BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Application of Duke)	Class No. 07 500 C A AID			
Energy Ohio, Inc. for an Increase in Gas)	Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR			
Rates.)				꼺(
In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. for approval of an Alternative Rate Plan for its Gas Distribution Service)))	Case No. 07-590-GA-ALT		NOB FEB 21 PM	CEIVED-DOCKET
In the Matter of the Application of Duke)			Ü	in Sign
Energy Ohio, Inc. for Approval to Change)	Case No. 07-591-GA-AAM		<u>ان</u> عد	<u> </u>
Accounting Methods)		•	_	~~

NOTICE OF FILING DEPOSITION BY THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Pursuant to Ohio Adm. Code 4901-1-21, The Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel gives notice of filing the deposition of Donald Storck, which was taken on February 19, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

JANINE L. MIGDEN-OSTRANDER

CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

Larry \$. Sauer, Counsel of Record

Joseph P. Serio

Michael E. Idzkowski

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel

10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485 (614) 466-8574 (Telephone) sauer@occ.state.oh.us serio@occ.state.oh.us idzkowski@occ.state.oh.us

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of basiness.

Technician An Date Processed 2/2//08

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that a true copy of the foregoing Ohio Consumers' Counsel's Notice of

Filing deposition, was served via Electronic Mail, this 21st day of February, 2008.

Larry S/Sauer

Assistant Consumers' Counsel

Thomas Lindgren

Paul A. Colbert
John Finnigan
Associate General Counsel
Duke Energy Ohio
139 Fourth Street, Room 25 ATII
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

William Wright
Attorney General's Office
Public Utilities Section
180 East Broad Street, 9th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

David F. Boehm Michael L. Kurtz Kurt J. Boehm Boehm, Kutz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-4454 David Rinebolt Ohio Partners for Affordable Energy 231 West Lime Street P.O. Box 1793 Findlay, Ohio 45839-1793

John M. Dosker General Counsel Stand Energy Corporation 1077 Celestial Street, Suite 110 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-1629 Sally W. Bloomfield Thomas J. O'Brien Bricker & Eckler LLP 100 South Third Street Columbus, Ohio 43215-4219

John W. Bentine Mark S. Yurick Chester, Willcox & Saxbe LLP 65 East State Street, Suite 1000 Columbus, Ohio 43215-4213 Mary W. Christensen Christensen Christensen Donchatz Kettlewell& Owens, LLC 100 East Campus View Blvd. Suite 360 Columbus Ohio 43235

Howard Petricoff Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP 52 E. Gay Street Columbus Ohio 43215

1 1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO 2 3 In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy: Case No. 07-589-GA-AIR 4 Ohio, Inc. for an Increase: in Gas Rates. 5 In the Matter of the 6 Application of Duke Energy: Case No. 07-590-GA-ALT Ohio, Inc. for Approval 7 of an Alternative Rate Plan for its Gas 8 Distribution Service. 9 In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy: Case No. 07-591-GA-AAM Ohio, Inc. for a Approval: 10 to Change Accounting 11 Methods. 12 13 DEPOSITION 14 of Donald L. Storck, taken before me, Rosemary F. 15 Anderson, a Notary Public in and for the State of 16 Ohio, at the offices of Duke Energy Corporation, 139 17 East Fourth Street, Room 2500, Cincinnati, Ohio, on Tuesday, February 19, 2008 at 1:18 p.m. 19 20 21 ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC. 185 South Fifth Street, Suite 101 22 Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201 (614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481 FAX - (614) 224-5724 24

2 1 APPEARANCES: 2 Duke Energy By Mr. John J. Finnigan, Jr. 3 139 East Fourth Street Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 4 On behalf of the Company. 5 Janine L. Migden-Ostrander 6 Ohio Consumers' Counsel Mr. Larry S. Sauer (via telephone) 7 and Mr. Joseph P. Serio (vis telephone) 10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3485 В 9 On behalf of the Residential Consumers of the State of Ohio. 10 ALSO PRESENT: 11 Ms. Sharon Babcock 12 Mr. Anthony Yankel (via telephone) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

DONALD L. STORCK

being by me first duly sworn, as hereinafter certified, deposes and says as follows:

EXAMINATION

By Mr. Sauer:

б

- Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Storck. My name is Larry Sauer, on attorney with the Office of Ohio Consumers' Counsel. We're here today to take your deposition. Have you had your deposition taken before?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. You are somewhat familiar with the general ground rules. You can see there's a court reporter to take down what you say so I'll ask a question, you respond, and try to answer with yes and no answers so that she can take it down. If you want to clarify an answer, you can expand on that from there, that's fine.

Try to avoid "un-uhs" and "uh-huhs"

because that's difficult for us to read in the

transcript later to understand what you were saying.

If you need a break, just let me know. I just ask if

there's a question pending, that you answer the

question and then we will take a break. That's kind

1 of the rules.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Are you okay with that?

- A. Yes, I am.
- Q. All right. What materials have you brought with you today?
 - A. I've just brought my data book.
 - Q. What is contained in your data book?
- A. It includes testimony, Mr. Yankel's testimony, Mr. Gonzales' testimony, and some of the data requests from OCC.
 - Q. Do you have any workpapers with you?
 - A. No, I do not.
- Q. After high school could you kind of run through your educational background?
- A. Sure. I attended Ball State University.

 I graduated in December 1976. I'm sorry. Did you want to know my work background, too?
- Q. I will get to that eventually but right now just your educational.
- A. I also passed my CPA I think like 1982. That's my educational.
- Q. Okay. And after college what has your work history been?
 - A. I joined the Public Service Company of

- Indiana in December 1, 1976, and I've been with the Public Service Company of Indiana and its successors all the way to Duke Energy since then.
- Q. All right. What positions have you held with originally PSI Energy and now Duke since 1976?

5

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. Originally I started off in Corporate

 Accounting as a staff accountant. I moved to the

 Fuels and Mining Department where I worked in

 Contract Administration and Auditing. I worked in

 the Treasury Department; Budgets and Forecasts; came

 back to Corporate Accounting; PSI Investments, which

 was a non-reg subsidiary; back to Corporate

 Accounting; Gas Operations and Wholesale Power

 Transmission Operations; worked for Cinergy

 Resources; Regulated Business Unit; Financial

 Operations; and currently my position is in Rates.
 - Q. What is that current position?
 - A. I am the director of Rate Services.
- Q. What are the responsibilities of the director of Rate Services?
- A. Primarily tariff administration, cost-of-service studies. Those are the two primary responsibilities.
 - Q. Are you with Duke Energy Shared Services

1 now?

