

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

IN THE MATTER OF THE)	Docket No.
APPLICATION OF)	15-2302-01
CARBON/EMERY TELECOM INC.)	
FOR AN INCREASE IN UTAH)	Hearing
UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND)	
SUPPORT)	VOLUME 2

January 27, 2016
9:14 a.m.

Hearing Officer: Jennie T. Jonsson

Location: Public Service Commission
160 East 300 South, Room 451
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Job No. 281111
Reporter: Teri Hansen Cronenwett
Certified Realtime Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

For Carbon/Emery: Kira M. Slawson
 BLACKBURN & TOLL
 257 Eats 200 South
 Suite 800
 Salt Lake City, UT 84111
 (801) 521-7900
 kslawson@blackburn-stoll.com

For the Division of Public Utilities: Justin C. Jetter
 ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
 160 East 300 South
 5th Floor
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114
 (801) 366-0335
 jjettter@utah.gov

For the Office of Consumer Services: Robert J. Moore
 ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
 160 East 300 South
 5th Floor
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114
 (801) 366-0353
 rmoore@utah.gov

I N D E X

Witness	Page
DAVID BREVITZ	
Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	249
Cross-Examination by Mr. Jetter	259
Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	260
BION OSTRANDER	
Direct Examination by Mr. Moore	263
Cross-Examination by Ms. Slawson	284
Cross-Examination by Mr. Jetter	298
Redirect Examination by Mr. Moore	299

1	DOUGLAS MEREDITH	
2	Direct Examination by Ms. Slawson	301
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Jetter	304
3	Redirect Examination by Ms. Slawson	313
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 January 27, 2016

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3 JUDGE JONSSON: Good morning. For the record,
4 today is Wednesday, January 27th, 2016. It's just after
5 nine o'clock in the morning. We've had some technical
6 difficulties in getting going. But this is the date and
7 time set for the continuation of the hearing, the formal
8 hearing in docket No. 15-2302-01 in the matter of the
9 application of Carbon/Emery Telecom, Incorporated, for
10 an increase in Utah Universal Service Fund Support.

11 We are to the point in the proceeding where
12 the Office of Consumer Services has the opportunity to
13 present its case in chief. So Mr. Moore, if you're
14 ready.

15 MR. MOORE: Yes, your Honor.

16 JUDGE JONSSON: Take it away.

17 MR. MOORE: Initially, if I may, at the
18 pleasure of the record to correct an error.

19 JUDGE JONSSON: Please.

20 MR. MOORE: It's been brought to my attention,
21 the very first words out of my mouth yesterday were
22 incorrect. Apparently I testified that I was
23 representing the Office of Community Services instead of
24 the Office of Consumer Service. I'd like to make that
25 correction on the record.

1 JUDGE JONSSON: Thank you.

2 MR. MOORE: The office calls David Brevitz.

3 DAVID BREVITZ,

4 called as a witness at the instance of the Office of
5 Consumer Services, having been first duly sworn, was
6 examined and testified as follows:

7 DIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. MOORE:

9 Q. Could you state your name, employer and
10 business address.

11 A. My name is David Brevitz. I'm an independent
12 regulatory consultant employed on behalf the Office of
13 Consumer Services in this matter.

14 Q. Have you reviewed the application and
15 testimony presented in this docket?

16 A. Yes, I have.

17 Q. Have you filed direct rebuttal and surrebuttal
18 testimony?

19 A. Yes, along with related exhibits.

20 Q. Do you have any changes to this testimony?

21 A. I have three changes. The first -- in each
22 piece of testimony. The first change is in my direct,
23 and it parallels the change that Mr. Coleman made
24 yesterday. And it involves confidential numbers. But I
25 think if I refer to Mr. Coleman's change, we can

1 accomplish that in public.

2 At Line 103 of my direct testimony, there is a
3 table which derives the weighted average rate of return,
4 and the separations factors in that table are slightly
5 off what they should be. So if one puts in the
6 separations factors that Mr. Coleman put in yesterday
7 and runs the arithmetic, the weighted average return
8 changes from the 8.45 percent shown in the direct as
9 filed to 8.46 percent.

10 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay.

11 A. And that should be the change. If we're ready
12 to move on to the next change, in my rebuttal at Line
13 20 -- at Line 98, change 1984 to 1991.

14 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. Tell me the line again.
15 Sorry.

16 THE WITNESS: Line 98, change 1984 to 1991.

17 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay.

18 A. And then in my surrebuttal at Line 354, delete
19 two words. Delete "expected future." And that
20 completes my changes.

21 JUDGE JONSSON: Thank you.

22 **Q. (By Mr. Moore) Other than those changes, if I**
23 **asked you the questions presented in your written**
24 **testimony, would your answers be the same?**

25 A. Yes, they would.

1 Q. Have you prepared a summary of your testimony?

2 A. Yes, I have.

3 Q. Would you read that into the record please?

4 A. Yes, I will. My direct rebuttal and
5 surrebuttal testimonies and related exhibits have been
6 pre-filed on behalf of the Office of Consumer Services
7 on the subject of the appropriate rate of return for
8 Carbon/Emery's application for increased Utah universal
9 service funds.

10 This case differs from a general rate case
11 where a company seeks to collect its revenue requirement
12 only from its customers. In this case Carbon/Emery
13 seeks to transfer money from all consumers in Utah to
14 the members of Emery Telcom. At least three rate return
15 issues have been presented to the commission.

16 The first is, what is the investors' required
17 return on equity for the state portion of the weighted
18 average cost of capital? The second question is, what
19 is the appropriate balance of debt versus equity to be
20 assumed for the hypothetical capital structure for the
21 state portion of the weighted average cost of capital
22 since Carbon/Emery is now 100 percent equity on its
23 books?

24 The third question is, what's the appropriate
25 rate of return for the interstate portion of weighted

1 average cost of capital to be drawn from the FCC's Form
2 492 rate of return report?

3 In my testimonies, I made the following
4 observations and recommendations to the commission:
5 First, Carbon/Emery presents its proposed rate of return
6 and equity based on improper risk assessment that is
7 contrary to modern portfolio theory, basic principles of
8 finance and long-standing regulatory practice.

9 In particular, the company advocates that
10 various premia be layered on top of determined rate of
11 return based on individual company risk assessment.
12 This advocacy is entirely inconsistent with modern
13 portfolio theory under which investors are compensated
14 only for systematic risk within an efficient portfolio
15 but not for any unsystematic risk such as the specific
16 risks of an individual company.

17 Systematic risk is measured by beta in the
18 capital asset pricing model, which accounts for the
19 firm's sensitivity to changes in macroeconomic factors
20 such as inflation, the state of the economy, the term
21 structure of interest rates, and the spread between
22 yields on low and high grade bonds.

23 The investor-required return on a company's
24 stock is a function only of the risk factors that affect
25 all stocks, systematic risk. Under modern portfolio

1 theory, investors are not compensated for firm-specific
2 or unsystematic risks since the investor can minimize
3 these risks by adhering to the cardinal rule of
4 investing, diversify.

5 Carbon/Emery's emphasis on firm-specific risk
6 and various premia results in an inappropriately high
7 requested rate of return on equity which should be
8 rejected by the commission. Second, Carbon/Emery's
9 advocacy of recognizing firm-specific risk in various
10 premia is inconsistent with the efficient market
11 principles which underlie the operation of global
12 capital markets.

13 Were these various premia to actually exist,
14 the implication would be that their investment
15 strategies to profitably exploit them, efficient markets
16 arbitrage away any apparent excess returns.

17 Third, Carbon/Emery's advocacy of recognizing
18 firm specific risks and various premia as well as
19 leverage beta are not accepted approaches to rate of
20 return determination in state rate making proceedings.
21 Carbon/Emery provides no citations to any decision by
22 the State Regulatory Commission accepting this approach.

23 In my search I could not find any instances
24 where a state regulatory commission accepted such
25 recommendations. However, I did find instances where

1 state commissions explicitly rejected these type of
2 approach.

3 If the commission accepts Carbon/Emery's
4 advocacy in this case, it can expect many jurisdictional
5 utilities across all sectors to seek higher rates of
6 return based on various premia specifically seeking
7 inclusion of a small company premium.

8 No. 4, Carbon/Emery's advocacy of recognizing
9 firm specific risks in various premia is one directional
10 and improperly ignores substantial offsetting additional
11 benefits, which pertain to incumbent local exchange
12 companies such as subsidy funds administered by state
13 and federal regulators, subsidized long-term debt
14 funding available from the RUS, subsidized long-term
15 debt funding available from banks owned by incumbent
16 local exchange companies such as CoBank, and the ability
17 to raise rates by a general rate case and long-standing
18 monopoly franchise originally granted to incumbent local
19 exchange companies.

20 Fifth, Carbon/Emery fails to provide a rate of
21 return calculation which is consistent and comports with
22 long standing State Regulatory Commission practices and
23 modern portfolio theory. My testimony provides a
24 recommended return on equity of 10 percent based on
25 appropriate and consistent rate of return estimations

1 from recent determinations for state universal service
2 funding using both the standard CAPM, C-A-P-M and DCF
3 methodologies.

4 The commission can appropriately rely on these
5 estimations and recommendations in this case. DCU also
6 provides a recommendation based on the standard CAPM
7 methodology which again is consistent with long-standing
8 regulatory practice.

9 Six, Carbon/Emery recommends a capital
10 structure of 65 percent equity and 35 percent debt for
11 the computation of the state portion of the weighted
12 cost of capital. OCS recommends the commission employ a
13 50-50 capital structure based on the fact that such a
14 capital structure is more balanced in favor -- the
15 requested capital structure is imbalanced in favor of
16 the individual company and against the consumers which
17 pay money into the UUSF.

18 Furthermore, the commission explicitly
19 rejected the use of 65-35 hypothetical capital structure
20 in favor of individual company determinations. The
21 50-50 that the OCS recommends comes from an analysis of
22 comparable companies.

23 No. 7, "The commission's rule requires
24 calculation of a weighted average rate of return on
25 capital of the intrastate and interstate jurisdiction."

1 That's a quote from the applicable rule. "From the
2 FCC's Form 492 rate of return report, which is generated
3 by the NECA administration on behalf of the NECA pool."

4 Carbon/Emery selects a return from this report
5 which comprises only a small portion of the interstate
6 jurisdiction and not the full interstate jurisdiction.
7 The interstate jurisdiction is comprised of multiple
8 services including common line, special access and
9 switched access services.

10 The commission's rule evidently did not
11 contemplate that the Form 492 report has more than one
12 rate of return on it. And not -- and the rule is not
13 specific on which rate of return to use from that form.
14 OCS believes the proper application of the rule requires
15 a rate of the return which covers all interstate
16 services, and that return would be the 9.40 percent rate
17 of return recommended in my testimonies.

18 The rule refers only to a rate of return on
19 the Form 492, not any separate or additional rate of
20 return calculations. It's reasonable for the commission
21 to employ the rate of return on Form 492 which captures
22 all interstate services and includes hundreds of rural
23 telephone companies across the country such as
24 Carbon/Emery.

25 There seems to be some confusion surrounding

1 the rule of NECA, the role of NECA and the Form 492
2 report. All rural telephone companies are in NECA's
3 common line pool. However, some companies, including
4 Emery, have elected to withdraw from NECA's traffic
5 sensitive and special access pools.

6 All companies offer common line special access
7 and traffic-sensitive access services in the interstate
8 jurisdiction. Each company has the choice of offering
9 special access and traffic sensitive access services,
10 either through the NECA pooling arrangements or by
11 managing and administering their own interstate tariffs.

12 No. 8. Carbon/Emery makes various assertions
13 that the company's access to capital is constrained and
14 therefore, the much higher rate of return sought is
15 justified. However, Carbon/Emery provides no specific
16 evidence that access to capital is in fact constrained,
17 and in fact, its financial results demonstrate the
18 opposite.

19 Carbon/Emery's paid off all its long-term
20 debt, and at the same time it has substantially grown
21 member equity. Cooperative members continue to
22 contribute to and benefit from growing member equity.

23 Lastly, Carbon/Emery's rate of return
24 recommendations is imbalanced against the Utah statewide
25 consumers that pay money to fund the UUSF. This

1 imbalance can be considered from the likely reaction of
2 a Utah consumer to the fact that the company has
3 suggested it's appropriate that the consumer pay a 16.83
4 percent return to the company's member owners.

5 Such a consumer would no doubt refer to his or
6 her experience with investments and returns and view
7 such a request with dismay and perhaps anger, given that
8 investment experience, and especially so since the
9 consumer most likely cannot use Carbon/Emery services.

10 OCS's rate of the return recommendation of
11 8.46 is properly balanced between the consumers which
12 fund the UUSF and the need to fund appropriate cost of
13 basic telephone service from the UUSF. Furthermore,
14 this recommended rate of return is consistent with
15 recent return on equity decisions of the commission.
16 And therefore, we recommend that the commission adopt
17 the 8.46 rate of return as recommended.

18 **Q. Does that complete your summary?**

19 **A.** Yes, it does.

20 MR. MOORE: Mr. Brevitz is available for
21 cross.

22 JUDGE JONSSON: Ms. Slawson.

23 MS. SLAWSON: Carbon/Emery has no questions
24 for Mr. Brevitz.

25 JUDGE JONSSON: Mr. Jetter.

1 MR. JETTER: I do have a few questions for
2 Mr. Brevitz. I think they'll be relatively brief.

3 CROSS-EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. JETTER:

5 Q. Are you familiar with, and maybe counsel might
6 have a copy, of OCS Exhibit 2R-2 which is a letter --

7 A. I have it.

8 Q. Okay. And I'm going to read briefly from that
9 letter a sentence that appears about a little beyond
10 halfway down. And this reads, "The general parameters
11 of the rule accompanied by the variability attempted to
12 be included in the rule proposed may be applied by the
13 division itself in its interactions with companies."

14 Is that an accurate reading of what's included
15 in that letter?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And I believe in your opening statement you
18 had said that the commission rejected the rule; is that
19 correct?

20 A. Yes. Uh-huh.

21 Q. Is it your understanding then that the
22 commission also rejected the principles within the rule
23 and rejected their use in the future?

24 A. No. I would not say that.

25 Q. Okay. And finally, would it be reasonable for

1 a rural utility, a rural telephone company, potentially
2 to fall within the range of possible capital structures
3 that could all be considered reasonable?

4 A. I don't know that I would put it that way. I
5 would say that the commission can and will exercise its
6 knowledge and judgment to determine what the appropriate
7 capital structure is in this case. We recommended
8 50-50. The department's recommended 65-35.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. And the commission will make a decision.

11 Q. That's the only questions I have for you.

12 Thank you.

13 A. Uh-huh.

14 JUDGE JONSSON: Any redirect?

15 MR. MOORE: One quick one.

16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. MOORE:

18 Q. After the sentence that Mr. Jetter read to
19 you, is the next question -- sentence, "The commission
20 is also concerned of the impact of a rule in setting
21 just and reasonable rates under Title 54 where the
22 commission is required to make a determination based
23 upon the evidence presented in adjudicated proceedings,
24 based on circumstances facing each company relevant to
25 the time in which rates will be affected"?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Do you believe that's consistent with a, an
3 ongoing policy setting rates consistent throughout the
4 local telephone companies?

5 A. Can you repeat that.

6 Q. Do you believe that's consistent with the
7 notion that there should be a long-term policy setting
8 capital structure for incumbent telephone companies?

9 A. I think the sentence that we just went over
10 indicates that the commission desires to have the
11 ability to make determinations based on the facts and
12 circumstances in the individual cases as they arise,
13 rather than have the outcome governed by a particular
14 rule.

15 MR. MOORE: Thank you. I have no further
16 questions.

17 JUDGE JONSSON: Recross?

18 MR. JETTER: No.

19 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. Mr. Brevitz, I just
20 want to make sure that I understand. So you're
21 recommending that the interstate rate of return taken
22 off of the NECA form is 9.4, correct?

23 THE WITNESS: Yes. For all the relevant lines
24 of business in the interstate jurisdictions.

25 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. And on the intrastate

1 where you're evaluating cost of debt and cost of equity,
2 there's no dispute that the cost of debt is the 5.636
3 that Carbon put in its application, right?

4 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct.

5 JUDGE JONSSON: The cost of equity is where we
6 have the dispute. And your recommendation is for 10
7 percent?

8 THE WITNESS: Yes.

9 JUDGE JONSSON: Right? And so your, your
10 blend intrastate rate is then the 8.46, or is that the
11 total overall?

12 THE WITNESS: 8.46 is the overall combined
13 weighted average cost of capital for both jurisdictions.

14 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay.

15 THE WITNESS: 7.82 is the cost of capital for
16 the state jurisdiction.

17 JUDGE JONSSON: That was my question.

18 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

19 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. 7.82 percent for the
20 intrastate cost of equity.

21 THE WITNESS: Yeah, cost of capital. That's
22 the blended cost of debt and equity.

23 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. Great. Thank you.

24 THE WITNESS: And then the interstate return
25 of 9.40 is a comprehensive overall return for both debt

1 and equity.

2 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. MOORE: Office calls Bion Ostrander.

4 BION OSTRANDER,

5 called as a witness at the instance of the Office of
6 Consumer Services, having been first duly sworn, was
7 examined and testified as follows:

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. MOORE:

10 Q. For the record, can you state your name, your
11 employer and your business address.

12 A. Bion Ostrander, Ostrander Consulting, 1121 SW
13 Chetopa Trail, Topeka, Kansas, 66615.

14 Q. Have you reviewed the application and the
15 written testimony in this case?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Did you file pre -- written test -- written
18 direct testimony and written surrebuttal testimony in
19 this case?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you have any changes to this testimony?

