

**BEFORE
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO**

In the Matter of the Review of Ohio)	
Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric)	
Illuminating Company, and The Toledo)	Case No. 17-974-EL-UNC
Edison Company's Compliance with)	
R.C. 4928.17 and Ohio Adm. Code)	
Chapter 4901:1-37.)	

**EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH'S MEMORANDUM CONTRA INTERLOCUTORY
APPEAL, REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATION TO THE PUCO COMMISSIONERS, AND
APPLICATION FOR REVIEW BY THE OFFICE OF THE OHIO CONSUMERS'
COUNSEL, OHIO MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION ENERGY GROUP,
INTERSTATE GAS SUPPLY, INC., AND NORTHEAST OHIO PUBLIC ENERGY
COUNCIL**

I. INTRODUCTION

In December 2021, the Commission stayed discovery of FirstEnergy agreements with the Sustainability Funding Alliance (“SFA”) and the IEU-Ohio Administration Company (“IEU”) and related topics, in order to avoid “interfere[ing] with the criminal investigation by the United States Attorney or the action brought by the Ohio Attorney General.”¹ That ruling made clear that while parties may pursue relevant and appropriate discovery in the open PUCO proceedings involving FirstEnergy, that discovery should not include information that is currently the subject of the Department of Justice’s (“DOJ”) pending investigation.

Well after the Commission’s order, the Ohio Consumers’ Counsel (“OCC”) issued a subpoena to depose Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah in this corporate separation proceeding. Consistent with the discovery stay, OCC indicated that it intended to ask about a narrowly tailored set of topics related directly to corporate separation. None of the requests in OCC’s subpoena sought information that would intrude on DOJ’s investigation. Accordingly, while Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah objected to the deposition, her opposition (and the Commission’s ruling) never addressed the Commission’s order. But when Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah’s deposition began, OCC abandoned the narrow framing upon which it sought a deposition and instead went headlong into questioning about SFA and other issues at the core of DOJ’s ongoing investigation.

Upholding the Commission’s December 2021 discovery stay, the Attorney Examiners ruled during the deposition that OCC and other parties to this proceeding may not yet seek non-public information related to the deferred prosecution agreement (“DPA”). Because that ruling

¹ *In the Matter of the 2020 Review of the Delivery Capital Recovery Rider of Ohio Edison Company, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and the Toledo Edison Company*, Case No. 20-1629-EL-RDR (Dec. 15, 2021), ¶¶ 14, 16.

was a straightforward and correct application of the Commission’s December 2021 ruling, the Commission should deny the Request for Certification and Application for Review filed by OCC, the Ohio Manufacturers’ Association Energy Group, the Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council, and Interstate Gas Supply Inc. (collectively, the “Intervenors”).²

II. ARGUMENT

A. OCC’s Surprise Deposition Questions Flouted the Commission’s December 2021 Ruling.

The Intervenors’ Request for Certification fails because it does not present any “new or novel question,” and the Attorney Examiners’ ruling does not “represent[] a departure from past precedent.”³ To the contrary, the ruling is consistent with the Commission’s previous orders, and the Commission has already rejected the Intervenors’ arguments. Tellingly, the Intervenors avoid any mention of the Commission’s December 15, 2021, ruling in the PUCO delivery capital investment rider investigation that stays discovery of matters in the scope of DOJ’s investigation, but that ruling squarely governs this dispute.⁴ Far from a departure, the Attorney Examiners’ oral ruling during Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah’s deposition affirmed the Commission’s established approach.

On December 15, 2021, the Commission stayed discovery of “any agreements with SFA or IEU-Ohio Administration Company” and related facts, reasoning that “it is of utmost importance that our investigations do not interfere with the criminal investigation by the United

² Case No. 17-974-EL-UNC, Interlocutory Appeal, Request for Certification to the PUCO Commissioners, and Application for Review by OCC, OMAEG, IGS, and NOPEC, Mem. at 15 (July 26, 2022) (“Intervenors’ Mem.”).

³ See O.A.C. 4901-1-15(B).

⁴ *In the Matter of the 2020 Review of the Delivery Capital Recovery Rider of Ohio Edison Company, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and the Toledo Edison Company*, Case No. 20-1629-EL-RDR (Dec. 15, 2021).

States Attorney or the action brought by the Ohio Attorney General.”⁵ OCC sought rehearing, and the Commission denied that request. In doing so, the Commission specifically stated that there may be additional facts regarding the alleged SFA agreement “which are not presently publicly known,” and “premature disclosure of such facts may inadvertently interfere with the investigation.”⁶ And it explained that “even if there is a low risk of interfering in the criminal investigation, the Commission is unwilling to accept that risk. We will err on the side of caution before we run the risk of interference in the ongoing Federal criminal investigation.”⁷ The Intervenor now make the inexplicable claim that the delivery capital investment rider investigation had “proceeded almost unimpeded by the DOJ’s criminal investigation,”⁸ but omit any discussion of the Commission’s discovery stay and denial of rehearing.

The reasoning of the Commission’s December 2021 discovery stay applies with equal force to this corporate separation proceeding. The Commission made clear that contrary to OCC’s argument that there was no “overlap” between the issues in the delivery capital investment rider investigation and criminal investigations, “the facts certainly overlap between investigations, and witnesses may overlap between the investigations.”⁹ It is exploration of the facts—not discussion of the statutes that those facts may implicate—that creates the risk of interference with DOJ’s investigation. It would make no sense to allow deposition questioning about the exact set of facts that the Commission ruled “may inadvertently interfere with the

⁵ *Id.* ¶¶ 14, 16.

⁶ Case No. 20-1629-EL-RDR (Feb. 9, 2022), ¶ 20.

⁷ *Id.* ¶ 20.

⁸ Intervenor’s Mem. at 4.

⁹ Case No. 20-1629-EL-RDR (Feb. 9, 2022), ¶ 20.

investigation” simply because the delivery capital investment rider and corporate separation proceedings are based on different provisions of Ohio law.

When OCC subpoenaed Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah for a deposition, it was aware of the Commission’s December 2021 ruling. OCC knew that while it could seek relevant and appropriate information on topics such as those discussed in the two corporate separation audits of FirstEnergy, it could not yet seek information that is currently the subject of DOJ’s investigation. OCC’s subpoena appeared to respect those limits. The subpoena contained a list of requests relating to corporate separation records, corporate separation training, internal audits, and FirstEnergy’s corporate separation plan.¹⁰ None of the requests mentioned SFA, IEU, or other facts at issue in DOJ’s investigation.

When the deposition began, that all went out the window. Under the guise of “background,” OCC and the other Intervenors proceeded to ask direct questions about issues for which the Commission had stayed discovery. For example, OCC asked questions about the nature of an alleged agreement between FirstEnergy and SFA and underlying settlement negotiations:

- “I was asking about what your role was in the settlement negotiations, and my question is, what outside parties did you negotiate with? . . . Did you negotiate with Sam Randazzo?”¹¹
- “Did you participate in any settlement negotiations with Sustainability Funding Alliance?”¹²

¹⁰ See Ex. A at 1-2.

¹¹ Ex. B, Deposition of Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah (July 21, 2022), Tr. at 27:23-28:6.

¹² *Id.* at 28:14-16.

- “[D]id FirstEnergy ever enter into contract with Sustainability Funding Alliance?”¹³
- “When did you become aware of FirstEnergy’s or any FirstEnergy entity used, its agreement with SFA?”¹⁴

Beyond alleged SFA agreements and negotiations, OCC also launched broad inquiries into general allegations of misconduct with no apparent connection to corporate separation:

- “So did you have any role in any investigation that occurred before Mr. Jones was fired relating to what his role was with House Bill 6?”¹⁵
- “Did you perform any part of the investigation into Mr. Jones’ conduct that led up to his firing?”¹⁶
- “What do you understand was the reason Mr. Jones was fired?”¹⁷
- “Did Mr. Jones engage in any unethical conduct, during your tenure at FirstEnergy?”¹⁸
- “Did you become aware of any allegations of improper conduct against Mr. Jones at any time you worked at FirstEnergy?”¹⁹
- “[D]id you ever become aware of any complaints of improper conduct by Mike Dowling?”²⁰
- “[W]ere you ever aware of any allegations of improper conduct by Mr. Dennis Chack?”²¹

¹³ *Id.* at 80:14-16.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 113:3-5.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 85:10-13.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 87:8-10.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 89:11-12.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 90:13-15.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 93:1-4.

²⁰ *Id.* at 94:22-24.

²¹ *Id.* at 95:4-6.

- “Did Mr. Evans ever meet with any legislators to argue in favor of legislation that would have benefited FirstEnergy?”²²
- “Did Mr. George ever register as a lobbyist for FirstEnergy?”²³
- “[H]ave you been notified by anyone from the Department of Justice that you are under investigation?”²⁴

As OCC was aware, the Commission’s stay of discovery into facts at issue in DOJ’s investigation squarely prohibited these lines of questioning. OCC claimed that these questions were justified as “background” and because “it was Mr. Jones’ improper tone at the top that allowed those misallocations to occur.”²⁵ But it cannot use a corporate separation review as an excuse to conduct free ranging discovery into every allegation of misconduct at FirstEnergy simply because FirstEnergy’s regulated utilities have affiliates and misconduct could theoretically include misallocations of costs.²⁶ And it certainly cannot use that theory as a back door to avoid the Commission’s discovery stay.

OCC’s conduct amounts to a bait and switch. At the deposition, it represented that its questions about SFA were “one of the primary reasons for this deposition.”²⁷ If that is true, then OCC mislead the Commission and Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah when it filed its motion for subpoena. OCC never disclosed that it intended to ask about these topics in either its subpoena or

²² *Id.* at 81:23-25.

²³ *Id.* at 82:15-16.

²⁴ *Id.* at 39:13-14.

²⁵ *Id.* at 88:8-10.

²⁶ This is particularly true because OCC does not “have broad rights of discovery vis-a-vis the unrelated FirstEnergy Corp. and FirstEnergy Service Corp.” or their former employees. *See* Case No. 17-974-EL-UNC, Hr’g Tr., at 25:6-11 (September 30, 2021); *see also* Case No. 20-1502-EL-UNC, Hr’g Tr., 18:20-19:10, 23:14-18 (June 30, 2021) (limiting production to information about the Companies).

²⁷ Ex. B, Yeboah-Amankwah Tr. at 26:7-8.

briefing in response to Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's motion to quash. Instead, it decided to spring the questions for the first time at the deposition.

Predictably, OCC's inappropriate deposition questioning forced the parties to seek a ruling from the Attorney Examiners. But OCC then further confused the situation by presenting a misleading argument that—just as it does now—studiously avoided mention of the Commission's previous order and stay of discovery into the facts about SFA and IEU. Instead, OCC framed the issue as if the Commission had somehow *authorized* such questioning when it permitted Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's deposition to go forward. That is false. The Commission was presented with a request to depose Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah on corporate separation questions related to different topics. Because the scope of the Commission's December 2021 discovery stay was clear and OCC did not challenge it in its subpoena or briefing, the Commission did not address the issue or revisit its decision at that time.

Based on OCC's misleading picture of the authorized scope of the deposition, the Attorney Examiners allowed questioning based on documents to proceed. That ruling would have been complete if OCC had asked the questions forecasted in its subpoena and within the bounds of the Commission's discovery stay. But OCC did not, so further clarification was necessary. After additional discussion about the Commission's discovery stay and the particular topics that risked interference with DOJ's investigation, the Attorney Examiners clarified that parties could not ask about non-public information related to the DPA and declined to revisit the Commission's December 2021 ruling. That ruling was a correct and straightforward application of existing PUCO precedent.

The Intervenors now object to the Commission's purported reliance on a representation from DOJ. But DOJ's interest in preventing interference with its investigation is obvious, and

further documentation unnecessary. In the delivery capital investment rider proceeding, the Commission has already explained: “The filing of the Deferred Prosecution Agreement and the recitation of the facts surrounding the alleged ‘side agreement’ are clearly sufficient facts, as cited by the Commission in the Entry, for the Commission to base its decision to stay further proceedings regarding the alleged ‘side agreement’ in this case.”²⁸

The Attorney Examiners’ oral ruling makes clear that the Intervenors may not ask about the facts at the heart of DOJ’s investigation, such as the nature of the alleged SFA agreement and settlement negotiations with SFA and IEU-Ohio, including if these topics appear in documents that have been produced by FirstEnergy in this proceeding. The Attorney Examiners’ ruling did not break new ground, and their involvement would not have been necessary if OCC had not misrepresented the state of play. The Intervenors now argue that the ruling “could essentially shut down” Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah’s deposition.²⁹ But again, OCC and the other Intervenors remains free to ask about a range of other topics directly relevant to corporate separation, such as the issues raised in the Sage and Daymark audits. In other words, they can proceed with the deposition that they previously led Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah and the Commission to believe they would be taking.

B. The Commission’s Rulings do not Prejudice Parties to this Proceeding.

Finally, the Commission should deny the Intervenors’ request for certification for the additional reason that the Attorney Examiners’ oral ruling does not prejudice parties to this proceeding.³⁰ The Intervenors argue that the ruling inhibits their ability to seek discovery, but the

²⁸ Case No. 20-1629-EL-RDR (Feb. 9, 2022), ¶ 19.

²⁹ Intervenors’ Mem. at 1.

³⁰ See O.A.C. 4901-1-15(B).

Commission rejected an identical argument in the delivery capital investment rider investigation. There, the Commission stated: “With respect to OCC’s claim that the stay on discovery violates OCC’s ample rights of discovery under R.C. 4903.082, the Commission notes that OCC has already been exercising its ample rights of discovery in this proceeding,” including obtaining hundreds of thousands of pages of documents.”³¹ Moreover, the PUCO instructed the FirstEnergy Utilities to preserve “all documents and records related to any agreements with SFA or IEU-Ohio Administration Company until the stay has been lifted and the investigation has been completed.”³² And it explained that parties could raise issues and pursue discovery as appropriate after DOJ’s investigation is complete.³³ The Intervenors have provided no basis for distinguishing this proceeding, so the Commission’s prior ruling controls.

“It is well established that the Commission is vested with the broad discretion to manage its dockets to avoid duplication of effort.”³⁴ The Commission’s decision to pause discovery into certain facts until a concurrent federal criminal investigation is resolved is an entirely appropriate exercise of that discretion.

III. CONCLUSION

In sum, the Intervenors’ motion represents a clear attempt to do an end run on the Commission’s 2021 stay of discovery into facts currently under investigation by DOJ—without even bothering to mention that ruling. The Commission should reject this exercise in

³¹ Case No. 20-1629-EL-RDR (Feb. 9, 2022), ¶ 15.

³² Case No. 20-1629-EL-RDR (Dec. 15, 2021), ¶ 16.

³³ Case No. 20-1629-EL-RDR (Feb. 9, 2022), ¶ 15.

³⁴ *Id.* ¶ 15.

misdirection and let stand its ruling that at this time, parties to this proceeding may not ask about non-public facts related to the DPA and currently under investigation by DOJ.

Dated: August 1, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Marcella L. Lape

Marcella L. Lape (0077803)

Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP

155 N. Wacker Dr. Suite 2700

Chicago, IL 60606

marcie.lape@skadden.com

Counsel for Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically through the Docketing Information System of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio on August 1, 2022. The PUCO's e-filing system will electronically serve notice of the filing of this document on counsel for all parties.

/s/ Marcella L. Lape
Marcella L. Lape
Attorney for Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah

EXHIBIT A

STATE OF OHIO
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
180 E. EAST BROAD STREET
COLUMBUS OHIO 43266-0573

Michael DeWine
GOVERNOR



PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO
SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM

TO: Ms. Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah.
Former Vice President, General Counsel and Chief Ethics Officer
FirstEnergy Service Company

Upon application of Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel ("OCC"), Ms. Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah, is hereby required to appear for deposition at 10:00 a.m. on March 9, 2022 at OCC's office at 65 East State Street, Suite 700, Columbus, Ohio 43215. Ms. Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah is also required to produce the following documents to OCC at the same location, two days prior to the scheduled deposition:

- (1) All records that were in the possession of, or under the control of Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah related to corporate separation for the FirstEnergy Ohio utilities during 2016 through 2020.
- (2) All records containing processes and procedures that FirstEnergy Ohio utilities used pertaining to Ohio corporate separation requirements during 2016 through 2020.
- (3) All records pertaining to training undertaken with respect to FirstEnergy Ohio utilities' corporate separation compliance from 2016 through 2020.
- (4) All records pertaining to FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities' day-to-day compliance with Ohio's corporate separation rules and law.
- (5) All internal audits conducted during 2016 to 2020, pertaining to the FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities' compliance with Ohio corporate separation requirements.
- (6) All communications (emails, texts, etc.) between Mr. Yeboah and her supervisor and her supervisees, respectively, relating to the FirstEnergy Utilities' corporate separation plan for Ohio.
- (7) All records containing inquiries by FirstEnergy entities into the information that PUCO auditor Daymark stated (in its audit report) was missing and not available for Daymark's auditing.

- (8) All communications (emails, texts, etc.) between Mr. Fernandez and Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah relating to the FirstEnergy Utilities' corporate separation plan for Ohio, on and after May 1, 2020.
- (9) All records explaining, documenting and/or referencing the statement in an email from Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah about paying Lincoln Electric, including any opinion that she held with regard to making the payment. (Attached).
- (10) All records in any and all forms that Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah took with her from her job that ended at FirstEnergy.
- (11) The FirstEnergy position (job) descriptions for Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah.

The documents will be produced in connection with the proceeding entitled: "*In the Matter of the Ohio Edison Company, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and the Toledo Edison Company's Compliance with R.C. 4928.17 and the Ohio Adm. Code Chapter 4901:1-37 (Case No. 17-0974-EL-UNC),*"

Dated at Columbus, Ohio, this 7th day of February 2022.



Attorney Examiner

NOTICE: If you are not a party or an officer, agent, or employee of a party to this proceeding, then witness fees for attending under this subpoena are to be paid by the party at whose request the witness is summoned. Every copy of this subpoena for the witness must contain this notice.

EXHIBIT B

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMMISSION OF OHIO

~~~~~

IN THE MATTER OF THE OHIO EDISON  
COMPANY, THE CLEVELAND ELECTRIC  
ILLUMINATING COMPANY, AND  
THE TOLEDO EDISON COMPANY'S  
COMPLIANCE WITH R.C. 4928.17,  
AND THE OHIO ADMIN CODE  
CHAPTER 4901:1-37

CASE NO. 17-974-EL-UNC

~~~~~

DEPOSITION OF
EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH

July 21, 2022

10:08 a.m.

Taken at:

Embassy Parkway Suites
4040 Embassy Parkway
Fairlawn, Ohio

Kurt M. Spencer, Notary Public

1 APPEARANCES:

2
3 On behalf of the Deponent:

4 Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom LLP, by

5 MARCIE LAPE, ESQ.

6 PATRICK FITZGERALD, ESQ.

7 BRIAN O'CONNER, ESQ.

8 155 North Wacker Drive

9 Suite 2700

10 Chicago, Illinois 60606

11 (312) 407-0954

12 marcella.lape@skadden.com

13
14 On behalf of Ohio Consumers' Counsel:

15 JOHN FINNIGAN, ESQ.

16 MAUREEN R. WILLIS, ESQ.

17 LARRY SAUER, ESQ.

18 MIKE HALL, ESQ.

19 65 East State Street

20 Seventh Floor

21 Columbus, Ohio 43215-3420

22 (614) 466-8574

23 john.finnigan@occ.ohio.gov

24 maureen.willis@occ.ohio.gov

On behalf of Ohio Edison Company:

Jones Day, by

RYAN A. DORINGO, ESQ.

MICHAEL R. GLADMAN, ESQ.

North Point

901 Lakeside Avenue

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

(216) 586-7273

radoringo@jonesday.com

On behalf of FirstEnergy Corp:

Jones Day, by

ADAM J. HOLLINGSWORTH, ESQ.

MICHAEL KOSLEN, ESQ.

North Point

901 Lakeside Ave,

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

(216) 586-7112

ahollingsworth@jonesday.com

On behalf of Ohio Attorney General:

THOMAS LINDGREN, ESQ.

WERNER MARGARD, ESQ.

RHIANNON PLANT, ESQ.

CHRISTINA SHAFFER, ESQ.

DONALD LEMING, ESQ.

TOM SHEPHERD, ESQ.

30 East Broad Street

Twenty-fifth Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 644-8768

thomas.lindgren@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

On behalf of Ohio Manufacturers'

Association Energy Group:

Carpenter Lipps & Leland LLP, by

KIMBERLY W. BOJKO, ESQ.

JONATHAN WYGONSKI, ESQ.

280 North High Street

Suite 1300

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 365-4124

bojko@carpenterlipps.com

1
2 On behalf of Northeast Ohio

3 Public Energy Council:

4 Bricker & Eckler, LLP, by

5 DANE STINSON, ESQ.

6 100 South Third Street

7 Columbus, Ohio 43215

8 (614) 227-2300

9 dstinson@bricker.com
10

11 On behalf of Interstate Gas Supply:

12 JOSEPH OLIKER, ESQ.

13 EVAN BETTERTON, ESQ.

14 6100 Emerald Parkway

15 Dublin, Ohio 43016

16 (614) 659-5069

17 joe.oliker@igs.com
18

19 On behalf of Ohio Environmental Council:

20 Clean Energy Attorney,

21 KARIN NORDSTROM, ESQ.

22 1145 Chesapeake Avenue

23 Suite I

24 Columbus, Ohio 43212-3449
25

On behalf of Industrial Energy Users, IEU-Ohio:

Wallace Mcnees & Nurick, LLC, by

MATTHEW R. PRITCHARD, ESQ.

21 East State Street

Suite 1700

Columbus, Ohio 43215

(614) 719-2853

mpritchard@mcneeslaw.com

On behalf of Ohio Energy Group

Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry, by

JODY KYLER COHN, ESQ.

36 East Seventh Street

Suite 1510

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

(513) 421-2255

On behalf of Citizens Utility Board, Ohio

Hubay|Dougherty, by

Trent Dougherty

PO Box 12460

Columbus, Ohio 43212

trent@HubayDougherty.com

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

TRANSCRIPT INDEX

APPEARANCES..... 2

EXAMINATION OF EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH

BY MR. FINNIGAN..... 12

BY MR. OLIKER..... 100

BY MS. BOJKO..... 121

BY MR. STINSON..... 154

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE..... 202

EXHIBIT CUSTODY

NO EXHIBITS MARKED

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

1 EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH, of lawful
2 age, called for examination, as provided by the
3 Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure, being by me
4 first duly sworn, as hereinafter certified,
5 deposed and said as follows:

6 MR. FINNIGAN: Good morning, Ma'am.
7 My name is John Finnigan. I am with the Office
8 of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel. With me is my
9 colleague, Ms. Maureen Willis. The first thing
10 we would like to do today is to enter
11 everyone's appearance so we know who was here
12 in attendance at the deposition. So I've done
13 that for us. Let's go around the table with
14 the people in the room, and, then, we will do
15 the ones remotely after that.

16 Marcie, would you like to begin.

17 MS. LAPE: Sure. Marcie Lape from
18 Skadden & Arps. I am here on behalf of the
19 Deponent, Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah.

20 MR. FITZGERALD: And joining
21 Ms. Lape is Pat Fitzgerald from Skadden & Arps.

22 MR. O'CONNOR: And also joining
23 Ms. Lape is Brian O'Connor from Skadden & Arps.

24 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Adam
25 Hollingsworth from Jones Day on behalf of

1 FirstEnergy Corp.

2 MR. DORINGO: Ryan Doringo, and my
3 colleague, Mike Gladman, who is remote, of
4 Jones Day on behalf of Ohio Edison Company, the
5 Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and the
6 Toledo Edison Company.

7 MR. FINNIGAN: That is everyone in
8 the conference room. Let's go ahead and do the
9 appearances for the people who are
10 participating remotely. What I will do is
11 mention the name of each organization and then
12 whoever is on the call for that organization
13 can enter their appearance.

14 Let's first begin with OCC. Is
15 there anyone participating remotely from OCC?

16 MR. SAUER: Larry Sauer with OCC,
17 as well, John.

18 MR. HALL: Mike Hall from OCC is
19 also on.

20 MR. FINNIGAN: Is there anyone
21 participating remotely from FirstEnergy
22 Utilities?

23 MR. DORINGO: John, it's just me
24 and Mike today.

25 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Anyone else

1 from First --

2 MR. GLADMAN: Hey John, it is Mike
3 Gladman for the companies, and I will tell you
4 that Matt Pritchard is noted in the chat.

5 We can barely hear you guys at all.

6 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Thank you,
7 Mike. So we need to speak more loudly. So
8 Mike, please let us know if you are having that
9 problem again. We have the computer facing
10 Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah so that you can hear her
11 clearly. But if you don't hear any of the
12 attorneys, will someone please speak up and
13 notify us, and we will try to speak more
14 loudly. Thank you, Mike.

15 MR. HALL: Okay.

16 MR. FINNIGAN: Let's go through the
17 list then. Is there anyone else on for
18 FirstEnergy Corp?

19 MR. KOSLEN: Yes. Michael Koslen
20 for FirstEnergy Corp.

21 MR. FINNIGAN: Is there anyone for
22 the Office of the Ohio Attorney General?

23 MR. LINDGREN: Yes. Good morning.
24 This is Tom Lindgren. My colleague, Werner
25 Margard, is also on and we are representing the

1 staff. We have Christina Shaffer, Donald
2 Leming and Tom Shepherd from the staff on as
3 well.

4 MR. FINNIGAN: Thank you. Anyone
5 from OMA EG?

6 MS. BOJKO: Yes. This is Kim Bojko
7 and John Wygonski for the Ohio Manufacturers'
8 Association Energy Group with Carpenter Lipps
9 and Leland.

10 MR. FINNIGAN: NOPEC?

11 MR. STINSON: Yes. This is Dane
12 Stinson on behalf of NOPEC with Bricker &
13 Eckler, LLP.

14 MR. FINNIGAN: NRDC? IGS?

15 MR. OLIKER: Hi, this is Joe Oliker
16 from IGS Energy. Evan Betterton is also on the
17 phone.

18 MR. FINNIGAN: IEU?

19 MR. PRITCHARD: Good morning, this
20 Matt Pritchard on behalf of IEU Ohio with the
21 law firm of Mcnees Wallace & Nurick.

22 MR. FINNIGAN: OEG?

23 MS. COHN: Good morning, this is
24 Jody Cohn calling with the Ohio Energy Group.
25 Thank you.

1 MR. FINNIGAN: Is there anyone else
2 who has not identified themselves, if so,
3 please do so now.

4 MS. NORDSTROM: Good morning, Karin
5 Nordstrom with Ohio Environmental Council.

6 MS. PLANT: And Rhiannon Plant. I
7 am also here at the Ohio Attorney General's
8 Office.

9 MR. DOUGHERTY: This is Trent
10 Dougherty with Citizens Utility Board, Ohio.

11 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Let's go
12 ahead and get started.

13 EXAMINATION OF EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH
14 BY MR. FINNIGAN:

15 Q. Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah, thank you for
16 appearing for your deposition today. Let the
17 record reflect that your deposition is being
18 taken pursuant to a motion for subpoena and an
19 Attorney Examiner Order that was issued on
20 June 16th, in the case of 17-974 EL UNC.

21 Ma'am, have you given a deposition
22 before?

23 A. No, I have not.

24 Q. Okay. Could you tell us about your
25 background, beginning with your educational

1 background.

2 A. I attended law school at
3 Washington and Lee University. Started out of
4 school at a law firm in Cleveland.

5 Q. What year was that, please?

6 A. 2003 to 2005. Took position at
7 FirstEnergy in 2005 doing commercial finance
8 work, then, switched over to state regulatory
9 some years after that. I'm not sure exactly
10 when. Did Ohio regulatory work until 2011 with
11 the merger of Allegheny. Did some State Affairs
12 work from 2011 to -- I'm not sure the end date
13 with that. Went back to the Legal Department
14 did state and federal regulatory work.

15 2017, became corporate secretary,
16 Chief Ethics Officer, from 2017 to maybe
17 2018/2019 and then came back to the Legal
18 Department and as Deputy General Counsel
19 overseeing a number of different affairs within
20 the Legal Department, before assuming the
21 position of General Counsel in 2020, the spring
22 of 2020, until about --

23 MR. GLADMAN: John, I hate to
24 interrupt. But on our end, we can't hear -- we
25 effectively can't hear anything.

1 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

2 Q. Ma'am, I believe you were telling
3 us about your employment history and you've
4 reached the year 2020, when you were appointed
5 General Counsel for FirstEnergy?

6 A. Yes. I served in that position
7 until November of 2020.

8 Q. Are you employed at this time?

9 A. Yes, I am.

10 Q. What is your employment, at this
11 time?

12 A. I work for Signet Jewelers.

13 Q. And what is your position there?

14 A. Vice President, Ethics Compliance
15 and Enterprise Risk Management.

16 Q. And you began your employment there
17 when?

18 A. February of 2022.

19 Q. Where is that business located at?

20 A. Akron, Ohio.

21 Q. What kind of business is it, just a
22 retail jewelry business?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. Now, I'd like to go through your
25 employment history just to make sure I

1 understand the details you gave me. You
2 mentioned coming out of law school, you worked
3 for a law firm beginning in 2003. What law
4 firm was that?

5 A. Calfee & Halter.

6 Q. And was that in the commercial
7 finance area?

8 A. Yes, it was.

9 Q. Who was your supervisor there?

10 A. Carl Buse.

11 Q. You joined FirstEnergy in 2005?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And that was in the Legal
14 Department?

15 A. Yes, it was.

16 Q. In what area of the Legal
17 Department?

18 MS. LAPE: Asked and answered.

19 Q. Go ahead. You may answer.

20 A. I did commercial finance work.

21 Q. Did you stay in that Department of
22 Commercial Finance within the Legal Department,
23 until your next position within FirstEnergy?

24 A. No. I went from commercial finance
25 work to state regulatory work.

1 Q. And what year was that?

2 A. I'm not certain.

3 MR. GLADMAN: John, I'm very sorry
4 to interrupt you. It sounds just terrible.

5 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

6 Q. Ma'am, you were going through your
7 employment history. There are a few details I
8 did not get. So I just want to ask you to
9 flush those out a little bit more.

10 You mentioned that you left the
11 Legal Department in about 2011; is that right?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. And to take what position?

14 A. State Affairs.

15 Q. Okay. And what position within
16 State Affairs?

17 A. Legislative work.

18 Q. And what was your title?

19 A. Executive Director of State
20 Affairs.

21 Q. For what states?

22 A. The states that FirstEnergy
23 operated in.

24 Q. And you held that position until
25 2017?

1 A. No. I had gone back to the Legal
2 Department at a certain date that I don't
3 recall.

4 Q. About when? What is your best
5 estimate?

6 A. Perhaps '12 or '13.

7 Q. And what position did you take upon
8 returning to the Legal Department?

9 A. I don't recall. Maybe Executive
10 Director, State Affairs, maybe, State Legal
11 Affairs.

12 Q. You mentioned that your current
13 employment is with Signet Jewelers. How do you
14 spell that?

15 A. S-I-G-N-E-T.

16 Q. And what is your business address
17 there?

18 A. I don't know, off the top of my
19 head.

20 Q. Okay. Now, at your different
21 levels of employment within FirstEnergy, when
22 you worked in the Legal Department, who was the
23 head of the Legal Department, at that time?

24 MS. LAPE: Objection. Time.

25 Q. When you started there in 2005?

1 A. Leila Vespoli.

2 Q. And how long did she remain General
3 Counsel?

4 A. I don't recall that date.

5 Q. Who succeeded her as General
6 Counsel?

7 A. Bob Ruffner.

8 Q. Do you know, approximately, when he
9 became General Counsel?

10 A. I don't.

11 Q. When you were Executive Director of
12 State Affairs, to whom did you report?

13 A. When I was in legal or out of the
14 legal?

15 Q. Why don't you give me both.

16 A. Out of legal, Mike Dowling; in
17 legal, Bob Ruffner.

18 Q. When you were Assistant General
19 Counsel, did you report to Mr. Ruffner?

20 A. I'm not sure I held that title.

21 Q. When you were Chief Ethics Officer,
22 to whom did you report?

23 A. When I was within or outside of
24 legal?

25 Q. Both.

1 A. When I was outside of legal, I
2 reported to Chuck Jones; within legal, I
3 reported to Bob Ruffner.

4 Q. Have you ever acted as a registered
5 lobbyist in any state?

6 A. I don't recall.

7 Q. Have you ever met with any state
8 legislators to advocate for any bill involving
9 FirstEnergy's business?

10 MS. LAPE: Objection.

11 A. I don't think so.

12 Q. Did you supervise lobbyists, when
13 you worked in any role at FirstEnergy?

14 A. Yes, I did.

15 Q. Did you have responsibility for
16 knowing what the circumstances were, under
17 which lobbyists had to register with any state
18 legislative lobbying authority?

19 A. I don't remember.

20 Q. When you held any of your positions
21 at FirstEnergy, did you have any responsibility
22 for meeting with state regulatory officials,
23 like, at the Public Utilities Commission of
24 Ohio?

25 MS. LAPE: Objection. Vague.

1 A. I don't think so.

2 Q. Did you supervise others, who met
3 with regulatory officials?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Did you need to know, as their
6 supervisor, what were the circumstances, under
7 which they were allowed to have contact with
8 those regulatory officials?

9 A. I don't remember.

10 Q. Have you heard of a concept called
11 ex parte communications?

12 A. Yes, I have.

13 Q. What is your understanding of that
14 concept?

15 A. Communications with a regulator
16 between a party to a pending case.

17 Q. Okay. And did you have any
18 responsibility for training the people who
19 reported to you about ex parte communications?

20 A. I don't recall.

21 MS. LAPE: Does this have something
22 to do with Corporate Separation?

23 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, it does. It
24 does have to do with the topic of Corporate
25 Separation, because some of the cases involved

1 in this case, we believe involved improper
2 ex parte communications. So this relates to
3 those transactions.

4 MS. LAPE: That has to do with
5 whether or not FirstEnergy complied with
6 Corporate Separation Rules?

7 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, that's right.
8 Because part of the rules have to do with
9 allocating costs that were generated or
10 originated with a competitive business to the
11 non-competitive business. And so I'm asking
12 this as background to those allocation
13 transactions.

14 MS. LAPE: This is a close line,
15 but let's continue.

16 MR. FINNIGAN: And I'm sorry.
17 Could you repeat the last answer, please.

18 (Whereupon, the court reporter read
19 back the last answer)

20 Q. Okay. Have you ever registered as
21 a legislative or regulatory lobbyist?

22 A. I don't recall.

23 Q. Did you ever become aware of any
24 ex parte communications between anyone at
25 FirstEnergy and any Ohio regulatory officials?

1 MS. LAPE: Objection.

2 A. Can you repeat the question.

3 (Whereupon, the court reporter read
4 back the last question.)

5 A. I don't think so.

6 Q. Did you ever appear before the
7 Public Utilities Commission of Ohio on behalf
8 of FirstEnergy in the capacity as an attorney
9 for the companies?

10 A. Yes, I did.

11 Q. During what period of time?

12 A. I'm not sure; you know, commencing
13 in 2006, perhaps, but I don't know until then.

14 Q. Did you ever appear as an attorney
15 for the FirstEnergy Utilities before the PUCO
16 on any electric security plan case?

17 A. I believe so.

18 Q. Which ones were those?

19 A. I believe the first one.

20 Q. And what year?

21 A. I don't recall.

22 Q. Would it have been around 2008?

23 A. It could have been.

24 Q. Did you appear as an attorney on
25 behalf of the FirstEnergy utilities for a 2014

1 electric security plan case?

2 A. I don't remember.

3 Q. Did you have any supervisory
4 responsibilities that involved 2014 electric
5 security plan case?

6 MS. LAPE: Objection. Vague.

7 A. I believe so.

8 Q. What were those responsibilities?

9 A. I believe, at that time, I served
10 as Executive -- I'm not sure of my title there,
11 but, I believe, I oversaw the state regulatory
12 group of FirstEnergy.

13 Q. And who was in that group that you
14 supervised, at that time?

15 A. Brett Bingaman oversaw the group.
16 But I don't recall all the attorneys in the
17 group, at the time.

18 Q. Did you participate in settlement
19 negotiations in that case?

20 A. I believe so.

21 Q. With what other --

22 MIKE RODMAN: John, I'm sorry.
23 It's Mike Gladman. Can you tell us what this
24 has to do with Corporate Separation, and
25 whether the companies are compliant with the

1 Corporate Separation laws and regulations in
2 Ohio -- I don't see a connection between
3 Ebony's participation in an ESP case from eight
4 years ago.

5 MR. FINNIGAN: The connection is
6 that we believe that there was a settlement
7 that was entered into with Sustainability
8 Funding Alliance, as a result of that case, and
9 that those costs were charged to the utilities,
10 and that they were misallocated, which is
11 Corporate Separation violation.

12 MR. GLADMAN: Well, ask a question
13 related to that, instead of trying to get into
14 settlement discussions --

15 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, I will --

16 MR. GLADMAN: -- we are not going
17 to --

18 MR. FINNIGAN: I will when I get to
19 that point. I'm just setting the background
20 for right now.

21 MR. GLADMAN: John, let me just put
22 this out there, and you know this. There is an
23 entirely different proceeding related to this
24 specific transaction, which has been put on by
25 the Commission. I have grave concern that you

1 are trying to probe into an area that the
2 Commission has stayed, at this point in time.

3 So a little bit more latitude on
4 background, but I don't know how much further
5 we can let this go.

6 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, you say you
7 can let this go, I don't believe you have any
8 authority to stop this deposition from
9 occurring. This is not your client. This is a
10 different party than the client you represent.

11 So, and in addition to that, as you
12 know from the comments that we filed in this
13 case, we believe that this case involves issues
14 of misallocated costs related to the contract
15 with Sustainability Funding Alliance, which I
16 am asking about.

17 MS. LAPE: It sounds like, I think,
18 the allocation of cost questions, we can get
19 into, but there is an Order from the Commission
20 stating that you should not get into the
21 subject matters that are under investigation by
22 the US Attorney's office. So we are going to
23 cut it off, or get the Examiner on the line, if
24 you keep asking questions that relate to that
25 subject matter.

1 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, yes, I do have
2 to ask questions about the transactions that
3 underlie the misallocated costs, and the
4 transactions with the Sustainability Funding
5 Alliance are among those misallocated costs.
6 So I have to ask those, because those are
7 issues in this case. So that's one of the
8 primary reasons for this deposition.

9 MS. LAPE: Then I think we're going
10 to have to get the Examiner on the line.

11 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, at this point,
12 I don't even have a question pending before the
13 witness.

14 MS. LAPE: Okay.

15 MR. FINNIGAN: And let me ask, are
16 any of the Attorney Examiners on the call --
17 okay -- it sounds as if not.

18 Q. Okay. So my question was --

19 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Sir, I was just
20 going to say, we know that the SFA issues are
21 going to be something that we are going to have
22 to deal with separately. So one way to
23 approach this is for you to ask all of the
24 other transactions that you are interested in,
25 and, then, we can get to the SFA stuff at the

1 end of that.

2 MR. FINNIGAN: Sure. But let me
3 proceed. I think I have an idea of how I would
4 like to do my questioning. But thank you.

5 Q. So before we had a discussion among
6 attorneys, we were talking about settlement
7 negotiations in the 2014 ESP case --

8 MS. LAPE: Again, just to set the
9 stage. Those settlement negotiations, the
10 content of them would be confidential and we
11 shouldn't be discussing them. But to the
12 extent you're asking just, did you participate,
13 did they occur, those are fine.

14 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, actually, they
15 might have been confidential, at one time, but
16 there was information about those settlement
17 negotiations that have been disclosed by
18 FirstEnergy. So to the extent that they might
19 have been confidential, they no longer are,
20 because of the disclosure of that information.

21 MS. LAPE: We'll see when the
22 question arises.

23 Q. So, Ma'am, I was asking about what
24 your role was in the settlement negotiations,
25 and my question is, what outside parties did

1 you negotiate with?

2 A. I don't recall.

3 Q. Do you recall any?

4 A. No.

5 Q. Did you negotiate with Sam
6 Randazzo?

7 MS. LAPE: Objection. This is
8 outside the scope. This is exactly the subject
9 matter that we're not supposed to be getting
10 into, per the Commissioner's Order.

