RECEIVED PUBLIC SERVICE

1 STATE OF NEW YORK PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 3 In the Matter 4 -of-5 6 7 Corporation for Gas Service. 8 9 10 11 12 13 10:30 a.m. 14 PRESIDING: 15 16 ELIZABETH LIEBSCHUTZ 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

2005 JUN -2 AM 9: 19 Case 04-G-1047 - Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Rates, Charges, Rules and Regulations of National Fuel Gas Distribution 3rd Floor Hearing Room Public Service Commission Agency Building Three Albany, New York Tuesday, May 24, 2005 DISK **ENCLOSED** Administrative Law Judge

| 1 | APPEARANCES: |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | For National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation: |
| 4 | Michael W. Reville, Deputy General Counsel National Fuel |
| 5 | 6363 Main Street Williamsville, New York 14221-5887 |
| 6 | |
| 7 | Bruce V. Miller, Esq. Saul Ewing LLP One Riverfront Plaza |
| 8 | Newark, New Jersey 07102 |
| 9 | |
| 10 | For NYS Public Service Commission: |
| 11 | Justyn P. Bates, Esq. Peter Catalano, Esq. NYS Department of Public Service |
| 12 | 3 Empire State Plaza |
| 13 | Albany, New York 12223-1350 |
| 14 | For the Consumer Protection Board: |
| 15 | John Walters, Esq. Consumer Protection Board |
| 16 | 5 Empire State Plaza Albany, New York 12223 |
| 17 | For the Small Customer Marketer Coalition: |
| 18 | Usher Fogel, Esq. 557 Central Avenue |
| 19 | Suite 4A |
| 20 | Cedarhurst, New York 11516 |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

| 1 | For NYSEG: |
|----|--|
| 2 | Scott J. Mueller, Esq. LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene & MacRae |
| 3 | 280 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110-3173 |
| 4 | Jeffrey A. Rosenbloom, Senior Attorney |
| 5 | NYSEG RGE 89 East Avenue |
| 6 | Rochester, New York 14649-0001 |
| 7 | For Multiple Intervenors: |
| 8 | Michael B. Mager, Esq. Moshe H. Bonder, Esq. |
| 9 | Couch White 540 Broadway |
| 10 | PO Box 22222 Albany, New York 12201 |
| 11 | For Public Utility Law Project: |
| 12 | - |
| 13 | Ben Wiles, Senior Attorney 90 State Street |
| 14 | Suite 601 Albany, New York 12207 |
| 15 | For Energetix: |
| 16 | Robert J. Hobday, Managing Director Energetix |
| 17 | 755 Brooks Avenue Rochester, New York 14619 |
| 18 | ROULDSOL, NOW TOLK THOLY |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Good morning. I call case 04-G-1047, Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Rates, Charges, Rules and Regulations of National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation for Gas Service.

We are here pursuant to a notice issued May 9, 2005 setting today as the date for evidentiary hearings in this proceeding.

I note that a substantial number of the parties have submitted a Joint Proposal in this case, and as a consequence we are following a procedure to allow for that Joint Proposal and not engaging in full blown evidentiary hearings today. We will mainly be admitting exhibits on to the record today, and I may have a few limited questions for witnesses today.

Let's begin by taking appearances, please.

MR. MILLER: For National Fuel Gas

Distribution Corporation, Bruce V. Miller and

Michael W. Reville, and with us Eric Meinl,

general manager of the rates and regulatory

affairs department, who will answer the judge's

questions.

MR. WALTERS: Consumer Protection Board,
John Walters.

| 1 | MR. BATES: For the Department of Public |
|----|--|
| 2 | Service Staff, Justyn P. Bates, staff counsel. |
| 3 | With me is Peter Catalano, staff counsel, Linda |
| 4 | Horlbeck, John Sano and Alan Mostek. |
| 5 | MR. FOGEL: On behalf of Small Customer |
| 6 | Marketer Coalition, Usher Fogel. |
| 7 | MR. WILES: Ben Wiles on behalf of the |
| 8 | Public Utility Law Project. |
| 9 | MR. MAGER: On behalf of Multiple |
| 10 | Intervenors, the law firm of Couch White by |
| 11 | Michael Mager and Moshe Bonder. |
| 12 | MR. MUELLER: On behalf of New York State |
| 13 | Electric and Gas Corporation and Rochester Gas |
| 14 | and Electric Corporation, Jeffrey A. Rosenbloom |
| 15 | and Scott Mueller. |
| 16 | MR. HOBDAY: Robert Hobday, Managing |
| 17 | Director of Energetix, Inc. |
| 18 | JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Is there anyone else who |
| 19 | wants to enter an appearance this morning? |
| 20 | MR. BATES: One extra staff. That's Michael |
| 21 | Saloney and also Leonard Silverstein. |
| 22 | JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Very good. Thank you. |
| 23 | Let's begin actually with the admission as |
| 24 | exhibits into the record of the prefiled |
| 25 | testimony that was submitted in this proceeding. |

As we have discussed in various procedural conference calls with the parties, the understanding here is that this particular material is being admitted as an exhibit or as a series of exhibits. It is not considered sworn testimony. It does not necessarily represent the testimony that would be given by the witnesses or adopted by the parties if they were testifying here today.

Rather, it's evidence of the initially filed presentations of the parties, and as such, forms the backdrop against which settlement negotiations took place in this proceeding.

If we could begin with the company, please, since obviously the company initially filed testimony.

Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: One other point. This settlement, this Joint Proposal, has the provision that provides if the Commission were to disapprove it or disapprove it in large part, parties could go back to litigation.

And my understanding, based on what your

Honor says, is that no party would be deemed to

have foregone their right to cross-examine or

any other procedural rights if we end up back into litigation as a result of the exercise of that provision were the Commission not to approve or disapprove substantial portions of the Joint Proposal.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: That is correct.

MR. MILLER: We have a number of different volumes the company put in with its initial filing testimony and exhibits. We then made a supplemental filing and also have a rebuttal filing.

I guess because we are going first, it might make sense to put all those volumes into the record instead of waiting for our rebuttal to go after other parties.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Actually I guess I would prefer we keep it in strict chronological order, so that if perhaps Exhibit 1 could represent your initial filing, if that's amenable to you, followed by a separately numbered exhibit for the supplemental.

MR. MILLER: Then we have three volumes.

The first volume is the testimony that was filed with the case, and then we have volume II and volume III, which were the exhibits that were

filed initially.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Okay, so, let's mark those as Exhibit 1 collectively consisting of three volumes. The first volume representing prefiled testimony and the second and third volumes representing prefiled exhibits accompanying that testimony.

I should note this was all prefiled on August 26th, I think.

(Exhibit 1 marked for identification.)

MR. CATALANO: 27th, your Honor.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: 27th, thank you, 2004.

And then the next exhibit, I think Mr.

Miller, would be supplemental testimony.

MR. MILLER: Yes. We filed the supplemental in response to the Commission's policy statements.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Do you have the date of that filing?

MR. MILLER: We are checking, your Honor. The policy statements came out August 25th.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: It's not essential if no one has it. I confess I have rearranged all of mine, as apparently everyone else has as well.

We will leave it that Exhibit 2 represents

19 20 21

22

23

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

in response to the Commission's retail markets
policy statement.

(Exhibit 2 marked for identification.)

Mr. Miller, this is a single volume?

MR. MILLER: Single volume contains the testimony of three witnesses, all prefiled, and exhibits.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: And actually it might help to--that was the testimony of Mr. Meinl.

MR. MILLER: Ms. Friedrich-Alf and Mr. Heine.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: I think, then, if we continue to proceed chronologically, then we move to the staff and the intervenors who prefiled testimony in December of 2004 in response to these filings by the company.

Mr. Bates.

MR. BATES: Thank you, Your Honor.

Your Honor, the Department of Public Service staff also prefiled the testimony on December 31st. It's a collection of an exhibit, which I would represent is the collection of staff testimony and exhibits.

Would it be helpful if I ran--it's not a

single bound volume, would it be helpful if I identified the different portions?

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: If you would identify the witnesses whose testimony and exhibits make up the exhibit and the order that you intend to present them that would be helpful.

MR. BATES: First, there is prepared testimony of Steven D. Blaney, Christopher R. Stolicky and Richard T. Lepkowski.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: That's joint testimony as a panel?

MR. BATES: That's joint testimony as a panel. That was offered together with exhibits referred to in that prepared testimony, the same names.

Also the prepared testimony of Audrey L.

Capers and exhibits referred to in the prepared testimony of Audrey L. Capers.

For the retail access panel there is the prepared testimony of Paul C. Emerson, Sue Herlands and Lea Ann Rosenthal. Accompanying that testimony is prepared exhibits of the retail access panel, also by Paul Emerson, Sue Herlands and Lea Ann Rosenthal.

Prepared testimony of Gregory R. Luthringer

and the accompanying exhibits referred to in the testimony, prepared testimony, of Gregory R. Luthringer.

There is the prepared testimony of the Consumer Services Panel, which consists of William Mills and Leonard Silverstein.

Accompanying the Consumer Services Panel testimony is the prepared exhibits of the Consumer Services Panel.

It's also the prepared testimony of Alan F.

Mostek and accompanying that testimony is the

exhibits referred to in the prepared testimony

of Alan Mostek. Also the work papers

accompanying staff witness Mostek's testimony.

There is the prepared testimony of Valerica Oreifej. There is the prepared testimony of Sandra D. Reulet, and the exhibits referred to in the prepared testimony of Sandra D. Reulet.

Prepared testimony of Michael Saloney.

There is the prepared testimony of John P. Sano and the exhibits referred to in the prepared testimony of John P. Sano. The prepared testimony of William D. Wade and the prepared exhibits of William D. Wade.

The prepared testimony of Daniel J. Wheeler

and the prepared exhibit of Daniel J. Wheeler.

The prepared testimony of Gerald R. Wojcinski

and prepared exhibits referred to in the

prepared testimony of Gerald R. Wojcinski.