22 A. Yes. I am going to start with my revised
23 direct testimony, page 1, Line 3. After the reading
24 that says, "I am an independent regulatory consultant,"
25 there should be a period. And then the remainder of

1 that sentence and the related footnote should be
2 stricken.

3 And in its place should be inserted, "I have
4 previously practiced as a CPA in Kansas since 1990."
5 But I am not presently holding myself out as a CPA in
6 Kansas because I have not renewed my permit to practice,
7 and I have not yet submitted the required hours of
8 continuing education.

9 And that same change should also be made to my
10 OCS Exhibit 1D-1 which is my CV. And if you go to that
11 Exhibit, 1D-1, the second sentence and related footnote
12 should be stricken. So where it says, "I am an
13 independent regulatory consultant and have maintained an
14 uninterrupted permit to practice as a certified public
15 accountant in the state of Kansas since 1990," that
16 should be stricken.

17 The reason I am making that change is just to
18 make sure and to clarify in case there is any
19 misunderstanding that I'm not holding myself out at this
20 time as a CPA with a permit to practice. That will be
21 renewed probably in the next few months, pending me
22 getting my CPE continuing hours -- continuing education
23 hours submitted.

24 **Q. Was that your only change?**

25 **A.** No. I have some other changes. Page 19 --

1 JUDGE JONSSON: Is this still in your revised
2 direct?

3 THE WITNESS: Yes.

4 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay.

5 A. Page 19. If you go to table BC03, under the
6 column that says allocation factors, if you go down to
7 the third line that says CABS, that should be stricken
8 and should be changed to "accounting in general." And
9 then if you go to the 8th line down which currently says
10 Human Resources, that should be stricken and again that
11 should say, "accounting in general."

12 I'm making this change because there was a
13 company document that had these allocation factors in
14 that format that I think were all under the same
15 assumption now that the accounting in general factor is
16 applied to those particular department cost pools.

17 I have some more changes. If you go to page
18 27, the sentence that starts on 5, on Line 581 through
19 Line 585 should be stricken. That starts out, "If total
20 revenues was adopted..." And the reason that I'm
21 striking that sentence is because the sentence down on
22 Lines 589 and 594 basically state the same thing and
23 provide that -- state that with more clarity.

24 And now page 30, going to Footnote 37. And
25 I'm going to add some words on the end of that sentence

1 so that sentence currently ends with OCS 2.36. And the
2 remaining language after that should say, "...for Carbon
3 and 2.40 for Emery, comma, with the related Excel
4 spreadsheets for these data request responses provided
5 with my direct testimony at work paper 1.5."

6 The reason I am making that change is because
7 OCS data request 2.36 relates to Carbon, and OCS data
8 request 2.40 relate to Emery. But they both provide the
9 same information related to the overheads. And when you
10 look at certain Excel files, they may say 2.36 or 2.40,
11 but they're the same information. They're just for
12 either company, although it's the same information.

13 Page 31 -- I'm sorry. Yes, page 31, footnote
14 38, this will be the same change. After the current
15 language it says, "OCS 2.36," and the language that
16 should be added to that is, "...for Carbon and 2.40 for
17 Emery, with the related Excel spreadsheets for these
18 data request responses provided with my direct testimony
19 in work paper 1.5."

20 Also on page 31, Line 669 the first word
21 there, "Emery," that should be changed to
22 "Carbon/Emery's." Page 34, Line 735, "Column H" should
23 be changed to read "Column J." Page 35, Line 745
24 "Column I" should be changed to "Column K." Page 36
25 Line 781 after the word, "of," the two words, "triple

1 play" should be inserted there.

2 Page 37, Line 783, strike the word, "IP TV"
3 and insert "digital TV." This change is made to reflect
4 that the triple play bundle includes one regulated
5 service and two nonregulated services. But that other
6 nonregulated service is digital TV and not IP TV. And
7 that concludes the changes for my direct.

8 And I have one change for my surrebuttal. And
9 that is at page 20, Line 450, the word, "interstate"
10 should be changed to "intrastate." And finally, the
11 last change that I have to my testimony is, I'm
12 withdrawing my adjustment related to the migration of
13 cable TV customers from the cable TV affiliate to the
14 Internet affiliate. This adjustment was originally
15 proposed by DPU and then withdrawn. And now I've
16 withdrawn that adjustment. That concludes my changes.

17 **Q. (By Mr. Moore) Other than those changes, if I**
18 **were to ask you those questions in your prepared**
19 **testimony, would your answers be the same?**

20 A. Yes.

21 **Q. Have you prepared a summary of your testimony?**

22 A. I have. In this case, Carbon seeks about
23 800,000 of new UUSF, along with existing UUSF of about
24 one million for total UUSF of about 1.8 million that it
25 is seeking. Through its adjustments in this case, the

1 OCS proposes to eliminate all of the new UUSF of 800,000
2 that Carbon is requesting and remove about 400,000 of
3 the existing UUSF so that OCS's bottom line
4 recommendation is that Carbon should get about 600,000
5 of UUSF.

6 My testimony proposes adjustments that are
7 consistent with state and federal law and regulatory
8 best practices included in Section 254K of the Federal
9 Telecom Act, Utah Code 54-8B-6 and the FCC's Part 32
10 affiliate transaction rules, along with the FCC's Part
11 64 cost allocation procedures.

12 The largest adjustment that I propose is
13 related to an overhead adjustment. And if this
14 adjustment is not made, it is my opinion that
15 Carbon/Emery's regulated operations will be subsidizing
16 its nonregulated operations for a fairly significant
17 amount. And that would be in violation of Utah Code
18 54-8B-6.

19 Regarding the overhead adjustment, I have a
20 number of concerns. One is that Carbon has not provided
21 a fully documented and supported Part 64 cost allocation
22 manual. This manual is deficient in a number of ways.
23 When the information was first submitted, it included
24 basically some PDF pages that look like they'd been in
25 Excel format, I think about 10 pages.

1 And those pages had no underlying Excel
2 spreadsheets at that time that showed the calculations
3 or explanation of how those factors were derived.
4 Subsequently, through a data request that OCS sent
5 asking for all supporting calculations and documentation
6 for the CAM, the company did provide some Excel
7 spreadsheets.

8 But once again, they provided these Excel
9 spreadsheets without really any written explanation of
10 what literally are hundreds of thousands of fields
11 included in these spreadsheets.

12 Also some of these spreadsheets are
13 database-type Excel documents. And they were not
14 presorted to show the amount of cost pools and how much
15 had been allocated to various expense accounts through
16 various allocation factors. And that's also a
17 requirement of the CAM.

18 So essentially the OCS is left with a CAM
19 with -- that really doesn't have a lot of narrative
20 explanation as to how the factors were derived along
21 with the supporting calculations.

22 Some of the problems I have with the Carbon
23 allocation factors are varied and numerous. First of
24 all, Carbon, for the cost pools of chief executive
25 officer, board of directors and public relations and

1 marketing, they allocate 75 percent of those costs to
2 regulated operation and 25 percent to nonreg. I have
3 made adjustments --

4 JUDGE JONSSON: Can I get the pools again.
5 CEO, board...

6 THE WITNESS: And public relations slash
7 marketing. And each one of those cost pools uses the
8 same allocation factor, which is a single input
9 allocation factor that is the number of billing records.
10 For those three cost pools -- anyway, for the board of
11 director and chief executive officer cost pools, I have
12 changed that allocation factor to allocating 50 percent
13 to regulated and 50 percent to nonregulated.

14 For the remaining cost pool, public relations
15 and marketing, I have changed that to an allocation
16 factor of 25 percent regulated and 75 percent
17 nonregulated.

18 The loan remaining cost pool which I've
19 adjusted is customer service representatives. And the
20 company has allocated about 65 percent of those costs to
21 regulated operations and about 35 percent to nonreg.
22 And my adjustment basically flips those two allocations
23 and allocates about 35 percent to regulated and 65
24 percent to nonregulated.

25 The reason that I have opted to use a

1 corporate allocation factor that includes five inputs
2 instead of one is because in my vast experience in
3 telecommunications and regulation in general, I've never
4 seen a corporate overhead allocator that uses customer
5 records as one single input.

6 Corporate overhead costs are varied and kind
7 of like a hodgepodge of various different expenses. And
8 so it would not usually be anticipated that one single
9 allocator could be cost causative or directly related to
10 all of those different types of expenses. Also, Carbon
11 is not provided any precedent in Utah cases or other
12 regulatory cases to show that a single input billing
13 records allocator has been accepted or adopted in a
14 regulatory proceeding.

15 One of the examples that I've talked about is
16 using Mr. Johansen, the chief executive officer, as an
17 example. Mr. Johansen's salaries, benefits, travel
18 costs, cell phone costs and miscellaneous travel costs
19 and credit card costs are all included in the chief
20 executive officer cost pool. And so they're all
21 allocated by single input factor of number of billing
22 records.

23 But I don't think that the manner in which
24 Mr. Johansen spends his time is cost causative or
25 directly related to the number of billing records. I

1 don't believe there's a director cost causative
2 relationship in that regard.

3 The allocators that I have used or the inputs
4 and drivers that I have used in my corporate overhead
5 allocators consist of five elements. It's revenues,
6 expenses, payroll, net plant, and number of billing
7 records. So I have included the company's billing
8 records as one component, but I've also included four
9 other components.

10 The company has taken exception with my use of
11 revenues as one of the inputs to the corporate overhead
12 allocator. However, it was just as recent as May 2014
13 that the company itself used revenues as a single driver
14 for the business solutions allocator. So it's clear
15 that despite their objection to me using revenues, they
16 themselves were using the same revenues allocator as a
17 driver in another overhead allocator -- or another
18 allocator.

19 Also, around 19 -- I'm sorry. Around year
20 2006, the company used three inputs, including payroll,
21 number of customers and billing records, for the
22 corporate overhead general and allocating -- accounting
23 allocator.

24 So it's clear that the company has used
25 revenues and has used multiple inputs in the past. But

1 for some reason they've changed that to a single unit
2 allocator which is number of billing records. And
3 coincidentally using that single allocator drives more
4 cost to the regulated operations and assists the company
5 in getting increased UUSF.

6 The company has also taken exception with my
7 use of an allocator of 24 of 25 percent for allocating
8 the public relations and marketing cost to regulated
9 operations. One of the examples I give is the triple
10 play bundle which the company offers to its customers,
11 which includes one regulated service, which is basic
12 local service, and two nonregulated services which are
13 Internet and digital TV.

14 And for simplicity purposes, you could
15 rationalize that I'm going to allocate a third of the
16 advertising public relations costs to each one of these
17 services, just on a common sense or reasonableness
18 standpoint.

19 But when I further examine the type of
20 advertising information the company provided me, I saw
21 that there was no specific advertising or documentation
22 that advertised basic local service as a stand-alone
23 service. And even the advertising for triple play never
24 specifically promoted local service. It just merely
25 listed local service as one of the components of the

1 triple play package.

2 Regarding the customer service representatives
3 factor, we also have a difference of opinion there. I
4 have allocated 35 percent of those costs to regulated
5 operations. Basically using some of the same rationale
6 that I used for the 25 percent factor for payroll and
7 marketing, except I ratcheted it up another 5 percent
8 just to be conservative.

9 The company's claim that the amount that I
10 have allocated of 900 -- I'm sorry. That's a
11 confidential number. The company claims that the number
12 that I have allocated is excessive and they said the
13 amount should be less than that. And in rebuttal,
14 Carbon/Emery provided an Excel spreadsheet with pivot
15 table. However, when I attempted to open that pivot
16 table and look at it, it was hard-wired or hard-coded.

17 So I could not open it up. I could not look
18 at the formulas. I could not see how the company
19 determined its calculations. So I'm not necessarily
20 saying it's incorrect. I'm just saying I don't have
21 adequate information at this point in time to audit that
22 information. And the company subsequently never sent me
23 an updated disk or information that would fix that
24 information.

25 Another adjustment that I'm proposing is to

1 only include 50 percent of telephone plan under
2 construction of materials and supplies and rate base,
3 and I've basically used the same logic for removing 50
4 percent of those costs in both cases. Those account
5 balances have fluctuated significantly in recent years,
6 and it appears a significant increase in these accounts
7 is due to the company's placement of fiber.

8 However, my concern is, if we establish the
9 level of telephone plan under construction materials and
10 supplies at the highest level it may ever be because of
11 the company's construction fiber placement plan, when
12 those levels fall off, they will continue to recover
13 UUSF at those unusually high levels. Therefore, I have
14 removed 50 percent of those amounts to reflect what I
15 think is a more reasonable level based on historical
16 levels.

17 Another adjustment I have made is to remove
18 the company's proposed three year projection of an
19 access line loss. The company projects that it will
20 lose access lines through three years outside the test
21 period through December 17th. They have already made
22 one true-up revision to that adjustment because their
23 projection was not accurate, and that's an indication of
24 the problems with using these projections.

25 There are a lot of other changes in revenues

1 expenses that could possibly occur in the next three
2 years, and the company has not made any attempt to
3 synchronize those adjustment. They've basically taken
4 one single component and said that is going to change in
5 the next three years and apparently assume that there
6 will be no other changes for the next three years. And
7 I don't think that's a reasonable manner to approach
8 this. I think it's more reasonable just to go ahead and
9 withdraw that adjustment or remove it.

10 Also, I'm proposing an Adjustment 8 for
11 depreciation. My adjustment is somewhat similar to the
12 DPU's adjustment in that we're both attempting to come
13 to the reasonable depreciation expense amounts, except
14 we're coming at it from different angles. I'm not
15 opposed to the DPU adjustment. I just look at it as
16 another methodology, an alternative to mine.

17 I've adjusted four accounts. And for the two
18 larger accounts related to subscriber equipment and
19 aerial cable, these accounts will be fully depreciated
20 in the not-so-far future. And I have taken the amount
21 of depreciation that remains to be depreciated on those
22 accounts and amortized it over five years. So
23 essentially I've delayed recovery of that depreciation
24 from three years to five years.

25 And one thing I do want to make clear is that

1 I'm only temporarily stopping depreciation on these
2 accounts. I'm not saying that these accounts will be
3 permanently stopped from recording depreciation. If the
4 company continues to make plan additions to these
5 accounts in the future, I'm not opposed to them coming
6 in and asking for increased UUSF if that occurs.

7 However, the problem that will occur if we
8 don't deal with these depreciation issues now is, once
9 again, the company will receive these elevated levels of
10 depreciation expense in the -- through its UUSF funds
11 that it draws down.

12 And then when these accounts do become fully
13 depreciated and/or if they would stop depreciation on
14 those themselves, they would continue to receive those
15 elevated levels of UUSF without actually incurring the
16 costs. And so those are some of the issues we are
17 attempting to deal with.

18 Finally the last adjustment I propose is an
19 interest synchronization adjustment. And the company is
20 opposed to this adjustment because they say interest
21 synchronization is not reasonable for a company that has
22 a hypothetical capital structure.

23 But I provide an example of a case here in
24 Utah, and I cited to a specific commission order which
25 calculated synchronization on Gunnison Telephone

1 Company. And that was via a stipulation between
2 Gunnison and the DPU, and the commission accepted that
3 stipulation. So there's definitely some precedent
4 there.

5 Also, the company has used the cost of debt in
6 its cost of capital calculations, although it doesn't
7 have any existing debt. So they are getting the
8 advantage of using the cost of debt via an increased
9 rate of return. So that benefits them, and they get
10 increased UUSF.

11 But it appears the company wants the best of
12 both worlds. They want to be able to include the cost
13 of debt in rate of return, and receive an elevated rate
14 of return and increased UUSF, but they don't want to
15 recognize the interest synchronizations on that same
16 cost of debt. So in a sense, they want to recognize
17 cost of debt when it's beneficial to them, but they want
18 to ignore the cost of debt also when it's beneficial to
19 them. That concludes my summary.

20 MR. MOORE: Your Honor, before I submit
21 Mr. Ostrander for cross, I want to state that the OCS
22 had a different understanding with regard to the
23 questions asked by the commission prior to this hearing.
24 We understood that the answers should be in the form of
25 evidence presented by a witnesses.

1 JUDGE JONSSON: That's fine.

2 MR. MOORE: Rather than a policy argument
3 presented by attorneys. However, I would like to simply
4 ask Mr. Ostrander these questions and have him reply
5 quickly. If on cross policy issues comes up, we would
6 like to object to Mr. Ostrander sending up the policies
7 of the OCS and instead introduce those -- if this
8 occurs, introduce the policies through the testimony of
9 Michele Beck of the office.

10 JUDGE JONSSON: We'll deal with that if it
11 comes up. If you feel like you need to change your
12 witness, let me know, and we'll see where we are. To
13 the statement you'd like to have Mr. Ostrander respond
14 to those questions, that's fine. You can go ahead and
15 do that now.

16 Q. (By Mr. Moore) Yes, Mr. Ostrander, in
17 question No. 1, Utah Code 548-B, are you satisfied that
18 the continued or increased disbursements of the UUSF
19 would not serve to subsidize a nonregulated operations
20 of Carbon/Emery, Carbon/Emery Telecom, Carbon/Emery?
21 Why or why not?

22 A. OCS is concerned that continued and increased
23 disbursements from the UUSF would cause nonregulated
24 affiliate operations to be subsidized by Carbon/Emery's
25 regulated operations. And this would be in violation of

1 the statutory language.

2 The adoption of OCS proposed adjustments will
3 sufficiently mitigate the subsidization of nonregulated
4 affiliate operations by Carbon/Emery's regulated
5 operations to warrant continuation of the UUSF at the
6 level we recommend in this case.