11 MR. FINNIGAN: Are you instructing
12 her not to answer?

13 MS. LAPE: I am at this point.

14 Q. Did you participate in any
15 settlement negotiations with Sustainability
16 Funding Alliance?

17 MS. LAPE: Same objection.

18 THE WITNESS: Do I need to answer?

19 MS. LAPE: You don't need to
20 answer.

21 Q. Did you participate in any
22 settlement negotiations with IEU Ohio?

23 MS. LAPE: Same objection. And you
24 do not need to answer.

25 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Now, at this

1 point, I'm not asking about the content of any
2 settlement negotiations. I am just asking
3 whether there were any, in which she
4 participated. So I want the record to be clear
5 about that.

6 Q. Did you -- well, strike that. Is
7 Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah your married name?

8 A. Yes, it is.

9 Q. When you worked at FirstEnergy, did
10 you appear before the PUCO under your maiden
11 name?

12 A. Yes, I did.

13 Q. What was that name?

14 A. Miller.

15 Q. Did you appear for the FirstEnergy
16 Utilities before the Public Utilities
17 Commission of Ohio on the Utilities Corporate
18 Separation case?

19 A. I don't recall.

20 Q. Do you recall participating with
21 Jim Burke in an application for approval of the
22 Companies' initial Corporate Separation Plan?

23 A. I may have.

24 Q. Is there anything you recall about
25 that case?

1 MR. DORINGO: And I'm just going to
2 object, and just caution you, Ebony, as the
3 lawyer, I think you were acting in legal
4 capacity for the companies, at the time, and
5 not to reveal any privileged communications.
6 The companies will assert that privilege.

7 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

8 Q. What do you recall about that case?

9 A. I don't have any active memory of
10 it.

11 Q. Did you have to familiarize
12 yourself with Ohio law and regulations
13 pertaining to Corporate Separation, in
14 connection with that case?

15 A. I don't remember my involvement in
16 the case.

17 Q. All right. So you don't remember
18 whether you became familiar with Corporate
19 Separation law and regulations?

20 A. I can make a lot of assumptions on
21 what I would have done, in preparation for the
22 case, but I don't remember.

23 Q. Have you ever had to study Ohio
24 Corporate Separation laws and regulations?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And why did you have to become
2 familiar with those?

3 A. I don't have an active memory on
4 why. But overseeing Ohio regulatory law, I can
5 make an assumption on why I would have made
6 myself familiar with it.

7 Q. And why was that?

8 A. Because I oversaw Ohio regulatory.

9 Q. So you are familiar with Ohio
10 Corporate Separation requirements?

11 A. Not sitting here today.

12 Q. Can you tell me what your
13 responsibilities were as Chief Ethics Officer?

14 A. I oversaw the Companies' employee
15 concerns line. If an employee had a concern,
16 they could report it directly to me. I oversaw
17 Code of Conduct training and Insider Trading.

18 Q. Anything else?

19 A. That's what I recall, off the top
20 of my head.

21 Q. And you mentioned the employee
22 concerns line. As your, in your role as Chief
23 Ethics Officer, were all the employee concerns
24 that were reported over the employee concerns
25 line reported to you?

1 A. They were reported. They could
2 have been reported directly to me, or through
3 the employee concerns line, they would have
4 gone to a third party vendor that then sent a
5 report to me and to others.

6 Q. Who are the others?

7 A. The head of internal audit, at the
8 time. And I served in the role, and would have
9 also gotten the report.

10 Q. I'm sorry. Did you mention that
11 person's name? I didn't hear, if you did.

12 A. I did not.

13 Q. What was that person's name?

14 A. Kevin Burgess.

15 Q. What responsibility did you have
16 for investigating calls that came in over the
17 employee concerns line?

18 A. Once we received the report, Kevin
19 Burgess and I would align on who would be
20 assigned to investigate the report and then
21 they would do the investigation and report back
22 the findings.

23 Q. Were written reports made?

24 A. Yes, they were.

25 Q. And when you say that the findings

1 were reported back, was it to you and
2 Mr. Burgess?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. Anyone else?

5 A. Someone in Human Resources.

6 Q. Who was that?

7 A. Dave Winston.

8 Q. Anyone else?

9 A. I don't recall.

10 Q. After the concerns were
11 investigated and a report came back -- well,
12 strike that. Who did the actual investigation?

13 MS. LAPE: Objection.

14 A. It depended on the nature of the
15 claim.

16 Q. Could you explain that?

17 A. If it was a Human Resources-related
18 issue, someone in Human Resources would
19 investigate it; if it was a financially-related
20 issue, someone in internal audit would
21 investigate; if it was a security-related
22 issue, someone in securities would investigate,
23 for example.

24 Q. Would people within those
25 respective departments be appointed to do the

1 investigations?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. And after the reports came back of
4 these investigations, what was the next step in
5 processing the calls that came in?

6 A. To review the report for its
7 thorough and completeness, and, then, any
8 Action Items to follow-up with the applicable
9 H.R. representative, or internal auditing, to
10 take action.

11 Q. Did you report to anyone about the
12 results of employee concerns line
13 investigations?

14 A. Yes, I did.

15 Q. And to whom did you report?

16 A. To the Audit Committee.

17 Q. The Board of Directors Audit
18 Committee?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. Were those reports in writing?

21 A. I don't recall.

22 Q. Were minutes prepared of those
23 Board meetings?

24 A. Committee --

25 Q. Yes.

1 A. Were committee minutes taken?

2 Q. Yes.

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. During your tenure at FirstEnergy,
5 were there ever any calls on the employee
6 concerns line related to level of signature
7 authority?

8 MS. LAPE: Objection. Foundation.

9 A. I don't recall.

10 Q. During your time as Chief Ethics
11 Officer, were there ever any calls that came in
12 on the employee concerns line relating to
13 improper payment of invoices, or improper
14 payments to a vendor?

15 A. Not that I can remember.

16 Q. Were there any calls that came in
17 on the employee concerns line relating to
18 Generation Now?

19 MS. LAPE: Objection. Foundation.
20 Scope. This is also going into the subject
21 matter under investigation by the US Attorney's
22 office, once again. You don't need to answer.

23 MR. FINNIGAN: Did you instruct her
24 not to answer?

25 MS. LAPE: About a question related

1 to Generation Now --

2 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes.

3 MS. LAPE: Yes.

4 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Well, this is
5 an issue in this case, just, because, costs for
6 Generation Now were charged to consumers. So
7 that's why I'm asking about this issue.

8 Q. Did you ever receive any calls on
9 the employee concerns line relating to
10 Sustainability Funding Alliance?

11 MS. LAPE: Same objection.

12 MR. FINNIGAN: You will have to let
13 us know if you are instructing her not to
14 answer.

15 MS. LAPE: I'm instructing you not
16 to answer. And you can ask the question of,
17 did you ever receive a call about a Corporate
18 Separation issue, which would be allowable in
19 this proceeding.

20 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, and these are,
21 the questions I just asked are related to
22 Corporate Separation violations, because of the
23 improper allocation of costs. That's why I was
24 asking her.

25 MS. LAPE: Well, you can ask a

1 general question that is permissible in this
2 proceeding that would cover what you're asking
3 about.

4 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, I appreciate
5 that. But I will judge the way in which I will
6 want to ask the questions. And, as I
7 mentioned, these are all relevant, in that they
8 have to do with the costs that were
9 misallocated to consumers.

10 MS. LAPE: And they are all issues
11 that the Commission has instructed not to be
12 questioned about in this proceeding.

13 MR. FINNIGAN: No, they haven't
14 made such an instruction.

15 MS. WILLIS: If I could jump in.
16 You are referring to an Order. I just want to
17 make sure the Order you are referring to, where
18 the Commission ruled we cannot ask these
19 questions, that's kind of my -- a very basic
20 Order. Which Order are you referring to?

21 MR. DORINGO: And, Maureen, it's in
22 the -- from the Commission, you guys know that
23 the Commission expanded the scope of the DCR
24 case to investigate whether there was a
25 violation of the Ohio statute that required

1 FirstEnergy, or the companies, to disclose the
2 side agreement. In that Order and elsewhere,
3 frankly, the Commission was very clear that
4 discovery into the Sustainability Funding
5 Alliance, and the other matters that are under
6 investigation by the DOJ, is somewhere where
7 the Commission is not going to go, they said.

8 MS. WILLIS: Okay. And --

9 MR. DORINGO: -- Examiner Price
10 said, "This is the worst mistake that
11 Commission could make."

12 MS. WILLIS: Ryan, which Order, if
13 you could, because I got the -- I'll just pull
14 it up on the --

15 MR. DORINGO: It is
16 December-something, 2021.

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: December 15th.

18 MS. WILLIS: And the 20-1629, is
19 that what you are referring to?

20 MR. DORINGO: Yes.

21 MS. WILLIS: Okay. Can you give us
22 a moment. And that is the same Order that you
23 are referring to?

24 MS. LAPE: Yes. Paragraph 14.

25 MS. WILLIS: All right. Let me

1 pull that up.

2 MR. GLADMAN: I'm sorry. Can you
3 repeat that. It wasn't quite clear.

4 MS. LAPE: Yes. It is in the
5 December 15, 2021 Order, Case No. 20-1629 in
6 paragraph 14, where the Commission states that
7 it is of the utmost importance that our
8 investigations do not interfere with the
9 criminal investigation by the United States
10 Attorney or the action brought by the Ohio
11 Attorney General.

12 Q. Ma'am, have you been notified by
13 anyone from the Department of Justice that you
14 are under investigation?

15 MS. LAPE: Objection. Do not
16 answer that question.

17 Q. Ma'am, I want to ask you about the
18 circumstances under which your employment ended
19 with FirstEnergy. Who notified you that your
20 employment was ending?

21 MS. LAPE: Objection.

22 THE WITNESS: Can I answer the
23 question?

24 MS. LAPE: Yes.

25 A. My counsel.

1 Q. Who?

2 A. Counsel.

3 Q. And what was counsel's name?

4 A. Pat Fitzgerald.

5 Q. What do you understand were the
6 reasons why your employment at FirstEnergy
7 ended?

8 A. I think the company issued an AK
9 that provided its reasons.

10 Q. And I have read that AK, and it
11 says the reason was because of inaction on your
12 part that was influenced by improper tone at
13 the top; is that correct?

14 MS. LAPE: Objection.

15 A. I think the document states what it
16 states.

17 Q. Is that what you understand was the
18 reason?

19 A. My understanding was the document.

20 Q. All right. Do you understand that
21 your employment at FirstEnergy ended, because
22 of any inaction on your part?

23 A. Not to my knowledge.

24 Q. Do you understand that your
25 employment at FirstEnergy ended, because of

1 some improper tone at the top that influenced
2 your work there?

3 MS. LAPE: Objection.

4 MR. GLADMAN: Let me get an
5 objection in. Unless you are asking whether or
6 not there was something to do with Corporate
7 Separation related to Ebony's departure from
8 the company, I think this is inappropriate. So
9 note my objection.

10 A. No behavior on my part, but I can't
11 speak to the Company's rationale. You would
12 have to ask the company.

13 Q. So you don't really know why your
14 employment ended at FirstEnergy --

15 MS. LAPE: Objection. Asked and
16 answered.

17 Q. Is that fair?

18 A. I've indicated my understanding.

19 Q. And do you feel that you did
20 anything wrong during your employment at
21 FirstEnergy that led to your employment ending?

22 MS. LAPE: Objection. Scope.

23 A. Absolutely not.

24 MR. GLADMAN: Objection scope.

25 Q. During your tenure at FirstEnergy,

1 did you have any responsibility for the
2 Corporate Separation Plan for the Ohio
3 FirstEnergy utilities?

4 MS. LAPE: Objection. Time period.

5 A. While I was engaged, I don't recall
6 my role.

7 Q. Okay. When you say while you were
8 engaged, do you mean while you were engaged in
9 employment at FirstEnergy, or while you were
10 engaged with the Corporate Separation Plan, you
11 don't recall your role? Can you explain that
12 answer?

13 A. You referenced a filing that had my
14 name on it, and while I recall being engaged in
15 that filing, I don't recall my role.

16 Q. Okay. I want to ask a different
17 topic from that. I don't want to ask you any
18 questions, at this point, with respect to any
19 role you might have played regarding the
20 initial approval of the Corporate Separation
21 plan. Let's put that aside.

22 What I want to ask you now, is
23 that, apart from the initial approval of the
24 Corporate Separation plan, did you have any
25 responsibility at any time after that for

1 whether the Corporate Separation Plan was
2 complied with, and I am referring to the
3 Corporate Separation Plan for the FirstEnergy
4 Ohio Utilities?

5 MR. DORINGO: And I'll just again
6 caution not to reveal any privileged
7 information relating to your representation
8 with the companies.

9 A. In my role as Chief Ethics Officer,
10 if there was a concern with compliance with
11 Corporate Separation, internal or external
12 parties could contact me, and report it, just
13 like many of the employee concerns lines, or
14 other concerns that people brought on behalf of
15 themselves or others.

16 Q. Did you ever have any
17 responsibility for maintaining records related
18 to FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities Corporate
19 Separation Plan?

20 A. I don't recall if that was a direct
21 responsibility.

22 Q. Could it have been an indirect
23 responsibility?

24 MS. LAPE: Objection.

25 A. I don't recall if that was a

1 responsibility.

2 Q. Did you ever have any
3 responsibility during your tenure at
4 FirstEnergy for determining whether FirstEnergy
5 employees received any training on Ohio
6 Corporate Separation requirements?

7 A. Through my role as Chief Ethics
8 Officer, I am sure that we provided training on
9 Corporate Separation through our Code of
10 Conduct training.

11 Q. And did that training include
12 training on Ohio Corporate Separation
13 requirements?

14 A. Yes, it did.

15 Q. Are you aware of any audit findings
16 that FirstEnergy did not provide training on
17 Ohio Corporate Separation requirements?

18 MS. LAPE: Objection. Foundation.

19 A. Not that I can recall.

20 Q. Are you familiar with a Sage audit
21 of the FirstEnergy Corporate Separation Plan,
22 during the time you worked there in 2018?

23 A. Not that I can recall.

24 Q. Did you recall anyone ever bringing
25 to your attention that -- well, strike that.

1 Are you familiar with the FERC
2 standards of conduct?

3 A. I'm aware that they exist. I would
4 have to see them to be able to speak to them.

5 Q. Are the Ohio Corporate Separation
6 requirements co-extensive with the FERC
7 standards of conduct, in other words, if one
8 complies with the FERC standards of conduct,
9 will they automatically be complying with the
10 Ohio Corporate Separation requirements?

11 MS. LAPE: Objection. Are you
12 asking for a legal opinion?

13 MR. FINNIGAN: Her understanding,
14 as Chief Compliance Officer.

15 MS. LAPE: Objection. She was
16 Chief Ethics Officer.

17 A. I don't believe that they
18 overlapped, precisely.

19 Q. So are there requirements under the
20 Ohio Corporate Separation laws and regulations
21 that would not be met merely by complying with
22 FERC standards of conduct?

23 MS. LAPE: Objection. You can
24 answer, if you know.

25 A. I believe so.

1 Q. Who did the training for employees
2 of the FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities on Ohio
3 Corporate Separation requirements?

4 A. Ohio Corporate Separation was
5 decentralized, in the sense that it was covered
6 by a variety of different departments. As
7 Chief Ethics Officer, I provided for our Code
8 of Conduct certain Ohio Corporate Separation
9 training. But I'm not saying that that was the
10 only training provided.

11 Q. I'm sorry. When you say you
12 provided the training, did you provide it
13 personally?

14 A. There was, through the Code of
15 Conduct that my team administered, there was a
16 Corporate Separation component to it.

17 Q. And was this Ohio Corporate
18 Separation requirements?

19 A. Yes, it was.

20 Q. And you mentioned "my team." Who
21 was on that team?

22 A. Chief Ethics Officer was an
23 unstaffed position, and, so, I would work with
24 internal auditing and H.R. And so, with the
25 Code of Conduct training, I think I worked

1 mostly with internal auditing to administer the
2 training.

3 Q. And are you saying that there was
4 separate training on Ohio Corporate Separation
5 requirements that was separate and apart from
6 FERC standards of conduct training?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. And did you keep records of which
9 employees completed that training?

10 A. The system would note who completed
11 the training and who didn't.

12 Q. I'm sorry. Who would note?

13 A. The system.

14 Q. When you say the system, what is
15 the system?

16 A. It was an electronic program, or
17 something that was administered over the
18 computer.

19 Q. What was the name of that program?

20 A. I don't know.

21 Q. Who had responsibility for
22 administering it?

23 A. I don't recall.

24 Q. Was that part of your
25 responsibility as Chief Ethics Officer?

1 A. I would ensure that the training
2 was launched, and, then, I would get reports
3 back on the completion, and follow-up with
4 members of management to ensure their team had
5 taken the training, and then get reports back
6 regarding certain components of the training.

7 Q. Now, you've talked about your role
8 as Chief Ethics Officer. Did you ever hold the
9 title of Chief Compliance Officer?

10 A. No, I did not.

11 Q. Now, during the time you worked at
12 FirstEnergy, was there ever any issue with
13 missing records related to compliance with the
14 Ohio Corporate Separation requirements?

15 MS. LAPE: Objection.

16 A. I don't recall.

17 Q. Were the records for compliance
18 with Ohio Corporate Separation Rules maintained
19 in electronic or paper form or both?

20 MS. LAPE: Objection. Time period.

21 A. I don't know. My records would
22 have been electronic. But, as I said, the role
23 was decentralized amongst a variety of
24 different departments, and I'm not sure how
25 they kept their records.

1 Q. Now, going back to when you were
2 notified that your employment at FirstEnergy
3 ended, did you have access to any company
4 records, after you were notified about that?

5 MS. LAPE: Objection.

6 A. I did.

7 Q. And what was the nature of your
8 access to those records?

9 A. At that time, we were working
10 remotely, and I had certain paperwork and
11 documents in my possession.

12 Q. What did you do with the paperwork
13 and documents when you ended your employment?

14 A. I returned them to FirstEnergy.

15 Q. And to whom did you return them?

16 A. I don't recall.

17 Q. What was the person's position?

18 A. I don't know.

19 Q. Was there somebody who, at H.R.,
20 who supervised your separation from the
21 company?

22 A. I don't know.

23 Q. Did you turn over all the records
24 within your possession?

25 A. I did.

1 Q. Did you ever have any
2 responsibility for overseeing how costs were
3 allocated from FirstEnergy's competitive
4 businesses to the non-competitive businesses?

5 A. I don't think so.

6 Q. So your job did not include
7 oversight of whether there were ever improper
8 subsidies from the competitive business to the
9 non-competitive business --

10 MS. LAPE: Objection.

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. -- or vice-versa, any subsidies
13 from the non-competitive business to the
14 competitive business.

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. Do you know who had that
17 responsibility?

18 A. I would assume Accounting.

19 Q. What person in Accounting?

20 A. I don't know.

21 Q. Was it Art Richards?

22 A. I'm not familiar whether he's in
23 Accounting.

24 Q. Are you aware of whether there are
25 any Ohio Corporate Separation requirements

1 relating to cost allocation?

2 A. I am aware that there are.

3 Q. And what did you do to make sure
4 that those were complied with?

5 A. There was training.

6 Q. What review was done of the cost
7 allocations to make sure that they were
8 properly done, and in compliance with the Ohio
9 separation requirements?

10 A. I don't recall.

11 Q. Are you familiar with an entity by
12 the name of Sustainability Funding Alliance?

13 MS. LAPE: Are we going to go into
14 these questions again?

15 MR. FINNIGAN: I have a list of
16 questions about this, yes.

17 MS. LAPE: Okay. Well, I will let
18 you ask if she is familiar with it, but we're
19 not going to go much further than that.

20 A. I'm familiar with that name.

21 Q. Okay. And what dealings did you
22 have with that organization?

23 MS. LAPE: Objection. Scope.

24 MR. DORINGO: Objection scope.

25 MS. LAPE: And also, we have the

1 Commission's Order.

2 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, again, I'm
3 going to -- if you are instructing the witness
4 not to answer, you need to tell her so that we
5 all know.

6 MS. LAPE: Yes. I am instructing
7 the witness not to answer questions about any,
8 about Sustainability Funding Alliance, as that
9 is under investigation. Those topics are under
10 investigation by the US Attorney's Office.

11 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. She hasn't
12 told us that, so we have no way of knowing
13 that.

14 MS. LAPE: It's public record. I'm
15 pretty sure everybody in this room knows that.

16 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, that might be.
17 But if the witness is not part of that
18 investigation or a subject or a target, there
19 is no reason why the witness can't answer
20 questions about it.

21 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Except for the
22 Order.

23 MS. LAPE: Except for there is that
24 Order by the Commission saying that these
25 topics should not be explored.

1 MS. WILLIS: Well, I mean, to be
2 fair, we can all pull up the Order and take a
3 look at it. And I think the Order, I don't
4 think it goes quite nearly as far as you would
5 say. So, I mean, perhaps we need to get the
6 Examiner on the phone. We can do that.

7 MS. LAPE: I read the exact
8 language from that Order. I did not
9 mischaracterize it.

10 MS. WILLIS: You didn't read the
11 entire paragraph.

12 MS. BOJKO: Excuse me. We disagree
13 with your interpretation of the Order. We are
14 not talking about criminal matters, at this
15 point, or anything related to the Attorney
16 General's Office. We are talking about
17 Corporate Separation, and all of these
18 companies and issue directly relate to the
19 Corporate Separation proceeding, and how the
20 costs were allocated, you know, we're not
21 getting into the same issues that the Order was
22 referencing.

23 MR. FINNIGAN: And let me just see
24 if we can get an answer on this. So Tom or
25 Vern, could one of you contact one of the

1 Attorney Examiners to see if they can join the
2 call.

3 MR. LINDGREN: Hey John, I don't
4 have their direct phone number, but I will
5 attempt to contact her.

6 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Let's take a
7 short recess, while you do that.

8 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

9 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honors, thank
10 you both for joining. This is John Finnigan
11 with OCC. We are here in Akron for the
12 deposition of Ms. Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah, and an
13 issue has arisen about the scope of
14 questioning.

15 I started to ask a series of
16 questions relating to her dealings with
17 Mr. Randazzo and Sustainability Funding
18 Alliance that she was instructed not to answer.
19 That's why we asked you to join the call.

20 Our theory of this case is that
21 these questions are issues in the case, because
22 this case involves Corporate Separation
23 requirements and possible violations, part of
24 which would include cost misallocations. We
25 know from the audit report for the expanded

1 scope audit in the DCR case that some, I
2 believe, it was \$24 million in costs from
3 Sustainability Funding Alliance were improperly
4 allocated to the FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities.
5 So I was asking these questions as background
6 to find out more information about those
7 improper cost allocations in violation of the
8 Corporate Separation requirements.

9 And, so, we were wondering if you
10 can give us guidance, as to whether that is a
11 legitimate scope of questioning in this case.
12 And Ms. Lape is here representing the witness.

13 MS. LAPE: Good morning. Thank you
14 for joining the call. We did have a question
15 with respect to scope, and whether these
16 questions were appropriate, in light of the
17 Commission's prior Order, that it is of the
18 utmost importance that the investigation not
19 interfere with the criminal investigation by
20 the US Attorney's office and the action brought
21 by the Ohio Attorney General.

22 It is impossible to speak to the
23 allocation of payments with respect to
24 Sustainability Funding Alliance and
25 Mr. Randazzo without getting into the subject

1 matter of, you know, the settlement
2 discussions, without getting into the purpose
3 of the payments, without getting into the
4 subject matters that are under direct
5 investigation by the US Attorney's office.

6 And so they seem inappropriate, at
7 this point in time, and given the Commission's
8 prior Order with respect to that matter.

9 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honors, if I
10 may respond to that. You know, we are here on
11 a public call, where not everyone on this call
12 has signed a confidentiality agreement with
13 FirstEnergy Corp, but, we have, and in the
14 course of records that we have received, there
15 is great detail about all the payments that
16 were made to Sustainability Funding Alliance.
17 There is a great deal of information about
18 e-mail communications and text communications
19 between Mr. Randazzo and Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah
20 and others at FirstEnergy about --

21 MS. LAPE: Objection. You are
22 misrepresenting the record.

23 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, excuse me.
24 Let me --

25 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Please let him

1 finish and then we can allow you to respond.

2 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, I would just
3 like to finish. So it is our view that this
4 subject matter is not confidential in any way,
5 or outside the scope of questioning in this
6 case. Because to establish that these costs
7 were misallocated, we have to ask about the
8 nature of the dealings with Mr. Randazzo and
9 Sustainability Funding Alliance.

10 It is all documented in the text
11 messages and the e-mail exchanges that we've
12 received in documents, and, now, we're simply
13 asking the witness what her involvement was in
14 all of those communications that we already
15 have in paper form.

16 MR. DORINGO: Your Honors, this is
17 Ryan Doringo on behalf of the companies. If I
18 could just be heard for a moment.

19 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Certainly.

20 MR. DORINGO: Thank you. Your
21 Honors, fundamentally, the Commission has
22 expressed, not just in the December 15th Order
23 in the Rider DCR case, but continuously through
24 these proceedings something more than
25 hesitation, I mean, an outright refusal to get

1 into the details of the matters that are under
2 investigation by the Department of Justice and
3 other regulators. These questions go directly
4 to that.

5 The questions were relating to
6 whether, or the substance of the communications
7 that happen during ESP 4 with Randazzo or IEU
8 Ohio. These are not germane to Corporate
9 Separation issues. We disagree with that. OCC
10 and others have all the information about the
11 payments that were made and how they were
12 allocated. That's not what they are going for
13 here. They are using that as a pretext to get
14 to information that should not be disclosed, in
15 light of the Commission's Order on December
16 15th and its other statements on these issues.

17 MR. OLIKER: I will wait to speak,
18 but I just want to reserve a moment to suggest
19 an additional topic, since you are on the line.
20 But I don't want to interrupt the discussion.

21 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Would anyone
22 else like to weigh in on this?

23 MS. BOJKO: Yes, Your Honor. This
24 is Kim Bojko with Ohio Manufacturers's
25 Association Energy Group. We believe, first of

1 all, a bit of misrepresentation by the
2 companies. We weren't even allowed to ask
3 questions about, did settlement discussions
4 happen, did you talk to this entity, did this
5 entity speak with you? It wasn't even the
6 contents of settlement discussions. It was
7 whether they occurred and who did they occur
8 with. Those are proper, even under the
9 Commission's current rules in the current
10 proceedings. So those questions were not
11 allowed to be asked either, the witness was
12 instructed to not answer.

13 But I think that any kind of
14 allocation of cost directly goes to this
15 proceeding Corporate Separation violation.
16 This witness was the ethics officer, at the
17 time, and she was involved in the process, in
18 the Complaint process, and she's also stated
19 she was involved in settlement discussions.
20 And anything that occurred that resulted in
21 allocations of cost that were improper to the
22 Ohio utilities, is very much a Corporate
23 Separation violation issue, and it should be
24 allowed to move forward.

25 So we support the position, I

1 think, that the companies didn't properly
2 instruct, or the witness' attorney didn't
3 properly instruct her there. It wasn't proper.
4 Thank you.

5 MR. OLIKER: Your Honor, if I could
6 add to that. There are questions regarding the
7 allocation. For example, we should be entitled
8 to explore whether the agreement with
9 Sustainability Funding Alliance was for the
10 benefit of FirstEnergy Solutions, a competitive
11 affiliate and questions regarding how those
12 costs were coded to the Ohio utilities, what
13 the intent was, those all go to chapter
14 29.2817, and whether or not there was undue
15 benefit being made to an affiliate. That is
16 the whole proper context of this letter.

17 And we don't want prejudge any of
18 the things regarding the DOJ. That's not what
19 we're here to explore. That's separate. The
20 actual activities that took place near the
21 agreement, that's completely separate aside.
22 That's not what we're asking about.

23 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Lape, any
24 response?

25 MR. DORINGO: Your Honors, for the

1 companies again. First of all, I want to
2 clarify that we have not instructed the witness
3 not to answer anything. I want to be clear on
4 that front.

5 Second of all, there hasn't been a
6 single question about the actual cost
7 allocation. It's been about the substance of
8 the communications. I think, look, cost
9 allocation matters are relevant here, but the
10 substance of those communications is directly
11 involved in the expanded scope DCR case. It's
12 for another proceeding that the Commission has
13 stayed. Thank you.

14 MS. LAPE: Your Honors, just to
15 reiterate; the fact of the settlement
16 discussions with SFA, the substance of those
17 contracts with SFA, those are direct subject
18 matters under investigation by the US
19 Attorney's office. We don't believe that the
20 questions that have been posed here are proper.

21 Again, I understand if there are
22 questions related to the allocation, itself,
23 and aside from that, any questions related to
24 the subject matter we think are inappropriate,
25 in light of the investigation that is ongoing

1 right now.

2 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, if I may
3 respond to that. We've received thousands and
4 thousands of pages of documents relating to
5 contracts, e-mail communications, text
6 discussions, relating to the subject area. So
7 this certainly is not off limits to the case,
8 because we've already received this
9 information. Now we are asking one of the
10 persons involved what her role was, with
11 respect to these communications.

12 So we would maintain that it is not
13 off limits, because we have all of these
14 documents that center on this topic. It does
15 go to the issue of improper cost allocations,
16 and we are simply asking her these background
17 questions about what her role was in these
18 improper cost misallocations.

19 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Your Honors,
20 these subject matters became off limits on
21 December 15, 2021, when the Commission issued
22 its Order, and it was issued because there is
23 an ongoing criminal investigation of a very
24 serious matter.

25 So there is an existing stay of

1 discovery, and it's the very subject matter
2 that OCC is trying to get into. We are all
3 aware of the fact that there was a search
4 warrant at Commissioner Randazzo's home. That
5 is a matter of public record. And the subject
6 matter that they are trying to get into is
7 precisely related to the underlying US
8 Attorney's office investigation.

9 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.
10 Anyone else? Okay. We are going to take a
11 couple minutes to discuss the arguments and
12 come back on with our ruling. Thank you.

13 MS. LAPE: Thanks very much.

14 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

15 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: We are ready to
16 make the ruling. Can everyone hear me?

17 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes.

18 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.
19 Okay. Before getting into the substance of the
20 ruling, I will note Attorney Examiners always
21 seem to be at a disadvantage getting pulled
22 into depositions without knowing, you know, the
23 20 questions proceeding the disputed question,
24 or the 20 questions that will come thereafter.

25 But based on the argument presented

1 by the parties, we do find that this line of
2 questioning will be permitted.

3 In the June 16, 2022 entry in this
4 proceeding, we did deny the motion to quash and
5 allow this deposition to proceed.

6 And based on that, I will remind
7 the parties that the discovery threshold is a
8 very low bar, in that it's only allowable for
9 information reasonably calculated to lead to
10 discovery of admissible evidence, pursuant to
11 Ohio Admin Code 4901:1-16(B). And while we
12 note that these questions are being permitted,
13 as of today for the purposes of the deposition,
14 we again reiterate the relevancy of this
15 proceeding and this line of questioning will be
16 addressed at the hearing.

17 Specifically, to the issue
18 regarding certain documents pertaining to the
19 DOJ or FERC investigations, we did note in that
20 same entry that documents that had already been
21 produced, we would allow parties to ask
22 questions related to those documents, during
23 those depositions subject to that ruling,
24 that's paragraphs 38 and 39 of this June 16,
25 2022 entry. If we do tread into areas that

1 have otherwise been deemed confidential, I
2 believe, that we already have an adequate means
3 of making sure that that information is not
4 inadvertently disclosed in the public record by
5 accessing the confidential portion of the
6 deposition that has already been set up.

7 So we would expect the parties to
8 refrain from asking certain questions if those
9 would divulge confidential details, until the
10 confidential portion of the deposition is held.

11 So I believe that covers everything
12 that had been raised. Are there any additional
13 questions for the Attorney Examiners, at this
14 time?

15 MR. DORINGO: Your Honors, I think
16 we would insist that, precaution, that this
17 line of questioning just goes forth entirely in
18 the confidential session?

19 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, this is
20 John Finnigan for OCC --

21 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes.

22 MR. FINNIGAN: We are happy to
23 proceed that way and we do have a number of
24 documents that we had intended to mark as
25 deposition exhibits, during the confidential

1 session. So it would be just as easy for us to
2 conduct all that questioning during this
3 afternoon's confidential session.

4 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Well, I
5 certainly think that makes sense, and well
6 done.

7 MS. LAPE: Can I ask one clarify
8 question, Your Honor?

9 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Yes, you may.

10 MS. LAPE: Understanding the ruling
11 with respect to confidentiality, our concern
12 was really with respect to interference with
13 the criminal investigation by the US Attorney's
14 office. And so I just wanted to understand if
15 the ruling is that they are authorized to ask
16 any questions, with respect to those issues
17 that are under investigation?

18 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I think my
19 ruling is permitting them to ask any questions
20 related to the documents that have already been
21 produced in the discovery phase of this
22 proceeding. If there are additional questions
23 of a particular document, or a particular line
24 of questioning related to a specific document
25 is raised in the confidential session, we can

1 take that up. But I don't believe my ruling is
2 quite as broad as what you're trying to argue
3 for.

4 MS. LAPE: Well, I'm certainly not
5 trying to argue for that. I just want to
6 understand where we draw the lines here.
7 Because if it's about asking about a specific
8 document that had been produced, that's one
9 thing. But if it's about authorizing
10 Mr. Finnigan to ask questions about
11 interactions with Mr. Randazzo, about payments
12 made to SFA, about the settlement negotiations,
13 you know, that are under investigation, you
14 know, it's going to be hard. We just need to
15 know so that we know how to move forward.

16 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: How would that
17 be any different than questions regarding the
18 documents --

19 MS. WILLIS: It's not.

20 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: The 470,000
21 pages of documents or --

22 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, it would
23 not. You know, we were just giving background
24 questions leading into those documents. Those
25 documents are very detailed, very specific, and

1 they were produced, as you noted, they were
2 produced by FirstEnergy Corp. So there is no
3 privilege existing with regard to those
4 documents. So these were background questions.
5 We can go into the documents themselves. We
6 were just trying to establish background and
7 foundation.

8 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Does that
9 answer your question?

10 MS. LAPE: Yes. And the December
11 15, 2021 ruling is still in effect, as well --
12 we assume?

13 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm sorry. Can
14 you ask your question one more time.

15 MS. LAPE: Yes. Just confirming
16 that the December 15, 2021 Order is still in
17 effect, as well.

18 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Unless the
19 attorney examiners with the Commission have
20 overruled one of our prior entries and/or
21 Orders, they are still standing, yes.

22 MS. LAPE: Great. Thank you.

23 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Of course.

24 MS. BOJKO: Your Honor, this is Kim
25 Bojko. This is why we ended up calling you,

1 because the attorney is claiming that that
2 December 15th Order, paragraph 14, precludes us
3 from asking any questions, regarding these
4 exact questions and issues. And we believe
5 that she is misinterpreting the Order, or
6 broadly interpreting it. And so we're not
7 talking about the crime in the criminal
8 investigation, or the AD mentioned. We are
9 trying to ask questions about the payments and
10 allocations and everything else.

11 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Which I think
12 would, I agree would be fair game consistent
13 with our rulings today, as well as our prior
14 entries and orders.

15 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, to put it
16 into focus, I believe the attorney believes
17 that the Commission, because they deferred
18 ruling on the violation of 4928.145, the
19 disclosures of side agreements, that, because
20 that, the Commission made that ruling, that
21 that means we can't ask any questions about
22 side agreements.

23 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Didn't that
24 ruling also provide a stay of discovery, as to
25 that specific issue, Ms. Willis?

1 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, with
2 respect to the violation of that particular
3 law, 4928.145 -- our questions are not going to
4 a violation of that law, and whether there was
5 action that violated the law -- our questions
6 are going to whether side agreements existed,
7 which resulted in costs being allocated
8 improperly to the FirstEnergy Utilities, and,
9 in turn, to their customers.

10 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Ms. Lape, would
11 you, or I'm sorry -- whoever would like to
12 respond to that.

13 MR. DORINGO: Your Honor, right.
14 With respect to the ruling, that DCR matter,
15 it's, the point of the Commission's stay of
16 discovery was, as we read it, to not get into
17 the substance of the communications relating to
18 the side agreement, or the potential side
19 agreement that was discussed in that Order and
20 referred to in the DPA. So I agree that the
21 Commission stayed discovery on that issue,
22 which, I think, was your question. And that is
23 a much broader issue than just cost allocation.

24 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Mr. Doringo,
25 you don't agree that that discovery on that

1 issue could, in fact, also apply to the
2 broader, as you just said, the broader issue of
3 cost allocation?

4 MR. DORINGO: Well, I think the
5 Commission just stayed discovery on the issue,
6 Your Honor, and I think it's a very broad stay
7 of discovery on that issue. That is how we
8 interpret the Order, and that is the reason we
9 got you on the phone.

10 But, yes. I don't think that
11 agreement is relevant, and the potential side
12 agreement, ESP 4, is relevant to Corporate
13 Separation, you know, matters. But I think
14 that there is a broad stay of discovery on that
15 side agreement, or potential side agreement in
16 ESP 4. That was the point of our argument.

17 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, just to
18 present our side. This is another way of
19 attacking the ruling that you just made a
20 couple of minutes ago, where you said that we
21 are allowed to ask questions about the
22 documents that were produced by FirstEnergy
23 Corp in discovery that relate to the dealings
24 with Mr. Randazzo and Sustainability Funding
25 Alliance. Now, the company and the utilities

1 are trying to come through the back door, and
2 say, "Well, no, you can't ask about those,
3 because those all relate to a side deal." And
4 then the side deal in question is one between
5 the FirstEnergy utilities and Sustainability
6 Funding Alliance.

7 So what they're trying to say is
8 that, "Well, that's a side deal. You can't ask
9 any questions about that, because discovery is
10 stayed on that topic." If that were the case,
11 then, the ruling that you just made moments ago
12 would have no impact, where you said that we
13 are allowed to ask questions about the
14 discovery documents that were produced by
15 FirstEnergy Corp in response to the subpoena.

16 We have many documents that were
17 produced in discovery that relate to the
18 dealings between Mr. Randazzo and
19 Sustainability Funding Alliance, and our
20 position is that they can't say that, "Well,
21 that was a side deal," and block all of our
22 questioning about that through those means.

23 MR. DORINGO: Just to clarify, Your
24 Honor, we're not saying it was a side deal.
25 That's not something the Commission has

1 determined, or anybody has determined yet.
2 What we are saying is that the December 15th
3 Order references a 2015 agreement between SFA
4 and FirstEnergy, and says we are going to stay
5 discovery on that issue. We think that is
6 pretty broad, and that's the point.

7 MS. WILLIS: But, one last point --
8 the entry went to whether or not a statute was
9 violated. That statute is whether or not, if
10 there was a side agreement, whether or not the
11 company was obligated to, on the basis of this
12 written discovery, to alert the parties.
13 That's what that's about. It's not about
14 whether or not a side agreement existed. It is
15 about whether or not that law was violated, and
16 that law is very specific.

17 So to say that this issue, the side
18 agreement is an issue that's then deferred,
19 that's not correct. It was whether or not
20 4928.145 was violated.

21 MR. DORINGO: That's a legal
22 question. The underlying facts go to the DOJ's
23 investigation.

24 MS. WILLIS: Well, I will say this,
25 that the documents that --

1 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you.
2 Thank you. Would anyone else care to weigh in?
3 Okay. Hearing none. I am a little frustrated
4 that, if this was the crux of the dispute, why
5 that wasn't raised in the first instance of the
6 Examiners joining in the call.

7 That being said -- I am looking at
8 the entry dated December 15, 2021, and issued
9 in Case No. 20 1629 EL RDR, in which it states,
10 we will stay further investigation of this
11 issue, including discovery, it's also been
12 Ordered by the Commission. The companies are
13 directed to preserve all documents and all
14 records related to the potential violation of
15 R.C. 4928.145, including, but not limited to,
16 all documents and records related to any
17 agreements of SFA, or IEU Ohio Administration
18 Company, until the stay has been lifted and the
19 investigation has been completed, including a
20 hearing, if necessary.