2

3

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- A. Yes, I am.
- Q. How long have you been in your current position?
- A. I believe it was April 2006 I began this position.
- Q. You said at one point in your career you were gas operations and wholesale power operations.
- A. Wholesale power transmission operations, yes.
 - Q. What did you do in that particular role?
- A. I was business unit controller, and as result of that, I managed the budgeting process for those organizations. I was also the financial liaison with corporate accounting, and I also did management reporting for those organizations.
- Q. What time period were you in that role; do you recall?
- A. Started that in late '94, early '95, in that range, and it ran up through 1999.
- Q. So at the time of Duke's last rate case in 2001, you weren't in that position.
 - A. No, I was not.
 - Q. Did you have any role in that rate case

1 | at all?

2

3

4

7

8

10

11

12

13

74

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A. I recall being involved in some data requests. That was my only role.
- Q. Okay. On page 26 of your testimony, you have a question discussing the purpose of your testimony? Do you see that?
- A. That's my direct testimony. I don't have that with me. Okay. They have a copy for me.
 - Q. Okay, thank you.
 - A. Page 2 of my testimony, yes.
- Q. You describe as part of your purpose of the testimony you sponsor the jurisdictional allocations.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you see that? What exactly are the jurisdictional allocations?
- A. Because this gas case we don't have wholesale. Usually in an electric case it would be a wholesale versus state jurisdictional. Again, it's all one jurisdiction in this case.
- Q. Okay. There were no jurisdictional allocations.
 - A. No, there were not.
 - Q. On the same page beginning at line 13

- there's a question regarding the cost-of-service studies.
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. You state: Cost-of-service study is an embedded fully allocated cost-of-service study.
 - A. Yes, I did.
 - Q. Okay. What do you mean by that?
- A. Embedded means that it's based on the cost in the test period. It's not a marginal cost-of-service study. Fully allocated is basically fully allocated all the costs out to the rate classes.
- Q. So the cost-of-service study was done in-house.
 - A. Yes, it was.
- Q. And did you alone prepare the cost-of-service study?
 - A. It was prepared under my direction.
- Q. Okay. And how many other -- at this time how many employees report to you?
 - A. Zero.
 - Q. Zero?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Who else would have participated in the

cost-of-service study beside yourself?

- A. There was Rick Ellers and Jim Ziolkowski.
- Q. And what is Rick Ellers' position?
- A. Currently or then?
- Q. At the time of the cost-of-service study.
- A. He was a coordinator -- rates coordinator.
 - Q. And who does Rick report to?
 - A. At that point in time, me.
- Q. So at the time the cost-of-service study was prepared, he was the only direct report to you?
 - A. No.

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Is that a yes?
- A. No. I had other direct reports.
- Q. Okay. And they were essentially in that position to assist you during the rate case?
- A. No. They just reported to me. There was a reorganization subsequent to that which had them report directly to my supervisor.
- Q. Did Duke use a consultant or any other outside resources to complete the cost-of-service study?
 - A. No.
- Q. Beginning to end about how many man-hours

- did it take to complete the cost-of-service study?
- A. I really don't have a good estimate.
 - Q. Do you know about how many weeks it took you to prepare it?
 - A. There were multiple people involved, and I don't know how long total was spent on it.
 - Q. Page 4 of your testimony, line 2 there's a question regarding the methodology you used in the cost-of-service study. Do you see that?
 - A. Appendix 4.
 - MR. FINNIGAN: Page 4, line 2.
 - A. Yes.

2

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21.

22

23

- Q. And it says first you developed the allocation factors based on customer commodity and demand statistics for the test period. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Can you describe what that process entailed?
- A. Basically what we did is we went out and gathered various customer commodity demand statistics. There were some cost statistics in there too to develop the allocators that we used in the cost-of-service study, and it's just a matter of

pulling together the information from many sources from within the company and developing the allocators.

Q. How did you develop the allocation factors for the customer related allocations?

- A. You mean like the ones based on number of customers? I'm not sure I follow your question.
- Q. How many different customer allocation factors are there?
- A. I know there's one based on number of customers. There's the customer component of mains. I don't have a complete cost-of-service study in front of me to tell you all the different ones.
- Q. Generally behind each of those allocation factors what's the basis?
- A. Again, it depends on which one. We have one which is based just solely on the number of customers. We went out and calculated the number of customers for the period.
- Q. Okay. Like the customers of mains, how would that allocation factor be derived?
- A. What we did on there, that was the one where we used the regression analysis to determine the customer component or demand component of mains.

And then we used that and applied it to the -- one of them was number of customers and the other allocator was the peak and average method allocator.

Q. Similarly, how did you develop the allocation factors for the commodity-related allocations?

- A. There are many of those. Some of them were based on throughput and the peak and average method. It depends on which allocator you are speaking of.
 - Q. Same with the demand-related allocation.
- A. The demand related were pretty much just based on the -- like the K-415, the cost of mains had both the demand and commodity. The demand was based on the regression analysis.
- Q. And then the next step you say you then functionalized those costs. How was that step performed?
- A. Basically it was between production and distribution, and, of course, we have very little production so we were able to identify the costs that were production and then pretty much everything else went to distribution.
 - Q. Okay. Then you said you classified these

Armstrong & Okey, Inc. Columbus, Ohio 614-224-9481

costs as either customer commodity or demand related or some combination in some instances. How did you go about making those classifications?

- A. What we did, that's where we actually used the allocators from my workpapers, and we applied different allocators to different various cost elements, whether it was plant in service, whether it was operation or maintenance expense or taxes to allocate it between those.
- Q. What are some of the circumstances where you people allocated based on a combination of the above classifications?
- A. Well, one is the K-415 where we used multiple allocators. That's where we used the regression analysis to determine what weighting to use on the customer component versus the average and peak excess method.
- Q. So the K-415 has some demand component to it as well as throughput?
 - A. Yes.

Q. And then you say finally you made some allocations to the rate classes based on general principles outlined in the cost allocation studies you reference in your testimony.

- 1
- Α. Yes.
- 2
- Can you kind of walk me through those 0. steps?

3

How we allocated that out between the Α. various classes?

5 6

0. Yes.

Α.

Ο.

Α.

ο.