And that completes the filing made by staff on December 31, 2004.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: And the sum total of all those documents will be marked as Exhibit 3.

(Exhibit 3 marked for identification.)

MR. BATES: Thank you, Your Honor. I am handing them up to the reporter now.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Thank you. Mr. Walters.

MR. WALTERS: Your Honor, the CPB will submit as prefiled testimony, also filed on December 31, 2004, the direct testimony and referenced exhibits of Donna M. Deviot and direct testimony and exhibit of Tariq Niazi.

Mr. Niazi is one exhibit with three schedules.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Thank you. That collectively will be marked as Exhibit 4.

(Exhibit 4 marked for identification.)

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Mr. Roland.

MR. ROLAND: On behalf of the Small Customer Marketer Coalition, testimony of one Usher Fogel submitted on December 31, 2004. One document.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: That will be marked as Exhibit 5.

(Exhibit 5 marked for identification.)

Mr. Mager.

MR. MAGER: On behalf of Multiple

Intervenors, the direct testimony of Dr. Alan

Rosenberg. Also includes a separate exhibit of

Dr. Alan Rosenberg.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Dr. Rosenberg's testimony and exhibit will be marked collectively as Exhibit 6.

(Exhibit 6 marked for identification.)

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Is there anyone here on behalf of the National Energy Marketers

Coalition? I believe that that organization also submitted prefiled testimony, which certainly exists in the file room of our agency, but no one is here today to enter it as an exhibit.

Is there anyone else that had--any other intervenor testimony in December of 2004? I think we have it all.

I think we then move to the company's rebuttal filing.

MR. FOGEL: Are you going to reserve an

exhibit for NEMA? I don't know if they knew the testimony would actually be introduced as an exhibit today. It may be worthwhile to reserve the number and a letter can go around to the parties.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Does anyone have a view as to whether we should put that on the record today or not? I think its existence is represented in our agency's files and if they haven't come today to enter it, why, we don't need to go through that today.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Mr. Miller.

MR. MILLER: The next filing that was made was the company's rebuttal testimony and exhibits. They are contained in one volume which I will bring up.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Mr. Miller, we probably should have, just for the benefit of clarity, run through the list of witnesses last time around, but I take some comfort in the fact they are bound in a single volume, but now that I realized I should have done that before.

Maybe I will ask you to run through the names of the witnesses whose testimony and exhibits are contained in the volume you are

Я

holding.

б

MR. MILLER: The rebuttal witnesses were

Bauer, Fiorella, Frank, Friedrich-Alf, Gruchala,

Hanley, Hart, Heine, Meinl, Michalski, Mugel,

Pijacki, Spanos, Sprague, and Truitt.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Thank you. Am I correct to the extent there are exhibits they are also contained together with the testimony in that one volume?

MR. MILLER: Yes. They follow the testimony.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Exhibit 7, representing the company's rebuttal filing in January 2005.

(Exhibit 7 marked for identification.)

Next, I think we just, for the ease of having everything in one place and for the reference of witnesses to the extent anyone is answering questions today, why don't we admit as an exhibit the Joint Proposal that was filed by the parties on April 15, 2005.

We can reserve a number for that. I certainly have an extra copy I can provide to the reporter at a break, but it's understood that the company is going to be providing as Exhibit 8 a copy of the Joint Proposal,

containing all of the signatures obtained to date, together with there is a short supplement or addendum, if you will, that was submitted shortly thereafter, which has also been signed by the proponents of the Joint Proposal, so that the proposal as signed and the supplemental on April 22, 2005 will together represent Exhibit 8.

(Exhibit 8 reserved.)

Next, as we had previously discussed, there is a series of discovery questions, if you will, that were promulgated by me to the parties which have been numbered by the parties as questions ALJ 1 through ALJ 60, and I would like to admit those into the record at this time as exhibits.

I think we can number them each sequentially so that since we are now on Exhibit 9, ALJ 1 would be Exhibit 9 and so forth. I don't know who on behalf of the parties is prepared to submit those.

MR. MILLER: We have those, Your Honor.

MR. MAGER: Are you assigning each interrogatory response a separate exhibit number or are they all collectively 9?

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: I think I would assign

them each a number.

I am not sure we have any additional records or other exhibits a party wanted to proffer here today. I will note for the record that the record, as maintained by the Commission's Secretary, of course also includes the description—I should say at the moment to date—includes the description of opposition filed by NYSEG and RG&E on April 22, 2005, as well as the parties' statements in support or opposition that were filed on May 6, 2005.

That would include statements in support

filed by the Department of Public Service,

National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation,

Multiple Intervenors, New York State Consumer

Protection Board, the Small Customer Marketer

Coalition, as well as a statement of opposition

that was filed jointly by New York State

Electric & Gas and Rochester Gas & Electric

Company jointly.

The opposition of NYSEG and RG&E is currently the subject of a motion filed by the company objecting to the admission of that opposition into the record in this proceeding, which is pending a ruling by me.

Mr. Catalano, was there something you wanted to say?

MR. CATALANO: Yes, Your Honor.

Can I ask you if you will reconsider your decision to number each question sequentially. It's going to make it very difficult for the witnesses to keep track of what we are talking about. The way they have it now, they know what question 46 is and now question 46 is going to be a different number. I think it's going to be a little more difficult than it needs to be.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: You think we should simply acknowledge it going in as Exhibit 9 and refer to them by ALJ number? I think that's workable and probably makes life easier for our reporter. So we will amend the record to note that Exhibit 9 will consist of sequentially numbered responses to questions that I have promulgated to the parties, which have been denominated ALJ 1 and so forth all the way through ALJ 60.

(Exhibit 9 marked for identification.)

MR. WILES: The Public Utility Law Project filed a statement in support and you didn't call it out. I have a copy if I could hand it up.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: I apologize, Mr. Wiles, and for some reason I do not have a copy right before me anyway, so if you have an extra I would happily take it. We don't need to admit it as an exhibit today. Thank you.

I guess it would be helpful if we explain a little bit about Exhibit 9, the responses to my questions. And perhaps someone on behalf of the company can explain.

I gather there is a slightly different procedure that's been followed as to which of these responses represents the consensus response of the proponents of the proposal.

MR. REVILLE: Yes, Your Honor. We had e-mail messages distributed to the parties and to your Honor that described a procedure for development of the first and second set.

We used a procedure that was designed to achieve, as best as we could, consensus on the responses to the questions, and that applied to ALJ numbers 1 through 45.

The numbers 46 through 60, which were distributed yesterday by e-mail, were developed under a slightly different procedure. We have the consensus of company and staff and

2.0

potentially one other party, but we sent those--the responses out to the parties yesterday and asked those parties to reply to the company if there were any objections.

We received only one. We made a modification, so to that extent I suppose we have somewhat of a consensus, but it was not as thorough because of the time constraints as the prior process.

I suppose with the parties here today, if we could poll the parties and see if they have any objection. If there are no objections, we would have a consensus on those as well.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Are there parties here today that have had an opportunity to review the answers that were supplied to ALJ 46 through 60 that are in a position to comment as to whether they have any objection or are comfortable having the consensus of the proponents?

Mr. Mager.

MR. MAGER: Multiple Intervenors reviewed the responses and with one modification, which we requested and the company made, we don't have any objections to any of the responses.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: So am I right the answer

| 1 | that has been submitted as part of Exhibit 9 |
|----|--|
| 2 | already reflects the modification you requested? |
| 3 | MR. MAGER: Yes, it does, Your Honor. |
| 4 | JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Thank you. |
| 5 | Anyone else? |
| 6 | MR. WALTERS: We have no objection to the |
| 7 | submitted amendments. |
| 8 | JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: On behalf of CPB? |
| 9 | MR. WALTERS: Yes. |
| 10 | JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Any of the other |
| 11 | proponents of the Joint Proposal that are in a |
| 12 | position to comment on the responses to those |
| 13 | questions that were submitted? |
| 14 | MR. FOGEL: I am okay with them, Your Honor. |
| 15 | JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: That's Mr. Fogel on |
| 16 | behalf of the Small Customer Marketer Coalition? |
| 17 | MR. FOGEL: Yes. |
| 18 | JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Mr. Wiles, has PULP had |
| 19 | an opportunity to review the answers that were |
| 20 | submitted to ALJ questions 46 through 60? |
| 21 | MR. WILES: Yes. We read them yesterday |
| 22 | afternoon, Your Honor. I have no objection to |
| 23 | the answers. |
| 24 | JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: And Mr. Hobday, do I |
| 25 | understand Energetix is a proponent of the Joint |

| Proposa | al? |
|---------|-----|
|---------|-----|

MR. HOBDAY: We are not.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Very well. We don't have to check with you.

I have just a couple brief follow up questions that I would like to ask regarding ALJ 47, 48 and 49.

I suspect it would be most efficient if I could direct my questions regarding ALJ 47 and 49, initially at least, to a witness on behalf of the company, and then my remaining question may really be more of a legal question to address to the lawyers.

If that's amenable with the company, could you call your witness, please.

MR. MILLER: We call Eric H. Meinl.

ERIC H. MEINL,

after first having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Thank you. Please be seated.

If you would state your name for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: Eric H. Meinl.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Mr. Meinl, if I could

draw your attention to the response to ALJ 47,
which has been marked as part of Exhibit 9.

This question asked for some discussion of the
refund that is being proposed to pass back an
overcollection of state income tax and asked how
that related to the way that the state income
tax was previously collected from customers.

And the second sentence of the answer says that the SIT or state income tax surcharge was collected as a percentage of revenues. And I just want to clarify.