21 And Mr. Doringo, that entry only
22 was regarding the potential violation of
23 R.C. 4928.145 from the issues raised in the
24 audit reports in that case; isn't that correct?

25 MR. DORINGO: So, right, I agree

1 that that entry relates to that statute, and
2 the stay of discovery, you know, in the updated
3 expanded scope case to investigate whether
4 there was a violation of that statute. But we
5 think the underlying facts subject to the stay
6 of discovery should remain protected,
7 specifically, given the Commission's statement
8 in paragraph 14 of that Order, that it is of
9 the utmost importance that our investigations
10 do not interfere with the criminal
11 investigation by the US Attorney's Office, or
12 the action brought by Ohio attorney general.

13 And, Your Honors, we think that the
14 facts that OCC and others may try to get into
15 here, go directly to those issues that are
16 under investigation, and which prompted the
17 Commission to issue that stay.

18 MR. OLIKER: Your Honor, may I say
19 something?

20 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: You may.

21 MR. OLIKER: The renegotiations
22 that we are talking about took place many, many
23 years, before House Bill 6. It is only
24 tangentially connected to those events. I
25 really think people are confusing the issues

1 here when we're talking the Corporate
2 Separation issue. We can't explore the facts
3 at all. There is no foundation established for
4 a cost allocation.

5 Now, I agree somewhat that people
6 should tread lightly, try to keep the issues a
7 focus of this case, not the (inaudible). But
8 to say those issues are completely, you know,
9 out of bounds, would prevent us from having a
10 complete log here.

11 MS. LAPE: Your Honor, if I may
12 add, the reason we objected in the first
13 instance is because the reasons that the
14 Commission stayed the discovery, related to the
15 SFA or IEU Ohio Administrative Company
16 agreements and documents and records in the,
17 you know, Case 20-1629, are the exact -- we
18 think it applies equally to this case, you
19 know, discovery was stayed, as to those
20 particular agreements. And the other matter,
21 because of the interference, the potential
22 interference with the criminal investigation,
23 that same reasoning applies in this case, and
24 so that's why we asked for the call in. And
25 apologies, if we were not clear enough about

1 the reasoning behind the issue.

2 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Your Honor,
3 it's not that OCC will never be able to ask
4 questions about these topics. It's just that,
5 until the stay is lifted, the Commission has
6 spoken. And your decision here is going to
7 have pretty wide-ranging impacts, both on this
8 ongoing criminal investigation, and, also,
9 potentially, on the Liberty of the people who
10 may be under investigation.

11 And so I think it is incumbent upon
12 Your Honors to really sort of make sure that
13 the decision here is not off the cuff, and it
14 is well thought out and grounded in the
15 discovery stay and the logic behind it that the
16 Commission implemented in December.

17 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, if I may,
18 the documents that we intended to question on
19 were released by FirstEnergy Corp, clearly,
20 they would not have released the documents, if
21 they believed that releasing the documents in
22 discovery would interfere with the
23 investigations that have been ongoing.

24 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Okay. Thank
25 you all. As we have a clearer picture, as to

1 what the specific issue is, now, after hearing
2 the second round of arguments, we will take a
3 couple minutes again to discuss this. The
4 examiners will take a couple minutes to discuss
5 this between themselves and we will be back in
6 the next couple minutes. Thank you.

7 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

8 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Examiner

9 St. John and I did have a chance to discuss the
10 arguments raised in the second round from the
11 parties, and we do tend to agree with OCC that
12 questions regarding the use agreement should be
13 permitted, as to whether it goes to violations
14 of the Corporate Separation plan, specifically,
15 Ms. Willis, is certainly entitled to ask
16 whether or not these agreements were entered
17 into with the express purpose to benefit the
18 utilities competitive affiliate, and related
19 questions of that nature.

20 So we do believe, despite the
21 Company's arguments, otherwise, the entry and
22 Case No. 20-1629 on December 15, 2021 was
23 directed and targeted toward a violation of
24 R.C. 4928.145, and that will not have bearing
25 on questions related to those agreements, as it

1 relates to the Corporate Separation plan.

2 Any additional questions?

3 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Your Honor, so
4 just to clarify, are you permitting questions
5 that are narrowly tailored to the specific
6 issue of Corporate Separation, but leaving
7 other issues off the table?

8 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: I'm sorry. My
9 audio cut out just for the tail end of your
10 question. Can you repeat that, please.

11 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes. I just
12 wanted to clarify that questions that are
13 narrowly tailored to Corporate Separation are
14 permitted, but things that go beyond that are
15 not?

16 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Well, I will
17 just note that that is the purpose of this
18 proceeding. It is an investigation into the
19 companies' compliance with the Commission's
20 Corporate Separation rules. Apart from that, I
21 will not go into detailing the scope of this
22 proceeding. I feel like we've ad nauseam went
23 into that in prior entries and orders, however,
24 if that question does come up, the Examiners
25 are a phone call away, and would be happy to

1 join the call again.

2 MS. WILLIS: Thank you, Your
3 Honors.

4 ATTORNEY EXAMINERS: Thank you.
5 Anything else?

6 MS. LAPE: None here. Thank you.

7 ATTORNEY EXAMINER: Thank you. We
8 will go ahead and log off. We, of course, will
9 be available in the course of any additional
10 disputes, as the deposition carries on.

11 MR. FINNIGAN: Thank you. Let's go
12 ahead and resume the deposition.

13 Q. Ma'am, did FirstEnergy ever enter
14 into contract with Sustainability Funding
15 Alliance?

16 MS. LAPE: Objection. Entity.

17 MR. DORINGO: John, I thought we
18 agreed we would put this in the confidential
19 session.

20 MR. FINNIGAN: I have some general
21 questions about the relationship, and a lot of
22 this has been reported in the news media. So I
23 don't think any general questions implicate any
24 confidential information.

25 MS. LAPE: Maybe we should read

1 back that Attorney Examiner's ruling, because
2 I'm pretty confident that she said the
3 questions related to these issues should be in
4 the confidential session.

5 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes. Erring on
6 the side of caution.

7 MS. LAPE: I mean, we have the
8 transcript.

9 MS. WILLIS: We don't need to do
10 that. Let's just move on.

11 Q. Ma'am, do you know a gentleman by
12 the name of Matt Evans?

13 A. I've met Mr. Evans.

14 Q. And by whom is he employed?

15 A. At the time I met him, he was
16 employed by Boych.

17 Q. Did FirstEnergy ever have any
18 consulting agreement with Boych?

19 A. I don't know.

20 Q. Did Mr. Evans ever perform any
21 services for FirstEnergy?

22 A. I don't know.

23 Q. Did Mr. Evans ever meet with any
24 legislators to argue in favor of legislation
25 that would have benefited FirstEnergy?

1 A. I don't know.

2 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And I would
3 object on scope and how this ties with
4 Corporate Separation.

5 Q. Did Mr. Evans ever register as a
6 lobbyist on behalf of FirstEnergy?

7 A. I don't know.

8 Q. Do you know Tony George?

9 A. I've heard the name.

10 Q. In what context?

11 A. I don't remember.

12 Q. Did Mr. George ever perform
13 lobbying services on behalf of FirstEnergy?

14 A. I don't know.

15 Q. Did Mr. George ever register as a
16 lobbyist for FirstEnergy?

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection
18 as to scope.

19 A. I don't know.

20 Q. I want to go back to your role with
21 the Ohio Corporate Separation plan. Were you
22 ever designated as the Compliance Officer for
23 the Ohio Corporate Separation Plan for the Ohio
24 FirstEnergy utilities?

25 A. Yes, I was.

1 Q. For what period of time?

2 A. For the time I served as Chief
3 Ethics Officer.

4 Q. During the entire time you were
5 Chief Ethics Officer, you were the designated
6 Compliance Officer under the Corporate
7 Separation plan?

8 A. It was that title that was
9 designated, not myself, specifically.

10 Q. What were your responsibilities as
11 Compliance Officer under the Ohio Corporate
12 Separation Plan?

13 A. I'd have to review the language.

14 Q. What language is it that you need
15 to review?

16 A. Either the plan, or -- or there's
17 something to indicate that title will serve as
18 a Corporate Compliance, Ohio Corporate --
19 Corporate Separation compliant -- there's some
20 language to that, but I don't know off the top
21 of my head.

22 Q. Are there any activities that you
23 ever performed in your role as a Compliance
24 Officer for the Ohio Corporate Separation Plan?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. What were those activities?

2 A. Training, communications, to the
3 extent there was any complaint, the
4 investigation or assigning the investigation.

5 Q. Did you have any interaction with
6 the auditor of the Ohio Corporate Separation
7 plan, during the time you held that role?

8 A. What's the auditor?

9 Q. Were there any audits ordered of
10 the Ohio Corporate Separation plan during the
11 time that you held the role of Compliance
12 Officer?

13 MS. LAPE: Objection.

14 A. Ordered by who?

15 Q. Ordered by the Public Utilities
16 Commission?

17 A. I don't recall if there were any
18 audits by the PUCO or FERC.

19 Q. What training did you perform as
20 the Compliance Officer?

21 A. There's training contained in the
22 Code of Conduct training. There was some
23 ad hoc trainings conducted from time-to-time by
24 the Legal Department.

25 Q. I just want to come back to the

1 time when your employment with FirstEnergy
2 ended -- you said that was in November of 2020?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. Was there a period of time from
5 when Mr. Jones was fired by FirstEnergy, before
6 you were separated?

7 MS. LAPE: Objection.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. So did you have any role in any
10 investigation that occurred before Mr. Jones
11 was fired relating to what his role was with
12 House Bill 6?

13 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection to
14 scope.

15 MS. LAPE: And you can answer a
16 specific question about whether an
17 investigation existed, but I would caution you
18 not to waive any attorney/client privilege,
19 unless your -- unless FirstEnergy's counsel is
20 permitting that.

21 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No. We would
22 also uphold the privilege here.

23 MR. DORINGO: Companies also object
24 on scope.

25 A. Could you repeat the question.

1 MR. FINNIGAN: Could you repeat the
2 question.

3 (Whereupon, the court reporter read
4 back the last question.)

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. What was your role?

7 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection
8 to scope.

9 A. Counsel for the company.

10 Q. And what activities did you perform
11 in carrying out that role?

12 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection.
13 This is nothing to do with Corporate
14 Separation.

15 A. Worked with outside counsel.

16 Q. Who was your outside counsel that
17 you worked with?

18 MS. LAPE: Objection. What does
19 this have to do with Corporate Separation?

20 MR. FINNIGAN: This goes to the
21 whole point of Corporate Separation with the
22 governance issues that the company related in
23 its SEC files. But, in any event, let me just
24 conduct the questioning. You certainly can
25 object and instruct her not to answer, but, you

1 know, it is related to the case.

2 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And just to
3 make sure the record is clear, we are also
4 asserting privilege objection to this question,
5 as well.

6 A. Jones Day.

7 Q. All right. Did you perform any
8 part of the investigation into Mr. Jones'
9 conduct that led up to his firing?

10 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection.
11 Scope and privilege.

12 MS. LAPE: Yes. Same objection.
13 It's a privileged investigation. She says she
14 was acting as counsel. It has nothing to do
15 with Corporate Separation, and I don't know why
16 you keep pursuing these lines.

17 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, this has
18 everything to do with Corporate Separation,
19 because --

20 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And we would
21 instruct the witness not to answer this
22 question.

23 MR. FINNIGAN: I don't know that
24 you have any ability to do that. But let me
25 just say that, for the record, these questions

1 all relate to Corporate Separation, because
2 Mr. Jones' conduct enabled these cost
3 allocations to occur. The whole reason, or the
4 driving force behind the cost allocations that
5 we are concerned about -- these cost
6 allocations have to do with the contracts
7 between Mr. Randazzo and the company. And it
8 was Mr. Jones' improper tone at the top that
9 allowed those misallocations to occur.

10 So we have a series of questions
11 about what Mr. Jones' actions were that enabled
12 these cost allocations. So we have to ask,
13 just to get into the background of how the cost
14 allocations happened, who authorized them, who
15 approved of them -- so this is all part of that
16 line of questioning.

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, any
18 questions that go under the privileged internal
19 investigation are privileged and we are not
20 going to allow the witness to answer.

21 MS. LAPE: And we will instruct her
22 not to answer any questions that go into areas
23 that FirstEnergy has client privilege over.

24 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, let me -- I'll
25 ask the questions, and you can certainly

1 instruct her not to answer, and, then, we can
2 get a ruling from the Attorney Examiners.

3 Q. So the SEC filings that reported on
4 Mr. Jones' firing, are you familiar with those?

5 A. I don't recall.

6 Q. Are you aware that FirstEnergy Corp
7 stated publicly that Mr. Jones was fired,
8 because of an inappropriate tone at the top?

9 A. I don't recall.

10 Q. What do you understand was the
11 reason Mr. Jones was fired?

12 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection.
13 Calls for privileged information.

14 MS. LAPE: Objection. Do not
15 answer.

16 MR. FINNIGAN: If you're going to
17 instruct the witness not to answer, you need to
18 state it loudly enough for the court reporter
19 to pick it up.

20 MS. LAPE: Yes. If you could not
21 hear me, I instructed her not to answer.

22 Q. What does the term improper tone at
23 the top mean to you?

24 A. Inappropriate -- I don't know a
25 different adjective for "tone" -- I do this

1 sometimes with my children, where I try to give
2 them a different adjective for a word that they
3 don't know.

4 But I don't know what -- an
5 inappropriate tone at the upper level of a
6 company.

7 MS. LAPE: And this is just, you
8 are asking her just generally what her
9 understanding is, because we've already said
10 that she is not going to testify about specific
11 decisions at FirstEnergy.

12 Q. Okay. Did Mr. Jones engage in any
13 unethical conduct, during your tenure at
14 FirstEnergy?

15 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection.
16 Calls for privileged information. Instruct the
17 witness not to answer.

18 MS. LAPE: Objection. I'm
19 instructing the witness not to answer.

20 Q. In your role --

21 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: If you want to
22 ask questions about Corporate Separation, we're
23 all here to do that.

24 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, as I mentioned
25 earlier, all these questions have to do with

1 what allowed the improper cost misallocations.

2 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Sure. So if
3 you want to get onto those questions.

4 MR. FINNIGAN: I will. But I'm
5 going to ask these first as background, so I
6 need to find out how they happened. It's
7 important to this case. It is important for
8 finding out, you know, how and why and who were
9 involved in the misallocations. We can't just
10 receive a number that there was \$24 million in
11 improper cost misallocations, and just be
12 satisfied with that. We have to find out the
13 background of who did it, why they did it, who
14 they did it with, how it happened and that's
15 what all these questions related to.

16 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: But you haven't
17 asked any of those questions yet.

18 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, I certainly
19 am, and you're not letting the witness answer
20 them.

21 Q. So let me ask you this, Ma'am, in
22 your role as Chief Ethics Officer, did you have
23 any responsibility for dealing with complaints
24 of criminal violations that were reported to
25 you?

1 MR. DORINGO: Objection to scope.

2 MS. LAPE: Objection. It assumes
3 facts not in evidence.

4 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And objection
5 and instruct her not to answer, to the extent
6 that the answer would reveal any
7 attorney/client communications or privileged
8 information.

9 Q. Ma'am, are you familiar with the
10 Companies' Corporate Compliance Program?

11 A. I don't have an active memory of
12 it, but, at the time I was at the company, I
13 was familiar with it, yes.

14 Q. Did you have any responsibilities
15 as Chief Ethics Officer for implementing the
16 Corporate Compliance Program?

17 A. I took responsibilities.

18 Q. And what were they?

19 A. Well, there was a document that
20 detailed the responsibilities for the position.

21 Q. Did those responsibilities include
22 being the person to whom people would report
23 allegations of improper conduct?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Did you become aware of any

1 allegations of improper conduct against
2 Mr. Jones at any time you worked at
3 FirstEnergy?

4 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I would object,
5 and instruct the witness not to answer, to the
6 extent that it calls for her to reveal any
7 attorney/client privileged communications or
8 privileged information.

9 MS. LAPE: Objection. You can
10 answer to the extent it doesn't lead to any
11 attorney/client privileged information. And
12 it's, again, outside the scope.

13 A. Could you repeat the question.

14 Q. Let me ask a different question.
15 During the time you were responsible for the
16 Companies' compliance program, did you become
17 aware of any allegations of improper conduct
18 against Mr. Jones?

19 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection
20 and same instruction.

21 MS. LAPE: Again, you can answer to
22 the extent you don't reveal any attorney/client
23 privileged information. Why don't you ask her
24 if she had any complaints about Corporate
25 Separation policy.

1 Q. Just go ahead.

2 MR. FINNIGAN: I mean, you can
3 instruct the witness not to answer, but,
4 otherwise, I will ask the questions I am
5 inclined to ask, not the ones you would like me
6 to ask her.

7 A. I apologize. I just don't know
8 what would be a violation of my attorney/client
9 obligations, at this point, with that question.

10 Q. During your employment at
11 FirstEnergy, did you ever have to take any
12 action in your role as Chief Ethics Officer
13 with relation to the Corporate Compliance
14 Program that involved Mr. Jones?

15 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection.
16 Same instruction. Again, the question is not
17 tailored to Corporate Separation, and to the
18 extent it calls for privileged information, we
19 ask the witness not to answer it.

20 MS. LAPE: Same objection and
21 instruction.

22 Q. During your tenure as Chief Ethics
23 Officer, did you ever become aware of any
24 complaints of improper conduct by Mike Dowling?

25 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection.

1 Same instruction.

2 MS. LAPE: Same objection. Same
3 instruction.

4 Q. During your tenure as Chief Ethics
5 Officer, were you ever aware of any allegations
6 of improper conduct by Mr. Dennis Chack?

7 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection
8 same instruction.

9 MS. LAPE: Same objection. Same
10 instruction.

11 Q. The media has reported that
12 Mr. Ruffner was separated from the company.
13 What is your understanding of the reason why he
14 was separated?

15 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection to
16 scope.

17 MS. LAPE: Objection to scope, and,
18 to the extent that your recollection, or
19 anything that you know, came from communication
20 with counsel, that should not be revealed
21 either.

22 THE WITNESS: Could you read back
23 the question?

24 Q. I will re-ask it. I'm just asking,
25 what is your understanding of why Mr. Ruffner

1 was separated?

2 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection,
3 scope.

4 MS. LAPE: Same objection and
5 instruction.

6 A. Just the AK, complete the AK.

7 Q. What the AK says is that he was
8 separated by inaction that was influenced by
9 improper tone at the top. What did you
10 understand that to mean?

11 MS. LAPE: Objection. AK speaks
12 for itself. Do you have the AK?

13 A. I didn't have any special
14 understanding of it.

15 Q. Do you think that Mr. Ruffner did
16 anything wrong, related to the House Bill 6
17 matter?

18 MR. DORINGO: Objection to scope.

19 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection, to
20 the extent that it calls for the revelation of
21 any attorney/client privileged information, I
22 instruct the witness not to answer.

23 MS. LAPE: Objection and same
24 instruction.

25 Q. Was anyone else separated from

1 FirstEnergy, besides yourself relating to House
2 Bill 6?

3 MS. LAPE: Objection.

4 MR. DORINGO: Objection.

5 A. You would have to ask FirstEnergy.

6 Q. Hmm?

7 A. You would have to ask FirstEnergy.

8 Q. I'm just asking you from your
9 knowledge.

10 MS. LAPE: Same objection. And
11 scope.

12 MR. FITZGERALD: And nothing you
13 heard from counsel you should reveal, meaning,
14 your personal counsel.

15 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And, again, for
16 the record, this has nothing to do with
17 Corporate Separation.

18 A. I don't know.

19 Q. Did you sign some separation
20 agreement with FirstEnergy?

21 MS. LAPE: Objection. This is far
22 outside the scope. This has nothing to do
23 with --

24 MR. DORINGO: Objection to scope.

25 Q. Go ahead. You can answer.

1 A. No.

2 Q. Did you enter into any joint
3 defense privilege with FirstEnergy Corp, or the
4 FirstEnergy utilities, or any other party?

5 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection.

6 MS. LAPE: Objection. Scope --

7 MR. DORINGO: Objection. Scope.

8 MS. LAPE: -- and instruct you not
9 to answer, to the extent it reveals any
10 privileged information.

11 A. At what time?

12 Q. At any time.

13 A. I believe as an Officer of the
14 company, there may have been a joint defense.

15 Q. I'm asking, did you enter into a
16 joint defense agreement, after your employment
17 ended with FirstEnergy?

18 A. That is a different question.

19 Q. Okay. That is my question.

20 MR. DORINGO: Objection to scope.

21 MS. LAPE: Objection to scope, and
22 to the extent it calls for privileged
23 information.

24 A. I don't think so.

25 Q. Has the company notified you that

1 they may clawback any of your compensation --

2 MS. LAPE: Objection.

3 Q. -- that you received during your
4 employment at FirstEnergy?

5 MS. LAPE: I think we should get
6 the Attorney Examiners back on the line,
7 because this line of questioning has gotten out
8 of control.

9 MR. FINNIGAN: Are you instructing
10 her not --

11 MR. DORINGO: Objection to scope.

12 MS. LAPE: I am instructing her not
13 to answer until we have, unless and until we
14 have a direct Order from the Attorney Examiners
15 to answer this line of questioning.

16 MR. FINNIGAN: Let's take a brief
17 recess for five minutes.

18 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

19 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Let's go back
20 on the record. That's all the questions that
21 OCC has for the public session. So we will
22 turn it over to any other parties that want to
23 ask questions during the public session.

24 MR. OLIKER: John, I have about
25 twenty questions. So I hope I can do it in the

1 public session. I don't know if you want me to
2 proceed before we go to lunch. I will defer to
3 you for that.

4 MR. FINNIGAN: My preference would
5 be to just push through the public session now,
6 get that over with, and, then, take a lunch
7 break and come back for the confidential
8 session. So why don't we go ahead and do that.
9 And it sounds like that might be Joe, but
10 whoever it is really needs to speak up, because
11 we are having trouble hearing you.

12 EXAMINATION OF EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH
13 BY MR. OLIKER:

14 Q. All right. Thank you. Ebony, good
15 to see you again. My name is Joe Olikar.
16 We've known each other for a long time.

17 A. Hi Joe.

18 Q. Good to see you. I'm going to try
19 to follow-up on some of the questions received
20 from Mr. Finnigan. I will try to keep this in
21 the public record, please, if anybody objects,
22 let me know. I will try to keep the questions
23 as generic as possible to avoid having to do
24 that.

25 Going back to some of the

1 discussions about the audit reports, are you
2 familiar with the Sage Audit report, (phonetic)
3 Daymark Audit Report?

4 A. I don't recall them.

5 Q. Are you familiar that there is an
6 audit in Case No. 17-974?

7 A. I'm not familiar with the docket.

8 Q. Did you participate in the
9 Corporate Separation audit of the FirstEnergy
10 utilities, while you were still employed by
11 FirstEnergy?

12 A. I did not.

13 Q. So I think it's safe to say you
14 have not reviewed any audit reports that were
15 filed with the Public Utilities Commission of
16 Ohio?

17 A. Not that I recall.

18 Q. You were generally familiar with
19 the purpose of Ohio's Corporate Separation
20 requirements, correct?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. And are you familiar -- scratch
23 that. Do you know if FirstEnergy has Corporate
24 Separation policies that are specific to Ohio,
25 or does it leverage its first Code of Conduct?

1 A. I don't remember.

2 Q. And are you aware that while you
3 were employed by FirstEnergy, it offered
4 non-jurisdictional services, such as home
5 warranty products?

6 A. I recall it offered services. I
7 don't recall if that is a correct example of
8 them.

9 Q. Are you familiar with a company
10 called Home Search?

11 A. I am not.

12 Q. And you are familiar with the term
13 non-jurisdictional service, are you not?

14 A. I am generally familiar with that
15 term, correct.

16 Q. Can you give a general definition
17 for the record, based upon your knowledge.

18 A. Services, other than the
19 distribution of energy that a utility may offer
20 that the Commission does not regulate in the
21 same way.

22 Q. But you generally agree that there
23 are non-competitive services, such as
24 distribution service and competitive retail
25 electric services, such as generation service,

1 and other services that are typically
2 considered non-jurisdictional outside of the
3 Commission's general regulation.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And I think we already established
6 this, but I want to make sure we are clear.
7 You agree that while you were employed by
8 FirstEnergy, FirstEnergy did, in fact,
9 market/provide non-jurisdictional services to
10 its customers.

11 MS. LAPE: Objection.

12 MR. DORINGO: Objection. And Joe,
13 my objection is just, I know it's easy to do,
14 but you're using FirstEnergy, and, you know, we
15 have three utilities. We have other Ohio
16 operating -- you have other entities operating
17 in Ohio.

18 So just for the clarity of the
19 record, if you could be a little more precise,
20 I would appreciate that.

21 Q. So with that objection, and I'm
22 happy to have it clarified, we are referring to
23 the three FirstEnergy utility operating
24 companies collectively as FirstEnergy or
25 FirstEnergy Utility.

1 MS. LAPE: Do you want the question
2 read back?

3 THE WITNESS: No.

4 A. I am aware that the services were
5 offered by an entity in the corporate umbrella,
6 but I do not recall which entity it was.

7 Q. Are you familiar with the entity
8 known as Smart Mark?

9 A. I am not.

10 Q. What about FirstEnergy products?

11 A. I am aware of that name. I don't
12 know if that is an entity name or a group name.

13 Q. Do you know where that entity or
14 group resides within the FirstEnergy family
15 tree of companies?

16 A. My recollection, which may or may
17 not be correct, is that it was a group or a
18 department within FirstEnergy.

19 Q. And when you say FirstEnergy, are
20 you referring to utility or one of the service
21 companies outside of the utility?

22 A. My understanding or recollection is
23 that it would have been perhaps with a service
24 company, FirstEnergy service company.

25 Q. And are you familiar with the

1 entity known as FirstEnergy Home?

2 A. I am not.

3 Q. And do you know, did FirstEnergy,
4 the utility, have any internal safeguards or
5 Corporate Separation requirements that were
6 applicable to FirstEnergy employees marketing
7 non-jurisdictional service?

8 A. The FirstEnergy Ohio operating
9 companies, is that what you're asking about?

10 Q. Yes.

11 A. I recall that there were.

12 Q. And what type of safeguards were in
13 place?

14 A. I don't remember them.

15 Q. And am I correct that when the
16 FirstEnergy, the utility, provided a
17 non-jurisdictional product to customers, they
18 would invoice and collect for those services on
19 the utility bill?

20 A. I don't know.

21 Q. Do you remember a Corporate
22 Separation complaint that was filed against
23 FirstEnergy by the Retail Energy Supply
24 Association?

25 A. I don't remember it.

1 Q. Do you remember a letter that Mark
2 Whitt, on behalf of the Retail Energy Supply
3 Association addressed to you, regarding the
4 alleged Corporate Separation violation of
5 FirstEnergy Ohio Utilities?

6 A. No, I don't remember.

7 Q. Can we go off the record for a
8 second.

9 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

10 Q. Now, can you see my screen?

11 A. I can.

12 Q. And just take a minute and look.
13 This is an exhibit to a Compliant. The letter
14 is titled January 4, 2018, and just let me know
15 if this refreshes your recollection about a
16 particular issue.

17 A. Can you scroll down to the next
18 page. Can you scroll down again.

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. Is there another page -- I've
21 reviewed the letter. It does not refresh my
22 memory.

23 Q. You said you don't remember that?

24 A. No. I don't have any active memory
25 of it, no.

1 Q. Okay. So, and I'll go to the next
2 page. Do you remember writing this e-mail,
3 January 16, 2018?

4 A. No. But it appears consistent on
5 how I would have handled such a complaint, but
6 I don't remember the communication.

7 Q. Okay. And am I correct that, at
8 your direction, there was a preliminary
9 investigation conducted in FirstEnergy? Do you
10 remember doing that?

11 A. I don't.

12 Q. You do or you do not?

13 A. I do not.

14 Q. Okay. I can stop sharing now.
15 Now, how many, can you recall any other times,
16 when a specific Corporate Separation violation
17 or allegation was brought to your attention?

18 A. I do not recall.

19 Q. And regarding the separation of
20 non-jurisdictional services, do you know the
21 methods through which FirstEnergy marketed its
22 product?

23 A. I don't.

24 Q. Do you know if FirstEnergy
25 utilities used its call center to market its

1 non-jurisdictional service?

2 A. I don't.

3 Q. And would you agree that, at one
4 point in time, IGS approached FirstEnergy, and
5 requested that it be permitted to offer its own
6 non-jurisdictional services on the utility
7 bill?

8 A. I recall that IGS approached the
9 Ohio utilities to offer certain
10 non-jurisdictional services, but I don't recall
11 the nature or scope or if the request was to be
12 on the utility. But I don't recall the
13 specifics around the request.

14 Q. Do you remember -- strike that.
15 Would you agree that FirstEnergy declined to
16 permit IGS to put its non-jurisdictional
17 services on the utility bill?

18 A. I don't remember.

19 Q. And am I correct that you were not
20 aware how FirstEnergy may have accounted for
21 any of its own costs to provide
22 non-jurisdictional services to customers?

23 A. I don't recall.

24 Q. And do you know if FirstEnergy had
25 any restriction in place that would prevent

1 FirstEnergy employees from accessing customer
2 information to market non-jurisdictional
3 services?

4 A. Could you repeat the question.

5 MR. OLIKER: Could the court
6 reporter read it back.

7 (Whereupon, the court reporter read
8 back the last question.)

9 MR. DORINGO: I'm just going to
10 object on the use of "FirstEnergy" there being
11 imprecise and vague.

12 Q. To make it clear, when I'm talking
13 about FirstEnergy, I'm talking about utilities.
14 But if the witness wants to correct it in her
15 response, that's fine.

16 A. I don't recall.

17 Q. Do you believe it would have been
18 improper for a FirstEnergy employee to use the
19 utility database to access FirstEnergy
20 distribution customer information to market
21 non-jurisdictional service?

22 A. I've been away from the Corporate
23 Separation rules and regulations for a bit now,
24 and I don't have a working knowledge, sitting
25 here today, of the ins and outs to compare it

1 to what you've asked me.

2 Q. If a customer was calling
3 FirstEnergy, the utility, to connect its
4 electric service, do you believe it would be
5 improper for a call center agent to market
6 non-jurisdictional service?

7 MR. DORINGO: Object to form.

8 A. Same response. I would have to
9 look over the Corporate Separation rules and
10 regulations to be able to advise on what is
11 permissible and not permissible.

12 Q. Am I correct that FirstEnergy
13 Utility's call center get questions from
14 customers regarding non-jurisdictional services
15 provided by the FirstEnergy Utility?

16 A. I don't know.

17 Q. And because you do not know, would
18 you agree if such calls occurred, you also do
19 not know how those call center employees were
20 accounted for?

21 A. Could you repeat the question.

22 MR. OLIKER: Could the court
23 reporter read it back.

24 (Whereupon, the court reporter read
25 back the last question.)

1 (Mr. Oliker dropped from the call)

2 MR. FINNIGAN: Joe, you are back
3 on. Please re-ask your last question.

4 Q. We touched on this just a few
5 minutes ago, are you familiar with FirstEnergy
6 Utility's relationship with HomeServe?

7 A. I don't recall, no.

8 Q. And what about the FirstEnergy
9 parent company, are you familiar with their
10 relationship with HomeServe?

11 A. No.

12 Q. And you remember discussions
13 earlier how you told about the agreement with
14 the Sustainability Funding Alliance, I want to
15 keep the conversation general here, do you
16 remember that discussion?

17 A. Here today?

18 Q. Yes.

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And when did you become aware of
21 any of the -- and to streamline things -- can
22 you call Sustainability Funding Alliance, SFA,
23 because I simply cannot say it?

24 A. Okay.

25 MS. LAPE: I think that we had an

1 agreement, or that Attorney Examiner had said
2 that this could be, all questions related to
3 SFA would be under the confidentiality session.

4 MR. OLKER: I'm not sure they said
5 all questions. I think they said specific
6 questions regarding things, other than the
7 public documents themselves. I have some very,
8 very high level background that is not
9 confidential.

10 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Our preference
11 would be for all questions related to SFA to be
12 in the confidential session consistent with the
13 Attorney Examiner's inclination.

14 MS. WILLIS: Well, to be clear, the
15 Attorney Examiner said that it would be a good
16 idea. She hadn't really ruled. Let's be clear
17 about that -- she said, "That's a good idea."

18 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: That's why I
19 said "inclination."

20 MS. WILLIS: But, you know, Joe, if
21 you want to ask, you ask.

22 MR. OLKER: There has already been
23 some questions on the record about this. So if
24 I get into confidential, then, you just try to
25 cut me off. But I don't think you'll find this

1 to be such.

2 Q. When did you become aware of
3 FirstEnergy's or any FirstEnergy entity used,
4 its agreement with SFA?

5 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I'm going to
6 object, and instruct the witness not to answer,
7 to the extent that it reveals any
8 attorney/client privileged information. And,
9 again, I would reiterate my request that these
10 questions be posed in the confidential session.

11 MS. LAPE: I'm also going to
12 object, and instruct that you not waive any
13 attorney/client privileged information. And I
14 do think that these questions should be in the
15 confidential session given the discussion we
16 had earlier with the Attorney Examiner.

17 MR. OLIKER: Okay. If we go down
18 this route, we're going to have to submit this
19 whole transcript to the Attorney Examiners, and
20 make them go through line-by-line for what is
21 confidential and what is not. These questions
22 are not who has any confidential information.

23 MR. DORINGO: Joe, from the
24 Companies' point of view, it's a sensitive
25 enough issue. I would hate to burden the

1 attorney examiners with that, but, we think
2 just being careful here makes sense, and the
3 Attorney Examiners seemed to agree with that.

4 MR. OLIKER: Well, I will make that
5 requirement, if these questions have to be in
6 the confidential session. So if you are going
7 to require that, then, you are putting that on
8 the Attorney Examiners.

9 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: That's our
10 position.

11 MS. WILLIS: Go ahead and ask, Joe.

12 MR. OLIKER: I'm sorry.

13 MS. WILLIS: I said to go ahead and
14 ask your questions. I don't think they're
15 going to require you to put it into the
16 confidential session.

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: No, we are.
18 That's our position. We requested --

19 MS. WILLIS: Well, you're not going
20 to require him, require, you're not going to
21 require him. So we don't -- I'd rather us not
22 keep calling the Examiner up over these issues.
23 I think we should be able to work them out.
24 You would like him to do it. He doesn't want
25 to do it. There was no ruling. He should go

1 ahead.

2 MR. FITZGERALD: I think, before we
3 work things out, when we talked to the
4 Examiners, we clearly understood this would be
5 handled in a confidential session.

6 MS. WILLIS: But it's not a ruling.
7 She said, you know, clearly not a ruling.

8 MS. LAPE: You agree that she said,
9 "I would be inclined to have everything in the
10 confidential session?"

11 MS. WILLIS: I think what she said,
12 "That sounds like a good idea."

13 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Correct. And
14 so we agree that it's a good idea.

15 MR. FITZGERALD: And then why don't
16 we take it up with the Examiner? If this --

17 MS. WILLIS: Well, do you want to
18 call the Examiner over that -- have -- you
19 know, have at it. But I think she's going to
20 get a little annoyed by calls over things like
21 this.

22 MR. FINNIGAN: Joe, let me suggest
23 that we are operating with a limited amount of
24 time here. We can certainly carve out time and
25 go to the Attorney Examiner to talk about

1 whether this discussion, where you've got a
2 couple of questions, ought to be in a public or
3 a confidential session. But to save time, and
4 since you are participating in the confidential
5 session, would it make sense for you just to
6 reserve those questions for the confidential
7 session?

8 MR. OLIKER: I have about five
9 questions. I don't want to talk about House
10 Bill 6. I don't want to talk about anything
11 post-2018. I have some simple questions
12 regarding the agreements.

13 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, why don't you
14 ask your five questions, and they can instruct
15 the witness not to answer, if they are
16 declined, or let the witness answer. So go
17 ahead.

18 Q. Ebony, are you familiar with the
19 initial 2013 agreement with SFA?

20 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I'm going to
21 object and instruct the witness not to answer,
22 until we are in the confidential session.

23 MS. LAPE: Same objection and
24 instruction.

25 Q. All right. Well, then, are your

1 thoughts -- a similar question -- you are aware
2 that the FirstEnergy utility voted expenses
3 related to the SFA as distribution-related?

4 MR. DORINGO: Objection.

5 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection.
6 Same instruction.

7 MS. LAPE: Same objection. Same
8 instruction.

9 MS. BOJKO: I would like to note on
10 the record that these are not confidential
11 questions; whether she was aware or not, are
12 not confidential questions, and I want to note
13 that on the record so we can go back and
14 release everything to the public, if you are
15 going to instruct the witness not to answer.
16 These are not confidential questions, whether
17 she was aware.

18 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes. OCC joins in
19 that objection. And this is something that we
20 can take up with the attorney examiners at
21 another time, either this afternoon, or at a
22 different date. But, yes, we think that these
23 are all public record type of questions that
24 ought to be answered, and inappropriate use of
25 an instruction not to answer. So we join in

1 that.

2 MR. OLIKER: What I will suggest,
3 after this is done, I don't necessarily think
4 the attorney examiners will have to get
5 involved today. But there will be a
6 transcript. It will have a confidential and a
7 public session. I suggest that we send the
8 confidential session to the attorney examiners
9 and let them decide what goes into the public
10 record. We can take their arguments and deal
11 with it that way.

12 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes. That might be
13 a good approach, Joe. Let's deal with that,
14 you know, at the appropriate time. Do you have
15 any more questions, at this time?

16 MR. OLIKER: Give me one minute to
17 look at my notes. Okay. Just a couple more
18 questions.

19 Q. Ebony, are you familiar with the
20 process of building expenses between different
21 utility service companies in general?

22 A. I'm aware that it is done.

23 Q. Okay. Back in your earlier days at
24 FirstEnergy, you represented the company in
25 distribution cases, correct?

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. And one of the rules of a
3 distribution case is to identify the operation
4 and maintenance expenses that are necessary to
5 operate the utility, correct?

6 A. The cost to provide service?

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. Cost of service is one component,
9 yes.

10 Q. And, in order to come to a cost of
11 service, you look at various allocations from
12 the parent company, not just the utility,
13 correct?

14 A. I don't recall how the parent
15 company filters into the cost of service.

16 Q. In your most recent role at
17 FirstEnergy, were you involved in approving
18 invoices for different operating companies?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Would that have been Bill Redman or
21 Eileen Mickelson?

22 A. I don't think so.

23 Q. Who do you believe would have been
24 responsibility for making determinations on
25 which costs should be assigned to which

1 operating companies?

2 A. That's a different question,
3 perhaps, Accounting and the rates department.

4 Q. Are you familiar with their review
5 process, because you ultimately would have to
6 sign-off on the allocation that's invoiced?

7 A. I would not do that, what you
8 indicate -- I would not ultimately sign-off on
9 allocation of those invoices.

10 Q. Do you know who, specifically,
11 within FirstEnergy would sign-off?

12 A. I do not.

13 Q. Were you familiar with the process
14 that FirstEnergy would undertake to assign
15 expenses from various operating companies?

16 A. Well, I had different levels of
17 understanding, depending on what position I
18 held, at the time, and what I was working on;
19 if I was engaged in a rate case, I would have
20 had a more in-depth understanding. My
21 understanding changed. Sitting here today, I
22 don't recall the specifics.

23 Q. Was Chuck Jones ever involved in
24 those determinations, if you know?

25 A. I don't know.

1 Q. How about Dennis Chack?

2 A. I don't know.

3 Q. Those are all the questions that I
4 have for the public record. Thank you, Ebony.

5 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. I think
6 that's all for now. It is 10 after 2:00. Why
7 don't we resume at 3 o'clock. We will finish
8 up the questioning in the public session that
9 Kim and Dane mentioned that they have and then
10 we will go to the confidential session after
11 that. So we'll see you back at 3 o'clock.

12 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

13 MR. FINNIGAN: We are ready to get
14 started now for the afternoon public session.
15 I think where we left off, Joe had finished his
16 public questioning, and, now, Kim, we are going
17 to turn it over to you for your public
18 questioning.