7

workpapers. That's where we developed the allocators

Again, that's where you go to the

ß

to break it down between the classes, how much goes

10

to residential, how much residential, residential

11

firm, general service, firm transportation, and

12

finally interruptible transportation.

13 14

specific allocation percentages that you use or rely

It does not have specific

And the book you're referring to has some

And then finally you say you rely on your

15

on in order to do those allocations?

16

17

It talks about methodologies you can percentages.

18

use to allocate these costs.

19 20

- utility company experience or some knowledge of
- 21 cost-of-service studies to do something I presume

22

different than what the allocation studies book you referred to.

23

24

Not necessarily. I used my experience Α.

- based on to determine how certain costs should be allocated, is it related to number of customers versus throughput, things like that.
- Q. The next question down on page 4 discusses how you derived the demand commodity and customer allocation statistics for each rate class. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And it references a schedule 3 .2 in your answer.
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. What data from the schedule 3 .2 were you using in that step?
- A. We were using several of the different allocators.
- Q. Do you have workpaper 3.2 in front of you?
 - A. No, I do not.
- Q. The same page there's a question that begins on line 16. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And in your answer you talk about peak and average methodology --
- A. Yes.

- Q. -- used for allocating the demand items.
- A. Yes.

Я

- Q. Can you describe the peak and average method?
- A. Simply put, basically what you do is you first calculate the average usage by class, and once you've calculated that, you determine how much more -- that's the average. You determine the peak by class, and so you use the differential between the two. And it's a combination allocator where you determine where you allocate things to, the various classes, residential, general service, and interruptible transportation.
- Q. And did you develop the underlying data that supported those allocations?
 - A. Some of it I developed. Some I did not.
- Q. Which of the information or the underlying data did you not provide?
- A. The peak information was not developed by me. That was provided to me. The annual usage was provided to me. I did not develop that. I believe the rest --
 - Q. I'm sorry, sir?
 - A. I believe the rest of it was my

| calculation.

1

2

3

4

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Okay. The peak data you say you did not provide. Who provided that information?
- A. That was provided by Zinnia Hoying in our load research group.
 - Q. I'm sorry, which group?
 - A. Load research.
- Q. Would the selection of the peak day affect the outcome of your allocations?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And do you know if the data you used was based on a March peak day or February peak day?
- A. The data I used in my direct testimony was based on a March peak day.
- Q. And was the March peak day what was provided to you by Zinnia Hoying?
- A. No. What she provided was the load factors so we could convert from average usage to peak load. She provided that. We got the actual load day and basically used her information to calculate the peak load for each class of customer.
- Q. What you did didn't depend on what the actual peak day of the system was.
 - A. No. In the direct testimony, that's

correct.

- Q. But the actual peak day, if you use that, would result in a different allocation, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And can you explain again how you derived the March peak day?
- A. What we did is looked at the 12-month information we had, and then we took the load factors provided to us from load research and calculated what the peak load was, and when we did that it came out to be March. I forget the exact day but it was in the month of March.
- Q. And why would you calculate the peak day as opposed to using the actual peak day?
- A. The reason we do it is the company doesn't have the ability to measure a peak day for each class of customer. We don't have a demand meter on all of them so we have to go and do a calculation based on whatever the peak day is for the year, so we're calculating the class peaks, not the system peak.
 - Q. Do you know who Zinnia Hoying reports to?
 - A. I believe his name is William Baker.
 - Q. Who does William Baker report to?

A. I don't know.

Я

- Q. Don't know. Do you know Jim Riddle?
- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And is he within the direct reports of Zinnia or William Baker?
 - A. No, he is not.
- Q. So they're in a different organization than Jim Riddle?
- A. I'm not sure I can answer that because I don't know. It depends on how far up in the organization you want to say. You know, under the chairman of the board they're all under the same organization. Again, I'm not sure where their organizations cross over.
- Q. If I look at Mr. Riddle's testimony, he's manager of load forecasting, and you said Zinnia Hoying is in load research.
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. But as far as you're concerned, the information you used didn't come from Mr. Riddle or Mr. Riddle didn't have any input or review of the information you were looking at from load research.
 - A. Not that I'm aware of.
 - Q. You know that Mr. Riddle filed testimony

in this case.

- A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Okay. Mr. Riddle, through a review of the research data, can you identify what exactly the peak day was?

MR. FINNIGAN: Do you mean Mr. Storck?

MR. SAUER: Yes, Mr. Storck, thank you.

- A. Can you repeat the question?
- Q. Based on your review of the load research data for the test year, can you identify what the actual peak day was for the test year?
 - A. Not through that information.
- Q. Based on throughput can you identify that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And did you look at throughput data for the test year?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And can you tell me what the actual peak day was in the test year?
 - A. February 5, 2007.
- Q. And did your allocation methodology take that peak day into account in any of the calculations you were doing for peak and average?

A. No, it did not.

- Q. Mr. Storck, do you recall responding to an OCC Interrogatory No. 299 in which there were some questions asked regarding some mathematical errors in the cost-of-service study?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And I believe there were three errors listed in that response; do you recall that?
 - A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Do you remember what the first error was?
- A. The first error was relative to a number that was printed in a formula on one of my workpapers. It was a peak load number.
- Q. And how about the second error, do you recall that?
- A. The second error was a summation error on I believe it was the calculation of the peak and average allocator. Something wasn't summed correctly.
 - Q. Okay. And the third error.
- A. I believe that was relative to the day of the peak.
- Q. Did you then go back and do a revised cost-of-service study having taken into consideration

those mathematical errors?

- A. I am in the process of developing one.
- Q. Okay. When do you anticipate that would be completed?
 - A. No later than this Friday.
- Q. And do you have -- I realize the study is not done, but do you have an order of magnitude as to what the impact of those changes will have on the allocations to the residential customers?
- A. I don't think it's going to change it that much.
- Q. I know we are talking millions of dollars here. Are we talking one or two, or do you have a sense of again the order of magnitude?
- A. I can estimate that it's probably going to be a few million, say two to four million dollars perhaps, somewhere in that range, again, realizing my analysis isn't finalized yet.
- Q. I understand. Prior to making any changes to the cost-of-service study, do you know what the subsidy excess calculated by the company in the cost-of-service study was?
- A. My recollection for residential it was around a \$19 million subsidy. It was been subsidized

approximately \$19 million.