7 The commission should adopt OCS adjustments
8 that reduce Carbon/Emery's total proposed UUSF from
9 about 1.8 million to about .6 million, and this would
10 consist of the following: Removing the entirety of OCS
11 proposed new increase in the UUSF of about 816,909 and
12 removing about \$428,897 of Carbon/Emery's existing UUSF
13 to about 1,038,714, which results in a residual amount
14 of 609,907 that Carbon would be able to recover from the
15 UUSF.

16 Carbon/Emery assigns and allocates costs,
17 including corporate overhead expense to its regulated
18 operation that causes nonregulated affiliate services
19 such as retail Internet service provided by
20 Carbon/Emery's nonregulated affiliate to be subsidized
21 by Carbon/Emery's regulated services.

22 As an example, the OCS proposed adjustment
23 BC02 to revise Carbon/Emery's allocation of corporate
24 overhead expenses and shift a certain amount of
25 corporate overhead expenses from regulated operations to

1 nonregulated operations to prevent substantive cross
2 subsidizations of nonregulated operations by regulated
3 operations.

4 In addition, my testimony explains that I have
5 proposed adjustments that are consistent with state and
6 federal law, along with regulatory best practices to
7 help mitigate the negative impact of Carbon/Emery's
8 cross subsidization.

9 Citations to these are included in my
10 testimony. For example, my testimony explains that
11 controls subsidization concerns and related proposed
12 adjustments are properly addressed via Utah Code Section
13 54-8B-6 at Ostrander direct testimony, page 13, Line 292
14 through page 14, Line 313.

15 Also, my direct testimony addresses concerns
16 related to cross subsidization via Section 254K of the
17 Federal Telecom Act of 1996 at my direct testimony page
18 12, Line 261 through page 13, Line 290. Also my
19 testimony addresses concerns related to cross
20 subsidization via the FCC's Part 32 affiliate
21 transaction rules, per FCC Section 32.27, and that's
22 addressed in any direct testimony at page 14, Line 315
23 to page 15, Line 335.

24 The final citation in my direct testimony
25 addresses concerns related to cross subsidization via

1 the FCC's Part 64 allocation of cost rules at FCC
2 Section 64.901-904. And that is cited at my direct
3 testimony page 15, Line 337 to Line 347.

4 Q. The second question reads, "Utah Code Section
5 54-8B-15-1A states, 'Base of phone service means local
6 exchange services.' Utah Code section 54-8B-15-6A
7 states, 'The UUSF shall be designed to promote equitable
8 cost recovery of basic telephone services.'"

9 Are you satisfied that a continued or
10 increasing disbursement from the UUSF -- UUSF to
11 Carbon/Emery would comply with the statutory language?
12 Why or why not?

13 A. OCS is satisfied that reduced level of UUSF
14 that it recommends in this case will allow Carbon/Emery
15 adequate cost recovery related to basic telephone
16 service. The OCS further asserts than an increased
17 disbursement or continued disbursement at current levels
18 would be equitable because it would allow Carbon/Emery
19 cost recovery for more than is necessary for basic
20 telephone service.

21 Q. Question No. 3 reads, "Utah Code section
22 54-8B-15-5 states, 'Operation of the UUSF shall be
23 nondiscriminatory and competitive and technologically
24 neutral in the collection and distribution of funds,
25 neither providing a competitive advantage for nor

1 imposing competitive disadvantage upon any
2 telecommunication provider operating in the state."

3 Are you satisfied that continued or increased
4 disbursement from the UUSF to Carbon/Emery would comply
5 with the statutory language? Why or why not?

6 A. OCS is concerned that the continued and
7 increased disbursements from the UUSF would not promote
8 nondiscriminatory, competitive and technologically
9 neutral collection and distribution of UUSF, which would
10 be in violation of this statutory language.

11 When nonregulated affiliated Internet
12 operations are subsidized by Carbon/Emery's regulated
13 basic local exchange operations, via excessive
14 allocation of nonregulated affiliate cost to regulated
15 operations, this provides the company with excessive
16 UUSF which it can use to undermine competitors that do
17 not have the ability to subsidize their competitive
18 operations because they do not have access to UUSF
19 revenues, and they do not have regulated operations
20 which could be used to subsidize their competitive
21 operations.

22 The adoption of OCS proposed adjustments will
23 sufficiently mitigate any competitive advantage enjoyed
24 by Carbon/Emery to warrant continued disbursement of
25 UUSF funds at the level we recommend. OCS is satisfied

1 that the reduced level of UUSF disbursement that we
2 recommend will not create any competitive disadvantages
3 for Carbon/Emery.

4 MR. MOORE: Mr. Ostrander is available for
5 cross.

6 JUDGE JONSSON: Ms. Slawson.

7 MS. SLAWSON: Thank you. I'm going to need to
8 set up a projector. So it takes a few minutes to warm
9 up. I don't know if you want to break.

10 JUDGE JONSSON: Sure. Let's take a break.
11 Plan on about 10 minutes. See where we are then.

12 (Recess from 11:17 a.m. to 11:29 a.m.)

13 JUDGE JONSSON: All right. We're back on the
14 record. Ms. Slawson, go ahead.

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION

16 BY MS. SLAWSON:

17 Q. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Ostrander.

18 A. Good morning.

19 Q. I wanted to out -- at the outset, you are
20 aware, are you not, that Carbon's current revised
21 request for the UUSF in this case is \$573,643, correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. I'm going to jump around a little bit
24 in the sake of trying to be brief. You just testified
25 that the imputed debt, 35 percent benefits the company.

1 In fact, if the actual company debt is zero, the
2 calculation would show that the state rate of return
3 would be the state return on equity; is that correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Okay. Will you turn in your testimony to OCS
6 Exhibit 1D2 Schedule A3.

7 A. Okay.

8 Q. And I believe this is the schedule that you
9 use as the basis for your table embedded in your
10 testimony BC05; is that correct?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Okay. The revenues that you've listed in
13 Column D on the schedule, because I'm going to talk
14 about actual dollar numbers here, I'm not going to say
15 the numbers. But I want you to look at the column that
16 has the dollar figures in it.

17 A. Okay. So just for clarification, you're on
18 page 2.

19 Q. Page 2 of the --

20 A. There's two pages to that particular --

21 Q. Yeah, let's make sure.

22 A. I just heard the word revenues, so...

23 Q. Yeah, page 2.

24 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. And the exhibit number
25 is OCS Exhibit 1D3. Is that what I heard?

1 MS. SLAWSON: I think it's 1 D-2, Schedule A3,
2 page 2.

3 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay.

4 Q. (By Ms. Slawson) The revenues listed in Column
5 D are annual revenue figures; is that correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Okay. And the operating expenses listed in
8 Column F, those are annual expense figures, correct?

9 A. Correct. They exclude depreciation and income
10 taxes.

11 Q. Right. Net plant that you have listed in
12 Column H, those are annual net plant figures?

13 A. Well, trial balance is not an annual amount.
14 It's -- it's an amount that carries forward. But it's
15 the end of December 31st, 2014.

16 Q. Okay. In your net plant number, you did not
17 reallocate the shared assets which were held 100 percent
18 on the books of ETV, correct?

19 A. I did not do that.

20 Q. Okay.

21 A. And I don't think --

22 Q. And that --

23 A. -- that any of these --

24 Q. That was the question. Thank you. Also, by
25 your --

1 A. Well, they didn't include any adjustments.

2 Q. It's going to go faster if I ask the
3 questions, and you answer the ones that I ask.

4 A. Well, there's -- I have to explain that these
5 amounts don't include any adjustments.

6 JUDGE JONSSON: If there's more that you want
7 to explain, your counsel can help you with that on
8 redirect.

9 THE WITNESS: Okay.

10 Q. (By Ms. Slawson) The -- by using the net plant
11 figure, I believe you've testified this is net plant.
12 So depreciation is eliminated from that; is that
13 correct? Depreciation expense.

14 A. Accumulated depreciation is --

15 Q. Okay.

16 A. -- deducted from that.

17 Q. And by, by using net plant, you don't take
18 into account the different depreciation methods applied
19 to the regulated and the nonregulated companies that
20 were testified to earlier, correct?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Okay. On payroll amounts listed in Column L,
23 those are annual payroll figures?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Okay.

1 A. Without any adjustment.

2 Q. And then, then the billing records that you
3 listed in Column J, you've got those listed as dollar
4 figures, but those are not dollar numbers; is that
5 correct?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. The underlying data for those would be a
8 number of billing records, correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay. And the billing records that you've
11 listed there, if you -- if we eliminate the dollar sign,
12 those are monthly billing records; is that correct?

13 A. I believe that's correct.

14 Q. Okay. So if we were going to be consistent
15 with the analysis, the figure in Column J should be
16 multiplied by 12 to get an annual figure, correct, on
17 billing records?

18 A. Well, it's a matter of --

19 Q. All the other --

20 A. -- what's representative because the -- I'm
21 relying on your allocation factors.

22 Q. Okay. All of the other columns are
23 annualized. But the Column J is a monthly figure; is
24 that correct?

25 A. That's correct.

1 Q. Okay. Let's see. You excluded the -- you
2 just testified that you excluded the accumulated
3 depreciation from the net plant number, correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And then on the operating expenses, did you
6 include from Column F payroll from net operating
7 expenses?

8 A. No, I didn't.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. It's intended to be in there.

11 Q. So you've got payroll in Column J, and then
12 you've also included payroll in Column F; is that
13 correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. And you would agree, would you not,
16 that Carbon/Emery has plant that would be fully
17 depreciated but still has costs associated with it?

18 A. Can you --

19 Q. Plant can be fully depreciated, but it still
20 has costs associated with it. Not depreciation but
21 other costs associated with it, correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. Okay. I want to talk a little bit
24 about -- in your surrebuttal testimony and then here
25 today in your summary, you talked about on the one hand

1 Carbon/Emery gave you hundreds of thousands of fields of
2 information, and then you testified that Carbon wasn't
3 forthcoming with its data. So I want to touch on that a
4 little bit.

5 Looking -- you indicated that Carbon/Emery
6 gave you -- sent you a pivot table that was hard-coded;
7 is that correct?

8 A. Excuse me.

9 Q. You said it wasn't working?

10 A. I was not able to open it up and look at the
11 assumptions or the formulas in it.

12 Q. And that was sent to you how?

13 A. I received it -- that particular version, it
14 was confidential, so I probably received it on a CD.

15 Q. And would it surprise you to know that it was
16 confidential, sent by me and you received it by e-mail?

17 A. That would not surprise me.

18 Q. Okay. And are you saying -- when you're
19 saying you couldn't open it, do you mean you couldn't
20 open the attachment, or do you mean that you couldn't
21 open the pivot table?

22 A. I couldn't open the pivot table.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. I could open the broad Excel spreadsheet.

25 Q. And so when you opened it, the summary page

1 looked like this; is that correct?

2 A. I believe that's correct.

3 Q. Okay. And you're saying that when you went
4 to, for example, Column C-20, CSR Distribution, and you
5 clicked on that, it was hard-coded because the number
6 appeared up in the formula bar but no formula. Is that
7 what you're saying by hard-coded?

8 A. My version -- and maybe you have got this a
9 little bit -- my -- the pivot table appeared like as a
10 square like within the middle of the spreadsheet.

11 Q. Okay. So let's look at the exhibit that we've
12 identified.

13 MS. SLAWSON: I'll make sure that you have the
14 one that's been marked. May I?

15 COURT REPORTER: Yes.

16 Q. (By Ms. Slawson) I have turned to what's been
17 marked as CE Exhibit 3.3R. I'll give you just a minute
18 to get there. Okay. Does the exhibit that's printed in
19 the book look like the exhibit that's on the screen?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. And do you -- are you -- is it your
22 testimony that you received the exhibit that looks like
23 this, or are you testifying that you received an exhibit
24 that looks different?

25 A. I received a particular schedule that had a

1 pivot table that was kind of inserted within the body of
2 the exhibit. So you could appear like you could punch
3 on it and open it up and select things.

4 Q. Okay. Well, let's just see because this is
5 the one that was sent to you. Let's just see. If we go
6 into that column and we double click it like you would
7 do in a pivot table, doesn't that take you to all of the
8 underlying data that the pivot table and that column in
9 the pivot table is representing?

10 A. This particular spreadsheet does.

11 Q. So I guess I want to be clear. You're -- are
12 you suggesting that you did not receive this particular
13 spreadsheet in this particular form?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. So I guess we might need to recall a
16 witness or enter into evidence the e-mail that was sent.
17 Let me ask you this. Did you have any -- did you call
18 when you got the pivot table, and it was represented to
19 be a pivot table, and you couldn't make it work, did you
20 call the company?

21 A. I did better than that. I put it in my
22 testimony. And I never got any response back from the
23 company and never received a replacement disk.

24 Q. No. I'm talking about before under you filed
25 your testimony. When you were in the process of filing

1 -- preparing your testimony, did you call the company?

2 A. No. I didn't know what to --

3 Q. Did you notify your counsel that the document
4 was not as represented, and that he or she should make a
5 call to Carbon/Emery's counsel?

6 A. I didn't know what I was supposed to have and
7 not supposed to have. There's a lot of documents I
8 received --

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. -- which did not have the required
11 information. And so I don't know what Emery was
12 intending to provide me. I never really know that.

13 Q. Well, they said in their testimony they were
14 intending to provide you a pivot table. I would imagine
15 that if the pivot table didn't work, you would contact
16 the company. But you're saying, your testimony here
17 today, is that you did not contact anybody at the
18 company about the nonworking pivot table that you
19 allegedly received; is that correct?

20 A. I did not contact them because it was in my
21 testimony and they could have contacted me.

22 Q. Okay. Yes or no?

23 A. I did not contact them.

24 Q. Okay. That's the only question I have on the
25 pivot table. You also indicated that you received the

1 cost allocation manual -- we're done with this. Have a
2 seat if that's more comfortable for you.

3 You also testified that you received a PDF of
4 the cost allocation manual; is that correct?

5 A. That was -- in the company's original filing,
6 that was a document that was originally provided.

7 Q. Okay. And would, would it surprise to know
8 that a copy of the Excel spreadsheet form of the cost
9 allocation manual was sent by counsel to your counsel
10 the day of the filing?

11 A. I don't know.

12 Q. Of the application.

13 A. I don't know, because sometimes there were
14 documents I would receive, and I would not have a
15 working version.

16 Q. So --

17 A. And some of those documents we got, and some
18 of them we didn't.

19 Q. Would it surprise -- do you have anything to
20 dispute that the document was sent in an Excel
21 spreadsheet version to office for the division and
22 office for the -- I mean counsel for the division and
23 counsel for the office the date it was filed on March --
24 April 2nd?

25 A. I can't confirm if it was or wasn't.

1 Q. Okay.

2 A. I just don't know.

3 Q. Did you visit Carbon or Emery to inspect its
4 books and records or plant prior to filing your
5 testimony in this case?

6 A. No. We --

7 Q. Yes or no?

8 A. We got the indication that DPU was not going
9 to go and do field work, so we decided if they weren't
10 going to go that, it probably would not be necessary for
11 us.

12 Q. Okay. And did you participate in the
13 conference held at the Office of Consumer Services on
14 August 24th with the company and the office to go over
15 some of the details in the testimony that was filed?
16 Did you participate in that conference?

17 A. Conference call?

18 Q. No. We actually had a conference. I just
19 wondered if you were there.

20 A. I don't -- I don't believe so.

21 Q. Okay. And one of your adjustments is with
22 regard to materials and supplies, correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. And you're concerned if Carbon's UUSF is
25 established when the materials and supplies are what you

1 would call high, then the materials and supplies -- and
2 if they then decrease or fall off, level off, that
3 Carbon will over-recover UUSF; is that correct?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. And if Carbon -- and if Carbon's levels of
6 materials and supplies did drop off, it would be
7 reflected on Carbon's annual report filed with the
8 Public Service Commission; is that correct?

9 A. For what period?

10 Q. For the period -- for annually. They file
11 that annually. So the materials and supplies would be
12 reflected on the annual Public Service Commission
13 report, correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Okay. And the division reviews the annual
16 reports, correct?

17 A. They review the annual reports, but that
18 doesn't mean they take actions.

19 Q. But they could. If they determined that the
20 materials and supplies had leveled off or decreased, the
21 Division of Public Utilities could say, "Hey, you're
22 over earning." Is that correct?

23 A. I guess they could.

24 Q. Okay.

25 A. But I'm not aware that they've done that.

1 Q. You're not aware that they've done that in
2 this case, or you're not aware they have done that in
3 any case?

4 A. I'm not aware that they've done that in a
5 number of cases that I've been involved in.

6 Q. Okay. But it wouldn't surprise you to know
7 that they have in fact done that with other telecoms
8 that you have not provide -- or not been involved with?

9 A. Oh, I'm not disputing that.

10 Q. Okay. You also indicated that in your BCO
11 Adjustment 2 with regard to the accounting and general
12 allocator, you don't think billing records as a single
13 input is appropriate; is that correct?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. And yet in Mr. Woolsey's rebuttal testimony,
16 he included a calculation of the A and G allocator using
17 billing records, gross plant and payroll, weighted
18 equally. And the result was within one half of one
19 percent of the original calculation using billing
20 records alone, wasn't it?

21 A. He did that, but he included gross plant
22 instead of net plant. I'm recommending the use of net
23 plant. So he used -- you know, selected some factors
24 that I had not used.

25 Q. Gross -- and he select -- selected gross plant

1 so that all of the plant would be -- all of the plant
2 that might have costs associated would be included in
3 the calculation, correct?