19 EXAMINATION OF EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH

20 BY MS. BOJKO:

21 Q. Okay. Off the record, Ebony, you
22 graciously agreed to let me call you Ebony; so,
23 thank you for that. As you know, my name is
24 Kim Bojko, and, in this proceeding, I represent
25 the Ohio Manufacturers Association Energy

1 Group.

2 My questions this afternoon are
3 going to focus on your time when you served as
4 Chief Ethics Officer from 2017 until November
5 of 2020. Okay?

6 A. Okay.

7 Q. Okay. And in that position, you
8 were ultimately responsible for compliance
9 monitoring and tracking; is that correct?

10 A. Certain corporate compliance.

11 Q. I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

12 A. I was responsible for certain
13 corporate compliance.

14 Q. And would your, would one of
15 those -- you said certain corporate
16 compliance -- could you maybe tell me what
17 certain corporate compliance is that you were
18 responsible for?

19 A. It was decentralized at
20 FirstEnergy, and, so, there was a variety of
21 different departments that handled different
22 components of corporate compliance. You know,
23 sitting here today, I can't really name them.
24 I don't kind of recall all the groups. There
25 was federal regulatory energy compliance, but

1 there were a number of different other areas of
2 compliance.

3 I do recall that we would have a
4 compliance summit, that we would get together
5 all of the people responsible for compliance,
6 and go through their various responsibilities
7 and what they were doing to execute those.

8 Q. I'm sorry. Execute what?

9 A. Their responsibilities.

10 Q. And one of those responsibilities
11 would have been Corporate Separation
12 compliance; is that right?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. And when you engaged in the
15 corporate compliance monitoring and tracking,
16 during your time at the company, did you have a
17 process or a system in place for employees to
18 report potential client violations, regarding
19 Corporate Separation compliance?

20 A. Employees could report it through
21 the employee concerns line.

22 Q. And the employee concerns line is
23 what you referenced this morning with
24 Mr. Finnigan. Were there any other methods in
25 place for employees to highlight Corporate

1 Separation concerns?

2 A. They could report it to the Legal
3 Department, Human Resources, internal audit.

4 Q. And internal audit is actually a
5 separate section or division within the
6 company; is that correct?

7 A. It is.

8 Q. Was there a tracking system that
9 employees could access electronically, in order
10 to, I guess, in order to make their complaint
11 known to one of these departments?

12 A. I don't recall.

13 Q. How were employees made aware of
14 the ability for them to raise Corporate
15 Separation compliance issues with either the
16 employee concerns line, Legal Department, H.R.
17 or internal audit?

18 A. I can't -- I don't recall all the
19 different mechanisms that were available to
20 employees, but there was training and various
21 communications.

22 Q. When you say various
23 communications, by whom?

24 A. The communications department.

25 Q. Do you know if they were given

1 anything in writing, regarding their ability to
2 make a complaint regarding Corporate Separation
3 requirements?

4 A. I don't recall.

5 Q. You mentioned a third party vendor
6 receiving the calls on the employee concerns
7 line; is that correct?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And you stated that the third party
10 vendor line issued, or created a report, that
11 then you received and Kevin Burgess; is that
12 correct?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Was that report sent to you via
15 e-mail, or was there some kind of tracking
16 system at FirstEnergy that would house that
17 report?

18 A. I received it via e-mail.

19 Q. And how were the records maintained
20 with regard to the employee concerns line
21 component?

22 A. Through the third party database.

23 Q. And what about the reports that you
24 received from third party vendor, where were
25 those reports housed and maintained?

1 A. I would get an e-mail regarding the
2 complaint, and there would be a link to go back
3 to the third party vendor's database.

4 Q. Thank you very much for that
5 clarification. These employee concerns lines,
6 they could have covered other issues, other
7 than Corporate Separation; is that correct?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. So were the complaints classified
10 or indexed, based on the category of concern?

11 A. I believe that there were some
12 categories.

13 Q. Did the company have a method for
14 marking the complaint that's resolved?

15 A. I believe it was noted in the
16 database.

17 Q. Do you know if an employee could
18 make a written complaint, instead of just
19 calling into the employee concerns line?

20 A. Yes, they could.

21 Q. And was there a written process in
22 place for them to do that?

23 A. I don't understand the question.

24 Q. Did you have a written process?
25 Did employees know how to or who to submit a

1 written Complaint to?

2 A. I believe there was communication
3 that a written complaint could be sent to the
4 Chief Ethics Officer.

5 Q. So you were the only one that
6 received written complaints, during your time
7 as Chief Ethics Officer?

8 A. No. It could also be sent to the
9 Legal Department or Human Resources. Employees
10 could send a written complaint to anyone in the
11 organization.

12 Q. Were there physical records of
13 these complaints kept by FirstEnergy by you?

14 A. At one time, there were hardcopy
15 records and then there was kind of an
16 initiative to convert them to all electronic
17 records. I'm not sure if there were any kind
18 of paper records maintained, after they went to
19 electronic format.

20 Q. And where would the electronic
21 records be held in the system?

22 A. I believe the employee concerns
23 would have been entered into the database.

24 Q. I'm sorry. Into what database, the
25 third party database?

1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. And Mr. Olier showed you earlier a
3 complaint launched by PUCO, and you received --
4 I know you don't recall that -- presumably, you
5 received the hardcopy or electronic of that.
6 What would have been done with that Complaint
7 after receiving it?

8 A. I would have assigned it either to
9 internal audit or the Legal Department for
10 review and investigation.

11 Q. So, if you received that letter
12 electronically, would you have forwarded it to
13 one of the those departments for investigation?

14 A. I don't know if I would have
15 forwarded it or had the document, run it down
16 to the department.

17 Q. Okay. And then physically what
18 would you have done with the document? Where
19 would you have put it? Would you have kept it
20 in a file somewhere? Where would you have put
21 that letter?

22 A. If I would have run the document
23 down to the department, they would have
24 retained the document.

25 Q. Okay. And if you received it

1 electronically, would you have saved it on the
2 system somewhere?

3 A. I don't recall.

4 Q. So, other than the recent complaint
5 that's been discussed here today, did you
6 receive other complaints, during your time as
7 Chief Ethics Officer from 2017 through
8 November of 2020?

9 MS. LAPE: Objection. Related to
10 Corporate Separation, or anything?

11 MS. BOJKO: Anything, right now.

12 A. I did.

13 Q. And were any of those complaints
14 related to Corporate Separation?

15 A. I don't recall.

16 Q. So the third party vendor system
17 that you referenced that had a database that
18 housed the complaints, who had access to that
19 database?

20 A. I don't recall sitting here today
21 everyone that had access to that database. I
22 would have had access. An administrative
23 assistant would have had access. Someone in
24 internal auditing would have access, and
25 someone in H.R. would have had access. There

1 were more people who had access, but I don't
2 recall who.

3 Q. And the regular employees would not
4 have had access, right?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. Do you believe that that third
7 party database is still in existence today?

8 A. I don't know.

9 MS. LAPE: Objection.

10 Q. Was the compliance system and third
11 party database that you described in place,
12 before you took the position as Chief Ethics
13 Officer, or did you implement its use?

14 A. The third party vendor had a
15 product already in place. When I took office,
16 I implemented an enhanced version of it.

17 Q. And prior, right before leaving
18 office, was that enhanced version still in
19 place in use?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And you don't know whether the
22 County still utilizes the same version that you
23 used; is that correct?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. Okay. So we talked about the

1 employees having this employee concerns line,
2 and I did already mention that stakeholders,
3 customers or other third person, if they had a
4 complaint regarding Corporate Separation, would
5 they, where would they -- just send it to you,
6 or H.R. or legal -- would that have been the
7 process, at the time you were there?

8 A. Those are places a third party
9 could have sent it to.

10 Q. Let me -- I apologize. That was a
11 poorly-worded question. Let me ask it
12 different way. A stakeholder or a customer or
13 another certain person could not have called
14 the employee concerns line; is that fair --

15 A. They could have.

16 Q. -- or they could have -- how would
17 they have known what number to call? Was that
18 posted on your website or something?

19 A. I don't recall.

20 Q. And during your time, as Chief
21 Ethics Officer, if an audit was conducted,
22 would the auditor have access to the third
23 party vendor database that housed the
24 complaints regarding Corporate Separation?

25 MS. LAPE: Objection. An audit

1 about Corporate Separation? Or any audit?

2 Q. Well, given that the complaint is
3 broader than Corporate Separation, my question
4 was, any auditor, that would have needed access
5 to this database for any type of complaint?

6 A. External or internal auditor?

7 Q. Well, let's do both. First,
8 internal auditor.

9 A. Internal audit had access to the
10 database.

11 Q. All right. How about external
12 audit? Let's take them apart. During your
13 time at FirstEnergy, you have been involved in
14 various audits supported by the Commission in
15 various audits; is that fair?

16 MS. LAPE: Objection.

17 A. In general, over the course of my
18 career, I have engaged in a few audits.

19 Q. So when the Commission hires an
20 external auditor to do a review of a rider, or
21 Corporate Separation, would that auditor have
22 had access to this third party vendor database
23 to review complaints that had been made?

24 A. I don't recall such a request.

25 Q. So if an auditor asks for all

1 records, regarding Corporate Separation
2 compliance and monitoring tracking Corporate
3 Separation issues, as Chief Ethics Officer, you
4 don't believe that that auditor would have been
5 provided access to the third party vendor
6 database, unless the auditor specifically knew
7 about it and asked, would have had access to
8 that database?

9 MR. DORINGO: Object to form.

10 MS. LAPE: Objection.

11 A. I didn't say that.

12 Q. So if an auditor was auditing
13 company compliance issues, and there were
14 complaints regarding compliance issues, how
15 would this third party database, would you have
16 given access to the auditor to review those
17 records?

18 A. I would have acted under advice
19 from counsel from our Legal Department.

20 Q. Advice from counsel for what,
21 whether you should allow access, or whether you
22 should tell the auditor that the database
23 exists?

24 MS. LAPE: Objection.

25 A. If the request came in through the

1 Legal Department, they would have advised me on
2 how to respond to the request. I don't know.

3 Under a hypothetical situation, if
4 an auditor called me up specifically, and asked
5 me for access to the database, I don't know
6 that specific hypothetical, but, typically, a
7 request would have come to me through our Legal
8 Department.

9 Q. All right. So during your time as
10 Chief Ethics Officer, you don't ever recall a
11 time where an audit of the Corporate Separation
12 rules and Code of Conduct were conducted and
13 you provided access to the thirty party
14 vendor's database, regarding Corporate
15 Separation?

16 A. I don't recall.

17 MS. LAPE: Objection.

18 Q. If an auditor asked you for
19 records, would you consider the third party
20 database for records -- let me rephrase.
21 Sorry.

22 If an auditor asked for records,
23 regarding compliance monitoring and tracking,
24 would you have provided the third party
25 database records to the auditor?

1 A. It's hard for me to answer the
2 question, but auditor typically would not be
3 asking me anything. They would be making a
4 request to the company that would go through
5 the Legal Department, and the Legal Department
6 would ask me to provide any documentation that
7 they needed to satisfy the auditor's request.

8 Q. Okay. Fair enough. So under that
9 scenario in your internal process, were you
10 ever asked to provide an auditor access to the
11 third party vendor database, with regard to
12 Corporate Separation compliance?

13 A. Not that I recall.

14 Q. Understanding November of 2020, you
15 were working remotely; is that correct?

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. And you indicated that you had
18 documents, and I'm assuming they were loaded at
19 your house, you had documents, company
20 documents, at your house; is that correct?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Did you return all of the documents
23 you had, or did you return a portion of the
24 documents?

25 A. I returned everything I have had.

1 Q. When did -- I believe, you still
2 said you had computer access, after your
3 termination. When did that computer access
4 terminate?

5 A. I didn't say that.

6 Q. I misheard that. I'm sorry. Did
7 you -- I thought you said that, after you
8 leave, you still had computer access; is that
9 not correct?

10 A. I didn't understand your question.
11 But, no, I didn't have access, to my knowledge.

12 Q. Okay. So upon termination, you
13 believe you lost access to corporate records --

14 MS. LAPE: Objection.

15 Q. -- in that timeframe, correct?

16 MS. LAPE: Objection.

17 MS. BOJKO: I didn't hear your
18 objection. I'm sorry.

19 MS. LAPE: Form. Upon her
20 separation.

21 MS. BOJKO: I'm actually talking
22 about the documents, not the separation.

23 Q. Did you --

24 A. Upon my separation, I don't recall
25 when my access was terminated.

1 Q. I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. You
2 don't recall when, is that what you said?

3 A. Yes. I don't recall when my access
4 was terminated, immediately, at the time of my
5 separation, or any moments after that.

6 Q. Did you access any corporate
7 documents, after you received your termination
8 notice?

9 MS. LAPE: Objection.

10 A. I don't recall.

11 Q. You mentioned to Mr. Finnigan that
12 you returned records/documents, in your
13 possession. What was the time period that that
14 occurred -- was it the same day? A week later?
15 When did you return the documents?

16 A. It was not the same day, but I
17 don't recall when.

18 Q. Weeks or months or days after, do
19 you recall?

20 A. No. I don't recall.

21 Q. During your time as Chief Ethics
22 Officer, did the utility companies propose any
23 changes to their approved Corporate Separation
24 Plan?

25 A. I don't know.

1 Q. Do you recall any discussions,
2 regarding potential changes to the Companies'
3 Corporate Separation Plan?

4 MR. DORINGO: I will object. And
5 just -- well, caution -- you have a need to not
6 reveal privileged communications, in your
7 capacity as a lawyer for the companies.

8 MS. BOJKO: I'm sorry. I can't
9 hear the attorney very well. But he is
10 objecting based on privileged information, but
11 all my questions are about when she was Chief
12 Ethics Officer, not when she was acting in the
13 capacity of an attorney.

14 MS. LAPE: She was also General
15 Counsel, during the time that she was Chief
16 Ethics Officer, as well, and Deputy General
17 Counsel. So there is a line to be drawn here,
18 and to the extent that she would need to
19 provide any attorney/client privileged
20 information, in order to answer a question, we
21 would advise her not to do so.

22 MS. BOJKO: Fair enough. But I
23 didn't ask for substance. I just asked if
24 there were any discussions regarding the
25 potential changes.

1 A. I don't remember.

2 Q. Do you recall whether you
3 internally suggested any changes to the
4 Corporate Separation Plan?

5 MR. DORINGO: Same caution from me.

6 MS. LAPE: Yes. Objection, to the
7 extent it would require her to disclose
8 privileged information.

9 MS. BOJKO: Again, I'm not asking
10 for the substance, just whether it occurred or
11 not.

12 A. I don't recall.

13 Q. Do you recall any other employees
14 recommending or suggesting any changes to the
15 Corporate Separation Plan?

16 A. I don't recall.

17 Q. Do you recall any specific
18 compliance issues, regarding the Corporate
19 Separation Plan, that may have existed when you
20 were Chief Ethics Officer?

21 A. No. I don't recall.

22 Q. So you don't recall whether there
23 were any instances of potential compliance
24 issues, regarding Corporate Separation, during
25 your time as Chief Ethics Officer?

1 A. I think if you would have asked me
2 four years ago, or three years ago, I would
3 have had a better memory. But, sitting here
4 today, no, I don't recall.

5 Q. Fair enough. Are you familiar with
6 the Company's regulated money pool?

7 A. Generally.

8 Q. To your knowledge, do the companies
9 -- and when I say companies, I'm talking about
10 the Ohio -- do the companies track the source
11 of funds from the regulated money pool, to your
12 knowledge?

13 A. Can you repeat the question, or can
14 I have it read back?

15 Q. I will repeat it. To your
16 knowledge, do companies track the source of
17 funds that were placed in the regulated money
18 pool?

19 A. I don't know.

20 Q. And do you know whether the DMR,
21 Distribution Modernization Rider funds were
22 placed in the regulated money pool?

23 MR. DORINGO: Objection. Scope.

24 MS. LAPE: Objection. Same
25 objection.

1 A. Well, I was aware that there was a
2 money pool agreement. I was not aware or
3 involved in any of the details around that
4 agreement.

5 Q. Do you know whether or not Ohio
6 subsidiaries have access to the regulated money
7 pool?

8 A. If Ohio's -- you said, if the
9 subsidiaries have access?

10 Q. Non-Ohio subsidiary.

11 A. My understanding was that there was
12 a regulated and unregulated money pool. There
13 could have been others, but, that's, pretty
14 much, the extent of my understanding of the
15 money pool agreements.

16 Q. Did you know, or do you know
17 whether funds that were placed in the money
18 pool, whether they're earmarked for that?

19 A. I don't know what that means, and I
20 was not engaged in the money pool agreement.

21 Q. Well, did you ever have an
22 opportunity to handle any complaints, regarding
23 the need of the money pool funds?

24 A. Not that I remember.

25 Q. Were there ever any internal

1 instructions, regarding Corporate Separation
2 violations with respect to the money pool?

3 MS. LAPE: Objection. I caution
4 you not to answer to the extent you would need
5 to disclose attorney/client privileged
6 information.

7 MS. BOJKO: Again, I'm not asking
8 for substance, just whether it happened.

9 A. I don't remember.

10 Q. Were there ever any internal
11 discussions about revising accounting practices
12 for the money pool?

13 MR. DORINGO: Objection. Scope.

14 A. Not that I can recall.

15 Q. Do you know whether the Ohio
16 companies incurred any direct or indirect costs
17 for political or charitable spending that have
18 been identified?

19 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So I would
20 object and caution the witness not to answer,
21 to the extent it reveals any attorney/client
22 privileged information.

23 MS. BOJKO: I'm sorry. We can't
24 hear any -- when FirstEnergy Corp's attorney
25 objects, nobody can hear him.

1 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So I will
2 repeat the objection. For the record, I
3 object, and I'm cautioning the witness not to
4 answer the question, to the extent it reveals
5 any attorney/client privileged information.

6 MS. BOJKO: Thank you.

7 A. I'm sorry. Was that question
8 complete? It seemed to lack an ending. Maybe
9 you can read it back to me. I don't think I
10 had the whole question.

11 Q. Sure. My question was simply, to
12 your knowledge, did the companies incur any
13 direct or indirect cost for political or
14 charitable spending?

15 MS. LAPE: Objection. You can
16 answer to the extent you understand the
17 question.

18 A. I guess I struggle with the
19 question. I mean, to the extent that the
20 company buys a table at the Boy Scout's event,
21 is that incurring a cost -- and, if so, I'm
22 aware that the company participated in events,
23 and, I guess, purchased tables.

24 Q. And were those costs allocated to
25 the Ohio companies?

1 MR. DORINGO: Objection. Form.

2 A. I think first, for clarification,
3 when I said company, I was referring to a
4 subsidiary of FirstEnergy Corp, unaware of
5 which one it was. I guess I was more
6 specifically referring to the FirstEnergy
7 Foundation, and I'm not aware of any costs that
8 the companies incurred, to your question.

9 Q. Do the Ohio companies engage in, or
10 support the enactment of House Bill 6?

11 MR. DORINGO: Objection. Scope.

12 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection.
13 Scope.

14 MS. LAPE: Objection.

15 A. I understand that the companies
16 engaged in a certain section of House Bill 6.

17 Q. Which section was that?

18 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection.
19 Scope.

20 A. A provision on decoupling.

21 Q. And I think you said previously
22 that you are aware that payments were made by
23 FirstEnergy Corp to third parties to support
24 the enactment of HB 6; is that correct?

25 A. I did not say that.

1 Q. Okay. Then I will just ask you, I
2 didn't want to repeat. Thank you. Are you
3 aware that payments were made by FirstEnergy
4 Corp to third parties to support enactment of
5 House Bill 6?

6 MR. DORINGO: Objection. Scope.

7 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection
8 scope.

9 A. I apologize. I can't -- I'm not
10 sure if responding to your question, in any
11 manner, would violate my attorney/client
12 privilege.

13 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: In light of
14 that response, we ask the witness not to answer
15 the question, to the extent that it would
16 reveal any attorney/client privileged
17 information.

18 MS. BOJKO: Okay. Well, I think it
19 is public record. But I will ask my next
20 question --

21 Q. Were portions of those payments
22 allocated to the Ohio companies, do you know?

23 A. If there were payments, I don't
24 know how they were allocated.

25 Q. And I'm assuming that your answer

1 would also be that you don't know the party,
2 what were the expenses related to those
3 payments, if they were allocated, to your
4 knowledge?

5 MS. LAPE: Objection. This is all
6 hypothetical, and you're asking the witness to
7 speculate.

8 MS. BOJKO: Well, I strongly
9 disagree. I think the witness can answer, if
10 she knows.

11 A. If there were expenses that then
12 led to payments of those expenses -- I don't
13 know how those hypothetical expenses or
14 payments were allocated.

15 Q. Were you responsible for monitoring
16 the companies' vending, Ohio companies'
17 vending, to make sure it was compliant with the
18 Corporate Separation Plan?

19 A. No.

20 Q. I'm sorry. Did you say no?

21 A. Yes. I said no.

22 Q. Who would have been responsible for
23 monitoring the Ohio Companies' vending to
24 ensure it was compliant with the Corporate
25 Separation Plan, if it was not the Chief Ethics

1 Officer?

2 MR. DORINGO: Object to form.

3 A. I would think it would be the
4 business unit that was trained on it, and the
5 accounting unit that oversaw it.

6 Q. Did you state, again, that you were
7 not ever the Ohio Compliance Officer?

8 A. I never served in a title of Chief
9 Compliance Officer.

10 Q. Who did serve that title?

11 A. I'm not aware of that position.

12 Q. So you would not have kept records,
13 regarding the allocation of money to the
14 company, regarding any payments related to
15 counsel; is that correct?

16 A. Assuming that there were payments
17 associated with House Bill 6, I guess, I would
18 need a little clarification.

19 The companies did engage in a
20 section of House Bill 6, in connection with
21 that, there were outside legal expenses
22 associated with that representation. I was
23 aware of the legal expense for decoupling. I
24 don't recall being aware of any other expense,
25 at that time.

1 Q. And were you in charge of approving
2 those outside legal expenses that you just
3 mentioned?

4 A. I don't recall.

5 Q. Would you have kept records of the
6 outside legal expenses associated with the Ohio
7 companies' decoupling issue?

8 A. It would have been in a database in
9 the system.

10 Q. What database? Is it a different
11 one than you were talking --

12 A. CounselLink.

13 Q. CounselLink. Is this an internal
14 database for FirstEnergy Corp?

15 A. I don't know how the software is
16 structured.

17 Q. But you had access to this
18 CounselLink database, correct?

19 A. That's correct.

20 Q. So do you recall, is it your belief
21 that the legal expenses associated with the
22 decoupling issue were charged to the companies?

23 MR. DORINGO: Object to form.

24 MS. LAPE: Objection.

25 A. I don't know.

1 Q. But you would have known, back when
2 you were Chief Ethics Officer; is that a fair
3 assumption?

4 MS. LAPE: Objection.

5 A. I'm not sure if I would have been
6 aware of how every person allocates their
7 expenses in every matter throughout the
8 organization.

9 Q. Would you have reviewed the outside
10 legal expenses, regarding the House Bill 6
11 decoupling issue, to make sure it was compliant
12 with the companies' Corporate Separation plan?

13 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Objection. And
14 I would just caution the witness not to reveal
15 any attorney/client privileged information.

16 MR. DORINGO: Objection. Form.

17 A. I don't know.

18 Q. Did anyone raise a concern with
19 House Bill 6 related expenses with regards to
20 Corporate Separation issues?

21 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection.
22 Same instruction.

23 A. I don't remember.

24 Q. If there was an audit conducted,
25 would the auditor, regarding Corporate

1 Separation issues, would the auditor have had
2 access to the CounselLink database, in order to
3 review the expenses related to House Bill 6
4 that were charged to the Ohio Companies?

5 MS. LAPE: Objection. Form.

6 A. I don't know.

7 Q. If somebody would have reported an
8 issue, a Corporate Separation concern regarding
9 expenses allocated to the Ohio companies, would
10 you have been made aware of that Corporate
11 Separation concern?

12 A. If someone would have reported it
13 to me, or to the employee concerns line, I
14 would have been aware. If they would have
15 reported it to, in another way, I would have
16 only been aware if it was brought to my
17 attention.

18 Q. So would the Legal Department or
19 H.R. or any other division, department, that
20 received a complaint, regarding Corporate
21 Separation, have brought it to the attention of
22 the Chief Ethics Officer?

23 MS. LAPE: Objection. Calls for
24 speculation.

25 A. I believe it depends on whether it

1 was deemed a legal matter.

2 Q. But your counsel explained to me
3 earlier that you were also General Counsel,
4 during this time, or Assistant General Counsel,
5 during this time; is that right?

6 A. For part of the time.

7 Q. So you wouldn't have been made
8 aware of Corporate Separation concern or
9 violation, as Chief Ethics Officer and General
10 Counsel?

11 MR. DORINGO: Object to form.

12 MS. LAPE: Objection.

13 A. I think that it is possible that I
14 would have been aware. I think it's also
15 possible that an outside party would not bring
16 it to my attention.

17 Q. What do you mean an "outside
18 party," somebody -- we were talking about
19 H.R. -- do you mean outside the companies or
20 outside H.R.?

21 A. Outside the company.

22 Q. Okay. But in the normal course of
23 the process that the company engaged in, when
24 you were their Chief Ethics Officer, would you
25 assume that there was a Corporate Separation

1 violation, concern, regarding expenses
2 allocated to the Ohio company, that issue would
3 have been brought to your attention, as Chief
4 Ethics Officer, in general?

5 A. I don't know. If it was raised in
6 the Legal Department, and it was resolved with
7 the party, it may or may not have been brought
8 to my attention.

9 Q. Okay. And just to clarify the
10 record, can you tell me, just for the time you
11 were General Counsel, can you just more clearly
12 define for me, during your time as Chief Ethics
13 Officer, and when you were also General
14 Counsel, please?

15 A. From May of 2020 to November of
16 2020, I also served as General Counsel.

17 Q. And did you also say you were
18 Assistant General Counsel, prior to that, then,
19 while you were also Chief Ethics Officer?

20 A. I was Deputy General Counsel. I
21 don't have my CV in front of me. I don't
22 recall when I became Deputy General Counsel and
23 Chief Ethics Officer.

24 Q. My understanding, you were Chief
25 Ethics Officer in 2017, were you also Deputy

1 General Counsel back in 2017 through May 2020?

2 A. No, I was not. I was Chief Ethics
3 Officer and not Deputy General Counsel, for a
4 period of 2017 to 2018 or 2019.

5 Q. So, then, sometime in 2018 or 2019,
6 is when you became Chief Ethics Officer?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. Thank you very much for that
9 clarification. I just have a couple more
10 questions.

11 Are you being paid today for your
12 time to testify here?

13 A. I am not.

14 Q. Are you being compensated in any
15 other way for your time to testify today?

16 A. I am not.

17 Q. Thank you so much for your time,
18 Ebony. I have no further questions.

19 A. Thank you.

20 MR. FINNIGAN: I think one other
21 person indicated that they had questions for
22 the public session. I believe, Dane, you said
23 you had some -- or, now, that you are going to
24 participate in the confidential, do you want to
25 hold those for the confidential session?

1 MR. STINSON: No. I just have a
2 very few questions for the public session, so I
3 think we can get started with them.

4 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Go ahead.

5 EXAMINATION OF EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH
6 BY MR. STINSON:

7 Q. My name is Dane Stinson. I am
8 representing NOPEC. Good to see you, again,
9 Ebony. Just a few questions, and they relate
10 to the period when you were Chief Ethics
11 Officer and Compliance Officer, but I want to
12 focus initially on the period from January and
13 through April of 2020.

14 MS. LAPE: Objection.

15 Q. Now, during that time, Chuck Jones
16 was the CEO of FirstEnergy Corp; is that
17 correct?

18 A. Can you give me the period of time
19 again.

20 Q. January through April 2020.

21 A. From January to April, 2020, Chuck
22 Jones was the CEO.

23 Q. Right. During that same time, he
24 would have been Director of the three Ohio
25 FirstEnergy utility companies; is that also

1 correct?

2 A. I don't know.

3 Q. You don't know if he has held
4 executive positions with the electric utilities
5 during that period?

6 A. I don't know.

7 Q. Do you know if he was the manager
8 of SUVON, LLC, FirstEnergy advisors?

9 A. I don't know.

10 Q. What about with Steven Straub, do
11 you know whether he was the Director of the
12 three Ohio utilities during that period?

13 A. No, I don't.

14 Q. Do you know the position of Dennis
15 Chack, during that period when FE was
16 FirstEnergy Corp or FirstEnergy Services
17 Company?

18 A. I don't recall his title, but he
19 was over communications and FE Products.

20 Q. Would he have been a Vice President
21 of Marketing and Branding at FirstEnergy
22 Services Company?

23 A. I don't recall his title.

24 Q. During your term as Chief Ethics
25 Officer, did anyone inquire about whether

1 Mr. Jones' positions with the three Ohio
2 utilities, and any affiliates, violated the
3 Corporate Separation rules?

4 MR. DORINGO: Object to the form.
5 And I just caution you, Ebony, not to reveal
6 any privileged information.

7 A. I don't recall what, if any
8 position, he had with the Ohio utilities, nor
9 do I recall any questions regarding it.

10 Q. What about with respect to
11 Mr. Straub? Were there any questions or
12 inquiries about his decisions with a regulated
13 utility and a non-regulated affiliate?

14 MS. LAPE: And same caution, it's
15 okay to answer this question, but just make
16 sure that you don't disclose any
17 attorney/client privileged information.

18 A. I guess it's a different question.
19 You've indicated a non-utility affiliate. I
20 don't recall any questions regarding
21 Mr. Straub, nor am I aware of the positions
22 that he may or may not have had.

23 Q. Okay. Just one other question.
24 Mr. Finnigan had asked you if you were aware of
25 any party conversations between FirstEnergy and

1 Ohio regulatory officials. You indicated that
2 you didn't think so. Let me be a little more
3 specific.

4 Are you aware of any conversations
5 Mr. Jones had with PUCO Chairman Randazzo,
6 during that same January through April, 2020,
7 timeframe, regarding approval of an energy
8 license?

9 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So I would
10 object to that question, to the extent that it
11 calls for any attorney/client privileged
12 information. And, also, it was my belief the
13 questions related to Mr. Randazzo were going to
14 be held in the confidential session.

15 MR. STINSON: I can't hear your
16 objection. So I would like the objections
17 restated so I can hear them.

18 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Sure. I
19 objected and cautioned the witness not to
20 answer the question, to the extent that it
21 would reveal any attorney-client privileged
22 information. And then I also noted my
23 objection to the scope, and, also, my
24 understanding that we were reserving questions
25 related to Mr. Randazzo for the confidential

1 session.

2 MS. LAPE: And also, to the extent
3 that she learned information through her
4 attorneys, she should not answer as well.

5 MS. WILLIS: I would note for the
6 record that the company itself accompanied with
7 a filing in a case, the text message between
8 Jones and Chairman Randazzo, so, I believe, the
9 attorney/client privilege has been waived.

10 MR. DORINGO: I strongly object.
11 The privilege has never been waived by the
12 companies.

13 MS. WILLIS: By the filing of the
14 public document with the text exchange, that is
15 not a waiver?

16 MR. DORINGO: It was not a
17 privileged document that was filed.

18 MS. LAPE: And to the extent that
19 Ebony learned things through her attorneys,
20 that privilege has never been waived.

21 MR. STINSON: Again, I'm having
22 trouble hearing what the objections and
23 conversations are in the room. I didn't hear.
24 I think you're far away.

25 MS. LAPE: Is there a question

1 pending -- do you need us to repeat all of our
2 objections?

3 MR. STINSON: Right. I didn't hear
4 the objections. Sorry.

5 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So on behalf of
6 FirstEnergy corporation, I objected and
7 cautioned the witness not to answer the
8 question, to the extent it would reveal any
9 privileged and confidential information.

10 I objected to the scope, and I also
11 noted for the record our understanding that the
12 questions related to Commissioner Randazzo
13 would be asked in the confidential session.

14 MS. LAPE: I further objected to
15 the extent that disclosure of any answer would
16 involve disclosure of information that Ebony
17 learned through her own attorneys, as that has
18 never been waived.

19 MR. STINSON: Well, I disagree. I
20 think that some of these text messages between
21 Mr. Chack and Mr. Jones go to the question of
22 whether there was a conversation with
23 Mr. Randazzo, I think that's fair game in the
24 public portion of the company deposition.

25 MS. LAPE: I don't think we even

1 remember the question that is pending.

2 MR. STINSON: Okay. I'm just
3 talking about, I've asked whether you're aware
4 of any conversations between Mr. Jones and PUCO
5 Chairman Randazzo, during the January through
6 April of 2020 timeframe.

7 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection
8 and same instruction.

9 A. I don't know if I'm able to respond
10 to the question and maintain attorney/client
11 privilege.

12 Q. Again, I'm not asking about the
13 content of the communications or conversations.
14 I'm asking whether you are aware of any
15 conversations between Mr. Jones and
16 Mr. Randazzo during that period.

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Same objection
18 and same instruction.

19 MS. LAPE: Same objection and same
20 instruction. And this seems very outside the
21 scope right now of Corporate Separation.

22 MR. STINSON: It is not outside the
23 scope of Corporate Separation, when you have an
24 official of a non-regulated utilities affiliate
25 directing the Executive of the electric utility

1 to make inquiries about a pending certification
2 allocation with PUCO Chair; clearly, this isn't
3 about Corporate Separation issues.

4 A. I don't think I'm aware.

5 Q. You don't think or you weren't --
6 I'll withdraw that.

7 MS. LAPE: Yes. As she is sitting
8 here today, or at the time?

9 MR. STINSON: I withdrew that
10 question. No other questions, Your Honor.

11 MR. FINNIGAN: Well, thank you,
12 Dane. Thanks a lot. So I think that's all the
13 folks who indicated this morning that they
14 would have questions for the public session.
15 But let me ask again -- are there any other
16 parties who haven't gone yet that want to ask
17 questions during this public session, before we
18 move to the confidential session? Okay.
19 Hearing none. Let me just, before you jump
20 off, there has been a slight change of plans
21 here, and that's this --

22 At the beginning of today's
23 deposition, I said that we are going to end the
24 public session and then go into the
25 confidential session for the rest of the

1 deposition. Well, that may not be true now,
2 based on some information we learned at lunch.
3 What we found out was that --

4 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Hold on a
5 second. No. We can go into the confidential
6 session.

7 MR. FINNIGAN: So what we found out
8 this morning was that --

9 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: John, please,
10 let's go into the confidential session.

11 MR. FINNIGAN: What we found out
12 this morning was that there was a ruling --

13 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Excuse me,
14 John --

15 MR. FINNIGAN: -- from the Attorney
16 Examiner that we are allowed to ask questions
17 about the confidential documents that were
18 produced in discovery relating to
19 Sustainability Funding Alliance and
20 Mr. Randazzo. And that was our intent during
21 the confidential session, however, we found out
22 from First --

23 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: John, I would
24 ask you not to reveal --

25 MR. DORINGO: Can go off the

1 record?

2 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes. We need
3 to go off the record here.

4 MS. WILLIS: This is a public
5 record. There is nothing confidential about
6 what you communicated to us. It involves
7 everyone in this case, and it involves the
8 Attorney Examiner. It is a matter of public
9 record.

10 MR. DORINGO: It has nothing to do
11 with the examination of this witness.

12 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It has nothing
13 to do with this witness.

14 MS. WILLIS: Sure, it does.

15 MR. FINNIGAN: Hold on. Let me
16 finish my statement. Do not interrupt me.

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, I would
18 just ask you, before you continue speaking, not
19 to reveal the contents of what I shared with
20 you.

21 MR. FINNIGAN: I refuse to not
22 disclose that, because you didn't tell me
23 anything in confidence.

24 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I certainly did
25 tell you --

1 MR. FINNIGAN: No, you did not.

2 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: -- when we
3 stepped outside and we had the conversation off
4 the record.

5 MR. FINNIGAN: We stepped outside
6 in the hallway and we had a conversation off
7 the record, but you didn't say that it was in
8 confidence.

9 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, I don't
10 think I need to spell that out.

11 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Well, you
12 should have spelled it out, if you wanted it to
13 be confidential.

14 MS. WILLIS: And, honestly, there
15 is nothing confidential about a request to an
16 examiner that you are making, you have asked
17 it, or you had a conversation with the US
18 Attorney and that --

19 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I have asked
20 you that we do this on the confidential
21 session. That was the purpose of the
22 conversation outside.

23 MR. FINNIGAN: So anyway, let me
24 continue my statement --

25 MS. BOJKO: Okay. Wait a second.

1 John, before you continue your statement. I'm
2 sorry. We cannot hear the FirstEnergy counsel
3 when he speaks. It is completely unfair for
4 the rest of us to not be able to hear.

5 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So since we are
6 done with the public session with the
7 questions, I'd ask that we terminate the Zoom
8 and then we can continue with the confidential
9 session.

10 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. I just want
11 to make a statement for the record, while we
12 are on the public session. So let me do that.

13 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, John,
14 again, I would ask you not to reveal the
15 contents of what I told you.

16 MR. FINNIGAN: Again, you didn't
17 tell me anything in confidence, so I don't
18 believe --

19 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Well, right
20 now, I'm clarifying that I was doing it in
21 confidence, so I would ask you to respect that,
22 as a professional.

23 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. But you
24 didn't tell me anything, at the time, that was
25 in confidence, so I didn't take it as a

1 confidential communication.

2 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And, now, I am
3 clarifying, and I didn't know that I needed to
4 use any magic words, in order to have a
5 professional confidential conversation.

6 MS. LAPE: And perhaps we could
7 have the Attorney Examiner just make a decision
8 on this and --

9 MS. WILLIS: Well, that would be on
10 the public record, absolutely, on the public
11 record. When the Attorney Examiner comes on,
12 that is a matter of public record. It is not,
13 these are not secretive proceedings.

14 This is a deposition open to all,
15 and to push a matter, because you don't want
16 the appearance to be whatever it is, you know,
17 being done in the secrets and done in the
18 shadows, which is the way companies operate,
19 that's inappropriate. We are in a jurisdiction
20 where it's public. There are public records.
21 There are laws that are about the public, and
22 that require these proceedings to be public.
23 There is nothing private or confidential about
24 the fact that he has asked the Attorney
25 Examiner --

1 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: We -- hold on.

2 MS. LAPE: Come on.

3 MS. WILLIS: -- asked that the
4 Attorney Examiner be called.

5 MR. FINNIGAN: Excuse me, folks.
6 Let me -- I'm going to say something in the
7 public record of this deposition. So please
8 don't interrupt me as I say it.

9 MR. FITZGERALD: I just want to
10 note that we are objecting to it. I never
11 heard the word off the record mean something
12 but confidential. And if that's the --

13 MS. WILLIS: And, if you continue
14 to object, your remedy is to seek a protective
15 order of this, and keep it from being on the
16 public. But at this point, it becomes public.
17 It will be transcribed and that will be your
18 opportunity, if you believe that it is
19 confidential, to make that motion for
20 protection.

21 MR. FITZGERALD: I recognize you
22 want to put the horse out of the barn and then
23 say later, "Well, you can deal with it after it
24 is out of the barn." But it's out of the barn.

25 MR. FINNIGAN: So folks on the

1 public call, here is what I was starting to
2 say. At this morning's session, when we
3 started this deposition, I said that you could
4 just hang up, and when we ended the public
5 session that would be the end of your
6 involvement. But, now, that's not the case.

7 The reason is, because when we
8 recessed for lunch, FirstEnergy Corp's
9 attorney, Mr. Hollingsworth, told us that after
10 the Attorney Examiners made their ruling,
11 stating that the parties are allowed to ask the
12 witness about the documents that were produced
13 in discovery relating to Sustainability Funding
14 Alliance payments by FirstEnergy Corp and
15 activities by Mr. Randazzo, as the 100%
16 shareholder of Sustainability Funding Alliance,
17 apparently, Mr. Hollingsworth, or another
18 attorney at his firm, had a conversation with
19 Emily Glatfelter of the US Attorney's office,
20 and has tried to arrange a call between her and
21 the plural Attorney Examiners in an apparent
22 attempt to get them to reverse their ruling.

