, and competitive, correct?
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A. I am not disputing that.
Q. And to your knowledge, sir, is Kroger offering any witness in this proceeding who will dispute that Duke Energy Ohio's proposed competitive bidding process is open, fair, and transparent?
A. To my knowledge, Kroger is not intending to offer a witness to address that.
Q. And you are not disputing, Mr. Higgins, that the designated option manager for Duke Energy Ohio's competitive bidding process is independent, are you?
A. No.
Q. To your knowledge is Kroger offering any witness in this proceeding who will dispute the designation of Charles River Associates, d/b/a CRA International, as an independent option manager?
A. To my knowledge, no.
Q. Okay. Mr. Higgins, you are not offering any opinion in this case with regard to Duke Energy Ohio's recovery of costs approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or the FERC, correct?
A. I have not offered an opinion on that; that is correct.
Q. And to your knowledge, sir, Kroger is not offering any witness in this proceeding who will dispute Duke Energy Ohio's ability to recover FERC-
approved costs, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Mr. Higgins, you've identified that you are a principal with Ener -- I'm sorry. You are a principal with Energy Strategies, LLC. Are you an attorney by training?
A. No, I am not.
Q. Can you tell me, sir, on what you relied in concluding that it is the policy of the State of Ohio to impose a gradual and orderly transformation to market pricing?
A. I base that on my experience over the years, both involved in helping make state policy -- not in Ohio but elsewhere -- and on my, my reading of the plain language in the statute.
Q. Okay. What state policy have you been instrumental in shaping or forming?
A. I spent a number of years as the assistant director of the State Energy Office in Utah. And in that role I was involved on a daily basis in the development of the State of Utah's energy policy, both with respect to resource development and energy conservation.
Q. Does Utah -- do the State laws -- regulatory laws in Utah recognize a market rate offer similar to
that available under Ohio law for distribution utility companies?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Higgins, can you tell me in your opinion, please, what would make a transformation to market pricing gradual?
A. It would be a matter of both degree and time. It would be a combination of the, the steps necessary with respect to rate changes, as well as a period of time to allow for the transformation. And aliso to provide assurance that when the -- there was sole reliance on market pricing that the opportunities for a competitive retail market were robust and likely to be robust for the long term.
Q. What do you mean -- I understand the time element, but with respect to degree what do you -- how does that make the transformation gradual?
A. Well, you know, I would say that "gradual" of course by its nature as a word implies an element of degree. And that is that something is happening incrementally. It is happening a little bit at a time.

And so I believe that, you know, if enough time is allowed for something to be transformed, then it speaks to the, the degree. But I believe that a
degree or extent of impact is a component of gradual.
Q. Mr. Higgins, you mentioned that you have with you a copy of Amended Senate Bill 221. Are you familiar with Ohio Senate Bill 3?

MR. YURICK: Objection, relevance.
You can go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Well, I may be. I may not recall it by number.
Q. (By Ms. Spiller) Okay, that's fair. Are you aware, sir, that Ohio has recognized a competitive market for electric generation service since 2001?
A. Yes.
Q. And would that, sir, be a, a gradual transformation to a competitive market in your opinion?
A. Well, my, my understanding, based on my experience in Ohio which goes back to 2000 , is that that was the intent. Although it appears to me that, based on the adoption -- or passage of Amended Senate Bill 221, that there may have been some reassessment of how much progress had been made, which gave rise to the, to the later legislation.

But I do believe that the -- it was likely the intent that, you know, starting in 2000, that by 2010 there would be some gradual movement toward a
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competitive market.
Q. So I guess to understand, is it your opinion, sir, that the Ohio legislature then implemented Senate Bill 221 because the development -- because they wanted to accelerate the development of the competitive market?
A. I don't know that it was necessarily to accelerate the development of the competitive market. I believe, you know, it appears to me that it was intended to provide additional guidance and addi -and a somewhat different framework to that development.
Q. And it is your opinion, sir, that the transition to market under the market rate offer cannot occur in less than five years, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So sir, in your opinion if a transition to market occurred in less than five years and that transition would enable customers to realize lower generation costs, you believe the Ohio Commission would have to reject that transition as illegal?

MR. YURICK: Objection, calls for a legal conclusion.

You can go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
Q. (By Ms. Spiller) Mr. Higgins, in light of that objection I'm certainly happy to rephrase. But in your opinion, the Commission could not accelerate the transition to full market pricing in less than five years, even if doing so would enable customers to receive lower generation costs, correct?
A. Yes, because they would need to take the entire period into account. And the -- while it may be the case that on a particular -- at a particular point in a particular year there might be lower standard service offer rates from moving to a, a full SSO in year three, that may not necessarily be the case over the say full five-year period.

So I believe the Commission would have to, you know, would be cognisant of the guidance in -- or requirements in the statute and would need to use a five-year period at a minimum.
Q. But you do agree, sir, that the Ohio Commission has the discretion to change the blending percentage, the blending duration under the market rate offer, correct?
A. I believe they have limited discretion to do 50. They have the discretion to go below the percentages that are shown in the statute, with the exception of year one, which I believe must be
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10 percent.
The -- for years two, three, four, and five they can go up to the percentage that is enumerated in the statute. I don't believe they can go above the percentage that's enumerated in the statute. And they can extend the period from five to ten years -- or from five up to ten years.
Q. So in your opinion even beginning in year two of the MRO the Commission cannot prospectively shorten the path to market to less than five years?
A. I believes that is what the statute says, yes.
Q. Okay. Have you consulted with your counsel in forming that opinion regarding statutory interpretation?

MR. YURICK: Objection, that's privileged.
MS. SPILLER: I'm not asking for the content, I'm simply asking whether the consultation occurred.

THE WITNESS: Can I go ahead and answer? MR. YURICK: Uh, yeah.

THE WITNESS: The answer is yes.
Q. (By Ms. Spiller) Okay. Thank you, sir. Mr. Higgins, if you would refer, please, to page 7 of your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. And beginning on line 16 of that testimony you quote the relevant statutory language from Revised Code Section 4928.142(E), correct?
A. I, I -- well, you said the "relevant" section. I do quote the section that it appeared to me, from Duke's filing, that Duke was relying upon. So yes, I do, I do provide an excerpt there.
Q. Okay.
A. But I don't contend that that's the only relevant section.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. Do you agree, sir, that the statutory language reflected on page 7, beginning line 16 of your testimony, enables or vests the Ohio Commission with discretion to alter the blend under the market rate offer?
A. They, they can do so under certain circumstances. Namely, to mitigate the effect of an abrupt or significant change in the, in the Company's standard service offer price.
Q. And what would you define, sir, as an "abrupt" change in the standard serve offer price?
A. Well, I mean, that's go -- that is obviously a matter of judgment based on circumstances. So I don't -- obviously one would be looking at a degree of price change involved. And I don't have a specific
number in mind if I, you know, as to what would pass the test for "abrupt." Obviously that would be a call the Commission would have to make.
Q. So you have no opinion as to what -- as to how "abrupt" is to be interpreted under this provision of the revised code?
A. Well, it would be -- I would have an opinion that it would be a, a sudden impact. A sudden change that created a substantial impact on customers.

Now, you know, what constitutes a substantial impact is going to depend somewhat on circumstances and a framework. And I have not attempted to identify what bright line would constitute an abrupt change in this proceeding, or a significant change in this proceeding. But certainly I've made -- you know, I've come to conclusions about that in other proceedings.

So I, I can analyze it. I -- it just -right now this language leaves it to the discretion of the Commission to make that determination.
Q. But you believe that that significant or abrupt change -- well, strike that.

With regard to the standard service offer price that is set forth in this particular statutory provision contained on lines 19 and 20 of your testimony, do you interpret that, sir, as the standard
service offer price under the MRO?
In other words, the standard offer price that's derived from both competitive bid percentage and the Company's then current or existing standard service offer.
A. I believe that it would be the standard service offer that was in effect at the time the Commission made its review and determination about prospective rates.
Q. So it would be the standard service offer price charged under the MRO, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And that price, sir, during this blending period is derived from two different prices, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. A portion of it is the market bid or option price, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the other component of that MRO -- strike that.

The other component of the standard service offer price under the MRO is, per the statute, the Company's then-most-recent standard service offer price, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And here that second component, the Company's then-most-recent standard service offer price, would be the price under Duke Energy Ohio's current ESP, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And for purposes of clarity in your testimony this afternoon, sir, can we agree that that component will be referred to as the "Legacy ESP price"?
A. Yes.
Q. You've indicated that that Legacy ESP price represents the status quo, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you mean, Mr. Higgins, that that price does not change during the blending period?
A. No, it's subject to change, based on several factors that I identified in my testimony. Such as fuel or purchase power costs, for example.
Q. And those changes to the Legacy ESP price can either be up or down, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And those adjustments, sir, per the statute can occur as often as quarterly, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But it's your opinion that periodic changes
to the Legacy ESP price for things such as fuel or purchase power cannot cause abrupt or significant changes to the overall SSO price charged under the market rate offer?
A. Well, they -- I believe that, you know, you could have an abrupt or significant change based on a change in a fuel adjuster.
Q. Do you have an opinion, sir, as to what would be an abrupt or significant change based upon the fuel component of the Legacy ESP price?
A. You know, again, it's really going to depend on the circumstances and the facts in a particular case. You know, there's no one bright line number that identif -- that, you know, delineates an abrupt or significant change. It's a matter of judgment that has to be brought to bear.
Q. But sir, if I understand correctly, you've just testified that you could have a significant or abrupt change to the Legacy ESP price of the standard service offer price charged under the market rate offer, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But it's also your opinion, sir, that a significant or abrupt change to the standard service offer price charged under the market rate offer can
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only occur as a result of changes to the market bid price, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Higgins, do you believe that the PUCO, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, can only adjust the percentages of the blend under the market rate offer where the market bid price is above the then-current standard service offer price?
A. I believe that in all probability, yes.
Q. And why is that, sir?
A. The Commission has the discretion to alter price -- alter proportions prospectively if there are to be significant or abrupt changes in the standard offer -- standard service offer price.

And for that to occur, or for that situation to occur, it would be in the event that the market price that was coming in as part of the bid price portion of the blend were creating changes in the status quo.

