FARUKI IRELAND & COX P.L.L.

22

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

500 Courthouse Plaza, S.W. 10 North Ludlow Street Dayton, Ohio 45402 937-227-3700 Fax 937-227-3717

R. Holtzman Hedrick (937) 227-3727 hedrick@ficlaw.com

February 5, 2009

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Attention: Renee Jenkins **Docketing Division** 180 E. Broad Street, 10th Floor Columbus, OH 43215

RE:

DP&L ESP Filing, Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO et al

Dear Ms. Jenkins:

Enclosed are: (1) fourteen (14) copies of The Dayton Power and Light's Notice of Filing Depositions; and (2) deposition transcripts of:

- Gonzalez, Wilson
- Ibrahim, Amr A. b.
- Duann, Daniel J. C.
- Yankel, Anthony J. d.
- McClelland, Barry E. e.
- Pullins, Steven W. f.
- Fein, David I. g.
- Woolridge, J. Randall h.
- Bowser, Joseph G. 🗸 i.
- Sawmiller, Daniel J. j.
- k. Murray, Kevin M.
- Dickstein, Shelley J. (awaiting transcript) l.
- Frye, Mark R. (awaiting transcript) m.
- Higgins, Kevin C. (awaiting transcript) n.

Very truly yours,

K Holtzman Hedrich

R. Holtzman Hedrick

RHH/tes Enclosures



TRUSTED WISDOM. EXTRAORDINARY RESULTS.

ficlaw.com

This is to certify that the images appearing are ete reproduction sccurate and compl

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the :
Application of The Dayton :
Device and Light Company

Power and Light Company : Case No. 08-1094-EL-SSO

For Approval of Its Electric Security Plan.

In the Matter of the : Application of The Dayton :

Power and Light Company : Case No. 08-1095-EL-ATA

For Approval of Revised Tariffs.

In the Matter of the :
Application of The Dayton :
Power and Light Company :

For Approval of Certain : Case No. 08-1096-EL-AAM Accounting Authority :

Accounting Authority
Pursuant to Ohio Rev.
Code §4905.13.

In the Matter of the : Application of The Dayton :

Power and Light Company : Case No. 08-1097-EL-UNC

For Approval of Its
Amended Corporate
Separation Plan.

DEPOSITION

of Joseph G. Bowser, taken before me, Julieanna Hennebert, a Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, at the offices of McNees, Wallace & Nurick, LLC, 21 East State Street, 17th Floor, Columbus, Ohio, on Wednesday, February 4, 2009, at 9:30 a.m.

	Page 2		Page 4	4
1	APPEARANCES:	1	JOSEPH G. BOWSER	
2	Faruki, Ireland & Cox, P.L.L.	2	being by me first duly sworn, as hereinafter	
3	By Mr, Charles J. Faruki 500 Courthouse Plaza, SW	3	certified, deposes and says as follows:	
3	10 North Ludlow Street	4	EXAMINATION	
4	Dayton, Ohio 45402	5	BY MR. FARUKI:	
5	On behalf of the Applicant.	6	Q. Morning, Mr. Bowser.	
6	Manage Walland & Nimial, LLC	7	A. Good morning.	ļ
7	McNees, Wallace & Nurick, LLC Ms. Lisa G. McAlister	8	Q. You have in front of you a copy of your	
8	Fifth Third Center, Suite 1700	9	own testimony in this case?	
	21 East State Street	10	A. Yes, I do.	
9	Columbus, OH 43215	11	Q. Tell me what else you've brought with you	
10	On behalf of Industrial Energy Users-Ohio.	12	today.	
11	Gagra-Onio.	13	A. I've also brought with me the company's	
12		14	three books of the filing; Books I, II, and III, with	_
13	,	15	the schedules and testimonies, and I've brought FERC	3
14 15		16	form 1 pages that I rely on in an area of my	
16		17	testimony.	
17		18	I also have excerpts from the company's	
18		19	10Q report filed with the Securities & Exchange	
19		20 21	Commission for the quarter ended September 30 of 2008. And I have a copy of Mr. Murray's testimony.	
21		22	Q. Anything else?	
22		23	A. I believe that's it.	
23		24	Q. If you would look at your testimony maybe	
24 25		25	starting on page 2.	
25		20		٠
	Page 3		Page 5	5
1	Wednesday Morning Session,	1	A. Okay.	
2	February 4, 2009.	2	Q. You're not a lawyer, correct?	
3	CTIDLE ATIONS	3	A. No, I am not.	
4	STIPULATIONS	4	Q. You are an accountant?A. Correct.	
5	It is stipulated by and between counsel for the respective parties that the deposition of Joseph	5 6	A. Correct. Q. Are you a CPA?	
7	G. Bowser, a witness called by the Applicant under	7		
8	the applicable Rules of Civil Procedure, may be	8	A. Yes, I am. Q. And how long have you been a CPA?	1
9	reduced to writing in stenotypy by the Notary, whose	-	A. Since 1984.	
10	notes thereafter may be transcribed out of the	10	Q. And you're licensed where?	
11	presence of the witness; and that proof of the	11	A. Pennsylvania.	
12	official character and qualification of the Notary is	12	Q. Are you an economist?	
13	waived.	13	A. No, I'm not.	-
1.4		14	Q. How long have you been employed by the	ا د
15		15	McNees-Wallace firm?	
16		16	A. Since July of 2005.	
17		17	Q. Was it immediately before that that you	
18		18	were director of analytical services at OCC?	
19		19	A. That's correct.	
20		20	Q. For how long did you have that position?	
21		21	A. Approximately ten years.	1
22		22	Q. On page 3, actually starts at the bottom	
23		23	of 2 and continues ending on top of 4, you list a	
24		24	number of cases in which you've offered testimony	۱.
25		25	Did the testimony that you offered in any of those	

Page 9

cases relate to any of the issues you're testifying on about in this case?

1

2

3

4 5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

> 1 2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And take a minute and look at the list, if you like.

A. Yes, in Case 08-935, which was the AEP electric security plan case, in that case I offered testimony with regard to the sale or transfer of generating assets, and I also offer testimony on that issue in this case.

And I believe at this time I believe that's the only case where there was a similar issue to this.

Q. Okay. The issue in the AEP case with regard to sale or transfer of generating assets was different a question than the one presented in this case; is that right?

MS. McALISTER: Just for clarification, Charlie, I think you said AEP and the case was First Energy.

THE WITNESS: It was AEP.

MS. McALISTER: I'm sorry, I thought you said 08-935,

MR. FARUKI: He did say 08-935. Why don't we clear that up then.

Q. I'm looking at line 21 of page 3, Joe.

1 is that right?

2

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

23

25

1

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

24

25

- A. I believe that's correct.
- Q. And are you aware that DP&L built the Tait units, specifically Tait units 1, 2, and 3,

5 after DP&L's last rate case?

- A. Yes, I was aware of that.
 - Q. And you know that its -- by "its" I
- 8 mean DP&L's ownership interest of those units have
- 9 not been in rate base.
 - A. Yes, correct.
 - Q. And I understand you're not a lawyer.
 - You are not rendering an opinion as to whether DP&L's ownership interest or its ability to transfer that

14 interest is restricted by Senate Bill 221, are you?

A. Not as a lawyer, no. But my

16 understanding of Senate Bill 221 is that a company

17 has to have Commission permission to transfer any

18 generating asset. And I don't believe that Senate

19 Bill 221 distinguishes between whether or not those

20 units were ever in rate base or not.

- Q. And what's the basis for that statement?
- A. From my reading of Senate Bill 221.
 - Q. What in particular?
- A. I don't recall the exact section.
 - Q. If you take a look at page 5, line 9.

Page 7

Do you need to revise your other answer?

- A. Yes, I need to revise that, I'm sorry. I picked up the wrong docket number.
 - Q. That's okay.
- A. The correct docket number for the AEP case was 08-917.
 - Q. Okay. Let me restate my question.
 With regard to your question in the AEP

case, the 80-917 case about sale or transfer of generating assets, is it true that that question in

the AEP case was different from the one in this case?

A. It was a very similar issue. I don't believe it was exactly the same. In this case that we're in here, DP&L is giving notice to the Commission of its intent to transfer some generating

assets to an affiliated company.

I believe in the AEP case -- well, you know, I don't recall exactly how it was different.

Q. Fair enough.

Why don't we stay on that issue, if you'd look at page 5 of your testimony, please.

With regard to section II of your testimony, which you've titled "Notice of Intent to Transfer Generating Assets," the Tait assets that are

the subject of the notice have not been in rate base;

A. Yes.

Q. You recognize that Tim Rice's testimony

3 does not discuss the transfer of, to use your phrase

4 in line 9, "contractual entitlements" of part of the5 OVEC ownership interest?

A. I don't understand the question.

Q. Is it accurate -- let me back up one. You've read Mr. Rice's testimony.

A. Yes.

Q. And is it accurate that his testimony does not discuss a notice of intent to transfer contractual entitlements?

A. I don't recall.

Q. You understand that DP&L's ownership with regard to the Ohio Valley Electric Corporation, or OVEC, is not a direct ownership of assets?

A. Well, if we look at Exhibit JGB-1 to my testimony, at page 2 of 2 it indicates there that

19 DP&L has a 4.9 percent equity ownership in OVEC.

Q. Yes, sir.

A. So to me that means they do in effect own the company, and so to me that means that the company does have ownership in the assets of that company.

Q. Let me push you on that in staying with your Exhibit JGB-1, page 2. The 4.9 percent is

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 13

recited as a percentage of equity in OVEC. Do you see that in the second line?

A. Yes, I do.

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And you understand that means the ownership of stock.
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And you recognize the distinction in the real world between the ownership of shares of stock or stock interest on the one hand and ownership of an asset on the other?
- A. Well, in my experience usually they're, you know, it's basically a similar thing. The fact that the company has an equity ownership means that 13 they own a piece of the company.
- O. But it is the company, not the shareholder, that owns the assets, right?
- A. Well, you might be getting into a legal distinction there that I'm not sure I'm qualified to answer.
 - Q. Fair enough.