23 So when we go into this
24 confidential session, I am going to ask the
25 Attorney Examiners that that part of the

1 discussion be in the public record, just as
2 their ruling that we were allowed to ask those
3 questions, as part of the public record. So I
4 would ask that the folks, who were in the
5 public session of the deposition, stay on this
6 call for another half hour.

7 We are going to go to -- or, let me
8 make this suggestion, we are going to have to
9 end the public session now. But I would say
10 check your computers for the next half hour,
11 and we may be alerting you that we will resume
12 the public session, because it is our intent
13 that when we go into the confidential session,
14 that we will ask the Attorney Examiners that
15 this whole discussion about FirstEnergy Corp's
16 contact with Ms. Glatfelter, and
17 Ms. Glatfelter's position about what should
18 happen at this deposition, should all be part
19 of the public record. And if that is the case,
20 then, we want you all to participate in that
21 and be aware of that.

22 So please check your computers for
23 the next half hour, and we will notify you. We
24 should know by that time if we will be resuming
25 the public session. So, with that, if no one

1 has any questions, we will end it for now,
2 and then --

3 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So I do have an
4 objection, both to your statement and also the
5 mischaracterization of my representation to you
6 of the communication with AOC Glatfelter.

7 MS. BOJKO: We cannot hear you.

8 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So I just
9 objected to Mr. Finnigan's representation of
10 the communication with AOC Glatfelter and
11 objected to this proceeding being done on the
12 public session.

13 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. We are going
14 to end the public session, at this time, and we
15 will start the --

16 MS. BOJKO: John, before you do
17 that, can I just ask a question. There was a
18 fight in the room and we couldn't hear the
19 fight over resolution. Was that on the record,
20 or not on the record, the last -- the statement
21 by Mr. Finnigan and the objection by
22 FirstEnergy company?

23 MR. FINNIGAN: It's on the record.

24 MS. BOJKO: Okay. I didn't think
25 we went back on the record, after we went off

1 the record.

2 MR. FINNIGAN: That is on the
3 record. We are going to go off the record now,
4 and end the public session, and we are going to
5 start the confidential session immediately
6 after that.

7 THE WITNESS: I will read.

8 (Morning session concluded at 4:26 p.m.)

9 (NOTE: The confidential afternoon
10 session was ruled by the Attorney
11 Examiners to be moved over and is
12 heretofore a continuous transcript
13 with the public morning session
14 that was just completed.)

15 AE ADDISON: Hello everyone. Can
16 everyone hear me?

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes, we can.
18 Thank you. And so Attorney Examiners, we just
19 wanted to thank you for joining us and
20 apologize for bothering you this late in the
21 day. An issue came up during the course of the
22 deposition that we want to bring to your
23 attention.

24 So since you joined the deposition
25 earlier today, and made your ruling on the

1 permissible scope of the deposition, counsel
2 for OCC has asked a series of questions that
3 really go to the heart of the ongoing US
4 Attorney Office prosecution and investigations,
5 including several questions about HB 6, the
6 termination of Chuck Jones, other topics
7 unrelated to Corporate Separation, in addition
8 to its previously posed questions about
9 Sustainability Funding Alliance and Sam
10 Randazzo.

11 And so pursuant to FirstEnergy's
12 ongoing cooperation obligations to DOJ, we
13 reached out to the lead prosecutor of the DOJ
14 investigation to inform her about this
15 development, since her previous understanding
16 was that discovery into these topics was stayed
17 by the Commission in its December 21, 2021
18 ruling, and she authorized us to represent to
19 you, the Attorney Examiners, that DOJ has an
20 objection to lines of questioning on the record
21 in these proceedings about Sam Randazzo, about
22 Sustainability Funding Alliance, and is
23 available, if you would like to speak to her
24 about the issue and DOJ's position, as it could
25 be an important data point for your decision in

1 terms of the scope of these depositions.

2 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, this is
3 John Finnigan from OCC, just to let you know
4 the circumstances we are under right now, we
5 are in a confidential session of the
6 deposition, where only the parties that have
7 signed a confidentiality agreement with
8 FirstEnergy Corp have access to the information
9 that is being discussed, at this time.

10 Since your ruling earlier today
11 about the questioning that parties were allowed
12 to do in this deposition was made during the
13 public session of this deposition, I would ask
14 that this discussion that we are having now,
15 also, be in the public session of the
16 deposition, otherwise, by limiting it to only
17 parties who have signed the confidentiality
18 agreement with FirstEnergy Corp, we are
19 unfairly excluding other parties to this case,
20 who have a right to know what is being
21 discussed here.

22 AE ADDISON: Thank you. Does
23 anyone want to speak to either of those two
24 issues?

25 MS. BOJKO: Yes, Your Honor. Kim

1 Bojko with OMA EG would like to speak on both
2 issues. First of all, I completely disagree
3 with the FirstEnergy corporate attorneys'
4 characterization of the questions being asked.
5 The questions were background questions leading
6 up to questions that are directly related to
7 this case. He didn't even let us get to the
8 questions related to the case, because we
9 couldn't properly lay the foundation, in order
10 to ask if the witness had any knowledge of
11 either the people, or the subject matter at
12 issue. Many of the questions were just asking
13 if she recalled or if she knew about certain
14 events that happened and not the substance of
15 the events themselves.

16 So I wholly disagree with the
17 conversation that these are unrelated to the
18 Corporate Separation. As you know, any
19 payments made to these entities or individuals
20 that were then charged back to the companies,
21 is a Corporate Separation violation, or could
22 be, and is directly related to this case, and
23 these Corporate Separation compliance-type
24 issues are what is being sought through the
25 discovery of this witness.

1 So I disagree with the
2 characterization that these questions have
3 nothing to do with Corporate Separation. I
4 think that this is completely different than
5 the criminal proceeding. We are not asking
6 questions related to the criminal proceeding.
7 We are asking questions that will go to the
8 allocation of expenses, which is an issue in
9 this case.

10 I also think it was improper for
11 FirstEnergy Corporation's counsel to call the
12 DOJ's office without all of us on the phone, ex
13 parte, sort of, not with the Judge, but we
14 think it was highly inappropriate to hear one
15 side of the story, and him characterizing
16 questions the way that he did, which, I am sure
17 that I will disagree with, because I just
18 disagreed with his statement. So I think that
19 was inappropriate.

20 I also think it's inappropriate, as
21 to the second issue. I think it is
22 inappropriate that this discussion has been
23 held in secret in a confidential session. It
24 should be a public record. Many of the
25 documents have already been released to the

1 public. This has been discussed in the media
2 to great lengths. None of the questions that
3 we had asked them so far have anything to do
4 with a confidential issue, and should not be in
5 confidential session, however, I think some of
6 us reluctantly agreed, when we were on the call
7 earlier, to just ask the questions in
8 confidential session.

9 So I think that this discussion and
10 FirstEnergy's actions of calling the DOJ,
11 should very much be in the public record and
12 this whole discussion should be moved to the
13 public transcript. Thank you.

14 MR. STINSON: Your Honor, this is
15 Dane Stinson with NOPEC. I agree with OCC's
16 and OMA EG's positions, especially, the fact
17 that a ruling was made on the public record,
18 and, now, we're being asked to modify or change
19 that ruling on the private non-transparent
20 record; transparency requires that we have this
21 discussion on the public record.

22 AE ADDISON: Thank you. Anyone
23 else?

24 MR. BETTERTON: Your Honor, I'll
25 just jump in real quick. I agree with what you

1 stated before. And I would just like to admit
2 that a lot of the questions that were being
3 asked, and objected to, long predate any
4 investigation in the criminal proceedings. So
5 that's another area to consider. But I agree
6 with what OCC and OMA EG have said.

7 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, if we
8 could speak to the merits of the call.

9 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, do you
10 want to have that discussion now, or do you
11 want to give us guidance whether this should be
12 in the public record or in the confidential
13 session?

14 AE ADDISON: Well, I'm still
15 mulling that over, Mr. Finnigan. We can
16 certainly remove portions of the transcript, as
17 we see fit. So let's continue. Ms. Wills?

18 MS. WILLIS: Mr. Finnigan is
19 prepared to address it.

20 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, this
21 goes back to the ruling that the Commission
22 made in the 20- 1629 case, where it said that
23 the foreign investigations that the Commission
24 is conducting into the House Bill 6 matters,
25 all target topics that are part of the

1 Commission's exclusive jurisdiction. And to
2 that extent, the Commission's investigations
3 are complementary to the US Attorney's criminal
4 investigations.

5 We do not see any circumstances,
6 where FirstEnergy Corp should be permitted to
7 come in and block any questioning about the
8 documents that they have released. They
9 released documents that provide information
10 about the payments to Sustainability Funding
11 Alliance that was owned by Mr. Randazzo, and
12 they also entered into deferred prosecution
13 agreement that admits that those payments
14 happened, and admits that payments were made to
15 a certain public official B for engaging in
16 activities that would benefit FirstEnergy Corp,
17 during his role as Chair of the Public
18 Utilities Commission.

19 So all that information is in the
20 public record through their admission of the
21 criminal charge of honest services wire fraud.
22 They signed a statement of facts, where they
23 laid out all these facts into evidence in the
24 public record. And now, when we bring in
25 former employees from the company, they want to

1 stop us from asking any questions about it. So
2 we don't really understand the argument, as to
3 why this should be confidential, when all that
4 information is in the public domain.

5 At the end of the day, this case
6 goes to issue of something that is in the
7 Commission's exclusive jurisdiction, and that
8 is whether costs were improperly allocated to
9 utility customers for lobbying on behalf of the
10 utility. And the Commission really needs to
11 take action here to protect the consumers, and
12 to really fulfill what it said all along, that
13 it wanted to act on a transparent basis with a
14 full set of facts, and we can't get the full
15 set of facts, if we are not allowed to ask
16 questions of witnesses about the documents that
17 we've already received.

18 Now, it seems like, if FirstEnergy
19 Corp really had any concern that these matters
20 were confidential and might interfere with the
21 US Attorney's investigation, they might have
22 contacted the US Attorney, before giving us
23 about 500,000 pages of documents that contained
24 the same information that we want to ask
25 questions about. Why was it not interfering

1 with the criminal investigation to give us all
2 those documents, and, now, it is interfering
3 with the investigation to ask questions about
4 the documents that they gave us?

5 Also, the whole idea about us
6 taking Ms. Yeboah-Amankwah's deposition in the
7 first place was the subject of a motion to
8 quash that the Commission ruled on. They could
9 have brought up these arguments in the motion
10 to quash; they didn't. They could have
11 notified the US Attorney that this deposition
12 was going to take place, and they didn't; they
13 waited until the eleventh hour, after you made
14 your ruling this morning that we are allowed to
15 ask questions about these documents, which we
16 believe was the proper ruling. And, now, they
17 are trying to do an end run around it by
18 calling up the US Attorney's office in secret,
19 and talking about it in this confidential
20 session in secret, and keeping all this
21 information out of the public domain.

22 So our position is that this is a
23 topic that is the proper focus of this
24 investigation, as the Commission has held all
25 along, and indicated in its Order, in that, we

1 cannot proceed with our discovery, and prepare
2 for a hearing in the case, unless we have the
3 ability to depose witnesses, and ask them
4 questions about the information that is in the
5 documents, otherwise, we just have to go to a
6 hearing and just dump a pile of documents in
7 the Commission's offices, and not present any
8 testimony about it, because we were not allowed
9 to ask any witnesses questions about the
10 documents that we were given. In my experience
11 and practice --

12 AE ADDISON: Mr. Finnigan, if I
13 could interject, the Commission has noted its
14 interest to not interfere with the federal
15 investigation, however, correct --

16 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes, Your Honor.
17 That is correct.

18 AE ADDISON: -- as was noted in our
19 earlier phone call?

20 MR. FINNIGAN: Yes. Yes. And, you
21 know, the heart of our position, Your Honor, is
22 that any discussion of whether this might
23 interfere with the US Attorney's investigation,
24 should be held in public, and let's hear what
25 the US Attorney was told about the deposition,

1 and let's hear the US Attorney's position,
2 because we see no reason why that discussion
3 should be held in secret, especially, when the
4 point of the discussion is try to reverse your
5 ruling from earlier today that we are allowed
6 to ask these questions.

7 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So a couple of
8 things that I would like to clarify for the
9 record. Mr. Finnigan suggested that we, you
10 know, waited until the eleventh hour to inform
11 the Assistant United States Attorney about
12 these issues, which is patently false.

13 She was aware of this deposition,
14 and she was also aware the Commission's
15 December 2021 ruling, which to everyone who
16 read it, believed that these issues would not
17 be fair game for deposition, because the
18 Commission put a stay on discovery of these
19 topics. And so when the Attorney Examiners
20 made their ruling this afternoon, that was a
21 significant material change in the scope of
22 what we all believed the scope of the
23 deposition would be, and, so, it was
24 appropriate and consistent with our cooperation
25 obligations to inform her, at that time.

1 It clearly was not done in secret,
2 because I immediately informed counsel for OCC
3 of the conversation, and of the AUSA's position
4 that questions into these topics, into these
5 subject matters, does exactly what the
6 Commission was worried it would do and would
7 interfere with her ongoing investigation. You
8 don't have to take it from me. I am
9 representing to you that that was her position,
10 and she is more than happy to share it with
11 you.

12 AE ADDISON: But she's not
13 available on the phone call right now.

14 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I'm happy to
15 provide contact information for you to speak
16 with her.

17 MR. FINNIGAN: And, Your Honor, one
18 other point, the questioning that we were going
19 to do about documents, was going to be in a
20 confidential session of the deposition, where
21 everybody participating has signed a
22 confidentiality agreement with FirstEnergy
23 Corp, that none of the information is going to
24 be disclosed to the public, unless it is done
25 consistent with the terms of the

1 confidentiality agreement, where FirstEnergy
2 Corp would have full rights to object, and
3 would receive advanced notice of any attempt by
4 a party to make the information public, and
5 could file either before the Commission or a
6 court, in an attempt to block that from
7 happening.

8 FirstEnergy Corp voluntarily
9 entered into that confidentiality agreement,
10 and all the parties that would be participating
11 in the questioning, also, signed the agreement,
12 and agreed to operate under those terms.

13 So if the information is going to
14 be kept confidential, it doesn't seem like
15 there is any way it could interfere with the
16 criminal prosecution. The other thing we would
17 note is that we are informed that there was a
18 deposition of FirstEnergy Corp that took place
19 on, I believe, it was May 19th and 20th, and we
20 have the topics from that deposition. They
21 were filed in the US District Court, before the
22 deposition took place. All the topics that
23 were to be discussed in that deposition, as
24 indicated in the US District Court filing, were
25 the same matters that we had intended to ask

1 about, and that you had allowed us to ask about
2 in the confidential session of the deposition.

3 So if the Plaintiffs in the
4 securities litigation are allowed to take a
5 two-day deposition of FirstEnergy Corp about
6 these same topics, why can't OCC take a same
7 deposition about the same topics? It would be
8 patently unfair to customers to be prevented
9 from obtaining the same type of information
10 that the Plaintiffs in the federal securities
11 litigation were allowed to get.

12 AE ADDISON: Thank you.
13 Mr. Hollingsworth, do you want the last word?

14 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: I would just
15 say that nobody is trying to prevent the
16 consumers from getting access to this
17 information and to these witnesses. It's just
18 a matter of timing, and the US Attorney's
19 office has represented to us that the timing of
20 these questions would materially impact their
21 investigation.

22 And so, for the reasons set out in
23 the December 2001 ruling by the Commission,
24 where it says it is of utmost importance that
25 our investigations do not interfere with the

1 criminal investigations. We would ask that you
2 consider your ruling to be consistent with
3 those admonishments by the Commission.

4 AE ADDISON: Thank you. We will go
5 ahead and take a brief break and confer with
6 one another and hop back on when we are ready
7 to provide a ruling.

8 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And just to be
9 clear, we are going to break, and no additional
10 questions are going to be posed until we
11 resume. So there is not a need for an
12 immediate response, particularly, if you would
13 like to speak with the prosecutor at issue.

14 AE ADDISON: Thank you.

15 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

16 AE ADDISON: All right.

17 Mr. Hollingsworth, just as a follow-up to our
18 earlier argument, what, specifically, is your
19 position, then, on what should not be permitted
20 to be asked in Confidential Session?

21 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Certainly, Your
22 Honor. So if the question is, what should the
23 permissible scope of deposition questions for
24 the Corporate Separation hearing be on
25 questions related to Mr. Randazzo and

1 Sustainability Funding Alliance, again, if the
2 questions are narrowly tailored to the
3 Corporate Separation topics specifically, and
4 not underlying reasons for the payments, or for
5 the other potential issues that could under
6 investigation by the Department of Justice,
7 then, we would have no problem with certain
8 narrowly tailored questions like that.

9 It's just getting into the
10 underlying facts about the agreements with
11 Sustainability Funding Alliance, the nature of
12 the payments and the, you know, the FirstEnergy
13 rationale for paying those payments. Those
14 would be, I think, the topics of interest to
15 the Department of Justice, and ones that should
16 not be asked, at this time, on the record.

17 AE ADDISON: Would you agree
18 with me, then, that questions pertaining to
19 non-public information, related to the deferred
20 prosecution agreement, that may interfere with
21 the federal investigation, those should not be
22 permitted, per your representations made from
23 the DOJ?

24 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes,
25 definitely. Non-public information would

1 interfere with the investigation.

2 AE ADDISON: Thank you. I do
3 believe a balance can be struck, in terms of
4 what questions may be permitted to be asked in
5 confidential session, certainly, we agree that
6 any non-public information that relates to the
7 deferred prosecution agreement that may
8 interfere with the federal investigations,
9 should not be permitted, and we will not permit
10 such questions to be asked.

11 It continues to be the Commission's
12 interest, I believe, that we cited that before,
13 to not interfere with the ongoing criminal
14 investigation by the United States Attorney for
15 the Southern District of Ohio, or the civil
16 action by the Ohio Attorney General, Dave Yost,
17 specific to Ohio's civil RICO statute. That
18 continues to be the case today, however, I feel
19 as if our ruling just now is not inconsistent
20 with our prior rulings earlier today in the
21 public transcript.

22 And further, in taking up various
23 parties' arguments, as to whether those
24 arguments entertained by the Attorney
25 Examiners, at the beginning of this

1 confidential session, should be moved into the
2 public session, we certainly agree that that
3 does provide a level of transparency, and
4 provides parties that may not have had access
5 to the confidential session, a larger, better
6 picture view, as to what types of questions
7 were actually permissible in this proceeding.

8 And so we should, we are going to
9 be directing both, as soon as the Attorney
10 Examiners entered the confidential, in which I
11 believe we were at the very beginning, if not,
12 very close to the beginning, as soon as we
13 entered into the confidential session, as well
14 as our ruling discussed right now, should be
15 moved into the public transcript.

16 Are there any questions?

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Not from us,
18 Your Honor.

19 MR. DORINGO: Your Honor, I don't
20 have any more questions on this topic. I am
21 going to be a major downer. I do have one
22 small issue that I want to raise, but not on
23 this topic.

24 AE ADDISON: Well, let's hear if
25 anyone has any issues with this topic, and,

1 then, we will move on to Mr. Doringo.

2 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, I just
3 wanted to clarify whether this will constitute
4 your ruling, as you've just described it, or
5 will there be any written ruling that comes out
6 and memorializes what you've just said here?

7 AE ADDISON: Oh, no, Mr. Finnigan.
8 This will be all that the parties get.

9 MR. FINNIGAN: Okay. Thank you.

10 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, if I may.
11 As you said, you believe your ruling is
12 consistent with this morning's ruling, does
13 that mean this morning's ruling stands?

14 AE ADDISON: Absolutely. I did not
15 provide any sort of ruling that contradicts
16 what we stated earlier. I believe they can
17 be -- they are both still good rulings for
18 purposes of this deposition.

19 MS. BOJKO: Your Honor, I have a
20 question.

21 AE ADDISON: Certainly.

22 MS. BOJKO: Thank you. You said
23 non-public information cannot be disclosed. We
24 are asking questions, it's my understanding, in
25 a confidential session, so all of the

1 confidential session would not be considered
2 non-public. So my understanding of your ruling
3 is that these questions that we are asking, can
4 be asked, and that there would be no limits on
5 background information, or things that happened
6 prior to House Bill 6 with regard to Corporate
7 Separation issues and payments to entities; is
8 that correct?

9 AE ADDISON: And I'm sorry,
10 Ms. Bojko. Could you go back just maybe a
11 step; my audio fell bad here just for a moment.

12 MS. BOJKO: Sure. My question was,
13 you made a statement that no non-public
14 information can be discussed or questioned.
15 And it's my understanding that the next session
16 we are setting forth is purely a confidential
17 session, so nothing in the confidential session
18 will be disclosed publically, until either a
19 party requests that it be disclosed, or Your
20 Honors state it will be disclosed publically,
21 similar to our discussion here.

22 So is it fair to assume from both
23 your ruling this morning and the ruling this
24 afternoon, that we are able to ask questions
25 about history and background leading up to the

1 Corporate Separation allocation questions, as
2 well as events and items that happened
3 Corporate Separation related before HB 6, we
4 can ask all those questions, because none of
5 them will be directly in the public record,
6 when we ask them, right?

7 AE ADDISON: Ms. Bojko, my ruling
8 is simply that we are not going to permit
9 questions related to the non-public
10 information, regarding the deferred prosecution
11 agreement that could potentially interfere with
12 the federal investigations. I think that
13 we've, Mr. Hollingsworth made it very clear,
14 based on the representation from the DOJ that
15 that is taking it one step too far.

16 And while my earlier ruling stands,
17 we will go ahead and pump the brakes, as it
18 comes to that particular area of questioning.
19 So anything that is not seeking that, that's
20 where my ruling is limited.

21 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And thank you,
22 Your Honor. I think that that helps to
23 clarify. But just to be clear. So the subject
24 of the deferred prosecution agreement relates
25 to the payments related to House Bill 6, and,

1 also, to Sustainability Funding Alliance.

2 AE ADDISON: Sir, Mr. Hollingsworth

3 --

4 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes, Your
5 Honor?

6 AE ADDISON: Can you hear me?

7 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes, I can.

8 AE ADDISON: Okay. I'm sorry.
9 Could you repeat that.

10 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Yes. So I just
11 wanted to be clear that when you are referring
12 to the non-public information, related to the
13 deferred prosecution agreement, the subject of
14 the deferred prosecution agreement, were the
15 payments related to HB 6 and the Sustainability
16 Funding Alliance. So those would be, the
17 questions about anything non-public related to
18 those topics, would not be permitted; is that
19 an accurate understanding of your ruling?

20 AE ADDISON: Well,
21 Mr. Hollingsworth, I think it was a more
22 general ruling than that. But any non-public
23 information that would -- perhaps, I need to
24 say this clearer -- any non-public information,
25 related to the deferred prosecution agreement,

1 so anything that's referenced, anything that's;
2 and, perhaps, we are trying to say the same
3 thing.

4 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So any topic
5 that is referenced in the deferred prosecution
6 agreement.

7 MS. WILLIS: No.

8 AE ADDISON: I don't know if I
9 would go that far, Mr. Hollingsworth. That
10 would essentially nix everything in that line
11 of questioning, and, I believe, we are trying
12 to strike a balance here. My ruling is limited
13 to non-public information related to the
14 deferred prosecution agreement. I am not
15 saying that all topics included in that
16 deferred prosecution agreement are off the
17 table. Does that help? Does that makes sense?

18 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: It does. I'm
19 just trying to make sure that, before we hop
20 off the call, everyone is on the same page so
21 that we don't have to bother you again. So I
22 apologize if I'm being thick and --

23 AE ADDISON: No. No. That's fine.

24 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, and since
25 we are giving great weight to what the company

1 corp counsel represented, with respect to
2 Ms. Glatfelter, can we ask that Affidavits be
3 filed by Ms. Glatfelter or the company, under
4 oath, indicating exactly the conversation?
5 Because if we are going to go through this in a
6 public process, we can't really rely on a
7 representation made with respect to a
8 conversation had with a third party. So I
9 would ask that consistent with --

10 AE ADDISON: Ms. Willis, I am
11 making my ruling based on the arguments had
12 during a call. I remind everyone this is a
13 deposition transcript. And my ruling will
14 stand. I will not be requiring or asking any
15 additional process, as to these rulings, and, I
16 believe, I've given my basis for providing my
17 rulings and we will move on from there.

18 MS. BOJKO: Your Honor, Kim Bojko
19 again. I'm sorry --

20 AE ADDISON: Yes.

21 MS. BOJKO: Maybe I'm being thick
22 right now. But if you're, if you are saying we
23 cannot ask any non-public information, then,
24 shouldn't this part of the transcript also be
25 made public, and that there would be no need

1 for a confidential session? I'm just a little
2 confused as --

3 AE ADDISON: Well, Ms. Bojko, it's
4 related to the DPA, the deferred prosecution
5 agreement. So any other confidential
6 information, any other document of the 470,000
7 documents that were provided during discovery,
8 any of those that have been marked
9 confidential, or, otherwise, those would
10 certainly be, you know, appropriate to raise in
11 this confidential session.

12 So I am only referring to the
13 non-public information, as it relates to the
14 DPA, not any of the additional discovery
15 documents that we indicated in one of our prior
16 entries, that would be permissible to use
17 during this deposition.

18 MS. BOJKO: Okay. Thank you. That
19 helps. So then any event that happened, prior
20 to the DPA, or not related to the DPA, are
21 still fair game.

22 AE ADDISON: Correct.

23 MS. BOJKO: Thank you.

24 AE ADDISON: Okay. And,
25 Mr. Doringo, what is the additional issue that

1 you had to address?

2 MR. DORINGO: Thanks, Your Honors,
3 for indulging me. OCC has a motion for
4 extension under the procedural schedule. We
5 have a testimony deadline for the companies on
6 Monday, the 25th. We are trying to figure out
7 deposition dates for remaining witnesses.

8 So I was just wondering if we would
9 be likely to see a ruling on that motion by say
10 Friday or Monday, or where that stands.

11 AE ADDISON: I won't go into the
12 motion in this call in great detail. We are
13 aware of the motion. It is properly before us,
14 and a decision is forthcoming. So I will leave
15 it at that. But, yes, thank you for raising
16 that.

17 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: And Your Honor,
18 just a procedural question. In the unlikely
19 event that there is a dispute about where this
20 line is, going forward, what is your preferred
21 preference for how we handle the situation; for
22 example, if the person defending the deposition
23 believes that the question has exceeded the
24 permissible scope that you just articulated,
25 would you like us to instruct the witness not

1 to answer, and, then, move on, or would you
2 like us to have that issue teed up for
3 resolution by the Attorney Examiners, or how
4 would you like us to handle it going forward so
5 that we act consistent with your desires?

6 AE ADDISON: I should ask, how much
7 longer are the parties prepared to go this
8 evening for this deposition?

9 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: So for today,
10 we are not going to ask any substantive
11 questions. We just wanted to get a resolution
12 on this particular issue, because it's going to
13 inform how the next session goes.

14 AE ADDISON: Certainly. I don't
15 believe the Examiners would have a preference
16 between either of those two alternatives that
17 you just laid out. We will certainly be
18 available, in the event the parties would like
19 us to weigh in on any particular dispute, but
20 as these are deposition transcripts, I will
21 allow the parties to make that judgment call,
22 and we will be happy to join in on any
23 additional calls that you may need us.

24 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Okay. Thank
25 you, Your Honor.

1 AE ADDISON: Absolutely. Any
2 additional questions?

3 MR. FINNIGAN: Your Honor, just
4 from a procedural standpoint, since this call
5 was initiated, as a confidential call, during a
6 confidential session of the deposition, as I
7 understand your ruling, is it that this
8 discussion that we are now having should be
9 transferred into the public part of the
10 deposition transcript?

11 AE ADDISON: Yes, Mr. Finnigan.
12 Thank you for raising that. I believe I had
13 indicated earlier that the arguments had,
14 before we took a brief break, as well as our
15 rulings, based on those arguments, were to be
16 moved into the public session. I believe that
17 any discussion clarifying those particular
18 rulings should also be moved into the public
19 session.

20 So I agree that the entirety of the
21 confidential session, as we did not go into any
22 substantive questions, is permissible to be
23 moved into the public transcript.

24 MR. FINNIGAN: Thank you, Your
25 Honor.

1 AE ADDISON: Absolutely. Any
2 additional questions? Okay. With that, I wish
3 you all a very good evening, and, again, we
4 will be available in the event that you need us
5 to resolve any additional disputes.

6 MR. FINNIGAN: Thank you.

7 MR. HOLLINGSWORTH: Thank you, Your
8 Honor.

9 AE ADDISON: Thank you.

10 (Deposition concluded at 6:07 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Whereupon, counsel was requested to give
2 instructions regarding the witness' review of
3 the transcript pursuant to the Civil Rules.

4
5 SIGNATURE:

6 Transcript review was requested pursuant to the
7 applicable Rules of Civil Procedure.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

The State of Ohio,)

SS:

County of Cuyahoga.)

I, Kurt M. Spencer, a Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that the within named witness, EBONY YEBOAH-AMANKWAH, was by me first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the cause aforesaid; that the testimony then given by the above-referenced witness was by me reduced to stenotypy in the presence of said witness; afterwards transcribed, and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of the testimony so given by the above-referenced witness.

I do further certify that this deposition was taken at the time and place in the foregoing caption specified and was completed without adjournment.

1 I do further certify that I am not
2 a relative, counsel or attorney for either
3 party, or otherwise interested in the outcome
4 of this action.

5 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
6 set my hand and affixed my seal of office at
7 Cleveland, Ohio, on this 26th day of
8 July, 2022.

9
10
11
12 
13

14 Kurt M. Spencer, Notary Public
15 within and for the State of Ohio
16

17 My commission expires December 02, 2025.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Veritext Legal Solutions
1100 Superior Ave
Suite 1820
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Phone: 216-523-1313

July 26, 2022

To: Marcie Lape, Esq.

Case Name: In Re: Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric
Illuminating Company, And The Toledo Edison Company'S Compliance, Et
Al. v.

Veritext Reference Number: 5319823

Witness: Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah Deposition Date: 7/21/2022

Dear Sir/Madam:

Enclosed please find a deposition transcript. Please have the witness
review the transcript and note any changes or corrections on the
included errata sheet, indicating the page, line number, change, and
the reason for the change. Have the witness' signature notarized and
forward the completed page(s) back to us at the Production address
shown
above, or email to production-midwest@veritext.com.

If the errata is not returned within thirty days of your receipt of
this letter, the reading and signing will be deemed waived.

Sincerely,
Production Department

NO NOTARY REQUIRED IN CA

DEPOSITION REVIEW
CERTIFICATION OF WITNESS

ASSIGNMENT REFERENCE NO: 5319823

CASE NAME: In Re: Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric
Illuminating Company, And The Toledo Edison Company'S Compliance, Et
Al. v.

DATE OF DEPOSITION: 7/21/2022

WITNESS' NAME: Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah

In accordance with the Rules of Civil
Procedure, I have read the entire transcript of
my testimony or it has been read to me.

I have made no changes to the testimony
as transcribed by the court reporter.

Date Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah

Sworn to and subscribed before me, a
Notary Public in and for the State and County,
the referenced witness did personally appear
and acknowledge that:

They have read the transcript;

They signed the foregoing Sworn
Statement; and

Their execution of this Statement is of
their free act and deed.

I have affixed my name and official seal

this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Notary Public

Commission Expiration Date

DEPOSITION REVIEW
CERTIFICATION OF WITNESS

ASSIGNMENT REFERENCE NO: 5319823

CASE NAME: In Re: Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric
Illuminating Company, And The Toledo Edison Company'S Compliance, Et
Al. v.

DATE OF DEPOSITION: 7/21/2022

WITNESS' NAME: Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah

In accordance with the Rules of Civil
Procedure, I have read the entire transcript of
my testimony or it has been read to me.

I have listed my changes on the attached
Errata Sheet, listing page and line numbers as
well as the reason(s) for the change(s).

I request that these changes be entered
as part of the record of my testimony.

I have executed the Errata Sheet, as well
as this Certificate, and request and authorize
that both be appended to the transcript of my
testimony and be incorporated therein.

Date

Ebony Yeboah-Amankwah

Sworn to and subscribed before me, a
Notary Public in and for the State and County,
the referenced witness did personally appear
and acknowledge that:

They have read the transcript;

They have listed all of their corrections
in the appended Errata Sheet;

They signed the foregoing Sworn
Statement; and

Their execution of this Statement is of
their free act and deed.

I have affixed my name and official seal
this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Notary Public

Commission Expiration Date

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

ERRATA SHEET
VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS MIDWEST
ASSIGNMENT NO: 5319823

PAGE/LINE(S) /	CHANGE	/REASON
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Date
SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS _____
DAY OF _____, 20_____.

Notary Public

Commission Expiration Date

&	1820 204:2	154:13,20,21	4040 1:21
& 2:4 4:17 5:4	19th 184:19	157:6 160:6	407-0954 2:11
6:3,12 8:18,21	2	2021 38:16 39:5	421-2255 6:17
8:23 11:12,21	2 7:3	62:21 68:11,16	43016 5:15
15:5	20 63:23,24 74:9	74:8 78:22	43212 6:23
0	177:22 205:16	172:17 182:15	43212-3449 5:24
02 203:17	206:22 207:22	2022 1:18 14:18	43215 4:11,22
1	20-1629 38:18	64:3,25 203:8	5:7 6:7
10 121:6	39:5 76:17	204:4	43215-3420 2:21
100 5:6 7:8	78:22	2025 203:17	44114 3:8,18
168:15	2001 185:23	20th 184:19	204:2
10:08 1:19	2003 13:6 15:3	21 1:18 6:5	45202 6:16
1100 204:1	2005 13:6,7	172:17	466-8574 2:22
1145 5:22	15:11 17:25	216 3:9,19	470,000 67:20
12 7:7 17:6	2006 22:13	216-523-1313	196:6
121 7:9	2008 22:22	204:3	4901:1-16 64:11
12444 203:13	2011 13:10,12	227-2300 5:8	4901:1-37 1:11
12460 6:22	16:11	24 55:2 91:10	4928.145 69:18
13 17:6	2013 116:19	25th 197:6	70:3 73:20
1300 4:21	2014 22:25 23:4	26 204:4	74:15,23 78:24
14 38:24 39:6	27:7	26th 203:7	4928.17 1:9
69:2 75:8	2015 73:3	2700 2:9	4:26 171:8
15 39:5 62:21	2017 13:15,16	280 4:20	5
68:11,16 74:8	16:25 122:4	29.2817 60:14	500,000 179:23
78:22	129:7 152:25	2:00 121:6	513 6:17
1510 6:15	153:1,4	3	5319823 204:8
154 7:10	2018 44:22	3 121:7,11	205:2 206:2
155 2:8	106:14 107:3	30 4:9	207:2
15th 38:17 57:22	116:11 153:4,5	312 2:11	586-7112 3:19
58:16 69:2 73:2	2018/2019 13:17	36 6:14	586-7273 3:9
16 64:3,24 107:3	2019 153:4,5	365-4124 4:23	6
1629 74:9 177:22	202 7:12	38 64:24	6 75:23 85:12
16th 12:20	2020 13:21,22	39 64:24	96:16 97:2
17-974 1:13	14:4,7 85:2	4	116:10 144:10
12:20 101:6	122:5 129:8	4 58:7 71:12,16	144:16,24 145:5
1700 6:6	135:14 152:15	106:14	147:17,20
	152:16 153:1		149:10,19 150:3

172:5 177:24 191:6 192:3,25 193:15 60606 2:10 6100 5:14 614 2:22 4:12,23 5:8,16 6:8 644-8768 4:12 65 2:19 659-5069 5:16 6:07 200:10	136:2,3,8,11,13 136:25 137:3,6 141:6,9 148:17 150:2 173:8 185:16 189:4 accessing 65:5 109:1 accompanied 158:6 accounted 108:20 110:20 accounting 50:18,19,23 120:3 142:11 147:5 accurate 193:19 acknowledge 205:11 206:16 act 179:13 198:5 205:14 206:20 acted 19:4 133:18 acting 30:3 87:14 138:12 action 34:8,10 39:10 55:20 70:5 75:12 94:12 179:11 188:16 203:4 actions 88:11 176:10 active 30:9 31:3 92:11 106:24 activities 60:20 83:22 84:1 86:10 168:15 178:16	actual 33:12 60:20 61:6 ad 69:8 79:22 84:23 adam 3:14 8:24 add 60:6 76:12 addison 171:15 173:22 176:22 177:14 181:12 181:18 183:12 185:12 186:4,14 186:16 187:17 188:2 189:24 190:7,14,21 191:9 192:7 193:2,6,8,20 194:8,23 195:10 195:20 196:3,22 196:24 197:11 198:6,14 199:1 199:11 200:1,9 addition 25:11 172:7 additional 58:19 65:12 66:22 79:2 80:9 186:9 195:15 196:14 196:25 198:23 199:2 200:2,5 address 17:16 177:19 197:1 204:16 addressed 64:16 106:3 adequate 65:2 adjective 89:25 90:2	adjournment 202:22 admin 1:10 64:11 administer 47:1 administered 46:15 47:17 administering 47:22 administration 74:17 administrative 76:15 129:22 admissible 64:10 admission 178:20 admit 177:1 admits 178:13 178:14 admonishments 186:3 advanced 184:3 advice 133:18,20 advise 110:10 138:21 advised 134:1 advisors 155:8 advocate 19:8 ae 171:15 173:22 176:22 177:14 181:12,18 183:12 185:12 186:4,14,16 187:17 188:2 189:24 190:7,14 190:21 191:9 192:7 193:2,6,8 193:20 194:8,23
7			
7/21/2022 204:9 205:3 206:3 719-2853 6:8			
9			
901 3:7,17			
a			
a.m. 1:19 ability 87:24 124:14 125:1 181:3 able 45:4 77:3 110:10 114:23 160:9 165:4 191:24 absolutely 41:23 166:10 190:14 199:1 200:1 access 49:3,8 109:19 124:9 129:18,21,22,23 129:24,25 130:1 130:4 131:22 132:4,9,22 133:5 133:7,16,21 134:5,13 135:10			

195:10,20 196:3 196:22,24 197:11 198:6,14 199:1,11 200:1,9 affairs 13:11,19 16:14,16,20 17:10,11 18:12 affidavits 195:2 affiliate 60:11,15 78:18 156:13,19 160:24 affiliates 156:2 affixed 203:6 205:15 206:21 aforesaid 202:12 afternoon 117:21 121:14 122:2 171:9 182:20 191:24 afternoon's 66:3 age 8:2 agent 110:5 ago 24:4 71:20 72:11 111:5 140:2,2 agree 69:12 70:20,25 74:25 76:5 78:11 102:22 103:7 108:3,15 110:18 114:3 115:8,14 176:15,25 177:5 187:17 188:5 189:2 199:20 agreed 80:18 121:22 176:6 184:12	agreement 38:2 56:12 60:8,21 70:18,19 71:11 71:12,15,15 73:3 73:10,14,18 78:12 81:18 97:20 98:16 111:13 112:1 113:4 116:19 141:2,4,20 173:7 173:18 178:13 183:22 184:1,9 184:11 187:20 188:7 192:11,24 193:13,14,25 194:6,14,16 196:5 agreements 69:19,22 70:6 74:17 76:16,20 78:16,25 116:12 141:15 187:10 ahead 9:8 12:12 15:19 80:8,12 94:1 97:25 100:8 114:11,13 115:1 116:17 154:4 186:5 192:17 ahollingsworth 3:20 ak 40:8,10 96:6 96:6,7,11,12 akron 14:20 54:11 al 204:7 205:3 206:3	alert 73:12 alerting 169:11 align 32:19 allegany 13:11 allegation 107:17 allegations 92:23 93:1,17 95:5 alleged 106:4 alliance 24:8 25:15 26:5 28:16 36:10 38:5 51:12 52:8 54:18 55:3,24 56:16 57:9 60:9 71:25 72:6,19 80:15 111:14,22 162:19 168:14 168:16 172:9,22 178:11 187:1,11 193:1,16 allocated 50:3 53:20 55:4 58:12 70:7 143:24 145:22 145:24 146:3,14 150:9 152:2 179:8 allocates 149:6 allocating 21:9 allocation 21:12 25:18 36:23 51:1 55:23 59:14 60:7 61:7 61:9,22 70:23 71:3 76:4 120:6 120:9 147:13	161:2 175:8 192:1 allocations 51:7 55:7 59:21 62:15 69:10 88:3,4,6,12,14 119:11 allow 57:1 64:5 64:21 88:20 133:21 198:21 allowable 36:18 64:8 allowed 20:7 59:2,11,24 71:21 72:13 88:9 91:1 162:16 168:11 169:2 173:11 179:15 180:14 181:8 182:5 185:1,4,11 alternatives 198:16 amankwah 1:17 7:6 8:1,19 10:10 12:13,15 29:7 54:12 56:19 100:12 121:19 154:5 202:10 204:9 205:4,9 206:4,13 207:20 amankwah's 180:6 amount 115:23 annoyed 115:20 answer 15:19 21:17,19 28:12 28:18,20,24 35:22,24 36:14
---	---	--	--