And in that event, mathematically it would be the -- a situation in which the market price was higher. The -- at least certainly under most situations that I could conceive of.
Q. When you say "creating changes in the status quo," is that the standard service offer price charged
under the market rate offer during the blending period?
A. Yes.
Q. Sir, I'd ask you -- well, strike that. Are you aware of how Duke Energy Ohio's current ESP price compares to current market prices?
A. In general, yes.
Q. And what is your awareness, sir?
A. That for many customers the current ESP price is higher than market prices.
Q. How much higher?
A. I don't, I don't know.
Q. So in the second year of the ESP -- or I'm sorry, of the MRO, it's your position that the market bid component can be no more than 20 percent, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'd like to ask you, sir, to assume a couple of -- make a couple of assumptions for purposes of this next question. The first is that the blending percentages are 20 percent market, 80 percent Legacy ESP.

I'd also ask you to assume, sir, that the ESP price, which, which forms 80 percent of the overall SSP price (sic), is above the market price.
A. Okay.
Q. With those assumptions in mind, is it your opinion that reducing the market bid price percentage would mitigate price changes?
A. Well, reducing the market bid component in that situation would increase the overall blended price. You know, you asked about price changes, but I didn't -- in your question I didn't see anything changing.

But, but I will agree that change -- if you reduced the percentage of the blend it would have the -- of the market price under those assumptions it would have the effect of increasing the overall blended price.
Q. Do you believe that that result, sir, is consistent with what the legislature intended when allowing for the market rate offer?
A. I'm trying to understand your question. The result of lowering the blend in causing a higher percentage, is that what you're -- a higher overall blended price, is that what you're asking me?
Q. Right.
A. I don't believe they intended that specific outcome, necessarily. Although, you know, within the framework of a 5 to 10 -year period that -- you could have a circumstance, I suppose, where that occurred.

But nevertheless, you know, the Commission does not appear to be instructed to lower the percentage in such a situation. It's just required to have a -- no more than a certain percentage. So I don't see any instruction or direction to the Commission to lower it below 20 in that circumstance.
Q. Do you bel -- is your opinion, Mr. Higgins, that the Ohio Commission has the discretion to adjust the blending percentages when doing so would provide a benefit to electric generation consumers in the form of reduced generation costs?
A. Yes, consistent with the provisions of Division D of the portion of the revised code that we were talking about, which sets guidance as to the percentages that are allowed.
Q. So in that regard, sir, it's your opinion that the Commission in the first five years of the market rate offer can adjust the percentages, but no more than 10 percent in year one, 20 percent in year two, 30 percent in year three, 40 percent in year four, and 50 percent in year five, correct?
A. Yes, with the exception of year one, where I don't believe there appears to be any discretion.
Q. Okay, that's fair. Mr. Higgins, what is your definition of a robust competitive market for electric
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generation service?
A. I would consider a market to be robust if there was not any undue ability for participants to exercise market power in, in that market. And, you know, of course there are, there's a lot of discussion in the literature and in, you know, in the regulatory world about what would constitute market power. Or what tests are necessary to pass market power tests.

But -- or pass muster for a robust market. But in general it's when you do not have any undo market power by the participants who are selling into that market.
Q. Does a robust competitive market correspond to a particular level of customers being served by alternative suppliers?
A. I believe that would be a factor. But also a factor is the number of suppliers and their relative concentration of the sales volume.
Q. Okay. Do you know how many certified retail electric service providers are serving customers in Duke Energy Ohio's service territory?
A. I don't -- I do not know the count of the different providers.
Q. You are aware, sir, of the percentage of Duke Energy Ohio's load that has selected alternative
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generation suppliers, correct?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Do you have an opinion, sir, as to whether Duke Energy Ohio's service territory represents a robust and competitive market for electric generation service?
A. In my opinion the jury is still out on that. There is certainly -- there has certainly been an opportunity for customers to take alternative service other than the ESP product offered by Duke Energy Ohio.

But it's not clear to me, based on the market concentration in that market, whether or not it would qualify to be considered robust, or robust over the long term.
Q. Can you help me understand how much more of Duke Energy Ohio's load would need to switch to competitive suppliers before competition would be deemed robust in its territory?
A. Well, it's not so much a matter of the percentage that have switched, but for example in an evaluation of market power one would look at the fact that 60 percent of the switched customer load appears to be being served by Duke's affiliate company, Duke Energy Retail Sales.

And in most evaluations of electric power market structure, a 60 percent concentration would be considered pretty high for one seller. It could give rise to concerns about market power. So that's not -that does not mean to say that customers have not had the opportunity to save money by switching. Obviously that is the case.

And so there is a market they can go to. But whether or not that market is providing pricing that would be considered robust or sustainable over the long term, again, would be an open question. I haven't concluded that it's not. But I certainly wouldn't be prepared to say that a market where 60 percent of the, of the market share is in the hands of one company is necessarily robust.
Q. Do the -- to your knowledge, sir, do the Kroger facilities located in Duke Energy Ohio's service territory take electric generation service from entities other than Duke Energy Ohio?
A. Yes, they do.
Q. Do you know if any of the contracts between those certified retail electric service providers and the Kroger facilities taking service from them in Duke Energy Ohio's territory include a demand component?
A. I have not seen the contracts.
Q. Do you know, Mr. Higgins, whether any certified retail electric service provider active in Duke Energy Ohio's service territory, do you know of any such provider that includes demand charges as part of their offer?
A. I'm not specifically aware of that. Although I am somewhat aware that arrangements between the CRE -- a CRES provider and a customer sometimes takes the form of a differential relative to the ESP price.

And it would seem to me that implicit in that then is that, to the extent there is such an arrangement in place, that there would -- while there may not be an explicit demand charge in the contract, being tied to a differential off of the ESP price then certainly the price involved would have been derived from demand charges. Since demand charges are part of the ESP price.
Q. Are you -- aside from the pricing that you just described, sir, the differential to the ESP price, do you know whether these CRES, C-R-E-S, providers use fixed kilowatt hour charges in their offers to commercial and industrial customers?
A. I'm not specifically aware.
Q. So you can't deny that those CRES providers would, in fact, use such an offer based on fixed
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kilowatt hour charges?
A. I --

MR. YURICK: Objection, asked and answered. But you can go ahead and answer again.

THE WITNESS: I have not seen any of the contracts and so I can't deny what you just said.
Q. (By Ms. Spiller) I'm sorry, sir. Because you haven't seen any of the contracts you do not know whether any CRES providers use fixed kilowatt hour charges for purposes of developing offers to their customers?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Would that be true with regard to any Kroger facilities that may be -- that exist that may be operating in other service territories within Ohio as well?
A. I, I've not seen the Kroger contracts in other service areas in Ohio.
Q. Okay. Mr. Higgins, do you agree that the market rate offer is to be established through a competitive bidding process?
A. Yes.
Q. And that competitive bidding process, sir, will yield market-based rates, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And market-based rates do not incorporate demand charges, do they?
A. Not -- well, actually they can. Certainly through the structure that Duke has proposed they, they would not, because the requirements of the proposed bidding arrangement that the Company has filed preclude a demand charge bid.

So by design, by definition, this market rate offer would not include a demand charge. But certainly there are demand charges in the market.
Q. With regard to the rate design proposal that reflects -- or described in your testimony, Duke Energy Ohio would be taking the per-kilowatt-hour rate from suppliers and then converting that to another rate when charging customers, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in that circumstance, Mr. Higgins, Duke Energy Ohio would be collecting one rate from its customers and yet paying suppliers a different rate, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And sir, in that circumstance some sort of supplier cost reconciliation rider would be necessary to ensure that what is charged by suppliers aligns with that which is paid by customers, correct?
A. I believe that, you know, such a vehicle can accomplish that, yes.
Q. Do you believe that such a vehicle should accomplish that?
A. I believe it's not unreasonable for such a vehicle to accomplish that. You know, I believe that, you know, depending on the circumstances such a vehicle may or may not be necessary. I didn't testify about such a vehicle, but I don't find one to be unreasonable.
Q. Okay. Under the market rate offer as proposed by Duke Energy Ohio and the rate design described in its filing, distribution charges would still have a demand component, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. To your knowledge, sir, is The Kroger Company averse to hourly pricing?
A. No.
Q. Mr. Higgins, your proposal as reflected in your testimony, your proposal concerns demand charges with an energy-based kilowatt hour credit, correct?
A. Your phone cut out briefly during your question, so could you please ask that again?
Q. Okay. I'm sorry, I'll restart it. I'd like to ask you about your proposal of demand charges with
an energy-based kilowatt hour credit.
A. Yes, uh-huh.
Q. Would you agree with me, Mr. Higgins, that under this proposal -- this proposal would unjustly reward high-load-factor customers in the same way that you claim capacity-related charges unjustly charge them?
A. No, I don't agree with that.
Q. And why not, sir?
A. Because under my proposal -- this is my alternative proposal -- there would, there would be an alignment between the demand charges that are currently reflected in Duke's rates as a proxy for going forward capacity costs, which Duke clearly recognizes are included as part of the bid.

The suppliers to -- the winning suppliers from the bidding process are obligated to bring capacity to the table to -- as part of their product. And so they will clearly be embedding the capacity cost in their energy bid.

And my proposal is simply an attempt to reflect capacity costs in the retail price, knowing that capacity costs are embedded in the wholesale bid. And I offer an alternative that simply lines up with the current Duke weighting of capacity costs in its
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I don't think there's anything unjust about that at all. I think it's reasonable.
Q. Mr. Higgins, I would ask you, do you have your deposi -- or your testimony still readily available to refer to page 13, please?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Line 11, sir? Could you describe for me -- or I guess my question is, what is the windfall benefit that the lower-load-factor customers would receive under Duke Energy Ohio's rate design as proposed?
A. Well, if you look at Table KCH-1 you can see an illustration of that windfall benefit? Table KCH-1 shows, on a revenue-neutral basis -- that is, abstracting away from any changes in the overall level of generation costs -- what the rate impacts are from the Company's proposed rate design in the Company's proposed year three.

So you can see, for example, for a DP customer with a load factor of 30 percent, that customer would see a rate reduction of about 16 and-ahalf percent solely through the change that Duke is proposing in eliminating generation-related demand charges and pricing the bid component strictly on a
kilowatt hour basis. Even though the bid component includes a capacity product.

In my view this creates a windfall benefit for the low-load-factor customers, as illustrated in the table.
Q. With regard to your table, sir, that appears on page 14 of your testimony, what was the source on which you relied in identifying a 30 percent load factor for Duke Energy Ohio's customers on rates TS?
A. The -- it was simply for consistency across the different categories. There may not be a 30 percent load factor on Schedule TS, but if there were, this would be the rate that would be shown from it.