Does that mean, for example, on an individual customer's bill the entire bill consisting of both delivery charges and commodity charges was totaled and then the SIT surcharge was calculated as a total percentage of the bill?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. The SIT surcharge was built into what is referred to in the tariff as the tariff surcharge, which was composed of the GRT piece and the state income tax piece. Those pieces were summed and applied to the total amount of the bill, delivery charge plus gas supply charges, if any.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: It wasn't strictly

volumetric, but the combination of the
components charged as either volumetric charge
or individual charge?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: If I could also turn your attention to the response to ALJ 49 also included as part of Exhibit 9. I had asked about the sort of cost/benefit analysis that a customer might engage in, a large transportation company customer, in deciding whether to take monthly metered service or daily metered service in the company. And I also asked about the costs and benefits to National Fuel Gas Distribution of that choice by the customer.

The bottom of the first page of the response there is a paragraph that begins "This change will not produce additional non-gas cost revenues or delivery rate cost savings for NFG".

Does this change refer to a customer switching from monthly metered service to daily metered service?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: When you say it does not produce additional non-gas cost revenues or delivery rate cost savings, am I right that it

actually would reduce the non-gas cost revenues to the company?

THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor. The company is, in effect, indifferent as far as to what service the customer would choose, because the non-gas cost revenues that the company would collect, assuming that the volume stayed the same, would be the same. All that would change would be the amount of gas cost revenues that the company would collect or avoid.

And since those costs are perfectly matched within our gas adjustment clause or gas reconciliation mechanism, the company is in effect indifferent to what service the customer chooses.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Thank you. As this answer explains, the daily transportation service did not include a charge for balancing; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: It's a lower charge for balancing, Your Honor.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: But there is some balancing charge?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I believe--let me refer you to the exhibit in the JPO.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: I think it would be-
THE WITNESS: I think it's K.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: K, yes. Exhibit K of

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: K, yes. Exhibit K of the Joint Proposal I do have in front of me.

THE WITNESS: There is two sections.

Section two is the determination of the gas cost included in monthly metered rate, and section three is the gas cost that's built into the daily metered rate, in effect, the cost of balancing charges.

And as you can see from that exhibit, the daily metered charges are lower than the monthly metered charges, but there is a small balancing charge associated with daily metered service also.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Okay. Is the company similarly indifferent as to which balancing charge is assessed against the customers in the monthly service versus the daily service?

THE WITNESS: Yes. From the company's perspective, again, it's all treated as gas cost revenue. It has no impact on the earnings of the company, so we would be indifferent.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Okay. Great. Thank you. Those were my only two questions that I wanted

to follow up on.

Is there anyone else here that has any questions for Mr. Meinl? Thank you, then, Mr. Meinl. You may step down.

(Witness excused.)

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: I had also asked of the proponents of the Joint Proposal a question that has been numbered ALJ 48. This question refers to two provisions of the Joint Proposal, one relating to safety and the other relating to service quality.

There are two performance plans in the Joint Proposal and as to both of them the Joint Proposal provides their provisions will extend for a number of years, even if there is an intervening rate case which would result in a Commission Decision.

And I had asked whether those provisions were enforceable and if so how. Clearly the response that is included as part of Exhibit 9 reflects the fact that the parties do not have much of a consensus view on this issue, but I would like to hear I guess at least from the company and from staff and any other proponent who would like to be heard as to your view as to

the legal enforceability of these provisions.

And if you would like to make any policy statement as to the wisdom of these provisions I would be eager to hear it.

Can we hear from the company first.

MR. MILLER: Sure. In the past when a rate plan expired, the provisions such as these would expire with the rate plan, and that was what we were trying to remedy.

The parties were going back and forth as to what would happen on the expiration of the rate plan. That's why these provisions do extend beyond the two year time of the rate plan.

We believe if the Commission adopts the

Joint Proposal that it becomes an Order of the

Commission, and it is the Commission—to the

extent any Order is binding on the Commission,

that Order would be binding on the Commission.

It wouldn't necessarily be ironclad if

conditions changed, but that our view is that if

the Commission adopts that provision of the

settlement with the extension of those terms

that those terms should be in place until their

expiration.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Let me clarify, Mr.

Miller.

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am familiar with provisions of rate plans that might set rates for, let's say, two years, such as this plan does, and have a service quality plan that extends for a longer period of time, such as four or five years or until the next Commission rate case, whichever comes sooner; but in this case the parties have provided that the service quality plans and the safety performance plans will extend for a certain number of years or until the next Commission rate case, whichever comes later, which would suggest if there is a Commission--let's say, for example, there is a full blown litigated National Fuel Gas Distribution Corporation rate case in the year 2008, that the parties by this provision, as I understand it, intend to preclude the parties in that proceeding, and the Commission in that proceeding, from reopening the issue of a safety performance plan or a service quality plan by virtue of what would be contained in an order issued by the Commission in 2005 in this case.

What I am trying to explore is, furthermore,
I think it is unlikely that the Commission would

2.1

want to do such a thing in an order this year in this case. I am a little unclear as why the parties themselves would want to tie their hands in the future as well, so I am looking for some comment on both why the Commission would want to do this or why the parties would want to do this.

MR. MILLER: As to why the parties would want to do it, I think various parties might have varying ideas as to why they agreed to do it. We would view it certainly as being enforcement against—the parties would agree to the extension of these terms or these plans for a definite term. Whether or not it would bind the Commission would be a matter for the Commission and various parties to argue about in the future, and I can see arguments on both sides whether the Commission would be bound or not.

I mean there is a recognition in this
agreement that the Commission retains its right
should circumstances change dramatically to take
action. So, as far as the Commission is
concerned, I am not going to argue the
Commission's case because we often argue against

PAULINE E. WILLIMAN, C.S.R.

the Commission's position. The give and take

was they wanted some period of repose on these

provisions and that's what the parties agreed

to.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Okay. Thank you.

Staff, can you add anything to what the company has said?

MR. BATES: These particular programs and their extension beyond the term of the Joint Proposal is something--is an element of staff's litigated case. I think it's also fair to say that staff recognizes the company has a good--a relatively good history in terms of both of these types of programs, the safety and the service quality program.

In the culmination of the documents, the

Joint Proposal, staff also recognizes it's a

relative term when compared to some other

utilities, and extending these two particular

programs offers the benefit of stability, while

it's also increasing targets I believe under

both programs.

I would let my staff witnesses correct me if
I am making any misstatement there. As far as
whether this binds the Commission, I would agree

with Mr. Miller that that's probably something
that parties would have to argue in the specific
circumstances that could arise in the event
there was a need to amend those programs earlier
than the proposed periods, but we don't perceive
it as necessarily binding upon what the
Commission does in this proceeding or what it
would have to do, but it's difficult to say
without specific factual underpinnings of why
the Commission would need to change it.

MR. CATALANO: Your Honor, we don't see it as tying our hands, your phrase. We see it as providing significant additional benefits to customers that we otherwise wouldn't have for the extension period. So it's something that we want and we think benefits New Yorkers. It's not a question of limiting our discretion, as you seemed to imply.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: My only concern is in the precise situation where there is an intervening proceeding that occurs before the designated expiration of these plans, and it's in that limited circumstance where the parties seem to be--one could argue that perhaps this merely represents a commitment by the parties not to

propose either in litigation or negotiations any changes to these plans, but it further purports to forbid the Commission from tinkering with them, if you will, even in the context of an otherwise fully litigated case on National Fuel Gas Distribution's rates and service, before the expiration of these plans.

MR. CATALANO: Even in that instance the bar is higher than it would otherwise have been, so we stand only to gain and not to lose.

JUDGE LIEBSCHUTZ: Thank you.

Any other party wish to be heard on this question? Seeing none, that concludes the questions that I specifically wanted to address at today's hearing. Is there any other matter that any party wishes to raise this morning? If not, then, thank you all very much for coming and we are adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned.)

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

| 1 | | INDEX OF EXHIBITS | |
|----|---------|--|--------|
| 2 | Exhibit | | Marked |
| 3 | 1 | National Fuel August 2004 Volume I - testimony | |
| 4 | | Volume II - exhibits Volume III - exhibits | 86 |
| 5 | 2 | National Fuel Supplemental Testimony and Exhibits | 87 |
| 7 | 3 | Staff testimony and exhibits | 90 |
| 8 | 4 | Direct testimony and exhibits of Donna M. Devito and | |
| 9 | : | Tariq N. Niazi | 90 |
| 10 | 5 | Direct Testimony of Usher Foge | 1 91 |
| 11 | 6 | Direct Testimony of Dr. Alan Rosenberg | 91 |
| 12 | 7 | National Fuel Rebuttal | |
| 13 | 7 | Testimony and Exhibits | 93 |
| 14 | 8 | Joint Proposal | 94 |
| 15 | 9 | ALJ's requests for information | 96 |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |

| | | | | | | | Co | Hach26 | 71 L | | | | -01 | - Com | 111122101 |
|---|------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|--------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | -of [1] 79: | 4 | | 601 [1] | 81:13 | | 109:3 | | | bar [1] | 111:8 | | 110:11 | 111:8 | |
| | 02110-317 | ⁷ 3 [1] | | 6363 [1] | 80:5 | | agreem | ent [1] | 108:21 | bascdin | 1 | 84:23 | Cedarh | urst [1] | 80:19 |
| | 81:3 | | | 7 [3] | 93:12 | 93:14 | Alan [6] | 83:4 | 89:10 | Bates 19 | - 1 | 80:10 | Centra | | 80:18 |
| | 04-G-1047 | 7 [2] | 79:5 | 112:12 | | | 89:13 | | 91:8 | 83:2 | 83:20 | 87:18 | certain | | 107:11 |
| | 82:2 | | | 755 [1] | 81:17 | | 112:11 | | | 87:19 | 88:7 | 88:12 | certain | | |
|) | 07102[1] | | 80:8 | 8 [4] | 93:25 | 94:8 | Albany | ้เรา | 79:12 | 90:10 | 109:8 | | 93:22 | 1 y [3] | 91:17 |
| | 1 [8] 85: | | 86:3 | 94:9 | 112:14 | 74.0 | 80:12 | 80:16 | 81:10 | Bauer [1 |] | 93:3 | certify | | 113:6 |
| | 86:10 94: | | 94:17 | 86[1] | 112:4 | | 81:14 | | | become | S m | 106:15 | | | |
| | 96:20 97: | 21 | 112:3 | 87[1] | 112:6 | | ALJ [13] | 94:14 | 94:14 | begin [3] | | 82:17 | change 102:19 | [5] | 102:16 108:22 |
| | 10[1] 79: | 13 | | 89[1] | 81:5 | | 94:17 | 96:14 | 96:20 | 83:23 | | 0=11. | 110:10 | 103:8 | 108:22 |
| | 11516[1] | | 80:19 | | | 04.15 | 96:21 | 97:21 | 98:16 | begins [| 11 | 102:16 | change | d | 106:20 |
| | 12201 [1] | | 81:10 | 9 [12] 94:18 | 82:7 | 94:17 | 99:20 102:6 | 100:6 | 100:9 | behalf [| | 83:5 | | | |
| | 12207 [1] | | 81:14 | 96:17 | 94:24 96:22 | 96:13 97:7 | | 105:8 | | 83:7 | 83:9 | 83:12 | change | | 111:2 |
| | 12223 [1] | | 80:16 | 101:2 | 102:7 | 105:20 | ALJ's[| | 112:15 | 90:23 | 91:5 | 91:14 | charge | | 101:23 |
| | | | | 112:15 | 102., | 100.20 | allow [1 | - | 82:12 | | 97:8 | 99:8 | 102:2 | 102:3 | 103:18 104:14 |
| | 12223-135 80:12 |) U [1] | i | 90 [3] | 81:13 | 112:7 | amenab | le [2] | 85:19 | 99:16 | 100:11 | | 103.20 | 103.23 | 104.14 |
| | | 7 | | 112:9 | 0 | | 100:14 | | | Ben [2] | 81:12 | 83:7 | charge | 1 | 102:2 |
| | 14221-588 80:5 |) / [1] | ļ | 91 [2] | 112:10 | 112:11 | amend | [2] | 96:16 | benefit | [2] | 92:18 | | | |
| | 14619 [1] | | 01.17 | 93 [1] | 112:13 | | 110:4 | | | 109:20 | | | charges 82:3 | 5 [8] - 101:14 | 79:6 101:15 |
| | | | 81:17 | 94[1] | 112:14 | | amendr | nents [1 |] | benefits | S [3] | 102:13 | | 101:14 | |
| | 14649-000 |) I [1] | ļ | 96[1] | | | 99:7 | | | 110:13 | | | 104:13 | 101.10 | 101.12 |
| | 81:6 | 20 | | | 112:15 | | amount | [2] | 101:23 | best [1] | 97:19 | | check | 17 | 100:4 |
| | 15 [1] 93: | | | a.m [1] | | | 103:9 | | | beyond | [2] | 106:13 | checkin | • | 86:20 |
| | 2[3] 86: | 25 | 87:4 | access [| [2] | 88:19 | analysi | | 102:8 | 109:9 | | | choice | | 102:14 |
| | 112:5 | | 07.16 | 88:23 | <u>.</u> | | Ann [2] | 88:21 | 88:24 | bill [4] | 101:13 | 101:13 | choose | | 102:14 |
| | 2004 [7] 86: 90:6 90: | 12 | 87:16 90:25 | accomp 86:7 | | | answer | | 82:22 | 101:17 | 101:23 | | | | |
| | 90:6 90: 91:21 112 | | 90:23 | 89:11 | 88:21 89:14 | 89:7 | 98:25 | | 103:17 | bind (1) | 108:14 | | choose | | 103:15 |
| | 2005 [8] 79: | | 82:7 | accurate | | 113:7 | answer | _ | 93:18 | binding | [3] | 106:17 | Christo | | |
| | 93:13 93: | | 94:7 | achieve | | | answer | | 98:16 | 106:18 | 110:6 | | chrono | logical | [1] |
| | 95:9 95: | | 107:23 | | | 97:19 | 99:19 | | | binds [1] | 1 | 109:25 | 85:17 | | |
| | 2008 [1] 107 | | | acknow 96:13 | reage [| 1] | anyway | | 97:3 | bit [1] | 97:7 | | chrono 87:14 | iogicai | Iy [1] |
| | 22 [2] 94: | | 95:9 | action [| • • | 108:23 | арреага | | | Blaney | [1] | 88:8 | | atamaa. | |
| | 22222 [1] | | 81:10 | | | 100.23 | арреага | inces [1] |) | blown [| 21 | 82:13 | 110:23 | Stance | [1] |
|) | 24 [1] 79: | | | add [1] | | | 82:17 | | | 107:15 | • | | circum | ctanooc | l raz |
| | 25th[1] 86: | | | addend | | 94:3 | applied | [2] | 97:20 | Board [4 | i | 80:13 | 108:22 | 314HCC3 | [2] |
| | | | | addition | | 95:2 | 101:22 | | | 80:15 | | 95:16 | clarify | | 101:11 |
| | 26th [1] 86: | | | 102:17 | | | approve | | 85:4 | Bonder | [2] | 81:8 | 106:25 | [2] | 101;11 |
| | 27th [2] 86: | | 86:12 | address | [2] | 100:13 | April [3] | | 93:20 | 83:11 | | | clarity | r11 | 92:18 |
| | 280[1] 81: | | | | | | | 95:9 | | Boston | [1] | 81:3 | clause | | 103:12 |
| | 3 [4] 80: | | 90:8 | adjourn | lea [2] | 111:18 | argue (5 | l | 108:16 | bottom | [1] | 102:15 | | | |
| | 90:9 112 | | | 111:19 | | 102.12 | | 108:25 | 110:2 | bound [| | 92:21 | Clearly | [1] | 105:19 |
| | 30 [1] 79: | | | adjustn | | | 110:24 | 4 | 100.15 | 108:18 | • | | Coaliti 83:6 | on [6] 90:24 | 80:17 91:15 |
| | 31 [3] 90: | 6 | 90:15 | Admini 79:17 | strativ | e [1] | argume | | 108:17 | Box [1] | 81:10 | | 95:17 | | 91:13 |
| | 90:25 | | | | | 00.00 | arise [1] | | | break [1] | | 93:23 | collect | | 103:7 |
| | 31st[1] 87: | | | admissi 95:23 | I On [2] | 83:23 | assesse | | 104:18 | brief [1] | | | 103:10 | [4] | 103.7 |
| | 3rd[1] 79: | 10 | | admit [3 | | 93:18 | assign [| | 94:25 | bring [1] | | | collecte | ed rai | 101:7 |
| | 4 [3] 90:2 | 20 | 90:21 | 94:14 | | 93:16 | assigni | ng [1] | 94:22 | Broadw | | 81:9 | 101:10 | Ju [2] | 101.7 |
| | 112:8 | | | admitte | | 84:4 | associa | ted [1] | 104:14 | Brooks | | 81:17 | collecti | On 121 | 87:22 |
| | 45 [1] 97:: | | | admitti | | | assumi | ng [1] | 103:7 | 1 | | | 87:23 | OH [2] | 07.22 |
| | 46 [5] 96:5 | | 96:9 | | _ | 82:14 | attentio | | 102:6 | Bruce [2 82:1? | J | 80:6 | collect | velv (4) | 86:3 |
| | 97:22 98: | 16 | 99:20 | adopted | | 84:8 | Attorne | | 81:4 | Buildin | 6 *** | 70-11 | 90:20 | | 94:24 |
| | 47 [2] 100 | :7 | 100:9 | adopts [| [2] | 106:14 | 81:12 | y () | 01.1 | | | 79:11 | comfor | | 92:20 |
| | 48 [2] 100 | :7 | 105:8 | 106:21 | | 00.00 | Audrey | [2] | 88:16 | built [2] | | 104:8 | comfor | | |
| | 49 [3] 100 | :7 | 100:10 | affairs [| | 82:22 | 88:18 | | | | 88:20 | | coming | | 111:17 |
| | 102:6 | | | aforesa | | 113:9 | August | [3] | 86:9 | calculat | | 101:16 | comme | | 98:17 |
| | 4A [1] 80:: | 19 | | afterno | | 99:22 | 86:21 | 112:3 | | calls [1] | | | 99:12 | | 70.17 |
| | 5 [4] 80:: | | 91:2 | again [1] | | 104:21 | Avenue | | 80:18 | Capers | [2] | 88:17 | Commi | | 101 |
| | 91:3 112 | | | against | | 84:12 | l | 81:17 | | 88:18 | - 0 - | | 79:1 | 79:6 | 79:11 |
| | 540 [1] 81:9 | 9 | | 104:18 | | 108:25 | avoid [1 |] | 103:10 | Case [14] | | 82:2 | 80:9 | 82:3 | 84:20 |
| | 557[1] 80: | 18 | | agency | [2] | 79:11 | B [1] | 81:8 | | | 85:24 107:8 | 105:16 107:12 | 85:3 | 105:17 | 106:14 |
|) | 6[4] 91: | 11 | 91:12 | 91:17 | ! _ | | backdro |)p [1] | 84:12 | 107:16 | | | | 106:16 | |
| | 95:11 112 | :11 | | agency' | | 92:9 | balanci | | 103:18 | 108:25 | | | | 106:21 107:14 | |
| | 60 [5] 94: | | 96:21 | agree [2] | | 109:25 | 103:21 | 103:23 | 104:10 | Catalan | | 80:11 | | 107:14 | |
| | 97:22 98: | 16 | 99:20 | agreed [| 2] | 108:10 | 104:13 | 104:17 | | | 86:11 | 96:3 | | 108:16 | |
| | | | | L | | | | | | L | | | | | |
| | Dauling E | XX7: | 11: | α c \mathbf{p} | /E10\ | 467 44 | 03 | | | | | | | Y 1 | . Dama 1 |

| Condenselt" | | Conden | ıseIt¹ | 1 |
|-------------|--|--------|--------|---|
|-------------|--|--------|--------|---|

| \sim | • | • | | ~ |
|--------|-----|------------|-------|---------|
| Com | nis | S10 | n's - | Gregory |
| | | | | |