1.0

- Q. And, again, after making the corrections, will that be a dollar for dollar adjustment to the subsidy excess, or do you know yet?
- A. I'm not sure what you mean by dollar for dollar change in the subsidy excess.
- Q. Well, the order of magnitude on the change in the cost-of-service study you said was two to four million dollars. Does that have the same effect on the subsidy excess?
- A. When I said the two to four million dollars, I meant the change in the subsidy excess for residential. That's the number I'm quoting you.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. So roughly I think that's what it's going to end up, but, again, it's still a draft in progress.
- Q. Okay. Do you know of any corrections to the cost-of-service study at this time that you've come across since you've been rereviewing again?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And what might that be?
- A. The two that come to mind there was an issue with some street lighting gas usage that was

left out of rate GS. It was extremely minor. And then the question on the regression analysis, when we originally prepared that we left out one of the sizes of pipes, and I've gone back and revised that to include all sizes of pipe.

- Q. Which sizes of pipe were left out; do you know?
 - A. I believe it was the 1-1/4.
- Q. And that's the only pipe you've included in the new analysis?
 - A. Yes.

Я

- Q. And do you know what the impact of including the 1-1/4 pipe has had?
- A. It increased the Y intercept. I believe it went to a little over \$3.
- Q. When you say it increased the Y intercept, can you explain what you mean by that?
- A. Yes. If you look at the regression analysis, we plotted all the points, the cost per installed foot of pipe for the various sizes. When you use a regression analysis, you basically fit a straight line using the least squares method, and wherever that line crosses the Y axis, that is the demand component or customer component of mains.

1 Ο. And what was the Y intercept prior to you 2 making changes to the cost-of-service study? 3 I don't recall the exact number, but it Α. was like \$1.80. 4 5 And that's gone to \$3. 6 Α. A little over \$3, yes. 7 Ο. Mr. Storck, I believe I asked you about

your participation in the last rate case, and you

A. That is correct.

didn't file any testimony, correct?

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And do you know who developed the customer component of mains in the last case?
 - A. It was done by Paul Ochsner.
- Q. Before you developed your calculation of customer component in this case, did you look back at what Mr. Ochsner had done in the previous case?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And did you look at what the staff report had said in the last case regarding the calculation of the customer component of mains in the last case?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And did the staff have some recommendations that you recall?
 - A. My recollection is they used the

regression analysis but they deleted at least maybe one or two of our pipe sizes. I don't know for sure.

- Q. And when you originally went through the cost-of-service study, what was the reason for leaving out the 1-1/4 inch mains?
 - A. It was just omission.
 - Q. Okay.

(Discussion off record.)

(Recess taken.)

- Q. (By Mr. Sauer) I'm trying to recall where we were at when we broke off the call. Mr. Storck, I think you were explaining that the omission of the 1-1/4 inch line was a mistake; is that correct?
 - A. Right, it was an omission.
- Q. Okay. And you have now gone back and corrected that mistake.
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. And have you been running various scenarios since you completed the cost-of-service study at the time the case was filed?
- A. No. I've just been working on trying to review all the issues that have come up and make sure I've got them corrected.
 - Q. Okay. And have you run any

cost-of-service studies with instead of the March 1 2 peak day, a February peak day? 3 The one that I'm working on right now Α. trying to finalize by this Friday will have a 5 February 5 peak day in it. 6 Q. Okay. 7 Will that corrected MR. SAUER: 8 cost-of-service study be made available to the 9 parties? That was probably more directed to you, 10 John. 11 Yes, it will, Larry. MR. FINNIGAN: 12 plan to file that with supplemental testimony that 13 Don will sponsor, and it will have that 14 cost-of-service study and the workpapers that relate 15 to it. 16 MR. SAUER: Okay, very good. Thank you. 17 Offhand do you know, Mr. Storck, what Q. 18 percentage of the mains account is allocated to the 19 residential class? 20 I'm not sure I'm following the question. Α. 21 Okay. I think you said there was a 0. 22 K-415 --23 Yes. Α. 24 -- allocation factor, and that's how the Q.

1 mains are allocated between the various customer 2 classes. 3 That is correct. Α. 4 Q. And will the K-415 allocator change as a result of what you're doing here? 5 Yes, it will. Α. 7 Okay. And that study is still not 0. complete so you don't know what the new percentage 9 will be yet. 10 Α. Right. I'm still in the process of 11 running the numbers, and I'm checking to make sure we 12 have everything correct. 13 MR. SAUER: Okay. If we can go off the 14 record here, I may be finished. I'll go over my 15 notes and I'll be right back. 16 THE WITNESS: Okay. 17 (Recess taken.) 18 MR. SAUER: Mr. Storck, I have no further 19 I appreciate your time today. questions. 20 (The deposition concluded at 2:14 p.m.) 21 22 23

29 State of Ohio : SS: County of : 2 I, Donald L. Storck, do hereby certify that I 3 have read the foregoing transcript of my deposition given on Tuesday, February 19, 2008; that together with the correction page attached hereto noting changes in form or substance, if any, it is true and 5 correct. 6 7 Donald L. Storck 8 9 I do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the deposition of Donald L. Storck was 10 submitted to the witness for reading and signing; that after he had stated to the undersigned Notary 11 Public that he had read and examined his deposition, he signed the same in my presence on the ____ day of _____, 2007. 12 13 14 Notary Public 15 My commission expires _____, _____, 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

1	CERTIFICATE
2	State of Ohio : SS:
3	County of Franklin :
4	I, Rosemary F. Anderson, Notary Public in and
5	for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, certify that the within named Donald L. Storck was by me duly sworn to testify to the whole
6	truth in the cause aforesaid; that the testimony was taken down by me in stenotypy in the presence of said
7	witness, afterwards transcribed upon a computer; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the
8	testimony given by said witness taken at the time and place in the foregoing caption specified and
9	completed without adjournment.
10	I certify that I am not a relative, employee, or attorney of any of the parties hereto, or of any
11	attorney or counsel employed by the parties, or financially interested in the action.
12	
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Columbus, Ohio, on this 20th day of February, 2008.
14	
15	Rosemary F. Anderson,
16	Professional Reporter, and Notary Public in and for the
17	State of Ohio.
18	My commission expires April 5, 2009.
19	(RFA-8103-2)
20	
21	
22	