In my testimony, of course, I did not refer to a 30 percent load factor customer on TS. But for consistency across the table I showed all the available -- all the categories that were there.
Q. Are you aware, Mr. Higgins, of any Duke Energy Ohio customers on rate TS having a 30 percent load factor?
A. As I said, I'm not.
Q. Okay. Are you aware, Mr. Higgins, of any Duke Energy Ohio customers on rate D, as in "David," $S$, having an 80 percent load factor?
A. I'm not specifically aware of any.
Q. So for purposes of developing this table, with specific reference to the 80 percent load factor for rate DS, was that simply, as you just described, to compare each of these load factors and each of these rate schedules?
A. It was to provide a consistent set of benchmarks across the rate schedules. It's not implausible for there to be an 80 percent load factor customer on DS, although it would be on the high end. You know, the -- for example, grocery stores often run as high as an 80 percent load factor. And so it's not an implausible load factor for a DS customer.
Q. In speaking with Mr. George did he share with you the load factor of the Kroger facilities here in Duke Energy Ohio's service territory?
A. Mr. George provides me with the data for the Kroger stores. And so I'm generally familiar with the load factors for the Kroger stores.
Q. And what is the Kroger stores' load factor here in Duke Energy Ohio's service territory?
A. I -- let me reflect on that for a moment. The -- a typical load factor for a Kroger store runs between 65 and 80 percent. I can't say for sure whether that's the load factor in the Duke Energy Ohio
service territory, but that's a typical range.
Q. And on what rate schedule are the Kroger stores here in Duke Energy Ohio's service territory?
A. In -- for the most part they're on DP.
Q. Continuing, sir, on page 14 of your testimony, lines 8 and 9. You state there that the rate impacts reflected in the table $\mathrm{KCH}-1$ are calculated for total SSO rates, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. You conclude on line 9 that the rate impact for the generation component is considerably larger, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Higgins, does this mean that for purposes of your analysis as summarized on Table KCH-1 that you used an all-in rate that included generation, transmission, and distribution?
A. Yes. That's what was in the Company's work papers.
Q. Okay. Sir, if we may turn to page 18 of your deposition? Line 14, please?
A. Of my -- 18 of my testimony?
Q. I'm sorry, of your testimony, yes, sir.
A. And page 18 , did you say?
Q. Page 18, line 14, please?
A. Okay.
Q. You reference there a rider implemented by the FirstEnergy companies, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that rider is GT, correct?
A. Well, actually it was, it was for rate schedule -- it was applicable to rate schedule GT.
Q. Okay.
A. The rider was included as a part of what I believe was rider EDR, which was the economic development rider that FirstEnergy had.
Q. Okay. And that was a rider that was approved under a case filed by the FirstEnergy Distribution Utilities as Case No. 08935, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know, sir, whether that rider is still in existence?
A. To my knowledge, it is not.

Let me clarify that. I really should say I don't know.
Q. Okay. Do you have an opinion, Mr. Higgins, as to whether the structure of Duke Energy Ohio's rates for commercial (inaudible) industrial customers is appropriate?
A. You know, there was some background noise
during your question. I think you asked me if I have an opinion of whether the Company's ESP rate design is appropriate?
Q. The rate structure for our commercial and industrial customers.
A. In my opinion the, the rate structure, the rate design is an appropriate rate design.

MS. SPILLER: Thank you. To continue along, we will -- we are -- Mr. Higgins, we are -- I have no further questions at this time. Would certainly offer the opportunity for questioning from other counsel on the phone.

And I don't want to put anyone on the spot but I think, you know, we can just start with the list of attendees as they called in. And Rick, I think you were first that I heard join the call this morning.

MR. REESE: I have no questions.
MS. SPILLER: Doug, do you have any questions for the witness?

MR. HART: Nope.
MS. SPILLER: David or Mark?
MR. KUTIK: This is David Kutik. Yes, I do have questions for the witness.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. KUTIK:
Q. Mr. Higgins, you indicated that you're not a lawyer, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. I'm sorry, I did not hear you.
A. Correct.
Q. And can you tell me what, in your qualifications or experience, provides you with the expertise to provide an interpretation of a statute for the Commission?

MR. YURICK: Other than his understanding of English?

THE WITNESS: Well, my testimony -- in my testimony I do not attempt to draw any legal opinions. I, I have been involved in the formulation of energy policy, either on behalf of the State government or as a party to proceedings for about 27 years.

And so it's -- I'm attempting to comment on what the language appears to say and what the policy implications of that language is.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Would you agree with me that to discern what the policy is of a statute one has to interpret the statute?

MR. YURICK: Objection, he already answered
the question.
MR. KUTIK: No, he didn't. No, he didn't. And stop coaching him.

MR. YURICK: Yeah, he did. Yeah, he did.
MR. KUTIK: He did not.
MR. YURICK: You can, you can go ahead and answer it again, Kevin.

THE WITNESS: I've -- one has to, one has to bring your judgment and experience to bear in reading the language and inferring what the policy is from it.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) All right. But one has to interpret the statute, in part, to determine what the policy underlying the statute is. Fair to say?
A. Well, yeah, you have to interpret the language.
Q. Okay. Now, did you have any involvement in the development of SB-221?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you have any involvement in the development of a statute called "SB-3"?
A. I did not.
Q. Did you review any legislative history with respect to SB-221?
A. I don't believe I had.
Q. Would your answer be the same for SB-3?
A. Probably. Although SB-3 goes back to 2000, and I was involved in reviewing a number of the applications that were made by Ohio Utilities pursuant to SB-3. So I don't have any --
Q. Again my question is, did you review any statutory history related to SB-3?
A. And I'm saying I can't recall whether I had or not back in 2000.
Q. Okay. Now, with respect to what you did to prepare for this testimony would it be fair to say that in developing your interpretations of the statute you relied, at least in some part, on what you were advised by counsel?
A. In some part. I, I actually, you know, did my own reading and discussed the issues with counsel.
Q. I'm sorry? Could you repeat what you said?
A. Sure. I did my own reading and research and discussed the issues with counsel.
Q. Okay. Would it be fair to say, then, that your interpretation of the statute was confirmed to you by counsel?

MR. YURICK: Objection. You don't answer that, that's privileged.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Can you answer that, sir? MR. YURICK: No, he can't.

Don't answer it.
MR. KUTIK: Okay.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Can you explain to me, sir, what role the interpretation of counsel played in your interpretation and testimony in this case?

MR. YURICK: Same objection, but you can answer it if you can without disclosing any conversations that you and I have had.

THE WITNESS: Well, that's in -- that's a bit of a challenge to do.

MR. YURICK: Well, if you can't do it, don't do it.

THE WITNESS: I can say that $I$, I haven't provided any testimony that, to my knowledge, is contradicted by anything counsel has discussed with me.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) That's not my question. My question is, can you describe for me what role the interpretation of counsel played in developing your testimony?

MR. YURICK: There's, there's an objection. And I think you can answer it to the extent that you don't disclose any conversation that has passed between you and I.

THE WITNESS: It -- I would say that, that
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counsel did not really play much of a role, if any, in developing my testimony.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Okay. Did it play much of a role in developing your thinking as to what the interpretation of the statute was?

MR. YURICK: Objection. You can go ahead and answer. Same, same thing. If you can answer the question without divulging conversations between you and I, you can answer it.

THE WITNESS: The answer is no.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) So you can't tell me what role counsel -- counsel's interpretation played in your -- the development of your interpretation --
A. I'm not -- I didn't hear that to be your question.
Q. All right. Can you tell me what role the interpretation of counsel played in your interpretation of the statute?

MR. YURICK: Objection. You can go ahead and answer to the extent that it doesn't involve disclosing conversations that you and I have had.

THE WITNESS: I would say that strictly speaking, the answer is none.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Okay. So you developed your interpretation of the statute independent of anything
that your counsel told you. Fair to say?
A. I would say that's, that's fair to say. You know, you're asking me to parse my thought process separate and apart from any actual conversations I may have had. But I would say that it's -- in my view the -- I arrived at my own conclusions.
Q. Okay. Now, for this case did you prepare any study or analysis of wholesale power prices in the P -- in PJM?
A. No.
Q. Did you prepare any study or analysis of wholesale prices within MISO?
A. No.
Q. For purposes of this case did you review any study or analysis of wholesale power prices in PJM?
A. Not for purposes of this study, no. Not for purposes of this testimony.
Q. Have you seen such studies or analysis?
A. Over the years I have, yes, uh-huh.
Q. Okay. Would your answers be the same with respect to wholesale prices in MISO?
A. Yes.
Q. In other words you haven't seen them for purposes of this case, but you've seen them generally over the years?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you reviewed the testimony submitted by Duke of Mr . Rose in this case?
A. You know, the answer is no. I attempted to, but the file was corrupt. So --
Q. I'm sorry, could you state that again? You said -- the transmission here was corrupt.
A. Okay. The -- I attempted to review Mr. Rose's testimony, but the file was corrupt and I couldn't access it. And I, I didn't, I didn't feel it was necessary for purposes of my testimony, but I did not have an opportunity to read his testimony.
Q. All right. So the answer to my question is that you have not reviewed Mr. Rose's testimony?
A. Correct.
Q. So would it be fair to say at the present time you have no basis to dispute Mr. Rose's testimony?
A. That is correct.