| | | Condenseit | | | nmission's - (| JICEUI y |
|--|---|--|------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|----------------|
| | counsel [3] 80:4 | discussed [1] 94:10 | examined [1] | 100:18 | filing [9] | 85:9 |
| 110:7 110:10 111:3 | 83:2 83:3 | discussion [1] 101:3 | example [2] | 101:12 | 85:10 85:11 | 85:19 |
| | couple [1] 100:5 | distributed [2] 97:15 | 107:14 | | 86:19 90:5 | 91:24 |
| 86:16 87:2 95:5 | course [1] 95:6 | 97:23 | excused [1] | 105:5 | 92:13 93:13 | |
| 108:25 | CPB [2] 90:13 99:8 | Distribution [7] | exercise [1] | 85:2 | filings [1] | 87:17 |
| commitment [1] | | 79:6 80:2 82:4 | | | Fiorella [1] | 93:3 |
| 110:25 | cross-examine [1] | 82:19 95:14 102:14 | exhibit [45] | 84:4 | firm [1] 83:10 | |
| commodity [1] 101:15 | 84:25 | 107:16 | 85:18 85:20 86:10 86:13 | 86:3 | | 05.00 |
| company raci 94.14 | culmination [1] 109:16 | Distribution's [1] | 86:10 86:13 87:4 87:22 | 86:25 88:5 | | 85:23 |
| 84:15 85:8 87:17 | customer [11] 80:17 | 111:6 | 90:8 90:9 | 90:17 | | 97:17 106:5 |
| 93:24 95:20 95:23 | 83:5 90:23 95:16 | | 90:18 90:20 | 90:21 | | 100.5 |
| 97:9 97:25 98:4 | 99:16 102:9 102:10 | document [1] 90:25 | 91:2 91:3 | 91:7 | five[1] 107:6 | |
| 98:23 100:11 100:14 | 102:14 102:19 103:5 | documents [2] 90:8 | 91:10 91:11 | 91:12 | | 79:10 |
| 102:10 102:12 103:2 | 103:14 | 109:16 | 91:19 92:3 | 93:12 | | 80:18 |
| | customer's [1] 101:13 | done [1] 92:22 | 93:14 93:19 | 93:25 | | 90:24 |
| | customers [3] 101:7 | Donna [2] 90:16 | 94:7 94:9 | 94:17 | | 99:15 |
| 105:24 106:5 109:7 | 104:18 110:14 | 112:8 | 94:18 94:23 | 96:13 | 99:17 112:10 | |
| | D [5] 88:8 89:17 | down [1] 105:4 | 96:17 96:22 | 97:5 | | 93:10 |
| company's [4] 91:23 | 89:18 89:23 89:24 | Dr [4] 91:6 91:8 | 97:7 101:2 | 102:7 | 100:5 | |
| 92:14 93:13 104:20 | daily [7] 102:11 102:20 | 91:9 112:11 | 103:25 104:3 105:20 112:2 | 104:11 | | 85:20 |
| compared [1] 109:18 | 103:17 104:9 104:12 | dramatically [1] | | 00 11 | 97:11 | |
| completes [1] 90:5 | 104:14 104:19 | 108:22 | exhibits [30] | 82:14 | | 82:11 |
| components [1] 102:2 | Daniel [1] 89:25 | duly[1] 100:18 | 83.22 84:5 85:25 86:6 | 85:9 | | 100:19 |
| composed [1] 101:21 | date [5] 82:7 86:18 | e-mail _[2] 97:15 | 85:25 86:6 87:24 88:4 | 87:8 88:13 | 1 | 111:3 |
| concern [1] 110:19 | 94:2 95:8 113:13 | 97:23 | 88:17 88:22 | 89:8 | 1 | 113:7 |
| | December [6] 87:16 | eager [1] 106:4 | 89:12 89:17 | 89:21 | | 84:25 |
| concerned [1] 108:24 | 87 :21 90:6 90:15 | earnings [1] 104:22 | 89:24 90:3 | 90:16 | | |
| concludes [1] 111:13 | 90:25 91:21 | - | 92:15 92:25 | 93:7 | | 84:11 |
| conditions [1] 106:20 | deciding [1] 102:10 | ease [1] 93:15 | 94:15 95:3 | 112:4 | | 96:20 |
| | decision [2] 96:5 | easier [1] 96:15 | 112:4 112:6 | 112:7 | 106:10 | |
| confess [1] 86:23 | 105:17 | East [1] 81:5 | 112:8 112:13 | | four[1] 107:6 | |
| | deemed [1] 84:24 | effect [3] 103:4 | existence [1] | 92:8 | | 93:3 |
| | definite [1] 108:14 | 103:14 104:9 | exists [1] | 91:17 | Franklin [1] | 81:3 |
| 1 00 10 00 10 10 00 | delivery [4] 101:14 | efficient [1] 100:8 | expiration [4] | 106:11 | Friedrich-Alf | [2] |
| consequence [1] | 101:23 102:18 102:25 | cither [1] 102:2 | 106:24 110:22 | 111:7 | 87:11 93:3 | - |
| 00.11 | denominated [1] | Electric [4] 83:13 | expire [1] | 106:8 | front [1] 104:4 | |
| considered [1] 84:5 | 96:20 | 83:14 95:19 95:19 | expired [1] | 106:7 | | 80:2 |
| 1 • • • • • • • • • • | | element [1] 109:10 | explain [2] | 97:6 | | 82:18 |
| consisting [2] 86:3 | department [4] 80:11 82:22 87:20 95:13 | ELIZABETH[1] | 97:9 | J1.0 | 95:14 102:13 | |
| 1 | | 79:16 | explains [1] | 103:17 | 111:5 112:3 | 112:5 |
| | Deputy [1] 80:4 | Emerson [2] 88:20 | explains [1] | 103:17 | 112:12 | |
| | described [1] 97:16 | 88:23 | | | full [2] 82:13 | 107:15 |
| | description [2] 95:7 | Empire [2] 80:12 | extend [3] | 105:14 | fully [1] 111:5 | |
| Consumer [7] 80:13 | 95:8 | 80:15 | 106:12 107:10 | 100.10 | furthermore [1] | 107:24 |
| | designated [1] 110:21 | | extending [1] | 109:19 | l = | 108:4 |
| | designed [1] 97:18 | Energetix [4] 81:15 81:16 83:17 99:25 | extends [1] | 107:5 | 108:17 | •00.7 |
| contained [4] 92:15 92:25 93:8 107:22 | determination[1] | | extension [4] | 106:22 | gain [1] 111:10 | |
| loomtoima era 197.6 | 104:6 | Energy [1] 91:14 | 108::3 109:9 | 110:15 | _ | 70.7 |
| contains [1] 87:6 | developed [1] 97:23 | enforceable [1] 105:19 | extent [4] | 93:7 | | 79:7 82:5 |
| context[1] 111:4 | development [1] | enforcement [1] | 93:17 98:6 | 106:17 | | 83:13 |
| | 97:17 | 108:12 | extra [3] 83:20 | 93:22 | 95:14 95:19 | 95:19 |
| copy [4] 93:22 93:25 | Deviot [1] 90:16 | engage [1] 102:9 | 97:3 | | 101:24 102:13 | 103:9 |
| 96:25 97:2 | Devito [1] 112:8 | engaging [1] 82:13 | F [1] 89:10 | | 103:12 103:12 | |
| Corporation [8] 79:7 | different [s] 85:7 | enter [3] 83:19 91:18 | fact [2] 92:20 | 105:21 | 104:8 104:21 | 107:15 |
| 00:2 02:3 02:19 | 88:2 96:10 97:10 | 92:10 | factual [1] | 110:9 | 111:6 | |
| 83:13 83:14 95:14 | 97:24 | entire [1] 101:13 | fair[1] 109:11 | | | 97:10 |
| 107:16 | difficult [3] 96:6 | Eric [4] 82:20 100:16 | familiar [1] | 107:2 | | 80:4 |
| [CO11CC1 [4] 03:0 | 96:11 110:8 | 100:17 100:24 | far [3] 103:4 | 108:23 | 82:21 | |
| 93:6 103:19 109:23 | direct [7] 90:15 | Esq[8] 80:6 80:10 | 109:24 | | | 90:2 |
| [COSt [10] 102:17 102:18 | 90:17 91:6 100:9 | 80:11 80:14 80:18 | few [1] 82:15 | | 90:4 | |
| 102:24 102:25 103:6 103:9 104:6 104:8 | 112:8 112:10 112:11 | 81:2 81:8 81:8 | file [1] 91:17 | | | 84:7 |
| 103:9 104:6 104:8 | Director [2] 81:16 | essential [1] 86:22 | | 04.10 | | 109:12 |
| cost/benefit [1] 102:8 | 83:17 | event [1] 110:3 | filed [12] 84:15 85:23 | 84:10 | 109:13 | |
| | disapprove [3] 84:21 | evidence [1] 84:10 | 90:14 93:19 | 86:15 95:9 | Great [1] | 104:24 |
| COSIS [2] 102:13 103:11 | 84:21 85:4 | evidentiary [2] 82:8 | | 95:18 | Greene [1] | 81:2 |
| Couch [2] 81:9 | discovery [1] 94:11 | 82:13 | 95:22 96:24 | | | 88:25 |
| | discretion [1] 110:17 | Ewing [1] 80:7 | files [1] 92:9 | | 89:2 | |
| <u></u> | | 1 | | | | |
| Pauline F Williman | CCD (C10)4(2 4 | 407 | | | Y 1 | Dags 2 |