23

ability 18:16 able 12:21 about 9:24 10:3 13:3 14:17 15:22 21:14 25:7 above 13:12 account 20:23 27:18 accountant 5:7 accounting 1:10 5:7,11,13 6:15 across 23:20 action 30:11 actual 17:19,23 18:2,14 20:11 20:19 actually 13:4 adjournment 30:9 adjustment 23:3 administration 5:9,21 affect 17:9 affixed 30:13 aforesaid 30:6 after 4:13,22 23:2 29:10 afternoon 3:6 afterwards 30:7 again 7:19 11:16 14:7 18:5 19:13 22:14,17 23:2,16,20 allocate 13:9 14:18 16:11 allocated 8:5,10 8:11 13:11 14:4 15:2 27:18 28:1 allocating 16:1 allocation 10:14 11:4,8,14,21 12:5,11 13:23 14:14,22 15:6 18:3 20:22 27:24 allocations 7:13 7:16,22 11:5 12:6 13:22 14:15 16:15 17:9 22:9 allocator 12:2,3 12:9 16:10 21:18 28:4 allocators 10:23 11:3 13:5,6,14 14:8 15:15 alone 8:16

Alternative 1:7 analysis 11:23 12:15 13:15 22:18 24:2,10 24:19,21 26:1 Anderson 1:15 30:4,15 annual 16:20 answer 3:15,17 3:23 15:10,22 19:9 answers 3:16 Anthony 2:12 anticipate 22:3 APPEARANCES 2:1 Appendix 10:10 Application 1:3 1:6,9 applied 12:1 13:6 appreciate 28:19 Approval 1:6,10 approximately 23:1 April 6:5 30:18 ARMSTRONG 1:21 around 22:24 asked 21:4 25:7 assist 9:16 attached 29:4 attended 4:15 attorney 3:7 30:10,11 Auditing 5:9 available 27:8 average 12:3,8 13:16 15:23 16:3,6,8 17:18 20:24 21:18 avoid 3:19 aware 19:23 axis 24:23

В Babcock 2:11 back 5:11,12 21:23 24:4 25:15 26:15 28:15 background 4:14 4:17Baker 18:23,24 19:5 Ball 4:15 based 8:8 10:14 11:6,10,17 12:8,13,14 13:11,22 15:1 17:12,14 18:19

20:9,13 basically 8:10 10:20 12:19 16:5 17:20 24:21 basis 11:15 before 1:1,14 3:10 25:14 began 6:5 beginning 7:24 9:24 begins 15:20 behalf 2:4,9 behind 11:14 being 3:2 7:2 believe 6:5 16:21,24 18:23 21:7,17,21 24:8,14 25:7 beside 9:1 between 12:19 13:9 14:4,9 16:9 28:1 board 19:12 book 4:6,7 14:13 14:22 both 12:14 break 3:22,24 14:9 Broad 2:7 broke 26:11 brought 4:5,6 budgeting 6:13 Budgets 5:10 business 5:15 6:12

calculate 16:6 17:21 18:13 calculated 11:18 16:7 18:9 22:21 calculating 18:20 calculation 17:1 18:18 21:17 25:14,19 calculations 20:23 call 26:11 came 5:10 18:10 caption 30:8 career 6:7 case 1:3,6,9 6:21,24 7:17 7:18,20 9:16 20:1 25:8,12 25:15,16,19,20

26:20 cause 30:6 certain 15:1 CERTIFICATE 30:1 certified 3:3 certify 29:3,9 30:5,10 chairman 19:12 change 1:10 22:10 23:6,8 23:12 28:4 changes 22:8,20 25:2 29:5 checking 28:11 Cincinnati 1:17 2:3 Cinergy 5:14 circumstances 13:10 clarify 3:17 **class** 15:7 16:6 16:9 17:21 18:17,20 27:19 classes 8:12 13:22 14:5,9 16:12 28:2 classifications 13:3,12 classified 12:24 college 4:22 Columbus 1:22 2:8 30:13 combination 13:2 13:11 16:10 come 19:20 23:20 23:23 26:22 commission 1:1 29:16 30:18 commissioned 30:4 commodity 10:14 10:21 12:14 13:1 15:5 commodity-rel... 12:5 company 2:4 4:24 5:2 11:2 14:20 18:15 22:21 complete 9:21 10:1 11:12 28:8 completed 22:4 26:19 30:9 component 11:11 11:24,24 13:16 13:18 24:24,24

25:12,15,20

concerned 19:19

computer 30:7

concluded 28:20 consideration 21:24 consultant 9:20 Consumers 2:6,9 3:8 contained 4:7 Contract 5:9 controller 6:12 convert 17:18 coordinator 9:6 9:7 copy 7:8 corporate 5:6,11 5:12 6:15 Corporation 1:16 correct 18:1,3 25:9,10 26:13 26:17 28:3,12 29:5 30:7 corrected 26:16 26:23 27:7 correction 29:4 corrections 23:2 23:18 correctly 21:19 cost8:9 10:22 12:13 13:7,23 24:19 costs 8:11 12:17 12:21 13:1 14:18 15:1 cost-of-service 5:22 8:1,4,5 8:10,13,17 9:1 9:5,10,21 10:1 10:9,24 11:12 14:21 21:5,24 22:20,22 23:8 23:19 25:2 26:4,19 27:1,8 27:14 counsel 2:6 3:8 30:11 County 29:2 30:3 course 12:20 court 3:13 CPA 4:20 cross 19:14 crosses 24:23 current 5:17 6:3 currently 5:16 9:4 customer 10:14 10:21 11:5,8 11:11,24 13:1 13:16 15:6 17:21 18:17 24:24 25:12,15 25:20 28:1

customers 11:7 11:11,18,19,20 12:2 15:2 22:9 D data 4:6,7,10 7:2 15:12 16:14,18 17:2 17:11,13 20:4 20:10,16 day 17:8,12,1217:14,15,20,23 18:2,6,11,13 18:14,16,19 20:5,11,20,23 21:21 27:2,2,5 29:11 30:13 December 4:16 5:1 deleted 26:1 demand 10:15,21 11:24 12:12,14 12:14 13:1,18 15:5 16:1 18:17 24:24 demand-related 12:11 Department 5:8 5:10 depend 17:22 depends 11:1612:9 19:10 deposes 3:3 deposition 1:13 3:9,9 28:20 29:3,9,11 derived 11:21 15:5 18:5 describe 7:11 10:18 16:3 determine 11:23 13:15 15:1 16:7,8,11 develop 10:23 11:4 12:4 16:14,21 developed 10:13 14:8 16:16,19 25:11,14 developing 11:2 22:2 different 11:8 11:13 13:6,6 14:22 15:14 18:3 19:7 differential 16:9 difficult 3:20