MR. YURICK: Objection. You can go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Have you done or seen any study of Duke's riders or cost recovery mechanisms for the recovery of fuel costs?

```
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A. Well, I mean, I'm generally familiar with them.
Q. Okay. And so you reviewed those riders and the level of those riders?
A. I'm familiar with the, for example the, the pattern. The fact that the recovery has been somewhat volatile.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar enough to know what the level of those riders is?
A. I, I do not recall at this moment.
Q. Okay. Have you reviewed the riders for the cost recovery mechanisms relating to recovering costs for purchased power, again for Duke?
A. Not, not to my, you know, recent recollection. I mean, I say that because it's, you know, from time to time I will review the various rate impacts on Kroger from -- for different utilities, and so that would include all the various riders.

But I haven't -- I don't recall specifically looking at the purchased power rider in preparing for this case, for example.
Q. Okay. So since you can't recall it, you couldn't provide any description of the variability of the -- that rider or the level of that rider?
A. No.
Q. What I said was correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Have you reviewed any rider that Duke has or any cost recovery mechanism for the recovery of costs relating to supply and demand resource portfolio compliance?
A. Not, not specifically in preparing for this case.
Q. Would it be fair to say that you could not comment on the variability or level of such riders or cost recovery mechanisms?
A. No.
Q. It would be fair to say that?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you reviewed Duke's riders or cost recovery mechanisms, with respect to the recovery of environmental costs, sufficient to be able to tell me what the variability of that rider or cost recovery mechanism is?
A. No.
Q. Is it your understanding in this case that Duke is proposing to transfer some of its generation assets to an affiliate?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that transfer an issue that is up for the

Commission's approval in this case, to your understanding?
A. To my understanding, it is not.
Q. I want to refer you to the language of Ohio Revised Code 4928.142(E), as in "Edward," which part of which appears on page 7 of your prepared testimony.
A. Okay.
Q. Are you there, sir? Are you there, sir?
A. Yes.
Q. On line 17 of your -- of that page of your testimony there is a phrase "notwithstanding any other requirement of this section." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What does that mean?
A. It means it's not contingent on any other section or any other division in the --
Q. So that -- so when it talks about any other requirements of this section --
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- that would include Division $D$, as in "David"?
A. Yes.
Q. In the same Division of Section 142 -- excuse me, Section 4928.142 there is a phrase starting on line 18 of your testimony which discusses:
"...to mitigate any effect of an abrupt change -- abrupt or significant Change in the electric distribution utility's standard service offer price...."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What does "any" mean in that phrase?

MR. YURICK: Objection (inaudible.)
THE REPORTER: I'm sorry?
MR. YURICK: I said objection, but he can answer.

THE WITNESS: Well, "any" typically means -or in that phrase would refer to an effect that would, um. From -- it would be an effect from any possible change. I guess I'm using the word in the definition. It's kind of a tough word to define since it's so basic, but.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) Well --
A. Not, you know, I guess "any" would mean, you know, not precluding other -- not, not precluding anything so, so long as it comports to the, the requirements in the rest of the sentence.
Q. Okay. Well, would you agree with me that "any" there could include all effects of an abrupt or
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significant change?
A. Potentially, yes, uh-huh.
Q. That wouldn't be unreasonable to read it that way, correct?
A. I would say probably not.
Q. That it probably would not be unreasonable?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you read this phrase -- well, let me just -- let me back up.

With respect to what you have quoted here as part of Section $4928.142(E)$ on page 7 of your testimony, do you believe that that was written in part to protect the Company?
A. No, I think it was written to protect, to protect customers.
Q. Okay. So that's the sole basis of the change that should be mitigated, would be for the protection of customers?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, I want to talk with you about the phrase "Beginning in the second year" in Division (D) of Section 4928.142(E.) Do you read that to mean that the Commission could only begin to consider potential changes to the proportions outlined in Division (D) starting the second year? In other words, they can
only start their consideration in the second year?
A. Well, it, it specifically says that beginning in the second year is when they can take action. The -- so I suppose it would be a matter of interpretation to say whether they could consider it prior to the, prior to the period they can take action.
Q. So one possible interpretation of this statute, and particularly phrase, might mean that the Commission could consider a change before the beginning of the second year, but you could only effect that change sometime after the beginning of the second year?
A. Potentially, yes.
Q. Now, in your testimony you provide some commentary about your view as to what the phrase "not more than" modifies in Division (D) of Section 4928.142, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have -- or you quote part of that division on page 9 of your testimony at line 8 , correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you agree with me that if the general assembly wanted to be clear or clearer in adopting
your view of what "not more than" modifies, the general assembly would have included the word "and," $a-n-d$, before the phrase "not more than"?
A. I'm thinking. I would agree that if they had inserted the word "and" before that it would potentially provide more clarity.
Q. Okay. Now, you believe that -- and I'm now referring to page 8 of your testimony -- that there is an underlying public policy of gradual transformation to market pricing for $5 S 0$ generation service, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And would you, would you agree with me that your basis for believing that the general assembly has articulated that public policy is in Section -- or Revised Code Section 4928.142(E) and (D)?
A. Yes.
Q. You also say there is a goal of conservative migration to full MRO pricing, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And would you -- is it your testimony or your belief that that goal has been expressed --

SPEAKER UNKNOWN: Now entering.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) -- by the general assembly --

MS. TURKENTON: Tammy Turkenton.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) -- by the general assembly in

Section 140 -- 1 -- Section $4928.142(D)$ and (E)?
A. I believe it's embodied in that, yes.
Q. Okay. Well, with respect to those -- the two goals that -- or the two policies that you've articulated that we've just talked about in the last few questions, can you point me to any other statute in Ohio that embodies either of those policies?
A. Not off the top of my head.
Q. Do you believe that there are such statutes? MR. YURICK: Objection. Go ahead and answer if you can.

THE WITNESS: Well, you know, it wouldn't surprise me if there were, in that, that that would show consistency with the two divisions we just discussed.
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) All right. But I guess what I'm saying is you say you can't recall anything off the top of your head. My question to you is, do you believe that there are other statutes which support the embodiment or the articulation of either of those policies?
A. I'm not specifically aware of any.
Q. Now, when we're talking about conservative migration can you define that for us, please?
A. Yes. By "conservative migration" I mean one
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that takes account of potential unintended consequences from moving too quickly to something. And so by a conservative migration it is designed to be gradual, and to move within certain defined parameters that ensure that small steps are taken to getting to the final goal.
Q. Well, would you believe -- or would you think that a conservative migration would be an increase in the market-rate-based component of the SSO price that is no greater than 10 percent on an annual basis? Would that be your definition of what "conservative migration" means?
A. Well, I, I don't have a specific number such as that, but I don't know that a number like that would be unreasonable.
Q. Okay. Well, would you think that a 50 percent increase in the market-based component of the SSO price would constitute conservative migration?
A. I don't think it would, no. Well, let me, and let me go back to your prior question, if I may? I think I misunderstood your question. I thought you were asking about the price change itself.

But if you were asking me about the, the change in the proportion of the market-based component then I do believe that, you know, moving 10 percent at
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a time would constitute a conservative migration.
Q. I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last portion of your answer. So could either the Court reporter -well let me just have the court reporter read it, please.

THE REPORTER: One moment.
MR. KUTIK: (Inaudible.)
THE REPORTER: What?
MR. KUTIK: Could I -- could we have the court reporter read the entire answer. And when you read it could you come close to the phone? Because I'm really having trouble hearing the witness.