36:16 39:16,22 42:12 45:24 52:4,7,19 53:24 54:18 59:12 61:3 68:9 85:15 86:25 87:21 88:20,22 89:1,15 89:17,21 90:17 90:19 91:19 92:5,6 93:5,10 93:21 94:3,19 96:22 97:25 98:9 99:13,15 113:6 116:15,16 116:21 117:15 117:25 135:1 138:20 142:4,20 143:4,16 145:14 145:25 146:9 156:15 157:20 158:4 159:7,15 198:1 answered 15:18 41:16 117:24 anybody 73:1 100:21 anyway 164:23 aoc 170:6,10 apart 42:23 47:5 79:20 132:12 apologies 76:25 apologize 94:7 131:10 145:9 171:20 194:22 apparent 168:21 apparently 168:17	appear 22:6,14 22:24 29:10,15 205:11 206:15 appearance 8:11 9:13 166:16 appearances 2:1 7:3 9:9 appearing 12:16 appears 107:4 appended 206:11,18 applicable 34:8 105:6 201:7 application 29:21 applies 76:18,23 apply 71:1 appointed 14:4 33:25 appreciate 37:4 103:20 approach 26:23 118:13 approached 108:4,8 appropriate 55:16 118:14 182:24 196:10 approval 29:21 42:20,23 157:7 approved 88:15 137:23 approving 119:17 148:1 approximately 18:8 april 154:13,20 154:21 157:6	160:6 area 15:7,16 25:1 62:6 177:5 192:18 areas 64:25 88:22 123:1 argue 67:2,5 81:24 argument 63:25 71:16 179:2 186:18 arguments 63:11 78:2,10,21 118:10 180:9 188:23,24 195:11 199:13 199:15 arisen 54:13 arises 27:22 arps 2:4 8:18,21 8:23 arrange 168:20 art 50:21 articulated 197:24 aside 42:21 60:21 61:23 asked 15:18 36:21 41:15 54:19 59:11 76:24 91:17 110:1 133:7 134:4,18,22 135:10 138:23 140:1 156:24 159:13 160:3 164:16,19 166:24 167:3	172:2 174:4 176:3,18 177:3 186:20 187:16 188:4,10 191:4 asking 21:11 25:16,24 27:12 27:23 29:1,2 36:7,24 37:2 41:5 45:12 55:5 57:13 60:22 62:9,16 65:8 67:7 69:3 90:8 95:24 97:8 98:15 105:9 135:3 139:9 142:7 146:6 160:12,14 174:12 175:5,7 179:1 190:24 191:3 195:14 asks 132:25 assert 30:6 asserting 87:4 assign 120:14 assigned 32:20 119:25 128:8 assigning 84:4 assignment 205:2 206:2 207:2 assistant 18:18 129:23 151:4 152:18 182:11 associated 147:17,22 148:6 148:21 association 4:16 11:8 58:25
--	--	--	---

105:24 106:3 121:25 assume 50:18 68:12 151:25 191:22 assumes 92:2 assuming 13:20 135:18 145:25 147:16 assumption 31:5 149:3 assumptions 30:20 attached 206:7 attacking 71:19 attempt 54:5 168:22 184:3,6 attendance 8:12 attended 13:2 attention 44:25 107:17 150:17 150:21 151:16 152:3,8 171:23 attorney 4:2 5:20 10:22 12:7 12:19 22:8,14,24 26:16 39:10,11 53:15 54:1 55:21 56:25 57:19 58:21 60:2,23 63:9,15 63:18,20 65:13 65:21 66:4,9,18 67:16,20 68:8,13 68:18,19,23 69:1 69:11,16,23 70:10,24 74:1 75:12,20 77:24	78:8 79:8,16 80:4,7 81:1 85:18 89:2 92:7 93:7,11,22 94:8 96:21 99:6,14 112:1,13,15 113:8,13,16,19 114:1,3,8 115:25 117:20 118:4,8 138:9,13,19 142:5,21,24 143:5 145:11,16 149:15 156:17 157:11,21 158:9 160:10 162:15 163:8 164:18 166:7,11,24 167:4 168:9,10 168:18,21,25 169:14 171:10 171:18 172:4,19 179:22 180:11 181:25 182:11 182:19 188:14 188:16,24 189:9 198:3 203:2 attorney's 25:22 35:21 52:10 55:20 56:5 61:19 63:8 66:13 75:11 168:19 178:3 179:21 180:18 181:23 182:1 185:18 attorneys 10:12 23:16 27:6 158:4,19 159:17	174:3 audio 79:9 191:11 audit 32:7 33:20 34:16,17 44:15 44:20 54:25 55:1 74:24 101:1,2,3,6,9,14 124:3,4,17 128:9 131:21,25 132:1 132:9,12 134:11 149:24 auditing 34:9 46:24 47:1 129:24 133:12 auditor 84:6,8 131:22 132:4,6,8 132:20,21,25 133:4,6,12,16,22 134:4,18,22,25 135:2,10 149:25 150:1 auditor's 135:7 audits 84:9,18 132:14,15,18 ausa's 183:3 authority 19:18 25:8 35:7 authorize 206:11 authorized 66:15 88:14 172:18 authorizing 67:9 automatically 45:9 available 80:9 124:19 172:23 183:13 198:18	200:4 ave 3:17 204:1 avenue 3:7 5:22 avoid 100:23 aware 21:23 44:15 45:3 50:24 51:2 63:3 89:6 92:25 93:17 94:23 95:5 102:2 104:4,11 108:20 111:20 113:2 117:1,11,17 118:22 124:13 141:1,2 143:22 144:7,22 145:3 147:11,23,24 149:6 150:10,14 150:16 151:8,14 156:21,24 157:4 160:3,14 161:4 169:21 182:13 182:14 197:13 b b 64:11 178:15 back 13:13,17 17:1 21:19 22:4 32:21 33:1,11 34:3 48:3,5 49:1 63:12 72:1 78:5 81:1 82:20 84:25 86:4 95:22 99:6,19 100:7,25 104:2 109:6,8 110:23 110:25 111:2 117:13 118:23
--	--	--	---

121:11 126:2 140:14 143:9 149:1 153:1 170:25 174:20 177:21 186:6 191:10 204:16 background 12:25 13:1 21:12 24:19 25:4 55:5 62:16 67:23 68:4,6 88:13 91:5,13 112:8 174:5 191:5,25 bad 191:11 balance 188:3 194:12 bar 64:8 barely 10:5 barn 167:22,24 167:24 based 63:25 64:6 102:17 126:10 138:10 162:2 192:14 195:11 199:15 basic 37:19 basis 73:11 179:13 195:16 bearing 78:24 began 14:16 beginning 12:25 15:3 161:22 188:25 189:11 189:12 behalf 2:3,14 3:2 3:12 4:2,15 5:2 5:11,19 6:2,11	6:19 8:18,25 9:4 11:12,20 22:7,25 43:14 57:17 82:6,13 106:2 159:5 179:9 behavior 41:10 belief 148:20 157:12 believe 14:2 21:1 22:17,19 23:7,9 23:11,20 24:6 25:7,13 45:17,25 55:2 58:25 61:19 65:2,11 67:1 69:4,16 78:20 98:13 109:17 110:4 119:23 126:11 126:15 127:2,22 130:6 133:4 136:1,13 150:25 153:22 158:8 165:18 167:18 180:16 184:19 188:3,12 189:11 190:11,16 194:11 195:16 198:15 199:12 199:16 believed 77:21 182:16,22 believes 69:16 197:23 benefit 60:10,15 78:17 178:16 benefited 81:25 best 17:4	better 140:3 189:5 betterton 5:13 11:16 176:24 beyond 79:14 bill 19:8 75:23 85:12 96:16 97:2 105:19 108:7,17 116:10 119:20 144:10 144:16 145:5 147:17,20 149:10,19 150:3 177:24 191:6 192:25 bingaman 23:15 bit 16:9 25:3 59:1 109:23 block 72:21 178:7 184:6 board 6:19 12:10 34:17,23 bob 18:7,17 19:3 boehm 6:12 bojko 4:18,24 7:9 11:6,6 53:12 58:23,24 68:24 68:25 117:9 121:20,24 129:11 136:17 136:21 138:8,22 139:9 142:7,23 143:6 145:18 146:8 164:25 170:7,16,24 173:25 174:1 190:19,22 191:10,12 192:7	195:18,18,21 196:3,18,23 bother 194:21 bothering 171:20 bounds 76:9 box 6:22 boy 143:20 boych 81:16,18 brakes 192:17 branding 155:21 break 100:7 186:5,9 199:14 brett 23:15 brian 2:7 8:23 bricker 5:4 11:12 bricker.com 5:9 brief 99:16 186:5 199:14 bring 151:15 171:22 178:24 bringing 44:24 broad 4:9 67:2 71:6,14 73:6 broader 70:23 71:2,2 132:3 broadly 69:6 brought 39:10 43:14 55:20 75:12 107:17 150:16,21 152:3 152:7 180:9 building 118:20 burden 113:25 burgess 32:14,19 33:2 125:11
--	--	---	--

burke 29:21 buse 15:10 business 14:19 14:21,22 17:16 19:9 21:10,11 50:8,9,13,14 147:4 businesses 50:4 50:4 buys 143:20	calls 32:16 34:5 35:5,11,16 36:8 89:13 90:16 93:6 94:18 96:20 98:22 110:18 115:20 125:6 150:23 157:11 198:23 capacity 22:8 30:4 138:7,13 caption 202:21 care 74:2 career 132:18 careful 114:2 carl 15:10 carpenter 4:17 11:8 carpenterlipps.... 4:24 carries 80:10 carrying 86:11 carve 115:24 case 1:13 12:20 20:16 21:1 22:16 23:1,5,19 24:3,8 25:13,13 26:7 27:7 29:18 29:25 30:8,14,16 30:22 36:5 37:24 39:5 54:20,21,22 55:1 55:11 57:6,23 61:11 62:7 72:10 74:9,24 75:3 76:7,17,18 76:23 78:22 87:1 91:7 101:6 119:3 120:19	158:7 163:7 168:6 169:19 173:19 174:7,8 174:22 175:9 177:22 179:5 181:2 188:18 204:6 205:3 206:3 cases 20:25 118:25 categories 126:12 category 126:10 cause 202:12 caution 30:2 43:6 81:6 85:17 138:5 139:5 142:3,20 149:14 156:5,14 cautioned 157:19 159:7 cautioning 143:3 center 62:14 107:25 110:5,13 110:19 ceo 154:16,22 certain 16:2 17:2 46:8 48:6 49:10 64:18 65:8 108:9 122:10,12 122:15,17 131:13 144:16 174:13 178:15 187:7 certainly 57:19 62:7 66:5 67:4 78:15 86:24 88:25 91:18	115:24 163:24 177:16 186:21 188:5 189:2 190:21 196:10 198:14,17 certificate 7:12 202:1 206:11 certification 161:1 205:1 206:1 certified 8:4 certify 202:8,19 203:1 chack 95:6 121:1 155:15 159:21 chair 161:2 178:17 chairman 157:5 158:8 160:5 chance 78:9 change 161:20 176:18 182:21 204:14,15 206:8 207:3 changed 120:21 changes 137:23 138:2,25 139:3 139:14 204:13 205:7 206:7,9 chapter 1:11 60:13 characterization 174:4 175:2 characterizing 175:15 charge 148:1 178:21
--	---	--	---

charged 24:9 36:6 148:22 150:4 174:20 charitable 142:17 143:14 chat 10:4 check 169:10,22 chesapeake 5:22 chicago 2:10 chief 13:16 18:21 31:13,22 35:10 43:9 44:7 45:14,16 46:7,22 47:25 48:8,9 83:2,5 91:22 92:15 94:12,22 95:4 122:4 127:4,7 129:7 130:12 131:20 133:3 134:10 137:21 138:11 138:15 139:20 139:25 146:25 147:8 149:2 150:22 151:9,24 152:3,12,19,23 152:24 153:2,6 154:10 155:24 children 90:1 christina 4:6 11:1 chuck 19:2 120:23 154:15 154:21 172:6 cincinnati 6:16 circumstances 19:16 20:6 39:18 173:4	178:5 cited 188:12 citizens 6:19 12:10 civil 8:3 188:15 188:17 201:3,7 205:5 206:5 claim 33:15 claiming 69:1 clarification 126:5 144:2 147:18 153:9 clarified 103:22 clarify 61:2 66:7 72:23 79:4,12 152:9 182:8 190:3 192:23 clarifying 165:20 166:3 199:17 clarity 103:18 classified 126:9 clawback 99:1 clean 5:20 clear 29:4 38:3 39:3 61:3 76:25 87:3 103:6 109:12 112:14 112:16 186:9 192:13,23 193:11 clearer 77:25 193:24 clearly 10:11 77:19 115:4,7 152:11 161:2 183:1	cleveland 1:6 3:8 3:18 9:5 13:4 203:7 204:2,6 205:3 206:3 client 25:9,10 85:18 88:23 92:7 93:7,11,22 94:8 96:21 113:8,13 123:18 138:19 142:5,21 143:5 145:11,16 149:15 156:17 157:11,21 158:9 160:10 close 21:14 189:12 code 1:10 31:17 44:9 46:7,14,25 64:11 84:22 101:25 134:12 coded 60:12 cohn 6:13 11:23 11:24 colleague 8:9 9:3 10:24 collect 105:18 collectively 103:24 columbus 2:21 4:11,22 5:7,24 6:7,23 come 63:12,24 72:1 79:24 84:25 100:7 119:10 134:7 167:2 178:7 comes 166:11 190:5 192:18	coming 15:2 commencing 22:12 comments 25:12 commercial 13:7 15:6,20,22,24 commission 1:2 19:23 22:7 24:25 25:2,19 29:17 37:11,18 37:22,23 38:3,7 38:11 39:6 52:24 57:21 61:12 62:21 68:19 69:17,20 70:21 71:5 72:25 74:12 75:17 76:14 77:5,16 84:16 101:15 102:20 132:14,19 172:17 177:21 177:23 178:18 179:10 180:8,24 181:13 182:18 183:6 184:5 185:23 186:3 203:17 205:19 206:25 207:25 commission's 52:1 55:17 56:7 58:15 59:9 70:15 75:7 79:19 103:3 178:1,2 179:7 181:7 182:14 188:11
---	--	---	---

commissioned 202:8	142:16 143:12 143:25 144:8,9	compare 109:25	completeness 34:7
commissioner 63:4 159:12	144:15 145:22 146:16,16,23	compensated 153:14	completion 48:3
commissioner's 28:10	147:19 148:7,22 149:12 150:4,9	compensation 99:1	compliance 1:9 14:14 43:10
committee 34:16 34:18,24 35:1	151:19 154:25 158:12 166:18	competitive 21:10,11 50:3,4 50:8,9,13,14 60:10 78:18 102:23,24	45:14 48:9,13,17 51:8 79:19 82:22 83:6,11,18 83:23 84:11,20 92:10,16 93:16 94:13 122:8,10 122:13,16,17,22 122:25 123:2,4,5 123:12,15,19 124:15 130:10 133:2,13,14 134:23 135:12 139:18,23 147:7 147:9 154:11 174:23 204:7 205:3 206:3
communicated 163:6	174:20 197:5	complaint 59:18 84:3 105:22 107:5 124:10 125:2 126:2,14 126:18 127:1,3 127:10 128:3,6 129:4 131:4 132:2,5 150:20	compliant 23:25 83:19 106:13 146:17,24 149:11
communication 95:19 107:6 127:2 166:1 170:6,10	company 1:6,7 3:2 9:4,5,6 40:8 41:8,12 49:3,21 71:25 73:11 74:18 76:15 86:9,22 88:7 90:6 92:12 95:12 98:14,25 102:9 104:24,24 111:9 118:24 119:12,15 123:16 124:6 126:13 133:13 135:4,19 143:20 143:22 144:3 147:14 151:21 151:23 152:2 155:17,22 158:6 159:24 170:22 178:25 194:25 195:3 204:6,7 205:3,3 206:3,3	complaints 91:23 93:24 94:24 126:9 127:6,13 129:6 129:13,18 131:24 132:23 133:14 141:22	complied 21:5 43:2 51:4
communications 20:11,15,19 21:2 21:24 30:5 56:18,18 57:14 58:6 61:8,10 62:5,11 70:17 84:2 92:7 93:7 124:21,23,24 138:6 155:19 160:13	company's 1:8 41:11 78:21 140:6	complementary 178:3	complies 45:8
companies 10:3 22:9 23:25 29:22 30:4,6 31:14 38:1 43:8 53:18 57:17 59:2 60:1 61:1 74:12 79:19 85:23 92:10 93:16 103:24 104:15,21 105:9 113:24 118:21 119:18 120:1,15 137:22 138:2,7 140:8,9,10,16	company's 204:7 205:3 206:3	complete 76:10 96:6 143:8	complying 45:9 45:21
		completed 47:9 47:10 74:19 171:14 202:22 204:16	component 46:16 119:8 125:21
		completely 60:21 76:8 165:3 174:2 175:4	components 48:6 122:22
			computer 10:9 47:18 136:2,3,8

computers 169:10,22 concept 20:10,14 concern 24:25 31:15 43:10 66:11 126:10 149:18 150:8,11 151:8 152:1 179:19 concerned 88:5 concerns 31:15 31:22,23,24 32:3 32:17 33:10 34:12 35:6,12,17 36:9 43:13,14 123:21,22 124:1 124:16 125:6,20 126:5,19 127:22 131:1,14 150:13 concluded 171:8 200:10 conduct 31:17 44:10 45:2,7,8 45:22 46:8,15,25 47:6 66:2 84:22 86:24 87:9 88:2 90:13 92:23 93:1,17 94:24 95:6 101:25 134:12 conducted 84:23 107:9 131:21 134:12 149:24 conducting 177:24 confer 186:5 conference 9:8	confidence 163:23 164:8 165:17,21,25 confident 81:2 confidential 27:10,15,19 57:4 65:1,5,9,10,18 65:25 66:3,25 80:18,24 81:4 100:7 112:9,12 112:24 113:10 113:15,21,22 114:6,16 115:5 115:10 116:3,4,6 116:22 117:10 117:12,16 118:6 118:8 121:10 153:24,25 157:14,25 159:9 159:13 161:18 161:25 162:5,10 162:17,21 163:5 164:13,15,20 165:8 166:1,5,23 167:12,19 168:24 169:13 171:5,9 173:5 175:23 176:4,5,8 177:12 179:3,20 180:19 183:20 184:14 185:2 186:20 188:5 189:1,5,10,13 190:25 191:1,16 191:17 196:1,5,9 196:11 199:5,6 199:21	confidentiality 56:12 66:11 112:3 173:7,17 183:22 184:1,9 confirming 68:15 confused 196:2 confusing 75:25 connect 110:3 connected 75:24 connection 24:2 24:5 30:14 147:20 consider 134:19 177:5 186:2 considered 103:2 191:1 consistent 69:12 107:4 112:12 182:24 183:25 186:2 190:12 195:9 198:5 constitute 190:3 consulting 81:18 consumers 2:14 8:8 36:6 37:9 179:11 185:16 contact 20:7 43:12 53:25 54:5 169:16 183:15 contacted 179:22 contained 84:21 179:23 content 27:10 29:1 160:13	contents 59:6 163:19 165:15 context 60:16 82:10 continue 21:15 163:18 164:24 165:1,8 167:13 177:17 continues 188:11 188:18 continuous 171:12 continuously 57:23 contract 25:14 80:14 contracts 61:17 62:5 88:6 contradicts 190:15 control 99:8 conversation 111:15 159:22 164:3,6,17,22 166:5 168:18 174:17 183:3 195:4,8 conversations 156:25 157:4 158:23 160:4,13 160:15 convert 127:16 cooperation 172:12 182:24 corp 3:12 9:1 10:18,20 56:13 68:2 71:23 72:15 77:19
--	--	---	--

89:6 98:3 144:4 144:23 145:4 148:14 154:16 155:16 168:14 173:8,18 178:6 178:16 179:19 183:23 184:2,8 184:18 185:5 195:1 corp's 142:24 168:8 169:15 corporate 13:15 20:22,24 21:6 23:24 24:1,11 29:17,22 30:13 30:18,24 31:10 36:17,22 41:6 42:2,10,20,24 43:1,3,11,18 44:6,9,12,17,21 45:5,10,20 46:3 46:4,8,16,17 47:4 48:14,18 50:25 53:17,19 54:22 55:8 58:8 59:15,22 71:12 76:1 78:14 79:1 79:6,13,20 82:4 82:21,23 83:6,11 83:18,18,19,24 84:6,10 86:13,19 86:21 87:15,18 88:1 90:22 92:10,16 93:24 94:13,17 97:17 101:9,19,23 104:5 105:5,21 106:4 107:16	109:22 110:9 122:10,13,15,17 122:22 123:11 123:15,19,25 124:14 125:2 126:7 129:10,14 131:4,24 132:1,3 132:21 133:1,2 134:11,14 135:12 136:13 137:6,23 138:3 139:4,15,18,24 142:1 146:18,24 149:12,20,25 150:8,10,20 151:8,25 156:3 160:21,23 161:3 172:7 174:3,18 174:21,23 175:3 186:24 187:3 191:6 192:1,3 corporation 159:6 corporation's 175:11 correct 14:23 16:12 33:3 34:2 34:19 40:13 47:7 50:11,15 73:19 74:24 85:3 101:20,21 102:7,15 104:17 105:15 107:7 108:19 109:14 110:12 115:13 118:25 119:1,5 119:13 122:9 123:13 124:6	125:7,8,12,13 126:7,8 128:1 130:5,23,24 135:15,16,20,21 136:9,15 144:24 147:15 148:18 148:19 153:7 154:17 155:1 181:15,17 191:8 196:22 202:17 corrections 204:13 206:17 cost 25:18 51:1,6 54:24 55:7 59:14,21 61:6,8 62:15,18 70:23 71:3 76:4 88:2,4 88:5,12,13 91:1 91:11 119:6,8,10 119:15 143:13 143:21 costs 21:9 24:9 25:14 26:3,5 36:5,23 37:8 50:2 53:20 55:2 57:6 60:12 70:7 108:21 119:25 142:16 143:24 144:7 179:8 council 5:3,19 12:5 counsel 2:14 8:8 13:18,21 14:5 18:3,6,9,19 39:25 40:2 85:19 86:9,15,16 87:14 95:20 97:13,14 133:19	133:20 138:15 138:17 147:15 151:2,3,4,10 152:11,14,16,18 152:20,22 153:1 153:3 165:2 172:1 175:11 183:2 195:1 201:1 203:2 counsel's 40:3 counsellink 148:12,13,18 150:2 county 130:22 202:4 205:10 206:15 couple 63:11 71:20 78:3,4,6 116:2 118:17 153:9 182:7 course 56:14 68:23 80:8,9 132:17 151:22 171:21 court 21:18 22:3 86:3 89:18 109:5,7 110:22 110:24 184:6,21 184:24 205:7 cover 37:2 covered 46:5 126:6 covers 65:11 created 125:10 crime 69:7 criminal 39:9 53:14 55:19 62:23 66:13
--	--	---	---

69:7 75:10 76:22 77:8 91:24 175:5,6 177:4 178:3,21 180:1 184:16 186:1 188:13 crux 74:4 cuff 77:13 current 17:12 59:9,9 custody 7:14 customer 109:1 109:20 110:2 131:12 customers 70:9 103:10 105:17 108:22 110:14 131:3 179:9 185:8 cut 25:23 79:9 112:25 cuyahoga 202:4 cv 152:21	135:11 148:8,10 148:14,18 150:2 date 13:12 17:2 18:4 117:22 204:9 205:3,9,19 206:3,13,25 207:20,25 dated 74:8 dates 197:7 dave 33:7 188:16 day 3:3,13 8:25 9:4 87:6 137:14 137:16 171:21 179:5 185:5 203:7 205:16 206:22 207:22 daymark 101:3 days 118:23 137:18 204:19 dcr 37:23 55:1 57:23 61:11 70:14 deadline 197:5 deal 26:22 56:17 72:3,4,8,21,24 118:10,13 167:23 dealing 91:23 dealings 51:21 54:16 57:8 71:23 72:18 dear 204:11 december 38:16 38:17 39:5 57:22 58:15 62:21 68:10,16 69:2 73:2 74:8 77:16 78:22	172:17 182:15 185:23 203:17 decentralized 46:5 48:23 122:19 decide 118:9 decision 77:6,13 166:7 172:25 197:14 decisions 90:11 156:12 declined 108:15 116:16 decoupling 144:20 147:23 148:7,22 149:11 deed 205:14 206:20 deemed 65:1 151:1 204:20 defending 197:22 defense 98:3,14 98:16 defer 100:2 deferred 69:17 73:18 178:12 187:19 188:7 192:10,24 193:13,14,25 194:5,14,16 196:4 define 152:12 definitely 187:25 definition 102:16 dennis 95:6 121:1 155:14	deny 64:4 department 13:13,18,20 15:14,17,21,22 16:11 17:2,8,22 17:23 39:13 58:2 84:24 104:18 120:3 124:3,16,24 127:9 128:9,16 128:23 133:19 134:1,8 135:5,5 150:18,19 152:6 187:6,15 204:23 departments 33:25 46:6 48:24 122:21 124:11 128:13 departure 41:7 depended 33:14 depending 120:17 depends 150:25 deponent 2:3 8:19 depose 181:3 deposed 8:5 deposition 1:16 8:12 12:16,17,21 25:8 26:8 54:12 64:5,13 65:6,10 65:25 80:10,12 159:24 161:23 162:1 166:14 167:7 168:3 169:5,18 171:22 171:24 172:1 173:6,12,13,16
d			
dane 5:5 11:11 121:9 153:22 154:7 161:12 176:15 data 172:25 database 109:19 125:22 126:3,16 127:23,24,25 129:17,19,21 130:7,11 131:23 132:5,10,22 133:6,8,15,22 134:5,14,20,25			

180:6,11 181:25 182:13,17,23 183:20 184:18 184:20,22,23 185:2,5,7 186:23 190:18 195:13 196:17 197:7,22 198:8,20 199:6 199:10 200:10 202:20 204:9,12 205:1,3 206:1,3 depositions 63:22 64:23 173:1 depth 120:20 deputy 13:18 138:16 152:20 152:22,25 153:3 described 130:11 190:4 designated 82:22 83:5,9 desires 198:5 despite 78:20 detail 56:15 197:12 detailed 67:25 92:20 detailing 79:21 details 15:1 16:7 58:1 65:9 141:3 determinations 119:24 120:24 determined 73:1 73:1 determining 44:4	development 172:15 different 13:19 17:20 24:23 25:10 42:16 46:6 48:24 67:17 89:25 90:2 93:14 98:18 117:22 118:20 119:18 120:2,16 122:21 122:21 123:1 124:19 131:12 148:10 156:18 175:4 direct 43:20 54:4 56:4 61:17 99:14 142:16 143:13 directed 74:13 78:23 directing 160:25 189:9 direction 107:8 directly 31:16 32:2 53:18 58:3 59:14 61:10 75:15 174:6,22 192:5 director 16:19 17:10 18:11 154:24 155:11 directors 34:17 disadvantage 63:21 disagree 53:12 58:9 146:9 159:19 174:2,16	175:1,17 disagreed 175:18 disclose 38:1 139:7 142:5 156:16 163:22 disclosed 27:17 58:14 65:4 183:24 190:23 191:18,19,20 disclosure 27:20 159:15,16 disclosures 69:19 discovery 38:4 63:1 64:7,10 66:21 69:24 70:16,21,25 71:5 71:7,14,23 72:9 72:14,17 73:5,12 74:11 75:2,6 76:14,19 77:15 77:22 162:18 168:13 172:16 174:25 181:1 182:18 196:7,14 discuss 63:11 78:3,4,9 discussed 70:19 129:5 173:9,21 176:1 184:23 189:14 191:14 discussing 27:11 discussion 27:5 58:20 111:16 113:15 116:1 169:1,15 173:14 175:22 176:9,12	176:21 177:10 181:22 182:2,4 191:21 199:8,17 discussions 24:14 56:2 59:3 59:6,19 61:16 62:6 101:1 111:12 138:1,24 142:11 dispute 74:4 197:19 198:19 disputed 63:23 disputes 80:10 200:5 distribution 102:19,24 109:20 117:3 118:25 119:3 140:21 district 184:21 184:24 188:15 division 124:5 150:19 divulge 65:9 dmr 140:20 docket 101:7 document 40:15 40:19 66:23,24 67:8 92:19 128:15,18,22,24 158:14,17 196:6 documentation 135:6 documented 57:10 documents 49:11,13 57:12 62:4,14 64:18,20
--	---	---	---

64:22 65:24	85:23 92:1	earlier 90:25	eileen 119:21
66:20 67:18,21	96:18 97:4,24	111:13 113:16	either 59:11
67:24,25 68:4,5	98:7,20 99:11	118:23 128:2	83:16 95:21
71:22 72:14,16	103:12 109:9	151:3 171:25	117:21 124:15
73:25 74:13,16	110:7 113:23	173:10 176:7	128:8 173:23
76:16 77:18,20	117:4 133:9	181:19 182:5	174:11 184:5
77:21 112:7	138:4 139:5	186:18 188:20	191:18 198:16
135:18,19,20,22	140:23 142:13	190:16 192:16	203:2
135:24 136:22	144:1,11 145:6	199:13	el 1:13 12:20
137:7,12,15	147:2 148:23	earmarked	74:9
162:17 168:12	149:16 151:11	141:18	electric 1:6 9:5
175:25 178:8,9	156:4 158:10,16	east 2:19 4:9 6:5	22:16 23:1,4
179:16,23 180:2	162:25 163:10	6:14	102:25 110:4
180:4,15 181:5,6	189:19 190:1	easy 66:1 103:13	155:4 160:25
181:10 183:19	196:25 197:2	ebony 1:17 7:6	204:6 205:3
196:7,15	dougherty 6:20	8:1,19 12:13	206:3
doing 13:7	6:21 12:9,10	29:7 30:2 54:12	electronic 47:16
107:10 123:7	dowling 18:16	100:12,14	48:19,22 127:16
165:20	94:24	116:18 118:19	127:19,20 128:5
doj 38:6 60:18	downer 189:21	121:4,19,21,22	electronically
64:19 172:12,13	dpa 70:20 196:4	153:18 154:5,9	124:9 128:12
172:19 176:10	196:14,20,20	156:5 158:19	129:1
187:23 192:14	draw 67:6	159:16 202:9	eleventh 180:13
doj's 73:22	drawn 138:17	204:9 205:4,9	182:10
172:24 175:12	drive 2:8	206:4,13 207:20	email 204:18
domain 179:4	driving 88:4	ebony's 24:3	embassy 1:20,21
180:21	dropped 111:1	41:7	emerald 5:14
donald 4:7 11:1	dstinson 5:9	eckler 5:4 11:13	emily 168:19
door 72:1	dublin 5:15	edison 1:5,8 3:2	employed 14:8
doringo 3:4 9:2	duly 8:4 202:7	9:4,6 204:6,7	81:14,16 101:10
9:2,23 30:1	202:10	205:3,3 206:3,3	102:3 103:7
37:21 38:9,15,20	dump 181:6	educational	employee 31:14
43:5 51:24	e	12:25	31:15,21,23,24
57:16,17,20	e 17:15 56:18	effect 68:11,17	32:3,17 34:12
60:25 65:15	57:11 62:5	effectively 13:25	35:5,12,17 36:9
70:13,24 71:4	107:2 125:15,18	eg's 176:16	43:13 109:18
72:23 73:21	126:1	eight 24:3	123:21,22
74:21,25 80:17			124:16 125:6,20

126:5,17,19 127:22 131:1,14 150:13 employees 44:5 46:1 47:9 105:6 109:1 110:19 123:17,20,25 124:9,13,20 126:25 127:9 130:3 131:1 139:13 178:25 employment 14:3,10,16,25 16:7 17:13,21 39:18,20 40:6,21 40:25 41:14,20 41:21 42:9 49:2 49:13 85:1 94:10 98:16 99:4 enabled 88:2,11 enactment 144:10,24 145:4 enclosed 204:12 ended 39:18 40:7,21,25 41:14 49:3,13 68:25 85:2 98:17 168:4 energy 4:16 5:3 5:20 6:2,11 11:8 11:16,24 58:25 102:19 105:23 106:2 121:25 122:25 157:7 engage 90:12 144:9 147:19	engaged 42:5,8,8 42:10,14 120:19 123:14 132:18 141:20 144:16 151:23 engaging 178:15 enhanced 130:16 130:18 ensure 48:1,4 146:24 enter 8:10 9:13 80:13 98:2,15 entered 24:7 78:16 127:23 178:12 184:9 189:10,13 206:9 enterprise 14:15 entertained 188:24 entire 53:11 83:4 205:5 206:5 entirely 24:23 65:17 entirety 199:20 entities 103:16 174:19 191:7 entitled 60:7 78:15 entity 51:11 59:4 59:5 80:16 104:5,6,7,12,13 105:1 113:3 entries 68:20 69:14 79:23 196:16 entry 64:3,20,25 73:8 74:8,21 75:1 78:21	environmental 5:19 12:5 equally 76:18 errata 204:14,19 206:7,10,18 207:1 erring 81:5 esp 24:3 27:7 58:7 71:12,16 especially 176:16 182:3 esq 2:5,6,7,15,16 2:17,18 3:4,5,14 3:15 4:3,4,5,6,7 4:8,18,19 5:5,12 5:13,21 6:4,13 204:5 essentially 194:10 establish 57:6 68:6 established 76:3 103:5 estimate 17:5 et 204:7 205:3 206:3 ethics 13:16 14:14 18:21 31:13,23 35:10 43:9 44:7 45:16 46:7,22 47:25 48:8 59:16 83:3 83:5 91:22 92:15 94:12,22 95:4 122:4 127:4,7 129:7 130:12 131:21 133:3 134:10	137:21 138:12 138:16 139:20 139:25 146:25 149:2 150:22 151:9,24 152:4 152:12,19,23,25 153:2,6 154:10 155:24 evan 5:13 11:16 evans 81:12,13 81:20,23 82:5 evening 198:8 200:3 event 86:23 143:20 196:19 197:19 198:18 200:4 events 75:24 143:22 174:14 174:15 192:2 everybody 52:15 183:21 everyone's 8:11 evidence 64:10 92:3 178:23 ex 20:11,19 21:2 21:24 175:12 exact 53:7 69:4 76:17 exactly 13:9 28:8 183:5 195:4 examination 7:6 8:2 12:13 100:12 121:19 154:5 163:11 examiner 12:19 25:23 26:10 38:9 53:6 56:25
---	--	---	--

57:19 58:21 60:23 63:9,15,18 65:21 66:4,9,18 67:16,20 68:8,13 68:18,23 69:11 69:23 70:10,24 74:1 75:20 77:24 78:8,8 79:8,16 80:7 112:1,15 113:16 114:22 115:16 115:18,25 162:16 163:8 164:16 166:7,11 166:25 167:4 examiner's 81:1 112:13 examiners 26:16 54:1 63:20 65:13 68:19 74:6 78:4 79:24 80:4 89:2 99:6 99:14 113:19 114:1,3,8 115:4 117:20 118:4,8 168:10,21,25 169:14 171:11 171:18 172:19 182:19 188:25 189:10 198:3,15 example 33:23 60:7 102:7 197:22 exceeded 197:23 exchange 158:14 exchanges 57:11 excluding 173:19	exclusive 178:1 179:7 excuse 53:12 56:23 162:13 167:5 execute 123:7,8 executed 206:10 execution 205:14 206:19 executive 16:19 17:9 18:11 23:10 155:4 160:25 exhibit 7:14 106:13 exhibits 7:15 65:25 exist 45:3 existed 70:6 73:14 85:17 139:19 existence 130:7 existing 62:25 68:3 exists 133:23 expanded 37:23 54:25 61:11 75:3 expect 65:7 expense 147:23 147:24 expenses 117:2 118:20 119:4 120:15 146:2,11 146:12,13 147:21 148:2,6 148:21 149:7,10 149:19 150:3,9	152:1 175:8 experience 181:10 expiration 205:19 206:25 207:25 expires 203:17 explain 33:16 42:11 explained 151:2 explore 60:8,19 76:2 explored 52:25 express 78:17 expressed 57:22 extension 197:4 extensive 45:6 extent 27:12,18 84:3 92:5 93:6 93:10,22 94:18 95:18 96:20 98:9,22 113:7 138:18 139:7 141:14 142:4,21 143:4,16,19 145:15 157:10 157:20 158:2,18 159:8,15 178:2 external 43:11 132:6,11,20 f facing 10:9 fact 61:15 63:3 71:1 103:8 166:24 176:16 facts 73:22 75:5 75:14 76:2 92:3	178:22,23 179:14,15 187:10 fair 41:17 53:2 69:12 131:14 132:15 135:8 138:22 140:5 149:2 159:23 182:17 191:22 196:21 fairlawn 1:21 false 182:12 familiar 30:18 31:2,6,9 44:20 45:1 50:22 51:11,18,20 89:4 92:9,13 101:2,5 101:7,18,22 102:9,12,14 104:7,25 111:5,9 116:18 118:19 120:4,13 140:5 familiarize 30:11 family 104:14 far 53:4 97:21 158:24 176:3 192:15 194:9 favor 81:24 fe 155:15,19 february 14:18 federal 13:14 122:25 181:14 185:10 187:21 188:8 192:12 feel 41:19 79:22 188:18
---	--	---	--

fell 191:11	26:11,15 27:2,14	firing 87:9 89:4	103:23,24,25
ferc 45:1,6,8,22	28:11,25 35:23	firm 11:21 13:4	104:10,14,18,19
47:6 64:19	36:2,4,12,20	15:3,4 168:18	104:24 105:1,3,6
84:18	37:4,13 45:13	first 8:4,9 9:14	105:8,16,23
fifth 4:10	51:15 52:2,11,16	10:1 22:19	106:5 107:9,21
fight 170:18,19	53:23 54:6,9,10	58:25 61:1 74:5	107:24 108:4,15
figure 197:6	56:9,23 57:2	76:12 91:5	108:20,24 109:1
file 128:20 184:5	62:2 63:17	101:25 132:7	109:10,13,18,19
filed 25:12	65:19,20,22	144:2 162:22	110:3,12,15
101:15 105:22	67:10 71:17	174:2 180:7	111:5,8 113:3
158:17 184:21	80:11,20 86:1,20	202:10	117:2 118:24
195:3	87:17,23 88:24	firstenergy 3:12	119:17 120:11
files 86:23	89:16 90:24	9:1,21 10:18,20	120:14 122:20
filing 42:13,15	91:4,18 94:2	13:7 14:5 15:11	125:16 127:13
158:7,13 184:24	99:9,16,19 100:4	15:23 16:22	132:13 142:24
filings 89:3	100:20 111:2	17:21 19:13,21	144:4,6,23 145:3
filters 119:15	115:22 116:13	21:5,25 22:8,15	148:14 154:16
finance 13:7	117:18 118:12	22:25 23:12	154:25 155:8,16
15:7,20,22,24	121:5,13 123:24	27:18 29:9,15	155:16,21
financially 33:19	137:11 153:20	35:4 38:1 39:19	156:25 159:6
find 55:6 64:1	154:4 156:24	40:6,21,25 41:14	165:2 168:8,14
91:6,12 112:25	161:11 162:7,11	41:21,25 42:3,9	169:15 170:22
204:12	162:15 163:15	43:3,18 44:4,4	173:8,18 174:3
finding 91:8	163:21 164:1,5	44:16,21 46:2	175:11 178:6,16
findings 32:22	164:11,23	48:12 49:2,14	179:18 183:22
32:25 44:15	165:10,16,23	55:4 56:13,20	184:1,8,18 185:5
fine 27:13	167:5,25 170:13	60:10 68:2 70:8	187:12
109:15 194:23	170:21,23 171:2	71:22 72:5,15	firstenergy's
finish 57:1,3	173:2,3 177:9,15	73:4 77:19	19:9 50:3 85:19
121:7 163:16	177:18,20	80:13 81:17,21	113:3 172:11
finished 121:15	181:12,16,20	81:25 82:6,13,16	176:10
finnigan 2:15	182:9 183:17	82:24 85:1,5	fit 177:17
7:7 8:6,7 9:7,20	190:2,7,9 199:3	88:23 89:6	fitzgerald 2:6
9:25 10:6,16,21	199:11,24 200:6	90:11,14 93:3	8:20,21 40:4
11:4,10,14,18,22	finnigan's 170:9	94:11 97:1,5,7	97:12 115:2,15
12:1,11,14 20:23	fired 85:5,11	97:20 98:3,4,17	167:9,21
21:7,16 24:5,15	89:7,11	99:4 101:9,11,23	five 99:17 116:8
24:18 25:6 26:1		102:3 103:8,8,14	116:14

flom 2:4 floor 2:20 4:10 flush 16:9 focus 69:16 76:7 122:3 154:12 180:23 folks 161:13 167:5,25 169:4 follow 34:8 48:3 100:19 186:17 follows 8:5 force 88:4 foregoing 202:16,21 205:13 206:18 foreign 177:23 form 48:19 57:15 110:7 133:9 136:19 144:1 147:2 148:23 149:16 150:5 151:11 156:4 format 127:19 former 178:25 forth 65:17 191:16 forthcoming 197:14 forward 59:24 67:15 197:20 198:4 204:16 forwarded 128:12,15 found 162:3,7,11 162:21 foundation 35:8 35:19 44:18	68:7 76:3 144:7 174:9 four 140:2 frankly 38:3 fraud 178:21 free 205:14 206:20 friday 197:10 front 61:4 152:21 frustrated 74:3 fulfill 179:12 full 179:14,14 184:2 fundamentally 57:21 funding 24:8 25:15 26:4 28:16 36:10 38:4 51:12 52:8 54:17 55:3,24 56:16 57:9 60:9 71:24 72:6,19 80:14 111:14,22 162:19 168:13 168:16 172:9,22 178:10 187:1,11 193:1,16 funds 140:11,17 140:21 141:17 141:23 further 25:4 51:19 74:10 153:18 159:14 188:22 202:19 203:1	g g 17:15 game 69:12 159:23 182:17 196:21 gas 5:11 general 4:2 10:22 13:18,21 14:5 18:2,5,9,18 37:1 39:11 55:21 75:12 80:20,23 102:16 103:3 111:15 118:21 132:17 138:14,16 151:3 151:4,9 152:4,11 152:13,16,18,20 152:22 153:1,3 188:16 193:22 general's 12:7 53:16 generally 90:8 101:18 102:14 102:22 140:7 generated 21:9 generation 35:18 36:1,6 102:25 generic 100:23 gentleman 81:11 george 82:8,12 82:15 germane 58:8 getting 28:9 53:21 55:25 56:2,3 63:19,21 185:16 187:9 give 18:15 38:21 55:10 90:1	102:16 118:16 154:18 177:11 180:1 201:1 given 12:21 56:7 75:7 113:15 124:25 132:2 133:16 181:10 195:16 202:13 202:18 giving 67:23 179:22 194:25 gladman 3:5 9:3 10:2,3 13:23 16:3 23:23 24:12,16,21 39:2 41:4,24 glatfelter 168:19 169:16 170:6,10 195:2,3 glatfelter's 169:17 go 8:13 9:8 10:16 12:11 14:24 15:19 25:5,7 38:7 51:13,19 58:3 60:13 62:15 68:5 73:22 75:15 79:14,21 80:8,11 82:20 88:18,22 94:1 97:25 99:19 100:2,8 106:7 107:1 113:17,20 114:11,13,25 115:25 116:16 117:13 121:10 123:6 126:2
--	--	--	--