On page 6, still on the same subject, page 6 you have an answer to question 9 on line 3 that begins "DP&L has owned its share of the OVEC generation assets for a number of years. . . "

Do you see that?

wouldn't be a good idea to transfer generating assets if in fact a short time from now you might have to go out and buy some generating assets to meet your needs.

- Q. When you say "you might have to go out and buy generating assets," you're speculating about that, aren't you?
 - A. Yes, I am. That's hypothetical.
- Q. Similarly on line 19 of this page, page 6, let me read the whole sentence that begins on 17, "By implication, permitting transfer of these assets will result in SSO service that is subject to wholesale pricing volatility and may lead to lower reliability."
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Two questions: The "may lead to lower reliability" is also speculative on your part, isn't
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. What do you mean "subject to wholesale pricing volatility" in that sentence?
- A. To the extent that you don't own the generation yourself or have access to that generation and you have to go out on the wholesale market, you'll be subject to the volatility that can exist in

Page 11

A. Yes.

Q. When you say "DP&L has owned its share of the OVEC generation assets," do you consider that to be similarly a legal conclusion that you are not qualified to opine on?

A. Well, I think what I was doing there was I was saying that that the equity ownership does equate to control or ownership of those assets, and that's just my interpretation not as an attorney.

- Q. And so you agree that you're not able to express any sort of legal opinion that equity ownership is equivalent to asset ownership; is that right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. A bit further down on page 6, line 11, there's a sentence that begins "Given the current turmoil in financial and capital markets. . ."

Would you explain what you mean by that or what you have reference to?

A. Yes, right now I think it's a pretty well known fact that the U.S. economy is in fairly bad shape, there's a great deal of restriction on people and companies being able to obtain credit at this time, banks are hurting, many banks have bad loans outstanding, and so my point here is it doesn't -- it

that market.

And particularly in the case of the OVEC generation, that generation is very reasonably priced.

In 2007 the cost of that was about \$34 per megawatt hour, so that's very reasonably cost generation that would be beneficial to customers.

- Q. What did you consult with that \$34 figure you just listed?
- A. If you look at my Exhibit JGB-2, page 2 of 3, that's a FERC form 1 page and the first column is called megawatt hours purchased, and the number that corresponds with OVEC is the number on line 13, which is 760,729 megawatt hours, and then if you go all the way to the right, there's a total settlement amount of \$26,080,078.

If you divide that at settlement cost by the megawatt hours purchased, you'll get the \$34 per megawatt hour.

- Q. When you are using the term "volatility" both in your answer and in this sentence, what does that mean here?
- A. PJM prices, for instance, which is the RTO that Dayton is part of, prices can vary a great deal over the course of a year, even from hour to

hour during times of peak load in the summertime. So that's the volatility that I'm talking about.

Q. Do you agree that a company should be able to use the assets that are not in its rate base to maximize a return on them?

- A. I would say under normal circumstances, yes, that would be the case.
 - Q. Is the issue that -- I'll withdraw that.

Is the issue in this case as you see it regarding OVEC and Tait one of who should pay for this service as opposed to an issue of reliability?

- A. I don't understand what you mean by "who should pay for this service."
 - Q. Let me ask it more simply then.

Is the question in this case regarding Tait and OVEC as you understand it a reliability question?

- A. It's more of a question of using the company's generating assets in a way that's most beneficial to customers and to be able to meet its load.
- Q. And so you think that these assets that are not in rate base should be used in a way that is most beneficial to customers? Is that the point of your opinions in this case?

whether it's -- there's an amount that is either ultimately due to the company or ultimately due from the company back to rate payors.

Such as if you've got an overrecovery, let's say, under some rider that gets trued up, then the idea is that you recognize the time value of money on that.

- Q. So the carrying charges you're saying should go either way; either in favor of the company or in favor of the customer, so to speak?
- A. Right. If there are -- under usual rider accounting, if there are over- or underrecoveries, there's often a carrying charge rate applied to that so it can either accrue to the company or to the company's customers.
- Q. Couple of questions on your question 12, page 7. I'm interested in figuring out the line between you on the one hand and Mr. Murray on the other.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You have a reference to Mr. Murray's testimony. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And I take it this is simply an opinion of him that you're referencing for completeness?

Page 15

Page 17

- A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And the basis for that is what?
- A. Well, again, my understanding of Senate Bill 221 is that the company has to have Commission approval to transfer any generating assets, not just whether they've been in rate base or not.

So I would think the Commission would want to look at this sort of a transaction and study it and decide whether or not permitting this sort of transfer is in the best interests of the company's customers than the company.

- Q. And the basis for that is the section of Senate Bill 221 that you can't recall; is that right?
- A. It was kind of a long answer. The basis for?
- Q. For your statement I asked you what the basis for your opinion was, you started out by referencing Senate Bill 221. I'm just trying to avoid repeating what I asked you about earlier.
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Let me go on to carrying charge rates, Mr. Bowser, bottom of page 6. Would you tell me the purpose of carrying charges?
- A. The purpose of carrying charges is to recognize the time value of money and depending

- A. Yes. Mr. Murray concludes that the company shouldn't be permitted to defer its fuel-related expenses, and so that's correct, I'm just making that linkage.
 - Q. In other words, just for clarity, Joe, this is Murray's recommendation that you're referencing.
- A. With respect to the deferred fuel, that's correct.
 - Q. Yes, sir.

And going on to the next question, the answer beginning at line 13 -- let me start with this, line 14 where you refer to a debt-based carrying charge, do you know of other cases in which a debt-based carrying charge has been ordered by the Ohio Commission?

- A. Yes, there have been a number of those. Probably the most recent one, in fact it applies to DP&L, was in Case No. 08-1332, and in that case the company asked for authority to defer storm-related costs, and in that case the company requested and the Commission permitted that the carrying costs be based on the company's cost of debt.
- Q. And are you saying that the storm-related costs there are similar to the fuel-related expenses

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

here?

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

- A. Well, they're both an expense item. The storm costs are operation and maintenance expenses, and fuel is also an expense item. So in that sense they are similar.
- Q. Are there any senses in which they're dissimilar?
- A. For the purpose of accruing carrying charges, no. None that I can think of.
- Q. On line 14 you say "...a debt-based carrying charge would be more appropriate. . . "

What's the basis of that statement?

A. Well, typically you know, the company has asked for a rate of return or so-called cost-of-capital-based carrying charge rate. That type of carrying charge rate is normally only applied to capital investments. There's no capital here.

Basically it's what the company should be made whole for here is the cost of carrying that deferral or regulatory asset until amortization occurs.

- Q. Is that the entirety of the basis for this "more appropriate" opinion?
- 24 A. I don't know if it's the entirety but 25 that's my main reason.

A. Well, there are a lot of variables that would enter into determining whether that's a significant figure or not. So I think you have to be more specific.

- Q. So you don't have an opinion on that?
- A. No. Without more information, no.
- O. Given the magnitude of the number over a two-year period, the \$163 million, would it be reasonable to consider that these expenses are funded in the ratio of the overall cost of DP&L's capital weighting?
- A. Again, I don't have enough information to know that. I haven't looked at the company's cash flow statements, for instance, to know how much free cash flow the company is generating versus what the company has to borrow either long term or short term. So I don't really have an opinion on that.
- Q. All right. Just to finish up then, would it be accurate, sir, that you don't have an opinion on whether it would be reasonable for DP&L to carry the \$163 million in costs for a long period of time with only a debt return if it is going to cost the company more than that to carry these costs?
- A. No, that's not my opinion. I think the debt cost is totally appropriate carrying costs

Page 19

Page 21

- Q. I just want to make sure I get all of them. If there are any others, tell me, and if not, I'll move on.
 - That's mainly it.
- Q. Do you know under DP&L's filing how long is possible deferral for the deferred fuel costs?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Do you recall that it was two years of deferral and then recovery over ten years up to 12 years?
- A. I don't recall exactly, but that sounds approximately correct, yes.
- Q. Do you recall the order of magnitude of the deferrals for 2009 and 2010?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. I'll tell you, I'll represent to you, you can accept this subject to check, that it was \$52 million in 2009 and 111 million in 2010. So it totals approximately 163 million.

Do you know the source of the funding for 21 the cash outlay to fund those expenditures?

- A. No, I don't.
- Q. Do you agree that for a company DP&L's size that is a significant number? And by "that" I mean the 163 million.

because long term debt is typically issued for ten or 1 2 more years.

So if long term debt happened to, which I don't know, but happened to be a source of funding for this to the company, then no, the debt-based carrying charge would be entirely appropriate.

Q. Let me go on to question 14, on page 7. Your answer on line 19 begins "The structure of the deferral mechanism is problematic from my perspective."

What do you mean when you reference "the structure of the deferral mechanism"?

A. Basically there what I'm talking about is the fact that it is a deferral that's being proposed there. As Mr. Murray said, he doesn't believe that the deferral is appropriate, and I think one of the things is I think it's if you don't have to defer costs, it's a better idea not to do that.

And I think it helps me lead to my conclusion that it would be -- this entire plan I think would be a better idea if it was proposed to last for a longer period of time than has been proposed by the company.

MR. FARUKI: Read me that last sentence of his answer.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

23

24

25

Page 25

(Record read.)

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Let me ask you, sir, about that last sentence where you say "this entire plan would be a better idea if it were proposed to last for a longer period of time."

What do you mean by that?

A. In other words, the plan that the company's operating under right now ends December 31, 2010. Basically this current case is proposing the initiation of several riders, some of those riders would extend out into the future beyond the period of the plan.

And if there was a way to provide for a longer plan than some of those, I think, costs that are anticipated to be recovered might be able, if there had to be deferrals, to be recovered within the period of that longer plan.

- Q. So just going over to page 8, is that what you're referencing, approximately lines 17 to 20, when you talk about "extending the current plan's term"?
- 22 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 23 Q. I just want to make sure I'm following 24 you.
- 25 A. Yes.

That's what you would try to do, correct.

Q. Going back to the deferral option or approach, if there is a deferral, then -- deferral of fuel costs, of course, is what I'm talking about.

5 If there is a deferral of fuel costs,

Mr. Bowser, what is the near-term affect on customers in terms of rates they would pay?