THE REPORTER: Okay.
(The previous answer was read back as follows:
"I don't think it would, no. Well,
let me go back to your prior question, if I may? I think I misunderstood your question. I thought you were asking about the price change itself.
"But if you were asking me about the change in the proportion of the market-based component then I do believe that, you know, moving 10 percent at a time would constitute a conservative
migration.")
Q. (By Mr. Kutik) So Mr. Higgins, would an increase that is greater than 10 percent in the market -- in the allocation or proportion of market .of the market-based component of the SSO price be inconsistent with conservative migration as you've defined that term?
A. There could be circumstances when an increase of 10 percent -- more than 10 percent was warranted. I think it would, you know, depend on what assessment the Commission makes of the, of the market in Ohio. Or in -- specifically in Duke's Energy Ohio's service territory.

I think that the 10 percent number at least for the first five years provides some guidance as to what a, a conservative migration would look like. But it wouldn't preclude in any particular year making it more than 10 percent.
Q. Well, again, would you believe that an increase in the component -- the market-based component that is greater than 10 percent on an annual basis would be inconsistent with conservative migration?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. Now, you've talked on page 9 of your
testimony -- oh, excuse me, on page 12 of your testimony about -- and I'm particularly looking now at line 9, about:
"Allowing the full blending period to occur will allow the Commission to monitor this retail market development." Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So one of -- is it your opinion that one of the things that the Commission needs to take into account is the retail market development in the Duke Energy Ohio service territory?
A. I believe that it would be a reasonable factor for them to take into account, yes.
Q. All right. And would it be fair to say that you have done no market analysis with respect to that retail market in terms of determining how competitive that market is?
A. I haven't done any in-depth analysis. I've -- I'm familiar with the market share, for example, that Duke Energy Retail Sales apparently has. And it is on the high side when it comes to assessments of potential market power. How --
Q. But did I understand your prior testimony in response to Ms. Spiller's question --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that you are not prepared to say at this time whether the retail market in the Duke Energy Ohio service territory is competitive or not?
A. That is -- that's correct, yes. Or whether it would pass the test of robustness is what $I$ believe I said.
Q. All right.
A. And I -- and that's true.
Q. And would it also be in terms of whether the market is a competitive market? In other words, you're not prepared to make a determination at this time as to whether it is or not?
A. Correct. I mean, when I say -- when we say "competitive market" we mean a -- I think implicit in that is a robust competitive market. I would certainly agree that there are opportunities or -apparently ample opportunities for customers to shop from a CRES supplier.

However, whether or not the market would constitute a robust competitive market is an open question. In my mind.
Q. Let me refer you to page 11 of your testimony. And the sentence that begins on line 17, where you say:
"In such a scenario, it is particularly important for customers to be able to access a robust competitive market themselves; to that end, the blending period is important to ensure that such a robust market materializes."

Now, the market that you're referring to there is what?
A. It's the retail competitive market.
Q. Did you say it could be, or it is?
A. It is the retail competitive market, That I am referring to in my testimony.
Q. And is it, is it your testimony that whether a -- this market in Duke's territory is robust is a question that includes an analysis of the presence or absence of market power?
A. Ultimately I believe the answer to that is yes.
Q. And you have not done that analysis, correct?
A. I have not done that analysis beyond the commentary that I have offered.
Q. Why is it important for customers to have access to a robust competitive market?
A. Well, it, it appears to me to be consistent with the general thrust of a policy in which prices
would be set through a market process. And so to me it seems to be a, an important component of the overall policy that is established with a market rate offer.

That there's a, an option that the electric distribution company offers, but that customers also have the ability to access the market themselves. It appears to be part of a -- both appear to be components of the overall policy goal in mind with this legislation.
Q. Do customers benefit if they have access to a robust competitive market?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that Duke is exercising market power in its service territory with respect to the retail market?
A. I have -- I do not have any -- I don't -- I do not have an opinion on that at this point:
Q. All right. Do you have any reason to believe that any supplier or entity at all is exercising market power in Duke's service territory with regard to the retail market?
A. I, I do not have an opinion about that.
Q. You -- in answer to Ms. Spiller's questions you indicated that you were familiar with the
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circumstances under which Kroger takes generation service in Duke's territory, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And is it the case that Duke -- that, excuse me, that Kroger is receiving all of its generation service from CRES suppliers? Or providers?
A. To my knowledge. I, I don't know about all. But certainly I do -- I am aware that Kroger is purchasing a substantial amount, if not all of its power in that service territory, from a CRES supplier.
Q. Do you know whether Kroger is receiving generation service from more than one CRES provider in Duke's territory?
A. To my knowledge, they are not.
Q. Do you know who that provider is?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is it?
A. Duke Energy Retail Sales.
Q. Do you know the term or length of any of the contracts that Kroger has for that service with Duke Retail?
A. I believe they extend until the end of 2011. MR. KUTIK: Let me have one moment, please. (Pause.)

MR. KUTIK: I have no further questions at
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this time. Thank you, Mr. Higgins.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MS. SPILLER: Rick, did you have any -- this
is Amy Spiller. Rick, did you have any questions?
MR. CHAMBERLAIN: No, I don't.
MS. SPILLER: Steve, certainly wanted to extend the opportunity to you as well. Any questions? MR. BEELER: No questions.

MS. SPILLER: And Kelly, for purposes of the record, Tammy Turkenton, also with the Ohio -- Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, joined the deposition while in progress.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
MS. SPILLER: And I don't have any other questions for the witness.

MR. YURICK: We'll need -- this is Mark
Yurick. We'll need signature on that.
(The deposition was concluded at 11:28 a.m.)
(Read and sign was requested by counsel for the witness.)
(December 22, 2010 - Kevin Higgins)

## CERTIFICATE

STATE OF $\qquad$ COUNTY OF $\qquad$ SS.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have read the foregoing testimony consisting of 62 pages, numbered from 5 to 66, inclusive, and the same is a true and correct transcription of said testimony, with the exception of the corrections I have listed below in ink, giving my reasons therefor.

3. Page ___ Line __ Correction $\qquad$
4. Page ___ Line___ Correction $\qquad$
Reason
5. Page ___ Line ___ Correction

Reason
6. Page ___ Line ___ Correction

Reason
7. Page ___ Line ___ Correction

Reason
8. Page ___ Line___ Correction

Reason
9. Page ___ Line ___ Correction Correction
Reason
10. Page $\qquad$ Line Correction
$\qquad$

Reason
11. Page $\qquad$ Line
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Reason
12. Page $\qquad$ Line $\qquad$ Correction $\qquad$
Reason $\qquad$

## KEVIN HIGGINS

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to at this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2010.

NOTARY PUBLIC
(December 22, 2010 - Kevin Higgins)

## CERTIFICATE

STATE OF UTAH
COUNTY OF SALT LAKE ; ss.

This is to certify that the deposition of
KEVIN HIGGINS was taken before me, KELLY L. WILBURN, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter in and for the State of Utah, at the time and place set forth herein;

That the said witness was duly sworn by me to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; that the testimony of said witness was reported by me in stenotype and thereafter caused by me to be transcribed into typewriting; that a full, true, and correct transcription of said testimony is set forth in the foregoing pages, inclusive, and said witness deposed and said as in the foregoing annexed deposition.

I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties to said cause of action, and that I am not interested in the event thereof.

SIGNED ON THIS 26th DAY OF December, 2010.

Kelly L. Wilburn, CSR, RPR Utah CSR No. 109582-7801
(December 22, 2010 - Kevin Higgins)


Kelly L. Wilburn, CSR, RPR
(December 22, 2010 - Kevin Higgins)

| benefit [\|]-28:10. | - 8:16 | matances (7) | 16:14, 17:1, 17:6, | constivute 100- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37:10, 37:14, 38:3, | 8:20, 9:1, 9:8, 9:22. | 20:17, 20:23, 21:11 | 17:8, 22:3, 28:25, | 21:13, 29:7, 58:18, |
| 64:11 | 10:14, 13:18, 18:9, | 24:12, 35:7, 60:8, | 29:13, 30:5, 30:18 | 59:1, 58:25, 62:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { best }[1]-5: 19 \\ & \text { better }[1]-10: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:13, 24:13, 31:7, } \\ & \text { 41:13, 46:5, 48:7, } \end{aligned}$ | 65:1 clation [11-6: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 33:21, 33:23, 61:17, } \\ & \text { 62:4, 62:11, 62:15, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { constikutes [1] - } \\ & 24: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| between [6] - 31:21, | 48:14, 48:24, 49 |  | 62:16, 62:21, 63:3 | consultation |