4 A. Well, the problem with that --

5 Q. Well, just yes or no?

6 A. You've got --

7 MR. MOORE: Your Honor, I believe he is --

8 JUDGE JONSSON: Do you know why Woolsey made
9 his calculations as he did?

10 THE WITNESS: I --

11 JUDGE JONSSON: Or would you be guessing?

12 THE WITNESS: I don't know why he did what he
13 did.

14 JUDGE JONSSON: So perhaps that's a question
15 for your own witness.

16 MS. SLAWSON: Okay. One second. Those are
17 all the questions I have.

18 JUDGE JONSSON: Any redirect? Oh, sorry.
19 Justin -- Mr. Jetter. Any cross?

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. JETTER:

22 Q. Thank you, your Honor. I just have one kind
23 of short series of clarification questions, if that's
24 okay.

25 A. Sure.

1 Q. In your opening statement you had mentioned
2 that it was your understanding that the division had
3 withdrawn its adjustment for cable migration; is that
4 correct?

5 A. Had withdrawn its original adjustment.

6 Q. Okay. And what is your position with respect
7 to the -- let me ask a question prior to this one. Is
8 it your understanding that the division maintains a
9 adjustment for cable migration, but it's substantially
10 smaller than it initially proposed?

11 A. I think they might have agreed with
12 Mr. Woolsey's adjustment.

13 Q. Okay. If the division continued a small cable
14 migration adjustment, would you be supportive or opposed
15 to that or uncertain?

16 A. I would not agree with that because I do not
17 agree with Mr. Woolsey's calculation methodology.

18 Q. Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. MOORE: I just have one question, your
20 Honor.

21 JUDGE JONSSON: Uh-huh.

22 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. MOORE:

24 Q. Is there a possible mistake in your testimony
25 regarding the three issues presented to the -- presented

1 **by the commission?**

2 A. There may be a mistake. I'm not sure how this
3 showed up in the official record, but regarding Question
4 No. 2, when I responded, I may have left out the word
5 "not," which would make a big difference in how it
6 reads.

7 **Q. Uh-huh.**

8 A. So this is really just two sentences. So I'll
9 just read the second sentence where I may have
10 inadvertently not included the word "not."

11 "The OCS further asserts that an increased
12 disbursement or continued disbursement at current levels
13 would not be equitable because it would allow
14 Carbon/Emery cost recovery for more than what is
15 necessary for basic telephone service."

16 MR. MOORE: Thank you. I have no further
17 questions.

18 JUDGE JONSSON: Ms. Slawson, anything further
19 for this witness?

20 MS. SLAWSON: No.

21 JUDGE JONSSON: Mr. Jetter?

22 MR. JETTER: No. Thank you.

23 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. Is that -- does that
24 conclude your case in chief?

25 MR. MOORE: That concludes the case. The

1 office rests.

2 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. I spoke with a couple
3 of the commissioners last night. They are willing to
4 take closing argument by brief, if that's what the
5 parties prefer. Ms. Slawson, you've already mentioned
6 that that would be your preference, correct?

7 MS. SLAWSON: That would be -- one point of
8 order. We have URTA as an intervenor.

9 JUDGE JONSSON: All right. You are correct.
10 Very good. Go ahead.

11 MS. SLAWSON: Shall I?

12 JUDGE JONSSON: Uh-huh.

13 MS. SLAWSON: URTA would file -- or would call
14 Douglas Meredith to the stand.

15 JUDGE JONSSON: Mr. Meredith, you remain under
16 oath.

17 THE WITNESS: Yes.

18 DOUGLAS MEREDITH,
19 recalled as a witness at the instance of the intervenor,
20 URTA, having been first previously sworn, was examined
21 and testified as follows:

22 DIRECT EXAMINATION

23 BY MS. SLAWSON:

24 Q. Good morning, Mr. Meredith.

25 A. Good morning.

1 **Q. You've already stated your name, employer and**
2 **business address for the record so we'll skip over that.**
3 **But can you tell us who you are representing?**

4 A. Yes, I'm representing the URTA, the Utah Rural
5 Telecom Association.

6 **Q. And as URTA's witness, do you have a summary**
7 **of your testimony that would differ from the summary you**
8 **previously gave?**

9 A. Yes, just with a little bit more emphasis on a
10 couple of points that URTA is very concerned about.

11 **Q. Go ahead.**

12 A. Good morning, your Honor. The Utah Rural
13 Telecom Association or URTA is an association comprised
14 of 13 members that are incumbent local exchange carriers
15 operating in Utah. URTA members are regulated by the
16 commission and provide operational information to the
17 division and the commission on a regular basis.

18 URTA is very concerned about the division's
19 proposed change of a company's decision of its
20 depreciation method when evaluating Utah USF
21 disbursements or rate case proposals. This proceeding
22 is a case of first impression before the commission for
23 URTA members. This proceeding is the first time a
24 change in depreciation method has been presented before
25 the commission to resolve a dispute between the division

1 and a URTA member.

2 URTA recommends that the commission allow URTA
3 members to use their chosen group asset method, as
4 prescribed by Part 32 of the code of federal
5 regulations. And if modifications are needed, use
6 adjustments to the average service life as described by
7 Utah Code Annotated 54-7-12.1 that informs the
8 commission to include the, quote, alteration of asset
9 lives to better reflect changes in the economic life of
10 plant and equipment, unquote.

11 This process is contrasted by the division's
12 single asset straight-line method proposed by witness
13 Hellewell, that did not evaluate the alteration of asset
14 lives, nor did he examine Carbon/Emery's FCC method that
15 addresses the same issue.

16 If the commission ultimately decides to move
17 away from a URTA member's chosen depreciation method,
18 this change should be on a prospective basis, used only
19 for new assets placed into service. Utah Code Annotated
20 54-4-4 -- 4A Roman F3 informs the commission on judging
21 the prudence of a company's decision on past -- in the
22 past and provides guidance in making monumental changes
23 to company operations.

24 Ultimately, if the commission wanted to adopt
25 the uniform policy for all companies, URTA recommends

1 that the commission adopt a rule-making process that
2 would provide for expression by all interested parties.

3 When judging this recommendation, URTA urges
4 the commission to please reflect on the experience we
5 had with the capital structure task force. As a
6 participant in this task force, I witnessed the
7 development of proposal that addressed and balanced
8 competing interests.

9 Furthermore, an added benefit of a rule making
10 process, is that all parties know the proposed policy.
11 This benefits all parties and serves the public
12 interest. URTA also observes that a rule making process
13 would serve the public interest in establishing guiding
14 principles for the development of an intrastate cost of
15 equity. Such a process would greatly increase the
16 precision of an estimate by establishing generally
17 accepted methods to estimate the cost of equity for a
18 particular company.

19 I urge the commission to consider these
20 recommendations as it judges this case. This ends my
21 URTA summary.

22 MS. SLAWSON: Mr. Meredith is available for
23 cross-examination.

24 JUDGE JONSSON: Mr. Jetter.

25 CROSS-EXAMINATION

1 BY MR. JETTER:

2 Q. I do have a few questions. Mr. Meredith, good
3 morning. Are you aware that there are URTA members that
4 use single asset straight line depreciation?

5 A. Yes, I am aware that some do. Their
6 circumstances are unique, I would say. I know that at
7 least one is an average schedule company. But the
8 decision of a company to use a particular depreciation
9 method is the company's.

10 Q. And it would be your testimony that the
11 universal service funds support for a company that is
12 subject to that decision should vary by company based on
13 their chosen depreciation method?

14 A. Yes. Because the Utah Code allows for
15 adjustments to the method that, that reflect what the
16 commission has described in its order on the motion for
17 summary judgment.

18 Q. And so it is your testimony then that the
19 amount that other rate payers for telephone service in
20 Utah pay to support rural telephone service should vary
21 based on the, I guess, the whims of an accountant at
22 each of URTA's members?

23 A. No. No.

24 Q. No. But you did testify that they should be
25 able to choose whatever depreciation method they wish

1 and that their universal service fund calculation should
2 then be calculated based on that?

3 A. No, I didn't say that either.

4 Q. You did testify that there are URITA members
5 that do have different accounting methods; is that
6 correct?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And you don't think those should be adjusted
9 by the commission?

10 A. No. I didn't say that either. What I said --

11 Q. Go ahead.

12 A. -- was that if there were to be changes to
13 better reflect the economic life of plant and equipment,
14 those changes and those adjustments can be made using
15 what the Utah Code talks about, and what we've described
16 in this proceeding as adjustment to the average service
17 life.

18 Q. And that's regardless of the fact that the
19 choice to use single asset straight line depreciation
20 would result in a different number for the exact same
21 scenario with the same company as the choice to use a
22 group asset method?

23 A. Well, the straight line method is not --
24 didn't come down from Mount Sinai on tablets.

25 Q. That's not what I asked you.

1 A. And so what I'm saying is, it's an
2 approximation. Straight line method is an
3 approximation. The group method is an approximation of
4 the actual diminution of value of the asset. And the
5 commission can judge very, very plainly which better
6 actual -- which method more accurately attempt -- or
7 describes the actual.

8 A straight line method as proposed by the
9 office does not have adjustments contemplated in it.
10 And so it's, by my judgment, a less accurate
11 representation of the actual.

12 JUDGE JONSSON: Did you mean to reference the
13 division when you mentioned --

14 THE WITNESS: Division, I'm sorry. Yes.

15 **Q. (By Mr. Jetter) Let me ask you another**
16 **question. When is -- are you familiar with the**
17 **accounting practices of URTA members?**

18 A. Some of them, yes.

19 **Q. Do you know when the last depreciation study**
20 **was done by any URTA member?**

21 A. URTA members -- depreciation study, I'm not
22 exactly sure how you're defining that. But URTA members
23 do review depreciation and depreciation expenses and
24 activities continually.

25 **Q. Do you know the last time that one of them**

1 reviewed their operations, all of their plant and
2 reviewed the service lives of the current plant and then
3 adjusted their accounting service lives to match?

4 A. Well, if -- well, they do this continually.
5 They look at -- they look at whether there's adjustments
6 that need to be made on a continual basis through --
7 particularly the cost studies. I can't speak to the
8 average schedule companies because they have different
9 procedures. But for a cost company like Carbon/Emery,
10 and for other cost companies that are URTA members, this
11 is a continual function.

12 Q. Okay. And so let's talk about that for a
13 second. Let's say hypothetically you have a building
14 that you put in your account with, let's say, a 30
15 year -- let's say a 20 year service life. And you
16 realize that that building is going to last for 60
17 years. You would certainly adjust that service life to
18 60 years, would you not?

19 A. That's a very strange hypothetical. Quite
20 extreme to go from an estimated service life when it was
21 placed into service at 20 and then suddenly realize
22 that, oh, golly, it's going to last for 60.

23 But an adjustment even that extreme is looked
24 at in evaluation. If it's reasonable to make that type
25 of a hypothetical extreme, then it would be reasonable

1 to make the adjustment.

2 **Q. It would be unreasonable not to make that**
3 **adjustment, would it not?**

4 A. In your hypothetical, if you -- if you find a
5 situation where the expected life of the asset exceeds
6 or needs to be changed from what is being used,
7 contemplated with all the assets that are -- with all
8 the activity and projected activity of that asset, yes,
9 it's reasonable to make the change.

10 **Q. Okay. And so if I looked at a group of**
11 **assets, for example, and we saw that more than half of**
12 **them were beyond their expected service life, and yet**
13 **the group was remaining with such a large amount of**
14 **assets and that far exceeding their expected service**
15 **life, that would indicate that these adjustments were**
16 **not being made in a timely manner, would it not?**

17 A. No, not at all. Because if an asset is beyond
18 its expected service life, that means that all the
19 depreciation expense that would accrue to that asset is
20 gone. There is no -- there is no depreciation expense
21 allocated to that asset.

22 And but the asset is still -- is still used
23 and useful. And so the company still uses it. It
24 doesn't dispose of that asset if it still has useful
25 life.

1 Q. Okay. How does -- how does the gross value of
2 that asset that's beyond its service life change the
3 depreciation diminution of value of a new asset that's
4 added that's unrelated to that old asset and is the
5 exception that it happens to be in the same group?

6 A. Well, technically there is only one asset in a
7 group. The group has the asset. There are units in
8 that group. But there's one asset for purposes of
9 depreciation.

10 Q. Okay. I guess we're talking semantics. So
11 let's go back and ask the same question. If we have a
12 unit in the group that is beyond its expected service
13 life, and you testified that it would be fully
14 depreciated, how is that changing the diminution of
15 value of a new unit that would be added within the same
16 group?

17 A. Well, under this particular method, the
18 proposal, the method prescribes that you use the average
19 service life of the group. And so if you were to add a
20 particular asset to -- a unit to a group asset, then the
21 average service life would change.

22 Q. And are you aware of that recalculation having
23 been done by URTA members?

24 A. Yes, they -- as I said before, they evaluate
25 that based upon the expected service life of the -- of

1 all of the units in a group on a continual basis.

2 Q. Okay. And so a building that would last for
3 60 years being on a 20 year depreciation schedule, how
4 would that match up with what you're describing?

5 A. Well, I wouldn't see that hypothetical.

6 Q. Okay. What if that was in fact on the books
7 of one of your URTA members?

8 A. If that was on the books of the URTA members,
9 then -- well, it's a hypothetical that is just so
10 extraordinarily odd that can't -- I don't know. I mean,
11 obviously, I would be saying are you sure you -- go
12 check the -- go check that 60 year expected life of
13 that, of the building. Because it's a hypothetical that
14 is a corner solution. It's way extraordinary.

15 Q. You're happy to discuss hypotheticals with all
16 of the other URTA members; is that right?

17 A. With -- I'm sorry. Say again.

18 Q. You're happy to discuss hypothetical future
19 interactions with the commission with the URTA members;
20 is that correct?

21 A. Well, the only hypothetical that I can recall
22 in this proceeding was a \$1,000 hypothetical which was
23 used. And that's, that's a perfectly reasonable
24 hypothetical because it's very true to what happens.

25 Q. Okay. But a building that, let's say, was

1 \$500,000, but in the same scenario where you fully
2 depreciated it by year 10 and you're now in 21 adding a
3 new unit in that group, how does that differ from -- or
4 other than if you were --

5 A. Well, the asset -- if you add a new unit to a
6 building group, then you have a change in, as I men --
7 as I said before, you have a change in the average
8 service life of that group.

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. And you make the change.

11 Q. But the annual depreciation method then from
12 that depreciation method of group depreciation would
13 result in a different number for a particular year than
14 a single asset straight line; is that correct?

15 A. I think I've already answered that. Correct,
16 yes.

17 Q. Okay. And so then two companies with the same
18 facts but different accounting methods would present
19 different depreciation calculations to the commission?

20 A. They could. Those approximations of
21 depreciation could differ.

22 Q. Okay. And you do have URTA members that use
23 varying types of accounting practices; is that correct?

24 A. Yes, as I've said before, they have
25 different -- they have different depreciation methods.

1 And this is why the alternative, also as I described in
2 my summary, comes to bear, that if the commission wants
3 a uniformity, then we should look at this so that all
4 interested parties are able to talk about it in a
5 rule-making procedure or task force.

6 **Q. But until then, they should -- you believe**
7 **that they should receive UUSF based on whatever,**
8 **whatever they decide to come in with; is that correct?**

9 A. No. The depreciation expense is thoroughly
10 reviewed by the division. And if it comes to an
11 adjudicated proceeding, it's reviewed by the commission,
12 and it would be deemed -- whatever changes or
13 alterations are made would be deemed -- would be
14 eventually deemed prudent. And the commission and the
15 division and the company should receive that, that
16 assignment.

17 MR. JETTER: Thank you. That's all the
18 questions I have.

19 MR. MOORE: No questions, your Honor.

20 JUDGE JONSSON: Ms. Slawson, any redirect?

21 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

22 BY MS. SLAWSON:

23 **Q. I just have one question on redirect. You**
24 **testified that the URTA members have different methods**
25 **of doing depreciation. They also have different Public**

1 **Service Commission prescribed rates of depreciation,**
2 **don't they?**

3 A. Yes, I believe they do. They do indeed.

4 MS. SLAWSON: That's all I have.

5 JUDGE JONSSON: Any recross?

6 MR. JETTER: No recross, thank you.

7 JUDGE JONSSON: Thank you. Thank you for
8 keeping me on my toes. All right. So I believe that
9 concludes the testimony today; is that correct?

10 MS. SLAWSON: Yes.

11 JUDGE JONSSON: All right. And the
12 commission, as I mentioned before, is willing to accept
13 closing arguments by post-hearing brief. And I think
14 that's the way the parties want to go. So we need to
15 establish the deadline for that to happen. I also think
16 it might be worth discussing page limit. And then I am
17 going to specifically request that the parties deal with
18 two issues in their closing arguments.

19 One, when we've been talking about
20 depreciation and about some of the allocated accounts
21 for materials supplies, things like that, the parties
22 have all made reference to the possibility that another
23 rate case might be needed down the road.

24 If Carbon -- Carbon's UUSF is set at a
25 relatively higher level based on a high depreciation

1 expense and high materials and supplies right now, then
2 we might need to have a rate case maybe within three
3 years, five years, whatever, to correct for that, if at
4 that point it's over-recovering.

5 On the other hand there's also been discussion
6 that if Carbon's UUSF is set today according to adjusted
7 depreciation and a more normalized value for materials
8 and supplies and things like that, then down the road at
9 some point, if it feels like it's under-recovering, it
10 can come in for a rate case and that UUSF can be bumped
11 up.

12 My question for you in your closing arguments
13 is to give some sort of analysis as to why the
14 commission should go one way or the other. If there's
15 going to be a true-up, if you will, needed down the
16 road, then why should the commission, Carbon, go high
17 now and true up down later down the road?

18 Division office, why should the commission go
19 normalized now and if necessary, increase later down the
20 road? Okay. So I'd like you to address that point.