- A. Well, first of all, Mr. Murray recommends that there not be a deferral.
 - O. I understand.
- A. So we don't believe that the deferral is appropriate.

But basically what -- one of the ways it could be handled would be through a phase-in of rates. And again, talking about Senate Bill 221 and the fact that I'm not an attorney, I believe though that it does anticipate that there can be a phase-in, you know, to help moderate rates, for instance.

Q. You talk about a phase-in later in your testimony. I'll get to that, but let me go back to my question.

Assume no phase-in, and assume no deferral, what is the effect near term on customer rates?

MS. McALISTER: Excuse me, just for

Page 23

Q. So when you're talking, for example, in line 18 on page 8 about "extending the current plan's term," can you amplify what your thought is there?

A. Yeah, in other words, to me if there was a way to make the plan, let's say, extend for several years, perhaps out through 2013 or '14, that to me just as a big regulatory picture would make more sense.

Pretty soon we're going to be halfway through 2009 by the time probably the company gets an order and gets something in place, and in another year and a half the current plan's going to expire, so very quickly we're going to be back, I think, doing another plan.

- Q. So just so I'm understanding, you would be talking about an extension of the current plan's term and no deferrals; that's the thought, right?
- A. That would be the preferred way of doing it, correct.
- Q. And so at the bottom of page 7 when you talk about it being "more appropriate to have current period recognition," under your thought there would be current period recognition, to use your phrase, through whatever year the plan was extended. Do I have that right?

clarification did you say "no deferral"?

2 MR. FARUKI: Yes; no deferral and no 3 phase-in. 4

MS. McALISTER: Okay, thank you.

O. You understand my question?

- A. It would depend on what the company's actual fuel costs are then.
- Q. Well, suppose it was approximately 163 million in '09 and '10.
- A. Then the company would book those expenses.
 - Q. Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you.
- A. No, no, go ahead, I'm finished.
- Q. Wouldn't it have near term an effect of increasing customer rates as compared to the situation where there was a deferral of those expenses?
- A. Well, I don't believe so under the current plan.
- 20 Q. Tell me where in your testimony you 21 talked about phase-in. I know it was in here 22 someplace.
 - A. I believe it's on page 8 at line 4.
 - Q. Oh, thank you.
 - Are you expressing an opinion on whether

- 1 a phase-in should be adopted?
 - A. No, I'm just saying that's an option.
- Q. Okay. Focusing on your testimony, page 8, lines 7 through 11, Mr. Bowser. I'll give you a chance to read that to yourself first.
 - A. Okay,

б

- Q. Are you saying, in other words, that the amount should be included in rates in 2009 and '10?
- A. Well, I'm saying that the fact that it would be preferred that any deferrals be amortized during a current ESP or plan period, that -- I'm sorry, I lost my train of thought. What was your question?
- Q. Let me have the question read back and as much of your answer as you finished.

(Record read.)

- A. Yeah, this supports again my contention of why you might want to have the period of planning be longer, because it would give more time to permit those amortizations to take place. If there were any,
- Q. With regard to your answer to question
 15, begins on page 8, I guess going through question
 17. As I understand what you are proposing or
 recommending, it is that a debt-based carrying charge

Page 27

would apply to each of the items that you're listing on page 9, lines I to 7; is that right?

A. If carrying charges were permitted by the Commission on those items, then yes.

- Q. And the reason for that recommendation or opinion is the same as we covered before with regard to a debt-based carrying charge?
- A. That's correct.
 - Q. No additional reasons, in other words?
 - A. Not that I can think of right now.
- Q. On page 9, line 18, part of your answer talks about better reflecting the cost of carrying over/underrecoveries; do you see that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And why do you say would "better reflect" that cost?
 - A. Well, typically over/underrecoveries are something that get trued up no less frequently than once a year. So if there were dollars that did represent an under- or overrecovery, then a debt-based carrying charge rate would make more sense than a cost-of-capital-based carrying charge rate.
 - Q. If carrying charges are authorized, you think an annual true-up is sufficient?
 - A. It would depend on the circumstances

perhaps of a particular rider, but just as a general matter, I would think annually would be administratively an efficient way to do it.

MR. FARUKI: Off the record.

(Off the record.)

Q. Back on the record.

I had a few questions on your section IV,
Mr. Bowser.

A. All right.

Q. First a general question: Do you have any -- are you expressing an opinion with regard to the suitability of a rider to collect distribution infrastructure costs?

Leaving aside the level of the cost, I'm just talking about the suitability of the rider.

A. No, I'm not.

Q. And the answer that begins on page 10, line 5 -- I'll withdraw that.

Are you expressing any opinion in this case on whether or not the company needs to expend funds for distribution infrastructure?

A. No, I am not.

Q. Are you expressing an opinion in this case as to whether the company's cost estimates are reasonable or justified?

Page 29

A. No.

Q. On page 10, line 10, you're asked a question as to whether you believe that the company's proposal for the infrastructure investment rider should be approved as part of the ESP, and your answer begins "Not in its present form."

Tell me why you answer it that way.

A. Yes, there are a couple reasons for that. The main reason is the levelization methodology that the company has proposed, and the other reason is the significance of the dollars that are being expended.

And as I note in my testimony, the capital dollars that are estimated to be spent for Smart Grid and AMI are over 40 percent of the company's current net distribution plant investment, so these dollars are extremely significant as they relate to the company's plant in service.

- Q. If I understand what you're saying, you're explaining that the significance of the dollars being expended, in other words, the order of magnitude of the dollars is what makes the levelization methodology inappropriate?
- A. No, it's not. No, those are two separate issues.
 - Q. Then I'm misunderstanding.

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

18

22

25

4

5

6

7

10

11

14

21

22

23

Leave aside the levelization methodology then and explain to me what your reasoning is about the significance of the dollars being expended.

1

2

3

4

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Because those dollars are so significant and the timeline for these cases is short, my recommendation is that the company seeks recovery of these costs in a distribution case.
- Q. And what is the benefit of starting --I'll withdraw that. Let me give you a better auestion.

Can you contrast for me what the difference is between starting recovery under a rider now versus starting recovery in a distribution rate case later?

- A. It's in the ability to analyze the costs and make sure that those costs should be incurred. So it's the fact of having more time in a distribution case.
- Q. You would achieve the same goal with a reconciliation or true-up, would you not?
- A. You could do that, but I don't believe 21 22 the company is proposing any true-up for rider IIR. 23 At least not through 2015.
 - Q. If you -- I'm looking for a non-pejorative word -- added a reconciliation or

Q. From 2011 forward can you contrast the revenues requirements under the levelization approach?

- 4 A. At some point -- without looking at the 5 schedule, at some point they'll cross over in the two revenue streams and then in the later years, for 6 instance, 2014 and 2015, the recoveries under the levelization approach would be lower than the revenues that the company would collect under the traditional approach that I advocate.
 - Q. There would be some portion of the seven years where the revenue requirement would be greater?
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 Q. You haven't looked at which years that 15 would be?
- 16 A. It's on the schedule but I haven't looked at that one for a while. 17
 - Q. Which schedule do you have reference to?
- A. It's, I believe it's the A1 or A2 19 20 schedule.
- 21 It's A2 in Book II.
 - MR. FARUKI: Off the record.
- (Off the record.) 23
- 24 Q. Back on the record.
 - Mr. Bowser, while we were off the record

Page 31

true-up for the company's proposal, would you find that satisfactory?

- A. If you looked at that issue in isolation, yes. But I still disagree with the levelization approach for the rider and the fact that there are no -- well, I'm sorry, that's it,
- Q. Then let me go to your levelization point and ask you to explain that to me.
- A. All right. Under the proposal the company would collect a revenue requirement under this rider basically in an equal amount for the seven vears of the rider.

And what that has the effect of doing is it increases the revenue requirement the customers would be expected to pay in the early years of the application of the rider, particularly 2009 and 2010, above what that rider would be if it were based -- if the rider were set on the incurrence of cost; as costs were incurred.

- Q. And so if you didn't have the levelization approach, costs would be lower in the '09 and 2010 period?
- 23 A. The revenue requirements that would be recovered from customers would be lower in those 24 years, that's right. 25

Page 33 you looked up the schedule that to which you had

2 referenced. Can you tell us what that was? 3

- A. Yes. It's Schedule A2, page 1 of 1, in Book II, and the numbers that I cite in my testimony on page 12, lines 17 and 18, appear on that Schedule A2, on lines 29 and 31.
 - Q. Thank you.

8 Let me ask you then on page 11, about 9 line 12, a sentence that begins "In the alternative..."

- A. Yes.
- O. This is an alternative recommendation 12 you're making? 13
 - A. Correct.
- O. And specifically it's an alternative to 15 16 what?
- 17 A. To what the company is proposing.
- 18 Q. On line 14 of page 11 you recommend that 19 the "increase should be limited to a single year's rate increase"; is that right? 20
 - A. That would be one way to do it, yes.
 - Q. And what would you see is the benefit of that as an alternative approach?
- A. It would allow more time to then evaluate 24 25 the appropriateness of the company's plans and the

Page 37

costs that they expect they'll incur. 1

Q. Page 12, please. Sentence that begins on line 6 -- sorry, line 5, where it says "Given the magnitude..."

Do you see that?

A. Yes.

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11. 12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

- Q. When you are talking about ramping up recovery under a traditional cost recovery model, what does that mean?
- A. If you think about capital costs, capital costs get incurred, those get included in the rider and the company typically gets a return on those dollars.

So as the program is rolled out, so to speak, typical programs, those construction dollars will ramp up over time as the program is rolled out.

And so that basically then leads to being able to recognize the actual costs that have been incurred and reflecting those costs in the rider.

- Q. The paragraph that starts on page 12, line 19, is the problem that is described in that paragraph one that would be addressed by a true-up provision?
- A. Well, there would still be the levelization problem as well.

this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Q. In line 5 you say, you have a statement about the Commission considering "an ESP that would run longer than the period that DP&L is proposing."

Are you offering an opinion or recommendation as to how much longer?