| 32:7, 36:12, 39:24, | 50:21, 51:8, 51:2 | 38 | 63:9, 63:11, 63:2 | 19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:24, 47:8 } \\ & \text { beyond [1] - 63:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 1,65: 4 \\ & \text { categories [2] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clarffy\|i]-41:19 } \\ & \text { clarity } 4-23: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 64:12 } \\ & \text { compllance }(1) \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | consulted [1] - 19:13 consulting [1] - |
| bid [14]-22:3, 22:17. | \| 38:11, 38:18 | 56:6 | $51: 6$ | $10: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 25:1, 25:7, 25:17 } \\ & 26: 15,27: 2,27: 4 \end{aligned}$ | causing (1)-27:18 <br> cortain [3]-20:16. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { claer [2]-30:12, } \\ & 55: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { componemt }[21] \text { - } \\ 16: 1,22: 20,22: 22, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { consumars [1] - } \\ & \text { 28:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 34:7, 36:15, 36:20, | 28:4, 58:4. | clanar [ 11 - 55:2 | 23:2, 23:8, 24:10. | ntained [1]-21:24 |
| $36: 23,37: 25,38: 1$ | certalinly 121 - 18:2, 21:15, 25:22, 30:8, | clearly 13-5:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:15, 27:4, 31:24, } \\ & 35: 14,37: 25,38: 1, \end{aligned}$ | contenid (1)-20:9 |
| 13:5, 13:10, 33:21, | 31:12, 32:15, 34:10, | 30.14, ${ }^{\text {clicent }}$ [1]-10:20 | 40:11, 58:9, 58:1 |  |
| 33:23, 34:6, 36:17 | 42:10, 62:17, 65:8, | 59:11 | 58:24, 59:23, 60:5, | 52:15 |
| Bill $16-7: 3,8: 12$, | 66:6 | ching (1) - 44:3 | 60:20, 60:21, 64:2 | continue [4] - 42 |
| 16:3, 16:4, 16:20, | Certainly $12-10: 20$, | (3) - 20:3, 52:5, | components is | continuling (1) - 40:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:4 } \\ & \text { bh(5)-5:14, 11:13 } \end{aligned}$ | 34:3 certined [3]-29:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 15 \\ & \text { code }[2]-21: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 64:9 comports $[1]$ - $53: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ontract } 11-32: 13 \\ & \text { ontricts } \\ & \text { on } 1 \end{aligned}-31: 21 \text {, }$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 12:16, 15:21, 46:9 } \\ \text { blend }[\text { [] - 20:14, } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 31:22, 32:2 } \\ & \text { chaltenge }[1]-46: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 28:13 | computer (1)-8:1 <br> concelve [1]-25:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 26,3 k 6,33: 8, \\ & 33: 17,65: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 25:6, 25:18, 27:10. | AnBERLAN (i) - | lecting [1] -34:18 | concentration [3] - |  |
| 27:18 $\text { blanded }\{3 \mid \text { - 27:5, }$ | 66:5 change [20] - 18:19, | combhnation [II15:8 | 29:18, 30:13, 31:2 concerns [2]-31:4, | 46: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:13, 27:20 } \\ & \text { blanding \|g - 18:19, } \end{aligned}$ | 20:18, 20:21, 20:25, 21:8, 21:13, 21:14, | coming (1)-25:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 35:20 } \\ & \text { conclude }(1) \text { - 40:10 } \end{aligned}$ | 46:23 conv |
| 18:20, 22:14, 23:15, | 21:21, 23:15, 23:78, | 51:10 | concluded(2) - | 46:8, 4 |
| 26:1, 26:19, 28:9, | 24:6, 24:7, 24:9, | commantary [ ${ }^{\text {d }}$ - | 31:12, 66:18 | 40, |
| 61:4, 63:5 | 24:15, 24:18, 24:24, | 55:16, 63:21 | luding (1) - 14:9 | converling 11 |
| briefly (1)-35:22 <br> bright (2) - 21:13, | 27:9, 37:23, 53:2, $53: 3,53: 18,54: 1,$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { commereial (n } \\ 32: 22,41: 23,42 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { concluelon } 111^{-} \\ & \text {17:23 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 34:14 } \\ & \text { copy } 14-7: 8,7: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:13 } \\ & \text { bring }[3]-6: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 16,55: 10,55: 12, \\ & 58: 22,58: 24,59: 20, \end{aligned}$ | Commiselon 124 . | $\begin{aligned} & \text { conclusions [2 } \\ & \text { 21:16, 48:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 8:4, 8:13, 18:3 |
| 36:17, 44:9 | 59:22 | 18:19, 19:2 | firmed 11 | 9:23, 11:17, 11:24, |
| ke [1] - 11:13 | changes (12)-15:9, | 20:14, 21:3, 21:19 | 45:20 | $11: 25,123,12: 4,$ |
| brought $[18]$ - 6:14, | 23:19, 23:25, 24:3, | 22:8, 25:5, 25:11 | connection12 | $12: 25,13: 20,13: 22,$ |
| 6:17, 6:19, 6:20, 7:2, | 25:1, 25:13, 25:18 | 28:1, 28:6, 28:8, | 5:11, 9:2 | 14:1, 14:2, 17:15, |
| 7:6, 7:7. 7:15, 7:19, | 25:24, 27:3, 27:6, | 28:17, 43:11, 54:23, | consequences [11 | 18:6, 18:21, 20:3, |
| 7:21, 7:23, 7:24, 8:1, | 37:16, 54:24 changing [1]-27:8 characterizes il $^{1}$ - | 55:10, 60:11, 61:5, | 58:2 | 22:11, 22:15, 22:18, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:4, } 24: 16 \\ & \text { business }[3] \text { - } 5: 23 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 61:10, 66:11 | conservation [i] 14:23 | 22:25, 23:1, 23:5, 23:12, 23:20. 23:21. |
| 5:24, 8:11 | 12:10 | 52: | nervative [14 - | $23: 23,24: 21,25: 2,$ |
| Business [1]-6:25 | charge (4)-32:13 | compani | 56:17, 57:23, 57:25, | 26:15, 28:21, 30:1 |
| BY ${ }_{[2]}$ - 5:9, 43:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 34:7, 34:9, } 36.6 \\ & \text { charged }[8]-22: 11, \end{aligned}$ | 15:2, 41:3 | 58:3, 58:8, 58:11, 58:18, 59:1, 59:25 | 33:12, 33:24, 34:15, |
| C | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 3,24: 20,24: 25, \\ & 25: 25,34: 24 \\ & \text { charges } 144-32: 4 . \end{aligned}$ | 31: | 60:6, 60:16, 60:22 | $35: 21,40: 8,40: 12$ |
| calculated [1] - 40:8 |  |  | consilder (4)-29:2, <br> 54:23, 55:5, 55:10 | 41:3, 41:6, 41:14, 43:4, 49:18, 48:2 |
|  | charges 144-32:4, 32:16, 32:21, 33:1, | 12:22, 34:6, 54:1 | consididerably [1] | $51: 1,54: 4,55: 18,$ |
| 19:9. 24:2 <br> capacity (a) - 36:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 16,32: 21,39: 1, \\ & 39: 10,34: 2,34: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 7:19, 20:18, 22:4 | 40:11 | 55:22, 56:10, 56:18, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 35:13, 35:20, 35:25, } \\ & 36: 6,36: 12,37: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 22:24, 23:2, 37:18. | constidaration [1]- 55:1 | 62:5, 63:19, 65:2 $\text { Correct } 19]-7: 13 \text {, }$ |
| capacty [a] - 36:6, 36:14, 36:18, 36:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 36:6, 36:12, 37:25 } \\ & \text { charging (1) }-34: 15 \end{aligned}$ | mpera [1] - 39:5 | considered [s | 22:12, 2216, 22:19, |
| 36:22, 36:23, 36:25, <br> 38:2 | Charles River Associates [1] - 13:14 | $\text { res }[1]-26: 6$ | 30:14, 31:3, 31:10 | 43:5, 43:7, 49:15, |
| capacity-rolated [7] -36:6 | check [1]-8:13 circumstance $[4]$ - | compotition [1] - | consistency ${ }^{(1)}$ 38:10, 38:17, 57:14 | 54:7, 62:14 correctly [1]-24 |
|  |  | \| 30:18 competitive [zes - | 38:10, 38:17. 57: conslatent 14 - | correspond [1]- |
| 36:6 <br> carear[1]-11:8 <br> Case 4i-7:12, B:14, | circumstance $(4]$ -27:25, 28:6, 34:17,34:22 | 12:24, 12:25, 13:4, | 27:15, 28:12, 39:7, | 29:13 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Case } 14 \mathrm{j}-7 \\ 8: 19,41: 14 \end{gathered}$ |  | 13:10. 15:13, 16:10. |  | corrupt [0] - 49:5, |

(December 22, 2010 - Kevin Higgins)

| 49:7, 49:9 | 42:21, 42:22, 52:21 | 12 | 49:3, 50:13, 51:3 | 37:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - $11: 20$, | DECEMBER $[1]$ - $5: 1$ | 41:11, 44:17, 44:20, | 51:22, 64:14, 85:4, | where [ 1 ]- |
| $\begin{aligned} & 34: 23,36: 20,49: 24, \\ & 50: 12,51: 4,51: 11, \end{aligned}$ | December\|4-6:7, | 47:13, 61:6, 61:1 different $60-17$ | 65: |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51:15, 51:18 } \\ & \text { costa } 115-13: 19, \end{aligned}$ | doemed [1] - 30:19 | 22:14, 29:23, 34:19, | :24, 61:2 |  |
|  | define (9-20:20, |  | 65:18 |  |
| 14:1, 17:20, 18:6, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:17, } 57: 24 \\ & \text { defined }[2]-58: 4, \end{aligned}$$60: 7$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { dififerential (3) - } \\ 32: 9,32: 14,32: 19 \end{gathered}$ | 10 |  |
| 23:18, 28:11, 36:14 36:22, 36:23, 36:25 |  |  | 117]-5:11, 7:11, 7:1 | emboded [1] - 57:2 |
| 37:17, 49:25, 50:12, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:7 } \\ & \text { definition } 14-28: 25 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | dreet $[1]-12: 11$ direction 1 (1) -9:13, | $12: 21,30: 10,31: 1$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 51: 5,51: 17 \\ & \text { counsel [16] - } \end{aligned}$ | 34:8, 53:16, 58:11 degree [8] - 15:7, 15:16, 15:20, 15:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9:15, 28:5 } \\ & \text { director }[y]-14: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 12,34: 17,35: 12, \\ & 38: 19,38: 24,39: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 57 |
| 9:7, 19:13, 4 |  | diliscem [1] - 43:23 <br> diteclose [1] - 46:23 |  |  |
| 45:13, 45:15, 45:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 16,15: 20,15: 25, \\ & 16: 1,20: 24 \end{aligned}$ |  | Duke Energy | , |
| 45:21, 46:4, 46:15, $46: 19,47: 1,47: 12$, | 16:1, $20: 24$ <br> delineates [ 1 ] - <br> 24:14 <br> demand [15] - 31:24, | $\text { disclosIng }\|x\| \text { - 46:7, }$ | 0 | , 63:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:19, 47:1, 47:12, } \\ & 47: 17,48: 1,66: 19 \end{aligned}$ |  | 47:21 | 2:24, | 65 |
| nsel's [1]-47:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { demand }[15]-31: 24, \\ & \text { 32:4, 32:13, 32:16, } \end{aligned}$ | dilacration [8] - <br> 18:19, 18:22, 18:23, | 4, 26 |  |
| 29:22 | 34:2, 34:7, 34:9, 34:10, 35:14, 35:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:19, 18:22, 18:23, } \\ & \text { 20:14, 21:18, 25:11, } \\ & \text { 28:8, 28:23 } \end{aligned}$ | 29:21, 29:24, 30, | 9:10, 10:16, 13:19, |