21 And then also in dealing with depreciation,
22 there's been some discussion about how the asset -- how
23 Carbon's assets should be viewed. Carbon, it seems like
24 your position is to ask the commission to view the
25 assets and then each asset group were sort of one big

1 machine that's being continually repaired, improved,
2 whatever, and therefore is being it depreciated all at
3 once.

4 And the division, the office seem to view the
5 asset groups as being of a different nature, that when
6 an addition is made, it's not a new piece to a new
7 machine. It's a new asset, and the fully depreciated
8 assets are then skewing that assets depreciation.

9 I believe we have in the record, particularly
10 in the exhibits, some pretty good list of what Carbon's
11 assets are. And so I think we have the facts that we
12 might need in order to decide whose view of the assets
13 is more accurate. But I would like some discussion in,
14 in your closing argument briefs as to why these assets
15 look like a machine versus why these assets don't like
16 one single machine.

17 And I think that would be helpful to me and to
18 the commission. Okay. So with that, does any party
19 want to propose a deadline for closing argument briefs.

20 MR. JETTER: Can I make one request?

21 JUDGE JONSSON: Sure.

22 MR. JETTER: If -- presumably we'll have, as
23 you discussed, a page limit. I was considering -- I
24 think it might be worthwhile to have a response that's
25 somewhat shorter page limit. So to make a response

1 brief, but if parties need to respond to something they
2 may not have anticipated --

3 JUDGE JONSSON: So you're thinking maybe two
4 deadlines. One to file final closing arguments, and one
5 to file a reply to any other party's closing.

6 MR. MOORE: So I would be in support of that
7 argument as well.

8 JUDGE JONSSON: I'm certainly willing to go
9 there. I am concerned about the cost of this case.
10 This case has been protracted. There's been a great
11 deal of briefing. Every time we go for a new round of
12 briefing, the costs go up. And so I want you to bear
13 that in mind as well. What's your --

14 MR. JETTER: And I would be happy to make --

15 JUDGE JONSSON: What's your suggestion?

16 MR. JETTER: Maybe the reply could be one or
17 two pages.

18 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay.

19 MR. JETTER: Just very brief.

20 MR. MOORE: We would like at least five pages.

21 JUDGE JONSSON: For closing argument?

22 MR. MOORE: For the reply brief.

23 JUDGE JONSSON: For a final reply. What's
24 your thought Kira, Ms. Slawson?

25 MS. SLAWSON: Well, we're also concerned about

1 the costs. Just kind of thinking out loud here. If it
2 were a oral closing argument, we'd be limited by
3 minutes.

4 JUDGE JONSSON: Right.

5 MS. SLAWSON: And we could reserve however
6 many minutes we thought we might need to reply.

7 JUDGE JONSSON: Right.

8 MS. SLAWSON: So I guess you could set a total
9 page limit and use it how you want.

10 JUDGE JONSSON: I like that idea.

11 MS. SLAWSON: But as I'm thinking about this,
12 you know, the initial closing argument then could be one
13 page, and if they do everything on reply, so the parties
14 don't have the opportunity to -- the other parties
15 wouldn't have a opportunity to respond to the actual
16 closing. They get the last word. So you know --

17 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. So somebody please make
18 a proposal.

19 MS. SLAWSON: Maybe.

20 MR. JETTER: I would -- well --

21 MS. SLAWSON: Five pages for the reply seems
22 fine.

23 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay.

24 MS. SLAWSON: For the closing argument, I mean
25 there's a lot of evidence in the case, maybe 25 or 30

1 pages.

2 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. And you don't
3 necessarily need to repeat the evidence.

4 MS. SLAWSON: Right.

5 JUDGE JONSSON: You can cite to it.

6 MS. SLAWSON: Right.

7 JUDGE JONSSON: Twenty-five and five? Thirty
8 and five?

9 MR. JETTER: Yeah, I can probably do 10 for a
10 closing. If we need more, that's fine.

11 MS. SLAWSON: The company has more issues
12 because we have to address the issues of the division
13 and the office.

14 JUDGE JONSSON: Both. Correct.

15 MR. MOORE: We would recommend 25 and 5.

16 MS. SLAWSON: That's fine.

17 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. All right. And then
18 dates.

19 MR. JETTER: I think we're going to need time
20 to get a transcript.

21 JUDGE JONSSON: Shall we set the dates after
22 we see the transcript?

23 MR. JETTER: Sure. Do we -- well --

24 JUDGE JONSSON: Or do you want to just say
25 like 30 days or X days after the transcript for closing

1 argument, and then X days after that for rebuttal.

2 MR. JETTER: That works for us.

3 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. So what period do you
4 need? The commission staff has input. Yes, John.

5 MR. HARVEY: Just what's our 240 deadline to
6 have an order out?

7 JUDGE JONSSON: We don't have a 240.

8 MS. SLAWSON: Not a rate case.

9 MR. HARVEY: Oh, that's right.

10 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. How many days?

11 MS. SLAWSON: Does anybody have any idea about
12 how long the transcript's going to take?

13 (Discussion off the record.)

14 MS. SLAWSON: I'm wondering if for scheduling
15 purposes it might be easier to set the dates after we
16 get the transcripts. Because, you know, if the deadline
17 for filing ends up on a day that somebody has a hearing,
18 that's going to be anxiety provoking.

19 JUDGE JONSSON: I just don't want to have to
20 get the parties back together to discuss things. So --
21 well, again, then we have more cost. So if we can
22 figure out today how many days you need to put together
23 your closing argument and how many days you need to put
24 together your reply, I think that would be best. So I'm
25 going to push you on that. Three weeks after

1 transcripts?

2 MS. SLAWSON: That's fine.

3 MR. JETTER: Yeah.

4 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. If there's a holiday in
5 there, I'll adjust. So when I say three weeks, 21 days
6 excluding any holidays. Including weekends but
7 excluding holidays, okay? And then for your reply then,
8 a week after that?

9 MR. JETTER: I think that's reasonable.

10 MR. MOORE: That's fine, your Honor.

11 MS. SLAWSON: Sure.

12 JUDGE JONSSON: Okay. So when we get the
13 transcript, I'll issue a scheduling order. But I'll
14 just do it unilaterally without calling a schedule
15 conference, and put the actual dates into it. And issue
16 that.

17 Okay. I think with that, I'm ready to close
18 the hearing unless I've missed something. Anybody?
19 Okay. Thank you all very much. This has been extremely
20 helpful.

21 MS. SLAWSON: Thank you.

22

23 (The proceedings in this matter concluded at
24 12:17 p.m.)

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF UTAH)
COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Teri Hansen Cronenwett, Certified Realtime Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah.

That the proceedings were reported by me in Stenotype, and thereafter transcribed by computer under my supervision, and that a full, true, and correct transcription is set forth in the foregoing pages, Volume 2, numbered 248 through 321 inclusive.

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

WITNESS MY HAND and official seal at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 8th day of February, 2016.



Teri Hansen Cronenwett, CRR, RMR
License No. 91-109812-7801

My commission expires:
January 19, 2019

<hr/> \$ <hr/>	282:3	24th 295:14	347 282:3	54-8B-15-5 282:22
\$1,000 311:22	15-2302-01 248:8	25 270:2,16 273:7 274:6 318:25 319:15	35 255:10 266:23 270:21, 23 274:4 284:25	54-8B-15-6A 282:6
\$428,897 280:12	16.83 258:3	254K 268:8 281:16	354 250:18	54-8B-6 268:9, 18 281:13
\$500,000 312:1	17th 275:21	261 281:18	36 266:24	548-B 279:17
\$573,643 284:21	19 264:25 265:5 272:19	27 248:1 265:18	37 265:24 267:2	581 265:18
<hr/> 1 <hr/>	1984 250:13,16	27th 248:4	38 266:14	585 265:19
1 263:23 279:17 286:1	1990 264:4,15	290 281:18	<hr/> 4 <hr/>	589 265:22
1,038,714 280:13	1991 250:13,16	292 281:13	4 254:8	<hr/> 6 <hr/>
1.5 266:5,19	1996 281:17	2nd 294:24	400,000 268:2	6 280:9
1.8 267:24 280:9	1D-1 264:10,11	2R-2 259:6	450 267:9	60 308:16,18, 22 311:3,12
10 254:24 262:6 268:25 284:11 312:2 319:9	1D2 285:6	<hr/> 3 <hr/>	492 252:2 256:2,11,19,21 257:1	600,000 268:4
100 251:22 286:17	1D3 285:25	3 263:23 282:21	4A 303:20	609,907 280:14
103 250:2	<hr/> 2 <hr/>	3.3R 291:17	<hr/> 5 <hr/>	64 268:11,21 282:1
1121 263:12	2 285:18,19,23 286:2 297:11 300:4	30 265:24 308:14 318:25 319:25	5 265:18 274:7 319:15	64.901-904 282:2
11:17 284:12	2.36 266:1,7, 10,15	31 266:13,20	5.636 262:2	65 255:10 270:20,23
11:29 284:12	2.40 266:3,8, 10,16	313 281:14	50 270:12,13 275:1,3,14	65-35 255:19 260:8
12 281:18 288:16	20 250:13 267:9 308:15, 21 311:3	315 281:22	50-50 255:13, 21 260:8	66615 263:13
12:17 321:24	2006 272:20	31st 286:15	54 260:21	669 266:20
13 281:13,18 302:14	2014 272:12 286:15	32 268:9 281:20 303:4	54-4-4 303:20	<hr/> 7 <hr/>
14 281:14,22	2016 248:1,4	32.27 281:21	54-7-12.1 303:7	7 255:23
15 281:23	21 312:2 321:5	335 281:23	54-8B-15-1A 282:5	7.82 262:15,19

735 266:22	accept 314:12	accurately 307:6	260:23 313:11	adoption 280:2 283:22
745 266:23	accepted 253:19,24	Act 268:9 281:17	adjust 308:17 321:5	advantage 278:8 282:25 283:23
75 270:1,16	271:13 278:2 304:17	actions 296:18	adjusted 270:19 276:17 306:8 308:3 315:6	advertised 273:22
781 266:25	accepting 253:22	activities 307:24	adjustment 267:12,14,16 268:12,13,14, 19 270:22 274:25 275:17, 22 276:3,9,10, 11,12,15 277:18,19,20 280:22 288:1 297:11 299:3, 5,9,12,14 306:16 308:23 309:1,3	advertising 273:16,20,21, 23
783 267:2	accepts 254:3	activity 309:8	advocacy 252:12 253:9, 17 254:4,8	advocates 252:9
<hr/> 8 <hr/>	access 256:8,9 257:5,6,7,9,13, 16 275:19,20 283:18	add 265:25 310:19 312:5	advocates 252:9	aerial 276:19
8 257:12 276:10	accompanied 259:11	added 266:16 304:9 310:4,15	adjustments 267:25 268:6 270:3 280:2,7 281:5,12 283:22 287:1,5 295:21 303:6 305:15 306:14 307:9 308:5 309:15	affect 252:24
8.45 250:8	accomplish 250:1	adding 312:2	affected 260:25	affiliate 267:13,14 268:10 279:24 280:4,18,20 281:20 283:14
8.46 250:9 258:11,17 262:10,12	account 275:4 287:18 308:14	addition 281:4 316:6	affiliated 283:11	agree 289:15 299:16,17
800,000 267:23 268:1	accountant 264:15 305:21	additional 254:10 256:19	administered 254:12	agreed 299:11
816,909 280:11	accounting 265:8,11,15 272:22 297:11 306:5 307:17 308:3 312:18, 23	additions 277:4	administering 257:11	ahead 276:8 279:14 284:14 301:10 302:11 306:11
8th 265:9	accounts 252:18 269:15 275:6 276:17, 18,19,22 277:2,5,12 314:20	address 249:10 263:11 302:2 315:20 319:12	administration 256:3	allegedly 293:19
<hr/> 9 <hr/>	accrue 309:19	addresses 281:15,19,25 303:15	adopt 258:16 280:7 303:24 304:1	allocate 270:1 273:15
9.4 261:22	accumulated 287:14 289:2	addressed 281:12,22 304:7	adopted 265:20 271:13	
9.40 256:16 262:25	accurate 259:14 275:23 307:10 316:13	adequate 274:21 282:15		
900 274:10		adhering 253:3		
98 250:13,16		adjudicated		
9:14 248:1				
<hr/> A <hr/>				
a.m. 248:1 284:12				
A3 285:6 286:1				
ability 254:16 261:11 283:17				

allocated 269:15 270:20 271:21 274:4, 10,12 309:21 314:20	13 276:20 280:13,24 286:13,14 305:19 309:13	appears 259:9 275:6 278:11	arrangements 257:10	attempt 276:2 307:6
allocates 270:23 280:16	amounts 275:14 276:13 287:5,22	applicable 256:1	assertions 257:12	attempted 259:11 274:15
allocating 270:12 272:22 273:7	analysis 255:21 288:15 315:13	application 248:9 249:14 251:8 256:14 262:3 263:14 294:12	asserts 282:16 300:11	attempting 276:12 277:17
allocation 265:6,13 268:11,21 269:16,23 270:8,9,12,15 271:1 280:23 282:1 283:14 288:21 294:1, 4,9	and/or 277:13	applied 259:12 265:16 287:18	assessment 252:6,11	attention 248:20
allocations 270:22	anger 258:7	approach 253:22 254:2 276:7	asset 252:18 303:3,8,12,13 305:4 306:19, 22 307:4 309:5,8,17,19, 21,22,24 310:2,3,4,6,7, 8,20 312:5,14 315:22,25 316:5,7	attorneys 279:3
allocator 271:4,9,13 272:12,14,16, 17,18,23 273:2,3,7 297:12,16	angles 276:14	approaches 253:19	assets 286:17 303:19 309:7, 11,14 315:23, 25 316:8,11, 12,14,15	audit 274:21
allocators 272:3,5	Annotated 303:7,19	appropriately 255:4	assignment 313:16	August 295:14
alteration 303:8,13	annual 286:5, 8,12,13 287:23 288:16 296:7, 12,15,17 312:11	approximation 307:2,3	assigns 280:16	average 250:3, 7 251:18,21 252:1 255:24 262:13 303:6 305:7 306:16 308:8 310:18, 21 312:7
alterations 313:13	annualized 288:23	approximation s 312:20	assists 273:4	aware 284:20 296:25 297:1, 2,4 305:3,5 310:22
alternative 276:16 313:1	annually 296:10,11	April 294:24	association 302:5,13	<hr/> B <hr/>
amortized 276:22	answers 250:24 267:19 278:24	arbitrage 253:16	assumes 276:5	back 284:13 292:22 310:11 320:20
amount 268:17 269:14 274:9,	anticipated 271:8 317:2	argument 279:2 301:4 316:14,19 317:7,21 318:2,12,24 320:1,23	assumed 251:20	balance 251:19 286:13
	anxiety 320:18	arguments 314:13,18 315:12 317:4	assumption 265:15	balanced 255:14 258:11 304:7
	apparent 253:16	arise 261:12	assumptions 290:11	balances 275:5
	apparently 248:22 276:5	arithmetic 250:7	attachment 290:20	banks 254:15
	appeared 291:6,9			bar 291:6