- A. I didn't have a particular period in mind, but at least three or four years.
- Q. Three or four years longer or three or four years total?
- A. Three or four years total. But it could be even longer. I haven't really thought that through in detail.
- Q. Changing subjects and talking about the creditworthiness section, section V of your testimony, sir, do you know what the risk is that the creditworthiness provision was to address?
- A. Because I failed to see a relationship between a customer's creditworthiness dropping below the highest credit classification of the company and necessarily translates into the fact that then that customer should somehow have their economic development program terminated.

So I guess I didn't see what the provision was -- why it's really there.

Page 35

Q. So it's partially addressed by a true-up provision; is that right?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Would you tell me with respect to footnote 1 on page 12 what your basis is for supporting the company's proposal to collect the IIR, the investment infrastructure fixed cost on a per-customer basis?
- A. Yes, because those costs are fixed and don't vary with consumption, it can make exception to allocate those on a per-customer basis. It could also make sense to do that on a demand basis.

You know, kilowatt hours, not so good because that's based on usage.

- Q. In your opinion is it preferable to collect them on a per-customer basis?
 - A. For these particular costs, yes, I do.
 - Q. And why is that?
 - A. For the answer I just gave.
- Q. Page 13, the answer or the sentence on line 3 that begins "In addition," could you tell me 21 your reasoning for that statement?
 - A. I think I already answered that when we had the discussion earlier about the deferrals and extending the period of the plan that results from

Q. You're familiar with the concepts of business risk and credit risk?

- A. Generally, yes.
 - Q. What is credit risk as you understand it?
- 5 A. It's the risk that a customer won't pay 6 their bill, let's say.
- 7 Q. I take it it's not your position that 8 there should be no creditworthiness provision whatsoever; is that correct?
 - A. As this provision is written I don't think it should be there.
 - O. I understand.

Your recommendation is that the creditworthiness provision in the company's proposal be removed; is that right?

- A. Yes.
- 1.7 Q. And I'm asking you a different question: 18 Are you offering an opinion that there should be no
- 19 creditworthiness provision at all?
- 20 A. No, I'm not.
- 21 Q. Put more simply, would you agree that
- 22 some creditworthiness provision would be appropriate? 23 A. There may be, but that provision could --
- you know, that's pretty wide open as to what that 24 25 provision might entail. So I can't anticipate

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 necessarily what might be in there, so it's hard for me to answer that, it's a pretty wide open question. 2
 - O. Well, it's not your position that DP&L should bear the credit risk of the company regardless of that company's financial stability, is it?
 - A. That's correct.

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

1.3

1.4

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 7 Q. What we're talking about here is an 8 economic development program or arrangement; is that 9 correct?
 - A. Yes, it is,
 - Q. And more specifically, who would bear the risk of default by the company that has proposed the economic development program in order to achieve that benefit?
 - A. Well, again, it doesn't appear to me that this is what that's addressing at all. It seems to allow for a degree of interpretation that merely because a customer's credit drops below what the company considers the highest credit classification, then the company could unilaterally terminate the contract. It just seems extreme.
- Q. If we leave aside the highest 22 23 classification point, do you see a business rationale or economic rationale for including a 24 25 creditworthiness provision that would protect DP&L in

- the type of costs as opposed to the amount that the
- rider seeks to recover is appropriate? 2
 - A. Correct.
- 4 Q. The last sentence of your answer to 5 question 24 reads "The Company is proposing that 6 Rider AER be refiled annually and trued-up to actual 7 costs."
 - A. Yes.
- 9 Q. I take it from your testimony that if 10 this rider is adopted or recorded, you would agree 11 with that?
 - A. I think that's a reasonable period to do true-ups, yes.
 - Q. Over to page 15, please. Tell me the basis for the opinion that you're expressing in the paragraph on lines 9 through 17, when you say in lines 11 and 12 if hydro, solar, or wind facilities are built, such costs are more appropriately collected on a per-customer basis, demand basis, or a percentage of customers' bills.
 - A. It's similar to what we talked about on rider IIR, if the costs are fixed, for those facilities your main costs for hydro, solar, or wind is the cost of the plan itself.
 - And so it makes sense to recover those

- the event of a customer's default?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And what would be that rationale or 3 4 purpose?
 - A. Well, the company shouldn't necessarily have to absorb, you know, or take a financial hit because of a company's -- or, a customer's failure.
 - Q. In general terms, you know or you are familiar with the reasonable arrangement statute Section 4905.31?
- 11 A. Not very familiar.
- 12 Q. You know it exists.
- A. Yes, I do. 13
- O. And you're aware that an economic 14 15 development arrangement would be one type of 4905.31 reasonable arrangement? 16
 - A. You're getting beyond my knowledge here. I don't know.
 - Q. Okay. On page 14 you have a section that is dealing with the AER rider.
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. You understand the purpose of that rider would be for recovery of the costs of complying with the targets set by the legislation for renewable energy and advanced energy?

type of cost recovery; is that right? A. Correct. Q. Forgive me, I neglected to ask one more

not object to the use of a rider in concept for this

about for the other rider: As I understand it you do

A. That's how I understand it, yes. Q. Similar question to what I asked you

8 question about the previous subject on 9 creditworthiness. I didn't ask you about the refund 10 feature. If we could go back to that for a minute.

I take it it is not your recommendation or opinion in this case that the customer could get the benefit of an economic development arrangement and then default without any consequences to the customer; is that correct?

- I didn't address that issue.
- Q. Let me go back to the AER rider then.

You are not expressing here an opinion as to whether the cost -- whether the level of costs to be recovered under the AER rider is appropriate; is that correct?

- A. That is correct.
- O. And likewise, and I'm looking, sir, at page 14, approximately lines 12 to 18, you are not expressing an opinion as to whether or not the costs,

Page 39

3

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

1

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

23

24

25

Page 43

costs from customers then on a demand basis, a percentage of bills, or a per-customer basis.

Because what you do then is you -- with your existing rate design that you have, you're maintaining that revenue responsibility among classes, how that's allocated by using one of those methods.

Q. Then you go on beginning on line 14 to talk about the purchase of RECs, or renewable energy credits, and you say a demand basis or percentage of bills would also be a reasonable way to collect those costs.

Why do you say that?

- A. Again, looking at the bigger picture, those being purchased to meet an overall renewable requirement that DP&L has, so to me it makes sense to recover those costs on, let's say, a demand basis.
- Q. And do you have a criticism of the rate design of the AER rider as the company proposed it?
- A. Yes. As opposed to being set at a rate per kilowatt hour for all customers, which I address on line 12 at page 14, I believe that it should be, the rate should be developed preferably on a demand basis.
 - Q. Why do you say "preferably on a demand

for a fuel deferral, which we had discussed earlier. 1

2 And one his conclusions is that the company's current revenues are allowing the company 3 4 the opportunity to recover all of its costs.

And one of the ways that you can get an indication of that is based on the company's ROE, and so that's why I have this ROE, or return on common equity reference in my testimony.

- Q. So when you say there's a linkage to Mr. Murray's testimony, are you saying that what you have on page 16 is part of the foundation for him?
- A. Yes. He relies on that calculation to 12 say, yes, the company has robust earnings and it helps him lead to his conclusion that I mentioned earlier.
 - Q. Page 16, line 6 -- well, 6 and 7, you say -- you are citing to the earnings of the parent company; is that right? DPL, Inc.?
- 19 A. I mention both DP&L and DPL, Inc., the 20 parent, yes.
- 21 Q. DPL, Inc. is not a party to this case, 22 right?
 - A. No, it's not.
- 24 Q. How is the level of earnings or the 25 number for earnings for DPL, Inc. pertinent to the

Page 45

basis"?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3 4

5

6

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

- A. It's an easy way to administer demand as a charge per kilowatt. It's fairly easy to administer. And again, it preserves that relative revenue responsibility within between rate groups.
- Q. At the bottom of page 15 you recommend that it would be "collected from customers either on a demand basis or as a percentage of customers' bills."

Would there be an advantage to doing it as a percentage of customers' bills?

- A. That would also be acceptable. I don't know that there's necessarily an advantage in doing that over doing it on a demand basis, but either one would be acceptable I believe.
- Q. Go to page 16. Your section VII is headed "Financial Condition of DP&L," and you've got a single question on company's profitability.

What was the pertinence of this subject to your testimony in this case?

- 21 A. It's some linkage with Mr. Murray's testimony. 22
 - Q. And explain that linkage to me, please.
- 24 A. Okay. In Mr. Murray's testimony he 25 discusses again the -- whether there's a need or not

- recovery of fuel costs by its subsidiary DP&L?
- 2 A. Well, the fact that DP&L, the subsidiary, 3 is profitable has a bearing on DPL's profitability,
- 4 and given that, I looked at information, for
- instance, in the company's 10Q report, and you can 5
- 6 see that DPL's robust earnings are largely due to 7
 - DP&L, the subsidiary company.
 - O. Are you suggesting that the Commission should use the earnings of DPL, Inc., the parent, as a proxy for the earnings of DP&L?
- A. Not necessarily, I'm just using that as a 11 12 comparison.
 - Q. And why would you use that as a comparison as opposed to looking at the earnings of DP&L?
 - A. Well, I think it's important to look at both because while DP&L is the regulated company and is the subject of this proceeding, the financial community looks at DPL, the parent company, because that's where the stock is traded.

21 MR. FARUKI: Off the record.

22 (Off the record.)