direct 7:7 9:11

9:14 17:13,24 19:4 directed 27:9 direction 8:18 directly 9:19 director 5:18,20 discusses 15:5 discussing 7:5 Discussion 26:8 distribution 1:8 12:20,23 doing 20:24 28:5 dollar 23:3,3,5 23:6 dollars 22:12,16 23:9,12 Don 27:13 Donald 1:14 3:1 29:3,7,9 30:5 done 8:13 22:7 25:13,16 down 3:14,16 14:9 15:4 30:6 draft 23:16 Duke 1:3,6,9,16 2:2 5:3,5,24 9:20 Duke's 6:21 duly3:2 30:4,5 during 9:16

each 11:14 15:6 17:21 18:17 early 6:19 East 1:17 2:3 educational 4:14 4:19,21 effect 23:10 either 13:1 electric 7:18 elements 13:7 **Ellers** 9:2,3 embedded 8:5,8 employed 30:11 employee 30:10 employees 8:20 end 9:24 23:16 Energy 1:3,6,9 1:16 2:2 5:3,5 5:24 entailed 10:19 error 21:10,11 21:14,16,16,20 errors 21:4,7 22:1

essentially 9:15

estimate 10:2

22:15

eventually 4:18 everything 12:22 28:12 exact 18:11 25:3 exactly 7:15 20:4 **EXAMINATION 3:4** examined 29:11 excess 13:17 22:21 23:4,6 23:10,12 expand 3:17expense 13:8 experience 14:20 14:24 expires 29:16 30:18 explain 18:5 24:17 explaining 26:12 extremely 24:1

F

F1:14 30:4,15

factor 11:21 27:24 factors 10:14 11:5,9,15 12:5 17:18 18:8 familiar 3:12 far 19:10,19 FAX 1:23 February 1:18 17:12 20:21 27:2,5 29:4 30:13 few 22:16 Fifth 1:21 file 25:9 27:12 filed 19:24 26:20 finalize 27:4 finalized 22:18 finally 13:21 14:12,19 financial 5:15 6:14 financially 30:11 fine 3:18 finished 28:14 Finnigan 2:2 10:11 20:6 27:11 firm 14:11,11 first3:2 10:13 16:6 21:10,11 fit 24:21

following 27:20 follows 3:3 foot 24:20 forecasting 19:16 Forecasts 5:10 foregoing 29:3,9 30:7,8 forget 18:11 form 29:5 formula 21:12 four 22:16 23:9 23:11 Fourth 1:17 2:3 Franklin 30:3 Friday 22:5 27:4 from 3:17 4:10 11:1,2 13:5 15:12 17:18 18:9 19:20,22 front 11:13 15:16 Fuels 5:8 fully 8:5,10,11 functionalized 12:17 further 28:18

go 13:3 14:7 18:18 21:23 28:13,14 goes 14:9 going 22:10,15 23:15 gone 24:4 25:5 26:15 Gonzales 4:9 good 3:6 10:2 27:16 graduated 4:16 ground 3:13 group 17:5,6 GS 24:1

gas 1:4,7 5:13

gathered 10:21

13:22 14:11

Generally 11:14

given 29:4 30:8

general 3:13

16:12

6:8 7:17 23:24

hand 30:13 having 21:24 held 5:4 her 17:20 hereinafter 3:2 hereto 29:4 30:10 hereunto 30:12 high 4:13 history 4:23 Hoying 17:4,16 18:22 19:17

identify 12:21 20:4,10,13 impact 22:8 24:12 Inc 1:4,6,10,21 inch 26:5,13 include 24:5 included 24:9 includes 4:8 including 24:13 Increase 1:4 increased 24:14 24:16 Indiana 5:1,2information 11:1 16:17,19 17:3 17:20 18:8 19:20,22 20:12 input 19:21 installed 24:20 instances 13:2 instead 27:1 intercept 24:14 24:17 25:1 interested 30:11 Interrogatory 21:3 interruptible 14:12 16:13 Investments 5:11 involved 7:2 1.0:5 in-house 8:14 is**sue** 23:24 issues 26:22 items 16:1

J J2:2 Janine 2:5 Jim 9:2 19:2,8 John 2:2 27:10 joined 4:24 Joseph 2:7 Jr2:2 jurisdiction 7:20 jurisdictional 7:12,16,19,21 just 3:22,22 4:6