<p>base 275:2 282:5</p> <p>based 252:6,11 254:6,24 255:6,13 260:22,24 261:11 275:15 305:12,21 306:2 310:25 313:7 314:25</p> <p>basic 252:7 258:13 273:11, 22 282:8,15,19 283:13 300:15</p> <p>basically 265:22 268:24 270:22 274:5 275:3 276:3</p> <p>basis 285:9 302:17 303:18 308:6 311:1</p> <p>BCO 297:10</p> <p>BCO2 280:23</p> <p>BCO3 265:5</p> <p>BCO5 285:10</p> <p>bear 313:2 317:12</p> <p>Beck 279:9</p> <p>behalf 249:12 251:6 256:3</p> <p>believes 256:14</p> <p>beneficial 278:17,18</p> <p>benefit 257:22 304:9</p> <p>benefits</p>	<p>254:11 271:17 278:9 284:25 304:11</p> <p>beta 252:17 253:19</p> <p>big 300:5 315:25</p> <p>billing 270:9 271:12,21,25 272:6,7,21 273:2 288:2,8, 10,12,17 297:12,17,19</p> <p>Bion 263:3,4, 12</p> <p>bit 284:23 289:23 290:4 291:9 302:9</p> <p>blend 262:10</p> <p>blended 262:22</p> <p>board 269:25 270:5,10</p> <p>body 292:1</p> <p>bonds 252:22</p> <p>book 291:19</p> <p>books 251:23 286:18 295:4 311:6,8</p> <p>bottom 268:3</p> <p>break 284:9,10</p> <p>Brevitz 249:2, 3,11 258:20,24 259:2 261:19</p> <p>briefing 317:11,12</p>	<p>briefly 259:8</p> <p>briefs 316:14, 19</p> <p>broad 290:24</p> <p>brought 248:20</p> <p>building 308:13,16 311:2,13,25 312:6</p> <p>bumped 315:10</p> <p>bundle 267:4 273:10</p> <p>business 249:10 261:24 263:11 272:14 302:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>C-20 291:4</p> <p>C-a-p-m 255:2</p> <p>cable 267:13 276:19 299:3, 9,13</p> <p>CABS 265:7</p> <p>calculated 277:25 306:2</p> <p>calculation 254:21 255:24 285:2 297:16, 19 298:3 299:17 306:1</p> <p>calculations 256:20 269:2, 5,21 274:19 278:6 298:9</p>	<p>312:19</p> <p>call 292:17,20 293:1,5 295:17 296:1 301:13</p> <p>called 249:4 263:5</p> <p>calling 321:14</p> <p>calls 249:2 263:3</p> <p>CAM 269:6,17, 18</p> <p>capital 251:18, 20,21 252:1,18 253:12 255:9, 12,13,14,15, 19,25 257:13, 16 260:2,7 261:8 262:13, 15,21 277:22 278:6 304:5</p> <p>CAPM 255:2,6</p> <p>captures 256:21</p> <p>Carbon 262:3 266:2,7,16 267:22 268:2, 4,20 269:22,24 271:10 280:14 290:2 295:3 296:3,5 314:24 315:16,23</p> <p>Carbon's 284:20 295:24 296:5,7 314:24 315:6,23 316:10</p> <p>Carbon/emery</p>	<p>253:21 254:20 255:9 256:4,24 257:12,15 258:9,23 274:14 279:20 280:16 282:11, 14,18 283:4,24 284:3 289:16 290:1,5 300:14 308:9</p> <p>Carbon/emery's 251:8 253:5, 8,17 254:3,8 257:19,23 266:22 268:15 279:24 280:4, 8,12,20,21,23 281:7 283:12 293:5 303:14</p> <p>card 271:19</p> <p>cardinal 253:3</p> <p>carriers 302:14</p> <p>carries 286:14</p> <p>case 248:13 251:10,12 254:4,17 255:5 260:7 263:15, 19 264:18 267:22,25 277:23 280:6 282:14 284:21 295:5 297:2,3 300:24,25 302:21,22 304:20 314:23 315:2,10 317:9,10 318:25 320:8</p> <p>cases 261:12 271:11,12 275:4 297:5</p>
--	--	--	---	---

causative 271:9,24 272:1	circumstances 260:24 261:12 305:6	Coleman 249:23 250:6	314:1,12 315:14,16,18, 24 316:18 320:4	8,11,12 306:21 308:9 309:23 313:15 319:11
CD 290:14	citation 281:24	Coleman's 249:25	commission's 255:23 256:10	company's 252:23 257:13 258:4 272:7 274:9 275:7, 11,18 294:5 302:19 303:21 305:9
CE 291:17	citations 253:21 281:9	collect 251:11	commissioners 301:3	
cell 271:18	cite 319:5	collection 282:24 283:9	commissions 254:1	
CEO 270:5	cited 277:24 282:2	column 265:6 266:22,23,24 285:13,15 286:4,8,12 287:22 288:3, 15,23 289:6, 11,12 291:4 292:6,8	common 256:8 257:3,6 273:17	
certified 264:14	claim 274:9	columns 288:22	Community 248:23	comparable 255:22
change 249:22,23,25 250:11,12,13, 16 264:9,17,24 265:12 266:6, 14 267:3,8,11 276:4 279:11 302:19,24 303:18 309:9 310:2,21 312:6,7,10	claims 274:11	combined 262:12	companies 254:12,16,19 255:22 256:23 257:2,3,6 259:13 261:4,8 287:19 303:25 308:8,10 312:17	compensated 252:13 253:1
changed 265:8 266:21,23,24 267:10 270:12, 15 273:1 309:6	clarification 285:17 298:23	comfortable 294:2	company 251:11 252:9, 11,16 254:7 255:16,20 257:8 258:2 260:1,24 265:13 266:12 269:6 270:20 272:10,13,20, 24 273:4,6,10, 20 274:11,18, 22 275:19 276:2 277:4,9, 19,21 278:1,5, 11 283:15 284:25 285:1 292:20,23 293:1,16,18 295:14 303:23 304:18 305:7,	competing 304:8
changing 310:14	clarify 264:18	comma 266:3		competitors 283:16
check 311:12	clarity 265:23	commission 251:15 252:4 253:8,22,24 254:3,22 255:4,12,18 256:20 258:15, 16 259:18,22 260:5,10,19,22 261:10 277:24 278:2,23 280:7 296:8,12 300:1 302:16,17,22, 25 303:2,8,16, 20,24 304:1,4, 19 305:16 306:9 307:5 311:19 312:19 313:2,11,14		competitive 282:23,25 283:1,8,17,20, 23 284:2
Chetopa 263:13	clear 272:14,24 276:25 292:11	combined 262:12		complete 258:18
chief 248:13 269:24 270:11 271:16,19 300:24	click 292:6	comfortable 294:2		completes 250:20
choice 257:8 306:19,21	clicked 291:5	comma 266:3		comply 282:11 283:4
choose 305:25	close 321:17	commission 251:15 252:4 253:8,22,24 254:3,22 255:4,12,18 256:20 258:15, 16 259:18,22 260:5,10,19,22 261:10 277:24 278:2,23 280:7 296:8,12 300:1 302:16,17,22, 25 303:2,8,16, 20,24 304:1,4, 19 305:16 306:9 307:5 311:19 312:19 313:2,11,14		component 272:8 276:4
chosen 303:3, 17 305:13	closing 301:4 314:13,18 315:12 316:14, 19 317:4,5,21 318:2,12,16,24 319:10,25 320:23	comma 266:3		components 272:9 273:25
	Cobank 254:16	commission 251:15 252:4 253:8,22,24 254:3,22 255:4,12,18 256:20 258:15, 16 259:18,22 260:5,10,19,22 261:10 277:24 278:2,23 280:7 296:8,12 300:1 302:16,17,22, 25 303:2,8,16, 20,24 304:1,4, 19 305:16 306:9 307:5 311:19 312:19 313:2,11,14		comports 254:21
	code 268:9,17 279:17 281:12 282:4,6,21 303:4,7,19 305:14 306:15	combined 262:12		comprehensive 262:25
	coincidentally 273:3	combined 262:12		comprised 256:7 302:13

comprises 256:5	254:21,25 255:7 258:14 261:2,3,6	continue 257:21 275:12 277:14	295:22,23 296:3,4,8,13, 16,22 297:13, 14 298:3 299:4 301:6,9 306:6 311:20 312:14, 15,23 313:8 314:9 315:3 319:14	COURT 291:15
computation 255:11	268:7 281:5 288:14	continued 279:18,22 282:9,17 283:3,6,24 299:13 300:12	14 298:3 299:4 301:6,9 306:6 311:20 312:14, 15,23 313:8 314:9 315:3 319:14	covers 256:15
concern 275:8	constrained 257:13,16	continues 277:4	correction 248:25	CPA 264:4,5, 20
concerned 260:20 279:22 283:6 295:24 302:10,18 317:9,25	construction 275:2,9,11	continuing 264:8,22	cost 251:18,21 252:1 255:12 258:12 262:1, 2,5,13,15,20, 21,22 265:16 268:11,21 269:14,24 270:7,10,11, 14,18 271:9, 20,24 272:1 273:4,8 278:5, 6,8,12,16,17, 18 282:1,8,15, 19 283:14 294:1,4,8 300:14 304:14, 17 308:7,9,10 317:9 320:21	CPE 264:22
concerns 268:20 281:11, 15,19,25	consultant 249:12 263:24 264:13	contrary 252:7	costs 270:1,20 271:6,18,19 273:16 274:4 275:4 277:16 280:16 289:17, 20,21 298:2 317:12 318:1	create 284:2
conclude 300:24	Consulting 263:12	contrasted 303:11	country 256:23	credit 271:19
concluded 321:23	consumer 248:12,24 249:5,13 251:6 258:2,3,5,9 263:6 295:13	contribute 257:22	couple 301:2 302:10	cross 258:21 278:21 279:5 281:1,8,16,19, 25 284:5 298:19
concludes 267:7,16 278:19 300:25 314:9	consumers 251:13 255:16 257:25 258:11	controls 281:11		cross- examination 259:3 284:15 298:20 304:23, 25
conference 295:13,16,17, 18 321:15	contact 293:15,17,20, 23	Cooperative 257:21		CSR 291:4
confidential 249:24 274:11 290:14,16	contacted 293:21	copy 259:6 294:8		current 266:14 282:17 284:20 300:12 308:2
confirm 294:25	contemplate 256:11	corner 311:14		customer 270:19 271:4 274:2
confusion 256:25	contemplated 307:9 309:7	corporate 271:1,4,6 272:4,11,22 280:17,23,25		customers 251:12 267:13 272:21 273:10
conservative 274:8	continual 308:6,11 311:1	correct 248:18 259:19 261:22 262:4 284:21 285:3,10 286:5,8,9,18 287:13,20,21 288:5,6,8,12, 13,16,24,25 289:3,13,21 290:7 291:1,2 293:19 294:4		CV 264:10
considered 258:1 260:3	continually 307:24 308:4 316:1			<hr/> D <hr/>
consist 272:5 280:10	continuation 248:7 280:5			D-2 286:1
consistent				data 266:4,7,18 269:4 288:7 290:3 292:8
				database-type 269:13

date 248:6 294:23	decision 253:21 260:10 302:19 303:21 305:8,12	302:20,24 303:17 305:4, 8,13,25 306:19 307:19,21,23 309:19,20 310:3,9 311:3 312:11,12,19, 21,25 313:9,25 314:1,20,25 315:7,21 316:8	differs 251:10	discussed 316:23
dates 319:18, 21 320:15 321:15	decisions 258:15		difficulties 248:6	discussing 314:16
David 249:2,3, 11	decrease 296:2		digital 267:3,6 273:13	discussion 315:5,22 316:13 320:13
day 294:10 320:17	decreased 296:20	derived 269:3, 20	diminution 307:4 310:3,14	disk 274:23 292:23
days 319:25 320:1,10,22,23 321:5	deducted 287:16	derives 250:3	direct 249:7, 17,22 250:2,8 251:4 263:8, 18,23 265:2 266:5,18 267:7 281:13,15,17, 22,24 282:2 301:22	dismay 258:7
DCF 255:2	deemed 313:12,13,14	describes 307:7	directional 254:9	dispose 309:24
DCU 255:5	deficient 268:22	describing 311:4	directly 271:9, 25	dispute 262:2, 6 294:20 302:25
deadline 314:15 316:19 320:5,16	defining 307:22	designed 282:7	director 270:11 272:1	disputing 297:9
deadlines 317:4	delayed 276:23	desires 261:10	directors 269:25	distribution 282:24 283:9 291:4
deal 277:8,17 279:10 314:17 317:11	delete 250:18, 19	details 295:15	disadvantage 283:1	diversify 253:4
dealing 315:21	demonstrate 257:17	determination 253:20 260:22	disadvantages 284:2	division 259:13 294:21, 22 296:15,21 299:2,8,13 302:17,25 307:13,14 313:10,15 315:18 316:4 319:12
debt 251:19 254:13,15 255:10 257:20 262:1,2,22,25 278:5,7,8,13, 16,17,18 284:25 285:1	department 265:16	determinations 255:1,20 261:11	disbursement 282:10,17 283:4,24 284:1 300:12	division's 302:18 303:11
December 275:21 286:15	department's 260:8	determine 260:6	disbursements 279:18,23 283:7 302:21	docket 248:8 249:15
decide 313:8 316:12	depreciated 276:19,21 277:13 289:17, 19 310:14 312:2 316:2,7	determined 252:10 274:19 296:19	discuss 311:15,18 320:20	document 265:13 293:3 294:6,20
decided 295:9	depreciation 276:11,13,21, 23 277:1,3,8, 10,13 286:9 287:12,13,14, 18 289:3,20	development 304:7,14		
decides 303:16		differ 302:7 312:3,21		
		difference 274:3 300:5		

documentation 269:5 273:21	easier 320:15	ends 266:1 304:20 320:17	ETV 286:18	310:5
documented 268:21	economic 303:9 306:13	enjoyed 283:23	evaluate 303:13 310:24	excess 253:16
documents 269:13 293:7 294:14,17	economy 252:20	enter 292:16	evaluating 262:1 302:20	excessive 274:12 283:13, 15
dollar 285:14, 16 288:3,4,11	education 264:8,22	entirety 280:10	evaluation 308:24	exchange 254:11,16,19 282:6 283:13 302:14
double 292:6	efficient 252:14 253:10, 15	equally 297:18	eventually 313:14	exclude 286:9
doubt 258:5	elected 257:4	equipment 276:18 303:10 306:13	evidence 257:16 260:23 278:25 292:16 318:25 319:3	excluded 289:1,2
Douglas 301:14,18	elements 272:5	equitable 282:7,18 300:13	evidently 256:10	excluding 321:6,7
DPU 267:15 276:15 278:2 295:8	elevated 277:9, 15 278:13	equity 251:17, 19,22 252:6 253:7 254:24 255:10 257:21, 22 258:15 262:1,5,20,22 263:1 285:3 304:15,17	exact 306:20	Excuse 290:8
DPU'S 276:12	eliminate 268:1 288:11	error 248:18	EXAMINATION 249:7 260:16 263:8 299:22 301:22 313:21	executive 269:24 270:11 271:16,20
drawn 252:1	eliminated 287:12	essentially 269:18 276:23	examine 273:19 303:14	exercise 260:5
draws 277:11	embedded 285:9	establish 275:8 314:15	examined 249:6 263:7 301:20	exhibit 259:6 264:10,11 285:6,24,25 291:11,17,18, 19,22,23 292:2
driver 272:13, 17	Emery 251:14 257:4 266:3,8, 17,21 293:11 295:3	established 295:25	examples 271:15 273:9	exhibits 249:19 251:5 316:10
drivers 272:4	emphasis 253:5 302:9	establishing 304:13,16	exceeding 309:14	exist 253:13
drives 273:3	employ 255:12 256:21	estimate 304:16,17	exceeds 309:5	existing 267:23 268:3 278:7 280:12
drop 296:6	employed 249:12	estimated 308:20	Excel 266:3,10, 17 268:25 269:1,6,8,13 274:14 290:24 294:8,20	expect 254:4
due 275:7	employer 249:9 263:11 302:1	estimations 254:25 255:5	exception 272:10 273:6	expected 250:19 309:5, 12,14,18 310:12,25 311:12
duly 249:5 263:6	end 265:25 286:15			
E				
e-mail 290:16 292:16				
earlier 287:20				
earning 296:22				

expense 269:15 276:13 277:10 280:17 286:8 287:13 309:19,20 313:9 315:1	fact 255:13 257:16,17 258:2 285:1 297:7 306:18 311:6	field 295:9	fix 274:23	funding 254:14,15 255:2
expenses 271:7,10 272:6 276:1 280:24, 25 286:7 289:5,7 307:23	factor 265:15 270:8,9,12,16 271:1,21 274:3,6	fields 269:10 290:1	flips 270:22	fun 251:9 254:12 277:10 282:24 283:25 305:11
experience 258:6,8 271:2 304:4	factors 250:4,6 252:19,24 265:6,13 269:3,16,20,23 288:21 297:23	figure 287:11 288:15,16,23 320:22	fluctuated 275:5	future 250:19 259:23 276:20 277:5 311:18
explain 287:4,7	facts 261:11 312:18 316:11	figures 285:16 286:5,8,12 287:23 288:4	footnote 264:1, 11 265:24 266:13	<hr/> G <hr/>
explains 281:4, 10	fails 254:20	file 263:17 296:10 301:13 317:4,5	force 304:5,6 313:5	gave 290:1,6 302:8
explanation 269:3,9,20	fairly 268:16	files 266:10	form 252:1 256:2,11,13, 19,21 257:1 261:22 278:24 292:13 294:8	general 251:10 254:17 259:10 265:8,11,15 271:3 272:22 297:11
explicitly 254:1 255:18	fall 260:2 275:12 296:2	filed 249:17 250:9 292:24 294:23 295:15 296:7	format 265:14 268:25	generally 304:16
exploit 253:15	familiar 259:5 307:16	final 281:24 317:4,23	formula 291:6	generated 256:2
expression 304:2	faster 287:2	files 266:10	formulas 274:18 290:11	give 273:9 291:17 315:13
extraordinarily 311:10	favor 255:14, 15,20	filing 292:25 294:5,10 295:4 320:17	forthcoming 290:3	global 253:11
extraordinary 311:14	FCC 281:21 282:1 303:14	finance 252:8	forward 286:14	golly 308:22
extreme 308:20,23,25	FCC'S 252:1 256:2 268:9,10 281:20 282:1	financial 257:17	franchise 254:18	good 248:3 284:17,18 301:10,24,25 302:12 305:2 316:10
extremely 321:19	federal 254:13 268:7,8 281:6, 17 303:4	find 253:23,25 309:4	full 256:6	governed 261:13
<hr/> F <hr/>	feel 279:11	final 281:24 317:4,23	fully 268:21 276:19 277:12 289:16,19 310:13 312:1 316:7	grade 252:22
F3 303:20	feels 315:9	firm 253:18 254:9	function 252:24 308:11	granted 254:18
facing 260:24	fiber 275:7,11	firm's 252:19	fund 248:10 257:25 258:12 306:1	great 262:23
		firm-specific 253:1,5,9		