Q. Back on the record.

Just a few more questions, Mr. Bowser. Have I covered all of your opinions in

	Page 46			Page	48
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 1 22 23 24 25	this case? A. I don't know. I can't say that you've covered everything necessarily. I know we covered you asked questions on every main area that I addressed, I can say that. Q. You're not expressing opinions, as I understand it, on the suitability or desirability of any of the customer conservation and energy management, or CCEM programs; is that correct? A. That's correct. Q. And you're not expressing any opinions with regard to the subject of collaboratives; is that correct? A. No, I'm not. MR. FARUKI: That's all I have. Thank you for your time. (Signature not waived.) (Deposition concluded at 10:55 a.m.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 4 25	CERTIFICATE State of Ohio : SS: County of Franklin 1, Julicanna Hennebert, Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, certify that the within named Joseph G. Bowser was by me duly sworn to testify to the whole truth in the cause aforesaid, that the testimony was taken down by me in stenotypy in the presence of said witness, afterwards transcribed upon a computer; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony given by said witness taken at the time and place in the foregoing caption specified and completed without adjournment. I certify that I am not a relative, employee, or attorney of any of the parties hereto, or of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties, or financially interested in the action. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Columbus, Ohio, on this 4th day of February, 2009. Julicanna Hennebert, Registered Professional Reporter, and Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio. My commission expires February 19, 2013. (JUL-1365)		
	Page 47			ه ۱۹۵۰ میسیوسی د ۱۹۵۰ میلاد در	PARALITA MARIANA
1	State of Ohio :				
2 3 4 5	: SS: County of : I, Joseph G. Bowser, do hereby certify that I have read the foregoing transcript of my deposition given on Wednesday, February 4, 2009; that together with the correction page attached hereto noting changes in form or substance, if any, it is true and correct.				
6 7	correct.				
8 9 10	Joseph G. Bowser I do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the deposition of Joseph G. Bowser was 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				
12 13	of, 2008.				
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	My commission expires				

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			rage
A	19:23 37:21 41:10	appropriate 18:11	28:6 32:24 40:10	bills 41:20 42:2,11
ability 8:13 30:15	ahead 25:13	18:23 20:25 21:6	40:17 45:23	43:9,11
able 11:10,23 14:4	allocate 35:11	21:16 23:21 24:12	bad 11:21,24	bit 11:15
14:20 22:15 34:18	allocated 42:6	37:22 40:20 41:2	banks 11:24,24	book 25:10 32:21
	allow 33:24 38:17	appropriately	base 7:25 8:9,20	33:4
absorb 39:6	allowing 44:3	41:18	14:4,23 15:6	books 4:14,14
accept 19:17	alternative 33:10	appropriateness	based 17:22 31:17	borrow 20:16
acceptable 43:12	33:12,15,23	33:25	35:14 44:6	bottom 5:22 15:22
43:15	Amended 1:15	approval 1:4,7,10	basically 10:12	23:20 43:6
access 12:23	AMI 29:14	1:14 15:5	18:18 21:13 22:9	Bowser 1:18 3:7
accountant 5:4	amortization 18:20	approved 29:5	24:13 31:11 34:17	4:1,6 15:22 24:6
accounting 1:11	amortizations	approximately	basis 8:21 15:2,12	26:4 28:8 32:25
16:12	26:20	5:21 19:12,19	15:14,17 18:12,22	45:24 47:3,7,9
accrue 16:14	amortized 26:10	22:19 25:8 40:24		48:5
accruing 18:8	amoruzed 20:10 amount 13:16 16:1		35:5,8,11,12,16	
accurate 9:7,10		area 4:16 46:4	41:15,19,19 42:1	brought 4:11,13,15
20:19	26:8 31:11 41:1	arrangement 38:8	42:2,10,17,24	built 8:3 41:18
achieve 30:19	amplify 23:3	39:9,15,16 40:13	43:1,8,14	business 37:2 38:23
38:13	analytical 5:18	aside 28:14 30:1	bear 38:4,11	buy 12:3,6
action 48:11	analyze 30:15	38:22	bearing 45:3	C
actual 25:7 34:18	annual 27:24	asked 15:16,19	beginning 17:12	calculation 44:12
41:6	annually 28:2 41:6	17:20 18:14 29:2	42:8	
added 30:25	answer 7:1 10:19	40:2 46:4	begins 10:23 11:16	called 3:7 13:12
addition 35:21	10:22 13:21 15:14	asking 37:17	12:10 21:8 26:23	capital 11:17 18:17
additional 27:9	17:12 21:8,25	asset 8:18 10:10	28:17 29:6 33:9	18:17 20:10 29:13
address 36:17	26:15,22 27:11	11:12 18:20	34:2 35:21	34:10,10
40:16 42:21	28:17 29:6,7	assets 6:8,14 7:10	behalf 2:5,10	caption 48:8
addressed 34:22	35:19,20 38:2	7:16,24,24 9:16	believe 4:23 6:10	carry 20:20,23
35:1 46:5	41:4	9:23 10:16,24	6:10 7:13,17 8:2	carrying 15:21,23
addressing 38:16	answered 35:23	11:3,8 12:1,3,6,11	8:18 21:15 24:11	15:24 16:8,13
adjournment 48:9	anticipate 24:17	14:4,19,22 15:5	24:16 25:18,23	17:14,15,22 18:8
administer 43:2,4	37:25	assume 24:22,22	29:3 30:21 32:19	18:11,15,16,19
administratively	anticipated 22:15	attached 47:4	42:22 43:15	20:25 21:6 26:25
28:3	appear 33:5 38:15	attorney 11:9 24:16	beneficial 13:7	27:3,7,12,21,22
adopted 26:1 41:10	APPEARANCES	48:10,11	14:20,24	27:23
advanced 39:25	2:1	authority 1:11	benefit 30:8 33:22	case 1:4,7,10,14 4:9
advantage 43:10,13	applicable 3:8	17:20	38:14 40:13	6:2,5,6,6,9,11,13
advocate 32:10	Applicant 2:5 3:7	authorized 27:23	best 15:10	6:16,18 7:6,9,9,11
AEP 6:5,13,18,20	application 1:3,6,9	avoid 15:19	better 21:18,21	7:11,13,17 8:5
7:5,8,11,17	1:13 31:16	aware 8:3,6 39:14	22:4 27:12,15	13:2 14:7,9,15,25
AER 39:20 40:17	applied 16:13	a.m 1:22 46:18	30:9	17:19,19,21 22:9
40:20 41:6 42:19	18:16	A1 32:19	beyond 22:11 39:17	28:20,24 30:7,14
affect 24:6	applies 17:18	A2 32:19,21 33:3,6	big 23:7	30:18 36:1 40:12
affiliated 7:16	apply 27:1		bigger 42:14	43:20 44:21 46:1
affixed 48:13	approach 24:3 31:5	<u>B</u>	bill 8:14,16,19,22	cases 5:24 6:1
aforesaid 48:6	31:21 32:3,8,10	back 9:7 16:3 23:13	15:4,13,18 24:15	17:14 30:5
agree 11:10 14:3	33:23	24:2,20 26:14	37:6	cash 19:21 20:13
agree II'IA (4'2	. • •			

20:15	commission 1:1	conclusions 44:2	40:25 41:1,7,18	20:25 21:1,3
cause 48:6	4:20 7:15 8:17	Condition 43:17	41:22,23 42:1,12	debt-based 17:13
CCEM 46:9	15:4,7 17:16,22	consequences	42:17 44:4 45:1	17:15 18:10 21:5
Center 2:8	27:4 36:3 45:8	40:14	cost-of-capital-b	26:25 27:7,21
Certain 1:10	47:16 48:18	conservation 46:8	18:15 27:22	December 22:8
CERTIFICATE	commissioned 48:4	consider 11:3 20:9	counsel 3:5 48:11	decide 15:9
48:1	common 44:7	considering 36:3	County 47:2 48:3	default 38:12 39:1
certified 4:3	community 45:19	considers 38:19	couple 16:16 29:8	40:14
certify 47:3,9 48:5	companies 11:23	construction 34:15	course 13:25 24:4	defer 17:2,20 21:17
48:10	company 1:4,7,10	consult 13:8	Courthouse 2:3	deferral 18:20 19:6
chance 26:5	1:14 7:16 8:16	consumption 35:10	covered 27:6 45:25	19:9 21:9,12,14
changes 47:5	9:22,22,23 10:13	contention 26:17	46:3,3	21:16 24:2,3,3,5,9
Changing 36:14	10:14,15 14:3	continues 5:23	Cox 2:2	24:11,23 25:1,2
character 3:12	15:4,11 16:2,3,9	contract 38:21	CPA 5:6,8	25:16 44:1
charge 15:21 16:13	16:14 17:2,20,21	contractual 9:4,12	credit 11:23 36:20	deferrals 19:14
17:14,15 18:11,15	18:13,18 19:23	contrast 30:11 32:1	37:2,4 38:4,18,19	22:16 23:17 26:10
18:16 21:6 26:25	20:15,16,23 21:5	control 11:8	credits 42:10	35:24
27:7,21,22 43:3	21:23 23:10 25:10	copy 4:8,21	creditworthiness	deferred 17:8 19:6
charges 15:23,24	28:20 29:10 30:6	Corporate 1:15	36:15,17,19 37:8	degree 38:17
16:8 18:9 27:3,23	30:22 31:10 32:9	Corporation 9:15	37:14,19,22 38:25	demand 35:12
Charles 2:2	33:17 34:12 36:20	correct 5:2,5,19 7:5	40:9	41:19 42:1,10,17
Charlie 6:18	38:4,12,19,20	8:2,10 10:6 11:14	criticism 42:18	42:23,25 43:2,8
check 19:17	39:5 41:5 42:19	15:20 17:3,9	cross 32:5	43:14
circumstances 14:6	44:3,13,18 45:7	19:12 22:22 23:19	current 11:16 22:9	depend 25:6 27:25
27:25	45:17,19	24:1 27:8 32:13	22:20 23:2,12,16	depending 15:25
cite 33:4	company's 4:13,18	33:14 35:3 37:9	23:21,23 25:19	deposes 4:3
citing 44:17	14:19 15:10 16:15	38:6,9 40:6,15,21	26:11 29:15 44:3	deposition 1:17 3:6
Civil 3:8	17:23 20:13 22:8	40:22 41:3 46:9	customer 16:10	46:18 47:3,9,11
clarification 6:17	25:6 28:24 29:3	46:10,13 47:5	24:23 25:15 36:22	described 34:21
25:1	29:15,17 31:1	48:7	37:5 40:12,15	design 42:4,19
clarity 17:5	33:25 35:6 37:14	correction 47:4	46:8	desirability 46:7
classes 42:6	38:5 39:7 43:18	corresponds 13:13	customers 13:7	detail 36:13
classification 36:20	44:3,6 45:5	cost 13:5,6,17	14:20,24 15:11	determining 20:2
38:19,23	compared 25:15	17:23 18:19 20:10	16:15 24:6 31:14	developed 42:23
clear 6:24	comparison 45:12	20:22,25 27:12,16	31:24 41:20 42:1	development 36:23
Code 1:12	45:14	28:14,24 31:18	42:21 43:7,8,11	38:8,13 39:15
collaboratives	completed 48:9	34:8 35:7 40:5,19	customer's 36:19	40:13
46:12	completeness 16:25	41:24	38:18 39:1,7	difference 30:12
collect 28:12 31:10	complying 39:23	costs 17:21,22,25	D	different 6:15 7:11
32:9 35:6,16	computer 48:7	18:3 19:6 20:21	day 47:11 48:13	7:18 37:17
42:11	concept 40:4	20:23,25 21:18	Dayton 1:3,6,9,13	direct 9:16
collected 41:19	concepts 37:1	22:14 24:4,5 25:7	2:4 13:24	director 5:18
43:7	concluded 46:18	28:13 30:7,15,16	deal 11:22 13:25	disagree 31:4
Columbus 1:21 2:9	concludes 17:1	31:19,21 34:1,10	dealing 39:20	discuss 9:3,11
48:13	conclusion 11:4	34:11,18,19 35:9	debt 17:23 20:22	discussed 44:1
column 13:11	21:20 44:14	35:17 39:23 40:19	ucot 17.23 40.22	discusses 43:25
				the state of the s