| couple [3-9:9, |  |  | 31: | 14:5, 14:19, 60:12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:18 } \\ & \text { course \| } \end{aligned}$ | 34:10, 35:14, 35:20, 35:25, 36:12, 37:24, 51:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:8, } 28: 23 \\ & \text { discussed } \\ & \text { ( } 7 \text { - } 7: 22 \text {, }, \end{aligned}$ | 32:3, 37:11, 38:9, 38:16, 39:21, $40: 3$ |  |
| $15: 19,29: 5,38$ | 51:5 <br> Denls Georclem- | 45:15, 45:18, 46:15, | 38: | 10:3, 14:21, 14:22 |
| CRA intamation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Denis George [2] - } \\ & \text { 10:5, 10:6 } \end{aligned}$ | 67:15 diecusces III - | 20 | 43:18 |
| [1] - 13:14 | $\text { deny } 2 \text { - }-32: 24$ | 52:25 | 30:24, 36:13, 49:24, | Energy ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (1] - 6:24 |
| CRE [i] - 32:8 created [i1]-21:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 6 \\ & \text { deposi }[1]-37: 5 \\ & \text { deposition }[7]-6: 6 \text {, } \\ & 6: 10,6: 18,8: 5,40: 21 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |  | 51:15, 60:12, 63:14, 64:21, 65:2, 65:13 | Enargy-based同- |
| created [1]-21:8 <br> createn [1] - 38:3 |  | 29:5, 68:13 <br> diapute [4]-1344, <br> 13:13, 13:25, 49:17 | 64:21, 65:2, 65:13 duly $(z)-5: 3$, 5:6 | 35:21, 36:1 |
| creating [ $21-25: 18$ |  |  | duration (1) - 18:20 | [1]-43 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 25: 24 \\ & \text { credit [y] - 35:21, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:10, 6:18, 8:5, 40:21, } \\ & \text { 66:11, 66:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:13, 13:25, 49:17 } \\ & \text { disputing } 3 \text { - 12:23, } \end{aligned}$ | during (5) | ensume [3] - 34:2 |
| 36:1 | Deposition [y] - 6:7 depth [1] - $61: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:1, 13:8 } \\ & \text { Distribution }[2]-9: 3, \end{aligned}$ |  | ring (i) - 56: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32: 20,32: 24,33: 9, \\ & 62: 19,65: 6,65: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 22:14, 32:15 <br> describe国-37:8, | 41:13 diatribution [5] - | E | 59:10 |
|  |  | 15:1, 35:13, 40:17. |  | ontion |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 65:12 } \\ \text { current } 901 \end{gathered}$ | 46:18 <br> descrlbed [4] 32:18, 34:12, 35:13, | 53:3, 64:6 <br> division (x) 52:16, | earninge (1)-9:19 | enthy (i) - $64: 20$ <br> conumperided 124 - |
| 10:1, 22:4, 23:4, 25:8, |  | 56:21 <br> Divation ${ }^{4}$ - 28:13 | conomic H1-41-10 | 19:3, 19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:6, } 26: 9,36: 25 \\ & \text { customer (7) - 30:23, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 32:19, 34:12, 35:13, } \\ & 39: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 52:20, 52:23, 54:21, | $\text { economiat }[1]-6: 2$ | nmental |
| 32:8, 37:21, 37:22, | $50: 23$ | 52:20, 52:23, 54:21, <br> 54:24, 55:17 | R [i] - 41:10 |  |
| 38:16, 39:10, 39:13 | design (i) - 34:8 designated $[1]-13: 9$ | divisions 111-57:14 clvulging [i] $-47: 6$ |  | 11:7, 11:16 |
| customers [23] |  |  |  | EsP [16]-7:8, 7: |
| 17:19, 18:5, 21 26:9, 29:14, 29 | deasignation [1] - | docurnent ( 2 - $6: 21$. | 53:14, 53:15, 55:1 | 7:11, 8:10, 8:21, 23:4. |
| $30: 9,31: 5,32: 2$ | 13:14 <br> dealgned [1] - 58:3 | $9: 18$$\text { documentin } \Gamma \text { - }$ | cts [1]-53:2 | 6, 26:9, 26:13, |
| 33:11, 34:15, 34:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { determination [4]- } \\ & \text { 11:3, 21:19, 22:8, } \end{aligned}$ |  | elther (1)-23:20 |  |
| 34:25, 36:5, 37:10, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:10, 6:16, 8:3, 8:15, } \\ & 9: 13,9: 14,10: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 43:17, 57:7, 57:20 |  |
| 38:4, 38:9, 38:20, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 62:12 } \\ & \text { detarminations } \mid 11 \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | done 1 -49:23, | 59:3 <br> - entric \{12 - 11 | criabluatedial- |
| 38:24, 41:23, 42:5, |  | 61:16, 81:19, 63:19, 63:20 |  | 33:20, 6 |
| $54: 15,54: 18,62: 18$ 63:2, 63:22, 64:6, | 11:15 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:11, 28:10, } 28 \\ & 29: 20,30: 5,31: \end{aligned}$ | evaluation (1) |
| 64:11 | determine [1] - 44:12 <br> determining [il - | 63:20 double [1] - $8: 13$ | 31:18, 31:22, 32:2, | 30:22 |
| cul 11-35:22 | ```61:17 devaloped [1] - 47:24 doveloping [0]- 33:10, 39:2, 45:11, 48:19, 47:2, 47:4 developmemil12] - 14:21, 14:22, 17:4,``` | down 11-23:20 <br> DP ${ }^{21} 1-37: 20,40: 4$ <br> Craw [1]-43:15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:3, 64:5 } \\ & \text { electriclity is - 10:2, } \\ & \text { 11:1, 11:9 } \end{aligned}$ | 31:1 cvent (24-25:16, |
| D |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | DS [3] - 39:4, 39:10, <br> 39:13 <br> Duke [14] - 6:24, 9:17, 20:6, 34:4, 36:14, 36:25, 37:23, |  |  |
| d |  |  | $7: 15,7: 20,7: 23,7: 24$ | EXAMMIATION |
| daily [1] - 14:20 |  |  | eloment 14 -15:16, |  |
| data [1]-39:17 <br> David [4] - 38:2 |  |  |  | example in - 23:18 |
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| 30:21, 37:20, 39:11, | 1013-12:22, 49:5, | 39:17 | hourty (1) - 35:17 | Inserted [1] - $56: 5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50:5, 50:21, 61:21 |  | 7. |  | Instead [ [] - 10:11 |
| exception [3]-11:4, | filed [9] -6:7, 7:12 | 56:21, 58:6, 64:9 | I | - 28:2 |
| 18:25, 28:22 excerpt $[1]-20: 7$ excuse [3] - $52: 23$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:8, 8:9, 8:13, 9:3, } \\ & \text { 9:21, 34:7, 41:13 } \\ & \text { filing if: - } 6: 20,7: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { goals }[1]-57: 4 \\ & \text { gowemment }(1) \text { - } \\ & 43: 17 \end{aligned}$ | Identif [1]-24:14 | instruction [1] - 20:5 <br> Inatrumentel 11 - <br> 14:17 |
| 61:1, 65:4 | 8:9, 12:3, 20:6, 35:13 | gradual (8) - 14:10, | Identified $\mathrm{Ff}-8: 2$ 8:8, 14:3, 23:17 | Intendad [3]-17:10, |
| exercise (1)-29:4 exercising [2] - | final (1) - 58:6 <br> firm $[1]-6: 3$ | 15:6, 15:17, 15:18. 16:1, 16:13, 16:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B:8, 14:3, 23:17 } \\ & \text { ldentify }(2)-5: 20, \end{aligned}$ | 27:15, 27:22 <br> Intending [1]-13:6 |
| 64:15, 64:20 | First (4)-26:19, | $56: 9,58: 4$ | 24:12 | Intent la -16:18, |
| Exhibit $1_{[1]-6: 5}$ <br> exhiblts [1]-6:13 | 28:17, 42:16, 60:15 Firstenergy 14 - 9:3. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { greater }[3] \text { - 58:10, } \\ & 60: 3,60: 21 \end{aligned}$ | Identilying [1] - 38:8 Illegal (i)- 17:21 | 16:24 interpex (t) - 21:25 |
| exist [1]-33:14 | 41:3, 41:11, 41:13 | grocery $[$ [ 1 -39:.11 | Illuatrated [1]-38:4 | 43:24, 44:12, 44:14 |
| existence [1]-41:17 | five\|12]-17:15, | OT $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ - 41:5, 41:7 | Illustration []] - | Interpritation $[14$ - |
| existing [1]-22.4 | 17:18, 18:5, 18:13, $18: 17,192,19: 6$, | $\text { guess }(8)-7: 9,17: 2 \text {, }$ <br> 37:9, 53:16, 53:20. | 37:14 <br> Impact (6) - 16:1, | 19:15, 43:10, 45:20, 46:4, 46\%5, 46:19, |
| experiance 15 - 11:1, $14.12,16: 17$ | 18:17, 19:2, 19:6, 19:7, 19:10, 28:17, | 37:9, 53:16, 53:20, 57:16 | 21:8, 21:9, 21:11, | 46:4, 46:5, 46:19, 47:5, 47:12, 47:13, |
| 43:9, 44:9 | 28:21, 60:15 | guldance H - 17:10, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40:10 } \\ & \text { Impacts } 13 \text { - } 37: 17, \end{aligned}$ | 47:17, 47:18, 47:25, |
| expertise (1)-43:10 <br> explain 11 - 46:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { five-year\|x\|-18:13, } \\ & \text { 18:17 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $40: 7,50: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56:5, 65:8 } \\ & \text { interprotations } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\text { explicit } \mid+1-32: 13$ | fixed (3]-32:21, | H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Implausblele [7 - } \\ & 39: 9,39: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 45:11 |
|  | us [y- 11:15 | half [f] - 37:23 | 17:3, 41:2 | $\text { volve[ }[1] \text { - 47:20 }$ |
| $\text { extend }[3]-19: 6$ $65: 22,66: 7$ | $59: 15$ | $\text { hands [i] - } 31: 14$ | implications if - | Involved (x-11:6, 11:8, 14:13, 14:20, |
| extent \{4- 16:1, | [(2]-28:10, 32:9 | ppy [1] - 18:2 | 43: | 20:25, 32:15, 43:16, |
| 32:11, 46:22, 47:20 | ming $[2]-14: 17$. | d(1)-7:21, 8: | plicit ( 2 - $-32: 10$ | 452 |
| F | 26:23 | dra-57:8 | - 15:19 | 44:18, 44:18 |
|  |  | 6:12. 5:17, | 63:5, 63:22, 64:2 | 51 |
| facllities [4]-31:17, | $\text { th }[1]-21: 23$ | 43:6, 47:14, 59:2 | pose [y - 14:10 | masuadin-6:28 |
| $31: 23,33: 14,39: 15$ fact $[3]-30: 22$, | forward [1] - 36:14 <br> four $(2)$ - 19:2, 28:2 | hering ®n $^{2}$-10:21. | Inaudible [z] - 41:23; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { insuas in - 10:17, } \\ & \text { 11:4, 11:7, 11:15, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 32:25, 50:6 } \\ & \text { factor }[20] \text { - 29:16, } \end{aligned}$ | framework ${ }^{(3)}$ $17.1421 \cdot 1227+2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:12 } \\ & \text { held [y - } 66: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:9 } \\ & \text { Inaud\|ble (1] - } 59: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 11:18, 11:19, 12:2, 45:15, 45:18 |
| 29:17, 36:5, 37:10, | \| 17:11, 21:12, 27:2 | P11] - 30:1 | include (5) - $31: 24$, | $[1]-8: 7$ |
| 37:21, 38:4, 38:9, | 月- 23:18، 24:1, | Iping [1] - 14:13 | 34:9, 50:18, 52:20, | ttself [ [ - - 12:6, |
| 38:12, 38:16, 38:21, <br> 38:25, 39:3, 39:9. | $24: 7,24: 9,49: 25$ | GGINA (1) - $5: 5$ | 53:25 Included 14 - 36 | 58:22, 58:20 |
| 39:12, 39:13. 39:15, 39:20, 39:23, 39:25, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { full }[5]-18: 4,18: 11, \\ & \text { 18:13.56:18, } 61: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $5: 20,5: 22,6: 4,6: 9$ | 40:16, 41:9, 56:2 $\text { Includes }[4]-11: 2$ | J |
| 61:14 factors (3) - 23:17, | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:12, 12:23, 13:8, } \\ & \text { 13:17, 14:3, 15:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 32: 4,38: 2,63: 15 \\ \text { inconsistent }(2] \end{array}$ | -42 |