135:4 154:4 159:21 161:24 162:5,10,25 163:3 168:23 169:7,13 171:3 172:3 175:7 181:5 186:4 191:10 192:17 194:9 195:5 197:11 198:7 199:21 goes 53:4 59:14 65:17 78:13 86:20 118:9 177:21 179:6 198:13 going 16:6 24:16 25:22 26:9,20,21 26:21 30:1 35:20 38:7 49:1 51:13,19 52:3 58:12 63:10 67:14 70:3,6 73:4 77:6 88:20 89:16 90:10 91:5 100:18,25 109:9 113:5,11 113:18 114:6,15 114:19,20 115:19 116:20 117:15 121:16 122:3 153:23 157:13 161:23 167:6 168:24 169:7,8 170:13 171:3,4 180:12 183:18,19,23 184:13 186:9,10	189:8,21 192:8 195:5 197:20 198:4,10,12 good 8:6 10:23 11:19,23 12:4 55:13 100:14,18 112:15,17 115:12,14 118:13 154:8 190:17 200:3 gotten 32:9 99:7 governance 86:22 graciously 121:22 grave 24:25 great 56:15,17 68:22 176:2 194:25 197:12 grounded 77:14 group 4:16 6:11 11:8,24 23:12,13 23:15,17 58:25 104:12,14,17 122:1 groups 122:24 guess 124:10 143:18,23 144:5 147:17 156:18 guidance 55:10 177:11 guys 10:5 37:22 h h.r. 34:9 46:24 49:19 124:16 129:25 131:6 150:19 151:19	151:20 half 169:6,10,23 hall 2:18 9:18,18 10:15 hallway 164:6 halter 15:5 hand 203:6 handle 141:22 197:21 198:4 handled 107:5 115:5 122:21 hang 168:4 happen 58:7 59:4 169:18 happened 88:14 91:6,14 142:8 174:14 178:14 191:5 192:2 196:19 happening 184:7 happy 65:22 79:25 103:22 183:10,14 198:22 hard 67:14 135:1 hardcopy 127:14 128:5 hate 13:23 113:25 hb 144:24 172:5 192:3 193:15 head 17:19,23 31:20 32:7 83:21 hear 10:5,10,11 13:24,25 32:11 63:16 89:21	122:11 129:5 136:17 137:1 138:9 142:24,25 157:15,17 158:23 159:3 165:2,4 170:7,18 171:16 175:14 181:24 182:1 189:24 193:6 heard 20:10 57:18 82:9 97:13 167:11 hearing 64:16 74:3,20 78:1 100:11 158:22 161:19 181:2,6 186:24 heart 172:3 181:21 held 16:24 18:20 19:20 65:10 84:7,11 120:18 127:21 155:3 157:14 175:23 180:24 181:24 182:3 hello 171:15 help 194:17 helps 192:22 196:19 hereinafter 8:4 heretofore 171:12 hereunto 203:5 hesitation 57:25 hey 10:2 54:3 hi 11:15 100:17
---	--	--	--

high 4:20 112:8 highlight 123:25 highly 175:14 hires 132:19 history 14:3,25 16:7 191:25 hmm 97:6 hoc 84:23 hold 48:8 153:25 162:4 163:15 167:1 hollingsworth 3:14 8:24,25 26:19 38:17 52:21 62:19 77:2 79:3,11 81:5 82:2,17 85:13,21 86:7,12 87:2,10,20 88:17 89:12 90:15,21 91:2,16 92:4 93:4,19 94:15,25 95:7,15 96:2,19 97:15 98:5 112:10,18 113:5 114:9,17 115:13 116:20 117:5 142:19 143:1 144:12,18 145:7 145:13 149:13 149:21 157:9,18 159:5 160:7,17 162:4,9,13,23 163:2,12,17,24 164:2,9,19 165:5 165:13,19 166:2 167:1 168:9,17 170:3,8 171:17	182:7 183:14 185:13,14 186:8 186:17,21 187:24 189:17 192:13,21 193:2 193:4,7,10,21 194:4,9,18 197:17 198:9,24 200:7 home 63:4 102:4 102:10 105:1 homeserve 111:6 111:10 honest 178:21 honestly 164:14 honor 58:23 60:5 62:2 65:19 66:8 67:22 68:24 69:15 70:1,13 71:6,17 72:24 75:18 76:11 77:2,17 79:3 161:10 173:2,25 176:14 176:24 177:7,9 177:20 181:16 181:21 183:17 186:22 189:18 189:19 190:2,10 190:19 192:22 193:5 194:24 195:18 197:17 198:25 199:3,25 200:8 honors 54:9 56:9 57:16,21 60:25 61:14 62:19 65:15 75:13	77:12 80:3 191:20 197:2 hop 186:6 194:19 hope 99:25 horse 167:22 hour 169:6,10,23 180:13 182:10 house 75:23 85:12 96:16 97:1 116:9 125:16 135:19 135:20 144:10 144:16 145:5 147:17,20 149:10,19 150:3 177:24 191:6 192:25 housed 125:25 129:18 131:23 hubay 6:20 hubaydougher... 6:24 human 33:5,17 33:18 124:3 127:9 hypothetical 134:3,6 146:6,13	74:17 76:15 igs 11:14,16 108:4,8,16 igs.com 5:17 illinois 2:10 illuminating 1:7 9:5 204:7 205:3 206:3 immediate 186:12 immediately 137:4 171:5 183:2 impact 72:12 185:20 impacts 77:7 implement 130:13 implemented 77:16 130:16 implementing 92:15 implicate 80:23 importance 39:7 55:18 75:9 185:24 important 91:7 91:7 172:25 impossible 55:22 imprecise 109:11 improper 21:1 35:13,13 36:23 40:12 41:1 50:7 55:7 59:21 62:15,18 88:8 89:22 91:1,11 92:23 93:1,17
--	---	--	---

94:24 95:6 96:9 109:18 110:5 175:10 improperly 55:3 70:8 179:8 inaction 40:11 40:22 96:8 inadvertently 65:4 inappropriate 41:8 56:6 61:24 89:8,24 90:5 117:24 166:19 175:14,19,20,22 inaudible 76:7 inclination 112:13,19 inclined 94:5 115:9 include 44:11 50:6 54:24 92:21 included 194:15 204:14 including 74:11 74:15,19 172:5 inconsistent 188:19 incorporated 206:12 incumbent 77:11 incur 143:12 incurred 142:16 144:8 incurring 143:21 index 7:1 indexed 126:10	indicate 83:17 120:8 indicated 41:18 135:17 153:21 156:19 157:1 161:13 180:25 184:24 196:15 199:13 indicating 195:4 204:14 indirect 43:22 142:16 143:13 individuals 174:19 indulging 197:3 industrial 6:2 influenced 40:12 41:1 96:8 inform 172:14 182:10,25 198:13 information 27:16,20 43:7 55:6 56:17 58:10,14 62:9 64:9 65:3 80:24 89:13 90:16 92:8 93:8,11,23 94:18 96:21 98:10,23 109:2 109:20 113:8,13 113:22 138:10 138:20 139:8 142:6,22 143:5 145:17 149:15 156:6,17 157:12 157:22 158:3 159:9,16 162:2	173:8 178:9,19 179:4,24 180:21 181:4 183:15,23 184:4,13 185:9 185:17 187:19 187:25 188:6 190:23 191:5,14 192:10 193:12 193:23,24 194:13 195:23 196:6,13 informed 183:2 184:17 initial 29:22 42:20,23 116:19 initially 154:12 initiated 199:5 initiative 127:16 inquire 155:25 inquiries 156:12 161:1 ins 109:25 insider 31:17 insist 65:16 instance 74:5 76:13 instances 139:23 instruct 35:23 60:2,3 86:25 87:21 88:21 89:1,17 90:16 92:5 93:5 94:3 96:22 98:8 113:6,12 116:14 116:21 117:15 197:25 instructed 37:11 54:18 59:12	61:2 89:21 instructing 28:11 36:13,15 52:3,6 90:19 99:9,12 instruction 37:14 93:20 94:16,21 95:1,3 95:8,10 96:5,24 116:24 117:6,8 117:25 149:22 160:8,18,20 instructions 142:1 201:2 intended 65:24 77:18 184:25 intent 60:13 162:20 169:12 interaction 84:5 interactions 67:11 interest 181:14 187:14 188:12 interested 26:24 203:3 interfere 39:8 55:19 75:10 77:22 179:20 181:14,23 183:7 184:15 185:25 187:20 188:1,8 188:13 192:11 interference 66:12 76:21,22 interfering 179:25 180:2 interject 181:13
---	--	--	--

internal 32:7 33:20 34:9 43:11 46:24 47:1 88:18 105:4 124:3,4,17 128:9 129:24 132:6,8,9 135:9 141:25 142:10 148:13 internally 139:3 interpret 71:8 interpretation 53:13 interpreting 69:6 interrupt 13:24 16:4 58:20 163:16 167:8 interstate 5:11 investigate 32:20 33:19,21 33:22 37:24 75:3 investigated 33:11 investigating 32:16 investigation 25:21 32:21 33:12 35:21 38:6 39:9,14 52:9,10,18 55:18 55:19 56:5 58:2 61:18,25 62:23 63:8 66:13,17 67:13 69:8 73:23 74:10,19 75:11,16 76:22	77:8,10 79:18 84:4,4 85:10,17 87:8,13 88:19 107:9 128:10,13 172:14 177:4 179:21 180:1,3 180:24 181:15 181:23 183:7 185:21 187:6,21 188:1,14 investigations 34:1,4,13 39:8 64:19 75:9 77:23 172:4 177:23 178:2,4 185:25 186:1 188:8 192:12 invoice 105:18 invoiced 120:6 invoices 35:13 119:18 120:9 involve 159:16 involved 20:25 21:1 23:4 59:17 59:19 61:11 62:10 91:9 94:14 118:5 119:17 120:23 132:13 141:3 involvement 30:15 57:13 168:6 involves 25:13 54:22 163:6,7 involving 19:8 issue 33:18,20 33:22 36:5,7,18 48:12 53:18	54:13 59:23 62:15 64:17 69:25 70:21,23 71:1,2,5,7 73:5 73:17,18 74:11 75:17 76:2 77:1 78:1 79:6 106:16 113:25 148:7,22 149:11 150:8 152:2 171:21 172:24 174:12 175:8,21 176:4 179:6 186:13 189:22 196:25 198:2,12 issued 12:19 40:8 62:21,22 74:8 125:10 issues 25:13 26:7 26:20 37:10 53:21 54:21 58:9,16 66:16 69:4 74:23 75:15,25 76:6,8 79:7 81:3 86:22 114:22 124:15 126:6 133:3,13 133:14 139:18 139:24 149:20 150:1 161:3 173:24 174:2,24 182:12,16 187:5 189:25 191:7 items 34:8 192:2 j j 3:14	january 106:14 107:3 154:12,20 154:21 157:6 160:5 jewelers 14:12 17:13 jewelry 14:22 jim 29:21 job 50:6 jody 6:13 11:24 joe 11:15 100:9 100:15,17 103:12 111:2 112:20 113:23 114:11 115:22 118:13 121:15 joe.oliker 5:17 john 2:15 8:7 9:17,23 10:2 11:7 13:23 16:3 23:22 24:21 54:3,10 65:20 78:9 80:17 99:24 162:9,14 162:23 165:1,13 170:16 173:3 john.finnigan 2:23 join 54:1,19 80:1 117:25 198:22 joined 15:11 171:24 joining 8:20,22 54:10 55:14 74:6 171:19 joins 117:18 joint 98:2,14,16
--	---	---	--

jonathan 4:19	k	75:2 76:8,17,19	109:24 136:11
jones 3:3,13 8:25	karin 5:21 12:4	81:11,19,22 82:1	140:8,12,16
9:4 19:2 85:5,10	keep 25:24 47:8	82:7,8,14,19	143:12 146:4
87:6,8 88:2,8,11	76:6 87:16	83:20 87:1,15,23	174:10
89:4,7,11 90:12	100:20,22	89:24 90:3,4	known 100:16
93:2,18 94:14	111:15 114:22	91:8 94:7 95:19	104:8 105:1
120:23 154:15	167:15	97:18 100:1,22	124:11 131:17
154:22 156:1	keeping 180:20	101:23 103:13	149:1
157:5 158:8	kept 48:25	103:14 104:12	knows 52:15
159:21 160:4,15	127:13 128:19	104:13 105:3,20	146:10
172:6	147:12 148:5	106:14 107:20	koslen 3:15
jonesday.com	184:14	107:24 108:24	10:19,19
3:10,20	kevin 32:14,18	110:16,17,19	kurt 1:24 202:6
joseph 5:12	125:11	112:20 115:7,19	203:14
judge 37:5	kim 11:6 58:24	118:14 120:10	kurtz 6:12
175:13	68:24 121:9,16	120:24,25 121:2	kyler 6:13
judgment	121:24 173:25	121:23 122:22	l
198:21	195:18	124:25 126:17	lack 143:8
july 1:18 203:8	kimberly 4:18	126:25 128:4,14	laid 178:23
204:4	kind 14:21 37:19	130:8,21 134:2,5	198:17
jump 37:15	59:13 122:24	137:25 140:19	lakeside 3:7,17
161:19 176:25	125:15 127:15	140:20 141:5,16	language 53:8
june 12:20 64:3	127:17	141:16,19	83:13,14,20
64:24	knew 133:6	142:15 145:22	lape 2:5 8:17,17
jurisdiction	174:13	145:24 146:1,13	8:21,23 15:18
166:19 178:1	know 8:11 10:8	148:15,25	17:24 19:10,25
179:7	17:18 18:8 20:5	149:17 150:6	20:21 21:4,14
jurisdictional	22:12,13 24:22	152:5 155:2,3,6	22:1 23:6 25:17
102:4,13 103:2,9	25:4,12 26:20	155:7,9,11,14	26:9,14 27:8,21
105:7,17 107:20	36:13 37:22	160:9 166:3,16	28:7,13,17,19,23
108:1,6,10,16,22	41:13 45:24	169:24 173:3,20	33:13 35:8,19,25
109:2,21 110:6	47:20 48:21	174:18 181:21	36:3,11,15,25
110:14	49:18,22 50:16	182:10 187:12	37:10 38:24
justice 39:13	50:20 52:5	194:8 196:10	39:4,15,21,24
58:2 187:6,15	53:20 54:25	knowing 19:16	40:14 41:3,15,22
	56:1,10 63:22	52:12 63:22	42:4 43:24
	67:13,14,15,15	knowledge 40:23	44:18 45:11,15
	67:23 71:13	97:9 102:17	

45:23 48:15,20 49:5 50:10 51:13,17,23,25 52:6,14,23 53:7 55:12,13 56:21 60:23 61:14 63:13 66:7,10 67:4 68:10,15,22 70:10 76:11 80:6,16,25 81:7 84:13 85:7,15 86:18 87:12 88:21 89:14,20 90:7,18 92:2 93:9,21 94:20 95:2,9,17 96:4 96:11,23 97:3,10 97:21 98:6,8,21 99:2,5,12 103:11 104:1 111:25 113:11 115:8 116:23 117:7 129:9 130:9 131:25 132:16 133:10,24 134:17 136:14 136:16,19 137:9 138:14 139:6 140:24 142:3 143:15 144:14 146:5 148:24 149:4 150:5,23 151:12 154:14 156:14 158:2,18 158:25 159:14 159:25 160:19 161:7 166:6 167:2 204:5	larger 189:5 larry 2:17 9:16 late 171:20 latitude 25:3 launched 48:2 128:3 law 11:21 13:2,4 15:2,3,3 30:12 30:19 31:4 70:3 70:4,5 73:15,16 lawful 8:1 laws 24:1 30:24 45:20 166:21 lawyer 30:3 138:7 lay 174:9 lead 64:9 93:10 172:13 leading 67:24 174:5 191:25 learned 158:3,19 159:17 162:2 leave 136:8 197:14 leaving 79:6 130:17 led 41:21 87:9 146:12 lee 13:3 left 16:10 121:15 legal 13:13,17,20 15:13,16,22 16:11 17:1,8,10 17:22,23 18:13 18:14,16,17,24 19:1,2 30:3 45:12 73:21 84:24 124:2,16	127:9 128:9 131:6 133:19 134:1,7 135:5,5 147:21,23 148:2 148:6,21 149:10 150:18 151:1 152:6 204:1 207:1 legislation 81:24 legislative 16:17 19:18 21:21 legislators 19:8 81:24 legitimate 55:11 leila 18:1 leland 4:17 11:9 leming 4:7 11:2 lengths 176:2 letter 60:16 106:1,13,21 128:11,21 204:20 letting 91:19 level 35:6 90:5 112:8 189:3 levels 17:21 120:16 leverage 101:25 liberty 77:9 license 157:8 lifted 74:18 77:5 light 55:16 58:15 61:25 145:13 lightly 76:6 limited 74:15 115:23 192:20 194:12	limiting 173:16 limits 62:7,13,20 191:4 lindgren 4:3 10:23,24 54:3 line 21:14 25:23 26:10 31:15,22 31:25 32:3,17 34:12 35:6,12,17 36:9 58:19 64:1 64:15 65:17 66:23 88:16 99:6,7,15 113:20 113:20 123:21 123:22 124:16 125:7,10,20 126:19 131:1,14 138:17 150:13 194:10 197:20 204:14 206:7 207:3 lines 43:13 67:6 87:16 126:5 172:20 link 126:2 lipps 4:17 11:8 list 10:17 51:15 listed 206:7,17 listing 206:7 litigation 185:4 185:11 little 16:9 25:3 74:3 103:19 115:20 147:18 157:2 196:1 llc 6:3 155:8 llp 2:4 4:17 5:4 11:13
---	---	--	--

loaded 135:18 lobbying 19:18 82:13 179:9 lobbyist 19:5 21:21 82:6,16 lobbyists 19:12 19:17 located 14:19 log 76:10 80:8 logic 77:15 long 18:2 100:16 177:3 longer 27:19 198:7 look 53:3 61:8 106:12 110:9 118:17 119:11 looking 74:7 lost 136:13 lot 30:20 80:21 161:12 177:2 loudly 10:7,14 89:18 low 64:8 lowry 6:12 lunch 100:2,6 162:2 168:8	magic 166:4 maiden 29:10 mail 56:18 57:11 62:5 107:2 125:15,18 126:1 maintain 62:12 160:10 maintained 48:18 125:19,25 127:18 maintaining 43:17 maintenance 119:4 major 189:21 making 65:3 119:24 135:3 164:16 195:11 management 14:15 48:4 manager 155:7 manner 145:11 manufacturers 4:15 11:7 121:25 manufacturers's 58:24 marcella.lape 2:12 marcie 2:5 8:16 8:17 204:5 margard 4:4 10:25 mark 65:24 104:8 106:1 marked 7:15 196:8	market 103:9 107:25 109:2,20 110:5 marketed 107:21 marketing 105:6 155:21 marking 126:14 married 29:7 material 182:21 materially 185:20 matt 10:4 11:20 81:12 matter 1:5 25:25 28:9 35:21 56:1 56:8 57:4 61:24 62:24 63:1,5,6 70:14 76:20 96:17 149:7 151:1 163:8 166:12,15 174:11 185:18 matters 25:21 38:5 53:14 56:4 58:1 61:9,18 62:20 71:13 177:24 179:19 183:5 184:25 matthew 6:4 maureen 2:16 8:9 37:21 maureen.willis 2:24 mcnees 6:3 11:21 mcneeslaw.com 6:9	meagher 2:4 mean 42:8 53:1 53:5 57:25 81:7 89:23 94:2 96:10 143:19 151:17,19 167:11 190:13 meaning 97:13 means 65:2 69:21 72:22 141:19 mechanisms 124:19 media 80:22 95:11 176:1 meet 81:23 meeting 19:22 meetings 34:23 members 48:4 memorializes 190:6 memory 30:9 31:3 92:11 106:22,24 140:3 mention 9:11 32:10 131:2 mentioned 15:2 16:10 17:12 31:21 37:7 46:20 69:8 90:24 121:9 125:5 137:11 148:3 merely 45:21 merger 13:11 merits 177:8 message 158:7
m			
m 1:24 202:6 203:14 ma'am 8:6 12:21 14:2 16:6 27:23 39:12,17 80:13 81:11 91:21 92:9 madam 204:11			

messages 57:11 159:20 met 19:7 20:2 45:21 81:13,15 method 126:13 methods 107:21 123:24 michael 3:5,15 10:19 mickelson 119:21 midwest 204:18 207:1 mike 2:18 9:3,18 9:24 10:2,7,8,14 18:16 23:22,23 94:24 miller 29:14 million 55:2 91:10 minute 106:12 118:16 minutes 34:22 35:1 63:11 71:20 78:3,4,6 99:17 111:5 misallocated 24:10 25:14 26:3,5 37:9 57:7 misallocations 54:24 62:18 88:9 91:1,9,11 mischaracteriz... 170:5 mischaracterize 53:9 misheard 136:6	misinterpreting 69:5 misrepresentat... 59:1 misrepresenting 56:22 missing 48:13 mistake 38:10 modernization 140:21 modify 176:18 moment 38:22 57:18 58:18 191:11 moments 72:11 137:5 monday 197:6 197:10 money 140:6,11 140:17,22 141:2 141:6,12,15,17 141:20,23 142:2 142:12 147:13 monitoring 122:9 123:15 133:2 134:23 146:15,23 months 137:18 morning 8:6 10:23 11:19,23 12:4 55:13 123:23 161:13 162:8,12 171:8 171:13 180:14 191:23 morning's 168:2 190:12,13	motion 12:18 64:4 167:19 180:7,9 197:3,9 197:12,13 move 59:24 67:15 81:10 161:18 190:1 195:17 198:1 moved 171:11 176:12 189:1,15 199:16,18,23 mpritchard 6:9 mulling 177:15 n n 17:15 name 8:7 9:11 29:7,11,13 32:11 32:13 40:3 42:14 47:19 51:12,20 81:12 82:9 100:15 104:11,12,12 121:23 122:23 154:7 204:6 205:3,4,15 206:3 206:4,21 named 202:9 narrowly 79:5 79:13 187:2,8 nature 33:14 49:7 57:8 78:19 108:11 187:11 nauseam 79:22 near 60:20 nearly 53:4 necessarily 118:3	necessary 74:20 119:4 need 10:7 20:5 28:18,19,24 35:22 52:4 53:5 67:14 81:9 83:14 89:17 91:6 138:5,18 141:23 142:4 147:18 159:1 163:2 164:10 186:11 193:23 195:25 198:23 200:4 needed 132:4 135:7 166:3 needs 100:10 179:10 negotiate 28:1,5 negotiations 23:19 27:7,9,17 27:24 28:15,22 29:2 67:12 never 77:3 147:8 158:11,20 159:18 167:10 news 80:22 nix 194:10 non 21:11 50:4,9 50:13 102:4,13 102:23 103:2,9 105:7,17 107:20 108:1,6,10,16,22 109:2,21 110:6 110:14 141:10 156:13,19 160:24 176:19 187:19,25 188:6
--	--	--	--

190:23 191:2,13 192:9 193:12,17 193:22,24 194:13 195:23 196:13 nopec 11:10,12 154:8 176:15 nordstrom 5:21 12:4,5 normal 151:22 north 2:8 3:6,16 4:20 northeast 5:2 notarized 204:15 notary 1:24 202:6 203:14 204:25 205:10 205:18 206:15 206:23 207:23 note 41:9 47:10 47:12 63:20 64:12,19 79:17 117:9,12 158:5 167:10 171:9 184:17 204:13 noted 10:4 68:1 126:15 157:22 159:11 181:13 181:18 notes 118:17 notice 137:8 184:3 notified 39:12,19 49:2,4 98:25 180:11 notify 10:13 169:23	november 14:7 85:2 122:4 129:8 135:14 152:15 nrdc 11:14 number 13:19 54:4 65:23 91:10 123:1 131:17 204:8,14 numbers 206:7 nurick 6:3 11:21 o o'clock 121:7,11 o'conner 2:7 o'connor 8:22,23 oath 195:4 object 30:2 82:3 85:23 86:25 93:4 109:10 110:7 113:6,12 116:21 133:9 138:4 142:20 143:3 147:2 148:23 151:11 156:4 157:10 158:10 167:14 184:2 objected 76:12 157:19 159:6,10 159:14 170:9,11 177:3 objecting 138:10 167:10 objection 17:24 19:10,25 22:1 23:6 28:7,17,23 33:13 35:8,19	36:11 39:15,21 40:14 41:3,5,9 41:15,22,24 42:4 43:24 44:18 45:11,15,23 48:15,20 49:5 50:10 51:23,24 56:21 80:16 82:17 84:13 85:7,13 86:7,12 86:18 87:4,10,12 89:12,14 90:15 90:18 92:1,2,4 93:9,19 94:15,20 94:25 95:2,7,9 95:15,17 96:2,4 96:11,18,19,23 97:3,4,10,21,24 98:5,6,7,20,21 99:2,11 103:11 103:12,13,21 116:23 117:4,5,7 117:19 129:9 130:9 131:25 132:16 133:10 133:24 134:17 136:14,16,18 137:9 139:6 140:23,24,25 142:3,13 143:2 143:15 144:1,11 144:12,14,18 145:6,7 146:5 148:24 149:4,13 149:16,21 150:5 150:23 151:12 154:14 157:16 157:23 160:7,17	160:19 170:4,21 172:20 objections 157:16 158:22 159:2,4 objects 100:21 142:25 obligated 73:11 obligations 94:9 172:12 182:25 obtaining 185:9 occ 9:14,15,16 9:18 54:11 58:9 63:2 65:20 75:14 77:3 78:11 99:21 117:18 172:2 173:3 177:6 183:2 185:6 197:3 occ's 176:15 occ.ohio.gov 2:23,24 occur 27:13 59:7 88:3,9 occurred 59:7 59:20 85:10 110:18 137:14 139:10 occurring 25:9 oeg 11:22 offer 102:19 108:5,9 offered 102:3,6 104:5 office 8:7 10:22 12:8 25:22 35:22 52:10
---	--	--	---

53:16 55:20 56:5 61:19 63:8 66:14 75:11 130:15,18 168:19 172:4 175:12 180:18 185:19 203:6 officer 13:16 18:21 31:13,23 35:11 43:9 44:8 45:14,16 46:7,22 47:25 48:8,9 59:16 82:22 83:3,5,6,11,24 84:12,20 91:22 92:15 94:12,23 95:5 98:13 122:4 127:4,7 129:7 130:13 131:21 133:3 134:10 137:22 138:12,16 139:20,25 147:1 147:7,9 149:2 150:22 151:9,24 152:4,13,19,23 152:25 153:3,6 154:11,11 155:25 offices 181:7 official 160:24 178:15 205:15 206:21 officials 19:22 20:3,8 21:25 157:1 oh 190:7	ohio 1:2,5,10,21 2:14,21 3:2,8,18 4:2,11,15,22 5:2 5:7,15,19,24 6:2 6:7,11,16,19,23 8:3,8 9:4 10:22 11:7,20,24 12:5 12:7,10 13:10 14:20 19:24 21:25 22:7 24:2 28:22 29:17 30:12,23 31:4,8 31:9 37:25 39:10 42:2 43:4 43:18 44:5,12,17 45:5,10,20 46:2 46:2,4,8,17 47:4 48:14,18 50:25 51:8 55:4,21 58:8,24 59:22 60:12 64:11 74:17 75:12 76:15 82:21,23 82:23 83:11,18 83:24 84:6,10 101:16,24 103:15,17 105:8 106:5 108:9 121:25 140:10 141:5,10 142:15 143:25 144:9 145:22 146:16 146:23 147:7 148:6 150:4,9 152:2 154:24 155:12 156:1,8 157:1 188:15,16 202:2,7 203:7,15	204:2,6 205:3 206:3 ohio's 101:19 141:8 188:17 ohioattorneyg... 4:13 okay 9:25 10:6 10:15 12:11,24 16:15 17:20 20:17 21:20 26:14,17,18 28:25 36:4 38:8 38:21 42:7,16 51:17,21 52:11 54:6 63:10,19 74:3 77:24 90:12 98:19 99:19 107:1,7,14 111:24 113:17 118:17,23 121:5 121:21 122:5,6,7 128:17,25 130:25 135:8 136:12 145:1,18 151:22 152:9 154:4 156:15,23 160:2 161:18 164:11,25 165:10,23 170:13,24 190:9 193:8 196:18,24 198:24 200:2 oliker 5:12 7:8 11:15,15 58:17 60:5 75:18,21 99:24 100:13,15 109:5 110:22 111:1 112:4,22	113:17 114:4,12 116:8 118:2,16 128:2 oma 11:5 174:1 176:16 177:6 once 32:18 35:22 ones 8:15 22:18 94:5 187:15 ongoing 61:25 62:23 77:8,23 172:3,12 183:7 188:13 open 166:14 operate 119:5 166:18 184:12 operated 16:23 operating 103:16,16,23 105:8 115:23 119:18 120:1,15 operation 119:3 opinion 45:12 opportunity 141:22 167:18 order 12:19 25:19 28:10 37:16,17,20,20 38:2,12,22 39:5 52:1,22,24 53:2 53:3,8,13,21 55:17 56:8 57:22 58:15 62:22 68:16 69:2,5 70:19 71:8 73:3 75:8 99:14 119:10 124:9,10 138:20 150:2 166:4
---	---	--	---

167:15 174:9 180:25 ordered 74:12 84:9,14,15 orders 68:21 69:14 79:23 organization 9:11,12 51:22 127:11 149:8 originated 21:10 ought 116:2 117:24 outcome 203:3 outright 57:25 outs 109:25 outside 18:23 19:1 27:25 28:8 57:5 86:15,16 93:12 97:22 103:2 104:21 147:21 148:2,6 149:9 151:15,17 151:19,20,21 160:20,22 164:3 164:5,22 overlapped 45:18 overruled 68:20 oversaw 23:11 23:15 31:8,14,16 147:5 overseeing 13:19 31:4 50:2 oversight 50:7 owned 178:11	<p style="text-align: center;">p</p> p.m. 171:8 200:10 page 106:18,20 107:2 194:20 204:14,16 206:7 207:3 pages 62:4 67:21 179:23 paid 153:11 paper 48:19 57:15 127:18 paperwork 49:10,12 paragraph 38:24 39:6 53:11 69:2 75:8 paragraphs 64:24 parent 111:9 119:12,14 parkway 1:20,21 5:14 part 21:8 40:12 40:22 41:10 47:24 52:17 54:23 87:8 88:15 151:6 168:25 169:3,18 177:25 195:24 199:9 206:9 parte 20:11,19 21:2,24 175:13 participate 23:18 27:12 28:14,21 101:8 153:24 169:20	participated 29:4 143:22 participating 9:10,15,21 29:20 116:4 183:21 184:10 participation 24:3 particular 66:23 66:23 70:2 76:20 106:16 192:18 198:12 198:19 199:17 particularly 186:12 parties 27:25 43:12 64:1,7,21 65:7 73:12 78:11 99:22 144:23 145:4 161:16 168:11 173:6,11,17,19 184:10 188:23 189:4 190:8 198:7,18,21 party 20:16 25:10 32:4 98:4 125:5,9,22,24 126:3 127:25 129:16 130:7,11 130:14 131:8,23 132:22 133:5,15 134:13,19,24 135:11 146:1 151:15,18 152:7 156:25 184:4 191:19 195:8 203:3	pat 8:21 40:4 patently 182:12 185:8 patrick 2:6 paying 187:13 payment 35:13 payments 35:14 55:23 56:3,15 58:11 67:11 69:9 144:22 145:3,21,23 146:3,12,14 147:14,16 168:14 174:19 178:10,13,14 187:4,12,13 191:7 192:25 193:15 pending 20:16 26:12 159:1 160:1 161:1 people 8:14 9:9 20:18 33:24 43:14 75:25 76:5 77:9 92:22 123:5 130:1 174:11 perform 81:20 82:12 84:19 86:10 87:7 performed 83:23 period 22:11 42:4 48:20 83:1 85:4 137:13 153:4 154:10,12 154:18 155:5,12 155:15 160:16
--	---	---	---

permissible 37:1 110:11,11 172:1 186:23 189:7 196:16 197:24 199:22 permit 108:16 188:9 192:8 permitted 64:2 64:12 78:13 79:14 108:5 178:6 186:19 187:22 188:4,9 193:18 permitting 66:19 79:4 85:20 person 50:19 92:22 131:3,13 149:6 153:21 197:22 person's 32:11 32:13 49:17 personal 97:14 personally 46:13 205:11 206:15 persons 62:10 pertaining 30:13 64:18 187:18 phase 66:21 phone 11:17 53:6 54:4 71:9 79:25 175:12 181:19 183:13 204:3 phonetic 101:2 physical 127:12 physically 128:17	pick 89:19 picture 77:25 189:6 pile 181:6 place 60:20 75:22 105:13 108:25 123:17 123:25 126:22 130:11,15,19 180:7,12 184:18 184:22 202:20 placed 140:17,22 141:17 places 131:8 plaintiffs 185:3 185:10 plan 22:16 23:1 23:5 29:22 42:2 42:10,21,24 43:1 43:3,19 44:21 78:14 79:1 82:21,23 83:7,12 83:16,24 84:7,10 137:24 138:3 139:4,15,19 146:18,25 149:12 plans 161:20 plant 4:5 12:6,6 played 42:19 please 10:8,12 12:3 13:5 21:17 56:25 79:10 100:21 111:3 152:14 162:9 167:7 169:22 204:12,12	plural 168:21 po 6:22 point 3:6,16 24:19 25:2 26:11 28:13 29:1 42:18 53:15 56:7 70:15 71:16 73:6,7 86:21 94:9 108:4 113:24 167:16 172:25 182:4 183:18 policies 101:24 policy 93:25 political 142:17 143:13 pool 140:6,11,18 140:22 141:2,7 141:12,15,18,20 141:23 142:2,12 poorly 131:11 portion 65:5,10 135:23 159:24 portions 145:21 177:16 posed 61:20 113:10 172:8 186:10 position 13:6,21 14:6,13 15:23 16:13,15,24 17:7 46:23 49:17 59:25 72:20 92:20 114:10,18 120:17 122:7 130:12 147:11 155:14 156:8	169:17 172:24 180:22 181:21 182:1 183:3,9 186:19 positions 19:20 155:4 156:1,21 176:16 possession 49:11 49:24 137:13 possible 54:23 100:23 151:13 151:15 post 116:11 posted 131:18 potential 70:18 71:11,15 74:14 74:22 76:21 123:18 138:2,25 139:23 187:5 potentially 77:9 192:11 practice 181:11 practices 142:11 precaution 65:16 precise 103:19 precisely 45:18 63:7 precludes 69:2 predate 177:3 preference 100:4 112:10 197:21 198:15 preferred 197:20 prejudge 60:17 preliminary 107:8
---	---	--	--

preparation 30:21	98:3 145:12 158:9,11,20 160:11	172:21 177:4	196:4
prepare 181:1		process 59:17,18 118:20 120:5,13	prosecutor 172:13 186:13
prepared 34:22 177:19 198:7	privileged 30:5 43:6 87:13	123:17 126:21 126:24 131:7	protect 179:11
presence 202:15	88:18,19 89:13	135:9 151:23	protected 75:6
present 71:18 181:7	90:16 92:7 93:7 93:8,11,23 94:18	195:6,15	protection 167:20
presented 63:25	96:21 98:10,22	processing 34:5	protective 167:14
preserve 74:13	113:8,13 138:6	produced 64:21 66:21 67:8 68:1	provide 44:16 46:12 69:24
president 14:14 155:20	138:10,19 139:8 142:5,22 143:5	68:2 71:22 72:14,17 162:18	103:9 108:21 119:6 135:6,10
presumably 128:4	145:16 149:15 156:6,17 157:11	168:12	138:19 178:9 183:15 186:7
pretext 58:13	157:21 158:17 159:9	product 105:17 107:22 130:15	189:3 190:15
pretty 52:15 73:6 77:7 81:2	probe 25:1	production 204:16,18,23	provided 8:2 40:9 44:8 46:7
141:13	problem 10:9 187:7	products 102:5 104:10 155:19	46:10,12 105:16 110:15 133:5
prevent 76:9 108:25 185:15	procedural 197:4,18 199:4	professional 165:22 166:5	134:13,24 196:7
prevented 185:8	procedure 8:3 201:7 205:5	program 47:16 47:19 92:10,16	provides 189:4
previous 172:15	206:5	93:16 94:14	providing 195:16
previously 144:21 172:8	proceed 27:3 64:5 65:23	prompted 75:16	provision 144:20
price 38:9	100:2 181:1	proper 59:8 60:3 60:16 61:20	public 1:1,24 5:3 19:23 22:7
primary 26:8	proceeding 24:23 36:19	180:16,23	29:16 52:14 56:11 63:5 65:4
prior 55:17 56:8 68:20 69:13	37:2,12 53:19 59:15 61:12	properly 51:8 60:1,3 174:9	84:15 99:21,23 100:1,5,21
79:23 130:17 152:18 188:20	63:23 64:4,15 66:22 79:18,22	197:13	101:15 112:7 116:2 117:14,23
191:6 196:15,19	121:24 170:11 175:5,6 189:7	propose 137:22	118:7,9 121:4,8 121:14,16,17
pritchard 6:4 10:4 11:19,20	proceedings 57:24 59:10	prosecution 172:4 178:12	145:19 153:22 154:2 158:14
private 166:23 176:19	166:13,22	184:16 187:20 188:7 192:10,24	159:24 161:14
privilege 30:6 68:3 85:18,22		193:13,14,25 194:5,14,16	
87:4,11 88:23			