discussion 35:24	effect 9:21 24:23	exists 39:12	46:15	fund 19:21
dissimilar 18:7	25:14 31:13	expect 34:1	favor 16:9,10	funded 20:9
distinction 10:7,18	efficient 28:3	expected 31:15	feature 40:10	funding 19:20 21:4
distinguishes 8:19	either 16:1,9,9,14	expend 28:20	February 1:22 3:2	funds 28:21
distribution 28:12	20:16 43:7,14	expended 29:11,20	47:4 48:13,18	further 11:15
28:21 29:15 30:7	electric 1:5 6:6 9:15	30:3	FERC 4:15 13:11	future 22:11
30:13,18	employed 5:14	expenditures 19:21	Fifth 2:8	
divide 13:17	48:11	expense 18:2,4	figure 13:8 20:3	G
docket 7:3,5	employee 48:10	expenses 17:3,25	figuring 16:17	G 1:18 2:7 3:7 4:1
doing 11:6 23:14	ended 4:20	18:3 20:9 25:11	filed 4:19	47:3,7,9 48:5
23:18 31:13 43:10	ends 22:8	25:17	filing 4:14 19:5	general 28:1,10
43:13,14	energy 2:10 6:19	experience 10:11	financial 11:17	39:8
dollars 27:19 29:11	39:25,25 42:9	expire 23:12	38:5 39:6 43:17	Generally 37:3
29:13,16,20,21	46:8	expires 47:16 48:18	45:18	generating 6:8,14
30:3,4 34:13,15	entail 37:25	explain 11:18 30:2	financially 48:11	7:10,15,24 8:18
DPL 44:18,19,21	enter 20:2	31:8 43:23	find 31:1	12:1,3,6 14:19
44:25 45:9,19	entire 21:20 22:3	explaining 29:19	finish 20:18	15:5 20:15
DPL's 45:3,6	entirely 21:6	express 11:11	finished 25:13	generation 10:24
DP&L 7:14 8:3	entirety 18:22,24	expressing 25:25	26:15	11:3 12:23,23
9:19 10:23 11:2	entitlements 9:4,12	28:11,19,23 40:18	firm 5:15	13:3,3,7
17:19 20:20 36:4	equal 31:11	40:25 41:15 46:6	first 4:2 6:18 13:11	getting 10:17 39:17
38:3,25 42:16	equate 11:8	46:11	24:8 26:5 28:10	give 26:4,19 30:9
43:17 44:19 45:1	equity 9:19 10:1,13	extend 22:11 23:5	fixed 35:7,9 41:22	given 11:16 20:7
45:2,7,10,15,17	11:7,11 44:8	extended 23:24	Floor 1:21	34:3 45:4 47:4
DP&L's 8:5,8,12	equivalent 11:12	extending 22:20	flow 20:14,15	48:8
9:14 19:5,23	ESP 26:11 29:5	23:2 35:25	Focusing 26:3	giving 7:14
20:10	36:3	extension 23:16	following 22:23	go 12:2,5,24 13:14 15:21 16:9 21:7
dropping 36:19	estimated 29:13	extent 12:22	follows 4:3	24:20 25:13 31:7
drops 38:18	estimates 28:24	extreme 38:21	footnote 35:5	40:10,17 42:8
due 16:2,2 45:6	evaluate 33:24	extremely 29:16	foregoing 47:3,9	43:16
duly 4:2 48:4,5	event 39:1	F	48:7,8	goal 30:19
EE	exact 8:24	facilities 41:17,23	Forgive 40:7	going 17:11 20:22
earlier 15:19 35:24	exactly 7:13,18	fact 10:12 11:21	form 4:16 13:11	22:18 23:9,12,13
44:1,15	19:11	12:2 17:18 21:14	29:6 47:5	24:2 26:23
early 31:15	EXAMINATION	24:16 26:9 30:17	forward 32:1	good 4:7 12:1 35:13
earnings 44:13,17	4:4	31:5 36:21 45:2	foundation 44:11	great 11:22 13:24
44:24,25 45:6,9	examined 47:11	failed 36:18	four 36:8,9,10,11	greater 32:12
45:10,14	example 23:1	failure 39:7	Franklin 48:3 free 20:14	Grid 29:14
East 1:21 2:8	exception 35:10 excerpts 4:18	Fair 7:19 10:20		groups 43:5
easy 43:2,3	Exchange 4:19	fairly 11:21 43:3	frequently 27:18 front 4:8	guess 26:23 36:24
economic 36:22	Excuse 24:25	familiar 37:1 39:9	fuel 17:8 18:4 19:6	9-400 50,153 30,154
38:8,13,24 39:14	Excuse 24:23 Exhibit 9:17,25	39:11	24:4,5 25:7 44:1	Н
40:13	13:10	Faruki 2:2,2 4:5	45:1	half 23:12
economist 5:12	exist 12:25	6:23 21:24 25:2	fuel-related 17:3	halfway 23:9
economy 11:21	existing 42:4	28:4 32:22 45:21	17:25	hand 10:9 16:18
	VAISUING TAIT	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	11,20	
			The server of th	I 1825 - S. G.

48:13	indicates 9:18	justified 28:25	42:22 44:16	matter 1:3,6,9,13
handled 24:14	indication 44:6		lines 22:19 26:4	28:2
happened 21:3,4	Industrial 2:10	K	27:2 33:5,6 40:24	maximize 14:5
hard 38:1	information 20:6	kilowatt 35:13	41:16,17	McAlister 2:7 6:17
headed 43:17	20:12 45:4	42:21 43:3	linkage 17:4 43:21	6:21 24:25 25:4
help 24:18	infrastructure	kind 15:14	43:23 44:9	McNees 1:20 2:7
helps 21:19 44:14	28:13,21 29:4	know 7:18 8:7	Lisa 2:7	McNees-Wallace
Hennebert 1:19	35:7	10:12 17:14 18:13	list 5:23 6:3	5:15
48:4,15	initiation 22:10	18:24 19:5,20	listed 13:9	mean 8:8 11:18
hereinafter 4:2	instance 13:23	20:13,14 21:4	listing 27:1	12:20 13:22 14:12
hereto 47:4 48:10	20:14 24:18 32:7	24:18 25:21 35:13	LLC 1:21 2:7	19:25 21:11 22:6
hereunto 48:12	45:5	36:16 37:24 39:6	load 14:1,21	25:12 34:9
highest 36:20 38:19	intent 7:15,23 9:11	39:8,12,18 43:13	loans 11:24	means 9:21,22 10:4
38:22	interest 8:8,13,14	46:2,3	long 5:8,14,20	10:13
hit 39:6	9:5 10:9	knowledge 39:17	15:14 19:5 20:16	mechanism 21:9,12
hour 13:6,19,25	interested 16:17	known 11:21	20:21 21:1,3	meet 12:3 14:20
14:1 42:21	48:11		longer 21:22 22:4	42:15
hours 13:12,14,18	interests 15:10		22:14,17 26:19	megawatt 13:6,12
35:13	interpretation 11:9	largely 45:6	36:4,6,9,12	13:14,18,19
hurting 11:24	38:17	lawyer 5:2 8:11,15	look 4:24 6:3 7:21	mention 44:19
hydro 41:17,23	interrupt 25:12	lead 12:13,16 21:19	8:25 9:17 13:10	mentioned 44:14
hypothetical 12:8	investment 29:4,15	44:14	15:8 45:16	merely 38:17
	35:7	leads 34:17	looked 20:13 31:3	methodology 29:9
	investments 18:17	leave 30:1 38:22	32:14,16 33:1	29:22 30:1
idea 12:1 16:6	Ireland 2:2	Leaving 28:14	45:4	methods 42:7
21:18,21 22:4	isolation 31:3	legal 10:17 11:4,11	looking 6:25 30:24	million 19:18,18,19
II 4:14 7:22 32:21	issue 6:9,11,13 7:12	legislation 39:24	32:4 40:23 42:14	19:25 20:8,21
33:4	7:20 14:8,9,11	let's 16:5 23:5 37:6	45:14	25:9
III 4:14	31:3 40:16	42:17	looks 45:19	mind 36:8
IIR 30:22 35:6	issued 21:1	level 28:14 40:19	lost 26:12	minute 6:3 40:10
41:22	issues 6:1 29:24	44:24	lot 20:1	misunderstanding
immediately 5:17	item 18:2,4	levelization 29:9,22	lower 12:13,16	29:25
implication 12:11	items 27:1,4	30:1 31:4,7,21	31:21,24 32:8	model 34:8
important 45:16	IV 28:7	32:2,8 34:25	Ludlow 2:3	moderate 24:18
inappropriate		licensed 5:10	Та Л	money 15:25 16:7
29:22	J	Light 1:4,7,10,14	<u>M</u>	morning 3:1 4:6,7
included 26:8	J2:2	likewise 40:23	magnitude 19:13	move 19:3
34:11	JGB-1 9:17,25	limited 33:19	20:7 29:21 34:4	Murray 16:18 17:1
including 38:24	JGB-2 13:10	line 6:25 8:25 9:4	main 18:25 29:9	21:15 24:8
increase 33:19,20	Joe 6:25 17:5	10:2,22 11:15	41:23 46:4	Murray's 4:21
increases 31:14	Joseph 1:18 3:6 4:1	12:9 13:13 16:17	maintaining 42:5	16:21 17:6 43:21
increasing 25:15	47:3,7,9 48:5	17:12,13 18:10	maintenance 18:3	43:24 44:10
incur 34:1	Julieanna 1:18	21:8 23:2 25:23	making 17:4 33:13	T Y
incurred 30:16	48:4,15	27:11 28:18 29:2	management 46:9	N
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	July 5:16	33:9,18 34:3,3,21	market 12:24 13:1	named 48:5
31:19 34:11,19 incurrence 31:18	JUL-1365 48:19	35:21 36:2 42:8	markets 11:17	near 24:23 25:14