317:10	hard-coded 274:16 290:6 291:5,7	278:20 298:7, 22 299:20 302:12 313:19 321:10	implication 253:14	income 286:9
greatly 304:15	hard-wired 274:16	hours 264:7, 22,23	imposing 283:1	inconsistent 252:12 253:10
gross 297:17, 21,25 310:1	HARVEY 320:5,9	Human 265:10	impression 302:22	Incorporated 248:9
group 303:3 306:22 307:3 309:10,13 310:5,7,8,12, 16,19,20 311:1 312:3,6,8,12 315:25	heard 285:22, 25	hundreds 256:22 269:10 290:1	improper 252:6	incorrect 248:22 274:20
groups 316:5	hearing 248:7, 8 278:23 320:17 321:18	hypothetical 251:20 255:19 277:22 308:19, 25 309:4 311:5,9,13,18, 21,22,24	improperly 254:10	increase 248:10 275:6 280:11 304:15 315:19
growing 257:22	held 286:17 295:13	hypothetically 308:13	improved 316:1	increased 251:8 273:5 277:6 278:8, 10,14 279:18, 22 282:16 283:3,7 300:11
grown 257:20	Hellewell 303:13	hypotheticals 311:15	imputed 284:25	increasing 282:10
guess 292:11, 15 296:23 305:21 310:10 318:8	helpful 316:17 321:20	<hr/> I <hr/>	inadvertently 300:10	incumbent 254:11,15,18 261:8 302:14
guessing 298:11	Hey 296:21	idea 318:10 320:11	inappropriately 253:6	incurring 277:15
guidance 303:22	high 252:22 253:6 275:13 296:1 314:25 315:1,16	identified 291:12	include 275:1 278:12 287:1,5 289:6 303:8	independent 249:11 263:24 264:13
guiding 304:13	higher 254:5 257:14 314:25	ignore 278:18	included 259:12,14 268:8,23 269:11 271:19 272:7,8 281:9 289:12 297:16, 21 298:2 300:10	indication 275:23 295:8
Gunnison 277:25 278:2	highest 275:10	ignores 254:10	includes 256:22 267:4 271:1 273:11	individual 252:11,16 255:16,20 261:12
<hr/> H <hr/>	historical 275:15	imagine 293:14	including 256:8 257:3 272:20 280:17 321:6	inflation 252:20
half 297:18 309:11	hodgepodge 271:7	imbalance 258:1	inclusion 254:7	information 266:9,11,12 268:23 273:20
halfway 259:10	holding 264:5, 19	imbalanced 255:15 257:24		
hand 289:25 315:5	holiday 321:4	impact 260:20 281:7		
happen 314:15	holidays 321:6,7			
happy 311:15, 18 317:14	Honor 248:15			

274:21,22,23, 24 290:2 293:11 302:16 informs 303:7, 20 initial 318:12 initially 248:17 299:10 input 270:8 271:5,12,21 297:13 320:4 inputs 271:1 272:3,11,20,25 insert 267:3 inserted 264:3 267:1 292:1 inspect 295:3 instance 249:4 263:5 301:19 instances 253:23,25 intended 289:10 intending 293:12,14 interactions 259:13 311:19 interest 252:21 277:19,20 278:15 304:12, 13 interested 304:2 313:4 interests 304:8 Internet 267:14 273:13 280:19	283:11 interstate 251:25 255:25 256:5,6,7,15, 22 257:7,11 261:21,24 262:24 267:9 intervenor 301:8,19 intrastate 255:25 261:25 262:10,20 267:10 304:14 introduce 279:7,8 investing 253:4 investment 253:14 258:8 investments 258:6 investor 253:2 investor- required 252:23 investors 252:13 253:1 investors' 251:16 involved 297:5,8 involves 249:24 IP 267:2,6 issue 303:15 321:13,15	issues 251:15 277:8,16 279:5 299:25 314:18 319:11,12 <hr/> J <hr/> January 248:1, 4 Jetter 258:25 259:1,4 260:18 261:18 298:19, 21 300:21,22 304:24 305:1 307:15 313:17 314:6 316:20, 22 317:14,16, 19 318:20 319:9,19,23 320:2 321:3,9 Johansen 271:16,24 Johansen's 271:17 John 320:4 JONSSON 248:3,16,19 249:1 250:10, 14,17,21 258:22,25 260:14 261:17, 19,25 262:5,9, 14,17,19,23 263:2 265:1,4 270:4 279:1,10 284:6,10,13 285:24 286:3 287:6 298:8, 11,14,18 299:21 300:18, 21,23 301:2,9, 12,15 304:24 307:5,12 313:20 314:5, 7,11 316:21 317:3,8,15,18, 21,23 318:4,7, 10,17,23 319:2,5,7,14, 17,21,24 320:3,7,10,19 321:4,12 judges 304:20 judging 303:20 304:3 judgment 260:6 305:17 307:10 jump 284:23	307:12 313:20 314:5,7,11 316:21 317:3, 8,15,18,21,23 318:4,7,10,17, 23 319:2,5,7, 14,17,21,24 320:3,7,10,19 321:4,12 judge 248:3, 16,19 249:1 250:10,14,17, 21 258:22,25 260:14 261:17, 19,25 262:5,9, 14,17,19,23 263:2 265:1,4 270:4 279:1,10 284:6,10,13 285:24 286:3 287:6 298:8, 11,14,18 299:21 300:18, 21,23 301:2,9, 12,15 304:24 307:5,12 313:20 314:5, 7,11 316:21 317:3,8,15,18, 21,23 318:4,7, 10,17,23 319:2,5,7,14, 17,21,24 320:3,7,10,19 321:4,12 jurisdiction 255:25 256:6,7 257:8 262:16 jurisdictional 254:4 jurisdictions 261:24 262:13 justified 257:15 Justin 298:19 <hr/> K <hr/> Kansas 263:13 264:4,6,15 keeping 314:8 kind 271:6 292:1 298:22 318:1 Kira 317:24 knowledge 260:6 <hr/> L <hr/> language 266:2,15 280:1 282:11 283:5, 10 large 309:13 larger 276:18 largest 268:12 Lastly 257:23 law 268:7 281:6 layered 252:10
--	---	--	---

<p>left 269:18 300:4</p> <p>letter 259:6,9, 15</p> <p>level 275:9,10, 15 280:6 282:13 283:25 284:1 296:2 314:25</p> <p>leveled 296:20</p> <p>levels 275:12, 13,16 277:9,15 282:17 296:5 300:12</p> <p>leverage 253:19</p> <p>life 303:6,9 306:13,17 308:15,17,20 309:5,12,15, 18,25 310:2, 13,19,21,25 311:12 312:8</p> <p>limit 314:16 316:23,25 318:9</p> <p>limited 318:2</p> <p>lines 261:23 265:22 275:20</p> <p>list 316:10</p> <p>listed 273:25 285:12 286:4, 7,11 287:22 288:3,11</p> <p>literally 269:10</p> <p>lives 303:9,14 308:2,3</p>	<p>loan 270:18</p> <p>local 254:11, 16,18 261:4 273:12,22,24, 25 282:5 283:13 302:14</p> <p>logic 275:3</p> <p>long 254:22 320:12</p> <p>long-standing 252:8 254:17 255:7</p> <p>long-term 254:13,14 257:19 261:7</p> <p>looked 291:1 308:23 309:10</p> <p>lose 275:20</p> <p>loss 275:19</p> <p>lot 269:19 275:25 293:7 318:25</p> <p>loud 318:1</p> <p>low 252:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <hr/> <p>machine 316:1,7,15,16</p> <p>macroeconomy 252:19</p> <p>made 249:23 252:3 264:9 267:3 268:14 270:3 275:17, 21 276:2 298:8 306:14 308:6 309:16 313:13</p>	<p>314:22 316:6</p> <p>maintained 264:13</p> <p>maintains 299:8</p> <p>make 248:24 260:10,22 261:11,20 264:18 276:25 277:4 285:21 291:13 292:19 293:4 300:5 308:24 309:1, 2,9 312:10 316:20,25 317:14 318:17</p> <p>makes 257:12</p> <p>making 253:20 264:17 265:12 266:6 303:22 304:9,12</p> <p>managing 257:11</p> <p>manner 271:23 276:7 309:16</p> <p>manual 268:22 294:1,4,9</p> <p>March 294:23</p> <p>marked 291:14,17</p> <p>market 253:10</p> <p>marketing 270:1,7,15 273:8 274:7</p> <p>markets 253:12,15</p> <p>match 308:3 311:4</p>	<p>materials 275:2,9 295:22,25 296:1,6,11,20 314:21 315:1,7</p> <p>matter 248:8 249:13 288:18 321:23</p> <p>means 282:5 309:18</p> <p>measured 252:17</p> <p>member 257:21,22 258:4 303:1 307:20</p> <p>member's 303:17</p> <p>members 251:14 257:21 302:14,15,23 303:3 305:3,22 306:4 307:17, 21,22 308:10 310:23 311:7, 8,16,19 312:22 313:24</p> <p>men 312:6</p> <p>mentioned 299:1 301:5 307:13 314:12</p> <p>Meredith 301:14,15,18, 24 304:22 305:2</p> <p>method 302:20,24 303:3,12,14,17 305:9,13,15,25 306:22,23</p>	<p>307:2,3,6,8 310:17,18 312:11,12</p> <p>methodologies 255:3</p> <p>methodology 255:7 276:16 299:17</p> <p>methods 287:18 304:17 306:5 312:18, 25 313:24</p> <p>Michele 279:9</p> <p>middle 291:10</p> <p>migration 267:12 299:3, 9,14</p> <p>million 267:24 280:9</p> <p>mind 317:13</p> <p>mine 276:16</p> <p>minimize 253:2</p> <p>minute 291:17</p> <p>minutes 284:8, 11 318:3,6</p> <p>miscellaneous 271:18</p> <p>missed 321:18</p> <p>mistake 299:24 300:2</p> <p>misunderstand ing 264:19</p> <p>mitigate 280:3 281:7 283:23</p> <p>model 252:18</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>modern 252:7, 12,25 254:23</p> <p>modifications 303:5</p> <p>money 251:13 255:17 257:25</p> <p>monopoly 254:18</p> <p>monthly 288:12,23</p> <p>months 264:21</p> <p>monumental 303:22</p> <p>Moore 248:13, 15,17,20 249:2,8 250:22 258:20 260:15, 17 261:15 263:3,9 267:17 278:20 279:2, 16 284:4 298:7 299:19,23 300:16,25 313:19 317:6, 20,22 319:15 321:10</p> <p>morning 248:3, 5 284:17,18 301:24,25 302:12 305:3</p> <p>motion 305:16</p> <p>Mount 306:24</p> <p>mouth 248:21</p> <p>move 250:12 303:16</p> <p>multiple 256:7 272:25</p>	<p>multiplied 288:16</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>narrative 269:19</p> <p>nature 316:5</p> <p>NECA 256:3 257:1,10 261:22</p> <p>NECA'S 257:2, 4</p> <p>necessarily 274:19 319:3</p> <p>needed 303:5 314:23 315:15</p> <p>negative 281:7</p> <p>net 272:6 286:11,12,16 287:10,11,17 289:3,6 297:22</p> <p>neutral 282:24 283:9</p> <p>night 301:3</p> <p>nondiscriminat ory 282:23 283:8</p> <p>nonreg 270:2, 21</p> <p>nonregulated 267:5,6 268:16 270:13,17,24 273:12 279:19, 23 280:3,18,20 281:1,2 283:11,14 287:19</p>	<p>nonworking 293:18</p> <p>normalized 315:7,19</p> <p>not-so-far 276:20</p> <p>notify 293:3</p> <p>notion 261:7</p> <p>number 268:20,22 270:9 271:21, 25 272:6,21 273:2 274:11 285:24 286:16 288:8 289:3 291:5 297:5 306:20 312:13</p> <p>numbers 249:24 285:14, 15 288:4</p> <p>numerous 269:23</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <hr/> <p>oath 301:16</p> <p>object 279:6</p> <p>objection 272:15</p> <p>observations 252:4</p> <p>observes 304:12</p> <p>occur 276:1 277:7</p> <p>occurs 277:6 279:8</p>	<p>OCS 255:12,21 256:14 259:6 264:10 266:1, 7,15 268:1 269:4,18 278:21 279:7, 22 280:2,7,10, 22 282:13,16 283:6,22,25 285:5,25 300:11</p> <p>OCS'S 258:10 268:3</p> <p>odd 311:10</p> <p>offer 257:6</p> <p>offering 257:8</p> <p>offers 273:10</p> <p>office 248:12, 23,24 249:2,4, 12 251:6 263:3,5 279:9 294:21,22,23 295:13,14 301:1 307:9 315:18 316:4 319:13</p> <p>officer 269:25 270:11 271:16, 20</p> <p>official 300:3</p> <p>offsetting 254:10</p> <p>ongoing 261:3</p> <p>open 274:15, 17 290:10,19, 20,21,22,24 292:3</p> <p>opened 290:25</p>	<p>opening 259:17 299:1</p> <p>operating 283:2 286:7 289:5,6 302:15</p> <p>operation 253:11 270:2 280:18 282:22</p> <p>operational 302:16</p> <p>operations 268:15,16 270:21 273:4,9 274:5 279:19, 24,25 280:4,5, 25 281:1,2,3 283:12,13,15, 18,19,21 303:23 308:1</p> <p>opinion 268:14 274:3</p> <p>opportunity 248:12 318:14, 15</p> <p>opposed 276:15 277:5, 20 299:14</p> <p>opposite 257:18</p> <p>opted 270:25</p> <p>oral 318:2</p> <p>order 277:24 301:8 305:16 316:12 320:6 321:13</p> <p>original 294:5 297:19 299:5</p> <p>originally</p>
---	--	---	--	---

254:18 267:14 294:6	249:23	270:1,2,12,13, 16,20,21,23,24	298:1 303:10 306:13 308:1,2	potentially 260:1
Ostrander 263:3,4,12 278:21 279:4, 6,13,16 281:13 284:4,17	parameters 259:10	273:7 274:4,6, 7 275:1,4,14 284:25 286:17 297:19	play 267:1,4 273:10,23 274:1	practice 252:8 255:8 264:6, 14,20
outcome 261:13	Part 268:9,10, 21 281:20 282:1 303:4	perfectly 311:23	pleasure 248:18	practiced 264:4
outset 284:19	participant 304:6	period 263:25 275:21 296:9, 10 320:3	point 248:11 274:21 301:7 315:4,9,20	practices 254:22 268:8 281:6 307:17 312:23
over-recover 296:3	participate 295:12,16	permanently 277:3	points 302:10	pre 263:17
over-recovering 315:4	parties 301:5 304:2,10,11 313:4 314:14, 17,21 317:1 318:13,14 320:20	permit 264:6, 14,20	policies 279:6, 8	pre-filed 251:6
overhead 268:13,19 271:4,6 272:4, 11,17,22 280:17,24,25	party 316:18	pertain 254:11	policy 261:3,7 279:2,5 303:25 304:10	precedent 271:11 278:3
overheads 266:9	party's 317:5	phone 271:18 282:5	pool 256:3 257:3 270:14, 18 271:20	precision 304:16
owned 254:15	past 272:25 303:21,22	piece 249:22 316:6	pooling 257:10	prefer 301:5
owners 258:4	pay 255:17 257:25 258:3 305:20	pivot 274:14, 15 290:6,21,22 291:9 292:1,7, 8,9,18,19 293:14,15,18, 25	pools 257:5 265:16 269:14, 24 270:4,7,10, 11	preference 301:6
<hr/> P <hr/>	payers 305:19	place 264:3	portfolio 252:7,13,14,25 254:23	premium 254:7
p.m. 321:24	payroll 272:6, 20 274:6 287:22,23 289:6,11,12 297:17	placement 275:7,11	portion 251:17, 21,25 255:11 256:5	prepared 251:1 267:18,21
package 274:1	PDF 268:24 294:3	plainly 307:5	position 299:6 315:24	preparing 293:1
pages 268:24, 25 269:1 285:20 317:17, 20 318:21 319:1	pending 264:21	plan 275:1,9,11 277:4 284:11	possibility 314:22	prescribed 303:4 314:1
paid 257:19	percent 250:8, 9 251:22 254:24 255:10 256:16 258:4 262:7,19	plant 272:6 286:11,12,16 287:10,11,17 289:3,16,19 295:4 297:17, 21,22,23,25	possibly 276:1	prescribes 310:18
paper 266:5,19			post-hearing 314:13	present 248:13 312:18
parallels				presented 249:15 250:23