follow 11:7

4:19 9:17 22:14 23:7 22:11 multiple 10:5 10:24 11:17 mains 11:11,20 11:24 12:13 13:14 12:12 26:6,21 24:24 25:12,20 6:9 opposed 18:14 K 26:5 27:18 28:1 kind 3:24 4:13 name 3:6 18:23 maintenance 13:8 22:14 23:7 14:2 named 30:5 make 26:22 28:11 organization know 3:22 4:17 necessarily making 13:3 19:7,11,13 10:3,6 11:10 14:24 22:19 23:2 organizations need 3:22 17:11 18:22 25:2 19:1,2,2,10,11 new 24:10 28:8 managed 6:13 19:24 22:12,20 next 12:16 15:4 management 6:16 24:3 26:3 23:4,18 24:7 non-reg 5:12 manager 19:16 Notary 1:15 24:12 25:11 many 8:19,20 9:20 12:2 29:10,14 30:4 26:2 27:17 9:24 10:3 11:1 30:16 28:8 11:8 12:7 notes 28:15 knowledge 14:20 man-hours 9:24 K-415 12:13 noting 29:4 March 17:12,14 26:5 13:13,18 27:22 number 11:6,10 17:15 18:6,11 outcome 17:9 11:17,18 12:2 18:12 27:1 15:2 21:11,13 <u>L</u> marginal 8:9 23:13 25:3 outside 9:21 materials 4:4 L1:14 2:5 3:1 numbers 28:11 mathematical 25:6 28:14 29:3,7,9 30:5 21:4 22:1 0 Larry 2:6 3:7 matter 1:3,5,9 OCC 4:10 21:3 27:11 10:24 last 6:21 25:8 Ochsner 25:13,16 P2:7 may 28:14 off5:6 26:8,11 25:12,19,20 maybe 26:1 28:13 late 6:19 mean 8:7 11:6 later 3:21 22:5 Offhand 27:17 15:19 29:4 20:6 23:5 office 3:7 30:13 part 7:11 least 24:22 26:1 24:17 offices 1:16 participated leaving 26:5 means 8:8 Ohio 1:1,4,6,10 8:24 left 24:1,3,6 meant 23:12 1:16,17,22 2:3 participation let 3:22 measure 18:16 liaison 6:15 2:6,8,9 3:7 25:8 meter 18:17 lighting 23:24 29:1 30:2,4,13 method 12:3,9 30:17 parties 27:9 like 4:20 11:6 13:17 16:4 11:20 12:13 okay 4:2,22 7:4 30:10,11 24:22 7:8,9,21 8:7 passed 4:20 15:3 25:4 methodologies line 7:24 10:7 8:19 9:15 **Paul** 25:13 14:17 peak 12:3,8 10:11 15:20 11:20 12:24 methodology 10:8 24:22,23 26:13 17:2 20:3 15:23 20:22 listed21:8 21:20 22:3 Methods 1:11 little 12:20 23:14,18 26:7 Migden-Ostrander 24:15 25:6 26:15,24 27:6 2:5 load 17:5,7,17 27:16,21 28:7 might 23:22 17:19,20,21 28:13,16 million 22:16,16 18:8,9,10 OKEY 1:21 22:24 23:1,9 19:16,17,22 omission 26:6, 12 23:11 20:9 21:13 26:14 millions 22:12 long 6:3 10:6 once 16:6 peaks 18:20 mind 23:23 pending 3:23 look 19:15 20:16 one 6:7 7:20 Mining 5:8 24:18 25:15,18 11:10,16,17,22 people 10:5 minor 24:1 looked 18:7 12:1 13:13 13:11 mistake 26:13,16 21:12 22:2,13 per 24:19 looking 19:22 month 18:12 24:3 26:2 27:3 _____M__ more 16:8 27:9 ones 11:6,13 28:8 moved 5:7 only 7:3 9:11 percentages made 13:21 27:8 much 12:12,22 24:9 14:14,17 magnitude 22:7 14:9,10 16:7

operation 13:8 performed 12:18 operations 5:13 perhaps 22:17 5:14,16 6:8,8 period 6:17 8:9 10:15 11:19 pipe 24:5,6,9,13 order 14:15 22:7 24:20 26:2 pipes 24:4 place 30:8 plan 1:7 27:12 **plant** 13:7 6:14,16 19:14 plotted 24:19 originally 5:5,6 point 6:7 9:9 points 24:19 other 8:19 9:14 position 5:16,17 6:4,6,22 9:3 out 8:11 10:20 9:16 11:18 14:4 positions 5:4 18:10 24:1,3,6 power 5:13 6:8,9 prepare 8:16 10:4prepared 8:18 outlined 13:23 9:11 24:3 presence 29:11 over 19:14 24:15 30:6 PRESENT 2:10 presume 14:21 pretty 12:12,22 previous 25:16 page 7:4,10,24 Primarily 5:21 10:7,11 15:5 primary 5:22 principles 13:23 printed 21:12 **prior** 22:19 25:1 probably 22:15 27:9 process 6:13 particular 6:11 10:18 22:2 28:10 production 12:19 12:21,22 Professional 30:16 13:17 15:22 progress 23:17 16:3,8,19 17:2 provide 16:18 17:8,12,12,14 17:3 17:15,19,21,23 provided 16:20 18:2,6,10,13 16:21 17:3,4 18:14,16,19,21 17:16,17,19 20:5,11,19,23 20:24 21:13,17 18:9 PSI 5:5,11 21:22 27:2,2,5 Public 1:1,15 4:24 5:2 29:11 29:14 30:4,16 pulling 11:1 purpose 7:5,11 **put** 16:5 percentage 27:18 p.m1:18 28:20

qualified 30:5 question 3:15,23 3:24 7:5 B:1 10:8 11:7 15:4 15:19 20:8 24:2 27:20 questions 21:4 28:19 quoting 23:13 _____R ran 6:20 range 6:20 22:17 rate 1:7 5:18,20 6:21,24 8:11 9:16 13:22 15:6 24:1 25:8 rates 1:4 5:16 9:6 read 3:20 29:3 29:11 reading 29:10 realize 22:6 realizing 22:17 really 10:2 reason 18:15 26:4 recall 6:18 7:2 21:2,8,15 25:3 25:23 26:10 Recess 26:9 28:17 recollection 22:23 25:24 recommendations 25:23 record 26:8 28:14 reference 13:24 references 15:9 referred 14:23 referring 14:13 regarding 8:1 10:8 21:4

9:18 repeat 20:8 report 8:20 9:8 9:11,19 18:24 25:18 reported 9:17 reporter 3:14 30:16 reporting 6:16 reports 9:14 18:22 19:4 requests 4:10 7:3 rereviewing 23:20 research 17:5,7 18:9 19:17,22 20:4,9 residential 2:9 14:10,10,10 16:12 22:9,23 23:13 27:19 resources 5:15 9:21 respond 3:15 responding 21:2 response 21:8 responsibilities 5:19,23 rest 16:22,24 result 6:13 18:3 28:5 review 19:21 20:3,9 26:22 revised 21:23 24:4 RFA-8103-230:19 Rick 9:2,3,8 Riddle 19:2,8,20 19:21,24 20:3 Riddle's 19:15 right 4:4,18 5:4 26:14 27:3 28:10,15 role 6:11,17,24 7:3 Room 1:17 Rosemary 1:14 30:4,15 roughly 23:15 rules 3:13 4:1 run 4:13 26:24