near-term 24:6 necessarily 36:21 38:1 39:5 43:13 45:11 46:3	open 37:24 38:2 operating 22:8	29:2 33:3,5,8,18 34:2,20 35:5,20	per-customer 35:8 35:11,16 41:19	priced 13:4 prices 13:23,24
necessarily 36:21 38:1 39:5 43:13 45:11 46:3	operating 22:8		1 -	1 -
38:1 39:5 43:13 45:11 46:3				1 III BCCN 1 2.2.2.24
45:11 46:3	operation 18:3	39:19 40:24 41:14	42:2	pricing 12:13,21
	opine 11:5	42:22 43:6,16	phase-in 24:14,17	probably 17:18
need 7:1,2 43:25	opinion 8:12 11:11	44:11,16 47:4	24:19,22 25:3,21	23:10
needs 12:4 28:20	15:17 16:24 18:23	pages 4:16	26:1	problem 34:21,25
neglected 40:7	20:5,17,19,24	paragraph 34:20	phrase 9:3 23:23	problematic 21:9
net 29:15	25:25 27:6 28:11	34:22 41:16	picked 7:3	Procedure 3:8
non-pejorative	28:19,23 35:15	parent 44:17,20	picture 23:7 42:14	proceeding 45:18
30:25	36:5 37:18 40:12	45:9,19	piece 10:14	Professional 48:16
normal 14:6	40:18,25 41:15	part 9:4 12:17	PJM 13:23	profitability 43:18
normally 18:16	opinions 14:25	13:24 27:11 29:5	place 23:11 26:20	45:3
North 2:3	45:25 46:6,11	44:11	48:8	profitable 45:3
Notary 1:19 3:9,12	opportunity 44:4	partially 35:1	plan 1:5,15 6:6	program 34:14,16
47:10,14 48:4,16	opportunity 44.4 opposed 14:11 41:1	particular 8:23	21:20 22:3,7,12	36:23 38:8,13
note 29:12		28:1 35:17 36:7	22:14,17 23:5,14	· ·
note 29:12 notes 3:10	42:20 45:14 option 24:2 26:2		23:24 25:19 26:11	programs 34:15 46:9
l l	_	particularly 13:2 31:16	35:25 41:24	
notice 7:14,23,25	order 19:13 23:11			proof3:11
9:11	29:20 38:13	parties 3:6 48:10	planning 26:18	proposal 29:4 31:1
noting 47:4	ordered 17:15	48:11	plans 33:25	31:9 35:6 37:14
number 5:24 7:3,5	outlay 19:21	party 44:21	plant 29:15,17	proposed 21:14,21
10:24 13:12,13	outstanding 11:25	pay 14:10,13 24:7	plan's 22:20 23:2	21:23 22:4 29:10
17:17 19:24 20:7	OVEC 9:5,16,19	31:15 37:5	23:12,16	38:12 42:19
44:25	10:1,23 11:3 13:2	payors 16:3	Plaza 2:3	proposing 22:9
numbers 33:4	13:13 14:10,16	peak 14:1	please 7:21 34:2	26:24 30:22 33:17
Nurick 1:20 2:7	overall 20:10 42:15	Pennsylvania 5:11	41:14 43:23	36:4 41:5
0	overrecovery 16:4	people 11:22	point 11:25 14:24	protect 38:25
	27:20	percent 9:19,25	31:7 32:4,5 38:23	provide 22:13
object 40:4 obtain 11:23	over/underrecov	29:14	portion 32:11	provision 34:23
OCC 5:18	27:13,17	percentage 10:1	position 5:20 37:7	35:2 36:17,25
1	owned 10:23 11:2	41:20 42:2,10	38:3	37:8,10,14,19,22
occurs 18:21	ownership 8:8,13	43:8,11	possible 19:6	37:23,25 38:25
offer 6:8	9:5,14,16,19,23	period 20:8,21	Power 1:4,7,10,14	proxy 45:10
offered 5:24,25 6:6	10:5,8,9,13 11:7,8	21:22 22:5,11,17	preferable 35:15	Public 1:1,19 47:11
offering 36:5 37:18 office 48:13	11:12,12	23:22,23 26:11,18	preferably 42:23	47:14 48:4,16
	owns 10:16	31:22 35:25 36:4	42:25	purchase 42:9
offices 1:20	P	36:7 41:12	preferred 23:18	purchased 13:12
official 3:12		permission 8:17	26:10	13:18 42:15
I I	page 4:25 5:22 6:25	permit 26:19	presence 3:11	purpose 15:23,24
Ohio 1:1,11,20,22	7:21 8:25 9:18,25	permitted 17:2,22	47:11 48:6	18:8 39:4,22
2:4 9:15 17:16	10:21,22 11:15	27:3	present 29:6	Pursuant 1:11
47:1 48:2,4,13,17	12:9,9 13:10,11	permitting 12:11	presented 6:15	push 9:24
okay 5:1 6:13 7:4,7	15:22 16:17 21:7	15:9	preserves 43:4	Put 37:21
25:4 26:3,6 39:19	22:18 23:2,20	perspective 21:10	pretty 11:20 23:9	P.L.L 2:2
43:24	25:23 26:3,23	pertinence 43:19	37:24 38:2	
once 27:19	27:2,11 28:17	pertinent 44:25	previous 40:8	Q

qualification 3:12	reasoning 30:2	reflecting 27:12	31:23 32:6,12	36:15 39:10,19
qualified 10:18	35:22	34:19	42:5 43:5	43:16
11:5 48:5	reasons 27:9 29:8	refund 40:9	revenues 32:2,9	Securities 4:19
quarter 4:20	recall 7:18 8:24	regard 6:7,14 7:8	44:3	security 1:5 6:6
question 6:15 7:7,8	9:13 15:13 19:8	7:22 9:15 26:22	revise 7:1,2	see 10:2,25 14:9
7:10 9:6 10:22	19:11,13	27:6 28:11 46:12	Revised 1:7	16:22 27:13 33:22
14:15,17,18 16:16	recited 10:1	regarding 14:10,15	Rice's 9:2,8	34:5 36:18,24
17:11 21:7 24:21	recognition 23:22	regardless 38:4	rider 16:5,11 28:1	38:23 45:6
25:5 26:13,14,22	23:23	Registered 48:15	28:12,15 29:4	seeks 30:6 41:2
26:23 28:10 29:3	recognize 9:2 10:7	regulated 45:17	30:12,22 31:5,11	Senate 8:14,16,18
30:10 37:17 38:2	15:25 16:6 34:18	regulatory 18:20	31:12,16,17,18	8:22 15:3,13,18
40:2,8 41:5 43:18	recommend 33:18	23:7	34:11,19 39:20,22	24:15
questions 12:16	43:6	relate 6:1 29:17	40:3,4,17,20 41:2	sense 18:4 23:8
16:16 28:7 45:24	recommendation	relationship 36:18	41:6,10,22 42:19	27:21 35:12 41:25
46:4	17:6 27:5 30:6	relative 43:4 48:10	riders 22:10,10	42:16
quickly 23:13	33:12 36:6 37:13	reliability 12:14,17	right 6:16 8:1	senses 18:6
	40:11	14:11,16	10:16 11:13,20	sentence 11:16
R	recommending	relies 44:12	13:15 15:13 16:11	12:10,21 13:21
ramp 34:16	26:25	rely 4:16	20:18 22:8 23:17	21:24 22:3 33:9
ramping 34:7	recommends 24:8	removed 37:15	23:25 27:2,10	34:2 35:20 41:4
rate 7:25 8:5,9,20	reconciliation	rendering 8:12	28:9 31:9,25	separate 29:23
14:4,23 15:6 16:3	30:20,25	renewable 39:24	33:20 35:2 37:15	Separation 1:15
16:13 18:14,15,16	record 22:1 26:16	42:9,15	40:5 44:18,22	September 4:20
27:21,22 30:13	28:4,5,6 32:22,23	repeating 15:19	risk 36:16 37:2,2,4	service 12:12 14:11
33:20 42:4,18,20	32:24,25 45:21,22	report 4:19 45:5	37:5 38:4,12	14:13 29:17
42:23 43:5	45:23	Reporter 48:16	robust 44:13 45:6	services 5:18
rates 15:21 24:7,15	recorded 41:10	represent 19:16	ROE 44:6,7	Session 3:1
24:18,24 25:15	recover 41:2,25	27:20	rolled 34:14,16	set 31:18 39:24
26:8	42:17 44:4	requested 17:21	RTO 13:24	42:20 48:12
ratio 20:10	recovered 22:15,16	requirement 31:10	Rules 3:8	settlement 13:15,17
rationale 38:23,24	31:24 40:20	31:14 32:12 42:16	run 36:4	seven 31:11 32:11
39:3	recoveries 32:7	requirements		shape 11:22
read 9:8 12:10	recovery 19:9 30:6	31:23 32:2	S	share 10:23 11:2
21:24 22:1 26:5	30:12,13 34:8,8	respect 17:8 35:4	sale 6:7,14 7:9	shareholder 10:16
26:14,16 47:3,11	39:23 40:5 45:1	respective 3:6	satisfactory 31:2	shares 10:8
reading 8:22 47:10	RECs 42:9	responsibility 42:5	saying 11:7 16:8	short 12:2 20:16
reads 41:5	reduced 3:9	43:5	17:24 26:2,7,9	30:5
real 10:8	refer 17:13	restate 7:7	29:18 44:10	Signature 46:17
really 20:17 36:12	reference 11:19	restricted 8:14	says 4:3 34:3	signed 47:11
36:25	16:21 21:11 32:18	restriction 11:22	schedule 32:5,16	significance 29:11
reason 18:25 27:5	44:8	result 12:12	32:18,20 33:1,3,6	29:19 30:3
29:9,10	referenced 33:2	results 35:25	schedules 4:15	significant 19:24
reasonable 20:9,20	referencing 15:18	return 14:5 18:14	seal 48:13	20:3 29:16 30:4
28:25 39:9,16	16:25 17:7 22:19	20:22 34:12 44:7	second 10:2	signing 47:10
41:12 42:11	refiled 41:6	Rev 1:11	section 7:22 8:24	similar 6:11 7:12
reasonably 13:3,6	reflect 27:15	revenue 31:10,14	15:12 28:7 36:15	10:12 17:25 18:5
			in the contract of the second	