161:17,24 163:4 163:8 165:6,12 166:10,10,12,20 166:20,21,22 167:7,16,16 168:1,4 169:1,3 169:5,9,12,19,25 170:12,14 171:4 171:13 173:13 173:15 175:24 176:1,11,13,17 176:21 177:12 178:15,17,20,24 179:4 180:21 181:24 183:24 184:4 187:19,25 188:6,21 189:2 189:15 190:23 191:2,13 192:5,9 193:12,17,22,24 194:13 195:6,23 195:25 196:13 199:9,16,18,23 202:6 203:14 205:10,18 206:15,23 207:23 publically 191:18,20 publicly 89:7 puco 22:15 29:10 84:18 128:3 157:5 160:4 161:2 pull 38:13 39:1 53:2 pulled 63:21	pump 192:17 purchased 143:23 purely 191:16 purpose 56:2 78:17 79:17 101:19 164:21 purposes 64:13 190:18 pursuant 12:18 64:10 172:11 201:3,6 pursuing 87:16 push 100:5 166:15 put 24:21,24 42:21 69:15 80:18 108:16 114:15 128:19 128:20 167:22 182:18 putting 114:7 q qualified 202:8 quash 64:4 180:8,10 question 22:2,4 24:12 26:12,18 27:22,25 35:25 36:16 37:1 39:16,23 55:14 61:6 63:23 66:8 68:9,14 70:22 72:4 73:22 77:18 79:10,24 85:16,25 86:2,4 87:4,22 93:13,14	94:9,16 95:23 98:18,19 104:1 109:4,8 110:21 110:25 111:3 117:1 120:2 126:23 131:11 132:3 135:2 136:10 138:20 140:13 143:4,7 143:10,11,17,19 144:8 145:10,15 145:20 156:15 156:18,23 157:10,20 158:25 159:8,21 160:1,10 161:10 170:17 186:22 190:20 191:12 197:18,23 questioned 37:12 191:14 questioning 27:4 54:14 55:11 57:5 64:2,15 65:17 66:2,24 72:22 86:24 88:16 99:7,15 121:8,16,18 172:20 173:11 178:7 183:18 184:11 192:18 194:11 questions 25:18 25:24 26:2 36:21 37:6,19 42:18 51:14,16 52:7,20 54:16,21 55:5,16 58:3,5	59:3,10 60:6,11 61:20,22,23 62:17 63:23,24 64:12,22 65:8,13 66:16,19,22 67:10,17,24 68:4 69:3,4,9,21 70:3 70:5 71:21 72:9 72:13 77:4 78:12,19,25 79:2 79:4,12 80:21,23 81:3 87:25 88:10,18,22,25 90:22,25 91:3,15 91:17 94:4 99:20,23,25 100:19,22 110:13 112:2,5,6 112:11,23 113:10,14,21 114:5,14 116:2,6 116:9,11,14 117:11,12,16,23 118:15,18 121:3 122:2 138:11 153:10,18,21 154:2,9 156:9,11 156:20 157:13 157:24 159:12 161:10,14,17 162:16 165:7 169:3 170:1 172:2,5,8 174:4 174:5,5,6,8,12 175:2,6,7,16 176:2,7 177:2 179:1,16,25 180:3,15 181:4,9
--	--	---	--

182:6 183:4 185:20 186:10 186:23,25 187:2 187:8,18 188:4 188:10 189:6,16 189:20 190:24 191:3,24 192:1,4 192:9 193:17 198:11 199:2,22 200:2 quick 176:25 quite 39:3 53:4 67:2	randazzo's 63:4 ranging 77:7 rate 120:19 rates 120:3 rationale 41:11 187:13 rdr 74:9 reached 14:4 172:13 read 21:18 22:3 40:10 53:7,10 70:16 80:25 86:3 95:22 104:2 109:6,7 110:23,24 140:14 143:9 171:7 182:16 205:5,6,12 206:5 206:6,17 reading 204:20 ready 63:15 121:13 186:6 real 176:25 really 41:13 66:12 75:25 77:12 100:10 112:16 122:23 172:3 179:2,10 179:12,19 195:6 reason 40:11,18 52:19 71:8 76:12 88:3 89:11 95:13 168:7 182:2 204:15 206:8 207:3 reasonably 64:9	reasoning 76:23 77:1 reasons 26:8 40:6,9 76:13 185:22 187:4 recall 17:3,9 18:4 19:6 20:20 21:22 22:21 23:16 28:2,3 29:19,20,24 30:8 31:19 33:9 34:21 35:9 42:5 42:11,14,15 43:20,25 44:19 44:23,24 47:23 48:16 49:16 51:10 84:17 89:5,9 101:4,17 102:6,7 104:6 105:11 107:15 107:18 108:8,10 108:12,23 109:16 111:7 119:14 120:22 122:24 123:3 124:12,18 125:4 128:4 129:3,15 129:20 130:2 131:19 132:24 134:10,16 135:13 136:24 137:2,3,10,17,19 137:20 138:1 139:2,12,13,16 139:17,21,22 140:4 142:14 147:24 148:4,20 152:22 155:18	155:23 156:7,9 156:20 recalled 174:13 receipt 204:19 receive 36:8,17 91:10 129:6 184:3 received 32:18 44:5 56:14 57:12 62:3,8 99:3 100:19 125:11,18,24 127:6 128:3,5,11 128:25 137:7 150:20 179:17 receiving 125:6 128:7 recess 14:1 16:5 54:7,8 63:14 78:7 99:17,18 106:9 121:12 186:15 recessed 168:8 recognize 167:21 recollection 95:18 104:16,22 106:15 recommending 139:14 record 12:17 29:4 52:14 56:22 63:5 65:4 87:3,25 97:16 99:20 100:21 102:17 103:19 106:7 112:23 117:10,13,23 118:10 121:4,21
r			
r 2:16 3:5 6:4 r.c. 1:9 74:15,23 78:24 radoringo 3:10 raise 124:14 149:18 189:22 196:10 raised 65:12 66:25 74:5,23 78:10 152:5 raising 197:15 199:12 randazzo 28:6 54:17 55:25 56:19 57:8 58:7 67:11 71:24 72:18 88:7 157:5,13,25 158:8 159:12,23 160:5,16 162:20 168:15 172:10 172:21 178:11 186:25			

143:2 145:19 152:10 158:6 159:11 163:1,3,5 163:9 164:4,7 165:11 166:10 166:11,12 167:7 167:11 169:1,3 169:19 170:19 170:20,23,25 171:1,3,3 172:20 175:24 176:11 176:17,20,21 177:12 178:20 178:24 182:9 187:16 192:5 206:9 records 43:17 47:8 48:13,17,21 48:25 49:4,8,23 56:14 74:14,16 76:16 125:19 127:12,15,17,18 127:21 133:1,17 134:19,20,22,25 136:13 137:12 147:12 148:5 166:20 redman 119:20 reduced 202:14 reference 204:8 205:2 206:2 referenced 42:13 123:23 129:17 194:1,5 202:13 202:18 205:11 206:15 references 73:3	referencing 53:22 referred 70:20 referring 37:16 37:17,20 38:19 38:23 43:2 103:22 104:20 144:3,6 193:11 196:12 reflect 12:17 refrain 65:8 refresh 106:21 refreshes 106:15 refusal 57:25 refuse 163:21 regard 68:3 125:20 135:11 191:6 regarding 42:19 48:6 60:6,11,18 64:18 67:17 69:3 74:22 78:12 106:3 107:19 110:14 112:6 116:12 123:18 125:1,2 126:1 131:4,24 133:1,14 134:14 134:23 138:2,24 139:18,24 141:22 142:1 147:13,14 149:10,25 150:8 150:20 152:1 156:9,20 157:7 192:10 201:2 regards 149:19	register 19:17 82:5,15 registered 19:4 21:20 regular 130:3 regulate 102:20 regulated 140:6 140:11,17,22 141:6,12 156:12 156:13 160:24 regulation 103:3 regulations 24:1 30:12,19,24 45:20 109:23 110:10 regulator 20:15 regulators 58:3 regulatory 13:8 13:10,14 15:25 19:22 20:3,8 21:21,25 23:11 31:4,8 122:25 157:1 reiterate 61:15 64:14 113:9 relate 25:24 53:18 71:23 72:3,17 88:1 154:9 related 24:13,23 25:14 33:17,19 33:21 35:6,25 36:21 41:7 43:17 48:13 53:15 61:22,23 63:7 64:22 66:20,24 74:14 74:16 76:14	78:18,25 81:3 86:22 87:1 91:15 96:16 112:2,11 117:3,3 129:9,14 146:2 147:14 149:19 150:3 157:13,25 159:12 174:6,8 174:22 175:6 186:25 187:19 192:3,9,25 193:12,15,17,25 194:13 196:4,20 relates 21:2 75:1 79:1 188:6 192:24 196:13 relating 35:12 35:17 36:9 43:7 51:1 54:16 58:5 62:4,6 70:17 85:11 97:1 162:18 168:13 relation 94:13 relationship 80:21 111:6,10 relative 203:2 release 117:14 released 77:19 77:20 175:25 178:8,9 releasing 77:21 relevancy 64:14 relevant 37:7 61:9 71:11,12 reluctantly 176:6 rely 195:6
---	--	--	---

remain 18:2 75:6	92:22 101:2,3 123:18,20 124:2 125:10,14,17	134:2,7 135:4,7 164:15 206:9,11	142:2 156:10 165:21 195:1,7
remaining 197:7		requested 108:5	respective 33:25
remedy 167:14	reported 19:2,3 20:19 31:24,25	114:18 201:1,6	respond 56:10 57:1 62:3 70:12 134:2 160:9
remember 19:19 20:9 23:2 30:15 30:17,22 35:15 82:11 102:1 105:14,21,25 106:1,6,23 107:2 107:6,10 108:14 108:18 111:12 111:16 139:1 141:24 142:9 149:23 160:1	32:1,2 33:1 80:22 89:3 91:24 95:11 150:7,12,15	requests 191:19	responding 145:10
	reporter 21:18 22:3 86:3 89:18 109:6,7 110:23 110:24 205:7	require 114:7,15 114:20,20,21 139:7 166:22	response 60:24 72:15 109:15 110:8 145:14 186:12
remind 64:6 195:12	reporter's 7:12 202:1	required 37:25 204:25	responsibilities 23:4,8 31:13 83:10 92:14,17 92:20,21 123:6,9 123:10
remote 9:3	reports 32:23 34:3,20 48:2,5 74:24 101:1,14 125:23,25	requirement 114:5	responsibility 19:15,21 20:18 32:15 42:1,25 43:17,21,23 44:1 44:3 47:21,25 50:2,17 91:23 119:24
remotely 8:15 9:10,15,21 49:10 135:15	represent 25:10 121:24 172:18	requirements 31:10 44:6,13,17 45:6,10,19 46:3 46:18 47:5 48:14 50:25 51:9 54:23 55:8 101:20 105:5 125:3	
remove 177:16	representation 43:7 147:22 170:5,9 192:14 195:7	requires 176:20	
renegotiations 75:21		requiring 195:14	
repeat 21:17 22:2 39:3 79:10 85:25 86:1 93:13 109:4 110:21 140:13 140:15 143:2 145:2 159:1 193:9	reserve 58:18 116:6	reserving 157:24	responsible 93:15 122:8,12 122:18 123:5 146:15,22
rephrase 134:20	representations 187:22	resides 104:14	rest 161:25 165:4
report 18:12,19 18:22 31:16 32:5,9,18,20,21 33:11 34:6,11,15 43:12 54:25	representative 34:9	resolution 170:19 198:3,11	restated 157:17
	represented 118:24 185:19 195:1	resolve 200:5	restriction 108:25
	representing 10:25 55:12 154:8 183:9	resolved 126:14 152:6	result 24:8
	request 108:11 108:13 113:9 132:24 133:25	resources 33:5 33:17,18 124:3 127:9	resulted 59:20 70:7
		respect 42:18 55:15,23 56:8 62:11 66:11,12 66:16 70:2,14	results 34:12

resume 80:12 121:7 169:11 186:11 resuming 169:24 retail 14:22 102:24 105:23 106:2 retained 128:24 return 49:15 135:22,23 137:15 returned 49:14 135:25 137:12 204:19 returning 17:8 reveal 30:5 43:6 92:6 93:6,22 97:13 138:6 145:16 149:14 156:5 157:21 159:8 162:24 163:19 165:14 revealed 95:20 reveals 98:9 113:7 142:21 143:4 revelation 96:20 reverse 168:22 182:4 review 34:6 51:6 83:13,15 120:4 128:10 132:20 132:23 133:16 150:3 201:2,6 204:13 205:1 206:1 reviewed 101:14 106:21 149:9	revising 142:11 rhiannon 4:5 12:6 richards 50:21 rico 188:17 rider 57:23 132:20 140:21 right 16:11 21:7 24:20 30:17 38:25 40:20 62:1 70:13 74:25 87:7 100:14 116:25 123:12 129:11 130:4,17 132:11 134:9 151:5 154:23 159:3 160:21 165:19 173:4,20 183:13 186:16 189:14 192:6 195:22 rights 184:2 risk 14:15 rodman 23:22 role 19:13 27:24 31:22 32:8 42:6 42:11,15,19 43:9 44:7 48:7,22 62:10,17 82:20 83:23 84:7,11 85:9,11 86:6,11 90:20 91:22 94:12 119:16 178:17 room 8:14 9:8 52:15 158:23 170:18	round 78:2,10 route 113:18 ruffner 18:7,17 18:19 19:3 95:12,25 96:15 ruled 37:18 112:16 171:10 180:8 rules 8:3 21:6,8 48:18 59:9 79:20 109:23 110:9 119:2 134:12 156:3 201:3,7 205:5 206:5 ruling 63:12,16 63:20 64:23 66:10,15,19 67:1 68:11 69:18,20 69:24 70:14 71:19 72:11 81:1 89:2 114:25 115:6,7 162:12 168:10 168:22 169:2 171:25 172:18 173:10 176:17 176:19 177:21 180:14,16 182:5 182:15,20 185:23 186:2,7 188:19 189:14 190:4,5,11,12,13 190:15 191:2,23 191:23 192:7,16 192:20 193:19 193:22 194:12 195:11,13 197:9	199:7 rulings 69:13 188:20 190:17 195:15,17 199:15,18 run 128:15,22 180:17 ryan 3:4 9:2 38:12 57:17
s			
s 17:15 204:16 206:8,8 207:3 safe 101:13 safeguards 105:4,12 sage 44:20 101:2 sam 28:5 172:9 172:21 satisfied 91:12 satisfy 135:7 sauer 2:17 9:16 9:16 save 116:3 saved 129:1 saying 46:9 47:3 52:24 72:24 73:2 194:15 195:22 says 40:11 73:4 87:13 96:7 185:24 scenario 135:9 schedule 197:4 school 13:2,4 15:2 scope 28:8 35:20 37:23 41:22,24			

51:23,24 54:13 55:1,11,15 57:5 61:11 75:3 79:21 82:3,18 85:14,24 86:8 87:11 92:1 93:12 95:16,17 96:3,18 97:11,22 97:24 98:6,7,20 98:21 99:11 108:11 140:23 142:13 144:11 144:13,19 145:6 145:8 157:23 159:10 160:21 160:23 172:1 173:1 182:21,22 186:23 197:24 scout's 143:20 scratch 101:22 screen 106:10 scroll 106:17,18 seal 203:6 205:15 206:21 search 63:3 102:10 sec 86:23 89:3 second 61:5 78:2 78:10 106:8 162:5 164:25 175:21 secret 175:23 180:18,20 182:3 183:1 secretary 13:15 secretive 166:13 secrets 166:17	section 124:5 144:16,17 147:20 securities 33:22 185:4,10 security 22:16 23:1,5 33:21 see 24:2 27:21 45:4 53:23 54:1 100:15,18 106:10 121:11 154:8 177:17 178:5 182:2 197:9 seek 167:14 seeking 192:19 send 118:7 127:10 131:5 sense 46:5 66:5 114:2 116:5 194:17 sensitive 113:24 sent 32:4 125:14 127:3,8 131:9 separate 47:4,5 60:19,21 124:5 separated 85:6 95:12,14 96:1,8 96:25 separately 26:22 separation 20:22 20:25 21:6 23:24 24:1,11 29:18,22 30:13 30:19,24 31:10 36:18,22 41:7 42:2,10,20,24 43:1,3,11,19	44:6,9,12,17,21 45:5,10,20 46:3 46:4,8,16,18 47:4 48:14,18 49:20 50:25 51:9 53:17,19 54:22 55:8 58:9 59:15,23 71:13 76:2 78:14 79:1 79:6,13,20 82:4 82:21,23 83:7,12 83:19,24 84:6,10 86:14,19,21 87:15,18 88:1 90:22 93:25 94:17 97:17,19 101:9,19,24 105:5,22 106:4 107:16,19 109:23 110:9 123:11,19 124:1 124:15 125:2 126:7 129:10,14 131:4,24 132:1,3 132:21 133:1,3 134:11,15 135:12 136:20 136:22,24 137:5 137:23 138:3 139:4,15,19,24 142:1 146:18,25 149:12,20 150:1 150:8,11,21 151:8,25 156:3 160:21,23 161:3 172:7 174:18,21 174:23 175:3 186:24 187:3	191:7 192:1,3 series 54:15 88:10 172:2 serious 62:24 serve 83:17 147:10 served 14:6 23:9 32:8 83:2 122:3 147:8 152:16 service 102:13 102:24,25 104:20,23,24 105:7 108:1 109:21 110:4,6 118:21 119:6,8 119:11,15 services 81:21 82:13 102:4,6,18 102:23,25 103:1 103:9 104:4 105:18 107:20 108:6,10,17,22 109:3 110:14 155:16,22 178:21 session 65:18 66:1,3,25 80:19 81:4 99:21,23 100:1,5,8 112:3 112:12 113:10 113:15 114:6,16 115:5,10 116:3,5 116:7,22 118:7,8 121:8,10,14 153:22,25 154:2 157:14 158:1 159:13 161:14 161:17,18,24,25
---	---	---	---

162:6,10,21 164:21 165:6,9 165:12 168:2,5 168:24 169:5,9 169:12,13,25 170:12,14 171:4 171:5,8,10,13 173:5,13,15 175:23 176:5,8 177:13 180:20 183:20 185:2 186:20 188:5 189:1,2,5,13 190:25 191:1,15 191:17,17 196:1 196:11 198:13 199:6,16,19,21 set 27:8 65:6 179:14,15 185:22 203:6 setting 24:19 191:16 settlement 23:18 24:6,14 27:6,9 27:16,24 28:15 28:22 29:2 56:1 59:3,6,19 61:15 67:12 seventh 2:20 6:14 sfa 26:20,25 61:16,17 67:12 73:3 74:17 76:15 111:22 112:3,11 113:4 116:19 117:3 shadows 166:18	shaffer 4:6 11:1 share 183:10 shared 163:19 shareholder 168:16 sharing 107:14 sheet 204:14 206:7,10,18 207:1 shepherd 4:8 11:2 short 54:7 showed 128:2 shown 204:17 side 38:2 69:19 69:22 70:6,18,18 71:11,15,15,18 72:3,4,8,21,24 73:10,14,17 81:6 175:15 sign 97:19 120:6 120:8,11 signature 35:6 201:5 203:13 204:15 signed 56:12 173:7,17 178:22 183:21 184:11 205:13 206:18 signet 14:12 17:13 significant 182:21 signing 204:20 similar 117:1 191:21 simple 116:11	simply 57:12 62:16 111:23 143:11 192:8 sincerely 204:22 single 61:6 sir 26:19 193:2 204:11 sitting 31:11 109:24 120:21 122:23 129:20 140:3 161:7 situation 134:3 197:21 skadden 2:4 8:18,21,23 skadden.com 2:12 slate 2:4 slight 161:20 small 189:22 smart 104:8 software 148:15 solutions 60:10 204:1 207:1 somebody 49:19 150:7 151:18 somewhat 76:5 soon 189:9,12 sorry 16:3 21:16 23:22 32:10 39:2 46:11 47:12 68:13 70:11 79:8 114:12 122:11 123:8 127:24 134:21 136:6,18 137:1 138:8 142:23 143:7	146:20 159:4 165:2 191:9 193:8 195:19 sort 77:12 175:13 190:15 sought 174:24 sounds 16:4 25:17 26:17 100:9 115:12 source 140:10,16 south 5:6 southern 188:15 speak 10:7,12,13 41:11 45:4 55:22 58:17 59:5 100:10 172:23 173:23 174:1 177:8 183:15 186:13 speaking 163:18 speaks 96:11 165:3 special 96:13 specific 24:24 66:24 67:7,25 69:25 73:16 78:1 79:5 85:16 90:10 101:24 107:16 112:5 134:6 139:17 157:3 188:17 specifically 64:17 75:7 78:14 83:9 120:10 133:6 134:4 144:6 186:18 187:3
--	---	--	---

specifics 108:13 120:22 specified 202:21 speculate 146:7 speculation 150:24 spell 17:14 164:10 spelled 164:12 spencer 1:24 202:6 203:14 spending 142:17 143:14 spoken 77:6 spring 13:21 ss 202:3 st 78:9 staff 11:1,2 stage 27:9 stakeholder 131:12 stakeholders 131:2 stand 195:14 standards 45:2,7 45:8,22 47:6 standing 68:21 standpoint 199:4 stands 190:13 192:16 197:10 start 170:15 171:5 started 12:12 13:3 17:25 54:15 121:14 154:3 168:3 starting 168:1	state 2:19 6:5 13:8,11,14 15:25 16:14,16,19 17:10,10 18:12 19:5,7,17,22 23:11 89:18 147:6 191:20 202:2,7 203:15 205:10 206:15 stated 59:18 89:7 125:9 177:1 190:16 statement 75:7 163:16 164:24 165:1,11 170:4 170:20 175:18 178:22 191:13 205:13,14 206:19,19 statements 58:16 states 16:21,22 39:6,9 40:15,16 74:9 182:11 188:14 stating 25:20 168:11 statute 37:25 73:8,9 75:1,4 188:17 stay 15:21 62:25 69:24 70:15 71:6,14 73:4 74:10,18 75:2,5 75:17 77:5,15 169:5 182:18 stayed 25:2 61:13 70:21 71:5 72:10	76:14,19 172:16 stenotypy 202:14 step 34:4 191:11 192:15 stepped 164:3,5 steven 155:10 stinson 5:5 7:10 11:11,12 154:1,6 154:7 157:15 158:21 159:3,19 160:2,22 161:9 176:14,15 stop 25:8 107:14 179:1 story 175:15 straub 155:10 156:11,21 streamline 111:21 street 2:19 4:9 4:20 5:6 6:5,14 strike 29:6 33:12 44:25 108:14 194:12 strongly 146:8 158:10 struck 188:3 structured 148:16 struggle 143:18 study 30:23 stuff 26:25 subject 25:21,25 28:8 35:20 52:18 55:25 56:4 57:4 61:17 61:24 62:6,20	63:1,5 64:23 75:5 174:11 180:7 183:5 192:23 193:13 submit 113:18 126:25 subpoena 12:18 72:15 subscribed 205:10 206:14 207:21 subsidiaries 141:6,9 subsidiary 141:10 144:4 subsidies 50:8 50:12 substance 58:6 61:7,10,16 63:19 70:17 138:23 139:10 142:8 174:14 substantive 198:10 199:22 succeeded 18:5 suggest 58:18 115:22 118:2,7 suggested 139:3 182:9 suggesting 139:14 suggestion 169:8 suite 2:9 4:21 5:23 6:6,15 204:2 suites 1:20 summit 123:4
---	--	--	--

superior 204:1 supervise 19:12 20:2 supervised 23:14 49:20 supervisor 15:9 20:6 supervisory 23:3 supply 5:11 105:23 106:2 support 59:25 144:10,23 145:4 supported 132:14 supposed 28:9 sure 8:17 13:9 13:12 14:25 18:20 22:12 23:10 27:2 37:17 44:8 48:24 51:3,7 52:15 65:3 77:12 87:3 91:2 103:6 112:4 127:17 143:11 145:10 146:17 149:5,11 156:16 157:18 163:14 175:16 191:12 194:19 sustainability 24:7 25:15 26:4 28:15 36:10 38:4 51:12 52:8 54:17 55:3,24 56:16 57:9 60:9 71:24 72:5,19 80:14 111:14,22	162:19 168:13 168:16 172:9,22 178:10 187:1,11 193:1,15 suvon 155:8 switched 13:8 sworn 8:4 202:10 205:10 205:13 206:14 206:18 207:21 system 47:10,13 47:14,15 123:17 124:8 125:16 127:21 129:2,16 130:10 148:9 t t 17:15 table 8:13 79:7 143:20 194:17 tables 143:23 tail 79:9 tailored 79:5,13 94:17 187:2,8 take 16:13 17:7 34:10 53:2 54:6 63:10 67:1 78:2 78:4 94:11 99:16 100:6 106:12 115:16 117:20 118:10 132:12 165:25 179:11 180:12 183:8 185:4,6 186:5 taken 1:20 12:18 14:1 16:5 35:1 48:5 54:8 63:14	78:7 99:18 106:9 121:12 186:15 202:20 talk 59:4 115:25 116:9,10 talked 48:7 115:3 130:25 talking 27:6 53:14,16 69:7 75:22 76:1 109:12,13 136:21 140:9 148:11 151:18 160:3 180:19 tangentially 75:24 target 52:18 177:25 targeted 78:23 team 46:15,20 46:21 48:4 teed 198:2 tell 10:3 12:24 23:23 31:12 52:4 122:16 133:22 152:10 163:22,25 165:17,24 telling 14:2 tend 78:11 tenure 35:4 41:25 44:3 90:13 94:22 95:4 term 89:22 102:12,15 155:24	terminate 136:4 165:7 terminated 136:25 137:4 termination 136:3,12 137:7 172:6 terms 173:1 183:25 184:12 188:3 terrible 16:4 testify 90:10 153:12,15 202:11 testimony 181:8 197:5 202:13,17 205:6,7 206:6,9 206:12 text 56:18 57:10 62:5 158:7,14 159:20 thank 10:6,14 11:4,25 12:15 27:4 30:7 54:9 55:13 57:20 60:4 61:13 63:9 63:12,18 68:22 74:1,2 77:24 78:6 80:2,4,6,7 80:11 100:14 121:4,23 126:4 143:6 145:2 153:8,17,19 161:11 171:18 171:19 173:22 176:13,22 185:12 186:4,14 188:2 190:9,22
---	--	---	--

192:21 196:18 196:23 197:15 198:24 199:12 199:24 200:6,7,9 thanks 63:13 161:12 197:2 theory 54:20 thick 194:22 195:21 thing 8:9 67:9 184:16 194:3 things 60:18 79:14 111:21 112:6 115:3,20 158:19 182:8 191:5 think 19:11 20:1 22:5 25:17 26:9 27:3 30:3 40:8 40:15 41:8 46:25 50:5 53:3 53:4 59:13 60:1 61:8,24 65:15 66:5,18 69:11 70:22 71:4,6,10 71:13 73:5 75:5 75:13,25 76:18 77:11 80:23 96:15 98:24 99:5 101:13 103:5 111:25 112:5,25 113:14 114:1,14,23 115:2,11,19 117:22 118:3 119:22 121:5,15 140:1 143:9 144:2,21 145:18	146:9 147:3 151:13,14 153:20 154:3 157:2 158:24 159:20,23,25 161:4,5,12 164:10 170:24 175:4,10,14,18 175:20,21 176:5 176:9 187:14 192:12,22 193:21 third 5:6 32:4 125:5,9,22,24 126:3 127:25 129:16 130:6,10 130:14 131:3,8 131:22 132:22 133:5,15 134:19 134:24 135:11 144:23 145:4 195:8 thirty 134:13 204:19 thomas 4:3 thomas.lindgren 4:13 thorough 34:7 thought 77:14 80:17 136:7 thoughts 117:1 thousands 62:3 62:4 three 103:15,23 140:2 154:24 155:12 156:1 threshold 64:7	ties 82:3 time 14:8,11 17:23,24 22:11 23:9,14,17 25:2 27:15 30:4 32:8 35:10 42:4,25 44:22 48:11,20 49:9 56:7 59:17 65:14 68:14 81:15 83:1,2,4 84:7,11,23,23 85:1,4 92:12 93:2,15 98:11,12 100:16 108:4 115:24,24 116:3 117:21 118:14 118:15 120:18 122:3 123:16 127:6,14 129:6 131:7,20 132:13 134:9,11 137:4 137:13,21 138:15 139:25 147:25 151:4,5,6 152:10,12 153:12,15,17 154:15,18,23 161:8 165:24 169:24 170:14 173:9 182:25 187:16 202:20 timeframe 136:15 157:7 160:6 times 107:15 timing 185:18,19 title 16:18 18:20 23:10 48:9 83:8	83:17 147:8,10 155:18,23 titled 106:14 today 8:10 9:24 12:16 31:11 64:13 69:13 109:25 111:17 118:5 120:21 122:23 129:5,20 130:7 140:4 153:11,15 161:8 171:25 173:10 182:5 188:18,20 198:9 today's 161:22 told 52:12 111:13 165:15 168:9 181:25 toledo 1:8 9:6 204:7 205:3 206:3 tom 4:8 10:24 11:2 53:24 tone 40:12 41:1 88:8 89:8,22,25 90:5 96:9 tony 82:8 top 17:18 31:19 40:13 41:1 83:20 88:8 89:8 89:23 96:9 topic 20:24 42:17 58:19 62:14 72:10 180:23 189:20 189:23,25 194:4 topics 52:9,25 77:4 172:6,16
--	---	--	---

177:25 182:19 183:4 184:20,22 185:6,7 187:3,14 193:18 194:15 touched 111:4 track 140:10,16 tracking 122:9 123:15 124:8 125:15 133:2 134:23 trading 31:17 trained 147:4 training 20:18 31:17 44:5,8,10 44:11,12,16 46:1 46:9,10,12,25 47:2,4,6,9,11 48:1,5,6 51:5 84:2,19,21,22 124:20 trainings 84:23 transaction 24:24 transactions 21:3,13 26:2,4 26:24 transcribed 167:17 202:16 205:7 transcript 7:1 81:8 113:19 118:6 171:12 176:13 177:16 188:21 189:15 195:13,24 199:10,23 201:3 201:6 204:12,13 205:5,12 206:5	206:11,17 transcription 202:17 transcripts 198:20 transferred 199:9 transparency 176:20 189:3 transparent 176:19 179:13 tread 64:25 76:6 tree 104:15 trent 6:21,24 12:9 tried 168:20 trouble 100:11 158:22 true 162:1 202:16 truth 202:11,11 202:12 try 10:13 75:14 76:6 90:1 100:18,20,22 112:24 182:4 trying 24:13 25:1 63:2,6 67:2 67:5 68:6 69:9 72:1,7 180:17 185:15 194:2,11 194:19 197:6 turn 49:23 70:9 99:22 121:17 twenty 4:10 99:25 two 173:23 185:5 198:16	type 105:12 117:23 132:5 174:23 185:9 types 189:6 typically 103:1 134:6 135:2 u ultimately 120:5 120:8 122:8 umbrella 104:5 unaware 144:4 unc 1:13 12:20 underlie 26:3 underlying 63:7 73:22 75:5 187:4,10 understand 15:1 40:5,17,20,24 61:21 66:14 67:6 89:10 96:10 126:23 136:10 143:16 144:15 179:2 199:7 understanding 20:13 40:19 41:18 45:13 66:10 90:9 95:13,25 96:14 104:22 120:17 120:20,21 135:14 141:11 141:14 152:24 157:24 159:11 172:15 190:24 191:2,15 193:19	understood 115:4 undertake 120:14 undue 60:14 unethical 90:13 unfair 165:3 185:8 unfairly 173:19 unit 147:4,5 united 39:9 182:11 188:14 university 13:3 unregulated 141:12 unrelated 172:7 174:17 unstaffed 46:23 updated 75:2 uphold 85:22 upper 90:5 use 78:12 109:10 109:18 117:24 130:13,19 166:4 196:16 users 6:2 utilities 1:1 9:22 19:23 22:7,15,25 24:9 29:16,16,17 42:3 43:4,18 46:2 55:4 59:22 60:12 70:8 71:25 72:5 78:18 82:24 84:15 98:4 101:10,15 103:15 106:5 107:25 108:9
--	--	--	--

109:13 155:4,12 156:2,8 160:24 178:18 utility 6:19 12:10 102:19 103:23,25 104:20,21 105:4 105:16,19 108:6 108:12,17 109:19 110:3,15 117:2 118:21 119:5,12 137:22 154:25 156:13 156:19 160:25 179:9,10 utility's 110:13 111:6 utilizes 130:22 utmost 39:7 55:18 75:9 185:24	125:24 129:16 130:14 131:23 132:22 133:5 135:11 vendor's 126:3 134:14 veritext 204:1,8 207:1 veritext.com. 204:18 vern 53:25 versa 50:12 version 130:16 130:18,22 vespoli 18:1 vice 14:14 50:12 155:20 view 57:3 113:24 189:6 violate 145:11 violated 70:5 73:9,15,20 156:2 violation 24:11 37:25 55:7 59:15,23 69:18 70:2,4 74:14,22 75:4 78:23 94:8 106:4 107:16 151:9 152:1 174:21 violations 36:22 54:23 78:13 91:24 123:18 142:2 voluntarily 184:8 voted 117:2	w w 4:18 wacker 2:8 wait 58:17 164:25 waited 180:13 182:10 waive 85:18 113:12 waived 158:9,11 158:20 159:18 204:20 waiver 158:15 wallace 6:3 11:21 want 16:8 29:4 37:6,16 39:17 42:16,17,22 58:18,20 60:17 61:1,3 67:5 82:20 84:25 90:21 91:3 99:22 100:1 103:6 104:1 111:14 112:21 114:24 115:17 116:9,10 117:12 145:2 153:24 154:11 161:16 165:10 166:15 167:9,22 169:20 171:22 173:23 177:10,11 178:25 179:24 185:13 189:22 wanted 66:14 79:12 164:12 171:19 179:13	190:3 193:11 198:11 wants 109:14 warrant 63:4 warranty 102:5 washington 13:3 way 26:22 37:5 52:12 57:4 65:23 71:18 102:21 118:11 131:12 150:15 153:15 166:18 175:16 184:15 we've 57:11 62:3 62:8 79:22 90:9 100:16 179:17 192:13 website 131:18 week 137:14 weeks 137:18 weigh 58:22 74:2 198:19 weight 194:25 went 13:13 15:24 73:8 79:22 127:18 170:25,25 werner 4:4 10:24 whereof 203:5 whitt 106:2 wholly 174:16 wide 77:7 willis 2:16 8:9 37:15 38:8,12,18 38:21,25 53:1,10 67:19,22 69:15 69:25 70:1 73:7
v			
v 204:7 205:3 206:3 vague 19:25 23:6 109:11 variety 46:6 48:23 122:20 various 119:11 120:15 123:6 124:20,22 132:14,15 188:22 vending 146:16 146:17,23 vendor 32:4 35:14 125:5,10			

73:24 77:17 78:15 80:2 81:9 112:14,20 114:11,13,19 115:6,11,17 158:5,13 163:4 163:14 164:14 166:9 167:3,13 177:7,18 190:10 194:7,24 195:10 wills 177:17 winston 33:7 wire 178:21 wish 200:2 withdraw 161:6 withdrew 161:9 witness 26:13 28:18 30:7 39:22 52:3,7,17 52:19 55:12 57:13 59:11,16 60:2 61:2 87:21 88:20 89:17 90:17,19 91:19 93:5 94:3,19 95:22 96:22 104:3 109:14 113:6 116:15,16 116:21 117:15 142:20 143:3 145:14 146:6,9 149:14 157:19 159:7 163:11,13 168:12 171:7 174:10,25 197:25 201:2 202:9,14,15,18 203:5 204:9,12	205:1,4,11 206:1 206:4,15 witnesses 179:16 181:3,9 185:17 197:7 witness' 204:15 wondering 55:9 197:8 word 90:2 167:11 185:13 worded 131:11 words 45:7 166:4 work 13:8,10,12 13:14 14:12 15:20,25,25 16:17 41:2 46:23 114:23 115:3 worked 15:2 17:22 19:13 29:9 44:22 46:25 48:11 86:15,17 93:2 working 49:9 109:24 120:18 135:15 worried 183:6 worst 38:10 writing 34:20 107:2 125:1 written 32:23 73:12 126:18,21 126:24 127:1,3,6 127:10 190:5 wrong 41:20 96:16	wygonski 4:19 11:7 y year 13:5 14:4 16:1 22:20 years 13:9 24:4 75:23 140:2,2 yeboah 1:17 7:6 8:1,19 10:10 12:13,15 29:7 54:12 56:19 100:12 121:19 154:5 180:6 202:10 204:9 205:4,9 206:4,13 207:20 yost 188:16 z zoom 165:7
--	--	---

Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure

Title V. Discovery

Rule 30

(e) Submission to Witness; Changes; Signing.

When the testimony is fully transcribed, the deposition shall be submitted to the witness for examination and shall be read to or by the witness, unless examination and reading are waived by the witness and by the parties. Any changes in form or substance that the witness desires to make shall be entered upon the deposition by the officer with a statement of the reasons given by the witness for making them. The deposition shall then be signed by the witness, unless the parties by stipulation waive the signing or the witness is ill, cannot be found, or refuses to sign. The witness shall have thirty days from submission of the deposition to the witness to review and sign the deposition. If the deposition is taken within thirty days of a trial or hearing, the witness shall have seven days from submission of the deposition to the witness to review and sign the deposition. If the trial or hearing is scheduled to commence less than seven days before the deposition is submitted to the witness, the court may establish a deadline for the

witness to review and sign the deposition. If the deposition is not signed by the witness during the period prescribed in this division, the officer shall sign it and state on the record the fact of the waiver or of the illness or absence of the witness or the fact of the refusal to sign together with the reason, if any, given therefor; and the deposition may then be used as fully as though signed, unless on a motion to suppress the court holds that the reasons given for the refusal to sign require rejection of the deposition in whole or in part.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING CIVIL PROCEDURE RULES ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1, 2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE STATE RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS
COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.

**This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on**

8/1/2022 6:32:25 PM

in

Case No(s). 17-0974-EL-UNC

Summary: Memorandum Contra Application Interlocutory Appeal, Request for Certification to the PUCO Commissioners, and Application for Review by Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel, Ohio Manufacturers' Association Energy Group, Interstate Gas Supply, Inc., and Northeast Ohio Public Energy Council electronically filed by Ms. Marcella Lape on behalf of Yeboah-Amankwah, Ebony