28:11**s** same 7:24 12:11 15:19 19:12

running 26:18

S 2:6

23:9 29:11 Sauer 2:6 3:5,7 20:7 26:10 27:7,16 28:13 28:18 saying 3:21 **says** 3:3 10:13 scenarios 26:19 schedule 15:9,12 school 4:13 seal 30:13 second 21:14,16 see 3:13 7:6,15 10:9,15 15:7 15:20 selection 17:8 sense 22:14 Serio 2:7 service 1:8 4:24 5:2 13:7 14:11 16:12 Services 5:18,20 5:24 set 30:12 several 15:14 Shared 5:24 Sharon 2:11 signed 29:11 signing 29:10 Similarly 12:4 Simply 16:5 since 5:3,5 23:20 26:19 **sir** 16:23 sizes 24:3,5,6 24:20 26:2 solely 11:17 some 4:9 7:2 10:22 12:7 13:2,2,10,18 13:21 14:13,20 16:16,16 21:3 21:4 23:24 25:22 something 14:21 21:18 somewhat 3:12 somewhere 22:17 sorry 4:16 16:23 17:6 sources 11:1 South 1:21 speaking 12:10 specific 14:14 14:16 specified 30:8 spent 10:6

squares 24:22 SS 29:1 30:2 staff 5:7 25:18 25:22 started 5:6 6:19 state 1:15 2:9 4:15 7:19 8:4 29:1 30:2,4,17 stated 29:10 statistics 10:15 10:22,22 15:6 stenotypy 30:6 step 12:16,17 15:13 steps 14:3 still 23:16 28:7 28:10 Storck 1:14 3:1 3:6 20:6,7 21:2 25:7 26:11 27:17 28:18 29:3,7,9 30:5 straight 24:22 street 1:17,21 2:3,7 23:24 studies 5:22 8:2 13:23 14:21,22 27:1 study 8:4,5,10 8:13,17 9:1,5 9:10,22 10:1,9 10:24 11:12 21:5,24 22:6 22:20,22 23:8 23:19 25:2 26:4,20 27:8 27:14 28:7 submitted 29:10 subsequent 9:18 subsidiary 5:12 subsidized 22:24 subsidy 22:21,24 23:4,6,10,12 substance 29:5 successors 5:2 Suite 1:21 2:7 summation 21:16 summed 21:18 supervisor 9:19 supplemental 27:12 supported 16:15 sure 4:15 11:7 19:9,13 23:5 26:2,22 27:20 28:11

sworn 3:2 30:5

system 17:23

18:20

T take 3:8,14,16 3:24 10:1 20:22 taken 1:14 3:9 21:24 26:9 28:17 30:6,8 **talk** 15:22 talking 22:12,13talks 14:17 tariff5:21 taxes 13:9 telephone 2:6,7 2:12 tell 11:13 20:19 test 8:9 10:15 20:10,11,17,20 testify 30:5 testimony 4:8,9 4:9 7:4,6,7,10 7:12 10:7 13:24 17:13,24 19:15,24 25:9 27:12 30:6,8 thank 7:9 20:7 27:16 their 19:13 things 15:3 16:11 think 4:20 22:10 23:15 26:12 27:21 third 21:20 three 21:7 through 4:14 6:20 14:2 20:3 20:12 26:3 throughput 12:8 13:19 15:3 20:13,16 time 6:17,21 8:19 9:5,9,10 23:19 26:20 28:19 30:8 today 3:8 4:5 28:19 together 11:1 29:4 total 10:6 transcribed 30:7 transcript 3:21 29:3,9 30:7 transmission 5:14 6:9 transportation 14:11,12 16:13 Treasury 5:10 true 29:5 30:7

truth 30:6

25:19

26:1

15:2

regression 11:23

12:15 13:15

24:2,18,21

Regulated 5:15

12:12 13:1

relative 21:11

rely 14:14,19

21:21 30:10

remember 21:10

reorganization

relate 27:14

related 11:5

sponsor 7:12

27:13

	· · · · · ·		
try 3:15,19	23:7		94 6:19
	went 10:20 11:18	<u> </u>	95 6:19
rying 26:10,21 27:4	12:23 24:15	15:1	956:19
uesday 1:18	26:3	1-1/4 24:8,13	
29:4	were 3:21 6:8,17	26:5,13	
wo 5:22 16:10	7:21,23 9:15	1:18 1:18	<u>{</u>
22:13,16 23:8	10:5,22 12:8	102:7	
23:11,23 26:2	12:12,21,22	1011:21	
25.11,25 20.2	15:12,14 19:22	12-month 18:7	
τι	20:24 21:3,7	137:24	
ıh-huhs 3:19	24:6 26:11,12	1391:16 2:3	
inder 8:18 19:11	weren't6:22	16 15:20	
19:12	West 2:7	1800 2:7	
inderlying 16:14	we're 3:8 18:20	1851:21 191:18 29:4	
16:18	WHEREOF 30:12	1976 4:16 5:1,5	
indersigned	whole 30:5	1982 4:20	1
29:10	wholesale 5:13	19996:20	
understand 3:21	6:8,9 7:18,19	1333 0.20	
22:19	William 18:23,24	<u>2</u>	
unit5:15 6:12	19:5	27:10 10:7,11	
University 4:15	witness 28:16	15:9,12	
un-uhs 3:19	29:10 30:7,8	2:14 28:20	
usage 16:6,20	30:12	20th 30:13	
17:18 23:24	work 4:17,23	20016:22	
use 9:20 13:16	worked 5:8,9,14	20066:5	
14:14,18 16:9	working 26:21 27:3	2007 20:21 29:12	
18:2 24:21	workpaper 15:16	20081:18 29:4	
used 10:8,23 11:23 12:1	workpapers 4:11	30:13	
13:5,13,14	13:5 14:8	2009 30:18	1
14:24 16:1	21:13 27:14	223-94811:22	
17:11,13,20		224-57241:23	1
19:20 25:24	Y	224-9481 1:22 2500 1:17	
using 15:13,14	Y 24:14,16,23	267:4	
18:14 24:22	25:1	299 21:3	
Usually 7:18	Yankel 2:12	23521.3	
UTILITIES 1:1	Yankel's 4:8	3	
utility 14:20	year 18:19 20:10	3 15:9,12	
	20:11,17,20	3.215:16	
<u> </u>	z		
various 10:21	·	4	
13:6 14:5	Zero 8:21,22 Zinnia 17:4,16	410:7,10,11	
16:11 24:20 26:18 28:1	18:22 19:5,16	15:5	
versus 7:19	Ziolkowski 9:2	43215-34852:8	
13:16 15:3		43215-52011:22	
very 12:20 27:16	\$	452022:3	
via 2:6,12	\$1.80 25:4	5	
vis 2:7	\$19 22:24 23:1		
	\$3 24:15 25:5,6	520:21 27:5	
W		30:18	
walk 14:2	0	6	
want 3:16 4:17	07-589-GA-AIR		
19:11	1:3	614 1:22,23	[
wasn't 21:18	07-590-GA-ALT	A	i '
way 5:3	1:6	0001.00	
weeks 10:3	07-591-GA-AAM	800 1:22	
weighting 13:15	1:9	9	
well 13:13,19	!		
	1		