				<u> </u>
40:2 41:21	staying 9:24	talking 14:2 21:13	36:11	40:5 41:1
similarly 11:4 12:9	stenotypy 3:9 48:6	23:1,16 24:4,15	Tim 9:2	typical 34:15
simply 14:14 16:24	stipulated 3:5	28:15 34:7 36:14	time 6:10 11:24	typically 18:13
37:21	STIPULATIONS	38:7	12:2 15:25 16:6	21:1 27:17 34:12
single 33:19 43:18	3:4	talks 27:12	20:21 21:22 22:5	
sir 9:20 17:10	stock 10:5,8,9	targets 39:24	23:10 26:19 30:17	U
20:19 22:2 36:16	45:20	Tariffs 1:8	33:24 34:16 46:16	ultimately 16:2,2
40:23	storm 18:3	tell 4:11 15:22 19:2	48:8	underrecoveries
situation 25:16	storm-related	19:16 25:20 29:7	timeline 30:5	16:12
size 19:24	17:20,24	33:2 35:4,21	times 14:1	undersigned 47:10
Smart 29:14	streams 32:6	41:14	titled 7:23	understand 8:11
solar 41:17,23	Street 1:21 2:3,8	ten 5:21 19:9 21:1	today 4:12	9:6,14 10:4 14:12
someplace 25:22	structure 21:8,12	term 13:20 20:16	top 5:23	14:16 24:10 25:5
soon 23:9	study 15:8	20:16 21:1,3	total 13:15 36:10	26:24 29:18 37:4
sorry 6:21 7:2	subject 7:25 10:21	22:21 23:3,17	36:11	37:12 39:22 40:1
25:12 26:12 31:6	12:12,20,25 19:17	24:23 25:14	totally 20:25	40:3 46:7
34:3	40:8 43:19 45:18	terminate 38:20	totals 19:19	understanding
sort 11:11 15:8,9	46:12	terminated 36:23	traded 45:20	8:16 15:3 23:15
sounds 19:11	subjects 36:14	terms 24:7 39:8	traditional 32:10	unilaterally 38:20
source 19:20 21:4	submitted 47:10	testify 48:5	34:8	units 8:4,4,8,20
so-called 18:14	subsidiary 45:1,2,7	testifying 6:1	train 26:12	usage 35:14
speak 16:10 34:15	substance 47:5	testimonies 4:15	transaction 15:8	use 9:3 14:4 23:23
specific 20:4	sufficient 27:24	testimony 4:9,17,21	transcribed 3:10	40:4 45:9,13
specifically 8:4	suggesting 45:8	4:24 5:24,25 6:7,8	48:7	Users-Ohio 2:10
33:15 38:11	suitability 28:12,15	7:21,23 9:2,8,10	transcript 47:3,9	usual 16:11
specified 48:8	46:7	9:18 16:22 24:20	48:7	usually 10:11
speculating 12:6	Suite 2:8	25:20 26:3 29:12	transfer 6:7,14 7:9	UTILITIES 1:1
speculative 12:17	summertime 14:1	33:4 36:16 41:9	7:15,24 8:13,17	U.S 11:21
spent 29:13	supporting 35:6	43:20,22,24 44:8	9:3,11 12:1,11	
SS 47:1 48:2	supports 26:17	44:10 48:6,8	15:5,10	V
SSO 12:12	suppose 25:8	thank 25:4,24 33:7	translates 36:21	V 36:15
stability 38:5	sure 10:18 19:1	46:15	true 7:10 47:5 48:7	Valley 9:15
start 17:12	22:23 30:16	thing 10:12	trued 16:5 27:18	value 15:25 16:6
started 15:17	SW 2:3	things 21:17	trued-up 41:6	variables 20:1
starting 4:25 30:8	sworn 4:2 48:5	think 6:18 11:6,20	true-up 27:24	vary 13:24 35:10
30:12,13		14:22 15:7 18:9	30:20,22 31:1	versus 20:15 30:13
starts 5:22 34:20	T	20:3,24 21:16,17	34:22 35:1	VII 43:16
State 1:19,21 2:8	Tait 7:24 8:4,4	21:19,21 22:14	true-ups 41:13	volatility 12:13,21
47:1 48:2,4,17	14:10,16	23:13 27:10,24	truth 48:6	12:25 13:20 14:2
stated 47:10	take 6:3 8:25 16:24	28:2 34:10 35:23	try 24:1	TX 7
statement 8:21	26:20 37:7 39:6	37:11 41:12 45:16	trying 15:18	W 2.12 46.17
15:16 18:12 35:22	40:11 41:9	Third 2:8	turmoil 11:17	waived 3:13 46:17
36:2	taken 1:18 48:6,8	thought 6:21 23:3	two 12:16 19:8	Wallace 1:20 2:7
	talk 22:20 23:21	23:17,22 26:12	29:23 32:5	want 15:8 19:1
statements 20:14	***************************************		, · · · · · - · ·	i フルフょうん・1.V
statements 20:14 statute 39:9	24:19 42:9	36:12 [°]	two-year 20:8	22:23 26:18
		· ·	two-year 20:8 type 18:16 39:15	way 13:15 14:19,23 16:9 22:13 23:5

22.10 20.2 20.7	08-1094-EL-SSO	9:18,25 13:10		-
23:18 28:3 29:7	l .	1	7	
33:21 42:11 43:2	1:4	20 22:20	7 16:17 21:7 23:20	
ways 24:13 44:5	08-1095-EL-ATA	2005 5:16	26:4 27:2 44:16	
Wednesday 1:22	1:7	2007 13:5	760,729 13:14	
3:1 47:4	08-1096-EL-AAM	2008 4:21 47:12		
weighting 20:11	1:10	2009 1:22 3:2 19:14	8	
we're 7:14 23:9,13	08-1097-EL-UNC	19:18 23:10 26:8	8 22:18 23:2 25:23	
38:7	1:14	31:16 47:4 48:13	26:4,23	
whatsoever 37:9	08-1332 17:19	2010 19:14,18 22:9	80-917 7:9	
WHEREOF 48:12	08-917 7:6	31:16,22	9	
wholesale 12:13,20	08-935 6:5,22,23	2011 32:1		
12:24	09 25:9 31:22	2013 23:6 48:18	9 8:25 9:4 10:22	
wide 37:24 38:2		2014 32:7	27:2,11 41:16	
wind 41:17,23		2015 30:23 32:7	9:30 1:22	
withdraw 14:8	1 4:16 8:4 13:11	21 1:21 2:8 6:25		
28:18 30:9	27:2 33:3,3 35:5	221 8:14,16,19,22		
witness 3:7,11 6:20	10 2:3 25:9 26:8	15:4,13,18 24:15		
47:10 48:7,8,12	28:17 29:2,2	24 41:5		
word 30:25	10Q 4:19 45:5	29 33:6		
words 17:5 22:7	10:55 46:18			
23:4 26:7 27:9	11 11:15 26:4 33:8			
29:20	33:18 41:17	3 5:22 6:25 8:4	}	
world 10:8	111 19:18	10:22 13:11 35:21		
wouldn't 12:1	12 16:16 19:9 33:5	30 4:20		
25:14	33:9 34:2,20 35:5	31 22:8 33:6		
writing 3:9	40:24 41:17 42:22			
written 37:10	13 13:13 17:12	4		
wrong 7:3	35:20	4 1:22 3:2 5:23		
	14 17:13 18:10 21:7	25:23 47:4		
Y	23:6 33:18 39:19	4th 48:13		
Yeah 23:4 26:17	40:24 42:8,22	4.9 9:19,25		
year 13:25 23:12	15 26:23 41:14 43:6	40 29:14		
23:24 27:19	16 43:16 44:11,16	43215 2:9		
years 5:21 10:24	163 19:19,25 25:9	45402 2:4		
19:8,9,10 21:2	17 12:10 22:19	4905.13 1:12		
23:6 31:12,15,25	26:24 33:5 41:16	4905.31 39:10,15		
32:6,12,14 36:8,9	17th 1:21			
36:10,11	1700 2:8	5		
year's 33:19	18 23:2 27:11 33:5	5 7:21 8:25 28:18		
yvar 8 55.17	40:24	34:3 36:2		
\$	19 12:9 21:8 34:21	500 2:3		
\$163 20:8,21]	
\$26,080,078 13:16	48:18	6		
\$34 13:6,8,18	1984 5:9	6 10:21,22 11:15		
\$ 52 19:18	2	12:10 15:22 34:3		
ψυ ₄ 17,10	2 4:25 5:23 8:4 9:18	44:16,16		
0	014 7:10 CA.C CA.F A			