| | | | | | HUCHS | | | | OKI - U | <u>Journalia</u> |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| GRT [1] 101:21 | | 103:14 104 | | keep [2] | | 96:7 | mark [1] 86:2 | | 91:23 | |
| Gruchala [1] | 93:3 | individual | [2] 101:13 | L _[2] | 88:16 | 88:18 | marked [13] 87:4 90:8 | 86:10 | Ms [1] 87:11 | |
| guess [4] 85:16 97:6 | 85:12 105:23 | informatio | m rm 112-15 | Lamb | - | 81:2 | 90:20 90:21 | 90:9 91:3 | Mueller [3] 83:12 83:15 | 81:2 |
| H [4] 81:8 | 100:16 | initial [2] | 85:8 | large [2] | | 102:9 | 91:10 91:12 | 93:14 | Mugel [1] | 02.4 |
| 100:17 100:24 | 100:10 | 85:19 | 03:0 | last [1] | | | 96:22 101:2 | 112:2 | | 93:4 |
| hand [1] 96:25 | | instance [1] | 111:8 | | | 81:11 | Marketer [5] | 80:17 | Multiple [5] 83:9 91:5 | 81:7 95:15 |
| handing [1] | 90:11 | instead [1] | 85:14 | 83:8 | 83:10 | 96:23 | 83:6 90:24 | 95:16 | 98:21 | 93.13 |
| hands [2] | 108:3 | intend [2] | 88:5 | lawyers | | 100:13 | 99:16 | | N _[1] 112:9 | |
| 110:12 | 100.5 | 107:18 | 66.5 | Lea [2] | | 88:24 | Marketers [1] | 91:14 | name [1] 100:22 | |
| Hanley [1] | 93:4 | interrogate |) r y (1) | least [2] | | 105:23 | markets [1] | 87:2 | names [2] | 88:15 |
| happily [1] | 97:4 | 94:23 | - | leave [1] | | 01.0 | matched [1] | 103:11 | 92:24 | |
| Hart [1] 93:4 | | intervening | g [2] 105:16 | LeBoeu legal [1] | | 81:2 | material [1] matter [3] | 84:4 | National [13] | 79:6 |
| hear [3] 105:23 | 106:4 | 110:20 | | Leonar | | 83:21 | 108:15 111:15 | 79:3 | 80:2 80:4 82:18 91:14 | 82:4 95:14 |
| 106:5 | | intervenor | | 89:6 | և լշյ | 03.21 | may [7] 79:13 | 82:6 | 102:13 107:15 | |
| heard [2] | 105:25 | intervenor 83:10 87: | | Lepkov | vski m | 88:9 | 82:15 92:3 | 95:11 | 112:3 112:5 | 112:12 |
| 111:12 | = 0.40 | 95:15 98: | | letter [1] | | 0015 | 100:12 105:4 | | necessarily [3 | 84:6 |
| hearing [2] | 79:10 | introduced | | LIEBS | | Z 1501 | mean [2] 101:12 | | 106:19 110:6 | • |
| hearings [2] | 82:8 | ironclad [1] | | 79:16 | 83:18 | 83:22 | mechanism [1] | | need [4] 92:11 | 97:4 |
| 82:13 | 02.0 | issue [2] 105 | | 85:6 | 85:16 | 86:2 | Meinl [9] | 82:20 | 110:4 110:10 | |
| Heine [2] | 87:12 | issued [2] | 82:6 | 86:12 87:9 | 86:18 87:13 | 86:22 88:3 | 87:10 93:4 100:17 100:24 | 100:16 100:25 | needs [1] | 96:11 |
| 93:4 | | 107:23 | | 88:10 | 90:7 | 90:12 | 105:3 105:4 | 100.23 | negotiations | 1] |
| help[1] 87:10 | | J [3] 81: | 2 81:16 | 90:19 | 90:22 | 91:9 | merely [1] | 110:24 | 84:13 New [15] | 79:12 |
| helpful [3] | 87:25 | 89:25 | | 91:13 | 92:6 | 92:12 | messages [1] | 97:15 | 80:5 80:8 | 79:12 80:12 |
| 88:6 97:6 | | January [1] | | 92:17 94:25 | 93:6 96:12 | 93:12 98:14 | metered [9] | 102:11 | 80:16 80:19 | 81:6 |
| hereby [1] | 113:6 | Jeanne [2] | 113:4 | 98:25 | 99:4 | 99:8 | 102:11 102:20 | 102:20 | 81:10 81:14 | 81:17 |
| Herlands [2] | 88:21 | 113:13 | | 99;10 | 99:15 | 99:18 | 104:7 104:9 | 104:12 | 83:12 95:15 | 95:18 |
| 88:24 | | Jeffrey [2] 83:14 | 81:4 | 99:24 | 100:3 | 100:20 | 104:13 104:14 | | 110:16 113:6 Newark [1] | 80:8 |
| higher [1] | 111:9 | Jersey [1] | 80:8 | 100:25 | 101:25 | 102:5 103:22 | Michael [6] 81:8 82:20 | 80:3 83:11 | next[6] 86:13 | 92:13 |
| history [1] | 109:13 | John [5] 80: | | 102:23 | | 103.22 | 83:20 89:19 | 65.11 | 93:15 94:10 | 107:7 |
| Hobday [5] 83:16 83:16 | 81:16 99:24 | 83:4 89: | | 105:6 | 106:25 | | Michalski [1] | 93:4 | 107:11 | |
| 100:2 | JJ.21 | joint [20] | 82:10 | 110:19 | | | might [5] | 85:12 | NFG [1] 102:18 | |
| Honor [19] | 84:24 | 82:12 84: | | life [1] | | | 87:9 102:9 | 107:3 | Niazi [3] | 90:17 |
| 86:11 86:20 | 87:19 | 88:10 88: 93:25 94:: | | limited | [2] | 82:16 | 108:9 | | 90:18 112:9 | |
| 87:20 90:10 94:21 96:3 | 90:13 97:14 | 99:25 104 | | limiting | T (1) | 110:17 | Miller [22] 82:18 82:19 | 80:6 | non-gas [3] | 102:17 |
| 97:16 99:3 | 99:14 | 105:9 105 | :12 105:13 | Linda | 3 [1] | 83:3 | 84:18 85:7 | 84:17 85:22 | 102:24 103:6 none [1] 111:13 | |
| 99:22 101:18 | | 106:15 109 | :9 109:17 | list [1] | | 03.3 | 86:14 86:15 | 86:20 | | 112.5 |
| 103:3 103:21 | | 112:14 | 05.10 | litigate | 4 ras | 107:15 | 87:5 87:6 | 87:11 | Notary [1] note [4] 82:9 | 113:5 86:8 |
| Horlbeck [1] | 83:4 | jointly [2] 95:20 | 95:18 | 109:11 | | 107.13 | 92:12 92:13 93:2 93:10 | 92:17 94:21 | 95:4 96:16 | 80.8 |
| ideas [1] 108:10 | | JPO [1] 103 | ·25 | litigation |) n [2] | 84:22 | 100:16 106:6 | 108:8 | notes [1] 113:8 | |
| identification 86:10 87:4 | [8] 90:9 | Judge [50] | 79:17 | 85:2 | | | Mills [1] | 89:6 | notice [1] | 82:6 |
| 90:21 91:3 | 91:12 | 83:18 83:2 | 22 85:6 | LLP[1] | | | mine [1] 86:24 | | now [5] 90:11 | 92:21 |
| 93:14 96:22 | | 85:16 86:2 | | longer | | 107:5 | misstatement | [1] | 94:17 96:8 | 96:9 |
| identified [1] | 88:2 | 86:18 86:2 87:13 88:2 | | looking | | 108:4 | 109:24 | | number [11] | 82:9 |
| identify [1] | 88:3 | 90:7 90: | 12 90:19 | lose [1] | | 102.22 | modification [98:6 98:22 | 3] 99:2 | 85:7 92:4 94:16 94:23 | 93:21 96:5 |
| II [2] 85:24 | 112:4 | 90:22 91:9 | | lower [2 |] | 103:20 | moment [1] | 99:2 95:7 | 96:10 96:14 | 105:15 |
| III [2] 85:25 | 112:4 | 92:6 92: 93:6 93: | | Luthrin | oer m | 88:25 | monthly [5] | 95:7 102:11 | 107:11 | |
| impact [1] | 104:22 | 96:12 98: | | 89:3 | 801 [2] | 00.23 | 102:20 104:7 | 102:11 | numbered [4] | 85:20 |
| imply [1] | 110:18 | 99:4 99:8 | 99:10 | and the second s | 90:16 | 112:8 | 104:19 | · · — | 94:13 96:18 | 105:8 |
| Inc[1] 83:17 | 05.10 | 99:15 99:1 100:3 100 | 18 99:24 :20 100:25 | MacRa | | 81:2 | morning [2] | 83:19 | numbers [2] 97:22 | 97:21 |
| include [2] 103:18 | 95:12 | 100:3 100 | | Mager [| | 81:8 | 111:16 | | NYS [2] 80:9 | 80:11 |
| included [3] | 102:7 | 103:16 103 | :22 104:3 | 83:9 | 83:11 | 91:4 | Mosine [2] 83:11 | 81:8 | NYSEG [3] | 81:5 |
| 104:7 105:20 | 102.7 | 104:16 104 | | 91:5 98:21 | 94:22 99:3 | 98:20 | most [1] 100:8 | | 95:9 95:21 | |
| includes [3] | 91:7 | 106:25 109 111:11 | :5 110:19 | Main [1] | | | Mostek [3] | 83:4 | O'Connell [2] | 113:4 |
| 95:6 95:8 | | judge's [1] | 82:22 | maintai | | 95:5 | 89:11 89:13 | 55.1 | 113:13 | 05.00 |
| income [4] | 101:5 | Justyn [2] | 80:10 | makes [| | 96:15 | Mostek's [1] | 89:14 | objecting [1] | 95:23 |
| 101:6 101:9 | 101:21 | 83:2 | | manage | - | 82:21 | motion [3] | 79:5 | objection [4] 98:18 99:6 | 98:12 99:22 |
| increasing [1] indifferent [4] | 109:21 103:4 | K [3] 104 | :2 104:3 | Managi | | 81:16 | 82:2 95:22 | 07.15 | objections [3] | 98:4 |
| indifficient [4] | 103.7 | 104:3 | | 83:16 | | | move [2] | 87:15 | 98:12 98:24 | |
| L | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | |

| | | , | | Condens | | | | obviousiy | - Scott |
|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|---------|
| obviously [1] | 84:15 | 109:2 110:15 | | Professional [| 1] | 82:21 107:3 | 111:6 | reserved [1] | 94:9 |
| occurs [1] | 110:21 | periods [1] | 110:5 | 113:4 | | Rather [1] | 84:10 | response [8] | 86:16 |
| offered [1] | 88:13 | perspective [1] | 104:21 | proffer [1] | 95:3 | read [1] 99:21 | | 87:2 87:17 | 94:23 |
| offers [1] | 109:20 | Peter [2] 80:11 | 83:3 | program [1] | 109:15 | realized [1] | 92:22 | 97:13 102:6 | 102:15 |
| often [1] 108:25 | | 1 | 110:12 | programs [5] | 109:8 | really [1] | 100:12 | 105:20 | |
| one [15] 80:7 | 83:20 | 1- | 101:22 | 109:14 109:20 | | rearranged [1] | | responses [8] | 96:18 |
| 84:18 86:23 | 90:18 | | | 110:4 | | | 86:23 | 97:7 97:12 | 97:20 |
| 90:24 90:25 | 91:18 | | 101:22 | Project [3] | 81:11 | reason[1] | 97:2 | 98:2 98:22 99:12 | 98:24 |
| 92:15 93:9 | 93:16 | | 93:5 | 83:8 96:23 | | rebuttal [7] | 85:10 | | 0.5.5 |
| 98:5 98:22 | 105:9 | | 93:16 | promulgated [| 2] | 85:14 91:24 93:2 93:13 | 92:14 112:12 | result [2] | 85:2 |
| 110:24 | | 106:23 | | 94:12 96:19 | | 1 | | | 00.10 |
| opportunity [2] | 98:15 פ | plan [8] 106:7 | 106:8 | | 99:25 | received [1] | 98:5 | retail [3] 87:2 88:23 | 88:19 |
| 99:19 | | 106:12 106:13 | | 105:24 | | recognition [1] | | | 100.01 |
| opposition [5] | 95:8 | | 107:21 | proponents [5] | 94:5 | recognizes [2] | 109:12 | retains [1] | 108:21 |
| 95:11 95:17 | 95:21 | plans [8] | 105:12 | 97:13 98:19 | 99:11 | 109:17 | | Reulet [2] | 89:17 |
| 95:24 | | 107:2 107:9 108:13 110:22 | 107:10 | 105:7 | | reconciliation | [1] | 89:18 | |
| order [6] 85:17 | 88:5 | 111:7 | 111,2 | proposal [19] | 82:10 | 103:13 | | revenue [1] | 104:22 |
| 106:15 106:17 | 106:18 | Plaza [3] | 80:7 | 82:12 84:19 | 85:5 | reconsider [1] | 96:4 | revenues [5] | 101:10 |
| 107:22 | | 80:12 80:15 | ου. <i>/</i> | 93:19 93:25 | 94:5 | record [10] | 82:15 | 102:18 102:24 | 103:6 |
| Oreifej [1] | 89:16 | plus [1] 101:24 | • | 94:6 97:13 104:4 105:7 | 99:11 105:9 | 83:24 85:14 | 92:7 | 103:9 | 00.5 |
| organization [1 | 1] | PO [1] 81:10 | | 105:13 105:14 | | 94:15 95:4 | 95:5 | Teview [2] | 98:15 |
| 91:15 | | | | 109:10 109:17 | | 95:24 96:16 | 100:22 | 99:19 | 00.01 |
| otherwise [3] | 110:14 | point [1] 84:18 | 06.6 | proposed [2] | 101:4 | records [1] | 95:2 | reviewed [1] | 98:21 |
| 111:5 111:9 | | policy [4] | 86:16 | 110:5 | | refer [3] 96:14 | 102:19 | Reville [3] | 80:3 |
| overcollection | 1 [1] | 86:21 87:3 | 106:2 | Protection [4] | 80:13 | 103:24 | | 82:20 97:14 | |
| 101:5 | | poll[1] 98:11 | | 80:15 82:24 | 95:16 | reference [1] | 93:17 | RG&E [2] | 95:9 |
| P[4] 80:10 | 83:2 | portions [2] | 85:4 | provide [1] | 93:22 | referenced [1] | 90:16 | 95:21 | |
| 89:20 89:22 | | 88:2 | | provided [1] | 107:9 | referred [7] | 88:14 | RGE [1] 81:5 | |
| page [1] 102:15 | | | 98:17 | provides [2] | 84:20 | 88:17 89:12 | 89:17 | Richard [1] | 88:9 |
| panel [7] | 88:11 | 99:12 | | 105:14 | 07.20 | | 101:19 | right [5] 84:25 | 97:2 |
| 88:13 88:19 | 88:23 | | 110:20 | providing [2] | 93:24 | refers [1] | 105:8 | 98:25 102:25 | 108:21 |
| 89:5 89:7 | 89:9 | preclude [1] | 107:18 | 110:13 | 75.24 | reflects [2] | 99:2 | Riverfront [1] | 80:7 |
| papers [1] | 89:13 | 14 | 85:17 | provision [4] | 84:20 | 105:21 | | Robert [2] | 81:16 |
| paragraph [1] | 102:16 | | 83:24 | 85:3 106:21 | 107:17 | refund[1] | 101:4 | 83:16 | |
| part [4] 84:21 | 101:2 | | 86:8 | provisions [8] | 105:9 | regarding [2] | 100:6 | Rochester [4] | 81:6 |
| 102:7 105:20 | | | 87:21 | | | 100:9 | | 81:17 83:13 | 95:19 |
| particular [3] | 84:3 | 90:14 91:16 | | 106:7 106:12 | | | 113:4 | Roland [2] | 90:22 |
| 109:8 109:19 | | | 88:7 | 109:3 | | Regulations [2] | 79:6 | 90:23 | |
| parties [33] | 82:10 | | 88:17 88:25 | Public [10] | 79:1 | 82:4 | | room [2] 79:10 | 91:17 |
| 84:2 84:8 | 84:11 | | 89:8 | 79:11 80:9 | 80:11 | regulatory [1] | 82:21 | Rosenberg [3] | 91:7 |
| 84:22 85:15 93:20 94:12 | 92:5 94:13 | | 89:15 | 81:11 83:8 | 87:20 | related [1] | 101:6 | 91:8 112:11 | |
| 94:19 96:19 | 97:15 | | 89:19 | 95:13 96:23 | 113:5 | relating [2] | 105:10 | Rosenberg's [1 |) |
| 98:2 98:3 | 98:10 | | 89:22 | PULP [1] | 99:18 | 105:10 | | 91:9 | ì |
| 98:11 98:14 | 105:21 | | 90:2 | purports [1] | 111:2 | relative [1] | 109:18 | Rosenbloom [2 | ı) |
| 106:10 107:8 | 107:17 | | 94:19 | pursuant [1] | 82:6 | relatively [1] | 109:13 | 81:4 83:14 | |
| 107:18 108:3 | 108:6 | • | 88:6 | put [3] 85:8 | 85:13 | remaining [1] | 100:11 | Rosenthal [2] | 88:21 |
| 108:8 108:9 | 108:12 | presentations [| 1] | 92:7 | | remedy [1] | 106:11 | 88:24 | |
| 108:16 109:3 110:23 110:25 | 110:2 | 84:11 | | quality [5] | 105:11 | reopening [1] | 100.9 | Rules [2] | 79:6 |
| parties' [1] | 95:10 | PRESIDING [1 | 1] | 107:5 107:9 | 107:21 | | 107.20 | 82:3 | |
| 1- | | 79:15 | | 109:15 | | reply [1] 98:3 | 00.11 | ruling [1] | 95:25 |
| party [4] 84:24 111:12 111:16 | 95:3 | previously [2] | 94:10 | questions [15] | 82:16 | reporter [4] 93:23 96:16 | 90:11 | run [2] 92:19 | 92:23 |
| | | 101:7 | | 82:23 93:18 | 94:11 | | 113:5 | safety [4] | 105:10 |
| pass[1] 101:4 | | | 82:12 | 94:13 96:18 97:20 99:13 | 97:8 99:20 | repose [1] | 109:2 | 107:10 107:20 | 109:14 |
| past [1] 106:6 | 00.55 | 97:11 97:16 97:24 | 97:18 | 100:6 100:9 | 104:25 | represent [4] | 84:6 | Saloney [2] | 83:21 |
| Paul [2] 88:20 | 88:23 | 1 | 07.14 | 105:3 111:14 | 101.20 | 85:18 87:23 | 94:7 | 89:19 | |
| pending [1] | 95:25 | | 87:14 | R [5] 88:8 | 88:25 | represented [1] | | Sandra [2] | 89:17 |
| perceive [1] | 110:5 | proceeding [10] | | 89:2 90:2 | 90:4 | representing (3 | | 89:18 | |
| percentage [2] | 101:10 | | 83:25 107:19 | raise [1] 111:16 | | 86:4 86:6 | 93:12 | Sano [3] 83:4 | 89:20 |
| 101:16 | | | 110:21 | ran [1] 87:25 | | represents [3] | 86:25 | 89:22 | |
| perfectly [1] | 103:11 | proceedings [2] | | rate [13] 102:18 | 102:25 | 97:12 110:25 | 00.00 | Saul [1] 80:7 | |
| performance [3 | | 113:9 | 111.17 | 104:7 104:9 | 102:23 | requested [2] | 98:23 | savings [2] | 102:18 |
| 105:12 107:10 | | | 98:9 | 106:6 106:8 | 106:11 | 99:2 | 110.15 | 102:25 | |
| perhaps [3] | 85:18 | - | | 106:13 107:2 | 107:7 | requests [1] | 112:15 | Says [2] 84:24 | 101:8 |
| 97:8 110:24 | | 102:24 | 102:17 | 107:12 107:16 | | reserve [3] | 91:25 | schedules [1] | 90:18 |
| period [3] | 107:5 | 102.27 | | rates [5] 79:6 | 82:3 | 92:3 93:21 | | Scott [2] 81:2 | 83:15 |
| | | J | | L | | <u> </u> | | | |