| 39:5, 39:19 |  | 16:2, 18:1, 19:23 | 60:6, 60:22 | Joined (1)-60:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { facts }(1]-24: 12) \\ & \text { fair }(12)-11: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { general (10] - 8:22, } \\ \text { 12:17, 26:7, 29:40, } \end{gathered}$ | 23:14, 25:4, 28:7 $28: 24,32: 1,33: 15$ | Incorporata []]- 34:1 | $\text { Judgment }{ }^{3} \text { - 2023, }$ $24: 15,44: 9$ |
| 12:25, 13:5, 16:9, | 55:24, 56:2, 56:13, | 34:17, 35:19, 36:3, | Increses (0) - 27:5, | Jury 1 (1)-30:7 |
| 28:24, 45:10. 45:19, | 56:23, 56:25, 63:25 | 37:4, 30:19, 38:23. | 58:8, 58:17, 60:3, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 48:2, 49:16, 51:9, } \\ & 51: 13,61: 15 \end{aligned}$ | generally [3] - 39:18, $48: 24,50: 1$ | 40:14, 41:21, 42:9, 43:3, 60:2, 66:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 60:8, } 60: 20 \\ & \text { inereasing [1] - } \end{aligned}$ | K |
|  | generation (19) - | hish(v) - 31:3, 36:5, | 27:12 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 44:13, 48:1 } \\ & \text { fairty }[2]-11: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:11, 17:20, 18:6, } \\ & 28: 10,28: 11,29: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 39:10, 39:12, 61:22 } \\ & \text { hlightoad factor (1) } \end{aligned}$ | Incremmendaly $(1)$ - 16:21 | 37:14, 40.7. 40:15 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:10 } \\ & \text { famillar(7)- 16:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30:1, 30:5, 31:18, } \\ & 37: 1,37: 17, ~ 37: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -36: 5 \\ & \text { higher\|m- 26:22, } \end{aligned}$ | inciopendent [3]13:10, 13:15, 47:25 | Kelly [2] - 5:4, 66:9 KEVN (0) - $5: 8$ |
| 39:18, 50:1, 50:5. | 40:11, 40:16. 51:22, | $26: 10,26: 11,27: 18$ | indicated 3 - $\mathbf{2 3 : 1 1}$. | Kovin pi- $5: 22,44: 7$ |
| 50:8, 61:20, 64:25 | $58: 10,65: 1,65: 5 \text {, }$ | 27:19 | 43:3, 64:25 | kilowitit ( $-34: 13$ |
| Federal [1]-13:19 <br> FERC [2]-13:20. | 65:12 generation-related | history P1 - 44: $^{2}$ 422, $45: 6$ | Industrian [3] - 32:22, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Kllowath hour is - } \\ & 32: 21,33: 1,33: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { FERC }[2]-13: 20, \\ & 13: 25 \end{aligned}$ | generation-related $(\eta)-37: 24$ | 45.6 <br> hoping (1) $-5: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:23, 42:5 } \\ & \text { Infering }[11-44: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $36: 21,36: 1,38: 1$ |
| few 111-57:6 | George [z] - 39:14, |  |  | klind [ 1 + $53: 17$ |
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| 44：11，55：8，57：25， | 29：3，29：11 | point（4）－7：17． | 26：6，26：9，26：23 | $\text { 1, 17:10, } 20: 7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 61:9, 65:12, 65:23 | particular（a）－12：2， | 18：10，57：6，64：18 | 26：24，27：2，27：3 | 28:9, 39:7, 43:10, |
| 5， | 24：12，29：14， 60 | 57:7, 57:21 | 27 | pro |
| perating ${ }^{(1)}$－33：15 | 5 | policy 180 －11：3， | 32：15，32：17，32：20， | 46：1 |
| opinion［26］－13：18， | 55：9， | 11：11，11：15，11：20 | 19，58： | VdorF－32 |
| 13：21，15：4，16：15． | （1）－ $43: 1$ | 14：9，14：13，14：16 | 58：22，59：20，60：5 | 32：4，32：8，65：12， |
| 17：2，17：13，17：17 | ass 14－21：1，29：a， | 14：21，43：17，43：20， | price＿［1］－53：5 | \| 65:1 |
| 18：3，19：8，19：14， | 29：9，62：8 | 43：23，44：10，44：13， | pricesp－22．14 | $\begin{gathered} \text { providiows [1]- } \\ 29: 20,29: 23,31: 27 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:4, 21:7, 23:25, } \\ & 24: 8,24: 23,27: 2, \end{aligned}$ | passage（1）－16：19 passed（1）－46：23 | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 9,56: 14,63: 25, \\ & 64: 3,64: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $26: 6,26: 10,48: 8,$ $48: 12,48: 15,48: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29:20, 29:23, 31:22, } \\ & 32: 21,32: 24,33: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| 28：7，28：16，30：3 |  | portollo［1］－ $51: 5$ | $63:$ | 65 |
| 30：7，41：21，42：2， | ［11］－50： | portion（4）－22：17， | 15：8，15：12 | provides Pl － $39: 17$ ， |
| 42：6，61：9，64：18， $64: 23$ | ［1］－65：24 | 25：18，28：13，59：2 | 15：6，15：12，18：4， | 43:9, |
| opinions［f］－43：15 oppartunities［3）－ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { paying }(1) \text { - 34:19 } \\ & \text { per }(3) \text { - 22:23. } \\ & 23: 22,34: 13 \end{aligned}$ | \| 8:12 <br> position 121－10：16， | 37：25，56：10，56：18 principal［3］－6：2， | $\begin{aligned} & \text { provision (2) - } 21: 5 \text {, } \\ & \text { 21:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 15：12，62：17，62：18 opportunlty $\mid 51$－ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { per-killowatt-hour[1] } \\ & -34: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:14 } \\ & \text { posalble \|21-53:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 14：4 privileged（2） | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Provisiona [列- } \\ & \text { 28:12 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 30：9，31：6，42：11 | （1） | 5 | 19：16，45：23 | xy（1）－36：13 |
| 49:12, 66:7 $\text { oppose (2] - } 12 \text { : }$ | 26：15，26：20，26：23， 28：19， $28: 20,28: 21$, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { potential (n) - } 54: 23 \text {, } \\ & \text { S8:1. 81:23 } \end{aligned}$ | bablity［1］－ $25: 9$ | public［2］－56：9， |
| 12:21 | 28：19，28：20，28：21， | 88：1， $61: 23$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { proceoding } \\ 11: 23,13: 3,13: 1 \end{gathered}$ | 56：14 <br> Public： 125 |
| option（5）－12：20 | 37：21，37：23，38：0 | 55 | 13：24，21：14，21：15 | 68：10 |
| 13:9, 13:15, 22:17, | 38：12，38：16，38：20， | vontally 1 U－56：6 |  | $25:$ |
| derly $[11$－14：10 | 39：12，39：24，58：10， | 24:2, 29:4, 29:7, 29:8, | 11:14, 21:16, 43:1 | $24$ |
| come（1）－27：23 | 7，58：25，59：24 | 29：11，30：22，31：1， | process（8）－12：25 | purchamed |
| outilined［1］－54：24 | 60：3，60：9，60：14， | 31：4，48：8， | 13：5，13：10，33：21， | 50：13，5020 |
| overall 189 －24：3， | 60：18， $60: 2$ | 50：13，50：20，61：23， | 33：23，36：17，48： | purehating［ |
| 26：23，27：5，27：12， | percantage［11］ | 63：18，84：15，84：21， | 64：1 | 05 |
| 27：19，37：16，84：3， | 18：20，19：3，19：5 | 65：10 | procurement［i］ | rpose［1］－12：1 |
| 64：9 own［3］－45：15， | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 3,27: 2,27: 10 \\ & 27: 19.28: 3.28: 4 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { practice [2]-8:22, } \\ & 10: 23 \end{aligned}$ |  | ригрофея пія - 5:21, <br> $1 \cdot 15$ 2047 28．18 |
| 45:17, 48:6 | 29:24, 30:21 |  | $\text { product }[3]-30: 10$ |  |
|  | percentages \％0］ | 60：17 | 36：18， 38 | 48：14，42：16， 4 |
| P | 18：24，25：6，26：20 | praciuding ${ }^{\text {（2）}}$ | progreas［ 2 －－16：21， | 48：24，48：11， 60 |
| page｜8］－37：6，38：7． 40：5，40：20，40：24， <br> 52：10，61：1，62：23 <br> Page（1）－40：25 <br> page $7[4]$－19：23， <br> 20：12，52：8，54：11 <br> page $8_{[1]}$－ 56.8 <br> page 9 （2］－55：21， <br> 60：25 <br> paid（1）－34：25 <br> рарег［1］－7：25 <br> papers［5］－7：16， <br> 9：16，9：21，40：19 <br> parameters［1］－58：5 <br> parse［1］－48：3 <br> part（15）－25：17， <br> 32：4，32：16，36：15， <br> 36：18，40：4，41：9， <br> 44：12，45：12，45：14， <br> 52：5，54：11，54：13， <br> 55：20， $64: 8$ <br> partici［（1］－10：9 <br> participants ² $^{2}$－ | 28：9，28：15，28：18 <br> Perhaps［I］－10：24 <br> perhape ill－5：14 <br> period［12］－15：9， | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53:21 } \\ & \text { prepara [4 - 8:24, } \\ & \text { 45:10, 48:7, 48:11 } \\ & \text { prepared } 4 \text { - } 9: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 66：12 proportion（3） | $\begin{aligned} & \text { pursuant } \text { i1] - } 45: 3 \\ & \text { put }[1]-42: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | propertiona［2］ | 0 |
|  | period（12］－15：9， 18：8，18：13，18：17， | 10:13, 31:13, 52:6, | 25：12，54：24 <br> proposal（00－34：11， <br> 35：19，35：20，35：25， | qualineations（1）－ |
|  | $\text { 61:4, } 83: 5$ | $8: 20,8: 25,9: 8,9: 11,$ | 36：4，36：10，36：1 | 43:9 |
|  | periodic［1］－23：25 partaining $[1]$－ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 50:20, 51:7 } \\ & \text { presence }[1]-63: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 21 \\ & \text { proposed (B) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { quathyify }-30: 14 \\ & \text { quarterea }-8: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { parta } \\ & \text { 11:20 } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { vent (y) }-49: 10$ | $12: 24,13: 4,34: 4,$ | $9: 19$ |
|  | phone（6）5：12， 5：17，35：22，42：12 | pretty（it）－31：3 | $\text { 34:6, 35:12, } 37: 12$ | quarterty (I) - 23:23 |
|  | 58：11 | provious［1］－59：14 <br> price（50）－20：19． | proposing［r］ | ueationing［il）－ |
|  | phrase（間－52：11， 52：24，53：8，53：14． | 20:21, 20:25, 21:23, | 37:24, 51:22 | $42: 11$ <br> quantions［11］－ |
|  | 54:8, 54:20, 55:9, | $22: 13,22: 18,22: 23$ |  | 42：10，42：17，42：18， |
|  | 55：16，56：3 |  | prospactively | 2:23, 57:0, 64:24, |
|  | PJIM［2］－48：9，48：15 place［1］－32：12 | 239，23：11，23：14， | 19：9 | 66：8，66：15 |
|  | plato［1］－14：15 <br> play［2］－47：1，47：3 | , 24:19, 24:2 | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{P} \\ \mathbf{5 4} \end{array}$ | $\text { quickly }[\text { [] - } 58: 2$ |
|  |  | $24: 25,25: 2,25:$ | protection［1］ | qua回－8：21，8：23， |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { played } \mu \mathrm{J}-46: 4, \\ 46: 19,47: 12,47: 17 \end{gathered}$ | 25:8, 25:12, 25:14, | 54:17 | $23: 12,25: 19,26: 25$ <br> quoter 131－20：2． |
|  |  | 25：17，25：21，25：25， | provide［10］－10：18， | 20:5, 55:20 |

(December 22, 2010 - Kevin Higgins)
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| ```vehicle (0- - 35:1, 35:3, 35:6, 35:8, 35:9 vests!\mp@code{-20:13} view [4] - 38:3, 48:5, 55:16, 56:1 volatlle [1] - 50:7 volume [2]-7:18, 29:18``` |
| :---: |
| W |
| warranted [1] - 60:9 <br> weighting (1)-36:25 <br> wholesale (5) - <br> 36:23, 48:8, 48:12, <br> 48:15, 48:21 <br> WIIburn [i] - 5:4 <br> windfall [3] - 37:9, <br> 37:14, 38:3 <br> winning [1]-36:16 <br> withess (5) - 5:6, <br> 13:3, 13:7, 13:13, <br> 13:24 <br> word (5) - 15:19, <br> 53:16, 53:17, 56:2, <br> 56:5 <br> words [4] - 22:2, <br> 48:23, 54:25, 62:11 <br> world (1) - $29: 7$ <br> written [2]-54:12, <br> 54:14 |
| Y |
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