251:15 260:23 278:25 279:3 299:25 302:24	process 292:25 303:11 304:1,10,12,15	proposes 268:1,6	320:15	rate 250:3 251:7,10,14,25 252:2,5,10 253:7,19,20 254:17,20,25 255:24 256:2, 12,13,15,16, 18,19,21 257:14,23 258:10,14,17 261:21 262:10 275:2 278:9,13 285:2 302:21 305:19 314:23 315:2,10 320:8
presently 264:5	profitably 253:15	proposing 274:25 276:10	push 320:25	
presents 252:5	projected 309:8	prospective 303:18	put 250:6 260:4 262:3 292:21 308:14 320:22,23 321:15	
presorted 269:14	projection 275:18,23	protracted 317:10	puts 250:5	
pretty 316:10	projections 275:24	provide 254:20 265:23 266:8 269:6 277:23 293:12,14 297:8 302:16 304:2	<hr/> Q <hr/>	
prevent 281:1	projector 284:8	provided 266:4,18 268:20 269:8 271:11 273:20 274:14 280:19 294:6	question 251:18,24 260:19 262:17 279:17 282:4, 21 286:24 293:24 298:14 299:7,19 300:3 307:16 310:11 313:23 315:12	
previously 264:4 301:20 302:8	projects 275:19	provider 283:2	questions 250:23 258:23 259:1 260:11 261:16 267:18 278:23 279:4, 14 287:3 298:17,23 300:17 305:2 313:18,19	rates 252:21 254:5,17 260:21,25 261:3 314:1
pricing 252:18	promote 282:7 283:7	providing 282:25		rationalize 274:5 273:15
principles 252:7 253:11 259:22 304:14	promoted 273:24	provoking 320:18		reaction 258:1
printed 291:18	proper 256:14	prudence 303:21		read 251:3 259:8 260:18 266:23 300:9
prior 278:23 295:4 299:7	properly 258:11 281:12	prudent 313:14	quick 260:15	reading 259:14 263:23
problem 277:7 298:4	proposal 304:7 310:18 318:18	public 250:1 264:14 269:25 270:6,14 273:8,16 296:8,12,21 304:11,13 313:25	quickly 279:5	reads 259:10 282:4,21 300:6
problems 269:22 275:24	proposals 302:21	provoking 320:18	quote 256:1 303:8	ready 248:14 250:11 321:17
procedure 313:5	propose 268:12 277:18 316:19	prudence 303:21	<hr/> R <hr/>	realize 308:16, 21
procedures 268:11 308:9	proposed 252:5 259:12 267:15 275:18 280:2,8,11,22 281:5,11 283:22 299:10 302:19 303:12 304:10 307:8	prudent 313:14	raise 254:17	reallocate 286:17
proceeding 248:11 271:14 302:21,23 306:16 311:22 313:11		punch 292:2	range 260:2	reason 264:17 265:20 266:6 270:25 273:1
proceedings 253:20 260:23 321:23		purposes 273:14 310:8	ratcheted 274:7	

reasonable 256:20 259:25 260:3,21 275:15 276:7, 8,13 277:21 308:24,25 309:9 311:23 321:9	283:25 284:2 319:15	314:5,6	regulators 254:13	remains 276:21
reasonableness 273:17	recommendations 255:6 258:10 262:6 268:4 304:3	redirect 260:14,16 287:8 298:18 299:22 313:20, 21,23	regulatory 249:12 252:8 253:22,24 254:22 255:8 263:24 264:13 268:7 271:12, 14 281:6	remove 268:2 275:17 276:9
rebuttal 249:17 250:12 251:4 274:13 297:15 320:1	recommendations 252:4 253:25 255:5 257:24 304:20	reduce 280:8	rejected 253:8 254:1 255:19 259:18,22,23	removed 275:14
recalculation 310:22	recommended 254:24 256:17 258:14,17 260:7,8	reduced 282:13 284:1	reference 249:25 258:5	removing 275:3 280:10, 12
recall 292:15 311:21	recommending 261:21 297:22	refers 256:18	reference 307:12 314:22	renewed 264:6,21
recalled 301:19	recommends 255:9,12,21 282:14 303:2, 25	reflect 267:3 275:14 303:9 304:4 305:15 306:13	relate 266:8	repaired 316:1
receive 277:9, 14 278:13 292:12 294:14 313:7,15	record 248:3, 18,25 251:3 263:10 284:14 300:3 302:2 316:9 320:13	reflected 296:7,12	related 249:19 251:5 264:1,11 266:3,9,17 267:12 268:13 271:9,25 276:18 281:11, 16,19,25 282:15	repeat 261:5 319:3
received 290:13,14,16 291:22,23,25 292:23 293:8, 19,25 294:3	recording 277:3	regard 272:2 278:22 295:22 297:11	relates 266:7	replacement 292:23
recent 255:1 258:15 272:12 275:5	records 270:9 271:5,13,22,25 272:7,8,21 273:2 288:2,8, 10,12,17 295:4 297:12,17,20	regular 302:17	relations 269:25 270:6, 14 273:8,16	reply 279:4 317:5,16,22,23 318:6,13,21 320:24 321:7
recess 284:12	recover 275:12 280:14	regulated 267:4 268:15 270:2,13,16, 21,23 273:4,8, 11 274:4 279:25 280:4, 17,21,25 281:2 283:12,14,19 287:19 302:15	relationship 272:2	report 252:2 256:2,4,11 257:2 296:7,13
recognize 278:15,16	recovery 276:23 282:8, 15,19 300:14	regulation 271:3	relevant 260:24 261:23	REPORTER 291:15
recognizing 253:9,17 254:8	recross 261:17	regulations 303:5	rely 255:4	reports 296:16, 17
recommend 258:16 280:6			relying 288:21	representation 307:11
			remain 301:15	representative 288:20
			remainder 263:25	representative s 270:19 274:2
			remaining 266:2 270:14, 18 309:13	represented 292:18 293:4
				representing 248:23 292:9

<p>302:3,4</p> <p>request 258:7 266:4,7,8,18 269:4 284:21 314:17 316:20</p> <p>requested 253:7 255:15</p> <p>requesting 268:2</p> <p>required 251:16 260:22 264:7 293:10</p> <p>requirement 251:11 269:17</p> <p>requires 255:23 256:14</p> <p>reserve 318:5</p> <p>residual 280:13</p> <p>resolve 302:25</p> <p>Resources 265:10</p> <p>respect 299:6</p> <p>respond 279:13 317:1 318:15</p> <p>responded 300:4</p> <p>response 292:22 316:24, 25</p> <p>responses 266:4,18</p> <p>rests 301:1</p> <p>result 297:18 306:20 312:13</p>	<p>results 253:6 257:17 280:13</p> <p>retail 280:19</p> <p>return 250:3,7 251:7,14,17,25 252:2,5,11,23 253:7,20 254:6,21,24,25 255:24 256:2, 4,12,13,15,16, 17,18,20,21 257:14,23 258:4,10,14, 15,17 261:21 262:24,25 278:9,13,14 285:2,3</p> <p>returns 253:16 258:6</p> <p>revenue 251:11 286:5</p> <p>revenues 265:20 272:5, 11,13,15,16,25 275:25 283:19 285:12,22 286:4</p> <p>review 296:17 307:23</p> <p>reviewed 249:14 263:14 308:1,2 313:10,11</p> <p>reviews 296:15</p> <p>revise 280:23</p> <p>revised 263:22 265:1 284:20</p> <p>revision 275:22</p>	<p>risk 252:6,11, 14,15,17,24,25 253:5,9</p> <p>risks 252:16 253:2,3,18 254:9</p> <p>road 314:23 315:8,16,17,20</p> <p>role 257:1</p> <p>Roman 303:20</p> <p>round 317:11</p> <p>rule 253:3 255:23 256:1, 10,12,14,18 257:1 259:11, 12,18,22 260:20 261:14 304:9,12</p> <p>rule-making 304:1 313:5</p> <p>rules 268:10 281:21 282:1</p> <p>runs 250:7</p> <p>rural 256:22 257:2 260:1 302:4,12 305:20</p> <p>RUS 254:14</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>sake 284:24</p> <p>salaries 271:17</p> <p>satisfied 279:17 282:9, 13 283:3,25</p> <p>scenario</p>	<p>306:21 312:1</p> <p>schedule 285:6,8,13 286:1 291:25 305:7 308:8 311:3 321:14</p> <p>scheduling 320:14 321:13</p> <p>screen 291:19</p> <p>search 253:23</p> <p>seat 294:2</p> <p>section 268:8 281:12,16,21 282:2,4,6,21</p> <p>sectors 254:5</p> <p>seek 254:5</p> <p>seeking 254:6 267:25</p> <p>seeks 251:11, 13 267:22</p> <p>select 292:3 297:25</p> <p>selected 297:23,25</p> <p>selects 256:4</p> <p>semantics 310:10</p> <p>sending 279:6</p> <p>sense 273:17 278:16</p> <p>sensitive 257:5,9</p> <p>sensitivity 252:19</p> <p>sentence</p>	<p>259:9 260:18, 19 261:9 264:1,11 265:18,21,25 266:1 300:9</p> <p>sentences 300:8</p> <p>separate 256:19</p> <p>separations 250:4,6</p> <p>series 298:23</p> <p>serve 279:19 304:13</p> <p>serves 304:11</p> <p>service 248:10, 24 251:9 255:1 258:13 267:5,6 270:19 273:11, 12,22,23,24,25 274:2 280:19 282:5,16,20 296:8,12 300:15 303:6, 19 305:11,19, 20 306:1,16 308:2,3,15,17, 20,21 309:12, 14,18 310:2, 12,19,21,25 312:8 314:1</p> <p>services 248:12,23 249:5,13 251:6 256:8,9,16,22 257:7,9 258:9 263:6 267:5 273:12,17 280:18,21 282:8 295:13</p>
---	---	--	---	--

services.' 282:6	skewing 316:8	314:17	stated 302:1	304:5
set 248:7 284:8 314:24 315:6 318:8 319:21 320:15	skip 302:2	spends 271:24	statement 259:17 279:13 299:1	structures 260:2
setting 260:20 261:3,7	slash 270:6	spoke 301:2	states 282:5,7, 22	studies 308:7
shared 286:17	Slawson 258:22,23 284:6,7,14,16 286:1,4 287:10 291:13,16 298:16 300:18, 20 301:5,7,11, 13,23 304:22 313:20,22 314:4,10 317:24,25 318:5,8,11,19, 21,24 319:4,6, 11,16 320:8, 11,14 321:2, 11,21	spread 252:21	statewide 257:24	study 307:19, 21
shift 280:24	slightly 250:4	spreadsheet 274:14 290:24 291:10 292:10, 13 294:8,21	statutory 280:1 282:11 283:5, 10	subject 251:7 305:12
short 298:23	small 254:7 256:5 299:13	spreadsheets 266:4,17 269:2,7,9,11, 12	stipulation 278:1,3	submit 278:20
shorter 316:25	smaller 299:10	square 291:10	stock 252:24	submitted 264:7,23 268:23
show 269:14 271:12 285:2	solution 311:14	staff 320:4	stocks 252:25	subscriber 276:18
showed 269:2 300:3	solutions 272:14	stand 301:14	stop 277:13	subsequently 269:4 274:22
shown 250:8	sort 315:13,25	stand-alone 273:22	stopped 277:3	subsidization 280:3 281:8, 11,16,20,25
sign 288:11	sought 257:14	standard 255:2,6	stopping 277:1	subsidizations 281:2
significant 268:16 275:6	speak 308:7	standing 254:22	straight 305:4 306:19,23 307:2,8 312:14	subsidize 279:19 283:17, 20
significantly 275:5	special 256:8 257:5,6,9	standpoint 273:18	straight-line 303:12	subsidized 254:13,14 279:24 280:20 283:12
similar 276:11	specific 252:15 253:18 254:9 256:13 257:15 273:21 277:24	start 263:22	strange 308:19	subsidizing 268:15
simplicity 273:14	specifically 254:6 273:24	starts 265:18, 19	stricken 264:2, 12,16 265:7, 10,19	subsidy 254:12
simply 279:3		state 249:9 251:17,21 252:20 253:20, 22,24 254:1, 12,22 255:1,11 262:16 263:10 264:15 265:22, 23 268:7 278:21 281:5 283:2 285:2,3	strike 267:2	substantial 254:10
Sinai 306:24			striking 265:21	substantially 257:20 299:9
single 270:8 271:5,8,12,21 272:13 273:1,3 276:4 297:12 303:12 305:4 306:19 312:14 316:16			structure 251:20 252:21 255:10,13,14, 15,19 260:7 261:8 277:22	
situation 309:5				

<p>substantive 281:1</p> <p>suddenly 308:21</p> <p>sufficiently 280:3 283:23</p> <p>suggested 258:3</p> <p>suggesting 292:12</p> <p>suggestion 317:15</p> <p>summary 251:1 258:18 267:21 278:19 289:25 290:25 302:6,7 304:21 305:17 313:2</p> <p>supplies 275:2,10 295:22,25 296:1,6,11,20 314:21 315:1,8</p> <p>support 248:10 305:11,20 317:6</p> <p>supported 268:21</p> <p>supporting 269:5,21</p> <p>supportive 299:14</p> <p>supposed 293:6,7</p> <p>surprise 290:15,17 294:7,19 297:6</p>	<p>surrebuttal 249:17 250:18 251:5 263:18 267:8 289:24</p> <p>surrounding 256:25</p> <p>SW 263:12</p> <p>switched 256:9</p> <p>sworn 249:5 263:6 301:20</p> <p>synchronizatio n 277:19,21,25</p> <p>synchronizatio ns 278:15</p> <p>synchronize 276:3</p> <p>systematic 252:14,17,25</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>table 250:3,4 265:5 274:15, 16 285:9 290:6,21,22 291:9 292:1,7, 8,9,18,19 293:14,15,18, 25</p> <p>tablets 306:24</p> <p>takes 284:8</p> <p>talk 285:13 289:23 308:12 313:4</p> <p>talked 271:15 289:25</p> <p>talking 292:24 310:10 314:19</p>	<p>talks 306:15</p> <p>tariffs 257:11</p> <p>task 304:5,6 313:5</p> <p>taxes 286:10</p> <p>technical 248:5</p> <p>technically 310:6</p> <p>technologically 282:23 283:8</p> <p>Telcom 251:14</p> <p>Telecom 248:9 268:9 279:20 281:17 302:5, 13</p> <p>telecommunica tion 283:2</p> <p>telecommunica tions 271:3</p> <p>telecoms 297:7</p> <p>telephone 256:23 257:2 258:13 260:1 261:4,8 275:1, 9 277:25 282:8,15,20 300:15 305:19, 20</p> <p>temporarily 277:1</p> <p>term 252:20</p> <p>test 263:17 275:20</p> <p>testified 248:22 249:6</p>	<p>263:7 284:24 287:11,20 289:2 290:2 294:3 301:21 310:13 313:24</p> <p>testify 305:24 306:4</p> <p>testifying 291:23</p> <p>testimonies 251:5 252:3 256:17</p> <p>testimony 249:15,18,20, 22 250:2,24 251:1 254:23 263:15,18,21, 23 266:5,18 267:11,19,21 268:6 279:8 281:4,10,13, 15,17,19,22,24 282:3 285:5,10 289:24 291:22 292:22,25 293:1,13,16,21 295:5,15 297:15 299:24 302:7 305:10, 18 314:9</p> <p>theory 252:7, 13 253:1 254:23</p> <p>thing 265:22 276:25</p> <p>things 292:3 314:21 315:8 320:20</p> <p>thinking 317:3 318:1,11</p>	<p>Thirty 319:7</p> <p>thought 317:24 318:6</p> <p>thousands 269:10 290:1</p> <p>time 248:7 257:20 260:25 264:20 269:2 271:24 274:21 302:23 307:25 317:11 319:19</p> <p>timely 309:16</p> <p>Title 260:21</p> <p>today 248:4 289:25 293:17 314:9 315:6 320:22</p> <p>toes 314:8</p> <p>top 252:10</p> <p>Topeka 263:13</p> <p>total 262:11 265:19 267:24 280:8 318:8</p> <p>touch 290:3</p> <p>traffic 257:4,9</p> <p>traffic- sensitive 257:7</p> <p>Trail 263:13</p> <p>transaction 268:10 281:21</p> <p>transcript 319:20,22,25 321:13</p> <p>transcript's 320:12</p>
--	---	--	---	--

transcripts 320:16 321:1	underlie 253:11	unsystematic 252:15 253:2	268:1,3,5 273:5 275:13 277:6,10,15 278:10,14 279:18,23 280:5,8,11,12, 15 282:7,10, 13,22 283:4,7, 9,16,18,25 284:1,21 295:24 296:3 313:7 314:24 315:6,10	<hr/> W <hr/>
transfer 251:13	underlying 269:1 288:7 292:8	unusually 275:13		wanted 284:19 303:24
travel 271:17, 18	undermine 283:16	updated 274:23		warm 284:8
trial 286:13	understand 261:20	urge 304:19		warrant 280:5 283:24
triple 266:25 267:4 273:9,23 274:1	understanding 259:21 278:22 299:2,8	urges 304:3		ways 268:22
true 311:24 315:17	understood 278:24	URTA 301:8, 13,20 302:4, 10,13,15,18,23 303:1,2,17,25 304:3,12,21 305:3 306:4 307:17,20,21, 22 308:10 310:23 311:7, 8,16,19 312:22 313:24	<hr/> V <hr/>	Wednesday 248:4
true-up 275:22 315:15	uniform 303:25	URTA'S 302:6 305:22	variability 259:11	week 321:8
turn 285:5	uniformity 313:3	USF 302:20	varied 269:23 271:6	weekends 321:6
turned 291:16	unilaterally 321:14	Utah 248:10 251:8,13 257:24 258:2 268:9,17 271:11 277:24 279:17 281:12 282:4,6,21 302:4,12,15,20 303:7,19 305:14,20 306:15	vary 305:12,20	weeks 320:25 321:5
TV 267:2,3,6, 13 273:13	uninterrupted 264:14	utilities 254:5 296:21	varying 312:23	weighted 250:3,7 251:17,21,25 255:11,24 262:13 297:17
Twenty-five 319:7	unique 305:6	utility 260:1	vast 271:2	whims 305:21
type 254:1 273:19 308:24	unit 273:1 310:12,15,20 312:3,5	UUSF 255:17 257:25 258:12, 13 267:23,24	version 290:13 291:8 294:15, 21	withdraw 257:4 276:9
types 271:10 312:23	units 310:7 311:1		versus 251:19 316:15	withdrawing 267:12
<hr/> U <hr/>	universal 248:10 251:8 255:1 305:11 306:1		varying 312:23	whims 305:21
Uh-huh 259:20 260:13 262:18 299:21 300:7 301:12	unquote 303:10		vast 271:2	withdrawn 267:15,16 299:3,5
ultimately 303:16,24	unreasonable 309:2		version 290:13 291:8 294:15, 21	witnessed 304:6
uncertain 299:15	unrelated 310:4		view 258:6 315:24 316:4, 12	witnesses 278:25
under- recovering 315:9			viewed 315:23	wondered 295:19
			violation 268:17 279:25 283:10	wondering 320:14
			visit 295:3	

Woolsey 298:8	yields 252:22	
Woolsey's 297:15 299:12, 17		
word 266:20, 25 267:2,9 285:22 300:4, 10 318:16		
words 248:21 250:19 265:25 266:25		
work 266:5,19 292:19 293:15 295:9		
working 290:9 294:15		
works 320:2		
worlds 278:12		
worth 314:16		
worthwhile 316:24		
written 250:23 263:15,17,18 269:9		
<hr/>		
Y		
<hr/>		
year 272:19 275:18 308:15 311:3,12 312:2,13		
years 275:5,20 276:2,5,6,22, 24 308:17,18 311:3 315:3		
yesterday 248:21 249:24 250:6		