| | | | | Сопи | ensert | | | seated - | LUIAUIS |
|------------------|--------|------------------|--------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------|
| seated [1] | 100:21 | specifically [1] | 111:14 | targets [1] | 109:21 | transcription [1 |] | 83:10 | |
| second [3] | 86:5 | Sprague [1] | 93:5 | tariff [2] 10 | 1:20 101:20 | 113:8 | | Wiles [6] | 81:12 |
| 97:17 101:8 | 00.5 | stability [1] | 109:20 | Tariq [2] | 90:17 | transportation | [2] | 83:7 83:7 | 96:23 |
| Secretary [1] | 05.6 | | | 112:9 | 90:17 | 102:9 103:17 | [-] | 99:18 99:21 | 70.23 |
| | 95:6 | staff [16] | 83:2 | 1 | | | 104.01 | William [3] | 00.6 |
| section [2] | 104:6 | 83:2 83:3 | 83:20 | tax [4] 10 | | | 104:21 | | 89:6 |
| 104:7 | | 87:15 87:21 | 87:23 | 101:9 10: | 1:22 | true [1] 113:7 | | 89:23 89:24 | |
| sections [1] | 104:5 | 89:14 90:5 | 97:25 | term [3] 108 | 8:14 109:9 | Trustt [1] | 93:5 | Williamsville | [1] |
| see [5] 98:11 | 104:11 | 105:24 109:6 | 109:12 | 109:18 | | | 106:9 | 80:5 | |
| 108:17 110:11 | 110:12 | 109:17 109:23 | 112:7 | terms [4] | 106:22 | 107:24 | 100.5 | wisdom [1] | 106:3 |
| | | staff's [1] | 109:10 | 106:23 108 | | | | wish[1] 111:12 | 100.5 |
| Seeing [1] | 111:13 | stand[1] | 111:10 | | | | 79:13 | | |
| seem [1] 110:23 | | | | testified [1 | _ | turn [1] 102:5 | | wishes [1] | 111:16 |
| Senior [2] | 81:4 | state [12] | 80:12 | testifying | [1] 84:9 | two [8] 104:5 | 104:6 | within [1] | 103:12 |
| 81:12 | | 80:15 81:13 | 83:12 | testimony | [62] 83:25 | | 105:12 | without [1] | 110:9 |
| sense [1] | 85:13 | 95:15 95:18 | 100:22 | 84:6 84: | | | 109:19 | witness [14] | 89:14 |
| | | 101:5 101:6 | 101:9 | 85:9 85: | | tying [1] 110:12 | | 100:10 100:15 | |
| sentence [1] | 101:8 | 101:21 113:5 | | 86:7 86: | | 1 | | 100:10 100:13 | 100.24 |
| separate [2] | 91:7 | statement [4] | 87:3 | 87:10 87: | | | 109:14 | | 102:22 |
| 94:23 | | 95:17 96:24 | 106:3 | 87:24 88: | | unclear[1] | 108:2 | 103.3 103.20 | 103:24 |
| separately [1] | 85:20 | statements [4] | 86:17 | 88:10 88: | | under [2] | 97:24 | 104:2 104:3 | 104:20 |
| sequentially [3 | | 86:21 95:10 | 95:12 | 88:16 88: | | 109:21 | , | | |
| 94:16 96:5 | 96:17 | stayed [1] | 103:7 | 88:22 88: | | underpinnings | | witnesses [10] | 82:16 |
| | | | | 89:2 89: | | 110:9 | [1] | 84:8 87:7 | 88:4 |
| series [2] | 84:5 | stenographic [| 1] | 89:10 89: | | 1 | | 92:19 92:24 | 93:2 |
| 94:11 | | 113:8 | | 89:14 89: | | understand [2] | 99:25 | 93:17 96:7 | 109:23 |
| service [25] | 79:1 | step [1] 105:4 | | 89:18 89: | | 107:18 | | Wojcinski [2] | 90:2 |
| 79:7 79:11 | 80:9 | Steven [1] | 88:8 | 89:22 89: | | understood [1] | 93:23 | 90:4 | |
| 80:11 82:5 | 83:2 | Stolicky [1] | 88:9 | 90:2 90: | | 1 | 107:25 | workable [1] | 96:15 |
| 87:20 95:13 | 102:11 | | | 90:15 90: | | | 90:11 | worthwhile [1] | |
| 102:11 102:20 | 102:21 | Street [3] | 80:5 | 91:6 91: | | | 100:5 | | |
| 103:5 103:14 | 103:18 | 81:3 81:13 | | 91:21 92: | | | 100:3 | year [2] 106:13 | 107:16 |
| 104:14 104:19 | | strict [1] 85:17 | | 92:24 93: | | used[1] 97:18 | | years [4] 105:15 | 107:3 |
| 105:11 107:4 | 107:9 | strictly [1] | 101:25 | 112:3 112 | | Usher [4] | 80:18 | 107:6 107:11 | |
| 107:21 109:15 | 111:6 | subject [1] | 95:22 | | 2:10 112:11 | 83:6 90:24 | 112:10 | yesterday [3] | 97:23 |
| Services [3] | 89:5 | | | 112:13 | | utilities [1] | 109:19 | 98:3 99:21 | 77.23 |
| 89:7 89:9 | | submit [2] | 90:14 | thank [16] | 83:22 | | 81:11 | York [13] | 79:12 |
| set [2] 97:17 | 107:3 | 94:20 | | 86:12 87: | | 83:8 96:23 | 01.11 | 80:5 80:12 | 80:16 |
| | | submitted [8] | 82:10 | 90:12 90: | | 1 | | 80:19 81:6 | 81:10 |
| setting [1] | 82:7 | 83:25 90:25 | 91:16 | 97:5 99: | | | 82:19 | 81:14 81:17 | 83:12 |
| settlement [3] | 84:12 | 94:3 99:7 | 99:13 | 103:16 104 | | Valerica [1] | 89:15 | 95:15 95:18 | 113:6 |
| 84:19 106:22 | | 99:20 | | | 1:11 111:17 | various [2] | 108:9 | | |
| short [1] 94:2 | | substantial [2] | 82:9 | | | 108:16 | | Yorkers [1] | 110:16 |
| shortly [1] | 94:4 | 85:4 | | themselve | | | 108:10 | | |
| | 71.1 | such [4] 84:11 | 106:7 | thereafter | | | | | |
| sides [1] 108:18 | | 107:4 107:6 | 100.7 | third [1] 86: | :5 | " " | 104:19 | | |
| signed [2] | 94:4 | | 00.22 | thorough | | | 105:22 | | |
| 94:6 | | Sue [2] 88:20 | 88:23 | three [6] 79: | | | 108:11 | | |
| significant [1] | 110:13 | suggest [1] | 107:13 | | | virtue [1] | 107:22 | | |
| Silverstein [2] | | Suite [2] 80:19 | 81:13 | 86:4 87: | 7 90:18 | 1 | 85:23 | | |
| 89:6 | 33.21 | sum[1] 90:7 | | 104:8 | | | 86:4 | | |
| | 104.17 | | 101.22 | through [9] | | | 92:15 | | |
| similarly [1] | 104:17 | summed [1] | 101:22 | 92:19 92: | | | 93:9 | | |
| simply [1] | 96:13 | supplement [1] | | 96:21 97: | | | 112:4 | | |
| single [3] | 87:5 | supplemental | | 98:16 99: | | 112:4 | | | |
| 87:6 92:21 | | 85:10 85:21 | 86:14 | tie [1] 108 | 8:3 | 1 . | 85:8 | | |
| SIT [3] 101:9 | 101:15 | 86:15 94:6 | 112:5 | tinkering [| | 85:13 85:22 | 85:8 86:4 | | |
| 101:18 | -01.10 | supplied [1] | 98:16 | tóday [15] | 82:7 | | ou: 4 | | |
| situation [1] | 110.20 | | 101:24 | 82:14 82: | | 86:6 | | } | |
| | 110:20 | supply [1] | | | | volumetric [1] | | | |
| slightly [2] | 97:10 | support [3] | 95:10 | 84:9 91: | | W [2] 80:3 | 82:20 | | |
| 97:24 | | 95:12 96:24 | | 92:8 92: | | | 89:23 | | |
| small [6] | 80:17 | suppose [2] | 98:6 | 93:18 95: 98:10 98: | | 89:24 | IMD | | |
| 83:5 90:23 | 95:16 | 98:10 | | | | | 85:14 | | |
| 99:16 104:13 | | surcharge [4] | 101:9 | today's [1] | | | | ļ | |
| someone [1] | 97:8 | 101:16 101:19 | | together [4] | | | 80:14 | (| |
| somewhat [1] | 98:7 | suspect [1] | 100:8 | 93:8 94: | 2 94:7 | | 90:12 | l | |
| | | | | took [1] 84: | | | 99:9 | ĺ | |
| sooner [1] | 107:8 | switching [1] | 102:19 | total [3] 90: | | wants [1] | 83:19 | l | |
| sort[1] 102:8 | | sworn [2] | 84:5 | 101:23 | ., 101.10 | | 89:25 | 1 | |
| Spanos [1] | 93:5 | 100:18 | | | 101 15 | | 107:7 | | |
| specific [2] | 110:2 | T[1] 88:9 | | totaled [1] | 101:15 | 107:12 | 101.1 | 1 | |
| | 110.2 | taking [1] | 82:17 | track [1] 96: | :7 | | 01.0 | | |
| 1 110.0 | | I LUKELIJE III | 04.1/ | 1 | | White [2] | 81:9 | ĺ | |
| 110:9 | | , | | i | | | | | |